



From Celebration to Continuous Improvement: A Mixed-Methods Strategic Event Management Framework

Mary Rose Montano*, Ronald A. Gonzales, Anna Rhea C. Opeña, Aveto M. Dasal Jr, Jeanne Mae L. Ilao, Armando A. Salenga Jr, Francis Eduard T. Malitig, Lyka B. Rodelas, Michael S. Navarro, Meljhon G. Mosca
City College of Calamba, Philippines

Received : December 19, 2025

Revised : February 19, 2026

Accepted : February 23, 2026

Online : March 17, 2026

Abstract

School events play a vital role in strengthening institutional identity, stakeholder engagement, and the overall educational experience. However, many higher education institutions lack systematic, evidence-based approaches for evaluating these events and translating feedback into sustained improvement. This study evaluates a school graduation ceremony at the City College of Calamba to inform strategic and data-driven institutional event management practices. Using a convergent parallel mixed-methods evaluative approach, the study collected data from 274 stakeholders through a structured survey and open-ended responses to assess satisfaction across key dimensions of event planning and execution. Overall satisfaction levels were high, with mean scores ranging from 3.44 to 3.64 on a four-point Likert scale, indicating generally positive stakeholder perceptions. Technical and production quality received the highest rating ($M = 3.64$), while registration and rehearsal processes received the lowest ($M = 3.44$), highlighting specific areas for managerial improvement. No statistically significant differences in satisfaction were found across age, role, or department ($p > 0.05$), suggesting consistent event experiences across stakeholder groups. Based on these findings, the study proposes a Strategic Event Management Framework and corresponding Action Plan that translates evaluation results into concrete institutional management strategies. By reframing school events from isolated celebrations into strategically managed organizational activities, the framework supports continuous improvement, quality assurance, and institutional accountability. The study contributes to educational and institutional management literature by demonstrating how quantitative satisfaction indicators and qualitative feedback can be integrated to guide evidence-based decision-making in higher education event management.

Keywords: *Educational Management, Stakeholder Satisfaction, Organizational Events, Continuous Improvement, Strategic Framework*

INTRODUCTION

School events play a critical role in shaping institutional identity, strengthening community engagement, and enriching the educational experience (Le et al., 2024). At the City College of Calamba (CCC), activities such as graduation ceremonies, academic programs, and institutional training extend beyond celebration by publicly reflecting institutional performance and commitment to holistic education. Despite their strategic value, these events often face logistical and coordination challenges due to the absence of systematic evaluation and data-driven reflection (Thomas & Stephens, 2022).

The literature recognizes events as strategic platforms for branding and stakeholder engagement, emphasizing structured planning, risk management, and post-event evaluation (Neus, 2020; Bowdin et al., 2023; Ayub, 2025). Evaluation models, including adaptations of the Kirkpatrick framework, underscore the importance of assessing stakeholder satisfaction and event impact in educational settings (Alsalamah & Callinan, 2021; Rucks et al., 2024). However, in Philippine higher

Copyright Holder:

© Mary, Ronald, Anna, Aveto, Jeanne, Armando, Francis, Lyka, Michael, Meljhon. (2026)
Corresponding author's email: mfmontano@ccc.edu.ph

This Article is Licensed Under:



education, such models are rarely institutionalized, and events are commonly managed operationally rather than strategically, revealing a gap in evidence-based evaluation of large-scale institutional ceremonies.

This gap is particularly relevant for local colleges and universities (LCUs) like CCC, which operate under resource constraints while facing increasing demands for accountability and institutional visibility. Although CCC regularly conducts institutional events, no validated mechanism previously existed to systematically measure stakeholder satisfaction or integrate feedback into planning. The graduation ceremony was therefore selected as the focus of this study, as it is the most resource-intensive, logistically complex, and symbolically significant event of the academic year, encompassing multiple operational dimensions of event management.

Accordingly, this study evaluates stakeholder satisfaction with the CCC graduation ceremony and develops a Strategic Event Management Framework to support continuous improvement. Specifically, it seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What is the level of satisfaction among stakeholders (e.g., students, faculty, staff) regarding the key components of the graduation event?
2. Are there significant differences in satisfaction levels when grouped according to demographic variables (e.g., age, role in the event, department/college)?
3. Which aspects of the event received the highest and lowest satisfaction ratings?
4. What recommendations can be drawn from the quantitative results to develop an improved event management framework for future school ceremonies?

Ultimately, the study contributes a replicable framework that repositions school events as strategic, quality-oriented institutional processes. By institutionalizing systematic evaluation, higher education institutions can enhance stakeholder experience, strengthen credibility, and align major events with their broader educational mission.

Theoretical Foundation and Hypothesis Development

This study is anchored on the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) framework, particularly the Plan-Do-Check-Act (PDCA) cycle, which views institutional effectiveness as a product of systematic planning, implementation, evaluation, and refinement. In academic event management, CQI positions school events as recurring institutional processes requiring structured assessment rather than one-time ceremonial activities.

Data-Driven Decision-Making (DDDM) operationalizes CQI by guiding the collection and analysis of stakeholder satisfaction data ([Sarioguz & Miser, 2024](#); [Gaftandzhieva et al., 2023](#)). In this study, quantitative ratings and qualitative feedback represent the “Check” phase of PDCA.

Stakeholder Satisfaction Theory and service quality perspectives define perceived quality as a key indicator of organizational effectiveness ([Armbrecht, 2021](#); [Crompton, 2003](#)). Accordingly, satisfaction is operationalized across measurable event dimensions such as communication, logistics, venue, technical quality, staff support, accessibility, and overall experience. The Kirkpatrick/Phillips model further supports this approach by identifying satisfaction (Reaction level) as a foundational outcome ([Alsalamah & Callinan, 2021](#); [Rucks et al., 2024](#)).

Aligned with this framework, the study tests:

H1: No significant differences in satisfaction will exist across demographic groups (age, role, and department), reflecting standardized event implementation ([Pasaco-González et al., 2023](#)).

Testing this hypothesis provides empirical grounding for the proposed Strategic Event Management Framework and ensures coherence between theory, measurement, and institutional application.

Event Management Framework

Figure 1 illustrates the conceptual framework linking the evaluation of school events, specifically the CCC graduation ceremony, to the development of a Strategic Event Management Framework for continuous improvement. The process begins with event implementation, followed by the collection of stakeholder feedback through surveys and qualitative inputs from students, faculty, and staff. These data provide an evidence-based understanding of event effectiveness, highlighting strengths, weaknesses, and patterns.

Analysis of these findings informs targeted strategies to enhance planning, coordination, communication, and execution. The framework promotes a continuous improvement cycle, where evaluation results guide future events, ensuring consistency, accountability, and quality enhancement. By institutionalizing this data-driven approach, school events become strategic tools for boosting stakeholder satisfaction, reinforcing institutional branding, and fostering organizational learning.



