

# **Understanding value for money at a live music performance**

**E DU PLESSIS**

(Tourism, Research in Economic Environs and Society (TREES),  
North-West University)

[Lindie.DuPlessis@nwu.ac.za]

**M SAAYMAN**

(Tourism, Research in Economic Environs and Society (TREES),  
North-West University)

[Melville.saayman@nwu.ac.za]

## **Abstract**

Value for money is a complex concept and might differ between people, events and industries. The perceptions towards value for money may be influenced by a number of factors. Thus, the aim of this research was to determine the factors that influence value for money as well as the relationship between travel motives and value for money when attending a live music performance.

To achieve this goal, a survey was conducted at two Eagles concerts in South Africa. 889 usable questionnaires were obtained. Factor analyses in SPSS were carried out and a regression analysis was used to further analyse the data.

Findings from this research entailed four factors concerning value for money: performance quality, ancillary quality, souvenirs and exchange rate. The research further highlighted a strong relationship between value for money and motives, with performance quality (PQ) being the most significant. This study makes a valuable contribution to the industry in terms of literature and knowledge.

## **Key phrases**

*motives; music concerts; price; quality; tourism; value for money*

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

The prospect for any country's tourism business to expand depends on its ability to sustain a competitive advantage in its delivering of goods and services at the right price for the potential visitors (Dwyer, Forsyth & Rao 2002:331). Value for money contributes to any destination's aim in achieving a competitive advantage and obtaining the maximum benefit

with the resources available (Khan 2011:1). Decisions concerning value for money are a daily reality in people's lives; they are constantly deciding which products or services to buy, and evaluating the right balance between quality, price and the product or service received (Singh 2011:1). Therefore it is important to determine what it is that visitors consider value for money and the factors contributing to it.

The fact that visitors perceive tourism products and the value thereof in different ways makes the term value difficult to measure or explain. To visitors, "value" may imply monetary value and or the value that satisfies their basic needs. According to Weaver, Weber and McCleary (2007:334), "value" refers to a "visitor's overall assessment of the quality of a product based on perceptions of what is received and what is given", in other words, a trade-off between perceived benefits and perceived costs (Lovelock 2000:41).

Recent research studies suggest that perceived value may be a better predictor of repurchase intentions than either satisfaction or quality (Cronin, Brady & Hult 2000:193; Oh 2003:241). Khan (2011:1) holds that perceived value strengthens the idea that value for money contributes to the aim of achieving a competitive advantage. Although this is an important issue, surprisingly little research has been carried out on the concept of value for money and the experience of visitors to music events, particularly in South Africa (Kruger & Saayman 2012:183).

### **1.1 Music events**

This is more than ever relevant in light of the fact that the country currently is undergoing a boom in live music performances. The topic under investigation is especially valuable to the South African events industry since this information may be utilised by promoters in ensuring repeat visits to music events. Basic facilities and services should remain consistent, despite the specific artist or band that performs while also ensuring the quality of the former at the same time. Having knowledge for providing a memorable experience could ensure a competitive advantage for event organisers.

Millions of people attend live music events and concerts every year. Music concerts are not only a vital source of income for the majority of musicians and event organisers but also contribute to communities' social, economic and cultural life (Manners, Kruger & Saayman 2012). Getz (2008:403) adds that live music performances have a considerable economic impact and that consumers are accorded the opportunity to spend money on various items such as programmes, accommodation, refreshments and souvenirs (Earl 2001:345; Hausman 2000:411; Moskalyak 2008:Internet).

With this in mind, hosting major music events has become a significant motivator of tourism and now features strongly in the development and marketing plans of the majority of destinations (Getz 2008:402). South Africa has experienced remarkable growth in the number of international artists performing in the country since 1994 (Kruger & Saayman 2011:2). Major events companies realised the economic potential of hosting specifically music events in attracting large crowds.

In addition, these live music performances provide an extra activity on the tourism calendar of events. Therefore, when a music event delivers a memorable experience and visitors perceive it as being value for money, it may result in a potential to increase profits and establish repeat attendance (Yeoman, Robertson, Ali-Knight, Drummond & McMahon-Beattie 2004:66).

## **1.2 Expectations and motives of attendees to music events**

However, as stated by Yeoman *et al.* (2004:66) and by Saayman and Saayman (2011:3), it is important to keep in mind that different visitors will have differing expectations, wants and needs from essentially similar offerings. Needs stimulate and create motives and it is therefore important to establish if there is any correlation between motives and the perceptions of value for money. For this reason, information is therefore required with regard to the motivations of individuals who attend these live performances, in order for effective marketing strategies to be devised; this will also influence the perception of value for money (McCarthy, Ondaatje & Zakaras 2001).

