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INTRODUCTION

The study of festivals and events is now an important and prolific area of tourism research enquiry. Festivals and events have flourished in recent decades and interest in understanding their significance in the tourism academy has risen accordingly. Even the most cursory scan of leading tourism journals demonstrates that literature on festivals and events is now one of the most prolific of any area of tourism research and there is now a burgeoning collection of monographs, academic textbooks and practical handbooks available. Perhaps most obviously associated with this research activity is the body of literature dealing with the strategic and operational management of events. This is now a very significant literature, dating back to the 1970s, and several sub-streams with corresponding research specializations can now be identified. This literature is largely concerned with production and supply-side issues and tends to be applied in nature. There is also a smaller yet significant social sciences / humanities inspired tourism literature on festivals and events. This dates to at least the early 1970s and questions here often involve cultural and social change, the reproduction of place and of tradition, and the role of communities as producers/consumers. Thus, overall, there is a multiplicity of perspectives being brought to the study of festival and event - tourism relationships and
this is a defining feature of the literature. To a large degree, the complexity that this introduces mirrors the breadth of tourism research more broadly, involving as it does a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches, with diverse applied and conceptual orientations.

Great strides have been made in recent times to define the nature and extent of tourism related festival and event research. In its entirety, and in components, it is an area that has been extensively reviewed in recent times and several ‘state of the art’ type articles are available (e.g. Formica 1998, Hede, Jago and Deery, 2003; Getz 2004). A notable development has been the emergence of the term ‘events tourism’ and more recently ‘event tourism’. Getz (1989) began to discuss planning for ‘events tourism’ in 1989 and with his 2008 review article defines the parameters of ‘event tourism’. As Stokes (2005) notes, the perspective here is that of strategic management, and event tourism is construed as a sector primarily driven by the goal of economic benefits. Conceptualised as encompassing festivals and events, event tourism is understood to be at the nexus of tourism and event studies (Getz 2008: 406). Specifically, this nexus is posited as being the set of interrelationships that underpin ‘the marketing of events to tourists, and the development and marketing of events for tourism and economic development purposes’. ‘Event tourism’ has been the subject of a comprehensive review article published in a recent volume of *Tourism Management*, where the author, (Getz 2008), outlines a framework for knowledge creation and theory development.
This chapter takes the opportunity to review and reflect on the existing body of knowledge and to pose a number of questions about developments in the area. In the past, the literature on tourism and events has been accused of lacking in advanced theory and sophisticated and multiple research methods (Formica 1998). Certainly, the literature is characterised by a diversity of disciplinary approaches and priorities. However, as Getz (2008) points out, this is typical of any relatively new field of enquiry. As will be argued, much of the management / economics inspired literature demonstrate a marked tendency to dislocate events and festivals from broader processes other than to investigate their apparently uni-directional ‘impacts’ on contextual environments. Meanwhile, sociological and cultural orientations within the social sciences (and humanities) tend to be concerned with processes and not to any great extent with the tangible dimensions related to planning, implementing and measuring outcomes. Those with socio-cultural investigative foci tend to concern themselves with tourism contexts where festivals and events are socially constructed, are mutually reproductive of place and place identity, and are bound up with the appropriation and evolution of cultural practices and traditions (i.e., social and cultural change). Here we see a clear dichotomy between an approach that arguably has historically treated events and festivals as discrete entities, and privileges them because they have strategically useful tourism potential, and another that problematizes the instrumental development of festivals and events in the interests of tourism. A key question is whether potential exists for different disciplinary approaches to align more closely in the interest of creating a holistic understanding of the nature, meanings, and management of festival and event tourism relationships. As Getz (2008) clearly acknowledges in the opening paragraphs of his review, events have many partners
and proponents and many important societal and economic roles to play. What is critical to appreciate in this context is that the mutual engagement of tourism and events informs the subsequent reproduction of both in particular ways. Understanding and explaining the kind of engagements that occur is an important research endeavour for a variety of reasons. One pragmatic reason is to effectively promote event tourism as a sustainable form of development. As Waitt (2003) discusses, a planning/management regime sensitive to quality of life and equity outcomes is essential for sustainable tourism. Sustainability in tourism requires hosts to be positively disposed towards developments, so as to enhance the tourists’ experience and contribute to the destination’s attractiveness.

This chapter briefly, but critically, considers some recent developments in the management literature. It then turns its attention to the research contributions emanating from social science and humanities disciplines, and identifies a number of core research areas. In essence, a core concern of this chapter is to begin to seek ways of strengthening dialogue and exchange between the management literature on event tourism and those other literatures whose engagement with the study of tourism has stemmed from a more central interest elsewhere, be it with place, society, or culture. If, for instance, the event tourism literature asks ‘how can planned events effectively contribute to the development of sustainable tourism?’, a suggestion from this chapter is that it is also worthy to ask ‘how does the interaction of tourism and events influence their mutual reproduction as well as the reproduction of places, cultures and communities?’ The chapter begins with definitions and a brief chronological overview of literature developments.
A BRIEF HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