Figure 1. Event Management Framework

LITERATURE REVIEW

This section reviews literature on the role of school events in strengthening institutional identity, stakeholder engagement, and the educational experience, with emphasis on the City College of Calamba (CCC). It highlights the importance of strategic planning, coordination, and systematic evaluation in event management. The literature consistently underscores the need for data-driven approaches to assess stakeholder satisfaction, address recurring challenges, and support continuous improvement.

School Events as Strategic Institutional Processes

In higher education, events function not only as ceremonial occasions but as strategic platforms for institutional communication, identity formation, and stakeholder engagement (Neus, 2020). At the City College of Calamba (CCC), activities such as graduation ceremonies, academic programs, and trainings publicly reflect institutional performance and mission alignment. From a Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) perspective, these events are recurring institutional processes that require systematic evaluation to ensure effectiveness. Service quality literature

further highlight reliability, responsiveness, and coordination as key determinants of stakeholder satisfaction (Jonah et al., 2024), informing the survey constructs of this study.

While well-designed events foster student development, belongingness, and institutional loyalty (Tuten et al., 2020) and strengthen leadership and collaboration skills (Rcmadmin, 2023), the absence of structured evaluation leads to fragmented feedback and inconsistent improvement. Embedding Data-Driven Decision-Making (DDDM) within the CQI cycle enables satisfaction data to guide strategic action. Institutionalizing a Strategic Event Management Framework thus transforms event management at CCC from a logistical activity into an evidence-based, continuously improving institutional practice.

Evaluation Models and Measurement of Satisfaction

Clear key performance indicators (KPIs) are essential for evaluating event effectiveness and guiding improvement. The KPIs identified by the Indeed Editorial Team (2025) provide both quantitative and qualitative measures of participation, satisfaction, engagement, and institutional impact, positioning events as strategic institutional processes rather than isolated activities. This approach aligns with research emphasizing systematic pre- and post-event evaluation in academic settings (Damalie et al., 2022) and with expanded applications of the Kirkpatrick/Phillips model in education (Alsalamah & Callinan, 2021; Rucks et al., 2024).

Guided by these frameworks, the present study adopts a context-sensitive, multi-level evaluation model that integrates stakeholder satisfaction indicators with selected Kirkpatrick/Phillips levels, particularly Reaction/Satisfaction and Learning/Application. Consistent with Data-Driven Decision-Making (DDDM), quantitative measures (median, IQR, mean, and Kruskal–Wallis H test) provide objective performance indicators, while qualitative thematic analysis enriches interpretation within the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) cycle, supporting strategic alignment, accountability, and institutional development (Sarioguz & Miser, 2024).

Principles of Effective Event Management in the Academic Context

Understanding the multifaceted role of events is essential for effective planning. Events operate within social, legal, economic, and environmental contexts and should be treated as strategic institutional processes rather than purely logistical activities (Bowdin et al., 2023), consistent with the CQI principle of systematic planning, evaluation, and refinement. Purposeful design, coordinated execution, and post-event evaluation, supported by collaboration, budgeting, and risk management, are critical for sustained institutional impact (Lahi & Lahi, 2025).

In this study, these principles are operationalized through measurable constructs such as communication, coordination, venue and facilities management, technical execution, staff support, and risk preparedness, all of which contribute to stakeholder satisfaction. The inclusion of safety and reliability indicators is further justified by the importance of proactive risk management in addressing crowd, medical, and technical concerns (Ayub, 2025). Collectively, these perspectives support the use of structured satisfaction metrics to evaluate events and inform continuous improvement.

Strategic Frameworks in Educational Planning

Effective school event management depends on service quality dimensions such as responsiveness, reliability, and communication, which informed the operationalization of stakeholder satisfaction and the development of Likert-scale measures in this study (Jonah et al., 2024). Embedding quality practices in routine operations sustains improvement (Yangailo, 2023), while Data-Driven Decision-Making (DDDM) enhances efficiency, transparency, and innovation by

linking satisfaction data, statistical analysis, and evidence-based recommendations (Sarioguz & Miser, 2024).

Research further indicates that institutional self-evaluation strengthens adaptive capacity and continuous improvement (Gaftandzhieva et al., 2023; Koh et al., 2023). When evaluation is embedded within quality assurance systems, events evolve from isolated activities into strategic interventions (Gardezi, 2024). Together, the integration of service quality theory, CQI, and DDDM provides the conceptual basis for examining whether standardized event processes yield equitable satisfaction outcomes across stakeholder groups.

The Role of Quality Assurance, Planning, and Development Office

Institutional modernization requires aligning systems, processes, and personnel through structured quality mechanisms, with Quality Assurance (QA) professionals serving as strategic enablers of evaluation, benchmarking, and continuous improvement (Chaitanya, 2025). In this study, the QA perspective provides the governance lens for translating event evaluation data into strategic planning inputs, reinforcing CQI-DDDM integration. Evidence shows that quality initiatives are most effective when linked to organizational learning and continuous improvement (Rohman et al., 2022; Panerio, 2024). Accordingly, stakeholder satisfaction is treated as a measurable performance indicator, group comparisons test process consistency, and findings inform a Strategic Event Management Framework. This approach positions satisfaction as an outcome within a CQI-driven, data-informed institutional system rather than a purely descriptive measure.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design and Methodological Flow

This study employs a mixed-methods convergent parallel design to evaluate stakeholder perceptions of the graduation ceremony at the City College of Calamba (CCC). Quantitative and qualitative data were collected concurrently, analyzed separately, and integrated using a connecting integration strategy, where qualitative insights were used to explain and enrich quantitative trends. This approach provides a comprehensive assessment of stakeholder satisfaction and areas for improvement.

A validated survey instrument was administered using proportionate stratified random sampling. Likert-scale data were analyzed using non-parametric statistics (SPSS), while open-ended responses underwent thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke (2006). Findings from both strands were merged during interpretation, allowing triangulation of quantitative trends with qualitative narratives to strengthen the validity and depth of conclusions.

Research Instrument

A self-constructed structured survey questionnaire captured stakeholder perceptions of the graduation event, informed by literature on event evaluation, student engagement, and gender advocacy. Items were context-specific and aligned with study objectives. The instrument underwent expert validation by specialists in educational management and educational research and was pilot-tested for clarity, reliability, and usability.

Reliability analysis using Cronbach's alpha showed excellent internal consistency for the overall scale ($\alpha = .94$), with strong reliability across nine subscales ($\alpha = .85-.92$). The final instrument included two sections: demographic information (age, role, affiliation) and event evaluation indicators across nine thematic areas measured with a four-point Likert scale, totaling 45 items. Two open-ended questions captured key satisfaction points and improvement suggestions.

This instrument provided reliable, stakeholder-informed data to support the development of the Strategic Event Management Framework and CCC's continuous quality improvement in event planning.

