International Journal of Academic Research and Development
ISSN: 2455-4197
Impact Factor: RJIF 5.22
www.academicsjournal.com
Volume 3; Issue 2; March 2018; Page No. 199-205

Examining the effect of affective experiential state with affective loyalty with special reference to theme park Chennai city in India

[1] S Bhuvaneshwari, [2] K Malar Mathi

[1] Ph.D. Full-Time Research Scholar, Bharathiar School of Management and Entrepreneur Development, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India.

[2] Professor, Bharathiar School of Management and Entrepreneur Development, Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu, India

Abstract
Theme park is defined as the permanent resource for enjoyment, amusement and entertainment. In the tourism Industry theme park plays a vital role for increasing the tourism demand. The theme of the theme park mainly concentrate with the fun of rides, water games, costumed characters and restaurants' inside of the park create several environments. The theme park has created good feeling of life time with involvement of enjoyment. In this study, the main focus is on the affective experiential factors such as physical environment, social environment, visitors of the theme park and the staffs those who are providing service to the visitors inside of the theme park. Theme parks have made significant contribution to the tourism industry in terms of revenues, and give entertainment for the people and for the benefit for the overall economy as well.

Keywords: theme park, enjoyment, amusement, environment, tourism

Introduction
The study emphasizes on the affective experiential state of the visitors and its effect on affective loyalty. Current rate of population of 1.15 billion in the country there are 120 amusement parks and 45 family entertainment centres. This indicates that the growth rate potential of Indian amusement and the theme park industry. The Indian amusement and theme park Industry is set to move double revenues Rs.4, 000 crores from Rs.1, 700 crores. Amusement park market growing at CAGR of 10.16 during 2016.Ther is more than 800 amusement parks with annual attendance of over 700 million visitors.

Affective Experential State
Affective experiential state mainly focuses on psychological fact of an individual affective system through the generation of the person mindset, feelings and emotions. The Affective experiential is measured with four variables that is physical environment, social environment, actors (visitors') and audience (staffs). Physical environment is termed as service setting of the theme park. The setting denotes design, signs and symbols. Social environment is the perception of the quality of the customer. It can be called as atmosphere of the theme park. The actors or (staffs) all the employees of the theme park they are responsible to delivered the service to the customers. They can only deliver the service to the customers. Audience (Visitors) are they who consume the service in-park.

Affective Loyalty
Affective Loyalty is defined as Reiterated conformation of customer's expectations that leads to affective form of loyalty where a particularly favourable of attitude gets developed towards particular brand. Affective loyalty is an enhanced liking for competitive brands which is associated with liking of product and experiencing satisfaction with the brand. (Oliver 1999).

Research Objective
1. To examine the demographic difference in the variable
2. To examine the effect of Affective experiential state on Affective loyalty.

Research Methodology
Area of the Research
Chennai city, India namely MGM, VGP and Queen's Land.

Sampling Unit
Visitors of the theme park the people those who visits the theme park at least twice or more than that.

Sampling Size of the Respondent
115 Respondents

Sampling Technique
Purposive sampling technique

Questionnaire Design
The structured questionnaire was used for data collection. It mainly contains the first part of the questionnaire is demographic profile of the visitors. The second part contains Affective experiential state and Affective loyalty questions.5 point likert scale is used for the factors.

Table 1

Variables	No. of item	References
AES		
Physical environment	3	Bitner, 1990: Ha & jang (2010); Kotler (1973), Barber, Goodman & Goh, (2011), Bitner (1992).
Social environment	5	Heide & Gronhaugh (2006), Kotler (1973), Bitner (1992).
Behaviour of the Audience	8	Devellies (1991),
Actors	8	Bigne et.al.,(2005)
Affective loyalty	7	Oliver (1997)

Reliability of the Item

Table 2

Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha
5	.537

There is no significant result between the factors the table indicates the Post Hoc test for the age, education, monthly Income across the social environment from the above table it can be interrupted that there is no significant difference in the opinion regarding the social environment with educational qualification and monthly income.

