

until 20 years after it was established (Jordan, 2013). Even such a senior member of the establishment with many years' experience of the Arts Council as Lord Harewood was surprised.

I felt the Arts Council rather failed Buxton Festival. [...] It gave mixed messages. Buxton was encouraged to apply for three-year funding, a great deal of work went into it and then it was turned down (11 November 2010).

Harwood's incomprehension was echoed by many interviewees. It is an indication the Arts Council's funding rationale was opaque. In fact, there was a policy in place, as a former Arts Council Finance Director explained. Its policy was only to support 'artistic creation' not "to subsidise someone playing at being an impresario" and that there was a suspicion many festivals were "artificially brought together series of events" (AF 9 June 2011). There was also a policy of responsiveness, but this was to local authorities' views not those of residents or other stakeholders. In Buxton's case the County Council was unsupportive because the festival's focus on opera was considered one that would not interest its residents. The individuals interviewed who were involved in the festival's governance or management were not aware of these rules, meaning there was an accountability gap.

Derby Festé

Street performance festival Derby Festé started in 2007. It takes place annually on a Friday evening and Saturday at the end of September in the Cathedral Quarter (CQ) of Derby city centre. The CQ is an area comprising the Market Place, Derby Guildhall, the Silk Mill museum and key Arts Council National Portfolio Organisations (NPOs) QUAD digital media centre and Déda centre for contemporary dance, the two bodies which instigated and produce the festival.

Festé is primarily aimed at families who might not go into the CQ in the evenings and attracts 30-35,000 people over the course of the weekend, with 3,000 paying to go to the climatic Saturday night spectacular at the Bass Recreation Ground a short walk away near the river. The performances include contemporary circus and dance acts, stages for local artists and community performances and a parade, often featuring giant puppets imported from countries such as Spain or France, creating a sense of carnivalesque otherness marking the festive period as different from other weekends. Unlike Buxton Festival, the festival was programmed to have popular appeal, while staying true to Déda's artistic mission:

the quality of those contemporary dancers is something that you just wouldn't hire on a shopping Saturday for people to see, so that's what sets Derby Festé apart [...]. Festé stays true to pushing the boundaries with the art that happens.

[...] There are a lot of high-risk bookings in there (SS-C 4 November 2016).

Just as in Buxton, the artistic team argued artistic excellence was central to the festival's ability to transform the city's imaginary.

Festé is a project managed by an executive committee of four of the city's NPOs. Below this is a steering committee including staff from these four plus a marketing agency and a worker from an ACE-funded national body whose role was to diversify the festival's audiences by attracting BAME and working-class audiences. Sub-committees were tasked with programming, marketing and event management. In 2015 an additional organisation joined ACE's National Portfolio and was then invited to join the executive committee. Unlike the other NPOs, its work focused on using arts participation to support the needs of people from deprived communities rather than on presenting cultural work to the public. Its director noted that, despite having lobbied to be involved in the executive committee and programming group for some time, it was only when they became an NPO that this was agreed, making NPO status a tacit form of boundary maintenance similar to the professionalisation strategies Buxton used. Weber (1920) identified this as a market closure tactic. As in the Buxton case, the rules of participation in the governance structures were understood by the members, but were not transparent or codified into formal rules, making them difficult for outsiders to negotiate.

Festé's foundation narrative prioritised economic development and footfall to the city's cultural quarter by reimagining it as vibrant and welcoming in the face of competition from a new shopping mall that the founders feared would shift the retail focus to the other side of the city centre. A secondary purpose was to diversify audiences visiting the Cathedral Quarter, aiming for them to be more reflective of the city's diverse demographics. Despite this, and the interviewees' pride that Festé created a "general sense of togetherness" (AB 21 October 2016) where surprising new social conjunctions could be experienced, there was little evidence of these goals in its governance or management structures which excluded non-arts professionals.

