



Deposited via The University of Sheffield.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/160774/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Jepson, A., Clarke, A. and Ragsdell, G. (2014) Integrating “self-efficacy” theory to the motivation-opportunity-ability (MOA) model to reveal factors that influence inclusive engagement within local community festival. *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*, 5 (3). pp. 219-234. ISSN: 1758-2954

<https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEFM-11-2013-0027>

© 2014 Emerald Group Publishing Limited. This is an author-produced version of a paper subsequently published in *International Journal of Event and Festival Management*. This version is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial Licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. You may not use the material for commercial purposes.

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

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.



Integrating 'self-efficacy' theory to the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model to reveal factors that influence inclusive engagement within local community festivals

Introduction

This conceptual paper seeks to demonstrate how the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model would benefit from integrating self and group efficacy theory. It achieves this by building on previous analysis of primary data collected in the field at the UtcaZene, Street Music Festival, Veszprem, Hungary, (Jepson et al, 2013) using an adapted Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) model. The aim of this paper then is to produce an enhanced/augmented MOA model which could be tested empirically within future community festivals and events in order to reveal how self/group efficacy influences community participation. The paper is divided into six key areas of discussion. Firstly it highlights the importance of community festivals to the communities they serve, and secondly, demonstrates the role of community engagement within the event planning process. Following this there is discussion of the MOA model and its adaption to event planning; then the paper focusses on Social Cognitive Theory (SCT), and how this can be integrated within the MOA model. The penultimate section draws attention to the benefits of integrating SCT within the MOA model while the sixth section synthesises the key themes to form concluding remarks.

Importance of Community Festivals

The development of the festival and event industry, alongside the globalisation of major sports events, has seen large scale growth and extensive government support mainly as a result of objectives to: enhance and project the image of place, leverage positive sponsorship (Crompton, 1995) and regeneration opportunities, all with an overarching aim to ensure place competitiveness (Jones, 2012). As we move deeper into austerity measures resulting from worldwide economic recession, community festivals and events as “a sacred or profane time of celebration” (Falassi 1987, p.2) can be considered even more important than ever before. After all, festivals offer all stakeholders an opportunity to “celebrate community values, ideologies, identity and continuity” (ibid). Falassi’s (1987) research discovered 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 festivals celebrate. It is these very elements that constitute local cultures and give each festival its uniqueness; characteristics that visitors desire. It can be seen that there are analytical limitations to the context in which these definitions apply and the richness of definitions is both a blessing and a curse.

Research into community festivals has ranged from social capital (Wilks, 2011), building a sense of place and community (Arcodia & Whitford, 2006; Derrett, 2003; Gursoy, Kim, & Uysal, 2004; Pickernell, O'Sullivan, Senyard, & Keast, 2007; Van Winkle, Woosnam, & Mohammed, 2013), to evaluating the tourism potential and economic impact of festivals (Chhabra, Sills, & Cubbage, 2003; Tohomo, 2005; Tyrrell & Johnston, 2001).

More recently attention within festival studies has focused on the value of festivity within communities. According to Biaett (2013) 'festivity' is a word used to describe festive activity; things done to celebrate. He maintains that festivity has been an integral part of the human experience since the beginning of mankind, which has seen constant evolution through the ages from the purely organic, to the purposefully organic, to the organized, to that of commercial organism. Biaett's (2013) research discusses the importance of organic festivity within events which is being lost through commodification of cultural and events and a desire for scripted experiences (Ritzer, 1998). Biaett (2013) concludes that the overall sustainability of community festivals lies in its organically festive past.

The Role of Community Engagement

A central theme of this paper is community engagement which is widely acknowledged to be a complicated and misunderstood term. In the context of festivals and events it could be argued that the majority of this complexity lies in the definition of culture and community adopted by event producers. Our previous work (Clarke and Jepson, 2009; 2010; 2011; 2012; Clarke, Jepson and Wiltshier, 2008; Jepson, 2009; Jepson & Clarke, 2005, 2013, 2014) concentrated on the way decisions are taken in and around community festivals. We found that decisions tended to be based on a singular exclusive adoption of the term 'community' such as the needs of the local business community as event sponsors. Therefore our research showed a need for event producers to adopt a more pluralistic and inclusive definition of community events, giving support to replacing of the term 'community festival' with the term 'communities festivals and events'. Our research has found that none of the previous definitions of festivals/community festivals referenced the conditions which actually create a community festival and therefore we proposed a more critical and comprehensive definition that both guides and informs our views in this area of research. We define community festivals as a: *Themed and inclusive community event or series of events which 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.* (Jepson and Clarke, 2013: 7). The implications of our definition emphasise stakeholder equality through the planning process and also help to bring attention to preserving sensitive natural, cultural or social environments and, in particular, community values. This paper refers to the local community as; those who attended the festival, and those responsible for its

