REMEMBERING TOGETHER: THE IMPORTANCE OF SHARED EMOTIONAL MEMORY IN EVENT EXPERIENCES
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Drawing on the wider literature in the psychology and sociology of emotions and memory this study provides new insights into the formation and role of shared emotion in the memory of event experiences. The methodology draws together several data collection methods in order to capture the complexity of emotional response. Thick data are gathered from a single case study friendship pair using a combination of short surveys, physiological measures, photo elicitation, and paired interviews to provide a detailed understanding of the experience from anticipation to recollection and reflection to response. The longitudinal data show that what was felt at the time changes considerably in recollection often becoming more intense as time passes and it is the act of sharing these memories that appears to intensify and alter them. This suggests that the often flawed and certainly mediated memory of the experience has a more influential role to play in attitude formation than previously thought. Furthermore, it is the desire for a feeling of emotional congruity that creates and strengthens this emotional response in remembering. Therefore, the mediated memory of the attendee experience has more influence on behavior than the reality of the experience. It is recommended that event marketers use this understanding to design opportunities, beyond the experience, in which memories can be created and shared.
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Introduction

Experience design has become a vital part of many tangible product marketing campaigns as well as being the main product feature of “experiential products” such as arts, music, hospitality, and tourism (Berridge, 2007; Tussyadiah, 2014). However, this focus on the design of the experience may be seen as something akin to marketing myopia (Levitt, 1960), in that the product (the experience) is the focus, whereas the real value (for customers and marketers) lies in the consumer’s emotional response to the experience (J-S. Lee, Lee, & Choi, 2011). This response is far more complex than simple satisfaction (Koenig-Lewis & Palmer, 2008) and its complexity is increased in the consumption
of many experiential products due to the effect of shared emotion and the impact of “others” in that experience (Miao & Mattila, 2013). The value also does not lie solely in the “in the moment” emotional response, as emotional experiences, both positive and negative, become part of the consumer’s semiotic memory and in turn influence their self- and social identities, both fitting with and forming their values. Therefore, the experience and the emotion remembered as a result have the potential to shape attitudes and to be shaped by attitudes (Allen, Machleit, & Kleine, 1992) and are likely to be a useful additional indicator of future behavior.

This article explores the theory that the memory of emotion (real, moderated, misremembered, or distorted) has more influence on future attitude and behavior than the momentary experienced emotion during consumption (Allen et al., 1992). Understanding how event experiences generate memorable emotions and then how memory is mediated by subsequent experiences is a vital aspect in determining postconsumption satisfaction, referral, and loyalty (J-K. Kim & Fesenmaier, 2015a; Tung & Ritchie, 2011). At present, little research exists that considers the emotions felt during the experience and their effect on postconsumption behavior (Ladhari, 2007; Luomala & Laaksonen, 2000; Soscia, 2007) or the longitudinal effect of the emotions experienced during the event on memory and attitude (Klaus & Maklan, 2013; Koenig-Lewis & Palmer, 2008; J. Lee & Kyle, 2012; Tung & Ritchie, 2011). Indeed, there has been limited response to Marschall’s (2012) critique that marketing within experience sectors such as tourism and events has so far failed to explore memory and Pearce and Packer’s (2013) call for more research in the field informed by psychology. They proposed that future tourism research employs longitudinal designs taking an emic psychological perspective that focuses on the social and cultural context and utilizes advances in measuring physiological responses. This study begins to address this gap by adopting this approach to the study of attendee emotion, memory, and shared experiences, and their influence on attitude formation and behavioral intent.

Recent research has highlighted the importance of not just sharing the experience (J-K. Kim & Fesenmaier, 2015), but the emergence of collective emotions (Woosnam, Aleshinloye, Van Winkle, & Qian, 2014) and the value in collectively remembering these emotions (Wood, Kenyon, & Moss, 2012). Drawing from the literature within consumer psychology and social psychology (Mannell & Iso-Ahola, 1987) the concepts of emotion and shared, or collective, emotion is firstly discussed. Current theories and debates around the memory of emotion are then considered to develop a theoretical framework within which to study the relationship between shared experience, emotion, and memory within the consumption experience. This understanding then informs the development of a range of data gathering methods which, when combined, allow for both individual and shared emotional memories to emerge as well as providing some indication of the extent to which these affect both attitude and behavior.

**Literature Review**

**Emotion and the Memory of Emotion**

Although there has been continuing debate within psychology about what constitutes emotion (physiological response or subjective interpretation of experience), there is agreement on its importance in influencing future behavior (Damasio, Tranel, & Damasio, 1991; Levine, Lench, & Safer, 2009).

Much work has been undertaken to categorize and simplify emotional response (e.g., Mehrabien, 1980; Russell, 1980; Schlosburg, 1954; Wundt, 1897), but it could be argued that these have failed to capture the importance of the words and expressions used to describe the emotions felt and the nuances of these. There are clearly cultural differences that impact the way in which emotions are expressed, and possibly felt, as well as differences created by the social environment in which they are experienced and remembered (Mesquita & Nico, 1992; Picard, 2012; Russell, 1991). They have also tended to ignore the temporal dimension of emotions found to be of importance in more recent consumer research (Winterich & Haws, 2011; Wood & Moss, 2015). Emotions can be categorized as forward looking (such as anticipation, anxiety, hope), present focused (such as happiness, frustration), or backward looking (such as pride, shame). This...
suggests that in the moment emotional capture may not be sufficient as the forward/backward-looking emotional repertoire may only appear over time, both before and after consumption.

