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ABSTRACT

Literary festivals are an increasingly significant component of cultural participation nowadays, yet scholars ask for more research on the cultural benefits gained through festival participation. This study uses Bourdieu’s ideas about cultural capital and Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective to understand if, and how, literary festival participation shapes individual cultural capital. Empirically, the study takes an interpretivist stance and is a qualitative case study of one Irish and one Italian literary festival. The data gathered derive from key informant interviews (n = 4), participant observations, and on-site interviews (n = 92) and follow-up interviews (n = 34) with festival participants.

Findings reveal that individual cultural capital was reinforced, stimulated, or acquired. They suggest that literary festivals can be rewarding experiences for participants that lead to the development of all three states of cultural capital, both field-specific and non-field-specific. Findings also show that this complex and dynamic process that was shaped by internal and external elements. Participants acquired cultural capital during and after the festivals; through interaction; in and around the festival venues; through several actions and senses; and in ways that were influenced by different levels of involvement and enjoyment.

This study develops theory by furthering understandings of the cultural value of literary festivals and the nature of literary festival audiences. It interweaves cultural capital with the serious leisure perspective to produce a model that should help to overcome some of the conceptualisation and operationalisation constraints of cultural capital when applied in the festival context. The model is proposed to guide further research. It also develops the concepts of Literary Festival Careers and the Literary Festival Involvement Scale. The thesis ends with some suggestions to inform future festival policy development.
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<td>33: The follow-up in-depth semi-structured interview guide (PL)</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34: Information sheet for key informant interviewees (WW)</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35: Information sheet for key informant interviewees (PL)</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36: Consent form for key informant interviewees (WW)</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37: Consent form for key informant interviewees (PL)</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38: Key informant interview questions with Arts Officer, Kerry County Council</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39: Key informant interview questions with the WW chairperson</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40: Key informant interview questions with the PL director</td>
<td>405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41: Key informant interview questions with the cultural councillor of Pordenone</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GLOSSARY

- **Cultural capital acquisition, development, and accumulation**: In this study, the term cultural capital ‘development’ is used interchangeably with the terms ‘acquisition’ and ‘accumulation’ (used for its objectified state), to refer to a certain form of augmentation of pre-existing cultural capital resources. Cultural capital is, therefore, described as acquired, developed, and accumulated. In Chapter Seven, the term cultural capital ‘stimulation’ is also used to refer to the creation of a cultural interest (curiosity, attraction) sparked by festival participation, which in turn might lead to further cultural capital acquisition.

- **Festival participation and festival participants**: The term festival ‘participation’ has been chosen instead of festival ‘attendance’ or festival ‘consumption’ because the UNESCO (2009, p. 45) framework for cultural statistics defined cultural participation as including ‘cultural practices that may involve consumption as well as activities that are undertaken within the community, reflecting quality of life, traditions and beliefs. It includes attendance at formal and for-fee events, such as going to a movie or to a concert, as well as informal cultural action, such as participating in community cultural activities and amateur artistic productions or everyday activities like reading a book’. This study, therefore, includes both people who are visiting the festival (festival ‘attendees’, who can also be called visitors, spectators, audience members) and people who are involved in the festival programme or production, such as volunteers or speakers (festival performers), only when the latter are also attendees (when they have been audience members for at least one event during the festival). Thus, the terms festival participant and audience member are used to refer to the respondents.
• **Literary festivals:** The definition of literary festivals is contested, with scholars using a variety of terms, such as literature festivals (Giorgi, 2011a; Sapiro, 2016b), literary festivals (Weber, 2018), book festivals (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014), writers’ festivals (Stewart, 2013), and festivals of ideas (Murray, 2012), sometimes even interchangeably (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014). This study only employs the term ‘literary festival’ for two main reasons. Firstly, similarly to Weber (2018), this choice has been made to emphasise the role of literature and not the role of books, writers nor readers, since this study privileges the perspective of the audience members, who are not necessarily readers. Secondly, the term literary festival has been chosen as a broader term to describe a festival that relates to literary culture, featuring literary fiction and poetry, but also non-fiction, graphic novels, and other media.
INTRODUCTION

'We are what we repeatedly do'

(Aristotele, 300 BC)
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1  The rationale for the study

Since the 1990s, arts festivals have proliferated worldwide and ‘also continue to proliferate’ even in developing countries (Quinn, 2019, p. 8). Today festivals constitute important tourism and cultural consumption phenomena (Prentice & Andersen, 2003). Among different types of festivals, literary festivals are also flourishing in ‘number, popularity and geographic reach’ (Stewart, 2013, p. 263). From the oldest still-surviving literary festival in Europe, founded in 1949, more than 450 festivals are now held annually worldwide (Weber, 2018). During the twenty-first century, they have spread throughout the developing world and are now a very important element in the landscape of cultural consumption (Weber, 2018). This growth in literary festivals has led scholars to explore their social and political values, for instance, to consider festivals as moments that encourage the development of political ideas and shape citizens (Merfeld-Langston, 2010). As such, literary festivals play important roles in the current scenario of cultural consumption: economic, political, social, and cultural (Merfeld-Langston, 2010).

Yet, little research has been conducted into the process of cultural consumption associated with literary festivals and festivals more generally. Existing scholarly discussions on literary festivals are under-researched, relative to the number of studies exploring arts, sport, or food festivals for example. Moreover, some scholars (Négrier, 2015; Jordan, 2016) interpret the current explosion of festivals as a process of festivalisation of culture (Négrier, 2015). They argue that the term ‘festival’ has become an overarching label for all types of gatherings and celebrations (Jordan, 2016; Ronström,
According to them, events and cultural productions are now arranged in a ‘festival-like way’ (Ronström, 2016, p.67). For some, this means that the once aesthetic culture of festivals is now declining into commercialisation (Jordan, 2016) and that the cultural value of festivals is now questionable. All this suggests that there is a need to further explore the cultural value of literary festivals.

The focus on literary festivals in this thesis stems from a personal interest. The researcher has always been interested in festivals, particularly in literary festivals. She comes from a small Italian town that every year hosts a famous international literary festival, and her Master’s thesis explored the learning dimensions of two literary festivals in Italy and in Wales (Rossetti, 2016). This PhD emerged from this master’s research which revealed a significant gap in knowledge about the cultural outcomes of literary festivals and how they foster cultural resources development. Her paper ‘Foreign languages education and multilingual services in literary festival tourism: the case of Festivaletteratura in Italy’ (Rossetti, 2016) began to address this topic. However, much further enquiry was needed to investigate the cultural value of literary festivals: hence the development of this research. Following her interests in reading, festivals, and people she decided to pursue a PhD on literary festivals and their cultural outcomes.

1.1 Introducing literary festivals

The word festival derives from the classical Latin word festum meaning feast (Falassi, 1987) and it describes a periodically recurrent celebration (Arcodia & Whitford, 2006; Falassi, 1987). These social occasions differ from everyday life (Arcodia & Whitford, 2006). Festivals are one-off or recurrent celebrations that ‘may take place at the same time every year, and can last from one day to several days’ (Smith, MacLeod, &
Robertson, 2010, p. 66). As mentioned earlier, they have proliferated worldwide and now we are experiencing an on-going explosion of festivals (Quinn, 2019). Thus, festivals are becoming an important element of our cultural consumption practices (McGillivray & Frew, 2015).

As such, in recent decades, a growing number of scholars, especially sociologists of culture and specialists of urban studies and event management, have begun to analyse festivals. At the same time, book industries, literary prizes, and celebrity authors have become topics of interest for researchers. Studies about literary festivals adopt four main perspectives: literary studies (Driscoll, 2014; Elbeshhausen, 2014; Ommundsen, 2000, 2007, 2009; Stewart, 2009, 2010, 2013; Weber, 2018) including literary festivals going digital (Driscoll, 2015; Johanson & Freeman, 2012; Murray & Weber, 2017; Weber, 2015); sociology, especially the role played by the audience and the dimensions of the experience (Giorgi, 2011b, 2011c; Johanson & Freeman, 2012); urban studies, particularly in terms of their role concerning cultural democratization and their political significance (Giorgi, 2011a; Merfeld-Langston, 2010), and their role in the legitimation of works as cultural producers (Sapiro, 2016b); and tourism (Cassell, Lema, & Agrusa, 2010; Hoppen, Brown, & Fyall, 2014; Robertson & Yeoman, 2014).

Nevertheless, research on literary festival audiences remains limited (Mintel, 2011). Most studies come from Australia, France, or the UK where the first literary festivals were launched. Finally, very few studies seek to examine literary festivals in different national contexts, and studies including both Italian and Irish literary festivals are non-existent to date. This research investigates literary festivals drawing on Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital, which is further explored in the following section.
1.2 Introducing cultural capital

A key concept used in this thesis is Bourdieu’s cultural capital (2002 [1986]). Bourdieu developed the concept of cultural capital to analyse how culture creates social inequalities and class distinction. He developed several theories relating to culture, power, action, and social stratification. All of these theories intersect each other and the concepts are relational, so it is difficult to abstract one from another (Swartz, 1997). Bourdieu aimed to understand social practices analysing the reasons why people think and act as they do, and how these beliefs and actions affect social reproduction and class distinction (Grenfell, 2008). In his theory of practice he created the equation ‘[(habitus) X (capital)] + field = practice’ (1984 [1979], p. 101). Social practices are, therefore, influenced by capital, habitus and field. Capitals are economic, social, and cultural resources possessed by a person; habitus describes how people behave and the ways they engage in practices; and field is the social space in which practices occur (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002). These three theoretical concepts are inseparable, interconnected and mutually constituted (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002; Grenfell, 2008). They are all examined in Chapter Two. Thus, according to Bourdieu, human action is a dialectical orientation between individual action called agency (influenced by internal factors such as capitals) and the social field called structure (comprising external fields of power) (Bridge, 2004; Swartz, 1997). Interlinked with the theory of practice and class distinction is the theory of cultural production of art and literature. In ‘The Field of Cultural Production’ (1983) and ‘The Rules of Art’ (1996), Bourdieu analysed the conditions shaping the production, circulation and consumption of French literary and artistic works in the second half of the 19th century. Here, he examined cultural practice, the role of artists, and artistic and literary authority, considering the social structures of power, habitus, capital, and field.
According to Bourdieu (1984 [1979]), in the field, not every agent is equal, and some are dominant, having more power than others. This power distribution reflects the amount of capital possessed by the agent, who struggles to accumulate it. Thus, culture is a form of power and social distinction. Participation in the arts reproduces differing levels of cultural capital and creates class hierarchies. Bourdieu analysed cultural capital in relation to differential school attainment (Bourdieu, 1977 [1973], 1984 [1979], 1996 [1989]; 1979 [1964]), museum-going (Bourdieu, Darbel, & Schnapper, 1991 [1966]), hiring practices in firms, and choice of spouse (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]). He advocated that an agent needs to possess a certain stock of cultural competences, ‘dispositions acquired over time’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 100), in order to enjoy, appreciate, decipher and decode a work of art. According to him, cultural consumption is an act of ‘appropriation’, ‘identification’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 100), ‘deciphering’, and ‘decoding’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 2). Therefore, a work of art has meaning and interest only for those who possess the cultural competences to decipher the code into which the work is encoded (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]). For instance, Bourdieu, Darbel, and Schnapper in ‘The Love of Art’ (1991 [1966]) conducted research into European art museums in France, Greece, Holland, Poland and Spain, and their publics. They analysed the European museum-going public with its social capital, educational levels, attitudes to museums (pedagogic expectations), artistic preferences and tastes. They advocated that not every agent possesses the same level of cultural capital. Only a few visitors have a ‘cultural need’, which is the ‘wish to take advantage of museums’, something which ‘increases the more it is satisfied’ (Bourdieu, Darbel, & Schnapper, 1991 [1966], p. 37). The cultural need depends on the individual level of education measured by academic qualification obtained or length of schooling. So, according to Bourdieu (1984 [1979]), acquiring cultural competences is the act of learning ‘the adequate dispositions’
(Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 2). Aesthetic pleasure needs an act of decoding to decipher the cultural code.

Bourdieu argued that these dispositions, including aesthetic taste, are acquired throughout the agent’s life as an on-going process. Yet, he (1984 [1979]) emphasised the earlier stages of the life course in stressing that cultural capital is mainly acquired within the family and at school. This suggests that more work on cultural capital acquired in other contexts, in late adulthood years is needed (Friedman, 2014). As such, while most studies focus on how cultural capital is a marker of distinction, missing in this debate is an in-depth exploration of how agents, especially adults, can actually acquire cultural capital outside the formal educational and the occupational fields (Friedman, 2014; Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014). For this reason, this research is not an empirical investigation into cultural capital acquisition in order to understand class distinction but rather an enquiry into if and how cultural capital can be acquired in a specific field of cultural consumption. Consequently, while agents’ pre-existing levels of cultural capital are taken into consideration, this study is not an exploration of how cultural capital shapes participation.

1.3 Cultural capital and festival studies

Researchers have employed Bourdieu’s ideas to explore festivals (Friedman, 2015), but not to any great extent. Literature concerning cultural capital and festivals is fragmented and academic deliberations have understood, operationalised, and defined cultural capital from different angles (Getz & Page, 2016). A number of studies have started to address individual cultural capital acquisition through festival participation (Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015; Wilks, 2009), but much scope for further research remains,
especially in the context of literary festivals where studies are few in number (Mintel, 2011). As such, Szabó (2015) observed that systematic research on the educational dimensions of festivals is lacking and that an area which needs closer investigation is audience’s cultural capital and how it can be developed. In other words, ‘to date, the role that festivals play in forming, maintaining and shaping cultural capital is under-researched’ (Wilks & Quinn, 2016, p. 35).

There are contrasting existing scholarly discussions about the role of festivals in participants’ cultural capital. Some scholars claim that during festivals audiences can develop their cultural capital and learn (Karlsen, 2009; Quinn & Wilks, 2017). In contrast, others argue that participation cannot shape their cultural resources (Finkielkraut, 1987; Fumaroli, 1991) and that nowadays participants seek mere hedonism rather than cultural capital development (Négrier, 2015). Similarly, in literary festival studies, there is no general agreement on their cultural values. Some scholars claim that festival participants seek cultural capital development (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014) and participation can lead to cultural capital acquisition (Johanson & Freeman, 2012), like literary capital (Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015). In contrast, others claim that participants nowadays seek mainly intimate communication and physical proximity with authors rather than knowledge development (Meehan, 2005), and that literary festivals promote themselves primarily as entertainment due to their economic agenda (Driscoll, 2014, Giorgi, 2011b; Ommundsen, 2009).

All the above suggests that much work is needed on the cultural value of festivals and on how cultural capital can be acquired outside family and schooling in leisure activities like festivals.
1.4 Research aims and objectives

This study explores literary festival participation and adult participants’ cultural capital development through a qualitative analysis of one Irish and one Italian case. Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital is central to the study which seeks to further understandings of if and how participants can acquire cultural capital by participating in a cultural activity outside the standard institutionalised educational curriculum. The main research question is: How does literary festival participation shape individual cultural capital?

The study has three aims and several objectives (see Chapter 5). Firstly, it aims to contribute to an enhanced understanding of Bourdieu’s cultural capital. Here the concept of cultural capital and how it has evolved since Bourdieu’s definition is examined (objective 1a). Secondly, the study aims to consider how Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital might be usefully applied to the festival context. Here literary festivals, their audiences, and the dimensions of participation are reviewed (objective 2a). Then, cultural capital theory as applied in festival studies, including literary festivals, is reviewed (objective 2b). In the process of reviewing the literature on cultural capital, the study identifies some shortcomings in respect of both conceptualisation and operationalisation issues in festival settings. As such, it seeks to develop new approaches to addressing these shortcomings by drawing on other complementary theories. The thesis, therefore, asks whether Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure is as a fruitful source for addressing the issue of operationalisation of the embodied state in festival settings and for deriving new insights into the concepts of body, consciousness, time, involvement, enjoyment, and pre-existing cultural resources as they relate to the process of cultural capital development (objective 2c). Also, the evolution of Irish and Italian literary festivals is examined at this point (objective 2d). The third, and central, aim of the thesis is to understand if and how literary festival participation shapes individual cultural capital. Here there is an investigation into
whether literary festivals are arenas for cultural embodiment and cultural capital development, and into which state and type of cultural capital can be acquired (objective 3a). This is followed by an exploration of the factors at play in shaping participants’ cultural capital in festival contexts (objective 3b).


1.5 Research methodological approach

In methodological terms, this study applies an interpretivist approach. The epistemological assumption is intersubjective, the ontological assumption is that multiple realities exist, and that reality is subjective and relative. The qualitative study, highlighting the importance of meaning not measurement, facilitates an understanding of the perceptions of adult participants and their individual cultural capital acquisition.

The study presents findings from two case studies: Writers’ Week (WW) in Listowel (Ireland) and Pordenonelegge (PL) in Pordenone (Italy). It adopts a case study approach with an inductive logic, and is an exploratory study with a non-probability sample that is not intended to lead to generalisation. The purpose of the analysis is to understand the process of cultural capital development in two different cultural contexts rather than to compare the cultures at issue. Five sampling approaches were used. Firstly, the two countries were selected with purposive sampling, access, and resources. Secondly, the two festivals were selected with purposive sampling using 10 operational
criteria: geographical access, frequency, time interval, duration, year established, type, audience scale and size, bookstalls, writing awards, and positionality of the researcher.

Thirdly, 92 on-site interviewees were recruited with purposive and snowball sampling during the festivals. Moreover, 34 follow-up interviewees were recruited with purposive and snowball sampling post festivals. Finally, four key informant interviewees were recruited with purposive sampling.

Participant observations, on-site short semi-structured interviews, follow-up in-depth semi-structured interviews, and key informant in-depth interviews were conducted to deeply investigate cultural capital development associated with literary festival participation. Data collection included three phases: (1) the screening phase, (2) the pilot study phase, and (3) the main phase. The latter is, in turn, subdivided into two parts: (a) the on-site data collection, with observations and short interviews; (b) the follow-up data collection, with in-depth and key interviews. First, the researcher collected on-site data during WW and then during PL. It was, therefore, a parallel case study data collection, conducted in 2017, with sequential data collection inside the cases. All interviews were recorded, saved, and transcribed. Interviews were analysed with thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006), using the qualitative data analysis software NVivo and Excel.

1.6 Structure of the thesis and chapter descriptions

This thesis is divided into seven sections: (1) introduction, (2) literature review, (3) methods, (4) situational analysis, (5) findings, (6) discussion, and (7) conclusions. Some sections contain more than one chapter, with the literary review and the findings including three chapters each (Figure 1.1). Details of each chapter follow.
(1) **Introduction**

The first chapter serves an introductory function. Here, the conceptual framework, the research aims and objectives, as well as the theoretical and methodological approach are outlined.

(2) **Literary Review**

This section aims to address the first aim, which is to contribute to an enhanced understanding of Bourdieu’s cultural capital, and the second aim, which is to consider how Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital might be usefully applied to the festival context. This section reviews the relevant literature in the area and is divided into three chapters.

Chapter Two reviews Bourdieu’s cultural capital. As a matter of fact, to explore cultural capital acquisition associated with literary festivals the first step is understanding the concept of cultural capital. The chapter reviews, therefore, the concept of cultural capital in its three states (institutionalised, objectified, and embodied) and two types (field-specific and non-field-specific). It also reviews the process of cultural capital acquisition, especially in its embodied state. Then, since Bourdieu’s concepts are relational, the
Chapter Three reviews the relation between cultural capital and other types of capital, as well as its connection with Bourdieu’s theories. Here, the concepts of field, taste, interest, and cultural capital are reviewed in relation to cultural participation. Moreover, since some scholars argue that the concept of cultural capital is outdated, this chapter critically reviews how it has evolved since Bourdieu’s definition and addresses shortcomings in respect of conceptualisation and operationalisation. Here, the chapter addresses objective 1a: to examine how the concept of cultural capital has evolved since Bourdieu’s definition. The discussion raises the possibility of updating and clarifying the concept of cultural capital by approaching it differently and by focusing on how it is acquired beyond the realms of family, school, and work.

Chapter Three reviews literary festivals. As observed in Chapter Two, it is crucial to broaden the settings where cultural capital can be acquired, and literary festivals become relevant in this context. Literary festivals are flourishing at the present time, and this chapter explores the role of literary festivals in contemporary cultural practices. As such, after having reviewed the concept of cultural capital, the second step of the literature review is to understand the literary festival context. Therefore, this chapter addresses objective 2a: to analyse literary festivals, their audiences, and the dimensions of festival participation. It reviews the literature on literary festivals, including their types, historical overview, the nature of their audiences, motivations for attending, and the literary festival experience. All these elements need to be taken into consideration when exploring cultural capital development in festivals. As such, the chapter links literary festivals back to the concept of cultural capital. Thus, it addresses objective 2b: to explore how cultural capital has been used in festival studies. Here, the literature review shows that most studies focus on investigating how cultural capital shapes participation, in terms of, for
instance, access or social distinction, while the reverse is much clearer. There is, therefore, a need to fully explore how participation in cultural activities like festivals shapes individual cultural capital. However, the literary review also shows that there is no general agreement on how cultural capital is conceptualised and operationalised in festivals studies, especially in its embodied state. This suggests that in order to conduct an empirical analysis, the thesis needs to address these problems, and it does so in Chapter Four.

Chapter Four is the last chapter of the literature review and, by linking cultural capital and festivals, it focuses on cultural capital embodiment in festivals. Since Chapter Two and Three identify limits of cultural capital, the next step of this study is to try to address these limits before proceeding to the empirical research. Thus, this chapter critically asks if Stebbins’s (1982) serious leisure perspective is a useful theory for understanding and operationalising cultural capital embodiment in festival settings, addressing objective 2c. Following on from this critical review, the study’s conceptual framework is confirmed and presented.

(3) Methods
Chapter Five presents the research design and methods of this thesis, including: research aims and objectives; philosophical underpinnings; research approach; research methodology; methods of data collection, including sampling; ethical considerations; data analysis; data management plan; and methodological limitations.
(4) Situational Analysis
To fully understand cultural capital development in the two literary festival settings, it is important to have a clear picture of both the cultural contexts (the countries) and the settings (the festivals). This can also help the reader to better understand the importance of literary festivals in contemporary cultural consumption practices, as discussed in Chapter Three. We are experiencing an explosion of literary festivals, yet their cultural value is inadequately understood (Szabó, 2015). Moreover, scholars are not agreed that literary festivals are arenas for shaping individual cultural capital. Chapter Six aims therefore to address objective 2d: to examine the evolution of Irish and Italian literary festivals (1969 – 2017), and to select two case studies for in-depth study. It reviews literary festivals in Ireland and in Italy, examining: their historical evolution; geographical distribution; seasonal distribution; frequency and duration; and the public funders. Then, it introduces the two case studies by illustrating their origins, organisations, relationship with the towns, programmes, and sale of books. All this serves as an introduction to the empirical research that follows.

