Universitat
Oberta de
Catalunya
UOC

IN3
INTERNET
INTERDISCIPLINARY
INSTITUTE
http://in3.uoc.edu

Festivalization as a Creative City Strategy

Nikolay Zherdev (nzherdev@uoc.edu)
Open University of Catalonia

Doctoral Working Paper

Universitat
Oberta de
Catalunya

IN3
INTERNET
INTERDISCIPLINARY
INSTITUTE

http://in3.uoc.edu

Internet Interdisciplinary Institute (IN3)
http://www.in3.uoc.edu
Edifici MediaTIC
c/ Roc Boronat, 117
08018 Barcelona
Espanya
Tel. 93 4505200

Universitat Oberta de Catalunya (UOC)
http://www.uoc.edu/
Av. Tibidabo, 39-43
08035 Barcelona
Espanya
Tel. 93 253 23 00

© Nikolay Zherdev

Table of contents

Festivalization as a Creative City Strategy

Nikolay Zherdev (nzherdev@uoc.edu)

Open University of Catalonia

Abstract

Applying creative-based strategies, cities strive to be notable and distinctive in order to attract mobile citizens. In many cases it is achieved through transforming cities and cultural quarters into experience spaces. In this sense, one of the most popular instruments of cultural planning implementation is the creation of city identity and its promotion through cultural festivals, which have become a 'must-have' policy for Creative City urban planners attempting to galvanize local cultural life, build a continuity of 'happening' and thus attract creative individuals. These factors turn urban space into a place of constant festival, a phenomenon called festivalization of urban space. Discussing the connections between the Creative City theory and festival studies, the paper aims to bridge a gap between the two by addressing the question how festivalization is applied within the creative city paradigm. The paper concludes that nowadays festivals penetrate to various aspects of cultural, social and economic activities, turning from being a strategy implementation instrument into strategy itself.

Keywords
Festivalization, Creative City, Experience Economy, Inter-Urban Competition.

Introduction

As it was marked by Yeoman (2004), during the last half a century the amount of European festivals has increased from less than a thousand to more than 30 000, which triggered the appearance and fast development of festivals and events industry since early 1990s. Current works on cultural festivals have focused on describing various economic, social and cultural impacts these processes produce broader socioeconomic settings of festival omnipresence in urban space. This paper aims to discuss why and how festivalization, a specific way of organization and formation of urban space and social activities based on festivals, is implemented as a development and urban planning strategy in contemporary city. Moreover, looking at festivalization process as an inherent part of creative city the paper aims to characterize festivalized city and reflect on why creative city and festivalization policies are being developed side-by-side. In closing, author calls for greater attention to festivalization process as a prominent dimension of cultural revitalization of contemporary cities.

In 2002, in his book "The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life" Richard Florida claimed the beginning of the new *creative age*, where a *creative class* is the main driving force leading towards formation of a new *creative city* paradigm (Florida, 2002). This book provoked a large discussion of the creativity benefits and disadvantages in many aspects of social, economical and political life. In the context of urban development, the concept of creative city still attracts [creative city became a major driver for cities across the world and still attracts] high interest of economists, sociologists, policy makers and municipal authorities as one of the most promising ways out of economic crisis and industrial regress.

This paper focuses on cultural festivals as one of the most common instruments of creative city promotion, which have become a 'must-have' policy for urban planners of contemporary cities. Cultural festivals, besides presenting and embodying of new identities of revitalized areas, become a main element in construction of a 'happening' continuity, galvanizing the cultural life and creating proper 'atmosphere' of the urban space. These factors turn urban space into a place of constant festival, a phenomenon that Häußermann and Siebel (1993) called festivalization (*festivalisierung* in German) of urban policies and space. Unlike it was presented by Häußermann and Siebel as a "festivalization of urban politics" (1993) under festivalization we imply not solely periodic mega-events but also (and primarily) small-sized festivals that provide

the *continuous festival* experience[1]. With growing role of constant happening in urban space, which is an integral part of experience economy, festivalization influences both urban space production and consumption of creative city.

By the creative city, Florida (2002) refers to the promotion of cultural revitalization, attracting new creative individuals, stimulation of social participationas well as rising financial support of cultural industries and amenities. This evokes switching strategic priorities of urban development away from the emphasis alone of hard location factors (i.e. hard infrastructure) to soft location factors such as leisure activities and place-based images, emphasizing experiential and cultural characteristics of a place. Indeed, looking at many European and North American cities, the focus from the intensive construction and development of various cultural institutions such as museums, theaters, opera houses, etc. during the last two decades of 20th century has moved towards creativity as "a new method of strategic urban planning" (Landry, 2000: 12; Smith and Krogh Strand, 2011). The 'creativity' approach brings about the prioritization of human capital (Storper & Scott, 2009), the so-called 'creative class', which is supposed to enliven economic and cultural life of a city or a quarter. Taking into account the key role that cultural milieu and experiential aspects that possesses an urban area play in place promotion and attraction of new 'creative' residents (Florida, 2002), municipalities often tend to make their cultural policies more efficient providing city (or quarter) dwellers with continuous cultural experiences. One of the most prominent ways to provide such experiences is through intensification of festivals (Bianchini and Parkinson, 1994; Evans, 2003; García, 2004; Gibson and Stevenson, 2004; Häusserman and Siebel, 1993, Richards and Palmer, 2010).

