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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Festivals are at the heart of British music and at the heart of the British music industry. They form an essential part of the worlds of rock, classical, folk and jazz, forming regularly occurring pivot points around which musicians, audiences, and festival organisers plan their lives.

Funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the purpose of this report is to chart and critically examine available writing about the impact of British music festivals, drawing on both academic and ‘grey’/cultural policy literature in the field. The review presents research findings under the headings of:

- economy and charity;
- politics and power;
- temporality and transformation;
- creativity: music and musicians;
- place-making and tourism;
- mediation and discourse;
- health and well-being; and
- environment: local and global.

It concludes with observations on the impact of academic research on festivals as well as a set of recommendations for future research. To accompany the review, a 170-entry, 63,000-word annotated bibliography has been produced, which is freely accessible online, via the project website (https://impactoffestivals.wordpress.com/project-outputs/).
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INTRODUCTION

Festivals are now at the heart of the British music industry and are an essential part of the worlds of rock, classical, folk and jazz (Frith 2007). Festivals are big business: one recent report by UK Music puts the total direct and indirect spend generated by ‘music tourism’ for festivals in the UK in 2014 at more than £1.7 billion, sustaining over 13,500 full time jobs (based on 232 music festivals, UK Music 2015).

More specifically, Glyndebourne generates £11 million of Gross Value Added (GVA) for East Sussex’s economy every year (BOP 2013a), while the total gross direct spend for the 2007 Glastonbury Festival was estimated at over £73 million (Baker Associates 2007).

The 21st century has experienced a ‘boom’ in music festivals in Britain (Webster 2014), with a 71 per cent increase in the number of outdoor rock and pop music festivals held between 2003 and 2007 (Anderton 2008), and an increase of 185% in music festival income in Scotland over a five year period (EKOS 2014b). Concurrently, there has been an increasing amount of academic interest around festivals and impact from a variety of disciplines (cf Getz 2008, 2010).

From an initial focus on the economic impacts of cultural experiences in the 1960s and 1990s, through to a broader assessment of impact which considers instrumental and intrinsic value (Carnwath and Brown 2014), the literature shows that festivals play a significant economic, social and cultural role at local and international levels.

Defining what constitutes a ‘music festival’ is not a straightforward task; indeed, a typology of British pop festivals found seventeen different types alone (Stone 2009). One can broadly characterise festivals in three sometimes overlapping ways: greenfield events which predominantly programme music, often involving camping, open-air consumption and amplification; venue-based series of live music events linked by theme or genre, usually urban, and street-based urban carnival.

The report has been restricted to festivals within Britain; critical work about festivals is included from English language scholarship internationally. The report considers both festivals that take place in permanent or semi-permanent structures, and those outdoor festivals which utilise ‘mobile spaces’ (Kronenberg 2011).

The focus on a single (admittedly quite large) geographical location ensures that the report gathers together festivals which, to an extent at least, have a shared economic and cultural history. One of our findings is that there is more work on the impact of festivals within the folk and pop literature (rock, jazz, ‘world’, etc.) than from the classical/opaera literature, the latter of which have ‘traditionally been concerned with works and composers rather than the performance and concert context’ (Doctor et al 2007:6). See Appendix 1 for notes on the methodology employed.

A literature review of festival studies carried out by Donald Getz (2010) found three main approaches at play: sociologically/anthropologically based discourses on the roles, meanings and impacts of festivals in society and culture, festival tourism, and festival management, the latter two particularly focusing on economic impact and audience motivation.

A number of economic impact reports can also be found within the grey literature, more recently broadened to encompass social and cultural impacts as well (cf Williams and Bowdin 2007; Chouguley et al 2011). However, the more qualitative-based research tends to emphasise managerial, logistical and marketing elements that can obscure the cultural and social aspects of festivals (Anderton 2006).

The more qualitatively-based research from anthropology, sociology and cultural studies, often takes starting points from Émile Durkheim’s concept of ‘collective effervescence’ (1912/2001), Raymond Williams’ ideas about culture and society (1958), Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of the carnivalesque (1968), Christopher Small’s idea of ‘musicking’ (1998), and current theorisations around the process of ‘festivalisation’ (Bennett et al 2014; Newbold et al 2015), a collection by George McKay (2015a) brings together work on history, music, media, and culture of the pop festival.

Urban studies is also a rich source of literature, accounts about festivals in general tend either to be celebratory, focusing on the economic and place-making benefits of festivals, or more critical, in which festivals are instruments of hegemonic power which shift focus from everyday social problems (Waitt 2008), or meaningless collections of events (Payne 2006, AEA 2006), which are ‘placeless’: divorced from their local community (MacLeod 2006). Other fields which confirm the space of the festival as one of remarkable interdisciplinary interest range from medical studies to crowd management to waste management.

The report considers impacts on local and regional economic and cultural competitiveness, and presents the impact of festivals on both the temporary and the permanent community which camps or lives at the festival location. It also considers the processes through which arts and humanities research has impacted on festivals and offers recommendations for future research.
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subjective experience, for instance. Sometimes less tangible values and impacts: music festival as transformative of economic impact reports. But we place such material alongside other pragmatic interest in such data, and include in Appendix 2 a table specifically about our findings about the kinds of impact British music festivals have had, both short- and long-term. We have categorised these into eight areas.

At a time when revenue from recording has decreased, festivals for some musicians have become an essential income stream; the record industry now launches new albums by established artists at the start of the festival season, and tries to ‘break’ new acts through key festival appearances (Anderton 2008).

