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ABSTRACT
The nature and scope of festival studies is examined by compiling and analyzing a large-scale literature review of 423 research articles published in the English-language scholarly press. These have been annotated and their themes classified by reference to a pre-determined framework. Identification and discussion of three major discourses was enabled by this method, namely the roles, meanings and impacts of festivals in society and culture, festival tourism, and festival management. Conclusions focus on revealed research gaps and the need for greater interdisciplinarity to advance the field of festival studies.
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INTRODUCTION
By means of a large-scale, systematic review of the pertinent English-language research literature, this paper defines (i.e. delimits the nature and scope) of festival studies. Research trends and themes have been revealed, and three major discourses have been identified and described. Structure for the review was provided by a framework for understanding and creating knowledge about events (Getz, 2007) that places planned festival experiences and meanings as the core phenomenon of festival studies. The other elements in this framework are antecedents to attending festivals, planning and management, outcomes, knowledge creation, policy, and temporal and spatial patterns and processes.

Although confined to festivals, this process will also help develop event studies generically, as many of the concepts and research themes are shared. Festivals are an important sub-field within event studies, and of particular interest to scholars in many disciplines because of the universality of festivity and the popularity of festival experiences. Event management has emerged as a quasi-profession and a fast-growing field of studies in universities around the world. Within event studies, festival studies is also emerging as a distinct sub-field, in large part because festivals occupy a special place in almost all cultures and have therefore been well-researched and theorized by scholars in the disciplines of anthropology and sociology.

There is also a special appeal in festival studies for students and practitioners alike that is associated with their scope for inspiring creativity, attracting large crowds, and generating emotional responses. In this way
festivals are akin to, and part of the entertainment business, are often featured in place marketing and tourism, and have become permanent elements in both popular and high culture. In a trend documented in this paper, it will also be demonstrated that festivals are attracting more and more scholarship, from many more perspectives.

Festivals have been defined by Falassi (1987, p.2), in the classical cultural-anthropological perspective as “a sacred or profane time of celebration, marked by special observances.” Festivals celebrate community values, ideologies, identity and continuity. Perhaps more reflective of the modern approach to naming events as festivals, Getz (2005 p.21), defined them as “themed, public celebrations”. Pieper (1965) believed only religious rituals and celebrations could be called festivals. Numerous forms and themes of festival are possible, and the term festival is often misapplied and commercialised. No widely acceptable typology has emerged.

Previous Literature Reviews
Festivals have occupied an important place in the event-related literature, but have not previously been assessed separately. Prior to 1993, when the research journal Festival Management and Event Tourism was established (it was later re-named to Event Management), there were only sporadic research-based papers dealing with event tourism and festival/event management research. As confirmed by Formica (1998) there were few articles related to event management or event tourism published in the 1970s - he found a total of four in Annals of Tourism Research and Journal of Travel Research. Formica quantified the topics explored by festival and special event research articles from 1970 through 1996, concluding that the main areas covered were (in descending order of frequency) economic and financial impacts, marketing, profiles of festival or events, sponsorship, management, trends and forecasts.

The first set of journal papers to deal with festival and event management and tourism-related issues was published in a special issue of the Canadian Journal of Applied Recreation Research (now called Loisir/Leisure) in 1991. Cousineau (1991) wrote the editorial entitled “Festivals and events: A fertile ground for leisure research”, and the papers covered a geography of festivals in Ontario (Butler and Smale, 1991), a history of festivals in Quebec (Leduc 1991), a critical (i.e., political) analysis of ethnic and multicultural festivals (Dawson 1991), a methodological review of event impact assessment (Getz 1991) and a case study of public participation in Canada’s 125th anniversary celebrations as produced by the National Capital Commission (St. Onge 1991). In the same issue Robinson and Noel (1991) discussed research needs for festivals, taking a management perspective.

More recent reviews of event management and event tourism have been compiled by Getz (2000; 2008), Harris, Jago, Allen, Huyskens (2001), Hede, Jago, and Deery (2002, 2003), and Sherwood (2007). Getz (2000) reviewed articles published in the journal Event Management from its inception in 1993 up to Vol. 6 (2) in 2000, concluding that the most frequent topics were economic development and impacts of events, followed by sponsorship and event marketing from the corporate perspective. Also in 2000, at the ‘Events Beyond 2000’ conference in Sydney, Harris et al reviewed Australian events-related research. They determined that the most frequently examined topics were economic development impacts of events, other management topics, and community impacts (with resident attitudes and perceptions). However, most of the research literature on impacts was related to sport events, not festivals.

Hede, Jago and Deery (2002) reviewed thirteen tourism, hospitality and leisure journals and conference proceedings in identifying more than 150 publications focused on special events during the period 1990-2001. Both community/cultural and sporting events more commonly provided the context, while very little academic research was published on commercial, political or religious events. Impact evaluation was dominant, and event operations and management was revealed to be a small component in the studies they found. Marketing was a well established theme. In terms of future research needs they developed a matrix based on event stage (pre, during, and post event) and perspectives (organizational stakeholders, attendee, host community). Particular research gaps included: planning, human resource management, risk management, quality perceptions and management, social, cultural and environmental evaluation, value profiling, choice modeling, recommending behavior, repeat visitation, and attitudes.
Sherwood’s 2007 assessment of the literature was confined to event evaluation studies. He reviewed articles published in 50 journals, but 35% of the relevant papers were in *Event Management*; he also reviewed peer-reviewed conference papers, and the total number of papers considered was 224. The most frequent topic was economic impacts of events (nearly 30%), followed by social impacts (just under 20%), then event management (13.4%) and tourism impacts (13%). He clearly demonstrated the paucity of research and articles on the environmental impacts of events. Sporting events accounted for almost 60% of the papers, while “cultural events” accounted for 29%. The Getz (2008) review was specifically aimed at documenting and assessing the literature on event tourism, wherein festivals do figure prominently. While that article did describe festival tourism research, it did not seek to delimit the field of festival studies.

**METHOD**

The specific aim of this research was to systematically and thoroughly compile and analyze a bibliography, with annotations, of all festival-related articles published in English-language research journals, through 2008. The enormous scale of this project only became apparent once systematic database searching began, resulting in the necessity to adopt several heuristics to delimit the search in scope and content. For example, a Google search conducted in February of 2009 yielded about 284,000 hits using the search-term “festival”. Within Google Scholar, the same search yielded 327,000 hits. A more restricted search on “festival” in Informworld (see Routledge/Taylor and Francis), yielded 506 results from titles, abstracts and key words.

The two main databases searched were ‘Leisuretourism.com’ and ‘Hospitality and Tourism Index’. Publisher-maintained databases were also employed. After an initial database search, each journal in which a festival-related article appeared was also searched through its online table of contents, although this facility was not available for a few of the journals. A number of key authors, those publishing more than a few festival-related articles, were also searched separately. This “snowball” method proved very effective and resulted in 422 articles through early 2009. Ideally such a bibliography will be updated at least annually, but there is no rationale other than practicality for a specific termination date. Analysis of the bibliography reveals that the vast majority of cited articles were published after 1990, with numbers surging after 2000, so it is a rapidly growing field - albeit without strong cohesion. A decision was taken to do a full search of all core journals, that is the ones in which multiple festival-related articles were found. These are listed in Table 1 and they yielded about 60 % of the total. Of greatest relevance in terms of numbers of publications is the journal *Event Management* (formerly *Festival Management and Event Tourism*) with 125 citations in this bibliography.