---

[1] In some cases using the terms of "festivalization" and "eventification" might be confusing. Under certain circumstances they can be applied as synonyms albeit having certain differences that need to be clarified. Some authors (e.g. see Richards, 2007) use the term 'festivalization' in relation to cultural mega-events, while 'eventification' is related to rather small-scale cultural events, but not only festivals (see Jacob, 2010). In order to stay in line with the domain of festival studies and at the same time to emphasize the 'rescaling' of festivalization process, we prefer to focus on small- and medium scale cultural festivals rather than broader term of 'cultural events'. This conditions on preferring the notion of 'festivalization' to 'eventification' in the present research. More elaborated explanation of the concept will be given in parts 3 and 4 of the paper.

1. The creative turn in urban development

One of the main themes of aforementioned Florida's book was an explanation of 'creative class' representatives attraction as a key factor in succeeding under the conditions of creative economy, where human creativity becomes a main driver of urban development. Since the launching of the book, the concepts of 'creative economy', 'creative city' and creativity itself became exceedingly popular among urban theorists and policy-makers. And thus,an impressive number of cities all around the world are implementing creative city policies forming a 'creative' dimension in which interurban competition for attracting new citizens and creative and knowledge entrepreneurs (the ones called 'creative class') is set. But what makes creative economy within the context of urban development so important and popular?

Historical prerequisites of the 'creative' vector of urban development can be found in the intertwined processes of manufacturing (Fordist) economic crisis, emergence of globalization, the political economic restructuring of the Keynesian nation-state and the subsequent decay of industrial urban space in late 1970s, which led to formation of New Urban Politics in the 1980s (Jonas and Wilson, 1999) that emphasized, first a 'entrepreneurial turn' (Harvey, 1989) and subsequently a 'creative turn' (Krätke, 2011) in urban policies aimed at converting former manufacturing based cities into post-industrial economies. Such an economic regime implies growing importance of asthetical and semiotic values production (Lash and Urry, 1994; Molotch, 1996; Scott, 1997). In numerous types of economic sectors consumption patterns predetermine a necessity to provide products and experiences with specific, individual and aesthetic characteristics, which catalyze diversification of marketing as well as production itself: new economy conditions imply prioritizing clients' (or guests') experience (Pine & Gilmore, 1998: 98). This fosters development of marketing strategies, competition (including inter-urban competition as well) and entrepreneurship (Scott, 1997). As the entrepreneurial approach New Urban Politics consolidated during the 1990s, in the last decades the accent, within entrepreneurialism, has shifted towards stressing the importance of knowledge, creative and cultural priorities in urban economies and regeneration policies (Freestone & Gibson, 2006).

One of the clearest manifestations of creative and cultural prevalence in urban policies can be found in the city marketing and branding strategies. Since mid-1990s major part of these strategies were centered around cultural projects, sometimes even changing (or repositioning) the whole representation of a city in attempt to put it at the global or at least regional cultural map (Ashworth and Voogd, 1995; Ward, 1998; Bianchini, 1999). Such environment allows to regard culture as an economic commodity with its own market, demand and supply sides. Due to competitive environment such approaches are turning into a regular phenomenon, which is present almost in every culture-oriented contemporary city.

Besides city marketing, it is possible to distinguish two main economic-based approaches to creative city development (Trip and Romein, 2010). The first one is focused on production perspective (also known as innovative-based approach), which "considers the creative industries as a 'normal' economic sector, although with some rather specific characteristics: small, but crucial for the innovativeness of the urban economy, and to a large extent based on small firms and face-to-face contacts" (p.2). This perspective primarily implies post-industrialization of production, substituting 'traditional' industries with cultural industries like fashion, music, design, etc. In contrast to production-oriented perspective, the second approach "starts from the assumption that 'jobs follow people or 'labour follows capital" (p.3) and therefore is focused on consumption milieu, which implies creative talent attraction as a key success factor. This notion bring us back to the cornerstone of Florida's book - the attraction of creative class as a main economic success factor. It is hard to identify which approach is the prevalent one, since usually these approaches applied in complementary way: both production and consumption often done by the same people (creative class) and often share the same urban space (creative quarters). However, Trip and Romein (2010) suggest that creative city initiatives have economic and production-based background and hence emphasize the production perspective and entrepreneurial nature of creative city policies.

The aspect of entrepreneurialism is also noted by Kong's (2000) listing of creative city distinctive features, which, besides growth of entrepreneurship and public-private partnerships include increasing of infrastructure funding (here: hard infrastructure for cultural production), producing of flagship events fostering cultural tourism and public spaces revitalization. Indeed, all these four characteristics are visible in many cities across the world, which makes creative city one of the main discussion topics nowadays.

Thus, since the introduction of the Creative city concept in 1996 by Landry and Bianchini (see Laundry et al., 1996) and its further popularization by Florida (2002) as one of the most promising ways of urban revitalization and enhancing interurban competitive performance, creativity, as well as its main discursive themes (e.g. post-industrialism, creative class, creative economy, arts-led regeneration etc.), has become one of the most important terms in urban development strategies. Indeed, facing limited resources and pressures to deliver growth and jobs, municipalities are attracted by the perceived easiness of cultural transformation and achieving positive results in a short period of time, as it is may seem from reading 'pro-creative' literature. Such a development model (as well as very notion of 'creative city') has become even more appealing as cities face financial crisis and municipalities need to cut (or even refuse of) traditional methods of tax benefits and provision of hard infrastructure.

