

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54663/2182-9306.2022.v10.n19.5-35>

*Research Paper*

## Segmentation and the Key Communication Channels to Promote a Music Festival – The NOS Primavera Sound Case Study

António Lopes de Almeida \*

Elvira Vieira \*\*

Ana Pinto Borges \*\*\*

### ABSTRACT

In this paper, we segment the festival audience considering the loyalty and the participation intensity, and each group was characterized considering the main motivations, global satisfaction and the key communication channels to promote the event. We study the unique and authentic NOS Primavera Sound Festival that occurs in the city of Porto. To answer our research questions, we analysed two editions (2018 and 2019) that contemplate 2156 valid responses and subsequently applied non-parametric tests. We intend to contribute to the literature through the presentation of a clear audience segmentation and also the diverse potential communication channels across the different groups. This information is extremely useful not only for the festival organizers, but also for other stakeholders, namely marketers, policy makers, sponsors, sector professionals, researchers, among others.

**Keywords:** Cultural Events, Music Festival Audience Segmentation, Marketing Communication, NOS Primavera Sounds.

---

\* ISAG – European Business School and Research Center in Business Sciences and Tourism (CICET-FCVC), GOVCOPP – Research Unit, Universidade de Aveiro, Portugal. Email: [lopes.almeida@isag.pt](mailto:lopes.almeida@isag.pt)

\*\* ISAG – European Business School and Research Center in Business Sciences and Tourism (CICET-FCVC), IPVC- Polytechnic Institute of Viana do Castelo and UNIAG - Applied Management Research Unit, Portugal. Email: [elvira.vieira@isag.pt](mailto:elvira.vieira@isag.pt)

\*\*\* ISAG – European Business School and Research Center in Business Sciences and Tourism (CICET-FCVC), Center for Research in Organizations, Markets and Industrial Management (COMEGI), Portugal. Email: [anaborges@isag.pt](mailto:anaborges@isag.pt)

**Received on:** 2021/10/20

**Approved on:** 2022/07/04

Evaluated by a double blind review system

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Cultural tourism is one of the oldest types of tourism and the events' tourism phenomenon is one of its most significant and fastest growing forms (Krajnović & Gortan-Carlin, 2017). In this specific form, music events have assumed an increasing important role as integrated tourism products at destinations. The music festival industry is seen as one of the greatest boosters for cultural tourism and a major contributor to regional economic activity in many countries (Blesic et al, 2013; Getz, 2008; Duarte et al, 2018). Furthermore, music festivals become places of performance, cohesion and social mobility (Newbold et al, 2015). Borges et al (2016) highlight that music festivals are attractive events among youngsters, mostly during summer time and/or school breaks. Music festivals have risen awareness in recent years, particularly among millennials, with the internet (included the social networks) playing an important role on tickets' sales (Perez, 2016) and promoting the event.

Portugal has been asserting its cultural activity with positive impacts on different dimensions of the economy, and the biggest symbol of the cultural boom is the music festival season that marks the Portuguese summer. It is clear that festivals offer possibilities in terms of cultural consumption that are frequently perceived as integrating parts of the local development policies, thus contributing, on the one hand, for the reputation of the places/cities, and, on the other hand, creating employment and wealth (Carneiro et al, 2011; Borges et al, 2020).

In order for a festival to be sustainable and to render the economic contribution and all other social benefits, the importance of effective/strategic marketing planning of the festival must be recognized. At this context, an essential move towards strategic marketing planning is a deeper knowledge of the attendees that could result from market segmentation processes (Lee et al, 2004; Saayman & Saayman, 2016; Li & Wood, 2016; Pérez-Gálvez et al, 2017). The aim is to allow festival features to readapt, namely marketing communication efforts, towards different

kinds of audience segments. This is the main focus of this paper, to characterize the audience segments and also to evaluate the central marketing communication channels of the NOS Primavera Sound music festival. Detecting the most effective communication channels to increase awareness and engagement of different audience segments can support the festival organization with the festival design itself and the definition and focalization of their marketing communication strategy and efforts (Brown & Sharpley, 2019).

This paper is organized as follows: first the literature review is presented, followed by the research questions formulation. After that, the methodology is presented in which is described the sampling process, the questionnaire design, and the data analysis technique description and, after that, the results are presented. The paper ends with the conclusions, research limitations and future research suggestions.

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **2.1. Importance of festivals**

Festivals are an important expression of human activity and a “...pervasive feature of our cultural landscape that constitute a vital and growing component of the event industry” (Allen et al, 2011, p. 14). Particularly since the 1990s, around the world, the festival industry continues to evolve and develop rapidly, with consumers dedicating vast amounts of time and money to attend these events. Festivals represent not only social, cultural and entertainment opportunities for residents and tourists but also an important ‘financial injection’ to their host economies (Lotts et al, 2011). In Portugal, the 280 music festivals held in 2019 attracted 2.1 million participants and generated about €18 billion in gross revenue (Aporfest, 2019). These figures demonstrate the economic relevance of music festivals, allowing us also to understand the important place of festivals in the context of event management literature and academic research. With hundreds of festivals taking place every year, representing a huge competition, the general research findings can allow a deeper understanding of target audiences, so that festivals can be organized, managed and promoted more effectively and efficiently in order to develop their competitiveness and economic sustainability (Lee et al, 2008; Lee & Kyle, 2014; Frost & Laing, 2015; Saayman & Saayman, 2016). All these objectives, with emphasis on attendees' loyalty, are particularly important in the case of starting-up festivals, where the event itself and its economic success are yet an incognita. In these cases, as Robinson (2016, p.51) pointed, “(...) the difference between a

catastrophic loss and a tidy profit is often based on no more than a few thousand tickets”. Financial negative results are common in a festival first editions, hence this initial losses are normally seen as an investment in the festival brand and reputation, in the hope that repeating attendances in future editions would lead to economic sustainability (Anderton, 2021).

Getz et al (2010) reinforces the role of festival audience segmentation as powerful tool to improve festival management, the objective is to understand the different segments and use this knowledge to better target the participants’. A key component of festival marketing management is that the organizers understand participants' motivations; without this knowledge, facilitating effective festival planning is hampered, as is the ability to achieve a more productive segmented marketing positioning and strategy (Wamwara-Mbugua & Cornwell, 2009). Lee and Lee (2001) argue that the segmentation of festival participants’ through motivational factors allows festival managers to identify the strengths and opportunities of each group, helping to ensure their satisfaction. Particularly with a heterogeneous audience, segmenting the participants and knowing their characteristics based on motivations will be a powerful promotional tool allowing festival managers to communicate the most valued and appreciated characteristics of the festival by each segment (Formica & Uysal, 1998).

## **2.2. Festival audience segmentation**

Although the audience of a festival can be understood as a bit less heterogeneous market than the general consumer market, the segmented marketing approach it’s also important here. Peterson (1992) defends that seeing and handling an audience as an undifferentiated mass is no longer valid.

Market segmentation is a marketing technic that consists of subdividing a heterogeneous market into more homogeneous groups/segments. Consequently, marketing strategies/actions and the product positioning (festival) are adapted to the specific characteristics of each segment, gaining effectiveness and competitive advantage through an increased capacity to better satisfy the needs of each segment (Kotler & Keller, 2013; Dolnicar, 2015). At the base of the segmentation process it’s the selection and concretization of a set of criteria or variables that make it possible to constitute the segments. Segmentation criteria assume different typologies, from the most objective, such as geographic or sociodemographic, to more subjective criteria, such as behavioural or psychographic (Dolnicar, 2015; Botha & Slabbert, 2011). By way of illustration,

Table 1 presents a summary of the most used categories and segmentation criteria directed to festival audiences.

**Table 1.** Frequently used criteria at segmentation processes

| Categories        | Criteria  |
|-------------------|---|
| Socio-demographic | Gender, Age, Professional occupation, Family Life-cycle stage.  |
| Socio-economic    | Income level, Expenditure.  |
| Geographic        | Nationality, Country/Region of residence, Climate, Transport.   |
| Psychographic     | Social-class, Lifestyle, Personality.   |
| Behavioural       | Loyalty, Attitudes, Length of stay, Travel group size, Accommodation preferences, Benefits sought, Motivations. |

Source: Adapted from Botha & Slabbert (2011).

The content of the segments of participants in music festivals is naturally different according to the segmentation process and type of criteria used. One of the most used criteria subdivide festival participants into two basic segments: first-time participants (debutants) and repeat participants (Lau & McKercher, 2004; Lee et al, 2009). While the first segment is virgin in terms of festival experience, recurring attendees in addition to familiarity have a clear perception of the satisfaction level with the festival. It was found that these two segments differ significantly in terms of sociodemographic, behavioural, perceived value and motivations. More than the debutants, repeat participants tend to participate more and spend more money – a hypothetical proof to their loyalty. In fact, Lee et al (2009) argue that repeat participants have been found to show a stronger value-loyalty relationship than debutants. Thus, this audience segment could represent an economically attractive and cost-effective audience for festivals (Kruger et al, 2010).

Among several examples of festival audience segments, the work of McMorland and Mactaggart (2007) segmented the audience of music festivals in Scotland into the following four segments: ‘modernists’; ‘family and inspiration seekers’; ‘social pleasure seekers’; and ‘thrill seekers’. The research of Kruger and Saayman (2012) segmented the audience who attended a pop star's concert into two groups according to the audience commitment: ‘avid fans’ and ‘recreational goers’. In a study related to musical events participants in Portugal, Fonseca and Ramos (2014) suggested three segments: ‘music lovers’, ‘networkers’ and ‘tourists’. Kruger and Saayman (2016) research led to a segmentation into three groups: ‘enthusiasts’, ‘sentimentalists’ and ‘novices’.

Perez-Galvez et al (2017) segmented the public according to musical tastes leading to three different groups: ‘rock’, ‘classical’ and ‘guitar-lovers’, with the first two groups characterised by being a very selective audience and the third the most heterogeneous in terms of musical tastes. Also the results of the study of Mallet et al (2017) show that among others the segments differ in terms of experience with the festival and loyalty.

Many of these research works rely on motivational factors to segment the public, in fact this type of criteria in addition to be frequently used has proved to be very prolific in detecting and defining different audience segments.

### **2.3. Festival motivations**

The recognition that festivals are one of the fastest growing phenomena in leisure and tourism fields, and motivations to participate are important issues to festival sustainability, have led researchers to deeper explore this theme.

Some festival oriented studies focus on the general characteristics of its participants (Prentice & Anderson 2003; Song et al, 2014), while others specifically focus on their motivations, satisfaction and loyalty levels (Schofield & Thompson, 2007; Kitterlin & Yoo, 2014; Croes & Lee, 2015; Trindade et al, 2018; Teixeira et al, 2019).

