



**Understanding value creation and word-of-mouth behaviour
at cultural events**

Journal:	<i>The Service Industries Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	FSIJ-2018-0278.R2
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Suggested Keywords:	value, engagement, word-of-mouth < Practical Application (Heading- do not use) < Keywords, value co-creation < Theoretical Contribution (Heading- do not use) < Keywords, engagement

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Understanding value creation and word-of-mouth behaviour at cultural events

Abstract

Despite its undoubted importance to policy makers and practitioners, cultural value remains a highly contested concept. Empirical work in the area has, meanwhile, been hampered by the use of a unidimensional framework of cultural value. The understanding of word-of-mouth (WOM) communication behaviour related to cultural values has consequently been limited. The purpose of this paper is to develop cultural value segments using a multidimensional value framework to enable a profile to be developed of the WOM behaviour (both online and offline) of each segment. A typology with four distinct segments of cultural consumer, each exhibiting different combinations of cultural values and of WOM communication preferences. The study thereby challenges the orthodoxy of value creation and transmission in cultural settings. Practical recommendations include the use of market segmentation based on multi-dimensional value ‘constellations’: not only to achieve better audience development but also to encourage wider value communication through word of mouth.

Keywords

Culture; Value; Event; Value **co-creation**; Experience; Segmentation; Word of mouth

Introduction

It is widely acknowledged that policy makers would benefit from a better understanding of why and how much people value culture (Carnwath & Brown, 2014; Holden, 2006). This is especially the case in times of austerity, when public finances are stretched and spending decisions become increasingly difficult (O'Brien, 2015). The concept of cultural value, however, remains highly contested, there being little consensus about how it can best be understood and measured (Carnwath & Brown, 2014). A major contributory factor is that scholars from so many academic fields have taken an interest in the concept, each with their own approach to attempting to understand and measure it, and each with their own claims to correctness. Such academic subjects include economics (e.g. Heilbrun & Gray, 2001; Klamer, 2004; Throsby, 2003), public policy (e.g. Aabø, 2005; Holden, 2004, 2006), physiology and psychology (e.g. Silvia, 2009; Tschacher et al., 2012), cultural studies (e.g. Brown & Novak, 2007; Radbourne et al., 2009, 2013) and marketing (e.g. Boerner & Jobst, 2013; Holbrook, 1999; Hume & Sullivan Mort, 2008). Underpinning much of this research, however, is the assumption of homogeneity within samples, which implies that cultural value is unidimensional and thus capable of simple numerical measurement.

This paper is based on the premise that the integrative approach of marketing, while often marginalised in the literature (Carnwath & Brown, 2014), has much to recommend it in the context of understanding how cultural value is co-created at cultural events. In particular, the approach is based fundamentally on the premise that value is something that is attributed through a process of engagement in a consumption experience, rather than being located innately in a given product or derived through market exchange. Indeed, Holbrook (1999: 8) argues that “consumer value revised *not* in the product purchased, *not* in the brand chosen, *not* in the object possessed, but *rather* in the *consumption experience(s)* derived therefrom” (emphasis in original). Value is derived from more than just the product: Siu et al. (2013) found

1
2
3 that interactions with service providers and the broader cultural offering influence value, while
4
5 Ballantyne and Varey (2006) argue that relationships provide structural support for sustaining
6
7 value-creation activities. A central notion of this paper is that engagement with the product is
8
9 required to develop value.
10
11

12
13 The first objective of this paper is to contribute to the debate on cultural value by developing a
14
15 market segmentation based on the particular mixes or ‘constellations’ of consumer value
16
17 associated with the consumption experiences co-created in the course of attending a cultural
18
19 event. This objective speaks to the under-researched area of cultural value and to the
20
21 shortcomings of treating ‘groups’ of cultural consumers as homogeneous in respect of which
22
23 cultural values are sought and how they are generated. The second objective of the paper is to
24
25 understand the online and offline word-of-mouth (WOM) communication practices of each
26
27 cultural value segment that are consequent to the value-creation process of attending a cultural
28
29 event. The paper argues that engagement is central to understanding value, as the nature of the
30
31 engagement determines the nature of the value thereby created (Higgins & Scholer, 2009).
32
33 Value, meanwhile, is an important antecedent of WOM communications, with the nature of the
34
35 values co-created through engagement with culture determining the nature of the WOM
36
37 communications that follow (Hartline & Jones, 1996; Mukerjee, 2017). As such, this paper
38
39 aims to further the understanding of the communication of values associated with cultural
40
41 events, which is currently an under-researched area. In order to achieve this, the paper adopts
42
43 a five-dimensional interpretation of value based on the work of Sweeney and Soutar (2001)
44
45 and Williams and Soutar (2009). Two Welsh cultural festivals, known as
46
47 ‘eisteddfodau’ (singular: eisteddfod), serve as the context of the investigation.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 The paper begins with a literature review focusing on the major debates around cultural values
56
57 and on previous cultural-consumer segmentation studies. The discussion then moves to
58
59
60

1
2
3 examining values as an antecedent of WOM communication. This is followed by a discussion
4
5 of the methodological approach that will be used in the analysis. The results and findings are
6
7 then present. Discussion, conclusions and limitations of the research then follow.
8
9

10 **Literature Review**

11 *Cultural value*

12
13
14
15
16
17 Cultural value is undoubtedly a controversial subject (Fillis et al., 2015; O'Brien, 2015). Put
18 simply, the term 'value' refers to the outcome of an evaluation of an object by a subject
19 (Holbrook, 1999). In the case of cultural value, the subject is the person experiencing culture
20 (e.g. visiting a museum or attending a cultural event), while the object is the cultural 'product'
21 they are engaging with (e.g. the artefacts displayed in the museum or the performances at the
22 event, as well as the social setting).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 The actual process through which consumer value is generated is therefore highly complex.
33 Indeed, as Holbrook (1999) has argued, from a marketing point of view, consumer value is
34 necessarily interactive, relativistic, preferential and the product of experiences. Value is not
35 something that can be created and delivered in the form of a product, rather a value proposition
36 needs to be presented to the consumer, so that value can then be co-created as the consumer
37 engages with the product they are buying (Frow & Payne, 2011). As such, consumer value is
38 fundamentally co-created: something that arises only through producers and consumers
39 engaging with a product (Grönroos, 2011; Neghina et al., 2015; Pine & Gilmore 1998, 1999;
40 Zwass 2010). Authors such as Hearn et al. (2007) have argued that value co-creation
41 is becoming ever more inherent to the cultural sector as the lines between the producer
42 and consumer are becoming increasingly blurred. Rather than for consumers simply to
43 respond to what producers offer them, they are becoming ever more closely involved in the
44 production process (Payne et al., 2007). Holbrook recommends that consumer value is
45 therefore best
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 understood as a multidimensional construct: one that is flexible enough to cope with the
4 subtleties of the consumer-value creation process.
5
6

7
8 Holbrook's recommendation is even more prescient in the context of the cultural sector,
9 where consumer values transpose into cultural values. The fundamental difficulty in
10 measuring cultural values is that they are typically external to markets and thus not fully
11 expressed in them (Heilbrun & Gray, 2001). Economists have therefore developed a
12 range of techniques to measure people's hypothetical 'willingness-to-pay' for cultural
13 consumption. Typically this has taken the form of contingent valuation studies (Throsby,
14 2003), which are popular in the broadly analogous context of attempting to establish
15 values for environmental goods (or 'ecosystems services' as they are increasingly being
16 described, e.g. De Groot et al., 2012). There are, however, numerous conceptual and
17 technical limitations to such studies (Bennett, 1996; Throsby, 2003). These criticisms have
18 focused, *inter alia*, on the tendency for biases to arise associated with respondents having
19 different degrees of knowledge about the product being valued, the availability of
20 substitute goods and different budget constraint (Bennett, 1996).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Another possible approach to measuring cultural value is to do so indirectly by examining its
40 direct and indirect effects on the economy and society (Carnwath & Brown, 2014). Holden
41 (2006), for example, has argued that public investment in culture is capable of developing three
42 types of value: intrinsic, instrumental and institutional. While intrinsic value refers to an
43 individual's assessment of what is to be valued, instrumental and institutional refer to the
44 assessments of society more generally. Instrumental value refers to the economic returns to
45 investment in culture, while institutional value refers to the generation of public benefits such
46 as trust and mutual respect. These later impacts of culture relate to the formation of what is
47 known as 'social capital' (Lin, 1999; Sullivan Mort et al., 2015). Frey (2005) points out that
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 this type of valuation is generally aimed at the justification for public funding. Such
4
5 measurement approaches are not, however, without their own criticisms. Indeed, one of the key
6
7 tools of economic impact assessment is input-output analysis (e.g. Tohmo, 2005), which has
8
9 long been criticised by writers such as Briassoulis (1991) and Morimoto (1970). Key criticisms
10
11 include the assumption that markets are homogeneous, the frequent regional and national
12
13 integration of particular economic sectors, the short-term focus of the methodology, the lack
14
15 of consideration of intangible benefits (i.e. non-economic, such as social and community
16
17 benefits) and aggregation limits. With regard to the measurement of culture's impact on social
18
19 capital, key criticisms focus on how we are to measure how much social capital a particular
20
21 group already has and how this is added to by cultural production (Putnam, 2001; Stone &
22
23 Hughes, 2002). Some authors have even concluded that social capital is fundamentally
24
25 incapable of being measured (Lin, 1999).
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 Value co-creation is essentially ignored in financial appraisals of cultural events. An
33
34 organisation (firm) cannot simply deliver value (Vargo & Lusch, 2008). It is not simply
35
36 something that can be created and must be thought of in a broader sense than something that
37
38 can simply be manufactured. Both the organisation and the customer play a role in the creation
39
40 of value (Edvardsson et al., 2011); it is a function of the interaction between the two parties
41
42 (Grönroos and Voima, 2011). Moreover, value is created between parties with respect to a
43
44 broader social context than a simple dyadic creation process: it is contextual and specific to
45
46 social structures, systems and forces (Edvardsson et al., 2011).
47
48
49

