

Fall 12-1-2015

ASSESSING THE SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACT OF SPECIAL EVENTS IN THE CONTEXT OF GERMANFEST IN NEBRASKA, USA

Yanli Wang

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, yanliwangz@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nutritiondiss>

 Part of the [Civic and Community Engagement Commons](#), [International and Community Nutrition Commons](#), [Other Food Science Commons](#), and the [Other Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Wang, Yanli, "ASSESSING THE SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACT OF SPECIAL EVENTS IN THE CONTEXT OF GERMANFEST IN NEBRASKA, USA" (2015). *Nutrition & Health Sciences Dissertations & Theses*. 60.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/nutritiondiss/60>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Nutrition and Health Sciences, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Nutrition & Health Sciences Dissertations & Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

**ASSESSING THE SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACT OF SPECIAL
EVENTS IN THE CONTEXT OF GERMANFEST IN NEBRASKA,
USA.**

By

Yanli Wang

A THESIS

**Presented to the Faculty of
The Graduate College at University of Nebraska
In partial Fulfillment of Requirements
For the Degree of Master of Science**

Major: Nutrition and Health Sciences

Under the Supervision of Professor Fayrene L. Hamouz

Lincoln, Nebraska

December, 2015

ASSESSING THE SOCIOCULTURAL IMPACT OF GERMANFEST IN THE CONTEXT OF GERMANFEST IN NEBRASKA, USA.

Yanli Wang M.S.

University of Nebraska, 2015

Advisor: Fayrene L. Hamouz

The present study examined the sociocultural impact of special events based on the cultural festival of GermanFest in Syracuse, Nebraska. A total of 143 (71.5%) local residents responded to the self-administered survey. The dimensions of the sociocultural impact, the important reasons for celebrating the festival, the relationship among festival stakeholders, the levels of community involvement, and the improvement of the quality of life in the community as impacts of the festival and demographic information were investigated separately.

The Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale (FSIAS) was utilized to identify the dimensions of the sociocultural impact of GermanFest. Three dimensions were identified by the exploratory factor analysis: social costs, cultural life benefits, and community benefits. The means of the sociocultural impact statements indicated the residents' attitudes toward the festival. For example, residents agreed that the festival increased their pride in the community (mean=4.38) and enhanced the community's cultural identity (mean=4.31). Frequency descriptive statistics results indicated that the important reason for the city celebrates such a festival was attracting visitors and investment (mean=3.99); general cooperation was the main relationship among festival stakeholders (45.5% of the respondents indicated it); the local residents were somewhat actively involved in the festival (39.9% of the respondents indicated it); and the quality of residents' lives in the community was improved by the festival, for example, the

activities of daily living such as volunteer activities were improved by the festival (mean=2.73). The findings of this study have sociocultural, economic and environmental implications in benefitting residents and communities in future community festival planning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to my master thesis supervisor: Dr. Fayrene L. Hamouz for her time, patience and understanding through the excellent guidance and feedback. It had been an honor to work with you.

I would also like to express my sincerest gratitude to Dr. Carr, Dr. Causin, and Dr. Schnepf for the guidance and inspiration throughout this study. I want to thank Joan Kunzman as well for her help and patience in the past two years.

In addition, special thank you to Carolyn Gigstad from the Syracuse Area Chamber of Commerce for helping me with my questionnaire, and the good people in Syracuse.

My gratitude also goes to my friend, Leanna Meyer were there to help no matter time or day of the week and I really appreciate it.

I also would like to thank Debra Miller and Weldon Smith in the Nebraska Evaluation and Research Center for their help and guidance in my methodology part of this project.

Finally, the most special appreciate goes to my families who gave me the unconditional support and love. For my husband, Jingfeng Song, without his support and encouragement I cannot complete my project possible. Thank you to my son, Raymond, for his intelligence, loveliness and obedience. I thank my parents and in-laws for being supportive of me in pursuing my dream of higher education.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement	3
Research Problem.....	4
Research Objectives	5
Research Questions	5
Definition of Terms	5
Limitations of the Study	6
Significance of the Study	6
CHAPTER II.....	8
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
Definition of Terms	8
Sociocultural Impact	12
Stakeholders and Quality of Life	15
Social Exchange Theory and Community Involvement	19
Sociocultural Impact Measurement Scales.....	20
CHAPTER III	26
METHODOLOGY	26
The Description of GermanFest	26
Study Design	26
Study Population and Sample	27
Data Collection.....	28
Instrument.....	28
Study Procedure	30
Data Analysis	32
CHAPTER IV	35
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	35
Background of the Respondents.....	35
Sociocultural Impact Means.....	38

Sociocultural Impact Dimensions	40
Important Reasons for Celebrating the Festival	49
Relationship among the Festival Stakeholders.....	51
Levels of Involvement of Residents in the Festival	52
Improvement of the Quality of Life of the Community Residents	54
CHAPTER V	56
CONCLUSION	56
Conclusions	56
Recommendations	59
REFERENCES	60
APPENDIX A.....	68
APPENDIX B	69
APPENDIX C	74

List of Tables

Table 2.1 A List of Social Impact Factors	13
Table 2.2 Factor Items in the Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale (FSIAS)	22
Table 3.1 GermanFest Profile	26
Table 4.1 The Descriptive Frequency Distribution of the Demographic Information	35
Table 4.2 The Means of Sociocultural Impact Statements from Highest to Lowest	38
Table 4.3 The Communalities and Factor Loadings for the Dimensions of Sociocultural Impact of GermanFest.....	43
Table 4.4 Total Variance Explained for the Dimensions of Sociocultural Impact	45
Table 4.5 The Descriptive Statistics for the Important Reasons for Celebrating the GermanFest	49
Table 4.6 The Descriptive Frequency Distribution of the Relationship Among the Festival Stakeholders	51
Table 4.7 The Descriptive Frequency Distribution of Levels of Involvement of Residents in the Festival	53
Table 4.8 The Descriptive Statistics for the Improved Extent of the Quality of Life of the Community	54

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Tourism has been one of the largest global industries in the last 50 years (Coccossis & Parpaires, 1995). It is identified as the major contributor in the development of many countries. Specifically, tourism has contributed greatly to providing foreign exchange, enhanced local economies, community pride, awareness, and improved development of public services (Hassan, 2000; Long et al., 1990). According to figures from the World Tourism Organization, one billion travelers have been involved in the tourism industry as of 2010, and it has been predicted that number will grow up to 1.56 billion tourists by the year 2020 across the world (WTO, 2011). With its growth, many allied fields are also being stimulated within the tourism industry, one of them is special events.

Special events are temporal phenomena and its programs are arranged or scheduled in detail or well publicized in advance (Getz, 2007). These events are usually confined to particular locations, specific audiences, or other unique attributes. The meaning of specialness about an event is the quality of being particular and pertaining to a subjective interpretation by either the organizer or the visitor. To the customer or guest, a special event is an opportunity for an experience beyond the normal range of daily life choices (Getz, 2007). Nowadays, the link between tourism and events have expanded rapidly (Higham & Hinch, 2002), and many forms of special events have emerged. The growth of special events in numbers, diversity, and popularity has contributed to the parallel increase in festivals, which are organized temporarily at one location by a small group of persons (Gursoy, et al. 2004; Herrero et al. 2011).

Festivals are an important field within event tourism industry, and have increased tremendously in the past decades and become one of the fastest growing sectors. Getz (2005) defined festivals as themed public celebrations which were held regularly and annually in the same location or held periodically in different locations. Festivals provide unique opportunities for visitors to participate in a distinct experience from everyday life (Getz and Frisby, 1988). Festival organizers celebrate their culture and lifestyle, while they share a variety of experiences with local and outside visitors. At the same time, festivals help enhance and preserve local cultures, especially when festivals become local traditions after many years of celebration (Yolal, Cetinel, & Uysal, 2009). They provide an appropriate and periodic time for people to come together and have fun. Nowadays, large cities and small communities both have venues and facilities to promote various festivals each year. Festivals have increased dramatically in numbers, also including size, number of visitors, and stakeholders over the past few years and still continue to do so (Yolal et al. 2009; Herrero et al. 2011).

There are different types of festivals, one type is the cultural festival. Cultural festivals are an essential category of festivals. Festivals that focus on culture or ethnicity typically seek to teach members or visitors about their traditions. Elders often share stories and provide experiences that bring families and communities together. A cultural festival may be described as a specific event within the cultural domain, which shares the cultural production, experience, and wealth of places where these events are organized with locals and visitors (Herrero et al. 2011; Yolal & Uysal, 2009). Meanwhile, it is usually assumed that cities provide cultural festivals not only help revitalize the local community, but also reinforce the identity, image, and quality of life (Getz, 2008; Uysal

& Li, 2008). According to Mckercher and Hilary (2000), tourism sectors and organizations have reported that between 35 to 70 percent of tourists can be categorized as cultural tourists. Therefore, cultural festivals have attracted the attention of both festival organizers and tourists, and it is definite that the scope and variety of cultural festivals will keep evolving (Delamere et al, 2001).

The rapid growth of festivals has brought physical improvements to the host community. For example, added infrastructure through improvement such as new facilities and venues, renewed city image, enhanced sense of community pride and involvement, and enriched cultural activities. In addition, the nature of a festival and improvements going along with festival's development may create sociocultural impacts on the community and residents (Yolal et al. 2009). The sociocultural impact of festivals results from the interaction between "hosts", or local people, and "guests", or tourists (Smith, 1995), and can be regarded as changes in customs, lifestyles, values, cultural and social activities. These changes may encourage the level of community support and involvement in the festival, as well as result in community dissatisfaction and rejection. Therefore, it is important to understand the sociocultural impact of festivals to a host community.

Problem Statement

Numerous researchers (Gratton et al. 2000; Crompton & McKay, 1994; Crompton, Lee & Shuster, 2001; Walo, Bull & Breen, 1996) focused their studies on the economic impact of festivals over the past few years. However, Getz (2005) mentioned that festivals produced various impacts and it was not sufficient to study the economic impact only. Bagiran & Kurgun (2011) also suggested that other impacts like the sociocultural

impact may have an even more profound effect on the community than economic impacts. In addition, with the advent of the “triple bottom line” including the economic impact, social impact and environmental impact (Fredline, Jago, & Deery, 2005), a growing interest in sociocultural impact in the context of festivals is on trend (Hede, 2007; Fredline et al., 2003; Sherwood, 2007).

What’s more, it’s difficult to observe and investigate the sociocultural impact of festivals due to its intangible nature (Getz, 2005; Kim & Petrik, 2005; Balduck, 2011). Although researchers have tried to investigate it by other ways, for instance, some authors studied social impact in association with economic impact (Turco, Swart & Bob, 2003), other authors studied it by measuring the social capital of special events (Misener & Mason, 2006; Williams & Elkhatab, 2012). Specific study on the sociocultural impact of festivals is still limited at the current time.

Lack of research on sociocultural impact of cultural festivals is still a huge issue for this study. One important reason is that the festival study is a relatively new area for researchers, especially with respect to the sociocultural impact (Dinaburgskaya & Ekner, 2010).

Research Problem

The state of Nebraska celebrates many festivals for a great number of years, but there is a lack of study on the impact of these festivals particularly the sociocultural aspect. This study will delve into GermanFest, a cultural festival in Syracuse, NE., which has been implemented for more than 30 years. No study has been conducted on this festival, particularly on its sociocultural impact. Thus, there is a need to study the sociocultural impact of the GermanFest.

Research Objectives

The purpose of this study was to investigate the sociocultural impact of GermanFest in Syracuse, NE. In particular, the following research objectives will be investigated: 1) determine the dimensions of sociocultural impact of GermanFest; 2) determine the important reasons why the city celebrates such a festival; 3) examine the relationships among festival stakeholders; 4) determine the level of community involvement in the festival, and 5) determine whether the festival improves the quality of life in the community.

Research Questions

The following research questions were asked by the investigators of this study:

- 1) What are the dimensions of sociocultural impact of GermanFest?
- 2) What are the important reasons for celebrating the festival?
- 3) What's the relationship among the festival stakeholders?
- 4) What levels are the residents involved in the festival?
- 5) Did the festival improve the quality of life of the community?

Definition of Terms

Festivals are the themed public celebrations which are held annually in the same location or regularly in different places to celebrate culture, belief, commodity, or local identity (Getz, 2000). In addition, cultural festivals refer to the festivals which celebrate culture, traditions, lifestyle, craft, art, food, music. They feature cultural attributes and aim to bring people a different kind of cultural experience (Esu & Arrey, 2009). For this particular study, cultural festivals will be referred to the cultural heritage celebrations of the specific culture. Sociocultural impact relates to the value, lifestyle, social and cultural

development, cultural awareness and identity, the preservation of historical buildings in relation to a festival. Stakeholders are certain people, groups or entities who influence and are influenced by the implementing of a festival (Freeman, 1984).

Limitations of the Study

First, this study was based on the German cultural festival in Syracuse, Nebraska, so the findings may not be generalizable for other cultural festivals. Cultures and communities vary from one to the other, so the celebrations vary differently.

In addition, an intercept survey research method was used in this study and limited the access to the entire population. For instance, the researcher did not go to the businesses during the office hours. Moreover, the research cannot control respondents' willingness to fill in the survey. Some respondents refused to answer the questionnaire. So the sample might not fully represent the whole population.

The sociocultural impacts were intangible and difficult to evaluate, lots of factors such as the short time for answering the survey, the past experience, and instant mood may affect the results of the investigation and it could lead to the inaccuracy of the final assessment and outcomes.