### Table 1: Core Source Journals (100% coverage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE JOURNALS (N = 266 articles out of 422)</th>
<th>Number of articles from each journal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Management (formerly Festival Management and Event Tourism)</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Travel Research</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Management</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annals of Tourism Research</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Economics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Event Management Research</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Leisure</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Vacation Marketing</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention and Event Tourism (Formerly Convention and Exhibition Management)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Review International (formerly Pacific Tourism Review)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Applied Recreation Research (formerly Recreation Research Review)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Analysis</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism, Culture and Communication</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Journal of Arts Management</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Recreation Research</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal of Tourism Studies (defunct)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure Studies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all articles that mention festivals could be included, so emphasis was placed on festival in the title, abstract or key words. The article had to be about festivals in some significant way. For example, *Annals of*...
Tourism Research (searched through Science Direct) had 293 hits for “festival” but only two articles with “festival(s)” (or ‘fest’) in the title. In Journal of Travel Research (Sage Journals Online) there were 315 hits and 15 articles having “festival” in the title. In Tourism Management (Science Direct) were 317 hits and only 5 articles with “festival” in the title. Some articles are more about events in general but were deemed to be important for festival studies; indeed, there is considerable overlap, and many authors lump together some or all types of planned events.

Annotations cannot be reproduced owing to volume and possible copyright issues. They consist of the published Abstracts (and keywords when provided) downloaded from journal contents and other online databases. As such, they usually constitute the authors’ own emphasis of main topics and themes. There are 422 papers annotated, resulting in a total of 648 citations (owing to many being placed in two categories). The bibliography also contains a limited number of references to books and book chapters, each of which is cited in the discussion in the context of tracing the historical development of the field.

While the main elements in this framework come from the Getz (2007) framework, topics or sub-categories have been derived from the literature itself. Referring to each article’s title, key words and abstract, with priority given to the authors’ own words, each has been assigned to either one or two (no more) of the sub-categories; sometimes both are within a major category and sometimes they have been split. When three or more possible categories were suggested by the title, abstract or key words, the actual allocation was made with the goal of enhancing the utility of the bibliography (i.e., to avoid overcrowding in some categories and too little in others).

THREE DISCOURSES WITHIN FESTIVAL STUDIES

“Discourse” can be narrowly defined as a conversation, or as a rule-based dialogue among parties. To Jaworski and Pritchard (2005 p,1), discourse is ‘a semiotic system’: textual-linguistic, visual or any other ‘system of signification’. Foucault (1973) saw discourse as a system of ideas or knowledge, with its own vocabulary (such as the way academics speak to each other). This can result in the power to monopolise communications and debate and to enforce particular points of view. In this paper, discourse is taken to mean a structured line of reasoning or knowledge creation, including theory development and practical applications. Previous reviews and the new annotated bibliography enable identification and description of three major discourses within festival studies. They are closely tied to existing journals, as these tend to shape sub-fields and lines of research. No doubt there are many more specific discourses that can be detected within these.

Discourse on the Roles, Meanings and Impacts of Festivals in Society and Culture

What becomes apparent quite quickly through any literature review entailing the word “festival”, is that festival studies is very well established within anthropology and sociology, while festival management and festival tourism are much more recent and relatively immature. The knowledge domains for each of the sub-fields of event management and event tourism have, unfortunately, developed without much reference to the classical lines of theory development and research in the social sciences and humanities.

Festivals in society and culture, pertaining to their roles, meanings and impacts, is the oldest and best developed discourse. The literature review identified the following classical themes within this discourse (see Figure 1, (Themes in Festival Experience and Meaning): myth, ritual and symbolism; ceremony and celebration; spectacle; communities; host-guest interactions (and the role of the stranger); liminality, the carnivalesque, and festivity; authenticity and commodification; pilgrimage; and a considerable amount of political debate over impacts and meanings. There are landmark works by Van Gennep (1909), Victor Turner (1969, 1974, 1982, 1983 a/b, 1988), Geertz (1973), Abrahams (1982, 1987), Falassi (1987), and Manning (1983). Numerous contemporary studies of specific cultural celebrations have been published in literature outside events and tourism (e.g. Cavalcanti, 2001). Two recent books make explicit connections between tourism and the cultural dimensions of festivals: Long and Robinson (2004) and Picard and Robinson (2006).

Recently, scholars within and outside the traditional disciplines have been examining festivals with regard to an increasing variety of issues: their roles in establishing place and group identity; the social and cultural impacts of festivals and festival tourism; creation of social and cultural capital through festival production;
fostering the arts and preserving traditions; and a variety of personal outcomes from participation in festivals, including learning, acquired social and cultural capital, and healthfulness. The value and worth of festivals to society and culture has been addressed, as well as the imputed need for festivity, but research on these important issues has been slim. Festivals are being examined in the context of sustainability, corporate social responsibility, and as permanent institutions. Clearly these latter issues suggest the need for pertinent festival policy studies. Connecting this classical discourse with the ensuing structured literature review, it can be seen that it dominates our understanding of the core phenomenon and is also highly pertinent when considering social, cultural and personal outcomes.

Discourse on Festival Tourism

“Festival tourism” is an important element in “event tourism”, so much so that the term “festivalization” has been coined to suggest an over-commodification of festivals exploited by tourism and place marketers (see, for example, Quinn (2006) and Richards (2007). Indeed, a marked trend toward treating festivals as commodities has emerged. In this approach, drawing heavily upon consumer behavior and other marketing concepts, motivations for attending festivals have been studied at length, and more recently the links between quality, satisfaction, and behavior or future intentions have been modeled. The roles of festivals in tourism include attracting tourists (to specific places, and to overcome seasonality), contributing to place marketing (including image formation and destination branding), animating attractions and places, and acting as catalysts for other forms of development. Dominating this discourse has been the assessment of economic impacts of festivals and festival tourism, planning and marketing festival tourism at the destination level and studies of festival-tourism motivation and various segmentation approaches. The negative impacts of festivals and festival tourism is a more recent line of research.

“Event tourism” has been reviewed historically and ontologically by Getz (2008). Ritchie and Beliveau published the first article specifically about event tourism in the Journal of Travel Research in 1974, the topic being how “hallmark events” could combat seasonality of tourism demand. They examined the Quebec Winter Carnival and included citation of an unpublished study of the economic impacts of the Quebec Winter Carnival dated 1962, which is perhaps the earliest such study recorded in the research literature. Another early impact study was conducted by Vaughan in Edinburgh (1979).

Festival tourism is essentially instrumentalist, treating festivals as tools in tourism and economic development, or in place marketing and the selling of attractions and venues. Although arts and tourism linkages have been advocated by many (e.g., Tighe 1985; 1986), and certainly exist with regard to festivals, concerts and staged performances, there will always remain tension between these sectors. Looking ahead to the structured literature review, it can be seen that tourism is a theme running through all the elements of the framework. But it is most prevalent in the literature concerning outcomes (i.e. economic impacts) and motivations, marketing and evaluation, with many of these articles being published in mainstream tourism journals.

Discourse on Festival Management

This is the most recent discourse or sub-field to develop in the research literature, even though professional practice of event management has a much longer history. The first major textbook on this subject was Goldblatt's 'Special Events: The Art and Science of Celebration' (published in 1990), followed closely by ‘Festivals, Special Events and Tourism’ (Getz, 1991) and a year later Hall's ‘Hallmark Tourist Events' in 1992. Numerous books have been published from the event practitioners’ point of view, and there are many texts on specific elements of events management including human resources, risks, logistics, and marketing. But there has been little published specifically and exclusively on festival management (for examples, see Hall and Sharples (2008) on international food and wine festivals, and Long and Robinson (2004) on festivals and tourism).

Much of the literature pertaining to event tourism is of direct interest to festival managers, especially the line of research concerning consumer motivation and evaluation. As well, the literature on event and festival impacts is somewhat pertinent, to the extent that managers might want to know how assessments are conducted and what they contribute to strategic planning. Descriptions and evaluations of specific festivals do not usually enter the academic literature and do not necessarily generate new knowledge. While it is
intuitively apparent that festival managers should immerse themselves in theory and examples from sociology and anthropology, the classical approach to viewing festivals in society and culture is seldom mentioned in the event management literature. Instead, event and festival management is dominated by generic management concepts and methods (covering the full range of management functions, but especially marketing).