50
51 With value co-creation a central concept of service dominant logic, research is needed into
52
53 how producers and consumers engage in this activity (Payne et al., 2008; Jaakkola &
54
55 Alexander, 2014). Central to value co-creation is the understanding that the boundaries
56
57 between firms and customers has become blurred (Grönroos & Ravald, 2011; Jaakkola &
58
59 Alexander, 2014). In
60

1
2
3 one critical appraisal of the value co-creation process, design, development and manufacturing
4 take place in the provider of the value sphere (also known as the back office), while use of
5 value occurs in the customer sphere; the provider and customer meet in the ‘front office’
6 (Grönroos, 2008). Akin to this are customer and supplier processes, with the encounter
7 processes being where the producer and consumer of value engage with one another (Payne et
8 al., 2008). As such, there is a space where the co-creators of value meet, with considerations
9 of prior experience and development present in both. At a cultural festival, the organisers are
10 the composers of value, putting together the show with its various acts, while the consumer
11 attends and co-creates that value. The encounter space is the event, which is different in terms
12 of it being an array of various acts.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Customer engagement in value co-creation is a less well-understood area of value co-creation
28 (Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014). Engagement is a deeper relationship between the producer and
29 consumer of value, which is iterative (Doorn, 2011). Engagement in general involves a focal
30 subject (cultural participants) and an object (an event) (Brodie et al., 2011). There are
31 emotional, cognitive and behaviour aspects of engagement (Brodie et al., 2011), with
32 behavioural engagement of particular interest in this research. Two areas of behavioural
33 engagement are important in this research: the first involves the consumer helping to design
34 and improve the product, while the second involves the consumer giving WOM and being
35 involved in other forms of consumer-to-consumer engagement (Jaakkol & Alexander, 2014).
36 The behavioural aspects of engagement also include aspects such as reputation, social benefits
37 and explicitly value perceptions (Jaakkola & Alexander, 2014). Thus, while consumer
38 engagement is central to value creation it is also acknowledged to be beyond the dyad of the
39 producer-consumer relationship.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Value propositions are something that an organisation (firm) can offer (Vargo & Lusch, 2008).
4
5 A firm cannot deliver value: however, it can offer value propositions (Vargo et al., 2008). The
6
7 value proposition has diverse understandings, the first based around to the organisation's
8
9 position, price, strategy; a second around interaction, experience and a relationships-based
10
11 perspective; a third around benefits and competitive positioning around benefits consumer
12
13 choice; and a fourth that is much more customer-centric (Frow & Payne, 2011). Essentially,
14
15 the value proposition must be considered and developed with respect to multiple stakeholders.
16
17 Implicit in this is that various groups may contribute in the supply and consumption of value,
18
19 which may itself be multifaceted.
20
21
22
23
24

25 ***Dimensions of value***

26
27
28 Consumer value is a fundamental concern of the discipline of marketing (Holbrook, 1999;
29
30 Slater, 1997; Smith & Colgate 2007). Value takes many forms, with different people
31
32 experiencing it in various ways (Grönroos, 2008). The marketing approach to understanding
33
34 value is essentially to attempt to dissect it into a number of sub-components, some of which
35
36 may be analogous to the economic values noted above but others not. Studies that have
37
38 attempted to sub-divide consumer value into its various component parts include those by de
39
40 Ruyter et al. (1997), Grewal et al. (1998), Petrick and Backman (2002), Sheth et al. (1991),
41
42 Sweeney and Soutar (2001), Williams and Soutar (2009), and de la Torre and Throsby (2002).
43
44 Tasci (2016) also provides a useful overview. While some of these studies have tested their
45
46 proposed consumer value typology in the context of service experiences, to the authors'
47
48 knowledge none to date has been applied in the specific context of cultural values. The present
49
50 study is therefore the first to apply the marketing approach to the context of cultural events.
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 This study adopts the value typology of Williams and Soutar (2009), which identifies five
58
59 separate components to consumer value: functional value, emotional value, social value, price
60

1
2
3 value and novelty value. Given that the typology has already been tested in an experiential (co-
4 production) context and is an extension of that already developed and tested by Sweeney and
5 Soutar (2001), it is anticipated that the analysis will produce meaningful results. The remainder
6 of this section will therefore briefly explain each of the five value types and how they apply in
7 the case of an eisteddfod attendance.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 *Functional value* is the value acquired from the functional, utilitarian or physical performance
16 of a product. In the context of a cultural event such as an eisteddfod, functional value would
17 relate chiefly to how well the event is organised. These functional components are not only
18 manageable but may be subject to routine monitoring and evaluation. Functional value also
19 refers to the quality, the nature of the workmanship and the on-going 'performance' of a
20 product (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001). In the case of a cultural event such as an eisteddfod, this
21 component of value would relate to the perceived physical quality of the seating, programmes,
22 food and drink, toilets, and so on. Holden (2006) argues that value in terms of quality or
23 excellence can often be a very important component of the larger value construct, accounting
24 for a substantial proportion of the overall perceived value of a consumer product. This may
25 also be true for cultural events and this is something that the present paper seeks to investigate.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 *Price value* refers to the value for money perceived by the consumer: the magnitude of the
44 satisfaction gained from consuming the product to the costs involved, including the purchase
45 price and any ongoing costs that need to be paid over the product's lifetime (Sweeney & Soutar,
46 2001). In the context of the eisteddfodau, price value can be said to relate to what a person
47 attending the event feels they get for the admission price that they have paid (and the prices
48 paid around the event ground for refreshments, merchandise and so forth). In many ways, price
49 value is quite tangible, particularly insofar as the consumer may find it relatively easy to
50 evaluate how much they spent in relation to the returns they feel they received. Indeed, people
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 are quite used to doing this when they are deciding whether they have made a ‘good’ purchase,
4
5 whether they wish to make a repurchase and whether they wish to recommend it to others.
6
7
8
9

10 *Emotional value*, in contrast, refers to a product’s ability to arouse feelings or affective states.
11
12 It is non-cognitive and indeed personal by its very nature. It relates to the emotional responses,
13
14 such as excitement, fear, exhilaration, relaxation, feeling good, pleasure and enjoyment that
15
16 arise from consuming the product (Sweeney & Soutar, 2001; Williams & Soutar, 2009). In the
17
18 context of the eisteddfod, emotional value can be viewed as a complex mix of emotions derived
19
20 from being part of the event. As a co-created ‘experience’ product, the emotional value of a
21
22 cultural event can be expected to be derived not just from attending the event, but by being part
23
24 of the audience, competing in the event or even helping out with running it.
25
26
27
28
29

30 *Social value* is the perceived social gain acquired from association with one or more social
31
32 groups through consuming the product. Social value is an interesting measure of value,
33
34 particularly as it covers the notion of ‘conspicuous consumption’, which is a social gain by
35
36 association with others who consume the product (Williams & Soutar, 2009). The interactions
37
38 achieved, the relationships formed or further developed, and the prestige obtained by
39
40 association with certain (often ‘higher’) social groups, are all part of social value (Williams &
41
42 Soutar, 2009). Further, the notions of acceptance, making a good impression on other people,
43
44 social approval and personal perceptions are all intertwined in social value. In the context of
45
46 the eisteddfodau, it is possible to argue that these may arise because there is an ‘eisteddfod
47
48 culture’, embodied in the event itself and in the people who attend, which participants can
49
50 access and of which they can be part.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Novelty value* relates to the curiosity, novelty and/or satisfaction related to a desire for
4 knowledge (as such it is also sometimes referred to as ‘epistemic’ value; see Sheth et al., 1991).
5
6
7 It refers to knowledge seeking and curiosity (Williams & Soutar, 2009) and arises where
8
9 consuming the product can be seen as a novelty, or a chance to find more out about something
10
11 (Sheth et al., 1991). In the context of the eisteddfod, this could be the chance to experience
12
13 different cultural forms through the performances that are special to the eisteddfodau, as well
14
15 as to learn more about Wales and Welsh culture, and to hear and/or speak the Welsh language.
16
17
18
19