planning and management. Getz and Frisby (1988) were first to see the inherent value in festivals and the connection with the wider tourism industry, proposing that they are valuable tools to foster community development. Similarly Chavis and Wandersman (1990) concluded that building a sense of community stimulated healthy community development and that, actually, a sense of community is the glue that holds community based development together. More recent research by Van Winkle et al (2013) investigated how a sense of community was built through festival attendance. Our study suggests that understanding how and why communities engage with events in their locality will yield further understanding of how a sense of community is developed in time and space.

However, none of the associated benefits of community festivals will become reality unless there is engagement with local communities. At present though there is no academic agreement on what the optimal form of community participation should be; research by Cole (2006), Jamal and Getz (1995) and Simmons (1994) advocates 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. Other academics suggest the opposite view that full participation may not be desirable (Taylor, 1995; Yoon, Chen & Gürsoy, 1999; Tosun, 1999; Tosun & Timothy, 2003) 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 made difficult by the economic, political and sociocultural conditions that frame each community. Chavis and Wandersman (1990) discovered that there is a link between an individual's sense of community and stimulating their participation in neighbourhood activities. Their study identified that a strong and shared sense of community would motivate, empower and encourage participation through collective action. The interesting aspect with regards to local community festivals and events is that their *raison d'etre* means that local people have the right to participate as the event should be a representation of their cultural traditions and way of life.

This study lies within what Getz (2010) refers to as the 'classical discourse' within festival studies as its context is firmly situated within cultural anthropology and sociology. The study, like many others, is interdisciplinary as it concerns the roles local community take (as stakeholders), meanings (how local community culture is represented within the festival), and impacts (internal and external festival impacts and how these effect the local community). Unlike previous studies this research is unique in that it integrates social cognitive theory which is usually found in psychology discourses.

The MOA model and its adaption in the field of festival and event studies

Hung et al (2011) originally developed the MOA model as a way of explaining and determining the level of local participation in tourism development. 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 (Drake, 1991; Garrod, 2003). The nine stages were originally utilised to examine ecotourism planning and development, but many of the stages are applicable in the development of community events and festivals. This includes stages such as determining 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. 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).

Hung et al's (2011) reasoning to develop a holistic understanding is equally important 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.

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 by citing the importance of motivation within any decision to participate (Kyat, 2002; Milne & Ewing, 2004). Academic debate (Moscardo, 2007; Murphy and Murphy, 2004) 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 Behaire 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 et al (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. The MOA model remains a reliable and valid research instrument despite a major concern about the relationships and connections between the model's components which are often viewed in isolation. It is anticipated that framing the model in a social cognitive theory context will help to reveal these deeper relationships into how, and why, local populations are motivated or demotivated by events in their communities. The practical application and testing of the MOA model has been carried out via semi-structured questionnaires (Hung et al, 2011; Jepson, 2013). Details of the questions applied within Jepson et al's (2013) adapted MOA model to measure participation in local community events can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. *Adapted MOA model statements to measure community engagement in events*

Social cognitive theory (SCT)

Bandura (1986) proposed that an individual possesses a 'self-system' which enables them to exercise control over thoughts, feelings and actions. He came to the conclusion that it is this system which allows a person the ability to symbolize, learn from other people, develop contingency plans, regulate behaviour and perform self-reflection.

Social cognitive theory suggests that self-efficacy theorises that; "people's judgements of their capabilities to organise and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances" (Bandura, 1986, p. 391) have a significant impact on the choices a person makes, how much effort they put into a task, and how long they persevere in the task to attain success. A major concept within Bandura's (1986) theory is that actions, reactions, and behaviours in almost all situations are influenced by those observed in others. Therefore self-efficacy represents the personal perception of external social factors.