According to Wilson et al (2017), one of the main objectives of studying behavioural patterns and motivations is the interest in building festival audience segmentation strategies and, with the results, to evaluate the relationship between the core motivations and the participants' satisfaction and loyalty. Planning a festival, since its format/program until the marketing communication strategies to be used, the different motivations of each segment of participants should be taken into account, thus contributing to improve the engagement and satisfaction level of each group (Crompton & McKay, 1997; Pulido-Fernández & Sánchez-Rivero, 2010; Yolal et al, 2012; Lee & Kyle, 2014; Dolnicar, 2015). In the case of recurring festivals, the level of satisfaction is a key element in the potential revisit to the festival, so assessing the level of satisfaction is thus a crucial task for organizers and planners in order to improve loyalty standards (Kim et al, 2011; Kang et al, 2019).

Among other factors used to characterize audiences, motivations are generally heterogeneous and related with a diverse number of items, such as: the festival size and location; festival internationalization; the type of music; the program quality in terms of its authenticity and value; and participants' socio-demographic/economic characteristics (Saleh & Ryan, 1993; Saayman &

Saayman, 2016; Li & Wood, 2016). Several studies reveals interesting motivational dimensions and significant motivational differences between festival participants' segments across factors such as age, income, local residency, repeat participation (Mohr et al, 1993; Crompton and McKay, 1997; Formica & Uysal, 1998). Mohr et al (1993) found that two segments composed by debutants and repeated festival participants were significantly different according to the 'excitement' and 'novelty' motivational dimensions and also satisfaction level; with the second segment appearing to have higher satisfaction level. Formica and Uysal (1998) study revealed six motivational dimensions to participate on a festival: socializing/entertainment; attraction/excitement; group togetherness; cultural/historical; family togetherness; and site novelty. From this study emerged two distinct segments of participants, designated 'enthusiastic' (more involved and motivated) and 'moderate' (less involved and motivated), showing significant differences in terms of age, marital status and income. Lee (2000) work sought to detect motivational differences between segments of participants according to their geographic origin. The results arouse seven motivational dimensions: cultural exploration; family togetherness; escape; novelty; external group socialization; event attractions; and known group socialization. Also Abreu-Novais and Arcodia (2013) summarize six motivational dimensions for participating in music festival: cultural activities; socialization; opportunity to gather the family; novelty of the event; relaxation; and fun. The research from Kruger and Saayman (2016) add to this set of motivations three more dimensions: music/artists/program, knowledge/training and complementary experiences during the festival.

Understanding the different motivations for participating in a festival according to the various audience segments is an important task for the festival's marketing planning and in this context, more precisely, understanding which marketing communication means and channels can be more effective to reach the different target segments of a festival seems to be a key theme.

#### **2.4. Marketing communication**

One of the key success determinants for a music festival is its effective marketing communication (Getz, 2005; Masterman & Wood, 2005). This effectiveness will determine the volume of tickets sold, and simultaneously the ability to generate audience engagement and loyalty (Turner, 2017). Prakash and Sharma (2010) propose that event marketing management faces heavy challenges in the communicating field, aiming to reach several goals: set up brand awareness, create a unique brand identity, attract more audiences, improve loyalty and win

sponsors. According to Anderton (2015), traditional media (e.g. press) and social media are particularly relevant both to festival organisers and sponsors. This insofar as they provide promotion/awareness for the festival and also for sponsors brand because the impact of sponsorship is often evaluated by the presence in magazines (traditional) or by social media hits (recognized as ‘impressions’) – including website traffic, Twitter ‘followers’, and Facebook ‘likes’. Moreover, positive social media ‘impressions’ can potentially attract new attendees and simultaneously contribute to loyalty.

As argued by Beaudoin (2009) the more international a festival is, with a cultural and social diversified audience, the more strength a segmented marketing communication strategy will have. To fulfil the marketing communication goals we must be aware of several social and technological transformations underling the need to rethink, redirect, segment and expand marketing communication efforts for a festival. First of all is the growing consumers sophistication in their needs and motivations and its desire for customized information as much as possible; on the other hand, the growing competitiveness in the festival industry with each festival often fighting for the same public, and last but not least, the exponential technological advances and the growing importance of digital media (Kitchen et al, 2004; Kitchen & Schultz, 2009; Kliatchko, 2009; Seric et al, 2014).

Despite the general importance of formal marketing communication channels (e.g. TV or digital advertising), the results of some research lead to question of its impact on the decision-making to participate in an event. As Gitelson (2000) argue, for most of the public, that previous experience is the main driving force in the decision-making/participation process. On the other hand, Getz and Fairley (2004) suggest that, although formal marketing communication has primarily an impact on event awareness, the word of mouth (WOM) has the predominant role in the event success. The direct recommendation from satisfied attendees (e.g. friends and relatives) normally have a huge impact at one’s participation decision and motivation to attend (Thrane, 2002; Wong et al, 2018). On the festival segmentation study conducted by Lee et al. (2004), based on attendees motivations and nationality, it was concluded that the mass media (e.g. TV, Radio) influence more the domestic audience and WOM and travel agencies were more likely to be effective to influence foreign attendees. The authors Hede and Kellett (2011) state that although traditional marketing communication tools are still used, such as printed material (e.g. flyers) and mass media advertising, they have been losing their effectiveness with digital media. Thus, like



WOM, electronic word-of-mouth (E-WOM) and digital communication efforts - online advertising and social media presence, are asserting themselves in terms of effectiveness (Getz and Fairley, 2004). As Gyimóthy and Larson (2015) point out, these online communication channels are used in a pure marketing logic, gathering information aiming to percept the current and past festival attendee's expectations and experiences. From a marketing communication strict perspective, these channels should be used not only before the purchase - raising awareness, attracting and encouraging participation; but also during and, even after the festival - creating engagement and loyalty (Hudson & Hudson, 2013).

The answer to the research questions presented on the next section could represent a reinforcement to festivals' marketing segmentation and communication theory. As much as the authors know, there are only a few research works detailing marketing communication means/channels towards specific audience segments. In addition, the research contributions could also result in practical terms, insofar the findings could help festivals' organizations to better understand and select the most effective marketing communication means/channels to impact different segments of music festivals' audiences. Identifying how traditional and digital media influence different segments of festival participants, will help organisers develop the most effective marketing strategies to take advantage of the capability of each of these channels to create attraction and involvement to festival participants.

### **3. Case study and the research questions**

The Primavera Sound festival had its first edition in Barcelona in 2001, and since then it has become highly popular with national and international audiences. The Portuguese city chosen to host this festival was Porto, and since the first edition in 2012 until now (with the interruption of two editions due to the COVID-19 pandemic situation), NOS Primavera Sound has been a festival of reference in the context of European festivals. The excellent geographical location of the event, the good accessibilities to Porto city from the rest of Europe (and the world), the significant representation of the Portuguese musical scene and the city's growth as a tourist destination have been a strong contribution to the festival affirmation. The artistic orientation follows the same guidelines as the music event imported from Barcelona, distinguished by the variety of styles and the focus on new bands, highlighting both local and international artists with long and respected careers.

Considering that the main purpose of this work is to segment the festival audience taking in account the main motivations and the key communication channels to promote the event, the following questions were formulated:

**RQ1.** What could be the audience segmentation of music festival according to loyalty and commitment criteria?

**RQ2.** The audience segments of music festival are significant different between two editions?

**RQ3.** The segments of music festival differ according to their sociodemographic characteristics?

**RQ4.** The segments of music festival differ considering their motivations to participate in the event?

**RQ5.** The segments of music festival differ considering their global satisfaction with the event?

**RQ6.** Which communication channels are most promising in reaching (specific segments of) the music festival participants?

## **4. METHODOLOGY**

### **4.1. Events context and sampling process**

The study was based on the analysis of primary data, obtained through the application of survey. For data collection, the convenience non-probabilistic sampling technique was used and the questionnaires were applied through direct and personal interviews. The interviews were carried out at the event's venue (Parque da Cidade) by junior researchers, during the three days of the festival of each edition. The 2018 edition took place on the 7th, 8th and 9th of June, and the 2019 edition took place on the 6th, 7th, and 8th of the same month. The respondents' anonymity was guaranteed.

During the 2018 edition, 1179 valid answers were collected (33,4% on Thursday; 37,6% on Friday and 29,0% on Saturday), and in 2019 edition 977 complete answers were collected (25,5% on Thursday; 40,2% on Friday and 34,3% on Saturday). The 2018 edition of the festival had an approximate audience of 100 thousand attendees and the 2019 edition around 75 thousand. It should be noted that given the population of 100 thousand attendees, the sample should be constituted by 660 complete answers (for a confidence interval of 99% and a sampling error of 5%), so it can be concluded that both samples are representative of the population under study.

## 4.2. Questionnaire structure

In order to answer the research questions, the following parts of the questionnaire were used: i) The sociodemographic characteristics of the attendees: gender; age; marital status; educational qualifications; working conditions; nationality and residence; ii) Whether the respondent attended the festival in the previous edition; iii) The motivations to assist: line up; festival's reputation; surprise/a unique festival; schedule of concerts; amusement/ socializing/ meeting people; friend's suggestion; previous experience (Porto or Barcelona); iv) The type of ticket bought: 1 day; 2 or 3 days; v) The main communication mean/channel through which the participant obtained information of the festival: digital; television; radio; print materials and word-of-mouth; vi) The global satisfaction level with the event. To measure the audience motivations it was used a 5-point Likert-type scale of importance: (1) nothing important, (2) not important, (3) indifferent, (4) very important and (5) extremely important. For the global satisfaction level with the event, the respondents were asked to rate on a 5-point Likert-type scale of satisfaction: (1) very dissatisfied, (2) unsatisfied, (3) not very or not very satisfied, (4) satisfied and (5) very satisfied.

Before each edition, the questionnaire was validated by the event organization and also by a group of experts of the sector (researchers, policy makers and tourism professionals). It should be noted that, in order to avoid biases related to questionnaire structure and wording, a pilot survey was performed (using digital media) to test the questionnaire and assess potential variation within and across variable groups.

## 4.3. Data analysis procedures

In the data analysis technique, firstly we describe the samples through descriptive statistics. After that, it was performed a segmentation of the festival's audience, considering two criteria inspired, among others, on Gitelson (2000), Lee et al (2009) and Kruger et al (2010). The criteria are: i) The loyalty - evaluated through the participation (or not) on the previous edition; and ii) The commitment/ intensity of participation - assessed by the number of days attended at the festival.

Secondly, the differences between the segments were tested, considering the editions, the sociodemographic characteristics; motivations; global satisfaction factors and communication channels, through the analysis of the non-parametric Chi-Square test. This test is applied because the data is measured on the nominal or ordinal scale. In this sense, it is possible to determine the

relationship between categorical variables using a chi-square statistic (Pestana and Gageiro, 2014).

