

Event evaluation and design : human experience mapping

BEARD, Colin <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3836-3072>> and RUSS, William

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/14071/>

This document is the Published Version [VoR]

Citation:

BEARD, Colin and RUSS, William (2017). Event evaluation and design : human experience mapping. *Event Management*, 21 (3), 365-374. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

EVENT EVALUATION AND DESIGN: HUMAN EXPERIENCE MAPPING

COLIN BEARD AND WILLIAM RUSS

Sheffield Business School, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK

This article reports a phenomenological evaluation of a small-scale cause-related event. Three complementary methods were applied to the interpretation of data obtained from interviewing participants who took part in an event involving the experience of sleeping on the streets with homeless people in a city in the UK. The participant experience data were first explored by applying a simple multiphasic interpretation. A second layer of exploration involved separating the data into six human experience dimensions. A third and final interpretation method involved the collaborative construction of a schematic map as a composite-summative expression of the data. In order to further explore this collaborative schematic data interpretation approach, and its potential for application in event design, experience mapping has subsequently undergone further field trials with event experience designers from a range of private and public organizations across the globe, notably Singapore, Prague, Hong Kong, India, and the UK.

Key words: Event research; Event design; Phenomenology; Human experience mapping

Introduction: Experience Design

In every event “there is the intent to create, or at least shape the individual and collective experiences of the audience or participants. By definition, events are experiential and the experience must be designed” (Getz, 2007, p. 20). The events industry is very much concerned with the challenges of evaluating, designing, and delivering experiences; to understand and define the essence of the human experience is therefore imperative (Peperkamp, Rooijackers, & Remmers, 2015; Poulsson & Kale, 2004; Walls, Okumus, Wang, & Kwun, 2011). Brown

(2014) suggests that an emerging professionalism is occurring within the events industry, and that a paradigm shift has occurred with a clear movement “from event management predominant to event (or experience) design dominant” (p. 20). The more insight the events industry can gain about the consumption of experiences, the more the design of event experiences can develop as a predictive skill, based upon informed and purposeful action (Berridge, 2012).

How then is an event experience special in a way it might differ from an “everyday” experience? A number of authors take up the comparison of *an experience* with *everyday experiencing*: the

difference, it is suggested, is that an event experience should possess a “wow factor,” and it should be memorable and special, and conceivably unique (Berridge, 2012; Mehmetoglu & Engen, 2011; Pine & Gilmore, 1999). However, experience is a complex, multidimensional conception, with foundational roots in many fields and disciplines, within both the social sciences and the natural sciences. The literature concerning consumer experiences reveals “a wide-ranging and perplexing set of definitions and theoretical meanings,” partially explained by this multidisciplinary (Walls et al., 2011, p. 10). Furthermore, individuals construct their own unique experiences, based on their perception, and the experience will be heavily influenced by factors such as personal needs, past experiences, and selective sensory focusing (McIntyre & Roggenbuck, 1998). Experiences are not static, but fluid, generating an ever-changing perceptual novelty, and people want to have experiences that “dazzle their senses, touch their hearts, and stimulate their minds” (Schmitt, 1999, p. 22). A number of difficulties also arise when attempting to understand human experiences: experience is a slippery concept, variably “read” so that a complete understanding is elusive. Burr (2003) suggests that some experiences are resistant to description, and therefore “extra discursive,” and in a similar vein Sheets-Johnstone (2009) notes that the “gap between experiential and the linguistic is not easily bridged” (p. 239). Thus, as Pettersson and Getz argue (2009), “experiences cannot be fully designed, they are both personal (i.e., psychological) constructs that vary with the individual, as well as being social and cultural constructs related to influences on the individual and the (often) social nature of events” (p. 310).

Therefore, the meaning derived from any event is uniquely perceived by individuals: given the additional problem of a disparate event audience the design of the event experience is always going to be an inexact science, and so there will always be part of the event experience that resists any intention to homogenize. Despite such problems event designers remain highly influential in shaping whether attendee experiences are basic, memorable, or transforming (Hover & van Mierlo, 2006). Event design is an art and a science; event designers are choreographers, facilitators, artists, and curators, as well as organizers. This article contributes to the exploration

and understanding of human experiences within event design.