(5) Findings
This section presents the findings of the study in three chapters. These chapters and Chapter Ten address the main research question, which is to understand if and how participation in literary festivals shapes individual cultural capital. The findings reveal nine themes which are clustered into three core conceptual issues. The presentation of the findings is structured in line with three core conceptual issues and is therefore divided into three chapters.
Chapter Seven is the first chapter to present findings about cultural capital development and it aims to address objective 3a: to understand if literary festivals can be arenas for cultural capital development and to identify which state and what type of cultural capital can be acquired. It presents the findings relating to the manner in which respondents’ cultural capital developed: whether it was reinforced, acquired, or stimulated through participation. It also presents the findings relating to cultural capital development in its three states and two types.

After having understood that cultural capital acquisition occurred during literary festival participation, the other two findings chapters focus on how it occurred. Thus, Chapter Eight and Chapter Nine aim to address objective 3b: to explore the elements that may shape participants’ cultural capital. Findings show that cultural capital is shaped by both internal and external elements. As such, Chapter Eight presents the findings regarding the internal elements that shaped respondents’ cultural capital: their demographics; their pre-existing levels of economic and cultural capital; asceticism and enjoyment; the behavioural dimension; and involvement. Meanwhile, Chapter Nine presents the findings regarding the external elements that shaped respondents’ cultural capital: the social and cultural contexts; the temporal dimension; the spatial dimension; and the influence of festival features.

(6) Discussion

Chapter Ten interprets the findings in light of relevant literature and aims to address the main research question. It discusses how Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure perspective is useful for addressing the conceptual and operational limits of cultural capital in festival settings; the nature of literary festival participants and how they can be clustered into
literary festival careers which create a literary festival involvement scale; how respondents’ cultural capital was reinforced, acquired, or stimulated; how respondents acquired all the three states and the two types of cultural capital; and how cultural capital acquisition and embodiment in literary festivals is an extremely complex process shaped by both internal and external elements.

(7) Conclusions

Chapter Eleven outlines the study’s key contributions to knowledge, elaborates its research implications, practical implications for policymaker and festival organisers, limitations, and suggestions for further studies.
'Participation in cultural activities may spark a genuine interest in learning and thinking more deeply about the world'

(Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014, p. 293)
CHAPTER 2
CULTURAL CAPITAL

2 Introduction

The early part of the thesis establishes the conceptual framework. It is divided into three chapters, the first of which aims to address the first aim of this study: to contribute to an enhanced understanding of Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital. The intention here is to review the concept of cultural capital, the critiques surrounding it, and its indicators.

The key theorist of this study is, therefore, Pierre Bourdieu with his cultural capital theory, which is employed here as the main theoretical concept underpinning the research. To understand how cultural capital might be usefully applied to festival contexts, the concept itself needs to be fully explored. Thus, the chapter begins by defining cultural capital in its three states: the institutionalised, the objectified, and the embodied state. While Bourdieu, and most of the studies on cultural capital, focused on how cultural capital creates social inequalities and distinction, little work has been conducted on how it is acquired (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014; Noble & Watkins, 2003; Prieur & Savage, 2013). The literature review shows that, according to Bourdieu (1984 [1979]), cultural capital is mainly acquired within the family and at school during primary socialisation. However, Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) also described cultural capital development as an ongoing process through the lifetime of a person. The ‘accumulatory potential’ (Savage, Warde, & Devine, 2005, p. 42) of capitals, for example, allows cultural capital to be developed in the occupational field (Bourdieu, 1987; Lahire, 2008). Thus, this opens up the possibility to further investigate cultural capital acquisition in adulthood outside the
occupational field, which has not received much attention (Friedman, 2014). Moreover, when studying cultural capital, all the other capitals need to be taken into consideration. Thus, the chapter reviews the relationship between cultural capital and other types of capital: economic, social, and symbolic capital. Since Bourdieu’s concepts are relational, the review of cultural capital is placed in the broader context of the theory of practice. The chapter proceeds, therefore, to investigate Bourdieu’s theory of practice, also called field theory, highlighting the relationship between field, taste, participation, and cultural capital.

While Bourdieu is the key theorist, cultural capital as a theoretical idea has been explored and further developed by several academics. In seeking to address this study’s research aims and objectives it is, therefore, helpful and insightful to review some of these other works. Considered to be particularly useful in this regard are Ganzeboom’s (1982) interpretation of cultural participation as being not only shaped by cultural capital but also shaping cultural knowledge and appreciation; Kisida, Greene, & Bowen’s (2014) study about cultural consumers and the dynamics of cultural capital acquisition; and Holt’s (1998) study of self-actualisation and personal enrichment in leisure activities. Furthermore, a number of researchers have identified limits to the concept of cultural capital, and these, including Peterson and Kern’s (1996) idea of omnivores and Prieur and Savage’s (2011) concept of cosmopolitan cultural capital are considered. The chapter concludes by discussing the limits of cultural capital operationalisation in its embodied state. The review compares indicators identified by DeGraaf (1988), Crook (1997), Sullivan (2001), Barone (2006), Katsillis and Robinson (1990), and Kamphuis, Jansen, Mackenbach, and Van Lenthe (2015).
2.1 Defining cultural capital

Cultural capital is a broad term and scholars have interpreted it in several different ways. It appeared for the first time in the 1979 translation of Bourdieu and Passeron’s French edition of ‘The Inheritors’ (1979 [1964]), where they referred to *capital linguistique*. It was used to describe the knowledge, know-how, tastes, skills, attitudes, and habits of children with educated parents. According to them, familiarity with the highbrow culture, like classical music and fine arts, was the reason for the higher success of culturally privileged children in educational achievement relative to working-class children. In other words, the term cultural capital was used to explain the unequal educational attainment among children of different social classes (Friedman, 2014). It was mainly associated with the disparity in cultural tastes, which come from access to the educational system (Foley, McGillivray, & McPherson, 2012).

Later, in ‘Distinction’ (1984 [1979]), the concept of cultural capital was broadened from the educational system to the entire society. Bourdieu’s purpose was to argue that culture is a power source for social domination. Different levels of cultural capital were markers of class distinction. Cultural capital was used to explain the unequal distribution of cultural tastes and the disparity in cultural consumption practices. In ‘An invitation to reflexive sociology’ (1992), Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) defined field-specific cultural capital, i.e. that is strictly connected to a specific activity, and non-field-specific cultural capital, a more generic cultural capital. For instance, literature is the field-specific cultural capital of the literary field. Moreover, they recommended that cultural capital should be called informational capital. Prieur and Savage (2013) also argued that even if this suggestion has not received much traction, the term informational capital can capture some new tendencies much better than the term cultural capital.
'The concept of cultural capital has become part of the sociological lexicon’ (Prieur & Savage, 2011, p. 248) and is widely used by scholars. However, this concept is ambiguous because Bourdieu did not formally define it (Prieur & Savage, 2011). Furthermore, he was not precise about which of the higher-class resources can constitute cultural capital, how these resources can be acquired or inculcated (Noble & Watkins, 2003), nor transformed into educational credentials (Sullivan, 2002). This thesis acknowledges that cultural capital is widely used and useful to explain power dynamics and social distinction. However, this study adopts a new perspective by focusing on how these cultural resources are acquired. It explores this shortcoming specifically in an understudied context: among adults during festival consumption. Several scholars (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014; Prieur & Savage, 2013; Prior, 2005) also highlighted the lack of empirical investigation into cultural capital, arguing that what is important ‘is not necessarily to have the information, but to know how to get it’ (Prieur & Savage, 2013, p. 262). The most detailed explanation of cultural capital is provided in ‘The Forms of Capital’ (2002 [1986]), where Bourdieu subdivided cultural capital into three subgroups called states: the embodied state, the objectified state, and the institutionalised state. The definitions and characteristics of the three states are described in the following sections. The embodied state, the most complex one, is explained in relation to the concepts of bodily hexis and habitus, discussed below.

2.1.1 Embodied cultural capital, bodily hexis, and habitus

Bourdieu explained that the embodiment of cultural capital is linked to the body as a process of ‘incorporation’ which involves an act of ‘inculcation and assimilation of culture, cultivation, Bildung’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 85). In this way, the embodiment is a form of ‘self-improvement’, an ‘investment’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 85) of
cultural knowledge and ‘long lasting dispositions of the mind and the body’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 84). In other words, cultural capital embodiment is an incorporation and assimilation of knowledge, skills, values, norms and beliefs. Bourdieu (1990 [1980]) also defined these dispositions and physical attitudes as bodily hexis, or hexis corporal, which include stance, posture, and facial expressions. ‘Bodily hexis is political mythology realised, em-bodied, turned into a permanent disposition, a durable manner of standing, speaking and thereby of feeling and thinking’ (Bourdieu, 1977 [1972], pp. 93-94). In other words, bodily hexis is the expression of the agent’s habitus. As a matter of fact, he illustrated the embodied state as an ‘external wealth converted into an integral part of the person, into a habitus’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 85). So, the embodied state is interconnected with the concept of habitus.

Defining habitus is not easy since it is one of the most contested and misunderstood of Bourdieu’s ideas (Grenfell, 2008). Indeed, Bourdieu provided various explanations of habitus, like in ‘The Logic of Practice’ (Bourdieu, 1990 [1980], p. 56), where it is described as ‘embodied history, internalised as a second nature and so forgotten as history (...) the active presence of the whole past of which it is the product’. Habitus is, therefore, embodied and internalised as a system of dispositions, a habitual state, way of being, predisposition, tendency, propensity, or inclination (Bourdieu, 1986 [1984]). These dispositions are, for example, ‘ways of walking or blowing one’s nose, ways of eating or talking’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 466). Here the similarity with the bodily hexis is evident. These dispositions are durable, oriented towards practice, and transportable to different fields of activity (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002). Habitus is ‘forgotten as history’ (Bourdieu, 1990 [1980], p. 56) since all these individual past experiences are durably internalised and embodied. Accordingly, Bourdieu used the term habitus and not habit to highlight the generative principle of the habitus, as something
that ‘has become durably incorporated in the body in the form of permanent dispositions’ (Bourdieu, 1993a, p. 86), instead of the repetitive regular practice or habits (Grenfell, 2008; Swingewood, 2000). So, habitus is the result of the past experiences of the agent’s life and, at the same time, it is also an ‘active presence’ (Bourdieu, 1990 [1980], p. 56). It is, therefore, described as a ‘structured structuring structure’ (Bourdieu, 1977 [1972], pp. 72-79, 97). It is structured because it is shaped by the past and present circumstances encountered by the agent, and it is structuring because the agent’s habitus shapes present and future practices. Therefore, habitus links past, present, and future because it is the accumulation of all the ways of acting, thinking, and feeling that the agent has experienced through his/her life.

However, because Bourdieu did not define habitus clearly, nor its relation to the embodied state (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002), researchers interpret it differently (Noble & Watkins, 2003; Reay, 2004; Sullivan, 2002). For some scholars, habitus and the embodied state are strictly connected to one single idea, which refers to, for example, personal attitudes, preferences, tastes and competences (Prieur & Savage, 2011). In contrast, for others, they are two different concepts. For instance, according to Sullivan (2002) cultural capital is the possession of legitimate knowledge while habitus is a set of attitudes and values. Lash (1993, p. 197), meanwhile, defined habitus as ‘made up of cultural capital or (...) knowledge (including skills)’, while cultural capital is knowledge, ‘rhetorical ability, titles, and academic qualifications’ (Lash, 1993, p. 197). Elsewhere, Reay (2004) understood habitus as embodiment and socialised body. She interpreted the relation between habitus and the embodied state as habitus lying ‘beneath cultural capital generating its myriad manifestations’ (Reay, 2004, pp. 435-436).

This researcher’s interpretation of habitus is similar to that of Reay and Lash: habitus is made up of cultural capital, and is the socialised part of it. It is how the
embodied state, including bodily hexis, are expressed. It is in the concept of habitus that the personal bodily hexis combines with the social aspect of practice: ‘thoughts, perceptions, expressions, actions’ (Bourdieu, 1977 [1972], p. 95). Nevertheless, it is important to stress at this point that this research does not delve into the concept of habitus per se.

2.1.2 Objectified cultural capital

Besides the embodied state, another state is the objectified cultural capital. This refers to ‘material objects and media, such as writings, paintings, monuments, instruments, etc.’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 87). These cultural goods can be transmitted and acquired symbolically as well as materially. They can be appropriated materially, with the agent’s economic resources (economic capital), and symbolically, with the agent’s cultural resources (embodied cultural capital). As a matter of fact, Bourdieu (2002 [1986], p. 87) specified that the embodied capital is the ‘precondition for specific appropriation’ of cultural goods. For example, in order to play an instrument or fully understand and internalise the concepts of a book, the agent needs specific knowledge and skills. Only in this way can the agent ‘appropriate’ and ‘consume’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 87) the cultural product. In the case of the reader, (s)he can understand the meaning of the book, and not only possess it.

2.1.3 Institutionalised cultural capital

The last state is the institutionalised cultural capital, which refers to the institutional recognitions such as academic qualifications or credentials, possessed by an agent. Bourdieu (2002 [1986]) argued that the higher the education level (years of schooling), the higher the cultural capital level of the agent. In this way, there is a difference between
the cultural capital of the autodidact, who learns independently without an academic career, and the person who holds a certificate of cultural competence from an educational institution.

2.2 The process of cultural capital acquisition

After exploring the definition of cultural capital and its three states, the chapter now considers how cultural capital can be acquired. Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) stressed that the main sites for the acquisition and transmission of cultural resources are the family and the education system (Gunn, 2005). He advocated that the upper middle classes’ cultural resources, such as good manners, good taste or physical charm are inculcated via the family during primary socialisation (the domestic transmission of non-scholastic cultural capital). This contributes to explain the educational success of children from the dominant classes. The family also inculcates aesthetic deposition (taste) for decoding culture during consumption. However, Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) also argued that cultural capital acquisition is not static, but is an on-going process throughout an agent’s life and subject to systematic, ‘relentless accumulation’ (Savage, Warde, & Devine, 2005, p. 43). Bourdieu explained that cultural resources are augmented outside of the family in the field of education (at school with prolonged contact between disciple and master in a traditional education that inculcates school knowledge with methodological learning) and in the field of occupation. This cumulative and systematic process of acquisition of cultural capital creates a circuit of cultural capital. For instance, Bourdieu (1987, p. 4) argued that occupation could shape an agent’s habitus in terms of ‘the effects of the nature of work, of the occupational milieu, with its cultural and organisational specificities’. Several scholars (Friedman, 2014; Holt, 1988; Lahire, 2008) argued that the occupational
field is a site of cultural capital acquisition and ‘significant acculturation’ (Friedman, 2014, p. 31). The fact that cultural capital development is systematic and on-going opens up the possibility to investigate this process in adulthood outside the work environment. Bourdieu analysed cultural capital in some cultural practices (concerts, plays, museums, exhibitions, theatre, variety shows), especially in relation to economic expenditures (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], 2002 [1986]). However, his focus is on how cultural capital shapes participation and distinction rather than how cultural participation shapes individual cultural capital (Friedman, 2014). Some scholars, like Prior (2005, p. 136) have argued that ‘more studies that are willing to critically interrogate and strengthen Bourdieu’s categories in the process of application are needed’. The researcher agrees, hence the attempt to understand the process of cultural capital acquisition associated with festivals.

Bourdieu clearly explained the process of acquisition of the objectified state. As explained in 2.1.2, he advocated that the objectified state can be ‘appropriated both materially – which presupposes economic capital – and symbolically – which presupposes cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 87). He also claimed that to appropriate a work of art an agent needs the desire to possess it, and the right taste and interest in doing so (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]). Thus, the appropriation of an object of quality requires ‘a long investment of time’ and ‘capacities’ linked to the agent’s ‘personality’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 281). Likewise, Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) explained that the institutionalised state is acquired through formal education in terms of institutional recognitions and credentials. In contrast, the description of how the embodied state can be ‘inculcated’, ‘accumulated’, ‘acquired’, ‘assimilated’, ‘incorporated’, ‘embodied’, ‘appropriated’, and
‘transmitted’ provided by Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) is more complex. This is reviewed in the following section.

2.2.1 The embodied cultural capital acquisition

The individual embodied cultural capital acquisition process is defined as an on-going learning process. Bourdieu (2002 [1986]) explained that cultural capital embodiment is a process of personal self-improvement that costs time and requires a desire to learn, a \textit{libido scienti}. Properties, such as knowledge and skills, can be both inherited, from the ‘prestige of innate property’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 86), and acquired, through the ‘merits of acquisition’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 86). The latter is the one analysed in this study.

Bourdieu identified some variables according to which cultural capital can be acquired, such as ‘the period, the society, and the social class’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 86) and noted that this acquisition could happen in the absence of any deliberate inculcation, therefore also unconsciously. Thus, according to him, the embodiment of cultural capital can be unconscious as well as conscious.

Furthermore, he examined the length of acquisition, which covers, as mentioned, ‘two markets’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 86), namely early domestic education (where cultural capital is passively inherited through socialisation) and schooling (where cultural capital is actively acquired). Later, he also mentioned a third ‘occupational’ market (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 86). These are sites in which cultural competences are constituted together with a ‘sense’ of cultural investment (1984 [1979], p. 85). Thus, ‘it takes time to accumulate’ capital (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 83) and the manner in which culture is acquired perpetuates in the manner of using it (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]). Accordingly, the concepts of perseverance and repetition are crucial. It goes without
saying that a key question here is whether participation in cultural activities that can be one-off occasions and of short duration, such as festivals, can lead to cultural capital development. This is central to this thesis.

Overall, however, as Kisida, Greene, and Bowen (2014, p. 281) claimed, ‘the processes that drive the acquisition of cultural capital have not been sufficiently studied’. Very obviously, even though for Bourdieu the acquisition of cultural capital is a systematic and on-going process, he has not delved deeply into the process of cultural capital acquisition in adulthood (Savage, Warde, & Devine, 2005). Bourdieu stressed that cultural capital is mainly acquired early in life depending on family and schooling. Thus, cultural capital development in adulthood and in the occupation field is under-researched (Friedman, 2014).

2.3 How cultural capital relates to other types of capital
Besides cultural capital, in ‘The Forms of Capital’ (2002 [1986]), Bourdieu identified two other forms of capital: economic and social capital. They are related and need to be taken into consideration when analysing cultural capital. Economic capital is accumulated economic resources, such as money and property, while social capital is made up of social ‘connections’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 47). However, he claimed that no one form is more fundamental than the others even if in numerous works he gave priority to economic capital, which is ‘at the root of all the other types of capital’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 54). He also emphasised the conversions amongst the three forms of capital. Cultural capital, in particular, can be convertible, only ‘on certain conditions, into economic
capital and may be institutionalized in the form of educational qualifications’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 84).

The link between economic and cultural capital is intense. There is a strong correlation between the increase of economic capital, the increase of spare time, and the increase of social status. In this way Bourdieu explained that the dominant class has more economic resources and spare time to dedicate to transmitting cultural capital to their children, relative to the working class (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]); and that the production of art or the ability to play an instrument presupposes ‘not only dispositions associated with long establishment in the world of art and culture but also economic means (…) and spare time’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 75).

Similarly, cultural capital and social capital are strictly interconnected and almost indivisible. As mentioned earlier, social capital comprises all the social networks possessed by an agent. Bourdieu defined it as:

‘the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition –or in order words, to membership in a group- which provides each of its members with the backing of the collectivity-owned capital, a ‘credential’ which entitles them to credit, in the various senses of the world’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 88)

However, the definition of social capital most often used is Putnam’s (2000, p. 19), who defined it as ‘social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them’. Thus, according to him, social capital indicates different connections among individuals. These social networks are closely related to ideas of civic virtue, which is ‘most effective when embedded in a network of reciprocal social relations, or when trustworthy citizens are involved in public life’ (Finkel, 2010). In addition, Putnam (2000) interpreted social capital as bonding (among like-people) and bridging (among unrelated
people) processes. As explained by Jeannotte (2004 [2003]), bonding refers to social networks (strong ties) that reinforce homogenous groups, while bridging refers to networks (weak ties) that link people across diverse social cleavages.

As with economic capital, the relationship between cultural capital and social capital is intense. Firstly, Bourdieu highlighted the role of cultural competence and skills in accumulating social capital. He claimed that cultural capital, as cultural goods and ways of being, speaking, and doing, influences the process of accumulation of social capital. For instance, bodily hexis in terms of, for example, cultural attitudes, pronunciation or dress can influence how agents create social connections (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]). Here, according to Noble (2004), the concept of habitus is crucial. As explained, habitus, as a socialised body of ‘accumulated capital’ and ‘forgotten as history’ (Bourdieu, 1990 [1980], p. 56), ‘reproduces the social relations from which it derives’. Our habitus, therefore, reflects our social networks.

Secondly, Bourdieu highlighted the role of social capital in shaping cultural capital. He explained that cultural competence and skills are dependent on markets and social fields (1984 [1979]). According to him, depending on social relations and class, people can acquire different cultural capital. For instance, ‘educational qualification depends on social capital’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 85). As explained earlier, according to Bourdieu, children with educated parents can acquire and inherit higher cultural capital than children from working-class families. Thus, social capital is crucial in the process of cultural capital acquisition, especially in cultural participation and consumption, where ‘cultural capital is not activated in the act of consumption, but through the multiple interactions people engage in concerning taste’ (Friedman, 2011, pp. 357-358). Festival researchers have found it useful to employ the concept of social capital in examining the
social relations between audiences and other stakeholders (Quinn & Wilks, 2017; Wilks & Quinn, 2016).

Later, Bourdieu (1990 [1980]) added a fourth form of capital, called symbolic capital. It is ‘a form of capital or value that is not recognised as such’ (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002, pp. xv, xvi). For instance, prestige is a symbolic capital because it depends on people believing that someone possesses it. With the concept of symbolic capital, Bourdieu argued that the value of capital depends upon how it is recognised by society: ‘capital is valuable because we, collectively and sometimes in spite of ourselves, value it’ (Grenfell, 2008, p. 88). An example of symbolic capital is, for instance, the ‘reputation for competence and an image of respectability and honourability that are easily converted into political positions as a local or national notable’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 291). Thus, cultural capital can create differences in power and symbolic capital. For example, the school system ‘confers legitimacy, prestige and value (symbolic capital) upon the culture of the middle class, constituting it as cultural capital’ (Grenfell, 2008, p. 96).