Kruger and Saayman (2012:6) identified various motives of attendees concerning different live music events which included: unique experience, socialisation and event novelty, value, enjoyment and entertainment, artist affiliation, group togetherness and nostalgia. Mayfield and Crompton (1995:39) point out that the continued viability of a music event depends on the organisers' ability to ensure that what they are offering is continuously attuned to the benefits sought by attendees, influenced by initial motives to attend the event.

Furthermore, knowing the different motives and perceptions of attendees towards value for money at music events may assist event organisers to increase attendance at these live performances (Berridge 2007; McCarthy & Jinnat 2001:18). Findings of this nature will be particularly invaluable to the South African events industry since little research has focused on the factors and aspects contributing to and influencing the needs and wants of attendees at live music events.

### **1.3 Purpose of this research**

The purpose of this research is an attempt to answer the question: What do visitors regard as factors that contribute to value for money and how does this relate to the overall experience? The question also incorporates the query of whether a relationship between value for money and internal travel motives exists.

Understanding the concept of value for money and how it is being perceived could provide further clarity on why people buy expensive tickets to a music concert, in this case, the Eagles' live music performance, for seats where they could not clearly see the band, had to stand in long queues, shuffle along and were pressured by screaming crowds in a stadium. This knowledge could guide marketers and organisers in attracting the correct artist and focusing on the accurate aspects of providing a memorable experience. In the current economic climate it is very important to acknowledge the importance of money in visitors' lives and to provide a service or product worth paying for.

## **2. OPPORTUNITY INVESTIGATED**

The literature study was based on the following subtitles to provide a background to the study and literature framework to support the problem investigated.

### **2.1 Understanding value for money**

Value for money may be perceived and explained differently from various points of view. Economists (Collins & Parsa 2006; Lovelock 2000) could argue that value for money may only be measured by applying a monetary value, whilst socialists (Weaver, Weber & McCleary 2007) link value for money with the feeling of satisfaction. Within the literature (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry 1985; Swarbrooke 1995; Wilkins, Merrilees, & Herington 2007; Zeithaml 1988) this is portrayed according to the various perspectives held by the researchers who pursue this topic and the abundance of definitions explaining "value for money".

From the literature value for money could be explained as: firstly, an affordable price; secondly it represents what is desired from a product; thirdly it refers to the quality a visitor receives for the price paid and lastly it is that which a visitor gets in return for what is on offer (Zeithalm 1988).

From the latter, it is clear that a large number of researchers agree that value correlates with perception and satisfaction (Du Plessis 2009; Haarloff 2007; Petrick 2002, Sheth, Newman & Gross 1991; Sweeney & Soutar 2001). Petrick (2002:332) further explains and identifies five

dimensions of perceived value: quality, emotional response, monetary price, behavioural price and reputation. The mix of these and other factors as described by other researchers (Gardial, Clemons, Woodruff, Schumann & Burns 1994; Haarhoff 2007; Hallowell 1996; Petrick 2002; Sweeney & Soutar 2001; Weaver *et al.* 2007) is relevant and will vary on a case by case basis. Gardial *et al.* (1994:548) explain this statement by highlighting perceived value as a dynamic variable, experienced before purchase, at the moment of purchase, at the time of use and after use. For each of these moments, the valuation made may be different and influenced by various factors.

Although the relationship between quality and price, which are regarded as the two most important factors, influences the perception of value for money (Gardial *et al.* 1994; Haarhoff 2007; Hallowell 1996; Petrick 2002; Sweeney & Soutar 2001; and Weaver *et al.* 2007), there are other factors that also contribute. In this regard Saayman and Snyman (2005:135) indicate that good value for money is essential and may be measured in the following areas of tourism: accommodation, entertainment, sports, food, transport, culture, beverages and recreation.

The following could contribute to the perception of receiving value for money: accessibility, the spirit and energy of the place, language and local customs, way of life, uniqueness, friendliness, hospitality, safety and security, atmosphere and marketing. These factors were also identified as travel motives attracting tourists to live music events.

Value, on the other hand, refers to the “get” and “give” when it comes to the consumption of products and services as well as to the trade-off between quality and price which forms part of the value for money concept (Sweeney & Soutar 2001:204). Sweeney and Soutar (2001:204) suggest that quality and price exert different and differential effects on perceived value for money. When consumers feel they are receiving value for money they will invest in future purchases.