The Human Experience: A Literature Review

A number of schools of thought on consumer behavior have developed over time. The post-war (1950s) “rational” school of thought began to wane and by the 1970s a new wave of interest in consumer behavior developed and matured as the “emotional” school of thought. By the end of the 20th century a number of authors developed convergent thinking about an emerging “experience” focus, with Schmitt (1999) producing a key text on *Experiential Marketing*, in which he referred to a “new century of marketing” (p. 11), and Pine and Gilmore (1999) producing a key work on the *Experiential Economy*. Now, in the early 21st century, the continuing shift to experiences has resulted in a need to have more advanced understanding, particularly as experience design is being influenced by a renewed interest in the commercial applications of neuroscience and evolutionary psychology. This has moved experience design to a more sophisticated level, and a number of companies that focus on experience design are becoming conversant with a considerable body of research about the psychology, neuroscience, and chemistry that drives human behavior. Equipped with new scientific knowledge specific human experiences are being fashioned, and, in some cases, deliberately designed to be addictive in form. Recent book titles such as *Addiction by Design* (Schull, 2012), *The Power of Habit* (Duhigg, 2012), *Impulse* (Lewis, 2013) and *Hooked* (Eyal, 2014) all affirm such developments, in that they articulate how experiences can be made more compelling by applying habit forming, persuasive technologies that intentionally mold human life.

To illustrate the new science underpinning experience design we briefly draw attention to two contemporary examples of Kidzania and Disney. Kidzania is an experience design concept targeted at young people, with *play, experience, and learning* the three stated components within a real, scaled down shopping mall where kids spend money on play and leisure, and earn money by doing work at sponsored outlets. Promotional material reports that psychologists were and are extensively consulted in the development of every KidZania location

(<http://www.kidzania.com>). Similarly, the Disney experience is said to use new scientific understanding, with Loeffler and Church (2015) suggesting that Disney's theme parks demonstrate how the Disney experience focuses on four cognitive drivers that release the drugs of positive emotion that stimulate the human brain in reaction to a specific experience. The four natural drugs said to be used to hook children into the experience of pleasure at Disney, receiving specific mention, are serotonin, oxytocin, dopamine, and endorphin. The new science underpinning experience design is evident in these two cases.

However, there is much contention over what aspects of the human experience should be considered as most important, particularly in terms of "experiential value" (Peperkamp et al., 2015). The extent to which an event experience is socially (with other people), psychologically (inner psyche/self), emotionally (feelings), cognitively (mind/thinking), environmentally (space/place/more-than-human world), or otherwise constructed is central to this debate. Mannell and Kleiber (1997), for example, suggest that all experiences have three essential dimensions: the cognitive dimension (thinking), the conative dimension (acting/doing), and the affective dimension (emotions/feelings). Getz (2007) similarly suggests that experiences should be studied in terms of these three interrelated dimensions:

what people are doing, their behaviors ("conative" dimension), their emotions, moods, and attitudes ("affective" dimension), and their knowledge, awareness, perception, understanding ("cognitive" dimension). These three aspects of event experience design are commonplace within the literature, although other authors suggest that there are other equally important dimensions. For example, O'Sullivan and Spangler (1999) present a comprehensive overarching notion of event experience, suggesting that any experience involves:

Participation and involvement; the state of being physically, mentally, socially, spiritually, and emotionally involved; the changing knowledge, skill, memory, or emotion; a conscious perception of having intentionally encountered, gone to live through an activity or event; and effort that addresses a psychological need. (p. 23)

In a similar vein, Beard and Wilson (2013) take a multidisciplinary approach to create six significant aspects of the human experience, notably belonging, being, sensing, doing, knowing, and feeling.

Table 1 summarizes some of the wide-ranging views about the key aspects of the human experience emerging at the start of the 21st century. Event design is currently facing fresh challenges as further knowledge unfolds, and the multiple dimensions of human experience receive renewed attention.