Much work has shown that music festivals have the capacity to generate positive economic impacts, to varying degrees, including employment and increased revenues from locals and visitors, as well as providing focal points for marketing, attracting visitors and growing the tourism sector of the local economy (Brookes and Landry 2002; AB Associates 2000; Morris Hargreaves McIntyre 2004; SQW 2005; Lynn Jones Research 2006, EKOS 2006, 2011; Baker Associates 2007; SAM 2008; Chouguley et al 2011; BOP 2013a, 2013b; Li and Chen 2013).

Festivals have been key to the growth of the live music sector in the UK in recent times. As Simon Frith (2007) notes, the most significant means of expanding the size of the live audience for British promoters has ‘undoubtedly’ been festivals, which are now the ‘key asset’ in promoters’ portfolios for obvious economic reasons: the crowd size can be expanded beyond that of a venue, and economies of scale can kick in (ticketing, marketing, staging).

The local economy gets £100m a year ... So there’s no discussion about not allowing the festival a licence any more. They won’t stop it now.”

MICHAEL EAVIS, GLASTONBURY FESTIVAL; BBC 2008

THE IMPACT OF FESTIVALS:
A SURVEY OF THE FIELD(S)

We now turn attention to our core work, which is to present in a structured overview our findings about the kinds of impact British music festivals have had, both short- and long-term. We have categorised these into eight areas. We do pay particular attention to economic impact as we recognise the pragmatic interest in such data, and include in Appendix 2 a table specifically of economic impact reports. But we place such material alongside other sometimes less tangible values and impacts: music festival as transformative subjective experience, for instance.
Music festivals have been sites for social and political debate, and sometimes action (McKay 2003, 2005, 2015c), and the frivolity of festivals sometimes masks deeper socio-political issues around race, religion, class, sexuality, and gender (Falassi 1987; Hughes 1988; Burr 2006; Bartle 2013; Wilks 2013; Johansson and Toraldo 2015; Pielichaty 2015).

Festivals are or have been remarkable sites for experimenting with alternative lifestyles and practices, including narcotics (Clarke 1982; McKay 2000; Wolfenden 2004; Partridge 2006; O’Grady 2015; McKay 2015b), and may be overtly or covertly political (Clarke 1982; Burr 2006; Chalcraft and Magaudda 2011). On the other hand, from opera festivals at Glyndebourne to jazz festivals at Beaulieu and rock festivals at Knebworth, the history of festivals in Britain has also been inextricably intertwined with the British aristocracy and the Establishment (Clarke 1982; Cobbold 1996; Jolliffe 1999; McKay 2000, 2004; cf Gornall 2015), often as a means of raising revenue for estates.

The radical motivation for some festivals ranges from the countercultural free festival movement of the 1970s (Clarke 1982; McKay 1996; Worthington 2004) to the free party movement of the 1990s (McKay 1998; Partridge 2006; Martin 2014) to the idea of the ‘protestival’ (St John 2015) in today’s alter-globalisation movement. Within rock/pop festivals, two broad trajectories have emerged: the more overtly commercial festival and those which emerged from a post-hippie countercultural heritage and which eschew (overt) commercialism (Anderton 2011; cf Thomas 2008).

Arguably, Glastonbury reflects both trajectories: celebrated for its anti-commercial countercultural cool, it can also be described as a ‘modern cathedral of consumption’ in which experiences are ‘mediated and managerially puppeteered’ (Flinn and Frew 2013: 418; McKay 2000; Thomas 2008).

Some festivals have faced opposition from the state and local residents, and there can be tension between the imperative for regulation and participants’ desire for spontaneity (Burr 2006). The form of music matters as to the degree of opposition: classical festivals rarely elicit opposition whereas rock, pop or dance music festivals do, ‘reflecting a wider privileging of, and discrimination against, certain groups’ (Gibson and Connell 2009: 241); the latter are more likely to be heavily policed than others (Talbot 2011).


This is London: a global, multicultural city which should understand that its own multiculturalism is an inextricable part of its globalism, and that the Notting Hill Carnival needs London, just as London and the UK need the Carnival.”

CHRIS MULLARD, 2003 CITED IN MANN WEAVER DREW 2003: 55
**TEMPORALITY AND TRANSFORMATION**

Festivals are often cyclical and annual (Falassi 1987; Anderton 2006), and occur at particular periods within the annual calendar; for some, they therefore become a pivot around which the rest of the year is planned (Pitts 2005).

Music festivals allow for intense production and consumption of music over a relatively short period of time in a particular geographical place, and are sites for the intensification of ideas and behaviour (Pitts 2004), and for ‘musicking’: music-based rituals in which the values of the group are explored, affirmed, and celebrated, and where the participants’ ideal (even utopian) form of society is explored (Small 1998).

Festivals are places for being with like-minded people and for engendering feelings of belonging, ‘communitas’, and community (Pitts 2004, Pitts and Spencer 2008; Burland and Pitts 2010; Neville and Reicher 2011; Pitts and Burland 2013; Laing and Mair 2015). Festivals are often sites of multicultural and multigenerational music consumption, where different generations of fans (including families) can congregate and socialise (Bennett 2013). Music festival attendance can enhance social cohesion (Penrose 2013; Kaushal and Newbold 2015) and develop participants’ social capital (Wilks 2009), but the ‘superficial forms of temporary social cohabitation’ (Payne 2006: 56) found at some festivals creates ‘bonding’ social capital – the reinforcement of existing relationships – but less so ‘bridging’ capital – new and enduring social connections with previously unconnected attendees (Wilks 2011).