**STRUCTURED LITERATURE REVIEW**

The ensuing review is structured in such a way as to classify knowledge and reveal knowledge gaps from an ontological perspective. An a priori framework is employed from Getz (2007) which purports to delimit event studies, and by implication can be employed to delimit event tourism or festival studies. Four principles have been employed in creating the framework used in conducting this review. The first is that all fields of study must have their own unique core phenomenon, in this case festivals, their experience and meanings. Second, while many disciplines and closely-related fields contribute to festival theory and knowledge, they all take different theoretical and methodological perspectives and focus on different themes, thereby necessitating an integrative framework. Third, a systems approach is applicable, because festivals are produced deliberately, for specific audiences, with intended outcomes. Dynamic processes must also be considered, as no festival or population of festivals remains static over time.

**Figure 1: The Core Phenomenon: Experiences and Meanings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEMES IN FESTIVAL EXPERIENCE AND MEANING</th>
<th>REFERENCES (published journal papers only; n = 134)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Political and social/cultural meanings and discourse; social change</td>
<td>Manning (1978); Lavenda (1980); A. Cohen (1982); Jackson (1988; 1992); Marston (1989); Reily (1994); Van Binsbergen (1994); Neuenfeldt (1995); Gamson (1996); Murillo (1997); Shukla (1997); Atkinson and Laurie (1998); Mato (1999); Pritchard et al (1998); Waterman (1998; 2004); Pietersen (1999); Bankston and Henry (2000); Harcup (2000); Frost (2001); Atiken and Harris (2003); Derrett (2003); Díaz-Barriga (2003); Harvie (2003); Quinn (2003; 2005b); Jeong and Santos (2004); Richards and Ryan (2004); Wah (2004); Abreu (2005); Carnegie and McCabe (2005); Gotham (2005); Jamal and Kim (2005); Sinn and Wong (2005); Donovan and Debres (2006); Flint (2006); Foley et al (2006); Reid (2006); Brennan-Horley et al (2007); Crespi-Vallbona and Richards (2007); Evans (2007); Favero (2007); Harvey (2008); Johnson (2007); Junge (2008); Kim and Hong (2007); Gillespie (2008); Kaplan (2008); Martin (2008); Sharpe (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authenticity (identity, commercialization, commodification)</td>
<td>Greenwood (1972); Buck (1977); Cohen (1988); Dawson (1991); Sofield (1991); Hinch and Delamere (1993); Van Binsbergen (1994); Raybould et al (1995); Banksdon and Henry (2000); Cavallanti (2001); Halewood and Hannam (2001); Gotham (2002); Chhabra et al (2003a); Xie (2003, 2004); Foley and McPherson (2004); Xiao and Smith (2004); Carnegie and McCabe (2005); Chhabra (2005); Matheson (2005; 2008); Elias-Vavotsis (2006); Flint (2006); Hannam and Halewood (2006); Muller and Pettersen (2006); Cohen (2007); Kim and Jamal (2007); McCartney and Ostd (2007); Richards (2007); Robinson and Clifford (2007); Cummings (2008); Driscoll (2008); Frost (2008); Knox (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, cultural, place identity and attachment</td>
<td>De Bres and Davis (2001); Derrett (2003); Gibson and Davidson (2004); Jeong and Santos (2004); Quinn (2005b); Owusu-Frempong (2005); Winchester and Rofe (2005); Elias-Vavotsis (2006); Wood and Thomas (2006); Sabanpan-Yu (2007); McIlrney (2008); Ruback et al (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communitas, social cohesion, sociability</td>
<td>Eden et al (1995); Costa (2002); Owusu-Frempong (2005); Matheson (2005); Hannam and Halewood (2006); Roemer (2007); Chau (2008); Morgan (2008); Mackellar (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festivity, liminality, the carnivalesque</td>
<td>Turner (1974); Duivighaud (1976); A. Cohen (1982); Walle (1996);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ravenscroft and Mateucci (2002); Jamieson (2004); Anderton (2008); Chau (2008)

Rites and rituals; religion
Turner (1974); Graburn (1983); Logan (1988); Parsons (2000); Winchester and Rofe (2005); Roemer (2007); Kaplan (2008)

Pilgrimage

Myths and symbols
Manning (1978); Quinn (2003); Xie and Groves (2003); Cohen (2007)

Spectacle
Cavalcanti (2001); Foley and McPherson (2004); Favero (2007); Knox (2008)

Festivals are cultural celebrations and have always occupied a special place in societies. Their celebratory roles, and the many cultural and social implications of ritual and festivity, have long attracted the interest of sociologists and anthropologists. Festivals always have a theme, and they have potentially very diverse programs and styles, all in pursuit of fostering a specific kind of experience. Celebration embodies at once an intellectual, behavioural and emotional experience, with the emotional responses potentially leading to unexpected and undesired outcomes in both behavioural and political/attitudinal terms.

Because so many meanings can be attached to the festival experience, at personal, social-group and cultural levels, they must be viewed as social constructs that vary from area to area, and over time. While primitive celebrations might have sprung up organically, in concert with agricultural and climatic cycles, modern festivals are mostly created and managed with multiple goals, stakeholders and meanings attached to them. A festival in one country, however, might very well be perceived quite differently from festivals in other countries. Cross-cultural differences have not been studied systematically.

The core phenomenon of event studies is the event experience and meanings attached to it. Festivals are celebrations, so by definition they have a theme. They also have a variety of meanings, from different perspectives, that make them complex planned phenomena. Meanings exist at personal, social, cultural and economic levels. The experience itself is at once personal and social, with each form of festival (e.g. music, arts, heritage) embodying different experience potential. Event designers are particularly interested in knowing how their manipulation of setting, program and various human interactions affects the audience and/or participants, and whether or not the desired experiences and consequences are achieved. This requires knowledge of culture, the arts, and environmental psychology. Referring to Figure 1, it can be seen that 134 citations fit into this broad category, and a number of sub-themes have been identified – of which two are dominant. A brief summary of each theme follows.

Political discourse on the meanings and effects of festivals: In one school of thought, festivals and rituals bind people together in communities and cultures (Durkheim, 1976), while in another they reflect and encourage disagreement and even disputation of the meanings and impacts of events. An early paper by Lavenda (1980) assessed the political evolution of the Caracas (Venezuela) Carnival, including power relationships and the role of political elites. Bankston and Henry (2000) looked at how Cajun Festivals in Louisiana are “invented traditions” that contributed to Cajun identity revival since the 1960’s. Gotham (2005) theorized on “urban spectacles” highlighting the conflicts over meanings as well as the irrationalities and contradictions of the spectacularization of local cultures. Jackson (1988 and 1992) explicitly dealt with the politics of carnivals. Waterman (1998; 2004) examined the cultural politics of arts festivals, specifically noting how place marketing influences lead to “safe art forms” and how many arts festivals are dominated by cultural elites.

Authenticity, commodification: Greenwood’s (1972) study of a Basque festival from an anthropological perspective lamented the negative influence of tourism on authentic cultural celebrations. The authenticity of events, their social–cultural impacts, and effects of tourism on events remain enduring themes. MacCanell (1976) is almost always cited in discussion of tourism authenticity. In another early study, Buck (1977) advocated staged tourist attractions, such as festivals, for protecting vulnerable cultural groups.
Eric Cohen (1988) addressed commodification and staged authenticity in the context of tourism, and whether tourists could have authentic experiences. He argued that authenticity is negotiable and depends on the visitor’s desires. Emergent authenticity occurs when new cultural developments (like festivals) acquire the ‘patina of authenticity over time’. The article is not explicitly about festivals but is highly relevant. In a later article, Cohen (2007) addressed the authenticity of a mythical event in Thailand.

