Journal of Trends in Arts and Humanities
Print ISSN: 3007-7362
Online ISSN: 3007-7370
DOI: https://doi.org/10.61784/jtah3058

TWO WORLDS OF MAGIC: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF SHANGHAI DISNEYLAND AND UNIVERSAL BEIJING RESORT

YuHan Xiao
Management Department, Shanghai Technician School, Shanghai 200437, China.

Abstract: Shanghai Disneyland and Universal Beijing Resort are the two most significant theme-park investments ever made in China, representing the country's emergence as the decisive growth market for the global attractions industry. This article offers a systematic comparison of the two resorts across six dimensions: historical development and investment, ownership and governance, theming and intellectual property, attendance and financial performance, visitor experience and commercial ecosystem, and future outlook. Drawing on company filings, international attendance data, academic work on Disney's localization strategy, and official resort materials, it finds that although the two parks share similar ambitions and business models, they have followed markedly different paths. Shanghai's early entry, balanced partnership, and deeply localized storybook identity have produced strong attendance and early profitability, while Beijing's larger, faster build and consolidation of all losses into its parent's accounts have made its path to profitability considerably steeper. The comparison illuminates broader lessons about cultural localization, capital structure, and competitive strategy in the global theme-park industry.
Keywords: Theme parks; Glocalization; Cultural authenticity; East Asian theme park market

1 INTRODUCTION: THE CHINESE THEME PARK FRONTIER

1.1 The Landmark Entries

For most of the twentieth century, the world's most famous theme parks stood in the United States, Europe, and Japan. That geography changed dramatically in the 2010s as China emerged as the industry's most important growth market. Two landmark projects bookended this transformation: Shanghai Disneyland, which opened on June 16, 2016, and Universal Beijing Resort, which opened on September 20, 2021. Together they brought the two most recognizable theme-park brands on earth to the two largest cities of a country with hundreds of millions of potential visitors, setting new standards for scale, investment, and guest experience in the region.

1.2 Purpose and Structure of the Article

Theme parks are not merely collections of rides; they are elaborately themed environments that combine storytelling, retail, dining, and hospitality into a single branded experience [1].
This article offers a systematic comparison of the two resorts across six dimensions. Section 2 reviews their historical development and capital commitment; Section 3 examines their ownership and governance structures; Section 4 analyzes theming and cultural localization; Section 5 compares attendance and financial performance; Section 6 considers the visitor experience and commercial ecosystem; and Section 7 assesses challenges and outlook. The conclusion draws out the strategic lessons each resort offers for the global attractions industry. The analysis draws on company filings, international attendance data, academic work on Disney's localization strategy, and official resort materials.

2 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENT

2.1 Shanghai Disneyland: Two Decades in the Making

Shanghai Disneyland was the product of extraordinarily patient diplomacy. The idea was first raised as early as 1990, national approval followed in 2009, and ground was broken in 2011 before the park opened five years later. The total investment reached approximately RMB 34 billion, or about US$5.5 billion, making it one of the largest single-site tourism investments in China's history [2].

2.2 Universal Beijing Resort: A Faster, Bolder Entry

Universal Beijing Resort arrived later but larger. Planning dated back to a cooperation agreement signed in 2001, but construction began in 2016 and the resort opened on September 20, 2021, after roughly five years of building. With an investment estimated between US$6.5 billion and US$7.4 billion, it became the largest Universal Studios park in the world, covering approximately four square kilometers [3].

© By the Author(s) 2026, under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0).

2.3 Scale and Capital Commitment

Both projects represent bet-the-company levels of capital commitment in a single foreign market. Their scale is comparable in order of magnitude, although Beijing's reported investment is somewhat larger and its physical footprint more extensive, while Shanghai reached operational maturity first. This timing gap matters: Shanghai entered the market with nearly a decade of operating experience before its rival opened, giving it a substantial head start in brand recognition, guest loyalty, and infrastructure. Beijing, by contrast, had to build its reputation and traffic base from zero at full scale, a more demanding commercial proposition.

