



This is a repository copy of *Investigating the application of the motivation-opportunity-ability model to reveal factors which facilitate or inhibit inclusive engagement within local community festivals.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/160773/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Jepson, A., Clarke, A. and Ragsdell, G. orcid.org/0000-0002-7100-0329 (2014) Investigating the application of the motivation-opportunity-ability model to reveal factors which facilitate or inhibit inclusive engagement within local community festivals. *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 14 (3). pp. 331-348. ISSN 1502-2250

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15022250.2014.946230>

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism* on 13 Aug 2014, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/15022250.2014.946230>.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Investigating the application of the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model to reveal factors which facilitate or inhibit inclusive engagement within local community festivals

Allan Jepson, Alan Clarke & Gillian Ragsdell

Corresponding author: Allan Jepson,

a.s.jepson@herts.ac.uk

Abstract

Currently there is limited understanding, agreement and research within the phenomena of community engagement and participation in local community festivals and events. This paper aims to contribute to this growing, but limited, debate by justifying the adaption and integration of the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model, and proposing a combination of primary data collection and analysis methods, to reveal and understand the factors which either inhibit or facilitate local community engagement in festivals and events. The rationale of this conceptual paper is to determine how sustainability can be defined and achieved within local community festivals and events, by developing sustainable and inclusive community networks where the local population is actively engaged within the creation of events.

The paper begins by exploring the literature surrounding communities, community festivals and events, and community engagement. The paper then moves on to discuss the MOA model and its adaption and application to event studies. It builds on concepts discussed by Jepson and Clarke (2012) that support the creation of inclusive community festivals and events through inclusive participation within the planning and decision making process. The paper then moves on to explore the methodological concerns triggered by this model such as the need to be adaptable and flexible across a multifaceted community event in regards collecting primary data whilst maintaining integrity and validity during analysis . Finally the paper comments on the overall suitability of the MOA model to capture primary data and draw conclusions about best practice for community engagement in local festivals and events.

Introduction

The majority of community festivals and events are viewed through a largely positive lens, perhaps as a result of the positive impacts they promise to yield for those in the locality such as; the opportunity to develop a sense of community well-being, a chance to bring everyone together to celebrate culture and way of life, a chance to spend time socialising and meeting friends and family, the renewal of a sense of pride for where we live. All of these impacts though cannot be achieved without a process of community inclusivity, participation and engagement within the festival and

event planning process. This paper is an extension of work which we have been undertaking on community festivals and community engagement since 2000 (Clarke & Jepson, 2011; Jepson, 2009; Jepson & Clarke, 2005, 2013; Jepson, Clarke & Ragsdell, 2013; Jepson, Wiltshier, & Clarke, 2008; Sung, Hepworth & Ragsdell, 2013) and explores a conceptual development which we believe offers the opportunities for significant insights. We explore the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model, elaborating where its components could contribute to a deeper understanding of festivals and community events. This conceptual paper breaks new ground by applying the MOA model and adapting it for use within the realm of event studies; it does this by framing the model within three key areas of academic literature: Community, Community Festivals and Events, and Community Engagement.

Community, Community Festivals and Events, and Community Engagement

There is great complexity and a blurring of boundaries between the terms 'community', 'community culture', 'community festivals', and 'community engagement'. This paper seeks to disentangle these key concepts through literature discourse and to review each term in the context of festivals and with regards the suitability of utilising the MOA model as a tool to analyse community engagement in festivals and events.

Community and community culture

A major starting point for this paper is to recognise the complexities involved in defining a 'community'. Community is derived from the Latin word *com* (with or together) and *unus* (the number one or singularity) and is a word which is widely used within popular and academic discourse but one which is also highly contested. Some academics argue that it is the search for belonging within the insecure conditions of modern society (Delanty, 2003). It could also be argued that the ideology of community has never been more important due to the pressures of a globalised and rapidly homogenizing world and that the postmodern condition is searching to be a part of something unique and different. A key issue with regards community festivals is whether they should be defined in singularity, especially as they can take on multiple local cultures within a range of local communities. Richards and Palmer (2010, p. 165) discuss the concept of the local community and also document its complex nature; they define community as "a combination of individual local residents, and others who inhabit, work in and otherwise have a commitment to the local area".

This raises questions regarding community engagement such as whether true 'local residents' level of participation is higher than those who merely 'inhabit' the area. This question is raised because,

as yet, there has been no academic study within the field of events that has connected culture and community.

Many studies have laid claim to what festivals and events can do for local communities, and not what local communities can do for the festival and its programme of events. The majority of studies proclaim that festivals: can create or reinforce or challenge local or regional cultural identity (Boyle, 1997; Davila, 1997; De Bres & Davis, 2001; Hall, 1992; Smith, 1993; Waterman, 1998), boost local pride and enhance prestige and image, create a sense of place (Avery, 2000; Derrett, 2003), community (Dugas & Schweitzer, 1997) or well-being (Adams & Goldbard, 2001; Falassi, 1987). Falassi (1987) also commented that 'well-being' is important in a symbolic and social way; festivals therefore had the opportunity to periodically renew the life stream of a community, give sanctions to its institutions and, possibly, in some cases prove their value to the local population. Adams and Goldbard (2001) give a similar perspective with regard to community well-being and tell us that people turn to their culture to self-define and mobilize; to assert their local values; and to present them to visitors in a positive sharing of values. However, thoughts of a positive sharing of cultural values can only be achieved as a result of good festival organisation, communication (engagement with and inclusion of the local community in the planning process) and management.

De Bres and Davis (2001) comment that festivals can play a major role in challenging the perceptions of local identity or, as Hall (1992) proposes, can assist in the development or maintenance of community or regional identity; this is thought to be of great significance to a smaller community's festival as it could enhance their cultural values and help to share them with other communities. Derrett (2003) assimilates this position in her research into community festivals and their sense of place in which she comments that, if directed in the right way, festivals can perform a very useful community service by enhancing both group and place identity, a perspective which is backed up by further festival research (Boyle, 1997; Davila, 1997; Smith, 1993; Waterman, 1998). Derrett (ibid) continues to comment further that this sense of place should be celebrated through the festival as this is seen by visitors as an outward manifestation of community identity and a strong identifier of community and its people.