20 ***Segmentation***

21
22
23 Market segmentation is capable of providing invaluable insights for event organisers (Pulido-
24
25 Fernández & Sánchez-Rivero, 2010). Geographic, behavioural, socio-demographics and
26
27 psychographic variables such as motivations have all been used to segment tourism events,
28
29 both singly and in combination (Pulido-Fernández & Sánchez-Rivero, 2010). Indeed,
30
31 Tkaczynski and Rundle-Thiele (2011) found that segmentation was usually based around
32
33 Kotler’s four classic segmentation bases of geographic, demographic, psychographic and
34
35 behavioural. There have been some previous attempts to apply market segmentation in the
36
37 cultural sector, even if none has attempted to do so on the basis of cultural value. Such studies
38
39 have generally avoided using demographics as the sole basis for segmentation, as this has
40
41 tended not be particularly insightful (Vyncke, 2002). Formica and Uysal (1998), Lee et al.
42
43 (2004) and Li et al. (2009) thus elected to segment cultural consumption based on motivations
44
45 to engage in it. Other segmentation bases have been more arbitrary: Kruger et al. (2011), for
46
47 example, segmented arts festivals based on those who did or did not attend various
48
49 shows/productions, while the study of festivals by Kim et al. (2006) used activity preferences
50
51 as the segmentation base. Behaviour has also been used as a base for segmentation previously
52
53 in cultural event. Mackellar (2009), for example, used four behavioural variables to segment
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 attendees at an Elvis Presley festival: belonging to Elvis fan clubs, collecting Elvis
4 memorabilia, attending other Elvis-related events and impersonating Elvis.
5
6
7

8
9 There are thus numerous different ways to segment an event (Tkaczynski & Rundle-Thiele,
10 2011). Motivations are interesting and can arguably help event organisers better develop future
11 events (e.g. Lee et al., 2004, 2013). Segmentation is also conducted on consumption, for
12 example conspicuous consumption (Jaramillo & Moizeau, 2003), which gives insight to what
13 products event organisers should include. Yet it is difficult to see how understanding
14 motivations to attend and consumption preferences can guide value creation, given the range
15 of interactions and various types of value. If value is simply produced and consumed, with
16 boundaries between the parties, this is imaginable. Yet thinking of value being more than
17 unidimensional (Holbrook, 1999; Tacsı, 2016), and the notion of the prosumer, which
18 highlights the blurred lines between the roles of production and consumption of value (Ritzer
19 & Jurgenson, 2010), makes this a difficult prospect. With blurred lines between producers and
20 consumers of value, engagement with more than the performers seeing value derived from
21 numerous sources at an event means that a new approach is needed. We therefore propose to
22 use value dimensions as the ventral base for segmentation of cultural events to address these
23 issues.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 ***Communication of value*** 45

46
47 Once consumer values have been co-created, consumers have the opportunity to communicate
48 them to others. These communications might intend to ‘talk up’ the product by emphasising its
49 positive functional, price, emotional, social and novelty value components, or to ‘talk down’
50 the product, insofar as the messages may emphasise the lack or absence of such values.
51
52 Ultimately, WOM is an outcome of value co-creation (Balaji & Roy, 2017). Personal
53 communication about a product, where neither of the participants are marketers, is often
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 referred to as WOM (Bone, 1995). This has become an essential concept in marketing theory
4 and practice (e.g. Bughin et al., 2010) and the subject of much academic research (e.g. Buttle,
5 1998; King et al., 2014; de Matos & Rossi, 2008). Studies have found that positive WOM on
6 the part of customers may add twice as much to an organisation's long-term portfolio compared
7 with marketing-induced customers, who may add a short-term burst of value to the company
8 that soon falls away (Villanueva et al., 2008). Much of the interest from academics has been
9 on online WOM (e.g. Chu & Kim, 2018; Hennig-Thurau, Gwinner, Walsh & Gremler 2004),
10 although in some cases traditional and online forms have been combined (e.g. Trusov et al.,
11 2009). Electronic WOM is trusted by peers and a powerful tool for providing information about
12 products (Chu & Kim, 2018).

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
WOM is considered to be of immense importance by the cultural sector. It has long been
known, for example, that pre-exposure to information in the form of overheard reviews can
influence a person's ratings of a film (Burzynski & Bayer, 1977). There has been numerous
studies that have linked WOM to positive marketing outcomes for books (Chevalier &
Mayzlin, 2006), films (Dellarocas et al., 2007; Liu, 2006; Moul, 2007), food (Babin et al.,
2005) and theatre (Grisolia & Willis, 2012). It is also highly likely that multiple measures of
WOM will be required in some contexts. In a non-cultural-sector study, for example, Libai et
al. (2013) distinguished between the effect of positive WOM and the demonstration effect the
consumer has on others by being seen with their product.

The relationship between value and WOM has been investigated previously in the literature
(e.g. Balaji & Roy, 2017). Hartline and Jones (1996), for example, found a strong correlation
between consumer value and WOM, as well as a causal path between them. Molinari et al.
(2008), in contrast, found a positive correlation between value and WOM but did not find a
predictive path from consumer value to WOM: rather they found the reverse to be a better

1
2
3 explanation, with WOM leading to value. Eggert and Ulaga (2002), in a further contrast, found
4 a causal link between consumer value and WOM, but this suggested that consumer value is
5 actually an antecedent of WOM. Other studies that have linked WOM to value include Libai
6 et al. (2013), who argued that consumer value can be divided into two parts: price value and
7 social value. The latter depends on the characteristics of the person is and how they spread
8 WOM about the product (Libai et al., 2013). McKee et al. (2006), meanwhile, found that high
9 consumer value can cause consumers to become more loyal, show greater commitment to the
10 organisation, its brand(s) and its product(s), and be more willing to spread positive WOM in
11 order to create loyalty among his or her reference group. As such, there is some empirical
12 evidence to suggest that may be a relationship between consumer value and WOM in the case
13 of cultural events.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Research Design**

30
31
32 The sample for this study was collected at two multi-day events: the Llangollen International
33 Musical Eisteddfod (hereafter the International Eisteddfod) and the National Eisteddfod of
34 Wales (hereafter the National Eisteddfod). The events are multiple stage, multiple-genre events
35 of cultural significance. Trained fieldworkers were used to collect the data in person, using a
36 mall intercept method. At both events, the field workers were placed in locations near the main
37 entrance and asked passers-by whether they would participate in the survey. A small
38 confectionary gift was offered as a token of thanks to each of the participants but no financial
39 inducement was used. The surveys were conducted in either English or Welsh, according to
40 the preference of the respondent.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The sample was collected over six days: three at each of the events. A total of 328 usable
55 questionnaires were collected from the International Eisteddfod and 613 from the National
56 Eisteddfod. Around 60% of the combined sample collected was female. Approximately 24%
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of the sample lived in a household with children under the age of 18. In terms of attendance of
4 cultural events, survey respondents indicated that they attended an average of 5.4 cultural
5 events in a typical 12-month period. Only 16.7% of people in the sample said that they had not
6 previously been to the event at which they were surveyed. Indeed, 40.1% of the sample had
7 been over ten times to the event at which they were surveyed. The mean number of event days
8 that survey respondents expected to attend was 3.6. In defining their role at the event, 52.6%
9 of respondents indicated that they were general audience, 16.3% that they were there to
10 perform/compete, 23.2% that they were volunteers or staff members of the organisation, and
11 the remaining 7.9% that they were there to support family members. When asked if the overall
12 experience was positive on a seven-point scale (1 - extremely negative, 7 - extremely positive)
13 the mean was 6.2, indicating a very positive audience with their overall event experience.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 The measures of value used for the study were adapted from previous studies noted in the
30 literature review. The scales were selected on the basis of their previous implementation in the
31 product-service/experience context and their performance with regards to validity and
32 reliability. This selection process led to the value scales being taken from Sweeney and Souter
33 (2004) and Williams and Souter (2009). These scales are multiple-item, with the mean of the
34 combined items used for analysis. The communications items, meanwhile, were based on
35 Arnett et al. (2003) and were measured in terms of WOM intentions as single items. Three such
36 items were used: "I am likely to recommend this event to other people"; "I am likely to post
37 about my experiences on social media sites" and "I am likely to post my views about the event
38 on travel websites". All of the items were measured on a five-point scale, with a score of 5
39 denoting the highest value. Each of the items needed to be adjusted slightly to fit the context
40 of the study. The questionnaire was first pre-tested, with respondent interviews and
41 observations used to help ensure the accuracy of the scales. Some minor changes were made
42 as a result of this pre-testing to make the instrument more accessible. A summary of the
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 measurement constructs is shown in Table 1. A number of demographic (e.g. age, gender) and
4 behavioural characteristics (e.g. number of days of the event attended) were also collected: not
5 as the basis for segmentation but in order to help further profile the segments. These will be
6 discussed later in the paper.
7
8
9
10
11
12