Beyond their direct capital costs, both resorts have become engines of local economic development. Each created tens of thousands of jobs during construction and operations and has anchored surrounding commercial, residential, and infrastructure investment. The parks are therefore not simply corporate assets but instruments of urban policy, integrated into the broader ambitions of their host municipalities to develop tourism, consumption, and services-led growth.

3 OWNERSHIP AND GOVERNANCE MODELS

3.1 Shanghai: A Balanced Partnership Managed by Disney

Shanghai Disneyland operates through two owner companies and a single management company. Shanghai Shendi Group, a state-owned enterprise, holds 57 percent of the owner companies while The Walt Disney Company holds the remaining 43 percent; the management company, by contrast, is 70 percent owned by Disney and 30 percent by Shendi. This structure gives the Chinese partner majority ownership of the underlying asset while reserving creative and operational control for Disney, which manages the resort on behalf of both parties [2].

3.2 Beijing: State Backing with Comcast's Consolidated Ledger

Universal Beijing follows a similar broad template but with different economic consequences. The joint venture is 70 percent owned by Beijing Shouhuan Cultural Tourism Investment, a state-backed entity, and 30 percent by NBCUniversal, the entertainment arm of Comcast Corporation. Because Comcast is the primary beneficiary of the venture's variable-interest structure, the resort's full financial results are consolidated into Comcast's reported earnings [4].

3.3 Contrasting Risk and Return Structures

The two ownership models allocate risk and reward differently. In Shanghai, Disney's 43 percent equity stake means its profit share is proportional to performance, while its management fees provide a more stable income stream regardless of results. In Beijing, the consolidation of the entire venture into Comcast's books exposes the parent to the full volatility of the project's performance. This structural distinction helps explain why the two parks are reported so differently in their parents' financial statements, and why the burden of early losses falls more heavily on the American partner in the Beijing case.

In practice, these structures also shape incentives. Because Disney earns management fees in addition to equity returns, it is rewarded for growing revenue and maintaining brand standards even in lean years, while Shendi shares proportionally in the upside. Comcast, by contrast, carries the full consolidated result and is therefore more directly exposed to the timing of the park's recovery, which increases the pressure on its Beijing venture to reach profitability quickly.

4 THEMING, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY, AND CULTURAL LOCALIZATION

4.1 Disney's Glocalization: 'Authentically Disney, Distinctly Chinese'

The most consequential strategic difference lies in cultural localization. Disney pursued a deliberate glocalization strategy, blending its global storytelling with local norms and values to make Shanghai Disneyland feel like China's Disneyland. Academic analysis has shown how the park's brand narrative, from harmonious design themes to collective identity, was constructed to reconcile the tensions of bringing an American brand to China [5].

Bryman's concept of Disneyization provides a useful frame for understanding this process, since the resort extends the theming principles of retail, dining, and entertainment into every corner of the guest experience [1].

4.2 Universal's Cinematic Immersion and a Beijing-Exclusive Land

Universal's approach is built around the immersive recreation of blockbuster film worlds. Rather than a single overarching fairytale narrative, the park is organized as a set of distinct lands drawn from its film franchises, from The Wizarding World of Harry Potter to Transformers, Jurassic World, and Minions. Beijing stands out for its exclusive Kung Fu Panda Land of Awesomeness, the only one of its kind anywhere, which deliberately weaves Chinese architecture and cultural motifs into the experience [3].

4.3 Localization Strategies Compared

The contrast is subtle but revealing. Disney localizes primarily through tone, storytelling, and a unified magical identity that feels welcoming across cultures; Universal localizes through discrete thematic worlds, including one built explicitly around a Chinese cultural property. Both strategies aim to make their parks feel indigenous, but they proceed from different creative starting points: one seeks to be universally magical, the other to be spectacularly cinematic. Each approach carries implications for how quickly a park earns emotional loyalty from a culturally specific audience.

5 ATTENDANCE, REVENUE, AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE

5.1 Guest Volumes and Global Rankings

By attendance, Shanghai Disneyland has become one of the world's leading parks. According to the TEA Global Experience Index, it ranked as the world's fifth most-visited theme park in 2024, welcoming a record 14.7 million guests and posting the highest growth rate among the top ten parks [6]. Universal Beijing, still early in its life, drew approximately 9.8 million visitors in 2024, an increase of nearly 9 percent over the prior year, although its volumes remain well below those of its Shanghai rival [6].