Jepson (2011) argues this case further and maintains that community festivals and events too often manufacture historical context and culture to ensure a good fit with potential visitors especially if the programme of events is externally as well as internally facing. Therefore it should be the case that cultural analysis takes place within the local community to ensure that any creation or reinforcement of cultural identity is built on solid cultural foundations which will in turn ensure that the events have full community engagement, representation, and support.

Community festivals are susceptible to a system of cultural production which aims to make the festival product as widely appealing as possible and, in doing so, can change it to a more homogenous or commodified product which then disconnect from the local communities it set out to serve (Saleh & Ryan, 1993). This was explored further by Ferris (1996) and Robinson et al (2004) who gave the term 'placeless festivals' to ones which had fallen victim to a globalized marketplace and had become detached from place, space and cultural identity. Community identity and, moreover, a sense of community is a facet of local culture, and local culture is thought to be the blood that flows through society. Wheatley and Kellner-Rogers (1998), for example, see festivals as providing the heart to a community as their celebratory nature enables residents to experience freedom, and the ability to connect to the cultural values and indeed the society in which they live, rather than seeing the fixed structure and rules surrounding the community.

Festivals also have the potential to enhance or improve a destination's development, and economic regeneration through maximising event marketing to both existing and prospective tourists (Getz, 1991), but with this potential there are problems. Getz's perspectives are also carried forward by academics who identify regional and central government involvement in festivals as a way of attracting both tourists and possibly new residents to economically neglected regions, to improve the economic and social life of the area (Ashworth & Voodg, 1990; Hall & Hubbard, 1996; Jarvis, 1994; Jeong & Santos, 2004; Kearns & Philo, 1993; Paddison, 1993). Connected to the improvement of the economic and social life of an area is prestige and image enhancement (Avery 2000), which is often achieved through civic boosterism marketing campaigns, which can have a big impact on a destination as a pull factor with a view to attracting festival visitors (Brown, 1997; Hill, 1988; Janiskee, 1996; Waterman, 1998). It could be further suggested that developing local infrastructures should become a major priority for the public sector and its communities especially if we are to create sustainable community festivals and events. It can also be further concluded that research in community festivals has so far ignored how festivals can have an impact on society and social change, and also have a real impact on the quality of life (Liburd & Derkzen, 2009) of those who live, work, learn and represent the local community of a place.

Community Festivals

Community festivals can be considered as part of the new wave of alternative or special interest tourism as identified by Poon (1993). This means that they contain certain unique elements which are not replicated or mass produced. Festivals can be seen as prime manifestations of the experience economy (Pine and Gilmore, 1999) as they entertain, educate, hold aesthetic value and provide the platform for escapism. Falassi (1987, p. 2) saw festivals as "a sacred or profane time of

celebration marked by special observances” maintaining that the social functions of a festival are closely related to community values. Farber (1983) investigated festivals and public celebrations and concluded that much could be learned about a community’s symbolic, economic, political and social life. Falassi (1987) then added to Farber’s notions of symbolism by commenting that both the social and symbolic meanings were closely linked to a series of overt values that the local communities see as essential to its ideology, worldview, social identity, history, and its physical survival, all of which the festivals celebrate. It is these very elements that constitute local cultures and give each festival its uniqueness which, it is suggested, is ultimately what visitors’ desire.

Mainstream definitions of festivals all tend to agree the truism that the local community is vital to the success of community festivals. Goldblatt (1997) for example, suggests that a festival’s key characteristic is the sense of community created. Festivals and community events can assume many roles - for example Dunstan (1994) observes that festivals and cultural events provide a forum for cultural values and traditions, a shared purpose. One view echoed by previous festival research is that festivals provide a unique opportunity for community cultural development (Getz, 1997). Other studies (Dunstan, 1994; Frisby & Getz, 1989; Getz, 1991, 1997) also suggest festivals can be used as building blocks for communities and promote ethnic understanding within society; in doing so, they can preserve and celebrate local traditions, history and culture, or be used as a strategy to extend a destinations lifecycle (Chacko & Schaffer, 1993).

Dugas and Schweitzer (1997) maintain that developing a sense of community is hard work and long term, especially to achieve high levels of connectedness, belonging and support. Cultures and communities can be thought of as inseparable as they constantly evolve together; therefore a definition of a community festival should have reference to local cultures, including popular cultures. Inclusive culture provides a greater opportunity for the festival or event to include and recognise all ethnic groups within its boundaries. In that sense then, festivals and community events are multi-faceted both as a result of the culture contained within them and also because of the multitude of relationships within local community groups (Quinn, 2006). The other and most crucial aspect is that if a community festival is to represent the ‘way of life’ of its communities then it needs to have community inclusivity within the planning and decision making process; without these there is an inherent danger that the festival will not accurately represent the local community.

Taking these aspects into consideration this paper takes the definition put forward by Jepson and Clarke (2013, p. 7) and defines a community festival as: *A themed and inclusive community event or series of events which has/have been created as the result of an inclusive community planning*

process to celebrate the particular way of life of people and groups in the local community with emphasis on particular space and time.

This definition is one which promotes stakeholder equality through the planning process and also helps to bring attention to preserving sensitive natural, cultural and social environments but, in particular, community values.

Community Engagement

Most academics are in agreement that every event, no matter the size or scale, needs to foster positive engagement from the community it aims to serve otherwise its long term survival is in jeopardy (Derrett, 2003; Getz, 1997; Jeong & Santos, 2004; Lade & Jackson, 2004; Richards & Palmer, 2010; Theodori & Luloff, 1998). Engagement is often intertwined with stakeholder theory though it should be recognised that these are two very separate concepts. The majority of academic studies define stakeholder theory in economic terms as the ethical search and attainment of profits (Freeman, 1984) through giving 'good deals' to all stakeholders (Campbell, 1997). Tosun (2000) terms active participation as individuals voluntarily taking on the responsibilities and opportunities of citizenship within a community. However, the difficulties in applying this definition broadly as a result of differing local goals, economic, sociocultural, and political conditions, are acknowledged. Even though one could argue that local communities automatically become stakeholders in the creation of community festivals and events, they are not usually concerned with the wider economic performance of the event. Engagement, moreover community participation, is also often overlooked as merely a tool to involve locals in community planning and development. The reality is that local people are intertwined with a complex set of cultural and personal beliefs which either facilitates or inhibits members of the community to voluntarily take action or confront responsibilities of citizenship (Tosun, 2000).