## **5. RESULTS**

### **5.1. Sample description and segmentation**

Table 2 describes the sample collected in the 2018 and 2019 editions. In both editions there is a predominance of the female audience, with an increase of almost 2 percentage points (p.p.) in the most recent edition. The festival mainly attracts a young audience, with the most representative age group being between 18 and 25 years old. In fact, in both editions, 78,8% of the public was under 36 years old. In the case of a young audience, most were single. On the other hand, in terms of educational qualifications, 67,3% of those who were present, in the two editions, had an education level of at least a degree. With regard to professional status, more than half of the attendees were active in the labour market. Regarding the attendee's nationality, it should be noted that the 2019 edition had about 40,7% of foreigners, which means an increase of 17,9% compared to 2018. In addition to Portugal, the main nationalities registered were Spain, United Kingdom, Brazil, France, and Italy. Of the attendees' residing in Portugal, around 56,1% resided outside the Porto Metropolitan Area (PMA). Although in the last edition, attendees residing in the PMA continued to predominate, this decreased by 8.9 p.p. between editions. There was also a considerable growing of 11.5 p.p. in the quota of residents outside Portugal, which could suggest festival's increasing internationalization.

**Table 2.** Audience sample sociodemographic characteristics, 2018 and 2019.

| Variable                   | Description                       | 2018     | 2019    | Total    |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|---------|----------|
|                            |                                   | (n=1179) | (n=977) | (n=2156) |
|                            |                                   | %        | %       | %        |
| Gender                     | 1 - Female                        | 60,2%    | 62,1%   | 61,1%    |
|                            | 0 - Male                          | 38,8%    | 37,9%   | 38,9%    |
| Age                        | 1 - Inferior 18 years old         | 9,8%     | 3,6%    | 7,0%     |
|                            | 2 - Between 18 - 25 years old     | 43,9%    | 42,0%   | 43,0%    |
|                            | 3 - Between 26 - 35 years old     | 22,8%    | 35,8%   | 28,7%    |
|                            | 4 - Between 36 - 50 years old     | 19,9%    | 16,0%   | 18,1%    |
|                            | 5 - Over 50 years old             | 3,6%     | 2,6%    | 3,2%     |
| Marital status             | 1 - Single                        | 79,8%    | 79,3%   | 79,6%    |
|                            | 2 - Married                       | 16,0%    | 17,1%   | 16,5%    |
|                            | 3 - Divorced                      | 4,0%     | 3,4%    | 3,7%     |
|                            | 4 - Widow                         | 0,2%     | 0,2%    | 0,2%     |
| Educational qualifications | 1 - Elementary studies            | 4,5%     | 2,3%    | 3,4%     |
|                            | 2 - Secondary studies             | 33,5%    | 24,2%   | 29,3%    |
|                            | 3 - Degree                        | 45,4%    | 50,7%   | 47,8%    |
|                            | 4 - Master or PhD                 | 16,6%    | 22,9%   | 19,5%    |
| Working conditions         | 1 - Paid employment               | 17,9%    | 17,6%   | 17,8%    |
|                            | 2 - Self-employed                 | 38,5%    | 49,3%   | 43,4%    |
|                            | 3 - Unemployed                    | 4,2%     | 3,2%    | 3,7%     |
|                            | 4 - Retired                       | 0,2%     | 0,3%    | 0,2%     |
|                            | 5 - Housekeeping activities       | 0,2%     | 0,1%    | 0,2%     |
|                            | 6 - Student                       | 39,0%    | 29,5%   | 34,7%    |
| Nationality                | 1 - Portugal                      | 77,2%    | 59,3%   | 69,1%    |
|                            | 0 - Foreigner                     | 22,8%    | 40,7%   | 30,9%    |
| Residence                  | 1 - Porto Metropolitan Area (PMA) | 47,9%    | 39,0%   | 43,9%    |
|                            | 2 - Portugal, outside the PMA     | 30,5%    | 28,0%   | 29,4%    |
|                            | 3 - Outside Portugal              | 21,5%    | 33,0%   | 26,7%    |

In order to be able to answer the research question - RQ1 - we proceeded to the audience segmentation in which was contemplated the loyalty to the festival (whether the attendee was present or not in the previous edition) and the commitment to the festival edition, assessed by the participating intensity (based on the type of ticket purchased: daily or for 2/ 3 days). In this sense, four segments emerged: ‘Faithful to the festival’; ‘Festival lovers’; ‘Festival’s debutants’ and ‘Interested in the festival’.

Through Table 3, it is possible to verify that the ‘Festival’s debutants’ (34,6%), the most representative group, were not in the previous edition and attended the festival only for 1 day. However, this group representativeness fell between editions by 2.9 p.p.. The ‘Faithful to the festival’ (14,0%), the least representative group, were in the previous edition and attended the festival only for one day, too. The ‘Interested in the festival’ (27,0%), the second most representative group, which may include newcomers (because they did not participate in the previous edition) and attended 2/ 3 days to the festival. The ‘Festival lovers’ (24,4%), were in the previous edition and attended 2/ 3 days to the festival. This group increased between the two editions by 1.4 p.p.. With these results, the answer to research question RQ1 was successfully achieved from this specific segmentation process of the audience.

To answer the research question RQ2, it will be necessary to evaluate the result of the Chi-Square test. It appears, therefore, that there is no relationship between audience segmentation and the editions, since the test was not significant. Thus, it is concluded that there is no statistical evidence to determine the existence of a significant change in the segmentation of the audience between the two editions.

**Table 3.** Audience segmentation - Past experience and Type of ticket bought, 2018 and 2019

|                  |     | 2018                              |                                     | 2019                              |                                     | Total                             |                                     | Chi-Square test (p-value) |
|------------------|-----|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------------|
|                  |     | 1 day                             | 2/ 3 days                           | 1 day                             | 2/ 3 days                           | 1 day                             | 2/ 3 days                           |                           |
| Previous edition | No  | Festival's debutants<br>36,0%     | Interested in the festival<br>26,5% | Festival's debutants<br>33,1%     | Interested in the festival<br>27,7% | Festival's debutants<br>34,6%     | Interested in the festival<br>27,0% | 2,041<br>(0,564)          |
|                  | Yes | Faithful to the festival<br>13,8% | Festival lovers<br>23,7%            | Faithful to the festival<br>14,1% | Festival lovers<br>25,1%            | Faithful to the festival<br>14,0% | Festival lovers<br>24,4%            |                           |

Note: significant at \*\*\*  $p < 0,01$ ; \*  $p < 0,1$ .

Considering the conclusion above, the results of the two editions will now be presented together (the results by edition can be found in the Appendix).

To reply the research question RQ3, we need to evaluate the segmentation with the sociodemographic data. In all sociodemographic characteristics, it was found that the Chi-square

test was significant which means there are some differences between the two editions (to evaluate them see Tables A1 and A2 in the Appendix for the 2018 and 2019 editions, respectively). This result allows us to answer RQ3 that there are statistical differences between groups. This result allows us to answer RQ3, confirming that there were statistical differences between the groups.

**Table 4.** Audience segmentation considering the sociodemographic characteristics for both editions (n=2156)

| <b>Variables</b>                                | <b>Faithful to the festival (%)</b> | <b>Festival lovers (%)</b> | <b>Festival's debutants (%)</b> | <b>Interested in the festival (%)</b> | <b>Total 2019</b> | <b>Chi-Square test (p-value)</b> |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|
| <b><i>Gender</i></b>                            |                                     |                            |                                 |                                       |                   |                                  |
| Male  | 32,9%                               | 44,8%                      | 33,7%                           | 43,4%                                 | 38,9%             | 25,503<br>(0,000)***             |
| Female  | 67,1%                               | 55,2%                      | 66,3%                           | 56,6%                                 | 61,1%             |                                  |
| <b><i>Age</i></b>                               |                                     |                            |                                 |                                       |                   |                                  |
| <18   | 4,7%                                | 3,6%                       | 11,9%                           | 4,8%                                  | 7,0%              | 101,646<br>(0,000)***            |
| 18-25   | 51,5%                               | 37,0%                      | 46,1%                           | 40,1%                                 | 43,0%             |                                  |
| 26-35   | 22,9%                               | 29,3%                      | 24,4%                           | 36,7%                                 | 28,7%             |                                  |
| 36-50   | 17,3%                               | 25,5%                      | 15,0%                           | 16,1%                                 | 18,2%             |                                  |
| >50   | 3,7%                                | 4,6%                       | 2,7%                            | 2,2%                                  | 3,2%              |                                  |
| <b><i>Marital status</i></b>                    |                                     |                            |                                 |                                       |                   |                                  |
| Single  | 78,7%                               | 74,7%                      | 82,2%                           | 81,1%                                 | 79,6%             | 15,460<br>(0,079)*               |
| Married   | 16,9%                               | 19,8%                      | 15,1%                           | 15,1%                                 | 16,5%             |                                  |
| Divorced  | 4,0%                                | 5,1%                       | 2,7%                            | 3,6%                                  | 3,7%              |                                  |
| Widow(er)                                       | 0,3%                                | 0,4%                       | 0,0%                            | 0,2%                                  | 0,2%              |                                  |
| <b><i>Educational qualifications (full)</i></b> |                                     |                            |                                 |                                       |                   |                                  |
| Elementary studies                              | 5,0%                                | 2,1%                       | 5,1%                            | 1,9%                                  | 3,5%              | 63,652<br>(0,000)***             |
| Secondary studies                               | 28,9%                               | 21,3%                      | 36,3%                           | 27,6%                                 | 29,3%             |                                  |
| Degree  | 50,5%                               | 52,6%                      | 43,5%                           | 47,5%                                 | 47,8%             |                                  |
| Master or PhD                                   | 15,6%                               | 24,0%                      | 15,1%                           | 23,0%                                 | 19,5%             |                                  |
| <b><i>Working conditions</i></b>                |                                     |                            |                                 |                                       |                   |                                  |
| Paid employment                                 | 17,3%                               | 20,0%                      | 13,9%                           | 20,9%                                 | 17,8%             | 77,009<br>(0,000)***             |
| Self-employment                                 | 41,5%                               | 51,6%                      | 38,2%                           | 43,7%                                 | 43,4%             |                                  |
| Unemployed                                      | 5,0%                                | 4,0%                       | 2,7%                            | 4,1%                                  | 3,7%              |                                  |
| Retired   | 0,7%                                | 0,4%                       | 0,0%                            | 0,2%                                  | 0,2%              |                                  |
| Housekeeping activities                         | 0,3%                                | 0,2%                       | 0,1%                            | 0,2%                                  | 0,2%              |                                  |
| Student   | 35,2%                               | 23,8%                      | 45,1%                           | 30,9%                                 | 34,7%             |                                  |

|                               |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------|
| <b>Nationality</b>            |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Portuguese                    | 78,7% | 75,2% | 73,0% | 53,5% | 69,1% | 93,812<br>(0,000)***  |
| Other                         | 21,3% | 24,8% | 27,0% | 46,5% | 30,9% |                       |
| <b>Residence</b>              |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Porto Metropolitan Area (PMA) | 57,8% | 51,4% | 43,4% | 30,5% | 43,9% | 126,582<br>(0,000)*** |
| Portugal, outside the PMA     | 26,6% | 25,9% | 34,4% | 27,6% | 29,4% |                       |
| Outside Portugal              | 15,6% | 22,7% | 22,2% | 41,9% | 26,7% |                       |

Note: significant at \*\*\*  $p < 0,01$ ; \*  $p < 0,1$ .