Significance of the Study

1. This study would advance the theory development in festival impact studies particularly the sociocultural impact studies.
2. The results of the research could be used in planning community festivals in relation to local residents' attitude. It would contribute to the future celebrations of festivals and the development of special event planning industry.

3. This research may support academic experience in education research and teaching.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Considerable research indicated that special events had an important impact on their host communities and residents (Crompton, Lee & Shuster, 2001; Walo, Bull & Breen, 1996; Dwyer, Forsyth & Spurr, 2005; Lee & Taylor, 2005; Dwyer, 2000; Hede, 2008; Gibson & Waite, 2010). The sociocultural impact was one of those impacts. There were increasing conceptual and empirical studies on special events which were strongly associated with the research on festivals, and the sociocultural impact assessment (Gursoy et al. 2004). This chapter reviewed previous studies about the sociocultural impact of festivals, and was divided into five parts: 1) a review of definitions of tourism events, special events, festivals, and cultural festivals, 2) sociocultural impact, 3) stakeholders and quality of life, 4) social exchange theory and community involvement, and 5) sociocultural impact measurement scales.

Definition of Terms

Tourism and the Event Industry

Events were an important component of the tourism industry, and featured in developing of tourism destinations. Events involved in both the tourism industry and research area only arose a few years ago (Getz, 2007). Events based on tourism context were the spatial and temporal phenomena and each was unique because of distinctive interactions among the setting, people, theme-designed, and the programs (Getz, 2008). Tourism events were considered as being inclusive of all planned events for tourism and economic, social, cultural, and environmental purposes. Based on the different design and production, many forms and categories were found which included those in the business

setting including meetings, conventions, fairs, and exhibitions, and those in the private domain including weddings, parties, and social events for affinity groups.

Tourism events, from the small events such as weddings, parties and reunion, to mega-events, like world sport events and world conferences, had quite a broad range of activities. Three types of events which were most frequently discussed in the literature: business tourism events including meetings, conventions, and exhibitions; sport tourism events such as the Olympic Games, the World Cups; and festivals and other cultural celebrated events (Crompton et al, 2001; Walo et al, 1996; Daniels et al. 2004; Wood, 2004; Gibson et al, 2010; Dwyer & Mellor, 2000). In the study, special attention was given to festivals and other cultural celebrated events.

Special Events

Special events once were described as unique tourism forms ranging from the mega events to the community-based festivals, even down to certain programs at local parks or facilities (Dinaburgskaya & Ekner, 2010). The appealing aspects of those events were the internal attractiveness of each theme, which differentiated it from the fixed tourist attractions, and the lively atmosphere, which created a unique feeling originating from life but beyond our daily life. Ritchie (1984) defined special events as “major one-time or recurring events of limited duration, developed primarily to enhance awareness, appeal, and profitability of a tourism destination”. He mentioned the nature and main goal of special events. Shone and Perry (2004) defined special events from the same perspective but got a different definition, they defined the term as incidents occurring on non-routine occasions where leisure, cultural, personal or organizational objectives developed from the daily life, which aimed to celebrate, entertain, identify and highlight

the distinctive experience of a group of people. Although special events have become an important element of the leisure and tourism product in many regions, there was still no widely accepted definition for it.

Festival

Many researchers have attempted to define the concept of a festival, but there was still not an agreed upon definition. In the early studies, scholars considered religious and ritual events to be festivals, and also thought of cultural-anthropological events that celebrated the community's culture, beliefs, values and identities as festivals (Falassi, 1987). Getz (2005) defined festivals as themed public celebrations which were held regularly or annually in the same location or different locations. The themed public event was mentioned as the main feature of festivals. In addition, Arcodia and Whitford (2007) stated that festivals were emerging as growing and vibrant sectors of the tourism and leisure industry, and were seen to have significant economic, environmental, social, cultural, and political impacts on tourism destinations and host groups. Getz (2010) also mentioned that there were numerous forms and themes of festivals around the world, and the term festival was often misapplied. Different researchers emphasized different characteristics of festivals. Therefore, festivals became an important subfield within event studies and the essence of the current study.

Due to the universality of festival celebrations and particular festival experiences, the nature of festivals was being explored (Getz, 2010). For example, most festivals covered only a short period of time which indicated a transitory nature (Waterman, 1998). Recently festivals have emerged as an appealing research field because it covered all cultures and had the function of: attracting visitors and investments, creating city

identities, generating social consequences, and improving the well-being of host communities. Festivals and other cultural celebrated events including carnivals, religious events, concerts, and art festivals have thrived in recent years. Festivals in particular were examined with respect to the community life, urban development, cultural heritage, tourism and social changes, and reasons for attending (Picard & Robinson, 2006a; Yolal, et al., 2009). It was investigated that festivals including music festivals, wine festivals, and food festivals provided a significant boost to the social cohesion, the development of communities, as well as the enhancement of local cultural identities. There were relationships between the cultural and social order in festivals and other cultural celebrations, whether those events operated the culture order from the top down or the bottom up, or whether they fostered the social order or were oppressive, tourism festivals and cultural celebrations have profoundly implicated people's lives (Waterman, 1998).

Cultural Festival

Cultural festival was defined by Falassi (1987) as a periodic social occasion in which, to various degrees, all members of a whole community participating directly or indirectly, who were united by ethnic, linguistic, religious, historical bonds, and sharing a world view through a multiplicity of forms and events. Cultural bonding was emphasized in his definition. Early studies according to Mayo (1973) and Hunt (1975) stated that cultural festivals featured attributes such as topography, resident population, life-style and recreational character. Still other authors (Andersen, Prentice and Guerin, 1997) used the tourism destination attributes to define cultural festivals, like historical buildings, museums, galleries, theatres, and old towns. Even Scofield and Li (1995) developed their attributes to identify the cultural festivals, they were historic events and sites, cultural and

scenic heritage, traditional festivals, architecture, and folk art (music, dancing, and craft work). Few studies were found concentrating on other cultural festival's attributes, including ambience of the environment, source of information on the site, comfortable amenities, parking and interaction with vendors (Crompton and Love, 1995). Today, a combination of attributes including environments, theme, residents, stakeholders, cultural experience, social education, and the cultural identity made the festivals to be cultural festivals.

Sociocultural Impact

Social impacts were often generated from the studies of tourism, as they were mainly seen as results of tourism events or activities. Hall (1992) defined social impact as the manner of changes in the community and individual value systems, behavior patterns, community structures, lifestyle and quality of life. Later, Delamere et al. (2001) developed a scale to measure resident attitudes toward the social impact of the community festivals, in his article he viewed the social impact on interpersonal community relationships, well-being, traditions, lifestyles, community services and identity in hosting communities. Fredline et al. (2003) defined social impact as any potential impact on the quality of life for a people of community. The common denomination of the three studies mentioned was that the social impact pertains to the quality of life for a community.

In addition to studying social impact from tourism studies, some authors discussed it from a combined perspective of social and cultural impacts. For instance, Park (2007) described social impact as the changes in social and cultural aspects, which can be directly and indirectly related to a public or private activity. Small et al. (2005)

developed a list of social impact factors showing, the last social impact factor was from the cultural perspective as well.

Table 2.1 A List of Social Impact Factors¹

Social impact factors	Sub-factor items
Community impacts	Crowded footpaths and street leading to traffic congestion, difficulty finding car parking, crowding in local shops and facilities, noise pollution.
Leisure/Recreation impacts	Increased entertainment opportunities, increased future use of existing recreational and leisure facilities.
Infrastructure impacts	Restoration of existing public buildings, public facilities maintenance, advanced communication networks and banking systems.
Health and safety impacts	Increased police presence, increased crime and vandalism, increased emergency incidents.
Cultural impacts	Impacts on local character of the community, on the cultural identity, increased local interest in the region's culture and history, increased awareness of the cultural activities available, interaction with visitors offering an education experience.

¹ Adapted from Small et al. (2005).

There was often confusion about the difference between social and cultural impact (Brunt & Courtney, 1999). Burdge et al. (1995) stated social impact as the consequences to people of any public or private actions that alter the ways in which people live, work, socialize, and organize to meet their needs as members of society. It also included the cultural impact involving changes to the norms, values, and beliefs that guide their cognition of themselves and the society. In general, social impact had an immediate impact on the quality of residents' life and must be seen as short-term consequences, nevertheless, the cultural impact was long-term in nature and included changes in social relationships, norms and orders (Brunt & Courtney, 1999).

The cultural impact usually came from the studies of the cultural tourism.

According to Silberberg (1994), cultural tourism was defined as attracting people from outside the host community motivated by the interest of historical, artistic, scientific or heritage attractions of a community, district, and country. Another definition made by Cecil et al. (2008) was that experiencing the diverse mosaic of celebrations, traditions, arts and places that the tourist destinations offered to residents and visitors. Going along with the studies of cultural tourism, cultural impact has brought interest by scholars. Dumont et al. (2007) suggested that several indicators could reflect the cultural impact on residents, for instance, the access to leisure and recreational facilities, the degree of cultural exchanges, and the opportunities for learning and education. The cultural impact of tourism on residents was also thought as the conditions of urban living, such as mental and physical happiness, culture, and environmental health and safety (Cecil et al. 2008). Recently a study conducted by Mola et al. (2011) described the cultural impact as the consequences of cultural tourism in communities, it could be deemed as the changes in customs, lifestyles, traditions, values, festivals, and even languages. A common phenomenon was that residents can speak an acceptable level of foreign languages if the area attracted lots of international visitors. When the cultural and traditional values displayed some internal changes to meet the needs and expectations of tourists, it disrupted the old local forms of the cultural and traditional values, this kind of change was considered as cultural impact as well (Dahles, 2001).

The social impact and the cultural impact of festivals crossed in many areas, for instance, both of them include the changes in lifestyles, traditions, behaviors, and life values. Besides, some researchers thought the cultural experience was one aspect of the

social impact (Delamere's, 2001; Small et al., 2005). Hence, it was a good strategy to study the social impact and the cultural impact of a festival together.

The sociocultural impact of events often related to the tourist-host relationship, which was considered as the impact of effects on the host community. It had strong relationships with the style of events, the nature of activities, and the type of participants. The more the local residents were involved in events and interacted with other participants, the bigger probability of changes happening. Furthermore, if there was a difference in the cultural and economic conditions between residents and sponsors, vendors, tourists, and other parties involved, it was much easier for changes to arise in the quality of life, value systems, behavioral patterns, family relationships, and preferences in host communities (Cohen, 1984). For many reasons, the host community often was the weaker party in interaction with the local stakeholders. They were forced to accept various consequences brought by events as well as leverage interests among event stakeholders. Even worse, the sociocultural impact was not always apparent and sometimes difficult to measure and identify. Some cultural aspects even took a long time to become apparent.

Stakeholders and Quality of Life

Stakeholders

Festivals were usually held within a certain complex network of people or entities that influence, or were influenced by an organization's actions, these people or entities were called stakeholders (Freeman, 1984). Because festivals or events could meet diverse social, cultural, and economic roles, many stakeholders became involved, they cooperated and shared one or more common goals for the festival (Anderson & Getz,

2008). Festival organizers need to find out who the key stakeholders were while planning a festival because the key stakeholders may directly affect the success or failure of a festival (Andersson & Getz, 2008). The most important stakeholders were the ones on which festivals depended for resources or other kinds of support. Festival organizations need to be skilled at finding stakeholders and managing the relationships among them to ensure the success.

In order to examine and realize the cooperation among festival stakeholders, scholars identified the classification of them. Two broad categories of stakeholders were identified as strategic stakeholders who affected the organizations' performance, and moral stakeholders who were affected by the achievement of organization's' objectives (Freeman, 1984; Goodpastor, 1991). Additionally, six major stakeholders were commonly classified: festivals/events managers, employees, sponsors, the community, visitors, and the public sector (e.g. government, the state) (Mossberg & Getz, 2006). In accordance with their importance to festivals or events, stakeholders were stratified into primary stakeholders and secondary stakeholders (Reid and Arcodia, 2002). The former one included those on whom the festival was dependent, namely the employees, sponsors, spectators, attendees, and participants. These stakeholders had a strong relationship with festivals. Even to some degree, their decisions and behaviors decided the success or failure of a festival. The latter one contained the host community, government, essential services, media, tourist organizations, and businesses. These stakeholders also had the ability to affect whether or not festivals were programmed smoothly and implemented successfully. Reid and Arcodia (2002) considered that the good collaboration among stakeholders could help to prevent the failure of a festival. Therefore, identifying the

relationship among stakeholders within festivals was critical for the effective management of them by the festivals' organizers, as well as for festivals' success and long-term sustainability.

Quality of Life

Quality of life has become a topic of broad discussion in recent years. However, defining quality of life was difficult, because it was a subjective and dependent on each individual's experience, expectations, and perception. There were more than 100 definitions and models for measuring quality of life so far. An agreed upon definition for quality of life was that it was a multi-dimensional and interactive construct referring to many facets of people's lives (Schalock, 1996). Situations and environment were usually perceived differently by different people, therefore elements that contributed to the quality of life may fluctuate from person to person, and from culture to culture (Andereck & Nyaupane, 2010).

Schalock et al. (2002) reviewed and synthesized research on quality of life for several years and generalized the eight dimensions of it. They were as follows:

- Emotional and psychological well-being include: safety, mood, freedom from stress, self-concept, and enjoyment.
- Interpersonal and social relationships include: social networks, family, socioeconomic status, friendships, and supports.
- Material well-being includes: employment, economic security, food security, and shelter.
- Personal development includes: education, skill, achievement, personal competence, and advancement.