In contrast to Buxton Festival, Festé's audiences were local and accidental. According to research at its 2014 edition, only five per cent of respondents planned their trip specifically to go to the festival (The Audience Agency, November 2014). Festé was aware of its socially exclusive audiences and, with funding from a national NPO which had a widening participation remit, employed a part-time arts ambassador to broaden its appeal through work with residents in more deprived suburbs. Links were made to migrant communities from Eastern Europe, Roma and skateboarders who were asked to perform at community stages clearly differentiated from the spaces used by professional artists. Although described as important by the festival's leaders, this work was narrated as 'audience development', community participation rather than a strand of the

professional arts programme, with only a small proportion of the festival's budget (interview 2016) and no voice on the executive committee. While explicitly stated, it was evident this was work mandated from outside rather than integral to the festival's purpose and that it had little impact on the festival's tacit closures such as the choice of programming as a consequence.

Since the Arts Council is Festé's primary funder these pressures can be associated with the changes in ACE's own governance discussed above. In developing its ten-year strategy and five goals, ACE's decision-making became more transparent, with clear rules and systems for allocating grants, and processes for evaluating its progress towards widening participation. This openness, however, had not been incorporated into Festé's governance, which remained closed. Following Whitford et al.'s (2014) governance criteria, the rules of membership were limited to NPOs, a form of associational closure, but this was never formalised, so lacked transparency. And there was no formal role for CQ businesses, meaning the festival's policy to revitalise the area had no structures for implementation. Despite its stated desire to diversify audiences and encourage marginalised communities to visit the cultural quarter, the executive excluded local artists, professional and amateur. That committee membership was limited to NPOs and reflected Eurocentric views of culture meant the festival's responsiveness to and equitable involvement of minority communities was restricted. Consequently, the executive and programming teams had limited understanding of why many local communities rarely visited the city's ACE-legitimised arts venues. One interviewee explained residents from deprived suburbs might visit the city centre, but even then "within the city centre there's political or economic or social invisible boundaries or sections" (interview 2016). The Cathedral Quarter was one area they felt was 'not for the likes of you' (Morton-Smyth, 2004). As the NPOs were based in the CQ they had limited engagement with artists or audiences from disadvantaged areas, an omission exacerbated by the need to have enough cultural capital to feel comfortable with the festival's European-tradition programming (Wilks, 2011).

Although the two festivals were managed differently, claimed to have dissimilar purposes, and operated in particular contexts, both had tacit rules of association which restricted their abilities to engage wider publics in their governance structures. Buxton Festival demanded either high status in the international opera world, or the ability to donate financially. Inclusion in Festé's executive group was only open to organisations in receipt of ACE core funding. In analysing them as examples of social and market closure these distinctions provide a form of triangulation which helps to illuminate and add significance to similar boundary-monitoring behaviours.

Communal or associational closure?

Weber (1920) differentiated between communal social closure based on norms and associational closure based on rules. Elision of the two social closure types, and social and market closure effects can lead to incomplete and sometimes incorrect explanations for intergroup inequalities (Cardona, 2013). This elision is evident in relation to public festival policies and helps to explain why widening participation has been ineffective. Festivals are claimed to be sites for creative regeneration, community bonding, developing intercultural exchanges, for commissioning new artists and works, and for staging the canon. These purposes can be communal, associational or related to markets. And they can be either open or closed. A regeneration initiative might focus on one suburb, for example, with the aim of enhancing community cohesion through bonding activities for residents. Equally it might be a project aimed at bridging between diverse communities. Unless widening participation objectives are clearly identified and explicitly stated so there is accountability for outcomes from the outset, strategic or policy responses are likely to be confused leaving room for the 'monopolisation of cultural and material goods and opportunities' (Weber, 2004 p. 190). As festival organisations are more-or-less formally constituted, the rules of association were a good place to start to understand their rules-in-action.

Initially a core criterion for becoming a Buxton Festival trustee was membership of the global opera establishment. The festival's founding artistic director explicitly excluded supportive local residents, however knowledgeable about opera, from board membership on the basis that "we are the artistic people, and we can't have local amateurs, even very skilled amateurs, having too much influence on the artistic programme" (interview 2007), as this would detract from the festival's attempts to establish itself as an international opera festival. Such prestige could only be achieved by recruiting trustees with high cultural capital, tacitly if not explicitly defined through professionalism.