To encourage future purchases and to ensure consumer satisfaction there needs to be a product or service that offers value for money to the consumers. George (2004:4) explains that in order to do this effectively, event organisers must be able to appreciate that not all consumers are the same and do not have the same needs and wants. George (2004:208) further suggests that physical evidence is a critical factor when consumers want value for money. Examples of physical evidence include trained staff, technological advances and hygienic facilities. It is clear from the previous discussion that value for money is a complex term and is influenced by a number of factors, beliefs and research.

## 2.2 Factors of value for money

The challenge for managers and marketers, however, lies in the ability to provide the right factors or products at the right time to visitors, which will result in the perception of receiving value for their money. Nevertheless, one item that cannot be ignored is the price visitors pay for products. In the case of the music event under investigation, criticism was raised regarding the cost of the tickets, but the organisers experienced no difficulty selling out tickets in a record time. Based on the traditional supply and demand theory (Collins & Parsa 2006; Pellinen 2003), it could be argued that a fixed supply and a high demand will lead to high prices. Good value is therefore not necessarily perceived only when prices are low but it also comprises the overall assessment of the event and the perceived value derived from the same.

The question now arises; what are the factors that constitute value for money at a live music performance? To ensure repeat visits and to enjoy a competitive advantage (with regard to competing against companies who may currently hold the monopoly), managers of tourism destinations should follow the principles for achieving value for money in order to be successful and satisfy visitors that is based on offering a quality experience at an acceptable price (Du Plessis 2009:65; Cronin *et al.* 2000:195).

Various strategies and theories were discussed in the literature but merely gave guidelines as to what people perceived as value, prices and quality. Tait (2009:90) however, identified four different ways that described the customer's point of view regarding value and gives some insight into factors that could contribute to the positive perception towards value for money. Firstly, *Value is regarded as a low price for goods and services*. Price is always a factor and could be considered part of the experience if one takes into account that money is spent on accommodation, food, transport and souvenirs, to name just a few factors (Kainth & Verma 2011:21; Yang & Peterson 2004:802).

A bad experience, on the other hand, where for example a visitor feels he or she is being "ripped off" by paying a large amount extra for parking outside the stadium could decrease the overall satisfaction of the total experience. Value, according to customers, is the second potential benefit that may be gained by purchasing products or services, in this case tickets (Kompulla 2005:89). Thirdly, value is the quality one gets for the amount spent on a product or service. Quality is directly linked to the satisfaction customers have perceived on encountering a product or service. The product or service must be worth the price paid to be considered as value for money (Monroe 1990:46). Lastly, customers feel they make sacrifices for purchasing

a product or service, and perceive value as what is being received for the sacrifices made, in terms of cost, effort, time and willingness (Shiffman, Kanuk & Wisenblit 2010:29).

According to the latter, value has to do with receiving benefits from products and services when paying a price. These benefits may include factors such as quality of food, clean facilities, the quality of the infrastructure, the quality of the entertainment, variety of food, ability to purchase souvenirs and experiencing special effects to name but a few, which were all initiated by a motive to travel to the live music event. Value may then be determined using the following formula (Cant 2005:6; Sweeney & Soutar 2001:203): *Value=Perceived benefits/Price*.

However, knowing how to determine value does not answer the question that this research is attempting to address, which includes factors that contribute to the perceived benefits of the formula. Every event, product and destination tends to deliver different aspects that influence the visitors' perceptions regarding value for money and the overall experience. It could be assumed, based on the literature, which factors involved in music events tend to be mostly connected to the performance of the night, which differs from the usual factors such as price and quality that might contribute to value. This augments the research question by asking: what is the relationship between the initial travel motive and the perception of value for money.

### **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The method of research used is discussed under the following headings:

(i) study focus, (ii) the questionnaire, (iii) sample and (iv) the statistical analysis.

#### **3.1 Study focus**

The Eagles is an American rock band that was formed in Los Angeles, California in 1971. Its members managed to achieve various Number One hits as well as internationally acclaimed awards for their contribution to music as an art. The band was active from 1971 until 1980 after which it broke up, with each member trying to pursue their own careers. However, the band got back together in 1994 and continued their success. In 2012, The Eagles, in conjunction with Big Concerts, decided to bring their tour to South Africa for the first time, where they performed two shows: one at the FNB Stadium in Johannesburg and one at the Greenpoint Stadium in Cape Town (Kruger, Scholtz, Saayman, & Saayman 2012:1).

### 3.2 The questionnaire

A self-administrated questionnaire was used to achieve the aim of the research by data gathering. It consisted of the following three sections:

- Section A focused on the demographic details (gender, home language, occupation, province, spending, marital status, level of education and number of tickets purchased).
- Section B (travel motives) and C (value for money) contained Likert scale type questions. Respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they agreed or disagreed with each of the statements describing travel motivations and value for money (Tustin, Ligthelm, Martins & Van Wyk 2005:408).