Motivation for music festival attendance is not purely about the music (Gelder and Robinson 2009; Abreu-Novais and Arcodia 2013; Burland and Pitts 2013; Webster 2014) but about the overall festival experience; motivation to attend festivals in general is to seek cultural enrichment, education, novelty, and/or socialisation (Crompton 1997). As well as the performers, audiences too have strong roles to play in shaping the character and ethos of festivals (Pitts 2004), sometimes through ‘relational performance’ which places the festival-goers centre-stage (O’Grady 2013; O’Grady and Kill 2013; Robinson 2015).

Festivals also provide volunteers with learning and development opportunities (Jones and Munday 2001; Mann Weaver Drew 2003; Norfolk and Norwich Festival 2013), and can improve the skills and knowledge of practitioners and help them develop professional networks (CEBR 2013).

“**You’re in a private area where you’ve had to have a ticket to get in so everyone’s like-minded. There’s no-one malicious there, no-one’s going to come up to you to distract you while your wallet’s being pinched. Walk around drunk all day and not feel unsafe – it’s great!”**

FOLK FESTIVAL-GOER, CITED IN WILKS 2011: 291

**“I went down with four or five people that had no notion of folk and they enjoyed it so much they are actually doing Morris dancing. At festivals you do find out about new things.”**

FOLK FESTIVAL-GOER, CITED IN MORKIS HARGREAVES McINTYRE 2004: 7

Motivation for music festival attendance is not purely about the music (Gelder and Robinson 2009; Abreu-Novais and Arcodia 2013; Burland and Pitts 2013; Webster 2014) but about the overall festival experience; motivation to attend festivals in general is to seek cultural enrichment, education, novelty, and/or socialisation (Crompton and McKay 1997). As well as the performers, audiences too have strong roles to play in shaping the character and ethos of festivals (Pitts 2004), sometimes through ‘relational performance’ which places the festival-goers centre-stage (O’Grady 2013; O’Grady and Kill 2013; Robinson 2015).

Festivals also provide volunteers with learning and development opportunities (Jones and Munday 2001; Mann Weaver Drew 2003; Norfolk and Norwich Festival 2013), and can improve the skills and knowledge of practitioners and help them develop professional networks (CEBR 2013).

“**It’s going to sound corny, but, well, it’s a kind of utopia, really, something outside of the normal world we all live in.”**

MICHAEL EAVIS, GLASTONBURY FESTIVAL, 1995, CITED IN MCKAY 2000, 29
Festivals can be sites for musical experimentation and hybridity (Hutnyk 1998; Penrose 2013; Kaushal and Newbold 2015), ‘essential vehicles’ for the innovation and affirmation of daring artistic practices (Payne 2006), where ‘moments of mutual enrichment of the local by musics from elsewhere are commonplace’ (Blake 1997: 178).

Headliners may be internationally renowned musicians but festivals also provide platforms for up-and-coming (local) musicians; music festival producers/promoters are therefore both cultural importers and investors (Webster 2011), the flipside of which being occasional claims of ‘cultural invasion’ and even elitism (Harvie 2003). Performance at particular festivals can enhance the status of a musician and increase the chances of further festival bookings (Morris Hargreaves McIntyre 2004; Chalcraft and Magaudda 2011); other festivals include elements of adjudication in which musicians are judged and rewarded (Pitts 2004; Oronsolo Paleor and Wijnberg 2006).

Festivals are often sites for showcasing local talent and for creating a platform for exporting musicians abroad (Payne and Jeanes 2010). They can be ‘key tools’ for developing new audiences for musicians and for genres more broadly (Jazz Development Trust 2001). They thus function as trusted ‘curators’ in which listeners are more willing to take risks in the music they experience (Pitts 2005) and in the venues they attend; indeed, some festivals even sell out before the acts have been announced (Frith 2007). Festivals are sites for learning and personal development for musicians, audiences, and crew (including volunteers), and may even contribute to social inclusion via political engagement and ‘communitas’ (Laing and Mair 2015).

However, there is little research yet about the specific impacts of festivals on musicians/composers and/or genre development (cf LeGrove 1999; Philips 2012), or even on the important roles of festivals in commissioning new work or as sites for musical premières (cf Jolliffe 1999; SAM 2008). The commercialisation of festivals and the need to compete across markets can be seen in the inclusion of ‘popular music’ into festivals such as world and folk, or other art forms such as comedy and ballet into music festivals, although this can have subsequent impacts on participants’ perceptions of authenticity (Hutnyk 1998; Burns 2007; Matheson 2008).

That festival gig for us was really great ... Lots of people there were industry, lots of people were reviewers ... And we’re in talks with a couple of people who were there about festivals in the future ... so possible other gigs may come out of it as well.”

BEX BURCH, BAND LEADER, VULA VIEL, 2016

“Festivals and weekends are like being in a sweet shop – you have to sample everything! If you miss one item ... you feel cheated!”

CHAMBER MUSIC FESTIVAL-GOER, CITED IN PITTS 2008: 230
Festivals have become ‘ubiquitous’ within tourism and place marketing campaigns (Gibson and Connell 2005: 223) and are a cultural mechanism for reputational gain or transformation of locale. They are vehicles for celebrating, constructing and maintaining national or cultural identity (Blake 1997; McKean 1998; Cannadine 2008; Matheson 2008; Garrod and Dowell 2014); diasporic and migrant cultures are reflected in festival practice—from ‘mas’ (Trinidadian carnival) to fleadh to mela.