Data Collection and Analysis

Ethical clearance was obtained from the Office of the College President, endorsed by the Vice President for Research and Innovation. The survey was distributed via Google Forms to graduating students, faculty, and staff, with participants informed of the study's purpose, voluntary participation, confidentiality, and right to withdraw. Responses were securely stored.

A total of 274 usable responses were collected from 857 stakeholders, representing a response rate of 31.96%. Proportionate stratified random sampling ensured representation across students, faculty, and staff. Quantitative data, measured on a four-point Likert scale, were treated as ordinal and summarized using median and interquartile range (IQR). The Kruskal–Wallis H test with Dunn's post-hoc pairwise comparisons and Bonferroni correction assessed differences across three stakeholder groups ($p < 0.05$) using SPSS Version 28.

Table 1a. Four-Point Likert Scale

Weight	Verbal Interpretation (VI)
4	Very Satisfied (VS)
3	Satisfied (S)
2	Unsatisfied (U)
1	Very Unsatisfied (VU)

Table 1b. Interpretation of the Kruskal-Wallis H-test

Adjusted p-value	Interpretation
$p > 0.05$	No statistically significant difference among groups (NSD)
$p \leq 0.05$	A statistically significant difference exists among groups (SSD)

Qualitative responses were analyzed manually using [Braun and Clarke's \(2006\)](#) six-phase thematic analysis. Coding began with familiarization and line-by-line coding, followed by theme development, refinement, and naming. Themes were validated through peer review with colleagues in educational research to ensure credibility. Findings were triangulated with quantitative results to contextualize trends,

for example, low satisfaction in registration was explored alongside participant comments describing specific frustrations. This integration informed a Strategic Event Management Framework to improve future CCC events.

Respondents' Description

Proportionate stratified random sampling ensured fair representation of key stakeholder groups: non-teaching staff, faculty, and graduating students. A total of 274 respondents participated: 21 non-teaching personnel (7.66%), 24 faculty members (8.76%), and 229 graduating students (83.58%). This distribution reflects students' central role while incorporating administrative perspectives. The approach enabled balanced representation, meaningful group comparisons, and comprehensive understanding of stakeholder satisfaction.

Table 2. Distribution of Respondents Based on Proportionate Stratified Random Sampling

Stakeholder Group	Total Population	Sample Size (Respondents)	Percentage of Total Sample (%)
Non-Teaching Staff (S)	73	21	7.66%
Faculty (F)	83	24	8.76%
Graduating Students (G)	701	229	83.58%
Total	857	274	100%

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

These findings may be influenced by response biases, such as social desirability, particularly among students during a celebratory event, which could contribute to consistently high median scores. However, qualitative feedback highlighting specific frustrations, along with variability in mean scores and standard deviations, provides a more nuanced view of strengths and weaknesses. All quotes are presented with de-identified participant codes (e.g., G1, S22, F5) to ensure traceability and confidentiality. The following paragraphs present the findings of this research:

Demographic Profile of the Respondents

Age Distribution

Table 3 shows that most respondents (228 or 83.21%) are aged 24 and below, reflecting the large proportion of recent graduates. The 25–34 age group follows with 23 respondents (8.39%), while older brackets comprise smaller shares: 35–44 (4.01%), 45–54 (2.19%), 55–60 (1.46%), and above 60 (0.73%). This distribution indicates a predominantly young respondent base while still incorporating perspectives from older age groups.

Table 3. Age Distribution

Age	Frequency	Percentage
24 below	228	83.21
25-34	23	8.39
35-44	11	4.01
45-54	6	2.19
55-60	4	1.46
Above 60	2	0.73
Total	274	100.00

Role Distribution

Table 4 shows that most respondents were students (229 or 83.58%), followed by faculty (24 or 8.76%) and staff (21 or 7.66%). This distribution reflects the event's inclusive nature, engaging its primary beneficiaries, students, alongside faculty and staff, ensuring diverse perspectives in evaluating its effectiveness

Table 4. Role Distribution

Role in the event	Frequency	Percentage
Graduate (G)	229	83.58
Staff (S)	21	7.66

Role in the event	Frequency	Percentage
Faculty (F)	24	8.76
Total	274	100.00

Department/Office Distribution

Table 5 shows a diverse respondent pool, led by the Department of Business and Accountancy (82 or 29.93%), followed by Teacher Education (67 or 24.45%) and Computing and Informatics (66 or 24.09%). Arts and Sciences had 28 respondents (10.22%), while other offices contributed 31 (11.31%), ensuring cross-departmental perspectives in the event evaluation.

Table 5. Department/Office Distribution

Department/Office	Frequency	Percentage
DAS	28	10.22
DBA	82	29.93
DCI	66	24.09
DTE	67	24.45
Other offices	31	11.31
Total	274	100.00

Level of Satisfaction Among Stakeholders

On Pre-Event Communication

Table 6 indicates that stakeholders were “Very Satisfied” with the graduation event’s communication (Median = 4, IQR = 1), reflecting clear, accessible, and responsive information sharing. However, timeliness and consistency of announcements (Median = 3) suggest areas for improvement. In line with [Kozanecka \(2025\)](#), enhancing early dissemination and cross-platform alignment through centralized communication tools can elevate CCC’s strategy from satisfactory to seamless under the Strategic Event Management Framework.

Table 6. On Pre-Event Communication

Indicators	Median	IQR	VI
1.1 Timeliness of announcements and reminders	3	1	S
1.2 Clarity of graduation instructions (e.g., dress code, processional)	4	1	VS
1.3 Accessibility of information via official platforms	4	1	VS
1.4 Consistency of information across channels	3	1	S
1.5 Responsiveness to inquiries and concerns	4	1	VS
Overall	4	1	VS

On Registration and Rehearsal

Table 7 shows that respondents were “Very Satisfied” with the graduation’s registration and rehearsal processes (Median = 4, IQR = 1), reflecting smooth logistics and strong staff support. However, clarity of rehearsal guidelines (Median = 3) indicates minor communication gaps. Consistent with [Wibisono et al. \(2020\)](#), adopting technology-driven tools like E-Vent and providing digital rehearsal guides or visual walkthroughs can enhance clarity and ensure participants are efficiently registered and well-prepared.

Table 7. On Registration and Rehearsal

Indicators	Median	IQR	VI
2.1 Ease of registration process	4	1	VS
2.2 Availability of staff to assist during registration	4	1	VS
2.3 Clarity of rehearsal guidelines	3	1	S
2.4 Helpfulness of the rehearsal in preparing for the event	4	1	VS
2.5 Organization of rehearsal flow	4	1	VS
Overall	4	1	VS

On Venue and Facilities

Table 8 shows that all indicators for venue and physical arrangements were rated “Very Satisfied” (Median = 4, IQR = 1), reflecting strong approval for accessibility, space, comfort, cleanliness, sanitation, and signage. Aligned with [Ardani \(2017\)](#), these results emphasize the importance of matching venue features to audience needs. The consistently high ratings demonstrate meticulous planning and effective logistics, setting a benchmark for future institutional events.