- Physical well-being includes: fitness, health care, nutrition, recreation, health insurance, activities of daily living.
- Self-determination includes: individual control and decision, personal goals/values, autonomy, personal options and preferences.
- Social inclusion includes: community participation and acceptance, work environment, residential environment, community activities, roles, and volunteer activities.
- Rights include: privacy, voting, access, equity, civic responsibilities, and ownership.

Few studies specifically considered tourism's impact on the quality of life in the context of tourism events. Two types of indicators were used to examine the quality of life: one was objective situations of people's lives, such as income and education, and the other was the subjective evaluation of life environment, such as satisfaction with various aspects of life (Schalock, 1996). In this study, the researcher wanted to exam the quality of life through the combination of the objective and subjective types of evaluation with reference to life satisfaction, recreational opportunities, health, well-being, cultural experience, and social status within the community.

In summary, identifying the types of stakeholders was important before gaining support from them. Examining the relationships among festival stakeholders was crucial to understand how they cooperated during festivals. Quality of life was one attribute of sociocultural impact of festivals, and was often one of the important goals of festivals. Several variables like happiness, health and safety, personal growth and development were used to examine whether the quality of life was improved by festivals.

Social Exchange Theory and Community Involvement

Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory originated from the intersection of economics, sociology and social psychology (Emerson, 1976). Ap (1992) stated that the theory was “concerned with understanding the exchange of resources between individuals and groups as they interact”. The goal of this theory was to evaluate the exchange of benefits and the costs of social relationships. When the costs from social interaction outweighed the benefits, the exchange relationship terminated, and when the opposite was true, the exchange activity continued. A further explanation for this theory was that the relationship was evaluated as positive or negative according to how individuals judged the rewards and the costs of such an exchange. Perceptions of the exchange could be different in that an individual who perceived a positive outcome evaluated in a different way from an individual who perceived it negatively.

Applying this theory into the context of an event, it was used to postulate the residents’ attitude and levels of involvement in community events. Local people’s initial exchange motive was to improve the quality of life through participating and promoting the event. But usually they need to pay the price of inconvenience and risks caused by the event to achieve initial goals. When benefits were equal to or more than the payoff for support or participation, the exchange evaluation was considered as positive. Positive evaluations reflect their favorable attitude and behavior toward visitors and event organizers, thereby reinforcing the desire for future participation in the exchange relationship. Otherwise, if benefits were not equivalent to or less than costs, then negative evaluation occurred and the exchange relationship stopped.

Community Involvement

Hiller (1990) suggested that most events and festivals had little tangible, direct benefits for the average residents, as such the key point to understand the success or failure of an event/festival was lying in the opinions of residents. Residents' reactions to community festivals were highly associated with their experience, preference, and enjoyment of the festival. Ritchie and Lyons (1987) undertook a study based on the Calgary Olympics to demonstrate various forms of resident participation and highlight the level of resident satisfaction with the overall experience (95% of respondents were satisfied). Higher level of resident satisfaction not only created the acceptance of the festivals, but also indicated that residents feel comfortable becoming involved.

Local involvement in festivals depended largely on the perceived interest and certain benefits. For example, Rao (2001) suggested that festivals had good public aspects that went beyond pure entertainment because they provided a specific time and place for people to show their collective. By actively participating in a festival, people demonstrated their commitment to the community and built trust and relationships with others. In summary, the level of community involvement in a festival may be strongly related to the perceived benefits for participating in it. Social exchange theory supports the analysis of levels of community involvement in festivals.

Sociocultural Impact Measurement Scales

Measuring the sociocultural impact of special events from community residents' perspective has been studied by many authors (Delamere, 2001; Fredline, et al. 2003; Small & Edwards, 2003). Residents' characteristics and roles in supporting a festival had an important role in evaluating the festival impacts. Their attitudes, preferences, opinions,

and perception of festivals were the vital resource in understanding a festival's impacts, particular the sociocultural impact. As such, scholars created several frameworks and scales to measure the festival sociocultural impact regarding the residents' opinions and attitudes.

Dwyer et al. (2001) created a measurement framework to assess the tangible and intangible impact of special events. It served as a device to discern the economic and social impact of events and conventions. This framework was useful to evaluate an event with respect to its economic contribution to the host community. The particular importance for this study was that the framework also assessed the social impact for events and conventions from the tangible and intangible aspects.

Delamere, Wankel, and Hinch (2001) and Delawere (2001) developed a scale to evaluate the social impact of community festivals by examining residents' perception. The scale was called the Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale (FSIAS), an expectancy – value attitude model was built upon the existing literature about the sociocultural impact of tourism-related events to obtain residents' attitudes and thoughts, and ask them to rate how much importance they would like to place on these factors. Each item was expressed in a way that respondents could relate to their expectancy and opinion of events. This scale consisted of 47 items that were classified into two categories of social benefits and social costs (Grosbois, 2009; Delawere, 2001). Each of the initial dimensions was comprised of two sub-factors. Social benefits contained two sub-factors: community benefits and individual benefits. Social costs consisted of two sub-factors: community life quality concerns and community resource concerns.

Table 2.2 Factor Items in the Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale (FSIAS)¹

Factor 1—Social Benefits of Community Festivals
<p>The festival provides my community with an opportunity to discover and develop cultural skills and talents.</p> <p>I feel a personal sense of pride and recognition through participating in the festival.</p> <p>The festival enhances the image of the community.</p> <p>Local residents who participate in the festival have the opportunity to learn new things.</p> <p>The festival contributes to a sense of community well-being.</p> <p>The festival leaves an ongoing positive cultural impact in my community.</p> <p>The festival contributes to my personal well-being.</p> <p>I enjoy meeting festival performers/workers.</p> <p>The festival acts as a showcase for new ideas.</p> <p>Community groups work together to achieve common goals through the festival.</p> <p>Assisting in organizing the festival helps to build leaders within my community.</p> <p>The festival helps me to show others why my community is unique and special.</p> <p>My community gains positive recognition as a result of the festival.</p> <p>The festival provides opportunities for community residents to experience new activities.</p> <p>Community identity is enhanced through the festival.</p> <p>The festival contributes to a sense of togetherness within my community.</p> <p>I am exposed to a variety of cultural experiences through the community festival.</p> <p>Having the festival helps to improve the quality of life within my community.</p> <p>The festival is a celebration of my community.</p> <p>Friendships are strengthened through participation in the festival.</p> <p>The festival allows for the sharing of ideas among community groups.</p>
Factor 2—Social Costs of Community Festivals
<p>Pedestrian traffic increases to unacceptable levels during the festival.</p> <p>Noise levels are increased to an unacceptable point during the festival.</p> <p>Car/bus/truck/RV traffic increases to unacceptable levels during the festival.</p> <p>Vandalism in my community increases during the festival.</p> <p>Delinquent activity in my community increases during the festival.</p> <p>My community is overcrowded during the festival.</p> <p>The festival over taxes available community financial resources.</p> <p>The festival is an intrusion into the lives of community residents.</p> <p>The influx of festival visitors reduces the amount of privacy we have in our community.</p> <p>Ecological damage is increased to unacceptable levels during the festival.</p> <p>Litter is increased to unacceptable levels during the festival.</p> <p>Crime in my community increases during the festival.</p> <p>The festival is a source of negative competition between my community and neighboring communities.</p> <p>The festival leads to a disruption in the normal routines of community residents.</p> <p>The festival over taxes available community human resources.</p> <p>The festival is all work and no play for the community.</p> <p>Community recreational facilities are overused during the festival.</p> <p>Power is not equally distributed among groups in my community, as a result of the festival.</p> <p>Some people and/or groups in the community receiving more of the benefits of the festival</p>

than do others.

The festival leads to increased disagreement between and among community groups.

The festival weakens the identity of my community.

Some people and/or groups in the community experience more of the problems associated with the festival than do others.

When the festival does not live up to its expectations we feel a sense of failure in my community.

The festival highlights negative cultural stereotypes within my community.

The same group of people runs the festival, year after year.

In general, there is a decreased sense of community involvement in the festival.

¹ Adapted from Delamere, Wankel, & Hinch (2001).

Fredline et al. (2003) proposed their scale consisting of 45 impact factors in three steps: 1) the overall impact of the event, 2) the specific impacts of the event, and 3) the independent variables (including contact with tourists and patrons, perception of the theme, objective feeling during the whole event). The respondents were asked to assess whether or not they believed the phenomenon changed because of the event and how did they change (better or worse), if the answer was affirmative, how did those impacts affect their quality of life and the community resources. Responses were rated on a Likert-scale ranged from -3(strongly negative impact) to 3(strongly positive impact). This approach was a valuable tool for the post-event measurement of sociocultural impact.

Small, Edwards & Sheridan (2005) presented a framework to evaluate the sociocultural impact of a small festival and event from the perception of residents. It was the Social Impact Evaluation (SIE) framework. This framework consisted of six stages: 1) describe (festival or event characteristics) , 2) profile (destination profile), 3) identify (potential socio-cultural impacts were likely to occur as a result of the festival or event), 4) project (predicted the impacts perceptions of residents relate to the identified impacts), 5) evaluate (evaluated the perceived socio-cultural impacts after the festival has taken place), and 6) feedback (communicating the findings with event organizers and stakeholders). The first three stages contributed to build a holistic description of a festival

or event, while stage four and stage five measured the impacts that may result from the festival or event. The final stage was the feedback of perceptions of residents, which was used to share with the event organizers and stakeholders to capitalize on the positive impacts and ameliorate the negative impacts.

Another scale proposed by Small & Edwards (2003) was the Social Impact of Perception (SIP) scale. It was one of the most recent scales to be used to measure the sociocultural impact of festivals. Researchers developed a comprehensive questionnaire about the potential impacts which may occur in terms of festivals, and then applied it to the assessment process. The overall procedure contained three steps: first of all, the respondents were asked to comment whether or not they have perceived that the stated impacts occurred as a result of the festival. And then, if the answer was a yes, they needed to classify these impacts into two categories: positive impact and negative impact. Lastly, they were required to give the perceived value of each impact item according to a -5 to 5 rating scale which represent the levels of impacts (Small & Edwards, 2005). Zero was the midpoint of this rating scale and represents no impact, one represented a very small impact, two represented small impact, and three represented moderate impact, four represented a large impact, and five represented a very large impact. In the other direction, the values for each level of impacts were the same with those values for the positive impact. This scale was a simple but effective measurement to assess the sociocultural impact of festivals and special events, especially when researchers wanted to identify the dimensions of the sociocultural impact of community festivals.

In summary, a great number of researchers made contributions to the development of the sociocultural impact measurements scale. The scales were becoming more and

more reliable and valid. Researchers examined the sociocultural impact in relation to the local residents' opinion or attitude, the reasoning behind was that the local residents were not only the important participants in festivals, but also were the primary resources that festivals depend on. Therefore, those studies had vital significance for the present study to measure the sociocultural impact with respect to the local resident's opinion.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The Description of GermanFest

GermanFest is a two day event celebrating German cultural heritage and is sponsored annually in July in Syracuse, Nebraska, by the Chamber of Commerce. The profile for this festival is presented in Table 3.1. A day of activities including the Omaha German-American Society singers and dancers, “Viener” Dog races, “Viener Vogue” style show, KinderFun parade, German food, RibFest, wine tasting, and a street dance are held during the festival (http://www.gosyracusene.com/visit_syracuse/). Many residents celebrated and appreciated the German culture by painting designs on their bodies and wearing traditional costumes. Through this cultural festival, folk songs, music, food, costumes, and souvenirs are shown and sold along the street. Each year, people around the state and country are welcomed to visit their festival. Approximately 1000 visitors attended the 34th festival in 2014. It is a two day festival full of fun and enjoyment.

Table 3.1 GermanFest Profile

Characteristics	
Location	Syracuse, Nebraska
Theme	German Heritage Celebration
Duration	Two days
Number of years current held, 2014	34th
Local population, 2010	1,942
Attendees, 2014	Approximately 1,000

Study Design

The purpose of this study was to assess the sociocultural impact of GermanFest based on the opinions of residents of Syracuse, NE. Especially the study would:

- Determine the dimensions of the sociocultural impact of GermanFest.

- Determine the important reasons why the city celebrates such a festival.
- Examine the relationships among festival stakeholders.
- Determine the level of community involvement in the festival.
- Determine whether the festival improves the quality of life in the community.

A survey was utilized for this study. According to Scheuren (2004), a survey is a general view, examination, or description of people's attitudes, impressions, opinions, expectations, beliefs, and behaviors on specific facts.

Study Population and Sample

The targeted study population was the residents of the city of Syracuse. Most of them have experienced the festival, and witnessed the social changes derived from it. In this study, the sample was non-randomly selected from the local residents by using a convenience sampling approach (Ozdemir et al. 2011). The sample was based on the following characteristics: the researcher's ability to easily access them, and people who was willing to participate. The advantage of this method increased the speed of data collection and response rate, and avoided high investigation costs.

The sample size was determined by the certain number which was optimal to ensure valid inference to be made about the population. Ten percentage of total population was usually used as the desired sample size in the hospitality management industry (Causin, 2007). According to the 2010 census, the total population of the city of Syracuse was 1, 942. The targeted sample size was determined to be 200 people. An in-person survey was used to collect data that supported the response rate. In order to improve the accuracy and inference of the sample, other variables that might impede the

investigation process need to be under control, for example, the investigating time, the instant mood of participants, the communication with participants, and the attitudes toward the investigation.