13 **Table 1: Descriptive Results for Measures – near here**
14

15
16 Reliability for each of the scales was tested using Cronbach's alpha. Eight of the scales were
17 above 0.80 and the remaining two above 0.60, which are acceptable levels for this type of
18 research (Hair et al., 2010). For construct validity, an exploratory factor analysis was used. The
19 five-factor solution had a KMO of 0.850 and a significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity
20 (p<0.001), with each item having a communality above 0.60, indicating a suitable solution
21 (Cudeck 2000). One item had a low level of cross-loading but all others had loaded as
22 anticipated: as such, there was evidence of convergent validity. Discriminant validity was
23 analysed using the variance extracted method, as suggested by Fornell and Larcker (1981). In
24 each case, the mean of the squared estimates (which were all above 0.50) was found to be
25 greater than the squared correlations. There is thus also sufficient evidence to indicate
26 discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Having reviewed the reliability and validity of the data, cluster analysis was performed to
44 identify significant segments within the data. Cluster analysis is a popular marketing technique
45 that allows researchers to segment data by determining underlying structures in it (Punj &
46 Stewart, 1983). The procedure groups individuals with similar attitudes towards objects (in this
47 case, the various dimensions of cultural value expressed through attendance at a cultural event),
48 creating segments of people with demonstrably similar characteristics (Hair et al., 2010). This
49 method has been used previously in research in the non-profit sector (e.g. Kleinschafer et al.,
50 2011). This study used Ward's method with a squared Euclidian distance measure. This
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 approach is selected based on the ability to draw similar size segments, with strong internal
4
5 homogeneity (Hair et al., 2010), as well as previously being tested and showing robust results
6
7 (Punj & Stewart, 1983).
8
9

10
11 The cluster analysis was conducted using the mean values for each of the five value
12
13 constructs. The results indicated that a four-cluster (segment) solution was the soundest,
14
15 based on the dendrogram and agglomeration schedule. To analyse the validity of the
16
17 results, discriminant analysis and ANOVA were used. The discriminant analysis findings
18
19 showed that all of the value dimensions were significant in predicting segment membership
20
21 and around 90% of cases were successfully located. The ANOVA results indicated that the
22
23 value and communication variables were significantly different for each of the four clusters
24
25 ($p < 0.001$). Further, the use of the Bonferroni post-hoc estimates also indicates that the
26
27 groups are significantly different ($P < 0.001$). There is hence ample evidence that the
28
29 segmentation is both robust and valid.
30
31
32
33
34

35 **Results**

36
37
38 The results of the market segmentation are shown in Table 2, which shows the value
39
40 'constellation' for each segment. Table 3, meanwhile, links each segment to their
41
42 intended WOM-giving behaviour. The results show significant differences between
43
44 segments with respect to value types and this is also true of the communication
45
46 values. In terms of demographics, gender, having children living at home and income did
47
48 not show significant difference across the segments (see Tables 4 and 5). Employment
49
50 status and age, however, differed significantly across the four segments ($P < 0.001$). In terms
51
52 of behavioural variables, similar events attended and the nature of the experience displayed
53
54 significant differences.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2: Results for Segments and Variables – near here

Table 3: Clusters and Word of Mouth – near here

Table 4: Segment Descriptors – near here**Table 5: Further Segment Descriptors – near here**

The four segments demonstrate different consumer value constellations and behavioural characteristics. Their characteristics are now discussed in turn.

Segment 1

The first segment, which comprised 29.6% of the total sample, recorded the highest mean score for each of the value measures: not only did they generate high values the eisteddfod but did so in respect of every value type. This segment might therefore be labelled ‘Eisteddfod Enthusiasts’. Indeed, members of this group had the most positive experience of the eisteddfod they were visiting when responding to the survey (their mean rating being 6.68) and also tended to be more enthusiastic about attending cultural events in general, having the second highest mean for attending similar events (5.51 events in a typical 12-month period). They attended the greatest average number of days at their chosen event and on average had the longest history of attending the event in question.

With regard to demographics, members of this segment had the highest level of unemployment (10.4%) and the second oldest mean age (45.52 years). There are therefore relatively more retired people in this segment.

In terms of value communication, members of this segment were the most likely to tell others about their experience of the eisteddfod they had visited, giving the highest score with regard to WOM intentions through each of three channels. It is notable that this was the case both with traditional WOM (through in-person communication) and electronic WOM (or ‘e-WOM’, e.g. through posting on travel sites and use of social media). The use of electronic media seemed to

1
2
3 pose no barrier, even though the members of this segment tended to be older, such was the
4
5 urgency with which wished to tell others of their experience.
6
7

8 9 *Segment 2*

10
11
12 The second segment had the second smallest membership, comprising 24.3% of the total
13
14 sample. In terms of demographics, this group had the highest proportion who indicated that
15
16 they worked part time (22.9%); people in this group are also the most settled group, with an
17
18 average of 24.77 years in their current local area. The group had the greatest mean age (52.43
19
20 years), reflecting a tendency for this group to include many pensioners.
21
22

23
24 In terms of value types, members of this group had the second highest means for functional
25
26 value, price value and emotional value, but the lowest mean for novelty value and the second
27
28 lowest mean for social value. This might be explained by their behaviour: an outstanding
29
30 feature of this group is that its members attend the greatest number of similar events
31
32 (6.29 cultural events in a typical 12-month period), yet they were attending the fewest
33
34 days on average at the event at which they were surveyed. This seems to suggest that
35
36 members of this group were interested in attending cultural events generally, with the
37
38 eisteddfod being just one of the events they like. As such, this segment might be labelled
39
40 'Cultural Event Aficionados'.
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 In terms of communicating these values, members of this segment had the second highest
48
49 mean for giving positive WOM in person but were rather less likely to post about
50
51 experiences on online travel sites or social media. This may be a reflection of members of
52
53 this group being the oldest on average.
54
55

56 57 *Segment 3*

58
59
60 The third segment comprised 17.3% of the sample, making it the smallest of the four.
The group had the highest number of people in full time work (38.9%). The cohort was
also the

1
2
3 youngest in terms of mean years (40.01 years). This group recorded the lowest mean score in
4 terms of enjoying the eisteddfod they had just visited (mean = 5.59). However, the segment is
5 most clearly distinguished from the others by displaying the lowest mean for each of the five
6 different value means.
7
8
9
10

11
12
13 In terms of value communication behaviour, this group also recorded the lowest mean score
14 with regard to WOM intentions with respect to all three communication variables. As such, it
15 is evident that this group does not particularly value the event and did not intend to
16 communicate their experiences of the eisteddfod to others. It is also notable that members of
17 this group typically attend the fewest number of similar cultural events (4.41 in a typical 12-
18 month period). Members of this segment do not seem to be eisteddfod enthusiasts. Presumably
19 these individuals are attending the event to keep someone else company or perhaps to see a
20 family member or friend compete. As such, this group might be labelled ‘Must Have Been
21 Dragged Along’.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 ***Segment 4***

36
37
38 The fourth segment comprised 28.8% of the sample, making it the second largest. Members of
39 the group had lived the least time in their local area (18.62 years on average) and were the
40 second youngest on average (42.89 years). Members of this segment gave the second lowest
41 satisfaction rating with regard to their experience of the eisteddfod they had just visited (their
42 mean score being 5.95) and the second smallest number of visits to similar events during a
43 typical 12-month period (5.09 events on average). This group ranked second or third highest
44 in respect of all five value types. As such, this group might be termed ‘Stuck in the Middle’,
45 insofar as they recognise that they co-created a range of values by attending the eisteddfod but
46 these values were not very well developed. This group may then be one that the organisers of
47 the cultural event may wish to target in order to assist in such value development. This strategy
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 may be a rewarding one to adopt, as the group had the second highest mean for both online
4 communications items. As such, if they are online, perhaps an online campaign to reach and
5
6 communicate with the group would be a good starting point to engage in greater value creation
7
8 and thereafter online promotions.
9
10
11
12