From the literature, various factors were identified and used to develop the questionnaire, in line with Petrick (2002); Saayman and Snyman (2005); Sweeney and Soutar (2001) and Weaver *et al.* (2007).

### 3.3 The sample

A survey was undertaken and questionnaires were distributed at two Eagles concerts held at the FNB stadium in Johannesburg and Greenpoint Stadium in Cape Town during 2012. The venues were divided into blocks determined by the ticket price. For example, visitors with golden circle tickets are typically seated near the stage and use a separate entrance from visitors with cheaper tickets for the general standing area and seats further from the stage.

A stratified sampling method was therefore employed, and in order to limit bias, a simple random sampling method was used within the stratified method: trained fieldworkers followed specific guidelines as questionnaires were handed out to different non-homogeneous age groups, gender groups and ticket holders. Fieldworkers approached the respondents and explained the goal of the survey and the questionnaire to ensure that visitors participated willingly and responded openly and honestly.

A total of 900 questionnaires were administered for Cape Town and Johannesburg (470 and 430, respectively). In a population of 100,000 ( $N$ ), 398 respondents ( $n$ ) would be seen as representative and result in a 95% level of confidence with a  $\pm 5\%$  sampling error (Israel 2009:6). Therefore, since 46 134 tickets were sold for the two concerts, the number of completed questionnaires ( $n = 889$ ) was more than adequate (466 – Cape Town and 423 – Johannesburg). The 11 questionnaires were either lost due to people that left their seats and did not return in time for the fieldworkers to collect it or questionnaires that were not complete in full.



### 3.4 Statistical calculations

The data was captured using Microsoft® Excel® and analysed using SPSS (SPSS Inc, 2007). The analysis was performed in two stages: a factor analysis of the pooled data of both concerts and an analysis of significant differences between motivational factors and value for money factors at the two concerts. These results were compared for correlation with demographic profiles and spending.

First, a principal axis factor analysis, using an Oblimin rotation with Kaiser normalisation, was performed on the 27 value for money items (Petrick 2002; Saayman & Snyman 2005; Sweeney & Soutar 2001 and Weaver *et al.* 2007). and the 23 motivational items to explain the variance-covariance structure of a set of variables through a few linear combinations of these variables.

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was used to determine whether the covariance matrix was suitable for factor analysis. Kaiser's criteria for the extraction of all factors with eigenvalues larger than one, were used because they were considered able to explain a significant amount of variation in the data. All items with a factor loading greater than 0.3 were considered as contributing to a factor and all items with loadings less than 0.3 as not correlating significantly with this factor (Steyn, 2000). Any item that cross-loaded on two factors with factor loadings, of which both were greater than 0.3, was categorised in the factor where interpretability was best.

A reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) was computed for each factor to estimate its internal consistency. All factors with a reliability coefficient above 0.6 were considered as acceptable in this study. The average inter-item correlations were also computed as another measure of reliability - these, according to Clark and Watson (1995), should lie between 0.15 and 0.55.

Secondly, independent *t*-tests, two-way frequency tables and chi-square tests were used to investigate any significant differences between the visitor clusters. The study used demographic variables (gender, home language, country of origin, age, occupation and province of origin) and behavioural variables (length of stay, type of accommodation, transport, preferred type of music, expenditure, other festivals attended, initiator of attendance and when the decision to visit was made) to examine whether there were statistically significant differences between the groups. The results of the statistical analyses are discussed in the next section.

## 4. FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

This section provides an overview of the profile of respondents, discussion of the results of the factor analysis (value for money and internal travel motives) as well as the correlation analysis and presents the results of the linear regression analysis.

### 4.1 Profile of respondents

The demographic profile of the respondents is summarised as follows:

- The majority of respondents at both Cape Town and Johannesburg concerts were married, English-speaking women in the age range 43 to 46 years.
- Foreign residents were mostly from Canada, Dubai, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Namibia, the Netherlands, the UK, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
- Respondents from both cities were well qualified, with almost half being in professional occupations.
- In both cities, the majority of respondents were local people who travelled to the event in groups of three.
- Respondents from Cape Town as well as Johannesburg both purchased two tickets per group on average, while the average spending per group in Cape Town was R1846.56 and in Johannesburg was R1804.41. The average spending includes all the expenses of the group to attend the show and during the show.
- The main motive for all respondents to attend the event was to enjoy the music of their favourite band and also because it is a once in a lifetime experience.
- Respondents at both concerts indicated that they attend at least two concerts per year on average.