Data Collection

The data collection method chosen for this study was a questionnaire. Residents of Syracuse appear regularly in churches (e.g., Luther Memorial Church, United Methodist Church), the Syracuse Public Library, grocery store, restaurants (e.g., Dairy Chef, EI Portal Mexican Restaurant, Fireworks Restaurant), and the Green House which are located in Main Street. At those sites, a convenience sampling method was applied, which means only people who wanted to participate in the survey would be included. Participants were told that the survey was related to their community festival, GermanFest. As well, they were told that it would be helpful to reflect their attitude and opinion in relation to the festival. In addition, they were informed that their information and response would be kept confidential and anonymous.

Instrument

A self-administered survey questionnaire was created by the researchers. The questions were developed according to the existing literatures (Delamere, al et. 2001; Small & Edwards, 2003; Small, al et. 2005) and the objectives of this study. It was ensured that the variables were based on the common understanding of the phenomena. There were three sections in the survey (APPENDIX B). The first section was resident opinion questions in relation to the potential sociocultural impact of GermanFest. Following the Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale developed by Delamere et al. (2001), 47 social impact questions were created in the scale. After adding and removing some

questions to fit this study, the final version contained 25 sociocultural impact questions. The second part was questions about the overall opinion of the community and residents. The third section was the demographic information that contains eight questions listed as categorical variables.

In the first section of the survey questionnaire, the 25 sociocultural impact items measured the resident attitudes towards the sociocultural impact of GermanFest. Respondents were asked to evaluate each statement of the sociocultural impact, and select the choice that reflected their opinions on a 5-item Likert scale from “Strongly agree”, “Agree”, “Neither agree nor disagree”, “Disagree”, “Strongly disagree”. The impact statements were randomly arranged, and not be labeled as positive or negative. This arrangement was intended to reduce the bias of the respondents’ answers, because the respondents were able to make decisions without influence from the labels.

In the second section, questions 2, 3, 4 and 5 focused on overall opinion of community and residents and aimed at gaining a broader understanding of the complex phenomena. For example, to understand the important reasons the community annually held the festival, levels of residents’ involvement in the festival, and the extent of improvement the festival contributed to the quality of people’s lives. Question 2: Reasons why the city of Syracuse celebrates GermanFest was measured by a 5-item Likert scale from “Extremely important”, “More important”, “Important”, “Less important”, to “Not important”; Question 3: The extent of how the festival improved the quality of people’s lives used a 4-item Likert scale ranging from “Extremely improved”, “Improved”, “Somewhat improved”, to “Not improved”; Question 4: The relationship among festival stakeholders was explored by a multiple choice of “Mutually beneficial cooperation”,

“General cooperation”, “No relationship”, and “Competition for resources”; Question 5:

The levels of residents’ involvement in the festival was measured by a 4-item Likert scale from “Extremely active”, “Active”, “Somewhat active”, to “Not active”.

The third section of the survey focused on the demographic information, which included gender, age, marital status, education, length of residence in the community, number of times of attending the festival, and the roles in the 2014 festival. The questions were specific but not relevant to respondents’ personal information, such as the actual name and address.

Study Procedure

This study used an intercept survey, a variation of the in-person survey, in which information could be obtained from respondents as they passed by a populated public area such as a retail mall, or a workplace (Rea & Park, 2012). The investigator intercepted individuals on the main street in the city of Syracuse and invited people to participate in the survey.

According to Scheuren (2004), the key of a good survey was that all the concepts must be clear and simply expressed. Respondents are more likely to cooperate if the questions are simple, clear, easy to answer, and personally relevant to them. The advantages of the intercept survey method are quick data collection, easy sample accessibility, and quick feedback from respondents. Additionally, the investigator had the opportunity to explain unclear questions in the conducting of the survey, and made sure that the questions were not skipped. It was more cost-effective than the traditional telephone and mail-out surveys. The disadvantage of the intercept survey was limited information because the researcher may not find enough samples to represent all kinds of

people. Another weakness of this method was the respondents' reluctance to cooperate. If the researcher, as a stranger, suddenly appeared in front of respondents, they may have some stress and tended to be somewhat less inclined to participate. Each research method has its advantages and disadvantages, researchers should choose the suitable one for their investigations. GermanFest is an important cultural event in the city of Syracuse which is closely relevant to local residents. Besides, an intercept survey allowed participants enter data information on their own will about the concerns and preferences, so the intercept survey was suitable to this study based on the above reasons.

After the approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for review of human subjects' research, and the support from the City Mayor Office and the Syracuse Chamber of Commerce, the data collection begun. For the sake of increasing the professional impression and getting a high response rate, an instruction to the survey was added to clarify the goal and importance of the potential participation, as well as the possible response time and whether the participant was eligible to do the survey. The convenience sampling approach was employed in this study which means some of the population has zero chance of selection. The evaluation process should be done separately in each location, and the unfinished survey would not be included in the final analysis.

The data collection was conducted within three weeks in June, 2015. The researcher went to the city of Syracuse five times and conducted the survey in person. The respondents participating in the survey were residents of the city of Syracuse. The data was collected in Syracuse Public Library, banks (6), coffee houses (3), insurance companies (2), Green House, churches (3), and the city hall which located on the main

street in the city of Syracuse, and other places like the Community Memorial Hospital, Good Samaritan Society, eye clinic and restaurants within the city. Two hundred survey questionnaires were distributed to the local residents and 143 surveys were returned. The response return was 71.5%. When the researcher approached the local residents, the researcher completed introduction (self and survey purpose), and asked residents whether they would like to help with the survey. Most residents were willing to complete the questionnaire. Some residents were not able to fill in the questionnaire due to the time limit (office hours or busy hours), while other residents showed no interest in completing the survey.

When the researcher finished the data collection, information was input into a limited-access computer, and only the researchers had access to it. The paper surveys were placed on a secured location. The data information was only for the academic use, and aggregated information is presented. Data information of each respondent would be under full consideration and kept confidential and anonymous, no one can be identified through it.

Data Analysis

After finishing the data collection, results were coded into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 21.0 for Windows, SPSS, Inc., Chicago, Illinois) for the statistical analysis.

The statistical analysis used was Factor Analysis in the study to answer the following research questions: Question One: What are the dimensions of the sociocultural impact of GermanFest? According to Thomas & Brubaker (2000, p.202), factor analysis is a statistical method suitable for analyzing dependency between variables and often

used in combination with impact scales. Through factor analysis, the data would be reduced to a more manageable size while retaining as much of the original information as possible for researchers to interpret (Field, 2009). There are two types of factor analysis, exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Exploratory factor analysis deals with the theory building when the research wants to explore the underlying factors among the observed variables, while the confirmatory factor analysis deals with theory testing when the research interests in the relations among the observed variables are consistent with the hypothesized factor structure (Gaur and Gaur, 2009). Exploratory factor analysis was used in this study to answer the first research question.

It was noticed that four missing values were found in the first section of the questionnaire by four respondents: one missing value for the question “It is difficult to find car parking during the festival”, two missing values for the question “Overcrowding in local shops, streets and facilities during the festival”, and one missing value for the question “The festival causes the increased crime, alcohol and drug abuse”. It was suggested that cases with missing values should be deleted to prevent overestimation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007; Yong & Pearce, 2013). When analyzing the data, missing values were excluded cases listwise in “Options” defaulted by SPSS. As a result, the number of sample size was 139 instead of 143 in the factor analysis.

Simple descriptive frequency was used to analyze the research questions two to five and the demographic information. Descriptive frequency included the percentages, percentiles, measures of central tendency, and measures of variability. When using the frequency analysis, SPSS statistics could calculate the mean, median and mode to help the researchers analyze the results and draw conclusions. For example, when answering

the second research question (Determined the important reason why the city of Syracuse celebrates GermanFest) SPSS analysis would examine the means of each variable, and the variable with the highest mean would be the most important reason. Also, the missing value would be excluded from the analysis.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This study investigated the sociocultural impact of GermanFest with respect to the opinions of residents of Syracuse. This chapter describes the results analyzed by factor analysis and simple descriptive statistics. SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences version 21.0) was used to analyze the 143 (71.5%) usable surveys, 57 responses were unusable due to blank answers and unreturned surveys.

Background of the Respondents

Simple descriptive statistics reflecting the respondents' demographic background are found in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 The Descriptive Frequency Distribution of the Demographic Information¹

Variables	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	51	35.7
Female	91	63.6
No answer	1	0.7
Age groups		
20-29 years old	21	14.7
30-39 years old	19	13.3
40-49 years old	34	23.8
50-59 years old	34	23.8
60-69 years old	17	11.9
70-79 years old	10	7.0
80 years old and above	5	3.5
No answer	3	2.1
Current marital status		
Never been married	12	8.4
Married	113	79.0
Divorced	7	4.9
Widowed	10	7.0
No answer	1	0.7
Lived location		

Within the city of Syracuse	75	52.4
In the surrounding areas of city of Syracuse	66	46.2
No answer	2	1.4
Length of residency		
1-9 years	20	14.0
10-19 years	28	19.6
20-29 years	20	14.0
30-39 years	26	18.2
40-49 years	19	13.3
50-59 years	18	12.6
60 years and above	7	4.9
No answer	5	3.5
Highest level of education completed		
GED	2	1.4
High school	33	23.1
Technical/associates	34	23.8
Bachelor	50	35.0
Master/PhD	15	10.5
Other	4	2.8
High school and Technical/associates	3	2.1
High school and others	1	0.7
No answer	1	0.7
Times of attending the festival		
1-5 Times	47	32.9
6-10 Times	40	28.0
11-15 Times	21	14.7
16-20 Times	12	8.4
21-25 Times	3	2.1
26-30 Times	1	0.7
31 Times and above	12	8.4
No answer	7	4.9
Role in the festival		
Organizer	1	0.7
Vendor	1	0.7
Sponsor	6	4.2
Spectator	29	20.3
Visitor	14	9.8
Volunteer	28	19.6
Did not attend	38	26.6
Others	1	0.7
Sponsor and Volunteer	2	1.4

Spectator and Visitor	1	0.7
Spectator and Volunteer	14	9.8
Spectator and Other	1	0.7
Visitor and Volunteer	1	0.7
Organizer, Vendor and Sponsor	1	0.7
Organizer, Sponsor and Volunteer	1	0.7
Organizer, Spectator and Volunteer	1	0.7
Vendor, Spectator and Volunteer	1	0.7
Organizer, Sponsor, Spectator and Volunteer	1	0.7
No answer	1	0.7
Why did not attend the festival(n=38)		
Lack of time	12	31.6
No desire/ need	15	39.5
Others(Out of town, illness, and other responsibilities	11	28.9

¹ n=143.

The majority of the respondents were female (63.6%) between the ages of 40 and 59 years old (47.6%); married (79.0%); and most of them completed high school and earned at least one post-secondary degree (95%). This phenomenon generally reflected the census of 2010, where the gender makeup of the city was 45.9% male and 54.1% female with 49.9% of residents being married couples (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Syracuse,_Nebraska). The respondents who lived within the city of Syracuse (52.4%) was almost equal to the respondents who lived in the surrounding areas (46.2%), which indicates that geographically the sample populations were fairly distributed.

Many younger respondents between the ages of 20 and 29 years old attended the festival, which indicated that younger residents were enthusiastic about the festival. Some residents (9.1%) attended the festival for more than 30 years or even every year the festival was held indicating that some residents have a strong interest in and were the stable participants in the festival. Most of the respondents (73%) attended the festival in 2014 with their roles extremely varied. The majority of respondents were spectators

(20.3%) or volunteers (19.6%), some of them were visitors (9.8%) or sponsors (4.2%), and many participants (16.8%) played had a dual or plural role in the festival.

Sociocultural Impact Means

The means of each sociocultural impact statement are shown in Table 4.2. Five scales were used for the evaluation of how strongly the respondents agree or disagree with the sociocultural impact statements of GermanFest: *Strongly agree, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, Disagree, and Strongly disagree*. The mean of each question indicated the extent to which the respondents agreed or disagreed with the sociocultural impact statements (Causin, 2007). The higher the value of the mean indicates the stronger the residents' agreement with an impact item. By contrast the lower the value of the mean, the stronger the residents' disagreement with an impact item.

Table 4.2 The Means of Sociocultural Impact Statements from Highest to Lowest¹

Sociocultural Impact Statements	Means
Increased pride in the community because of this festival	4.38
The festival enhances the community's cultural identity	4.31
Provided more socializing opportunities for local people	4.30
The festival increases entertainment opportunities for local people	4.21
Enjoy having visitors who celebrate the festival together	4.16
Cultural experience and awareness are strengthened by the festival	4.15
Increased community well-being due to the festival	4.06
German art and music have been well preserved due to the festival	3.84
The festival increased resident's interest in history heritage	3.83
Interaction with visitors offers an educational experience	3.76
Increased opportunities for family reunions	3.73
Preservation of existing public/historical buildings due to the festival	3.68
Public facilities are maintained at a high standard due to the festival	3.62
Increased police presence during the festival time	3.53
It is difficult to find car parking during the festival	3.33
Trash are increased during the festival	3.33
Normal routines are disrupted during the festival	2.69
Locals avoid the festival	2.62

The festival causes the increased crime, alcohol and drug abuse	2.60
Overcrowding in local shops, streets and facilities during the festival	2.55
There is a decreased sense of community involvement in the festival	2.51
The festival causes noise pollution	2.34
Disagreement between/among social groups	2.32
Nature and grass destruction is increased during the festival	2.27
Increased price of goods and services due to the festival	2.25

¹n=139. 1 stands for “Strongly disagree”, 2 stands for “Disagree”, 3 stands for “Neither agree nor disagree”, 4 stands for “Agree”, and 5 stands for “Strongly agree”.