Table 1
The Contested and Complex Nature of Human Experience

Author(s)	Important Dimensions of the Event Experience	No. of Core Dimensions
Beard and Wilson (2002)	Belonging, doing, sensing, feeling, knowing, being (inner- and outer-world experiences).	6
Rossmann (2003)	Interacting people, physical setting, objects, rules, relationships, and animation.	6
Schmitt (1999)	Acting, feeling, relating, sensing, feeling. "Dazzle their senses, touch their hearts, and stimulate their minds." The experience involves the entire living "being."	5
McIntyre and Roggenbuck (1998)	Individual world—relational outer world experiences. Environment/nature, self and internal thoughts, others, emotions, and task/activity.	5
O'Sullivan and Spangler (1998)	Physically, mentally, emotionally, socially, or spiritually.	5
Bitner (1992)	Cognitive, emotional, physiological.	3
Mannell and Kleiber (1997)	The cognitive (thinking), the conative (acting/doing), and the affective (feelings).	3
Mannell (1984)	A state of mind.	1
Thorne (1963)	Sensual, emotional, cognitive, conative, self-actualization, climax/peak experiences.	6

Methodology

This research article seeks to contribute to the understanding of event experiences through a case study where innovative phenomenological approaches were applied to the understanding of human experiences. The case study, a dissertation topic by an undergraduate student (Russ, 2014) at a UK University, relates to a church-based, not-for-profit organization that developed the “Cathedral Archer Project” (CAP), which uses a broad crisis intervention approach to support people to progress out of homelessness. The awareness-raising experiential event we investigated is popularly known as the “sleep out,” which is a small part of the work of the CAP. This sleep-out experience qualifies as an event in that it is a temporal phenomenon, with a beginning and an end, planned and publicized in advance, and taking place in specific locations (Getz, 2007). It can be further classified, according to Getz (2007) as a cause-related event in that it is underpinned by a charitable act of compassion and designed to “raise money, or to promote a cause, which makes them part of social marketing” (p. 26).

It is suggested that phenomenology has not yet been widely or systematically applied to the event management field despite being a methodological approach that can be used for an in-depth examination of event experiences (Ziakas & Boukas, 2014), and a goal of phenomenology is to enlarge and deepen understanding of the range of immediate experiences (Spiegelberg, 1982). Getz also argues (2008) that “the experiential nature of travel and events requires phenomenological approaches” (p. 422). A phenomenological approach for understanding the sleep-out experience data was developed by the dissertation supervisor, and underpinned by three theoretical foundations: *phenomenology*, to get closer to the lived experiences of the event participants; *hermeneutics*, as a theory of understanding and interpreting textual forms; and *idiographic interpretation*, in that we focus on how individuals make sense of their experiences. Interpretative phenomenology is the basis for our methodology, and the supervisor chose to explore innovative ways for interpreting the event experience data with the student researcher. The term *interpretation* is used

throughout this article in recognition that the term analysis is problematic in phenomenology, implying a breaking into parts that may lead to a loss of the *whole* (Hycner, 1999).

Eleven participants who attended one specific sleep-out experience were contacted to take part in this small-scale research project; the final sample consisted of six in-depth, semistructured, audio recorded interviews. The interviews took place several months after the event and so data were based on memorable experiences. Participants were encouraged to talk freely about their experiences within multiphasic questioning parameters (Multiphasic Analysis is a term created by Clawson & Knetsch in 1966), related to antecedent experiences before the event (e.g., prior relationship with the charity; motivation to attend), involvement and engagement during the event (e.g., tell me about your experiences; most engaging aspects), and the reversion to normal life after the sleep-out event (e.g., changed views of the homeless; positive conversations with friends). This original interview data were first interpreted within this temporal (chronological) journeyed focus. Two further interpretations were then applied.

The second interpretation involved a disaggregation of the original data into themes, notably the six human experience dimensions derived from the work of Beard and Wilson (2013): (1) sensory-bodily experiences, (2) affective experiences, (3) cognitive experiences, (4) conative experiences, and experiences relating to (5) belonging and (6) being. In reality no boundaries exist between these six dimensions as they are inextricably intertwined to form the whole. Davis and Sumara (1997) regard any artificial segregation as problematic, arguing rightly that any “focus of enquiry is not so much on the components of experience but, rather, on the relations that bind these elements together in action” (p. 108).