The centrality of cultural capital was also evident in Festé's programming structures. While the festival was nominally curated by a sub-committee, in reality the programme was selected by its chair, Dèda's artistic director, and reflected his venue's focus on contemporary dance and circus. The festival programme, comprised of professional artists in Western dance and circus traditions, was presented to the committee each year as a *fait accompli*. Despite its stated desire to diversify audiences and encourage marginalised communities to visit the CQ, the executive excluded local artists from its governance and programming, allocating only a fraction of its budget to community work. That Eurocentric curatorial norms and committee membership might explain the festival audiences' homogeneity was only raised by one committee member interviewed. Rather, there was a belief that taking art onto the streets and making it free would encourage interest. However, as

Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) contended, culture is inherently exclusive, with rules that take a lifetime to understand. Taking the work onto the streets did increase the number of viewers, but with little evidence it had broken down any imperceptible participation barriers. Dèda's artistic director himself commented, while watching a contemporary dance piece taking place on Cathedral Green during the eleventh edition: "you know there are 500, 600 people here. If I programmed this in Dèda there might be 40" (September 2017). Despite over a decade of evidence to indicate the festival did not widen participation beyond the weekend, there was no indication he or other committee members questioned why this was the case.

Neither did they ask whether it was the right approach for revitalising the CQ as a retail centre. Festé was founded to develop a new imaginary for the cultural quarter to drive footfall to independent shops and develop a distinctive retail brand in contrast to the new shopping mall. However, while the festival did attract audiences, the business community had not responded; shops did not open late, and restaurants did not display festival posters or offer special deals; nor was there a positive response to calls for festival sponsors. The festival organisers expressed disappointment and confusion about this reticence. There was, however, no discussion of undertaking research with businesses in the cultural quarter to understand how best the festival could support them, nor a plan to involve them in its governance structures. When asked, retail outlets felt that because the festival took place in the evening, and on the streets, it was actually detrimental as they would have to pay staff for extra hours, but the on-street nature of the activity meant few people visited the shops. The festival's design was not suited to a direct economic effect of increasing their sales. The committee's rules-in-action, that membership was determined by ACE funding was a form of associational closure. It meant there were no structures for implementing the economic development policy, and that local business' voices were not heard, so their needs were not considered.

In both festivals the governance structures demonstrated clear evidence of social closure based on implicit associational factors related to professional expertise in the arts. These were presented as the ability to judge artistic quality, and attract international artists to the locality, a form of implicit communal closure through cultural capital more difficult to challenge than explicit rules. Local artists and cultural actors were excluded through both the formal and informal processes, limiting their potential to influence the festival's artistic direction, or to widen the range of participants and audiences.

Market closure through professional identity in the arts

Market closure through professional identity is a concerted process if it is done to deliberately to

limit competition rather than a result of unconscious social biases. So, to what extent did the closures above lead to the festivals securing market opportunities? And, if they did, was this a strategic act?

In limiting membership of their governing bodies to established professionals from the cultural sector, both festivals can be seen to be attempting to establish themselves as high-quality institutions worthy of funding by ACE. From its foundation, ACE sought to create institutions to 'elevate standards of performance in the arts' (Wilson 2019 p. 141). It argued standards could only be maintained by professionals with time to focus exclusively on developing their practice. Including professional opera artists and artistic directors as trustees in the case of Buxton Festival, or by running Festé exclusively from ACE funded organisations, means both were acting strategically to convince the funder of their commitment to artistic quality and, therefore, their suitability for funding.

While Festé attracted ACE funding from its foundation, Buxton Festival was unsuccessful for the first twenty years of its existence and even in 2018 received only about ten per cent of its turnover from ACE. It is notable, in addition to professional expertise in the opera field, membership of its board was also open to donors or individuals able to attract other philanthropists. This meant a significant proportion of the trustees were affluent members of the UK's elite. One was described by another trustee as, a "lovely man. An outgoing personality. Eton. The Guards ... he introduced some very important people". This man brokered relations between the founders and the region's business elites who then financed the festival through philanthropy and sponsorship. Offering board membership on this basis can be seen as collective action to create a socially exclusive and therefore loyal group of funders limiting the opportunities for competitor organisations and less affluent board members.