Janiskee (1980: 97) explained that festivals and events can be understood as ‘formal periods or programs of pleasurable activities, entertainment, or events having a festive character and publicly celebrating some concept, happening or fact’. The festive and public celebratory characteristics noted in this definition are important because festivals and events have long existed as significant cultural practices devised as forms of public display, collective celebration and civic ritual. In fact, according to Turner (1982: 11) people in all cultures recognise the need to set aside certain times and spaces for communal creativity and celebration. These practices date back centuries. Often they were allied to the rhythms of agrarian society (Rolfe, 1992). Very often there were religious underpinnings, as in many of the festivals that Fox Gotham (2005a) reminds us existed in the Middle Ages. Public displays and civic ritual were significant in Renaissance times (Muir 1997), while Geppert (2004) explains how imperial and international exhibitions came to be part of both public life and the collective imagination in Europe from the middle of the 19th century onwards. Researchers consistently point to the fact that throughout these earlier periods, festivals and events “encapsulate identity, in terms of the nation state, a sense of place, and the personal and heterogeneous identities of a people” (Matheson 2005 p. 224). Historical research demonstrates how festival and events have a long history of acting as tourist attractions and of effecting the reproduction of places as tourism destinations. Gold and Gold (2005: 268) describe how the recognition of Greenwich as the fulcrum of the earth’s time zones in 1884 inspired the
hosting of a year long festival intended to boost international tourism to the city. Adams (1986) discusses how, as long ago as 1859, the Handel Centenary Festival held in London’s Crystal Palace was marketed as a tourist attraction with the organisers distributing 50,000 prospectuses in the European offices of the railway companies serving the Crystal Palace.

Simultaneously, these transient, albeit often recurring, phenomena acted as an important means of collective identification for the communities hosting the events. Then as now, they engendered local continuity and constituted opportunities for asserting, reinforcing, reproducing and sometimes contesting prevailing social norms, cultural values and beliefs. Falassi (1987: 3) argued that festivals ‘renew periodically the life stream of a community and give sanctions to its institutions’. In a similar vein, Bonnemaison (1990) argued that what the literature terms the ‘hallmark event’ (see below for definition) functions like a monument, supporting and reinforcing the image of established power, whether religious or secular.

Festivals and events thus have a long historical trajectory, and embody the traditions of various pasts. They have flourished again in contemporary society, following a decline from the mid 20th century onwards (Boissevain 1992). Their recent proliferation is noted by many researchers (e.g. Manning 1983, Rolfe 1992, Prentice and Andersen 2003, Gursoy, Kim and Uysal 2004, Quinn 2005a) and is allied to their tourism potential. A set of demand-driven factors underpin their growth, including socialization needs, the growth of serious leisure (Prentice and Andersen 2003) and the move towards
the consumption of experiences (Getz 2008). On the production side, as discussed consistently in contributions to urban studies and urban geography literatures, the contemporary explosion of festivals and events is explained in terms of urban restructuring processes. A key driver for the growth and reinvention of festivals and events internationally has been their potential to deliver a series of development outcomes in terms of economic restructuring and revitalisation, destination repositioning, inward investment and tourism revenue generation (good items for evaluating the “success” of festivals and events). For example, Schuster (2001) has argued that festivals and events staged as urban ephemera or urban spectacle yield economic benefits by raising the profile of places, their products and institutions and attracting flows of tourists, capital and inward investment. For many western cities, a key motivation in developing festival and event strategies has been to recover from long-term economic decline. Festivals and events have been part of a wider range of new ‘cultural strategies’ (Fox Gotham 2005a) used to regenerate and orient post-production economies towards consumption (Zukin 1995) where leisure, entertainment and tourism underpin an ‘experience economy’ (Pine and Gilmore 1999). Meanwhile, for these cities, as well as for those trying to get onto the global stage for the first time, festivals and events form part of place-marketing strategies, fuelled by an ideology of globalization, localization and competition among cities. Shin (2004), for instance, presents the case of the Gwangju Biennale Festival as being representative of recent cultural festivals in South Korea, where the image of a ‘city of art’ was one of the standardized images developed by local governments to reshape the images of several South Korean cities. As in the past,
festivals and events entail public display and festive celebration, thus creating interest and attracting attention as they invigorate and enliven places.

DEFINITIONS

While Hede (2007) explains that special event research emerged as an area of tourism management in the mid 1970s, it was during the 1980s that the study of events began to grow dramatically in academia (Getz 2008). The marked rise of academic interest in events in that decade was closely linked to their role in place-marketing, a type of civic boosterism that views culture instrumentally (Loftman and Nevil 1996). Undoubtedly, this was an important context shaping research enquiry into festivals and events from then onwards. While the use of hallmark events as a civic boosterism instrument has been critiqued (Boyle 1997), it was widely viewed as a positive development among tourism researchers. Events are seen as an important motivator in tourism (Getz 2008), and as an effective enhancer of destination image (Hall 1992, Ritchie 1984). Hallmark events, for example, usually held in city locations, have been labelled ‘our new image-builders’ (Burns and Mules 1986) and a whole new discourse, including a new set of definitions and terminology, has been developed to examine the phenomenon. ‘Special events’ was an early and encompassing term used in the literature. This was understood to encompass different types of events including mega events (e.g. Olympic Games and World Cup), hallmark events (those closely linked with a destination), festivals and other more modest events. Over time, definitions were refined. Mega events, for example, were defined by Ritchie (1984: 2) as ‘major one-time or
recurring events of limited duration, developed primarily to enhance the awareness, appeal, and profitability of a tourism destination in the short and/or long term’. Within a place-marketing ethos, and from a supply perspective, festivals came to be increasingly defined simply as just one more type of event. Their festive, playful, celebrative qualities were recognised and prized because festivals offer tourists glimpses of local uniqueness (Litvin and Fetter 2006), diverse cultural experiences (Hall 1992) and opportunities to participate in distinctive, collective experiences (Getz 1989). However, there was little attempt to draw on established understandings of festivals as socially and culturally important phenomena involved in the construction of place and community identity (as distinct from image identity). While their reproduction as tourist attractions was sometimes problematized (e.g. Greenwood 1972), critical perspectives such as this did not noticeably influence the emerging event literature.