Much of the emphasis within tourism and events experience design has been on generating a positive emotional response (Tung & Ritchie, 2011), but this ignores the potential for negative emotions to be equally (and sometimes more) enjoyable. A negative emotion experienced through a protective frame (from a position of security) and with subjective transformation of the situation can be incredibly enjoyable and more memorable (Fokkinga & Desmet, 2012, 2013; Parrott, 2014). For example, the emotions engendered by riding a roller coaster, visiting an unfamiliar culture, parachuting out of a plane, or watching a horror film. Many experiential products involve (either deliberately or not) some element of negative emotion generation. These negative emotions can add engagement and meaning to situations; for example, shock or confusion created by a new art exhibition, sadness in a theater play, or feeling miserable in the mud at a festival.

Here, again, the temporal dimension of emotion is important, as a negative emotion can become positive when looked back upon. For example, you may have felt miserable as you traipsed through the mud back to your tent, but looking back on that weekend, you feel proud that you did it. Anxiety and anticipation can become relief or pride and the more challenging the experience the more the sense of achievement.

The enjoyment of positive and negative emotions happens both in the moment of the experience and in later reflecting upon it. Therefore, emotion and memory are inextricably linked and most methods designed to capture emotion are, in fact, capturing the memory it (with the exception of direct physiological measures).

This link between memory and emotion has proven fertile ground within psychology with much debate and seemingly contradictory findings. For example, M. D. Robinson and Clore (2002a, 2002b) argued that emotion itself is not remembered but only the situation in which it occurred. However, several researchers investigating implicit memory for emotion, particularly fearful memories, maintain that emotional memories are retained permanently and accurately (e.g., Fanselow & Gale, 2003; Le Doux, 1996; van der Kolk, 1994). More recently research has shown that even implicit emotional memory becomes more malleable with time and that this too is subject to bias influenced by recent experiences and goals (Ferguson & Bargh, 2004).

Within tourism Tung and Ritchie (2011) and J-H. Kim and Jang (2014) investigated the importance of different factors in creating memorable experiences. J. Lee and Kyle (2012) identified the inaccuracies of remembered emotions after attending community festivals in Texas but did not explore whether or not these postvisit moderated emotions were more important or less important in terms of revisit intention.

However, accurate memory is not necessarily a determinant of future behavior. In Safer, Levine, and Drapalski’s (2002) study of students’ memory of anxiety pre- and postresults, investigated the extent to which the real level of anxiety felt or the misremembered level affected how the students felt next time they had an exam. Both are important, as the anxiety felt at the time is stored subconsciously in implicit memory and will emerge in a similar situation, whereas the remembered level of anxiety will affect more cognitive decisions such as planning how to approach the next exam.

In tourism both positive and negative emotions are a “defining attribute of the tourist condition” (M. D. Robinson, 2012, p. 40). However, as well as understanding the strong emotions felt by the visitor at the time (stored in implicit memory) it is imperative to also explore the explicit memories of those emotions that have been created since the experience, as both will affect their attitude and approach to similar experiences in the future.

Shared Emotion, Shared Memory

Many products (hospitality, tourism, art, sport, music) involve some form of experience sharing with other customers, attendees, or visitors. This might be limited to merely being in the same place at the same time with little interaction or could be a vital component of the experience itself. The presence of fellow consumers creates a complex social environment in which consumption is subjectively experienced (Pearce & Packer, 2013; Thakor, 2013).
Suri, & Saleh, 2008) and is often an inherent part of the product (Grove & Fisk, 1997) with the potential to elicit both negative and positive emotional responses. Indeed, Miao and Mattila (2013) concluded from their study of psychological distance and the shared experience within hospitality that “customer-to-customer dynamics often have a greater impact on customer experiences than provider-to-customer” (p. 92). Despite these findings and collective emotion being described as a “red hot topic” in the field of social psychology (Dixon & Condor, 2011), this is an area seemingly overlooked in wider customer to customer interaction research (Nicholls, 2010) and in the customer experience (Verhoef, Lemon, Parasuraman, Roggeveen, Tsiros, & Schlesinger, 2009).

There are two aspects of collective or shared emotion that are of interest here. The perceived collective emotion felt during the event experience and the emotion engendered by sharing the experience after the event (J-K. Kim & Fesenmaier, 2015a). The former relates to the design of experience and the latter is related to the memory of emotion and the process through which this is mediated by both personal and social factors.

For over a century, there has been debate about collective emotion, beginning with Le Bon’s (1895) concept of “social contagion” (the spreading of emotion through a crowd) and Durkheim’s (1912) discussion of “collective effervescence” within a religious context. Although not without their critics, these early authors have inspired others to study this phenomenon in greater depth. For example, Collins (2004) discussed the “mutual entrainment of emotion and attention” (p. 48), arguing that emotionally heightened situations can produce a shared emotional/cognitive experience. Similarly, from their sociological perspective, Lawler and Thye (2006) argued that shared activities amplify emotions and that these emotions are then perceived as jointly produced, reaffirming group affiliation and structures of interdependence. Within tourism, Woosnam and Norman’s (2010) and Woosnam’s (2011) work based on Durkheim’s “emotional solidarity” has sought to identify the elements of shared emotion between visitors and residents.