These attendance figures reflect both structural and cyclical factors. Shanghai benefits from its location in the Yangtze River Delta, one of the most densely populated and affluent regions in the world, with a transport network that funnels visitors from across eastern and central China. Beijing draws on the capital's own enormous domestic demand, but its stronger seasonality and its later opening have kept its annual totals lower.

5.2 A Tale of Two Ledgers

Financially, the two resorts have diverged sharply. Shanghai Disneyland became profitable within its first year of operation, a first for any Disney park, and has since been widely described as one of the most profitable Disney resorts in the world [7]. Universal Beijing, by contrast, has struggled to reach profitability. Shouhuan Investment's consolidated statements show revenue of roughly RMB 7.95 billion in 2023, with a net loss of about RMB 1.53 billion, and a similar loss of roughly RMB 1.52 billion in 2024, bringing cumulative losses to more than RMB 3 billion over two years [8].

5.3 Explaining the Divergence

Several factors explain the gap in financial outcomes. Shanghai benefits from earlier entry, higher attendance, and a long-established base of regional demand, while Beijing faced the pandemic during its opening season, a later start, and comparatively lower guest volumes. The larger capital base of Universal Beijing, combined with the consolidation of all losses into Comcast's accounts, makes its path to profitability steeper. Attendance is the central variable: with 14.7 million visitors against Beijing's 9.8 million, the volume gap is the single largest driver of the financial divergence, and it is amplified by the heavier fixed costs of the larger Beijing asset (Table 1).

Table 1 Side-by-Side Comparison of Shanghai Disneyland and Universal Beijing Resort

Dimension	Shanghai Disneyland	Universal Beijing Resort
Opening date	June 16, 2016	September 20, 2021
Location	Pudong, Shanghai	Tongzhou, Beijing
Total investment	≈ RMB 34 bn / US$5.5 bn	≈ US$6.5–7.4 bn
Owner-company stakes	Shendi 57% / Disney 43%	Shouhuan 70% / NBCUniversal 30%
Management / consolidation	Disney 70% / Shendi 30%	Comcast consolidates (variable interest)
Resort scale	~4 km² resort	Largest Universal park (~4 km²)
2024 attendance	≈ 14 million	≈ 9.8 million
TEA 2024 global rank	5th most-visited worldwide	Among top growth parks
Profitability	Profitable since first year	Cumulative net loss > RMB 3 bn (2023–24)
Signature IP	Classic fairytale lands; Zootopia	Harry Potter, Jurassic, Transformers, Minions, Kung Fu Panda
Localization focus	'Authentically Disney, Distinctly Chinese'	Beijing-exclusive Kung Fu Panda Land

Sources: Shanghai Disney Resort (2024); Universal Beijing Resort (2021); Comcast Corporation (2024); The Walt Disney Company (2024); TEA & AECOM (2024).

6 VISITOR EXPERIENCE AND COMMERCIAL ECOSYSTEM

6.1 Rides and Entertainment

In terms of the guest experience, the two parks offer comparable breadth and ambition. Shanghai Disneyland features technologically advanced attractions, including an original Pirates of the Caribbean ride system, alongside classic fairytale lands and live shows. Universal Beijing counters with screen-based immersion and motion-heavy attractions

drawn from its films, including Harry Potter and Transformers experiences. Both invest heavily in parades, nighttime spectaculars, and seasonal programming designed to extend dwell time and encourage repeat visits.

6.2 Hotels, Dining, and Retail

The commercial ecosystems are also structurally similar. Each resort integrates a themed shopping street, multiple hotels, and extensive dining and merchandise offerings, so that the parks function as self-contained destinations rather than single-day attractions. Revenue diversification beyond the gate is a shared priority, as both operators seek to capture a larger share of guest spending across accommodation, food and beverage, and retail, recognizing that in-resort spending often rivals ticket revenue in importance.