DOMINANT THEMES: MANAGEMENT PERSPECTIVES

Previous literature reviews have identified the core areas of research and publication. Formica (1998) determined that economic impacts, then marketing, event profiles, sponsorship, management and forecasting / trend description were the main topics. Getz’ (2000) conclusions were very similar. More recently, Moscardo (2007) asserted that the existing tourism literature on festivals and events is dominated by four main topics including economic impacts, audience analysis with a view to improving marketing and service quality, the management of events with a particular concern to enhance marketing and service quality and broader event impacts as perceived by residents. Clearly, there remains scope for extending these emphases. As Getz (2008:
(continues, event tourism studies and related research are still in the early stage of development.

Economic impact

The emphases evident in the literature to date must be understood in context. Not surprisingly, as festivals and events became increasingly incorporated into urban and regional development agendas, the obvious growth in early academic interest was in management and economics, and research agendas were closely attuned to practitioners’ needs. There was a pronounced orientation towards understanding the impact of events, and from early on, events came overwhelmingly to be conceived as discrete entities with an ability to uni-directionally create a series on impacts, both positive and negative, on contextual environments. Ritchie’s (1984) identification of a range of impacts associated with what he called hallmark events was an important and influential publication. Although he identified a wide range of impact types, most subsequent research attention focused on measuring and evaluating the economic impacts of events on host economies, a development at least partially inspired by the realities of city and regional government needs for justifying investment in festival and event development strategies (e.g. Crompton and McKay 1994, Burgan and Mules 2001, Burns, Mules and Hatch 1986, Dwyer, Mellor, Mistillis and Mules 2000, Getz 2000, Mules and McDonald 1994). As early as 1989, voices were cautioning the need for a broader set of research concerns including ‘the anticipation and regulation of the impact of the event on the host
community, and the promotion of associated development in a manner which maximises short- and long-term economic, environmental and social benefits’ (Hall 1989: 21).

Gursoy, Kim and Uysal (2004) note that researchers have been very slow in directing research beyond economic impacts and motivations. The overtly ‘economic impact’ orientation of the literature has been well acknowledged by others (Moscardo 2007; Hede 2007; Getz 2008). Furthermore, there has been much debate concerning both the robustness of the methodologies and approaches used to determine economic outcomes and the accuracy of gains attributed to events. The measurement of economic outputs has employed a variety of mechanisms. Lee and Taylor (2005) critically reviewed the problems that beset economic impact studies, citing critical observations from inter alia Burgan and Mules (1992), Crompton (1999), Lee and Kim (1998) and Tyrrell and Johnston (2001). They concluded that on the basis of past research only direct expenditure attributable to an event should be considered in estimating the economic impact of an event. However, elsewhere, Wood, Robinson and Thomas (2006) argued that a focus on direct expenditure benefits will produce an incomplete picture. Thus the debate continues.

Other impacts

The concern with demonstrating significant, predominantly economic impact automatically led to a strong emphasis on large scale events (Gibson, Willming and Holdnak 2003). Much of the focus has been on sports events. As Getz (2008: 411) states: ‘Sports as ‘big business’ is an enduring theme in the literature’ and mega events, including most notably the Olympic Games but also the FIFA World Cup, the
Commonwealth Games and various motor-racing events, have received considerable attention. While there is a vast literature on the economic impact of major events, research enquiry in this area has also asked questions about destination image-enhancement, national identity and pride enhancement, and longer term regeneration outcomes in the form of sporting and commercial infrastructure as well as community-building and social legacies. The research evidence suggests that large scale events create both positive and negative impacts in both the short and the long term. Many studies have documented positive outcomes (e.g. Decco & Baloglu 2002, Ritchie & Smith 1991). A strong theme here is the enhancement of the international image of the host community, and the generation of short and long term visitor flows. With respect to the former, considerable attention has been paid to how events can re-shape a city’s image (Jeong and Faulkner 1996; Lee, Lee and Lee 2005) although Boo and Busser (2006) claim that few studies have empirically examined the role of festivals in destination image improvement and call for longitudinal research on this question. Meanwhile, the literature on the European City of Culture (ECOC) event is often preoccupied with the tourism outcomes of this annual cultural event (Bailey, Miles and Stark 2004; Garcia 2005). One of the ECOC’s most frequently discussed in the literature, Glasgow 1990, is widely attributed with having transformed the city’s image from a rarely visited, depressed post industrial city into a lively and attractive city that subsequent to the event increased its inbound tourist flows dramatically. The generation of environmental outcomes in the form of infrastructural legacies is another notable theme in the literature. Large events have come to be seen as catalysts for urban regeneration (Garcia 2004) although mixed outcomes have been reported in respect of the latter with several acknowledging negative
outcomes (Roche 1994, Hall & Hodges 1996, Hiller 1998, Ritchie 1999). Examples of such negativities include the accumulation of large debts for host communities and the displacement of local residents to make way for infrastructural improvements.

Some studies have pointed to positive, yet somewhat intangible and often surprising outcomes. Lee and Taylor (2005: 602) in an economic impact study, concluded in respect of the 2002 FIFA World Cup held in South Korea that ‘the success of the South Korean football team provided the country with a sense of national pride and cohesiveness that no economic impact assessment could ever put a dollar value on. Lee, Lee and Lee (2005) make the point that mega sports events like the Olympic Games draw a great deal of international attention to sport and in the process contribute to increased interest in sports tourism. Meanwhile Kim, Gursoy and Lee (2006) argue that several researchers (e.g. Milhalik & Simonette 1998, Ritchie & Aitken 1984) have suggested that residents in places that have held sports mega events can believe the positive social outcomes to be as important as economic outcomes or even more so. Elsewhere, Thomas & Wood (2004) and Wood (2005) indicated that in a UK context, the social benefits of local authority funded events are likely to outweigh the economic benefits.