We can further add to the argument questioning the validity, role, and value of festival stakeholders. Kapur and Weisbrod's (2000) research, for example, places festivals within the 'mixed economy' as a result of their interest and involvement from the public, private and voluntary sectors. Getz and Anderson (2008) quite rightly point out the importance of 'event ownership' and the impact this could have on relationships between sectors and on the planning and construction of events. It could also be argued that the major factor is the level of stakeholder involvement, influence and subsequent power which brings about impact and change within the festival planning process and shapes the final festival programme of events. Getz and Anderson (2008) further highlight the relationship between festival governance, assessment and the overall performance of the festival. So, in the case of our future research, one major aspect would be how the music festival(s) benefit

the local community and its musicians and vice versa. On a higher governance level and with mainly public sector involvement this may translate, as Getz and Anderson (2008) suggest, as an urban marketing campaign to change the image or perception of the area, and widen a strategy for local businesses as they feed off the festival and its visitors. It may also be pertinent to bear in mind some of the other goals identified by Getz and Anderson (2008) in their study across the three different stakeholder types such as creating a festival for all (not-for-profit festivals) or create a party for all citizens (Public festivals) and to create a yearly free event (Private Festivals).

Another possible inhibitor to community engagement within events is concerned with the planning and production process employed within a community festival's development. This is an area which is often overlooked but it is the planning process itself and the resulting decisions which dramatically shape the festival and its evolution within the local community. Behind every festival and event decision making process lies the existence of a multitude of stakeholder relationships; all of these relationships are connected through different cultures but all are influenced by power. So far few studies have engaged with power and decision making debates, Clarke and Jepson (2011) demonstrated how the values inscribed within exclusive ('Culture as high art forms and intellectual stimulation') rather than inclusive ('Culture as a way of life') definitions of 'culture' can exclude participation from community festivals; furthermore they tracked culturally loaded decisions from planning forums to representations of cultural diversity and event consumption.

Church and Coles (2007) argued that power and tourism cannot be separated as a result of the often complex decision processes and therefore research should engage with power discourses locally, regionally, nationally or internationally. It could be argued that the role of power in events and the decision making process is even more important within an events context as it is often a small team of people within the public sector making decisions on behalf of local people. One key question when investigating the event decision making process is where the power actually comes from. Church and Coles (2007) argue that power does not simply exist but must be created through the relationships between stakeholders; this is an example of what Wallerstein (1994) referred to as the 'civilising process' as this is where stakeholders align themselves within particular power structures. Westwood (2002) observed that the very environment where the decision making processes take place can influence both the decision making process and the stakeholders' involvement since the environment becomes a 'site of power'. Clarke and Jepson (2011) found that, once power had been defined and reinforced through the civilising process, people would readily obey a chain of command, which reinforces Weber's (1978) view that power is more easily exercised if it is linked to authority. Those in charge of making decisions can then become Ioannides et al's (1998) 'power brokers'.

Another way to refer to this power over other stakeholders is by bringing in the concept of 'hegemony' (Gramsci, 1976) which is the exercise of power, achieved by consensus as well as coercion, over one or more groups in the local communities. Researchers can also explore the way in which this power or hegemony is enacted; power can be seen in the constant surveillance of decision making or what Foucault (1978) described as 'Disciplinary Power'.

Power can also be achieved by restricting stakeholder knowledge, both in terms of the organisations who perhaps contribute financially to the festivals, and the local communities themselves. As long as discipline is retained due to any number or all of the factors described above then there will be very limited resistance to power. In a wider context this means that those with power and hierarchical control can assume complete control over the direction of the festival and its events.

Therefore power has direct impacts over decision making processes within a local community festival and could produce a non-inclusive community festival where stakeholders, including local communities, feel unable to challenge the established order of the planning process (Foucault, 1982). Community opinion may not then be represented, local cultural identity is defined by the dominant social groupings, little or no democracy exists within the festival planning process because of the dominance of those with power over decisions, and there is very little space to organise resistance to challenge decisions made on behalf of the local communities.

Other academics suggest the opposite view that full participation may not be desirable (Taylor, 1995; Tosun, 1999; Tosun & Timothy, 2003; Yoon, Chen & Gürsoy, 1999) as the local community might not have the desired skills or knowledge to make concise, informed or impartial decisions. Hung et al (2011) suggest that each situation is further complicated by the economic, political and sociocultural conditions that frame each community. The interesting aspect with regards to local community festivals and events is that their *raison d'être* means that local people have the right to participate as the event should be a representation of their cultural traditions and way of life.

From the comprehensive review of literature given here it can be concluded that four major research themes (presented in Figure 1.) emerge which can be used to frame and analyse the phenomena of community festivals and events. The first research theme is that of the relationship between the level of community engagement and the festival organisers' view of culture and community; inclusive or exclusive views on culture and cultural forms can shape the programme of events within a festival for the advantage or disadvantage of the local community. Advantages of an inclusive view of culture such as that put forward by Williams (1983) is more likely to result in a community festival that understands the needs and diversity within the local area and therefore is more likely to embrace and include all sections of the community. Exclusive views hold the opposite

and can be very detrimental, especially if communication and knowledge sharing is restricted by the festival organisers. Following on from this, the second research consideration should concentrate on the democracy of the planning process to ascertain whether invitations have been extended to members of the local community and community groups. From this it should then be considered whether the local community have then been empowered to share their views during the planning process, and as a result of this analysis can then be made on whether the community festival has achieved inclusion and cultural diversity in its offering to local people. The third research theme which merits discussion is the role of 'perception', and in particular whether the level of community participation in an event is positively influenced by a person's perception of the benefits an event might bring to the community. The fourth and final overarching research theme is to ascertain the relationship between a local community's level of participation and its ability to participate within community events and planning therein.

Adapting the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model to investigate community engagement in local community events and festivals

The Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model was first used within information processing (MacInnis & Jaworski, 1989), then subsequently adapted within advertising (Batra & Ray, 1986; MacInnis et al, 1991) and social marketing research (Rothschild, 1999). Hung et al (2011) saw the need to integrate 'means' orientated studies with 'ends' orientated studies and adapted these into the MOA model to test community participation in tourism development and to gain a more holistic understanding. This argument is also equivocal in studying festivals and community events as they are inseparable from culture and, as a phenomenon, provide very rich and subjective data streams which require a holistic approach in order to validate conclusions. At present there is no academic agreement on what the optimal form of community participation should be; some researchers such as Cole (2006), Jamal and Getz (1995), and Simmons (1994) advocate a high end participation philosophy whereby the local community is fully immersed in the planning process, and therefore holds power over the decision making process.