The notion of shared emotion remains hotly debated and several authors have reflected on whether there is ever actual sharing, but more accurately only a mirroring or convergence—”commonality” rather than “collectivity” as Salmela (2012) put it. Schmid (2009) argued that we experience our conscious states as anonymous and aper-sonal, so it is relatively easy for us to interpret our own feelings as if they were those of another. This suggests that we form our own individually felt emotions through constantly reflecting on how we think others feel. Therefore, not shared, but created by a perception of collectivity.

Our perception of the similarity of others within emotion research has been categorized on a contin-uum using the terms “I mode” and “we mode” collectivity (Salmela, 2012; von Scheve & Ismer, 2013). The strongest sense of “we mode” collectivity is seen in families, sects, workgroups, orchestras, teams, etc. (groups in which we are participants rather than spectators). The weakest form of “I mode” collectivity occurs when we are mutually aware that others feel the same (e.g., listening to music at a festival or watching a theater production—audience rather than participant). This lower level of convergence can still lead to the synchronization of copresent individuals’ responses such as audience applause, football chants, and laughter.

The social environment may also cause emotional dissonance where the expressed emotion does not reflect the felt emotion but is a response to the “dis-play rules” governing that social setting (Ekman, 1972; Picard, 2012). For example, the pressure to applaud, cheer, or laugh when not naturally inclined to—“to put on a front” to avoid awkward social experiences—can have a marked effect on enjoyment and satisfaction (Miao & Mattila, 2013). This pressure to appear as though we emotionally conform is a further challenge in empirical emotion research in that reported emotions may suffer from social desirability bias.

In summary, we argue that individuals feel only their own emotions and that these can be private or shared (but not aggregated). These individual emotions are influenced by assumptions about the emotions of those who are having similar experiences and/or have shared concerns. This influence is greater when there is physical proximity to others and where there is a greater feeling of shared identity (Woosnam et al., 2014). Although much
of this is subconscious, there is also a cognitive response that Salmela (2012) and Ekman (1972) suggested equates to a “group social-feeling rule” rather than an actual emotion. As part of this desire to feel a shared identity we imagine a greater level of shared emotion than there is and, to some extent, project our own emotions on to those around us (Markin, 2011). This highlights the importance of understanding to what we attribute the emotions we feel. For example, this could be to the task (the live event in this case), to self, to another (friend), or to the social group (Lawler, 2001).

In summary, a social exchange leads to positive emotion, which creates relational cohesion (Lawler & Yoon, 1996) or “emotional solidarity” (Durkheim, 1912) resulting in behavioral commitment. Therefore, the ripples of influence spread out as others are influenced by and influence this sharing of emotion. Therefore, within our study individual reflections on the emotions experienced become less important and more emphasis is placed on observing the sharing of emotional memory and understanding the effects generated by this sharing.

Memory of Emotion and Behavioral Intention

The final stage to consider in the “emotional journey” is how the experience of the emotion, the memory, sharing, and the reliving of it then impacts on attitudes and behavioral intention. It is this aspect that event marketers will find of most use and yet it is undoubtedly the hardest aspect to empirically test. The view that decision making is largely based on rational cognitive processes has gradually been overtaken with a growing consensus that emotional response and affective components of attitude have far more impact (Heath & Feldwick, 2007; McCabe, Li, & Chen, 2016). This change in emphasis has been partly led by Damasio et al.’s (1991) work on “somatic markers” showing that evoked emotion is consciously or unconsciously associated with past outcomes. These situation-specific somatic states based on, and reinforced by, past experiences help to guide behavior in favor of more “advantageous” choices. This suggests that the initial emotional reaction to a situation will have cognitive rational elements but the implicit memory of it and the subsequent response to that memory is less under our conscious control.

Implicit (subconscious) emotion has a direct effect on future behavior as the memory of this elicits a similar physiological response to the actual experience (Levine et al., 2009); however, the ability to forget and to update memories may be just as important. Forgetting and misremembering allow for the influence of more recent and relevant emotional experience on decisions. It is thus “the persistence and construction of relevant memories, rather than retention of exact copies of past experience,
that allow people to effectively navigate their complex world” (Levine et al., 2009, p. 1039).

Any investigation into the effect of emotion on behavioral intention and attitude does not necessarily need to extract our accurate memories of the moment but requires methods that will ascertain an accurate version of how we feel about it now and what has influenced that, possibly, moderated view. Semantic, rather than episodic, memory is where attitudes are formed and, therefore, recollected emotions will offer a different insight into predisposition to behave than attitudes alone (Allen et al., 1992).

In conclusion, there is evidence that how we think we felt is more important than how we actually felt. How we think we felt is determined by the emotions at the time, experiences since (including sharing those emotions), our values and attitudes, and the social context. This is further complicated by a seemingly teleological argument in that memory of past emotion is partly altered to fit current beliefs and memory of past emotion forms our current beliefs. Therefore, it is likely that this will also be the case in terms of attitudes and behavioral intention and the impact on these will be greater as the emotions are relived, shared, and amended. Developed from the literature discussed above, Figure 1 provides a proposed initial framework for understanding the complexity of emotion, memory, and sharing in the context of an event experience.