With regards to such a switch in development prioties, in the context of creative city inter-urban competition is based on the attractiveness to the mobile consumers (Zukin,

1995) and the key role here belongs to distinctiveness of a city, unique or authentic experience that it has to offer. The concept of experience is thus much important for competitiveness of a city that in the early 1990s emerged a term of experience economy, which refers to "a socioeconomic system where aesthetic experiences, rather than goods or services, form the basis for generating value" (Johansson and Kociatkiewicz, 2011: 392).

2. Experience matters

The explanation of such a shift from hard to soft infrastructure development prioritization could not be possible out of the context of experience economy. As it was mentioned in the previous part, experience production and consumption is one of the main value sources and competitive advantages during the transition from industrialism to post-industrialism and from service economy to experience economy (Pine and Gilmore 1998, 1999). Seen from this perspective, urban space shares the same need in experience production as in case of goods and services production. In the context of inter-urban competition it is possible to argue that "places are also being produced as a something in themselves" (Lorentzen, 2009: 832). This implies higher involvement of customers, visitors and residents into consumption process, building personal relationship with the place. According to Johansson and Kociatkiewicz (2011) a place "needs to provide an experience dimension that has the potential to engage the consumer beyond merely purchasing a product or service" (p. 392).

Here it is necessary to mark three key factors that make individual experience so prominent. Firstly, individuals (including creative class representatives) tend to plan their lives and search for the most comfortable places for work and leisure (Florida, 2002; Lund et al., 2005). This aspect gains even more importance since people's identity can be influenced or even formed by the places they visit and live. Secondly, in the context of experience economy sociable 'atmosphere' becomes a prominent characteristic of a place (Glaeser, 2001). Thirdly, consumption becomes a crucial factor for choosing a place to live:

In the experience economy, consumption becomes a driver of growth, and urban quality development becomes the means to attract consumers. People consume sociability, partake in activities and develop identities and individualities based on their urban living. Both visitors and residents are part of the experience space of the city. They make the place interesting and sociable. Different cities are attractive to

consumers, not because of size but because of their individual qualities (Lorentzen, 2009: 282).

Due to these reasons urban spaces are often transformed or even designed in order to provide necessary conditions for users to establish personal connections with the place. Such transformations can be jointly described by the term of "experiencescapes" - urban landscapes that are strategically planned for experience production and consumption **(**O'Dell, 2005).

It is possible to state that prominence of experincescapes goes beyond tourist attraction purposes, being implemented into everyday life of the citizens on rather permanent than temporary basis (Glaeser, 2001). At the same time blurring of distinction between spaces of work and leisure as well as growing importance of 'third places' (Florida, 2005) make experiences and experiencscapes a part and parcel of a creative city. Florida regards experience as one of the *qualities of a place* necessary to attract creative class representatives since cultural and creative products are rarely confined to a particular place and thus can be produced anywhere depending on the favorable conditions for production and consumption.

Talking about experience, Florida (2002) implicates all the multiplicity of characteristics that influence perception of a place including hard infrastructure, environment as well as intangible aspects like innovation and creative capacity. Indeed, all these factors matter, however it is possible to accentuate urban cultural festival as "a popular organizational form for creating experience spaces, and for marketing cities" (Johansson and Kociatkiewicz, 2011) and an omnipresent galvanizing part of creative areas. The festival, that can be recognized as easy-selling producer of aesthetic values, increase entrepreneurial confidence (Richards, 2007) and employment rates (Herrero et al, 2007) is a prominent means for experience production.

Despite the broadness and nebulosity of theoretical term of 'creative city', on practice it usually comes down to two strategies (in many cases combined), namely creating cultural and knowledge clusters, and organizing either mega and (or) numerous small cultural festivals. The first strategy refers to what Florida (2004) called 'positive benefits of co-location' and creativity and knowledge spillovers: certain tendencies of creative industries to organize horizontal linkages and thus obtain competitive advantages, which are also supposed to stimulate economic growth of the creative area. On policy-making level this leads to formation of cultural and knowledge quarters (Evans, 2009), an approach during 2000s' has turned into something of an urban cultural development hype" (Mommaas, 2004), especially while applying gentrification strategies. Talking about cultural quarters and gentrification it is important to emphasize the link between the existence of cultural activities and increasing of real estate value in the area. In many cases increasing cultural activities is done through construction of flagship development projects (e.g. museum, art gallery or opera house). However, in the current context of economic crisis, shrinking city development budgets made the cities

to switch strategic priorities of urban development away from hard location factors (hard infrastructure) to the second strategy, soft location factors with leisure activities and place-based images, emphasizing experiential and cultural characteristics of a place (Jakob, 2012). Thus, making a focal point on experience economy in cultural planning has turned out to be a critical necessity of any urban development strategy.Indeed, cultural development can be regarded as a kind of 'raw material' for the creation of place distinctiveness, image-building and regeneration of urban fabric (Richards, 2007). In this sense, one of the most popular instruments of cultural planning implementation is creating city identity and its promotion through cultural festivals, which have become an essential policy for creative city urban planners (see Bianchini and Parkinson, 1994; García, 2004; Evans, 2006; Van Aalst and Van Melik, 2012) that helps building proper 'vivid' atmosphere for creative individuals through"visual and audio cues such as outdoor dining, active outdoor recreation, a thriving music scene, active nightlife, and bustling street scene" (Florida, 2005: 99).