Hotel occupancy and length of stay are closely watched indicators in both resorts. Because a large share of visitors arrive from outside the immediate metropolitan area, both operators have designed their resorts to encourage overnight stays, with multiple hotel tiers and early-entry benefits that reward on-site guests. This lodging anchor boosts guest spending and reduces the risk of a pure day-trip business model.

6.3 Yield and Pricing

Both resorts employ dynamic, tiered pricing and paid fast-pass systems to manage capacity and boost yield. Such strategies smooth demand during peak periods and increase per-guest spending, reflecting a broader industry shift toward maximizing revenue per visit rather than raw attendance. This yield-focused logic is especially important in China, where holiday spikes concentrate demand and operators must both protect the guest experience and monetize peak crowds effectively.

7 CHALLENGES AND OUTLOOK

7.1 Operational Pressures and Seasonal Demand

Both resorts face the structural challenges of the Chinese market: pronounced seasonality around national holidays, intense domestic competition, and the cyclical sensitivity of discretionary spending. Weather also matters; the colder northern climate compresses Universal Beijing's comfortable outdoor operating season relative to Shanghai's milder conditions, adding to the seasonal imbalance and complicating year-round capacity management.

Regulatory and geopolitical factors also add a layer of uncertainty for both foreign-branded parks. Licensing, intellectual-property protection, data rules, and the broader relationship between the host country and the parent companies can affect everything from content approvals to expansion timelines, requiring careful, ongoing management by both operators.

7.2 Expansion Pipelines

The two companies continue to invest in their Chinese assets to sustain growth. Disney has added new themed lands to Shanghai, including a Zootopia area, to refresh the offering and drive repeat visits, while Universal Beijing likewise plans phased expansions of its lands and attractions. These pipelines are essential because guest retention in China increasingly depends on new content and experiences that give visitors a reason to return.

7.3 Implications for the Chinese Market

The two resorts illustrate divergent lessons for international operators entering China. Disney's early-mover, profitability-first path demonstrates the value of cultural localization and patient brand building; Universal's larger, faster build shows the risks of arriving later with a heavier balance sheet. Together they have raised the competitive bar for the entire Chinese theme-park industry, reshaped consumer expectations, and demonstrated that global brands must adapt deeply to local culture if they are to thrive.

8 CONCLUSION: DISTINCT PATHS, SHARED AMBITION

Shanghai Disneyland and Universal Beijing Resort are two answers to the same question: how to transplant a beloved global brand into China. Disney chose patience, partnership, and a deeply localized storybook identity; Universal chose scale, cinematic immersion, and a faster, more aggressive entry. The early evidence points to a stark contrast in financial outcomes, yet both parks have succeeded in making theme parks a mainstream part of Chinese leisure culture and in demonstrating the enormous appetite of the Chinese consumer market. Their competition will shape the future of the global attractions industry for decades, and their experience offers lasting lessons about the intersection of culture, capital, and commerce in one of the world's largest economies.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose.

REFERENCES

[1] Bryman A. The Disneyization of Society. Sage Publications, 2004.
[2] Shanghai Disney Resort. Shanghai Disney Resort: Company Overview and Fact Sheet. Disney Experiences, 2024.
[3] Universal Beijing Resort. Universal Beijing Resort Officially Opens: 'The Worlds of Film' Welcomes Its First Guests. Official Press Release, 2021.
[4] Comcast Corporation. Annual Report (Form 10-K), Fiscal Year 2024. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 2024.
[5] Galvez C M. Authentically Disney, Distinctly Chinese: A Case Study of Glocalization through Shanghai Disneyland's Brand Narrative. California State University, San Bernardino, 2018.
[6] Themed Entertainment Association. TEA Global Experience Index 2024: Global Attractions Attendance Report. Themed Entertainment Association, 2025.
[7] The Walt Disney Company. Annual Report (Form 10-K), Fiscal Year 2024. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, 2024.
[8] Gao Jianghong. Customer traffic is rising, but profits are falling: the five-year test of Beijing Universal Resort. 21st Century Business Herald, 2026-09-19.