Festivals as agents for behaviour change: a study of food festival engagement and subsequent food choices


ABSTRACT
Evaluations of festivals have concentrated on economic and cultural impacts, particularly within the immediate geographical area. Limited research has investigated festivals as vehicles for behaviour change in tourists who visit them. This paper studies food festivals which hold the potential for influencing future food choices. The study examines visitors’ prior involvement with local food, engagement at a festival, emotions evoked, and resulting future food purchasing intentions, as well as behaviour adopted six months later. Previous studies have highlighted the importance of remembered experiences on future purchasing, and this paper contributes to knowledge by extending these frameworks to incorporate engagement and emotions evoked at a food festival. Results indicate that engagement and positive emotions at a food festival are good predictors of food buying behaviour six months later. However, the influence of negative emotions reduces over time. The findings highlight the importance of emotions and engagement in changing food purchasing choices. Policy recommendations are made for further use of food festivals to influence food buying behaviour in a way that is considered socially and economically benign.
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HIGHLIGHTS:
• Examines food festival experiences and their effect on future behaviour
• 646 food festival visitors recorded their engagement, emotions and satisfaction
• Remembered emotions, satisfaction, actual behaviour were measured six months later
• Engagement and positive emotions remained good predictors of adopted behaviour
• The effect of negative emotions reduced over time
Festivals as agents for behaviour change: a study of food festival engagement and subsequent food choices

INTRODUCTION
The impact of events and festivals has been the focus of considerable literature. Probably the largest stream of literature has sought to assess economic impacts of specific events such as conferences and conventions (e.g. Crompton & McKay, 1997; Grado, 1998), sports events (Chhabra, 2004; Kim, Gursoy, & Lee, 2006), and cultural festivals (Quinn, 2006). These have typically used input-output models to assess multiplier benefits within a defined space and time, and have measured impacts on private sector organisations, individuals and public authorities (Anderson & Samuelson, 2000; Solberg, Andersson, & Shibli, 2002). Another common theme has been the study of cultural impacts of events on local communities (Gursoy, Kim, & Uysal, 2004; Prentice & Anderson, 2003). Similar to economic impact studies, cultural studies tend to focus on impacts within a defined community, rather than the wider benefits.

Research into impacts of festivals in a broader social and economic environment is relatively lacking. Some efforts have been made to assess impacts of events on non-local groups’ perceptions of a town or region associated with hosting an event, most notably high profile sporting events (Carlsen & Taylor, 2003). This study seeks to fill a gap in knowledge about festivals as possible agents for subsequent behaviour change by attendees, long after attending the festival. Public and not-for-profit stakeholders often sponsor festivals with objectives which include raising awareness of a topic and subsequently creating favourable attitudes and/or behaviours by attendees. For example, Scout camps for young people have an aim of developing personal skills, and local river festivals promote greater use by the public of waterways. The gap addressed in this paper is empirical evidence of the link between festival attendance and subsequent behaviour. Furthermore, the paper explores the extent to which such behaviour change is influenced not only by the mere act of attendance at a festival, but also the level of engagement in the activities available and the emotions evoked.

The focus for this study is food festivals which raise consumers’ awareness of food choices that may be considered benign from a public policy perspective. Through the experience of attending and sampling food, and the memories that are formed, these events may have the effect of encouraging visitors to consume a greater proportion of locally produced food which can be described as healthy for the consumer, and better for the economic and ecological environment. Attendance and engagement at a food festival typically involves activities and experiences that transcend the ordinary (Falassi, 1987). It is thus suggested that memories of attending food festivals and the emotions evoked may subsequently be triggered during ‘ordinary’ buying and consumption situations, potentially breaking habitual behaviour.

Food festivals have emerged in many countries as a means of promoting patterns of food consumption which are considered favourable for several policy reasons. Most significantly, they seek to promote food which is locally sourced rather than obtained through globalised supply chains (Hall & Sharples, 2008). This can result in reduction of CO₂ emissions through shorter ‘food miles’ (Coley, Howard, & Winter, 2009) and improvements to national balance of payments (Çela, Knowles-Lankford, & Lankford, 2007). Food festivals can be a focus for encouraging consumption of healthy rather than unhealthy food, most notably ‘organic’ food (Guptill & Wilkins, 2002). Finally, food festivals can contribute towards the sustainability of rural communities and their identity through preserving traditional craft based skills and sustainable methods of production (O’Sullivan & Jackson, 2002). Many governments have developed policies with respect to each of these policy aims, often backed by the availability of public funding to promote behaviour change. As an
example, in 2009, the UK government funded the ‘Change4Life’ campaign that urged the public to ‘eat well, move more and live longer’. Similarly, in France, a campaign was launched in 2007 to encourage people to improve their health by eating at least five portions of fruits and vegetables per day. In Wales, which is the focus for this study, the Welsh government has financially supported food festivals since 2001, with the core agenda of promoting greater consumption of Welsh food and drink, in addition to encouraging healthy eating (Wavehill Ltd & Centre for Local Economic Strategies for the Welsh, 2014; Welsh Assembly Government, 2010).

Food festivals are a potentially interesting vehicle for bringing about behaviour change. In a review of event tourism literature, Getz (2008) recognised the need to understand how visitors reflect on their experiences at festivals, and the influence this has on their future behaviour. Our study contributes to this call for research by examining the effect of the food festival experience on future behaviour towards local food. This research makes a contribution to knowledge by undertaking a two-stage ‘during’ and ‘after’ study of visits to food festivals. We go beyond recording mere attendance at a food festival, probing more deeply into visitors’ level of engagement with activities at the festival, and the effect the experience has on their intended behaviour, as well as the actual behaviour they subsequently adopt. The measurement of actual behaviour specifically addresses limitations noted in other festival and event studies which have only examined behavioural intentions (Kim, Kim, & Goh, 2011; Song, You, Reisinger, Lee, & Lee, 2014). Although food festivals and preferences for locally produced food have been investigated separately, this research makes a contribution by bringing the two aspects together to examine the link between engagement at food festivals, emotions, satisfaction and visitors’ subsequent food consumption decisions.

The structure of this paper is as follows: first the nature of food festivals and the interactions of visitors’ with them are discussed. The experiential aspects of food festivals are then explored with a particular focus on engagement and emotions, and how these may influence future food purchasing decisions. This is followed by a discussion of policy aims related to changing consumers’ food purchase and consumption habits. A predominantly quantitative ‘during’ and ‘after’ methodology is developed to test a series of hypotheses linking engagement, emotions and satisfaction of a food festival with subsequent changes in food purchase intentions and actual behaviour adopted.

CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND

Food Festivals

A food festival typically brings together consumers and producers in a multi-stimuli environment by providing samples, insights into methods of production and reassurance of authenticity amidst a general atmosphere of curiosity, exploration, and entertainment (Kim, Suh, & Eves, 2010). Food festivals allow visitors to engage with local food producers and learn about the food they offer by providing opportunities to engage in holistic, hedonistic experiences with food via sensory, affective, cognitive, behavioural and social stimuli, and allowing attendees to experiment with new flavours or tastes in a pleasant environment (Mason & Paggiaro, 2012; Wakefield & Blodgett, 1994). By stimulating visitors to try new food, food festivals might evoke emotions which are remembered when making future food decisions, thus breaking habitual and routine behaviour in food consumption choices. While much has been written about the hedonic value of mainstream food retailing, relatively little has been reported of the experiential aspects of buying from food festivals, whose role may not only be to make foods available efficiently and effectively, but also to provide a hedonistic experience (Sherry, 1990).
In recent years, many countries have witnessed growing numbers of food festivals (Spiller, 2012), which vary in form from a collection of local food suppliers serving a purely local group of customers, to major annual events which attract regional or national audiences. Food festivals in the UK run throughout the year, with the majority taking place between March and October, and in the weeks leading up to Christmas. With over thirty producers attending a typical festival, visitors are presented with a wide variety of food products, ranging from local meats and cheeses, to chutneys made from locally produced vegetables. Festivals typically provide high levels of interaction between customers and producers. At their individual stalls, producers offer visitors the opportunity to sample their produce, allowing them to experience the taste and flavours of the food, at the same time as being able to discuss the origin of the food and production processes. Sampling and purchasing of food is a core aspect of most food festivals, often supplemented with cookery demonstrations and workshops. Allowing visitors to observe celebrity chef demonstrations may inspire them with recipe ideas and inform them about food related issues, such as seasonality, local sourcing and traceability. Workshops can offer ‘hands-on’ cookery and food experiences for visitors. Being family events, many food festivals also offer entertainment specifically for children and encourage engagement of children by allowing them to prepare food dishes and to decorate their own cooking apron or utensils. Food festivals are typically very lively, with music and dance being a popular addition to complement the food-related activities available.