In the case of Festé, the city's NPOs effectively created a monopoly with two market consequences. Firstly, despite the festival's claims it had been established to drive footfall to the cultural quarter, very few shops supported it. The organisers were unable to explain this, but had no structures for engaging business owners, pointing to alternative priorities as its real purpose. The rationale became clear when the local authority threatened to withdraw funding, and the festival successfully lobbied ACE to support it through a corresponding increase in Dèda's NPO grant (Arts Council England, 2017a), showing its focus on artistic excellence rather than community benefits had been a good choice (Ilczuk and Kulikowska, 2007). This market closure had the effect of reinforcing the festival's focus on norms associated with its art forms rather than the Council's explicit priorities of economic development and social cohesion, thereby reinforcing cultural barriers to mobility.

Surprisingly, although Buxton Festival was successful in attracting tourists, a core part of the Council's economic development policies, this did not lead to extra income from the local authority or sponsorship from businesses based in the town. This absence was attributable to a lack of identification with the festival, which was considered to be entirely for the benefit of 'outsiders' rather than residents, a direct result of its socially elite programming and governance structures.

Both festivals successfully closed elements of the market: Festé through a process of professionalisation which appealed to ACE, Buxton through a form of associational closure based on programming an art form that appealed to an affluent social elite with economic capital. The consequence of these resource driven priorities was to exclude other social groups. Buxton Festival was not interested in attracting local residents because its focus was on cosmopolitan opera fans. Festé's stated concerns to drive footfall to the cultural quarter and attract audiences from lower socio-economic groups was marginalised because ACE funding prioritised cultural capital.

Conclusions

This paper asked to what extent festival governance constrained social mobility. It conceptualised festival production as forms of social and market closure within political economies in the UK regions which had been subject to declining funding for intrinsic cultural purposes. It identified Arts Council England's funding policies as highly significant and found there was a lack of transparency about its artistic judgements. Even after the institution of formal goals in its 2020 "Great Art for Everyone" strategy, what qualified as artistic excellence remained obscure. This led the festivals studied to develop governance models which tacitly preferred professional arts managers over residents and community members. The funding system had become a closed shop, intelligible and accessible only to those with valorised cultural capital in the form of the right qualifications, work experience or networks.

And the festivals were right to take this approach. Their governing bodies demonstrated themselves to be adept at identifying public policy rhetorics they could attach themselves to. They pragmatically and successfully employed narratives that festivals catalyse change and mobilise communities to access support from economic development funds related to tourism or place marketing as well as arts-specific funding. Festé used festival's image as places for social bonding to engage with urban policies to overcome social exclusion, while Buxton prioritised promoting the visitor economy.

There is a policy risk in this approach. If festivals are unable to achieve the results required, funding may be withdrawn. This study asked what the reason was for the gap between the policy rhetoric of festivals as inclusive spaces (Duffy and Mair, 2017) and the lived reality found in the

cases. Social closure at the governance level was found to be a useful frame for thinking about mobilities as it drew attention to vested interests within the festival cases' production systems. These undermined inclusion by prioritising the in-group's unquestioned notions of artistic excellence, pointing to the centrality of cultural form and equitable inclusion in decision-making if policy makers and festivals truly wish to widening participation. In both cases, festival producers used their professional expertise to dominate governance structures, restricting the range of actors with a voice in the festival's curation and, consequently, the festival's appeal to other socio-cultural groups. Opera is an elite art form in the UK and Buxton Festival's board and audiences reflected that. The town's demographics were middle and working class, and local residents formed a very small part of its audiences.

In the case of Festé, despite it taking place outdoors, there was limited engagement from BAME and working-class communities, albeit more than for shows in the partners' venues. It was evident there was a limited understanding of marginalised communities' views of the city centre. Rather than a neutral space, it was perceived by some as out-of-bounds, closed by the very 'European-feel' culture the committee felt was so welcoming because it reflected their own professional aesthetic. Audiences were demographically similar to those already visiting the cultural quarter, so while it might have grown audiences for the NPOs, the festival reinforced the quarter's exclusive image.