3. Festivals in the creative city

Besides the growing importance of festivals in creative industries and urban development strategies, academics point at the role of festival as a cultural activity, having potential to incorporate all the city residents (be it artists, knowledge workers or ordinary residents) which help to build a 'creative community' necessary for the formation of cultural capital and the success of the new creative face of the city. At this point, festivals are an effective instrument for providing the sense of inclusion rather than exclusion of the creative initiatives, albeit with caution about organizational priorities related to mass and elitist cultures. Richards (2007) links the current ubiquitous presence of festivals to a crisis of legitimization of the welfare state's cultural and public policies arguing for general accessibility of festivals for all the city residents.

It can be argued that the connection between cultural planning of the Creative City and Festival has many layers, which can be illustrated within creative city theory elements. Following the structure proposed by Durmaz (2008), we can distinguish three main components of the Creative City: Creativity Strategies, Creative Industries and Creative Community. Indeed, we can hardly imagine any kind of creative metropolis with no support of cultural and knowledge industries, development of local cultural life or promotion of the city and its initiatives. It also can be argued that festivals, being a very specific form of social, artistic and promotional activity, incorporate all these

dimensions. This makes festivals into something more than just another entertainment feature of creative areas, it turns into reality a phenomenon called festivalization of urban space and policies. Richards (2007), talking about festivalization noted "increasing use of flagship festivals and large cultural events as a means to market major cities" (282). However it is possible to argue that the same statement is valid also for a continuity of festivals, which creates the attractive and sometimes 'branded' festivalized atmosphere of a city. This context conduced the rising importance of festivalization, which can be considered as "a new policy paradigm in the field of urban culture" (ibid).

In general, festivalization can be defined as specific mechanisms of organization and formation of urban space and society activities as well as a way of entertainment of city residents and tourists through increasing the quantity and quality of festivals (Karpinska-Krakowiak, 2009). Richards (2007) mean by festivalization mainly policies of mega-events, linking festival to economic growth and investment attraction, while Hitters (2007) considers that festivalization implies continuous festivals, its permanent presence in the urban fabric. Jakob (2012) emphasizes the scalar difference between festivalization and eventification, focusing on her research on small-scaled festivals and other cultural events and thus talking about 'eventification'. In our research we will focus on bringing festivals to the neighborhood level and hence the term 'festivalization' will be used referring to continuous, primarily (but not exclusively) small-scaled festival process. Exploring academic literature, we can distinguish two interrelated types of festivalization: the first refers to cultural policies while the second is related to urban space. however, both things are interrelated and hardly separable.

Besides that, being part of experiencescapes, festivalization implies certain prioritization of creative class attraction over attraction of tourists and thus promotion of place to live rather than place to visit. It's a common knowledge that tourist destinations usually build their marketing strategies on the basis of tourist seasonality (mega-events, lasting several days is not an exception), while festivalization implies lowing the scale of the festival with elongating of festival process, sometimes covering the whole year. This makes city policies being focused primarily on existing and potential residents of the city.

Festivalization as a process can be also regarded as a means of urban space transformation, turning the cultural environment of the city into an attractor producing a positive image of festivalized space. Orientation of cultural policies on creativity brings to life new modes of cultural production and consumption and therefore creating new models of urban growth strategies and coalitions. These models imply the increasing importance of those who produce images and experiences and those for whom these experiences are being produced and hence creative class representatives emerge to prominence, especially its 'super-creative core' (Florida, 2002) – individual artists and artist communities.

4. Festivalizing the creative city

There are several aspects that make festivals something more than just a revitalization or galvanizing instrument of city councils and thus turn festivalization into full-fledged strategy within creative city paradigm. First of these aspects (and the most noticeable one) is the growth tendency of festival movement in *creative* areas: cities, districts or quarters. In many cases these areas have official festival plans and strategies (e.g. Barcelona, Berlin, Amsterdam, Gent, etc.) as a prominent part of cultural development plans. It doesn't mean that festivalization has exclusively top-down orientation: existance of these plans rather indicates the acknowledgement of festivals for cultural development than prioritization of top-down approaches over those coming from below. Second aspect is related to festivals being a necessary part of experiencescapes and their penetration into everyday life. Festival in its continuous dimension is no longer 'framed spontaneous play which contrasts routine everyday life' (Jamieson, 2004: 65). Looking at constant happening of festival it is possible to argue that instead of disrupting the everyday city flow (ibid) festivalization forms it in its own way, changing its spatial constitution and repositioning a particular identity of the city. Besides that, as a part of everyday life festivals are used to anchor the experiencescapes that are highly dependent on footloose cultural and creative industries. As it was suggested by Lorentzen (2009), this is possible since festivals and other cultural events are place-bound from both production and consumptionn perspectives: on the one hand final production of the event takes place in a particular venue (which often becomes a 'brand' since the name of famous music or cinema festivals are usually tightly connected to the place where it is held). On the other hand, in order to consume such events, the customer has to be physically present at the same venue. Hence, festivalization as a continuous (or routine) phenomenon anchors the experience production and consumption to particular area and force people to spend there larger amount of time, which gives significant advantage to place brand and thus leads to economic benefits.

The third aspect is related to deep reconsideration of top-down and bottom-up initiatives as two main factors that form festivalization process. On the one hand top-down initiatives driven by policy makers, and, on the other hand, bottom-up initiatives lead by individual and collective artists. While the initiatives of city administrations and local governments to strategically plan and control festivals and festivalized public spaces are well-studied in academic literature (see Richards, 2009, Answorth and Voogd, 2008; Jamieson, 2004), the second factor is rather unexplored despite its importance. Experience economy brings to life new actors, public-private partnerships, networks and interdependencies that result in new powerplay patterns fostering the production and consumption of experiences (lorentzen). One of the most important new actor that emerged with festivalization is local artists.