A few studies have examined the experiential values of food festivals (e.g., Kim et al., 2010; Mason & Paggiaro, 2012; Sims, 2009). It has been suggested that local food has the ability to provide authentic experiences by linking food and places (Robinson & Clifford, 2012). Sims (2009, p. 333) notes that consumers “choosing to consume local products may not just be enjoying the physical taste of the food; instead, they are also consuming the meaning behind it. Eating and drinking thus becomes a three-dimensional experience that enables the visitor to connect with the place and culture.” These three dimensions incorporate taste, place and tradition. Furthermore, buying or tasting food directly from the producer can give consumers a feeling of food sophistication and knowledge (Spiller, 2012), while at the same time emphasizing individuality and uniqueness (Baumann, 2005). Research has suggested that the taste of food purchased at food events may be perceived as different to functionally identical food bought through a supermarket (Spiller, 2012). However, little published research has investigated how engagement and satisfaction with a festival leads to longer-term change in visitors’ food buying behaviour. In this paper, engagement at the event (e.g. tasting, talking, and learning), visitor emotions, satisfaction and subsequent food purchasing behaviour are integrated.

Food Choices

In western developed economies, food choices satisfy increasingly diverse needs of buyers, from basic nutritional needs to higher order needs for exploration and inner peace of mind. These higher order needs have been driven by personal health concerns (Padel & Foster, 2005; Schifferstein & Oude Ophuis, 1998), environmental concerns (Baker, Thompson, Engelken, & Huntley, 2004), social norms (Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006) and personal norms (Dean, Raats, & Sheperd, 2008).

However, there is extensive evidence of an intention-behaviour gap where an intention to modify food choices is not matched by actual behaviour adopted (Seyfang, 2008). This is manifested in the presence of positive attitudes and intentions to adopt organic, sustainable, local and fair trade food products, but lower actual uptake (e.g., Megicks, Memery, & Angell, 2012; Padel & Foster, 2005; Tarkiainen & Sundqvist, 2009; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006). Part of the explanation for this intention-behaviour gap may lie in situational factors which act as
barriers to adoption, notably perceived high prices, lack of availability, lack of information and mistrust in labelling (Bottonaki, Polymeros, Tsakiridou, & Mattas, 2006).

Public policy has sought to address food choices which encourage more consumption of types of food where there is a shared social consensus, particularly foods which are low in fats leading to reduced obesity (Nestle & Jacobson, 2000); locally sourced rather than globally sourced food, leading to lower CO$_2$ emissions through ‘unnecessary’ transport of food; and traditional foods which may contribute to preservation of traditional rural skills and employment (Weatherell, Tregear, & Allinson, 2003).

Food consumption choices involve complex processes based on a variety of rational and emotional factors (Desmet & Schifferstein, 2008). Rational choice research has been extensive, typically focusing on issues of taste, price and ease of availability (e.g. Schifferstein, Fenko, Desmet, Labbe, & Martin, 2013; Weatherell et al., 2003). However, research has found that cognitive beliefs might be insufficient to change food consumption habits (Cramer & Antonides, 2011). For example, food labelling is often perceived as inadequate and confusing for consumers, leading many to lose interest in the primary messages (Verbeke & Ward, 2006). The limited value of cognitive approaches in explaining food-consumption choices might be rooted in the habitual nature of food-shopping activities and buyers’ time constraints (Goldsmith, Freiden, & Henderson, 1995; Verplanken, 2006). Consumers often fail to consider alternatives to what they normally buy during their weekly shopping for groceries (Aertsens, Verbeke, Mondelaers, & Van Huysenbroeck, 2009) and typically base their food choices on habit and simple cues, such as taste or convenience (Verbeke, 2008).

Food festivals may provide a policy initiative to stimulate and engage with consumers to break their habitual behaviour and to make food choices which are beneficial from a public policy perspective, and which facilitate consumers’ transition from intention to behaviour. It has been proposed that adding emotional and social aspects significantly improve attitude-based models of food choices, and that food involvement and desire are key determinants in explaining food buying behaviour (Tarkiainen & Sundqvist, 2009; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006). By incorporating emotional and social dimensions to food evaluations, food festivals may offer a valuable policy option to change attitudes and behaviour.

This paper builds on the literature which has investigated food consumption as an affective experience. Experiential aspects of food consumption have been extensively studied from a multi-sensory physiological perspective, for example to show the effects of sight and smell on perceived taste and pleasure of a food (Bell & Marshall, 2003; Schifferstein et al., 2013). Further research has shown the effects of the ambience of purchase and consumption environments on intention to purchase and repurchase with recent interest in the experiential aspects of retail supermarket shopping (Saarijärvi, Kuusela, & Rintamäki, 2013), which accounts for the bulk of food purchases in most developed economies (FSA, 2007).

The focus of this research is locally produced food, a concept for which there is no unified definition (Chambers, Lobb, Butler, Harvey, & Traill, 2007; Ricketts Hein, Ilbery, & Kneafsey, 2006). Arbitrary distances can be used to define the distance of the producer from consumer, but this simple measure is imperfect and some critics have noted that food produced close to the point of consumption may nevertheless have travelled considerable distances between farms, processors and warehouses before being made available to consumers (Mariola, 2008). At best, locally produced food as understood here could be conflated with a bundle of characteristics which are considered desirable from a public policy perspective, most notably being produced in a less intensive manner that respects the ecological environment and preserves the social, economic and ecological character of the local countryside.
While there is mixed evidence of locally sourced food being nutritionally better and safer than food from a global supply chain, localness may have an affective appeal (Pearson et al., 2011; Seyfang, 2008). Many governments and not-for-profit organisations have developed programs to promote purchase of food which is locally produced rather than transported considerable distances from the point of production to the point of consumption. Claimed benefits include reduction in traffic volumes, reducing the effects of CO₂ emissions on climate change and preserving local employment (Coley et al., 2009).

**Hypotheses Development**

**Engagement**

Previous literature on festival impacts has tended to measure the mere act of attendance, rather than what visitors actually do whilst at the festival. Our research seeks to explore the value of food festivals by introducing involvement and engagement as important antecedent factors leading to behavioural change. The terms ‘involvement’ and ‘engagement’ are closely linked and often used interchangeably. This paper distinguishes between engagement as an act of taking part in an activity, and involvement which implies a higher order mental commitment to the task in hand. Involvement has been defined as “the interest a consumer finds in a product” (Mittal & Lee, 1989, p. 365), and the personal relevance or importance of a product or category to the consumer (Celsi & Olson, 1988). It can thus be viewed as a ‘motivational state’ which “energizes or drives consumers’ overt behaviours” (Celsi & Olson, 1988, p. 211). More specifically it is an ‘intrinsic’ rather than an ‘extrinsic motivator’, because it is devoid of a ‘separable outcome’ (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Numerous studies within the context of tourism generally, and festivals specifically, have noted the effect of motivation on involvement and behaviour (e.g. Devesa, Laguna, & Palacios, 2010; Lee, Lee, & Wicks, 2004). In contrast, engagement has been described as a behavioural action encompassing interactive customer experiences (Brodie, Ilic, Juric, & Hollebeek, 2013; van Doorn et al., 2010). This is in line with Mollen and Wilson (2010), who state that whilst involvement comprises a passive, mental relationship, engagement requires active commitment. Thus the behavioural aspect differentiates engagement from involvement (Vivek, Beatty, & Morgan, 2012); engagement can be viewed as the behavioural component or outcome of involvement deriving from an activity. Within the framework of Service Dominant Logic (Vargo & Lusch, 2004), such engagement can create value through a process of consumer-producer co-creation. Food festivals enable a range of levels of engagement by visitors, from being a passive observer to an active participant. Co-creation, or engagement in this context, may be represented by discussing food preparation, knowledge sharing and taking part in practical demonstrations, while involvement may occur where an individual shows a personal concern about the safety of food. Previous research notes that consumers’ involvement or interest is a main driver of their subsequent participation or ‘engagement’ (Etgar, 2008; Xie, Bagozzi, & Troye, 2008). More recently, Vivek, Beatty and Morgan (2012) propose that higher levels of customer involvement will result in higher levels of customer engagement. Consequently, H1 proposes that in the context of food festivals greater levels of involvement with local food will lead to visitors becoming more engaged during the festival and therefore participating more intensely with the activities available.