Table 8. On Venue and Facilities

Indicators	Median	IQR	VI
3.1 Accessibility of the venue	4	1	VS
3.2 Adequacy of space for attendees	4	1	VS
3.3 Comfort of seating arrangements	4	1	VS
3.4 Cleanliness and sanitation facilities	4	1	VS
3.5 Availability of directional signs and guidance	4	1	VS
Overall	4	1	VS

On Program Flow and Content

Table 9 shows that respondents were generally “Very Satisfied” with the program flow and content (Median = 4, IQR = 1). Speeches, presentations, and activity sequencing received high

ratings, while punctuality and transitions scored slightly lower (Median = 3), indicating a need for better time management and backstage coordination. Consistent with Müller-Seitz and Schüßler (2013), the results highlight how well-structured events can strengthen institutional identity. Enhancing logistical precision could further elevate the ceremony's overall impact.

Table 9. On Program Flow and Content

Indicators	Median	IQR	VI
4.1 Punctuality and adherence to schedule	3	1	S
4.2 Smoothness and coordination of program transitions	3	1	S
4.3 Quality of speeches and presentations	4	1	VS
4.4 Appropriateness of the sequence of activities	4	1	VS
4.5 Inclusion of meaningful or memorable moments	4	1	VS
Overall	4	1	VS

On Technical and Product Quality

Table 10 shows that respondents were “Very Satisfied” with the event’s technical and product quality (Median = 4, IQR = 1) across all indicators, audio, visuals, lighting, livestream, and equipment reliability. This consistency reflects strong planning and execution, with no major disruptions to engagement or delivery. Aligned with Armbrrecht (2020) and Crompton (2003), the results affirm that technical excellence enhances audience experience and institutional reputation, making it a key driver of successful and memorable events.

Table 10. On Technical and Product Quality

Indicators	Median	IQR	VI
5.1 Clarity of audio and sound system	4	1	VS
5.2 Visibility of visual materials or screen displays	4	1	VS
5.3 Effectiveness of lighting and stage setup	4	1	VS
5.4 Quality of livestream or video coverage	4	1	VS
5.5 Reliability of equipment (e.g., mic, projector, lights)	4	1	VS
Overall	4	1	VS

On Support Staff and Assistance

Table 11 shows that respondents were “Very Satisfied” with the event’s support staff and assistance (Median = 4, IQR = 1) across all indicators, visibility, helpfulness, courtesy, responsiveness, and coordination. This reflects strong professionalism and teamwork, ensuring a

smooth event flow. Consistent with [Lockstone-Binney et al. \(2019\)](#), peak staff efficiency and responsiveness were evident throughout the event. Continued excellence can be sustained through ongoing training in customer service, coordination, and emergency response, reinforcing CCC's commitment to quality event delivery.

Table 11. On Support Staff and Assistance

Indicators	Median	IQR	VI
6.1 Visibility and approachability of staff	4	1	VS
6.2 Helpfulness of ushers and marshals	4	1	VS
6.3 Courtesy and professionalism of personnel	4	1	VS
6.4 Availability of assistance for special needs or emergencies	4	1	VS
6.5 Coordination among staff during the event	4	1	VS
Overall	4	1	VS

On Graduation Attire and Tokens

Table 12 shows that respondents were "Very Satisfied" with the graduation attire and tokens (Median = 4, IQR = 1) across all indicators, quality of toga, cap, and hood; timeliness of distribution; clarity of instructions; and organization of medals and tokens. The consistently high ratings reflect efficient logistics, quality control, and attention to detail. Aligned with [Sotak et al. \(2023\)](#) and signaling theory, the well-managed attire and tokens reinforced the ceremony's formality, professionalism, and institutional integrity. Sustaining this level of satisfaction calls for maintaining current practices and conducting periodic reviews to ensure continued excellence.

Table 12. On Graduation Attire and Tokens

Indicators	Median	IQR	VI
7.1 Quality of toga/cap/hood provided	4	1	VS
7.2 Timeliness of gown distribution	4	1	VS
7.3 Clarity of instructions on wearing proper attire	4	1	VS
7.4 Organization in distributing medals/diplomas/tokens	4	1	VS
7.5 Availability of souvenirs or giveaways	4	1	VS
Overall	4	1	VS

On Transport and Accessibility

Table 13 shows that respondents were “Very Satisfied” (Median = 4, IQR = 1) with transport and accessibility, including parking, traffic flow, entrance management, signage, and inclusivity for persons with disabilities and the elderly. These results indicate effective logistical planning that reduced congestion and ensured smooth, inclusive access. Consistent with the Public Transport–Space–Time Accessibility (PT–STA) model ([Dianin et al., 2024](#)), the event addressed both functional needs and participant comfort. Maintaining current measures while adopting real-time traffic monitoring and enhanced accessibility features will further strengthen future event performance.

Table 13. On Transport and Accessi

Indicators	Median	IQR	VI
8.1 Availability of parking space	4	1	VS
8.2 Traffic flow and entrance management	4	1	VS
8.3 Clear signage for directions	4	1	VS
8.4 Accessibility for persons with disabilities or elderly	4	1	VS
8.5 Coordination with local transportation (if applicable)	4	1	VS
Overall	4	1	VS

On Overall Satisfaction

Table 14 shows a median score of 4 (IQR = 1, “Very Satisfied”) across all indicators, reflecting a well-executed, memorable event that balanced formality and enjoyment while fostering positive institutional perception. These results align with [Nordahl-Pedersen and Hegg Holmen \(2023\)](#), highlighting the importance of early engagement, collaboration, and structured planning. Future events should continue using creative, coordinated, and feedback-driven approaches to maintain high satisfaction.

Table 14. On Overall Satisfacti

Indicators	Median	IQR	VI
9.1 Overall experience as a graduate/participant	4	1	VS
9.2 Smoothness of the entire ceremony	4	1	VS
9.3 Fulfillment of expectations for a graduation event	4	1	VS
9.4 Balance between formality and enjoyment	4	1	VS
9.5 Willingness to recommend future events based on this experience	4	1	VS
Overall	4	1	VS

Significant Differences on Satisfaction Levels*Age Demographics*

Table 15 shows that the Kruskal–Wallis test found no significant differences in satisfaction across age groups ($p > 0.05$). Participants of all ages reported consistently high satisfaction (medians = 3–4), indicating that the event’s communication, logistics, and design met diverse needs. These results support H1 and align with research on inclusive service design ([Pasaco-González et al., 2023](#)), highlighting that demographic parity in satisfaction is achievable even in large-scale, formal academic ceremonies.