Indeed, artists have a two-dimensional involvement in festivalization in the context of the creative city as: object of city attraction policies and, therefore, consumers of urban space, and as well as producers of cultural (or 'creative') content. In the context of growing importance of individual creativity – with the recurrent notions like 'everyone is creative' (Leadbeater, 1999; McRobbie, 2002), we can regard artists as the most creative part of the creative class or, in other words, its 'super-creative core' (Florida, 2002). This makes artists highly welcomed to the creative city for the sake of local creativity boosting, image improvement and attraction of broader strata of creative individuals and creative industries. Indeed, in the context of their specific and vanguard pattern of cultural consumption as creative class representatives, make them an aim for creative talent attraction policies.

On the other hand, we can regard local artists not only as an object of creative talent attraction policies, but also as producers of festivals, urban vitality and "creative atmosphere": we cannot imagine any art festival without artistic content and in certain types of festivals (e.g. music, performance art) without the immediate presence of artist. Yet, in the creative city, artists are not only passive producers of the atmosphere or part of the urban landscape. They are necessarily also entrepreneurs in creating the urban space festivalization and thus vitality. Due to certain similarities (intensive creativity application, tendency to work outside 'comfort areas', challenging mainstream trends) the notion of 'entrepreneur' is a kindred phenomenon to the notion of artist (O'Connor, 2010).

As it was suggested by Becker (2007), artist entrepreneurialism goes beyond purely financial benefits and commercial outcomes, being related also to the new ways of employment generation, practicing craft and professional opportunities. These aspects are determined by 'self-initiative' position of artists as entrepreneurs (Daum, 2005; Von Osten, 2007), resulting into high rates of self-employment. This makes artists being responsible not only for producing the artwork, but also for its promotion and selling. Therefore, the 'producing' role of artists can be traced not only within festival itself, where artists act as content-providers, but also within festivalisation as a process, where artists act as entrepreneurs having their own incentives and goals.

Festivalization nowadays has transformed from mere instrument of policy-makers into full-fledged strategy within creative city paradigm, which enriches and transforms the city in which it occurs. Having said that, it is nevertheless important to mark that festivalization also carries certain risks. Being a part of experience economy and in some cases strategically planned phenomenon festivalization represent particular images of the city, the images that festival organizers want to highlight. This overshadows other representations, creating a simplified picture of a city (Kociatkiewicz, 2011). Getz (2012) points at risks of 'commodification' and

'commoditization' processes that follow festivalization, leading towards loosing cultural identities, whether it be a particular festival, a creative quarter or a city. Indeed, as an increasingly popular development paradigm, festivalization (as well as cultural-creative regeneration in general) bears a risk of homogenization of spatial characteristics and 'banalising urban experiences' (Bianchini, 2004) in order to satisfy those looking for the ' authentic' experience of the city (Russo and Sans, 2009).

Besides that, there is also possible shortcomings of such paradigm application regarding social and spatial exclusion of non-creative (or non-festivalized) people, legitimizing gentrification, difficulties with integration of 'creative class' into regional economy, existence of various social and economic nuances that may hinder any positive effects (see Peck, 2005; Scott, 2006). Metz (2007, p. 30) argues that positioning a city as festival city can cause switching priorities from citizens to entrepreneurs.

5. Rescaling of festivalization

Taking into account the reach history of festivals, it is possible to assume that festivalization (at it broadest) existed long time before the concept was introduced by Häußermann and Siebel in 1993 (Yeoman, 2004). However, during the recent decades, many authors marked its influence on economic development through tourism and place marketing (Quinn, 2006; Getz, 2008; González-Reverté and Miralbell-Izard, 2005) and cultural authenticity of contemporary city (Richards, 2007). Taking this into account, the article stresses the exceptional role of festivals and festivalization particularly in the context of creative city development. Indeed, the growing importance of creative city paradigm accompanied by recent economic perturbations and rise of inter-urban competition made festivalization process even more important. One can argue that the reason of such an importance lies in the field of experience economy. As it was mentioned by Johansson and Kociatkiewicz (2011), experience economy has put festivals into the general context of experience production and consumption, transforming the general self-positioning as well as existing infrastructure of modern cities, where "the streets, buildings and parks of the city are temporarily claimed to assist in the production of the festive city space [and] the city's architecture is mobilized for experience-based consumption" (Johansson and Kociatkiewicz, 2011:396). Such a convergence between festival and experience-oriented development results in two major outcomes.

Firstly, the growing number of festivals with a high number of mid-size and low-scale ones (Yeoman, 2004) determines the new 'small-scale' role of festivalization. One of the most noticeable trait of previous studies on festivalization is emphasizing temporality and large-scale orientation of festivalization process. Usually the term 'festivalization' is applied to refer to large cultural festivals and other mega-events (see Richards, 2007), which is the case, however in the context of creative city development I argue for an alternative point of view on festivalization. Bearing in mind the importance of large-scale cultural events (ECoC, big name music festivals, etc.) we can point at growing prominence of continuous and in majority small-scaled festivalization happening in the creative city. It can be argued that such a process is most visible on the level of cultural quarters, which are one of the characteristics of the post-industrial city (Miles, 2000).