### 2.4 Cultural capital relation to field, taste and participation

As previously mentioned, the process of cultural capital acquisition needs to be placed in the wider context of Bourdieu’s theory of practice, which links cultural capital to field, habitus, and practice in the equation ‘[(habitus) X (capital)] + field = practice’ (1984 [1979], p. 101). This thesis focuses on the relationship between cultural capital and practice, understood as cultural participation. After having examined the connections cultural capital-habitus and cultural capital-other capitals, three further concepts need to be taken into consideration: field, taste and the pre-existing stock of the agent’s cultural
resources, since ‘each thing we learn to do or know depends on that which we already can do or know’ (Noble, 2004, p. 234).

While it is important to highlight that the focus of this thesis is not the concept of field per se nor the positions of the agents in the field, the notion of field is important for understanding the whole process of cultural capital acquisition since it is the social space where cultural participation occurs. Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) described society and social life as a football game and divided it into a number of fields, such as music and literary fields. Within these fields, agents engage in symbolic acts of ‘position-taking’ where they acquire and use capitals (Bourdieu, 1996, pp. 231-232). Thus, in the fields, the play is competitive, according to the amount of capital possessed by the agent, who struggles to accumulate it (Swartz, 1997). Not every agent is equal, but some individuals are dominant and have more power than others. Hence, Bourdieu focused on power relations among individuals and on the role culture plays in social reproduction (Swartz, 1997). He theorised that ‘differences in cultural capital mark the differences between classes’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 60). Capitals are, therefore, forms of power and domination. Class distinction is based on differences of capitals, among which there is culture, as well as aesthetic taste.

This thesis considers the concept of field, especially related to the power dynamics in literary festivals, however, it does not deeply focus on the literary field. As previously introduced, Bourdieu’s (1983, 1996) theory of production of art and literature explored the French literary field. Most of the studies on literary festivals investigate their role in contemporary literary and public culture, conceptualising literary festivals as literary fields (Ommundsen, 2009; Stewart, 2010; Weber, 2018). They focus, therefore, on the power dynamics in literary festivals and how they shape the literary field. This suggests that more work on how cultural capital is acquired in literary festivals is needed.
2.4.1 Taste and interest

Thus far, it is clear that Bourdieu (1948 [1979]) thinks that agents struggle in the field to accumulate capital. Differences of capitals, among which there are culture and aesthetic taste, create social distinction. Here, it is necessary to define the concept of taste. According to Bourdieu, tastes are ‘manifested preferences’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 56), ‘acquired dispositions to ‘differentiate’ and ‘appreciate’’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 467), markers of distinction which are not ‘(or not necessarily) a distinction of knowledge’ (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979], p. 467). He defined the individual aesthetic disposition towards a work of art as a manifestation of the system of cultural dispositions linked to a particular social origin at a given moment (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]). Making a classification of the arts, Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) identified three taste zones, which correspond to different education levels and social classes: legitimate taste, middlebrow taste, and popular taste. In sum, differing social classes correspond to differing tastes and vice versa.

The concept of taste is linked to the concept of interest. Bourdieu (1990 [1987]) renamed it as illusio or libido. As already mentioned, according to Bourdieu, practice is based on the link between habitus, capitals and field. He argued that there is no action without raison d’etre, interest, illusio and involvement (Bourdieu, 1990 [1980]). However, interest is not merely a ‘medium for economic action’ (Grenfell, 2008, p. 155), but is something that begins in childhood as an investment for social and cultural space. Thus, it is based on the ‘unconscious calculation of profit’ since every agent has a ‘personal interest in the outcome’ to improve their position in the field (Grenfell, 2008, p. 154). So, according to Bourdieu, cultural consumption of art and literature is never a mere aesthetic appreciation, but it is an expression of class position in the field (Grenfell, 2008) and actions, interests and decisions can be semi-conscious or unconscious.
However, it is clear that he believes that interests precede cultural participation (Yaish and Katz-Gerro, 2010). Once again Bourdieu stressed how interests lead to social domination, but he did not fully explore how tastes and interests are acquired outside family and schooling (Friedman, 2014; Noble & Watkins, 2003; Prieur & Savage, 2013).

The question as to if and how participation affects taste remains unclear. Some scholars, like Kisida, Greene, and Bowen (2014), started to investigate whether participation in cultural activities creates interests and tastes. They claimed that ‘participation in cultural activities may spark a genuine interest in learning and thinking more deeply about the world’ (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014, p. 293). They observed that students can be stimulated to acquire cultural capital after attending an art museum. Thus, exposure to an art institution incremented students’ interests and motivated them to acquire new cultural capital.

To sum up, tastes and interests can be acquired outside schooling and family and this opens up the possibility to study a cultural setting like festivals. Moreover, interests and tastes precede cultural participation, but it is not clear how participation influences taste, for example in festival settings. Little research has been conducted into how festival participation sparks interests and creates cultural capital (Szabó, 2015; Wilks & Quinn, 2016). As a result, there is a need to understand whether cultural tastes and interests follow cultural participation (objective 3a).

As already explained, for Bourdieu, cultural capital ‘operates in consumption fields through a particular conversion into tastes and consumption practices’ (Holt, 1998, p. 4). In other words, Bourdieu’s aim was to explain differential participation in high-cultural activities. To do so, he worked on the information-processing (or cognitive) theory (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]; Bourdieu, Darbel, & Schnapper, 1991 [1966]). The information-
processing theory suggests that individuals attend a high-cultural activity because of their cognitive abilities and information-processing capacititates (Ganzeboom, 1982). In other words, cultural knowledge is a prerequisite for appreciation and participation. Bourdieu and Passeron (1990 [1977]) worked also on the status-seeking theory, according to which individuals participate in high-cultural events because of their willingness to express their belonging to a certain social group and status (Ganzeboom, 1982).

Later, Ganzeboom (1982), comparing the two theories, advocated that the status theory is insufficient, contesting Bourdieu’s view that participation in high-cultural activities is an affirmation of elite status. Thereby Ganzeboom supported the information theory, affirming that cultural knowledge is a prerequisite for cultural participation. He also went further, suggesting that participation may develop cultural knowledge, which in turn can allow greater cultural appreciation, making further participation more likely (Figure 2.1). However, it can be argued that the role of cultural participation in building cultural knowledge, and more broadly cultural capital, is under-investigated, especially in festivals (Wilks & Quinn, 2016). This is a gap in the literature that this study seeks to address (objectives 3a and 3b).

Figure 2.1: Ganzeboom’s (1982) cycle of knowledge, appreciation and participation (Source: Author)
In trying to address this gap, Holt’s (1998) study is particularly useful, since he was one of the first scholars to use the concept of cultural capital to understand leisure activities. According to Holt (1998, p. 17), people with high cultural capital can achieve ‘self-actualization’ and personal enrichment in leisure activities, while people with low cultural capital can merely experience ‘autotelic sociality’, which is ‘intrinsic enjoyment’ (p. 18) from social interaction (Figure 2.2). In other words, people’s pre-existing stock of cultural capital is crucial in determining what and how they attend, and what they gain from the experience.

![Figure 2.2: Holt’s 1998 view of self-actualisation and autotelic sociality](Source: Author)

2.5 Critical reflections on cultural capital as a concept

Cultural capital has been employed in several disciplines and widely used by scholars. However, ‘cultural capital is not a set in stone or universally accepted, either within or across fields’ (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002, p. 22). Scholars argue that ‘there is considerable theoretical confusion in the different ways Bourdieu deployed cultural capital’ (Friedman, 2014, p. 29). Thus, it has been used in various ways and there is little general agreement about the appropriate way to conceptualise and operationalise it. Some scholars have used it in conjunction with other variables. For instance, Dumais (2002)
introduced gender to explain cultural capital as a proxy of education achievement; Côté (1996; 2005) elaborated the identity capital model; Emmison & Frow (1998), and more recently Roberts and Townsend (2015), investigated the role of information technology as a form of cultural capital; Hage (1999, 2002) theorised ‘whiteness’ as a form of cultural capital, while Wallace (2016) explored black cultural capital; and Throsby (1999) investigated the concept of cultural capital in economics. Jeannotte (2004 [2003]) argued that there are four main themes of research on cultural capital: personal empowerment, cultural development and quality of life, cultural participation, and cultural sustainability. Thus, it continues to be used in new and increasingly diverse ways.

Moreover, a large body of research has critiqued Bourdieu’s view of cultural capital. For example, Peterson (1997; 1996) questioned Bourdieu’s theory of homology with his theory of omnivorousness. As explained earlier, according to Bourdieu, each social class can be associated as a whole with the consumption of a particular taste zone, so with a particular form of art. Thus, he posited that highbrow classes are more culturally exclusive and intolerant than the working classes. In contrast, Peterson and Simkus (1992) demonstrated that higher-class people were not adverse to taking part in popular cultural activities. Four years later, Peterson and Kern’s omnivore thesis (1996, p. 901) defined as omnivorous the person who is likely to be involved or ‘at least open to appreciating’ different art genres and tastes, from highbrow to popular, independently of social class. On the contrary, the snob is the person who does not take part in any lowbrow activity. In other words, Peterson and Kern (1996, p. 904) theorised a shift from Bourdieu’s ‘snobbish exclusion’ to ‘omnivorous appropriation’, even if they did not mean that most highbrows had become perfectly omnivorous. They argued that the shift was caused by five inter-linked factors: (1) structural change in standards of living, education and the accessibility of the arts in line with a growing increase of migration and social class
mobility that have mixed different tastes; (2) a change of values concerning gender and racial differences, encouraging more tolerance and democratisation, especially after World war II; (3) developments in the fine arts; (4) generational politics of young white people; (5) and a change in status-group politics with a new administrative class replacing the earlier snobbish entrepreneurial upper-middle class (Peterson & Kern, 1996, p. 905-6). The theory of omnivourousness has been supported and expanded by several scholars (Chan, 2019; Bennet & Silva, 2006; Kwon & Kwon, 2013; Lizardo & Skiles, 2012).

More recently, in Europe, the growing sociological interest in new forms of cultural distinction has questioned both Bourdieu’s original theorisation of high cultural capital as well as Peterson and Kern’s ideas about the cultural omnivore. Prieur and Savage (2011; 2013) suggested new emerging forms of ‘cosmopolitan cultural capital’ (Prieur & Savage, 2013, p. 246). They argued that the traditional high-brow culture has declined and is no longer a characteristic of the well-educated. They do not support the omnivorous thesis either, because it takes the snobbish high-brow culture for granted. Instead, they suggested an alternative to the omnivore thesis, following Holt (1997) and Bennett, Savage, Silva, and Warde (2009). They emphasised that individuals with high levels of cultural capital possess a cosmopolitan orientation and can understand the world as more expansive than people with lower levels of cultural capital. What is clear from all of this re-thinking of cultural capital is that the concept of cultural capital remains ambiguous and needs to be updated (Prieur & Savage, 2011). Thus, more research is needed on the transmission, reproduction, and acquisition of cultural capital in the era of globalization (Sapiro, 2016a). Moreover, Bourdieu’s analysis was limited to a particular country (France), and to a particular time (the 1970s-80s), but he also mentioned that new field analysis is required, considering the issues of ‘temporality’ and ‘particularity’ (Grenfell, 2008, p.78). Sullivan (2002, p. 164) claimed, therefore, that ‘it may be that
cultural capital is more important in some countries than in others, or operates differently in different countries at different times’. Thus, more research on individual cultural capital acquisition in different countries and at different time periods is needed.

### 2.6 Cultural capital indicators

Besides understanding the complexity of the concept, for any scholar interested in researching cultural capital, a key question is how to operationalise it empirically. Bourdieu stated that ‘the best measure of cultural capital is undoubtedly the amount of time devoted to acquiring it’ (2002 [1986], p. 92). He observed the process of acquisition of cultural capital in childhood and argued that the individual cultural capital of children depends on the quantity of cultural capital possessed by the family and the usable time available to guarantee the transmission of this capital (2002 [1986]).

As regards the institutionalised state, Bourdieu (1984 [1979], p. 13) suggested that it can be ‘measured by qualifications’, ‘number of years of scholastic inculcation’ (1984 [1979], p. 13), and ‘duration of schooling’ (1984 [1979], p. 18). The objectified cultural capital, meanwhile, can be measured by the cultural goods possessed by the agent, such as ‘pictures, books, dictionaries, instruments, machines, etc…’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 84).

Concerning the embodied state, there is no general agreement about the appropriate way to operationalise it, maybe because ‘Bourdieu’s conception of cultural capital is very broad and not easily quantifiable’ (Vryonides, 2007, p. 870). Thus, scholars claim that ‘the original theory [of cultural capital] presents problems of operationalisation’ (Lamont & Lareau, 1988, p. 157). The dominant interpretation of the operationalisation of the embodied state in educational research derives from the works
of DiMaggio (1982; 2004), who identified two indicators: high-culture arts attendance and appreciation.

Over time, the operationalisation of embodied cultural capital in research has taken various directions, especially in the social sciences and in education. The most common indicators can be tracked back to quantitative research (Barone, 2006). For instance, De Graaf (1988) and Crook (1997) measured embodied cultural capital by dividing it into two factors, namely public cultural participation (seen as status-seeking) and reading (which can lead to a development and/or reflection of cognitive skills). Both Crook and De Graaf found that the reading experience, as an educational resource, is essential to academic success while participating in formal culture is not. More recently, Sullivan (2001) suggested measuring students’ cultural capital by dividing it into four groups: reading, TV viewing, music, and public cultural participation. She found there to be no association between music or public cultural participation and school grades, although there was a link between educational attainment and both reading and TV viewing. Thus, according to Sullivan, the verbal or literary forms, indicated by reading and watching TV, are more likely to generate knowledge and skills useful for school, rather than the visual or music forms, acquired through cultural participation. In contrast, Katsillis and Robinson’s (1990) quantitative measurement of students’ cultural capital, reveals two indicators of the embodied state: students’ reading habits (number of books read in the past year) and students’ cultural activity habits (frequency of attending theatres, museums, concerts, art galleries).

Thus, the most common indicators of the embodied state include measures of interest, taste and involvement in high culture; measures of cultural participation; and measures of cultural competence (Barone, 2006, p. 1042). One of the most recent and comprehensive systematic reviews of cultural capital indicators was developed by
Kamphuis, Jansen, Mackenbach, and Van Lenthe (2015). This review shows that the vast majority of studies were conducted in the field of educational research, mainly related to the educational achievement of children. Other research fields were employment/career, volunteering, parenting behaviour, and religion. The embodied state included four indicators: participation in cultural events, skills, knowledge/interest, and values like religion (Kamphuis, Jansen, Mackenbach, & Van Lenthe, 2015).

In sum, all the above suggests that there is no general agreement about the appropriate way to operationalise the concept of cultural capital, especially in its embodied state. There seem to be limitations in quantitative empirical research, since it does not capture adequately the full extent of the social dynamics, practices, beliefs, and attitudes of the individuals (Barone, 2006). As, Vryonides (2007) observed, social capital is very much connected with cultural capital, therefore, a qualitative approach, or mixed methods, is well placed to measure and understand cultural capital in educational and social research. Accordingly, several researchers have adopted a qualitative approach (Lareau & Weininger, 2003; Reay, 1998).

### 2.7 Summary

Figure 2.3 is a visual representation of this chapter. The chapter reviews Bourdieu’s cultural capital in its three states (institutionalised, objectified, and embodied) and two types (field-specific and non-field-specific). The literature review highlights the seminal contribution of the concept of cultural capital in different disciplines. The concept of cultural capital has been widely used in academic studies. However, ‘much confusion surrounds this concept’ (Lamont & Lareau, 1988, p. 153). Cultural capital is an
ambiguous term, especially in its embodied state, and some limits of the concept are observed, including Peterson and Kern’s (1997) omnivorous thesis and Prieur and Savage’s (2013) cosmopolitan cultural capital. Besides the need for theoretical clarification of the concept, scholars argue that cultural capital needs to be updated and analysed in the current scenario of cultural consumption outside France (Lamont & Lareau, 1988).

Moreover, there is no general agreement about the appropriate way to operationalise cultural capital. The most common indicators can be tracked back in quantitative research, but these do not capture adequately the full extent of the social dynamics (Barone, 2006; Vryonides, 2007). Specifically, cultural capital indicators are illustrated, following the views of Bourdieu, De Graaf, Crook, Sullivan, Katsilliss and Robinson, Yaish and Katz-Gerro, Kamphuis, and Vryonides. The intention is to understand what are the indicators of the embodied state, including taste and participation.

All the above suggests that there is confusion about the conceptualisation and operationalisation of cultural capital. A way to increase understanding might be to think differently and to focus more on how it is acquired rather than how it creates distinction (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014). Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) argued that taste and pre-existing stock of cultural capital shapes cultural participation. While it is clear that cultural capital, in terms of knowledge, tastes, skills, can shape participation in cultural activities, the reverse is much less clear. Ganzeboom (1982) began to address this by arguing that cultural participation shapes taste and individual cultural capital. Holt (1998) also argued that cultural participation can generate self-actualisation and personal enrichment, but only for individuals with high cultural capital. However, more understanding is needed about how cultural capital is acquired by agents (Noble & Watkins, 2003; Prieur & Savage, 2013).
Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) stressed that cultural capital is mainly acquired through family and schooling via primary socialisation. However, he also suggested that cultural capital acquisition is a systematic and on-going process and is developed in adulthood in the occupational field (Bourdieu, 1987). There is a need to open up the field of enquiry beyond family and schooling into adulthood and other cultural settings of cultural participation. Bourdieu did some work on museums but other cultural fields like festivals are an interesting possibility for research (Friedman, 2014). This also opens up the possibility to analyse cultural capital in different countries and time periods (Grenfell, 2008; Sullivan, 2002). Thus, Chapter Three reviews Bourdieu’s cultural capital in literary festivals.

![Figure 2.3: Visual representation of Chapter Two: cultural capital](Source: Author)
CHAPTER 3
LITERARY FESTIVALS

3 Introduction
After reviewing the concept of cultural capital, and how researchers have conceptualised and operationalised it, this chapter explores literary festivals and their relation to the concept of cultural capital. The chapter is divided into three parts. Firstly, addressing objective 2a, it explores literary festivals and their audiences. In order to properly connect cultural capital and literary festivals, it is first important to understand the characteristics of literary festivals and their participants. Here, the chapter reviews the historical evolution of literary festivals to better understand their role of cultural consumption arenas and the recent trend of festivalisation of culture mentioned in Chapter One. The second part addresses objective 2b by investigating how cultural capital has been used in festival studies. Finally, the last part of the chapter reviews the elements that need to be considered when investigating cultural capital acquisition in festivals. Here, the dynamics of literary festival participation and reasons for participating are reviewed.

3.1 Literary festivals
In order to explore the relationship between cultural capital and literary festivals, the first step is to understand what literary festivals are. Defining literary festivals is complicated because scholars suggest several different perspectives. Up to now there is no precise definition differentiating literary festivals from literature, book, or writers’ festivals.
Theorists refer to literary festivals using a variety of terms, such as literature festivals (Giorgi, 2011a; Sapiro, 2016b), literary festivals (Weber, 2018), book festivals (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014), writers’ festivals (Stewart, 2013), and festivals of ideas (Murray, 2012), sometimes even interchangeably (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014). A common assumption is that literary festivals are a subset of cultural festivals (Driscoll, 2014, 2015) and that they differ from book fairs, which are trade events for publishers whose main purpose is the economic return (Giorgi, 2011a).

Literary festivals ‘are about the celebration of the written word in readings, discussions or debates’ (Giorgi, 2011a, p. 12). They have been described ‘as ‘cultural peep-shows’ (O’Donnell 263) or ‘exercises in voyeurism’ (‘In the Flesh’), likened to ‘mock-heroic ritual[s]’ (Indyk 38) and said to obey ‘the shrink-wrapped requirement of cultural hypermarket tourism’ (O’Donnell 274)’ (Ommundsen, 2000, pp. 173-174).

Driscoll (2014, p. 192) provided a clear and exhaustive definition of literary festivals.

‘Literary festivals are cultural events with value and meaning. (…) literary festivals provide intellectual stimulation, a sense of intimate community, and opportunities for social and ethical reflection. They add a layer of personal meaning to books and offer the entertainment pleasures of large-scale performances. Criticisms that dismiss literary festivals as commerce-driven and are snide about their predominantly female, middle-class audiences only reinforce the fact that festivals are middlebrow institutions, working outside the legitimate sites of higher education and offering a more accessible kind of cultural experience’.

As explained in the Glossary, in this research only the term literary festival will be used. This choice has been made so as not to emphasise the role of neither books, writers nor readers, since this study privileges the perspective of the audience member, who is not necessarily a reader. Moreover, the term literary festival has been chosen as a broad term to describe a festival that relates to literary culture, featuring literary fiction and poetry, but also non-fiction, graphic novels, and other media.
Furthermore, an obvious way to define literary festivals is by types. Scholars (Giorgi, 2011b; Stewart, 2013) identified two types of literary festivals, namely international and peripheral, which differ in terms of the authors involved and the content presented. International festivals, such as the International Festival of Authors in Toronto, the International Literature Festival in Berlin and the New Yorker Festival, are found in big cities, important centres of the global publishing business and literary production and almost exclusively focus on literary issues. Authors are seen as ‘literary celebrities’ (Stewart, 2013, p. 269) and are more likely to be recognised for their writings and ideas rather than their personal biographies, which instead characterise peripheral festivals. These festivals tend to be international and commercial in orientation (Giorgi, 2011b).

Stewart (2013) argued that nowadays, most festivals take place in peripheral locations with less publishing business (Stewart, 2013). Peripheral festivals, in contrast, take place in smaller towns, like the Hay Festival of Literature in Wales and the Edinburgh Book Festival in Scotland. The authors programmed in peripheral festivals are not only traditional writers, but also include literary fiction authors and ‘bloggers, musicians, comedians and public figures more generally’ (Stewart, 2013, p. 268), who are considered cultural celebrities rather than literary celebrities. They also include local writers and the programme content involves literary prose and poetry, like international festivals, and also encompasses other national and regional topics (Ommundsen, 2000).

