Academic Q&A; — English

30 anticipated academic questions and answers concerning methodology, theoretical contribution, limitations, generalizability, practical implications, and future work.

Platform Roles and Core Research Question

Q16. Why do you think Instagram became the Save platform, YouTube the Plan platform, and TikTok the Impulse platform?

Answer

Thank you. I think there are three reasons. First, each platform has different affordances. Instagram encourages people to discover beautiful places and save them for later. YouTube is often used for searching, comparing, and planning. TikTok encourages quick emotional reactions through continuous recommendations. So I believe each platform naturally supports a different stage of tourist decision-making.

Q14. You have 3.1 million impressions — but how many of those viewers actually visited Nasu? Without conversion data, isn't this entire study just measuring attitudes, not behavior?

Answer

This is the most important limitation of the study, and I want to be completely honest about it. I cannot directly measure how many viewers visited Nasu. I do not have POS data from local stores, Google Maps routing data, or visitor counters linked to my content. What I *can* measure is *behavioral intention* and *behavioral expression* — through comments. The TikTok comments timestamped within hours of posting — 'On my way right now' — are the closest thing I have to real behavioral data. But even these cannot be independently verified. This is a genuine and significant limitation. The study is, in the language of the attitude-behavior gap literature, measuring proximal outcomes — not distal conversion. Future work — which I outline explicitly — would require QR code tracking, Google Maps integration, and store-level collaboration to close this gap. But I would argue that measuring *platform-level behavioral differentiation* — even at the attitudinal level — is a valuable first step. Understanding *which* platform elicits *which type* of response is foundational knowledge for designing the conversion pathway.

Q10. Have you considered that platform algorithm changes — especially TikTok's shift toward longer videos — might already be making your model obsolete?

Answer

That is a very timely question, and I think it points to an important characteristic of this kind of research. Platform affordances are not static. TikTok has indeed been shifting toward longer-form content. YouTube Shorts was introduced relatively recently. Instagram Reels continues to evolve. This is why I frame Kansei Resonance as a *conceptual lens* rather than a fixed model. The specific behavioral percentages I report are a snapshot. The underlying logic — that different interaction styles and affordances elicit different affective orientations — is more durable. In fact, the preliminary observation in my paper that YouTube Shorts showed higher Impulse behavior than long-form YouTube videos is already pointing in this direction. As platforms converge in format, the affordance-based distinctions may become more nuanced. This is an active area that requires ongoing empirical attention — and I think it is one of the most exciting directions in platform HCI research.

Theoretical Contribution

Q20. What exactly is Kansei Resonance?

Answer

Thank you. Kansei Resonance is not a new psychological theory. It is a conceptual framework. It helps explain why the same place creates different reactions on different platforms. It is an interpretation of the behavioral patterns observed in this study. □ 深掘り版（60〜90秒で聞かれた場合） Existing theories explain emotion within one platform. Our study observed a pattern across multiple platforms. Kansei Resonance is a way to describe that pattern. It focuses on how aesthetic elements, such as light, colour, atmosphere, and sound, interact with different platform affordances. I see it as a conceptual framework, not a causal theory.

Q5. Kansei Resonance — this sounds like a new label for something that already exists. How is this different from existing concepts like 'emotional contagion' or 'affective priming'?

Answer

That is exactly the right question to ask, and I want to answer it carefully. Emotional contagion describes the transfer of emotion from one person to another — it is fundamentally interpersonal. Affective priming describes how one stimulus influences the processing of a subsequent stimulus — it operates within a single session or context. Kansei Resonance is different in two ways. First, it operates *across platforms* — each with distinct affordances, interaction styles, and temporal distances. The 'accumulation' I describe happens over days or weeks, not seconds. Second, it is grounded in Kansei Engineering's specific emphasis on aesthetic micro-inputs — light, sound, ambience, texture — as the primary carriers of affective meaning. This is distinct from emotional contagion, which focuses on interpersonal dynamics. I want to be honest: Kansei Resonance is a *conceptual lens*, not a fully operationalized theory. It offers vocabulary for a phenomenon that existing frameworks do not adequately describe. The next step — which I outline in Future Work — is to operationalize it through psychometric instruments and multimodal affective measurement.

Q6. You describe the Save–Plan–Impulse pathway as 'sequential' — but your data shows each platform's distribution independently. You haven't actually demonstrated that individual users move through the sequence. Isn't calling it 'sequential' overstating your evidence?