Reports into festivals’ economic impact are often (perhaps unsurprisingly) superlative-heavy, the authors aware of the need to position their festival favourably in competitive local, regional and international markets. For example: Notting Hill Carnival is ‘both a major arts festival and the largest single public event staged on a regular basis in London’ (Mann Weaver Drew 2003: 11); Edinburgh’s summer festivals ‘represent the world’s biggest arts Festival’ (SQW 2005: 2; emphases added).

Music festivals often contribute to a positive image of a locale, both internally to its residents and externally to visitors, and hence attract people to live in the place and tourists to visit (Hughes 1998, 2000; Jones and Munday 2001; SQW 2005; Strategic Marketing 2009; BOP 2013b; Ward-Griffin 2015). As noted above, music festivals can play a part in the (economic, cultural and physical) regeneration of a city or region (Quinn 2005; Picard and Robinson, 2006; Eales 2013) or enable it to expand its political, economic, environmental and social influence (AEA 2006; BOP 2015). However, an influx of visitors is not unproblematic and can reveal deep-seated tensions: local authorities may use the ‘imagined tourist’ gaze as ‘judgmental Other’ to sanitise parts of a town or city deemed unsightly before a festival event, for example (Atkinson and Laurier 1998: 100; Waitt 2008).

PLACEmAKING AND TOURISM

Reports into festivals’ economic impact are often (perhaps unsurprisingly) superlative-heavy, the authors aware of the need to position their festival favourably in competitive local, regional and international markets. For example: Notting Hill Carnival is ‘both a major arts festival and the largest single public event staged on a regular basis in London’ (Mann Weaver Drew 2003: 11); Edinburgh’s summer festivals ‘represent the world’s biggest arts Festival’ (SQW 2005: 2; emphases added).

Music festivals often contribute to a positive image of a locale, both internally to its residents and externally to visitors, and hence attract people to live in the place and tourists to visit (Hughes 1998, 2000; Jones and Munday 2001; SQW 2005; Strategic Marketing 2009; BOP 2013b; Ward-Griffin 2015). As noted above, music festivals can play a part in the (economic, cultural and physical) regeneration of a city or region (Quinn 2005; Picard and Robinson, 2006; Eales 2013) or enable it to expand its political, economic, environmental and social influence (AEA 2006; BOP 2015). However, an influx of visitors is not unproblematic and can reveal deep-seated tensions: local authorities may use the ‘imagined tourist’ gaze as ‘judgmental Other’ to sanitise parts of a town or city deemed unsightly before a festival event, for example (Atkinson and Laurier 1998: 100; Waitt 2008).

Far left: Last Night of the Proms 2011 Photography: Roger Muggleton, CC BY-NC 2.0
Above left: Cowley Road Carnival 2013 Photography: Kamyar Adl, CC BY 2.0
Above right (top): Glastonbury Festival 2011 Photography: “Send a postcard” by Rachel Docherty, CC BY 2.0
Above right (bottom): Sidmouth Folk Festival 1956 Photography: John Dowell, Rockford Graphics

“The Proms is one of the best things that has ever happened to me. I love it, and everything about it. I’ve told my girls, I want my ashes scattered here... don’t let anyone see you do it, just scatter them in the bushes...”

77 year-old female regular at the Proms, cited in Hewett 2007: 231

“The Edinburgh Festival obliterates the city: there isn’t a town called Edinburgh any more, there’s a town called the Edinburgh Festival. And you can’t escape it.”

29 year-old male audience member, EFG London Jazz Festival 2015
The growth in festivals has been mirrored by a growth in mediation, particularly in books (cf. Larsen and O’Reilly 2009) and on radio and television, which now portrays (rock/pop) festivals as ‘safe, friendly, and trendy events’ as opposed to the earlier ‘countercultural and carnivalesque imagery’ (Anderton 2008: 47-48).

The mediation of festival via ‘traditional’ and new media is important as both marketing strategy (Sykes 2014) and as a means of anticipating, sharing and extending the experience for fans (Wall and Dubber 2010). Morey et al. 2014 term the latter ‘Festival 2.0’. Multiplatform mediation (television, radio, online) by in particular the BBC (Glastonbury, the Proms) pushes the festival concept into the national consciousness (Webster 2014) and exports ideas about and images of Britain and Britishness around the world (Blake 1997; Cannadine 2008), as well as being a useful means of audience development (Service 2007).

News media contribute to the discourse around festivals (Mann Weaver Drew 2003; Voase 2009; Johansson and Toraldo 2015) and media coverage and the estimated valuation of such coverage is a feature of some economic impact assessments (Brockie and Landry 2002; SQW 2005; Chouguley et al. 2011).

The history of festival mediation is also of interest; the 1960 Beaulieu Jazz Festival BBC live outside broadcast, for instance, was shut down as a result of crowd trouble during the so-called Battle of Beaulieu (McKay 2004). The 1959 film of the Newport Jazz Festival, Jazz on a Summer’s Day, created a ‘blueprint for all subsequent representations of pop festival films’ (Goodall 2015: 37), and documentaries about festivals reconstruct the event and re-present it to new generations (Wall and Long 2009; Bennett 2009), while festival posters have left a legacy of rich art and design (cf. Laing and Newman 1994).

“Why do the Ravers rave? At which point do enthusiasm and high jinks twist into the urge to hate and destroy?”
KENNETH ALLSOP, DAILY MAIL, 1 AUGUST 1960, ON THE ‘BATTLE OF BEAULIEU’ JAZZ FESTIVAL; CITED IN MCKAY 2005: 75

Festivals don’t do as well when there is no Glastonbury. When Glastonbury is on, it’s on the news the whole time, the BBC is pumping it out, and everyone thinks … festivals.”
FESTIVAL PROMOTERS, GLEN 2012
When I come away from the Festival, every fibre, not just my blood, is tingling... It’s in me because I’ve listened to it so much and it just makes me alive again.”