Concerns about disaggregation (Hycner, 1999) were overcome by applying a third interpretive process, which we termed *experience mapping*. This involved a collaborative construction of a schematic representation or experience map, as a summative visual representation of the “whole” whereby relations were bound together (Davis & Sumara, 1997). This group mapping process was initially trialed with groups (4–5 people) from delegates attending

a conference of the Association of Event Management Education held in Sheffield, UK in 2015. Conference attendees, considered to be “strangers” to the research (Denscombe, 2003), were given time to read data from the first two interpretations and then asked to transpose (by scribbling) *data they felt had significance, or of interest to them as individual interpreters*, onto six-foot-long rolls of paper on a desk top surface. The map was divided into three zones representing the three chronological phases, and when mapping was completed delegates had to explain their interpretations of the participant experiences to other participating groups. Each group was asked to first complete a “dress rehearsal” of this process before the final presentation.

After the completion and submission of the student dissertation a further set of experience mapping field trials were opportunistically conducted by the supervisor, while attending a range of global events. These trials resulted in further data being collected about participant views on the experience mapping processes. The events were as follows: (1) 45 educators attending the Cocurricular and Extracurricular Education Internal Conference, Ministry of Education, Singapore (October 17, 2014); (2) 25 lecturers, outdoor sports, and experiential educators attending the International Mountain & Outdoor Sports Conference, Prague, Czech Republic (November 20–23, 2014); (3) 30 experiential event designers from Kadoorie Farm and Botanical Gardens in Hong Kong (2015); (4) 40 outdoor experiential educators attending the Experiential Educators Conclave, Mumbai, India (December 11–13, 2015); and (5) 60 people in the US, who educate, train, and develop ambassadors and diplomats (May 2016).

Results

First Interpretations: A Multiphasic Focus

Space restrictions allow only short illustrative descriptions of the results of the three methods we applied to data interpretation, and so we will concentrate on the results from methods two (six-dimensional interpretation) and three (schematic experience mapping). The first data interpretation approach offered a simple chronological and

sequential understanding of the participant experiences, with a particular focus on the conative (doing): we first went to . . . then we were shown around . . . then we got our cardboard to sleep on.

Second Stage Interpretation: Segregation Into Six Experience Dimensions

Our second interpretation involved a disaggregation of the original data into the six core human experiential dimensions. This created several new lenses through which we explored the complexity of the event experiences, notably the sensorial, affective, cognitive, conative, being, and belonging aspects of the experience. A sample of findings from this second phenomenological approach is presented below to offer an insight into this layer of interpretation. Key words are highlighted in italics in order to foreground the dimensions located within the narratives.

Dimension 1: Participant Sensorial Experiences.

The data from the sleep-out event with homeless people evidence the importance of the sensorial experience, and the relational connection of the senses to feeling and thinking:

I remember thinking that the *trees rustling* was quite a *nice noise* but I wondered what that might be like if you were *cold and hungry* and, I mean I was in my *cozy warm sleeping bag* and it made me think what would it be like if it was *pissing with rain* and I was *under this tree*, you know. Would I be *getting wet*? Would the *leaves be making that noise*? Would I be thinking *how lovely they are*? Would I be *looking at the stars* thinking gosh, you know. Or would I be *stuck* in a doorway or whatever so it did make me think about the surroundings that I was in. And I knew that I had people round about me, if I had been on my own I'd have felt incredibly vulnerable. (Participant 2)

Dimension 2: Participant Emotional Experiences.

Human psychology suggests that we focus our experience on bad things and these experiences are said to be more prevalent than good (Baumeister, Bratslavsky, Finkenauer, Vohs, & Salovey, 2001); human survival adaptations create this dominant emotional dynamic, with attention directed more

frequently at potentially negative scenarios. If negative emotional experiences appear as more significant it is important for designers to acknowledge how the human condition gives prioritization for survival. Sleep-out event data presented above in the sensory data reinforce this; these negative emotions occur throughout participant data, revealing a milieu of emotional experiences: "If I had been on my own I would have felt incredibly *venerable*" (Participant 2).