There has been very little academic investigation into the way in which local communities participate in and engage with events in their locality. Hung et al (2011) developed the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model as a way of explaining the participation of local people in tourism development. As stated earlier, the model aims to bring together 'means' and 'ends' orientated studies to provide a more holistic view of how local people are empowered or inhibited to participate and become active in the tourism planning process. 'Means' orientated studies can be thought of as the process or conditions which affect a local community's ability to participate, while 'ends' orientated studies

are those which concentrate on the end results of participation (Hung et al, 2011). Means orientated studies within tourism have documented the many stages involved within participation process such as: determining the role of local participation in the project, choosing a research team, conducting preliminary studies, determining the level of local participation, assessing appropriate participation mechanisms, indicating dialogue and educational efforts, pursuing collective decision making, developing an action plan and implementation scheme, and monitoring and evaluating outcomes (Drake, 1991; Garrod, 2003). The nine stages mentioned above were originally utilised to examine ecotourism planning and development, but many of the stages are applicable in the development of community events and festivals. In particular they determine the local level and role of local participation, pursuing collective decision making, assessing appropriate participation methods and, perhaps most importantly, the level of communication, knowledge and awareness to facilitate participation.

Motivation can be taken as the driving force behind a person's decision-making process as it can affect the intensity and direction of behaviour (Bettman, 1979). Many studies discussed earlier have examined motivation to attend events but none have investigated the reasons for participation within them. Academic studies though have developed a precedent citing the importance of motivation within any decision to participate (Kyat, 2002; Milne & Ewing, 2004). Academic debate within tourism suggests that participation within the planning process is influenced by the level at which the project will affect them personally, and additionally is influenced by the perceived benefits of the project.

Opportunity is defined by Bahaire and Elliot-White (1999) within the context of tourism planning as circumstances which facilitate public involvement in the participation process; opportunity occurs when planners adopt a participatory approach which provides a supportive framework for community participation. And, finally, participation cannot occur without an open channel of communication between the community and planners. This is further documented by Aas, Ladkin, and Fletcher (2005) who discuss the importance of establishing early and straightforward channels of communication as a first step to community participation.

The final aspect of the MOA model is *Ability* which is seen as a complex entity which includes a combination of factors such as awareness, experience, knowledge, skills, accessibility to information, and financial resources. The resulting complexity led Jamal and Getz (1999) to highlight that, even though a community member has the right to participate and is motivated to seek out opportunity, they may lack the ability to do so.

Insert figure 1. Here please

Figure 1 Illustrates the MOA model which will be empirically investigated using a flexible research methodology to capture rich and subjective cultural data. The four research themes identified within the figure are borne out of a comprehensive review of literature and are recommended as overarching research and analysis considerations in the study of community participation and engagement.

In contrast to ‘means’ orientated studies, ‘ends’ orientated studies have focused on investigating the range and levels of participation, which has been described as ‘a typology of participation’ (Arnstein, 1969; Pretty, 1995; Tosun, 1999). Arnstein’s early research centred on the identification of eight ladder levels to achieve participation; manipulation, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power and citizen control. The stages of manipulation and therapy were identified by her as ‘non-participatory’ as they were designed to educate local people, while informing, consultation and placation were regarded as ‘tokenism’ due to local people acting in an advisory capacity. Finally, the delegated power and citizen control stages were identified as ‘citizen power’ and, as this is the top rung on the theoretical ladder, local people were in control and held power within or over the decision making process.

Table 1 gives a breakdown of the questions developed within the research questionnaire to analyse respondents’ motivation, opportunity and ability to engage with the festival.

Insert table 1. Here please

Creating a flexible methodology

In adapting the MOA model to test engagement within community festivals and events we recognize and acknowledge that a great degree of flexibility is needed especially within a local community festival context. This perspective is reached through a further realisation that, due to the complexities and diversities of local communities, a singular research methodology with limited data collection methods will not fully explain and provide accurate conclusions on the festival research phenomenon nor, moreover, on community engagement within it. Therefore we suggest that a mixed methodological approach is employed incorporating the critical realism paradigm through the use of both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Critical realism could be adopted for use within a study which tests the MOA model as it assumes that relationships are present between variables and facts. Fairclough (2003) provides further justification for this approach as he explains that social events contain social practices which exist within social structures which are all

part of reality. Brewer (2000) defines critical realism as providing real structures which provide a framework for people's actions. Further reasoning behind the methodological approach applied in this research is a reaction to the limited amount of development in tourism and event studies with regard to qualitative methodologies and philosophical underpinning (Decrop, 2004; Phillimore & Goodson, 2004).

Tribe (1997) argued the case for tourism research and put forward that a significant lack of engagement in tourism studies could be down to the fact that tourism is still an emergent field of study of which the major concentration had been in business and therefore quantitative approaches took precedent. It is thought that this argument can now also be applied to event studies as a new and emergent field of research. Traditional approaches to research have been judged against conventional criteria of reliability and validity. 'Validity' has been seen as the assumption of causality without researcher bias and 'reliability' as the ability of the research measures to capture the data specified by the research, repeatedly, consistently and with the likelihood of generating similar results in similar conditions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Decrop (2004) advances the criteria of trustworthiness to replace the older canons of positivist research. There are four dimensions to these criteria:

- (1) Credibility – which equates to the issues of internal validity.
- (2) Transferability – matched with external validity and more relevant to qualitative research than generalisability.
- (3) Dependability – related to reliability. This recognises that knowledge generated is bound by time, context, culture and value (Decrop, 2004). This then focuses attention on the correspondence between the data recorded by the researcher and what actually occurred in the setting.
- (4) Confirmability – associated with objectivity.

It has been recognised that research cannot be totally objective but the system of analysis is made explicit to construct a meaningful account of the phenomena and the ways in which those meanings emerged. They conclude that satisfying these criteria entails:

- Careful use, interpretation, examination and assessment of appropriate literature;
- Careful justification of the qualitative research methodologies employed in a study; and
- Careful structuring of data analysis to ensure full descriptive evaluation, and assessment to data of key significance.

The iterative analysis and triangulation of multiple sources will demonstrate the validity of the research processes undertaken and of the account to be constructed after data collection and analysis takes place.