Answer

You are correct, and this is a distinction I want to be very precise about. In the paper, I describe the pathway as a 'distributional pattern shaped by platform affordances' — not as individual-level sequential navigation. I was careful about this language. What the data shows is that each platform *dominantly* elicits one behavioral stage. The *aggregate* pattern forms a sequence: Instagram leads with Save, YouTube leads with Plan, TikTok leads with Impulse. I cannot confirm that any individual user moved through all three stages. That would require cross-platform user tracking — which I identify as a key future direction. The word 'sequential' in the title refers to the *stage-based logic* of tourist decision-making — not to proven individual transitions. I take your point that this could be clarified further in the paper, and I will address it in the revision.

Q7. Your theoretical framework draws heavily on Japanese Kansei Engineering. Do you think these findings would hold in Western cultural contexts, where aesthetic sensibilities may differ?

Answer

That is a fascinating question, and honestly one I think about a great deal. Kansei Engineering originated in Japan, and my field site is Japanese. So there is a real question about whether the specific *content* of aesthetic resonance — what counts as beautiful, atmospheric, or moving — differs across cultures. My belief — though I cannot yet prove it — is that the *mechanism* is more universal than the *content*. The idea that aesthetic micro-inputs accumulate and guide behavior through distinct affective stages does not depend on Japanese aesthetics specifically. But the specific types of images, sounds, and atmospheres that trigger Save versus Plan versus Impulse may well differ across cultures. A comparative study — perhaps comparing Nasu with a rural destination in Scandinavia, or in Southeast Asia — would be an excellent way to test this. I would genuinely welcome collaborators interested in that direction.

Q22. Which previous studies influenced your research the most?

Answer

Four studies were especially important. Nagamachi's work on Kansei Engineering. Lee and Gretzel's work on destination image. Park's work on travel planning. And Chen's work on TikTok and travel intention. My study builds on these works, while focusing on cross-platform behavior in rural tourism.

Methodology and Data Validity

Q1. You used a single-creator design. How can you claim the results reflect platform affordances rather than simply your personal style as a content creator?

Answer

That is a very fair question, and I want to address it directly. The single-creator design was intentional — not a weakness, but a methodological choice. By using the same creator, the same device, and the same editing pipeline across all three platforms, I controlled for the stylistic variance that would otherwise confound the comparison. If I had used different creators for different platforms, any behavioral differences might reflect creator style, not platform affordance. Now — can I generalize beyond my own style? No, not with this dataset alone. That is why I explicitly list multi-creator deployment as the first item in Future Work. But what I *can* claim is that, within this controlled design, the behavioral differences are statistically robust and consistent across 468 videos and 60 days. The single-creator design is a *starting point* — not a conclusion.

Q2. You coded 1,200 comments into three categories. But comments are self-selected — only motivated users comment. How do you know the silent majority behaves differently?

Answer

You are absolutely right that comments represent a self-selected, motivated subset of viewers. Silent viewers — who may simply save a post without commenting — are not captured. This is a known limitation of observational comment analysis, and I acknowledge it in the paper. However, I want to make two points. First, for the *Save* category on Instagram, I had an additional behavioral signal: the platform's save count metric. The save counts aligned strongly with the Save-coded comments, which suggests the comment patterns are not entirely disconnected from broader viewer behavior. Second, the purpose of this study is not to claim that *all* viewers behave this way. It is to show that the *types* of responses each platform elicits are systematically different. And that pattern — which is statistically robust — holds regardless of who the commenters are. Future work with opt-in user tracking would allow us to go beyond comments to actual behavioral data.

Q3. Cohen's κ of 0.82 is strong — but can you tell us more about the 3.1% of ambiguous cases? What made them ambiguous, and how were they resolved?

Answer

Good question. The ambiguous cases fell primarily into two patterns. The first was comments that combined Save and Plan language — for example, someone who wrote 'I want to visit this place, which route do you recommend?' That comment contains both aspiration and logistical planning. The second pattern was comments on TikTok that expressed strong emotion but were ambiguous about timing — 'I need to go here' without specifying when. In both cases, the two coders discussed and reached consensus, typically by identifying the *dominant* behavioral signal in the comment. This does reveal a limitation of a three-category scheme — real behavior exists on a continuum. A future direction would be to use a continuous rating scale rather than discrete categories, or to allow dual-coding for mixed cases. But for the purposes of this study, the 96.9% agreement rate gives me confidence in the overall pattern.

Q4. You mention that six YouTube videos failed to upload. Could these failures have systematically biased your YouTube sample?