One person had previously completed an abseil to raise money for the charity:

The abseiling ones were just *terrifying*. What's more . . . I think you kind of do that, and then forget about the charity, not forget about the charity but it doesn't give you the same ties and *emotional connection* towards the charity as the sleep-out did. (Participant 4)

Dimension 3: Participant Experiences of Knowing. The participant desire for knowledge in order to understand the cause and the reality of the homeless is significant. Data reveal a pervasive acquisition and, in the opinion of participants, to experience the sleep out is to really *know* and appreciate homelessness. The sleep out did produce a change in perception and an increased awareness of the plight of homeless people. The following extracts illustrate cognitive dimensions of participant experiences:

Would I be looking at the stars thinking gosh, *you know*. Or would I be stuck in a doorway or whatever so it did *make me think* about the surroundings that I was in. (Participant 2)

I *thought* it was little more than a soup kitchen to be honest, I *didn't realize* how much they were involved with the clients. (Participant 5)

It just made us more *knowledgeable*. (Participant 1)

Dimension 4: Participant Experiences of Doing Things. The data reveal how the conative (active, behavior, agency) dimensions of the experience play an important role in the sleep-out event. Participant comments suggest that the sleep out offered high levels of perceived reality and engagement. Participants made reference to three levels of engagement

with the charity, similar to findings from Hover and van Mierlo (2006) and how this event aligned with their sense of the reality of the experience (Binstead & Stuart, 1979). The basic level of engagement is simply giving money, with low experience reality: it is passive, with little or no engagement. Sponsored adventure experiences, like abseiling or skydiving, although memorable, were perceived as low reality experiences with little connection to the cause. However, the act of sleeping out appears to have a high perceived reality and high engagement that is not only memorable but potentially transformative (Hover & van Mierlo, 2006):

I walk past people begging in the subway, every single day and that kind of constantly reinforces that, you know, *something needs to be done* and that perhaps the Cathedral Archer is a good way of *contributing*. (Participant 6)

It was more the talk and the tour around the facilities about what they *actually do*. A bit more detail about all the depth of what *they do* and the lengths that they *go to*, to *help* people. (Participant 1)

You see these appeals on telly and it pulls at a heart string but then once that adverts' gone off and you've *donated*, it's kind of, it's forgotten because you've just *handed some cash over* and it's like . . . but when you've *actually done something* like that and you get a real experience of what one night of their life's like . . . definitely has a bigger impact than just *handing money over*. (Participant 4)

Dimension 5: Participant Experiences of Belonging and Relating. Baumeister and Leary (1995) and Gilbert (2009) have identified the deep human need to belong: to people, to communities, nature, and spaces and places. Participant data from the sleep-out project reveal the significant people and places that contributed to their sense of belonging. "There was very much a *feeling of oneness*, you know, all *being in it together* kind of thing" (Participant 5).

Belonging also surfaced in relation to specific spaces:

If you were just in town that moment, not in a sleeping bag, not lying on the floor, not under a tree wouldn't bother you at all but it kind of made you have a different kind of *awareness of people who were around you*. (Participant 4)

I want to make an impact on my own doorstep and *Sheffield is my home now*. (Participant 2)

The kitchens, the cathedral, the city, the outdoors, the skips (with waste cardboard that became the beds, and gave rise to the term “cardboard city”), and sheltering places were also some of the significant spaces referred to in the participant data.

Dimension 6: Participant Experiences of Being.

Being is a complex state, not of form or things, but about who we are, our identity, our inner self. Being is about our ability to be mindful, to be self-aware, and present, involving the construction of the sense of “self.” Participants on the sleep-out project talked of the “impact” the event had on them, and using words such as “stunned”: this is a powerful, physical metaphor, suggesting such experiences can be unsettling, and potentially transformative (Mezirow, 2000). The “impact” on the sense of self, or one’s being in the world is evident (Getz, 2007). Below is the juxtaposition of two contrasting identities, one a business woman, the other a homeless man and his dog:

Here was this laddie all disheveled and everything, put his arms around me and gave me a big hug and said “I bloody love you I do” and I said “come on then I’ll buy you a cup of tea.” What amazed me was that here was me in my business outfit and my suit and all the rest of it heading to meetings, posh briefcase and here was this laddie with his mangy dog giving me a hug in the middle of the street. (Participant 2)

Third Stage Interpretation:

A Schematic Experience Map

Sharing copies of the original phasic interview data, as well as the thematic data, all participants in the field trails experienced periods of getting “stuck,” and this was overcome by persuading them to start the process of scribbling notes on the mapping paper after approximately 20 minutes into the activity. They were reminded to select any data that, to them, represented significant experiences.