Table 15. On Age Demographics

Level of Satisfaction	Age	Median	IQR (Min-Max)	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Pre-event Communication (PC)	24 below	4.00	2-4	0.410	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	25-34	4.00	2-4			
	35-44	3.00	2-4			
	45-54	3.00	3-4			
	55-60	3.50	3-4			
	Above 60	3.50	3-4			
Registration and Rehearsal (RR)	24 below	4.00	1-4	0.218	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	25-34	3.00	1-4			
	35-44	3.00	2-4			
	45-54	4.00	3-4			
	55-60	3.50	3-4			
	Above 60	3.50	3-4			
Venue and Facilities (VF)	24 below	4.00	2-4	0.783	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	25-34	4.00	2-4			
	35-44	4.00	2-4			
	45-54	3.50	3-4			
	55-60	4.00	3-4			
	Above 60	3.50	3-4			
Program Flow and Content (PFC)	24 below	4.00	2-4	0.624	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	25-34	4.00	3-4			
	35-44	3.00	3-4			
	45-54	3.50	2-4			
	55-60	3.50	3-4			
	Above 60	3.50	3-4			
Technical and Production Quality (TPQ)	24 below	4.00	2-4	0.440	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	25-34	4.00	3-4			
	35-44	3.00	2-4			
	45-54	3.50	3-4			
	55-60	4.00	3-4			
	Above 60	3.50	3-4			
Support Staff and Assistance (SSA)	24 below	4.00	2-4	0.780	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	25-34	4.00	2-4			
	35-44	3.00	2-4			
	45-54	4.00	3-4			
	55-60	3.50	3-4			

Level of Satisfaction	Age	Median	IQR (Min-Max)	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
Graduation attire and Tokens (GAT)	Above 60	3.50	3-4	0.349	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	24 below	4.00	2-4			
	25-34	4.00	2-4			
	35-44	3.00	2-4			
	45-54	3.50	3-4			
	55-60	3.50	3-4			
Transportation and Accessibility (TA)	Above 60	3.50	3-4	0.549	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	24 below	4.00	2-4			
	25-34	4.00	3-4			
	35-44	3.00	2-4			
	45-54	3.50	3-4			
	55-60	3.50	2-4			
Overall Satisfaction (OS)	Above 60	3.50	3-4	0.792	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	24 below	4.00	2-4			
	25-34	4.00	2-4			
	35-44	3.00	2-4			
	45-54	3.50	3-4			
	55-60	3.50	3-4			

Roles Demographics

Table 16 shows no significant differences in satisfaction across roles ($p > 0.05$), with students, staff, and faculty all reporting high ratings (median = 4.00, IQR “Satisfied”–“Very Satisfied”). Consistent with [Balogun and Ajagunna \(2023\)](#), these results suggest that inclusive, well-coordinated planning and clear communication effectively met stakeholder needs, supporting functional excellence and institutional engagement.

Table 16. On Roles Demographics

Level of Satisfaction	Role	Median	IQR (Min-Max)	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
PC	Student	4.00	2-4	0.336	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	Staff	3.00	2-4			
	Faculty	3.50	3-4			
RR	Student	4.00	1-4	0.527	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	Staff	3.00	2-4			
	Faculty	4.00	1-4			
VF	Student	4.00	2-4	0.268	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	Staff	4.00	3-4			
	Faculty	4.00	3-4			
PFC	Student	4.00	2-4	0.542	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	Staff	3.00	2-4			
	Faculty	4.00	2-4			
TPQ	Student	4.00	2-4	0.339	Failed to	NSD

Level of Satisfaction	Role	Median	IQR (Min-Max)	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
SSA	Staff	4.00	2-4	0.408	Reject Ho	NSD
	Faculty	4.00	3-4		Failed to Reject Ho	
	Student	4.00	2-4		Failed to Reject Ho	
	Staff	4.00	2-4		Failed to Reject Ho	
	Faculty	4.00	3-4		Failed to Reject Ho	
GAT	Student	4.00	2-4	0.311	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	Staff	3.00	2-4		Failed to Reject Ho	
	Faculty	4.00	2-4		Failed to Reject Ho	
TA	Student	4.00	2-4	0.803	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	Staff	4.00	2-4		Failed to Reject Ho	
	Faculty	4.00	2-4		Failed to Reject Ho	
OS	Student	4.00	2-4	0.894	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	Staff	4.00	2-4		Failed to Reject Ho	
	Faculty	4.00	2-4		Failed to Reject Ho	

Department/Office Demographics

Table 17 shows that satisfaction ratings across departments and offices ranged from 3.00 to 4.00, with IQRs of 2-4 and all p-values above 0.05, indicating no significant differences in satisfaction levels. The DAS and DBA rated all aspects highly (median = 4.00), while the DTE and Other Offices gave slightly lower scores for pre-event communication and attire. This consistency reflects standardized communication, logistics, and program delivery, ensuring a uniformly positive experience. Minor variations highlight opportunities for targeted improvements, reinforcing fairness, inclusivity, and institutional pride across units.

Table 17. On Department/Office Demographics

Level of Satisfaction	Office	Median	IQR (Min-Max)	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
PC	DAS	4.00	2-4	0.326	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	DBA	4.00	2-4			
	DCI	4.00	2-4			
	DTE	3.00	2-4			
	Other Offices	3.00	2-4			
RR	DAS	4.00	2-4	0.164	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	DBA	4.00	2-4			
	DCI	4.00	1-4			
	DTE	3.00	1-4			
	Other Offices	3.00	2-4			
VF	DAS	4.00	3-4	0.184	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	DBA	4.00	3-4			
	DCI	4.00	3-4			
	DTE	4.00	2-4			

Level of Satisfaction	Office	Median	IQR (Min-Max)	p-value	Decision on Ho	Interpretation
PFC	Other Offices	3.00	2-4	0.448	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	DAS	4.00	3-4			
	DBA	4.00	2-4			
	DCI	4.00	2-4			
	DTE	4.00	2-4			
	Other Offices	3.00	2-4			
TPQ	DAS	4.00	3-4	0.765	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	DBA	4.00	3-4			
	DCI	4.00	3-4			
	DTE	4.00	2-4			
	Other Offices	4.00	2-4			
SSA	DAS	4.00	3-4	0.207	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	DBA	4.00	3-4			
	DCI	4.00	2-4			
	DTE	4.00	2-4			
	Other Offices	4.00	2-4			
GAT	DAS	4.00	2-4	0.320	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	DBA	4.00	2-4			
	DCI	3.00	2-4			
	DTE	3.50	3-4			
	Other Offices	3.50	3-4			
TA	DAS	4.00	2-4	0.323	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	DBA	4.00	3-4			
	DCI	4.00	3-4			
	DTE	4.00	2-4			
	Other Offices	3.00	3-4			
OS	DAS	4.00	2-4	0.298	Failed to Reject Ho	NSD
	DBA	4.00	2-4			
	DCI	4.00	3-4			
	DTE	4.00	2-4			
	Other Offices	3.00	2-4			

Highest and Lowest Satisfaction Ratings on Event Aspects

Event Aspects Satisfaction Ratings

To align with event management literature (e.g., [Armbrecht, 2020](#)), Table 18 reports mean scores and standard deviations alongside medians. Overall satisfaction was high ($M = 3.44$ – 3.64 ; $SD = 0.50$ – 0.66), with technical/production quality rated highest ($M = 3.64$) and

registration/rehearsal lowest ($M = 3.44$), indicating a need for clearer guidelines and improved coordination. The results suggest a well-executed event with minor areas for pre-event process enhancement.