Research by Csikszentmihalyi (1998) showed that the optimum level of self-efficacy slightly exceeds ability because, in this situation, people are most encouraged to tackle challenging tasks and gain experience. Bandura's (ibid) research also proved that motivation is a pivotal concept within self-efficacy and that high self-efficacy could affect a person's motivation in both positive and negative ways. Self-efficacy can also be inherently linked to destiny or a person's world views whereby people with high self-efficacy generally believe that they are in control of their own lives, that their own actions and decisions shape their lives. At the other extreme, those with low self-efficacy may see their lives as outside their control, and shaped

by others. Linked to this is an element of attribution theory; 'controllability' defines whether a person feels actively in control of the task or cause, and failing at this task leads the individual to think that they are unable to have any control. In turn, this then leads them to have feelings of humiliation, shame, anger or a combination of feelings.

Bandura's (ibid) research identified four significant factors affecting self-efficacy with the first being attained experience, or "Performance Accomplishments". The experience of mastery remains the most important factor determining a person's self-efficacy. (Success raises self-efficacy, while failure lowers it). The second factor is Modelling, or "Vicarious Experience", which can be thought of as an experience through others; "If they can do it, I can do it as well." When someone is seen to be succeeding, our own self-efficacy increases; when we see people failing, our self-efficacy decreases. Third comes social or "Verbal Persuasion" which generally manifests itself as direct encouragement or discouragement from another person. (Discouragement is generally more effective at decreasing a person's self-efficacy than encouragement is at increasing it). The fourth and final factor is physiological or "Emotional Arousal". This factor is a feature in stressful situations when people tend to exude signs of distress such as shakes, aches and pains, fatigue, fear, and nausea. When a person perceives one or more of these symptoms happening, it greatly affects self-efficacy. (A person's belief in the implications of physiological response alters self-efficacy, rather than the physiological response itself).

It is argued here that the concept of self-efficacy is one which can be applied and tested to reveal much about a person's motivations, abilities, thoughts, feelings and attitudes toward engaging with opportunities to participate in a local community event planning process. The MOA model reveals much about engagement such as prior knowledge of the planning process and how to get involved in the planning process. However, it does not reveal how the local community feels nor how it perceives the level of difficulty in engaging or involving themselves within planning events. Integrating all four of Bandura's (1986) factors affecting self-efficacy could also inform researchers in regards to: a person's emotional state before, during, and after participating in the planning process, whether they have participated as a result of social persuasion or modelling, and whether participation has altered the person's self-efficacy or their likelihood to participate in future local community event planning processes.

However there are methodological issues associated with directly testing and analysing self-efficacy in the field. Zimmerman (1996) identifies that the majority of studies are plagued with the mis-measurement of self-efficacy because they do not contain the optimal level of specificity in relation to the task. Therefore future research and testing of self-efficacy within the MOA model should ensure that respondents are given specific tasks or objectives so that those attempting them will have a fair chance to display a more accurate account of their self-

efficacy. In adapting the MOA model to include the concept of self-efficacy, there is also an important opportunity to determine how comfortable individuals might feel about contributing to events, and if they did so with people they knew or within groups. To test collective and self-efficacy, Bandura's (1993) theory on 'collective efficacy' can be used to formulate appropriate questions for testing. Table 2. shows the questions which have been integrated within the MOA model in order to test group/self-efficacy.

Table 2. Adapted MOA model with Self-efficacy statements to measure community engagement in events

Integrating these questions should allow for more detailed empirical analysis in regards to community engagement in local festivals and events. Self-efficacy is also extended to include 'collective efficacy' (Bandura, 1993), as this could help reveal if a key aspect of community engagement is related to group socialisation.