A few authors have examined the authenticity of ethnic festivals, including Hinch and Delamere (1993) on Canadian native festivals that served as tourist attractions. Xie (2003) studied traditional ethnic performances in Hainan, China in terms of the relationship between commodification and authenticity. Chhabra, Healy and Sills (2003a) and Chhabra (2005) addressed authenticity issues by reference to goods sold at a festival and the perceptions of visitors. Muller and Petterssen (2006) focused on a Sami festival in Sweden, while Neuenfeldt (1995) took a sociological approach to the study of an aboriginal festival in Australia, viewing the performance as social text.

Community, cultural, place identity and attachment: Festivals are connected to cultures and to places, giving each identity and helping bind people to their communities. Similarly, festivals and other planned events can foster and reinforce group identity. De Bres and Davis (2001) determined that events held as part of the Rollin’ Down the River festival led to positive self-identification for local communities. Derrett (2003) argued that community-based festivals in New South Wales, Australia, demonstrate a community’s sense of community and place. Elias-Vavotsis (2006) considered the effects of festivals on the cultural identity of spaces.

Communitas, social cohesion, sociability: Communitas, as used by Turner, refers to intense feelings of belonging and sharing among equals, as in pilgrimage or festival experiences. Research supports the existence and importance of ‘communitas’ at planned events. Costa (2002) described “festive sociability” at the Fire Festival in Valencia, Spain, as being central to the transmission of tradition. Matheson (2005) discussed festivals and sociability in the context of a Celtic music festival. The backstage space is the realm of authentic experiences and communitas. Hannam and Halewood (2006) determined that Viking themed festivals gave participants a sense of identity and reflected an authentic way of life.

Festivity, liminality, the carnivalesque: Liminality, or the temporary state of being apart from the mundane (as in a ritual, travel or event experience) is an enduring theme, with Turner as the greatest inspiration. It is also useful to examine the differences between sacred and profane experiences, with religious rites and rituals on the one hand and the social/behavioural inversions and revelry of carnival on the other extreme. Scholars often refer to the writings of Bakthin (1984) when discussing the “carnivalesque”.


Rites and rituals; religion: From the early writings of Van Gennep (1909) on rites de passage, anthropologists have been fascinated by the connection between ritual and festivity, much of which has religious or at least spiritually symbolic significance. Turner (e.g.1974) has probably had the greatest influence in a classical sense, whereas Graburn (1983) and others have looked at ritualistic behaviour in a tourism context, citing festivals as examples. Parsons (2006) studied the contemporary, “invented-tradition” festival of Saint Ansano in Sienna Italy, which is based on long-established rituals. Kaplan (2008) wrote about the rituals and politics associated with a very old Ethiopian festival.

Myths and symbols: Myths and symbols are embedded in traditional festivals, whereas in modern societies it is sometimes necessary or desirable to invent myths or symbolism with political, religious or other meanings. Manning (1978) evaluated Carnival in Antigua regarding its symbolism related to nationalism and its commodification as a tourist attraction. Quinn’s (2003) study of the Wexford Festival Opera in Ireland analysed symbolic practices and meanings associated with the festival, including myth making.
Pilgrimage: Festivals attract, or an essential part of pilgrimage in a religious or spiritual sense. Ahmed (1992) studied the Hajj in terms of its tourism importance and organizational challenges. Díaz-Barriga (2003) studied a pilgrimage festival in Bolivia which has become a point for political controversy and contested meaning. Nolan and Nolan (1992) studied religious sites in Europe that act both as festival-pilgrimage and secular tourist attractions, stressing management implications. Ruback et al (2007) compared the differences between religious pilgrims to a festival in India and non-religious visitors on their perception of the Mela.

Spectacle: MacAlloons’s (1984) theory of spectacle is important when considering all cultural performance, with the real threat that larger-than-life visual stimulations will replace or render insignificant the more fundamental purposes and expressions of festivity. Foley and McPherson (2004) analysed Edinburgh’s Hogmanay celebration from the perspectives of authenticity, festivity and televised spectacle. Knox (2008) studied the process by which Scottish song traditions evolved to become public spectacle and tourism performance, in the context of assessing their authenticity.

Figure 1: Antecedents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTECEDENTS</th>
<th>REFERENCES (n = 57 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Of all the possible antecedents to explaining participation in festivals, or demand for them, only the study of festival motivation is well-established. It has always been strongly attached to mainstream marketing and consumer research. A total of 57 journal articles are listed that pertain explicitly to motivations to attend festivals. Festival motivation studies were popular right from the beginning (1993) of the journal Festival Management and Event Tourism. Review articles have been published by Lee, Lee and and Wicks (2004), Li and Petrick (2006), and Wooten and Norman (2008).

Motivations: This category involves exploration of why people attend festivals, and how they make their choices and decisions. Many researchers have employed market segmentation in conducting motivational studies, and only a few have referred to theory on cultural needs or social identification. Within the event management and even tourism discourses the classical reasons for holding and attending festivals have all but been ignored, opening a great theoretical gulf. Almost entirely, scholars listed in this bibliography have adopted the positivistic, quantitative paradigm favoured by consumer behavior studies, even though this approach fails to consider fundamental social and cultural antecedents. It also gravely over-simplifies motivation (and completely ignores need) by commodifying festivals alongside other entertainment ‘products’.

Early studies of festival motivation, often in a tourism context, were reported by Mohr et al (1993), Uysal, Gahan and Martin (1993) and Backman et al (1995). After many studies it is generally found that the seeking and escaping theory (Iso-Ahola, 1980, 1983) is largely confirmed. These are intrinsic motivators, with the
event being a desired leisure pursuit. Researchers have demonstrated that escapism leads people to events for the *generic benefits* of entertainment and diversion, socializing, learning and doing something new, i.e., novelty seeking. Nicholson and Pearce (2000; 2001) studied motivations to attend four quite different events in New Zealand: an air show, award ceremony, wild food festival, and a wine, food and music festival. They concluded that multiple motivations were the norm, and that while socialization was common to them all, it varied in its nature. Event-specific reasons (or targeted benefits) were tied to the novelty or uniqueness of each event. *Serious leisure* (as used by Mackellar (2009 a/b, based on the theories of Stebbins) and *involvement theory* (e.g., as employed by S. Kim, Scott & Crompton, 1997) offer great potential for exploring event-specific motives.

Kay (2004) reviewed the literature on cross-cultural research in developing international tourist markets, noting how little had been published especially in the events sector. Since most published work is in English, from the North American or European cultural settings (including Australia and New Zealand), there will always be potential problems when taking our theories and methods into much different cultural environments. Schneider and Backman (1996) examined the issues surrounding the application of festival motivation scales to other cultures than their origin. They concluded that we can use the motivational scale in Arabic countries, while Dewar et al (2001) concluded the same for Chinese festivals. In other words, there does appear to be a universal set of motivations that lead people to attend festivals, and people are similar regardless of the culture (especially socialization and family togetherness, or what Getz (2005; 2007) calls “generic festival benefits”). However, that is a very large hypothesis in need of much more systematic, cross-cultural testing.

A number of specific motivational issues have been researched. Junge (2008) looked the motivations explaining heterosexual attendance at Gay events, while Kim, Borges and Chon (2006) employed the New Environmental Paradigm scale to examined motivations of people attending a film festival in Brazil that was created to foster awareness of environmental issues. Yuan et al (2005 a/b) studied wine festival attendees on their motivations, while Yuan and Jang (2008) explored the wine festival attendee’s satisfaction and behavioural intentions.

**Constraints:** Event and festival non-attendance, and constraints acting against attendance, have been largely ignored in the literature. Van Zyl and Botha (2004) considered the needs and motivational factors influencing decisions of residents to attend an arts festival, including ‘situational inhibitors’, while Milner et al (2004) conducted the only study of why people did not attend festivals and events. This is a line of research that deserves greater attention, especially in the context of leisure constraints theory (see, for example, Jackson, 2005).

