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Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to debate on community engagement and participation in local community festivals and events by empirically analysing the factors which either inhibit or facilitate engagement. The application of the motivation-opportunity-ability (MOA) model to the analysis of community festivals is an important contribution.

Design/methodology/approach – Recognising the complexity associated with community participation in festivals produced a set of four research questions which are addressed via a mixed methodology research design. The model was then tested using four key data collection methods including the interviews and the questionnaires analysed within this paper.

Findings – The MOA model can be seen as an appropriate framework with which to analyse community engagement in a local community festival setting, in the case of “The Utcazene-Fesztival”, a Street Music Festival in Veszprém, Hungary. Community participation is often interpreted quite simply as a way of involving local people in community planning and development. However, within the realm of community festivals and events the reality reveals a multitude of stakeholder webs and interconnected decision-making processes within a multi-faceted phenomenon. The paper reflects on the value of the MOA model to guide analysis within event studies and further considers the methodological challenges that the study brings to events studies.

Research limitations/implications – This paper presents two key data sets as part of a broader study of the MOA model. Due to size restrictions only the primary data derived through qualitative interviews and quantitative questionnaires are analysed here.

Originality/value – Currently there is limited understanding, agreement and research within community engagement remains an increasingly important area of academic enquiry. This particular paper explores the central concepts of inclusivity and engagement which can be considered as fundamental to the creation of successful community festivals and events. The paper begins by defining community festivals and events; it builds on Jepson and Clarke’s (2012) work on developing inclusive community festivals and events through inclusive participation within the planning and decision making process.
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Paper type Research paper
Defining community festivals and events
As a social cultural phenomenon, festivals, moreover cultural festivals, can be defined in numerous different ways which is why it is necessary to define the term as we are using it in this research. Festivals can be seen as prime manifestations of the experience economy (Pine and Gilmore, 1999) as they entertain, educate, hold aesthetic value and provide a platform for escapism. Farber (1983) investigated festivals and public celebrations and learned much about a community's symbolic, economic, political and social life. Falassi (1987) then added that both the social and symbolic meanings of a festival are closely linked to a series of overt values that the local community see as essential to their 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.

For example, none of these definitions include reference to the conditions which create a community festival. Therefore this research adheres to the definition put forward by Jepson and Clarke (2013) in their review of community festivals as:

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.

The implications of this definition emphasise stakeholder equality through the planning process and also helps to bring attention to preserving sensitive natural, cultural or social environments and, in particular, community values. Further justification to adopt this definition is imposed by the need for deep knowledge of the local context, especially the cultures involved and excluded from the festival being researched.

Engagement, inclusion and empowering local communities in community festivals and events
There has been very limited research in the field of event studies with regards community participation, although some research is forthcoming; Jepson and Clarke (2013) research provides a review of community festivals and engagement. This paper aims to redress the balance by applying the motivation-opportunity-ability (MOA) model to analyse facilitating and inhibiting factors at the Utcazenet Street Music Festival in Veszprem. The research uses the MOA model to explore research questions which determine the level and type of community interaction. This enables conclusions to be drawn about best practice for community engagement in local festivals and events. So, next the research questions are derived – two arise directly from the literature while two more are triggered from the interplay between the MOA model and the literature.

Development of research questions 1 and 2
Various 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, reinforce or challenge local or regional cultural identity (Hall, 1992; Smith, 1993; Boyle, 1997; Davila, 1997; Waterman, 1998; De Bres and Davis, 2001), boost local pride and enhance prestige and image, create a sense of place (Avery, 2000; Derrett, 2003),
community (Dugas and Schweitzer, 1997) or well-being (Falassi, 1987; Adams and Goldbard, 2001). Falassi (1987) also commented that as “well-being” is important in a symbolic and social way; festivals therefore have the opportunity to periodically renew the life stream of a community and give sanctions to its institutions, and, 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 advise that people turn to their culture to self-define and mobilise; 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 and 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 others (Boyle, 1997; Davila, 1997; Smith, 1993; Waterman, 1998). Derrett (2003) also comments 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 a community and its people.