For Cathedral Quarter businesses, while the festival appealed to affluent audiences likely to shop in independent local outlets, its timing as an evening event meant it was perceived as unlikely to increase short-term sales. The absence of dialogue between the festival's producers, whose vision of the area it represented, and the businesses it believed would be direct beneficiaries of the rebranding was a direct consequence of its professionally closed governance structures which were not devised to implement the stated policy.

From the literature it is clear the distinction between social and market closure is often elided in cultural policy and cultural policy analysis. This was evident when Festé's civic funding was replaced by Arts Council subsidy without the distinctions between local policy priorities and the ACE's goals, or indeed those of the arts organisations themselves, being noticed or commented on. This raises questions of transparency and local accountability. ACE is an all-England body with no responsibility for Derby or Buxton's regeneration or social cohesion. If festivals are not funded for local communities through local authorities, what are the processes for residents' needs to be considered?

ACE's historical focus on a limited palette of European art forms means, despite its stated aim of broadening audiences for the arts, it has struggled to engage communities from non-Western

cultures or working-class communities. In viewing this tension as the result of communal cultural closure, it becomes clear that membership of its governance structures, and those of the festivals' studied, is drawn from a narrow section of society. As a consequence, European cultural tastes were institutionalised throughout the festivals' designs. These cultural forms were crucial in determining participation. When applied to cultural production rather than consumption, the closure concept provides one explanation for the slow progress in diversifying arts audiences. It highlights the potential benefits of transparent, inclusive and accountable governance structures tied to explicit policy objectives.

By comparing two festivals started 30 years apart, the study also illuminated changes in ACE's governance. The introduction of ten-year strategies meant it had become more transparent and accountable, leading to critical reflection (e.g., Hussain, 2019) and the creation of clear mechanisms for implementing diversity strategies, such as the funding of Festé's ambassador post. It was also apparent that these changes had not resulted in the festival's governance structures being opened up and, despite festivals' reputation for disruption, governance closure had direct consequences on the cases' achievement of policy goals related to social mobility. Buxton Festival attracted tourists because opera drew cosmopolitan audiences happy to travel to experience their favourite art form. Festé, by contrast, struggled to widen participation because contemporary dance, even when presented as spectacular street performance, did not resonate with communities from non-Western cultural traditions. Referring back to Whitford et al.'s (2014) dimensions of event governance, by relying on professionalisation processes to bolster their claims to funding, both festivals can be seen as unresponsive, inequitable and locally unaccountable, but equally highly successful. It was, after all, their professional cultural expertise which enabled them to navigate tensions between local and national policies in order to access resources from different funding sources. This required tacit knowledge of the norms and symbols associated with their specific cultural fields.

In exploring festival production this paper contributes a critical understanding of festival institutions as examples of exclusive social spaces. It found the festivals' cultural forms were themselves used as rationales for cultural professional closure through rules based in tacit understandings of artistic excellence. This restricted transparency and accountability and led to the creation of festivals which were highly effective bonding sites for communities with relevant cultural capital but which did not effectively facilitate intercultural social mobilities. In illuminating the role of art forms in creating in-groups, the study runs contrary to common academic and policy narratives which envision festivals as inherently open spaces. Consequently, this analysis concludes policy makers seeking to achieve socio-cultural outcomes through festivals should first carefully

consider the unstated boundaries drawn by a festival's cultural programming. They should then establish transparent, codified, responsive, equitable and accountable governance structures to achieve agreed policy outcomes rather than vague notions of 'artistic excellence'.