Table 18. Satisfaction Summary on Event Aspects

Event Aspects	Mean	Std. Deviation	Remarks
PC	3.45	0.61	
RR	3.44	0.66	<i>lowest</i>
VF	3.60	0.55	
PFC	3.56	0.55	
TPQ	3.64	0.50	<i>highest</i>
SSA	3.58	0.54	
GAT	3.59	0.54	
TA	3.57	0.52	
OS	3.53	0.54	

Highest Satisfaction Themes

Table 19 shows graduates were most satisfied with ceremonial highlights (40 responses), followed by event flow/coordination (28) and guest speeches (22), with additional positive feedback on venue/atmosphere (18) and emotional/social impact (15). One participant (G68) noted, "Most satisfied with the processional and stage, it felt official and proud," highlighting the symbolic value of rituals. These findings align with [Tuten et al. \(2020\)](#) and suggest future events should emphasize symbolic moments, smooth coordination, engaging speakers, and improved venue aesthetics.

Table 19. Highest Satisfaction Themes

Codes / Categories	Verbatim Responses	No. it Occurs	No. of Participants Who Responded	Themes	Description of Themes
Memorable ceremonial moments	"G68: Most satisfied with the processional and stage." / G139: "Turning of the tassel was the peak."	40	40	Ceremonial Highlights	Graduates valued symbolic milestones (procession, tassel turning, diploma awarding) and meaningful speeches.
Positive event flow & organization	"F7: I am satisfied with the overall event flow." / S21: "The host managed delays well."	28	28	Event Flow & Coordination	Participants appreciated the smooth, timely, and well-organized program flow.
Inspirational speeches	"G16: Inspiring message from our	22	22	Guest Speeches &	Motivational speeches from

Codes / Categories	Verbatim Responses	No. it Occurs	No. of Participants Who Responded	Themes	Description of Themes
	guest speaker." / F18: "Senate President's quick but impactful speech."			Messages	guests, faculty, and the emcee were highlights.
Ambience, venue & visuals	"S9: Most satisfied with the venue." / "G6: Stage decoration and ambience." / "F9: Ventilation and seating arrangement."	18	18	Venue & Atmosphere	Venue aesthetics, decorations, and uplifting atmosphere received positive feedback.
Emotional connection	"G18: Heartfelt message from the MC." / "G27: Looking at our parents together." / "G89: Photo opportunities with classmates."	15	15	Emotional & Social Impact	Sentimental moments with peers and families enhanced the ceremony's emotional impact.

Least Satisfaction Themes

Table 20 shows timeliness as the main source of dissatisfaction (45 occurrences), including late starts, long waits, and extended programs. Coordination and communication issues followed (26 occurrences), along with concerns about photo opportunities (12), food (9), seating (8), and technical problems (6). One graduate (G45) noted, "Long delays waiting for the guest speaker made us tired and hungry." These results highlight the need to improve punctuality, streamline program flow, strengthen coordination, and enhance logistics and technical reliability for a more efficient and engaging graduation experience.

Table 20. Least Satisfaction Themes

Codes / Categories	Verbatim Responses	No. it Occurs	No. of Participants Who Responded	Themes	Description of Themes
Time delays & waiting	G45: "Long delays waiting for the guest speaker." / "G19: The event did not start on time."	45	45	Timeliness Issues	Late starts, long waits, and pauses caused discomfort, hunger, and disengagement.
Poor	"G57: Lack of	26	26	Coordination	Insufficient

Codes / Categories	Verbatim Responses	No. it Occurs	No. of Participants Who Responded	Themes	Description of Themes
coordination & unclear instructions	rehearsal." / G33: "Ushers unsure where to guide graduates."process."			& Communication Gaps	guidance, unclear instructions, and inconsistent rehearsals affected the program.
Seating & space concerns	"G110: Limited space between chairs." / "G205: Too cramped and hard to pass through."	8	8	Physical Comfort	Crowded seating made movement uncomfortable for graduates and guests.
Food-related dissatisfaction	"F19: Late lunch due to delays." / "S1: Porkchop was undercooked."	9	9	Catering & Refreshments	Delayed meals, venue restrictions, and subpar catering led to frustration.
Limited photo opportunities	"G37: Short time for photos on stage." / "G58: No proper stage photo provided."	12	12	Photo & Souvenir Concerns	Poorly managed photo opportunities disappointed some graduates.
Sound & technical issues	"S18: Sound system problems." / "G78: Graduation song interrupted."	6	6	Technical Limitations	Minor technical issues, including sound problems and song interruptions, disrupted the program flow.

Convergent Parallel Discussion

Quantitative results showed consistently high stakeholder satisfaction across all event dimensions ($M = 3.44\text{--}3.64$), with technical and production quality rated highest ($M = 3.64$). These findings converge with qualitative themes highlighting ceremonial highlights, program flow, venue atmosphere, and emotional impact, with narratives on the processional, stage design, tassel turning, and inspirational speeches explaining the strong ratings. The alignment of high operational

ratings with expressions of pride, belongingness, and shared achievement demonstrates complementarity between technical excellence and emotional experience, consistent with the CQI framework.

Despite overall positive evaluations, registration and rehearsal received the lowest mean score ($M = 3.44$), with qualitative feedback attributing this to delays, coordination gaps, and unclear instructions. This divergence indicates that stakeholder dissatisfaction stemmed primarily from pre-event logistical “hygiene factors,” while the on-site ceremonial experience remained strongly positive. No significant differences in satisfaction were found across age, role, or department, and qualitative responses similarly reflected shared concerns rather than group-specific issues, supporting standardized and inclusive event implementation.

Overall, the convergent analysis shows that while symbolic and emotional elements drive high satisfaction, pre-event operational inefficiencies pose the greatest risk to stakeholder experience. Strengthening punctuality, rehearsal clarity, and coordination therefore offers the greatest potential for improvement and directly informed the Strategic Event Management Framework and Action Plan, demonstrating the value of CQI- and DDDM-based mixed-methods evaluation.

Recommendations for Improvement

Table 21 shows participants prioritized punctuality, time management, and overall event organization. Key areas for improvement included delays, extended programs, seating comfort, rehearsals, staff coordination, and clear communication, along with ceremony content, technical quality, and professionalism. Food, refreshments, and photography were less critical but still affected satisfaction.

These findings align with prior frameworks emphasizing safety, inclusivity, and logistical efficiency (Carroll & Dr., 2024; Salama & Raffaelli, 2021) but highlight timeliness as the overriding concern. Careful preparation and professional execution are essential for smooth operations and reinforcing institutional reputation.