Primary data collection methods and the MOA model

The previous study which tested the MOA model by Hung et al (2011) was applied to tourism planning and utilised questionnaires and brief telephone interviews. Although specific details were not provided on the type of questionnaires, it is thought these were semi-structured in nature as they collected demographic data as well as tested participants' feelings on a Likert scale. In order to test the MOA model within community events we suggest that a combination of semi-structured interviews and structured questionnaires are used. Semi-structured interviews should take place

with festival organizers, as it is often the case that simple semi-structured interviews can be employed to ascertain the thoughts, feelings and perceptions of participants (Holloway, 2008). Testing the MOA model should be no different in this respect especially as research of this nature requires what Mason (2002) describes as an exploration of the importance of topics through the richness and depth of qualitative data. Interviews with festival organizers should take place in a neutral and calm environment away from the chaotic programming of the events which it is hoped will allow for more open and insightful responses. Interviews could then be analysed through proprietary software such as 'Nvivo' and further triangulated against other primary data sets.

Questions utilised within the interviews should be centred on understanding the community event organizers' cultural background, their understanding of 'community' / 'culture' and how this fits within the festival. Organizers should also be asked to comment on how successful they feel the festival has been in relation to informing, motivating, and providing opportunities to local people in order to participate in the event planning and decision making process. Finally, organizers should also be asked to discuss the positive and negative impacts of the event on local communities, and whether the festival represents local cultural traditions and accurately portrays their way of life.

Secondly we suggest that structured questionnaires are developed as the second data collection method. The questionnaires can be formulated to take account of attendee demographics and provide a body of primary data to contribute to the testing of the four research questions mentioned previously. The questionnaires should also be designed to inform the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model, and to capture data with regards to tourists, local communities and festival cultures. Within the Hung et al (2011) study 'Likert' scales were used within the questionnaire to determine respondents' feelings toward questions grouped with motivation, opportunity, and ability.

The responses on the 'Likert' scale could then be allocated a numerical value in order that the responses could be analysed as scale data. The authors would therefore make the assumption that the difference between the five points on the Likert scale (Strongly Agree / Agree / Neither Agree nor Disagree / Disagree / Strongly Disagree) was equal and could be quantified. Since this position could easily be challenged, we would argue for a simple 'yes / no / don't know' format when asking for agreement with statements relating to the MOA model. Detailed analysis can then still take place along with triangulation against other primary data sets mentioned in this section.

Event photography could also be utilised to capture evidence of local community traditions, cultural displays on offer within the community event as well as collecting evidence on aspects of touristic cultures, visual / performance cultures, local community cultures, or festival cultures. Photographs could easily be taken randomly across a wide range of community events. Additionally, video interviews and observational notes could be collected by using an iPad; observational notes could include thoughts on the atmosphere, type of festival event, and the reaction of the crowd to the different types of events within the festival or event programmes.

Conclusions

This paper, though conceptual in nature, was founded by already established work within the field of event studies and builds on this to investigate the inhibitors and facilitators to community engagement in events. This paper is borne out of the desire of the authors to probe deeper into how and why communities engage within events and looks to further establish best practice for festival organisers. Primary data collected within community events should inform on the already

established theoretical framework of the MOA model and, as a result, provide sufficient data which can then be analysed through the four research themes identified through a critical review of the literature:

- *Research Theme 1:* Local community culture as a way of life; and the relationship between organisers' views on 'community' and 'culture' and the creation of community festivals and events
- *Research Theme 2:* To determine whether cultural diversity and inclusivity is achieved as a result of empowering the local community to present their views during the festival and event planning process
- *Research Theme 3:* To understand whether positive local community perceptions of the benefits that festivals bring to the local community have a direct influence on the level of community participation
- *Research Theme 4:* To better understand the relationship between positive levels of community participation and their 'ability' to participate within community festivals and events

Community events bring together people in spaces which are not traditionally used for staged cultural performances. The city centre and the communities of musicians, performers, organisers and locals change with the infusion of enthusiasm from local and visitors alike. It is this dynamic which we hope researchers can capture through the application of a flexible approach to research and subsequent rigorous analysis of primary data collected in the field.

This paper has elaborated an approach to deepening our understanding of the complex issues which underpin the complexities of community festivals, both as festivals and as expressions of local communities. The research into the nexus of issues underpinning the roles and activities of local communities within festivals that claim to be tied to the local communities themselves is very important for all the stakeholders in the events. Explorations of the power relations are important to see how the various roles that are taken up by and ascribed to local communities develop competences and capabilities within those communities. The MOA model suggests that there are benefits to engagement and participation over and above those gained by being seen as the hosts of the local event. This paper has shown that the use of the MOA model could be highly beneficial and applicable for use in analysing community engagement within events and ascertain the importance of the three strands of the model. Future research should test the MOA model within a community event in order to explore these interconnections and interactions to determine what significance they have for local communities and for festival organisers.

References

- Aas, C., Ladkin, A. & Fletcher, J. (2005). Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (1): 28-48. DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2004.04.005. Please follow this link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160738304001021>
- Adams, D. & Goldbard, A. (2001). cited In: Derrett, R. (2003). Making sense of how festivals demonstrate a community's sense of place. *Event Management*, 8: 49–58. DOI:1525-9951/03. Please

follow this link:

<https://www.cognizantcommunication.com/ccsSiteFiles/EventManager/em81abs.html>

Andersson, T. & Getz, D. (2009). Tourism as a mixed industry: Differences between private, public and not-for-profit festivals. *Tourism Management* 30: 847–856. DOI:

10.1016/j.tourman.2008.12.008. Please follow this link:

<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261517708002136>

Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35 (4): 216-224. DOI:10.1080/01944366908977225. Please follow this link:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01944366908977225#.U64CICrxnfw>

Ashworth, G. & Voodg, H. (1990). *Selling the City: Marketing Approaches in Public Sector Urban Planning*. London: Belhaven Press.

Avery, P. M. (2000). City Cultures as the object of cultural tourism 2000, In: Robinson, M. (2000) *Developments in Urban and Rural Tourism*. Sunderland: Business Education Publishing Ltd, (2000: 35).

Bahaire, T. & Elliot-White, M. (1999). Community participation in tourism planning and development in the historic city of York, England. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 2 (3) 243-276.