**Methodology**

The discussion above raises many methodological challenges that are unlikely to be met by a single method or solely quantitative data. It is argued here that the methods employed need to be more “natural” to the respondents’ behaviors and the contextual environment to better capture their unforced feelings and behaviors and the meanings they place on them. Therefore, an emic perspective “genuinely driven from the participants’ full frame of reference” (Pearce & Packer, 2013, p. 404) is taken.

Therefore, the mixed-method research design includes a physiological measuring instrument.
Although a variety of technologies exist for measuring emotional response (D. T. Robinson, Rogalin, & Smith-Lovin, 2015) the device chosen was Q Sensor wristband. The device measures temperature and movement, but the most insightful data comes from the monitoring of electrodermal activity—the electrical change measured at the surface of the skin that arises when the skin receives innervating signals from the brain such as emotional arousal.

Similar galvanic skin response sensors have been used successfully in other recent studies especially when combined with other methods. For example, Baskett, Shang, Patterson, and Trull (2013) to study alcohol craving; Machajdik et al. (2011) looking at affective responses in decision making; J. K. Kim and Fesenmaier’s (2015b) study of travelers’ emotions; and Sparks, Perkins, Wang, Shao, and Mattesson (2012) in a study of tourism imagery.

The participants were briefed on how to operate the sensors and their baseline emotional data gathered by wearing the wristbands for 1 hr in a calm environment, 2 weeks before the research began. They were instructed to wear and activate the sensors from 4 hr before the event (to capture potential excitement, apprehension, anticipation) and 12 hr afterwards (the period in which immediate postevent reflections would occur). The two participating friends were then asked to wear them again during each of the follow-up interviews to provide an additional measure of the strength of relived emotions.

Experience Sampling Survey

During the event, it was particularly important for in-the-moment data capture to be as unobtrusive as possible while still capturing, as far as possible, the “true” emotion of the moment. Short surveys were sent to the participants via links in text messages. These were repeated at intervals, beginning a few hours before the event and continuing through the event program and into the following day.

The participants used their own phones for both survey responses and the photos for use as aide memoires in the postevent interviews. In this way, the participants could capture the experience at the time but reflect on it in more depth later (Isomursu, Tahti, Vainamo, & Kuutti, 2007)
The scale items in the survey were based on a number of previous studies of emotion (Andrews, Russell Bennett, & Drennan; Carstensen et al., 2010; Juslin, Liljestrom, Vastfjall, Barradas, & Silva, 2008; Larsen & Diener, 1992; Swenden et al., 2000) and adapted to fit the main emotional groups identified in live music experiences (Wood & Moss, 2015).

At the time of the text message, participants were asked to assess each emotion on a 3-point scale of emotional strength (not at all, a little, a lot) in reference to their “last undisturbed moment” (i.e., before the prompt). This aimed to capture what Heavey, Hulbert, and Lefforge (2010) referred to as “pristine inner experiences in flight” or to get as close to the real experience without the disturbance of the prompt. At the time of the text prompt participants were also reminded to take photos and had been previously briefed that these should be of scenes, people, or things that best represented how they were feeling.

See Appendix A for sample questions from the survey.

Core Method: Expositional Paired Interview

As expounded by Hurlburt and Heavey (2015) in much of their work on descriptive experience sampling, this technique uses cues or stimuli gathered during the experience to encourage a full and detailed explanation and reflection upon these from the interviewees. The method owes much to the more established autobiographical memory interview but addresses some of the issues associated with these, namely memory lapses or selective memory gaps (Kirkegaard Thomsen & Brinkmann, 2009). These are partially overcome through the cues created by notes taken at the time or, as in our research, the survey responses, comments, and photographs used to elicit memory.

Interview Procedure

The first expositional interviews were conducted approximately 2 weeks after the event, allowing time for memories of the event to be reflected upon and refined. The case study “friendship pair” were asked to send their photos to the facilitator before the interview and these were collated alongside the survey responses and the wristband data. This provided a timeline of cues that could be drawn upon in the interview and shown to the participants as needed.

The participants (friends) were interviewed together to explore how they shared the experience (Allegrettia, Borkan, Reis, & Griffiths, 2010) and how an agreed or debated memory of it was formed. The personal photographs, although not forming part of the data, were highly effective in aiding recall, and detailed interpretation (Basil, 2011) and also in encouraging the participants to “tell a story” (Young & Barrett, 2001) that, in turn, engendered emotional responses.

An initial analysis of this dialogue and the corresponding electrodermal (EDA) data aided the facilitation of the second stage interview held 6 weeks after the event and following the same format, of a minimally prompted unstructured interview using prompts such as “what was happening then?” and “how were you feeling when that happened?”

Table 1 summarizes the methods used to investigate the emotions felt at the time (experiential, episodic memory of emotion) and those used after the experience to gauge semantic memory of emotion and the effect of sharing and remembering on subsequent emotional response, attitude formation, and behavioral intention.

Analytical Processes

The data for analysis are in three waves. First was the EDA data recorded via wristband during the experience and illuminated by the survey responses. Within this wave, the felt emotions and in-the-moment reported emotions are compared and linked to the context in which they occurred for each participant.