**Figure 3: Outcomes and the Impacted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>REFERENCES (n = 132)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Social and cultural impacts:**
- Greenwood (1972); Buck (1977); Heenan (1978); Ritchie (1984); Cohen (1988); Eder et al. (1995); Pritchard et al. (1998); Dwyer et al. (2000 a/b); De Bres and Davis (2001); Delamere (2001); Delamere et al. (2001); Rao (2001); Molloy (2002); Fredline et al. (2003); Harvie (2003); Gursoy et al. (2004); Waterman (2004); Xiao and Smith (2004); Quinn (2005a/b; 2006); Sinn and Wong (2005); Small et al. (2005); Wood (2005); Yuen and Glover (2005); Arcodia and Whitford (2006); Snowball and Willis (2006a); Taylor et al. (2006); Wood and Thomas (2006); Brennan-Horley et al. (2007); Foley and McPherson (2007); Moscardo (2007); Reid (2007); Rollins and Delamere (2007); Sabanpan-Yu (2007); Small (2007); Karlsen and Brandstrom (2008); Kim et al. (2008); Rooney-Browne (2008)

**Personal impacts:**
- Christensen (1983); Gitelson et al. (1996); Pitts (2004; 2005); Frohlick (2005); Gursoy et al. (2006); Lea (2006); Taylor et al. (2006); Karlsen and Brandstrom (2008); Knowles et al. (2008); Liang et al. (2008); Lim et al. (2008); Robinson et al. (2008); Rowley and Williams (2008)

**Image and place marketing, efforts and effects:**
- Hughes (1999); Harcup (2000); Jago et al. (2003); Prentice and Anderson (2003); Anwar and Sohail (2004); Pugh and Wood (2004); Li and Vogelsong (2005); Boo and Busser (2006); Grant (2006); Mossberg and Getz (2006); Che (2008); Reid (2006); McClinchey (2008)

**Urban development and renewal:**
- Schuster (1995); Hughes (1999); Mules (1993); Gabr (2004); Che (2008)

**Environmental impacts:**
- Shirley et al. (2006)

"Outcomes" have to be viewed from multiple perspectives, ranging from personal to societal and at the local, regional, national and international levels. They include those that are intended - reflecting the purpose and goals of festivals - and those that are unintended and potentially negative. Increasingly, a Triple-Bottom-Line approach to impact assessment is becoming the new paradigm, although it is in some respects in direct conflict with the prevailing instrumentalist approach to festival tourism.

**Economic impacts:**
The "economic impacts" theme contains 59 of the 132 citations in the Outcomes category, and it is the dominant theme within the festival/event tourism discourse. Burns, Hatch and Mules (1986) conducted the seminal study of event impacts, including application of income multipliers and economic cost-benefit evaluation. With regard to economic impact methods, two papers in 2000 by Dwyer et al. provided state-of-art prescriptions on assessing and forecasting tangible and intangible event impacts. Burgan and Mules (2001) sought to reconcile economic impact and cost-benefit methods. Dwyer, Forsyth and Spurr (2006) explored the use of computable general equilibrium models and argued it is preferred over input-output approaches for special events. Brännas and Nordstrom (2006) used econometric models to determine the extent of increased hotel accommodation versus displacement caused by festivals. The potential for invalid assessment and deliberate misuse of event impact assessments has been detailed by Crompton and McKay (1994) and Crompton (2006). Specific topics within this theme include research by Bo, Ko and Blazey (2007) on how prior festival visitation (and other variables) influenced expenditures. Turco (1995) examined tax impacts.

**Social and cultural impacts:**
The second-largest category under “outcomes” is social and cultural impacts, containing 40 citations. With so much attention having been given to the economic dimensions of event tourism, it was to be expected that scholars would seek more balance. Although research on social and cultural impacts of events goes back to occasional anthropological studies like Greenwood (1972), the conceptual overview provided by Ritchie (1984), it can be said that only very recently has there begun a systematic and theoretically grounded line of comprehensive event impact research, including papers by Delamere (2001) and Delamere, Wankel and Hinch (2001) on development of resident attitude scales as social impact indicators. Fredline and Faulkner (1998; 2002 a and b) and Xiao and Smith (2004) have researched resident perceptions of event impacts, while Fredline, Jago and Deery (2003), Fredline (2006) and Small (2007) have all worked on development of social impact scales for events. Arcodia and Whitford...

A number of specific social impact issues have been considered, such as Eder, Staggenborg and Sudderth (1995) on how the National Women's Music Festival fostered lesbian identity but did not achieve its goals regarding racial diversity among women. Snowball and Willis (2006a) believed that cultural capital had been created by means of the National Arts Festival in South Africa.

Image and place marketing: Festivals are being employed as tools in destination image-making, re-positioning strategies, and branding. Articles deal with both the effort being made and the imputed or tested effects. Harcup (2000) examined how a festival was developed to deliberately help change the image of Leeds. Jago et al (2003) in Australia studied how to build events into destination branding. Li and Vogel (2005) compared two methods for assessing the effects of a small-scale festival on destination image, concluding that many visitors did go away with an enhanced image of the host community. Mossberg and Getz (2006) studied stakeholders and the ownership of festival brands, many of which are explicitly but informally co-branded with cities through their names. Boo and Busser (2006) tested how a festival could improve a destination's image.

Personal impacts: Effects of festival attendance at the personal level are increasingly being explored. This is one of the most important and potentially exciting lines of research as it should, by nature, attract a truly interdisciplinary approach. Because festivals are being used more and more to implement a wide range of public-sector policies (i.e., being conceived instrumentally as social marketing tools), researching the effects of attendance on persons has to be given much more profile. Examples to date include Gitelson, Kerstetter and Kienman (1995) who evaluated educational goal attainment at a university-based festival, while Gursoy, Spangenberg and Rutherford (2006) analysed attendees' attitudes to festivals and found that hedonic attitudes were more important than utilitarian attitudes in explaining motivation; while ostensibly a marketing/evaluation study, this approach theoretically illuminates the nature of the experience and what people want to get out of a festival.


Urban development and renewal: Only a few scholars have made a connection between festivals and urban development or renewal, and it is accurate to say that this topic is mostly connected to mega-events like the Olympics and World's Fairs. Regarding festivals, Mules (1993) looked at festivals as part of urban renewal strategy for Adelaide. Hughes (1999) examined the use of festival in urban image making and revitalization. Gabr (2004) looked at how the Dubai Shopping Festival utilized historic sites and resident attitudes towards this practice, and Che (2008) examined the branding of Detroit and promotion of a positive image through creation of the Detroit Electronic Musical Festival.

Environmental impacts: The paucity of articles on festival or event environmental impacts can only be described as appalling. The only one that fits this theme is by Shirley et al (2006) who reported on the effects of a festival on a nearby population of bats. Pertaining to events in general, several other authors have made contributions, according to Sherwood (2007) whose dissertation examined how a triple-bottom-line approach to event evaluation could be structured and implemented. Topics that should be thoroughly covered but are not, include: changes to ecological systems and the physical environment as a result of festivals and events; the energy consumption and carbon footprint attributable to event-related travel; water production and avoidance; pollution of air, water and land; effects on wildlife and habitat; reducing, recycling and re-using materials, buildings and sites. Basically, there is no correspondence found between popular rhetoric on sustainability and the entire field of event studies as evidenced by published research articles.
### PLANNING AND MANAGING FESTIVALS

#### Marketing:
- Market orientation; segmentation and target marketing; place marketing with festivals; developing new markets; market area and market potential; positioning; branding and image making; market potential

**References (n = 233)**

#### Planning:
- Strategic, operational, business, site; leadership and innovation; decision making; leveraging benefits; goals; success factors; institutionalization processes

**References (n = 233)**

#### Evaluation (effectiveness and efficiency; consumer satisfaction and service quality; return on investment; unanticipated impacts; learning organization)

**References (n = 233)**

#### Stakeholders:
- Festival organizational environment; types and roles of stakeholders and their management: partnerships and collaboration, networks

**References (n = 233)**

#### Risk, health, safety, law, crowding and security

**References (n = 233)**
This category contains 230 citations, covering most of the standard management functions applied to festivals. The marketing and evaluation themes in particular cross over with festival tourism, as often the focus is on festival tourism and attracting tourists.