**H1.** A greater level of local food involvement increases visitors’ level of engagement at the festival.

Stemming from the psychological roots of Ajzen’s (1991) Theory of Planned Behaviour (TPB), a wide range of literature has supported the relationship between
consumers’ prior involvement and behavioural outcomes (e.g., Bloemer & de Ruyter, 1999; Marshall & Bell, 2004). In their study of consumers’ involvement during food shopping, Behararell and Denison (1995, p. 24) explained that food has traditionally been classed as a low involvement product, where consumers make routine purchases displaying low levels of interest, “negligible information search, little deliberation in brand choice and ease of brand switching”. However, with recent concerns about globalised food chains and the provenance of ingredients, some have described food as a high involvement product, driven by intrinsic motivations (Marshall & Bell, 2004; Schifferstein & Oude Ophuis, 1998). Anecdotal evidence suggests that higher levels of food involvement, such as during a ‘food crisis’ following adulteration reports, leads consumers to search for alternatives and to break their routine behaviour of food shopping (Aertsens et al., 2009). Similarly, Olsen (2007) found in the context of seafood consumption that involvement acts as a mediator between attitude and re-purchase loyalty. In the context of organic and ‘green’ food products, it has been found that consumers’ personal involvement is a strong predictor of purchasing behaviour (Makatouni, 2002; Tanner & Kast, 2003; Tarkiainen & Sundqvist, 2009). Consequently, the link between involvement with local food, and intention to recommend local food sampled at the festival, as well as to purchase it in the future, is captured in H2.

H2. A greater level of local food involvement increases visitors’ (a) behavioural intention and (b) actual future behaviour.

It has been suggested that greater levels of engagement can also lead to increased customer loyalty and behavioural intention (Brodie, Hollebeek, Jurić, & Ilić, 2011; Brodie et al., 2013; Mollen & Wilson, 2010; Olsen, 2007). Vivek, Beatty and Morgan (2012) proposed that customer engagement is positively related to an individual’s word-of-mouth communication. In the context of food, Sims (2009) found that engaging with local food through food-related activities whilst on holiday led visitors to purchase more local food. Similarly, participating in wine related activities has been shown to have a positive effect on intention to take a further wine vacation (Sparks, 2007). H3 therefore hypothesises a positive relationship between levels of engagement at a food festival and future behavioural intentions and actual behaviour, as has been proposed but not tested in previous studies.

H3. A greater level of engagement at a festival increases visitors’ (a) behavioural intention and (b) actual future behaviour.

**Emotions**
Food consumption can be rich in emotions. The symbolic meanings around food might be based on cultural values and knowledge gained through experience about which types of food are considered pleasurable (Lupton, 1998). Food has many associations which can affect its taste. For example, childhood memories, positive emotions evoked by good times, or the setting and place in which the food was sampled (Bolles, 1991; Spiller, 2012). Desmet and Schifferstein (2008) refer to these experiences and associations as ‘sources of food emotions’. Even though an aim of food festivals is to evoke emotions through hedonistic experiences (Wakefield & Blodgett, 1994), little published research on food festivals has investigated the emotions evoked and the social impacts on the taste of the food sampled. Nevertheless, these are likely to inform food preferences and choices (Lyman, 1989; Spiller, 2012).

Emotions are “the primary motivational system for human beings” (Izard, 1977, p. 3), however it has been noted that they lack universal definition (Smith & Bolton, 2002). The terms emotions and affect are often used interchangeably, even though affect is the more abstract, comprising “a general category for mental feeling” while emotions are a specific
form of affect (Bagozzi, Gopinath, & Ny er, 1999, p. 184). Moods are a more enduring affective state, while a feeling is a sensation that has been checked against previous experiences and is essentially personal and biographic. In contrast, an emotion is the projection and display of a feeling and may be constrained by social norms (Shouse, 2005). As they are easier to identify and measure, emotions have been found to be a useful measure of affect in consumer related research (Bagozzi et al., 1999; Richins, 1997) and have also been specifically used in the context of festivals and events (Song, Lee, Kang, & Boo, 2012), as well as food consumption (King & Meiselman, 2010). Most studies of emotions in the psychology literature have used self-reported measures to record respondents’ subjective feeling, defined as their consciously felt experience of an emotion (Laros & Steenkamp, 2004; Stout & Leckenby, 1986).

The literature identifies several approaches for conceptualizing emotions. The dimensional approach suggests that certain categories or dimensions of emotions can fully explain any emotional state. Mehrabian and Russell (1974) originally proposed a three dimensional arrangement consisting of pleasure, arousal and dominance (PAD), while others have suggested four or even two dimensions to be more applicable (Lazarus, 1994). Russell (1980) posits that emotional experiences are best represented as a circle in a two-dimensional bipolar space, whereby the dimensions correspond to valence (positive or negative) and arousal (intensity). However, the approach of pairing positive and negative emotions together as bi-polar opposites has been criticised for presuming that positive and negative emotions cannot be felt simultaneously and it has been suggested that they should be conceptualized as distinct constructs (Babin & Darden, 1998).

In their content analysis of seminal studies of emotions, Laros and Steenkamp (2005) note that classification into positive and negative emotions as distinct constructs is the most widely used in consumer research. This is supported by Lee et al (2008) who state that most studies appear to capture positive and negative emotions. The distinction between positive and negative emotions has the advantage that models can be kept simple whilst the combination of positive and negative affect is still a good indication of a person’s attitude (Laros & Steenkamp, 2005). This approach has been widely adapted not only in the marketing literature (Laros & Steenkamp, 2005; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988), but also more specifically in the context of festivals (Grappi & Montanari, 2011; Lee et al., 2008; Song et al., 2014; Song et al., 2012) and experience with food (Desmet & Schifferstein, 2008). For example, in the context of festivals, Grappi and Montanari (2011) measure a positive emotion dimension (happy, pleased, energetic, and excited) and a negative emotion dimension (bored, angry, and annoyed).

Tourism contexts have most commonly been associated with positive emotions (Hosany & Gilbert, 2010). However, in the context of seeking to bring about behaviour change, some ideas may cause such strong emotional distress, that they trigger defence mechanisms, resulting in no behavioural change. These defences include denial of the evidence, apathy via a sense of powerlessness, delegation to others (rejecting personal accountability), and rational distancing (blocking emotions to cope) (Kollmuss & Agyeman, 2002). These mechanisms may explain how negative emotions, such as fear, anxiety, guilt and powerlessness, can inhibit the adoption of healthy eating behaviours, for example.