The second wave data consist of the recorded and transcribed paired interview held shortly after the event, which used the survey responses and participant photos to stimulate discussion. The emotions felt during the discussion and captured via the wristband enable analysis of how reliving, remembering, and sharing the experience directly affects emotional response. Finally, the third wave repeated the methods used in the second wave allowing us to ascertain changes in memory and emotional response over a longer period of time.

Themes and codings were checked and revised by allowing a further researcher in this area to...
In the Moment With Others

The data gathered at the event, as expected, showed fluctuating emotions throughout the day. Although taking part in the same activities, the reported emotions of the two friends did not noticeably converge until the morning after the event when they were both at home chatting, eating, relaxing, and feeling happy, affectionate, and content. Therefore, their emotional response to the environmental stimuli and their activities was affected more by other factors—possibly their overriding mood state and personality traits, I mode rather than we mode responses (Salmela, 2012). Figure 2 graphs reported happiness over the event period.

Although excitement and some anxiety are generated by the environment around them (i.e., when waiting for the bands to come on stage, queuing for food, dancing) the match between activity and reported emotion shows happiness and contentment occur most often when they are “chatting with friends.” The comments texted at the moments of reported happiness also often refer to “friends,” for example: “At the pub with friends. Feel happy and excited.” “Getting pizza, with friends, heading to a new venue soon.”

In this case, it appears that although the experience of the event itself creates emotions, the more profound and positive of these are due to the event being a catalyst for spending time with friends. Here they attribute their emotional response to the social group rather than the “task” (Lawler & Thye, 2012; D. T. Robinson et al., 2015).

Results and Discussion

The discussion is presented here in chronological order of the data gathering, starting with data captured during the event and moving on to the first and second interviews with their corresponding EDA data. Although similar themes emerge in both interviews following the “story” over time, rather than thematically, allows us to illustrate the subtle (and not so subtle) changes in the narrative of the experience and of the emotion across the three phases.

The wristband data helps to triangulate the spoken responses in that the strength of the emotion talked about or shown can be equated to EDA readings and equally the subject matter of the conversation is directly linked to emotional response (Fox, Kirwan, & Reeb-Sutherland, 2012; D. T. Robinson et al., 2015).

In the Moment With Others

The data gathered at the event, as expected, showed fluctuating emotions throughout the day. Although taking part in the same activities, the reported emotions of the two friends did not noticeably converge until the morning after the event when they were both at home chatting, eating, relaxing, and feeling happy, affectionate, and content. Therefore, their emotional response to the environmental stimuli and their activities was affected more by other factors—possibly their overriding mood state and personality traits, I mode rather than we mode responses (Salmela, 2012). Figure 2 graphs reported happiness over the event period.

Although excitement and some anxiety are generated by the environment around them (i.e., when waiting for the bands to come on stage, queuing for food, dancing) the match between activity and reported emotion shows happiness and contentment occur most often when they are “chatting with friends.” The comments texted at the moments of reported happiness also often refer to “friends,” for example: “At the pub with friends. Feel happy and excited.” “Getting pizza, with friends, heading to a new venue soon.”

In this case, it appears that although the experience of the event itself creates emotions, the more profound and positive of these are due to the event being a catalyst for spending time with friends. Here they attribute their emotional response to the social group rather than the “task” (Lawler & Thye, 2012; D. T. Robinson et al., 2015).
contentment, and affection were reported tend to correspond to much lower EDA. Although the wristband data clearly illustrates the rapid fluctuations in emotional states and the survey responses give some indication of what was happening at the time, this gives us limited insight into the felt experience. However, it does confirm the dynamic temporal nature of emotion (Fox et al., 2012) and the mediating effect of mood and personality (Imad Bokhari, 2011). Friend 2, a generally calmer person (self-described) who was also feeling lower (hungover) on the day, shows far fewer fluctuations whereas the more extrovert and “up for it” on the day Friend 1 shows a highly fluctuating emotional state throughout the event period.

Physiological Measure

From the findings discussed later it is clear that the interviews, and particularly the second interview, provide a greater depth of emotional reflection and we can see this physiologically validated in the wristband readings.

The wristbands provide tens of thousands of data points but, as we can see in Table 2, these can be analyzed to focus on peak moments and overall emotional intensity. During the second interview, both friends show a relatively high EDA with Friend 2’s peak being greater than at the actual event. Both show a higher average EDA reading in interview two than they did during the event. This suggests that remembering the event in the social context of the paired interview created a stronger emotional response than the experience itself.

During the event, the EDA data show similar fluctuations in emotional response over the tracked period with fewer peaks for Friend 2 but highs for both approximately matching moments of reported excitement. The times when feelings of relaxation, contentment, and affection were reported tend to correspond to much lower EDA. Although the wristband data clearly illustrates the rapid fluctuations in emotional states and the survey responses give some indication of what was happening at the time, this gives us limited insight into the felt experience. However, it does confirm the dynamic temporal nature of emotion (Fox et al., 2012) and the mediating effect of mood and personality (Imad Bokhari, 2011). Friend 2, a generally calmer person (self-described) who was also feeling lower (hungover) on the day, shows far fewer fluctuations whereas the more extrovert and “up for it” on the day Friend 1 shows a highly fluctuating emotional state throughout the event period.