All groups were also asked to carry out a “dress rehearsal” after a period of approximately 1 hour. The dress rehearsal involved walking alongside

the schematic map talking through their interpretations together. This dress rehearsal generated information exchange so that a storied explanation evolved to capture a sense of the whole while capturing subtle similarities and differences, as well as the spatial-relational complexity (Tversky, 2001). After approximately 90 minutes the groups were asked to present their findings to all the other groups by a similar process of walking and articulating their findings. The group interpretations produced a rich, holistic picture of the participant experiences in a remarkably short period of time (approx. 1.5 hours). Subsequent field trials have also generated very positive feedback, with participating scholars and practitioners producing sensitive, empathetic interpretations of the participant experiences with remarkable consistency.

Discussion

The original qualitative interview transcripts proved quite difficult to interpret when in a textual form covering several pages of paper. Experienced researchers may find such processing less demanding. To reduce the spatial processing load for the student, data were disaggregated into six core human experience categories (Beard & Wilson, 2013), as themes for interpretation and further understanding. This second phase disaggregation gave some focus to specific aspects of the experience, such as emotions. However, the third phase of interpretation involved the creation of a schematic representation of the data. Although there is little evidence of data mapping in phenomenology, maps are used for “service mapping,” involving the reengineering of the consumer experiences of service (Getz, O’Neil, & Carlsen, 2001; Pettersson & Getz, 2009).

The literature suggests that data interpretation can place a heavy relational processing load on the brain (Hummel & Holyoak, 1997), and that schematic representations may provide a supporting mechanism for the more abstract cognitive tasks such as the identification of category links, time or spatial frames, directionality, and other interpretative patterns. It is difficult to identify the underlying reasons for the apparent success of the mapping trials: however, it may be that sensory and motor

systems are put to work in service of abstract reasoning, and navigating the data through oration (linguistic), walking (motor/corporeal), and visual schematics (spatial-relational). Pinker (1989) does suggest that human sensory and motor programs may have become adapted to support more abstract tasks concepts, and Lakoff and Johnson (1999) argue that spatial relations are at heart of any conceptual systems, and concepts and reasoning are also embodied.

The conversations between participants and the active experiential nature of the schematic mapping process also appears to facilitate data interpretation. The collaborative, interactive dialogic process allowed both scholars and practitioners to speedily navigate and organize the data, and to understand the relational complexity, for example the participant experience in relation to a specific time or location. Indeed Denscombe (2003) suggests that phenomenological descriptions of experiences “can tell an interesting story . . . in a way that is immediately accessible and interesting to a wide range of readers” (p.106).

What then is the role of experience maps in event evaluation? Tversky (2001) notes that “graphics serve a variety of functions, among them, attracting attention, supporting memory, providing models, and facilitating inference and discovery” (p. 79), and furthermore she argues that “visualizations have become increasingly important in organizing large databases enabling efficient search through them” (p.108). Noteworthy in terms of the collaborative nature of experience mapping, Tversky (2001) suggests that spatial-temporal maps allow

“private, mental conceptualizations to be made public, where they can be shared, examined, and revised” (p. 110) (Table 2).

There is an ongoing discussion within event literature about the application of qualitative research for event design, with van Veggel (2005) highlighting that a tension has been noticed between applying qualitative methods as a research method, and making use of qualitative methods as a way to inform design. The experience mapping process was relatively quick to undertake and so there appears to be considerable potential for such phenomenological methods to be used by event practitioners for both evaluation and design, as means of “translation from research to design” (Peperkamp et al., 2015, p. 147). During the international trials both academics and practitioners said they would consider using experience mapping for both the analysis and design of events. However, at this stage we only have informal, unrecorded anecdotal evidence from the many participants in these workshops that experience mapping was valued. It is our intention to formally collect data on the value and outcomes of experience mapping, and so further research has recently been initiated with a postgraduate events student. One focus group and numerous questionnaires have provided us with some initial data that is currently being analyzed.