DOI:10.1080/13683509908667854. Please follow this link:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13683509908667854#.U64Crixnfw>

Batra, R. & Ray, M. L. (1986). Situational effects of advertising repetition: The moderating influence of Motivation, Ability, and Opportunity to respond. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 12 (March): 432-449. Please follow this link:

<http://www.jstor.org/discover/10.2307/254303?uid=3738032&uid=2134&uid=2&uid=70&uid=4&sid=21103905515701>

Bettman, J. R. (1979). *An Information Processing Theory of Consumer Choice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Boyle, M. (1997). as cited in: De Bres, K. & Davis, J. (2001). Celebrating group and place identity: A case study of a new regional festival. *Tourism Geographies*, 3(3): 326-337.

DOI:10.1080/14616680110055439. Please follow this link:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14616680110055439?queryID=%24%7BresultBean.queryID%7D#.U64Dsirxnfw>

Brown, R. (1997). as cited in: De Bres, K. & Davis, J. (2001). Celebrating Group and Place Identity: A case study of a new regional festival. *Tourism Geographies*, 3(3): 326-337.

DOI:10.1080/14616680110055439. Please follow this link:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14616680110055439?queryID=%24%7BresultBean.queryID%7D#.U64Dsirxnfw>

- Campbell, A. (1997). Stakeholders: the case in favour. *Long Range Planning*, Vol. 30 No.3, pp. 446-449. DOI: 10.1016/S0024-6301(97)00003-4. Please follow this link:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0024630197000034>
- Chacko, H. & Schaffer, J. (1993). The evolution of a festival: Creole Christmas in New Orleans. *Tourism Management*, 14(4): 475–482. DOI: 10.1016/0261-5177(93)90100-Y. Please follow this link
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/026151779390100Y>
- Church, A. & Coles, T. (2007). *Tourism, Power and Space*. London: Routledge.
- Clarke, A. & Jepson, A. (2011). Power, hegemony, and relationships in the festival planning and construction process. *International Journal of Festival and Event Management*, Vol. 2 (1): 7-19. DOI 10.1108/17582951111116588. Please follow this link:
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17582951111116588>
- Cole, S. (2006). Information and Empowerment: The keys to achieving sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14 (6): 629-644. DOI:10.2167/jost607.0. Please follow this link:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.2167/jost607.0#.U64FDSrxnfw>
- Davila, A. (1997). as cited in: De Bres, K. & Davis, J. (2001). Celebrating group and place identity: A case study of a new regional festival. *Tourism Geographies*, 3(3): 326-337. DOI:10.1080/14616680110055439. Please follow this link:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14616680110055439?queryID=%24%7BresultBean.queryID%7D#.U64Dsirxnfw>
- De Bres, K. & Davis, J. (2001). Celebrating group and place identity: A case study of a new regional festival. *Tourism Geographies*, 3(3): 326-337. DOI:10.1080/14616680110055439. Please follow this link:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14616680110055439?queryID=%24%7BresultBean.queryID%7D#.U64Dsirxnfw>
- Decrop, A. (2004). Trustworthiness in Qualitative Tourism Research, in Phillimore, J. & Goodson, L. (2004). *Qualitative research in tourism: ontologies, epistemologies and methodologies*. London: Routledge. pp156 - 169
- Delanty, G. (2003). *Community* [2nd Ed]. Oxon: Routledge.
- Derrett, R. (2003). Making sense of how festivals demonstrate a community's sense of place. *Event Management*, 8 (1): 49–58. DOI: 1525-9951/03. Please follow this link:
<https://www.cognizantcommunication.com/ccsSiteFiles/EventManagement/em81abs.html>
- Drake, S. P. (1991). *Local Participation in Ecotourism Projects, cited in: Nature Tourism: Managing for the Environment*, Edited by E. Whelan. Washington, DC: Island Press, pp. 132-163.

- Dugas, K. J. & Schweitzer, J. H. (1997). Sense of community and the development of block culture (Ronald E. McNair Post Baccalaureate achievement Program). Michigan State University. www.msu.edu/socomm/paper1997.htm (accessed December 12, 2001).
- Dunstan, G. (1994) (March 10). The background story of the Nimbin Mardi Grass (media release). Hemp Embassy, Nimbin.
- Falassi, A. (1987). *Time Out of Time: Essays on the Festival*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.
- Farber, C. (1983). as cited in: Getz, D. (1991). *Festivals, Special Events, and Tourism*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold 56).
- Ferris, W. R. (1996). A sense of place. National Endowment for the Humanities, Commonwealth Club of San Francisco. www.neh.fed.us/news/humanities/1998-01/ferris.html
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Boston, MA: Pitman Publishing.
- Frisby, W. & Getz, D. (1989). Festival management: a case study perspective. *Journal of Travel Research* 28(1), (summer): 7–11. DOI: 10.1177/004728758902800102. Please follow this link: <http://jtr.sagepub.com/content/28/1/7.full.pdf+html>
- Foucault, M. (1978). *The History of Sexuality Volume 1: An Introduction* New York: Pantheon
- Foucault, M. (1982). 'The subject and power' in Hubert, L.D. & Rabinow, P. (Eds.) *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf
- Garrod, B. (2003). Local participation in the planning and management of ecotourism: A revised model approach. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 2 (1): 33-53. DOI:10.1080/14724040308668132. Please follow this link: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14724040308668132#.U64Iqyrxfw>
- Getz, D. (1991). *Festivals, Special Events, and Tourism*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Getz, D. (1997). *Event Management and Event Tourism*. New York: Cognizant Communication Corp.
- Getz, D (2008). as cited in: Andersson, T., & Getz, D. (2009). Tourism as a mixed industry: Differences between private, public and not-for-profit festivals. *Tourism Management* 30: 847–856. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2008.12.008. Please follow this link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261517708002136>
- Goldblatt, J. (1997). *Special Events: Best Practices in Modern Events Management*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Gramsci, A. (1976). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks* (edited and translated by Hoare, Q. and Nowell-Smith, G.). London, Lawrence and Wishart
- Hall, C. M. (1992). *Hallmark Tourist Events: Impact, Management and Planning*. London: Belhaven Press.