Answer

I appreciate you catching that detail. The six videos that failed to upload were due to platform-side processing errors — not related to content type, length, or theme. They were distributed across different weeks of the study, and after reviewing them, they did not cluster around any particular content category. So while I cannot completely rule out bias, there is no systematic pattern that would suggest these six videos would have changed the overall behavioral distribution. The remaining 152 YouTube videos provide a robust sample. But you are right to flag it — in future deployments, I would implement a verification system to catch upload failures in real time.

Q17. Why did you choose Save, Plan, and Impulse? Why not four categories?

Answer

Thank you. We wanted a coding scheme that was simple, clear, and practical. During the pilot coding, most comments naturally fell into these three stages. Of course, human behavior is more complex. Future studies may use more detailed categories.

Q18. Why comments? Why not interviews or surveys?

Answer

Comments are naturally occurring data. People wrote them voluntarily. They were not responding to researchers. This gives us real behavioral expressions in a real-world setting. Of course, interviews and surveys would provide valuable additional information, and I hope to include them in future studies.

Q24. How did you know the differences were caused by platform affordances, not by different audiences?

Answer

Thank you. I cannot say platform affordances were the only reason. Audience differences may also play a role. However, the creator, filming style, and editing workflow were kept consistent. Therefore, platform affordances are one reasonable explanation for the observed differences.

Q27. Why did you use comments instead of actual visitor data?

Answer

Actual visitor data would certainly be stronger evidence. However, it was not available during this study. Comments provided naturally occurring, publicly available behavioural expressions. Future studies should combine comments with visitor tracking.

Limitations and Generalizability

Q19. Why Nasu? Why did you choose only one rural region?

Answer

Thank you. We did not choose Nasu because it represents every rural destination. We chose Nasu because it provides a very clear research setting. Attractions are far apart. Most visitors travel by car. Planning is essential. That makes Nasu an ideal place to study tourist decision-making. □ 深掘り版（60〜90秒で聞かれた場合） Of course, one region cannot represent every destination. That is one limitation of this study. However, our goal was not to generalize immediately. Our goal was to understand one well-defined rural environment under controlled conditions. Future studies should compare other rural regions and urban environments.

Q8. Nasu is a very specific case — a high-end, scenic, car-dependent Japanese tourist destination. Why should anyone believe this model applies to, say, a rural destination in developing economies, or an urban environment?

Answer

Nasu is indeed a specific case, and I want to be clear about what I am and am not claiming. I am not claiming that the exact percentages — 61%, 63%, 62% — would replicate in every rural destination. Context matters enormously. What I am claiming is more structural: that *car-dependent, dispersed rural environments amplify the planning stage* of tourist decision-making, and that this amplification shows up in how viewers use different platforms. This structural claim should generalize to any destination where mobility is constrained and pre-planning is essential — whether in rural Japan, rural New Zealand, or rural Portugal. How it manifests in developing economies, where platform usage patterns and infrastructure differ substantially, is an open question. I think that is a genuinely important research direction. For urban environments — as I note in the paper — the Planning stage may be less prominent, which would likely change the platform distributions. Comparative urban-rural studies are the obvious next step.

Q9. You conducted this study over 60 days — but Nasu is a seasonal destination. Summer and autumn would have very different visitor profiles and behaviors. Doesn't this temporal limitation seriously undermine your findings?

Answer

You raise a very valid point. The 60-day window covered spring and early summer — which is a relatively high-traffic period in Nasu, but not the peak autumn foliage season or winter snow season. Seasonal variation could affect both the volume and the type of visitors — and therefore the behavioral distributions I observed. I acknowledge this in the Limitations section. A longitudinal study spanning all four seasons would be necessary to understand whether the Save–Plan–Impulse distribution is stable across seasonal contexts, or whether it shifts — perhaps with higher Impulse behavior during peak foliage season when urgency is heightened. Within the 60-day window, however, the pattern was consistent across daily and weekly cycles — which gives me some confidence that it is not an artifact of a particular week or weather condition.

Q15. Your study focuses on short-form video. But many tourists — especially older demographics — rely on travel blogs, review sites, or word of mouth. Are you implying short-form video has replaced these channels?

Answer

Absolutely not — and I appreciate the opportunity to clarify this. Short-form video is one channel within a broader media ecosystem. Travel blogs, review platforms like TripAdvisor or Google Maps, word of mouth, and traditional advertising all continue to play important roles — especially for older demographics. My study focuses exclusively on short-form video because it is the fastest-growing format and the least studied in rural tourism contexts. I am not claiming it has replaced other channels. What I am claiming is more specific: *within* the short-form video ecosystem, different platforms serve different behavioral functions. This has implications for how tourism stakeholders allocate their short-form content efforts. The relationship between short-form video and other channels — how they complement or compete with each other — is a separate and fascinating research question that this study cannot answer.