Analysis and Findings

The information collected with the help of questionnaire are tabulated and analyzed by using various statistical tools like one way ANOVA and Regression were used. The tables were shown given below

Table 3: Test of Variance for Age Regarding for Physical Environment, Social Environment, Actors, Behaviour of the Audience

ANOVA Table						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Physical Environment	Between Groups	16.565	3	5.522	2.159	.097
	Within Groups	283.835	111	2.557		
	Total	300.400	114			
Social Environment	Between Groups	38.774	3	12.925	3.008	.033
	Within Groups	477.017	111	4.297		
	Total	515.791	114			
Behaviour of the audience	Between Groups	49.438	3	16.479	1.554	.205
	Within Groups	1176.857	111	10.602		
	Total	1226.296	114			
Actors	Between Groups	41.535	3	13.845	1.050	.373
	Within Groups	1463.457	111	13.184		
	Total	1504.991	114			

Table 3 depicts the one way ANOVA by comparing the age of the respondents of physical environment, social environment, Audience, Actors. The table tells that there is a significant difference between the opinion among different age group with physical environment, social environment, Audience, Actors.

Table 4: Post Hoc on Different Age Group Categories across Physical Environment, Social Environment, Actors, Behaviour of The audience

Dependent variable	(i) age	(J) Age	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Physical Environment	15-24	25-34	-.38243	.44892	.829
		35-40	-.77778	.46162	.337
		41 and above	-1.22222	.53303	.106
	25-34	15-24	.38243	.44892	.829
		35-40	-.39535	.36124	.694
		41 and above	-.83979	.44892	.247
	35-40	15-24	.77778	.46162	.337
		25-34	.39535	.36124	.694
		41 and above	-.44444	.46162	.771
	41 and above	15-24	1.22222	.53303	.106
		25-34	.83979	.44892	.247
		35-40	.44444	.46162	.771
Social Environment	15-24	25-34	-1.12661	.58197	.219
		35-40	-1.47222	.59843	.072
		41 and above	-1.94444*	.69101	.029
	25-34	15-24	1.12661	.58197	.219
		35-40	-.34561	.46831	.882
		41 and above	-.81783	.58197	.499
	35-40	15-24	1.47222	.59843	.072

		25-34	.34561	.46831	.882
		41 and above	-.47222	.59843	.859
	41 and above	15-24	1.94444*	.69101	.029
		25-34	.81783	.58197	.499
		35-40	.47222	.59843	.859
Behaviour of the audience	15-24	25-34	-1.30491	.91410	.485
		35-40	-1.52778	.93996	.369
		41 and above	-2.27778	1.08537	.160
	25-34	15-24	1.30491	.91410	.485
		35-40	-.22287	.73558	.990
		41 and above	-.97287	.91410	.712
	35-40	15-24	1.52778	.93996	.369
		25-34	.22287	.73558	.990
		41 and above	-.75000	.93996	.855
	41 and above	15-24	2.27778	1.08537	.160
		25-34	.97287	.91410	.712
		35-40	.75000	.93996	.855
Actors	15-24	25-34	.94315	1.01935	.791
		35-40	-.02778	1.04818	1.000
		41 and above	-.72222	1.21034	.933
	25-34	15-24	-.94315	1.01935	.791
		35-40	-.97093	.82027	.638
		41 and above	-1.66537	1.01935	.364
	35-40	15-24	.02778	1.04818	1.000
		25-34	.97093	.82027	.638
		41 and above	-.69444	1.04818	.911
	41 and above	15-24	.72222	1.21034	.933
		25-34	1.66537	1.01935	.364
		35-40	.69444	1.04818	.911

Table 4 indicates the statistical significance present across different Age group category on physical environment, social environment, Audience, Actors which is provided by Tukeys Post Hoc method. From the above table it can be Interpreted there is a significance difference between the Age group 15-24 and 41 and above for the social environment factor. For other factors there is no significant difference.

Table 5: Test of Variance for Educational Qualification Regarding for Physical Environment, Social Environment, Actors, Behaviour of the Audience

ANOVA						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Physical Environment	Between Groups	2.140	4	.535	.197	.939
	Within Groups	298.260	110	2.711		
	Total	300.400	114			
Social Environment	Between Groups	24.711	4	6.178	1.384	.244
	Within Groups	491.080	110	4.464		
	Total	515.791	114			
Behaviour of the audience	Between Groups	46.694	4	11.673	1.089	.366
	Within Groups	1179.602	110	10.724		
	Total	1226.296	114			
Actors	Between Groups	33.861	4	8.465	.633	.640
	Within Groups	1471.130	110	13.374		
	Total	1504.991	114			

Table 5 depicts the one way ANOVA by comparing the Educational qualification of the respondents of physical environment, social environment, Audience, Actors. The table tells that there is a significant difference between the opinion among different Educational qualification physical environment, social environment, Audience, Actors.