First Interview: Desire for Collective Emotion

In the first postevent interview, peaks of EDA coincided with nervousness at the start of the event. The emotions engendered in a more relaxed social environment beyond the direct event space and time (but related to it) appear to be particularly important to the participants. Therefore, the extent to which the emotional response continues, reemerges, or changes is of particular interest and is explored in the “memory” phase of data collection—the two photo elicitation interviews.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of EDA readings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDA Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of peaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of peaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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and new knowledge gained within the day and after affect their memory of the earlier experiences (Safer et al., 2002).

The EDA peaks and the recalled positive emotions are strongest when they share the response. Remembered shared lows led to greater feelings of emotional congruence in the interviews and an agreed emotional memory of events highlighting the potentially positive affect of negative emotions (Fokkinga & Desmet 2012, 2013).

As they talk about how others felt, we can see how the social context embeds the emotion in memory (Hirst & Echteroff, 2012; Lawler & Thye, 2006): “Everyone feels like the same, so you’re completely caught up in it.” “You’re caught up in the atmosphere with everyone else.”

The memory of feeling shared values with those in their immediate group and those at the event creates an atmosphere where collective emotion, or at least the perception of it, thrives (Lawler, 2001; Mesquita & Nico, 1992; Woosnam, 2012).

Second Interview: Hidden Tensions and Emotional Congruity

The second interview, conducted 4 weeks later (6 weeks after attending the event), sees both friends more relaxed with the process and with each other. Again, we can see the pronounced effect of later experiences on their memory and the new emotions felt in remembering particular aspects of the event (see Appendix B).

In this second interview, they start by “confessing” to having had a fall out on the day of the event, having been far less open about this on the day and in interview 1:

Yeah. I started the day hungover and tired and M (Friend 2) was a bit annoyed. (Friend 1)

Yes, she was late. I didn’t know where she was. There was a lot of clipped texts going, “are you here yet?” (Friend 2)

The EDA data during the interview show Friend 1’s emotions rise again as she recalls this frustration with some exacerbation at the “relaxed” response of Friend 2. Remembering the mismatch of their felt emotions on the day creates a reliving of that tension in Friend 1. As we move later into the interview they discuss a further negative experience in feeling that they were dressed in the wrong kind of outfit. Although negative at the time the fact that they both felt this way and indeed felt is so strongly that they went home to change creates a positive response in the memory (laughing at themselves during the interview). Here Friend 1 starts to use “we” and “us” far more often than previously, illustrating a marked shift from Salmela’s (2012) I mode to we mode collectivity:

M. D. Robinson and Clore (2002a, 2002b) argued that emotion is not remembered as such but the occasion that elicits it. Here we argue that the emotion is remembered but that in remembering it a new emotion is aroused. The negative emotion at the time becomes a positive emotion upon reflection and sharing. We could also assert that because the day ends well, the friends are more positive in their emotional memory of it. The later experiences interview and then with remembering “happiness” and “embarrassment.” There are pronounced peaks as the words happy are spoken. However, due to some nervousness, the general tone of the interview is a little subdued, initially muting emotional peaks. This changes as they relax in to the interview setting and start to remember the day in more detail.

The friends recall some of the excitement and stresses at the start of the event day, also illustrating their different reactions to the situation:

I was probably feeling a bit anxious, because of running late. It was about 12:55, and S was still talking to me, I was like . . . Aargh. (Friend 1)

I was very relaxed the whole time. As in “We’ll just get there when we get there, it’s fine, it’s a little bit stressful but we’re going to get down there.” (Friend 2)

The EDA data during the interview show Friend 1’s emotions rise again as she recalls this frustration with some exacerbation at the “relaxed” response of Friend 2. Remembering the mismatch of their felt emotions on the day creates a reliving of that tension in Friend 1. As we move later into the interview they discuss a further negative experience in feeling that they were dressed in the wrong kind of outfit. Although negative at the time the fact that they both felt this way and indeed felt is so strongly that they went home to change creates a positive response in the memory (laughing at themselves during the interview). Here Friend 1 starts to use “we” and “us” far more often than previously, illustrating a marked shift from Salmela’s (2012) I mode to we mode collectivity:

We were, like, “Our outfits are wrong.” which upset us . . . and we were like, “Oh, no, we’ve got it wrong.” I don’t know how important that is, but it was very important to us. (Friend 1)

M. D. Robinson and Clore (2002a, 2002b) argued that emotion is not remembered as such but the occasion that elicits it. Here we argue that the emotion is remembered but that in remembering it a new emotion is aroused. The negative emotion at the time becomes a positive emotion upon reflection and sharing. We could also assert that because the day ends well, the friends are more positive in their emotional memory of it. The later experiences
mother. I don’t want to feel like your mother [laughs]. (Friend 2)

Knowing that things worked out alright impacts on their reflection on the experience to a greater extent in this interview, again illustrating the importance of new experience, knowledge, and beliefs on emotional memory (Safer et al., 2002) with no more time for these to have had an effect. We can also see here how remembering details of the situation or context creates a new emotional response rather than reigniting the original emotion (M. D. Robinson & Clore, 2002a, 2002b) (i.e., shared laughter rather than the previous individual annoyance and guilt).

The desire for emotional congruency appears to be one of the main drivers for masking behavior where acting the emotion to match others is felt to be necessary both for self and for the group (Miao & Mattila, 2013). The memory of masking behavior can create tension later; however, as observed in interview 1 where the memory of hidden discord reignites that feeling and leads to a renewed desire for emotional “syncing.” This indicates that what we see as collective emotion, emotional solidarity (Woosnam, 2012), or a social exchange of emotions (Lawler & Thye, 2006) may actually be an innate desire to feel the same (von Scheve & Ismer, 2013) or at least to feel we feel the same.