13 **Table 6: Segment summaries – near here**
14

15 **Typology proposal** 16

17
18
19 As a result of the analysis, this paper proposes a typology of four segments, a summary of
20 which can be found in Table 6. This may be considered to be a prototype for further research.
21
22 The four segments – Eisteddfod Enthusiasts, Cultural Event Aficionados, Must Have Been
23 Dragged Along, Stuck in the Middle – each have different value constellations and
24 communication preferences, which form the basis of potential value propositions. Value
25 propositions are within the organisation's gift and represent offering designs that can then be
26 co-created by the consumer in real time as the event takes place (Vargo & Lusch, 2008).
27 Marketing communicates the promise (Payne et al., 2008) and, using the segmentation
28 approach, this paper enables such promises to be understood through the value constellations
29 that should constitute them. As such, the typology lays out the value constellations that need to
30 be proposed to future and returning cultural consumers.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 The place of value co-creation – the front office (Grönroos & Voima, 2011) – is in this case
47 an event, which constitutes a more complex setting than would be the case with a
48 simple manufactured product offering. As argued by Jaakkola and Alexander (2014), value
49 may take many forms. The segmentation approach allows the presentation of a multi-
50 dimensional value proposition, with several dimensions of value being used to entice cultural
51 consumers to engage in the value co-creation process. In this sense, the value proposition
52 should also be cognisant of the contextual and social aspects, as argued by Edvardsson et al
53 (2011). In a sense, by using
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a multidimensional conceptualisation of value, particularly social value, this paper is able to
4
5 better formulate a nuanced value proposition for each segment.
6
7

8
9 An important part of the typology presented is WOM profiling. WOM is seen as an outcome
10
11 of perceived value co-creation (Balaji & Roy, 2017). Given the segments and value
12
13 constellations that can be incorporated, this paper has also been able to gain a greater
14
15 understanding of how WOM communications vary for each segment. Once value has been co-
16
17 created, the WOM communication patterns using both online and traditional WOM can be
18
19 identified. The value proposition has essentially been offered and, in the encounter space, co-
20
21 created into consumer value constellations. These are then communicated via traditional and
22
23 online methods of WOM. As such, this paper makes it possible to see how cultural value, once
24
25 co-created, is then communicated. WOM and value co-creation arguably lead to purchase
26
27 intentions (See-To & Ho, 2014). This underlines the importance of the typology for cultural-
28
29 event organisers and, more generally, for those looking to communicate co-created value.
30
31
32
33

34 35 **Discussion and conclusions** 36

37
38 Segmentation in marketing of events is an area of great importance (Tkaczynski & Rundle-
39
40 Thiele, 2011). The first contribution of this research is that it has segmented attendees at
41
42 a cultural event by the kinds of value they derive from it through a process a value co-
43
44 creation. By using five measures of value, four segments based on cultural value have been
45
46 established. This segmentation provides a clear and useful means of understanding
47
48 different groups of attendees of a cultural event. This speaks to the issues of meta-services
49
50 and value, where the service is multifaceted (Janawade et al., 2015). As seen in Taheri et
51
52 al. (2014), consumer engagement in cultural events is beyond what is actually exhibited:
53
54 there are many 'services', sources of value at a cultural event, beyond the performers. The
55
56 audience interact with many people, many stalls, many facilities, and a variety of so-called
57
58 producers of value. To assume
59
60

1
2
3 value is derived from only one source – the organisers – is naïve, and to assume that the value
4 derived by an audience member is from the performers only is far too simple. Moreover, value
5 is dependent on the context, and many factors within that context as well as personal factors
6 (Horbel et al., 2016). Thus, to truly understand value in a cultural event, multiple dimensions
7 of value to represent to the complex context are required. This research develops understanding
8 providing a better use of theory around value and applying it to a complex cultural context.
9

10
11
12 The findings presented here are unique in that they focus on value and use it to generate the
13 segments. Segmentation of events has previously examined motivations, for example both
14 Formica et al. (1998) and Lee et al. (2004) used motivations to understand cultural consumer
15 segments. Behaviours have also been used (e.g. McKercher et al., 2002), as well as more
16 specific cultural factors, such as film nostalgia (Kim & Kim, 2018) or the event theme
17 (Chirieleison & Scrucca, 2017). While each of these studies contributes a unique taxonomy,
18 value created at the event is largely ignored. Segmenting on value, however, provides a sound
19 basis for further research of groups in different contexts (Ekinisi et al., 2014). The role of value
20 creation warrants a more prominent position in the thinking of events organisers, and doing so
21 provides both consumers and event organisers with a starting point for further interactions and
22 value co-creation. Understanding the need for interactions, and that both consumer and
23 producers play a role in value creation, is essential for organisations to flourish in the modern
24 economy (Prahalad & Ramaswamy, 2004). This research therefore helps to enlighten
25 theory around the issues of consumer-producer interaction and, particularly, value co-
26 creation.
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Traditionally, in a business-to-business setting, understanding what customer's value (the
54 value sought by the segments) allows suppliers to create unique value offers and
55 promote them effectively to different segments (Anderson & Narus, 1998). Not very
56 differently here, event organisers can understand value segments through the different value
57 constellations in each
58
59
60

1
2
3 segment, and further develop their capacity to co-create these five dimensions of value. The
4
5 lack of knowledge of the consumer is also addressed here, moving event and cultural value in
6
7 line with modern interpretations of value. Indeed, thinking has moved from supply-side value
8
9 creation to value co-creation through engagement with the experience (Prahalad
10
11 & Ramaswamy, 2004). The results allow suppliers to develop a value proposition,
12
13 something they can actually do, that is make an offer to be co-created (Vargo & Lusch,
14
15 2008). The production of cultural value has also been argued to be commodified, yet
16
17 the distinction between the producer and consumer is blurred (Richards, 1996; Grönroos,
18
19 2011). With the concept of prosumption, the distinction between producer and consumer
20
21 is removed: they generate value together (Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010). By including five
22
23 dimensions of value, including social value, the prosumption of value between
24
25 consumers is recognised. This provides greater insight into value generation, co-creation
26
27 and prosumption of value at cultural events. The centrality of producers and consumers of
28
29 values is highlighted in this study, with more emphasis on the multiple roles of value and
30
31 value co-creation. The research demonstrates that value not only has multiple dimensions
32
33 but also that these are manifested differently in four distinctive segments.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Another contribution of this study is that segmentation by value provides important insights
42
43 into how cultural values, once co-created, are transmitted beyond the immediate audience. The
44
45 approach of creating segments has been widely used in previous research, particularly the
46
47 segmentation of tourists and then developing understanding of their communications
48
49 preferences (e.g. Hosany & Prayag, 2013). There is a need for more research on consumer
50
51 WOM communications, in particular distinctions between online and offline communications
52
53 (Libai et al., 2010). The relationship between WOM and value is underdeveloped in the
54
55 literature, with contradictory findings typically noted. Jones et al. (2006), for example, found
56
57 that hedonic value but not utilitarian value influenced WOM. Rather than assuming that value
58
59
60

1
2
3 is an antecedent (or indeed a consequence) of WOM, this paper progresses the debate by
4 establishing a set of market segments based on the values members of the group derive from
5
6 co-creating the cultural experience. The resulting segments have a common structure based on
7
8 a five-dimensional value ‘constellation’, through which the WOM intentions of members of
9
10 the group can be profiled. The findings suggest that each of the four segments has a different
11
12 profile with regard to their intentions to engage in online and traditional WOM, thus enabling
13
14 the cultural organisations concerned to target their efforts in generating positive WOM from
15
16 their visitors.
17
18
19
20
21

22 **Managerial implications**

23
24
25 This paper has adopted a multidimensional approach to understanding value, using a value
26
27 framework developed in the marketing research literature. By means of a multidimensional
28
29 value measure, a segmentation as an approach we have developed understanding on how value
30
31 is both formed and then transmitted. The findings speak to value creation at cultural events
32
33 and offer insights into previously untested issues around what value actually constitutes. The
34
35 broader stakeholder approach, using value co-creation and embedded value measurements
36
37 also adds to the current debates around value co-creation.
38
39
40
41

42
43 This paper findings can be used for managerial actions, with the primary contribution an
44
45 understanding of the value segments, so management can develop value propositions. Value
46
47 propositions can be developed based on the four separate value constellations proposed in this
48
49 research. Moreover, the communication of value is also now better understood and this can be
50
51 harnessed by management in the design of future events. Thus the managerial implications are
52
53 that management can better tailor value propositions, and understand communication habits of
54
55 the segments they are dealing with.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For Peer Review Only

Reference list

- Aabø, S. (2005). Valuing the benefits of public libraries. *Information Economics and Policy*, 17(2), 175–198.
- Anderson, J.C., and Narus, J.A. (1998). Business marketing: Understand what customers value. *Harvard Business Review*, 76(6), 53–67.
- Arnett, D.B., German, S.D., and Hunt, S.D. (2003). The identity salience model of relationship marketing success: The case of nonprofit marketing. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(2), 89–105.
- Babin, B. J. Lee, Y., Kim, E., and Griffin, M. (2005). Modeling consumer satisfaction word-of-mouth: Restaurant patronage in Korea. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 19(3), 133–139.
- Balaji, M.S., and Roy, S.K., 2017. Value co-creation with Internet of things technology in the retail industry. *Journal of Marketing Management* 33(1-2), 7–31.
- Ballantyne, D., and Varey, R.J. (2006). Creating value-in-use through marketing interaction: The exchange logic of relating, communicating and knowing. *Marketing theory*, 6(3), 335–348.
- Bennett, J. (1996). The contingent valuation method: A post-Kakadu assessment. *Agenda*, 3(2), 185–194.
- Boerner, A. and Jobst, J. (2013). Enjoying theater: The role of visitor's [sic.] response to the performance. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts*, 7(4), 391–408.
- Bone, P.F. (1995). Word-of-mouth effects on short-term and long-term product judgments. *Journal of Business Research*, 32(3), 213–223.
- Briassoulis, H. (1991). Methodological issues: Tourism input-output analysis. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 18(3), 485–495.