- Hall, T. & Hubbard, P. (1996). The entrepreneurial city: New urban politics, new urban geographies? *Progress in Human Geography*, 20: 153–174. DOI: 10.1177/030913259602000201. Please follow this link: <http://phg.sagepub.com/content/20/2/153.full.pdf+html>
- Hill, K.T. (1988). *Festivals, USA*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Holloway, I. (2008). *A-Z of Qualitative Research in Healthcare and Nursing*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hung, K., Sirakaya-Turk, E. & Ingram, L., J (2011). Testing the efficacy of an integrative model for community participation. *Journal of Travel Research*, 50(3): 276–288. DOI: 10.1177/0047287510362781. Please follow this link: <http://jtr.sagepub.com/content/50/3/276.full.pdf+html>
- Ioannides, D. (1998). “Tour Operators: the gatekeepers of tourism” in Ioannides, D. & Debbage, K. (Eds), *The Economic Geography of the Tourist Industry: A Supply-side Analysis*. Routledge, London
- Jamal, T. B. & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration Theory and Community Tourism Planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22 (1): 186-204. DOI: 10.1016/0160-7383(94)00067-3. Please follow this link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0160738394000673>
- Jamal, T. B. & Getz, D. (1999). Community roundtable for tourism related conflicts: The dialectics of consensus and progress structures. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7: 290-313. DOI:10.1080/09669589908667341. Please follow this link: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09669589908667341#.U64K8yrxfw>
- Janiskee, R. (1996). as cited in: De Bres, K. & Davis, J. (2001). Celebrating group and place identity: A case study of a new regional festival. *Tourism Geographies*, 3(3): 326-337. DOI:10.1080/14616680110055439. Please follow this link: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14616680110055439?queryID=%24%7BresultBean.queryID%7D#.U635Rirxfw>
- Jarvis, B. (1994). as cited in: Jeong, S. & Santos, C. A. (2004). Cultural politics and contested place identity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3): 640-656. DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2004.01.004. Please follow this link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160738304000210>
- Jeong, S. & Santos, C. A. (2004). Cultural politics and contested place identity. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 31(3): 640-656. DOI: 10.1016/j.annals.2004.01.004. Please follow this link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160738304000210>
- Jepson, A. S. (2009). Investigating Cultural Relationships within the Festival Planning and Construction Process in A Local Community Festival Context. *Published PhD Thesis*.
- Jepson, A. S. (2011). In: Clarke, A. & Jepson, A. (2011). Power, hegemony, and relationships in the festival planning and construction process. *International Journal of Festival and Event Management*, 2 (1): 7-19. DOI 10.1108/17582951111116588. Please follow this link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17582951111116588>

- Jepson, A. S., & Clarke, A. (2005). 'The Jubilee Festival in Derby: involving the local community'. *3rd DeHann Tourism Management Conference: The Impact and Management of Tourism Related Events*, Nottingham University Business School. ISSN: 1471-1427.
- Jepson, A., Clarke, A. & Ragsdell, G. (2013). Applying the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model to reveal factors that influence inclusive engagement within local community festivals: The case of UtcaZene, 2012. *International Journal of Festival and Event Management* 4(3): 186 -205. DOI: 10.1108/IJEFM-06-2013-0011. Please follow this link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-06-2013-0011>
- Jepson, A. S. & Clarke, A. (2013). Community festivals and community development: Inclusive or exclusive events In Robinson et al (Eds.) *Research Themes in Events*. Wallingford, CABI.
- Jepson, A. S., Wiltshier, P. & Clarke, A. (2008). Community festivals: involvement and inclusion. *CHME International Research Conference 2008*. ISBN: 0-9548039-1-4.
- Kapur, K. & Weisbrod, B. (2000). as cited in: Andersson, T., & Getz, D. (2009). Tourism as a mixed industry: Differences between private, public and not-for-profit festivals. *Tourism Management* 30: 847–856. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2008.12.008. Please follow this link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261517708002136>
- Kayat, K. (2002). Exploring factors influencing individual participation in community-based tourism: The case of Kampung Relau Homestay Program, Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 7 (2): 19-27. DOI:10.1080/10941660208722116. Please follow this link: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10941660208722116#.U64MrCrxfw>
- Kearns, G. & Philo, C. (1993). *Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Lade, C. & Jackson, J. (2004). Key success factors in regional festivals: Some Australian experiences. *Event Management*, 9: 1–11. DOI: 1525-9951/04. Please follow this link: <https://www.cognizantcommunication.com/ccsSiteFiles/EventManagement/em91abs.html>
- Liburd, J. J. & Derkzen, P. (2009). Emic perspectives on quality of life: The case of the Danish Wadden Sea Festival. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 9 (2): 132–146. DOI: 10.1057/thr.2009.3. Please follow this link: <http://thr.sagepub.com/content/9/2/132.abstract>
- Lincoln & Guba (1985). as cited in Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*. 3rd ed. London: Sage.
- MacInnis, D. J., & Jaworski, B. J. (1989). Information processing from advertisements: Toward an integrative framework. *Journal of Marketing*, 53 (October): 1-23. ACCESSION # 4999726. Please follow this link: <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/4999726/information-processing-from-advertisements-toward-integrative-framework>

- MacInnis, D. J., Moorman, C. & Jaworski, B. J. (1991). Enhancing and measuring consumers' Motivation, Opportunity and Ability to process brand information from ads. *Journal of Marketing*, 55 (October): 32-53. ACCESSION #9111250447. Please follow this link: <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/9111250447/enhancing-measuring-consumers-motivation-opportunity-ability-process-brand-information-from-ads>
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching*. London: Sage.
- Milne, S. & Ewing, G. (2004). Community Participation in Caribbean Tourism. In Duval, D. T. (Ed.) (2004). *Tourism in the Caribbean: Trends, Development, Prospects*. London: Routledge, pp. 205-217.
- Paddison, R. (1993). City Marketing, Image Reconstruction and Urban Regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 30: 339–350. DOI: 10.1080/00420989320080331, Please follow this link: <http://usj.sagepub.com/content/30/2/339.full.pdf+html>
- Phillimore, J. & Goodson, L. (2004). *Qualitative Research in Tourism: Ontologies, Epistemologies and Methodologies*. London: Routledge.
- Pine, B. J. & Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The Experience Economy: Work is Theatre and Every Business is a Stage*. Massachusetts, Harvard Business School Press.
- Poon, A. (1993). *Tourism, Technology and Competitive Strategies*. Wallingford: CABI
- Pretty, J. (1995). The many interpretations of participation. *In Focus*, 16: 4-5. DOI: 10.1016/S0305-750X(00)00098-X. Please follow this link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X0000098X>
- Quinn, B. (2006). Problematising 'Festival Tourism': Arts festivals and sustainable development in Ireland. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14 (3): 288 – 306. DOI:10.1080/09669580608669060. Please follow this link: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09669580608669060#.U638Dyrxfw>
- Richards, G. & Palmer, R. (2010). *Eventful cities; cultural management and urban revitalisation*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Robinson, M., Picard, D. & Long, P. (2004). Festival tourism: Producing, translating, and consuming expressions of culture. *Event Management*, 8: 187-789. DOI:10.3727/1525995031436836. Please follow this link: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3727/1525995031436836>
- Rothschild, M. L. (1999). Carrots, sticks, and promises: A conceptual framework for the management of public health and social issue behaviours. *Journal of Marketing*, 63 (October): 24-37. ACCESSION #2443168. Please follow this link: <http://connection.ebscohost.com/c/articles/2443168/carrots-sticks-promises-conceptual-framework-management-public-health-social-issue-behaviors>
- Saleh, F. & Ryan, C. (1993). Jazz and knitwear: Factors that attract tourists to festivals. *Tourism Management*, August: 289-297. DOI: 10.1016/0261-5177(93)90063-Q. Please follow this link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/026151779390063Q>