There are some interesting features to be highlighted, namely the ‘Festival Lovers’ is the one that presents a profile of older attendees and with more academic qualifications, due to these predominant characteristics this group may be the one that requires more customized information. In the ‘Festival's debutantes’ single and students attendees predominate, as this type of profile normally is characterized by lesser income, this can be the underlying justification to its lower participation intensity in the festival. The ‘Interested in the festival’ is dominated by attendees residing abroad, they certainly went to the city on purpose to participate in the festival.

## 5.2. Motivations and global satisfaction of each audience segment

The description of audience segmentation considering the participation motivations and global satisfaction with the event is provided in Table 5 and allows us to answer to research question RQ4. The four groups exhibit differences from each other, in relation to the level of importance in scope of motivation. In the two editions, the Chi-square test was significant for the ‘festival’s reputation’; ‘friend’s suggestion’ and ‘previous experience at Porto/ Barcelona’ (see the Tables A3 and A4 for each edition). The ‘Festival lovers’ have greater representativeness in the degree “extremely important” in all motivational items, with exception to the ‘line-up’ and ‘schedule of the concerts’. As this is the most engaged and knowledgeable segment of the festival, it is important to carefully observe this profile in order to ensure its continued retention. This result could be expected because this is the most loyal group to the festival, and thus the surprise factor is no longer significant; the ‘schedule of the concerts’ is an important motivation for this group, but there are even more important mobilizing factors as the ‘festival's reputation’ and the ‘previous experience - Porto’.

The other groups also provide a major weight to the degree “extremely important” in all motivational items, with the exception of the ‘Faithful to the festival’ for the ‘line-up’, ‘schedule



of concerts’ and ‘amusement/socializing/meeting people’, which grant more weight to “very important”. This group, which participates in the festival only for one day, possibly is mainly attracted by a specific concert/band of their own interest, which could be why these motivational factors are not so relevant.

These results allow the answer to question RQ4, thus leading to the conclusion that, in relative terms, the groups have their own motivations regarding their participation in the festival.

**Table 5.** Audience segmentation considering the motivation and the global satisfaction for both editions (n=2156)

| Variables                                | Faithful to the festival (%) | Festival lovers (%) | Festival's debutants (%) | Interested in the festival (%) | Total | Chi-Square test (p-value) |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| <b><i>Line Up</i></b>                    |                              |                     |                          |                                |       | 17,743<br>(0,124)         |
| Nothing important                        | 2,7%                         | 3,3%                | 3,4%                     | 3,5%                           | 3,3%  |                           |
| Not important                            | 5,4%                         | 5,5%                | 3,1%                     | 6,3%                           | 4,9%  |                           |
| Indifferent                              | 12,8%                        | 18,4%               | 14,4%                    | 15,8%                          | 15,6% |                           |
| Very important                           | 39,9%                        | 31,3%               | 37,5%                    | 32,5%                          | 34,8% |                           |
| Extremely important                      | 39,1%                        | 41,5%               | 41,7%                    | 41,9%                          | 41,4% |                           |
| <b><i>Festival's reputation</i></b>      |                              |                     |                          |                                |       | 22,115<br>(0,036)**       |
| Nothing important                        | 1,9%                         | 2,7%                | 2,1%                     | 1,7%                           | 2,1%  |                           |
| Not important                            | 5,0%                         | 2,5%                | 2,3%                     | 2,3%                           | 2,7%  |                           |
| Indifferent                              | 10,1%                        | 11,5%               | 9,2%                     | 12,9%                          | 10,9% |                           |
| Very important                           | 38,0%                        | 29,9%               | 38,6%                    | 32,1%                          | 34,5% |                           |
| Extremely important                      | 45,0%                        | 53,6%               | 47,9%                    | 51,0%                          | 49,8% |                           |
| <b><i>Surprise/a unique festival</i></b> |                              |                     |                          |                                |       | 28,265<br>(0,005)***      |
| Nothing important                        | 4,0%                         | 3,8%                | 2,9%                     | 2,3%                           | 3,1%  |                           |
| Not important                            | 5,6%                         | 5,9%                | 2,9%                     | 2,7%                           | 4,0%  |                           |
| Indifferent                              | 14,9%                        | 17,6%               | 18,8%                    | 25,0%                          | 19,7% |                           |
| Very important                           | 35,9%                        | 30,9%               | 35,1%                    | 34,1%                          | 33,8% |                           |
| Extremely important                      | 39,5%                        | 41,8%               | 40,4%                    | 35,8%                          | 39,4% |                           |
| <b><i>Schedule of concerts</i></b>       |                              |                     |                          |                                |       | 16,672<br>(0,162)         |
| Nothing important                        | 2,4%                         | 4,2%                | 4,8%                     | 5,5%                           | 4,5%  |                           |
| Not important                            | 7,5%                         | 4,4%                | 7,0%                     | 7,1%                           | 6,4%  |                           |
| Indifferent                              | 18,8%                        | 17,1%               | 18,0%                    | 21,2%                          | 18,8% |                           |
| Very important                           | 36,9%                        | 36,9%               | 31,1%                    | 32,4%                          | 33,7% |                           |
| Extremely important                      | 34,5%                        | 37,5%               | 39,1%                    | 33,9%                          | 36,6% |                           |

|   |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------|
| <b>Amusement/Socializing/Meeting people</b> |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Nothing important                           | 2,0%  | 2,1%  | 2,7%  | 2,8%  | 2,5%  | 13,793<br>(0,314)     |
| Not important                               | 3,5%  | 4,1%  | 3,7%  | 5,5%  | 4,3%  |                       |
| Indifferent                                 | 15,4% | 16,3% | 17,0% | 19,1% | 17,2% |                       |
| Very important                              | 40,2% | 31,3% | 33,7% | 34,6% | 34,2% |                       |
| Extremely important                         | 39,0% | 46,3% | 43,0% | 38,0% | 41,9% |                       |
| <b>Friend's suggestion</b>                  |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Nothing important                           | 8,6%  | 11,4% | 8,4%  | 9,9%  | 9,6%  | 24,026<br>(0,020)**   |
| Not important                               | 3,4%  | 5,9%  | 5,8%  | 6,2%  | 5,6%  |                       |
| Indifferent                                 | 21,5% | 14,8% | 14,4% | 14,3% | 15,4% |                       |
| Very important                              | 33,9% | 24,4% | 32,1% | 27,5% | 29,1% |                       |
| Extremely important                         | 32,6% | 43,5% | 39,2% | 42,1% | 40,2% |                       |
| <b>Previous experience (Porto)</b>          |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Nothing important                           | 0,8%  | 2,0%  | 24,5% | 22,7% | 12,0% | 235,226<br>(0,000)*** |
| Not important                               | 1,7%  | 1,3%  | 2,7%  | 5,8%  | 2,7%  |                       |
| Indifferent                                 | 10,0% | 5,7%  | 15,2% | 14,8% | 10,9% |                       |
| Very important                              | 34,4% | 26,7% | 26,0% | 22,3% | 27,0% |                       |
| Extremely important                         | 53,1% | 64,3% | 31,6% | 34,4% | 47,4% |                       |
| <b>Previous experience (Barcelona)</b>      |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Nothing important                           | 15,3% | 28,0% | 40,2% | 31,7% | 30,9% | 46,204<br>(0,000)     |
| Not important                               | 6,1%  | 3,3%  | 3,3%  | 4,9%  | 4,2%  |                       |
| Indifferent                                 | 16,0% | 15,1% | 15,1% | 18,3% | 16,1% |                       |
| Very important                              | 31,3% | 15,9% | 19,6% | 15,4% | 19,2% |                       |
| Extremely important                         | 31,3% | 37,7% | 21,8% | 29,7% | 29,7% |                       |
| <b>Global satisfaction</b>                  |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Very dissatisfied                           | 1,1%  | 1,1%  | 0,6%  | 0,6%  | ,8%   | 17,303<br>(0,139)     |
| Unsatisfied                                 | 3,0%  | 1,3%  | 1,5%  | 0,6%  | 1,4%  |                       |
| Not very or not very satisfied              | 6,7%  | 6,3%  | 6,1%  | 6,7%  | 6,4%  |                       |
| Satisfied                                   | 41,4% | 34,2% | 41,3% | 41,3% | 39,6% |                       |
| Very satisfied                              | 47,8% | 57,1% | 50,5% | 50,8% | 51,8% |                       |

Note: significant at \*\*\*  $p < 0,01$ ; \*  $p < 0,1$ .

To answer research question RQ5, overall satisfaction with the event should be analysed.

In both editions, 91,4% of the attendees indicated they were satisfied or very satisfied with the festival. This percentage differs marginally between segments. The most satisfied segment is 'Festival lovers', with 57,1% indicating that were "very satisfied". As this last segment is one of the most loyal to the festival, it's not surprising this score and the inherent connection between

satisfaction and loyalty which is also consistent with previous research (e.g. Croes and Lee, 2015). Next, the most satisfied segment is the ‘Interested in the festival’, with 50,8%, followed by ‘Festival’s debutants’, with 50,5% and finally, although with a high percentage, but still the lowest of the four groups, is ‘Faithful to the festival’ with 47,8%. However, it was verified that the Chi-square test was not statistically significant, and we identified differences between the two editions (see Tables A3 and A4 in Appendix). This result answers to question RQ5.

### 5.3. Communication channels used by the music festival

To answer the last research question RQ6, we have to analyse the event communication channels used by the festival and identified by the respondents as sources of influence for participation. The statistical significance was only obtained in ‘digital’ and ‘word-of-mouth’ communication paths. As shown in Table 6, the digital media (e.g.: internet; social networks; digital newsletter) were the most effective communication channels to reach the audience across all segments.

**Table 6.** Communication channels influence by groups for both editions (n=2156)

| Channels  | Faithful to the festival (%) | Festival lovers (%) | Festival's debutants (%) | Interested in the festival (%) | Total | Chi-Square test (p-value) |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| <b>Digital</b> (e.g. internet, social networks, newsletter, e-wom)                          |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 67,1%                        | 59,8%               | 66,3%                    | 61,2%                          | 63,5% | 8,525<br>(0,036)**        |
| No  | 32,9%                        | 40,2%               | 33,7%                    | 38,8%                          | 36,5% |                           |
| <b>Television</b>   |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 7,6%                         | 7,4%                | 9,1%                     | 5,7%                           | 7,6%  | 5,571<br>(0,134)          |
| No  | 92,4%                        | 92,6%               | 90,9%                    | 94,3%                          | 92,4% |                           |
| <b>Radio</b>  |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 5,3%                         | 3,0%                | 4,1%                     | 2,6%                           | 3,6%  | 5,410<br>(0,144)          |
| No  | 94,7%                        | 97,0%               | 95,9%                    | 97,4%                          | 96,4% |                           |
| <b>Print materials</b> (e.g. newspaper/magazine, specialized magazines, flyers, billboards) |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 2,3%                         | 5,0%                | 3,2%                     | 3,3%                           | 3,5%  | 4,754<br>(0,191)          |
| No  | 97,7%                        | 95,0%               | 96,8%                    | 96,7%                          | 96,5% |                           |
| <b>Word-of-mouth</b>  |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 17,9%                        | 25,7%               | 18,6%                    | 29,7%                          | 23,2% | 29,058<br>(0,000)***      |
| No  | 82,1%                        | 74,3%               | 81,4%                    | 70,3%                          | 76,8% |                           |

Note: significant at \*\*\*  $p < 0,01$ , \*\*  $p < 0,05$ ; this it was a multi answer question.