1
2
3 Brodie, R.J., Hollebeek, L.D., Jurić, B., and Ilić, A., 2011. Customer engagement: Conceptual
4 domain, fundamental propositions, and implications for research. *Journal of Service Research*
5 *14* (3), 252–271.
6
7

8
9
10 Brown, A., and Novak, J. (2007). Assessing the intrinsic impacts of a live performance.
11 Available at: <http://culturehive.co.uk/resources/impacts-of-a-live-performance> [accessed
12 20.01.2016].
13
14

15
16
17 Bughin, J., Doogan, J., and Vetvik, O. J. (2010). A new way to measure word-of-mouth
18 marketing. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 2, 113-116.
19

20
21
22 Burzynski, M. H., and Bayer, D.J. (1977). The effect of positive and negative prior information
23 on motion picture appreciation. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 101(2), 215–218.
24

25
26
27 Buttle, F.A. (1998). Word of mouth: Understanding and managing referral marketing. *Journal*
28 *of Strategic Marketing*, 6(3), 241–254.
29

30
31
32 Carnwath, J.D., and Brown, A.S. (2014). Understanding the value and impacts of cultural
33 experiences. Manchester: Arts Council England.
34

35
36
37 Chevalier, J. A., and Mayzlin, D. (2006). The effect of word of mouth on sales: Online book
38 reviews. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 43(3), 345–354.
39

40
41
42 Chirieleison, C., and Scrucca, L. (2017). Event sustainability and transportation policy: A
43 model-based cluster analysis for a cross-comparison of hallmark events. *Tourism Management*
44 *Perspectives*, 24, 72–85.
45
46

47
48
49 Chu, S. C., and Kim, J. (2018). The current state of knowledge on electronic word-of-mouth in
50 advertising research. *International Journal of Advertising*, 37(1), 1-13.
51

52
53
54 Cudeck, R. (2000). Exploratory factor analysis. In Tinsley, H.E.A., and Brown, S.D. (eds)
55 *Handbook of applied multivariate statistics and mathematical modelling* (pp. 265-296). San
56 Diego, CA and London: Academic Press.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Dellarocas, C., Zhang, X., and Awad, N.F. (2007). Exploring the value of online product
4 reviews in forecasting sales: The case of motion pictures. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*,
5 *21(4)*, 23–45.
6
7

8
9 Doorn, J. van, 2011. Comment: Customer Engagement: Essence, Dimensionality, and
10 Boundaries. *Journal of Service Research* *14(3)*, 280–282.
11
12

13
14 Ekinci, Y., Ulengin, F., Uray, N., 2014. Using customer lifetime value to plan optimal
15 promotions. *The Service Industries Journal* *34(2)*, 103–122.
16
17

18
19 Edvardsson, B., Tronvoll, B., and Gruber, T. (2011). Expanding understanding of service
20 exchange and value co-creation: A social construction approach. *Journal of the Academy of*
21 *Marketing Science* *39(2)*, 327–339.
22
23

24
25 Eggert, A., and Ulaga, W. (2002). Customer perceived value: A substitute for satisfaction in
26 business markets? *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, *17(2/3)*, 107–118.
27
28

29
30 Fillis, I., Lee, B., and Fraser, I. (2015). Measuring the cultural value of the Royal Scottish
31 Academy New Contemporaries Exhibition as a platform for emerging artists. *Cultural Trends*,
32 *24(3)*, 245–255.
33
34

35
36 Formica, S., and Uysal, M. (1998). Market segmentation of an international cultural-historical
37 event in Italy. *Journal of Travel Research*, *36(4)*, 16–24.
38
39

40
41 Fornell, C., and Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable
42 variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *18(1)*, 39–50.
43
44

45
46 Frey, B.S. (2005). What values should count in the arts? The tension between economic effects
47 and cultural value. Institute for Empirical Research in Economics University of Zurich
48 Working Paper Series.
49
50

51
52 Frow, P., and Payne, A. (2011). A stakeholder perspective of the value proposition concept.
53 *European Journal of Marketing*, *45(1/2)*, 223-240.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Grewal, D., Monroe, K.B., and Krishnan, R. (1998). The effects of price-comparison
4 advertising on buyers' perceptions of acquisition value, transaction value, and behavioral
5 intentions. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(2), 46–59.
6
7

8
9 Grisolia, J.M., and Willis, K.G. (2012). A latent class model of theatre demand. *Journal of*
10 *Cultural Economics*, 36(2), 113–139.
11
12

13
14 Grönroos, C. (2008). Service logic revisited: who creates value? And who co-creates?
15 *European Business Review*, 20(4), 298-314.
16
17

18
19 Grönroos, C. (2011). Value co-creation in service logic: A critical analysis. *Marketing Theory*,
20 11(3), 279–301.
21
22

23
24 Grönroos, C., and Ravald, A. (2011). Service as business logic: Implications for value creation
25 and marketing. *Journal of Service Management* 22(1), 5–22.
26
27

28
29 Grönroos, C., and Voima, P. (2013). Critical service logic: Making sense of value creation and
30 co-creation. *Journal of the Academy Marketing Science* 41(2), 133–150.
31
32

33
34 Grisolia, J.M., and Willis, K.G. (2012). A latent class model of theatre demand. *Journal of*
35 *Cultural Economics*, 36(2), 113–139.
36
37

38
39 De Groot, R., Brander, L., Van Der Ploeg, S., Costanza, R., Bernard, F., Braat, L., ... and
40 Hussain, S. (2012). Global estimates of the value of ecosystems and their services in monetary
41 units. *Ecosystem services*, 1(1), 50-61.
42
43
44

45
46 Hair, J.F., Black, W.C., Babin, B.J. and Anderson, R.E. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis*, 7th
47 ed. Pearson Prentice Hall.
48
49

50
51 Hartline, M.D., and Jones, K.C. (1996). Employee performance cues in a hotel service
52 environment: Influence on perceived service quality, value, and word-of-mouth intentions.
53 *Journal of Business Research*, 35(3), 207–215.
54
55

56
57 Hearn, G., Roodhouse, S., and Blakey, J. (2007). From value chain to value creating ecology.
58 *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(4), 419–436.
59
60

1
2
3 Heilbrun, J., and Gray, C.M. (2001). *The economics of art and culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge
4 University Press.
5

6
7
8 Hennig-Thurau, T., Gwinner, K.P., Walsh, G., and Gremler, D.D. (2004). Electronic word-of-
9 mouth via consumer-opinion platforms: What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on
10 the Internet? *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 18(1), 38–52.
11
12

13
14 Higgins, E.T., and Scholer, A.A. (2009). Engaging the consumer: The science and art of the
15 value creation process. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 19(2), 100–114.
16
17

18
19 Holbrook, M. (1999). *Consumer value: A framework for analysis and research*. London and
20 New York: Routledge.
21
22

23
24 Holden, J. (2004). *Capturing cultural value: How culture has become a tool of government*.
25 London: Demos.
26
27

28
29 Holden, J. (2006). *Cultural value and the crisis of legitimacy*. London: Demos.
30
31

32
33 Hume, M., and Sullivan Mort, G., (2008). Satisfaction in performing arts: The role of value?
34 *European Journal of Marketing*, 42(3/4), 311–326.
35
36

37
38 Horbel, C., Popp, B., Woratschek, H., and Wilson, B. (2016). How context shapes value co-
39 creation: spectator experience of sport events. *The Service Industries Journal*, 36(11–12), 510–
40 531.
41
42

43
44 Hosany, S., and Prayag, G. (2013). Patterns of tourists' emotional responses, satisfaction, and
45 intention to recommend. *Journal of Business Research*, 66(6), 730–737.
46
47

48
49 Jaakkola, E., and Alexander, M., (2014). The role of customer engagement behavior in value
50 co-creation: A service system perspective. *Journal of Service Research* (17), 247–261.
51
52

53
54 Janawade, V., Bertrand, D., Léo, P.-Y., and Philippe, J. (2015). Assessing 'meta-services':
55 Customer's perceived value and behaviour. *The Service Industries Journal*, 35(5), 275–295.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Jaramillo, F., and Moizeau, F. (2003). Conspicuous consumption and social segmentation.
4 *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 5(1), 1–24.
5
6
7