The benefits of integrating 'self-efficacy' theory to the Motivation-Opportunity-Ability (MOA) Model

Integrating and testing self-efficacy theory within the MOA model could in the long term reveal what the ideal level of participation and engagement in community events should be: whether this is high end and full immersion (Cole, 2006; Jamal & Getz, 1995; Simmons, 1994) or limited participation (Taylor, 1995; Yoon, Chen & Gürsoy, 1999; Tosun, 1999; Tosun & Timothy, 2003). Additionally, self-efficacy also has the potential to help understand how a sense of community might be developed, reinforced or diluted through local community participation in events. In many cases though, determining the right level of participation can prove difficult - Hung et al's (2011) research found that community members may not always participate in tourism planning even though they thought tourism benefited the community. They suggested that this negative relationship could be a result of negative perceptions of tourism such as overcrowding or environmental damage. Although the context of festivals and event planning has many differences it does share many similarities since community festivals are usually small scale events supported by local government, hold perceived benefits to the local economy, connect place image and marketing, and, of course, benefit the local population. Jepson et al's (2013) study had alignment with exchange theory (Ap 1990; Jurowski, Uysal, & Williams 1997; Lindberg & Johnson 1997; Teye, Sirakaya, & Sonmez 2002) which suggests that residents are more likely to support community tourism development or, in this case, 'event development' when the perceived benefits outweigh the perceived costs. This view was supported by Jepson et al's (2013) study whereby local residents who believed that the festival was a strong economic contributor to the local economy felt that they had been given the opportunity to put their views forward on events in the city.

Other reasons for non-engagement could include: perceived benefits of planning not personally relevant to community members in order to motivate them to participate (Hung et al, 2011), lack of interest in participating in events/ tourism (Goodson 2003), a feeling that it is necessary to be involved in the decision-making process as government/ organisation officials will take care of local events, local community groups not invited to take part in the planning process or a feeling of being unable to challenge decisions being made by an established order (Clarke & Jepson, 2011). Future research should bear in mind these differing reasons and frame conditions as they can also affect an individual's level of self-efficacy.

Another aspect which can impact upon local community motivations and self-efficacy is the openness of event organisers with regards communication of planning meetings, moreover who is invited to them. Aas, Ladkin, and Fletcher (2005) suggest that open channels of communication are both an initial step and a basic criterion of community participation. When linked to self-efficacy this is essential as people need to gather attained experience, in order to higher their self-efficacy and feel they can contribute to the planning process. In Jepson et al's (2013) research it was found that some respondents felt they could not put their views forward to festival organisers and as a result they either did not know that, or thought that, attracting tourists to the festival was not good for the local economy. This provides further justification for integrating self-efficacy theory into the MOA model because it could reveal what was demotivating local people to stop them from putting their views forward. This could be revealed by collecting primary data on any one of Bandura's (1986) four factors of: attained experience, modelling, verbal persuasion, or physiological factors. Verbal persuasion may play a key part within community motivation and engagement as this could represent either positive or negative dialogue between festival organisers and local people which will, in turn, impact on the person's ability and to participate or to continue to participate.

However, even if festival and event organisers have an open communication system, hold regular meetings and invite local communities into the planning process, individuals may not hold the ability to participate due to limited knowledge about events, the environment or the planning process itself. Both Hung et al's (2011) and Jepson et al's (2013) reinforced Jamal and Getz's (1999) notion that both the right and the ability to participate should be present for community participation to occur.

Jepson et al's (2013) testing of the MOA model concluded that the opportunity category of the model contained the most positive associations and therefore argued that it held the key to determining community engagement. It is suggested here that self-efficacy will influence opportunity either positively or negatively, particularly if festival organisers are not known for

reaching out to engage local communities. Bandura's (1986) theoretical perspective indicates that limited opportunities would mean performance accomplishments and self-efficacy would be low or vice-versa if there were multiple opportunities to engage in the planning process. Jepson et al's (2013) study also found that if respondents knew how they could contribute to the planning of local community festivals and events and were given the opportunity to share their opinions about festivals and events with tourism officials and event organisers, they held positive values about planners listening to their views. Respondents who shared their views felt confident that their views were being taken into account and represented, and held positive views toward organisers providing opportunities to participate in the planning process.

Opportunity was also influenced by the level of contact with contact festival organisers - for example, respondents who had made contact with organisers to discuss aspects of the festival also felt positively about the organisers' ability to provide opportunities to contribute to decision making process in the planning of the festival and other events. From the issues identified here it would therefore be interesting to test the concept of self-efficacy further to determine its importance in the different stages of interaction between local people and festival and event organisers, and the perceptions they form about each other and the festival.