Pre-print May 2021

Bibliography

- Arts Council England (2010) *Achieving great art for everyone: A strategic framework for the arts*. Arts Council England.
- Arts Council England (2013) *Great Art and Culture for Everyone: 10-year strategic framework 2010–2020*. Manchester, UK: Arts Council England, p. 2014.
- Arts Council England (2017) *The data: 2018-22*. Available at: <https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/national-portfolio-2018-22/more-data-2018-22> (Accessed: 2 February 2021).
- Arts Council England (2017a) *National Portfolio: 2018-22*. Available at: <https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/our-investment/national-portfolio-2018-22> (Accessed: 18 August 2020).
- Arts Council England (2017b) *National Portfolio Organisations: Key data from the 2016/17 annual submission*. London: Arts Council England. Available at: https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Full_NPO_Survey_1617_FINAL.pdf (Accessed: 16 June 2019).
- Arts Council England (2020) *Equality, Diversity and the Creative Case: A Data Report 2018-19*. Online: Arts Council England. Available at: https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/ACE_DiversityReport_Final_03032020_0.pdf (Accessed: 20 August 2020).
- Arts Council England (2021) *Let's Create: Strategy 2020-2030*. Manchester: Arts Council England. Available at: https://www.artscouncil.org.uk/sites/default/files/download-file/Strategy%202020_2030%20Arts%20Council%20England.pdf (Accessed: 11 February 2021).
- Arts Council England (no date) *National Portfolio: 2018-22*. Arts Council England. Available at: <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/NPO> (Accessed: 27 June 2017).
- Autissier, A.-M. (2009) *Introduction*. Edited by A.-M. Autissier. Toulouse/Paris: Edition de l'attribut and Culture Europe International (The Europe of Festivals: From Zagreb to Edinburgh, intersecting viewpoints), pp. 21–41.
- Barker, A. *et al.* (2019) 'Everyday Encounters with Difference in Urban Parks: Forging "Openness to Otherness" in Segmenting Cities', 15(4), pp. 495–514.
- Belfiore, E. (2004) 'Auditing Culture: The Subsidised Cultural Sector and the New Public Management', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(2), pp. 183–202.
- Belfiore, E. (2019) *From CEMA to the Arts Council: Cultural Authority, Participation and the Question of 'Value' in Early Post-war Britain*. Springer (Histories of Cultural Participation, Values and Governance), pp. 67–96.
- Biernacki, P. & Waldorf, D. 1981, "Snowball Sampling: Problems and Techniques of Chain Referral Sampling", *Sociological Methods & Research*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 141-163.
- Bourdieu, P. (1985) *The Forms of Capital*. Edited by J. G. Richardson. New York: USA: Greenwood (Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education), pp. 241–258.

- Bourdieu, P. (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Brook, O., O'Brien, D. and Taylor, M. (2020) *Who Works in Culture?* Manchester University Press (Culture is Bad for You), pp. 54–76.
- Bradley, C. 2017, January 2017-last update, *National Classical Music Audiences An analysis of Audience Finder box office data for classical music events 2014-2016* [Homepage of The Audience Agency], [Online]. Available: <https://www.theaudienceagency.org/asset/1303> [2019, December 17].
- Bryman, A. (2015) *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: UK: Oxford University Press.
- Buck, L. (2004) *Market matters: The dynamics of the contemporary art market*. Arts Council England.
- Bull, A. (2019) *Class, Control, and Classical Music*. Oxford University Press.
- Butterfield, L.D., Borgen, W., Amundson, N. & Maglio, A.T. 2005, "Fifty Years of the Critical Incident Technique, 1954-2004 and Beyond", *Qualitative Research*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 475-497.
- Buxton Arts Festival Ltd 2018. *Report of the Trustees and Audited Financial States for t the Year Ended 31 October for Buxton Arts Festival Limited*. [Online]. Available [http://apps.charitycommission.gov.uk/Accounts/Ends57/0000276957 AC 20181031 E C.PDF](http://apps.charitycommission.gov.uk/Accounts/Ends57/0000276957_AC_20181031_E_C.PDF) [2020, June 27].
- Buxton International Festival, 2020a. *About Us* [Online]. Available: <https://buxtonfestival.co.uk/about-us>, [2020, June 27].
- Buxton International Festival, 2020b. *Friends* Available: <https://buxtonfestival.co.uk/friends-of-bif>. [2020, June 24].
- Cardona, A. (2013) 'Closing the Group or the Market? The Two Sides of Weber's Concept of Closure and their Relevance for the Study of Intergroup Inequality'. *Working Paper Series*; 15. Bielefeld: DFG
- DCMS (2018) *Taking Part focus on: Arts*. Department for Culture Media and Sport. Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/740256/April_2018_Arts_Focus_report_revised.pdf (Accessed: 17 December 2019).
- Duffy, M. and Mair, J. (2017) *Festival Encounters: Theoretical Perspectives on Festival Events*. Routledge.
- East Midlands Councils (2015) *East Midlands Profile*, East Midlands Councils, Leicestershire
- Festé, D. (2019) *Derby Festé generates more than £800k a year for local economy*. (Derby Festé/About Us). Available at: <https://www.derbyfeste.com/about-us/> (Accessed: 20 August 2020).
- Finkel, R. and Platt, L. (2020) 'Cultural Festivals and the City', *Geography Compass*, 14(9), p. e12498.
- Getz, D. and Andersson, T. (2010) 'Festival Stakeholders: Exploring Relationships and Dependency Through a Four-Country Comparison', *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 34(4), pp. 531–556.