CELTIC CONNECTIONS FESTIVAL-GOER, CITED IN MATHESON 2008: 69

HEALTH AND WELL-BEING

Research into the health impacts of festivals ranges from those offering a positive account of festival-going, associating festival attendance with wellness/well-being or a positive ‘festival imaginary’ (Lea 2006; O’Grady 2015; see also ‘temporality and transformation’ section above) or those focusing on more negative health impacts, such as soft tissue injuries and alcohol/drug overconsumption (Britten et al 1993, 1995; Hewitt, Jarrett and Winter 1996; Martinus et al 2010), or even (rarely) disease outbreak (Crampin et al 1999); there is also some literature on dealing with particular health issues such as Type Diabetes 1 (Charlton and Mackay 2010).

Festivals have an impact on health practitioners and health institutions, although seemingly less so if the festival has an onsite medical unit (Knight and Mulry 1996; Hewitt et al 1996). A study in an Irish hospital around the Oxegen festival in 2004, for example, concluded that music festivals significantly increase the workload of local hospital services, even with an onsite medical unit (Nix et al 2006). There is some evidence of festival as risky practice: at the 1991 Glastonbury Festival, for instance, 2.8% of the revellers sought medical aid compared to 1% at other large outdoor crowd events (Britten et al 1993).

“...and it was near silence that made me alive again.”

NURSE CITED IN KNIGHT AND MULRY 1996: 42

ENVIRONMENT: LOCAL AND GLOBAL

All music festivals temporarily increase the population of a locale thereby putting pressure on essential facilities such as accommodation, transport, infrastructure, and even policing (Mackay 2010). In addition, festivals have environmental impacts such as increased noise (Oakes and Warnaby 2011) or anti-social behaviour (Lynn Jones Research 2006), including increased crime levels, excessive drinking, and litter, or injustice/inconvenience such as traffic congestion/parking, and overcrowding (Mason and Beaumont-Kerridge 2004; Deery and Jago 2010; Hofman and Hiscock 2010).

Festivals also have direct local environmental impacts on flora and fauna: research into the impact of the Brinkburn Summer Music Festival on bat emergence, for instance, found that bats left the venue – Brinkburn Priory – up to 47 min later on festival nights (Shirley et al 2001). Other environmental impacts are less localised: music festivals import international musicians, the logistics of which are inherently resource-intensive and have a large carbon footprint; indeed, the estimated total UK festival industry emissions (excluding travel) is 19,778 tonnes of CO₂ per year (Powerful Thinking 2015).

Whilst on the one hand, festivals are highly environmentally impactful, they have also been sites for exploring and teaching about alternative ways of living, particularly around energy usage and waste, and many are directly attempting to lessen their environmental impact (Mair and Lai 2012, Cummings 2014). Glyndebourne, for instance, installed a wind turbine in 2005, which provides 95% of the organisation’s electricity needs (Glyndebourne n.d.); Shambala Festival in 2014 was powered by 100% renewable energy for the first time, after four years of striving (Shambala 2014), and Glastonbury’s green policies include increasing recycling, reducing road delivery, and planting trees (Glastonbury n.d.).

“I hadn’t prepared myself for people dropping their rubbish and walking away from it; or peeing on the land, which ruins the river and kills the fish and wildlife... I kind of hated the entire crowd. I wanted to go home.”

YORK 2015, TALKING ABOUT HER FIRST GLASTONBURY
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THE IMPACT OF ACADEMIC RESEARCH ON MUSIC FESTIVALS

Overall, it is likely that economic impact assessments have been instrumental in highlighting the value of festivals to local authorities and politicians (Braclalante et al 2011) and to sponsors (Maed 2016).

Festivals are also used as vehicles to educate the public about topics beyond simply music, or an enriched understanding of the music (Pitts 2008; BOP 2013a). They have been sites for public engagement and knowledge exchange, academic research collaboration and debate, either directly or indirectly (although this appears to be the exception rather than the rule), recent examples of such knowledge exchange-oriented and collaborative funded projects include:

- CHIME, Cultural Heritage and Improvised Music in European Festivals, a European research project supported by the JPI Heritage Plus programme (chimeproject.eu), which brings together researchers and festival organisers and agencies from the UK, Italy, The Netherlands, and Sweden (2015-17);
- The Impact of Festivals, a one-year AHRC-funded project at the University of East Anglia, in collaboration with the EFG London Jazz Festival, report launched at Cheltenham Jazz Festival (2015-16);
- Fields of Green: Music Festivals and Climate Change, an AHRC-funded project between three universities and Creative Carbon Scotland, exploring the sustainability of Scotland’s music festivals through the eyes of artists, audiences and festival organisers (2015-16);
- Cheltenham Festivals, a public engagement partner with the AHRC for the dissemination of funded academic research, including at Cheltenham music and jazz festivals (2013-15);
- ‘Professors in Residence’ and ‘Researchers in Residence’ are a recent public engagement innovation at popular music and jazz festivals, including Cheltenham Jazz Festival (2012), EFG London Jazz Festival (2014-16), and Edinburgh Jazz and Blues Festival (2016);
- Carnival Futures: Notting Hill Carnival 2020, funded by King’s Cultural Institute, brought together key organisations and practitioners to test alternative visions for the future of Notting Hill Carnival (2012-2014);
- Festival Performance as a State of Encounter, an AHRC-funded project at Leeds University, brought together festival practitioners and academics to explore the concept of relational performance within the context of popular music festivals (2009);
- Rhythm Changes, an EU HERA project led from the University of Salford (www.rhythmchanges.net) with academic partners from UK, the Netherlands, Denmark, Austria and Norway, which collaborated with jazz festivals including the EFG London Jazz Festival (REF 2014) (2007-13);
- Negotiating Managed Consumption: Young people, Branding and Social Identification Processes, an ESRC-funded project at the University of Bath, which sought to understand young people’s use of alcohol and web 2.0 in relation to music and free festivals (2007-10).