This paper builds upon previous widespread practice in the study of emotions by representing emotions as two distinct dimensions: positive and negative, which are derived by aggregating specific emotion types with similar valence (King & Meiselman, 2010; Laros & Steenkamp, 2005; Lee et al., 2008; Westbrook & Oliver, 1991). Some studies have reported that positive emotions have a stronger effect than negative emotions on satisfaction and behavioural intention (Lee et al., 2008; Oliver, 1993). However, other research has found the opposite, demonstrating the importance of triggers of negative emotions (Mano & Oliver,
1993). This suggests that within different contexts, the effect of positive emotions and negative emotions on satisfaction and behaviour may differ. Research has suggested that positive emotions specifically have a stronger effect than satisfaction on behavioural outcomes (Bigné, Mattila, & Andreu, 2008; Nyer, 1997), although these findings were contradicted by Bloemer and De Ruyter (1999). For food consumption, Desmet and Schifferstein (2008) noted a positive bias which they referred to as ‘hedonic asymmetry’. In this instance, eating and tasting food evoked more positive than negative emotions. In addition, no published research has shown how visitors’ engagement levels affect their emotions over time (Mason & Paggiaro, 2012), and in this respect, our study seeks to make a contribution.

Previous studies have suggested that consumers with higher levels of engagement with a product or service will experience greater levels of emotions (Vivek et al., 2012). In the context of wine festivals, Sparks (2007) identified a positive association between involvement with food and wine activities and visitors’ anticipated emotional attitude. H4 therefore hypothesises that higher levels of engagement will evoke higher levels of positive emotions.

H4. A greater level of engagement at a festival increases visitors’ positive emotions (a) immediately after the event and (b) after the passage of time.

Although literature conceptualising the effect of participation levels on emotions has generally focused narrowly on positive emotions, we seek to extend this knowledge by hypothesising that visitors who participate more intensely with the activities at a festival (and therefore become more engaged) will also experience less intense feelings of negative emotions. Specifically, in the context of festivals and events, Mason and Paggiaro (2012) called for further study of negative emotional responses as well as the more frequently studied positive responses.

H5. A greater level of engagement at a festival reduces visitors’ negative emotions (a) immediately after the event and (b) after the passage of time.

We then investigate the effects of emotions on behavioural intention. While there is evidence of the effects of positive emotions on behavioural intention (Bigné et al., 2008; Lee et al., 2008), we seek to validate this in the specific context of a food festival. Furthermore, it has been noted that the relationship between negative emotions and behavioural intentions is negative, and often weaker than the effect of positive emotions (Ladhari, Bruna, & Morales, 2008; Lee et al., 2008). We examine the role of positive and negative emotions within the specific context of food festivals and propose the following hypotheses.

H6. More intense positive emotions (a) immediately after the event, and (b) after the passage of time, are associated with increased (a) behavioural intention and (b) actual future behaviour.

H7. More intense negative emotions (a) immediately after the event, and (b) after the passage of time, are associated with reduced (a) behavioural intention and (b) actual future behaviour.

Satisfaction
It has been suggested that consumers are more likely to perceive a service encounter as an experience if they take part in producing the experience themselves (Harris, Harris, & Baron,
This participation of customers, i.e. co-creation through customers interacting, leads to greater satisfaction levels (Bijmolt et al., 2010; Brodie & Hollebeek, 2011). Similar to their suggestion that greater participation and engagement leads to more intense emotions, Vivek et al. (2012) also proposed that higher participation will lead to more positive cognitive evaluations. Thus in the specific context of food festivals, H8 is proposed.

H8. A greater level of engagement at a festival increases satisfaction (a) immediately after the event and (b) after the passage of time.

The inter-relationship between emotions and satisfaction was noted earlier, with competing suggestions from the literature that satisfaction leads to emotions and that emotional decoding is necessary for assessing satisfaction (Westbrook & Oliver, 1991). In the context of festivals, research has suggested that visitors’ emotions are related to their satisfaction levels (Grappi & Montanari, 2011; Lee et al., 2008; Mason & Paggiaro, 2012). However, knowledge is limited and Mason and Paggiaro (2012) recognised that festival and events research has generally assessed the effect of satisfaction on emotions, rather than the effect of emotions on satisfaction, and highlighted this as a gap which needs to be addressed in future research. The relationship between emotions and satisfaction is more widely established in other marketing contexts, with more intense feelings of positive emotions generally being found to be related to higher levels of satisfaction, and more intense feelings of negative emotions being related to lower levels of satisfaction (Babin & Darden, 1998; Ladhari, 2007). This valence-congruence relationship between emotions and satisfaction is therefore the basis for H9 and H10, tested within the context of a food festival.

H9. More intense positive emotions felt (a) immediately after the event, and (b) after the passage of time, are associated with increased satisfaction (a) immediately after the event and (b) after the passage of time.

H10. More intense negative emotions felt (a) immediately after the event, and (b) after the passage of time, are associated with reduced satisfaction (a) immediately after the event and (b) after the passage of time.

We then extend previous consumer research linking satisfaction and behavioural intention (e.g. Grappi & Montanari, 2011; Lee et al., 2008; Yoon & Uysal, 2005) with a specific hypothesis that satisfaction with a food festival will have a positive effect on future purchases of locally sourced food.

H11. Greater satisfaction (a) immediately after the event, and (b) after the passage of time, increases visitors’ (a) behavioural intention and (b) actual future behaviour.

**Lagged Time Effects**

Tourism literature has recognised the importance of memories of tourism related experiences (Kim, 2014). In their exploratory study which examined the aspects visitors remember about their tourism experiences, Tung and Ritchie (2011) identified the recollection of affective evaluations of events. Although participation at an event or festival may arouse a range of positive and negative emotions, which are described as being ‘memorable’ and ‘long lasting’, relatively little research has been undertaken into how these emotions and perceptions of satisfaction change with the passage of time (Mittal, Katrichis, & Kumar, 2001; Verhoef et al., 2009; White, 2010).
Memories of food may be stored and subsequently triggered by tasting or smelling specific foods. Alternatively, memories might also evoke a desire for a particular food in order to relive associated emotions (Lupton, 1994). It is thus crucial to examine the consumption experience as a long-term process where value creation starts before consumption, and lasts long after the consumption as the remembered experience (Arnould, Price, & Zinkhan, 2004; Tynan & McKechnie, 2009).

Although limited research has sought to examine the role of emotions in forming memorable tourism experiences (Kim, 2014), the effect of these memorable emotions on future behaviour has not been explored. In the marketing literature, it has been suggested that due to their richness and complexity, emotions are more likely to remain steady over time and hence may have a more significant impact than cognitive satisfaction on future behaviour, especially when there is a long period of time between the original consumption experience and the next purchase opportunity (Allen, Machleit, & Kleine, 1992).

This study makes a contribution by investigating the effects of emotions evoked at a food festival on consumers’ future food buying behaviour when the food festival has become a memory from the past. Two formulations of hypotheses 2 to 11 are thus specified; the first part to test immediate effects (hereafter referred to as Stage 1) and the second to test for lagged effects after the passage of time (hereafter referred to as Stage 2). The conceptual model is displayed in figure 1.

**Figure 1: Conceptual Model**

**METHOD**

**Participants and research context**

The research approach combined initial qualitative exploration with a two stage ‘during’ and ‘after’ questionnaire based survey. The context was food festivals held in Wales between April 2011 and March 2012. A total of thirty-one food and drink festivals took place during this period. Preliminary qualitative research sought to understand more about visitors’ perceptions of food festivals and the analysis of these comments informed the measurement scales adopted. In order to test the appropriateness of the methodological approach, a survey was piloted with 244 visitors at three festivals. In addition, exploratory and confirmatory
analysis was conducted on the data obtained in order to confirm the validity and reliability of the measurement scales adopted.

Respondents for the main study were recruited from seven food festivals which were selected to represent a balance between smaller and larger events, and between town-based and rural-based events. All were held in locations, and at times, when large numbers of tourists were likely to be present. Typical of the smaller festivals was the Brecon Beacons Summer Fayre, held annually in August with 35 food and drink exhibitors and around 2,500 visitors, while the Really Wild Food and Countryside Festival, St Davids is typical of a larger festival, held annually in May and attracting 80 exhibitors and 6,000 visitors.