The impact statement that Increased pride in the community because of this festival had the highest mean of 4.38, which indicated that residents agreed with the impact generalized by GermanFest. Other impacts were: The festival enhances the community's cultural identity (mean=4.31); Provided more socializing opportunities for local people (mean=4.30); The festival increases entertainment opportunities for local people (mean=4.21); Enjoy having visitors who celebrate the festival together (mean=4.16); Cultural experience and awareness are strengthened by the festival (mean=4.15); and Increased community well-being due to the festival (mean=4.06). These 14 variables had means higher than 3.00 among the 25 impact variables as agreed by residents as the sociocultural impact of GermanFest.

Two impact statements It is difficult to find car parking during the festival and Trash are increased during the festival had the same mean of 3.33, which indicated that residents agreed with that the car parking became difficult during the festival and trash was increased. The result was identical with the expectation that the researcher thought the two negative sociocultural impacts were generated from the GermanFest.

However, it is found that nine impact statements had means less than 3.00 with residents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with those impact variables. Overall, for example, the variable of Increased price of goods and services due to the festival had the

lowest mean of 2.25, which meant that the residents disagreed with the price was increased during the festival. As a common phenomenon, the prices of goods and services rise during many special events, but the community of Syracuse did not do so. It reflected that the residents of Syracuse welcomed visitors to the GermanFest and treated them fairly. Another impact statement of Disagreement between/among social groups had the mean of 2.32, which meant that residents disagreed with the statement disagreement happened by hosting the festival. By contrast, the residents had an agreement to hold the festival annually and they really did it for the past 34 years. One more example, the impact variable of Locals avoid the festival had the mean of 2.62, which indicated that residents disagreed with this negative impact statement and they attended instead of avoiding the festival. Nine impact variables had means less than 3.00 but were not perceived to be negative impacts of the GermanFest.

Sociocultural Impact Dimensions

The Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale (FSIAS) developed by Delamere et al. (2001) was used to categorize the resident's attitude toward the festival. These researchers identified two dimensions of FSIAS as "social benefits" and "social costs", and all of these impact items loaded on "benefits" and "cost" categories separately.

Results of the present research reported that the sociocultural impact was comprised of three factors or dimensions: social costs, cultural life benefits, and community benefits. Factor loadings for dimensions of sociocultural impact of GermanFest can be found in Table 4.3. In order to determine whether the data were appropriate for the factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was applied to the 25-item scale and showed the value of 0.766 which is greater

than the 0.60 required for good factor analysis (Field, 2009; Small, 2007). The reliability of the 25-item was 0.751 which is above the acceptable level 0.70 and indicated the internal consistency of the scales of the instrument (Geroge & Mallery, 2003).

When conducting a factor analysis, the starting point is to determine the intercorrelation between variables in the correlation matrix and determine if a patterned relationship exists among variables (Field, 2009). If the correlation for variables is high ($R > 0.8$), the data may have a problem of multicollinearity. The researcher needs to consider eliminating one of the variables before proceeding (Field, 2005). When looking through the correlation matrix, it was found that the question “Cultural experience and awareness are strengthened by the festival” and the question “The festival enhances the community’s cultural identity” had a coefficient of 0.8. The question “Cultural experience and awareness are strengthened by the festival” and the question “The festival increased resident’s interest in history heritage” had a coefficient of 0.7. The researcher decided to remove the variable “Cultural experience and awareness are strengthened by the festival” for the reason that it was identified as having high correlations with two other variables.

Principle component analysis works on the initial assumption that all variance is common. All communalities are 1.0 before extraction. Communalities indicate the common variance (Table 4.3). The variance of each retained factors was represented by the communalities after extraction (Field, 2009). For example, 52.9% of the variance associated with the question “Disagreement between/among social groups” is common or shared variance.

According to Field (2009), factor analysis was a research analysis tool often used in scale development procedures and to aid in reducing the number of items in the scale. In this study, the researcher specified the number of factors to be extracted as 3. Varimax rotation was used for the factor rotation because it is assumed that the factors or components are orthogonal, which means that they are not correlated. The rotated component matrix is a matrix of the factor loadings for each variable onto each factor. When using this matrix, factor loadings less than 0.45 have not displayed because the investigator asked that the loadings less than 0.45 be suppressed, which facilitated interpretation. In total, 3 factors were retained.

Based on Kaiser's criterion only those factors with eigenvalues greater than 1 were retained, and only variables with factor loadings of greater than 0.45 were further interpreted as the components of the final factor structure. Noticeably, the question "Enjoy having visitors who celebrate the festival together" had almost the same factor loadings (0.476 and 0.472) in two factors. Because of this, the researcher decided to remove this question and reran the factor analysis. Finally, the SPSS result contained 3 factors and 23 variables.

The factor loadings were used in the interpretation and naming of the factors. Factor loadings indicate the degree to which each of the variables correlates with each of the factors (Kachigan, 1986). The variables with the highest loadings on a factor were the interpretation and naming of a factor (Kachigan, 1986). The factor loadings 1, 2, and 3 can be found in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3 The Communalities and Factor Loadings for the Dimensions of Sociocultural Impact of GermanFest¹

Variables	Communalities	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Disagreement between/among social groups	0.529	0.726		
Increased price of goods and services due to the festival	0.498	0.685		
Overcrowding in local shops, streets and facilities during the festival	0.550	0.679		
Nature and grass destruction is increased during the festival	0.502	0.673		
The festival causes noise pollution	0.589	0.583		
There is a decreased sense of community involvement in the festival	0.340	0.556		
It is difficult to find car parking during the festival	0.357	0.532		
Locals avoid the festival	0.420	0.527		
Normal routines are disrupted during the festival	0.363	0.496		
The festival causes the increased crime, alcohol and drug abuse	0.417	0.484		
Trash are increased during the festival	0.359	0.479		
The festival enhances the community's cultural identity	0.659		0.798	
The festival increased resident's interest in history heritage.	0.627		0.773	
German art and music have been well preserved due to the festival	0.499		0.694	
Increased pride in the community because of this festival	0.536		0.694	
Interaction with visitors offers an educational experience	0.476		0.632	
Preservation of existing public/historical buildings due to the festival	0.399		0.587	
Increased opportunities for family reunions	0.285		0.516	

Provided more socializing opportunities for local people	0.523	0.669
The festival increases entertainment opportunities for local people	0.543	0.658
Public facilities are maintained at a high standard due to the festival	0.303	0.516
Increased community well-being due to the festival	0.399	0.464
Increased police presence during the festival time	0.225	0.455

¹ n=139. Initial Communalities=1.0

Extraction Method: Principle Component Analysis

Rotation: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Option: Suppress absolute value less than .45

The eigenvalues associated with each factor represent the variance explained by the particular linear component and SPSS also displays the eigenvalue regarding to the percentage of variance explained. For instance, factor 1 explained 21.64% of total variance in this study (Table 4.4). The first factor always accounts for the most variance and hence has the highest eigenvalue, and then the next factor accounts for as much of the remaining variance as it can, and so on. Based on this research the initial eigenvalues for factor 1 was 4.978, factor 2 was 3.504, and factor 3 was 1.916 (Table 4.4). Therefore, each successive factor would account for less and less variance. The eigenvalues associated with these factors were displayed in “Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings”. The values in this part of the table were the same as the values before extraction, expecting that here the values for the retained factors were displayed.

Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings were labeled in the third part of the table where the values represented the distribution of the variance after the varimax rotation. Rotation had the effect of optimizing the factor structure and equalizing the relative importance of the three factors (Field, 2009). Varimax rotation maximized the variance of

each of the factors, so the total amount of the variance accounted for was redistributed after rotation (Bruin, 2006). For example, before rotation, factor 1 accounted for more variance than the remaining two factors (21.64% compared to 15.24% and 8.33%), however after Rotated Sums of Squared Loadings, factor 1 accounted for 17.23%, and the other two factors accounted for 16.96% and 11.02% respectively.

Table 4.4 Total Variance Explained for the Dimensions of Sociocultural Impact

	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Initial Eigenvalues	4.978	3.504	1.916
% of Variance	21.643	15.236	8.331
Cumulative%	21.643	36.878	45.209
Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings Eigenvalues	4.978	3.504	1.916
% of Variance	21.643	15.236	8.331
Cumulative%	21.643	36.878	45.209
Rotated Sums of Squared Loadings Eigenvalues	3.962	3.901	2.535
% of Variance	17.227	16.962	11.020
Cumulative%	17.227	34.189	45.209

Interpretation:

The variables of factor 1 relate to the impact of GermanFest that affect the local residents' life in the community. In particular, these impacts cause inconvenience and disturbance to residents' life during this festival. Therefore, this factor was named the social costs dimension.

Factor loadings for the social costs dimension:

- Disagreement between/among social groups

- Increased price of goods and services due to the festival
- Overcrowding in local shops, streets and facilities during the festival
- Nature and grass destruction is increased during the festival
- The festival causes noise pollution
- There is a decreased sense of community involvement in the festival
- It is difficult to find car parking during the festival
- Locals avoid the festival
- Normal routines are disrupted during the festival
- The festival causes the increased crime, alcohol and drug abuse
- Trash are increased during the festival

The residents in the city of Syracuse showed their attitudes clearly toward the social costs dimension identified. This dimension had the similarity with the factor of “inconvenience” and “personal frustration” identified in Small (2007), the “community impacts” factor in Small et al. (2005), and the “amenity loss” factor presented in Delamere et al (2001). This factor reflected on the issues related to the inconvenience that the members of the local community experienced for hosting of the festival. These included the issues of the overcrowding during festival, the difficulty of finding car parking, the decreased sense of community involvement in the festival, increased price of goods and services, and the normal routines were disturbed during the festival days. The remaining issues identified in this dimension were found to have similarity with factors of “impacts on behavior and environment” in Fredline, et al. (2003) and “social costs of community festivals” in Delamere’s work (2001). These referred to the social, behavioral and environmental problems of the increased crime, alcohol and drug abuse, a voidance

of the festival, and disagreements among social groups by the festival, as well as the natural environmental problems of the increased destruction of nature and grass, the noise pollution. These problems not only brought the inconvenience to the residents' life during the festival days, but also caused community environmental problems to local residents. They were the price paid for hosting of the festival.

The variables of factor 2 relate to the impact resulting from the GermanFest that allow the community members to feel a sense of cultural identity, pride, and collectedness. The preservation of facilities and culture together with other educational opportunities provided to the community, can allow the community to grow and develop. Hence, this factor was named cultural life benefits dimension.

Factor loadings for the cultural life benefits dimension:

- The festival enhances the community's cultural identity
- The festival increased resident's interest in history heritage.
- German art and music have been well preserved due to the festival
- Increased pride in the community because of this festival
- Interaction with visitors offers an educational experience
- Preservation of existing public/historical buildings due to the festival
- Increased opportunities for family reunions

This research showed that the respondents identified the cultural life benefits that the festival generated. Seven impact items were included in this dimension and included the issues of: the cultural pride and identity enhanced, the German art and music have been preserved, the preservation of existing public/historical building, and interaction with visitors brought the residents the educational experience, as well as the interest in

history heritage. The results were similar to the factor of “community growth and development” in Small (2007), the “cultural impacts” factor in Small et al. (2005), and the “community benefits” factor in Woosnam et al.’s work (2013). The possible reasoning behind this was that the residents thought the enhancement of cultural pride and identity and the preservation of German art, music and historical buildings could contribute to the cultural growth and development that relate to the community as a collective, an entity. While the increased interest in history heritage, opportunities for family reunion and interactions with visitors offering them educational experiences provided them the cultural benefits as individual benefits. Those issues had a consistency with the factor of “individual benefits” termed in Delamere’s (2001) and Woosnam et al.’s (2013) study.

The variables of factor 3 relate to the benefit and opportunities that residents gain as a result of hosting the GermanFest. The social and entertainment opportunities provided to the residents, and the increased police presence due to the festival enhanced the sense of well-being to the entire community. Hence, this factor was named community benefits dimension.

Factor loadings for the community benefits dimension:

- Provided more socializing opportunities for local people
- The festival increases entertainment opportunities for local people
- Public facilities are maintained at a high standard due to the festival
- Increased community well-being due to the festival
- Increased police presence during the festival time

The dimension of community benefits identified in this study was parallel with the “health and safety impacts” factor in Small et al. (2005), the “entertainment and

socialization opportunities” factor in Small (2007), and the “social and economic development benefits” factor in Fredline et al (2003). This factor included the issues of increased socialization opportunities and entertainment opportunities, the public facilities were well maintained, the community well-being was enhanced, and together with the increased police presence. The economic benefits (Fredline et al., 2003) did not parallel with the dimension that were identified in the present study. The variable of this dimension all had relatively high means (above 3.00) which demonstrated that the community benefits did exist and have positively affected the life of the community.

Important Reasons for Celebrating the Festival

The descriptive statistics for the important reasons the city of Syracuse celebrates the festival were showed in Table 4.5. Five scales were used for the evaluation of the important reasons: *Not important*, *Less important*, *Important*, *More important*, and *Extremely important*.