For example, in this exchange they recognize the fake smile within one of the photographs:

Yeah, well M (Friend 2) said I needed to look more cheery. (Friend 1)

So I was like “N (Friend 1) do you think you could look like you’re having a bit more of a laugh on this day out please, because it’s supposed to be our big day out, I was having a great time [sarcastic].” (Friend 2)

This example of “putting on a face” to avoid awkward social experiences (Miao & Mattila, 2013) illustrates how important this is even when those around know that it is an expressed rather than felt emotion.

The importance of interceding experiences is also highlighted in this interview as a moment on the day, that wasn’t mentioned in the survey responses or in the first interview, takes on greater importance 6 weeks later.

So we arrived down to . . . HF [venue], and that horrible bouncer was working on the door. (Friend 2)

Oh yeah, that mean man. Friend 1 agrees.

Mean one. Oh, he’s just not a very nice guy. Friend 2 reinforces their shared opinion

He’s not a very nice guy. We’ve had another run-in with him since. (Friend 1)

So we’ve now really taken a dislike to him. He’s just gruff and rude. (Friend 2)

This excerpt shows how attitude formation is triggered by a later event that is then solidified by a reflection on the earlier event. Their new attitudes are reinforced as they share the memory through a process akin to Rime’s (2007) collaborative facilitation:

He shouldn’t work on doors. (Friend 1)

He should not work on doors, there’s no need to be so aggressive. Reinforces Friend 2.

The wider social setting is also an important aspect of remembered emotion. In interview 1, we could see that they felt happier when there were more people and this emerges more clearly in interview 2. For example:

I was kind of glad as well that we were going to have another bit of a crew. Because quite obviously I didn’t know if she (Friend 1) was going to make it. (Friend 2)

I just still was like . . . I’m glad that we’ve got the guys. (Friend 2)

In remembering the social context, they agree upon and embed the memory of the emotion (Hirst & Echteroff, 2012):

A big part of it [happiness] would be being on form with your pals—nothing to do with the bands. (Friend 1)

We were sitting outside with friends, the sun had come out. I was like “Yeah. Finally, this is what I thought Live at L (the event) was going to be like.” (Friend 2)

In this interview there is greater discussion of how the experience and the emotions felt are affecting their future attitudes and behavioral intentions in relation to bands, venues, and social groups:
So we had our pizza, but the girls are actually well up for it at this point. B had arrived and they were discussing venues and stuff, and this is me all over. I was like “I don’t really want to go see more new bands I don’t know” . . . and also when we looked on the app there were things that were saying “don’t bother coming,” “queuing.” (Friend 2)

At this point Friend 2 remembers having had enough but also feels some guilt at missing bands. They recall anticipating the next day at this point and that anticipation affects their motivation to attend more venues. In the next exchange we can see how, together, they postjustify the decision made by Friend 2 and lessen her feelings of guilt:

And I just . . . I remember I’d had a huge week at work and I was very conscious that I have no energy. (Friend 2)

You were worried about the next day, you were just “I don’t really want to lose tomorrow.” (Friend 1)

Yeah, I think I’d worked all the previous weekend. The girls were like “Come on.” I said “You two can go now, but . . .” (Friend 2)

For a second we considered that, then M (Friend 2) was like “No, we’ll go home.” And we were like “OK.” (Friend 1)

When I said it to B, I saw her eyes light up. So I went “Well I’m going to go home and have something to eat, relax a bit.” (Friend 2)

In remembering they are partly justifying a decision that they have some guilt about (i.e., not seeing the event through). Others (B) are brought in to help explain why the decision was made. It’s important to them, when remembering, that they believe they all felt the same at the time although from interview 1 and on the day data it is unlikely that they did. In the act of sharing, the memory converges to an agreed “idea” of what happened and how they felt. The temporal (forward-looking) aspect to what they felt is also part of the justification (i.e., anticipation of the next day becomes an important influence) (Winterich & Haws, 2011; Wood & Moss, 2015).

As they talk about the decision not to stay at the event, Friend 2 justifies this further through a more “rational” critique of the event:

Well for me it just didn’t have anything else. Live at L [the event] was brilliant but for me, with music festivals, I like something else to be happening around it and there was nothing. Whereas if I’d felt earlier on in the day that there was more of a carnival, festival atmosphere, I probably would have been way more inclined stay in there. (Friend 2)

Despite it being clear from earlier comments that the decision not to stay to the end of the event was an affective emotional one, Friend 2 feels the need, postevent, to explain it as being more cognitive and rational. This illustrates perhaps why rational thought processes have appeared more salient (Heath & Feldwick 2007). If asked directly we tend to frame the response rationally as affective decisions are far more difficult to recognize and express.