For both editions 63,5% of the total of respondents stated that digital media were the communication channels that have improved the festival's awareness. This finding is in line with the studies reviewed on this topic (Getz and Fairley, 2004; Hede and Kellett, 2011). The groups with the higher percentages were: 'Faithful to the festival' and 'Festival's debutantes'. For example, social media have become a prerequisite in our daily lives as it is a way for people to connect with friends/family and share information about events and other interests. Some of the most well-known social networks including Facebook, Instagram and Twitter are user friendly tools that allow not only to share information about the festival but also to make your presence known during the event.

Although with a considerable distance from 'digital' media, 'word-of-mouth' (WOM) was the second most important communication path, pointed out by 23,2% of the respondents. The groups with the higher average percentages were: 'Interested in the festival' and 'Festival lovers', which are the groups that spent more time at the festival. In the case of the first of the two groups, made up largely of foreigners, this result reinforces the conclusions reviewed in the literature (Lee et al, 2004). This two communication media prominence were clearly identified, together with the predominance of digital media, as the main communication marketing tools for the festival pointed out by the study. This conclusion answers the RQ6 research question.

## **6. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

We identify the audience segmentation of a music festival and contemplate the main motivations, global satisfaction, and the most important communication channels to promote the event. For that, six research questions were presented and all were successfully confirmed by the results.

Based on two segmentation criteria, four distinct audience groups emerged. The first criterion was loyalty related with the past experience with the festival and assessed by the participation on its previous edition. Gitelson (2000) highlight the past experience as an important factor which could define, not only the festival's awareness, but also the participation interest. The research from Lee et al (2009) and Kruger et al (2010) also claims the importance of this factor. The second criterion expresses the commitment to the festival edition, assessed by the participating intensity.

Although between the two editions there are no substantial differences between the segments, the four segments are significant different in sociodemographic characteristics, motivations to

participate, and satisfaction level with the festival. This conclusion reinforces the literature clue on music festivals audience heterogeneity (Li & Wood, 2016; Saayman & Saayman, 2016), and justifies the interest in adapting the marketing communication means/channels to each segment (Beaudoin, 2009).

Regarding the communication channels, and as Hede and Kellett (2011) have argued, the digital media (e.g. internet, social networks, newsletter, and e-wom) have been overtaking the traditional channels as the most effective path to communicate with the festival's audiences. In this study, digital media were the most effective communication channels to reach the audience across the four segments. Although with a considerable distance from digital media, WOM had the second highest percentage as a communication path. Thus, the present study's results clearly stated that WOM has a significant importance influencing the music festival's public (Getz & Fairley, 2004; Hede & Kellett, 2011), namely, the segment of participants with the highest representation of foreigners (Lee et al, 2004). This information is extremely useful not only for the festival organizers, but also for other stakeholders, namely marketers, policy makers, sponsors, sector professionals, researchers, among others. With it, festival stakeholders may promote and advertise the festival more efficiently, attract specific market segments, and better understand their festivalgoer's needs and desires. With our results, the patterns across segments of festival music participants were identified, as well as the use of more effective and efficient ways to reach them. In order to pursue the objective of audience retention, the group with the greatest potential to constitute itself as a target is the 'Festival lovers', whose profile is mainly characterized by: women, up to 25 years old, single, with a degree, self-employment, with Portuguese nationality and residing in the PMA. However, this profile won't bring more economic and social impact to the festival and to the region. The profile is 'Interested in the festival', which differs from the previous one by having more attendees of foreign nationality and residence. For this profile, all motivations are extremely important, and the level of satisfaction is very high, which can lead them to repeat the event (Kang et al, 2019). Furthermore, this profile, due the high level of satisfaction, is more likely to recommend the event (Kang et al, 2019; Wong et al, 2018; Schofield & Thompson, 2007; Yoon & Uysal, 2005; Thrane, 2002; among others). Now, we also know that this recommendation will be mostly through one of the digital paths, like e-wom.

There are two research limitations that could be highlighted; firstly, we did not contemplate, due to a lack of information, a qualitative methodology that could complement the information and contribute to reinforce the conclusions and define strategies. Secondly, because of a lack of information, the relation between the use and preferences of the audience regarding the different communication means was not considered. These limitations could be considered and overcome in future studies.

## REFERENCES

- Abreu-Novais, M. & Arcodia, C. (2013). Music festival motivators for attendance: developing an agenda for research, *International Journal of Event Management Research*, Vol 8, No. 1, pp 34-48.
- Allen, J., O’Toole, W., Harris, R. & McDonnell, I. (2011). *Festival & Special Event Management* (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), John Wiley & Sons, Milton, Qld, Milton, Qld.
- Anderton, C. (2015). Branding, sponsorship and the music festival, In George McKay (Ed.), *The Pop Festival: History, Music, Media, Culture*, pp 199-212, Bloomsbury, London.
- Anderton, C. (2021). Music Festival Capitalism, In Kruger Bridge, S. (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Global Popular Music*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Aporfest (2019). Annual Report - Festivais de Música em Portugal. Aporfest, www.aporfest.pt
- Beaudoin, C. (2009). Exploring the association between news use and social capital, *Communication Research*, Vol 36, No. 5, pp 611-636.
- Blesic, I., Pivac, T., Stamenkovi, I. & Besermenji, S. (2013). Motives of visits to ethno music festivals with regard to gender and age structure of visitors, *Event Management*, Vol 17, No. 2, pp 145-154.
- Borges, A., Rodrigues, P. & Matias, A. (2016). Customer satisfaction and expenditure behaviour in musical festivals: The Optimus Primavera Sound case study, *Tourism Economics*, Vol 22, No. 4, pp 825–836.
- Borges, A.P. Cunha, C. & Lopes, J. (2020). The main factors that determine the intention to revisit a music festival, *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, Vol 13, No. 3, pp 314-335.
- Botha, K. & Slabbert, E. (2011). Market segmentation of visitors to Aardklop National Arts Festival: A correspondence analysis, *Management Dynamics: Journal of the Southern African Institute for Management Scientists*, Vol 20, No. 1, pp 2-18.
- Bowdin, G., Allen, J., O’Toole, W., Harris, R. & McDonnell, I. (2011). *Events Management* (3<sup>th</sup> ed.), Elsevier Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Brown, A. & Sharpley, R. (2019). Understanding festival-goers and their experience at UK music festivals, *Event Management*, Vol 23, pp 699–720.
- Carneiro, M., Eusébio, C. & Pelicano, M. (2011). An expenditure patterns segmentation of the music festivals’ market, *International Journal of Sustainable Development*, Vol 14, No. 3/4, pp 290–308.
- Croes, R. & Lee, S.H. (2015). Women at a music festival: Biological sex defining motivation and behavioral intentions, *Event Management*, Vol 19, No. 2, pp 275-289.
- Crompton, J. & McKay, S. (1997). Motives of visitors attending festival events, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol 24, No. 2, pp 425-439.
- Dolnicar, S. (2015). Market segmentation approaches in tourism, in McCabe, S. (Ed.), *The Routledge Handbook of Tourism Marketing*, Routledge, Abingdon, pp 197-208.
- Duarte, P., Folgado-Fernandez, J. A. & Hernández-Mogollón, J. M. (2018). Measurement of the impact of music festivals on destination image: The case of a womad festival, *Event Management*, Vol 22, No. 4, pp 517–526.
- Fonseca, J. R. & Ramos, R. (2014). Segmenting and profiling the Portuguese festival-goers through the most ancient form of music retailing: the music festivals, *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, Vol 15, No. 4, pp 271-297.
- Formica, S., & Uysal, M. (1998). Market segmentation of an international cultural-historical event in Italy, *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol 36, No. 4, pp 16–24.
- Frost, W. & Laing, J. (2015). Avoiding burnout: the succession planning, governance and resourcing of rural tourism festivals, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol 23, No. 8, pp 1-20.