### 4.2 Results from the factor analysis

The factor analysis identified four factors (Table 1) for value for money, which was labelled according to items that contributed to it. These factors were labelled as (factor 1: *performance quality (PQ)*), (factor 2: *ancillary quality (AQ)*), (factor 3: *souvenirs*) and (factor 4: *exchange rate*).

Performance quality (PQ) has the highest mean value (4.03) and summarised the key aspects of a music event. Ancillary factor recorded the second highest mean value of (2.93) and captured the secondary aspects pertaining to the music event, namely: accommodation, food and beverage and transport. In the third place were souvenirs (2.410) and lastly the exchange rate, which influenced the foreign visitors.

**TABLE 1: Factors that influence the perception towards value for money**

Value for money factor and item	Factor			
	Performance quality	Ancillary quality	Souvenirs	Exchange rate
Quality of the infrastructure	0.820			
The quality of sound	0.808			
Quality of the show	0.807			
Venue management effectiveness	0.804			
Personal safety	0.792			
Quality and size of the screen	0.735			
Quality of services offered by staff	0.671			
Total event experience	0.662			
It's a once in a lifetime experience	0.662			
Level of hygiene conditions	0.661			
The total experience offered by the facility	0.640			
Atmosphere	0.634			
Price of the tickets	0.615			
Quality of the entertainment	0.568			
How close you are to the stage	0.530			
Venue / location	0.517			
Variety of food	0.409			
Price of the accommodation		0.812		
Quality of the accommodation		0.766		
Quality of the food and beverages		0.675		
Transport cost		0.551		
Parking cost		0.549		
Price of food and beverages		0.531		
Availability of souvenirs			0.835	
Price of the souvenirs			0.812	
Availability of facilities for children			0.423	

Value for money factor and item	Factor			
	Performance quality	Ancillary quality	Souvenirs	Exchange rate
Exchange rate, in the case of foreigners				-0.471
Cronbach Alpha	0.939	0.852	0.766	N/A
Mean values	4.03	2.93	2.41	N/A
<b>Extraction method:</b> Principal Axis Factoring				
<b>Rotation method:</b> Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation				

Source: Authors' compilation from survey results

The factor analysis, related to motivation to attend the concert identified four factors (Table 2), which were labelled according to items that contributed to it. These factors were labelled as (factor 1: *novelty*), (factor 2: *performance*), (factor 3: *unique experience*), and (factor 4: *sociable*).

**TABLE 2: Factors that influence the motivation to attend the Eagles concert**

Motivation factors and items	Factor			
	Novelty	Performance	Unique experience	Sociable
To experience new things	0.585			
For a chance to be with people who are enjoying themselves	0.582			
To relax and escape from daily tension and my busy every day environment	0.343			
Because I have seen The Eagles before and wanted to do so again		0.782		
Because of social status in terms of being seen by others		0.752		
Because of the possibility to meet the artist in person		0.630		
Enable one to get physically close to the artists when performing a song		0.521		
Because the attendance makes one part of the performances		0.517		
Enable one to experience the possibility of the artist singing a song for the first time		0.495		

Motivation factors and items	Factor			
	Novelty	Performance	Unique experience	Sociable
I always wanted to see The Eagles perform live			0.857	
It is a unique, once-in-a-lifetime experience			0.802	
To enjoy the music			0.741	
To be part of this unique and exciting event			0.684	
To see my favourite band			0.650	
These concerts are entertainment at its best			0.639	
The Eagles is a well-known international act			0.589	
To have fun and because I enjoy these types of special events			0.511	
For nostalgic reasons/memories			0.455	
It is a sociable event				0.725
To spend time with family, friends or someone special				0.635
This concert is value for money				0.489
Because I got tickets for free or as a present				0.381
I try to attend as many of these music events as possible				0.334
Cronbach Alpha	0.766	0.843	0.903	0.701
Mean value	3.45	2.59	4.10	3.04
<b>Extraction method:</b> Principal Axis Factoring <b>Rotation method:</b> Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation				

Source: Authors' compilation from survey results

The most important reason for attending a live music event such as this one is because of the unique experience (4.10), followed by novelty (3.45), its sociable nature (3.04) and the performance, in other words the band itself (2.59).

### 4.3 Results from the regression analysis

The three value factors, namely performance quality (PQ), ancillary quality (AQ) and souvenirs were used in the regression analysis as the dependent variables. Most questions had multiple choice responses or were answered on a 5-point Likert scale and the dummy variables were coded 1 and 2 according to Table 3. These variables were included in the regression analyses.

The relationship between the variables indicated in Table 3 and the motive factors and value for money factors was investigated. Other variables were also analysed but no significant differences were found, which is why these are not reported in the document.