Planning and evaluating events

As might be expected, there is a long-standing literature on event planning and what seems like dozens of text books are now available on the topic. Of late, a number of important themes in this area can be identified. One has been the move towards a more collaborative decision making approach to mega event planning. Gursoy and Kendall
argue that hallmark decision-making/political planning is gradually being abandoned as key decision-makers realise the value of local involvement and support. An underpinning argument for involving residents in event planning relates to the fact that if residents’ quality of life is adversely affected by the staging of events, then visiting tourist populations may be adversely affected in consequence because of the ensuing animosity or ill-feeling. Another recent theme is the need to adopt a more strategic approach to events so as to leverage as many benefits as possible for the host economy/community (Pugh and Wood 2004).

In terms of the post-event outcomes, there has been a growing awareness of the need for evaluation to be increasingly broadly defined. The literature is peppered with calls for researchers to move beyond the economic domain into other equally fruitful terrains where social, cultural and political issues can be addressed (Wood, Robinson and Thomas 2006; Gnoth and Anwar 2000; Bowdin, Allen, O’Toole, Harris and McDonnell 2006, Moscardo 2007). Recent work on evaluating and assessing the impacts associated with events has reflected this awareness. It has also been influenced by developments in the literature on the social impact of tourism more generally (e.g. Lankford and Howard 1994) and an upsurge of publications on the topic is now evident. Early research came from Fredline and Faulkner (2000), with Delemare (2001) developing a Festival Social Impact Attitude Scale (FSIAS) and Fredline, Jago and Deery (2003) and Fredline (2006) progressing the literature in this area. As Hede (2007: 14) notes, ‘research on event evaluation is currently focused on amalgamating the economic, social and environmental forms of evaluation into one framework’. In this context, she emphasises the emergence
of the Triple Bottom Line approach (TBL). The rationale behind Triple Bottom Line reporting is to illuminate the externalities associated with business activities and therefore to promote sustainability through planning and management practices that ameliorate negative outcomes and promote positive ones (Fredline, Raybould, Jago and Deery 2005: 3, cited in Hede 2007: 24).

Marketing and motivation

From a tourism perspective, events clearly require audiences. As Faulkner, Chalip, Brown, Jago, March and Woodside (2000) argue, the destination development engendered by an event is largely driven by the attendance it is expected to generate. Meanwhile, as Whitelegg (2000) notes, the impact of mega events on international tourism is related to their capacity to attract international audiences. Thus, the promotion and marketing of events is a key area of interest, and the question as to what motivates people to attend events has been an important social psychological question dating back to the early 1990s. There is now a substantial literature on the topic, including a recent review by Li and Petrick (2006). The complexity of motives at issue has been debated in general (e.g. Backman, Backman, Uysal and Sunshine 1995, Crompton and McKay 1997, Formica and Murrmann 1998, Getz and Cheyne 2002, Robinson and Gammon 2004) as well as in specific areas like sports events (Gibson, 1998, 2006), and business and convention events (Rittichainuwat, Beck and Lalopa 2001). The importance of understanding constraints has been discussed (Kim and Chalip 2004) as has the importance of market segmentation, with Formica and Uysal (1998) demonstrating that successful promotion depends on effective segmentation.
Local residents and stakeholder relationships

A supply-side perspective is very evident in most of the above literature, but in the move towards a wider interpretation of event impacts (e.g. Hede 2007) we see a growing interest in other stakeholders, including residents. One well established line of enquiry in the literature has concerned residents, and research into the perceived impacts of events on host communities is well established (Delamere 2001, Fredline and Faulkner 2002, Fredline, Jago and Deering 2003, Gursoy and Kendall 2006. Social exchange theory underpins a great deal of this research, and studies have tried to assess the extent and manner in which individuals are likely to participate in an exchange if they believe they are likely to gain benefits without incurring unacceptable costs (Homans 1974 cited in Gursoy and Kendall (2006: 607). Residents have also been central in the research that has explored how festivals and events are associated with enhanced community well-being, improved social cohesion, enhanced pride in place, building of community cohesion and identity, all of which have been investigated in festival and event settings (e.g. Derrett 2003).

With respect to stakeholders more generally, there has been a growing interest in theorising stakeholder relationships in festival and event settings from a number of management perspectives. Larson and Wikstrom (2001) and Larson (2002), for example, introduced the political market square concept into the event stakeholder literature. In the context of relationship marketing, Larson (2002) used the political market square concept to analyse the power dynamics evident in a project network of actors marketing a festival. Her analysis identified a series of political processes including gatekeeping, negotiation,
coalition building, trust and identity building. More recently, Getz, Andersson and Larson (2007) have argued that festivals are produced not by stand-alone organizations but by voluntary networks of stakeholders that must be managed effectively by the festival organization. Elsewhere, MacKellar (2007) used a network analysis methodology to study the relationships between organizations staging an event.