- Getz, D. (2005). *Event Management and Event Tourism* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), Cognizant Communication Corporation, New York.
- Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: definition, evolution, and research, *Tourism Management*, Vol 29, No. 3, pp 403-428.
- Getz, D. & Fairley, S. (2004). Media management at sports events for site promotion: cases and concepts, *Event Management: An International Journal*, Vol 8, No. 3, pp 127-139.
- Getz, D., Andersson, T. & Carlsen, J. (2010). Festival management studies, *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, Vol 1, No. 1, pp 29-59.
- Gitelson, R. (2000). A new perspective on the decision-making process of arts festival visitors, In *Proceedings of conference Events Beyond 2000: Setting the Agenda*, Australian Centre for Event Management, Sydney, pp 179-185.
- Gyimóthy, S. & Larson, M. (2015). Social media cocreation strategies: the 3Cs, *Event Management*, Vol 19, No. 3, pp 331-348.
- Hede, A. & Kellett, P. (2011). Marketing communications for special events - Analysing managerial practice, consumer perceptions and preferences, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol 45, No. 6, pp 987-1004
- Hoksbergen, E. & Insch, A. (2016). Facebook as a platform for co-creating music festival experiences - The case of New Zealand's Rhythm and Vines New Year's Eve festival, *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, Vol 7, No. 2, pp 84-99.
- Hudson, S. & Hudson, R. (2013). Engaging with consumers using social media: a case study of music festivals, *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, Vol 4, No. 3, pp 206-223.
- Kang, S., Miller, J. & Lee, J. (2019). The cannabis festival: Quality, satisfaction, and intention to return, *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, Vol 10, No. 3, pp 267-283.
- Kim, Y., Kim, M., Goh, B. & Antum, J. (2011). The role of money: the impact on food tourists' satisfaction and intention to revisit food events, *Journal of Culinary Science & Technology*, Vol 9, No. 2, pp 85-98.
- Kitchen, P. & Schultz, D. (2009). IMC: new horizon/false dawn for a marketplace in turmoil?, *Journal of Marketing Communications*, Vol 15, No. 2, pp 197-202.
- Kitchen, P., Schultz, D., Kim, I., Han, D. & Li, T. (2004). Will agencies ever 'get' (or understand) IMC?, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol 38, No. 11/12, pp 1417-1436.
- Kitterlin, M. & Yoo, M. (2014). Festival motivation and loyalty factors, *Tourism & Management Studies*, Vol 10, No. 1, pp 119-126.
- Kliatchko, J. (2008). Revisiting the IMC construct: a revised definition and four pillars, *International Journal of Advertising*, Vol 27, No. 1, pp 133-160.
- Kotler, P. & Keller, K. L. (2013). *Administração de Marketing*, (14<sup>a</sup> ed.), Pearson Education, São Paulo.
- Krajnović, A. & Gortan-Carlin, I. (2017). Music Event as a Tourist Product: Specifics, Issues, Challenges, In Leszek Butowski (Ed.), *Mobilities, Tourism and Travel Behavior - Contexts and Boundaries*, Leszek Butowski (Ed.) IntechOpen, pp 17-34.
- Kruger, M. & Saayman, M. (2012). Listen to your heart: motives for attending Roxette live, *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism*, Vol 13, No. 3, pp 181-202.
- Kruger, M. & Saayman, M. (2016). A 3E typology of visitors at an electronic dance music festival, *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, Vol 7, No. 3, pp 219-236.
- Kruger, M., Saayman, M. & Ellis, S. M. (2010). Does loyalty pay? First-time versus repeat visitors at a national arts festival, *South African Business Review*, Vol 14, No. 1, pp 79-104.
- Lau, L. S. & McKercher, B. (2004). Exploration versus consumption: A comparison of first-time and repeat tourists, *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol 42, No. 3, pp 279-285.
- Lee, C. K. and Lee, T. H. (2001). World Culture EXPO segment characteristics, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol 28, No. 3, pp 812-816.
- Lee, C. K. (2000). A comparative study of Caucasian and Asian visitors to a Cultural Expo in an Asian setting, *Tourism Management*, Vol 21, No. 2, pp 169-176
- Lee, C. K., Lee, Y. & Wicks, B. (2004). Segmenting of festival motivation by nationality and satisfaction, *Tourism Management*, Vol 25, No. 1, pp 61-70.
- Lee, J. & Kyle, G. (2014). Segmenting Festival Visitors Using Psychological Commitment, *Journal of Travel Research*, Vol 53, No. 5, pp 656-669.
- Lee, J., Lee, C. K. & Yoon, Y. (2009). Investigating differences in antecedents to value between first-time and repeat festival-goers, *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, Vol 26, No. 7, pp 688-702.
- Lee, Y. K., Lee, C. K., Lee, S. K. & Babin, B. J. (2008). Festivalscapes and patrons' emotions, satisfaction, and loyalty, *Journal of Business Research*, Vol 61, No. 1, pp 56-64.

- Li, Y. & Wood, E. (2016). Music festival motivation in China: free the mind, *Leisure Studies*, Vol 35, No. 3, pp 332-351.
- Loots, I., Ellis, S. & Slabbert, E. (2011). Factors predicting community support: The case of a South African arts festival, *Tourism & Management Studies*, Vol 7, pp 121-130.
- Mallet, H. M., George, W. & Blum, I. (2017). Segmenting the audience attending a military music festival, *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, Vol 9, No. 1, pp 67-85.
- Masterman, G., & Wood, E.H. (2005). *Innovative Marketing Communications: Strategies for the Events Industry* (1<sup>st</sup> ed.), Routledge, London.
- McMorland, L. A. & Mactaggart, D. (2007). Traditional Scottish music events: native scots attendance motivations, *Event Management*, Vol. 11 Nos. 1-2, pp 57-69.
- Mohr, K., Backman, K. F., Gahan, L. W. & Backman, S. J. (1993). An investigation of festival motivations and event satisfaction by visitor type, *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, Vol 1, No. 3, pp 89–97.
- Newbold, C., Jordon, C., Bianchini, F. & Maughan, C. (2015). *Focus on festivals: Contemporary European. Case-studies and perspectives*, Goodfellow, Oxford.
- Perez, J. (2016). Music Festivals: A Secondary Market Analysis, *CMC Senior Theses*, [https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc\\_theses/1338](https://scholarship.claremont.edu/cmc_theses/1338)
- Pérez-Gálvez, J. C., López-Guzmán, T., Gomez-Casero, G. & Cardozo, J. (2017). Segmentation of the spectators attending a festival based on musical preferences, *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, Vol 8, No. 3, pp 346-360.
- Pestana, H. & Gageiro, J. (2014). *Análise de dados para ciências sociais a complementaridade do SPSS* (6<sup>a</sup> ed.), Edições Sílabo, Lisboa.
- Peterson, R.A. (1992). Understanding audience segmentation: from elite and mass to omnivore and univore, *Poetics*, Vol 21, No. 4, pp 243-258.
- Prakash, K. & Sharma, R. (2010). Megamarketing an event using integrated marketing communications: the success story of TMH, *Business Strategy Series*, Vol 11, No. 6, pp 371-382.
- Prentice, R. & Andersen, V. (2003). Festival as creative destination, *Annals of Tourism Research*, Vol 30, No. 1, pp 7-30.
- Pulido-Fernández, J. & Sánchez-Rivero, M. (2010). Attitudes of the cultural tourist: a latent segmentation approach, *Journal of Cultural Economics*, Vol 34, No. 2, pp 111-129.
- Robinson, R. (2016). *Music Festivals and the Politics of Participation*, Routledge, New York.
- Saayman, M. & Saayman, A. (2016). Clustering attendees at the Philharmonic Orchestra's Summer Festival, *Leisure Studies*, Vol 35, No. 3, pp 314-331.
- Saleh, S. & Ryan, C. (1993). Factors that attract tourists to festivals, *Tourism Management*, Vol 14, No. 4, pp 289-297.
- Schofield, P. & Thompson, K. (2007). Visitor motivation, satisfaction and behavioural intention: the 2005 Naadam Festival, Ulaanbaatar, *International Journal of Tourism Research*, Vol 9, No. 5, pp 329–344.
- Seric, M., Gil-Saura, I. & Ruiz-Molina, M.E. (2014). How can integrated marketing communications and advanced technology influence the creation of customer-based brand equity? Evidence from the hospitality industry” *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, Vol 39, pp 144-156.
- Song, Z., Xing, L. & Chathoth, P. (2014). The effects of festival impacts on support intentions based on residents' ratings of festival performance and satisfaction: a new integrative approach, *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, Vol 23, No. 2, pp 316-337.
- Teixeira, S., Ferreira, J., Almeida, A. & Parra-Lopez, E. (2019). Tourist events and satisfaction: a product of regional tourism competitiveness, *Tourism Review*, Vol 74, No. 4, pp 943-977.
- Thrane, C. (2002). Music quality, satisfaction, and behavioral intentions within a Jazz festival context, *Event Management*, Vol. 7, No. 3, 143–150.
- Trindade, A., Borges, A., Vieira, E. & Gomes, S. (2018). Satisfaction Scoring Index for a musical festival during and after the event: The NOS Primavera Sound Case Study, *European Journal of Applied Business Management*, Special Issue, pp 109-121.
- Turner, P. (2017). Implementing integrated marketing communications (IMC) through major event ambassadors, *European Journal of Marketing*, Vol 51, No. 3, pp 605-626.
- Wamwara-Mbugua, L. W. & Cornwell, T. B. (2009). Visitor motivation to attending international festivals, *Event Management*, Vol 13, No. 4, pp 277-286.
- Williams, M. & Bowdin, G. (2007). Festival evaluation: An exploration of seven UK arts festivals, *Managing Leisure*, Vol 12, No. 2/3, pp 187-203.



Wilson, J., Arshed, N., Shaw, E. & Pret, T. (2017). Expanding the Domain of Festival Research: A Review and Research Agenda, *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol 19, No. 2, pp 195-213.

Wong, I. A., Xu, Y. H., Tan, X. S., & Wen, H. (2018). The boundary condition of travel satisfaction and the mediating role of destination image: The case of event tourism, *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp 207–224.

Yolal, M., Woo, E., Cetinel, F. & Uysal, M. (2012). Comparative research of motivations across different festival products, *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, Vol 3, No. 1, pp 66-80.

Yoon, Y. & Uysal, M. (2005). An examination of the effects of motivation and satisfaction on destination loyalty: A structural model, *Tourism Management*, Vol 26, No. 1, pp 45–56.

## Appendix

**Table A1.** Audience segmentation considering the sociodemographic characteristic, for 2018 edition (n=1179)

| Variables                                | Faithful to the festival (%) | Festival lovers (%) | Festival's debutants (%) | Interested in the festival (%) | Total 2018 | Chi-Square test (p-value) |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Gender</b>                            |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| Male                                     | 34,4%                        | 50,0%               | 31,1%                    | 45,2%                          | 39,8%      | 31,262<br>(0,000)***      |
| Female                                   | 65,6%                        | 50,0%               | 68,9%                    | 54,8%                          | 60,2%      |                           |
| <b>Age</b>                               |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| <18                                      | 5,5%                         | 4,3%                | 16,7%                    | 7,4%                           | 9,8%       | 77,558<br>(0,000)***      |
| 18-25                                    | 53,4%                        | 35,4%               | 46,2%                    | 43,3%                          | 43,9%      |                           |
| 26-35                                    | 19,0%                        | 26,1%               | 17,2%                    | 29,5%                          | 22,8%      |                           |
| 36-50                                    | 18,4%                        | 28,2%               | 16,5%                    | 17,9%                          | 19,9%      |                           |
| >50                                      | 3,7%                         | 6,1%                | 3,3%                     | 1,9%                           | 3,6%       |                           |
| <b>Marital status</b>                    |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| Single                                   | 77,9%                        | 73,9%               | 82,8%                    | 82,1%                          | 79,8%      | 14,008<br>(0,122)         |
| Married                                  | 19,0%                        | 20,0%               | 14,4%                    | 13,1%                          | 16,0%      |                           |
| Divorced                                 | 3,1%                         | 5,7%                | 2,8%                     | 4,5%                           | 4,0%       |                           |
| Widow(er)                                | 0,0%                         | 0,4%                | 0,0%                     | 0,3%                           | 0,2%       |                           |
| <b>Educational qualifications (full)</b> |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| Elementary studies                       | 6,7%                         | 2,5%                | 6,4%                     | 2,6%                           | 4,5%       | 54,918<br>(0,000)***      |
| Secondary studies                        | 33,1%                        | 23,6%               | 42,9%                    | 29,8%                          | 33,5%      |                           |
| Degree                                   | 45,4%                        | 50,4%               | 40,1%                    | 48,1%                          | 45,4%      |                           |
| Master or PhD                            | 14,7%                        | 23,6%               | 10,6%                    | 19,6%                          | 16,6%      |                           |
| <b>Working conditions</b>                |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| Paid employment                          | 19,0%                        | 19,6%               | 12,5%                    | 23,1%                          | 17,9%      | 91,166<br>(0,000)***      |
| Self-employment                          | 38,0%                        | 52,9%               | 30,7%                    | 36,5%                          | 38,5%      |                           |
| Unemployed                               | 6,7%                         | 3,2%                | 2,6%                     | 5,8%                           | 4,2%       |                           |
| Retired                                  | 0,6%                         | 0,4%                | 0,0%                     | 0,0%                           | 0,2%       |                           |
| Housekeeping activities                  | 0,6%                         | 0,4%                | 0,2%                     | 0,0%                           | 0,3%       |                           |
| Student                                  | 35,0%                        | 23,6%               | 54,0%                    | 34,6%                          | 39,0%      |                           |

|                               |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| <b>Nationality</b>            |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Portuguese                    | 86,5% | 81,8% | 83,3% | 59,9% | 77,2% | 72,986<br>(0,000)*** |
| Other                         | 13,5% | 18,2% | 16,7% | 40,1% | 22,8% |                      |
| <b>Residence</b>              |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Porto Metropolitan Area (PMA) | 67,5% | 53,2% | 48,1% | 32,7% | 47,9% | 91,476<br>(0,000)*** |
| Portugal, outside the PMA     | 19,6% | 28,2% | 36,6% | 30,1% | 30,5% |                      |
| Outside Portugal              | 12,9% | 18,6% | 15,3% | 37,2% | 21,5% |                      |

Note: significant at \*\*\*  $p < 0,01$ .