**TABLE 3: Questions used and the coding thereof**

Question description	Coding	Variable
Gender	Male = 1; Female =2	Gender
Age	Open question	Age
Total spending	Open question	Spending
Nights staying	Open question	Nights staying

Source: Authors' compilation from survey results

Table 4 indicates the results of the regression analysis of performance quality, ancillary quality and souvenirs.

The regression analysis (Table 4) revealed an interesting result: that in terms of the three factors of value for money, only one factor, *performance quality (PQ)*, displayed a significant relationship with all of the motives, namely *novelty*, *performance* and *unique experience*, although the latter has an inverse relationship. This result therefore confirms a strong relationship between value for money and motives at a music event since *PQ* captures all the key aspects of a music event. The other two value- for- money factors showed no significant relationship with any of the motives.

Total spending was also significant in the case of *PQ*. Hence, in terms of *ancillary quality (AQ)* it was only length of stay that indicated a significant relationship. Age showed a significant relationship with souvenirs although it is a negative correlation, which implies that younger attendees are less concerned about value for money than older attendees when it comes to souvenirs. This might be explained by their lack of income and that quality products are generally more expensive. Gender was inconclusive since in the case of *PQ* it has a positive correlation while in the case of *souvenirs* it showed a negative correlation.

**TABLE 4: Results of the regression analysis**

Performance quality		Ancillary quality		Souvenirs	
Variables	PQ	Variables	AQ	Variables	S
(constant)	2.554	(constant)	2.207	(constant)	1.577
Novelty	0.051 (.036)**	Novelty	0.083 (.078)	Novelty	-0.007 (.054)
Performance	-0.032 (.036)**	Performance	0.184 (.077)	Performance	0.340 (.053)
Unique experience	0.263 (.044)**	Unique experience	-0.078 (.098)	Unique experience	0.009 (.065)
Sociable	0.089 (.039)**	Sociable	0.099 (.088)	Sociable	0.089 (.058)
Gender	0.017 (.058)	Nights staying	0.022 (.016)**	Age	-0.005 (.003)*
Total spending	4.047E-06 (.000)*			Gender	-0.158 (.084)
R <sup>2</sup>	0.136	R <sup>2</sup>	0.161	R <sup>2</sup>	0.136
adj R <sup>2</sup>	0.127	adj R <sup>2</sup>	0.133	adj R <sup>2</sup>	0.127

\*p<0.01; \*\*p<0.05 Standard error in ( )

Source: Authors' compilation from survey results

The first finding reveals that there are four factors of value for money, namely *performance quality (PQ)*, *ancillary quality (AQ)*, *souvenirs* and *exchange rate*. These factors confirm that value for money as related to spending at/on a live music event differs from other tourism products, as was indicated by Weaver *et al.* (2007:334); Petrick (2002:333); Sweeney and Soutar (2001:205); Hallowell (1996:29) and Gardial *et al.* (1994:549).

This implies that management should focus its resources on *performance quality (PQ)* since this is the factor that contributes the most to a memorable experience. Moreover, the quality of the artists in terms of reputation and international standing is the key in the marketing of such events. In addition, emphasis should be placed on the unique, once-in-a-lifetime experience associated with attending live music performances.

The second finding confirms a strong relationship between the motives of the attendees at the music event and value for money, especially towards *quality of the performance (PQ)*

which includes aspects such as: quality of the infrastructure, quality of the sound, quality of the show and the overall effectiveness of management, to name just a few.

It is very important for managers, as in the case of the first finding, to focus on improving and managing the *performance quality (PQ)* factor, which captures the essence of the music event. By ensuring this managerial task is carried out, both motives and value for money factors, as indicated by attendees, are being positively influenced, which leads to a memorable experience. In essence it implies focusing on the very basics of hosting a music event.

The third finding not only indicates a clear relationship between spending and value for money but also confirms the findings of Du Plessis (2002) and Petrick (2002) that there is a strong relationship between the abovementioned factors. This relationship is positive: hence improved quality and therefore value for money leads to greater spending where once again, the emphasis falls on quality or, to put it in simple terms, good management.

The fourth finding indicates that there are an equal number of behavioural and socio-demographic variables influencing value for money. This is evident in the length of stay and age variable. Length of stay is only relevant under the factor *ancillary quality (AQ)*, which is understandable, since this factor deals with secondary issues of the event and particularly refers to quality and price of accommodation, transport and food.

There is also a significant difference between the variable of age and the value for money factor as related to souvenirs. The implication of this finding is that management could generate more revenue from souvenirs when providing a variety of products at different prices for different age groups. Attendees young or old just want something to remember the event by; therefore souvenirs become important.