Table 4.5 The Descriptive Statistics for the Important Reasons for Celebrating the GermanFest¹

Variables	Response	Mean
Attract visitors and investment	143	3.99
Improve city image	143	3.79
Foster social and cultural life	143	3.76
Inherit and celebrate German culture	143	3.71
Socialization opportunities	143	3.67
Improve community cohesion	143	3.56
Family togetherness	143	3.51
Stimulate urban development	142*	3.20

¹ n=143. 1 stands for “Not important”, 2 stands for “Less important”, 3 stands for “Important”, 4 stands for “More important”, and 5 stands for “Extremely important”.

* 142 responses due to one missing answer.

In the context of reasons for the celebration, residents tended to perceive the important reasons to be more beneficial to the community or themselves on a personal

level. From Table 4.5, Attract visitors and investment got the highest mean of 3.99 which indicated that this variable was the most important reason for the city of Syracuse celebrates GermanFest. Nevertheless, the means of two variables: Improve city image (mean=3.79) and Foster social and cultural life (mean=3.76), indicated that they were important reasons as well. These reasons were thought to be more beneficial to the community than individuals. All the means were above 3.00 and each variable could be considered to be an important reason. For example, the variable of stimulating urban development (mean=3.20) was deemed as the less important reason in this study.

The results showed that the most important reason was to attract visitors and investment; however, improving city image and fostering social and cultural life were the more important reasons. Performing festivals is now a worldwide phenomenon (Getz, 1991; Grant and Paliwoda, 1998). The reasons for the explosion of numbers of special events and festivals are multifaceted in reasons, ranging from city image improving, cultural planning, and tourism development, to socialization needs and leisure requirements (Prentice & Andersen, 2003). The results of this study were consistent with the aforementioned studies. One explanation was that GermanFest is a two-day cultural festival of celebrating German cultural heritage in the city of Syracuse. The aim of it is to celebrate the German culture with all the community members and visitors. It is important to attract more visitors and investment to ensure the continuous celebration of the festival. As more people attend the festival, the community is more likely to host it again, improve the city image and enhance the German culture. The festival also met the needs for entertainment and socialization of residents.

Relationship among the Festival Stakeholders

The descriptive frequency distribution in Table 4.6 revealed the relationship among the festival stakeholders. Four choices were used for analyzing the results: *Mutually beneficial cooperation, General cooperation, No relationship, Competition for resources*. Sixty five respondents (45.5%) indicated that the relationship among the festival stakeholders was general cooperation, 60 (42.0%) indicated the mutually beneficial, 16 (11.2%) indicated no cooperation, and only 2 respondents (1.4%) reported that there was competition for resources among festival stakeholders.

Table 4.6 The Descriptive Frequency Distribution of the Relationship Among the Festival Stakeholders¹

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Mean
Relationship among the festival stakeholders	143	100	1.72
Mutually beneficial cooperation	60	42.0	
General cooperation	65	45.5	
No relationship	16	11.2	
Competition for resources	2	1.4	

¹ n=143. 1 represents “Mutually beneficial cooperation”, 2 represents “General cooperation”, 3 represents “No relationship”, and 4 represents “Competition for resources”.

Respondents (87.5%) reported two main kinds of relationship among the festival stakeholders: mutually beneficial cooperation and general cooperation. One explanation was that the festival had a large body of stakeholders, some of which supported the festival during the festival, and some of them worked throughout the year like the festival organizers (Andersson, 2009). All stakeholders became the related entities and thereby parts of the festival context as well as the co-producers. They collaborated with each party to implement the festival, especially those people who had the obligation to take a prominent role in the planning of the festival. GermanFest aimed to celebrate and carry

forward the German cultural heritage, so people who participated in this festival had high passion for it. As evidenced by the data about the roles of the participants, most of them were spectators, visitors, volunteers, and sponsors, which revealed that the relationship among the stakeholders were peaceful and friendly, at least no conflict and competition for resources.

These kinds of cooperative relationships among stakeholders brought them the desired benefits when choosing to participate in the festival. In addition, the outcomes of participation met the common goal of the festival and the expectation of stakeholders. Because of such kinds of relationship, the GermanFest had successfully implemented for more than 30 years and would continue to do so. This result was consistent with the concept of Getz and Andersson (2009) that mutual beneficial cooperation was positive for the sustainability of festivals.

Levels of Involvement of Residents in the Festival

The descriptive frequency distribution showed the levels of involvement of the residents in the festival in Table 4.7. Four scales were used for the evaluation of involvement level of residents in the festival: *Extremely active*, *Active*, *Somewhat active*, and *Not active*. A total of 143 (100%) respondents answered to this question. Among them, 57 (39.9%) reported that they were somewhat active in the festival; 36 (25.2%) reported that they were actively involved in the festival; only 13 (9.1%) reported that they were extremely active in the festival. Still there were 37 (25.9%) reported that they were not actively involved in the festival. The mean was 2.83 and revealed that the overall level of involvement was close to somewhat active level.

Table 4.7 The Descriptive Frequency Distribution of Levels of Involvement of Residents in the Festival¹

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Mean
Levels of the residents involvement	143	100	2.83
Extremely active	13	9.1	
Active	36	25.2	
Somewhat active	57	39.9	
Not active	37	25.9	

¹ n=143. 1 stands for “Extremely active”, 2 stands for “Active”, 3 stands for “Somewhat active”, and 4 stands for “Not active”.

The mean of the descriptive frequency indicated that the community did not have a highly active level of involvement in it. One fourth of respondents reported they were not active in the festival. One of the possible explanations was that 38 respondents did not attend the festival. Even though the rest of respondents attended the festival, most of their roles were spectators, visitors, volunteers. As a result these people were not deeply involved in discussing, planning and processing this event.

According to the social exchange theory, the residents evaluated the exchange of benefits and the costs of social interaction. When the costs from social interaction outweighed the benefits, the exchange relationship would be terminated, and when the opposite was true, the exchange activity would continue (AP, 1992). The nature of this festival is non-profit and there was limited economic benefit that can be generated for the spectators, visitors, volunteers. Also, there were sociocultural benefits like increased socialization and entertainment opportunities, increased cultural experience and awareness, but it was not necessary for these people to get involved in this festival, instead they had other opportunities for them. When people did not expect benefits from

the festival, they would not have the wish to exchange the cost of actively supporting and participating in the festival.

Improvement of the Quality of Life of the Community Residents

Table 4.8 showed the descriptive statistics for the extent that the festival improved the quality of life of the community. Four scales were used for the evaluation of the extent of improvement: *Not improved*, *Somewhat improved*, *Improved*, and *Extremely improved*.

The higher the means of the variables, the more improved the quality of life of the community residents. The most improved facet of quality of life in the community was the activities of daily living such as volunteer activities (mean=2.73). It was consistent with the results of demographic information (many people volunteer (19.6%) to help process the festival). Community cohesion and Cultural experience and communication also got the same higher mean (mean=2.57) which indicated that those have been improved by the festival as well. Oppositely, the lower means of variables: Social statues and network (mean=2.22), Personal growth and development (mean=2.08), and Health and safety (mean=1.77) revealed that those were somewhat or not improved by the festival.

Table 4.8 The Descriptive Statistics for the Improved Extent of the Quality of Life of the Community¹

Variables	Response	Mean
Activities of daily living such as volunteer activities	143	2.73
Community cohesion	143	2.57
Cultural experience and communication	143	2.57
Family relationship and friendship	143	2.37
Satisfaction and happiness with life	143	2.34
Recreational facilities and areas	143	2.32
Residential environment	143	2.28
Social statues and network	143	2.22

Personal growth and development	143	2.08
Health and safety	142*	1.77

¹ n=143. 1 stands for “Not improved”, 2 stands for “Somewhat improved”, 3 stands for “Improved”, and 4 stands for “Extremely improved”.

* 142 responses due to one missing answer.

The results indicated that some of the facets of quality of life had been improved, like the activities of daily living such as volunteer activities, community cohesion, and cultural experience and communication. The remaining facets of quality of life had been somewhat improved, such as the family relationship and friendship, satisfaction and happiness with life, and recreational facilities and areas. In terms of the improved facets of the quality of life in the community, the activities of daily living such as volunteer activities improved compared to other variables. It was parallel with the demographic information of roles in the festival where volunteers accounted for one fifth of the respondents, which indicated that some people had the wish to volunteer and volunteered in the festival.

Being actively involved in the festival by volunteering in it could enhance the community cohesion and cultural experience (Jeannotte, 2003). Meanwhile, the festival provided opportunities for family reunion, socialization and entertainment which help to improve the family relationship and satisfaction with life. In addition, GermanFest increased police presence and supported preservation of public buildings and recreational facilities. All those phenomena indicated that the festival enhanced the quality of life in the community.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Simple descriptive frequency distribution and factor analysis were conducted to determine the dimensions of the sociocultural impact of GermanFest, the important reasons for celebrating the festival, the relationship among the festival stakeholders, the levels of involvement in the festival, and whether the festival improved the quality of life of the community. This chapter would conclude the results of the study and give the recommendations for future researches.

Conclusions

The results of the present study have achieved the research objectives and have important applications in the real festival setting. The three dimensions of the sociocultural impact were social costs, cultural life benefits, and community benefits. The important reason for the city celebrates such a festival was attracting visitors and investment; the cooperation was the main relationship among festival stakeholders; the local residents were somewhat actively involved in the festival; and the quality of residents' lives in the community has been improved by the festival.

As evidenced by the results of means of sociocultural impact, the residents and the festival planners could better understand that which impact was generalized by the festival and which was not. It is an effective way for festival organizers to know what impact were resulted from the festival and how did them impact the residents' life in the community.

From the results of dimensions of the sociocultural impact, hosting of the GermanFest impacted the community. The community leaders and festival organizers

should realize those sociocultural benefits impacts which were strongly agreed by the resident. For instance, the German culture and art was preserved and carried forward continuously, the socialization and entertainment opportunities were increased due to the festival, the senses of well-being was increased by the festival, as well as the public facilities and buildings were well maintained. The planners should keep enhancing them to benefit residents in the future festival planning.

Following the review of the literature regarding social exchange theory, it can be concluded that the residents will be actively involved in the festival if they are satisfied with the benefits. Therefore, keeping benefiting the residents is a good method to attract the support from them for the festival and let them remain in this relationship further on.

However, the community leaders and festival planners need to be aware of the social costs dimension of the festival. They should realize how the problems come out and then make a clear plan in advance to avoid them, or at least reduce their impacts to a desired extent. For instance, the organizers could plan the parking area as much as possible with distinct marks to make sure the parking is accessible; the festival planners need to reduce the disturbance to the local people and try to keep the normal routines of the non-attending residents.

Furthermore, the festival planners need to make an effort to retain those non-attending residents because they are the potential participants in the festival. Especially, the results of the study reported that 38 people accounted for 26.6% who did not attend the festival in 2014. Festival organizers should conduct an investigation about the reasons why they did not attend, and their expectations of the festival. Then trying to make

adjustments like adding or removing some programs to attract those people in future festival planning.

Another important implication of the results is that the community leaders and festival organizers can call for actions from the residents to reduce or remove the costs. For instance, some residents agreed that trash was increased during the festival time, with knowing this fact the residents can be more aware of their behaviors and the festival organizers can arrange more trash cans to improve the live festival environment.

Festival organizers can also utilize the results of this study to continue improvement in the quality of residents' life in the community. They can look at the mean differences from the variable with highest mean like the increased activities of daily living to the lowest variable as health and safety. What's more, festival planners should be aware of the impact by the residents at different age and stay time in the city. Residents who live longer in the city were inclined to have various attitudes toward the quality of their lives. It is an opportunity to ask their opinions regarding the improvement and keep them satisfied in the future.

The measurement of the resident's attitudes toward the sociocultural impact of community festivals, and the development of instruments to measure those attitudes are critical for both communities and festival organizers. With the increased awareness of the needs of the community, festival organizers can better understand the community concerns and attitudes and respond to them. It is necessary to spend a greater effort to enhance the benefits of the festival and explore the residents' interest to participate in the festival, and then go a further step to improve the quality of life of the community.

Recommendations

The questionnaire developed and used in this study was easy for respondents to understand and complete. However, it was conducted in the city with less than 2,000 population, and 200 participants participated in the survey. The future researchers can conduct this study with a bigger population and sample size.

Questions regarding the participant's family members and the motive of attending would be important to include in a future study. The motivation of attending could help researchers to understand the most successful part of the festival and the most attractive programs to participants.

Additional recommendation for research is to use mixed method to ensure the response rate because it is hard to find the appropriate time and location to get access to participants. Mail- out survey method could be considered as a choice, because it is more flexible for respondents to do it. It is also important to increase the interest in local resident's participation by incentives in the future research.

The present study examined the sociocultural impact regarding the residents' attitudes and was conducted before the festival time. In order to deep understand the complexity of attitude toward the impact of festival, it is recommended to conduct a post evaluation of the festival in the future study.