We recognise that inclusive participation requires that there are solid cultural foundations for a festival, which have been explored from a dramaturgical perspective by Ziakas and Costa (2010a, 2012). Clarke and Jepson (2011) argue this case further and maintain 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 (Schulenkorf et al., 2011). This raises many interesting issues about local, social capital, often expressed as identity or local citizenship within community development (Arcodia and Whitford, 2006; Misener and Mason, 2006a, b). 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 events have full community engagement, representation, and support O’Brien and Chalip (2008) have explored the possibilities of strategic leveraging, a concept explored by Chalip (2006) and Schulenkorf and Edwards (2012). Moreover Schulenkorf (2009, 2010a, b) has produced studies of how these values are attained through sport events.

This rapidly growing literature, drawing on sites other than musical festivals contributes to a comprehensive understanding of the context especially as the studies seem to be mutually reinforcing. An example of this comes in Ziakas and Costas’ (2010b) exploration of the inter-organisational linkages found in a host community’s events network. Which draws out similar issues to those found in Veszprém around Utcazene, Hungary.

The above exposition leads to the following research question:

**RQ1.** Is there a relationship between the level of community engagement and the festival organisers’ view of culture, and community, and does this impact on inclusivity, knowledge sharing and communication?
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 an events context is even more important 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.

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, the environment becomes a “site of power”. Clarke and Jepson (2011) found that, once power had been defined and reinforced through Wallerstein’s (1994) civilising process, people would readily obey a chain of command, which reinforces Weber’s (1986) view that power is more easily exercised if it is linked to authority. Those in charge of making decisions can then become Ioannides (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 community. 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 which 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. This might lead to community opinion not being represented, local cultural identity being defined by the dominant social groupings, little or no democracy within the festival planning process, and very little space to organise resistance to challenge decisions made on behalf of local communities. These discussions led to the development of the second research question:

**RQ2.** Do local community festivals only achieve cultural diversity and inclusion where the local community is invited, heard and empowered within the festival planning process?

**Adapting the MOA model to investigate community engagement in local community events and festivals**

Hung et al. (2011) adopted the MOA model used previously by, e.g. MacInnis and Jaworski (1989), Batra and Ray (1986), MacInnis et al. (1991), Rothschild (1999) and Olander and Thøgersen (1995) as a way of explaining the participation of local people 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; 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. At present there is no academic agreement on what the optimal form of community participation should be; 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. Other academics suggest the opposite view that full participation may not be desirable (Taylor, 1995; Yoon et al., 1999; Tosun, 1999; Tosun and 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. 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.

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 (Kayat, 2002; Milne and Ewing, 2004). Academic debate (see e.g. Moscardo, 2008; Murphy and Murphy, 2004) within tourism suggests that participation within the planning process is influenced by the level at which the project will affect the community as a group or individually and, additionally, is influenced by the perceived benefits of the project. This triggers a third research question:

RQ3. Is the level of participation in community events positively influenced by the perceived benefits of the event? (i.e. the greater the perceived benefits, the higher the level of participation).

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 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 the opportunity, they may lack the ability to do so. This leads to the final research question which will allow conclusions to be made about the level of participation within the festival.

**RQ4.** Is there a positive relationship between the level of participation and the community’s ability to participate? (i.e. the greater the ability, the higher the level of participation).

The figure below illustrates the MOA model and the four research questions which were investigated within the festival using a flexible research methodology to capture rich and subjective cultural data. A singular research methodology with limited data collection methods would not fully explain and provide accurate conclusions on the festival research phenomenon (Figure 1).

**Creating a flexible methodology**

The study was conducted at the Utcazene-Festival; a four-day Street Music Festival held in Veszprem, Hungary, during July 2012. A mixed methodological approach was employed that incorporated the critical realism paradigm through the use of both quantitative and qualitative data collection methods. Critical realism was adopted within this study 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. Further reasoning behind the methodological approach applied in this research was a reaction to the limited amount of development in tourism and event studies with regard to qualitative methodologies and philosophical underpinning (Phillimore and Goodson, 2004; Decrop, 2004). Tribe (1997) argued the case for tourism research and suggested that a significant lack of engagement in tourism studies could
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**Figure 1.** MOA model integrating hypothesis to test within community festivals
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 precedence. It is thought that this argument can now also be applied to event studies as a new and emergent field of research. The iterative analysis and triangulation of multiple sources demonstrated the validity of the research processes undertaken and of the account that was constructed after data collection and analysis took place (Decrop, 2004).

Primary data collection methods
Hung et al. (2011) applied the MOA model to tourism planning, and utilised questionnaires (Likert scale) and brief telephone interviews. Within this study four primary data collection techniques were employed – semi-structured interviews, photography, event observations and semi-structured questionnaires. This paper concentrates on the analysis of the semi-structured questionnaires and semi-structured interviews conducted in the field and does not refer to the other methods adopted.