## 5. CONTRIBUTION OF THE RESEARCH

The aim of the research was two-fold: firstly to identify the factors of value for money and secondly to determine the relationship between value for money and the motives of attendees at live music events. It was the first time this type of research had been conducted at a music event, not only in South Africa but globally, as far as the authors could establish. Therefore it makes a valuable contribution towards the literature on events tourism, thus benefitting academics and practitioners alike.

Seeing that events and especially music events are on the increase, this type of research is invaluable, highlighting the aspects on which managers need to focus in order to create a memorable experience. This study further demonstrates that the value for money factors differ



from one type of tourism offering to the next, as well as between tourism products. Live music performance events can be distinguished from other types of tourism products in four ways.

Firstly, they are dependent on the performance of a specific artist or band. Secondly, the exposure is of short duration, two-three hours. Thirdly, in the case at hand, the tickets for this particular show were expensive and lastly it was very crowded. Results from the study indicated a strong relationship between value for money and motives, which is one of the key findings of this research and an aspect that should be further investigated. *Performance quality (PQ)* was confirmed as the most important factor for value for money and added to the importance of ensuring quality in terms of all aspects that related to the band or artist performance, ensuring a once-in-a-life-time experience.

**Acknowledgement:** The authors hereby acknowledge the following institutions and people. Firstly the NRF (National Research Fund) for funding, secondly all the respondents for participating in the survey and thirdly for the reviewers positive comments on this article. .

## REFERENCES

- BERRIDGE G.** 2007. Event design and experience. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- CANT M.** 2005. The importance of price. In Cant C, Brink A & Machado R (eds). Pricing management. Claremont, South Africa: New Africa Books. pp. 1-14.
- CLARK LA & WATSON D.** 1995. Constructing validity: basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment* 7(3):309–319.
- COLLINS, M., & PARSA, H. G.** 2006. Pricing strategies to maximize revenues in the lodging industry. *Hospitality Management* 25:91–107.
- CRONIN J, BRADY M & HULT T.** 2000. Assessing the effects of quality, value and customer satisfaction on consumer behavioural intentions in service environments. *Journal of Retailing* 76(2):193–218.
- DU PLESSIS E.** 2002. Competitiveness of South Africa as a tourist destination. Potchefstroom: Potchefstroom University of Christian Higher Education. (Unpublished PhD thesis.)
- DU PLESSIS F.** 2009. Introduction to services marketing. In Boshoff C & Du Plessis F (eds). 2009. Services marketing: a contemporary approach. Cape Town, South Africa: Juta. pp. 1-30.
- DWYER L, FORSYTH P & RAO P.** 2000. The price competitiveness of travel and tourism: a comparison of 19 destinations. *Tourism Management* 21(1):9-22.
- EARL PE.** 2001. Simon's travel theorem and the demand for live music. *Journal of Economic Psychology* 22(3):335–358.
- GARDIAL SF, CLEMONS DS, WOODRUFF RB, SCHUMANN DW & BURNS MJ.** 1994. Comparing consumer's recall of pre-purchase and post-purchase product evaluation experiences. *Journal of Consumer Research* 20(4):548–560.
- GEORGE R.** 2004. Marketing South African tourism. New York, NY: Oxford.