REFERENCES

- Allen, J., Harris, R., Jago, L., & Veal, A. (2000). *Events beyond 2000: setting the agenda*. Australia: Australian center for event management.
- Anderson, J. C. (1984). The effect of sampling error on convergence, improper solutions, and goodness-of-fit indices for maximum likelihood confirmatory factor analysis. *Psychometrika*, 49(2), 155-173.
- Andereck, K., & Nyaupane, G. (2010). Exploring the nature of tourism and quality of life perceptions among residents. *Journal of travel research*, 50 (3), 248-260.
- Andereck, K., Valentine, K., & Knopf, R. (2005). Residents' perceptions of community tourism impacts. *Annals of tourism research*, 32(4), 1056-1076.
- Andereck, K., Vogt, C. (2000). The relationship between residents' attitudes toward tourism and tourism development options. *Journal of travel research*, 39, 27-36.
- Andersen, V., Prentice, R., & Guerin, S. (1997). Imaging of Denmark among visitors to Dennish, time arts exhibitions in Scotland. *Tourism management*, 18(7), 453 – 462.
- Ap, J. (1992). Residents' perceptions on tourism impacts. *Annals of tourism research*, 19(4), 665-690.
- Arcodia, C., & Whitford, M. (2006). Festival attendance and the development of social capital. *Journal of convention and event tourism*, 8(2), 1-18.
- Bachleitner, R., & Zins, A. (1992). Cultural tourism in rural communities: the resident's perspective. *Journal of business research*. 44 (3), 199-209.
- Balduck, A., Maes, M. & Buelens. (2011). The social impact of the Tour de France: comparisons of residents' pre-and post-event perceptions. *European sport management quarterly*, 11(2), 91-113.
- Bartlett, J., Kotrlik, J. and Higgins, C. (2001). Organizational research: Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *Information Technology, Learning and Performance Journal*, 19 (1), 43-50.
- Becker, H., & Vanclay, F. (2003). *The international handbook of social impact assessment: conceptual and methodological advances*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward elgar publishing.
- Berg, B. (1995). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (7th edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of tourism research*, 26(3), 493-515.

- Bull, C., & Lovell, J. (2007). The impact of hosting major sporting events on local residents: an analysis of the views and perceptions of Canterbury residents in relation to the Tour de France 2007. *Journal of sport and tourism*, 12 (3-4), 229-248.
- Burdge, R., & Vanclay, F. (1995). *Environmental and social impact assessment*. New Jersey, NY: John Wiley and sons.
- Carey, J., & Morgan, M. (1996). Intercoder agreement in analysis of response to open-ended interview questions: examples from tuberculosis research. *Cultural anthropology methods*, 8(3), 1-5.
- Carley, K. (1990). Content analysis. *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. 2, 725-730.
- Causin, G. G. (2007) *A study to examine the preparation and training of hospitality expatriate executives*. Oklahoma State University. DAI thesis and dissertations. Retrieved from <http://www.robertniles.com/stats/>.
- Cecil, A., Fu, Y., Wang, S., & Avgoustis, S. (2008). Exploring resident awareness of cultural tourism and its impact on quality of life. *European journal of tourism research*, 1(1), 39-52.
- Coccossis, H., & Parpaire, A. (1995). Assessing the interaction between heritage, environment and tourism. Mykonos. In Coccossis, H., & Nijkamp, P. (Eds) *Sustainable Tourism Development* (P. 127). Hong Kong: Avebury.
- Cohen, E. (1984). The sociology of tourism: approached, issues, and findings. *Annual review of sociology*, 11, 373-392.
- Cortina, J. M. (1993). What is coefficient alpha? An examination of theory and applications. *Journal of applied psychology*, 78, 98-104.
- Crompton, J. L., Lee, S., & Shuster, T. (2001). A guide for undertaking economic impact studies: the Springfest example. *Journal of travel research*, 40, 79-87.
- Crompton, J. L., & Love, L. L. (1995). The predictive validity of alternative approaches to evaluating quality of a festival. *Journal of travel research*, 34(11): 11-24.
- Crompton, J. L., & McKay, S. (1994). Measuring the economic impact of festivals and events: some myths, misapplications and ethical dimensions. *Festival management & event tour*, 2, 33-43.
- Cronbach's Alpha* Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Internal_consistency.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16 (3), 297-334.
- Crowe, S., Cresswell, K., and Avery, A. (2011). The case study approach. *Medical Research Methodology*, 11, 1-9.

- Dahles, H. (2001). *Tourism, heritage and national culture in Java*. Raymond: Curzon press.
- Delamere, T. (2001). Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, Part Two: Verification of the scale. *Event management*, 7, 25-38.
- Delamere, T. A., Wankel, L. M., and Hinch, T. D. (2001). Development of a scale to measure resident attitudes toward the social impacts of community festivals, Part 1: Item generation and purification of the measure. *Event management*, 7, 11-24.
- Dinaburgskaya, K. & Ekner, P. (2010). *Social impacts of the way out west festival on the residents of the City of Goteborg*. (Unpublished master's thesis) University of Gothenburg. Retrieved from <https://gupea.ub.gu.se/handle/2077/22602>.
- Dumont, E., Lask, T., Sutherland, M., & Tweed, C. (2007). *Identifying key indicators to measure the impacts of cultural tourism strategies upon urban quality of life*. Pro-active management of the Impact of Cultural Tourism upon Urban Resources Economies.
- Dwyer, L., & Forsyth, P. (2009). Public sector support for special events. *Eastern economic journal*, 35, 481-499.
- Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., & Spurr, R. (2005). Estimating the impacts of special events on an economy. *Journal of travel research*, 43(4), 351-359.
- Dwyer, L., Forsyth, P., & Spurr, R. (2006). Assessing the economic impacts of events: a computable general equilibrium approach. *Journal of travel research*, 45, 59-66.
- Dwyer, L., Mellor, R., Mistilis, N., & Mules, T. (2000). A framework for assessing "tangible" and "intangible" impacts of events and conventions. *Event management*, 6(3), 175-189.
- Emerson, R.M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annals Review of Sociology*, 2, 335-362.
- Esu, B. & Arrey, V. (2009). Tourists' satisfaction with cultural tourism festival: a case study of Calabar carnival festival, Nigeria. *International journal of business and management*, 4(3), 116-125.
- Falassi, A. (1987). *Festival: definition and morphology*. In Waterman, S. (Ed), *Carnival for elites? The cultural politics of arts festivals* (pp. 54-74). Boston, MA: Human Geography.
- Field, A. P. (2005). *Discovering statistic using SPSS* (2nd edition). London: Sage.
- Field, A. P. (2009). *Discovering statistic using SPSS* (3rd edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications.
- Freeman, R. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman publishing.

- Gaur, A. & Gaur, S. (2009). *Statistical methods for practice and research: a guide to data analysis using SPSS*. Los Angeles: Response.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: a simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4th edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Getz, D., Andersson, T. & Carlsen, J. (2010). Festival management studies: developing a framework and priorities for comparative and cross-cultural research. *International journal of event and festival management*, 1(1), 29-59.
- Getz, D. (2010). The nature and scope of festival studies. *International journal of event management research*, 5(1), 1-47.
- Goodpastor, K. (1991). Business ethics and stakeholder analysis. *Business ethics quarterly*, 1, 53-71.
- Grosbois, D. D. (2009). Assessing the socio-cultural impact of special events: frameworks, methods, and challenges. *Journal of tourism challenges and trends*, 2 (2), 39-52.
- Gunsoy, E., & Hannam, K. (2013). Festivals, community development and sustainable tourism in the Karpaz region of North Cyprus. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 5(1), 81-94.
- Gursoy, D., Kim, K., & Uysal, M. (2004). Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organizaers: an extension and validation. *Tourism management*, 25, 171-181.
- Hall, C. M. (1992). *Hallmark tourist events: impacts, management and planning*. London: Belhaven press.
- Haynes, S., Richard, D. & Kubany, E.S. (1995). Content validity in psychological assessment: a functional approach to concepts and methods. *Psychological assessment*, 7(3), 238-247.
- Haxton, P. Community involvement and the Olympic Games- a review of related research, paper presented at the 7th international postgraduate seminar on Olympic studies, IOA. Retrieved from http://www.geocities.ws/olympic_seminar7/papers/haxton.htm.
- Hede, A. M. (2007). Managing special events in the new era of the triple bottom line. *Event Management*, 11(1-2), 13-22.
- Herrero, L., Sanz, J. & Bedate, A. (2011). Who pays more for a cultural festival, tourists or Locals? A certainty analysis of a contingent valuation application. *International journal of tourism research*, 14(5), 195.
- Hinkin, T. R. (1995). A review of scale development practices in the study of organizations. *Journal of management*, 21(5), 967-988.

- Hiller, H. (1990). The urban transformation of a Landmark Event: the 1988 Calgary Winter Olympics'. *Urban affairs quarterly*, 26(1), 118-137.
- Hsieh, H. F., & Shannon, S. E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis. *Qualitative health research*, 15(9), 1277-1288.
- Jeannotte, M. S. (2003). Singing alone? The contribution of cultural capital to social cohesion and sustainable communities. *The international journal of cultural policy*, 9(1), 35-49.
- Kim, K., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, J. (2013). How does tourism in a community impact the quality of life of community residents? *Tourism management*, 36, 527-540.
- Kim, W., & Walker, M. (2012). Measuring the social impacts associated with Super Bowl XLIII: Preliminary development of a psychic income scale. *Sport Management Review*, 15, 91-108.
- Kondracki, N. L., & Wellman, N. (2002). Content analysis: review of methods and their applications in nutrition education, *Journal of nutrition education and behavior*, 34, 224-230.
- Liburd, J. & Derkzen, P. (2009). Emic perspectives on quality of life: the case of the Danish Wadden Sea Festival. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 9(2), 132-146.
- Malfas, M., Theodoraki, E. & Houlihan, B. (2004). Impacts of the Olympic games as mega-events. *Municipal engineer* 157, 209-220.
- Mayo, E. J. (1973). Regional Images and regional travel behavior: research for changing travel patterns, interpretation and utilization proceedings of the Travel Research Association. *Fourth Annual Conference*, 211-218.
- Misener, L., & Mason, D. S. (2006). Creating community networks: can sporting events offer meaningful sources of social capital? *Managing leisure*, 11, 39-56.
- Mola, F., Mohamed, B., & Rad, N. (2011). Evaluation of adverse tourism impacts on culture of George Town, Penang. *Sustainable tourism research cluster*, 31, 204-212.
- Neal, J., Uysal, M., & Sirgy, J. (2007). The effect of tourism services on travelers' quality of life. *Journal of travel research*, 46, 154-163.
- Ozdemir, G., & Culha, O. (2009). Satisfaction and loyalty of festival visitors. *Anatolia: an international journal of tourism and hospitality research*, 20(2), 359-373.
- Ozdemir, R. S., Topbas, S., & Louis, K. (2011). Public attitudes toward stuttering in Turkey: probability versus convenience sampling. *Journal of fluency disorders*, 36, 262-267.
- Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependency perspective*. New York: Harper and Row.

- Phelan C., & Wren J. (2005–2006). *Exploring reliability in academic assessment*. University of Northern Iowa. Retrieved from <http://www.uni.edu/chfasoa/reliabilityandvalidity.htm>.
- Picard, D., & Robinson, M. (2006). *Festivals, Tourism and Social Change: Remaking Worlds*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Prentice, R. & Andersen, V. (2003). Festival as creative destination. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30(1), 7-30.
- Prentice, R. & Andersen, U. (2003). Evoking Ireland: modeling tourist propensity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(2):490-516.
- Rea, L. & Park, R. (2012). *Design and conducting survey research: A comprehensive guide*. New Jersey, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Reid, S. (2007). Identifying social consequences of rural events. *Event management*, 11, 89-98.
- Reid, S., & Arcodia, C. (2002). Understanding the roles of the stakeholder in event management. *Events and place marketing*. Presented at the event research conference, Sydney, UTS Sydney.
- Ritchie, J. (1984). Assessing the impact of hallmark events: conceptual and research issues. *Journal of Travel Research*, 22(1), 2-11.
- Ritchie, B., & Lyons, M. (1987). Olympulse III/IV: A mid-term report on resident attitudes concerning the XV Olympic Winter Games. *Journal of travel research*, 26(1), 18-25.
- Rollins, R. & Delamere, T. (2007). Measuring the social impact of festivals. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 34(3), 805-808.
- Sapsford, R. & Jupp, V. (1996). *Data collection and analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE publications.
- Schalock, R. (2004). The concept of quality of life: what we know and do not know. *Journal of intellectual disability research*, 48(3), 203-216.
- Schalock, R., Brown, I, at al. (2002). Conceptualization, measurement, and application of quality of life for persons with intellectual disabilities: report of an international panel of expert. *Mental retardation*, 40(6), 457-470.
- Scheuren, F. (2004). *What is a survey?* Boston, MA: American statistical association.
- Small, K., Edwards, D. & Sheridan, L. (2005). A flexible framework for evaluation the socio-cultural impacts of a small festival. *International journal of event management research*, 1(1), 66-76.