The researcher was present at each of the festivals to explain the research objectives and to collect contact details. This avoided possible biases which might result from an intrusive survey being conducted at the festival and perceived as detracting from visitors’ enjoyment of the event (Lyons, 2008). In addition, the personal face-to-face contact reduced the risk that the visitor would perceive the subsequent email or postal invitation to participate in the study as ‘spam’ or ‘junk mail’, a common problem associated with online and postal surveys (Kaplowitz, Hadlock, & Levine, 2004).

As no adequate sampling frame was available, a convenience sampling method was adopted. At each festival the researcher’s stand was centrally positioned at a point where all visitors would pass, and all visitors passing while the researcher was free were invited to participate. This approach is consistent with previous studies (e.g. Grappi & Montanari, 2011; Lee et al., 2008). In total, 1452 visitors provided their contact details at the initial stage of the study. Immediately after each of the festivals, visitors were sent a survey invitation. A small prize draw incentive was included. A ‘multimode strategy’ of postal and online surveys was adopted, as recommended by Schaefer and Dillman (1998), in order to reduce sampling error. A total of 812 responses were received (55.9% response rate). Of these, 646 were fully completed and included in the analysis, a sufficient sample size to perform structural equation modelling (Hair, Black, Babin, & Anderson, 2010).

Six months after each of the festivals, a further invitation was sent to those respondents who had completed the previous stage of the study. Of the 499 respondents who indicated their willingness to participate in stage two, 246 took part and were successfully matched with their responses from the original survey (a response rate of 49.3%). The high response rates may be attributed to the initial direct engagement between the researcher and the respondents (Manfreda, Bosnjak, Berzelak, Haas, & Vehovar, 2008). Independent samples t-tests were conducted to confirm no significant differences in responses existed between those who completed the survey online and those who gave their response by post. Similarly, through adopting Armstrong and Overton’s (1977) test for non-response errors, whereby responses of early and late responders are statistically compared, no evidence of response bias was found.

**Measurements**

The measurement scales in this study were adapted from previous studies and further refined and contextualised by reference to the preliminary qualitative research. The three-item scale measuring ‘local food involvement’ was informed by Bell and Marshall’s (2003) ‘food involvement scale’. However, the contents of the items were adapted from Tanner and Kast’s (2003) sustainable consumption scales and the food sourcing preference items used in Kemp, Insch, Holdsworth, and Knight (2010).

The ‘engagement’ scale aimed to measure visitors’ participation in the food-related activities available at the festival. It has been noted that any scale measuring engagement will be very context specific (Brodie et al., 2011). The four-item scale has been adapted from Spiller (2012) and recognised that the experience of food comes both from tasting it, as well
Many emotion scales have been developed, and it has been common for researchers to adopt existing scales such as Izard’s (1977) Differential Emotions Scale (DES II), Plutchik’s (1980) Emotion Profile Index (EFI), Mehrabian and Russell’s PAD framework (Mehrabian & Russell, 1974) and Richins’ (1997) Consumer Emotions Set (CES) by incorporating those emotions specific to their study context (King & Meiselman, 2010; Lee et al., 2008; Westbrook & Oliver, 1991). Challenges of adapting emotions scales from the general psychology literature to the specific context of tourism and festivals have been noted (e.g. Hosany, Prayag, Deesilatham, Cauševic, & Odeh, 2014; Lee & Kyle, 2013). Thus the initial derivation of the emotions scale for this research was informed by previous studies that measured emotions in a similar context as this study (e.g. Desmet & Schifferstein, 2008; Grappi & Montanari, 2011; Lee et al., 2008; Song et al., 2014; Song et al., 2012). Following this, the list of emotions was refined through exploratory qualitative and quantitative research. For example, during the pilot study at three Welsh food festivals, visitors were given a card listing a range of specific emotions derived from the literature and asked to circle three of the most prominent emotions evoked by the festival, and were invited to propose their own emotions which they associated with food festivals. The pilot test with 244 visitors confirmed the validity and reliability of the scale. The final emotions scales distinguished between positive (happy, excited, pleased, content, pleasantly surprised) and negative emotions (annoyed, disappointed, unfulfilled, frustrated). These were measured on a five-point unipolar intensity scale anchored at ‘Not at all’ and ‘Very much’ following methods adopted previously (e.g. Laros & Steenkamp, 2004).

The cognitive ‘satisfaction’ element of the conceptual model assessed visitors’ cognitive thoughts rather than feelings about the festival. The seven-item scale has been adapted from well-established scales, particularly following the ‘festivalscape’ factors adopted in Lee et al. (2008) and Yoon, Lee, & Lee (2010). Finally, the items measuring ‘behavioural intention’ at stage 1 (immediately after the festival) and ‘actual behaviour’ at stage 2 (after six months) were adapted from existing literature (Zeithaml, Berry, & Parasuraman, 1996). There were also three open-ended questions which encouraged respondents to leave unstructured comments with the intention that these may help in the subsequent interpretation of the survey results. The measurement scales can be found in Appendix A.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Sample characteristics were as follows. The age of the respondents varied from 18 to over 65 years, with over two-thirds in the age range 35 to 64. 71.4% of the respondents were female, which is consistent with previous studies of food festival attendance (Miller Research, 2011). First time visitors accounted for 58.4% of the respondents. Most of the respondents attended the festival in the company of others, with over 50% visiting with family and only 5.0% stating they visited alone. Three quarters of the respondents spent three hours or more at the festival. Key characteristics of the sample are summarised in Table 1.

Food and drink tasting was the most popular activity participated in, closely followed by purchasing local food or drink to take home. The most popular product purchased was cheese, with nearly 50% of respondents listing some form of cheese; but other local food products included chutneys and jams, beer and cider, meat, fish, cakes, and eggs. Within the comments made to the open-ended survey questions, respondents identified the following reasons to buy more local food in future: support local business and local economy, quality and taste of the produce, environmental benefits, freshness of produce and ingredients, value
for money and trust/traceability of the produce, which is in line with the literature. The average amount spent on products to take home from the festival was between £11 and £20, with a minority of visitors spending more than £51 (8.5%), or not buying anything (5.6%).

Table 1: Sample summary characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Survey 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Survey 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage of</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percentage of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-time</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeat</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Measure Validation

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in AMOS (16.0) was applied to establish the validity and reliability of the multi-item measures. The measurement model fit indices were adequate for both stages (Stage 1: \( \chi^2=615.71, \text{df}=256, p<.000 \), stage 2: \( \chi^2=455.17, \text{df}=256, p<.000 \)). The chi-squared values divided by the degrees of freedom ratio for the measurement model were 2.41 (stage 1) and 1.78 (stage 2) and thus within the recommended range of 1 to 3 (c.f. Carmines & McIver, 1981). The comparative fit indices (CFI=.95 (stage 1 and 2)), the incremental fit index (IFI=.95 (stage 1 and 2)) and the Tucker-Lewis indices (TLI=.94 (stage1) and TLI=.93 (stage 2)) were all above .90 and the root mean squared errors of approximation (RMSEA=.047 (stage1) and RMSEA=.035 (stage 2)) were well below 0.08 (Bentler & Bonett, 1980).

All factor loading estimates measuring the same constructs for the CFA model at both stages were highly significant (p<.001) and the standardized loadings were all above .5, demonstrating that all indicators effectively measure their corresponding construct and support convergent validity. All variance-extracted estimates were above .50 and greater than the corresponding inter-construct squared correlation estimates, thus confirming discriminant validity (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). For each factor, Cronbach’s alpha and the composite reliabilities (CR) exceeded the threshold of .6 demonstrating adequate reliability (Bagozzi & Yi, 1988). Harman’s single factor test also indicated an absence of common method bias (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). Taken together, the evidence supports the validity and reliability of the multi-item measures which were thus deemed adequate for further analyses. Appendix B presents the Cronbach’s alpha values, CR values, average variance extracted, squared inter-construct correlations and covariances for all constructs.