Most of the above literature orients itself around the idea that events are first and foremost tourist attractions. Its main priority is to understand how the tourism industry can produce events that attract and satisfy tourists, plus generate a series of beneficial outcomes (tourist expenditure, image enhancement, related investment etc.). However, it is clear that there is now an increasing interest in moving away from a preoccupation with the event as a discrete entity towards a much broader conceptualization of festivals and events as phenomena embedded in a multiplicity of spatial, socio-cultural, political and environmental contexts. There is further an increasing inclination to problematize the relationships between festivals, events and tourism and to adopt a more critical and reflexive approach. This is very apparent in recent developments emerging in the literature on collaborative planning and social outcomes, for instance, in the work examining how events link into their contextual environments and host communities through stakeholder relationships and networks of various kinds (Moscardo 2007, Larson and Wikstrom 2001, Getz, Andersson and Larson 2007). It is in these literature areas that the distinction between management and other disciplinary approaches becomes blurred, and interchange between researchers working in diverse domains on closely related problems is most apparent.
DOMINANT THEMES: SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES

PERSPECTIVES

If the management literature has been profoundly conscious of development, planning and marketing-related outcomes, the more sociological and cultural orientations within the social sciences / humanities literature has tended to be concerned with processes. Undoubtedly, this reflects the differential weight attached to applied and conceptual enquiry in the different areas, although the conceptual preoccupation of the latter does not necessarily imply a more advanced theoretical underpinning or even a more clearly defined research agenda. To date, few if any, critical reviews or syntheses of what Getz (2008) has termed the ‘studies’ literature have been published, unlike in the management domain, and there has been little attempt to identify dominant research strands. This section makes an attempt to do this by identifying some of the key ways in which festival and event settings have been analyzed to further mainstream tourism debates. Much of the following literature, when empirical, uses qualitative case study methodology, in contrast to the management-related literature which much more frequently uses large scale survey tools and quantitative techniques in its empirical investigations. Discussions generally point to the complexity and multi-dimensionality of festivals and events and conceive of them as being dynamic and continuously evolving, reproduced through a multiplicity of local and extra-local relationships, and implicated in the construction of identity (of culture groups, communities, places and nations). Relationships that might be usefully explored in future research are considered towards the end of the discussion.
Tradition and Modernity – processes of cultural change

The role that tourism plays in affecting cultural change has been of enormous interest to tourism researchers for decades. Very often, enquiries have been located in festival and event sites. Indeed, this is an example of an area where festivals and events were originally at the fore in initiating a mainstream multi-disciplinary tourism debate, with Greenwood’s (1972) analysis of a Basque festival being highly influential. Following Marx, Greenwood argued that the Spanish Ministry of Tourism’s involvement in the Fuenterrabia transformed the festival from an authentic, locally embedded and meaningful cultural practice into a public spectacle for outsiders. The intervention, he argued, led to a decline of local interest and a loss of meaning such that ‘the ritual has become a performance for money. The meaning is gone’ (Greenwood, 1972, p.78). Greenwood’s paper initiated a still ongoing debate about tourism and commoditization. As Sofield and Li (1998: 270) note, his commoditization thesis was a very attractive one, and it became ‘one of the most powerful indictments of the corrosive effects of tourism’. It also quickly became one of the most frequently cited, strengthened by its inclusion in Cohen’s (1988) paper on authenticity and commoditization in tourism. Greenwood’s interpretation, however, has been subsequently critiqued (Wilson 1993), and the usefulness of his commoditization thesis hotly debated ever since. Originally, the core question was whether the commoditization of festivals and events through tourism renders these cultural practices and the social relations inherent therein, inauthentic (Matheson 2005). Recently, however, Shepherd (2002: 195) has argued that commodification within the sphere of culture is a social fact, and suggests that discussion
should now focus less on what has been commodified and more on how authenticity becomes constructed and decided.

As implied here, the commodification discussion is closely linked to the equally intense and lengthy debate on authenticity and tourism. It was MacCannell (1976) who first argued that the search for authentic experience is crucial to the tourist endeavor. In this context, the festival or event is particularly appealing because it is understood to offer ‘outsiders’ genuine insights into particular ‘insider’ cultural practices, traditions and heritages. Furthermore, the very nature of festivals entails an overt outward orientation which sees communities of people generate cultural meanings expressly to be read by the outside world (Quinn 2005b). The problem, however, as expressed early on in the literature, is that tourists are condemned to experiencing only a semblance of authenticity.

Drawing on Goffman’s (1959) models of front and back regions of social space, MacCannell (1976) argued that tourist settings are constructed to comprise 6 staged settings, all of which tourists strive, and ultimately fail, to ‘get behind’ in their quest to access the authentic back stages of the host community. MacCannell’s theorization, however, was later criticized because it equates the authentic with some sort of pristine, ‘original’ state which becomes automatically destroyed upon contact with tourism (Bruner 1994). Researchers like Bruner (1994), Olsen (2002) and Shepherd (2002) have argued instead that authenticity is a socially constructed process and that the critical question is ‘how do people themselves think about objects as authentic?’ In this line of thinking, authenticity is no longer seen as a quality of the object but as a cultural value constantly created and reinvented in social processes (Olsen 2002). Cohen (1988) further
elaborates this thinking by arguing the negotiability of authenticity. Being socially constructed, it has many potential forms and so ‘a cultural product, or a trait thereof, which is at one point generally judged as contrived or inauthentic may, in the course of time, become generally recognized as authentic, even by experts’ (Cohen 1988: 379).