Table 21. Recommendations for Improvement

Codes / Categories	Verbatim Responses	No. it Occurs	No. of Participants Who Responded	Themes	Description of Themes
Punctuality & Time Management	“G1: Start the program on time.” “F10: Avoid waiting for latecomers.” “S5: Shorten program to avoid delays.” “G6: Ensure speakers arrive early.”	15	12	Punctuality & Time Management	Adhere to schedules to maintain engagement and efficiency.
Space & Seating Arrangement	“S20: Provide more space between	8	6	Comfort & Accessibility	Provide a safe, comfortable, and accessible

Codes / Categories	Verbatim Responses	No. it Occurs	No. of Participants Who Responded	Themes	Description of Themes
	graduates' chairs." "F12: Ensure venue can accommodate attendees." "G26: Better crowd control." "F20: More parking areas."				environment.
Preparation & Rehearsals	"F5: Advance preparation weeks before event." "G28: More rehearsals, especially for hooding." "S2: Clear role assignments for staff." "S19: Avoid last-minute planning."	14	11	Event Readiness	Ensure early preparation, clear roles, and rehearsals for smooth execution.
Communication & Announcements	"G17: Clear and timely announcements." "S21: Include detailed program in group chats." "G10: Consistency in toga distribution info." "S14: Communicate roles to ushers and marshals."	12	9	Information Flow	Deliver clear, consistent, and timely communication.
Flow & Organization of Program	"G1: Maintain consistent procession	10	8	Program Flow & Coordination	Maintain seamless movement and

Codes / Categories	Verbatim Responses	No. it Occurs	No. of Participants Who Responded	Themes	Description of Themes
	flow.” “S3: Better coordination among marshals.” “S2: Avoid sudden changes in program.” “S12: Assign more marshals for large crowds.”				coordination during the event.
Ceremony Content & Enhancements	“G16: Allow graduates to hug parents briefly.” “G22: Invite inspiring guest speakers.” “F15: Separate special awards to shorten event.” “G3: Maintain ceremony solemnity.”	6	5	Ceremony Experience	Enhance the ceremony’s emotional, inspirational, and formal impact.
Food & Refreshments	“G17: Provide snacks or water at seats.” “Pre-order meal system.” “S2: Ensure staff have time to eat.”	5	4	Hospitality	Provide refreshments and accommodate staff and attendees.
Technical Quality	“S12: High quality sound system.” “Test AV and technical equipment.”	4	3	Technical Reliability	Ensure reliable and tested technical equipment.
Photography & Mementos	“G18: Official photoshoot in program.” “Ensure all	3	2	Souvenir & Documentation	Organize photography and timely release of

Codes / Categories	Verbatim Responses	No. it Occurs	No. of Participants Who Responded	Themes	Description of Themes
	graduates get fair coverage.” “Release diplomas and photos same day.”				mementos for lasting memories.
Behavior & Professionalism of Staff	“G43:: Improve marshals’ professionalism.” “G95: Avoid visible frustration.” “Maintain respectful tone.”	3	3	Staff Conduct	Promote staff professionalism, courtesy, and composure.
Other Suggestions	“F17: Provide clear venue directions.” “Better parking and crowd control.” “Shorten waiting time.”	4	3	Logistics	Optimize logistics for convenience and smooth event flow.

Proposed Event Management Action Plan

The Event Management Action Plan (EMAP) targets eight core areas, pre-event communication, registration and rehearsal, venue and facilities, program flow and content, technical quality, support staff, graduation attire, and transport/accessibility, by defining clear objectives, activities, timelines, and success indicators. This structured approach ensures systematic planning, efficient delivery, and measurable outcomes. Complementing the EMAP, the Event Management Plan (EMP) consolidates all event details, including schedules, logistics, budgets, and contingencies, into a single reference for alignment and coordination (Thomas & Stephens, 2022). Together, EMAP and EMP promote data-driven decisions, cohesive teamwork, and continuous quality improvement. They provide a scalable model for school event management, supporting enhanced participant satisfaction, smooth operations, and iterative refinement for future events.

Table 22. Event Management Action Plan

Event Aspect	Objective	Key Activities	Timeline	Success Indicator
Pre-event Communication	Ensure clear and timely communication	Disseminate event guidelines via email, social media, printed materials; conduct staff briefings	2 months–1 month before	≥90% participants report clarity; ≥95% staff understand roles

Event Aspect	Objective	Key Activities	Timeline	Success Indicator
Registration & Rehearsal	Streamline process and readiness	Implement efficient registration system; assign rehearsal roles; conduct dry-run; prepare timeline in advance	3–1 month before	Reduced registration waiting time; rehearsals run smoothly; all preparations completed 2 weeks prior
Venue & Facilities	Provide comfortable, accessible venue	Conduct site inspections; coordinate seating, lighting, sound; ensure accessibility	3–1 month before	Positive feedback on comfort, accessibility; no overcrowding complaints
Program Flow & Content	Deliver engaging, timely program	Curate agenda; enforce schedule; improve graduate flow; include meaningful segments; manage awards and program length	2 months–event day	≥95% participants find program engaging; ceremony starts/ends within 5 minutes of schedule; main event duration reduced ≥20%
Technical & Production Quality	Ensure high technical standards	Hire professional AV team; conduct technical rehearsals	1 month before	High satisfaction score on sound, lighting, and AV quality
Support Staff & Assistance	Provide excellent assistance and welfare	Train staff for ushering, troubleshooting; provide refreshments and breaks; improve logistics	1 month–event day	Participants rate staff ≥4.0; no complaints on staff behavior or fatigue
Graduation Attire & Token	Ensure quality and timely delivery	Coordinate early with suppliers; check gown and token quality	2 months before	Zero complaints on attire or token quality
Transport & Accessibility	Facilitate easy access	Arrange shuttle services, parking plans, and transport info	2 weeks before	Participants report smooth access to venue

CONCLUSIONS

This study underscores the value of a structured, responsive approach to managing large-scale academic events. Evaluation identified strong technical and program quality alongside areas for improvement in pre-event communication, registration, venue readiness, and transport, informing the development of an Event Management Framework and Action Plan. Findings show

that operational “hygiene factors,” particularly punctuality and coordination, drive dissatisfaction even when ceremonial elements are highly rated, highlighting the primacy of foundational logistics in institutional planning. By operationalizing continuous improvement through a PDCA-based Event Management Action Plan, the framework translates data-driven insights into actionable strategies that enhance operational efficiency and stakeholder experience, offering a practical guide for sustained institutional excellence.

LIMITATION & FURTHER RESEARCH

This study has limitations that should be considered when interpreting the findings. The reliance on self-reported satisfaction ratings may introduce response bias and may not capture all dimensions of the event experience. In addition, the focus on a single institution’s graduation ceremony limits the generalizability of the results. While the study examined core event management aspects such as communication, logistics, and program flow, other factors, including cultural context, emotional impact, and long-term outcomes, were not fully explored. Future research may incorporate interviews or focus groups, assess the framework across multiple event cycles, and extend the analysis to diverse institutions and event types to strengthen validation and applicability.