- Simmons, D. G. (1994). Community participation in tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 15 (2): 98-108. DOI: 10.1016/0261-5177(94)90003-5. Please follow this link:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0261517794900035>
- Smith, S. (1993). as cited in: De Bres, K. & Davis, J. (2001). Celebrating group and place identity: A case study of a new regional festival. *Tourism Geographies*, 3(3): 326-337.
DOI:10.1080/14616680110055439. Please follow this link:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14616680110055439?queryID=%24%7BresultBean.queryID%7D#.U635Rirxnfw>
- Sung, H-Y, Hepworth, M. & Ragsdell, G. (2013). Investigating essential elements of community engagement in public libraries: An exploratory qualitative study. *Journal of Library and Information Science* 45(3) 8: 206-21. DOI: 10.1177/0961000612448205. Please follow this link:
<http://lis.sagepub.com/content/45/3/206.short>
- Taylor, G. (1995). The community approach: Does it really work? *Tourism Management*, 16 (7): 487-489. DOI: 10.1016/0261-5177(95)00078-3. Please follow this link:
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0261517795000783>
- Theodori, G. & Luloff, A. (1998). Land use and community attachment. 7th International Symposium on Society and Resource Management, University of Missouri.
- Tosun, C. (1999). Towards a typology of community participation in the tourism development process. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10 (2): 113-134.
DOI:10.1080/13032917.1999.9686975. Please follow this link:
<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13032917.1999.9686975#.U632Qyrxnfw>
- Tosun, C. (2000). Limits to community participation in the tourism development process in developing countries. *Tourism Management*, 21: 613-33. DOI: 10.1016/S0261-5177(00)00009-1.
Please follow this link: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261517700000091>
- Tosun, C. & Timothy, D. J. (2003). Arguments for community participation in the tourism development process. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 14 (2): 2-15. DOI: 20043008143. Please follow this link:
<http://www.cabdirect.org/abstracts/20043008143.html;jsessionid=D6412DCE339D45BD2E85E54C489D8513>
- Tribe, J. (1997). as cited in Getz, D. (2012). *Event Studies: Theory, Research and Policy for Planned Events*. 2nd Ed. London: Routledge.
- Wallerstein, I. M. (1994). as cited in: Robbins. D (2000). *Bourdieu and culture*. London: Sage, (2000: 31 – 32).
- Waterman, S. (1998). Carnival for elites? The cultural politics of arts festivals. *Progress in Human Geography* 22(1): 54–74. DOI: 10.1191/030913298672233886. Please follow this link:
<http://phg.sagepub.com/content/22/1/54.abstract>

Weber, M. (1978). *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretive Sociology* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press

Westwood, S. (2002). *Power and the Social* London: Routledge

Wheatley, M. J., & Kellner-Rogers, M. (1998). The paradox and promise of community. In Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., Beckhard, R. & Schubert, R. F. (Eds.), *The community of the future* (pp. 9–18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Yoon, Y., Chen, J. S. & Gürsoy, D. (1999). An investigation of the relationship between tourism impacts and host communities characteristics. *Anatolia: An International Journal of Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 10 (1): 29-44. DOI:10.1080/13032917.1999.9686970. Please follow this link: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13032917.1999.9686970#.U63uLirxnfw>




Figure 1. MOA model Integrating key research themes within community festivals and events

RT. = Research Theme

Table 1. Adapted MOA model questionnaire to measure community engagement in events in Veszprem

Motivation to engage

- I think that attracting tourists to the festival is good for the local economy.
- I believe that hosting events showcases local community cultures, and creates new markets.
- I think that hosting events diversifies the Veszprem economy.
- I believe that hosting events is good for Veszprem's economy.
- I believe that the Veszprem Street Music festival is a strong economic contributor to the local economy.

Opportunity to engage

- I am aware that the event planners host meetings and community planning forums for events in Veszprem.
- The local organizers and local government are interested in hearing our views on the Veszprem Street Music Festival.
- The organizers of the Veszprem Street Music Festival represent my views and those of the local community in planning the festival.
- The organizers of the Veszprem Street Music Festival provide opportunities for me to contribute to decision making with regards the festival and other events.

Ability to engage

Awareness

- I am aware of the local community festivals and events which take place in Veszprem.
- I keep up to date with news relating to Veszprem and events which take place within it.
- I am familiar with the events programme in Veszprem.
- I receive information from organizers about community festivals and events in Veszprem.

Participation Levels

- I know how to contribute to the planning of local community festivals and events in Veszprem.
- I share my opinions about the festivals and events in my local community with tourism officials and event organizers.
- I provide assistance or resources and help to develop community events and festivals in Veszprem.
- I am able to contact festival organizers when necessary.
- I often meet with tourism / event organisers to discuss issues with regards events in the local community of Veszprem.
- When meeting with officials that develop events for the community I feel that I have the opportunity to put my views forward.
- I feel that my views on community festivals and events are considered during the planning of events in Veszprem.

Knowledge

- I know a lot about community festivals and events happening in Veszprem.
- I have knowledge about event visitors in my community.
- I understand the impacts caused within the local community when events take place.
- I know a lot about my local community.
- I know how I can participate in the planning process for the Veszprem Street Music Festival.