Therefore, the following definition of literary festivals will be used: literary festivals are cultural festivals where people meet to celebrate literature, books, and living authors. ‘They typically feature a variety of debates, book presentations, and readings by authors, although they can also offer other types of events like theatre, music concerts or walking tours, delivered over a period of days, from a weekend to one or two weeks. Usually, their primary goals include: promoting books, offering exposure for emerging
authors, building a sense of community, and fostering a love of reading’ (Rossetti & Quinn, 2019, p. 95).

What is clear from all these definitions is that literary festivals provide intellectual stimulation and entertainment pleasure. This leads to the question whether literary festivals can enhance audiences’ cultural capital. To answer this question, and before addressing it empirically, it is first fundamental to consider who the literary festival participants are.

3.1.1 Literary festival participants

Studies of festival audiences have pointed to ‘an interactive mix of spectators and participants (Mules & Ayling, 2005) with various levels of involvement’ (Mackellar, 2009, p. 90). As explained in the Glossary, this thesis uses the term participants to refer to all audience members. In 2013, the European Festival Association produced the first European Festival Census, which profiled the audience of cultural festivals in Europe (Guerzoni, Lissoni, Mussapi, Ramos, & Ranieri, 2015). The Census reports that the audience is evenly divided between men and women, with a homogeneous distribution of age ranges, and a majority who are single or without family ties. However, research on literary festival participants has been limited to date (Kruger, 2019). One reason for this is the difficulty involved in capturing an in-depth picture of literary festivals participants. Literary festivals are very numerous and often organisers do not have the time or the means to collect data since many festivals have unticketed events (Mintel, 2011). Moreover, Weber (2018, p. 80), analysing literary festivals in Australia and the UK, claimed that a ‘typical’ audience member does not exist since ‘the complexity and variety of their motivations refute [the] concept of a ‘general’ audience’.
However, it is possible to find some studies which have paid attention to literary festival participants. Often, they have argued that audiences are mainly female, middle-aged, locals or regionals, high-brow, and middle-class with high cultural capital (Ommundsen, 2009; Johanson & Freeman, 2012; Driscoll, 2014; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015). Here, it is important to note five main characteristics of literary festival participants. Firstly, the predominance of female participants, which for Ommundsen (2009, p. 22) represents the ‘feminisation of literary culture’, a key feature of women’s culture and the new literary middlebrow (Driscoll, 2014). Even if festival presenters are split between men and women, and most keynote speakers are male, most consumers are women (Driscoll, 2014). According to Driscoll (2014), the reason is linked to broader reading practices, and to the emphasis on emotional connections and social interactions which are related to the female culture.

Secondly, usually, most audiences are middle-aged (Weber, 2018). However, as already explained, many festivals have expanded their programmes to include children only events. Thus, while some decades ago, literary activities were dedicated mainly to older members of the family, with a medium-high level of education, today we are experiencing rapid growth of literature for children and adolescents (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014). Obviously, children do not take part in the events alone but are accompanied by their parents. This creates a significant expansion of the literary festival audience to include also the younger generations.

Thirdly, another important characteristic of literary audiences concerns social class. On this point, there is no uniform view among scholars. Most theorists (Driscoll, 2014; Ommundsen, 2009) claim that participants are middle class, highbrow with high cultural and economic capital, in terms of the level of education and annual income. This means that participants all seem to be readers, with the majority also being writers (or
aspiring, or emerging writers) (Ommundsen, 2009). Nevertheless, Lurie (2004, p. 12) claimed that literary festivals are experiencing a shift ‘beyond passionate lovers of literature to a more general and cashed-up audience’. Similarly, Giorgi (2011b) argued that festivals do not represent the middle class, as the literary salons used to. She explained that today’s diversification of cultural taste has led literary festivals to mediate different cultural tastes, styles and genres. This reflects the omnivorous thesis explained in Chapter Two. More recently, Weber (2018) focused on the significance of literary festivals within the context of contemporary book culture, using Bourdieu’s concept of the literary field. She observed that participants have different levels of engagement with literary culture, from ‘motivated readers’ to only ‘seeking enjoyment and catharsis’ (Weber, 2018, p. 83). So, she classified audience members into three clusters according to their level of active/passive engagement with the festival: spectators, festival-goers, and festival participants.

Fourthly, another key feature of literary festival participants is ethnicity. Weber (2018, p. 195) observed that Western literary festivals are ‘very white’, due to the majority of participants with Caucasian ethnicity. Finally, they seem to be mainly locals or regionals (Driscoll, 2014; Mintel, 2011; Sapiro, 2016b). Participants from outside the host place are very few, and they are usually holidaymakers.

Given all the above, it would seem that there are barriers to participating in literary festivals, for people who do not have the necessary economic and cultural capital to attend. As Sapiro (2016 p. 13) argued, access is limited and ‘cultural capital as a prerequisite for reading literature’ is important. For this reason, the empirical part of this study needs to consider pre-existing cultural capital.
3.1.2 Historical overview of literary festivals

After reviewing what literary festivals are and the features of the participants, the chapter now reviews the reasons why it is important to study them in relation to cultural capital. This section provides an overview of the historical evolution of literary festivals to understand their cultural value and cultural impact on audiences. To properly understand the evolution and expansion of literary festivals internationally it is crucial to also consider the wider festival sector, especially urban and arts festivals, and its interrelation with literary festivals. The first festival was said to be in Athens in 534 BC. It was a religious public ritual in honour of the god Dionysos (Quinn, 2005). From that moment, festivals were seen as places where individuals could be licentious and order could be inverted (Stewart, 2009). This tradition of festivals as carnivalesque continued throughout the years as festivals continued to realise their important social, political and cultural functions. Between the 12th and 18th centuries in Europe, independent city-states, such as Venice, used festivities to control their territories, in that public rituals were tools to generate civic consciousness, in the face of internal political division and external threats (Quinn, 2005).

Giorgi (2011b) argued that contemporary literary festivals share similar purposes and characteristics with the literary salons of the 17th and 18th century in promoting the exchange of ideas and linking art with politics. Literary salons, usually coffee houses or private households, hosted meetings of like-minded and well-educated middle-class individuals to discuss arts and politics. Salons were often used for presenting new ideas, which were later published in political journals. They were facilitators of democratisation, contributing to the emergent political public sphere.

However, the precursors of contemporary urban arts festivals can be traced back to the 19th century (e.g. the Bayreuth Festival in 1876 and the Salzburger Festspiele in
1920) (Quinn, 2005). During these years there was a growth of cities and urban elites, who used festivals as markers of social distinction. Festivals tended to present high-quality programmes, dedicated exclusively to art connoisseurs, and affirming ‘civilising and educational values of ‘high’ culture’ (Quinn, 2005, p. 7). This social distinction was also clear in literary festivals that ‘retain a measure of cultural capital as instances of high art production’ (Stewart, 2009, p. 17). The post-war period was characterised by the growth of many European arts festivals that contributed to the development of the cultural sphere (Quinn, 2005). The oldest still-surviving literary festival in Europe is the Times Cheltenham Literature Festival, in England. This was founded in 1949 (Driscoll, 2014), and for several years remained the only one of its kind.

The 1960s and 1970s were characterised by the rise of new social movements, such as feminism, gay rights, anti-war and environmentalism, all of which influenced festival production and often sought to use festivals for social aims and turn them into means for social interaction reducing the distinction between high and low arts (Quinn, 2005). However, there was then minimal literary festival activity until the 1980s, when they began to spread all over the world. Nowadays, there are more than 450 literary festivals worldwide (Weber, 2018), and they have multiplied internationally, including Germany, Italy, Spain, China, Thailand, Israel, and Kenya (Stewart, 2013), in major capitals and small regional towns. The most established festivals, in addition to the Cheltenham festival mentioned earlier, are the Poetry International festival in Rotterdam (launched in 1970), the Toronto International Festival of Authors (1980), Edinburgh International Book Festival (1983), the Melbourne Writers Festival (1986), and the Hay-on-Wye Festival of Literature and the Arts (1988) (Driscoll, 2014; Giorgi, 2011a).

Literary festivals really proliferated from the middle of the 1990s, such as the Étonnants-Voyageurs festival in Saint-Malo (1990), Festaletteratura in Mantua, Italy
(1997), the International Literature Festival Berlin (2001), Lit. Cologne (2001), Festival America in Paris (2002), the Brooklyn Book Festival in New York (2005), and the European Borderlands Festival (2006) (Sapiro, 2016). In Ireland, the first festival to contain a literature section was the Liberties Festival Dublin (1969) and the first literary festivals were the Listowel Writers’ Week (1970), the Cúirt International Festival of Literature in Galway (1985), and the International Literature Festival Dublin (1998). In Italy meanwhile, the first literary festivals were the Festival Internazionale di Poesia in Genoa (1995), Festivaletteratura in Mantua (1997), and the Andersen Festival in Genoa (1998). All literary festivals began as amateur and hobby initiatives and then developed into more-or-less professional organizations (Giorgi, 2011b).

The development of literary festivals was driven by several factors including industrialisation, economic pressures, development of the arts, and internationalisation (Giorgi, 2011b). As such, festivals proliferated thanks to governments, which began to develop cultural policies in order to promote reading with the help of some cultural intermediaries (Sapiro, 2016b). In addition, publishers and bookstores started to organise book fairs and festivals as new forms of promotion to attract the public. This growth of literary festivals needs to be understood in the broader context of cultural production and consumption, transformed by the mass media and by diverse patterns of leisure and tourism (Waterman, 1998; Weber, 2018). In this scenario, arts festivals more generally expanded in urban areas which used them in order to promote the economy, attract tourists and differentiate themselves in a highly competitive global market (Prentice & Andersen, 2003; Quinn, 2005).

Changing patterns of cultural consumption are also evident in literary festivals which in the last half-century ‘have flourished in number, popularity and geographic reach’ (Stewart, 2013, p. 263). Literary festivals are now growing as tourist attractions,
even if literary tourism continues to remain niche (Mintel, 2011). Thus, literary festivals have become forms of literary tourism and creative tourism. The tourismification of literary festivals has many causes. Certainly, festivals are expanding their programmes with, for example, music entertainment, theatre performances, art exhibitions, or walking tours, and this is increasing their appeal to a more extensive public (Mintel, 2011; Stewart, 2013).

The explosion of literary festivals and these programming changes have been criticised by some scholars who see it as an example of how culture is being festivalised (Meehan, 2005; Négrier, 2015). According to them, this current practice points to the decline of aesthetic culture into commercialisation. Négrier (2015) argues that, nowadays festivals are experiencing a change from ‘cultural permanence’ (p. 20), associated with cultural policies and public support for cultural activities in which the audience brought ‘a commitment to learning and the development of their cultural capital’ (p. 20), to ‘ephemeral presentism’ (p. 20), that focused more on the lively aspect of the feast. This purported change also highlights a shift from ‘asceticism’ to ‘social hedonism’ (p. 20), where the appreciation of culture is replaced with mere social entertainment and leisure. In other words, according to him, nowadays audiences attend festivals merely for fun and enjoyment, what he called hedonism. However, Négrier (2015) does not distinguish between different types of festivals. Literary festivals may differ, for example, from music or sport or food festivals, and in turn, their audiences may differ. Notwithstanding the detail, this shift from cultural permanence to ephemeral presentism creates an important context for this study of cultural capital acquisition as one might ask if it also concerns literary festivals. Indeed, emotions are present in festival participation. This study focuses on how cultural capital development occurs in festival contexts, therefore, emotions partially need to be considered, such as fun and enjoyment.
3.2 Cultural capital and literary festivals

Thus far it is clear that there is a need and plenty of scope for exploring the cultural value of literary festivals. To do this, this thesis uses Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital. The chapter proceeds by reviewing how researchers have sought to understand the relationship between cultural capital and literary festivals, considering also the wider context of arts and urban festivals.

The literature review of cultural capital in festival studies shows that three perspectives dominate: the municipality (the cultural capital of the city, which leads to urban generation), the community (local inhabitants’ cultural capital), and the individual (participants’ cultural capital). The predominant focus of the research on the cultural impacts of festivals and the development of cultural capital is on the city, as a cultural destination. This perspective links cultural capital to economic capital, urban tourism and cultural policy (Quinn, 2010). As noted earlier, literary festivals emerge from the cultural resources of the city, while for the city, the association with literary festivals and famous authors is an opportunity to further build cultural resources and urban tourism (Landry, 2006; Robertson & Yeoman, 2014). Thus, festivals are seen as cultural capital builders for the city, image-makers (Richards & Wilson, 2004), tourist attractions (Johnson, 2006), community builders (Quinn, 2006), local heritage maintainers (Snowball & Willis, 2006), and cultural infrastructure enhancers (Quinn, 2006).

A second theme in the literature is the community’s cultural capital. Researchers have investigated the cultural impacts of festivals on local communities from different angles. For instance, some scholars analysed the cultural impacts of festivals perceived by the local residents (Wood & Thomas, 2006), local youth (Jaeger & Mykletun, 2013), the organisers (Gursoy, Kim, & Uysal, 2004). Others examined cultural impacts on the non-host community of festivals and events (Deccio and Baloglu, 2002) and on local
artists (Lim, 2012). Comunian (2015), focusing on cultural production, explored festivals as artistic communities of practice who learn by doing and creating knowledge networks amongst them. However, most of these studies focus on festivals as generators of the host community’s cultural capital. They understand cultural capital as values, attitudes, traditions or tastes maintained, revitalised or developed through festivals.

Finally, the last body of scholarly work focuses on the audience’s cultural capital, which is the focus of this thesis. Most of the studies investigated how individual cultural capital shapes festival participation, including literary festivals. As observed in Chapter Two, Bourdieu, with the information-processing theory, just like Ganzeboom (1982) and Holt (1998) argued that participation in cultural activities depends on individual cognitive capacities. In the context of festival studies, several scholars have explored this topic, for instance how cultural capital influenced participation according to the type of event attended (Snowball & Willis, 2006). As mentioned previously, most of the studies about literary festivals have focused on the pre-existing level of audiences’ cultural capital to explain class distinction, power domination, and position-taking in the literary field (Driscoll, 2014; Driscoll & Squires, 2018; Merfeld-Langston, 2010; Sapiro, 2016b; Weber, 2015, 2018). Studies have shown how audiences need to possess certain cultural capital, mainly understood as knowledge and taste, to access festivals, ‘appreciate literary cultural forms’ (Merfeld-Langston, 2010, p. 348) and enjoy them (Kim, Cheng, & O’Leary, 2007).

### 3.2.1 Festival participation and the development of audiences’ cultural capital

Thus far it is clear that cultural capital shapes festival participation. However, the key question posed here is whether the reverse is also the case: does festival participation shape participants’ cultural capital? In educational studies, many scholars have explored
festivals as arenas for learning and identity formation (Karlsen, 2009; Rossetti, 2016), while in sociology, cultural studies and tourism studies, works have focused on habitus and attitude change after festival participation (Organ, Koenig-Lewis, Palmer, & Probert, 2015). Furthermore, according to Chwe (1998), public events, such as festivals, are vehicles for ‘common knowledge generation’ (1998, p. 47). Lampel (2011) also added that sometimes agents can build cultural capital that they were not expecting to build, so festivals can be environments of ‘predictable unpredictability’ (p. 342). However, there is not a significant amount of scholarly work on personal development through event participation (Getz & Page, 2016), especially in literary festivals (Weber, 2018). Szabó (2015) observed that systematic research on the educational dimension of festivals is lacking, and highlighted the need to investigate how audiences’ cultural capital can be developed.

However, a few scholars have attempted to investigate individual cultural capital acquisition during festivals. For instance, Wilks (2009), analysing music festivals, suggested that the ‘development of cultural capital is an on-going project for individuals’ (p. 270) and that people who repeatedly participate in festivals build cultural capital in the process. Similarly, McClinchey (2013) observed that multicultural festivals can foster cultural capital. According to McClinchey (2013, p. 75), festivals are opportunities for communicating and educating about culture, enabling participants ‘to pass on culture’. By attending festivals, audiences can build their ‘ethnic self’ (p. 76), seen as embodied cultural capital. Audiences can also accumulate objectified cultural capital during festival participation, by for example purchasing food, handicrafts, and other tangible cultural artefacts (McClinchey, 2013).

Since festivals are social gatherings and encourage us to be more open with others (McClinchey, 2013), these studies also considered how social capital may influence and
enable individual cultural capital development (Bentley, 2003; Ian, 2013; Newman, Goulding, & Whitehead, 2013; Wilks, 2009). For example, Quinn and Wilks (2019, p. 27) argued that bonding and bridging social capital in festivals allow individuals to ‘reinvigorate and renew memories and traditions, abilities and capacities’. Similarly, Newman, Goulding, and Whitehead (2013) observed that group dynamics and cultural participation are interlinked during visual art participation and shape identity and wellbeing.

Although some studies investigated individual cultural capital acquisition through festival participation, the focus is rarely on literary festivals. However, there are notable exceptions. For instance, literary festivals have been described as settings ‘for discovering introducing and discussing new works’ (Sapiro, 2016b, p. 9) and ‘alternative education providers’ which promote reading (Driscoll, 2014, p. 153). Sharing ideas creates opportunities to open dialogues and learn about, for example, other people and cultures (Merfeld-Langston, 2010). Analysing literary festival audiences with the hypothesis that festivals meet the needs and desires of readers to be fulfilled, Johanson and Freeman (2012, p. 312) argued that audiences are given time to reflect, debate, and have communal dialogue, in which ‘knowledge, advice and feedback are shared’ (Johanson & Freeman, 2012, p. 313). They claimed, therefore, that literary festivals confer cultural capital on attendees (2012, p. 312). Weber (2018, p. 32) also advocated that ‘literary festivals are spaces in which authors and readers (...) compete for legitimacy through the acquisition of cultural, social, and economic capital’. Similarly, Robertson and Yeoman (2014, p. 330) argued that participating at literary festivals ‘is part of that [individual] accumulation of cultural capital’. Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler (2015, p. 111), describing literary festivals as cultural producers, went as far as to state that they can generate capital littéraire in the audience, which is the literary ability of the participant, usually learned at
school, and understood as a condition of access to the literary field. Thus, according to Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler (2015), through festival participation audiences can acquire knowledge and skills related to literature, which form literary capital. Likewise, Driscoll (2014) observed that many participants of the Emerging Writers Festival in Melbourne appreciated the professional development aspects of the festivals, such as masterclasses and awards, where they developed their writing skills. The festival, therefore, was seen as a site for self-education. Kruger (2019, p. 203) went further, suggesting that literary festivals can stimulate behaviours like ‘greater awareness of the arts, increased purchasing behaviour of literary works, increased travel to support the literary arts and greater personal involvement’. Thus, according to Kruger (2019), literary festivals can enhance the literary arts both during and after participation.

Such arguments are, however, contested. Firstly, Finkielkraut (1987) and Fumaroli (1991) both claimed that mere attendance and exposure to cultural activities is not enough to significantly impact the ways in which individuals interact with culture. They both argued that the ability of people to achieve an understanding and an appreciation of traditional art forms cannot merely rely on cultural participation, but rather requires education and serious study (Merfeld-Langston, 2010). Secondly, according to some scholars, several literary festivals promote themselves primarily as entertainments (Driscoll, 2014; Giorgi, 2011b). In doing so, they do not satisfy the audience’s ‘hunger for intellectual stimulus’ (Ommundsen, 2009, p. 32), but instead, encourage audiences ‘to laziness of mind’, since not ‘many people at a literary festival are forced to think really very hard’ (Ommundsen, 2009, p. 32). In other words, the proliferation of festivals has diluted the effect of creating cultural capital (Driscoll, 2014).

In conclusion, two key questions arise: can literary festival participation lead to individual cultural capital development? If so, what state and type of cultural capital can
be acquired? As explained, participation allows a sharing of ideas and discussions about books and related topics which are not necessarily related to literature (Giorgi, 2011b). As such, is it possible that participation might develop non-field-specific cultural capital?

3.2.2 Issues of cultural capital in festival studies

Chapter Two pointed to theoretical confusion in the conceptualisation of cultural capital. It is an ambiguous concept, especially in its embodied state and scholars have understood and operationalised it differently (Prieur & Savage, 2011; Vryonides, 2007; Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002). This disagreement is also present among scholars in festival studies. Building cultural capital through festival participation has been explored by lots of theorists from different perspectives. However, much of the literature has not been using the term cultural capital explicitly. Instead, several terms have been employed by scholars to consider the cultural capital generated by festivals, such as cultural impacts or cultural outcomes (Getz & Page, 2016). Academic deliberations have understood, operationalised and defined cultural capital from different angles. In order words, cultural capital is neither widely nor uniformly used in the festival literature.

Moreover, researchers exploring cultural capital in festivals focus on the embodied state, but there is no general agreement on the best way to operationalise it (Friedman, 2014; Merfeld-Langston, 2010; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015; Snowball and Willis, 2006; Wilks and Quinn, 2016; Wilks, 2009). Scholars have identified several different indicators to capture cultural capital embodiment in festivals. The most common indicators are: cultural knowledge, reading and writing habits, cultural consumption and participation, habitus and norms, academic qualifications, taste, possession of cultural goods, occupation, and social origin (which includes parental occupation and education). Thus, there is no general conformity among the indicators and
very often they are not fully explained (Driscoll, 2014; McClinchey, 2013; Weber, 2015). Researchers have begun to explore the links between festivals and cultural capital, but little work has been conducted on identifying the indicators of cultural capital and its embodied state. This lack of agreement about which indicators to use suggests that more is needed on how to best operationalise cultural capital embodiment in festivals studies.

3.3 Literary festival participation and cultural capital development

To understand if and how cultural capital is acquired at literary festivals, the nature of the festivals, their temporal, spatial, social dimensions, and the dynamics of the experience need to be taken into account. The literary festival experience is a very complex moment that encompasses several dimensions that, in turn, can shape audiences’ cultural capital. According to Getz and Page (2016, p. 610), when analysing the experience and meaning of festivals we should ‘consider each dimension of the experience: conative (behaviour), affective (emotional) and cognitive’.