Primary data collection began with three semi-structured interviews with festival organisers prior to the festival period. Simple semi-structured interviews can often be employed to ascertain the thoughts, feelings and perceptions of participants (Holloway, 2008, p. 463) and it was no different for this study since. It required what Mason (2002) describes as an exploration of the importance of topics through the richness and depth of qualitative data. The intention of the interview questions was to promote an understanding of the festival organisers’ cultural background, their understanding of “community”/“culture” and how this fits within the festival. Organisers were also asked to comment on how successful they felt the festival had 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 the organisers were asked to discuss the positive and negative impacts of the festival on the local communities, and whether the festival represents local cultural traditions and accurately portrays their way of life. The interviews were conducted in Hungarian by researchers from the University of Pannonia, and then translated into English for analysis alongside the other primary data sets. Analysis of the interviews was conducted through iterative analysis, based on keywords and thematic contexts. These approaches allowed contextualised triangulation with the often conflicting elements exposed.

Following the semi-structured interviews, semi-structured questionnaires were employed using a simple random sampling method across the four days of the festival. The questionnaires were written in English and then translated into Hungarian and checked for face value and content validity (Litwin, 1995). The questionnaires were designed to capture the socio-demographic profile of festival visitors to contribute to the testing of the four research questions. The socio-demographic questions within the questionnaire further helped in understanding the percentage of local people attending the festival, the festival's main market segment, the major motivation(s) for attendees visiting the festival, and the cultural, economic and educational background of festival visitors. A total returned sample of 175 responses was collected over the festival period.

The second section of the questionnaire was designed to inform the MOA model, and to capture data with regards to tourists, local communities and festival cultures. Hung et al’s (2011) Likert scales were used within the questionnaire to determine respondents’ feelings towards questions grouped within the three categories of MOA. The responses on the Likert scale were then allocated a numerical value in order that the responses could be analysed as scale data. The authors had therefore made the
assumption that the difference between the five points on the Likert scale was equal and could be quantified. This position could be challenged but the questionnaire was designed to try to elicit more specific answers from respondents by adopting a simple “yes/no/don’t know” format when asking for agreement with statements relating to the MOA model. Table I gives a breakdown of the questions developed to analyse respondents’ motivation, opportunity and ability to engage with the festival.

Findings
The findings are organised in three sections: the findings from the semi structured questionnaire that provide an overview of the demographic profile of the festival; discussion of the specific sections of the MOA model, and, finally, discussion of the

Motivation to engage
13. Do you think that attracting tourists to the festival is good for the local economy?
14. Do you believe that hosting events showcases local community cultures, and creates new markets
15. Do you think that hosting events diversifies the Veszprem economy?
16. I believe that hosting events is good for Veszprem’s economy.
17. Do you believe that the Veszprem Street Music festival is a strong economic contributor to the local economy?

Opportunity to engage
18. I am aware that the event planners host meetings and community planning forums for events in Veszprem.
19. The local organizers and local government are interested in hearing our views on the Veszprem Street Music Festival.
20. The organizers of the Veszprem Street Music Festival represent my views and those of the local community in planning the festival.
21. 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
22. I am aware of the local community festivals and events which take place in Veszprem.
23. I keep up to date with news relating to Veszprem and events which take place within it.
24. I am familiar with the events programme in my Veszprem?
25. I receive information from organisers about community festivals and events in Veszprem.

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

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

Table I. Adapted MOA model statements to measure community engagement in events
findings derived from both the semi-structured questionnaires and interviews with the festival organisers.

**Demographic profile**
The final sample comprised a fairly even gender split. The majority of respondents were under the age of 25 which was to be expected at a festival of this genre. Most respondents were in full or part time work (89 per cent), and types of employment based on the UK scale of socio-economic status (Office for National Statistics, 2011) presented us with a preponderance of students, again not surprising given Veszprém is a University city, and higher occupations (43 per cent/61). The average monthly salary was 90 102 Hungarian Forint (or £258.037 GBP). The sample of 175 questionnaires revealed that 66 per cent (114) of respondents did not live locally in Veszprém compared to 34 per cent (60) who were native to the city. From those who were local to Veszprém, 62 per cent (36) had lived in Veszprém for at least 11 years, and had therefore witnessed the music festival’s evolution. Repeat visitation was high with 80 per cent (138) of respondents stating that they had visited the festival in previous years, with only 20 per cent (35) of respondents being first time visitors. This suggests that the festival is firmly embedded within the respondents’ annual social calendars (Table II).