Hypotheses Testing

Two structural models were estimated in order to test the hypothesised relationships; one regarding the food festival experience immediately after visitors attended the events and one
looking at the ‘remembered’ food festival experience after six months. Analysis was based on 646 respondents who fully completed stage 1 of the research. Those for which responses were missing at stage 2 were estimated using Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE), the model was also tested only with the 246 complete responses from both surveys and was confirmed to be both valid and reliable. The structural model fit statistics for both stages with all 646 responses indicated good fit: Stage 1: $\chi^2=685.44$, df=260, $p<.000$, $\chi^2$/df=2.64, CFI=.94, GFI=.92, TLI=.93, IFI=.94, RMSEA=.050; Stage 2: $\chi^2=509.40$, df=260, $p<.000$, $\chi^2$/df=1.96, CFI=.94, TLI=.92, IFI=.94, RMSEA=.039. The significant chi-square statistics were expected due to the large sample size (Kline, 2005). The stage 1 model explained 62% in the variation of intention to recommend/purchase local food, while the stage 2 model explained 40% in the variance of the actual behaviour. This is much higher than many studies based on TPB, that typically explain only 39% of variance in behavioural intention and 27% of actual behaviour (Armitage & Conner, 2001). Table 2 reports the standardised parameter estimates for the hypothesised models at stage 1 and stage 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypothesised paths</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Std path coeff.</td>
<td>t-value</td>
<td>Std path coeff.</td>
<td>t-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Local Food Involvement$\rightarrow$Engagement</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>8.37***</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>8.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a/b</td>
<td>Local Food Involvement$\rightarrow$Behavioural</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>3.11**</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intention/Actual Future Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a/b</td>
<td>Engagement$\rightarrow$Behavioural Intention/Actual Future Behaviour</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>7.23***</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>4.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a/b</td>
<td>Engagement$\rightarrow$Positive Emotions</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>7.97***</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>3.98***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5a/b</td>
<td>Engagement$\rightarrow$Negative Emotions</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-3.47***</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a/b</td>
<td>Positive Emotions$\rightarrow$Behavioural</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intention/Actual Future Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7a/b</td>
<td>Negative Emotions$\rightarrow$Behavioural</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intention/Actual Future Behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8a/b</td>
<td>Engagement$\rightarrow$Satisfaction</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>4.61***</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9a/b</td>
<td>Positive Emotions$\rightarrow$Satisfaction</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>7.57***</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>7.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10a/b</td>
<td>Negative Emotions$\rightarrow$Satisfaction</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-10.77***</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-1.98*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11a/b</td>
<td>Satisfaction$\rightarrow$Behavioural Intention/Actual Future Behaviour</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3.00**</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>3.24***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

H1 posits that a positive attitude towards local food will result in greater levels of participation in food-related activities available at the festival. As expected, this path was significant and positive for both stages ($\beta=:.54$ and $\beta=.53$; $p<.001$), and thus H1 is confirmed. These results support the propositions made by Sandstöm, Edvardsson, Kristensson, & Magnusson (2008), Verhoef et al. (2009), and Vivek et al. (2012), in the specific context of a European food festival.

H2a was also confirmed as greater levels of involvement with local food were found to be positively related to intention to recommend and purchase local food tasted at the food festival ($\beta=.16$; $p<.01$). However, local food involvement did not lead to actual recommendation/purchase behaviour ($p>.05$). Consequently, H2b was not supported. The
significant link between involvement and intentions was consistent with previous studies conducted in different contexts (Kim et al., 2010; Marshall & Bell, 2004). However, the missing link between involvement and actual behaviour contradicted similar studies (Makatouni, 2002; Schifferstein & Oude Ophuis, 1998; Tarkiainen & Sundqvist, 2009). Comparing the results immediately after the festival with those of six months later confirmed an intention-behaviour gap, as the mean responses for actual behaviour were significantly lower than the initial intentions ($M_{BehIn}=4.20$, $M_{ActualBeh}=3.16$; $t=16.67$, $p<.001$). These results support Ajzen’s (2002) theory that ‘control’ factors may prevent consumers from adopting the behaviour they intend to implement. In this case, the qualitative data obtained provided some justification for this, with respondents stating that availability, convenience, lack of awareness of purchasing options after the festival, and cost may have prevented them from purchasing more local food. This suggests that local food involvement or interest alone might not be strong enough to change food consumption behaviours.

Greater levels of engagement with food at the festival was significantly and positively related to behavioural intention ($\beta=.51$; $p<.001$), and actual behaviour ($\beta=.36$; $p<.001$), supporting for H3a and H3b. The literature has called for further research in this area (e.g., Brodie et al., 2011; Tarkiainen & Sundqvist, 2009; Vivek et al., 2012) and this paper has made a contribution to this debate. Greater levels of engagement in food related activities typically arose from sampling the food; a sensory engagement process which Williams (2006) noted was valuable in determining consumers’ purchasing intention and behaviour. In addition, some respondents explained in qualitative comments that talking to producers and learning more about them also built up a ‘personal connection’.

Higher levels of food engagement during the festival were also related to higher levels of positive emotions immediately after ($\beta=.46$; $p<.001$), and six months after the festival ($\beta=.31$; $p<.001$), thus confirming H4a and H4b. Greater levels of food engagement during the festival also led to significantly less feelings of negative emotions evoked immediately after the food festival ($\beta=-.17$; $p<.001$). However, the relationship between negative emotions and actual behaviour six months after the food festival was insignificant ($p>.05$). Consequently, H5a is supported, but not H5b. This supports previous studies suggesting that engagement in food related activities predominantly evokes positive emotions (Desmet & Schifferstein, 2008; Ferrarini et al., 2010; King & Meiselman, 2010). Allen et al. (1992) proposed that over time, emotions would remain fairly stable. This research contributes to the academic literature by confirming that the remembered food experience (i.e., food tasting at the festival) still evokes positive emotions six months after the event.

H6a/b and H7a/b were not supported, as neither positive nor negative emotions evoked at the food festival had direct significant effects on behavioural intention or actual recommendation/purchase of local food ($p>.05$). These findings contradict previous studies (Lee et al., 2008; Mason & Paggioaro, 2012). However, greater levels of food engagement at the festival did have a significant and positive influence on satisfaction levels immediately after the food festival ($\beta=.20$; $p<.001$), and six months after the event ($\beta=.14$; $p<.05$). Thus, H8a and H8b are confirmed, supporting suggestions by Vivek et al. (2012).

Positive emotions were related to higher levels of satisfaction, immediately after the food festival ($\beta=.34$; $p<.001$), and looking back at the event six months later ($\beta=.59$; $p<.001$). This supports H9a and H9b. It is interesting to note that the influence of positive emotions evoked six months later was greater than immediately after the event. Negative emotions were related to lower levels of satisfaction, directly after the food festival ($\beta=-.50$; $p<.001$), and looking back at the event six months later ($\beta=-.12$; $p<.05$), confirming H10a and H10b. However, in contrast to positive emotions, the influence of negative emotions on satisfaction decreased between the two stages of research. An important implication of this finding is the importance of emotions living on in memory and influencing future behaviour. The limited
previous research undertaken in the context of festivals had suggested a direct effect of emotions on future behaviour, but this study found an effect indirectly through satisfaction. This finding also confirms previous conceptualisations of satisfaction as a multifaceted concept with antecedent components in affect (Oliver, 1993; 1994).

Finally, H11a and H11b were supported, because satisfaction levels immediately after the food festival and six months after the event were significantly and positively related to intention to recommend/purchase ($\beta=.20; p<.01$), and actual recommendation/purchase of local food which had been sampled at the festival ($\beta=.28; p<.001$). This is in line with previous literature in the festivals context (e.g., Kim et al., 2010; Schofield & Thompson, 2007; Yoon et al., 2010).