The Research Excellence Framework exercise is one means of evaluating research impact: searching for festival’ on the REF 2014 impact case studies website returns 732 results while ‘music festival’ returns 37. The Wellcome Trust has also carried out research into public engagement and found that 30% of researchers had engaged in a festival/fair (science, literary, arts) in 2015 (Hamlyn et al 2015). The National Co-coordinating Centre for Public Engagement has produced a practical guide called University Engagement in Festivals (Buckley et al 2011).
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RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Based on this review of the academic and ‘grey’/cultural policy literature, the following are recommendations for further study:

- An authoritative set of cultural, historical, geographical, musicological, social studies of music festivals in Britain; also new work on international aspects of festivals, including comparative between countries, but also of diasporic and migrant festival practices in Britain;
- Further research which examines music festivals using a cross-genre approach (cf Blake 1997);
- Further research on festivals as events from within the fields of classical music and opera, which seem relatively under-represented;
- Co-produced research between festival organisations and academic researchers in order to explore issues of benefit and relevance to festivals themselves;
- Further research on the impact of festivals on musicians, for example on their career paths, and the role of festivals in commissioning new work;
- Further research into the mediation of music festivals;
- Development of a longitudinal interdisciplinary, mixed methods approach to measure economic, social, cultural and experiential impacts of festivals, including qualitative analysis;
- Work on new theories and critical approaches to festival culture;
- Greater research into the significant potential on the negative aspects of festivals in order to more accurately assess and critique their net impact;
- Analysis of networks between festivals and musicians’ touring schedules to understand competition and collaboration between festivals;
- Research into the creative role of the festival promoter/producer;
- Further research into the impact of academic research on festivals.

FURTHER RESEARCH ON MUSIC FESTIVALS
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Fields of Green: Music Festivals and Climate Change, an AHRC-funded project between three universities and Creative Carbon Scotland, exploring the sustainability of Scotland’s music festivals through the eyes of artists, audiences and festival organisers (2015-16);

Cheltenham Festivals, a public engagement partner with the AHRC for the dissemination of funded academic research, including at Cheltenham music and jazz festivals (2013-15);

‘Professors in Residence’ and ‘Researchers in Residence’ are a recent public engagement innovation at popular music and jazz festivals, including Cheltenham Jazz Festival (2012), EFG London Jazz Festival (2014-16), and Edinburgh Jazz and Blues Festival (2016);
NOTE ON METHODOLOGY

This report is based on a literature review which necessarily spans different disciplines and different types of event. Literature was restricted to academic books and journals, and policy/‘grey’ literature, but largely does not include newspaper or magazine articles; the search was limited to literature in English.

Library databases searched include the British Library, the Bodleian Library, the University of East Anglia, and Oxford Brookes University, as well as the Public Library Initiative (http://freetoveyjournals.pls.org.uk). Databases searched include the resources sections of the websites of Arts Council England, Creative Scotland, Arts Council of Wales, Live Music Exchange (http://www.livemusicexchange.org) and the University of East Anglia, as well as the website of the EFG London Jazz Festival (http://www.ljfest.co.uk) and the CHIME project website (http://chimeproject.eu), McKay’s academia page (http://eastanglia.academia.edu/GeorgeMcKay), and on the Live Music Exchange (http://www.livemusicexchange.org).

As stated in the introduction, one of our findings has been that there is more work pertaining to the impact of festivals as events within the folk and pop literature (rock, jazz, ‘world’, etc.) than within the classical and opera literature. We are aware that our backgrounds in rock/pop and jazz mean that we are more familiar with the folk and pop literature but the volume of literature in these fields has outweighed the classical/opera literature for the purposes of this literature review by about three to one. We have therefore recommended that more research is undertaken into the impact of festivals within the classical/opera field.

APPENDIX 1

ECONOMIC IMPACT ASSESSMENTS

The following list shows some of the results of economic impact assessments for British music festivals but with the caveat that the different methodologies employed by each study mean that direct comparison between festivals is inadvisable, even for the various Edinburgh Festivals reports. There is no generally agreed view as to what, or how much, cultural festivals contribute to the respective local economy (Hoijman and Hiscock 2010), and the heterogeneous nature of methodological approaches (for example, Jones and Munday 2004; Chouguley et al. 2011) means that aggregation of economic impact assessments is problematic (cf Bracalente et al. 2011).