Respondents were then asked to select from multiple reasons which motivated them to attend the festival. Not surprisingly music/entertainment was the strongest motivating factor (144), followed by atmosphere (131), meeting family and friends (117), socialising with others (99) and having fun (95).

**The MOA model and its application in the Utcazene Street Music Festival**
The second section of the semi structured questionnaire (as seen in Table III) was designed to determine the significance of motivation, opportunity and ability and how these factors impacted on respondents’ engagement with the Utcazene Street Music Festival. Questionnaires were coded and variables analysed using SPSS version 20. The basic distribution of all the questions was considered before pairing the questions in the MOA model, producing two-way tables.

Associations within the sections of the MOA model were then tested to inform on the relationships between motivation, opportunity and ability. Finally, all associations were tested using $\chi^2$ statistics. The testing revealed no associations between residents who were local and living in Veszprém against their participation level. So, being local...
did not imply a greater likelihood of participation in the planning of local events. In addition, within the participation section of the MOA model, it was possible to determine that, even though a person is local to Veszprem, this did not make them knowledgeable in how they could contribute to event planning nor did it make them any more likely to share their opinions about the festival and its events, provide assistance or resources and contact or meet with organisers to put their views forward. After this examination of how locality impacted on a respondent's motivation, opportunity and ability statistically significant associations from the MOA model within the music festival were then tested; the results are shown in Table III.

The statistically significant associations presented in Table III show the likelihood of respondents to answer “yes or no” to both questions and, as a result, reveals the major factors affecting participation in the planning process of the Utcazene Street Music Festival. It can be concluded that the opportunity cluster carries the most significant relationship to respondents' ability to participate within the planning processes of the music festival. This is followed by ability, and then motivation.

**Motivation**
To begin with, respondents who did not provide assistance to develop community events either did not know, or thought that events did not diversify or were not good (Item 16) for the Veszprem economy (Items 15/28). As a result they also felt that their views on festivals and events were not considered in the planning of the street music festival (Items 15/32).

Similarly respondents who felt they could not put their views forward to festival organisers either did not know or thought that attracting tourists to the festival was not good for the local economy of Veszprem (Items 13/31). On the contrary, respondents who believed that the festival was a strong economic contributor to the local economy had been given the opportunity to put their views forward on events in the city (Items 31/17). Interestingly though, respondents that had often met with officials to discuss issues with regards events in the local community either did not know or thought
that the music festival was not necessarily good for the local economy (Items 17/30). This potentially suggests that organisers were not forthcoming in sharing knowledge on the impacts the festival has on the local community. The motivation of respondents within the street music festival provides a good fit with already established theories on motivation as it influences the overall pattern and direction of behaviour (Bettman, 1979). A lack of motivation may also be linked to knowledge about the festival especially if the benefits associated with it are not widely recognised or understood.

Opportunity
It can also be seen that the opportunity category of the MOA model within the Veszprem street music festival contains the most positive associations and therefore holds the key to determining community engagement with the festival. Respondents that knew how they could contribute to the planning of local community festivals and events in Veszprem and were given the opportunity to share their opinions about festivals and events in Veszprem with tourism officials and event organisers, held positive values about planners listening to their views; felt confident that their views were being taken into account and represented, and held positive views towards organisers providing opportunities to participate in the planning process (Items 26/27/18/19/20/21).

Respondents who provided resources to the street music festival were aware that organisers hosted meetings and community planning forums for events in Veszprem; this revealed that they held positive views about festival organisers representing the their views and those of the local community during the planning of the street music festival (Items 28/18/20).

Opportunity was also influenced by the level of contact with 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 processes involved in festival planning. In addition, the respondents who held these positive views also agreed that local government were interested in hearing their views with regards the street music festival (Items 29/19/21). Respondents who were aware of when festival planning meetings were taking place had met with organisers and were therefore positive that organisers were providing good opportunities for local people to contribute to the festival planning process.

This meant that they had been able to put their views forward, which resulted in them feeling positive that their views were important to organisers and that they were being considered during the festival planning process. This then made a further positive connection between respondents and organisers in that the respondents felt that organisers were representing their views and those of the local community during the planning process (Items 31/18/19/20/21, Items 32/19/20/21).