- Small, K. (2007). Social dimensions of community festivals: An application of factor analysis in the development of the social impact perception (SIP) scale. *Event management*, 11, 45-55.
- Shone, A., & Parry, B. (2004). *Successful Event Management*. Boston, MA: Thomson Learning.
- Silberberg, T. (1995). Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritage sites. *Tourism management*, 16 (5), 361-372.
- Scofield, T.H.B & LI, F.M.S. (1988). Tourism development and cultural, policies of China. *Annals of tourism research*, 25 (2):362-392.
- Soteriades, M., & Dimou, I. (2011). Special events: a framework for efficient management. *Journal of hospitality marketing and management*, 20, 329-346.
- Syracuse, Nebraska. Retrieved from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Syracuse,_Nebraska
- Tabachnick, B. C., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th edition). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Thomas, R., & Brubaker, D. (2000). *Thesis and dissertations: a guide to planning, research, and writing*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
- Turo, D., Swart, K. & Bob,U. (2003). Socio-economic impacts of sport tourism in the Durban Unicity, South Africa. *Journal of sport tourism*, 8(4), 223-239.
- Waite, G. (2003). Social impacts of the Sydney Olympics. *Annals of tourism research*, 30(1), 194-215.
- Walo, M., Bull, A. & Breen, H. Achieving economic benefit at local events: a case study of a local sports event. *Journal of festival management and event tourism*, 4 (3), 95-106.
- Waterman, S. (1998). Carnivals for elites? The cultural politics of arts festivals. *Progress in human geography*, 22 (1), 54-74.
- Williams, P., & Elkhatab, A. (2012). Leveraging tourism social capital: the case of the 2010 Olympic tourism consortium. *International journal of event and festival management*. 3(3), 317-334.
- Wood, E. (2005). Measuring the economic and social impacts of local authority events. *International journal of public sector management*, 18(1), 37-53.
- Woosnam, K. M., Van Winkle, C. M., & An, S. (2013). Conforming the festival social impact attitudes scale in the context of a rural Texas cultural festival. *Event management*, 17, 257-270.
- Yolal, M., Cetinel, F., & Uysal, M. (2009). An examination of festival motivation and perceived benefits relationship: Eskiehir International Festival. *Journal of convention and event tourism*, 10(4), 276-291.

Yong, A., & Pearce, S. (2013). A beginner's guide to factor analysis: focusing on exploratory factor analysis. *Tutorials in quantitative methods for psychology*, 9(2), 79-94.

APPENDIX A

7/19/2015

Gmail - NUgrant Message - Official Approval Letter for IRB project #14997



Yanli Wang <yanliwangz@gmail.com>

NUgrant Message - Official Approval Letter for IRB project #14997

nugrant-irb@unl.edu <nugrant-irb@unl.edu>
 Reply-To: nugrant-irb@unl.edu
 To: gcausin2@unl.edu, yanliwangz@gmail.com

Tue, May 26, 2015 at 12:53 PM



May 19, 2015

Yanli Wang
 Department of Nutrition and Health Sciences

Gina Fe Causin
 Department of Nutrition and Health Sciences
 LEV 202F, UNL, 68583-0806

IRB Number:
 Project ID: 14997
 Project Title: Assessing the Sociocultural Impact of Special Events in the Context of GermanFest in
 Syracuse, NE

Dear Yanli:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects has completed its review of the
 Request for Change in Protocol submitted to the IRB.

1. It has been approved to revise some of the survey questions.

We wish to remind you that the principal investigator is responsible for reporting to this Board any of
 the following events within 48 hours of the event:

- * Any serious event (including on-site and off-site adverse events, injuries, side effects, deaths, or
 other problems) which in the opinion of the local investigator was unanticipated, involved risk to
 subjects or others, and was possibly related to the research procedures;
- * Any serious accidental or unintentional change to the IRB-approved protocol that involves risk or has
 the potential to recur;
- * Any publication in the literature, safety monitoring report, interim result or other finding that indicates
 an unexpected change to the risk/benefit ratio of the research;
- * Any breach in confidentiality or compromise in data privacy related to the subject or others; or
- * Any complaint of a subject that indicates an unanticipated risk or that cannot be resolved by the
 research staff.

This letter constitutes official notification of the approval of the protocol change. You are therefore
 authorized to implement this change accordingly.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB office at 472-6965.

Sincerely,

Becky R. Freeman, CIP

APPENDIX B



Sociocultural Impact Study Questionnaire

Dear Respondent:

Greetings!

We are researchers from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in the Hospitality, Restaurant and Tourism Management Program. We are currently doing a study to determine the sociocultural impact of GermanFest in Syracuse, NE. Your participation is greatly appreciated. If you choose not to participate, just return the questionnaire. If you have any questions about the research, please contact us.

Before you begin, please read the following instructions carefully:

- 1) Please answer each question as accurate as possible according to your experience and thought. There are no right or wrong answers. How and whether you answer all the questions will not affect your relationship with the investigator.
- 2) The questions that ask about your background will be used only to describe the types of participants completing this survey. The information will not be used to identify you and the answers you give will be kept private.
- 3) The survey will take about 5-10 minutes of your time to complete.
- 4) People aged 20 and older are eligible to do this survey.

Thank you so much for your participation!

Yanli Wang, MS. Principal Investigator
Hospitality Management Program
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Email: yanliwangz@gmail.com

Dr. Gina Fe G. Causin, Ph.D. Co-Principal Investigator
Assistant Professor
Hospitality, Restaurant & Tourism Management
College of Education and Human Sciences
University of Nebraska-Lincoln
Email: gcausin2@unl.edu

Sociocultural Impact Study Questionnaire

Section 1. Sociocultural Impact Statements

1. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each sociocultural impact statement of GermanFest:

Sociocultural impact statements	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Increased community well-being due to the festival					
Increased opportunities for family reunions					
Provided more socializing opportunities for local people					
The festival increases entertainment opportunities for local people					
It is difficult to find car parking during the festival					
Disagreement between/among social groups					
Overcrowding in local shops, streets and facilities during the festival					
Increased price of goods and services due to the festival					
The festival causes noise pollution					
Trash are increased during the festival					
Enjoy having visitors who celebrate the festival together					
Preservation of existing public/historical buildings due to the festival					
Public facilities are maintained at a high standard due to the festival					
The festival causes the increased crime, alcohol and drug abuse					
Increased police presence during the festival time					
Increased pride in the community because of this festival					
The festival enhances the community's cultural identity					
Cultural experience and awareness are strengthened by the festival					
The festival increased resident's interest in history heritage.					
German art and music have been well preserved due to the festival					
Interaction with visitors offers an educational experience					
Locals avoid the festival					
Nature and grass destruction is increased during the festival					
Normal routines are disrupted during the festival					
There is a decreased sense of community involvement in the festival					

Section 2. Community and Resident

2. Please indicate the important reasons why the city of Syracuse celebrates GermanFest?

Reasons	Extremely important	More important	Important	Less important	Not important
Stimulate urban development					
Foster social and cultural life					
Attract visitors and investment					
Improve city image					
Family togetherness					
Inherit and celebrate German culture					
Improve community cohesion					
Socialization opportunities					

3. Please indicate the extent of how the festival improves your quality of life?

Quality of life	Extremely improved	Improved	Somewhat improved	Not improved
Satisfaction and happiness with life				
Family relationship and friendship				
Health and safety				
Personal growth and development				
Recreational facilities and areas				
Cultural experience and communication				
Residential environment				
Activities of daily living such as volunteer activities				
Community cohesion				
Social statues and network				

4. What's the relationship among festival participants (residents, vendors, sponsors, spectators, etc.)?

- ☐ Mutually beneficial cooperation
- ☐ General cooperation
- ☐ No relationship
- ☐ Competition for resources

5. What's your level of community involvement with the festival?

- ☐ Extremely active
- ☐ Active
- ☐ Somewhat active
- ☐ Not active

Section 3. Demographic Information

6. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

7. What's your age: _____ Years.

8. What's your current marital status?

- ☐ Never been married
- ☐ Married
- ☐ Divorced
- ☐ Widowed

9. Where and how long have you been living in Syracuse?

- ☐ Within the city of Syracuse _____ Years.
- ☐ In the surrounding areas of city of Syracuse _____ Years.

10. What's the highest level of education you have completed?

- ☐ GED
- ☐ High school
- ☐ Technical/ associates
- ☐ Bachelor
- ☐ Master/PhD
- ☐ Other _____

11. How many times did you attend the festival? _____ Times (Approximately).

12. What is your role in the festival (2014)?

- ☐ Organizer
- ☐ Vendor
- ☐ Sponsor
- ☐ Spectator
- ☐ Visitor
- ☐ Volunteer
- ☐ Did not attend
- ☐ Others, please specify _____

13. If you did not attend the festival please indicate why (2014)?

- ☐ Lack of information
- ☐ Lack of time
- ☐ No desire/ need
- ☐ Expensive tickets
- ☐ Quality of cultural performance
- ☐ Other (please specify) _____.

APPENDIX C

Assessing the Sociocultural Impact of Special Event in the Context of

GermanFest in Nebraska, USA

Codebook

Variable Name: Responum

Variable Label: Respondent Number

Values and Values Label: Range

Variable Name: Q1A, Increased community well-being due to the festival; Q1B, Increased opportunities for family reunions; Q1C, Provided more socializing opportunities for local people; Q1D, The festival increases entertainment opportunities for local people; Q1E, Variable Label: It is difficult to find car parking during the festival; Q1F, Disagreement between/among social groups; Q1G, Overcrowding in local shops, streets and facilities during the festival; Q1H, Increased price of goods and services due to the festival; Q1I, The festival causes noise pollution; Q1J, Trash are increased during the festival; Q1K, Enjoy having visitors who celebrate the festival together; Q1L, Preservation of existing public/historical buildings due to the festival; Q1M, Public facilities are maintained at a high standard due to the festival; Q1N, The festival causes the increased crime, alcohol and drug abuse; Q1O, Increased police presence during the festival time; Q1P, Increased pride in the community because of this festival; Q1Q, The festival enhances the community's cultural identity; Q1R, Cultural experience and awareness are strengthened by the festival; Q1S, The festival increased resident's interest in history heritage; Q1T, German art and music have been well preserved due to the festival; Q1U, Interaction with visitors offers an educational experience; Q1V, Locals avoid the festival; Q1W, Nature and grass destruction is increased during the festival; Q1X, Normal routines are disrupted during the festival; Q1Y, There is a decreased sense of community involvement in the festival.

Values and Values Label:

1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q2A, Stimulate urban development; Q2B, Foster social and cultural life; Q2C, Attract visitors and investment; Q2D, Improve city image; Q2E, Family togetherness; Q2F, Inherit and celebrate German culture; Q2G, Improve community cohesion; Q2H, Socialization opportunities.

Values and Values Label:

1 = Not important; 2 = Less important; 3 = Important; 4 = More important; 5 = Extremely important; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q3A, Satisfaction and happiness with life; Q3B, Family relationship and friendship; Q3C, Health and safety; Q3D, Personal growth and development; Q3E, Recreational facilities and areas; Q3F, Cultural experience and communication; Q3G, Residential environment; Q3H, Activities of daily living such as volunteer activities; Q3I, Community cohesion; Q3J, Social statues and network.

Values and Values Label:

1 = Not improved; 2 = Somewhat improved; 3 = Improved; 4 = Extremely improved; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q4, What's the relationship among festival participants (residents, vendors, sponsors, spectators)?

Values and Values Label:

1 = Mutually beneficial cooperation; 2 = General cooperation; 3 = No relationship; 4 = Competition for resources; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q5, What's your level of community involvement with the festival?

Values and Values Label:

1 = Extremely active; 2 = Active; 3 = Somewhat active; 4 = Not active; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q6, Gender

Values and Values Label:

1 = Male; 2 = Female; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q7, What's your age?

Values and Values Label:

1 = 20-29 years old; 2 = 30-39 years old; 3 = 40-49 years old; 4 = 50-59 years old; 5 = 60-69 years old; 6 = 70-79 years old; 7 = 80 years old and above; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q8, What's your current marital status?

Values and Values Label:

1 = Never been married; 2 = Married; 3 = Divorced; 4 = Widowed; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q9A, Where have you been living in Syracuse?

Values and Values Label:

1 = Within the city of Syracuse; 2 = In the surrounding areas of city of Syracuse

Variable Name: Q9B, How long have you been living in Syracuse?

Values and Values Label:

1 = 1-9 years; 2 = 10-19 years; 3 = 20-29 years; 4 = 30-39 years; 5 = 40-49 years; 6 = 50-59 years; 7 = 60 years and above; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q10, What's the highest level of education you have completed?

Values and Values Label:

1 = GED; 2 = High school; 3 = Technical/associates; 4 = Bachelor; 5 = Master/PhD; 6 = Other; 23 = High school and Technical/associates; 28 = High school and Others; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q11, How many times did you attend the festival?

Values and Values Label:

1 = 1-5 Times; 2 = 6-10 Times; 3 = 11-15 Times; 4 = 16-20 Times; 5 = 21-25 Times; 6 = 26-30 Times; 7 = 31 Times and above; 99 = Missing/ No answer

Variable Name: Q12, What is your role in the festival (2014)

Values and Values Label:

1 = Organizer; 2 = Vendor; 3 = Sponsor; 4 = Spectator; 5 = Visitor; 6 = Volunteer; 7 = Did not attend; 8 = Others; 9 = Sponsor and Volunteer; 10 = Spectator and Volunteer; 11 = Spectator and Visitor; 12 = Spectator and Others; 13 = Visitor and Volunteer; 14 = Organizer, Vendor and Sponsor; 15 = Organizer, Sponsor and Volunteer; 16 = Organizer, Spectator and Volunteer; 17 = Vendor, Spectator and Volunteer; 18 = Organizer, Sponsor, Spectator and Volunteer; 99 = Missing/ No answer.

Variable Name: Q13, If you did not attend the festival please indicate why (2014)?

Values and Values Label:

1 = Lack of information; 2 = Lack of time; 3 = No desire/ need; 4 = Expensive tickets; 5 = Quality of cultural performance; 6 = Others; 99 = Missing/ No answer