Table 6: Post Hoc on Different Educational Qualification Categories across Physical Environment, Social Environment, Actors, Audience

Tukey HSD					
Dependent Variable	**(I) Education Qualification**	**(J) Education Qualification**	**Mean Difference (I-J)**	**Std. Error**	**Sig.**
Physical environment	secondary	diploma	.13333	1.20254	1.000
		under graduation	.60000	.98187	.973
		post-graduation	.59649	.98751	.974
		Masters or above	.45833	1.00836	.991
	diploma	secondary	-.13333	1.20254	1.000
		under graduation	.46667	.77624	.975
		post-graduation	.46316	.78336	.976
		Masters or above	.32500	.80949	.994
	under graduation	secondary	-.60000	.98187	.973
		diploma	-.46667	.77624	.975
		post-graduation	-.00351	.36278	1.000
		Masters or above	-.14167	.41621	.997
	post graduation	secondary	-.59649	.98751	.974
		diploma	-.46316	.78336	.976
		under graduation	.00351	.36278	1.000
		Masters or above	-.13816	.42934	.998
	Masters or above	secondary	-.45833	1.00836	.991
		diploma	-.32500	.80949	.994
		under graduation	.14167	.41621	.997
		post graduation	.13816	.42934	.998
Social Environment	secondary	diploma	-1.13333	1.54305	.948
		under graduation	-.22222	1.25989	1.000
		post graduation	-1.01754	1.26712	.929
		Masters or above	-1.29167	1.29388	.856
	diploma	secondary	1.13333	1.54305	.948
		under graduation	.91111	.99603	.891
		post graduation	.11579	1.00516	1.000
		Masters or above	-.15833	1.03870	1.000
	under graduation	secondary	.22222	1.25989	1.000
		diploma	-.91111	.99603	.891
		post-graduation	-.79532	.46550	.433
		Masters or above	-1.06944	.53406	.272
	post-graduation	secondary	1.01754	1.26712	.929
		diploma	-.11579	1.00516	1.000
		under graduation	.79532	.46550	.433
		Masters or above	-.27412	.55091	.987
	Masters or above	secondary	1.29167	1.29388	.856
		diploma	.15833	1.03870	1.000
		under graduation	1.06944	.53406	.272
		post-graduation	.27412	.55091	.987
Behaviour Of The Audience	Secondary	diploma	1.40000	2.39150	.977
		under graduation	1.86667	1.95265	.874
		post-graduation	.73684	1.96386	.996
		Masters or above	.41667	2.00534	1.000
	diploma	secondary	-1.40000	2.39150	.977
		under graduation	.46667	1.54371	.998
		post-graduation	-.66316	1.55786	.993
		Masters or above	-.98333	1.60983	.973
	under graduation	secondary	-1.86667	1.95265	.874
		diploma	-.46667	1.54371	.998
		post graduation	-1.12982	.72146	.522
		Masters or above	-1.45000	.82772	.407
	post graduation	secondary	-.73684	1.96386	.996
		diploma	.66316	1.55786	.993
		under graduation	1.12982	.72146	.522
		Masters or above	-.32018	.85383	.996
	Masters or above	secondary	-.41667	2.00534	1.000
		diploma	.98333	1.60983	.973
		under graduation	1.45000	.82772	.407
		post graduation	.32018	.85383	.996

Actors	secondary	diploma	1.86667	2.67072	.956
		under graduation	-.11111	2.18063	1.000
		post graduation	-.67544	2.19315	.998
		Masters or above	-.66667	2.23947	.998
	diploma	secondary	-1.86667	2.67072	.956
		under graduation	-1.97778	1.72394	.781
		post graduation	-2.54211	1.73975	.590
		Masters or above	-2.53333	1.79778	.623
	under graduation	secondary	.11111	2.18063	1.000
		diploma	1.97778	1.72394	.781
		post graduation	-.56433	.80569	.956
		Masters or above	-.55556	.92436	.975
	post graduation	secondary	.67544	2.19315	.998
		diploma	2.54211	1.73975	.590
		under graduation	.56433	.80569	.956
		Masters or above	.00877	.95352	1.000
	Masters or above	secondary	.66667	2.23947	.998
		diploma	2.53333	1.79778	.623
		under graduation	.55556	.92436	.975
		post graduation	-.00877	.95352	1.000

The Post Hoc test reveals that there is no significant difference among different categories of Educational qualification with respect to the AES Factors (Table 6).