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS
Festivals and events have become more numerous in recent years (Yoon et al., 2010). They typically involve coalitions of interested stakeholders thus considerable research is routinely undertaken to assess the impacts of a festival and the benefits that might accrue to the various stakeholder groups. For this reason, many studies have sought to estimate the social, economic and cultural impacts of a festival on the immediate area, region or nation. Studies have tended to focus on the direct benefits to stakeholders, such as expenditure by visitors in the local economy during the festival, or the number of jobs created. Relatively little research has been undertaken to assess the benefits of festivals as agents for behaviour change. Many festivals allow visitors to become involved in activities which are deemed to be “good” from broad public policy objectives. Eating locally produced rather than globally sourced food satisfies a number of public policy objectives, and a food festival presents opportunities for visitors to experience food outside of their normal routine. Previous research has also been limited by concentrating on the mere act of attendance rather than visitors’ level of engagement in activities while attending.

At best, published research has linked the experience of attending a food festival to preferences and sales of food while at the event. The present study makes a contribution to knowledge by undertaking a two stage ‘during’ and ‘after’ study linking attitudes, food engagement, satisfaction and emotions evoked at a food festival with subsequent decisions to buy locally produced food. Specifically it addresses the question raised by Hall and Sharples (2008) of whether food festivals have a wider impact than simply providing entertainment, and whether they successfully promote more benign types of food consumption and subsequently change food consumption habits. Numerous conceptual frameworks have highlighted the importance of remembered experiences for informing future purchase decisions. However, empirical longitudinal studies of the effects of remembered experiences over time are very limited (Mora & Moscarola, 2010; Palmer & Koenig-Lewis, 2010).

White (2010) called for more research to include positive and negative emotions as separate constructs, and to assess the effects both on satisfaction and behaviour over time. The current study addresses this gap, confirming that remembered feelings of positive emotions not only remained a significant predictor of satisfaction, but also their effect increased over time. The findings support Desmet and Schifferstein’s (2008) suggestion that food festival experiences can act as ‘sources of positive food emotions’, and extend this with long term effect on satisfaction and actual behaviour, rather than retrospective recall which has been more typical of previous studies. Negative emotions had an effect on satisfaction, but in contrast to positive emotions, their effect declined over time. One possible explanation for this is that cognitive dissonance occurs whereby over time, individuals suppress emotions which are inconsistent with underlying values and attitudes, while those that are consistent are reinforced with subsequent presentation of visual cues (Abercrombie, 1967; Hausknecht,
Sweeney, Soutar, & Johnson, 1998). Another explanation, suggested by Mitchell et al. (1997), is that people have a tendency to remember past events more fondly and to take a more ‘rosy view’ when reflecting on past experience.

The results demonstrate that visitors’ participation at food festivals drives a chain of desired outcomes which can inform policy frameworks for changing food buying behaviour. An individual’s level of engagement in a food festival provided the strongest predictor of intention to buy locally produced food, and actual purchase six months later. These findings are in line with previous studies and make a significant contribution to debate about the specific role of food engagement at festivals in changing food consumption behaviour (e.g., Tarkiainen & Sundqvist, 2009; Vermeir & Verbeke, 2006). Engagement also had a significant effect on emotions evoked at the festivals. In addition, the present framework suggests that emotions have an effect on behaviour indirectly through satisfaction. Although literature has begun to recognise the importance of the affective dimension in determining behavioural intentions of visitors (Grappi & Montanari, 2011; Kim, 2014), research has been limited and has not examined the effect over time, or the effect on actual behaviour adopted.

The study informs government policies which seek to increase consumption of local food, thereby achieving economic, environmental and employment objectives which were identified earlier in this paper. The importance of emotions found in this study should be reflected in communication messages which aim to make consumers feel happy about their food choices. The greater effects of positive emotions compared with negative emotions suggests that messages of fear about the harmful consequences associated with globalised food supply chains are likely to be less effective than messages which focus on feeling good about the nutritional and environmental benefits of consuming locally produced food. Local food producers should seek to reinforce positive emotions over time through the selective management of cues. Regular sharing of experiences of food linked to a festival through social media can help to continue a sense of engagement which drives emotions and subsequent behaviour.

An important finding of the present study is that while respondents’ initial attitude to locally produced food had a significant influence on intention, there was no significant link to subsequent actual behaviour. However, engagement with food at the festival was a strong predictor of subsequent purchases. This is an important ‘value added’ aspect of a food festival which is difficult to quantify in traditional economic assessments of festivals. These results are consistent with previous studies, suggesting that positive attitudes might be insufficient to change behaviour due to the habitual nature of food shopping (Tarkiainen & Sundqvist, 2009). Engagement at food festivals offers one possible method by which government policies to change food choices may be implemented. In addition, food festival organisers may encourage greater levels of engagement at the festival by specifically promoting the activities in their advertisements, by providing a festival timetable and map stimulating participation in events for all visitors. The activities at the festivals could then be linked to promote desired behaviour. For example, chef demonstrators could offer discount vouchers for visitors to buy the local food ingredients in retail outlets or online after the festival. Other methods can include ‘open days’ on farms, introducing children to urban farms and offering samples provided by farmers in urban grocery stores. These approaches can build positive associations and memories, not only with the specific local food tasted at the specific events, but with local food in general.

The present two-stage study identified a continuing gap between what people said they would buy immediately after a food festival and what they actually bought six months later. This intention-behaviour gap may be explained by a number of factors, including limited availability of locally produced food, inconvenient location and opening hours of outlets where such food can be purchased. In addition, the cost of locally produced food may be
perceived as being too high for consumers to regularly purchase it. Although food festivals may be a valuable tool in raising awareness and preference for locally produced food, policy also needs to pay attention to improving its accessibility and affordability. Some respondents noted that they were unaware how they could later buy the locally produced food that they had sampled at the festival. Producers could address this with leaflets listing outlets and directing visitors to websites where more information could be provided about access to the products. Making use of Quick Response (QR) codes on their stalls can allow visitors to scan these using their mobile devices, linking them quickly to producers’ websites and social media forums related to local food. Forums can be useful tools for keeping the memory of the festival alive, encouraging continuing engagement through sharing of experiences between members and continuing experimentation with locally produced food. These memories of taste might evoke a desire for a particular food in order to relive associated emotions experienced at the festival (Lupton, 1994; 1998).

Finally, although this study did not specifically look at children’s experiences of food festivals, it is likely that engagement in food festivals at an early age may provide rich memories which will inform food choices later in life. There is a suggestion that food buyers’ preferences are acquired in early childhood, and food festivals provide a good opportunity for children to learn about the value of food (Coakley, 2003; Olshavsky & Granbois, 1979). This is reinforced by the findings of a recent study by Roberts and Pettigrew (2013) who found that for children, psychosocial needs play a greater role than physiological needs in food choice and consumption. This study would appear to endorse government initiatives to promote healthier and more sustainable eating habits among children through engagement with food, and more research would be useful to replicate this study specifically for audiences of children.

Limitations of the study should be noted. This study adopted the approach of measuring emotions as two distinct constructs – positive and negative emotions. It should be acknowledged that this approach does not take account of any differences between discrete emotions of the same valence (Laros & Steenkamp, 2005). Some researchers argue that several discrete emotion types of the same valence exist at a lower level of aggregation, having different antecedents and consequences (Söderlund & Rosengren, 2004). This approach has been adopted by several researchers in a tourism and festival context (Hosany & Gilbert, 2010; Hosany et al., 2014; Lee & Kyle, 2013). Thus, further research could adopt scales which aggregate several discrete emotion types into more than two dimensions, for example, Hosany and Gilbert’s (2010) 15-item Destination Experience Scale (DES) representing three dimensions of joy, love and positive surprise, or Lee and Kyles (2013) Festival Consumption Emotions scale (FCE) with six dimensions.

Although a variety of food festivals formed the basis of the sampling, there are limits of generalisations to other places and other times. The place reflects a UK context where attitudes towards food authenticity may differ from other countries. A while after the research was completed, a further ‘food scare’ occurred in the UK when traces of horse meat were found in meat labelled as beef, and there was anecdotal evidence that this resulted in raised levels of interest in locally produced food.