Schematic phenomenological interpretations, in this case derived from the original phasic and thematic data, appear to have considerable potential to generate a rich understanding of event experiences. However, the potential synergy between the three approaches is worthy of further investigation. We

Table 2
Multiple Layers of Interpretation and Understanding of the Event Experiences

Interpretive Focus	Description
Phasic	Original interview data read. Strong focus on understanding the phases of the experience (i.e., what participants experienced before, during, and after the sleep-out event).
Thematic	Data disaggregated into six human dimensions as “themes” for a further interpretation and understanding of the sleep-out experiences.
Schematic	Summative expression, piecing together the whole. Visual map of data chunks, process of transposing data into temporal zones on a long sheet of paper through collaborative writing. Relations not inherently visual are made visual. Understanding through walking (corporeal) alongside the spatial-temporal (schematic) map, explaining the parts-whole/sameness and differences, through a spoken, storied narrative. Readily accessible.

would also like to further explore the nature of the interaction between people creating the maps (e.g., in the generation of a collaborative view—similarity and difference), between private internal (mental) representations and external visual physical representations (schematic maps), between parts and the whole (e.g., disaggregated and aggregated), and the potential application of experience mapping as a means of reconstructing event experiences by scholars and practitioners alike (see, for example, recent work by Peperkamp et al., 2015). These questions characterize the next steps that we hope to take in order to further develop our research.

Conclusion

This case study presents creative phenomenological methods to interpret data gathered from participants attending a cause-related event involving the experience of sleeping out on the streets of a large UK city. Phenomenological interpretation involved three forms: a *multiphasic* interpretation (MPI), a six-dimensional *themed* segregation of data (6DI), and finally a multidimensional, *schematic* experience mapping (EM). The latter was initially developed for an interactive workshop at a UK events conference and this first trial suggested that this collaborative mapping process facilitated the generation of a rich, multidimensional spatial-relational understanding of the data in a relatively short period of time. The event experience mapping technique, drawing on multidisciplinary research, provides a relatively sophisticated yet intuitive means of data interpretation that has potential for application by both scholars and practitioners. Experience mapping creates a multidimensional schematic that is substantiated by a visual, conversational, and textual interaction, resulting in an in-depth understanding of the participant event experiences. The article speculates on the reasons for the apparent success of the process; however, to further explore this collaborative schematic data interpretation approach and its potential for application in event design, experience mapping is undergoing further field trials. Event designers from a range of private and public organizations across the globe, notably Singapore, Prague, Hong Kong, India, and the UK, have already taken part in trials and it is our

intention to analyze and collect further data on the mapping processes.

References

- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497–525.
- Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Finkenauer, C., Vohs, K. D., & Salovey, P. (2001). Bad is stronger than good. *Review of General Psychology*, 5(4), 323–370.
- Bitner, M. J. (1992). Servicescapes: The impact of physical surroundings on customers and employees. *The Journal of Marketing*, 56(2), 57–71.
- Beard, C., & Wilson, J. P. (2013). *Experiential learning: A handbook for education, training and coaching*. London: Kogan Page.
- Berridge, G. (2012). Designing event experiences. In S. J. Page & J. Connel (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of events* (pp. 273–288). Oxon: Taylor Francis Group.
- Binstead, D., & Stuart, R. (1979). Designed reality into management learning events. *Personnel Review*, 8(3), 12–19.
- Brown, S. (2014). Emerging professionalism in the event industry: A practitioner's perspective. *Event Management*, 18(1), 15–24.
- Burr, V. (2003). *Social constructionism*. London: Routledge.
- Davis, B., & Sumara, D. J. (1997). Cognition, complexity and teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review*, 67(1), 105–125.
- Denscombe, M. (2003). *The good research guide for small scale research projects*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Duhigg, C. (2012). *The power of Habit: Why we do what we do, and how to change*. London: RH Books.
- Eyal, N. (2014). *Hooked: How to build habit forming products*. London: Penguin.
- Getz, D. (2007). *Event Studies: Theory, research and policy for planned events*. London: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Getz, D. (2008). Event tourism: Definition, evolution, and research. *Tourism Management*, 29(3), 403–428.
- Getz, D., O'Neill, M., & Carlson, J. (2001) Service quality evaluation at events through service mapping. *Journal of Travel Research*, 39(4), 380–390.
- Gilbert, P. (2009). *The compassionate mind*. London: Constable & Robinson.
- Hover, M., & van Mierlo, J. (2006). *Imagine your event: Imagineering for the event industry*. Unpublished manuscript, Breda University of Applied Sciences and NHTV Expertise, Event Management Centre, Netherlands.
- Hummel, J. E., & Holyoak, K. J. (1997). Distributed representations of structure: A theory of analogical access and mapping. *Psychological Review*, 104, 427–466.
- Hycner, R. H. (1999). Some guidelines for the phenomenological analysis of interview data. In A. Bryman & R. G. Burgess (Eds.), *Qualitative research* (pp. 143–164). London: Sage.

- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1999). *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Lewis, D. (2013). *Impulse: Why we do what we do without knowing it*. London: Random House.
- Loeffler, B., & Church, B. T. (2015). *The experience: The 5 principles of Disney service and relationship excellence*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Mannell, R. C. (1984). The playful side of laughter. *Journal of Leisureability*, 11, 4–7.
- Mannell, R. C., & Kleiber, D. A. (1997). *A social psychology of leisure*. Pittsburgh, PA: Venture Publications.
- McIntyre, N., & Roggenbuck, J. W. (1998). Nature/person transactions during an outdoor adventure experience: A multi-phasic analysis. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(4), 401–422.
- Mehmetoglu, M., & Engen, M. (2011). Pine and Gilmore's concept of experience economy and its dimensions: An empirical examination in tourism. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 12(4), 237–255.
- Mezirow, J. (2000). *Learning as transformation: Critical perspectives on a theory in progress*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- O'Sullivan, E. L., & Spangler, K. J. (1999). *Experience marketing*. State College, PA: Venture Publishing.
- Peperkamp, E., Rooijackers, M., & Remmers, G. (2015). Evaluating and designing for experiential value: The use of visitor journeys. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 7(2), 134–149.
- Pettersson, R., & Getz, D. (2009). Event experiences in time and space: A study of visitors to the 2007 World Alpine Ski Championships in Åre, Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 9(2–3), 308–326.
- Pine, J., & Gilmore, B. H. (1999). *The experience economy, work is theatre and every business is a stage*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.
- Pinker, S. (1989). *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Poulsson, S. H. G., & Kale, S. H. (2004). The experience economy and commercial experiences. *The Marketing Review*, 4, 267–277.
- Rossmann, J. R. (2003). *Recreation programming: Designing leisure experiences*. Urbana, IL: Sagamore Publishing.
- Russ, W. (2014). *The significance of experiential events for the charity sector and their impact on attendees through event analysis*. Unpublished Undergraduate Project, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK.
- Schmitt, B. H. (1999). *Experiential marketing: How to get customers to sense, feel, think, act, relate to your company and brands*. New York: The Free Press.
- Schull, N. (2012). *Addiction by design: Machine gambling in Las Vegas*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sheets-Johnstone, M. (2009). *The corporeal turn, an interdisciplinary reader*. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic.
- Spiegelberg, H. (1982). *The phenomenological movement: A historical introduction*. Hague, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Thorne, F. C., (1963). The clinical use of peak and Nadir experience reports. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 19 (2), 248–250.
- Tversky, B. (2001). Spatial schemas in depictions. In M. Gattis (Ed.), *Spatial schemas and abstract thought* (pp. 79–112). London: MIT Press.
- van Veggel, R. J. F. M. (2005). Where two sides of ethnography collide. *Design Issues*, 21(3), 3–16.
- Walls, A. R., Okumus, F., Wang, Y., & Kwun, D. J. (2011). An epistemological view of consumer experiences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 30(1), 10–21.
- Ziakas, V., & Boukas, N. (2014). Contextualising phenomenology in event management research. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 5(1), 56–73.