Table 7: Test of Variance for Monthly Income Regarding for Physical Environment, Social Environment, Actors, Audience

Anova						
		Sum of Squares	**df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Physical environment	Between Groups	26.168	3	8.723	3.531	.017
	Within Groups	274.232	111	2.471		
	Total	300.400	114			
Social environment	Between Groups	32.382	3	10.794	278	.065
	Within Groups	483.410	111	4.355		
	Total	515.791	114			
Behaviour of the audience	Between Groups	55.537	3	18.512	1.755	.160
	Within Groups	1170.759	111	10.547		
	Total	1226.296	114			
Actors	Between Groups	32.284	3	10.761	.811	.490
	Within Groups	1472.707	111	13.268		
	Total	1504.991	114			

Table 7 depicts the one way ANOVA by comparing the Monthly Income of the respondents of physical environment, social environment, Audience, Actors. The table tells that there is a significant difference between the opinions among different Monthly Income with the factors affecting AES.

Table 8: Post Hoc on Different Educational Qualification Categories across Physical Environment, Social Environment, Actors, Behaviour of The Audience

Dependent Variable	(I) Monthly Income	(J) Monthly Income	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Physical environment	10000-20000	20000-30000	.62069	.41278	.439
		30000-40000	-.12017	.40007	.991
		40000 and above	-.78305	.43374	.276
	20000-30000	10000-20000	-.62069	.41278	.439
		30000-40000	-.74086	.40007	.255
		40000 and above	-1.40374*	.43374	.009
	30000-40000	10000-20000	.12017	.40007	.991
		20000-30000	.74086	.40007	.255
		40000 and above	-.66288	.42167	.399
	40000 and above	10000-20000	.78305	.43374	.276
		20000-30000	1.40374*	.43374	.009
		30000-40000	.66288	.42167	.399
Social environment	10000-20000	20000-30000	-.13793	.54804	.994
		30000-40000	-.49321	.53117	.790
		40000 and above	-1.44397	.57588	.064

	20000-30000	10000-20000	.13793	.54804	.994
		30000-40000	-.35528	.53117	.909
		40000 and above	-1.30603	.57588	.112
	30000-40000	10000-20000	.49321	.53117	.790
		20000-30000	.35528	.53117	.909
		40000 and above	-.95076	.55985	.330
	40000 and above	10000-20000	1.44397	.57588	.064
		20000-30000	1.30603	.57588	.112
		30000-40000	.95076	.55985	.330
Behaviour of the audience	10000-20000	20000-30000	-.75862	.85288	.810
		30000-40000	-1.03448	.82663	.596
		40000 and above	-2.03448	.89620	.111
	20000-30000	10000-20000	.75862	.85288	.810
		30000-40000	-.27586	.82663	.987
		40000 and above	-1.27586	.89620	.487
	30000-40000	10000-20000	1.03448	.82663	.596
		20000-30000	.27586	.82663	.987
		40000 and above	-1.00000	.87126	.661
	40000 and above	10000-20000	2.03448	.89620	.111
		20000-30000	1.27586	.89620	.487
		30000-40000	1.00000	.87126	.661
Actors	10000-20000	20000-30000	-.93103	.95656	.765
		30000-40000	-.79310	.92712	.828
		40000 and above	-1.54310	1.00515	.420
	20000-30000	10000-20000	.93103	.95656	.765
		30000-40000	.13793	.92712	.999
		40000 and above	-.61207	1.00515	.929
	30000-40000	10000-20000	.79310	.92712	.828
		20000-30000	-.13793	.92712	.999
		40000 and above	-.75000	.97717	.869
	40000 and above	10000-20000	1.54310	1.00515	.420
		20000-30000	.61207	1.00515	.929
		30000-40000	.75000	.97717	.869

Table 8 Indicates the statistical significance present across different Income categories on physical environment, social environment, Audience, Actors which is provided by Tukeys Post Hoc method. From the above table it can be interpreted there is a significance difference among 20,000-30,000 and 40,000 and above with the p value.009 for the physical environment factor. For other factors there is no significant difference.