As well as the positive associations identified with opportunity there was also positive reinforcement of negative opinions relating to engagement with the music festival. First those respondents who did not meet with festival organisers to discuss issues relating to events in Veszprem felt that organisers either did not want to hear their views or did not know if they wanted to hear their views. As a result of this they also did not know or thought organisers did not represent their views or those of the local community in planning the street music festival (Items 30/19/20). The second relationship identified within this section of the primary data related to respondents ability to contribute to the planning process. Respondents who did not know how to contribute to the planning process, also did not know if the organisers were interested...
in hearing their views and, as a result, also did not know whether organisers were providing opportunities for people to contribute to the planning of events in Veszprem (Items 37/19/21). Therefore organisers had not provided a supportive framework for community participation where opportunity could occur within an open and straightforward channel of communication (Bahaire and Elliot-White, 1999; Aas et al., 2005).

Ability
Ability is discussed under the headings of awareness and knowledge.

Awareness
Analysis demonstrated that respondents had limited awareness of the festival organisation and planning process. Those who did receive information from festival organisers were more likely to; know how to contribute to the planning of local community events in Veszprem, share their opinions on the festival, contact organisers when they needed to, meet with event organisers, put their views forward, and finally feel that their views were being considered during the planning of events in Veszprem. The analysis clearly shows that participation in the form of contact and dialogue with event organisers was therefore the key to respondents’ awareness of events happening in Veszprem, as they received information from organisers, were familiar with the events programme in Veszprem, and were more likely to keep up to date with the events which were happening within their community.

Knowledge
Two positive associations were identified within the domain of knowledge of the music festival. First, the respondents that were able to contact festival organisers had good knowledge on the community festivals and events which were happening in Veszprem so there is evidence of knowledge transfer in regard event programming from organisers to local people (Items 33/29). As a result of this knowledge of events in Veszprem, respondents were much more likely to put forward their views at meetings with organisers, and felt that their views were being considered within the festival and event planning process (Items 31/33). Negative opinions were also raised within the knowledge domain with the underlying factor that, if respondents did not know how to contribute to the planning process they also felt their views were not being considered during the planning process. This also had a further detrimental effect in that respondents did not understand or did not know the impacts that the music festival had on the city (Items 32/35). It could therefore be argued that it was organisers who restricted the respondents’ ability to participate within the festival planning process, and not as Jamal and Getz (1999) suggest that as individuals they lacked the ability to participate.

Discussion
The application of the MOA model to the Utcazene Street Music Festival has revealed many different relationships between respondents and the way in which they participate in the festival planning process. The questions which carried the most positive relationships in the primary data after analysis all fell within the ability section of the MOA model. Question 31; when meeting with officials that develop events for the community I feel that I have the opportunity to put my views forward, for example, carried eleven positive associations across to the opportunity domain of the MOA model.
the model (Items 18-21). If respondents were certain that they had made their views regarding the festival known to organisers then they became positive about the opportunities to engage in the planning process. The same relationship was apparent within question 32; I feel that my views on community festivals and events are considered during the planning of events in Veszprem where a positive response to this question also meant respondents were equally positive about their opportunities to participate in the planning process.

Another question which determined the responses of participants was question 26; I know how to contribute to the planning of local community festivals and events in Veszprem which had seven positive associations connected to it and ensured that respondents were again positive about their opportunity to participate within the festival planning. Within this sample there is a clearly a strong relationship between respondents’ attitudes towards opportunity which is influenced directly by the respondents perception of successful participation and whether they felt they had put their views forward, and whether they thought their views were bring considered within the planning process. This returned sample has also revealed that the knowledge respondents held with regards the music festival acted as a major influence over how negative or positive their views were with regards the organisation of the festival. For example, a lack of knowledge about the festival, or its impact on the locality left respondents offering largely negative or uncertain views concerning their opportunities to engage with the festival and event planning process.

It could be further argued that respondents participation was influenced either positively or negatively based on opportunities for engagement.

The discussion will now move on to the four research questions detailed within the literature review. Data analysis of the semi structured interviews with organisers (Org1/Org2/Org3) took place to address the first research question; Is there a relationship between the level of community engagement and the festival organisers view of culture and community, and does this impact on inclusivity, knowledge sharing and communication?, which revealed that, although there originally was a team of three main organisers involved in producing the street music festival, only one person was making key planning decisions:

Interviewer: who makes the key decisions in the festival. so for example […] who selects and how the bands get selected, who decides on who can come?
Org2: only one person.
Org3: yes only one.
Org2: The main organiser (Org1).