Previous studies (Jepson et al, 2013; Hung et al, 2011) found that ability and awareness were major factors in trying to determine the level of community engagement. Jepson et al's (2013) study concluded that respondents had limited awareness of the festival organisation and planning process. It also revealed that respondents who received information from festival organisers were more likely to: know how to contribute to the planning of local community events in, share their opinions on the festival, contact organisers when they needed to, meet with event organisers, put their views forward and, finally, felt that their views were being considered during the planning of community events.

The final aspect connecting community engagement was the domain of knowledge. Jepson et al's (2013) study found that local people who were able to contact festival organisers had good knowledge on the community festivals and events which were happening in their local community which demonstrate evidence of knowledge transfer in regard to event programming from organisers to local people. The study also found that those with knowledge about local events had high self-efficacy and were more likely to put forward their views within planning meetings with organisers. It should be considered here though, as well as the organisers' ability to empower the local community, they also have the ability to disempower by restricting opportunities, knowledge and, in addition, access to a democratic planning process. It can therefore be concluded that knowledge could be a key driver to respondents' levels of self-efficacy dependent on access to and contact with event organisers. Jepson et al, (2013) showed that participation in the form of contact and dialogue with event organisers

was the key to respondents' awareness of events happening in their local area which could have a positive or negative impact on a respondent's future self-efficacy and their engagement with events in their local community.

The MOA model reveals much about how and why people choose to engage and participate within events in their local community, but it does not reveal enough about a person's 'Ability' to participate and whether they feel confident in doing so. The introduction of Bandura's (1986) four factors which influence a person's self-efficacy should enable greater analysis to place within the ability domain of the MOA model.

As a result of discussions presented within this paper several research questions emerge to guide future research and testing of the model, these can be seen illustrated within 'Figure 1.'

Figure 1. Research questions to illustrate the importance of group/self-efficacy within community participation in events

It is anticipated that understanding how self-efficacy affects a local community's motivation, opportunity, and ability may well hold the key to determining why and how they choose to engage with and participate in local event planning.

Conclusions

This conceptual paper has been framed by previous empirical research by Jepson et al (2013) which documented and analysed primary data collected using an adapted version of the MOA model questionnaire during the Utcazene Street Music Festival, 2012. Herein has been presented a conceptual discussion to understand how integrating Bandura's (1986) concept of self-efficacy and collective efficacy (1993) within the MOA framework could allow further analysis and understanding of the factors which influence inclusive engagement within local community festivals. The MOA model is built from theoretical perspectives taken from several fields, including advertising, consumer behaviour, tourism, public participation, and now event studies. A key strength of the MOA model is that it can be applied to destinations with the aim to enable or facilitate community participation. It is also a very transparent model in that it will allow festival planners to identify the reasons that participation is successful or a failure. Hung et al (2011) also advocate that the model can be used to predict patterns of participation based on the analysis of the motivation, opportunity and ability. This gives practical insights for those managing and developing community festivals as they can, after analysis, address the imbalance in the model by, for example, holding more public meetings or consultations to increase the opportunities for local people. A major drawback of the MOA model is that, although it tells us which of the domains are being neglected or are a cause for concern, it

does not offer deeper analysis to understand local people's confidence in the planning process either as an individual or as a group.

The integration of social cognitive theory, moreover self-efficacy, into the MOA model would allow deeper theoretical analysis of both individual and group understanding of why they did or did not hold confidence within the planning process and how resilient they were to carry on trying to participate within it.

The concept of self-efficacy within community festivals and events can be analysed from the results of primary data collection through questionnaires or focus groups which have included the four factors of: attained experience, modelling, verbal persuasion, or physiological factors, and collective efficacy as highlighted by Bandura's (1986, 1993) research. Measuring self-efficacy has much to contribute in regards to community engagement in the event planning process; there is strong evidence to support its inclusion within the MOA model. It could be used to further inform on the synergy within and between the three disciplines underpinning the model such as the relationship between knowledge, opportunity and ability, as well as reveal new ones between self-efficacy and knowledge, opportunity, and ability. Through writing this paper it has become evident that the MOA model can be easily adapted to accommodate self-efficacy measurement and then, in addition to measuring residents' desire to participate, the MOA model would also reveal personal perceptions of complexity to get involved within the planning process. In addition, integrating the concept of collective efficacy (Bandura, 1993) could help reveal whether community engagement is related to group socialisation, as has been the case within previous festival motivational studies.