- Gray, C. (2004) 'Joining-Up or Tagging On? The Arts, Cultural Planning and the View from Below', 19(Summer), pp. 38–49.
- Higgins, C. (2008) 'Arts Council must regain credibility after funding fiasco, says report', 30 July. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/culture/2008/jul/30/arts.council.funding> (Accessed: 16 September 2020).
- Hussain, A. (2019) *Making the Creative Case for Diversity Across Arts and Culture: An Outsider Looking in*. Springer (Global Diversity Management), pp. 137–143.
- Ilczuk, D. and Kulikowska, M. (2007) *Festival Jungle, Policy Desert? Festival Policies of Public Authorities in Europe*. Warsaw: Cultural Information and Research Centres Liaison in Europe (CIRCLE).
- Jancovich, L. (2017) 'The Participation Myth', *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 23(1), pp. 107–121.
- Jordan, J. (2013) *The Buxton Festival Lifecycle: towards an organisational development model for festivals*. Leicester, UK: De Montfort University.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991) *Critique of Everyday Life*. London/New York: Verso (2).
- Buxton Festival Ltd., B. A. F. (2017) *Buxton International Festival / About Us*. Buxton Arts Festival Ltd. Available at: <http://www.buxtonfestival.co.uk/about> (Accessed: 2 August 2017).
- Mahon, M. and Hyyryläinen, T. (2019) 'Rural Arts Festivals as Contributors to Rural Development and Resilience', *Sociologia Ruralis*, 59(4), pp. 612–635.
- Martiniello, M. (2015) 'Immigrants, Ethnicized Minorities and the Arts: A Relatively Neglected Research Area', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(8), pp. 1229–1235.
- Matthews, J. and Smith Maguire, J. (2014) *Introduction: Thinking with Cultural Intermediaries*. Edited by J. Smith Maguire and J. Matthews. London, UK: Sage (The Cultural Intermediaries Reader), pp. 1–12.
- Maughan, C. and Bianchini, F. (2004) *Economic and Social Impact of Cultural Festivals in the East Midlands*. <http://www.efaaef.eu/newpublic/upload/efadoc/11/Economic%20and%20social%20impact-final%20report.pdf>, accessed 14/5/2013: Arts Council England, East Midlands; East Midlands Development Agency.
- McIntosh, G. (2008) *Review of Arts Council England's Regularly Funded Organisations Investment Strategy 2007-08 - Lessons Learned*. London: Arts Council England.
- Miles, A. (2015) *Culture, Participation and Identity in Contemporary Manchester*. Manchester University Press (Culture in Manchester).
- Morton-Smyth (2004) 'Not for the Likes of You'. London: Arts Council England
- Nwonka, C. J. (2020) 'The New Babel: The Language and Practice of Institutionalised Diversity in the UK Film Industry', *Journal of British Cinema and Television*, 17(1), pp. 24–46.
- Patel, K. and Naudin, A. (2018) *Diversity and Cultural Leadership in the West Midlands: A Report for the West Midlands Leadership Commission*. Birmingham
- Pernecky, T. and Lück, M. (2013) *Events, Society and Sustainability: Critical and Contemporary Approaches*. Routledge.