As can be seen from the data presented above, two of the festival organisers were very clear that they were not in charge and clearly understood that they were not in a position to challenge the main organiser (Org1). This did not come as a surprise as it mirrors the findings of Clarke and Jepson (2011) whereby the festival’s programming and cultural content was selected by one organiser.

A point of difference for Utcazene was that it had evolved far from its original purpose:

Interviewer: Please can you briefly tell us about how the festival started?
Org2: Well the festival started 13 years ago, and was very small scale in the beginning was only street music shows and four or five stages, they were little stages and only acoustic, all the bands were amateur and supplied their own amplifiers and even built their own stages. Then after the fifth year there were bigger bands from Hungary and also International bands were also invited to perform.
Org3: The organiser of the festival then went to visit a similar street music festival, the artists from there were professional bands then came here and it became an International Street Music Festival.

Interviewer: Please can you briefly tell us about how the festival started?

Org1: I offered to organise the festival, invite musicians if the city provided accommodation for the performers for free [...] the festival is about good music but that can build a community, involving locals and “outsiders” alike.

As the festival has grown and attracted professional bands its definition of community has widened to include those in the surrounding towns and cities, which is reflected within the primary data (only 34 per cent of respondents lived locally in the city of Veszprém). This potentially has had a detrimental impact on local engagement within the festival. Another inhibitor to community engagement within the festival though proved to be the main organiser who revealed that:

Org1: Locals are involved in the planning only through the voting, and he does not want to involve them in more depth, I want to continue to make decisions about who performs at the festival.

The main organiser had adopted the role of power broker (Ioannides, 1998) and was able to easily exercise this power as it was linked to a festival hierarchy (Weber, 1986). The voting system is for all visitors to the street music festival; they get the opportunity to vote for their favourite bands performing at the various stages; in turn the bands then have the opportunity to win a cash prize (£1,430 GBP). It can be strongly argued that the Utcazene Street Music Festival organisational structure has enabled the festival to outgrow its local community focus into a self-proclaimed international music festival to which the majority of visitors are from outside Veszprém and from within one key age demographic of 18-25-year-olds. Furthermore the organiser of the festival has restricted knowledge and opportunities for local engagement by the frequency of its planning forums – this was an aspect which was highlighted earlier where respondents’ negative opinions were identified in the knowledge domain with the underlying factor being that respondents did not know how to contribute to the planning process. As a result of these factors local community engagement is restricted to voting for their favourite bands performing within the festival.

The second research question: Do local community festivals only achieve cultural diversity and inclusion where the local community is invited, heard and empowered within the festival planning process?, proved more difficult than expected to answer based on the data captured during the main research period. The population of the city of Veszprém is 86,102 (Veszprém census, 2001) with the vast majority of citizens (81,766) being native Magyars (95 per cent) (Veszprém census, 2001). There was limited cultural diversity in this respect as the bands were performing in Hungarian, with the remaining 5 per cent (2,937) of the population (Africans, Arabic, Bulgarian, Gipsy Romany Bea, Greek, Croatian, Chinese, Polish, Hebrew, Jewish, German, Armenian, Romanian, Russian, Serbian, Slovakian, Slovenian, Ukrainian) not performing native songs or in their own language. Therefore cultural diversity in the context of this question and within the music festival relates to local bands, song, dance and traditions within the festival. The music festival shows evidence that it began with local involvement, engagement and support but that this has changed as the more popular and non-local bands have been brought in to attract more “outsiders” or tourists. Organiser 1 was asked about the role of local musicians:

Org1: Most musicians come from outside Veszprém, one of the main stages is dedicated to the local musicians, their bands. This stage is always the one in Ováros Square, the main square
of the city. This is a way of motivating the locals to come and enjoy the performances of the local bands.

Although retaining a local stage is a very positive thing for the festival, local people still do not have any say over who performs on the stage. Organisers 2 and 3 were asked about local involvement within the festival:

Interviewer: So how are the local/communities involved in the festival?, so for example if I lived in Veszprem would I be able to contribute to the festival, and have a say in what happens?

Org2: Well [...] I think [...] in the first five years you could have it was good because the street musicians only not one but most of the Veszprem people come here, but this year a lot of more foreign groups and bands are coming from Pécs and many other cities.