Thus, within mainstream tourism debates, it is becoming increasingly accepted that there are many reasonable answers to the question of what is authentic (Olsen 2002); that questions about the meanings of authenticity are always open to negotiation (Timothy and Boyd 2003); and that it is now necessary to speak of ‘competing authenticities, all products of particular social forces engaged in a process of cultural (re)invention and consumption within the context of existing social relations’ (Shepherd 2002: 196). Recent empirical investigations in festival and events settings are moving to reflect this theoretical position although the idea that authenticity pertains to the quality of the object is still being explored. McCartney and Osti (2007: 26), examining the cultural authenticity of the Dragon Boat races in Macau, discuss the risk of commercialization diminishing the meaning of an event, transforming it into spectacle or entertainment and ‘thereby destroying its cultural authenticity’. Richards (2007), however, following on from the work of researchers like Cohen (1988) and Shepherd (2002), explores the value that different event audiences attach to authenticity. He explored how residents and visitors view commercialization processes and authenticity in traditional events and found that while residents and visitors generally agree that the Catalan festival studied, La Mercè, is authentic, their perceptions of authenticity vary. Drawing on Wang (1999), Richards (2007) argues that residents were more likely to
emphasize a ‘constructive authenticity’ based on familiar cultural norms (particularly those related to the role of tradition and language in Catalan society), while visitors tended to appreciate an ‘existential authenticity,’ one reliant on enjoying the festivity and the attendant socialization. Elsewhere, Müller and Pettersson’s (2005) analysis of a Swedish festival celebrating Sami heritage shows how different sets of meanings can be produced simultaneously and apparently satisfactorily for both producers and consumers. They describe how the experiences available to tourists, local residents and indigenous peoples range from being variously ‘staged’ to being ‘non-staged’. Furthermore, they conclude that it is probably the co-existence of more or less staged, authorized and unauthorized representations of Sami heritage that makes the festival attractive to a range of audiences, all of whom can relate to, and engage in, the festival in different ways. Thus, an important theoretical argument becoming established in the literature is that local residents, as producers and as established audiences, can engage meaningfully in festivals in ways that address both their own needs and those of visitors at the same time. However, more empirical research is needed to further elaborate this position.

**Local and Global: reproducing place**

Festivals and events have long been of interest to researchers because they constitute a vehicle for expressing the close relationship between identity and place (Aldskogius 1993, Lewis and Pile 1996, Smith 1996, Ekman 1999, Lavenda 1997). Festivals in particular have been a focus for empirically investigating how people connect with their place and with other people through their festival practices. The type of identity in question can be linked to different spatial spheres, ranging from the local to
the international. The literature on place-marketing is most often interested in mega events and in country or major city destinations, but equally, a breadth of spatial spheres have been studied. Hall (1992), for example, has written about the role of events in developing or maintaining community or regional identity. De Bres and Davis (2001) discuss how a Kansas River Festival helped to promote a sense of pride, kinship and community among the river communities involved. Derrett (2003) focused on how events contribute to an enhanced sense of place. More recently, Moscardo (2007) examined 36 case studies of regional festivals and events, seeking to broaden understanding of how events contribute to regional development.

Throughout this literature, there has been an understanding that the meanings produced in festival sites display the influence of forces prevailing both locally and in other geographic spheres. Important questions have been: how do particular constellations of internal / external linkages emerge over time? Can events remain embedded in specific locales and retain meanings for place-based communities while meeting the needs of visiting audiences? In this, the reproduction of events is conceptualized as being akin to the reproduction of tourism places: it illuminates at once the twin processes of global homogeneity and local heterogeneity that characterize modern capitalism (Fox Gotham 2005a). Thus, Green (2002), writing about carnival practices in Trinidad, argues that outside influences have always been a part of carnival, with much borrowing, adaptation and re-invention of traditions implicit over time. Quinn (2003) writing about an arts festival in Ireland argues that the practice of producing a
festival is an evolving one, partially informed by the introduction of externally sourced traditions, and by their subsequent re-invention through local lenses.

The link between globalization and cultural homogenization has been problematized in event settings. Some researchers have argued that large scale events erode place distinctiveness, leading to a process of homogenisation and ultimately ending up being counter-productive to the original place marketing objectives (Richards and Wilson 2006). McCartney and Osti (2007: 26), for example, raise the issue of ‘event homogenisation,’ as ‘destinations jostle to reproduce successful themed festivals of their own’. Yardimci (2007: 5), writing about festivals in Istanbul, describes how festivals’ failure to create difference in their content ‘pushes them to emphasize instead, the difference of the city - in a monumental image of oriental Istanbul - that merges its socio-historical heritage with a western techno-economic level of material development, familiarity with culture and adherence to secularism’. As McCarthy (2005) explains, the fact that events may not be culturally embedded in the locality and have but few linkages to local ideas of identity and local lifestyles is problematic. Isar’s (1976: 126) argument that genuine festivals must be ‘rooted in society, in real life,’ and Degreef’s (1994: 18) belief that ‘artistically responsible’ arts festivals must respond and evolve in tandem with the changing artistic needs felt by diverse resident and visitor groups, may be lost in the bid to achieve place marketing or other goals. Thus, the result may be a privileging of the global and all that that entails, at the expense of the local. Yardimci’s (2007) analysis of recent festival development in Istanbul, for example, posits the positioning of the West as a reference point against which Turkey’s success in cultural development can be
assessed. Fox Gotham (2005a) argues that as part of tourism, festivals and events can be promoted by powerful economic forces in ways that may undermine local traditions and decision making. For example, the literature has been conscious of the possibility that in the preoccupation with meeting visitor needs, events may disregard local residents. Eisinger (2000) suggested that events may have little to do with local citizens, being designed for a ‘visitor class,’ attracted into the event location from elsewhere. The implicit notion of displacement here is taken up by Misener and Mason (2006) who, writing about sports events, examine how events transiently reproduce space in ways that disrupt or at least alter, local ways of living in place. They suggest that local citizens ‘often struggle to find meaning, a sense of identity and a sense of connectedness in their own neighbourhoods’ as one-off strategies like sporting events transport the space around them (Misener & Mason, 2006, p.385).