The concept of self-efficacy could also be applied to and analysed against festival directors or key members of the festival planning committee to determine how self-efficacy affects their roles, decision making, the festival and members of the local community. For example, if the self-efficacy of a festival director is high then the resulting attitude is that the decisions being made within the festival are correct and there is little or no need to involve the local community within the planning process. From this it can be concluded that further analysis could actually inform on the right balance of self-efficacy within the planning process, and identify barriers to those engaging within it.

It should be recognised by researchers that, in order to test self-efficacy within a festival or event planning process, residents must be presented with ample opportunities to engage in dialogue with festival organisers and to attend planning forums; as a result they would be knowledgeable about the opportunities and be able to display a fair and unbiased level of self / collective efficacy. Researchers in this area would be well advised to take this into account when planning research and selecting festivals and events for analysis to ensure that a valid and accurate account of self / collective efficacy be recorded.

The task for organisers of local community festivals and events is firstly to recognise that local communities have much to offer in regards to the creation of festivals and events, and should therefore be offered opportunities to engage and develop competences and capabilities within their development. Secondly, organisers should look to reach the right balance of information, ensure that local people know how and when they can contribute to the planning process to put their views forward regardless of whether they are positive or negative, and to be open and honest about the festival or events they seek to stage. Finally, studies investigating engagement and inclusion should be longitudinal, and be based on communities, and not just a community which may be easy to find, manage, or marginalise.

References

- Aas, C., Ladkin, A., & Fletcher, J. (2005). Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32 (1): 28-48.
- Ap, J. (1990). "Residents' Perceptions Research on the Social Impacts of Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 17 (4):610-16.
- Arcodia, C., & Whitford, M. (2006). Festival attendance and the development of social capital. *Convention and Event Tourism*, 8(2), 1–18.
- Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35 (4): 216-224.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1993). Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist*, 28, 117-148.
- 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.
- Bettman, J. R. (1979). *An information processing theory of consumer choice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Biaett, V. (2013), Exploring the on-site behavior of attendees at community festivals: A social constructivist grounded theory approach (Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, USA). Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/2286/R.I.17788>.
- Chavis, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (1990). Sense of community in the urban environment: A catalyst for participation and community development. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18, 55–81.
- Chhabra, D., Sills, E., & Cabbage, F. W. (2003). The significance of festivals to rural economies: Estimating the economic impacts of Scottish Highland Games in North Carolina. *Journal of Travel Research*, 41(4), 421–27.
- Clarke, A., & Jepson, A. (2011) 'Power and Hegemony in a Community Festival' *International Journal of Events and Festival Management* 2(1) 7 – 19
- Clarke, A., Jepson, A., & Wilshier, P. (2008) 'Community Festivals: involvement and inclusion' CHME 2008 Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure: Promoting excellence in research, teaching and learning. Conference proceedings of the 17th Annual CHME Research Conference.
- Cole, S. (2006). Information and empowerment: The keys to achieving sustainable tourism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 14 (6): 629-644
- Crompton, J. (1995) Factors that have stimulated the growth of sponsorship of major events. *Festival Management and Event Tourism*, 3 (2), 97-101.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1998). *Finding flow: The psychology of engagement with everyday life*. Basic Books
- Derrett, R. (2003). Making sense of how festivals demonstrate a community's sense of place. *Event Management*, 8(1), 49–58.