In addition, economic impact reports tend towards the positive benefits of the festivals they assess but tend to avoid or ignore any ‘typicality’ of arts and culture festivals (Vrettos 2006). Spending on festivals by local authorities, whether via direct subsidy or through the provision of local services, can deplete resources for other projects, particularly in urban areas, where the temporary spectacle of festivals may have been fostered at the expense of longer term artistic and audience development (Hughes 2000), although research into this aspect of festivals is currently scarce.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FESTIVAL (DATE OF RESEARCH)</th>
<th>ECONOMIC IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheltenham Jazz and Music Festivals (2002)</td>
<td>Jazz: 13,000 paid-for attendances; Music: 18,000. Music, Jazz, Literature and Science festivals’ total combined contribution to local economy: c. £3m. Inward cash sponsorship: £600,000, local authority expenditure: £350,000, other grants: c. £120,000. Broadcast exposure valued at minimum of £50,000 and print media coverage at £210,000 (Brookes and Landry 2002).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notting Hill Carnival (2002)</td>
<td>Visitor spend over the three days by Carnival-goers was over £45 million; overall income impact of the Notting Hill Carnival was £93 million; Carnival supports up to 3,000 full-time equivalent jobs per year (Mann Weaver Drew 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shetland Folk and Shetland Accordion and Fiddle Festival (2002)</td>
<td>Combined, the festivals attracted 7,000 people. Gross estimated attendance by tourists: 600 (14%) at the Folk Festival; 760 (27%) at the Accordion and Fiddle Festival (20% of attendance for Festivals overall). Combined income: £117,129.56; combined total expenditure: £115,824.69; combined direct income from tourists was £13,980; visitor spend from tourists attending festivals in Shetland was £68,626.80. Volunteer time equivalent to c. 0.5 FTE (AB Associates 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidmouth Festival / FolkWeek (based on Association of Festival Organisers’ 2004 data)</td>
<td>Estimates of economic impact range between £0.6 million and £1.4 million for Sidmouth, and between £1.1 million and £2.4 million for East Devon (depending on whether the small or large net-to-gross ratio is used) (Hoijman and Hiscock 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh International Festival (2004)</td>
<td>Estimated attendances of 334,900 (a decrease from 416,267 in 2003); £49,777 daily expenditure per person (incl. day trips). Estimated impact in Edinburgh: total output: £19.3m; total income £217,000; Employment (FTE): 23 person-years (Jones and Munday 2001).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FESTIVAL (DATE OF RESEARCH)</th>
<th>ECONOMIC IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edinburgh International Jazz and Blues Festival (2004)</strong></td>
<td>Estimated attendances of 75,000 (an increase from 49,581 in 2002); £36,97 daily expenditure per person (incl. day trips). Economic impact in Edinburgh: total output: £2,9m; total income: £0.7m; 53 FTEs, and 91 press and broadcast items (SQW 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edinburgh Mela (2004)</strong></td>
<td>Estimated attendances of 40,000; £12.05 daily expenditure per person (incl. day trips). Economic impact in Edinburgh: total output: £800,000; total income: £200,000, 16 FTEs (SQW 2005).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hull International Jazz Festival (2004)</strong></td>
<td>£60,000 turnover, with 50% of this generated through ticket sales, suggesting a £420,000 contribution to the local economy from the expenditure associated with the festival (Long and Owen 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leicester Belgrave Mela (2004)</strong></td>
<td>Economic impact unadjusted: £3,224,520 supporting 163 jobs. Economic impact adjusted (total when local audiences and non-local expenditure made by the festivals are removed): £560,414 supporting 29 jobs (Maughan and Bianchini 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bradford Festival (incl. Mela) (2005)</strong></td>
<td>Estimated to turnover approximately £440,000, suggesting a £1.78m contribution to the local economy from the expenditure on the festival alone, assuming a multiplier of 2.78. Around £300,000-£340,000 is invested by Bradford Council in the festival each year (Long and Owen 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harrogate International Festival (2005)</strong></td>
<td>Gross ticket sales of £226,000 and £176,000 from sponsorship, donations and individual contributions towards its activities. This sum amounts to 35% of the organisation’s tangible income – a significant proportion when compared with a national average of 7% for combined arts organisations’ (Long and Owen 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brecon Jazz (2006)</strong></td>
<td>Generated between £1.86m and £2.2m of direct expenditure in Brecon and the overall gross value was estimated to be between £2.9m and £3.37m in the Welsh economy, the festival created or safeguarded between 63 and 73 FTE jobs (Lynn Jones Research 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T in the Park (2005)</strong></td>
<td>The 2005 T in the Park event generated net additional impact of: £1.42m and 34 annual FTEs at the Perth &amp; Kinross level; £0.9m and 53 annual FTEs at the Tayside level; and £7.3m at the Scottish level (EKOS 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V Festival (2006)</strong></td>
<td>Gross direct expenditure in the East of England region: £7.4m; Essex: £7.2m; and Chelmsford for £6.6m. Total direct overall expenditure by Metropolis Music, their contractors and visitors: £8.2m (Chelmsford City Council 2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glastonbury Festival (2007)</strong></td>
<td>177,500 Festival visitors with over 700 acts playing 80 stages or performance spaces. Total gross direct spend estimated at £73,286,500, which equates to an expenditure of £2.45 by visitors to the Festival for every £1 of expenditure by Glastonbury Festivals. Estimated employment generation in South West Region: 1,110 FTE jobs (Baker Associates 2007).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Henley Festival (2008)</strong></td>
<td>Income totalled £1.7m (2007: £1.6m); annual sales of 18-20,000 tickets, with a box office value in 2008 of just over £900,000; free events attended by a further 4,500 people annually; 23,000 visitors in 2009 (70% of whom are from the Thames Valley). £38,000 profit (2007: £24,200) was donated to the Henley Festival Trust (DPA 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creamfields (2008)</strong></td>