Marketing: Marketing is the dominant theme with 57 citations, and is even more important when closely-related themes are also considered (see “evaluation” and “motivation”). Festival marketing research has examined marketing or consumer orientation, segmentation for target marketing purposes, place marketing with festivals, developing new markets, market area and market potential studies, branding and image-making with festivals. Several researchers have sought to determine the marketing orientation of festivals (Mayfield & Crompton, 1995; Tomljenovic & Weber, 2004; Mehmetoglu & Ellingsen, 2005). It has often been observed, and the research tends to confirm this suspicion, that arts festivals in particular display a lack of concern for tourism and take a product orientation that tends to ignore customer needs and commercial realities.


Ensor, Robertson and Ali-Knight (2007) employed interviews to examine success, specifically what factors contribute to innovation and creativity. Hede (2007) argued that the triple-bottom-line approach has to be introduced at the event planning stage, involving all the stakeholders. O’Brien (2007) discussed how to leverage festivals for maximum local benefit. Concerning start-up planning, Frost (2001) examined the planning and development of two anniversary celebrations in Australia and California.

Evaluation: Evaluation emerged as a strong topic, with 36 citations, although the majority of these research articles pertain to assessments of quality and satisfaction. This fashion has basically adopted consumer marketing to events through application of model-building. For example, Bourdeau, DeCoster and Paradis (2001) examined satisfaction levels at a music festival comparing residents and tourists. S. Lee, Petrick and Crompton (2007) developed a structural-equation model to examine relationships between perceived festival service quality, perceived value and behavioural intentions. K. Kim (2008) identified motivational segments of Koreans attending a cultural festival employing factor-cluster analysis, then evaluated satisfaction levels to draw marketing implications.

What is not receiving much attention is evaluation of the effectiveness or efficiency of event operations, or return on investment measures, evaluation of unanticipated outcomes or learning systems. Along those lines, Getz and Frisby (1991) studied management effectiveness in community-based festivals in Ontario, Canada, while Williams and Bowdin (2007) documented how UK festivals employed evaluation and the methods used.

Stakeholders: With so many potential goals to satisfy, and stakeholders to involve, festivals are somewhat unique in the events sector. Stakeholders and stakeholder management have come into the lexicon on festivals, with 23 citations. Sometimes stakeholders are a secondary topic when discussing planning and the strategic environmental forces affecting festivals. However, a number of recent studies have explicitly used stakeholder theory to examine festival politics and strategies, the festival organizational environment, types and roles of stakeholders and stakeholder management. Articles on partnerships and collaborations also deal with stakeholders, such as Long (2000) who examined organizational partnerships in the management of a themed festival year in the UK.

Larson (2002; 2008) and Larson and Wikstrom (2001) employed the concept of a “political market square” to examined power and inter-stakeholder dynamics at festivals. Getz, Andersson and Larson (2007) used case studies in Canada and Sweden to identify key stakeholders, their multiple roles, and how they were being managed. Crespi-Vallbona and Richards (2007) studied the meaning of cultural festivals through the perspectives of multiple stakeholders in Catalunya, Spain. Stokes (2008) addressed the stakeholder orientation of event tourism strategy makers in Australia, and Johnson, Glover and Yuen (2009) in studying the Festival of Neighbourhoods in Kitchener, Ontario, Canada, focused on the role of community representatives in creating the event.

Human resources: Topics include staffing, volunteers, professionalism and professionalization, accreditation and ethics, and if volunteers have received the greatest attention. Elstad (2003) examined their continuance and commitment, while Slaughter and Home (2004) studied motivations of long-term volunteers, comparing human services and events. Bendle and Patterson (2008) looked at volunteers at arts events from a serious leisure perspective.
Risk, health, safety, law, crowding and security: These are major concerns to all event managers, and while several books cover risk management specifically, only a few research articles have been published. Barker, Page and Meyer (2000) considered event impacts and visitors’ perceptions of safety. Mowen, Vogelsong and Graefe (2003) researched perceived crowding at a festival in how it influenced visitor attitudes towards crowd management strategies. Earl, Parker and Capra (2005) and Earl (2008) specifically addressed crowd psychology and related challenges for festival organizers.

Economics and financing: The economics and financing of festivals (12) remains largely underdeveloped as a research topic. Crompton and Love (1994) used inferential evidence to determine the likely reaction of visitors to a price increase at a festival, and much later Wanhill (2006) looked at opera festivals in Finland from the perspective of pricing and revenue. Clarke and Hoaas (2007) looked specifically at factors affecting revenue from concession sales at the Red River Revel Arts Festival. Anderson and Getz (2007b) examined resource dependency as a threat to festivals. Frey (1986; 1994) examined the economics of the Salzburg Festival and music festivals; ownership was also examined. Tomljenovoc and Weber (2004) examined Croatian festivals, looking at reasons why organizers thought they should be funded by government. Barbato and Mio (2007) focused on accounting and management control of the Venice Biennale.

Sponsorship: Sponsorship is partly a marketing topic and partly related to finances. With only 11 citations, there is much more research and theory in the mainstream literature and in sport marketing that could be applied to festivals. An early study by Crompton (1993) focused on why a business would sponsor events, and later Crompton (1995) assessed factors that stimulated the growth of event sponsorship. Alexandris et al (2008) examined the influence of spectators’ attitudes on sponsorship awareness at three events, including a festival.

Programming: Only 9 citations were found on the content of festivals or the programming process. Leenders et al (2005) examined success in the Dutch music festival market by reference to variables of format and content that are controllable by producers. Finkel (2006) studied the Lichfield Festival to assess tensions between artistic programming goals on the one hand and the influence of economic goals in leading to programming standardization. Andersson and Getz (2009) considered how ownership of festivals affected their programming.

Attendance estimates and forecasts: Attendance estimation techniques have been scrutinized by several researchers, but forecasting seems to have been largely overlooked. Perhaps the open nature of many public festivals has led researchers to believe that forecasting is unnecessary or too difficult. Butters and Brantley (1993) documented the use of tag and recapture method for estimating open-festival attendance, while Denton and Furse (1993) described their method for estimating attendance at the open, multi-event and multi-location Barossa Valley Vintage Festival. Raybould et al (2000) used air photos. Tyrell and Ismail (2005) also discussed methods for obtaining estimates of attendance and economic impacts at open-gate festivals.


Ownership: Whether privately owned, not-for-profit, or in the public sector, the ownership of festivals makes a potentially huge difference to the nature of its management and the experiences offered to attendees. Yet with only 3 citations, it has not received the attention of researchers that it warrants. Frey (1994) researched the economics of not-for-profit music festivals. Acheson et al (1996) studied problems facing nonprofit festivals (the case of the Banff Television Festival), and Getz and Anderson 2009 compared private, not-for-profit and for-profit festivals within a “mixed-industry” context.
Catering, food and beverage: The only citation on this theme is that of Boo, Ghiselli and Almanza (2000) who examined consumer perceptions and concerns about festival food safety. Apparently the generic hospitality and catering literature has sufficed to date, with festival-specific issues not deemed to be in need of research.