REFERENCES

- Alsalamah, A., & Callinan, C. (2021). Adaptation of Kirkpatrick’s four-level model of training criteria to evaluate training programmes for head teachers. *Education Sciences*, 11(3), 116. <https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci11030116>
- Ardani, E. G. (2017). The importance of the venue selection in an event organization: Case study special event organization Rencontre Alumni Entreprise 1 & 2. *E-Journal of Tourism*. <https://doi.org/10.24922/eot.v4i1.30168>
- Armbrecht, J. (2021). Event quality, perceived value, satisfaction and behavioural intentions in an event context. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 21(2), 169–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2021.1877191>
- Armbrecht, J., Lundberg, E., Andersson, T. D., & Mykletun, R. J. (2020). 20 years of Nordic event and festival research: A review and future research agenda. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2020.1823245>
- Ayub, A. (2025, July 11). *Event risk management: 7 safety risks to plan for*. vFairs. <https://www.vfairs.com/blog/event-risk-management/>
- Balogun, K., & Ajagunna, A. (2023). Exploring the influence of demographic factors on perceptions of festival tourism in Ilara-Mokin, Nigeria: A social exchange analysis. *Journal of Tourismology*, 9(2), 169–179. <https://doi.org/10.26650/jot.2023.9.2.1297439>
- Bowdin, G. A. J., McDonnell, I., Harris, R., O’Toole, W., Allen, J., & Jago, L. (2023). *Events management* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003044963>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Carroll, E., & McCarthy, C. M. (2024, November). *Enhancing event reputations: Insights and recommendations for secure and engaging experiences*. Digital Commons @ DePaul University.
- Chaitanya, K. (2025, April 30). *Quality-driven transformation: The strategic role of QA in modernization*. Thoughtworks.
- Crompton, J. L. (2003). Adapting Herzberg: A conceptualization of the effects of hygiene and motivator attributes on perceptions of event quality. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(3), 305–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287502239039>

- Damalie, I. F., Agbanu, P., Fiadzomor, P., & Akrong, S. (2022). Evaluation, an effective tool for performance assessment of workshops and events towards policy direction in university education in Ghana. *Open Access Library Journal*, 9(10), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oalib.1109277>
- Dianin, A., Gidam, M., Hauger, G., & Ravazzoli, E. (2024). Measuring public transport accessibility to fixed activities and discretionary opportunities: A space-time approach. *European Transport Research Review*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12544-024-00636-2>
- Gaftandzhieva, S., Hussain, S., Hilcenko, S., Doneva, R., & Boykova, K. (2023). Data-driven decision making in higher education institutions: State-of-play. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 14(6). <https://doi.org/10.14569/ijacsa.2023.0140642>
- Gardezi, S. (2024). The development and status of self-evaluation as a component of school inspection and quality assurance: A comparison across four countries. *Heliyon*, 10(20), e39321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2024.e39321>
- Indeed Editorial Team. (2025, July 25). *17 KPIs to track the success of an event*. Indeed Career Guide.
- Jonah, I. G., Awara, N., James, E. E., & Horace, O. L. (Eds.). (2024). *Enhancing service quality in the event planning sector*. Faculty of Management Science.
- Koh, G. A., Askill-Williams, H., & Barr, S. (2023). Sustaining school improvement initiatives: Advice from educational leaders. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 34(3), 298–330. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09243453.2023.2190130>
- Kozanecka, B. (2025, January 20). *From chaos to clarity: Best practices for event communication strategy*. 6Connex.
- Lahi, A., & Lahi, A. (2025, January 26). *Event coordination: Ultimate guide with tips and best practices*. Mirorim.
- Le, T. H., Novais, M. A., Arcodia, C., Berchtenbreiter, R., Humpe, A., & Nguyen, N. (2024). How authenticity in events fosters social sustainability: Towards an authenticity ecosystem and implications for destination management. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 51, 101222. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2024.101222>
- Lockstone-Binney, L., Hanlon, C., & Jago, L. (2019). *Staffing for successful events: Having the right skills in the right place at the right time*. Victoria University.
- Müller-Seitz, G., & Schüßler, E. (2013). From event management to managing events. In *Managementforschung* (pp. 193–226). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-02998-2_6
- Neus, F. (2020). Event portfolio management – The case of higher education institutions. In *Handel und internationales Marketing* (pp. 59–77). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-29262-1_5
- Nordahl-Pedersen, H., & Heggholmen, K. (2023). What factors contribute to success in an event project? *Procedia Computer Science*, 219, 1946–1953. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2023.01.494>
- Panerio, C. J. (2024). Quality assurance, continuing quality improvement, and research productivity outcomes. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5002465>
- Pasaco-González, B. S., Campón-Cerro, A. M., Moreno-Lobato, A., & Sánchez-Vargas, E. (2023). The role of demographics and previous experience in tourists' experiential perceptions. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3768. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043768>
- Rcmadmin. (2025, April 12). *The importance of events in shaping the success of management students*. Regional College of Management.
- Rohman, F., Noermijati, N., Mugiono, M., & Soelton, M. (2022). The role of quality assurance in improving the distribution of organizational performance. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, 11(1), 237–248. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.uscm.2022.10.003>
- Rucks, L., Wingate, L., López, M., Becho, L. W., FitzGerald, M., & Dean, K. L. (2024). Leveraging the

- Kirkpatrick four-level model to evaluate evaluation capacity building work. *New Directions for Evaluation*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ev.20619>
- Salama, M., & Raffaelli, Y. (2021). *Event management: A sustainable project management perspective*. Goodfellow Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.23912/9781911635734-4785>
- Sarioguz, O., & Miser, E. (2024). Data-driven decision-making: Transforming management in the information age. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*. <https://doi.org/10.56726/irjmets49577>
- Sotak, K. L., Serban, A., Friedman, B. A., & Palanski, M. (2023). Perceptions of ethicality: The role of attire style, attire appropriateness, and context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 189(1), 149–175. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-023-05347-7>
- Thomas, K., & Stephens, S. (2022). Understanding the management theory in event management: A conceptual framework. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4051469>
- Tuten, J. H., Westcott, K. M., & White, W. J. (2020). Understanding gains from on-campus cultural events. *Journal of Campus Activities Practice and Scholarship*, 2(2), 55–66.
- Wibisono, Y. P., Primasari, C. H., & Kurniawan, S. R. S. (2020). Analysis of event marketing, registration, and ticketing digitalization. *Jurnal Teknik Informatika dan Sistem Informasi*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.28932/jutisi.v6i1.2199>
- Yangailo, T. (2023). Understanding strategic planning and continuous improvement. *Economia Aziendale Online*. <https://doi.org/10.13132/2038-5498/14.4.1141-1155>