<td>48,000 people attended the event which generated £7.2m (inclusive of ticket prices). Average spend per person was £150.83 over the duration of their trip and the majority of festival-goers were economically active; 61% were in social grades A/B/C1 (cited in Mersey Partnership 2009).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FESTIVAL (DATE OF RESEARCH)</th>
<th>ECONOMIC IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edinburgh Jazz and Blues Festival (2010)</strong></td>
<td>Estimated attendances of 37,300; £41.10 daily expenditure per person; overall net economic impact in Edinburgh: output £1.29m, income £0.52m, 26 FTEs, 132 articles. The Festival included a significant proportion of Scottish artists (Chouguley et al 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edinburgh International Festival (2010)</strong></td>
<td>Estimated attendances of 396,713; £57.70 daily expenditure per person (paid for events); overall net economic impact in Edinburgh: output £20.84m, income £5.18m; 437 FTEs, 1,952 articles (Chouguley et al 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edinburgh Mela (2010)</strong></td>
<td>Estimated attendances of 34,590; £11 daily expenditure per person (paid for events); overall net economic impact in Edinburgh: output £0.49m, income: £0.14m; 11 FTEs, 94 articles (Chouguley et al 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Celtic Connections (2010)</strong></td>
<td>Number of unique visitors to the festival: 61,593. Visitors to Celtic Connections 2010 generated a net expenditure of £6,452,935.60, resulting in an output of £10,151,108, an income of £2,774,762, and 142.6 FTE jobs (for one year) in Glasgow (Glasgow Grows Audiences 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T in the Park (2010)</strong></td>
<td>The economic impacts for the event were: Perth &amp; Kinross level – £2,714,572 (£1,117,200 of expenditure from visitors &amp; £1,597,371 from organiser’s expenditure); Tayside level – £3,753,663 (£1,803,455 of expenditure from visitors &amp; £1,950,208 from organiser’s expenditure); Scottish level – £9,575,595 (£4,523,184 of expenditure from visitors &amp; £5,052,411 from organiser’s expenditure) (EKOS 2011).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shrewsbury Folk Festival (2013)</strong></td>
<td>Generated £548,077 additional spending in the area. 73% were first-time or infrequent visitors, 85% were ‘very likely to return to Shrewsbury’, and 92% were very likely to recommend Shrewsbury (Shropshire Council 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manchester Jazz Festival (2013)</strong></td>
<td>Audience expenditure: £985,126.58; festival-goer expenditure: £13,175.64; direct economic impact: £1,000,428.22. Total funding: £145,595 (incl. local funding: £29,100; Arts Council England: £90,146). Each £1 of public sector investment generated £6.87 of new income into Manchester. Audiences from outside Manchester: 68.7%; performers from outside Manchester: 78.3% (Li and Chen 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norfolk and Norwich Festival (2013)</strong></td>
<td>Generated £2,397,464 of economic activity; festival-goers spent on average £46 per head whilst attending the event (excluding their ticket purchase), 124 volunteers. Nearly half the expenditure was on the artistic programme (42%), 35% on staffing and overheads, 17% on education, and 6% on marketing and development (Norfolk and Norwich Festival 2013).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glyndebourne (2013)</strong></td>
<td>Lowes’ gross economic impact is £8.6m, leading to a GVA of £5.4m, equivalent to supporting 354 jobs. East Sussex: gross economic impact of £16.2m, leading to a GVA of £10.8m, equivalent to supporting 682 jobs (BOP 2013a).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>T in the Park (2014)</strong></td>
<td>The economic impacts for the event were: Perth &amp; Kinross level – £2,741,572 (£1,177,200 of expenditure from visitors &amp; £1,597,371 from organiser’s expenditure); Tayside level – £3,753,663 (£1,803,455 of expenditure from visitors &amp; £1,950,208 from organiser’s expenditure); Scottish level – £9,575,595 (£4,523,184 of expenditure from visitors &amp; £5,052,411 from organiser’s expenditure) (EKOS 2011).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE OF ECONOMIC IMPACT OF MUSIC FESTIVALS BY UK REGION IN 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REGION</th>
<th>TOTAL DIRECT AND INDIRECT SPEND (a)</th>
<th>NO. OF MUSIC TOURISTS ATTENDING FESTIVALS</th>
<th>PROPORTION OF LIVE MUSIC AUDIENCES that are music tourists at festivals</th>
<th>NO. OF FULL-TIME JOBS: sustained by music tourism at festivals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>£273m</td>
<td>194,000</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>1,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>£146m</td>
<td>166,000</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>£184m</td>
<td>341,000</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>£8m</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>£177m</td>
<td>229,000</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1,435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>£43m</td>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>£155m</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>1,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>£181m</td>
<td>309,000</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>£221m</td>
<td>272,000</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>2,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>£69m</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>£158m</td>
<td>195,000</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>1,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; Humber</td>
<td>£121m</td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>£1,736m</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,195,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>64%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,543</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, festivals have significant economic impacts across the UK: they generate major amounts of direct and indirect spending (£1.7bn), attract high numbers of music tourists (2.2m), and sustain a large number of jobs (13.5K).

It should be noted that the festivals included in the UK Music report were largely driven by data from large and medium sized festivals and do not necessarily capture the smaller festivals, therefore these totals are likely to be on the conservative side.

---

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

To accompany the review, a 170-entry 63,000-word annotated bibliography has also been produced (DOI: 10.6084/m9.figshare.3413854), which is accessible online via the project website (https://impactoffestivals.wordpress.com/project-outputs/).

For a selection of historical and critical literature on specific British festivals, see the Impact of Festivals Resources section (https://impactoffestivals.wordpress.com/resources/).
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