Cultural entrepreneurship: Acheson, Maule and Filleul (1996) profiled the entrepreneurs who started the Banff Television Festival in the only article fitting this theme. But research on the founders and owners of festivals must be considered a priority for the future, as this theme links directly to organizational culture, strategy, success and failure factors, and stakeholder management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FESTIVAL EXPERIENCE DESIGN THEMES</th>
<th>REFERENCES (n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Settings (festival places)</td>
<td>Janiskee (1996b); Janiskee (1991); Getz (2001); Morgan (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themes and programming, creativity; staging, choreography, scripting, performance</td>
<td>Pitts (2004; 2005); Finkel (2006); Morgan (2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service provision and quality</td>
<td>Getz, O'Neill and Carlsen (2001); Cole and Illum (2006); Ralston et al (2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumables (food, souvenirs, merchandise)</td>
<td>Boo et al (2000); Donovan and Debres (2006); Robinson and Clifford (2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Festival experience design is both art and science, and must draw heavily upon environmental psychology for a more complete understanding of the interactions between people, settings and programmes or management systems. Mostly festival experience design has been in the realm of creative arts or traditional cultural performances, but it is increasingly being viewed as a specialist field within event management. Berridge (2006) has devoted a book to it, with case studies, while Brown and James (2006) have provided some basic experience design principles. Getz (2007) concluded that experiences cannot be designed or engineered, but can be suggested and facilitated. He specifically examined how festival producers could design programmes and themes, service quality, consumables (especially food and beverages) and the setting.

Setting: Several articles deal with the places in which festivals are held Janiskee 1991, 1996b and Getz 2001, but only Morgan (2006) provided advice on actual setting design for festivals. Morgan tried to understand the event experience from attendees’ perspectives and developed a model of the experience which includes the main elements of design and programming, physical organization (setting), social interaction, personal benefits, symbolic meanings, and cultural communication.

Themes and Programming: Pitts (2004; 2005) combined a discussion of musical performance and listening experiences at festivals, yielding insights for festival design and on personal impacts. The Finkel (2006) research focused on programming decisions rather than the creative process. Morgan (2008) used ethnography to obtain insights from visitors on festival experiences and applied this to his prism model of festival experience design.

Consumables: Many festivals celebrate food and beverages, or feature them as essential parts of the experience. Souvenirs and gifts, or merchandise sold at festivals can also be considered part of the experience and therefore in need of careful design. The four cited articles only provide some degree of relevance to actual design. Boo et al (2000) obtained consumer perceptions of festival-food safety and health issues, with implications for producers. Donovan and Debres (2006) show that Juneteenth (an African-American celebration) has become a culinary tourist event because barbecue is a regional food tourism attraction. Robinson and Clifford (2007) looked at the authenticity of foodservice experiences at a festival, related to quality management.
Service Provision and Quality: Staff and volunteers are frequently part of the festival experience, either in terms of their interactions with customers to provide service, or their performances. Service “blueprinting” sets out detailed specifications for host-guest encounters as well as tangible evidence of quality and therefore provides festival designers with a useful tool. Getz, O’Neill and Carlsen (2001) used triangulation (i.e., 3 methods including participant observation) to assess service quality and satisfaction at a surfing event, recommending use of service mapping and blueprinting for event design. Cole and Illum (2006) modelled the linkages between service and experience quality, satisfaction and future behavioural intentions at a rural festival. Ralston et al (2007) developed a model to integrate service and experience factors for events and festivals. See also the many studies under the heading Evaluation.

The dynamic elements of the festival studies framework include temporal and spatial processes, knowledge creation, and policy – all of which change over time and have an important influence on festival management and festival tourism. In disciplinary terms, historians and geographers have studied temporal and spatial patterns, while policy is generally framed as a political science or public administration subject. Knowledge creation covers festival-related research in general.

Policy: Few researchers have taken a mainstream political science perspective in festival research. The preferred topics include government funding issues and policies (Frey, 2000; Tomljenovic & Weber, 2004; Felenstein & Fleischer, 2003), and the nature and justification for public-sector involvement with festivals. Some papers cover policy development for festivals and events (e.g., Getz & Frisby, 1991), but on that topic one has to look mostly in books (e.g., Hall & Rusher, 2004; Getz, 2007). Specific topics covered include articles by Burke (2007), who addressed the development of cultural policies through the lens of the Caribbean Festival for the Arts, Foley, McPherson and Matheson (2006) who evaluated festival policy in Singapore from the perspective of globalisation, and Peters and Pikkemaat (2005) on the management of city events in Innsbruck Austria, illustrating important success factors and risks within a policy context. Thomas and Wood (2004) studied event-based tourism strategies among local authority strategies in the UK, while Pugh and Wood (2004) looked at local authorities in London as to their policies and strategies for events and festivals. Wah (2004) examined how traditional festivals were influenced by government in China, where a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PATTERNS AND PROCESSES</th>
<th>REFERENCES (n =78)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy: funding, public involvement with events</td>
<td>Tighe (1986); Getz and Frisby (1991); St. Onge (1991); Ryan (1995); Turco (1995); Sofield and Li (1998); Waterman (1998); Larson and Wikstrom (2001); Larson (2002; 2008); Felenstein and Fleischer (2003); Quinn (2005a); Pugh and Wood (2004); Stokes (2004); Thomas and Wood (2004); Tomljenovic and Weber (2004); Wah (2004); Whittford (2004ab); Abreu (2005); Greene (2005); Peters and Pikkemaat (2005); Snowball (2005); Finkel (2006); Foley et al (2006); Grant (2006); Burke (2007); Snowball and Webb (2008); Johnson et al (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporal processes: history of and historical analysis of festivals, festival evolution, life cycle</td>
<td>Ritchie and Beliveau (1974); Janiskee (1980; 1991; 1994; 1996a); Frisby and Getz (1989); Chacko and Schaffer (1993); Walle (1994); Ryan et al (1998); Sofield and Li (1998); Ekman (1999); Parsons (2000); Beverland et al (2001); Higham and Ritchie (2001); Petterssen (2003); Sofield and Sivan (2003); Xie and Groves (2003); Mules (2004); Richards and Ryan (2004); Visser (2005); Driscoll (2008); Snowball and Webb (2008); Tikkanen (2008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Temporal: Boorstin (1961), an historian, first drew attention to the phenomenon of "pseudo events" created for publicity and political purposes. His book remains useful in terms of the ongoing discourse on festival authenticity. Most other researchers have examined festivals within a temporal context rather than regarding their place in history. Historical perspectives on individual festivals have been published (e.g., Ritchie and Beliveau, 1974; Chacko & Schaffer, 1993; Petterssen, 2003), although they are not frequent and are usually incidental to broader research. Using and historical methodology Sofield and Li analysed the evolution and sustainability of an 800-year-old Chinese festival, while Sofield and Sivan (2003) similarly examined the evolution of Hong Kong’s Dragon Boat Races. Snowball and Webb (2008) assessed the effects of the South African National Arts Festival as to its value in the transition to democracy. Xie and Groves (2003) addressed the cultural iconography of a Canadian/American festival over its 41 year history.

The life cycle or evolution of festivals as a theoretical construct has been raised several times in the research literature (Frisby & Getz, 1989; Walle, 1994), but not tested rigorously through comparative and longitudinal studies. Tikkanen (2008) examined the internationalization of a festival over time. Driscoll (2008) looked at the decline of a festival from an historical perspective, while Mulies (2004) examined the evolution of a festival's management. Richards and Ryan (2004) historically examined the evolution and maturation of an important Maori festival in New Zealand. Beverland et al (2001) applied the life-cycle model to analysis of the evolution and strategies of wine festivals. Policy and politics affecting festivals has generated some research interest. More recently the notion of festival institutionalization has been added to this line of theory-building, informed by theories of resource dependency, stakeholders, actor networks, institutionalism and population ecology (Getz & Andersson, 2008). It has to be stressed that studies of festival failure are rare indeed.

Spatial: Festivals exist in relationship to their environment, so spatial patterns and processes are of importance. The geographer Robert Janiskee made a huge contribution to the field through his compilation and analysis of a very large database of festivals in the USA. Just in terms of published journal articles, he examined macro-scale festival growth trends (1994), their temporal distribution (1996a), and living history events (1996b). Similar spatial-temporal studies have been made at a smaller scale including in New Zealand (Ryan et al, 1998; Higham & Ritchie, 2001) and the Canadian Province of Ontario (Butler & Smale, 1991). Visser (2005), as part of a broader study, examined spatial-temporal patterns of festivals in South Africa. Ekmann (1999) considered the revival of celebrations in a region in Sweden.