At the same time such intensification of festival activities influences the temporality of festivalization. Usually festivalization is treated in academic literature as a phenomenon located outside everyday realm, something that "contrasts routine [of] everyday life" (Jamieson, 2004: 65). It is possible to assume that this perspective derives from festival nature, which, as it was described by Falassi (1987), is a temporal phenomenon limited in time. However the process of festivalization in the creative city influences the everyday life: eventful and creative atmosphere is formed through festivalization penetration into daily life of creative or cultural areas. Hence, one can argue the change of festivalization perspective: from mega to micro and from temporal to permanent, festivalization is not only changing the urban space for certain (limited) period of time but rather becoming a part and parcel of everyday life of modern creative city.

Secondly, besides physical and symbolic transformation of the city, festivalization determines certain shift in control over experience production process. Having in mind all the specificities of experience economy, one can argue that only specific types of experience production fits experience economy goals. With the growing continuity of festivalization process the new role of (local) artists as the producers of such 'appropriate' experience constituent is emerging. Such experience production is related to the presence of various art spaces, usually organized and held by individual artists or small artist groups, whose presence in aggregate stimulates cultural and economic development of neighborhoods. Markusen et al (2006) argues that success of such projects relates to the 'energy' of constant, around the clock activities in contrast to the flagship projects, where schedules are strictly defined.

However, all the diversity of festivalization actros and stakeholders is not limited by solely municipality initiatives and local artists: such a twofold approach does not take into account the side of social associations that also can be regarded as initiator and active supporter of festivalization processes. Such division of organizational activities

between bottom-up and top-down sides partly grades artificial orchestrating of festivalized space where top-down side tend to take strong steps to carefully control the construction and management of the festival space. This make festivalization processes more informal, spontaneous and chaotic, where collective action have been taken place, which can be considered as one of the distinctive characteristics of experiencescapes (Bogason et al., 2004). With regards to such a changing role of artists it is possible to project classic Bakhtin's analysis of subversive nature of the festival (1984) on the artists as festival organizers. Bakhtin described festival nature as a challenging of status quo, yet imploded into broader social order implying primarily festival audiences as carriers of such a nature. However, changing role of festivalization emphasize informal and unofficial bottom-up initiatives and ambitions, which sometimes rather provocative, experimental or even disruptive. These initiatives often come from independent artists, social associations and other community-level stakeholders, whose festival endeavors can be considered as reframing of urban space meanings from the grassroots.

With regards to such changes within festivalization process we need to mark that festivalization is not limited to creative city and experience economy. This process is multilayered and at the same time many-sided, engaging various issues of urban regeneration, gentrification, place marketing, etc. This article considers the process of festivalization and its outcomes exclusively within the intersection between festival studies and creative city theory.

Conclusion

Cultural festivals, besides presenting and embodying of new identities of revitalized areas, become a main element in construction of a 'happening' continuity, galvanizing the cultural life and creating proper 'atmosphere' of the urban space, which became increasingly important due to creative city turn in urban development. These factors turn urban space into a place of 1) continuous and 2) manifold festivalization process, where experience production and consumption are part and parcel of the everyday life of the creative city. Yet, since this process is formed by both top-down and bottom-up initiatives, it is hard to classify it as either an artificial or organic construct.

Considering the existing works in the academic domains of creative city and festival studies, the paper argues for a broadening of festivalization perspective in creative city context in terms of scale, time and power. In this sense, more research is needed on cultural and creative neighborhoods as main nodes of 'low-level' festivalization process

as well as artist communities and other 'grassroot' actors in order to better understand festivalization process as well as potential changes in relationships between top-down and bottom-up approaches to cultural planning.

Besides that, it is crucial to understand the the potential role in festivalisation of (non-creative) neighborhood residents and economic actors (local business, real state developers, etc) as well as the complexity of how these actors interrelate and their relation with structural processes such as governance regimes or cultural-historical trajectories, which constitute specific urban setting in which the process takes place, namely creative district, quarter, neighborhood or (in some cases) the whole city, since urban space besides being socially constructed also shapes production, consumption and organizational modes of forming festivalization. We cannot imagine festivalization of *any* urban setting, it should have certain historical, tangible and intangible specificity related to urban governance, cultural life and residents of the area.

Bibliographic references

ASHWORTH, G. J. and Voogd, H. (1995) Selling the City: Marketing Approaches in Public Sector Urban Planning (London: Wiley).

BECKER, G. D. (2007) "Adventuring" Arts Entrepreneurship Curricula in Higher Education: An Examination of Present Efforts, Obstacles, and Best Practices. Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society, 37 (2), pp. 87-112.

BIANCHINI, F. (1999) "The Relationship between Cultural Resources and Urban Tourism Policies: Issues from European Debates", in D. Dodd and A. van Hemel (eds) Planning Cultural Tourism in Europe: a Presentation of Theories and Cases, Amsterdam: Boekman Foundation.

BIANCHINI, F. (2004) A Crisis in Urban Creativity? Reflections on the Cultural Impacts of Globalisation, and on the Potential of Urban Cultural Policies. In the Age of the City: The Challenges for Creative Cities, Osaka.

BIANCHINI, F. and PARKINSON, M. (eds) (1994) Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

BOURDIEU, P. (1977) Outline of a Theory of Practice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Creative Metropoles (2011) Situation Analysis of 11 Cities, Final report. Tallinn: Creative Metropoles.

DURMAZ, B., YIGITCANLAR, T., and VELIBEYOUGLU, K. (2008) Creative Cities and the Film Industry: Antalya's Transition to a Eurasian Film Centre. The Open Urban Studies Journal, Vol 1, pp. 1-10.