When exploring cultural capital development in festivals, the festival environment is an important element that can shape experiences and personal benefits. This includes physical factors like time and space, including event locations (Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016; Morgan, 2008). Several studies delved into the concepts of time and space in festival studies. Festivals have been defined as liminal spaces (Jaimangal-Jones, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2010; Lucas & Wright, 2013; Pielichaty, 2015; Turner, 1984), where the ritual is linked to spatial and social space. These liminal zones allow participants to engage in out of the ordinary practices and perform ‘carnivalesque inversions of the everyday’ (Ravenscroft & Matteucci, 2003, p. 1). Jaimangal-Jones, Pritchard, and Morgan (2010) theorised music festivals as rites of passage, temporary social and spatial constructions. Similarly, Wilks and Quinn (2016, p. 24) conceptualised
art festivals as ‘other places’ using Foucault’s concept of heterotopia. According to them, festivals are ‘several spaces within a single space’. Thus, during festivals, spaces, like cafes, theatres and pubs maintain their original functions and ‘also provide the settings for intensified social interaction’ (p. 34). Moreover, festival attributes like programme content, amenities and tickets are other physical factors that can shape participation (Cole & Chancellor, 2009; Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016; Morgan, 2008). As such, it is important to ‘examine how [festival] design can influence experience and behaviour’ (Getz & Page, 2016, p. 610).

Besides external factors, some personal factors, such as demographics (Axelsen & Swan, 2010) and the role of the body, can shape festival participation and personal outcomes. As a matter of fact, during literary festivals people debate about books and ‘most of the time is spent communicating about the performance [of the speakers]’ (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014, p. 322), so, the physical presence of people is crucial. The most extreme reference to the importance of physical involvement comes from Meehan (2005). He argued that during festivals, the literary text becomes secondary, subordinate, or even redundant. What is important is the physical presence of both writers and readers, what he called ‘flesh’. Indeed, the role of the body is crucial in cultural participation since ‘there are no experiences without bodies’ (Matteucci, 2016, p. 69). The sentient body can generate through its senses ‘a number of personal benefits such as social, intellectual, self and physical development’ (Matteucci, 2016, p. 68). Here, one might ask how the use of the body and its senses during festivals can shape participants’ cultural capital. Only a few scholars have deeply explored the bodily experiential consumption and corporeality of festivals (Cummings & Herbert, 2015; Henry, 2000; Lea, 2006) and the embodiment of knowledge through festival participation (Duffy & Waitt, 2011; Karlsen, 2009). For instance, Herborn (2017), analysing live music events, argued that the dynamic
entanglement between the environment and participants’ bodies can shape their cultural embodiment. Thus, the role of the body and its relationship with cultural capital embodiment need further investigation (Boden & Williams, 2002).

Scholars argue that social context and interaction is another element shaping festival experiences and their cultural outcomes (Axelsen & Swan, 2010; Geus, Richards, & Toeplol, 2016; Morgan, 2008; Packer & Ballantyne, 2010). Thus, it needs to be considered when exploring cultural capital development in festivals. In literary festivals, the physical presence of writers and readers and the dynamic interaction between them create a literary community (McAleese, 2018), a sense of belonging and participation (Ommundsen, 2009). Driscoll (2014, p. 165) argued that the ‘bookish community’ is a key theme of the experience and comprises ‘the warmth of the festival atmosphere’ and the ‘intimacy with star authors’, who are considered high-profile guests with whom audiences create emotional connections. Likewise, Weber (2015) included the social dimension and the audience’s desire for interaction with the writers in her theoretical modelling of the literary festival participants’ experience. This needs to be understood in the wider context of cultural festivals, as gatherings of people, intense interplays of actors (Quinn, 2013), arenas of performative practices (Lucas & Wright, 2013) and immersive experiences (Jordan, 2016). During festivals, the audiences are not mere spectators, as in theatres and concert halls, rather they become involved in the performances (Fabiani, 2011; Sherry Jr, Kozinets, & Borghini, 2013). However, there has been little academic research on the immersive nature of festivals (O’Grady, 2015), and especially on literary festival audience member’s experience (Weber, 2018). All this leads to the question: what is the role of social interactions in cultural capital development during festivals?

Besides social interactions, Weber (2015) suggested three other dimensions of the literary festival participants’ experience: aesthetics, affective and intellectual. The
aesthetic dimension relates to the appreciation and pleasure of the qualities of the texts, and the enjoyment of speeches and literary debates. The affective dimension refers to the emotional engagement between authors and audiences through ‘celebrity confessionals’ (Weber, 2015, p. 91). Finally, the intellectual dimension, also called cognitive or analytical, is the participant’s involvement in intellectual discussions. This depends on the individual’s previous knowledge and conceptions. Once again, the role of pre-existing cultural resources is remarkably important for ‘cognitive success’ (Weber, 2015, p. 91).

The practice of literary consumption is, therefore, an ‘active involvement - physical, emotional, intellectual and social’ (Ommundsen, 2009, p. 21). Involvement, engagement and the entire festival atmosphere are very important for shaping the experience. Indeed, festival studies argue that the festival atmosphere (Packer & Ballantyne, 2010), including timing (Axelsen & Swan, 2010), the levels of engagement, involvement (Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016) and entertainment (Semrad & Rivera, 2018) are all crucial factors of festival experiences and their outcomes. One might ask if and how all the dimensions of the experience play a role in the process of cultural capital development in literary festivals. Motivations for participating might also play an important role in cultural capital development, as explained in the following section.

3.3.1 Reasons for participating in literary festivals and cultural capital development

To investigate if and how participants acquire cultural capital at festivals and to examine if we are experiencing what Négrier (2015, p. 20) called ‘ephemeral presentism’, the reasons for participating need to be explored. This section reviews the reasons for participating in literary festivals, with reference to cultural and arts festivals more generally. Festival research suggests that audiences participate in arts festivals because
of ‘escapism, socialization, relaxation, prestige, nostalgia, atmosphere, family togetherness, and a desire to learn’ (Van Zyl & Botha, 2004, p. 215). According to the 2013 European Festival Census (Guerzoni, Lissoni, Mussapi, Ramos, & Ranieri, 2015), festivals are a time of escape, arenas for socialising with friends and opportunities to meet other people who share similar interests. From the existing literature, reasons for participating in literary festivals can be sub-divided into five macro categories, which are interlinked and often overlapping: social, aesthetic, affective, intellectual, and hedonistic (Meehan, 2005; Ommundsen, 2009; Johanson & Freeman, 2012; Stewart, 2013; Driscoll, 2014; Weber, 2015).

The festival literature has strongly highlighted the socialisation factor, both known group socialisation (with family and friends) and external interaction (general socialisation) (Bowen & Daniels, 2005; Chacko & Schaffer, 1993; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Nicholson & Pearce, 2001). People may participate to ‘accompany friends or relatives’ (Jeannotte, 2000, p. 10), to network with friends (Johanson & Freeman, 2012) or with other people who share the same interests, and to gain a sense of community (Stewart, 2013). The aesthetic category encompasses the willingness to live an experience and see the well-known artists, and is widely recognised to underpin motivations for participating in arts and music festivals (Crompton & McKay, 1997; Faulkner, Fredline, Larson, & Tomljenovic, 1999; Getz & Cheyen, 1997; Nicholson & Pearce, 2001; Prentice & Andersen, 2003). Indeed, literary festivals create opportunities to see, meet, and listen to favourite writers (Johanson & Freeman, 2012). As such, festivals become spiritual and affective experiences. Participants, as fans, can listen to authors talking about their personal life, troubles, or personality. As readers, they can listen to authors talking about their process of writing books, their ideas, and even their ‘unique timbre’ of voice (Stewart, 2013, p. 264). As regards the intellectual enrichment, it has been acknowledged
that people go to arts and music festivals because of educational reasons (Crompton, 1979), a desire for cultural exploration (Crompton & McKay, 1997), and the need to learn, stimulate or challenge oneself (Jeannotte, 2000). Similarly, people may participate in literary festivals to have stimulating and creative conversations, to listen to other ideas, to be informed about different topics, to learn about local culture (Cassell, Lema, & Agrusa, 2010), or to educate children (Jeannotte, 2000). They may participate to acquire cultural skills, such as writing skills in a non-academic site (Driscoll, 2014), or for ‘comparing notes’: ‘a bit like a conference really’ (Johanson & Freeman, 2012, p. 311). Hedonism can be another reason for participating in literary festivals. Festival studies have highlighted the need to be entertained, to live the experience, to relax and enjoy oneself, to party, to escape and to have novelty and excitement (Crompton, 1979; Nicholson & Pearce, 2001; Van Zyl & Botha, 2004).

As explained earlier, Meehan (2005) argued that literary festival audiences seem to be wanting to participate mainly for the desire of intimate communication and physical proximity with authors rather than to develop their own knowledge. He described this as the deindustrialisation of the literary arts (also called the materialisation of culture), characterised by an interest in physical closeness with the author instead of knowledge of the text. The process of the deindustrialisation of culture was subsequently supported by Johanson and Freeman (2012). The main cause of this process may be the rise of celebrity public culture (Merfeld-Langston, 2010; Stewart, 2013). This reflects what Ommundsen (2009, p. 30) defined as the meet-the-author culture: ‘audiences don’t come to hear authors read, they want to find out who they are, as writers and as human beings, to experience the aura surrounding the creator of literary works’. As mentioned earlier, some scholars, such as Négrier (2015), who claim that people now attend festivals merely for fun and enjoyment rather than for a commitment to learning.
All the above suggests that motivations could influence participation and in turn cultural capital acquisition. The reasons for participating need, therefore, to be investigated, as well as all the other dimensions of festival participation, when exploring cultural capital development.

### 3.4 Summary

Literary festivals have proliferated worldwide and they are now tourism attractions (Mintel, 2011; Weber, 2018). Their programmes have also changed and now include events not related to literature so as to become increasingly oriented towards a more generic audience (Stewart, 2013). This proliferation of literary festivals and shift in the programme have been criticized by some scholars who see it as a process of commercialisation of culture (Négrier, 2015). Researchers argue that the audience is not committed to learn and acquire cultural resources anymore and that the cultural value of literary festivals has changed (Meehan, 2005). Thus, there is a need to fully explore the cultural value of literary festivals nowadays. The chapter illustrates the relationship between cultural capital and literary festivals and how scholars have different perspective and use different indicators. Most of the studies focus on how cultural capital shapes festival audiences. Fewer investigate how participation affects individual cultural capital. As such, much scope remains to further investigate the role of festival participation in shaping individual cultural capital (Szabó, 2015; Wilks & Quinn, 2016). In this context, works specifically on literary festivals are rare and there are two contrasting perspectives. Some scholars (Driscoll, 2014; Johanson and Freeman, 2012; Robertson and Yeoman, 2014; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015) have argued that participation can generate knowledge, interest and skills, while for others (Finkielkraut, 1987; Fumaroli,
participation is not enough to impact audiences’ cultural capital. All this suggests that more work on how literary festival participation shapes the audience’s cultural capital is needed. Scholars have yet to fully explain the process of cultural capital acquisition in this scenario (Szabó, 2015; Wilks & Quinn, 2016). Moreover, existing studies have focused primarily on the development of field-specific cultural capital, such as literary capital (Kruger, 2019; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015), without investigating non-field-specific cultural capital acquisition. Finally, scholars argue that some elements need to be considered while exploring the cultural outcomes of festivals, like the reasons for participating and the dimensions of literary festival participation (external factors, i.e. time, space, social context, and festival attributes; and personal factors, i.e. demographics, physical involvement/behaviour, emotional involvement/enjoyment, and intellectual involvement) (Figure 3.1). Nevertheless, the concept of cultural capital has been understood and operationalised differently by scholars leading to the lack of a shared view. There is no general agreement on the best way to conceptualise and operationalise cultural capital in festivals. Before analysing cultural capital empirically in literary festivals, Chapter Four addresses these shortcomings.
Does festival participation shape individual cultural capital?

Figure 3.1: Visual representation of Chapter Three: literary festivals

(Source: Author)
CHAPTER 4

THE SERIOUS LEISURE PERSPECTIVE

4 Introduction

The previous chapters identified the two main limits of cultural capital, especially in its embodied state: its conceptualisation and operationalisation, both in general and in respect of festival contexts. As explained previously, defining cultural capital is difficult. It is an ambiguous concept (Prieur & Savage, 2011; Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002) and has been operationalised in different ways, above all its embodied state (Vryonides, 2007). For instance, Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) argued that cultural capital development requires time, but he did not deeply take on board time spent outside family, schooling, and work. Also, he argued that cultural capital can be acquired consciously and unconsciously but he did not fully explain how this happens, the role of the body in this process, nor engagement with the physical environment, especially in adulthood (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002). Moreover, cultural capital is not uniformly understood and operationalised in the festival literature (Getz & Page, 2016; Wilks & Quinn, 2016). Events and festivals scholars draw on different indicators and terms, such as cultural impacts or outcomes, to refer to cultural capital.

All this means that to empirically analyse how cultural capital is acquired in literary festivals it needs to be first conceptualised and operationalised more fully (Figure 4.1). For instance, as explained in Chapter Three, there is a current debate about the relative roles of enjoyment/asceticism (Meehan, 2005; Négrier, 2015) (see 3.1.2 and 3.3.1), levels of pre-existing cultural capital (Ommundsen, 2009) (as explained in 3.1.1), and time/repeat participation (Finkielkraut, 1987; Fumaroli, 1991) (see 3.2.1) in the
process of cultural resources acquisition in festival contexts. These elements need to be considered to better define cultural capital as a concept in festivals. A possible solution to overcome these issues of operationalisation and conceptualisation of cultural capital may be to use another theory to support the analysis. Academic deliberations argue that leisure theories can help to further understanding of festivals and events, and a predominant contribution has been ‘the use of methods to examine the experience’ of events (Patterson & Getz, 2013, p. 232). A number of priorities for interdisciplinary research between leisure and event studies have been identified, including ‘improving the theoretical understanding of the benefits of attending events and the effects of events on society and culture’ (Patterson & Getz, 2013, p. 238), which this study aims to address. Thus, a possible solution to overcome the limits of cultural capital might be to use a leisure theory in support (Figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1: Process of addressing the problems of cultural capital operationalisation and conceptualisation in festival contexts (Source: Author)
Several leisure frameworks have been employed in festival and event studies to understand personal motivations and benefits. One of the theories used in festival studies is Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure perspective. Festivals have been conceptualised using the theory of serious leisure, with studies being done, for example, on arts festivals (Prentice & Andersen, 2003), renaissance festivals (Kim, 2005), comedy festivals (Frew, 2006), Viking festivals (Hannam & Halewood, 2006), dance festivals (Brown, 2007), nostalgia-based festivals (Mackellar, 2009), and folk festivals (Begg, 2011). The general argument is that regular and recurrent festival attendance generates seriousness, commitment, investments of time, money and energy. Festival participation as a form of serious leisure offers the creation of a festival career, characterised by a sense of belonging, social interaction, self-renewal, self-expression, self-actualisation, and status (Mackellar, 2009). Festivals can be learning experiences where perseverance may lead to knowledge and skills acquisition or cultural goods acquisition (Begg, 2011). Also, literary festivals have been conceptualised as serious leisure activities that can be pursued to acquire knowledge and skills (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014). So here, similarities between cultural capital and serious leisure can be seen. Does this mean that the two theories overlap? Are there complementarities that could be usefully examined? If so, one might ask whether the serious leisure perspective might be useful to overcome the issues of cultural capital conceptualisation and operationalisation in festivals. Only a few scholars have explored how serious leisure shapes cultural capital (Beedie & Hudson, 2003; Begg, 2011; Dunlap, 2009). More work needs to be done to fully understand if and how the serious leisure perspective can be a valuable theory to addresses the shortcomings of cultural capital in festival contexts. So, one possibility is to consider festivals as serious leisure activities that can shape individual cultural capital, another might be to consider
serious leisure and cultural capital as complementary and overlapping theories in festival settings.

Thus, this chapter addresses objective 2c: to investigate whether the serious leisure perspective might be a suitable theory to address the limitations of conceptualisation and operationalisation of cultural capital in festival settings. It asks two key questions (Figure 4.1). First, since cultural capital is an ambiguous term and is not uniformly understood in the festival literature, could drawing on Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective conceptually help interpret cultural capital in new and more coherent ways in festival contexts? Second, since there is no general agreement on the best indicators to use for the embodied state of cultural capital, could seeking inspiration from Stebbins’ serious leisure indicators help operationalise cultural capital embodiment in festival contexts? Here, this thesis also answers the call for more studies about embodied information and participants’ behaviour in serious leisure activities (Cox, Griffin, & Hartel, 2017; Mackellar, 2009).

To do all this, the chapter is divided into three sections. First, it starts by reviewing the serious leisure perspective. Second, the task is to determine whether the serious leisure perspective might be a useful theory that could be empirically employed to address the shortcomings of cultural capital in festivals. To do so, linkages between serious leisure and cultural capital embodiment are explored. The intention here is to understand how the two theories overlap in terms of concepts and to see if seeking inspiration from serious leisure indicators helps to better conceptualise and identify cultural capital embodiment indicators in festival contexts. Finally, the conceptual framework is presented.
4.1 The serious leisure perspective

Stebbins defined the concept of leisure as an ‘uncoerced activity engaged in during free time, which people want to do and, in either a satisfying or a fulfilling way (or both), use their abilities and resources to succeed at this’ (Stebbins, 2007, p. 4). According to him, the serious leisure perspective synthesises three main types of leisure: casual leisure, project-based leisure, and leisure with serious pursuits (Figure 4.2).

People involved in a leisure activity start as what he called casual leisurists, without any knowledge or skill about the activity. As such, casual leisure is a short-term pleasurable activity that does not require special training (Stebbins, 1997). Even though it is very important for personal and social life, casual leisure gives merely brief enjoyment, pleasure, and sensory stimulation. Stebbins (2015) also argued that another benefit of casual leisure is learning through edutainment, also called serious hedonism or infotainment. During causal leisure, participants are entertained and educated at the same time and can learn something inadvertently. Examples of casual leisure are: play, relaxation such as napping, passive entertainment like reading or watching TV, active entertainment such as party games, sociable conversations, sensory stimulation like drinking, and casual volunteering (Stebbins, 2004). Casual leisurists might become project-based or serious leisurists if their initial casual curiosity turns into a serious pursuit.

Project-based leisure is a one-off or occasional creative activity carried out in free time (Stebbins, 2005). One-off projects can be making and thinking, liberal arts such as tourism, activity participation, volunteering, and art projects. Occasional projects, meanwhile, can be decorating homes for Christmas or other creative activity undertaken during religious occasions, birthdays or national holidays (Stebbins, 2005). While it does not develop into serious leisure, project-based leisure involves planning, effort, and
sometimes skill or knowledge. Moreover, even though project-based leisure does not become ‘a central life interest’ (Stebbins, 2005, p. 10) as serious leisure does, it is able to generate the same personal and social rewards as serious leisure (Stebbins, 2005).

The last type of leisure involves serious pursuits and includes serious leisure and devotee work. Serious leisure is ‘the systematic pursuit of an amateur, hobbyist, or volunteer activity that participants find so substantial and interesting that they typically launch themselves on a career centred on acquiring and expressing its special skills, knowledge and experience’ (Stebbins, 1992, p. 3). Serious leisure is further defined by six key characteristics. Firstly, participants have the ‘occasional need to persevere at it’ (Stebbins, 1992, p. 6). Here the element of repetition and recurrent participation is crucial. Secondly, they have ‘careers in their endeavors’ (Stebbins, 1992, p. 6). It is important to notice that the term career ‘brings with it ideas of accumulating progress, rewards and prestige’ (Mackellar, 2009, p. 86). Thirdly, serious leisurists make a personal ‘effort based on special knowledge, training, or skill, and sometimes all three’ (Stebbins, 1992, p. 6). The pre-existing stock of competences can also be understood as motivation for participation, helping the leisurist to find the activity ‘interesting’ (Stebbins, 1992, p. 3). Thus, the role of previous knowledge and skill is fundamental as a prerequisite for the acquisition of further knowledge and abilities. This acquisition process is defined by Stebbins (1992, p. 7) as a form of ‘self-directed learning’ outside formal education programmes. The knowledge and skills acquired lead to the fourth characteristic: serious leisure generates durable benefits (called rewards). According to Stebbins (2014; 2001; 2013), serious leisure can generate personal and social rewards. Some rewards are particularly relevant for this study since they might be associated with cultural capital in festivals: personal enrichment, self-actualisation, self-image, self-expression, self-gratification, re-creation, and lasting physical products of the activity. The fifth
characteristic of serious leisure is creating a ‘unique ethos’ (1992, p. 7), such as beliefs, values and principles, shared by the members of the leisure community (Stebbins, 2001). This implies a social activity that creates a community and a sense of belonging to it (Mackellar, 2009). Accordingly, the sixth characteristic is that participants usually ‘tend to identify strongly with their chosen pursuits’ (Stebbins, 1992, p. 7). They share a condition of sameness with the other members of the community (Stebbins, 2013). During serious leisure activities, leisurists can meet people, make new friends, and take part in a group, becoming members of a social world. Serious leisurists can be sub-divided into three types: amateurs, hobbyists, and volunteers (Stebbins, 1982).

Finally, devotee workers are professionals, full or part-time workers dependent on the income of an activity. They are workers who gain a livelihood with the activity. However, for them, the line between work and leisure is not clear as they consider their work as a form of leisure (Stebbins, 2004a). Thus, devotee work is a form of leisure with serious pursuits.

Figure 4.2: The serious leisure perspective (Source: Adapted from Stebbins, 1982)
4.1.1. Leisure careers and the concept of involvement

Alongside the types of leisure, the concepts of career and involvement need to be reviewed, as they will be used to explore the problems of operationalisation and conceptualisation of cultural capital in festivals. Stebbins (2007) theorised the concept of leisure career as a personal role shaped by a continuum of different levels of knowledge and skills, from casual, to project-based, serious leisurists, and devotee workers. Leisure career involves a ‘steady development as a skilled, experienced, and knowledgeable participant’ in a particular activity (Stebbins, 2007, p. 19). Thus, for instance, serious leisurists possess more knowledge and skills than casual leisurists. However, boundaries are imprecise and careers are not necessarily linear (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008). Stebbins included all these careers in the Serious Leisure Perspective Involvement Scale (SLPI scale), which goes from casual and project-based leisurists to serious leisurists and finally to devotee workers (Figure 4.3). Here, levels of involvement may peak at any point on the scale (The Serious Leisure Perspective Website, Retrieved May 15, 2017). As explained in Chapter Three, involvement is an important part of festival participation (Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016), but there are different perspectives on if and how cultural resources are acquired as a result of participating in festivals, with some scholars arguing that nowadays people are less involved since they attend for mere hedonism and do not seek cultural capital acquisition (Meehan, 2005; Négrier, 2015). The SLPI scale might be a valuable tool to further understand cultural capital development in festivals, in terms of how it occurs with differing levels of involvement.