8 Jones, M.A., Reynolds, K.E., and Arnold, M.J. (2006). Hedonic and utilitarian shopping value:
9 Investigating differential effects on retail outcomes. *Journal of Business Research*, 59(9), 974–
10 981.
11
12
13

14
15 Kim, S., and Kim, S. (2018). Segmentation of potential film tourists by film nostalgia and
16 preferred film tourism program. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 35(3), 285–305.
17
18

19
20 Kim, K., Sun, J., Jogaratnam, G., and Oh, I.-K. (2006). Market segmentation by activity
21 preferences: Validation of cultural festival participants. *Event Management*, 10(4), 221–229.
22
23
24

25 King, R.A., Racherla, P., and Bush, V.D. (2014). What we know and don't know about online
26 word-of-mouth: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*,
27 28(3), 167-183.
28
29
30

31
32 Klamer, A. (2004). Social, cultural and economic values of cultural goods. In Rao, V. and
33 Walton, M. (eds) *Cultural and public action* (pp. 17-39). Redwood City, CA: Stanford
34 University Press.
35
36
37

38
39 Kleinschafer, J., Dowell, D., and Morrison, M. (2011). Doing more with less: Understanding
40 the contributions of regional art gallery members through marketing segmentation. *Arts*
41 *Marketing: An International Journal*, 1(1), 39–55.
42
43
44

45
46 Kruger, M., Saayman, M., and Ellis, S. (2011). Segmentation by genres: The case of the
47 Aardklop National Arts Festival. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 13(6), 511–526.
48
49
50

51 Lee, C.-K., Lee, Y.-K., and Wicks, B.E. (2004). Segmentation of festival motivation by
52 nationality and satisfaction. *Tourism Management*, 25(1), 61–70.
53
54
55

56 Lee, C.-K., Kang, S. K., and Lee, Y.-K. (2013). Segmentation of mega event motivation: The
57 case of Expo 2010, Shanghai, China. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(6), 637–
58 660.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 Li, M., Huang, Z., and Cai, L. A. (2009). Benefit segmentation of visitors to a rural
6 community-based festival. *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 26(5-6), 585–598.
7
8
9
10 Libai, B., Muller, E., and Peres, R. (2013). Decomposing the value of word-of-mouth seeding
11 programs: Acceleration versus expansion. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 50(2), 161–176.
12
13
14
15 Libai, B., Bolton, R., Bügel, M.S., de Ruyter, K., Götz, O., Risselada, H., and Stephen, A.T.
16 (2010). Customer-to-customer interactions: Broadening the scope of word of mouth research.
17 *Journal of Service Research*, 13(3), 267–282.
18
19
20
21
22 Lin, N. (1999). Building a network theory of social capital. *Connections*, 22(1), 28-51
23
24
25
26 Liu, Y. (2006). Word of mouth for movies: Its dynamics and impact on box office revenue.
27 *Journal of Marketing*, 70(3), 74–89.
28
29
30
31 Mackellar, J. (2009). Dabblers, fans and fanatics: Exploring behavioural segmentation at a
32 special-interest event. *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 15(1), 5–24.
33
34
35
36 de Matos, C.A., and Rossi, C.A.V. (2008). Word-of-mouth communications in marketing: A
37 meta-analytic review of the antecedents and moderators. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing*
38 *Science*, 36(4), 578–596.
39
40
41
42
43 McKee, D., Simmers, C.S., and Licata, J. (2006). Customer self-efficacy and response to
44 service. *Journal of Service Research*, 8(3), 207–220.
45
46
47
48 McKercher, B., Cros, H. du., and So-Ming, B.C. (2002). Activities-based segmentation of the
49 cultural tourism market. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 12(1), 23–46.
50
51
52
53 Molinari, L.K., Abratt, R., and Dion, P. (2008). Satisfaction, quality and value and effects on
54 repurchase and positive word-of-mouth behavioral intentions in a B2B services context.
55 *Journal of Services Marketing*, 22(5), 363–373.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Morimoto, Y. (1970). On aggregation problems in input-output analysis. *Review of Economic*
4 *Studies*, 37(1), 119–126.
5
6
7

8 Moul, C.C. (2007). Measuring word of mouth's impact on theatrical movie admissions. *Journal*
9 *of Economics and Management Strategy*, 16(4), 859–892.
10
11
12

13 Mukerjee, K. (2018). The impact of brand experience, service quality and perceived value on
14 word of mouth of retail bank customers: Investigating the mediating effect of loyalty. *Journal*
15 *of Financial Services Marketing*, 23(1), 12–24.
16
17
18

19 Neghina, C., Caniëls, M.C.J., Bloemer, J.M.M., and Birgelen, M.J.H. van. (2015). Value
20 cocreation in service interactions Dimensions and antecedents. *Marketing Theory*, 15(2), 221–
21 242.
22
23
24

25 O'Brien, D. (2015). Cultural value: Empirical perspectives. *Cultural Trends*, 24(3), 209–210.
26
27
28

29 Payne, A. F., Storbacka, K., and Frow, P. (2008). Managing the co-creation of value. *Journal*
30 *of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 36(1), 83–96.
31
32
33

34 Petrick, J.F., and Backman, S.J. (2002). An examination of the construct of perceived value for
35 the prediction of golf travelers' intentions to revisit. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(1), 38–45.
36
37
38

39 Pine, B.J.II, and Gilmore, J.H. (1998). Welcome to the experience economy. *Harvard Business*
40 *Review*, 76(4), 97–105.
41
42
43

44 Pine, B.J.II, and Gilmore, J.H. (1999). *The experience economy: Work is theatre and every*
45 *business a stage*. Boston: Harvard Business School.
46
47
48

49 Prahalad, C.K. and Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creating unique value with customers. *Strategy*
50 *& Leadership*, 32(3), 4–9.
51
52
53

54 Pulido-Fernández, J.I., and Sánchez-Rivero, M. (2010). Attitudes of the cultural tourist: A
55 latent segmentation approach. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 34(2), 111–129.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Punj, G., and Stewart, D.W. (1983). Cluster analysis in marketing research: Review and
4 suggestions for application. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 20(2), 134–148.

5
6
7
8 Putnam, R. (2001). Social capital: Measurement and consequences. *Canadian Journal of*
9 *Policy Research*, 2(1), 41-51.

10
11
12
13 Radbourne, J., Glow, H., and Johanson, K. (2013). Knowing and measuring the audience
14 experience. In Radbourne, J., Glow, H., and Johanson, K. (eds) *The audience experience: A*
15 *critical analysis in the performing arts* (pp.1-13). Bristol and Chicago: Intellect.

16
17
18
19 Radbourne, J., Johanson, K., Glow, H., and White T. (2009). The audience experience:
20 Measuring quality in the performing arts. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 11(3),
21 16-29.

22
23
24
25 Richards, G. (1996). Production and consumption of European cultural tourism. *Annals of*
26 *Tourism Research*, 23(2), 261–283.

27
28
29
30 Ritzer, G., and Jurgenson, N. (2010). Production, consumption, prosumption: The nature of
31 capitalism in the age of the digital ‘prosumer.’ *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 10(1), 13–36.

32
33
34
35 de Ruyter, K., and Wetzels, M., Lemmink, J., and Mattson, J. (1997). The dynamics of the
36 service delivery process: A value-based approach. *International Journal of Research in*
37 *Marketing*, 14(3), 231–243.

38
39
40
41 See-To, E. W., & Ho, K. K. (2014). Value co-creation and purchase intention in social network
42 sites: The role of electronic Word-of-Mouth and trust—A theoretical analysis. *Computers in*
43 *Human Behavior*, 31, 182-189.

44
45
46
47 Sheth, J.N., Newman, B.I., and Gross, B.L. (1991). Why we buy what we buy: A theory of
48 consumption values. *Journal of Business Research*, 22(2), 159–170.

49
50
51
52 Silvia, P.J. (2009). Looking past pleasure: Anger, confusion, disgust, surprise, and other
53 unusual aesthetic emotions. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts*, 3(1), 48-52.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Siu, N.Y.-M., Zhang, T.J.-F., Dong, P., and Kwan, H.-Y. (2013). New service bonds and customer value in customer relationship management: The case of museum visitors. *Tourism Management*, 36, 293–303.

Slater, S. F. (1997). Developing a customer value-based theory of the firm. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 25(2), 162–167.

Smith, J. B., and Colgate, M. (2007). Customer value creation: A practical framework. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 15(17), 7-23.

Stone, W., and Hughes, J. (2002). *Social capital: Empirical meaning and measurement validity*. Melbourne: Australian Institute of Family Studies.

Sullivan Mort, G., Weerawardena, J., Sargeant, A., and Bennett, R. (2015). Social entrepreneurship and value creation in not-for-profit organizations. In Campbell, C.L. (ed.) *Marketing in transition: Scarcity, globalism, and sustainability* (pp. 372-376). New York: Springer International

Sweeney, J. C., and Soutar, G.N. (2001). Consumer perceived value: The development of a multiple item scale. *Journal of Retailing*, 77(2), 203–220.