**Table A2.** Audience segmentation considering the sociodemographic characteristic, for 2019 edition (n=977)

| Variables                                | Faithful to the festival (%) | Festival lovers (%) | Festival's debutants (%) | Interested in the festival (%) | Total 2019 | Chi-Square test (p-value) |
|--|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Gender</b>                            |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| Male                                     | 31,2%                        | 38,8%               | 37,2%                    | 41,3%                          | 37,9%      | 4,175<br>(0,243)          |
| Female                                   | 68,8%                        | 61,2%               | 62,8%                    | 58,7%                          | 62,1%      |                           |
| <b>Age</b>                               |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| <18                                      | 3,6%                         | 2,9%                | 5,6%                     | 1,8%                           | 3,6%       | 31,691<br>(0,002)***      |
| 18-25                                    | 49,3%                        | 38,8%               | 45,8%                    | 36,5%                          | 42,0%      |                           |
| 26-35                                    | 27,5%                        | 33,1%               | 33,7%                    | 45,0%                          | 35,8%      |                           |
| 36-50                                    | 15,9%                        | 22,4%               | 13,0%                    | 14,0%                          | 16,1%      |                           |
| >50                                      | 3,6%                         | 2,9%                | 1,9%                     | 2,6%                           | 2,6%       |                           |
| <b>Marital status</b>                    |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| Single                                   | 79,7%                        | 75,5%               | 81,4%                    | 80,1%                          | 79,3%      | 9,175<br>(0,421)          |
| Married                                  | 14,5%                        | 19,6%               | 16,1%                    | 17,3%                          | 17,1%      |                           |
| Divorced                                 | 5,1%                         | 4,5%                | 2,5%                     | 2,6%                           | 3,4%       |                           |
| Widow(er)                                | 0,7%                         | 0,4%                | 0,0%                     | 0,0%                           | 0,2%       |                           |
| <b>Educational qualifications (full)</b> |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| Elementary studies                       | 2,9%                         | 1,6%                | 3,4%                     | 1,1%                           | 2,3%       | 16,874<br>(0,051)*        |
| Secondary studies                        | 23,9%                        | 18,8%               | 27,6%                    | 25,1%                          | 24,2%      |                           |
| Degree                                   | 56,5%                        | 55,1%               | 48,0%                    | 46,9%                          | 50,7%      |                           |
| Master or PhD                            | 16,7%                        | 24,5%               | 21,1%                    | 26,9%                          | 22,9%      |                           |
| <b>Working conditions</b>                |                              |                     |                          |                                |            |                           |
| Paid employment                          | 15,2%                        | 20,4%               | 15,8%                    | 18,5%                          | 17,6%      | 17,571<br>(0,286)         |
| Self-employment                          | 45,7%                        | 50,2%               | 48,0%                    | 52,0%                          | 49,3%      |                           |
| Unemployed                               | 2,9%                         | 4,9%                | 2,8%                     | 2,2%                           | 3,2%       |                           |
| Retired                                  | 0,7%                         | 0,4%                | 0,0%                     | 0,4%                           | 0,3%       |                           |
| Housekeeping activities                  | 0,0%                         | 0,0%                | 0,0%                     | 0,4%                           | 0,1%       |                           |
| Student                                  | 35,5%                        | 24,1%               | 33,4%                    | 26,6%                          | 29,5%      |                           |

|                               |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| <b>Nationality</b>            |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Portuguese                    | 30,4% | 32,2% | 40,6% | 53,9% | 40,7% | 32,764<br>(0,000)*** |
| Other                         | 69,6% | 67,8% | 59,4% | 46,1% | 59,3% |                      |
| <b>Residence</b>              |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Porto Metropolitan Area (PMA) | 46,4% | 49,4% | 37,2% | 28,0% | 39,0% | 51,782<br>(0,000)*** |
| Portugal, outside the PMA     | 34,8% | 23,3% | 31,6% | 24,7% | 28,0% |                      |
| Outside Portugal              | 18,8% | 27,3% | 31,3% | 47,2% | 33,0% |                      |

Note: significant at \*\*\*  $p < 0,01$ ; \*  $p < 0,1$ .

**Table A3.** Audience segmentation considering the motivation and the global satisfaction for 2018 edition (n=1179)

| Variables                                   | Faithful to the festival (%) | Festival lovers (%) | Festival's debutants (%) | Interested in the festival (%) | Total | Chi-Square test (p-value) |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| <b>Line Up</b>                              |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Nothing important                           | 1,3%                         | 1,8%                | 3,9%                     | 2,7%                           | 2,7%  | 27,158<br>(0,007)***      |
| Not important                               | 3,9%                         | 3,3%                | 1,6%                     | 6,3%                           | 3,6%  |                           |
| Indifferent                                 | 12,5%                        | 17,9%               | 13,2%                    | 13,0%                          | 14,2% |                           |
| Very important                              | 42,1%                        | 30,0%               | 40,0%                    | 32,3%                          | 35,7% |                           |
| Extremely important                         | 40,1%                        | 46,9%               | 41,3%                    | 45,7%                          | 43,7% |                           |
| <b>Festival's reputation</b>                |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Nothing important                           | 2,0%                         | 2,2%                | 2,6%                     | 2,0%                           | 2,3%  | 30,219<br>(0,003)***      |
| Not important                               | 6,7%                         | 1,9%                | 2,4%                     | 3,1%                           | 3,0%  |                           |
| Indifferent                                 | 10,0%                        | 8,2%                | 7,9%                     | 11,5%                          | 9,2%  |                           |
| Very important                              | 41,3%                        | 28,3%               | 40,2%                    | 30,5%                          | 34,8% |                           |
| Extremely important                         | 40,0%                        | 59,5%               | 47,0%                    | 52,9%                          | 50,7% |                           |
| <b>Surprise/a unique festival</b>           |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Nothing important                           | 4,7%                         | 1,5%                | 2,7%                     | 1,7%                           | 2,4%  | 32,941<br>(0,001)***      |
| Not important                               | 7,4%                         | 5,7%                | 3,0%                     | 2,1%                           | 4,0%  |                           |
| Indifferent                                 | 12,2%                        | 15,1%               | 17,5%                    | 21,9%                          | 17,4% |                           |
| Very important                              | 38,5%                        | 28,7%               | 35,8%                    | 38,7%                          | 35,2% |                           |
| Extremely important                         | 37,2%                        | 49,1%               | 41,0%                    | 35,6%                          | 41,0% |                           |
| <b>Schedule of concerts</b>                 |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Nothing important                           | 2,0%                         | 1,9%                | 4,0%                     | 4,8%                           | 3,4%  | 18,858<br>(0,092)*        |
| Not important                               | 6,0%                         | 3,0%                | 6,3%                     | 6,6%                           | 5,5%  |                           |
| Indifferent                                 | 17,9%                        | 19,4%               | 19,0%                    | 24,6%                          | 20,4% |                           |
| Very important                              | 41,1%                        | 36,9%               | 31,9%                    | 32,5%                          | 34,6% |                           |
| Extremely important                         | 33,1%                        | 38,8%               | 38,8%                    | 31,5%                          | 36,0% |                           |
| <b>Amusement/Socializing/Meeting people</b> |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Nothing important                           | 2,0%                         | 1,2%                | 2,7%                     | 2,7%                           | 2,2%  | 16,732<br>(0,160)         |
| Not important                               | 4,8%                         | 4,7%                | 3,8%                     | 6,8%                           | 5,0%  |                           |

|  |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------------|
| Indifferent                            | 16,3% | 14,3% | 18,0% | 18,8% | 17,1% | 34,771<br>(0,001)***  |
| Very important                         | 41,5% | 31,8% | 37,4% | 36,5% | 36,4% |                       |
| Extremely important                    | 35,4% | 48,1% | 38,2% | 35,2% | 39,3% |                       |
| <b>Friend's suggestion</b>             |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Nothing important                      | 9,8%  | 14,5% | 9,4%  | 8,0%  | 10,3% |                       |
| Not important                          | 3,8%  | 4,7%  | 5,8%  | 8,4%  | 6,0%  |                       |
| Indifferent                            | 24,8% | 15,3% | 14,7% | 14,5% | 16,2% |                       |
| Very important                         | 36,1% | 21,3% | 33,9% | 30,5% | 30,3% |                       |
| Extremely important                    | 25,6% | 44,3% | 36,1% | 38,5% | 37,3% |                       |
| <b>Previous experience (Porto)</b>     |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Nothing important                      | 1,4%  | 2,4%  | 27,8% | 26,7% | 14,4% | 176,342<br>(0,000)*** |
| Not important                          | 2,1%  | 0,8%  | 2,4%  | 6,7%  | 2,7%  |                       |
| Indifferent                            | 12,1% | 5,2%  | 15,3% | 14,5% | 11,3% |                       |
| Very important                         | 36,9% | 21,7% | 27,3% | 22,4% | 26,2% |                       |
| Extremely important                    | 47,5% | 69,9% | 27,3% | 29,7% | 45,4% |                       |
| <b>Previous experience (Barcelona)</b> |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Nothing important                      | 16,7% | 30,9% | 44,4% | 37,5% | 34,7% | 48,522<br>(0,000)***  |
| Not important                          | 9,5%  | 3,7%  | 3,6%  | 6,9%  | 5,4%  |                       |
| Indifferent                            | 16,7% | 21,3% | 16,6% | 18,1% | 18,2% |                       |
| Very important                         | 34,5% | 10,3% | 18,3% | 12,5% | 17,3% |                       |
| Extremely important                    | 22,6% | 33,8% | 17,2% | 25,0% | 24,4% |                       |
| <b>Global satisfaction</b>             |       |       |       |       |       |                       |
| Very dissatisfied                      | 0,6%  | 1,4%  | 0,9%  | 0,6%  | 0,9%  | 20,717<br>(0,055)*    |
| Unsatisfied                            | 3,1%  | 1,1%  | 1,4%  | 1,0%  | 1,4%  |                       |
| Not very or not very satisfied         | 8,6%  | 6,4%  | 6,8%  | 5,1%  | 6,5%  |                       |
| Satisfied                              | 40,5% | 30,7% | 42,0% | 44,2% | 39,7% |                       |
| Very satisfied                         | 47,2% | 60,4% | 48,8% | 49,0% | 51,4% |                       |

Note: significant at \*\*\*  $p < 0,01$ ; \*  $p < 0,1$ .