Stebbins’ analysis of the public in leisure activities also needs to be reviewed, since later in this chapter it will be used to investigate the conceptualisation of cultural capital in festivals. Stebbins (1992, p. 59) defined the public as ‘people with a common interest;
people not served by, but rather informed, enlightened, or entertained by professionals or amateurs, or both, and who make active demands upon them’. According to him, the public is entertained by practitioners: amateurs and professionals, with whom they create the Professional-Amateur-Public system. According to Stebbins (1992), among the members of the public in art and entertainment, it is possible to find dabblers, who are actively involved but possess little technique and knowledge (Stebbins, 1992). Also, in every public, there are also novices, who are beginners. They pursue the activity consistently, without being mere dabblers, and someday they may become amateurs, or even professionals (Stebbins, 1992). Again, all this might be useful to better understand levels of involvement and asceticism among literary festival participants. According to Stebbins (1992), other public members might be amateurs and professionals themselves, who consume the products of their colleagues. In addition, the public is often composed of amateurs’ friends and relatives, who consume leisure with ‘a sense of interpersonal obligation as out of a sense of appreciation’ (Stebbins, 1992, p. 59). Hobbyists are also part of the public. For hobbyists, participation is continual and systematic, and their aim is to acquire and maintain knowledge and skill. They can transform into amateurs if professionalization occurs (Stebbins, 1992). They can be liberal arts hobbyists, who seek to acquire broad knowledge, to gain a deep understanding of a sector of human life systematically for its own sake, which means they do not acquire knowledge in order to use it, as amateurs do (Stebbins, 1994). Liberal arts hobbyists can be consumers or buffs. Consumers uncritically consume events, concerts or exhibitions as pure entertainment and sensory stimulation (one-shot project-based leisure). Buffs participate in activities as ‘more or less knowledgeable experts, as serious leisure’ (Stebbins, 2014, p. 101). The key question here is whether all this might help to better understand the nature of literary
festival participation and the role of involvement in the process of cultural capital development in festival contexts.

4.1.2. From casual edutainment to serious fulfilment

As previously explained, different leisure careers produce different benefits. Stebbins (2015) argued that hedonic casual leisure can produce social conversation and sensory stimulation. It can also produce edutainment or serious hedonism. It is a process of learning in an enjoyable setting which does not need a commitment to a serious pursuit. During causal leisure activities, participants are both entertained and educated, and they can learn something inadvertently. Edutainment is, therefore, unintentional and accidental since casual participants do not actively seek it out nor do they consider leisure as utilitarian, they merely seek sensory stimulation. Stebbins (2015) argued that edutainment could also be defined as infotainment since participants are not truly educated with a systematic and supervised process. Rather, they simply gain some new information. As explained earlier, casual leisurists might become serious leisurists if their initial casual curiosity turns into a serious pursuit. Serious leisure involves, therefore, a self-directed learning process which is systematic and intentional. As such, serious participants actively seek fulfilment. To sum up, rewards such as edutainment, serious hedonism or infotainment, are accidental and brief benefits of casual leisure. This differs from self-directed learning, which is an intentional and systematic benefit of serious leisure. The latter leads to personal fulfilment and rewards. Here one might ask if all this could help to better understand cultural capital development in festival contexts (Figure 4.3).
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Figure 4.3: Casual edutainment and serious fulfilment (Source: Author)

4.1.3. Serious leisure indicators

Serious leisure has been operationalised empirically both with quantitative and qualitative methods. Some researchers (Akgül, Özdemir, Erturan Öğüt, & Karaküçük, 2016; Gould, Moore, Karlin, Gaede, Walker, & Dotterweich, 2011; Hungenberg, Gould, & Daly, 2013) employed the quantitative Serious Leisure Inventory and Measure (SLIM) model developed by Gould, Moore, McGuire and Stebbins (2008). The SLIM model includes 54 operational items clustered in 18 sub-dimensions that represent the six qualities of serious leisure: Perseverance, Effort, Career progress, Career contingencies, Personal enrichment, Self-actualisation, Self-express-abilities, Self-express-individual, Self-image, Self-gratification-satisfaction, Self-gratification-enjoyment, Re-creation, Financial return, Group attraction, Group accomplishments, Group maintenance, Unique ethos, and Identity (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008). Particularly useful for this study are the items: Perseverance (see 4.1), Effort (see 4.1), Personal enrichment, Self-actualisation, Self-expression (abilities and individual), Self-image, and Re-creation. Personal enrichment refers to the process ‘of increasing one’s intellectual or spiritual resources [that arise from] the accumulation of cherished and valued experiences
resulting from serious participation’ (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008, p. 49). Self-actualisation is the use and realisation of the participant’s talents, skills, knowledge and abilities in the activity. Self-expression (abilities and individual) refers to the expressions of the participants’ potential and capacities. While Self-image is defined as ‘one’s conception of oneself or of one’s role’. ‘One’s self-image is enhanced through the expression of unique skills, abilities and knowledge’ (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008, p. 50). Finally, Re-creation is the process of regeneration and reinvigoration of one’s self through participation.

Other theorists (Barbieri & Sotomayor, 2013; Heo, Lee, Kim, & Stebbins, 2012; Li & Kao, 2014) explored the relationships among the six key characteristics of serious leisure to empirically understand participation in various activities. Most researchers have used quantitative methods, but a few have also employed qualitative or mixed methods (Brown, 2007; Matthew Lamont, Kennelly, & Moyle, 2014; O’Connor & Brown, 2010). Here the question is whether serious leisure indicators can help operationalise cultural capital in festival contexts.

4.2. Seeking inspiration from the serious leisure perspective to conceptualise and operationalise cultural capital in festivals

The second part of this chapter asks whether serious leisure, and the whole serious leisure perspective, might be useful in furthering understandings of Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital in leisure activities like festivals and help to address problems of conceptualisation and operationalisation (Figure 4.4).
The relationship between serious leisure and the process of cultural capital embodiment has yet to be fully explored. As mentioned, scholars explored how serious leisure activities shape cultural capital (Beedie & Hudson, 2003; Dunlap, 2009), including festivals (Begg, 2011). They investigated how serious leisure activities develop cultural capital in terms of knowledge, skills, values, and cultural goods purchasing. However, serious leisure has never been fully aligned with the cultural capital theory. Accordingly, this research adopts a different perspective and asks if there is an association between the process of knowledge, values, and skills acquired through serious leisure and cultural capital embodiment. Such an association might throw light on how cultural capital and serious leisure intersect each other, how their concepts overlap, and whether they could be used in tandem in festival contexts to more fully conceptualise and operationalise cultural capital.
cultural capital embodiment. There are four parallels of particular relevance: 1) body; 2) time; 3) effort and involvement; 4) pre-existing cultural resources.

4.2.1. Body

An obvious parallel between cultural capital embodiment and serious leisure is the act of learning and embodying notions and abilities. The embodied state of cultural capital is linked to the body as a process of ‘incorporation’ of culture (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 85). It ‘must be invested personally by the investor’ and ‘it declines and dies with his [/her] bearer’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], pp. 85-86). Moreover, cultural capital is long-lasting and ‘contains a tendency to persist in its being’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 83). The embodied state, in particular, is an ‘external wealth converted into an integral part of the person, into a habitus’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 85). Similarly, during serious leisure, participants are involved in an individual self-directed way of learning (Roberson, 2005), where the body is a source of information (Cox, Griffin, & Hartel, 2017). For instance, during reading, running, or listening to music, information is embodied. Auditory, tactile, and olfactory properties are, therefore, fundamental in serious leisure. Through the body, knowledge and skills are embodied in what Stebbins (1992) defined as a long-lasting process of self-actualisation.

Moreover, Bourdieu (1984 [1979], p. 86) argued that the context is fundamental during cultural capital embodiment. For instance, he delved into the three ‘markets’ of cultural capital acquisition (family, school, work). However, he did not fully explain how the body interacts with the environment, especially in informal learning arenas like festivals. Therefore, an aspect of cultural capital that needs further elucidation is how it is embodied. In this respect, Stebbins (2013) acknowledged a strong link between the sentient body and the physical environment, claiming that during serious leisure, spaces
can be perceived as having visual, auditory, tactile and olfactory properties. For instance, Cox, Griffin, and Hartel (2017) investigated the role of the body in the process of information embodiment in three types of serious leisure: running, amateur music, and the liberal arts hobby. They found that the body and its senses had a crucial role, including visual sensations, sound, smells, and sensations of the skin. As mentioned, the physical environment is perceived as an important dimension of the festival experience (Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016). Festival experience includes the use of the body and its senses (Cummings & Herbert, 2015), which can generate intellectual, self, and physical benefits (Matteucci, 2016). Thus, incorporating Stebbins’ ideas about the sentient body and the physical environment might yield greater insights. Serious leisure might help to enhance the understandings of the role of the body and how it interacts with the physical space in cultural capital embodiment in festivals.

Moreover, according to Bourdieu (2002 [1986]), cultural capital can be embodied both consciously and unconsciously. However, he did not fully explain how cultural capital embodiment occurs (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002). Again, serious leisure might enhance the understanding of the role of consciousness during cultural capital embodiment in festivals. O’Connor (2007, p. 131), while working on serious leisure, argued that knowledge and skills are embodied with a ‘bodily intentionality’ during serious leisure. The corporal dimension of the activity, with the use of the body and its senses, makes the acquisition of knowledge and skills bodily conscious. This might also be the case in literary festivals and using serious leisure in support of cultural capital might throw light on how cultural capital is embodied here.
4.2.2. Time

Both cultural capital embodiment and serious leisure may occur during free time. Bourdieu (2002 [1986], p. 87) claimed that ‘time free from economic necessity’ is ‘the precondition for the initial accumulation’ of cultural capital. Similarly, leisure, including serious leisure, is an ‘uncoerced activity engaged in during free time’ (Stebbins, 2007, p. 4). Moreover, both the processes of serious leisure and cultural capital embodiment need an investment of time to occur. For Bourdieu, recurrent participation is important since cultural capital acquisition ‘is an investment, above all of time’ (2002 [1986], p. 85). According to him, ‘it is difficult to break the cycle where cultural capital is added to cultural capital’ (1977 [1973], p. 493). Likewise, Stebbins (2014) claimed that fulfilment in any leisure activity is heavily time-consuming. In serious leisure, knowledge and skills ‘often take years to develop, which is why the idea of formative career is so central’ (Cohen-Gewerc & Stebbins, 2013, p. 53).

However, Bourdieu did not deeply analyse time spent outside family, schooling, and work. So, one might ask about the role of time in festival contexts. Understanding this in festival studies is crucial since festivals can last from one day to one or two weeks and one may argue that they are too short in duration to shape participants’ cultural capital. There are contrasting views on the role of time and repeat participation in the process of cultural capital acquisition in festival contexts. Some scholars argue that mere attendance at festivals is not enough to significantly impact the ways in which individuals interact with culture and how they acquire cultural resources (Finkielkraut, 1987; Fumaroli, 1991). In contrast, for others, festival participation can shape cultural capital. For instance, according to Wilks (2009), cultural capital acquisition in festivals occurs in a circular way. Meaning that, although festivals might last only a few hours or days, participants who attend regularly or for the entire duration of the festival might end up
acquiring knowledge and skills. The serious leisure perspective might elucidate the role of time in cultural capital acquisition in festivals. As explored previously, serious leisure is time-consuming and generates cultural development through repeat participation. For instance, serious participants at the Australian Wintersun festival developed their skills and reinforced their values with repeat participation and perseverance (Mackellar, 2009). Similarly, Kim (2005) argued that serious participants at the Texas Renaissance Festival gained durable personal benefits, like personal freedom, through repeat and meaningful participation. Moreover, Stebbins (2015) claimed that casual leisurists can gain knowledge and information through edutainment in short-term pleasurable activities. Thus, Stebbins’ concept of edutainment might further the understanding of the role played by time in cultural capital acquisition in festivals.

4.2.3. Effort and involvement

The role of effort and involvement is another close parallel between the two domains. Bourdieu (2002 [1986]) argued that cultural capital can be embodied consciously and unconsciously. As such, it can be intentional and unintentional. According to him (2002 [1986], p. 85), cultural capital embodiment, when it occurs consciously, implies inculcation that presupposes ‘a personal cost’, ‘an effort’, ‘with all the privation, renunciation, and sacrifice that it may entail’. Similarly, the third key characteristic of serious leisure is that people need to put effort and commitment into the activity (Stebbins, 1992).

However, Bourdieu (2002 [1986]) did not fully explain the role of effort and involvement during cultural capital acquisition. In festival contexts this is a very timely issue (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002). As mentioned in Chapter Three, some scholars now argue that festival participants are no longer committed to learn and acquire cultural
resources, what Négrier (2015) called asceticism, but rather participate in festivals mainly for socio-hedonistic reasons (Meehan, 2005). The serious leisure perspective might be helpful in exploring the role of involvement and asceticism/effort that participants make in acquiring cultural capital in festival settings. Stebbins (the Serious Leisure Perspective Website, Retrieved May 15, 2017) developed the Serious Leisure Perspective Involvement scale which could be useful to better understand levels of involvement among festival participants. As a matter of fact, sometimes levels of involvement are complex and difficult to identify since boundaries are blurred. For instance, in leisure activities, work and leisure can be simultaneously experienced as moments of personal development and unique lifestyle (Carnicelli-Filho, 2010). Moreover, Stebbins (2015) argued that during causal leisure activities participants are both entertained and educated, and they can learn something inadvertently. This edutainment process is, therefore, unintentional and accidental since casual participants do not actively seek it out. Stebbins (2015) argued that edutainment could also be defined as infotainment since participants are not truly educated with a systematic and supervised process. Rather, they simply gain some new information. In contrast, serious leisure involves a self-directed learning process which is systematic and international. As such, serious participants actively seek fulfilment. For instance, Begg (2011) analysed how serious festivalgoers acquired knowledge and skills in participating in two Australian folk festivals with a high level of commitment. Thus, festivals were ‘not merely a few days or hours of frivolity’ (Begg, 2011, p. 248), but ‘participating in the folk scene was a way of life’ (p. 251). Here one might ask how all this translates into literary festival contexts and whether Stebbins’ SLPI scale might elucidate Bourdieu’s concept of effort in acquiring cultural capital.

Finally, Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective might be helpful in understanding the role of enjoyment in acquiring cultural capital in festival contexts. Bourdieu (2002
[1986], p. 85) argued that cultural capital acquisition is a process of ‘privation, renunciation, and sacrifice’. However, in festivals, enjoyment and hedonism are implied dimensions of the experience (Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016). The serious leisure perspective, with the concepts of career and leisure benefits, might be a valuable theory to throw light on the role played by enjoyment. Stebbins (2015) argued that hedonic casual leisure can produce social conversation, sensory stimulation and edutainment. The latter is a process of learning in an enjoyable setting which does not need a commitment to a serious pursuit. Thus, festival participants might experience edutainment, and this could further the understanding of knowledge creation and cultural capital embodiment. To further investigate the role of enjoyment in the process of cultural capital development in festivals, Stebbins’ definitions of fun, enjoyable, satisfying, fulfilling, and gratifying activity might also be used. Both casual and serious leisure generate hedonism and self-gratification rewards: ‘the activity is fun to do’ (Stebbins, 1997, p. 21). However, according to Stebbins (2004), casual and serious participants describe the activity differently. For casual leisurists an activity is fun, enjoyable, or gratifying because it gives mere pleasure, delight and amusement. In contrast, for serious leisurists an activity is gratifying or fulfilling because it enables the individual’s full potential and character to develop over many years. The use of these different adjectives might better explain the degrees of enjoyment and asceticism that participants experience and bring to a festival. Thus, this might elucidate how the enjoyment factor is connected and shapes cultural capital development in festival contexts.
4.2.4. Pre-existing cultural resources

Another close parallel is the role of pre-existing cultural resources. According to Bourdieu (1984 [1979]), cultural consumption is an act of decoding and deciphering. Only the agents who possess the necessary cultural competence can understand and consume the work of art or cultural activity. Moreover, according to Bourdieu, tastes are subjective ‘manifested preferences’ (1984 [1979], p. 56) which organise consumption (Sassatelli, 2007). So, tastes shape and condition cultural participation. Also for Stebbins (2013, p. 53), previously acquired knowledge and skills are fundamental, since ‘it takes substantial amounts of the relevant skills, knowledge, training, and experience to reach fulfillment in the activity to which they apply’. Thus, serious leisurists possess exceptional skill, knowledge, and experience. Like Bourdieu, Stebbins also observed that people need to have a taste for the activity. For example, while science museums can be arenas for casual edutainment, art museums cannot be, because they presuppose that the agent possess a previously acquired taste and appreciation of art (Stebbins, 2015).

However, there is a debate on the levels of pre-existing cultural resources in festival contexts. Some researchers claim that cultural capital, including taste, shapes festival participation. For instance, knowledge and passion in literature shapes access to literary festivals (Merfeld-Langston, 2010), so that participants possess high levels of engagement with literature (Ommundsen, 2009). In contrast, others claim that nowadays, levels are mixed and participants are not only passionate literature enthusiasts anymore (Giorgi, 2011b; Weber, 2018). Moreover, as previously mentioned, Holt (1998) argued that levels of pre-existing cultural resources shape cultural development in leisure activities: only high cultural capital individual can gain self-actualisation. Thus, one may ask whether the serious leisure perspective, with the concept of career, might be a useful theory to better understand the nature of literary festival audience and the role of pre-
existing cultural resources during the process of cultural capital development in festivals.

As explained, Stebbins (1982, 2007) theorised the concept of leisure careers. Different careers possess different levels of knowledge, skills, and abilities. They also gain benefits from the experience: from edutainment to serious fulfilment. This might throw light on the role of pre-existing cultural capital in festival contexts.

After having reviewed the two theories, this study suggests that there are close parallels between cultural capital embodiment and serious leisure. The parallels can be labelled: body, time, effort and involvement, and pre-existing level of cultural capital. Thus, using them in tandem might yield mutually instructive outcomes that help to further understandings of both cultural capital and serious leisure. The following section discusses the potential that serious leisure has for helping to operationalise the embodied state of cultural capital in festivals.

### 4.2.5. The indicators of cultural capital in festival contexts

This section addresses the problems associated with operationalising embodied cultural capital in festival contexts. The intention is to identify a series of indicators that might overcome this limitation. These will be employed empirically later in the study. As explained in Chapter Two, ‘the operationalisation of social and cultural capital in empirical research has taken many directions’ (Vryonides, 2007, p. 868) including research in festival studies. The indicators of the institutionalised and the objectified states have been mostly operationalised respectively as the highest education completed and possession of cultural goods. The most common indicators of the embodied state identified by quantitative and qualitative studies have been: exposure, habits, and frequency in participating in cultural activities; cultural competence and familiarity
(including knowledge and skills); reading habits; art appreciation and interests (including for example TV watching, and music); and values, norms, and beliefs (De Graaf, 1988; DiMaggio, 1982; Friedman & Laurison, 2019; Kamphuis, Jansen, Mackenbach, & Van Lenthe, 2015; Katsillis & Rubinson, 1990; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2016; Sullivan, 2001; Wilks & Quinn, 2016). Indeed, Bourdieu has examined cultural capital by looking at agents’ knowledge, skills, cultural practices, and attitudes, including manners and dispositions that he called bodily hexis. However, there is no uniform agreement on how to best operationalise the embodied state (Vryonides, 2007).

On the contrary, as explained previously, Stebbins has clearly defined serious leisure indicators and they have been deeply empirically tested by several scholars. There is, therefore, a general agreement on how to best operationalise serious leisure as the indicators are clearly defined. The previous section explored parallels between serious leisure and cultural embodiment and it seems that the two domains refer to the same concepts. Thus, this study asks whether cultural capital could be operationalised in adulthood outside the occupational field using some serious leisure indicators, including self-expression, perseverance, effort, self-actualisation, personal enrichment, self-image, and re-creation. Integrating serious leisure and cultural capital indicators might elucidate better the best indicators for the embodied state in festival settings and deepen the understanding of cultural capital embodiment.

**Cultural Participation.** Most of the scholars (Crook, 1997; DeGraaf, 1988; Katsillis & Robinson, 1990) working on cultural capital identified exposure, habits, and repeat participation in cultural activities as embodied cultural capital indicators. Thus, cultural participation is one indicator of embodied cultural capital in festivals used in this research. Moreover, Bourdieu (2002 [1986], p. 85) argued that, besides frequency in participating,
‘privation’, ‘sacrifice’, and ‘renunciation’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 85) are elements of the process of cultural capital acquisition. They could be understood as persistence and commitment to behaviour that requires significant effort in leisure activities (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008). Thus, serious leisure might help to further explore the concepts of effort and involvement in festival participation (as explained in 4.2.3).

Stebbins (1992) identified perseverance and effort as key elements of serious leisure. In serious leisure activities, commitment and repeat visitation play a role in how knowledge, skills, and values are embodied, including in festival contexts (Begg, 2011; Mackellar, 2009). Thus, the two serious leisure characteristics of perseverance and effort could be integrated with Bourdieu’s characteristic of frequency in participating in cultural activities and sacrifice into the indicator ‘cultural participation’ for festival contexts. Here, using Bourdieu’s and Stebbins’ indicators in tandem might further the understandings of the concept of involvement, discussed in 4.2.3.

**Cultural knowledge, skills & abilities, and tastes & interests.** Another indicator that is widely recognised by scholars is the familiarity with high-culture. Thus, this is included as an indicator of the embodied state in this research. However, some scholars have referred to cultural competence (Barone, 2006), while others have divided it into a number of indicators, like skills and knowledge and interest. For instance, some scholars identified reading habits as embodied cultural capital indicators (Crook, 1997; Katsillis & Robinson, 1990), while others divided taste into reading, TV viewing, and music (Sullivan, 2001). To overcome this lack of clarity and clearly identify the indicators to use in this thesis, this study follows Stebbins’ (1992) and Kamphuis, Jansen, Mackenbach, and Van Lenthe’s (2015). They identified three elements that are used as indicators in this thesis: ‘cultural knowledge’, ‘skills and abilities’, and ‘tastes and
interests’. As a matter of fact, Bourdieu (2002 [1986], pp. 84-85) defined cultural capital as a form of ‘self-cultivation’, ‘self-improvement’ and ‘dispositions of the mind. This can be linked to Stebbins’ concept of self-actualisation in serious leisure. It is the realisation of an agent’s talents and capacities, and personal enrichment includes the process of increasing agent’s intellect resources (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008). This implies that capacities, skills, abilities, and knowledge are applied and developed during serious leisure activities (Stebbins, 1992). For instance, Hastings, Kurth, Schloder, and Cyr (1995) assessed skill accumulation as an indicator of self-actualisation. All these elements of self-actualisation, self-improvement, skill development, and knowledge generation have been identified in festival settings (Driscoll, 2014; Karlsen, 2009). Thus, Stebbins’ self-actualisation and personal enrichment could be integrated with Bourdieu’s self-cultivation and self-improvement into the indicators: ‘skills and abilities’, and ‘cultural knowledge’ for festival contexts. Moreover, serious leisure activities, seen as cherished experiences, can lead to passion, taste, and interest generation (Stebbins, 2001).