GARCÍA, B. (2004) Urban Regeneration, Arts Programming and Major Events: Glasgow 1990, Sydney 2000 and Barcelona 2004. International Journal of Cultural Policy, 10, pp. 103–118.

EVANS, G. L. (2003) Hard-branding the cultural city: from Prado to Prada, International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 27(2), pp. 417– 440

EVANS, G. L. (2006) "Branding the City of Culture – the Death of City Planning?" In J. Monclús M. and Guàrdia (eds)Culture, Urbanism and Planning. Aldershot, Burlington, VT: Ashgate. pp.197-214.

EVANS, G. L. (2009) Creative Cities, Creative Spaces and Urban Policy. Urban Studies, 46 (5/6), pp.1003-1040.

FLORIDA, R. (2002) The Rise of the Creative Class: and How it's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life. New York: Basic Books.

FLORIDA, R. (2004) Cities and the Creative Class. London: Routledge.

FLORIDA, R. (2005) The Flight of the Creative Class. New York: Harper Business.

FRANK, S. and Roth, S. (2000) Festivalization and the media: Weimar, Culture City of Europe 1999. International Journal of Cultural Policy, 6(2), pp.219–241.

GETZ, D. (2012) Event Studies: Theory, Research and Policy for Planned Events.New York: Routledge.

GIBSON, L. and STEVENSON, D. (2004) Urban space and the uses of culture, International Journal of Cultural Policy, 10(1), pp. 1–4.

HARVEY, D. (1989) "From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: the Transformation of Urban Governance in Late Capitalism". Geografiska Annaler, 71 B, pp. 3–17.

HÄUSERMANN, H. and SIEBEL, W. (1993) Die Politik der Festivalisierung und die Festivalisierung der Politik. Große Ereignisse in der Stadtpolitik. In H.Häussermann and W. Siebel (eds) Festivalisierung der Stadtpolitik: Stadtentwicklung durch große Projekte. Leviathan. Sonderheft13. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag. pp. 7-31.

HITTERS, E. (2007) Porto and Rotterdam As European Capitals of Culture: Towards the Festivalization of Urban Cultural Policy. In G.Richards (Ed.) Cultural Tourism: Global and Local Perspectives. New York: Haworth Press, pp. 281-301.

JACOB, D. (2011) Constructing the Creative Neighborhood: Hopes and Limitations of Creative City Policies in Berlin. City, Culture and Society (1)1, pp.193-198.

JAKOB, D. (2012) "The Eventification of Place: Urban Development and Experience

Consumption in Berlin and New York City". European Urban and Regional Studies, published online, October 3, 2012, DOI: 10.1177/0969776412459860.

JOHANSSON, M. and KOCIATKIEWICZ, J. (2011) City festivals: Creativity and control in staged urban experiences. European Urban and Regional Studies 18: 392–405

JONAS, A. E. G. and Wilson, D. (Eds) (1999) The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Karpińska-Krakowiak, M. (2009) Festivalisation of the City: Contemporary Examples. Urban People, 11(2). pp.338–350.

KONG, L. (2000). Culture, economy, policy: trends and developments. Geoforum, 31, 385–390.

KRÄTKE, S. (2011) The Creative Capital of Cities; Interactive Knowledge Creation and the Urbanization Economies of Innovation. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

LANDRY, C. (2000) The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators.London: Earthscan.

LANDRY, C., Greene, L., Matarasso, F. and Bianchini, F. (1996) The Art of Regeneration: Urban Renewal Through Cultural Activity. London: Comedia.

LASH, S. and URRY, J. (1994) Economies of Signs and Space. London: Sage.

LEADBEATER, C. (1999) Living on Thin Air: The New Economy. London: Viking.

LORENTZEN, A. (2009) Cities in the experience economy, European Planning Studies, 17(6), pp. 829–845.

MANERI, M. and TER WAL, J. (2005) The Criminalisation of Ethnic Groups: An Issue for Media Analysis, Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 6 (3), pp.9-19

McROBBIE, A. (2002) "From Holloway to Hollywood: Happiness at Work in the New Cultural Economy?" In P. Du Gay and M. Pryke (eds.) Cultural Economy: Cultural Analysis and Commercial Life. London: Sage.

MOLOTCH, H. (1996) LA as design product: how art works in a regional economy. In The City: Las Angeles and Urban Theory at the End of the Twentieth Century, A.J. Scott and E.W. Soja (eds.), pp. 225–275. University of California Press, Los Angeles.

MOMMAAS, H. (2004) Cultural Clusters and the Post-Industrial city: Towards the Remapping of Urban Cultural Policy, Urban Studies, 41(3), pp. 507–532.

OOI, C-S. and PEDERSEN, S.J.(2010) City Branding and Film Festivals: Re-evaluating Stakeholders' Relations. Place Branding and Public Diplomacy 6 (4), pp.316-332.

PECK, J. (2005) "Struggling with the Creative Class". International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 29 (4), pp.740-770.

PINE, B.J. and GILMORE, J.H. (1999) The Experience Economy: Work is Theatre and Every Business is a Stage.Boston Mass: HBS Press.

QUINN, B. (2005) Arts Festivals and the City. Urban Studies, 41 (5/6), pp.927-42.

RICHARDS, G. (Ed.). (2007) Cultural Tourism: Global and Local Perspectives. New York: Haworth.