Taheri, B., Jafari, A., and O’Gorman, K. (2014). Keeping your audience: Presenting a visitor engagement scale. *Tourism Management*, 42, 321–329.

Tasci, A.D.A. (2016). A critical review of consumer value and its complex relationships in the consumer-based brand equity network. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, 5(3), 171–191.

Throsby, D. (2003). Determining the value of cultural goods: How much (or how little) does contingent valuation tell us? *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 27(3-4), 275–285.

Tkaczynski, A., and Rundle-Thiele, S.R. (2011). Event segmentation: A review and research agenda. *Tourism Management*, 32(2), 426–434.

1
2
3 Tohmo, T. (2005). Economic impacts of cultural events on local economies: An input–output
4 analysis of the Kaustinen Folk Music Festival. *Tourism Economics*, 11(3), 431–451.
5
6
7

8 de la Torre, M., and Throsby, D. (eds.) (2002). *Assessing the values of cultural heritage:*
9 *Research report*. Los Angeles, CA: Getty Conservation Institute.
10
11
12

13 Trusov, M., Bucklin, R. E., and Pauwels, K. (2009). Effects of word-of-mouth versus
14 traditional marketing: Findings from an Internet social networking site. *Journal of Marketing*,
15 73(5), 90–102.
16
17
18

19 Tschacher, W., Greenwood, S., Kirchberg, V., Wintzerith, S., van den Berg, K., and Tröndle,
20 M. (2012). Physiological correlates of aesthetics perception of artworks in a museum.
21 *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts*, 6(1), 96–103.
22
23
24

25 Vargo, S.L., and Lusch, R.F. (2008). Service-dominant logic: Continuing the evolution.
26 *Journal of the Academy Marketing Science*. 36(1), 1–10.
27
28
29

30 Vargo, S.L., Maglio, P.P., and Akaka, M.A. (2008). On value and value co-creation: A service
31 systems and service logic perspective. *European management journal*, 26(3), 145-152.
32
33
34

35 Villanueva, J., Yoo, S., and Hanssens, D.M. (2008). The impact of marketing-induced versus
36 word-of-mouth customer acquisition on customer equity growth. *Journal of Marketing*
37 *Research*, 45(1), 48–59.
38
39
40

41 Vyncke, P. (2002). Lifestyle segmentation from attitudes, interests and opinions, to values,
42 aesthetic styles, life visions and media preferences. *European Journal of Communication*,
43 17(4), 445–463.
44
45
46

47 Williams, P. and Soutar, G.N. (2009). Value, satisfaction and behavioral intentions in an
48 adventure tourism context. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 36(3), 413-438.
49
50
51

52 Zwass, V. (2010). Co-creation: Toward a taxonomy and an integrated research perspective.
53 *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 15(1), 11–48.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Descriptive Results for Measures

	Mean	Std. Deviation	Alpha
Functional value	4.400	0.665	0.89
Price value	3.786	0.982	0.84
Emotional value	4.187	0.694	0.87
Social value	3.720	0.935	0.83
Novelty value	3.851	0.792	0.61
I am likely to recommend this event to other people	4.428	0.711	-
I am likely to post about my experiences on social media sites	2.900	1.481	-
I am likely to post my views about the event on travel websites	2.314	1.298	-

Table 2: Results for Segments and Variables

Values/segments	1	2	3	4	Total
Functional Value Mean	4.856	4.655	3.919	3.992	4.396
Price Value Mean	4.473	4.225	2.396	3.588	3.798
Emotional Value Mean	4.771	4.173	3.535	3.983	4.185
Social Value Mean	4.671	2.998	2.870	3.885	3.726
Novelty Value Mean	4.491	3.414	3.399	3.818	3.847

All values significant ($P < 0.001$)

Key: 1 = 'Eisteddfod Enthusiasts', 2 = 'Cultural Event Aficionados', 3 = 'Must Have Been Dragged Along', 4 = 'Stuck in the Middle'

Table 3: Clusters and Word of Mouth

	1	2	3	4	Total
I am likely to post my views about the event on travel websites (TripAdvisor, etc)	2.603	2.049	1.848	2.553	2.323
I am likely to tell other people positive things about this event	4.677	4.582	4.085	4.255	4.430
I am likely to post about my experiences on social media sites (Facebook, etc)	3.340	2.614	2.374	3.017	2.901

All values significant ($P < 0.001$)

Key: 1 = 'Eisteddfod Enthusiasts', 2 = 'Cultural Event Aficionados', 3 = 'Must Have Been Dragged Along', 4 = 'Stuck in the Middle'

Table 4: Segment Descriptors

			Segments based on value means				Total
			1	2	3	4	
Sex (n/s)	Male	Count	85	83	54	95	317
		%	34.0%	40.9%	37.0%	39.9%	37.9%
	Female	Count	165	120	92	143	520
		%	66.0%	59.1%	63.0%	60.1%	62.1%
Children (n/s)	No children at home	Count	188	156	99	179	622
		%	76.7%	77.6%	69.7%	78.9%	76.3%
	Yes have children at home	Count	57	45	43	48	193
		%	23.3%	22.4%	30.3%	21.1%	23.7%
Employment *	Full time	Count	72	74	56	83	285
		%	28.9%	36.1%	38.9%	35.3%	34.2%
	Homemaker	Count	15	4	1	5	25
		%	6.0%	2.0%	.7%	2.1%	3.0%
	Unemployed	Count	26	11	9	21	67
		%	10.4%	5.4%	6.3%	8.9%	8.0%
	Part time employed	Count	34	27	33	43	137
		%	13.7%	13.2%	22.9%	18.3%	16.4%
	Other	Count	102	89	45	83	319
		%	41.0%	43.4%	31.3%	35.3%	38.3%

n/s = non-significant, *P<0.01

Key: 1 = 'Eisteddfod Enthusiasts', 2 = 'Cultural Event Aficionados', 3 = 'Must Have Been Dragged Along', 4 = 'Stuck in the Middle'

Table 5: Further Segment Descriptors

		Segments based on value means				Total
		1	2	3	4	
Length of time lived	N	218	190	137	204	749
in local area (years) *	Mean	22.49	24.77	19.11	18.62	21.39
	Std Dev.	16.40	17.33	15.72	14.43	16.18
Income n/s	N	217	193	134	212	756
(1=<£9,999, 2=£10-14,999,	Mean	4.21	4.47	4.58	4.00	4.29
3=£15-19,999, 4=£20-24,999,						
5=£25-29,999, 6=£30-49,999,		2.92	2.62	2.86	2.97	2.85
7=£50-74,999, 8=>£75,000,						
based on ONS categories)	Std Dev.					
	N	248	205	143	233	829
Age (years) *	Mean	45.52	52.43	40.04	42.88	45.54
	Std Dev.	21.09	17.38	18.40	20.23	19.97
Experience of event	N	256	215	154	250	875
(1=extremely	Mean	6.68	6.37	5.59	5.95	6.2
negative, 7= extremely						
positive) *	Std Dev.	0.55	0.79	1.12	0.87	0.91
Similar events will attend	N	245	204	147	245	841
in 12-month period *	Mean	5.51	6.29	4.41	5.09	5.38

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Std Dev.	4.24	5.18	2.53	4.87	4.48
----------	------	------	------	------	------

n/s – not significant, *p<0.001

Key: 1 = ‘Eisteddfod Enthusiasts’, 2 = ‘Cultural Event Aficionados’, 3 = ‘Must Have Been Dragged Along’,
4 = ‘Stuck in the Middle’

For Peer Review Only

Table 6: Segment summaries

<p>Segment 1: 'Eisteddfod Enthusiasts' (29.6%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highest scores for every value type • Most positive experience of this event • Attended the most similar events • Most likely to be unemployed • Second oldest mean age • Most likely to tell others using travel websites • Most likely to give traditional word of mouth • Most likely to tell others using social media 	<p>Segment 2: 'Cultural Event Aficionados' (24.3%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest mean for novelty value • Second lowest mean for social value • Second highest means for functional value, price value and emotional value • Most likely to work part time • Lived longest period at their current residence • Highest mean age • Attended greatest number of similar events • Attending the fewest days at this event • Second most likely to give word of mouth in person • Unlikely to give electronic word of mouth
<p>Segment 3: 'Must Have Been Dragged Along' (17.3%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lowest scores for every value type • Most likely to be in full-time work • Youngest in mean years • Least enjoyment of this event • Attended the fewest such events • Least likely to tell others using travel websites • Least likely to give traditional word of mouth • Least likely to tell others using social media 	<p>Segment 4: 'Stuck in the Middle' (28.8%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second or third according to all five value types • Lived shortest period at their current residence • Second youngest mean age • Second least positive experience of this event • Second least likely to attend other such events • Second most likely to tell others using travel websites • Second most likely to tell others using social media