As seen before, taste is a close parallel between cultural capital embodiment and serious leisure. According to Stebbins (1992, p. 3), serious leisurists can find the activity ‘interesting’. Therefore, another indicator of the embodied state employed in this thesis is ‘cultural tastes and interests’. Again, using Bourdieu’s and Stebbins’ indicators in tandem might further the understandings of the concept of embodiment of knowledge, skills, and taste discussed in 4.2.1.

**Values and personal enrichment.** Bourdieu (2002 [1986], p. 85) defined the process of acquiring the embodied state as ‘self-cultivation, Bildung’. The concept of Bildung refers to a process that includes cultural as well as personal maturation (Stoianov, 2012). This individual transformation is the development of the self. Kamphuis, Jansen, Mackenbach,
and Van Lenthe (2015) included values, norms, and beliefs, such as religion, in his systematic review of quantitative measures of cultural capital. However, only a few scholars have identified values and norms as indicators of embodied cultural capital. This development of the self could refer to the characteristic of personal enrichment in serious leisure, which is a process of increasing cultural and spiritual resources (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008). For instance, Mackellar (2009) investigated value reinforcement in festivals, therefore, the ‘self-cultivation, Bildung’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 85) could be integrated with the serious leisure indicators of self-image and recreation (regeneration of oneself through the activity) (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008). They could be merged with the indicator called ‘values and personal enrichment’. This indicates all those values that influence the individual philosophy of life, including self-image.

**Bodily hexis (expression of the self and attitudes).** Bourdieu (1977 [1972]) examined cultural capital by looking at agents’ attitudes, including manners and dispositions that he called bodily hexis. Nevertheless, there is confusion about how to best operationalise bodily hexis, with some scholars understanding it as habits (Katsillis and Robinson, 1990) or involvement (Barone, 2006). Drawing on Stebbins’ indicators, Bourdieu’s concept of embodiment and the role of the body, discussed in 4.2.1, might be further understood. Thus, this thesis integrates Bourdieu’s concept of dispositions of the body with the serious leisure dimension of self-expression (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008) into the indicator ‘bodily hexis’ for festival contexts. This can be sub-divided into expression of the self during the activity, and attitudes. As a matter of fact, self-expression, bodily consumption, and corporeality are important elements of festivals (Herborn, 2015) that
are as interplay of actors (Quinn, 2013) and arenas of performative practices (Lucas & Wright, 2013).

All the above suggests that embodied cultural capital indicators could be integrated with serious leisure indicators in festival settings since they seem to refer to similar concepts. Seeking inspiration from serious leisure indicators might suggest new ways to operationalise cultural capital embodiment in festivals and new possibilities for deepening the understanding of embodiment.

While there is no general agreement on the indicators of the embodied state, the literature review shows that the operationalisation of the other two states of cultural capital is less confused. Thus, the indicators of the other states of cultural capital used in this research are ownership of cultural objects for the objectified state, and educational qualifications for the institutionalised state (Table 4.1). To sum up, cultural capital indicators used in this research are: cultural objects ownership, educational qualifications, cultural participation, skills and abilities, cultural knowledge, values and personal enrichment, interests and tastes, and bodily hexis (Table 4.1). Here, it is important to note that even though Stebbins referred to knowledge, skills, and abilities related to the specific activity, in this study the indicators include both field-specific (literary capital) and non-field-specific cultural capital (generic cultural capital). The reason is that festival participation allows a sharing of ideas and discussions about books and related topics which are not necessarily related to literature (Giorgi, 2011b). Thus, one might wonder whether cultural capital development goes beyond literary capital acquisition. As explained in Chapter Three, the few studies researching how participation in literary festivals shapes participants’ cultural capital focused on literary capital (Kruger, 2019;
More work needs to be done on how participation shapes individual cultural capital, considering all its states and types.

Table 4.1: Cultural capital indicators used in this study (Source: Author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State of cultural capital</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objectified</td>
<td>Cultural and educational resources and objects ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalised</td>
<td>The highest educational achievement completed by the respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embodied</td>
<td>Cultural participation (frequency/perseverance of attending and commitment/effort to cultural events or activities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Skills and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values and personal enrichment (e.g. self-image)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interests and tastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bodily hexis (self-expression and attitudes)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3. Conceptual framework

![Figure 4.5: Conceptual framework of the research (Source: Author)](image)

Figure 4.5 represents the conceptual framework of this thesis which is divided into three parts. It begins with Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital in its three states (institutionalised, objectified, and embodied) and two types (field-specific and non-field-specific). As already discussed, the concept of cultural capital has been used in several disciplines and research areas, including festival studies. However, cultural capital is an ambiguous term, especially in its embodied state (Lamont & Lareau, 1988). Scholars have understood cultural capital differently and there is theoretical confusion about how to
define it, especially its embodied state, in festival settings as elsewhere (Friedman, 2014). This lack of a shared view about how to conceptualise cultural capital led some theorists to expand or question Bourdieu’s cultural capital. Examples are Peterson and Kern’s (1997) omnivorous thesis and Prieur and Savage’s (2013) cosmopolitan cultural capital. Moreover, scholars argue that the concept of cultural capital needs to be updated and studied in contemporary cultural consumption contexts and outside France (Lamont & Lareau, 1988). Furthermore, beside theoretical confusion around the concept of cultural capital, there is also a methodological confusion on how to best operationalise the embodied state (Vryonides, 2007). Up to now, there is no general agreement about the appropriate way to operationalise cultural capital embodiment. This methodological confusion affects festival studies, including literary festivals (Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015). Thus, two limits of cultural capital are identified: its operationalisation and conceptualisation.

Secondly, the conceptual framework deals with the relationship between cultural capital and festival participation, including literary festivals. Here, most of the studies focus on how cultural capital shapes festival participation and less on how cultural capital is shaped by participation. As such, to fill this gap in knowledge we need to think differently and approach cultural capital in a new way. Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) stressed that cultural capital, which is mainly acquired through family and schooling via primary socialisation, creates social distinction. As such, most festival researchers have focused on how cultural capital shapes festival participation and creates power dynamics and distinction (Stewart, 2009; Weber, 2018). A different approach is to focus on how it is acquired outside family and school rather than how it creates distinction (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014). As a matter of fact, Bourdieu argued that cultural capital acquisition is an on-going process, so this opens up the possibility to study cultural capital development.
in other contexts, like festivals (Friedman, 2014). Equally, while it is clear that cultural capital can shape participation in cultural activities, the reverse is much less clear. Ganzeboom (1982) and Holt (1998) began to address this by arguing that cultural participation shapes tastes and individual cultural capital, but much more is needed on how cultural capital is acquired by agents (Prieur & Savage, 2013). Only a few studies investigate how festival participation shapes participants’ cultural capital (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015). Much work on the role of festival participation in shaping individual cultural capital is needed (Szabó, 2015; Wilks & Quinn, 2016). The few scholars who investigated cultural capital development in festivals focused mainly on the acquisition of field-specific cultural capital, such as literary capital (Kruger, 2019; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015), without providing deep insights into non-field-specific cultural capital development. Moreover, there are contrasting views on if/how cultural capital is acquired in festival contexts. Specifically, the elements of body, time, asceticism, enjoyment, and pre-existing cultural resources in the process of cultural capital development in festivals are not clear. For instance, since literary festivals are proliferating worldwide and are developing programmes to attract more generic audience, they have been criticized by some scholars who see it as a process of commercialisation of culture where participants are not committed to learn and acquire cultural resources anymore (Meehan, 2005; Négrier, 2015). Thus, there is a need to fully explore the cultural value of literary festivals and to ask if/how they shape participants’ cultural capital. In order to do this, the problems of operationalisation and conceptualisation of cultural capital in festival contexts need to be addressed.

Thus, the last step of the conceptual framework addresses the two limits of cultural capital in festival contexts. It asks whether Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective might be
a valuable theory to overcome the problems of conceptualisation and operationalisation of cultural capital in festivals. The intention is to better understand the concept and to identify the indicators to use in this study. Festivals, including literary festivals, have been conceptualised as serious leisure activities where participants can gain personal rewards like knowledge and skills. However, this thesis asks whether there is another way at looking at this process of knowledge, abilities, and taste development. It suggests that there are parallels between cultural embodiment and serious leisure. This means that the two theories might overlap in festival contexts. Cultural capital embodiment and serious leisure might refer to the same concepts and process of acquiring knowledge, skills, taste, interests, and bodily abilities, at least in festival contexts. Seeking inspiration from some serious leisure indicators (personal enrichment, self-expression, perseverance, effort, self-actualisation, self-image, re-creation) might suggest a new way to operationalise cultural embodiment and open up possibilities for deepening the understanding of embodiment in festival settings. As such, Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective might address the shortcomings of cultural capital with respect to the concepts of body and consciousness, time, effort/asceticism, involvement, enjoyment, and pre-existing cultural capital. Thus, one might ask whether serious leisure and cultural capital might be used in tandem as overlapping theories in festival contexts. Using serious leisure in support of cultural capital might be beneficial to provide a more comprehensive framework to understand and operationalise how cultural capital is embodied in festival settings.
4.4. Summary

This chapter asks whether Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure perspective might be a useful theory to conceptualise and operationalise cultural capital embodiment in festival contexts. The intention is to identify the appropriate indicators to use in this thesis and to clarify cultural capital as a concept in festival settings. Links between serious leisure and Bourdieu’s cultural capital are under-researched. So, this chapter advocates developing linkages between cultural capital embodiment and serious leisure, concerning the role of body, time, effort and involvement, and pre-existing level of cultural resources. The parallels suggest that the two theories overlap and seem to refer to the same concepts. Accordingly, it is proposed to use Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective to bring further clarity to aspects of the cultural capital development process: body and involvement with the physical environment, consciousness, time, effort and asceticism, enjoyment, and pre-existing cultural capital. Furthermore, the intention is to ask whether serious leisure indicators could make cultural embodiment more operationalisable in empirical settings like festivals. As such, this chapter has identified indicators of cultural capital embodiment specifically for literary festival contexts to use in this thesis: cultural objects ownership, educational qualifications, cultural participation, skills and abilities, cultural knowledge, values and personal enrichment, interests and tastes, and bodily hexis. The next chapter discusses the research design and methods.
‘We live in our bodies and learn about self, others, and culture through analysing the performances of our bodies in the world. The performing body is at once a pool of data, and then the interpreter of data in knowledge creation, in the process of epistemology’

(Spry, 2010, p. 160)
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

5  Introduction
The general purpose of this research is to understand if and how literary festival participation shapes individual cultural capital. This chapter provides an overview of the research methodology and methods employed in the study. It starts by highlighting the research aims and objectives. This is followed by the philosophical underpinnings and the research approach and design. Then, the methodology and methods of data collection are outlined, including the screening phase, the pilot study phase, the sampling, the ethical considerations, the issues of validity, reliability, and reflexivity. Next, the details of data analysis and data management plan are explained. Finally, the chapter concludes by addressing methodological limitations.

5.1  Research question, aims and objectives
This is an investigation of adult participants’ cultural capital acquisition associated with literary festival participation. It involves an analysis of one Irish and one Italian case study. The conceptualisation and operationalisation of the embodied state are understood to be problematic (Prieur & Savage, 2011; Vryonides, 2007) so this study employs Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure to help build a research design where cultural capital can be conceptualised and operationalised effectively. The research question is:
How does literary festival participation shape individual cultural capital?

The three aims and their associated objectives are as follows.

1. To contribute to an enhanced understanding of Bourdieu’s cultural capital.
   a. To examine how the concept of cultural capital has evolved since Bourdieu’s definition.

2. To consider how Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital might be usefully applied to the festival context.
   a. To analyse literary festivals, their audiences, and the dimensions of participation.
   b. To explore how cultural capital has been used in festival studies.
   c. To investigate whether the serious leisure perspective might be a suitable theory to address the limits of conceptualisation and operationalisation of cultural capital in festival settings.
   d. To examine the evolution of Irish and Italian literary festivals (1969 – 2017), and to select and present two cases for in-depth study.

3. To understand if and how literary festival participation shapes individual cultural capital.
   a. To understand if literary festivals can be arenas for cultural embodiment and cultural capital development, and which state (institutionalised/ objectified/ embodied) and what type of cultural capital (field-specific/ non-field-specific) can be acquired.
   b. To explore the elements that may shape participants’ cultural capital in festival contexts.
5.2 Philosophical underpinnings

The researcher adopts an interpretivist approach which focuses on the interpretation and understanding of human behaviour. Interpretivism dates back to Max Weber and to his concept of Verstehen, which means ‘understanding’ (Bryman, 2016; Travers, 2001). The interpretivist position emphasises the understanding of a phenomenon through the interpretation of the views of its participants (Bryman, 2016). Therefore, interpretivism concerns interaction among individuals (Creswell, 2003). This is especially true due to the engagement between informants and the researcher who listens to them carefully to understand and interpret their thinking and point of views. In other words, interpretivist researchers aim to collect what is meaningful for their informants (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2016). This study aims to understand the cultural capital development associated with festival participation as identified by participants. It emphasises informants’ own interpretations and meanings. One may argue that when knowledge is actively constructed by society, interpretivism can be called social constructivism/constructionism (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). However, the terms are often interchangeably used and there is no general agreement among scholars about the best way to define them. This thesis agrees with Tracy (2012) in arguing that the interpretive paradigm includes the idea that reality is socially constructed. Thus, in this study interpretivism is understood as ‘a way of seeing both reality and knowledge as constructed and reproduced through communication, interaction, and practice’ (Tracy, 2012, p. 62).

Patterson and Getz (2013) argued that both leisure and festival studies are epistemologically very closely related. The epistemological assumption of this study is intersubjective: the researcher interacts with the individuals being researched. Thus, the phenomenological nature of the approach is the emic perspective (the insider) (Holloway, Brown, & Shipway, 2010; Jennings, 2010). As anticipated, the study, therefore, prioritises
the world of the informants, their points of view, and their perspectives, combining
descriptions of their social and cultural profiles with the meanings they attach to
phenomena (Holloway, Brown, & Shipway, 2010). In part, this follows Getz’s (2008) call
for studies that highlight the experiential dimension of festivals.

The research is informed by several different areas of study, including festival
studies, leisure studies, cultural sociology, and educational research. Patterson and Getz
(2013) claimed that in terms of ontology there are many overlapping areas of knowledge
between leisure and festival studies. One of these overlapping elements is the use of
interpretivism, which aims to understand and interpret participants’ views (Denzin &
Lincoln, 2011; Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2016). Accordingly, the ontological
assumption of this thesis is that reality is subjective and relative. Multiple realities and
truths exist and are as numerous as the participants in the study. Realities are co-created
and co-constructed (Bryman, 2016; Creswell, 2003). Multiple realities mean that different
groups of people can see phenomena differently, and realities might vary from culture to
culture and from situation to situation (Denscombe, 2014) and they all need to be
recognised as valid. The assumption of multiple realities, therefore, rejects the notion that
only one perspective is correct and the others are wrong (Denscombe, 2014).

As mentioned, interpretivism is seen to be biased by the researcher’s values and
beliefs (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Therefore, the axiological implication is that the
interpretation of participants’ values and beliefs play a crucial role in the research process.
According to this, the researcher aims to adopt an empathetic stance, which understands
the interviewees’ point of views (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2016). However, it is
impossible to avoid bias. Even Bourdieu (1988 [1984]) asked researchers to adopt a
reflexive approach towards their social and cultural background. Thus, the study has a
value-laden nature (Creswell, 2003). Interpretivism is usually associated with qualitative
approaches (Creswell, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011) and that is the case in this study, as explained in the following section.

5.3 Research approach and design

According to Yin (2003), there are three designs for case studies: exploratory, explanatory and descriptive. This study is exploratory, with the purpose of understanding a phenomenon about which the researcher has little preliminary knowledge and familiarity (Thomas, 2016). An exploratory design is appropriate as exploratory studies are valuable tools to ask open questions and to gain insights about phenomena of interest that are under-explored (Saunders, Lewis, & Thornhill, 2016). It adopts an interpretivist approach and qualitative methods and strategies such as case studies and the use of interviews (Creswell, 2003; Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Employing a qualitative approach is somewhat surprising because Bourdieu’s (1984 [1979], 2002 [1986]) cultural capital and Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure have some employed quantitative methods. Moreover, several researchers (Getz, 2010; Getz & Page, 2016; Langen & Garcia, 2009; Quinn, 2009) claim that to date, the most comprehensive work on the cultural impacts of festivals has come from social science studies using quantitative methodologies (Delamere, Wankel, & Hinch, 2001; Fredline, Jago, & Deery, 2003; Small, 2007; Small, Edwards, & Sheridan, 2005; Wood & Thomas, 2006). Notwithstanding this, the study adopts a qualitative approach for several reasons.

Firstly, it does so in order to better understand the phenomenon studied in terms of the meanings that informants bring to it. The cultural dimensions of festivals are intangible and it is difficult to quantify them (Small, Edwards, & Sheridan, 2005). The qualitative approach highlights the importance of meaning not measurement (Holloway,
Brown, & Shipway, 2010, 2010), and so there is an opportunity for qualitative studies to reveal these meanings (Getz, 2008; Getz, 2010; Snowball & Willis, 2006). This study follows Quinn’s (2009, p. 497) suggestion that ‘an obvious area for further research is not only the measurement of these [festival] impacts but also a more thorough understanding of how and why such outcomes materialize’.

Secondly, even if the positivistic-quantitative paradigm, following consumer behaviour studies, has been adopted by many scholars in exploring festival impacts, this does not fully consider social and cultural antecedents (Getz, 2010). As such, a qualitative approach allows exploring ‘a social or human problem’ taking into consideration norms and values (Creswell & Poth, 2018, p.326).

Thirdly, Vryonides (2007) examined cultural capital measurement in educational research, arguing that there are limitations in quantitative empirical research, as it does not adequately capture the full extent of the social dynamics, the practice, beliefs, and attitudes of the individuals. He observed that the qualitative, or the mixed methods, approach is required to measure and understand cultural capital in educational and social research.

Fourthly, this research supports Quilgars, Elsinga, Jones, Toussaint, Ruonavaara, and Naumanen’s (2009) and Mangen’s (1999) calls for a qualitative approach in cross-cultural studies, in order to obtain more in-depth understandings of attitudes and behaviours among the cases (Quilgars, Elsinga, Jones, Toussaint, Ruonavaara, & Naumanen, 2009), and to ‘locate phenomena in dynamic societal context’ (Mangen, 1999, p. 110).

Finally, this study tries to overcome the limitations of quantitative approaches in investigating literary festival audiences and their experiences in-depth, as identified by
Weber (2015). This study answers Weber’s (2015) call for qualitative and sociological enquiry of participants’ experiences in literary festivals.

Usually in a qualitative study, inductive logic prevails because meanings emerge from participants (Bryman, 2016; Creswell, 2003). In inductive studies, the aim is to discover a theory or understand a phenomenon (Berg & Lune, 2012), but the research question has been defined before the fieldwork. This study is inductive as it explores existing literature on cultural capital and serious leisure and seeks to develop theory in the area. As mentioned earlier, the aim is not to test a theory nor to measure a behaviour with some pre-existing hypotheses but instead, to understand a process. Thus, the aim of the study is to explore new aspects of individual cultural capital acquisition in the festival context. The study, starting from known premises, produces context-bound information which looks for patterns in understanding the phenomenon studied (Creswell, 2003).

5.4 Research methodology

Case study methodology was selected as an appropriate methodology because a case study is an in-depth inquiry into a social phenomenon within its real-life setting (Yin, 2003), and it also provides a deep understanding of events and people (Berg & Lune, 2012). Sharpley and Stone (2012) argued that much research in the festival sector is case study based because every festival has unique impacts, even if attempts have been made to develop general frameworks (Delamere, Wankel, & Hinch, 2001; Fredline, Jago, & Deery, 2003; Small, Edwards, & Sheridan, 2005). Since it is a case study, there is the ‘How’ research question (Berg & Lune, 2012; Yin, 2003) and the focus on contemporary as opposed to historical events. According to Thomas (2016), there are three kinds of case
studies, namely outlier, key, and local cases. This study employs key cases as they are exemplary cases that reveal something from in-depth study. On the contrary, outlier cases are the ones that differ from the norm and local cases are chosen because of researcher’s familiarity.

A case study may refer to a single individual or a group. This study refers to a group, namely ‘the literary festival adult audience’ and the smaller unit of analysis is the singular person participating in the festival. It is a collective case study (Stake, 1995), which can also be called a multiple case study (Yin, 2003). Nevertheless, it does not compare the two cases, rather the aim is to provide a better understanding of the phenomenon studied in different cultural contexts. It involves two cases, namely Pordenonelegge (PL) in Pordenone (Italy) and Writers’ Week (WW) in Listowel (Ireland). It also includes the Dublin Book Festival (DBF) and the Mountains to Sea dlr Book Festival (MTS) as pilot studies. The multiple case study was chosen because the research does not focus on a critical, extreme, representative nor revelatory single literary festival audience (Thomas, 2016). Moreover, Yin (2003, p. 46) claimed that multiple case studies are ‘considered more compelling, and the overall study is therefore regarded as more robust’. Therefore, the multiple case study is always preferred over the single case study, if the researcher has sufficient resources (Yin, 2009). The researcher selected this methodology in light of her financial resources, time available, personal conditions, such as linguistic and cultural resources, and access, all of which have made the undertaking of the multiple case study possible.

The multiple case study raises the question of replication. This is a non-probability sample of cases that do not lead to generalisation. Details of the rationale of replicability of the study and reliability are explained in 5.4.1.
Finally, about the time horizon, it is a parallel study at one point in time. In a parallel study, the cases are all being studied at the same time, which means during the same year of the festivals, in this instance, 2017. It is not a sequential study where the cases happen one after the other with the assumption that the first affects the second, although within each case the data collection was sequential. This means that for each festival, data were collected first on-site and then after two-four weeks with follow-up interviews (see 5.5).