- Powell, W. W. and DiMaggio, P. J. (2012) *The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality*. Edited by Walter W Powell and Paul J DiMaggio. USA: University of Chicago Press (The new institutionalism in organizational analysis), pp. 63–82.
- Quinn, B., Columbo, A., Lindström, K., McGillivray, D. and Smith, A., 2020. Festivals, Public Space and Cultural Inclusion: Public Policy Insights. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, pp.1-18.
- Saha, A. (2018) *Race and the Cultural Industries*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sassatelli, M. (2015) *Festivals, Urbanity and the Public Sphere: Reflections on European Festivals*. Edited by C. Newbold et al. Oxford: UK: Goodfellow Publishers (Focus on Festivals: Contemporary European Case Studies and Perspectives), pp. 28–39.
- Smith, A. (2012) *Events and Urban Regeneration: The Strategic Use of Events to Revitalise Cities*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Stark, P., Gordon, C. and Powell, D. (2013) *Rebalancing Our Cultural Capital – A Contribution to the Debate on National Policy for the Arts and Culture in England*. London, UK: GPS Culture. Available at: www.theroccreport.co.uk (Accessed: 10 December 2016).
- Stark, P., Gordon, C. and Powell, D. (2014) *The PLACE Report; Policy for the Lottery, the Arts and Community in England*. London, UK: GPS Culture. Available at: <http://www.gpsculture.co.uk/place.php> (Accessed: 10 December 2016).
- Stark, P., Gordon, C. and Powell, D. (2016) *A Policy for the Arts and Culture in England: The Next Steps?* London, UK: GPS Culture.
- Stevenson, D. (2019). The cultural non-participant: Critical logics and discursive subject identities. *Arts Marketing*, 9(1), 50-64.
- The Audience Agency *Without Walls Associate Touring Network Derby Festé 2014 Audience Survey Report*, November 2014.
- The Audience Agency 2018, July 2019-last update, *Outdoor Arts Audience Report* [Homepage of The Audience Agency], [Online]. Available: <file:///Users/imac2002/Downloads/outdoorarts20185.pdf> [2019, December 17].
- The Audience Agency 2019, *Metroculturals* [The Audience Agency], [Online]. Available: <https://www.theaudienceagency.org/audience-spectrum/metroculturals> [2019, December 17].
- Toynbee, J. (2016) *Making popular music: Musicians, creativity and institutions*. London, UK: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Waterman, S. (1998) 'Carnivals for elites? The Cultural Politics of Arts Festivals', *Progress in Human Geography*, 22(1), pp. 55–74.
- Weber, M. (1920) *Economy and Society: An Outline of Interpretative Sociology (Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft: Grundriß der verstehenden Soziologie)*. Edited by G. Roth and C. Wittich. Berkeley, CA: USA: University of California Press.
- Weber, M. (2004) *The distribution of power within the political community: class, status and parties*. Oxford: Routledge (The Essential Weber: A Reader), pp. 182–199.
- Whitford, M., Phi, G. T. and Dredge, D. (2014) 'Principles to Practice: Indicators for Measuring Event Governance Performance', 18(3), pp. 387–403.
- Wilks, L. (2011) 'Bridging and Bonding: Social Capital at Music Festivals', 3(3), pp. 281–297.

Williams, R. (1979) 'The Arts Council', *The Political Quarterly*. 50(2), pp. 157–171.

Wilson, J. M. (2019) *State Funding of the Arts in England: An Assemblage in Action*. The Open University.

Yeung, E. and Thomas, R. (2020) 'The 'Long Tail' of Event Management Research: Evidence from the Field's Main Journals', pp. 1–8.

Yin, R. K. (2009) *Case Study Research, Design & Methods 4th ed*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Pre-print May 2021