RICHARDS, G., & PALMER, R. (2010). Eventful cities, cultural management and urban revitalization. Oxford: Elsevier. pp.516.

SCOTT, A. J. (1997). The cultural economy of cities. International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 21(2), 323–339.

SCOTT, A. J. (2006) Creative Cities: Conceptual Issues and Policy Questions. Journal of Urban Affairs 28, pp.1–17.

Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft Arbeit und Frauen in Berlin (2005) Kulturwirtschaft in Berlin 2005. Berlin: Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft Arbeit und Frauen in Berlin.

SMITH A and von KROGH STRAND I. (2011) Oslo's New Opera House: Cultural Flagship, Regeneration Tool or Destination Icon? European Urban and Regional Studies,18, pp. 93–110.

STORPER, M. and SCOTT, A.J. (2009) 'Rethinking human capital, creativity and urban growth', Journal of Economic Geography, 9(1), pp.147-167.

TREMBLAY, D.G. and BATTAGLIA, A. (2012) El Raval and Mile End: A Comparative Study of Two Cultural Quarters between Urban Regeneration and Creative Clusters, Journal of Geography and Geology, 4(1), pp.56-74

VAN AALST, I. and VAN MELIK, R. (2012) City Festivals and Urban Development: does Place Matter? European Urban and Regional Studies. 19, pp.195–206.

VON OSTEN, M. (2007). "Unpredictable Outcomes". In G. Lovink & N. Rossiter (Eds), My Creativity Reader: A Critique of Creative Industries. Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures, pp. 49-58.

WARD, S. (1998). Selling places: The marketing and promotion of towns and cities, 1850-2000. New York: E & FN Spon

WATERMAN, S. (1998). Carnivals for Elites? The Cultural Politics of Arts Festivals. Progress in Human Geography,22 (1), pp.54-74.

YEOMAN, I. (2004). Festival and Events Management. An International Arts and Culture Perspective. Amsterdam: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Resumen

Mediante la aplicación de estrategias basadas en la creatividad las ciudades intentan destacar con el fin de atraer a los ciudadanos móviles. En muchos casos, se logra a través de la transformación de las ciudades y barrios culturales en espacios de experiencia. En este sentido, uno de los instrumentos más populares de implementación de la planificación cultural es la creación de la identidad de la ciudad y su promoción a través de festivales culturales . Estos festivales se han convertido en una política de " must-have " para los planificadores urbanos de la Ciudad Creativa que intentan galvanizar la vida cultural local, construir una continuidad del happening y así atraer a personas creativas. Estos factores convierten el espacio urbano en un lugar de festival constante, un fenómeno llamado festivalización del espacio urbano. Centrandose en las conexiones entre la teoría de la Ciudad Creativa y los estudios del festival , el trabajo tiene como objetivo cubrir tender puentes entre los dos, abordando la cuestión de cómo se aplica festivalización dentro del paradigma de Ciutat Creativa. El documento concluye que hoy en día los festivales penetran endiversos aspectos de las actividades culturales, sociales y económicos, pasando de ser un instrumento de aplicación de la estrategia a una estrategia en ella misma.

Palabras clave

Festivalización , Creative City, economía de la experiencia , la Competencia inter-urbana.

Resum

Mitjançant l'aplicació d'estratègies basades en la creativitat les ciutats intenten destacar per tal d' atraure els ciutadans mòbils . En molts casos , s'aconsegueix a través de la transformació de les ciutats i barris culturals en espais d'experiència. En aquest sentit , un dels instruments més populars d'implementació de la planificació cultural és la creació de la identitat de la ciutat i la seva promoció a través de festivals culturals. Aquests festivals s'han convertit en una política de " must - have " per als planificadors urbans de la Ciutat creativa que intenten galvanitzar la vida cultural local , construir una continuïtat del happening i així atraure persones creatives . Aquests factors converteixen l'espai urbà en un lloc de festival constant , un fenomen anomenat festivalització de l'espai urbà . Discutint les connexions entre la teoria de les Ciutats Creatives i els estudis del festival , el treball té com a objectiu obrir un diàleg entre els dos , abordant la qüestió de com s'aplica la estivalització dins del paradigma de Ciutat Creativa. El document conclou que actualment els festivals penetren a diversos aspectes de les activitats culturals , socials i econòmics, passant de ser un instrument d'aplicació de l'estratègia en l'estratègia en ella mateixa.

Paraules clau

Festivalització , Creative City , economia de l'experiència.

Nikolay Zherdev
nzherdev@uoc.edu
PhD candidate
Open University of Catalonia

Nikolay Zherdev is a PhD student at the IN3-UOC. His research interests include cultural transformation of contemporary cities, cultural policies and creative city theory. At the moment he is writing a dissertation on the development of Barcelona and Berlin's creative neighborhoods. He has a MSc degree in Leisure, Tourism and Environment (Wageningen University).

Nikolay Zherdev
nzherdev@uoc.edu
Doctorand
Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

Nikolay Zherdev es estudiante de doctorado del IN3-UOC. Su investigacion se centra en la transformación cultural de las ciudades contemporáneas, políticas culturales y teoría de la ciudad creativa. Actualmente está escribiendo su tesis sobre el desarrollo de barrios creativos en Barcelona y Berlín. Tiene un máster por la universidad de Wageningen en Ocio, turismo y medioambiente.

Universitat Oberta de Catalunya

IN3 INTERNET INTERDISCIPLINARY INSTITUTE

http://in3.uoc.edu