The evolution of the festival and a desire for growth towards a more national and international audience has brought with it many changes. There has been a move away from the street musicians who once were the festival’s raison d’être, towards a more professional and well-known band ethos which has helped it to grow within its major market demographic of 18-25-year-olds. The festival therefore cannot be considered as an inclusive festival as it does not attract an inclusive market demographic. Additionally the festival does not offer opportunities for local people to contribute to the planning process – they cannot seek empowerment within the process and have any impact on decisions relating to the festival and its growth.

The third research question investigated whether the level of participation in community events was positively influenced by the perceived benefits of the event. There was a clear relationship here demonstrated through the motivation section of the questionnaire sample. Respondents who believed positively that the street music festival was a strong economic contributor to the local economy had engaged with organisers and put their views forward on events in the city. Respondents who felt negatively that they could not put their views forward to festival organisers either did not know or thought that attracting tourists to the festival was not good for the local economy of Veszprem. There was an indication that, even though respondents had met often with event officials, this relationship was not one of positivity and knowledge sharing. For the main organiser of the festival the positive impacts for the city were very clear:

Interviewer: Please tell us about the contribution of the street music festival to the city of Veszprem;

Org1: The city gets filled with life; the city centre is full of people which is normally empty and dead after 5 pm and at weekends. The festival provides a meeting place for people, for local people as well as for other people to meet up with their friends from Veszprém. A lot of people time their visit to Veszprém to coincide with the Street Music Festival. This is one of the flagship events of the city so it enhances the image of the place. It also contributes to the pride of the locals, even if those who live in the centre like to complain during the festival they still appreciate what it does for the city.

There is clearly a breakdown in communication between local residents and the organiser(s) of the festival with regards the positive impacts that the festival brings, but also evidence of conflict between local people and the organisers.

The final research question was to examine whether there was a positive relationship between the level of participation and the communities ability to participate. This relationship was also clearly revealed by the questionnaire analysis with the keys to ability being the amount of dialogue and information that respondents received from the
festival organisers. If the level of information was positive and their level of awareness was high respondents were more likely to know how to contribute to the planning of local community events in Veszprem, share their opinions on the festival, contact organisers when they needed to, meet with event organisers, and put their views forward thus their level of participation was high as a result. If respondents felt that they did not have enough information and dialogue with festival organisers then the experience became negative with the feeling that their views were not being considered during the planning process and that they did not understand or did not know the impacts that the music festival had on the city.

Conclusions
This paper was founded by an already established theoretical framework within the field of tourism, the MOA model, and a desire to understand and document the factors which influence inclusive engagement within local community festivals. The research has utilised a flexible research and data collection strategy in order to study the Utcazene street music festival in Veszprem, Hungary. The evidence collected during the Utcazene Street Music Festival has tested the practical application of the MOA model. The paper has justified the use of the MOA model and proved that it is an easily adaptable and useful model in evaluating local residents’ desire to participate within the planning process and therefore become engaged in events within their community.

This paper has critically explored four research questions in an approach to deepen understanding of the complex issues which underpin the complexities of community festivals, both as festivals and as expressions of local communities. 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.

The theoretical and research implications stem from the 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 research has explored a wide range of interconnections and interactions within to determine what significance they have for local communities and for festival organisers. Applying the MOA model to the research context of the Utcazene Street Music Festival has revealed the many complex relationships between local respondents and the way in which they participate or attempt to participate within the planning process of an event in their community. Many lessons have emerged for both organisers and local people; organisers should take note that the most important aspect for members of the local community is that they have the opportunity to put their views forward on the festival irrelevant of whether positive or negative.

This research also revealed that there is a clearly a strong relationship between respondents’ attitudes towards opportunity which is influenced directly by the respondents’ perception of successful participation and whether they felt they had put their views forward, and whether those views were considered within the planning process. Another aspect of importance was the knowledge local respondents held with regards the music festival as this acted as a major influence over how negative or positive their views were with regards the organisation of the festival. A lack of knowledge or restriction of knowledge by the main organiser left local people disempowered and offering largely negative or uncertain views concerning their
opportunities to engage with the festival and event planning process. The task for organisers of local community festivals and events is therefore to seek the right balance of information, ensure that local people know how and when they can contribute to the planning process, and to be open and honest about the festival or events they seek to stage.
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