On the other hand, there is an increasingly well supported argument that ‘local actors can use urban spectacles for positive and progressive ends’ (Fox Gotham 2005a: 235). Writing about New Orleans, he cites the example of the Essence Festival which functions as a vehicle for encouraging critical dialogue and debate over the causes and consequences of social inequality and continuing black marginalization in US society. Elsewhere, Nurse’s (1999) analysis of Caribbean carnivals found that the substantial tourism and economic dimensions do not overshadow the profound social meanings of these festivities. While Alleyne-Dettmer’s (1997) analysis of London’s Notting Hill Carnival conceives of local celebrations, such as carnival, as settings where the local becomes re-worked in a dynamic and constantly changing global environment. In a
discussion on Mardi Gras, Fox Gotham (2005b: 323) urges researchers to ‘develop our understanding of how places and extra-local flows constitute each other, rather than seeing them as opposing principles’.

**The politics of identity and representation**

A further key theme in the literature is that the reproduction of festivals and events as tourist attractions is strongly shaped by power dynamics. Boyle (1997) pointed to the power dynamics involved in their production and argued that events are socially constructed in specific ways by certain groups to promote particular ideas and beliefs. Events are never ‘impromptu or improvised…and arts festivals in particular, are never spontaneous’ (Waterman 1998: 59). Shin’s case of the Gwangju Biennale, for example, shows that ‘a festival is cultural, but its aim is economic – in advertising the city to tourists and investors – and that its process is immersed in political dynamics that influence potential transformations in the image of a city and urban space’ (Shin 2004: 630). Meanwhile, Hitters’ (2000) analysis of Rotterdam as European Cultural Capital 2001 showed the event to be socially and politically contested. As Matheson (2005) notes, festivities offer an opportunity to decode the inner structures and workings of a society. Hence, a strong line of enquiry has been to explore both the reproduction of dominant meanings by powerful stakeholders and the resistance that this has evoked in response. Clearly, the urban literature explains how and why powerful stakeholders like city governments and the tourism industry favour the development of events. Elsewhere, researchers have been at pains to demonstrate how the construction of festivals and events involves the elevation of selective cultural details / social positions and
community voices to symbolic status and the simultaneous downgrading or silencing of others (De Bres and Davis 2001, Quinn 2005b). This process unfolds not simply in the interest of constructing a desirable image of place to be represented in the international tourism market-place, but also more profoundly for the sake of promoting vested interests, maintaining social order and the cultural status quo. Power divisions have many, often multiple, bases including social class, race, gender and sexuality. Waterman (1998), for example, argues that high-brow arts festivals still explicitly prefer to present themselves as élitist, citing the case of the Israel Festival as one that is unashamedly so. Jamieson’s (2004) analysis of the Edinburgh Festival for example, reveals a festival city that is spatially constructed in ways that privilege visiting audiences, containing them within parts of the city considered ‘appropriate’ for cultural consumption, while leaving the social deprived outskirts of the city relatively free of festival activity. Lewis and Pile (1996) focuses on gender and analyses how the performance of ‘woman’ in the Rio de Janeiro Carnival unfolds through power, knowledge and social equivocation about what ‘woman is or might be’. While Waitt (2005) asks questions about the reconstitution of sexuality in Australian national space through an analysis of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games.

The idea that the particular sets of meanings reproduced through events are open to challenge, contestation and disruption from those who disagree or think differently is well accepted in the literature. Boyle and Hughes (1994: 468) wrote about local opposition to Glasgow’s 1990 City of Culture event, describing the ‘discomfort locals have experienced with the willingness of city leaders to forego cultural traditions’.
Spooner (1996) conceived of an annual African-Caribbean carnival in Bristol, as a potential site of resistance and analyzed black women's experiences in this light. Shin (2004: 625) examined how the Gwangju Biennale in South Korea ‘initiated power struggles among promoters who had different goals and images of the city in mind’. Waitt’s (2005) analysis of the Sydney 2002 Gay Games discussed the contentiousness, exclusions, and resistance fostered by the Games. He found them to be associated with, for example, the fixing of sexual identities in the dualism of homosexual / heterosexual, the privileging of the culture of masculinity and its imposition onto gay bodies, and the imposition of meanings of togetherness onto people who are materially and socially differentiated.

While considerable attention has been paid to the power dynamics that underpin the reproduction of events, Crespi-Vallbona and Richards (2007) make the point that insufficient attention has been paid to the manner in which particular constituencies of actors may actually share meanings and consensus. They argue, for example, that in the case of cultural events it may be quite common for a range of actors to agree on the importance of the event being staged but to diverge on the aims or content of the event itself, and call for a closer investigation of the politics of consensus as well as of conflict. This call for a more nuanced interpretation of event processes could be usefully applied more broadly within the social sciences literature on festival and event tourism. It seems accurate to suggest that the literature under review in the latter part of this chapter has tended to emphasise the tensions and dichotomies that characterise the reproductive dynamics evident in festival and event tourism relationships. What is and is not
authentic? What is and is not rooted in place? Who is included and excluded? Are the
audience tourists or residents? All these have been key questions. Now that many of these
tensions have been aired, increasing attention is currently being paid to the many
complexities that blur and diminish these dichotomies. This sort of development is
evident in all of the social sciences literature areas under review and might be advanced
still further by examining two sets of relationships that have not yet received much
attention in the literature: namely those between leisure and tourism, and between
production and consumption.