‘Locally produced food’ remains a difficult concept to define. Apart from imposing arbitrary limits on the distance between production and consumption, some critics have noted that food produced close to the point of consumption may nevertheless have travelled considerable distances between farms, processors and warehouses before being made available to consumers. At best, ‘locally produced food’ as understood here could be conflated with a bundle of characteristics which are considered desirable from a public policy perspective, most notably ecologically sustainable production methods and the preservation of rural economies. Finally, a limitation of the quantitative methodology is the lack of depth.
of insight into specific emotions and types of engagement which might have most long lasting effects on food buying choices. Although the unstructured comments left by participants provided some insights, more in-depth qualitative research would be useful to explore the granularity of complex associations between engagement, emotions and memory. It is also possible that there is a two way relationship between food engagement and involvement with local food. This study examined the effect of involvement on food engagement, but it is possible that engagement may also lead to higher interest in local food. A qualitative research framework would be useful for exploring further this interaction of effects.
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Appendix A: Scale items, means, standard deviations, skew and kurtosis, Cronbach’s alpha, average variance extracted and construct reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale items, means, standard deviations, skew and kurtosis, Cronbach’s alpha, average variance extracted and construct reliabilities</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>α</th>
<th>AVE</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local food involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’d like to know a bit more about you and food. Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. (1 = strongly disagree, to 5 = strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I like to buy food that is produced locally</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I try to buy food from local markets and farmers’ markets as much as possible</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• I don’t really mind where in the world my food comes from (reverse coded)</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.87</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking back to the food festival you attended, please indicate to what extent you took part in the following activities. (1 = not at all, to 5 = very much)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Food and drink tasting</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discussing food or drink products with local producers</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning more about local food and drink.</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Learning more about local producers.</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction (Stage 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’d like to know what you thought about the festival. Please indicate how satisfied you were with the following aspects. (1 = very dissatisfied, to 5 = very satisfied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The layout of the food festival (e.g. stalls)</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The size of the food festival</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The atmosphere of the food festival</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.83</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The general organisation of the food festival</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>-.69</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variety of food and drink available</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of food and drink available</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The food festival as a whole</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction (Stage 2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’d like to know what you thought about the festival. Please indicate how satisfied you were with the following aspects. (1 = very dissatisfied to 5 = very satisfied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The layout of the food festival (e.g. stalls)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The size of the food festival</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.70</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The atmosphere of the food festival</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The general organisation of the food festival</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.46</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Variety of food and drink available</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.95</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quality of food and drink available</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.80</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The food festival as a whole</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-1.27</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Emotions (Stage 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking back at the last food festival you attended, please indicate the extent you felt the following emotions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1 = not at all, and 5 = very much)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Happy</th>
<th>Pleasantly surprised</th>
<th>Pleased</th>
<th>Excited</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Emotions (Stage 2) - Looking back at the last food festival you attended, please indicate the extent you felt the following emotions.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>-.74</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-.48</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unfulfilled</th>
<th>Annoyed</th>
<th>Disappointed</th>
<th>Frustrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotions (Stage 1) - Looking back at the last food festival you attended, please indicate the extent you felt the following emotions.</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>7.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>3.98</td>
<td>16.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unfulfilled</th>
<th>Annoyed</th>
<th>Disappointed</th>
<th>Frustrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Emotions (Stage 2) - Looking back at the last food festival you attended, please indicate the extent you felt the following emotions.</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>19.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>17.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommend a member of family or a friend to try the food I tasted at the food festival</th>
<th>Try to buy local food or drink I saw at the festival either from a local shop, online or through mail order, or direct from the producer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavioural Intention (Stage 1) - After visiting the food festival, how likely would you be to do the following things? (1 = very unlikely, to 5 = very likely)</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommended a member of family or a friend to try the food I tasted at the food festival</th>
<th>Purchased local food or drink I saw at the festival either from a local shop, online or through mail order, or direct from the producer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual Behaviour (Stage 2) - After visiting the food festival, have you done any of the following things? (1 = Not at all, to 5 = very much)</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: All of the negative emotion variables had kurtosis values greater than 3, and two also had a skewness value greater than 3, thus indicating non-normal distribution. These results showed low intensity of feelings for negative emotions. However, the large sample size minimised the risk of this non-normal distribution causing problems during analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), and likewise the maximum likelihood estimation technique that was adopted has been described as being “robust to violations of the normality assumption” (Hair et al., 2010, p. 663).

All responses were based on five point scales. The labels given to the extremities of each of the scales as well as any neutral points are outlined in the table above.
### Appendix B: Construct reliabilities, average variance extracted, covariances and squared inter-construct correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct (Stage)</th>
<th>No. items</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3a</th>
<th>4a</th>
<th>5a</th>
<th>6a</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3b</th>
<th>4b</th>
<th>5b</th>
<th>6b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local food involvement (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food engagement (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotions (Stage 1) (3a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.08**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotions (Stage 1) (4a)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.02*</td>
<td>-.08**</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (Stage 1) (5a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local food intentions (Stage 1) (6a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-.07**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotions (Stage 2) (3b)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10**</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotions (Stage 2) (4b)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction (Stage 2) (5b)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local food behaviour: (Stage 2) (6b)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Diagonal shaded boxes represent the average variance extracted (AVE) for the constructs. Below the diagonal shows the covariances. Above the diagonal shows the squared inter-construct correlations (SIC). ** Indicates significant covariances at p<.001 (two-tailed). * Indicates significant covariances at p<.05 (two-tailed).
## Appendix C: List of food festivals studied in main study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name / Location of festival</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Main Objectives</th>
<th>Typical no. of food/drink exhibitors</th>
<th>Typical no. of visitors</th>
<th>Duration of festival</th>
<th>No. Responses Stage 1</th>
<th>No. Responses Stage 2</th>
<th>Weblink</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pilot test</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gorseinon Food Festival, Gorseinon</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Celebrate the best of Welsh produce and connect consumers with local producers.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>67</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gdt.org.uk/foodfestival/about.html">http://www.gdt.org.uk/foodfestival/about.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Wales Food Festival, National Botanic Gardens</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Support local producers and educate consumers.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>123</td>
<td><a href="http://www.gardenofwales.org.uk/whats-on/events/">http://www.gardenofwales.org.uk/whats-on/events/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Llŷn Land and Seafood Festival, Pwllheli</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Promote the best Welsh produce.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47</td>
<td><a href="http://www.llynlandandseafoodfestival.co.uk/">http://www.llynlandandseafoodfestival.co.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Really Wild Food and Countryside Festival, St Davids</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Get people back in touch with the countryside and teach them about local produce.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>179</td>
<td><a href="http://www.reallywildfestival.co.uk/">http://www.reallywildfestival.co.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon Beacons Summer Fayre, Brecon</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Celebrate Welsh food and drink.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td><a href="http://www.breconbeacons.org/events/">http://www.breconbeacons.org/events/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Food Festival, Welshpool</td>
<td>Annual (no longer running)</td>
<td>Promote local produce and educate consumers about local sourcing.</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>305</td>
<td><a href="http://www.welshfoodfestival.co.uk/">http://www.welshfoodfestival.co.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main study</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Fagans Food Festival, St Fagans</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Showcase the finest Welsh foods and drinks, and educate consumers about the history of where their food comes from.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>108</td>
<td><a href="https://www.museumwales.ac.uk/whatson/?event_id=4333">https://www.museumwales.ac.uk/whatson/?event_id=4333</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abergavenny Food Festival, Abergavenny</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Promote the best of Welsh produce and link producers with local stockists.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>35,000+</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>36</td>
<td><a href="http://www.abergavennyfoodfestival.com/">http://www.abergavennyfoodfestival.com/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narberth Food Festival, Narberth</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Connect consumers with local food and drink producers.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>95</td>
<td><a href="http://www.narberthfoodfestival.com/">http://www.narberthfoodfestival.com/</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neath Food and Drink Festival, Neath</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Celebrate the variety and high quality of Welsh produce.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>52</td>
<td><a href="http://www.npt.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=5442">http://www.npt.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=5442</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>