- Drake, S. P. (1991). *Local participation in ecotourism projects*. In *Nature Tourism: Managing for the Environment*, Edited by E. Whelan. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Falassi, A. (1987). *Time Out of Time: Essays on the Festival*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico.
- Garrod, B. (2003). Local participation in the planning and management of ecotourism: A revised model approach. *Journal of Ecotourism*, 2 (1): 33-53.
- Getz, D. (2010). The nature and scope of festival studies. *International Journal of Event Management Research*, 5 (1): 1-46
- Gursoy, D., Kim, K., & Uysal, M. (2004). Perceived impacts of festivals and special events by organizers: An extension and validation. *Tourism Management*, 25(2), 171–182.
- Goodson, L. (2003). *Tourism Impacts, Community Participation and Gender: An Exploratory Study of Residents' Perceptions in the City of Bath*. PhD thesis, Brunel University, Uxbridge, London.
- 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.
- Jamal, T. B. & Getz, D. (1995). Collaboration theory and community tourism planning. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22 (1): 186-204.
- 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.
- Jepson, A. & Clarke, A. (2009) 'Cultural Festivals and Cultures of Communities' In Cooper, C. (ed) Proceedings of the EUTO Conference 2008 "Attractions and Events as Catalysts for Regeneration and Social Change" Christel DeHaan Tourism & Travel Research Institute, University of Nottingham and The Centre for Tourism and Cultural Change, Leeds Metropolitan University The University of Nottingham September 2008 2008/1 pp 68 - 88 ISSN 1471 - 1427
- Jepson, A. & Clarke, A. (2005) 'Contemporary Cultural Festivals, Communities and the City: the case of the case of the Derby Jubilee Festival 2002' in Ennew, C. (ed) The Significance of Mega-events for Tourism (Christel de Haan Travel and Tourism Research Institute, University of Nottingham)
- Jepson, A. and Clarke, A. (In Press) *Exploring Community Festivals and Events*. Abingdon, Oxford, Routledge.
- Jepson, A. S. & Clarke, A. (2013). *Community festivals*. In: Research themes in events management. Edited by Finkel, R., McGillivray, D., McPherson, G. & Robinson, P. CAB International.
- 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).
- Jurowski, C., M. Uysal, and D. R. Williams (1997). "A Theoretical Analysis of Host Community Resident Reactions to Tourism." *Journal of Travel Research*, 36 (2): 3-11.
- Jones, C. (2012). Events and festivals: fit for the future. *Event Management*, 16, 107-118.
- 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.
- Lindberg, K., and R. L. Johnson (1997). "Modeling Resident Attitudes toward Tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24 (2):402-24.
- Litwin, M. S. (1995) *How to measure survey reliability and validity*. London: Sage.
- Milne, S. & Ewing, G. (2004). *Community participation in Caribbean tourism*. In *Tourism in the Caribbean: Trends, Development, Prospects* edited by D. T. Duval. London: Routledge.
- Moscardo, G. (2007). Analyzing the role of festivals and events in regional development. *Event Management*, 11 (1/2), 23-32.
- Murphy, P.E. & Murphy, A.E (2004). *Strategic management for tourism communities: Bridging the gaps*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

- Pine, B., J. & Gilmore, J., H. (1999). *The experience economy: work is theatre and every business is a stage*. Massachusetts, Harvard Business School Press.
- Pickernell, D., O'Sullivan, D., Senyard, J. M., & Keast, R. L. (2007) Social capital and network building for enterprise in rural areas: Can festivals and special events contribute. Paper presented at the 30th Institute for Small Business and Enterprise, Glasgow.
- Pretty, J. (1995). The many Interpretations of participation. *In Focus*, 16: 4-5.
- Ritzer, G. (1998) *The McDonaldization Thesis*. London, Sage,.
- Simmons, D. G. (1994). Community participation in tourism planning. *Tourism Management*, 15 (2): 98-108.
- Taylor, G. (1995). The community approach: Does it really work? *Tourism Management*, 16 (7): 487-489
- Teye, V., E. Sirakaya, & S. Sonmez (2002). "Resident Attitudes toward Tourism Development." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 29 (3): 668-88.
- Tohmo, T. (2005). Economic impacts of cultural events on local economies: An input-output analysis of the Kaustinen Folk Music Festival. *Tourism Economics*, 11(3), 431-451.
- 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.
- Tosun, C., & Timothy, D. J. (2003). Arguments for community participation in the tourism development process. *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 14 (2): 2-15.
- Tyrrell, T. J., & Johnston, R. J. (2001). A framework for assessing direct economic impacts of tourist events: Distinguishing origins, destinations, and causes of expenditures. *Journal of Travel Research*, 40(1), 94-100.
- Van Winkle, C. M., Woosnam, K. M., & Mohammed, A. M. (2013) Sense of community and festival attendance. *Event Management*, 17, 155-163.
- Wilks, L. (2011) 'Social capital in the music festival experience'. In Page, S. and Connell, J.(eds) *Handbook of events studies*. Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 260-272.
- 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.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1996, April). Measuring and mismeasuring academic self-efficacy: Dimensions, problems, and misconceptions. Symposium presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.