**Table A4.** Audience segmentation considering the motivation and the global satisfaction for 2019 edition (n=977)

| Variables           | Faithful to the festival (%) | Festival lovers (%) | Festival's debutants (%) | Interested in the festival (%) | Total | Chi-Square test (p-value) |
|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| <b>Line Up</b>      |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Nothing important   | 4,7%                         | 5,1%                | 2,5%                     | 4,5%                           | 4,1%  | 8,085<br>(0,778)          |
| Not important       | 7,5%                         | 8,3%                | 5,4%                     | 6,4%                           | 6,8%  |                           |
| Indifferent         | 13,2%                        | 19,0%               | 16,3%                    | 19,5%                          | 17,5% |                           |
| Very important      | 36,8%                        | 32,9%               | 33,5%                    | 32,7%                          | 33,5% |                           |
| Extremely important | 37,7%                        | 34,7%               | 42,3%                    | 36,8%                          | 38,0% |                           |

|  |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| <b><i>Festival's reputation</i></b>                |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Nothing important                                  | 1,9%  | 3,2%  | 1,2%  | 1,3%  | 1,9%  |                      |
| Not important                                      | 2,8%  | 3,2%  | 2,1%  | 1,3%  | 2,3%  |                      |
| Indifferent  | 10,2% | 15,5% | 11,2% | 14,7% | 13,2% | 8,495<br>(0,745)     |
| Very important                                     | 33,3% | 31,8% | 36,1% | 34,2% | 34,0% |                      |
| Extremely important                                | 51,9% | 46,4% | 49,4% | 48,4% | 48,6% |                      |
| <b><i>Surprise/a unique festival</i></b>           |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Nothing important                                  | 3,0%  | 6,6%  | 3,1%  | 3,2%  | 4,1%  |                      |
| Not important                                      | 3,0%  | 6,2%  | 2,7%  | 3,7%  | 4,0%  |                      |
| Indifferent  | 19,0% | 20,9% | 20,9% | 29,2% | 23,0% | 17,639<br>(0,127)    |
| Very important                                     | 32,0% | 33,6% | 33,8% | 27,9% | 31,8% |                      |
| Extremely important                                | 43,0% | 32,7% | 39,6% | 36,1% | 37,1% |                      |
| <b><i>Schedule of concerts</i></b>                 |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Nothing important                                  | 2,9%  | 6,9%  | 6,2%  | 6,3%  | 6,0%  |                      |
| Not important                                      | 9,6%  | 6,0%  | 8,0%  | 7,7%  | 7,6%  |                      |
| Indifferent  | 20,2% | 14,3% | 16,4% | 16,7% | 16,4% | 7,223<br>(0,843)     |
| Very important                                     | 30,8% | 36,9% | 29,8% | 32,1% | 32,6% |                      |
| Extremely important                                | 36,5% | 35,9% | 39,6% | 37,1% | 37,4% |                      |
| <b><i>Amusement/Socializing/Meeting people</i></b> |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Nothing important                                  | 1,9%  | 3,3%  | 2,6%  | 2,8%  | 2,8%  |                      |
| Not important                                      | 1,9%  | 3,3%  | 3,5%  | 3,7%  | 3,3%  |                      |
| Indifferent  | 14,0% | 18,7% | 15,4% | 19,5% | 17,3% | 8,389<br>(0,754)     |
| Very important                                     | 38,3% | 30,6% | 27,6% | 32,1% | 31,2% |                      |
| Extremely important                                | 43,9% | 44,0% | 50,9% | 41,9% | 45,5% |                      |
| <b><i>Friend's suggestion</i></b>                  |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Nothing important                                  | 7,0%  | 7,8%  | 6,8%  | 12,4% | 8,7%  |                      |
| Not important                                      | 3,0%  | 7,4%  | 5,9%  | 3,3%  | 5,2%  |                      |
| Indifferent  | 17,0% | 14,2% | 14,0% | 13,9% | 14,4% | 12,229<br>(0,427)    |
| Very important                                     | 31,0% | 27,9% | 29,3% | 23,4% | 27,5% |                      |
| Extremely important                                | 42,0% | 42,6% | 44,1% | 46,9% | 44,2% |                      |
| <b><i>Previous experience (Porto)</i></b>          |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Nothing important                                  | 0,0%  | 1,4%  | 19,0% | 17,5% | 8,8%  |                      |
| Not important                                      | 1,0%  | 1,9%  | 3,2%  | 4,8%  | 2,7%  |                      |
| Indifferent  | 7,0%  | 6,3%  | 15,1% | 15,1% | 10,4% | 75,676<br>(0,000)*** |
| Very important                                     | 31,0% | 32,7% | 23,8% | 22,2% | 28,0% |                      |
| Extremely important                                | 61,0% | 57,7% | 38,9% | 40,5% | 50,2% |                      |
| <b><i>Previous experience (Barcelona)</i></b>      |       |       |       |       |       |                      |
| Nothing important                                  | 12,8% | 24,3% | 33,3% | 23,5% | 25,1% |                      |
| Not important                                      | 0,0%  | 2,9%  | 2,9%  | 2,0%  | 2,3%  | 17,165<br>(0,143)    |
| Indifferent  | 14,9% | 6,8%  | 12,7% | 18,6% | 13,0% |                      |

|                                |       |       |       |       |       |                   |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------|
| Very important                 | 25,5% | 23,3% | 21,6% | 19,6% | 22,0% | 15,257<br>(0,228) |
| Extremely important            | 46,8% | 42,7% | 29,4% | 36,3% | 37,6% |                   |
| <b>Global satisfaction</b>     |       |       |       |       |       |                   |
| Very dissatisfied              | 1,9%  | ,5%   | 0,0%  | ,5%   | ,5%   |                   |
| Unsatisfied                    | 2,9%  | 1,5%  | 1,8%  | 0,0%  | 1,4%  |                   |
| Not very or not very satisfied | 3,8%  | 6,1%  | 4,8%  | 9,1%  | 6,2%  |                   |
| Satisfied                      | 42,9% | 39,3% | 39,9% | 37,0% | 39,3% |                   |
| Very satisfied                 | 48,6% | 52,6% | 53,5% | 53,4% | 52,5% |                   |

Note: significant at \*\*\*  $p < 0,01$ .

**Table A5.** Communication channels influence by groups for 2018 edition (n=1179)

| Channels  | Faithful to the festival (%) | Festival lovers (%) | Festival's debutants (%) | Interested in the festival (%) | Total | Chi-Square test (p-value) |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| <b>Digital</b> (e.g. Internet, social networks, newsletter, e-wom)  |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 68,7%                        | 60,4%               | 66,5%                    | 62,5%                          | 64,3% | 4,620<br>(0,202)          |
| No  | 31,3%                        | 39,6%               | 33,5%                    | 37,5%                          | 35,7% |                           |
| <b>Television</b>   |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 8,6%                         | 6,4%                | 9,7%                     | 5,8%                           | 7,7%  | 4,758<br>(0,190)          |
| No  | 91,4%                        | 93,6%               | 90,3%                    | 94,2%                          | 92,3% |                           |
| <b>Radio</b>  |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 6,1%                         | 2,9%                | 5,2%                     | 3,2%                           | 4,2%  | 4,522<br>(0,210)          |
| No  | 93,9%                        | 97,1%               | 94,8%                    | 96,8%                          | 95,8% |                           |
| <b>Printmaterials</b> (e.g. Non-specialist newspaper/magazine, specialized magazines, flyers, billboards) |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 1,2%                         | 3,9%                | 3,1%                     | 3,2%                           | 3,1%  | 2,586<br>(0,460)          |
| No  | 98,8%                        | 96,1%               | 96,9%                    | 96,8%                          | 96,9% |                           |
| <b>Word-of-mouth</b>  |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 16,0%                        | 28,2%               | 17,9%                    | 29,8%                          | 23,2% | 22,998<br>(0,000)***      |
| No  | 84,0%                        | 71,8%               | 82,1%                    | 70,2%                          | 76,8% |                           |

Note: significant at \*\*\*  $p < 0,01$ .

**Table A6.** Communication channels influence by groups for 2019 edition (n=977)

| Channels  | Faithful to the festival (%) | Festival lovers (%) | Festival's debutants (%) | Interested in the festival (%) | Total | Chi-Square test (p-value) |
|---|------------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-------|---------------------------|
| <b>Digital</b> (e.g. Internet, social networks, newsletter, e-wom)  |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 65,2%                        | 59,2%               | 65,9%                    | 59,8%                          | 62,4% | 4,071<br>(0,254)          |
| No  | 34,8%                        | 40,8%               | 34,1%                    | 40,2%                          | 37,6% |                           |
| <b>Television</b>   |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 6,5%                         | 8,6%                | 8,4%                     | 5,5%                           | 7,4%  | 2,463<br>(0,482)          |
| No  | 93,5%                        | 91,4%               | 91,6%                    | 94,5%                          | 92,6% |                           |
| <b>Radio</b>  |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 4,3%                         | 3,3%                | 2,8%                     | 1,8%                           | 2,9%  | 2,251<br>(0,522)          |
| No  | 95,7%                        | 96,7%               | 97,2%                    | 98,2%                          | 97,1% |                           |
| <b>Printmaterials</b> (e.g. Non-specialist newspaper/magazine, specialized magazines, flyers, billboards) |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 3,6%                         | 6,1%                | 3,4%                     | 3,3%                           | 4,1%  | 3,447<br>(0,328)          |
| No  | 96,4%                        | 93,9%               | 96,6%                    | 96,7%                          | 95,9% |                           |
| <b>Word-of-mouth</b>  |                              |                     |                          |                                |       |                           |
| Yes   | 20,3%                        | 22,9%               | 19,5%                    | 29,5%                          | 23,2% | 9,213<br>(0,027)**        |
| No  | 79,7%                        | 77,1%               | 80,5%                    | 70,5%                          | 76,8% |                           |

Note: significant at \*\* $p < 0,05$ .

#### How to cite this article:

Almeida, A. L., Vieira, E., & Borges, A. P. (2022). Segmentation and the Key Communication Channels to Promote a Music Festival – The NOS Primavera Sound Case. *International Journal of Marketing, Communication and New Media*, Vol. 10, N° 19, 5-35.