After a brief discussion of the rest of their evening the friends soon move on to talking about the next morning, which both from their recollections and the EDA readings during the interview represent some of the happiest moments. These feelings are not directly related to, but are still triggered by, attending the event. Here the happiness is due to the remembering of entertaining friends, being hospitable, eating good food, and relaxing:

That’s my favourite thing in the world. I’m more the group that I’m with, so at that point I was “Oh, the lads are lovely, I’ll go get breakfast for everyone” . . . and also when we looked on the app there were things that were saying “don’t bother coming,” “queuing.” (Friend 2)

At this point Friend 2 remembers having had enough but also feels some guilt at missing bands. They recall anticipating the next day at this point and that anticipation affects their motivation to attend more venues. In the next exchange we can see how, together, they postjustify the decision made by Friend 2 and lessen her feelings of guilt:

And I just . . . I remember I’d had a huge week at work and I was very conscious that I have no energy. (Friend 2)

You were worried about the next day, you were just “I don’t really want to lose tomorrow.” (Friend 1)

Yeah, I think I’d worked all the previous weekend. The girls were like “Come on.” I said “You two can go now, but . . .” (Friend 2)

For a second we considered that, then M (Friend 2) was like “No, we’ll go home.” And we were like “OK.” (Friend 1)

When I said it to B, I saw her eyes light up. So I went “Well I’m going to go home and have something to eat, relax a bit.” (Friend 2)

In remembering they are partly justifying a decision that they have some guilt about (i.e., not seeing the event through). Others (B) are brought in to help explain why the decision was made. It’s important to them, when remembering, that they believe they all felt the same at the time although from interview 1 and on the day data it is unlikely that they did. In the act of sharing, the memory converges to an agreed “idea” of what happened and how they felt. The temporal (forward-looking) aspect to what they felt is also part of the justification (i.e., anticipation of the next day becomes an important influence) (Winterich & Haws, 2011; Wood & Moss, 2015).

As they talk about the decision not to stay at the event, Friend 2 justifies this further through a more “rational” critique of the event:

Well for me it just didn’t have anything else. Live at L [the event] was brilliant but for me, with
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change. For example, an event designed to foster social inclusion within diverse communities needs also needs strategies for encouraging the remembering and consolidating of the felt emotions after the event. These are likely to be more successful if they inspire the social sharing of the experience. Memorable moments within the event will increase the chances of this but what is also need is “created” opportunities for nostalgic reflection.

Clearly there is already an understanding that music events are a social product, but these findings suggest that the social context is of primary importance in generating an emotional response eclipsing, to some extent, the music, performers, and venues (i.e., all the things focused on by event designers). The extension of the experience beyond the time frame of the “product,” with a potentially deeper emotional response, has implications for memory and for subsequent attitudinal and behavioral change and appear to have been overlooked by event marketers to date.

Figure 3 illustrates the observed transformative effect of the wider context of experience on emotional response and emphasizes the impact of a desire to feel emotional congruity on this. Therefore, this in turn creates shared and strengthened attitudes, which are likely to have a greater effect on future behavior than the experience itself.

Limitations and Further Research

It would be customary to call for validation of these findings through a larger quantitative study. However, we feel that the richness of the data generated when combined with other qualitative methods overcomes, to some extent, the issues associated with small samples.

The physiological measures of emotional response add a useful objectivity to emotion interpretation but are limited in terms of depth of understanding. For example, an increase in EDA while talking about a happy moment may actually change.
relate to anxiousness at the interview situation or a subconscious memory of another experience. However, the narrative approach to longitudinal studies reflecting on experience has great potential within events studies with more work to be done on the techniques to elicit emotional memories and understand how these are effecting future behaviors.

Replications of this study in other event contexts are welcomed and are necessary to understand the effect of other specific settings on the phenomena studied. It would be particularly interesting to study potentially stronger “we mode” (Salmela, 2012) occasions such as fan attendance at sports events or concerts. The influence of family roles in group experience could also be explored using similar methods with a family day trip as the context. The strength of the existing social ties of participants and the effect of the event on these is also worthy of additional study.

A further area for exploration is to extend the research longitudinally following the experience and their contacts for a longer period of time. The sharing element of emotional memory is fertile ground for event marketers as it relates to word of mouth, loyalty, and, of course, social media. The act of sharing over time, whatever the medium, does appear to consolidate the emotion, makes it more memorable, and affects attitude and behavior and is therefore worthy of further in-depth studies. This would provide meaningful insights into repeat attendance motivation and recommendation to others.

Appendix A: Excerpts From Smartphone ESM Survey

2. What are you up to? (tick all that apply and feel free to add others)

- Getting ready
- Chatting
- Drinking
- Eating
- Sleeping (well/relatively)
- Dancing
- Watching something
- Listening to something
- Travelling
- Other (please specify)

3. Are you feeling any of these? (just tick those that apply)

- Happy
- Relaxed
- Nostalgic - thinking back
- Expected - looking forward
- Gratefully
- Excited
- Up for it
- Buzzy
- Proud
- Content
- Improved
- Free
- Other - just in case we've missed something (please specify)

4. How about any of these? (just tick those that apply)

- Unhappy
- Anxious
- Bored
- Wanted
- Apprehensive
- Nervous
- Grumpy
- Disappointed
- Low
- Miserable
- Angry
- Other - just in case we've missed something (please specify)

5. How about the people around you? Are they...

- Happy
- Relaxed
- Nostalgic - thinking back
- Expected - looking forward
- Gratefully
- Excited
- Up for it
- Buzzy
- Proud
- Content
- Improved
- Free
- Other - just in case we've missed something (please specify)
Appendix B: Example of EDA Data—Excerpt From Second Interview
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