Practical Implications and Future Work

Q11. You mention implications for Regional DX. But most small rural businesses in Japan — and elsewhere — have very limited digital literacy. How realistic is it to expect them to implement a multi-platform strategy?

Answer

That is a deeply practical question, and it comes from the right place. You are absolutely right that asking a small café owner to simultaneously manage Instagram aesthetics, YouTube route guides, and TikTok impulse content is unrealistic as a direct recommendation. My argument is more structural. The insight is that *different platforms serve different purposes in the tourist decision journey* — and even a minimal intervention can be designed around this logic. For example: a local tourism board could create YouTube-style planning content centrally, while individual businesses focus only on Instagram world-building. A regional media operation — like the one I run alongside this research — can handle the TikTok impulse layer. The model is a *division of labor* framework as much as it is a guide for individual businesses. And AI tools are making it increasingly possible for small operators to participate — which is something I explore in my parallel work on regional digital transformation.

Q12. You are both the researcher and the content creator in this study. This raises serious concerns about researcher bias. How do you address the conflict of interest?

Answer

I want to address this directly, because it is an important concern. The potential bias is real: as the creator, I had aesthetic preferences, and those preferences shaped what I filmed and how I edited. I mitigated this in two ways. First, the behavioral data — the comments — came from viewers who had no knowledge of my research intentions. They were responding to the content as ordinary tourists, not as research participants. So the *outcome measure* is independent of my bias as a creator. Second, the coding of comments was performed by two independent coders who were not the creator, achieving Cohen's κ of 0.82. So the *interpretation* of the behavioral data is also independent. Where my subjectivity *does* enter is in the content production itself — what I chose to film. This is an unavoidable characteristic of in-the-wild research. Future multi-creator designs would distribute this subjectivity across multiple individuals. I believe the trade-off — ecological validity for researcher independence — was worth making for this first exploratory study. But I take the concern seriously.

Q25. How is your work different from destination marketing research?

Answer

Many destination marketing studies focus on one platform. My study compares three platforms within the same environment. The focus is not marketing success, but different stages of tourist decision-making.

Q26. Could AI produce similar content in the future?

Answer

I think AI will become an important tool. AI can help create, analyse, and optimise content. However, understanding local culture, atmosphere, and human experience still requires human observation. I believe AI and humans will work together.

Q13. This is a fascinating study. Are you planning to scale this to other regions in Japan, or internationally?

Answer

Yes — very much so. The immediate next step is a multi-creator deployment in Nasu, involving local business owners and regional tourism partners. This would test whether the Save–Plan–Impulse distribution holds across different production styles. Beyond that, I am particularly interested in comparative studies — perhaps examining a rural destination with high walkability and transit access, to see how the Planning stage distribution changes when car dependence is removed. Internationally, I think rural destinations in Europe — the Loire Valley, the Scottish Highlands, rural Tuscany — would be excellent comparison cases. They share the car-dependent, dispersed structure of Nasu but have different cultural aesthetics and different platform usage patterns. I am also developing an anime IP project set in Nasu — which will generate a new wave of content and viewer behavioral data. That will allow me to test whether narrative-driven content produces the same platform segmentation as documentary-style short videos. If anyone in the room has interest in cross-cultural collaboration, I would genuinely welcome that conversation.

Q23. Would you change anything if you repeated this study?

Answer

Yes. I would change three things. First, I would include multiple creators. Second, I would collect user-level tracking data. Third, I would conduct a longer study, covering all four seasons. I believe these improvements would strengthen the findings.

Q29. If you continue this research, what will you do next?

Answer

I would like to expand this research in three directions. First, multiple creators. Second, different rural regions. Third, individual user tracking. I think these three steps will strengthen the model.

Research Origin and Reflection

Q21. Why did you start this research?

Answer

Two years ago, I moved to Nasu. I found many wonderful local businesses. But many people outside the region did not know about them. I thought, "What a waste." So I started making short-form videos. Later, I noticed different reactions on different platforms. That observation became this research.

Q28. What surprised you most during the study?

Answer

Honestly, I expected some differences. But I did not expect them to be so consistent. Across different places, different days, and different videos, the same pattern appeared again and again. That surprised me the most.

Q30. What is the single most important message of your research?

Answer

The main message is very simple. Different platforms support different stages of tourist decision-making. We should not treat Instagram, YouTube, and TikTok as the same. Each platform has its own strength.

This public edition excludes presenter-only notes, response tactics, memorization cues, and internal preparation guidance.