Table 9: Model Fit Influence of Affective Loyalty and Affective Experiential State

Model Summary					
R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Sig
.557[a]	.308	.295	.64784	21.7845	.001[b]
A. Dependent variable: affective loyalty B. Predictors: (constant), actors, physical environment, social environment, behaviour of the audience					

This table shows it is inferred that the model R square value of 0.30 thus shows the components of (Actors, Physical environment, Social environment, Audience).They contribute 30% of Affective loyalty integrated in the model. The R value of 0.557 shows the moderate significant relationship (F=21.7845) between the components of (Actors, Physical environment, Social environment, Audience).The variable taken in the model explain around thirty percent of the variations and the model emerged to fit.

Table 10: Multiple Regression Results between Affective Loyalty and Affective Experiential State

Factors	Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	22.705	2.767		8.205	.000
Physical environment	2.221	.522	2.243	4.258	.001
Social environment	0.298	.092	0.298	3.229	.002
Behaviour of the Audience	-1.936	.508	-2.012	-3.807	.001
Actors	0.295	0.91	0.296	3.227	.001

The physical environment (b=2.221) is not significant and the coefficient is positive which would indicate that improvement in physical environment is related to the Affective loyalty. The Beta value of 2.24 indicates that a change of one standard deviation in physical environment will result in change of 2.24 standard deviation in Affective loyalty.

Therefore physical environment have higher impact on the Affective loyalty. The nature of Audience is not significant (.001) and the coefficient is negative. This indicates that the better behaviour of the Audience better the Affective loyalty.

Conclusion

The results indicated that the entire theme park AES component did have direct positive effect on the loyalty. The behaviour of the Audience has a negative effect on the loyalty. Age, income and educational qualification of the visitors have significant association with the variables. It is not enough in today's competitive market only to provide good theme park services. Theme park management should also offer experience that fulfil visitor's needs and elicit positive emotional feelings. Behaviour of Audience was not found to have a definite impact on visitor's emotions. For example many focus group participants commended that the misbehaviour of other park visitors such as queue-jumping and littering negatively affected their feelings and the level of enjoyment. Hence the theme park should pay attention to giving proper instructions to in-park visitors so that easily understand their roles which will enhance the theme park experience of all patrons.

References

1. Rose S, Clark M, Samouel P, Hair N, Online customer experience in e-retailing: an empirical model of antecedents and outcomes. Journal of Retailing. 2012; 88(2):308-322.
2. Yang Z, Peterson RT. Customer perceived value, satisfaction, and loyalty: The role of switching costs. Psychology & Marketing, 2004; 21(10):799-822.
3. García Gómez B, Gutiérrez Arranz A, Gutiérrez Cillán J. The role of loyalty programs in behavioral and affective loyalty. Journal of Consumer Marketing. 2006; 23(7): 387-396.
4. Bitner MJ. Evaluating service encounters: the effects of physical surroundings and employee responses. the Journal of Marketing, 1990, 69-82.
5. Ali F, Kim WG, Li J, Jeon HM. Make it delightful: Customers' experience, satisfaction and loyalty in Malaysian theme parks. Journal of Destination Marketing & Management. 2016.
6. Nguyen N, Leblanc G. Contact personnel, physical environment and the perceived corporate image of intangible services by new clients. International Journal of Service Industry Management. 2002; 13(3):242-262.
7. Pearce P. *The* Ulysses factor: Evaluating visitors in tourist settings. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
8. Mossberg, L. (2007). A marketing approach to the tourist experience. Scandinavian journal of hospitality and tourism. 2007; 7(1):59-74.
9. Mayer KJ. Human resource practices and service quality in theme parks. International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management. 2002; 14(4):169-175.
10. Oliver RL. Whence consumer loyalty?. the Journal of Marketing, 1999, 33-44.
11. Greifeneder R., Bless H, Pham MT. When do people rely on affective and cognitive feelings in judgment? A review. Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2011; 15(2):107-141.
12. Bigné JE, Andreu L, Gnoth J. The theme park experience: An analysis of pleasure, arousal and satisfaction.Tourism management, 2005; 26(6):833-844.
13. Edvardsson B, Enquist B, Johnston R. Cocreating customer value through hyperreality in the prepurchase service experience. Journal of service research. 2005; 8(2):149-161.
14. Tsang NK, Lee LY, Wong A, Chong R. THEMEQUAL—Adapting the SERVQUAL scale to theme park services: A case of Hong Kong Disneyland. Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing. 2012; 29(5):416-429.
15. Dong P, Siu NYM. Servicescape elements, customer predispositions and service experience: The case of theme park visitors. Tourism Management, 2013; 36:541-551.