**Relationship between Leisure and Tourism in festival and event settings**

Urry (1995), among others, has pointed to the de-differentiation of tourism and
leisure in recent times, while the merits of conceptualizing leisure and tourism as two
very closely related phenomena have been persuasively argued by Crouch (1999, 2000).
Yet to date, the tendency to conceptualize festivals and events as tourism affairs has
overwhelmed any inclination to understand them as leisure phenomena. Tourism
researchers coming from strategic / management perspectives have been preoccupied
with large scale events because they constitute tourist attractions. Smaller scale events
have been of lesser interest precisely because they are thought to attract fewer tourists.
Consequently, festival and event audiences have tended to be understood quite distinctly
as either visitors or local residents by researchers adopting both management and social
science perspectives. This constitutes a limitation in the literature. There has been much
passing acknowledgement of how events largely depend on locally sourced audiences
and indeed on how their tourism appeal is linked to how engaging they are for local
communities. Yet, it is only recently that there has been a move to collapse these distinctions somewhat and to appreciate that the significance of events lies in the meanings they hold for both local and visiting populations, and in both their leisure and tourism functions. There is also increasing acknowledgement that individuals can seamlessly move between leisure and tourism worlds. This can be seen particularly in the literatures on small events and on sporting events. Shipley and Jones (2007), for example, show how individuals’ leisure and tourism practices can merge in event settings. They employ the concept of serious leisure to examine the behavior of long distance runners participating in an international running event. From another perspective Gibson et al. (2003), found that college sports events, historically outside the domain of event tourism research, actually attract a significant proportion of fans from outside of the local community. They use this finding to call for a stronger emphasis on small scale sports events, arguing that they merit more attention from tourism researchers. Daniels (2007) draws attention to the fact that research on regular events (leisure) is sparse relative to that on mega events (tourism). She suggests that an economic argument exists for paying greater attention to smaller events and draws on central place theory to develop an understanding of how location influences economic outcomes. In shifting focus onto smaller, regular events that primarily draw on resident demand, researchers simultaneously begin to move tourism enquiries closer to those of leisure. These ways of thinking encourage a move away from a dichotomous line of enquiry that separates tourists and tourism from residents and leisure to a more complex yet holistic approach that understands people capable of playing different roles at different times.
Production – consumption

Conceiving of events as both leisure and tourism settings also raises questions about the consumption of events. To date, there has been relatively little interest in analyzing the intricacies of how festivals and events are consumed (Boyle 1997). While there is a well established literature on what motivates people to travel to events, there has been less interest in enquiring about how people engage with events, both in leisure and tourism domains. Motivational research, for example, has established that socialization is an important factor motivating people to attend events, yet little attention has been paid to understanding how individuals come together to collectively engage in events. In this context, the concept of ‘practicing’ festival and event settings might be usefully employed to analyze what Larsen (2008) has called the ‘emotional geography of sociability, of being together with close friends and family members from home’. Clearly, also, the consumption of events is shaped by power dynamics. In the festival literature there has been a suggestion that festivals can reproduce place so as to privilege consumption by visitors, with space being transformed such that it is tourists who feel at home and locals who feel dislocated (Quinn 2003, Jamieson 2004). However, further implied here is the idea that tourists’ engagement in an event informs that event’s reproduction. This draws attention to the fact that the production and consumption of events are closely linked rather than being two distinct arenas of activity, and that the consumption of events, like tourist products and experiences more generally, is an important part of the ongoing reproduction of both the event and the host place.
TOWARDS A MORE HOLISTIC RESEARCH APPROACH

The literature on festivals, events and tourism is an important and growing area of tourism research. It is characterised by quite different sets of disciplinary approaches, all of which conceive of the study topic in fundamentally different ways. The resulting breadth of enquiry is impressive, but it is not holistic in the sense that different disciplinary approaches do not yet seamlessly fit together in ways that are always mutually beneficial. This is to be expected of an area of study that is still relatively young, yet it would be undoubtedly beneficial for greater dialogue to occur across disciplinary boundaries. Two central and inter-connected points are made in this chapter. Firstly, closer links could be usefully drawn between the research focused on understanding the dynamics of process and that which seeks to plan, implement and market festivals, plus identify and measure sets of outcomes for “success”. Secondly, conceiving of festivals and events as phenomena that are embedded in diverse spatial, cultural, social and political environments is fundamental to fully understanding the relationships between festivals, events and tourism.

A closer convergence of disciplinary approaches would yield greater understanding of the links between processes and outcomes in respect of a multiplicity of issues. Events are socially and politically constructed phenomena that require deconstruction to fully understand how and why they function as they do. Outcomes are rarely inevitable or natural, but rather are reproduced in particular ways in order to achieve particular sets of meanings. Thus, for example, in the impact literature while there has been some discussion of the generation of social capital in the guise of e.g.
community pride, sense of place and community well-being, an obvious area for further research is not only the measurement of these impacts but also a more thorough understanding of how and why such outcomes materialise.

As already discussed, recent developments in the literature demonstrate a growing agreement of the need to conceive of events more broadly, and to investigate the manifold ways in which they link into contextual environments. Moscardo (2007) for example, seeks to broaden the preoccupation with the role that festivals and events play in tourism or destination development to incorporate questions about their role in the development of regions more generally. Gursoy and Kendall (2006) signal a need to understand more about stakeholders and speak of the need to consult with local residents and in effect, to embed events in locality. Getz, Andersson and Larson (2005) have stressed how events cannot be produced on their own, without external resources and willing co-producers. Schuster (2001) has written about how successful events are those that are embedded in particular locales, of interest to local populations and driven by local agendas. The embedding of events in contextual environments automatically increases the complexity of research enquires in that it raises questions about a multiplicity of concerns that include, but extend beyond tourism-related economic outcomes into social, cultural and political issues. As numerous researchers have noted, the potential for further research enquiry into these issues is extensive as is the potential for further enquiry to advance mainstream tourism debates. This potential will be realized most effectively through dialogue and a cross fertilization of ideas from researchers
examining the relationships between festivals, events and tourism from a multitude of disciplinary perspectives.
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