- GETZ D.** 2008. Event tourism: definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management* 29(1):403–428.
- HAARHOFF R.** 2007. An analysis of the price competitiveness of South Africa as an international tourist destination. Bloemfontein: Central University of Technology. (Unpublished DTech thesis.)
- HALLOWELL R.** 1996. The relationships of customer satisfaction, customer loyalty, and profitability: an empirical study. *International Journal of Service Industry Management* 7(4):27-42.
- HAUSMAN A.** 2011. Attribute satisfaction and experiential involvement in evaluations of live musical performance: theory and managerial implications for services. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services* 18(1):210–217.
- ISRAEL GD.** 2009. Determining the sample size. [Internet: <http://edis.ifas.ufl.edu/pd00600pdf>; downloaded on 2011-05-07.]
- KAINTH JS & VERMA HV.** 2011. Consumer perceived value: construct apprehension and its evolution. *Journal of Advanced Social Research* 1(1):20-57.
- KHAN MWA.** 2011. Value for money audit is a true sense of resource and this is the part of consultancy services. [Internet: <http://wakbs.blogspot.com/2011/03/value-for-money-vfm-audit-is-true-sense.html>; downloaded on 2012-03-13.]
- KOMPULLA R.** 2005. Pursuing customer value in tourism – a rural tourism case-study. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* 3(2):83-104.
- KRUGER M, SCHOLTZ M, SAAYMAN M & SAAYMAN A.** 2012. A marketing analysis and economic impact of the Eagles. Potchefstroom: Tourism Research in Economic Environs and Society (TREES). (Unpublished report.)
- KRUGER M & SAAYMAN M.** 2011. Attendance at the U2 concert - is it a case of 'This is a man's world?' Potchefstroom: Tourism Research in Economic Environs and Society (TREES). (Unpublished report.)
- KRUGER M & SAAYMAN M.** 2012. Listen to your heart: motives for attending Roxette live. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism* 13(3):181-202.
- LOVELOCK CH.** 2000. Service marketing. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall International..
- MANNERS B, KRUGER M & SAAYMAN M.** 2012. Managing the beautiful noise: evidence from the Neil Diamond show. *Journal of Convention and Event Tourism* 13(2):100-120.
- MAYFIELD TL & CROMPTON JL.** 1995. Development of an instrument for identifying community reasons for staging a festival. *Journal of Travel Research* 33(3):37–44.
- McCARTHY KE & JINNETT K.** 2001. A new framework for building participation in the arts. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- McCARTHY KE, ONDAATJE EH & ZAKARAS L.** 2001. Guide to the literature on participation in the arts. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- MONROE K.** 1990. Pricing: making profitable decisions. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- MOSKALYAK A.** 2008. IT facts. [Internet: <http://blogs.zdnet.com/ITFacts/?cat=10>; downloaded 2011-12-09.]
- OH H.** 2003. Price fairness and its asymmetric effects on overall price, quality, and value judgements: the case of an upscale hotel. *Tourism Management* 24(4):241-249.
- PARASURAMAN A, ZEITHAMLVA & BERRY LL.** 1985. A conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing* 49(1985):41–50.
- PELLINEN J.** 2003. Making price decisions in tourism enterprises. *Hospitality Management* 22:217–235.

- PETRICK JF.** 2002. Experience use history as a segmentation tool to examine golf travellers' satisfaction, perceived value and repurchase intentions. *Journal of Vacation Marketing* 8(4):332–342.
- SAAYMAN M & SNYMAN JA.** 2005. Entrepreneurship tourism style. Potchefstroom, South Africa: Institute for Tourism and Leisure Studies.
- SAAYMAN M & SAAYMAN A.** 2011. Clustering attendees at the Philharmonic Orchestra's Summer Festival. Lisbon, Portugal: ICATE (4<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Advances in Tourism Economics; 14-15 April.)
- SCHIFFMAN LG, KANUK LL & WISENBLIT J.** 2010. Consumer behaviour. Boston, MA: Pearson Prentice Hall.
- SHETH JN, NEWMAN BI & GROSS LG.** 1991. Why we buy what we buy: a theory of consumption values. *Journal of Business Research* 22(2):159–170.
- SINGH J.** 2011. Make your money when you buy something. [Internet: <http://www.dailynews.co.tz>; downloaded 2012-02-27.]
- SPSS.** 2010. SPSS R\_ 16.0 for Windows, [Internet: [www.spss.com](http://www.spss.com); downloaded 2011-01-12.]
- STEYN HS.** 2000. Practical significance of the difference in means. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology* 26(3):1–3.
- SWARBROOKE J.** 1995. Development and management of visitor attractions. Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- SWEENEY JC & SOUTAR G.** 2001. Consumer perceived value: the development of multiple item scale. *Journal of Retailing* 77(2):203–220.
- TAIT M.** 2009. Understanding customers. In BOSHOFF C & DU PLESSIS F (eds). 2009. Services marketing: a contemporary approach. Cape Town, South Africa: Juta. pp. 89-112.
- TUSTIN DH, LIGTHELM AA, MARTINS JH & VAN WYK HJ.** 2005. Marketing research in practice. Pretoria, South Africa: UNISA Press.
- WEAVER PA, WEBER K & MCCLEARY KW.** 2007. Destination evaluation: the role of previous travel experience and trip characteristics. *Journal of Travel Research* 45(3):333-334.
- WILKINS H, MERRILEES B & HERINGTON C.** 2007. Towards an understanding of total service quality in hotels. *Hospitality Management* 26:840–853.
- YANG Z & PETERSON RT.** 2004. Customer perceived value, satisfaction and loyalty: the role of switching costs. *Psychology and Marketing* 21(10):799-822.
- YEOMAN I, ROBERTSON M, ALI-KNIGHT J, DRUMMOND S & McMAHON-BEATTIE U.** 2004. Festival and events management: an international arts and culture perspective. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- ZEITHAML VA.** 1988. Consumer perceptions of price, quality, and value: a means-end model and synthesis of evidence. *Journal of Marketing* 52(3):2-22