Knowledge creation and research: Of special significance to academics is the process of knowledge creation, such as through comparative festival research that serves to build theory and potentially shape management practice. Of these citations, many are about research methodologies and needs. Some are more in the line of thought pieces than empirical research, but at this early stage in the development of the field these are important. Duvignaud’s (1976) treatise on the sociology of festivals sought to define and explain festivity from a sociological perspective. Carlsen, Getz and Soutar (2001) employed a Delphi method using a panel of experts to identify research and evaluation needs. Carlsen, Ali-Knight and Robertson (2007) developed a research agenda for festivals in Edinburgh, while Jamal and Kim (2005) discussed the interdisciplinarity of knowledge creation concerning heritage tourism, including festivals, with an emphasis on socio-political contexts.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Through systematically reviewing the published research literature pertaining to festivals, a definition of the field of “festival studies” can be offered. As well, ontological progress has been made through identification of its major discourses, themes and topics. After discussing these theoretical advances, research gaps are identified and priorities suggested.

“Festival studies” can simplistically be defined as the study of festivals, but within the context of “event studies” as defined by Getz (2007), some elaboration is required. The core phenomenon is actually the festival experience and meanings attached to it. People create festivals for specific purposes, and one’s experience of a festival provides meaning. As well, festivals have importance and multiple meanings within
societies and cultures that transcend individual experiences. To fully understand and create knowledge about festivals it is also necessary to consider who produces them and why, how they are planned and managed, why people attend (or do not), their outcomes on multiple levels, and the dynamic forces shaping individual festivals and festival populations.

Within festival studies, three major discourses, or structured lines of reasoning and knowledge creation (including theory and practical applications), are clearly identifiable. The classical discourse, mostly flowing from cultural anthropology and sociology, concerns the roles, meanings and impacts of festivals in society and culture. While it is somewhat connected to festival tourism and management, those linkages have been under-developed.

Festival tourism is an instrumentalist discourse in which festivals are viewed as tools in tourism, economic development and place marketing. This discourse is dominated by the positivistic, quantitative research paradigm in which consumer behavior approaches prevail. Festivals are clearly commodified by tourism, which has given rise to considerable reflection and critical theory. Progress in understanding festival motivations has been stifled by this approach as it ignores the fundamental needs for celebration and many of the social/cultural reasons for seeking out festivity and social events. It should also be stressed that festivals are increasingly being used for other policy purposes, including to help achieve social and cultural goals, which places them as instruments of social marketers.

The third discourse is Event Management, which focuses on the production and marketing of festivals and the management of festival organizations. While event managers do often take an interest in the tourism literature, for marketing purposes, there is little evidence that the classical discourse rooted in sociology and anthropology is influencing event management research, concepts or practice. This appears to reflect a modern conceptualization of festivals as entertainment, thereby linking event management and event tourism paradigmatically.

Research Gaps and Priorities: The Three Discourses

In terms of discourses, each is developing rapidly in terms of numbers of publications and breadth of thematic overage, but the obvious gap is in bridging them into a collective that should be called festival studies. This can be conceived as a sub-field of event studies, but one with its own unique theoretical heritage and professional applications.

In the classic discourse concerning the roles, meanings and impacts of festivals in society and culture, sociological and cultural anthropological theory and methodologies prevail. Our understanding of festivals as social/cultural phenomenon, and of the festival experience for individuals and groups, must be rooted in these disciplines, but there is little evidence in the research literature (and in the pertinent textbooks) that the connections are being made.

Festival tourism, in terms of what the literature covers, has over-emphasised consumer motivations and economic impacts; its methods and concepts are well developed, but progress can still be made through comparative and cross-cultural studies. A more balanced, triple-bottom-line approach is needed for evaluating festival tourism impacts. This discourse is firmly situated within a positivistic, quantitative paradigm in which consumer behavior approaches prevail, leaving little room for understanding the cultural and social roots of antecedents and constraints, especially in different cultures and for specific social groups. Festival management, generally lumped in with event management in colleges and universities, does incorporate the instrumentalist approach to festival tourism, but has not made good use of the classical discourse.

Research Gaps and Priorities: Themes and Topics

The Core Phenomenon: Most of what we know about the festival experiences, and the meanings attached, is drawn from the classical discourse and the disciplines of cultural anthropology and sociology. Leisure research and theory should make a bigger contribution, as well as environmental psychology. Festival designers have traditional relied on the arts when it comes to creativity and programming, but festival design encompasses much more. The goal has to be a unified theory of festival experiences. As well, the value or
worth of festivals and other celebrations has to be conceptualized in terms other than those found in the event tourism discourse, with emphasis on personal, societal and cultural contributions.

Antecedents: An over-emphasis on consumer-behaviour theory and methods is limiting theoretical advancement in understanding antecedents for attending or participating in festival. Even so, little of this line of research, which seems pre-occupied with elaborate model building and testing, actually deals with how choices are made. More importantly, constraints have not been explored systematically, nor across cultures and social groups.

Planning and Management: We know very little about social and private entrepreneurship in the festivals, nor do we know much about the relative strengths and weaknesses of the three common ownership types. The ongoing influence of founders and organizational culture is a related question, as the core values in festivals should be quite different from those for other planned events. Key stakeholders and their support or resistance will generally be major factors in determining long-term viability and achieving institutional status, but we do not know anything about this outside a few developed countries. Network analysis holds considerable potential for examining festivals within their policy, stakeholder and market environments.

While success factors, failure and the life-cycle have been addressed by a few researchers, little has been done to examine festival growth or sustainability strategies, nor to identify constraints. Of the various management functions applied to festivals, the following have been neglected: festival financing, innovation, logistics and control systems, site planning, professional staff development, branding, evaluation methods and accountability.

Outcomes: A top priority should be to make advances in the Triple Bottom Line approach to valuing events and assessing their outcomes. This requires a broader, multi-stakeholder assessment of festival goals, meanings and impacts. There is little more needed in terms of understanding how festivals generate economic benefits, although economists will undoubtedly continue to refine their approaches, but progress can be made in understanding the conditions necessary for generating desired social, cultural and environmental impacts. Determining the value or worth of festivals from a multi-stakeholder perspective should be a priority.

Patterns and Processes: The influence of policy on festivals is a topic in need of development, and there has been nothing in the literature reported by way of evaluation of policy effectiveness. Whole-population studies are needed when examining spatial and temporal patterns, including a population-ecology perspective on how festivals grow, and why they fail or become permanent institutions.

Research Gaps and Priorities: Methodology
Almost all festival studies have been based on single or a few cases, generally within the same culture and environment as the researcher. Few whole-population studies have been attempted in the festivals and events sectors. Combining these with longitudinal assessment of festival evolution will be extremely important in theorizing about environmental influences.

Much research has been conducted on festival motivations, but not on actual experiences or the meanings attached to them. Applying phenomenological (hermeneutics) and experiential assessment methods is a real need, and open to both experimental and participant-observation techniques. Using environmental psychology theory is essential to advance this component. Cross-cultural comparisons of festivals will be useful in generating new ideas from an artistic perspective, as well as in revealing much more in theoretical terms about forms of celebration and meanings.

Experimentation should be attempted as festival studies progresses. This methodology, and resulting theory-building, will likely work well in the areas of design (where laboratory experiments can be implemented) and service management (where festival-goers can be exposed to different management devices). Choice modeling can also help with the testing of new ideas, including the examination of how people value festivals.
To progress a field of study, greater interdisciplinarity is essential, and this has been quite limited in festival studies; the three discourses do not generally inform each other, and cross-over research is rare. Festival-unique theory should emerge, but so far exists only within the classical discourse. Methodologies should not be restrictive, and a single epistemological paradigm (such as quantitative positivism) should not predominate. Ontological progress has to be made in defining and linking key concepts, developing a common vocabulary, and scoping the discourses, themes and topics. This current paper has sought to make a contribution in all these areas.
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