### 5.4.1 Validity and reliability

In order to strengthen credibility and ensure that the data have been properly collected and interpreted, this study emphasises validity and reliability (Yin, 2016). Internal validity is the process that determines that the data are accurate (Creswell, 2016). Three validation strategies were used in this study, covering the three qualitative validity lenses: the researcher’s lens, the participants’ lens, and the readers’ lens (Creswell, 2016). As regards the researcher’s lens, triangulation was used as a tactic to construct validity. Triangulation included the use of multiple sources of evidence, extensive quotations, and reviews of transcripts to verify data accuracy (Robson & McCartan, 2016), as is explained in the sections dealing with methods of data collection and analysis. Since the data are in two languages, all the translations have been made by the researcher, who is an Italian native speaker fluent in English, and double-checked by her supervisor, who is a native English speaker with a good knowledge of Italian. Also, a large proportion of translations have been verified by a specialist translator. Finally, the Italian verbatim citations and their English translations are presented side by side so that readers familiar with Italian have an opportunity to corroborate and triangulate the translations (Yin, 2016).
As regards the participants’ lens, to instil trustworthiness and authenticity, a qualitative study needs to include details about the topic, site, participants, and approach to data collection (Yin, 2016). This research, therefore, involved a prolonged engagement in the field to have a better insight of what was being studied and, besides the details explained in the following paragraphs, it also illustrates how the challenges encountered were overcome. As regards the readers’ lens, rich descriptions of the settings and people studied are provided (Creswell, 2016). The rich and detailed descriptions allow the reader to be transported to the actual setting. The findings chapters include quotes, descriptions of the festivals, and how respondents behaved. Moreover, peer debriefing was another validation strategy used in the study undertaken (Creswell, 2016; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The researcher shared and discussed the findings with her supervisor during all the process of data analysis.

Also, to create transparency, analytical memos have been used, following Birks, Chapman, and Francis’s (2008) guidelines. In particular, the researcher used ‘mapping research activities memos’ with mind maps and memos maintained through a reflexive oral diary. A research diary is a document that records the researcher’s feelings, interpretation of data and reflections about the research process. It helped the researcher to adopt a reflexive position, encouraging critical analysis and thinking. It was useful to reflect (Lamb, 2013). It helped to keep track of the research process, to reflect on methodological issues, to record concerns and to notice how personal values and beliefs impacted the research (Nadin & Cassell, 2006). It was also a tool that allowed the researcher to improve her reflexive and moderator skills. During the first year it was employed in an unstructured way, but starting from the second year the researcher started to record audios monthly following a structured guide. The guide included: date, location and personal feelings; the status of the research; what the researcher has learned in the
previous month; what are her concerns; what she needs to improve; and what is the next step. Using a research diary to document and reflect on the research experience has been deemed a valuable tool that allows validity and reliability to be constructed (Lamb, 2013; Nadin & Cassell, 2006).

Reliability refers to the degree to which other researchers can carry out the same results of the study in different contexts (Silverman, 2013). Yin (2003) argued that multiple cases may lead to the possibility of a literal replication, which predicts similar results, or a theoretical replication, which produces contrasting results for predictable reasons. This study can be partially replicated and can shape the design of further studies, but the cases were not chosen on the basis that different or similar responses were expected from each one. The aim of the study undertaken is not to create the basis for generalisation but to foster the understanding of a process and build theory for further research. As a matter of fact, ‘case studies can never form a sample from which you can generalise’ (Thomas, 2016, p. 173).

This is a small-scale study. The number of cases deemed necessary or sufficient for literary replications is less than six, usually two or three, while theoretical replications are often from four to six (Rowley, 2002). Since this study does not lead to generalisation but can be partially replicated, the number of cases was chosen to have an adequate overview of the phenomenon, considering access, resources and time available. Therefore, two cases were deemed to be sufficient for the study.

5.4.2 Reflexivity

As mentioned, this is an interpretivist study, which can be biased by the researcher’s values and beliefs (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Bourdieu (1988 [1984]) exhorted
researchers to adopt a reflexive approach towards their social and cultural background since their position in a field and their cognitive bias can shape how they view the world (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992). Schirato and Webb (2003) identified three main aspects of Bourdieu’s reflexivity: the social origin of the researcher, the researcher’s position within the academic field like sociology, and the researcher’s intellectual bias produced by the academic field. To enhance reflexive awareness the researcher adopted several strategies. She engaged with the field during the screening phase and took notes of the lessons learned from it. Moreover, she took notes during the entire PhD, both oral notes with the reflective diary and written/oral notes after the interviews on-site and post-festivals. She reflected on the methods, her impressions of data collection, her behaviours, and her values. She was extremely aware of rigour, focusing on details during data collection and analysis. Additionally, to reflect on her position in the academic field, she attended the British Sociological Association conferences organised by the Bourdieu study group twice. There, she was able to engage with other researchers, reflect, share her doubts, and learn about Bourdieu’s theories. She also got in touch with Dr. Stebbins via email and a Skype call, to reflect and share her questions about the serious leisure perspective. All this helped the researcher to enhance reflexive awareness.

5.5 Methods of data collection

A multiple method approach was chosen for primary data collection to attempt an in-depth understanding of how literary festival participation shapes individual cultural capital. This included the use of participant observations and interviews. Usually, the inductive approach includes qualitative data and a variety of methods for data collection in order to gather as many perceptions of the phenomenon as possible (Saunders, Lewis,
& Thornhill, 2016). Multi-methods of data collection adds rigour, depth, complexity, and richness to the research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Moreover, Denzin and Lincoln (2011) argued that qualitative researchers should use a wide range of interpretative methods. In this study, three types of interviews were used: short on-site semi-structured interviews, in-depth follow-up semi-structured interviews, and key-informant interviews. The research was divided into three phases (Figure 5.1), namely 1) the screening phase, 2) the pilot studies phase and 3) the main study phase. The main study phase is subdivided into two parts: during the festivals with observations and on-site interviews, and post-festivals with in-depth follow-up and key informant interviews.

Figure 5.1: The three phases of the research (Source: Author)

5.5.1 The screening phase

The study began with a screening phase that included desk research and observations. The desk research involved creating a database of all the literary festivals in Ireland and in Italy, outlined in Chapter Six. Observations were conducted at five Irish literary festivals, namely Cuirt International Festival of Literature (Cuirt), International Literature Festival Dublin (ILFD), Howth Literary Arts Festivals (Howth), Bloomsday Festival (Bloomsday), Zurich Dalkey Book Festival (Dalkey). The observations were useful for the researcher to better understand her secondary data and formulate the research
question. The five festivals were selected according to available resources, geographic locations, and key differences among them:

- Locations (two in the capital city of Dublin, and three in towns: Howth, Dalkey, and Galway),
- Type of festival (two international literary festivals, one literary festival, one book festival, and one festival about a single author),

The researcher compiled notes on the methodology and the methods used (Appendix 4), details of data collection, data analysis, and findings. During the screening, the researcher learned five key lessons that informed the study undertaken here.

(1) Firstly, a set of 10 operational criteria, whereby festivals has been deemed qualified to be cases, were selected (see 5.6.2). All the pilot studies and the case studies were selected according to the research question, the objectives and access to the potential data (Yin, 2003).

(2) Secondly, the researcher understood that applying strictly dichotomous thinking about international and peripheral elements of festivals is over-simplistic since there can be elements of overlap. For instance, the screening phase showed that sometimes urban international festivals host cultural celebrities, such as music, sport or political figures, and not only literary celebrities (Stewart, 2013). For example, the ILFD hosted the Irish football and rugby player Bressie, who now is a leading advocate for mental health in Ireland but who cannot be defined as a literary celebrity. This means that defining literary festivals and their types is difficult.
(3) Thirdly, since the observations revealed that types of literary festivals can overlap and differences can be found in both content as well as authors invited, the researcher understood that it is useful to take into consideration not only the better-known and established festivals but also small festivals, as Weber (2015) suggested. This allowed her to have a more complete picture of the literary festival sector and the variety of festivals on offer. Moreover, Small, Edwards, and Sheridan (2005) said that small-scale festivals can be useful to have a better in-depth analysis of, for example, learning impacts.

(4) Fourthly, the literature says that literary festivals are expanding their programmes to include children’s events or other types of events to attract a more extensive public (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014). This was clear from the screening phase which revealed that different types of events are now offered: from events about books written by well-known authors, to writing workshops, debates about cultural topics, and fringe events, such as evening concerts, brunches, or theatre performances.

(5) Finally, the last lesson learned from the screening phase concerned motivations for participation. Existing scholarly discussion on literary festivals argue that reasons for attending are several, often overlapping, and can be clustered into: social, aesthetic, affective, intellectual, hedonistic, and duty (Meehan, 2005; Ommundsen, 2009; Johanson & Freeman, 2012; Stewart, 2013; Driscoll, 2014; Weber, 2015). The screening phase allowed the researcher to understand that these motivations often overlap and are extremely interlinked. This allowed the researcher to better understand the complex reality of literary festivals.
5.5.2 The pilot studies phase

The second phase involved two pilot studies: the Dublin Book Festival (DBF) and the Mountains to Sea dlr Book Festival (MTS). A pilot study is useful for refining ‘data collection plans with respect to both the content of the data and the procedures to be followed’ (Yin, 2009, p. 92). Four criteria were used to select the pilot studies: access, geographic proximity, convenience according to resources and time available, and similarities of the festival production. Following these criteria, the two festivals were selected. Both the festivals are quite new, they have a similar duration (four/five days), they are located in the same greater urban area (Dublin), and they run annually, as Table 5.1 shows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1: The two pilot studies at a glance (Source: Author)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin Book Festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountains to Sea dlr Book Festival</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher gathered all the primary data herself and piloted data collection (participant observations, on-site interviews, and key informant interviews) and data analysis. During the DBF, the researcher conducted participant observations, 76 on-site short interviews (Appendix 5), and administered 19 questionnaires (Appendix 6). However, the researcher found difficulties in recruiting respondents who were reluctant in filling out the questionnaire (Table 5.2 point 10). Moreover, during the DBF, the on-site interviews were unstructured and were found to be very time and energy-consuming. Thus, after the first pilot study, the researcher understood that a second pilot study was
deemed necessary. The written questionnaires were eliminated and oral semi-structured interviews were preferred. During the MTS, she conducted participant observations and 30 on-site short interviews (Appendix 7). The researcher used the same protocol for the observations (Appendix 8), following Spradley’s (1990) template. During both pilot studies she interviewed adult (over 18 years old) female and male festival participants on the spot. In both pilot studies, the interviews lasted between 10 and 15 minutes. The design of the interviews was driven by the conceptual framework illustrated in Chapters Two-Four. The interviews were recorded and conducted during the festivals, in indoor and outdoor venues. Participants were approached verbally and were randomly selected (every fifth person who passed the spot in which the researcher had positioned herself), during different time periods from morning, afternoon and evening, over the days of the festivals. It was, therefore, a purposive sampling, aimed to maximise information. The researcher spent as much time as possible in the field to maximise data collection and reach saturation. Ethical considerations are explained in 5.8. The researcher also piloted key interviews with DBF festival organisers, interview transcription, and analysis with NVivo. Finally, the researcher created two reports as executive summaries of the pilot studies and gave them to the two festival organisers, following the last phase of the thematic analysis explained in 5.9 (Braun & Clarke, 2015).

5.5.3 Refinements made following the pilot studies
As Yin (2009, p. 94) suggested, ‘pilot reports should be explicit about the lessons learned for both the research design and field procedures’. Moreover, if there is more than a single pilot case the report should also indicate the modifications made in the next pilot case (Yin, 2009). Therefore, all the changes applied after each pilot study are illustrated in Table 5.2.
Table 5.2: Changes applied after the pilot studies (Source: Author)

| The observations | 1. The researcher noted that it was important to carry out observations in different festival venues, and especially during the events, when she could witness participants’ behaviour (e.g. if they took notes, took pictures, talked, asked questions, expressed emotions). For this reason, the researcher needed to attend some events, at least one per type (e.g. reading, walking tour, conversation, workshop) and she needed to sit in the back to have a better overview. |
| The on-site interviews | 1. The researcher learned that adult participants who attend the festival with and for their children should be included in the sample, but that those who have yet to attend any event should be excluded because their festival experience is as yet limited. |
| 2. The field notes can be taken both in Italian and in English, depending on what feels more natural at the time. | 2. Even if interviewing is extremely time and energy-consuming, it is crucial to maximise the hours spent at the festival in order to reach saturation. |
| 3. It was found useful to take pictures to support the observations, and to record comments and feelings during the festival experience, even if they did not occur at the time. | 3. It is crucial to consider any audience surveys being carried out by the festival organisation concurrently. |
| 4. Finally, a few changes in the observation protocol were necessary (Appendix 8). | |
4. Variation of venues, events, and time of data collection were considered appropriate. Communal spaces, such as the ‘winter garden’, are very advantageous venues for interviewing.

5. During the DBF, interviews were unstructured and very time and energy-consuming. To overcome this obstacle, the researcher created a semi-structured interview guide.

6. During the MTS the interview guide included a section of ladders, following the ladder technique of the Means-End-Theory (Gutman, 1982). The laddering, which is a qualitative, in-depth, one-to-one interview technique, was chosen because of its reflexive nature. As such, it makes the interviewee think critically about the links among his/her personal values and his/her motivation of selection. However, it was decided to eliminate the ladders because of lack of training and time limits. Usually, two or three ladders are obtained in 60/75 minutes and one-fourth of the interviewees cannot go beyond one ladder (Reynolds & Gutman, 1988).

7. The researcher also understood that follow-up in-depth interviews were deemed necessary because during the on-site interviews informants were still attending the festival and their self-perception of cultural capital development sometimes was not clear, and short interviews did not allow a deep insight. Moreover, during in-depth interviews, it is possible to explore how the informants usually acquire cultural capital.

8. The researcher learned that questions need to focus not on singular events’ impacts but on the whole festival experience. The first question ‘Did you enjoy the event/ Are you enjoying the festival?’ turned out to be a good first question because it ‘broke the ice’. Other useful questions were ‘If you
had to describe the festival with three adjectives, which ones would you chose?’ and ‘What does the festival mean to you? How could you describe it?’, which were not included in the pilot studies. On the contrary, a few questions were eliminated after the first pilot study because they were too complex, e.g. ‘Do you think the festival can increase your cultural resources?’.

9. With respect to the objectified cultural capital acquisition, questions about the reasons for book purchasing turned out to be useful. The researcher also understood that the questions about the act or desire to get books signed were not useful.

10. Finally, a questionnaire survey was used during the DBF but this was omitted from the MTF because it was deemed not to be appropriate. The researcher encountered difficulties in recruiting respondents for the questionnaire for two reasons. Firstly, the questionnaire appeared to be too time-consuming for the respondents. Some participants as soon as they saw the questionnaire said they did not have time to complete it, while when asked to answer a few questions verbally they agreed. So, some participants revealed themselves to be more available to ‘chat’ and to do an interview than to fill in a written questionnaire. Secondly, the questionnaire appeared to be ‘over-rigid and inappropriate’ (Mangen, 1999, p. 116). The questions, despite being open questions, do not give a flexible opportunity to the respondents to justify the answers or criticise the questions, as interviews can give. Interviews allow, therefore, respondents to follow a logical thread of speech, unlike written questionnaires. For all the data gathering consent was obtained.
5.5.4 Piloting the in-depth interviews

While observations, on-site, and key interviews were piloted during the pilot studies, the in-depth interviews were piloted during the main study phase. Two pilot in-depth interviews were conducted. One was conducted on June 17th, two weeks after the first case study (WW in Ireland), in English, with Darrel, in Dublin, face-to-face, and lasted 53 minutes. The other one was conducted on September 25th, two weeks after the second case study (PL in Italy), in Italian, with Maura, on the phone, and lasted 34 minutes. The pilot interviews were useful to understand if length, time, location, approach (face-to-face and on the phone), flow, and questions were appropriate. Moreover, the ice breaker question, the act of recording, and the explanation of the information sheet with the consent form were checked for suitability. After the first pilot in-depth interview (Darrel), a few changes to the questions were made. The interviewee suggested four sub-questions to clarify existing questions. All the four sub-questions were deemed to be appropriate and were included in the questions list: (1) ‘Did you enjoy it [the festival]?’ (2) ‘What did you get out of it [the festival]?’ (3) ‘Have you learned anything?’ (4) ‘Was there anything that inspired you?’ The in-depth interview questions were also piloted in Italian with Maura, who confirmed that she understood all the questions. Thus, no changes were made after the pilot interview with Maura, and the Italian questions were confirmed to be understandable, clear, and appropriate. Finally, it was found that conducting an in-depth follow up interview over the phone proved to be useful. For this reason, it was decided that should the need arise, it would be appropriate to conduct a follow up interview over the phone.
5.5.5 The main study phase

This thesis adopts a qualitative approach since it aims for a deeper understanding of a phenomenon in different cultural contexts, to get inside the actual literary festival practice and the participants’ cultural capital development process, to analyse the phenomena, understanding the dynamics and the peculiarities of each case.

Terminology in international research is ambiguous with researchers using terms such as cross-country, cross-national, cross-societal, cross-cultural, trans-cultural, trans-national and trans-societal synonymously (Alonso & Barredo, 2013). This study employs the term ‘cross-cultural’ because the emphasis is on the understanding of a phenomenon in two different cultures. Therefore, the two different nations are the context of the study and not the unit of analysis (Kohn, 1989).

Livingstone (2003) argued that cross-cultural studies are carried out for different purposes, including analysing transnational phenomena across different cultural contexts, which is connected to the main aim of this study. Thus, the study undertaken aims to understand a phenomenon in different cultural contexts. Also, Getz, Andersson and Carlsen (2010) argued that festivals are socio-culturally bound and can have different meanings from nation to nation. The literature shows that while cross-cultural research has been widely used in the tourism literature, only a few scholars have undertaken it in festival settings. Kay (2004, p. 191) even claimed that ‘the potential benefits from [cross-cultural research in the event sector] can be great’. Since the literature is scarce, this study contributes to the growing body of literature on small-scale qualitative cross-cultural studies of festivals. Moreover, this thesis answers the call for more cross-disciplinary analysis of qualitative comparative research across the social sciences (Smelser, 2003). Also, it provides researchers working on qualitative cross-cultural studies with a rationale and practical advice for planning, collecting, and analysing phenomena in festival
settings. Some of the challenges encountered in the methodological process used in qualitative cross-cultural research are reported in the following sections.

5.6 Sampling

Sampling was guided by the theory described in the previous chapters and the aim was to explore participants’ cultural capital development associated with literary festival participation. Sampling involved five stages (Figure 5.2). The first stage involved the purposive sampling of the macro contexts with the selection of two different cultural countries (Italy and Ireland). The second stage was the purposive sampling of two similar festivals (Pordenonelegge and Writers’ Week), what Hammersley (2000) called settings. The selections of the cultural contexts (the countries) and the settings (the festivals) were influenced by access and convenience (economic resources, geographical proximity, time available, the fact they do not overlap so it was possible to conduct observations during the festivals, linguistic and cultural resources). This might be seen as convenience sampling (Yin, 2016). However, purposive sampling is also guided by time and resources available (Silverman, 2013). As such, cases can be selected also for practical reasons (Stake, 1995). With purposive sampling, the researcher needs to think critically about the parameters of case and population selection (Silverman, 2013). Contexts were selected, therefore, because they are culturally different, and festivals were chosen because they are similar in their production and supply.

Finally, the last three stages included selecting the interviewees. A first set of interviewees was selected with a combination of purposive and snowball sampling during on-site short semi-structured interviews. Interviewees for the follow-up interviews were largely recruited during the on-site interviews from those who agreed to be interviewed.
post-festival. Thus, it was largely purposive and also snowball sampling. The aim was to capture the full range of participants’ characteristics, but it is crucial to remember that ‘a purposive sample is not necessary a representative sample’ (Yin, 2016, p. 94). Accordingly, as explained, the study does not aim to generalise the findings. Finally, key informant interviewees were selected with purposive sampling in order to have one interviewee connected to the festival (i.e. director or chairperson) and one connected to the county or town cultural activity department. Details of the sampling approaches are discussed in the following sections.

![Figure 5.2: The sampling approaches (Source: Author)](image)

### 5.6.1 Sampling the cultural contexts (the countries)

Livingstone (2003) claimed that existing scholarly discussion pays little attention to the matter of country selection in cross-cultural research. Here, the context, influencing festival participation and individual cultural capital development, was divided into a macro-context (national) and a micro-context (local/town). Both contextual analyses must be developed. The main sources for secondary data collection were Eurostat (2015) and
Compendium for European studies (2016, 2018), ISTAT for Italian statistics (2011, 2017), and Arts Audiences for Irish statistics (2014), and the two websites of WW and PL.

Both the countries and the festivals were geographically accessible to the researcher who lived in Ireland and has a home in Italy. The two countries were also chosen because they are neither extremely different nor extremely similar countries (Livingstone, 2003). Italy and Ireland are both European countries but with different cultural contexts, in terms of supply of cultural activities, public support for culture & art, cultural participation, reading index, and educational attainment.

Ireland seems to offer a rich supply of cultural activities, in terms of, for instance, participation with free admission to national cultural institutions (Compendium, 2016), the UNESCO City of Literature cultural award (Eurostat, 2015), and increase of cultural participation [from 2013 to 2014] (ArtsAudience, 2014). In contrast, Italy is still affected by the slowdown of the economic crisis of 2011 (Compendium, 2018; ISTAT, 2011). Similarly, educational qualifications and reading index in Ireland are higher than the average level of the European countries, while in Italy they are lower (Compendium, 2016). More details on the macro and micro contexts are provided in the research notes in the Appendices.

The second contextual level concerns the two cultural micro-contexts of Listowel and Pordenone. Listowel, in North Kerry, is a small heritage and market town. It is sometimes described as the Literary Capital of Ireland because it is the birthplace of many of Ireland’s most prominent male writers past and present including Dr. John B. Keane, Dr. Bryan MacMahon, Professor Brendan Kennelly, George Fitzmaurice, Maurice Walsh and Robert Leslie Boland (Writers Week, 2017). The town, with an area of 33 km², has a
population of 8,670 inhabitants (2014), one public library, three bookshops, four museums, and hosts five festivals every year, of which two are related to literature (Writers’ Week and Sean Mccarthy weekend).

Plate 5.1: Listowel (Source: Author)

Pordenone is an old town with historical buildings, frescoes and monuments. The dynamic and creative soul of the town is evident from its architectural, artistic, musical and literary production as well as the numerous events which make the town an international destination. The town, with an area of 38.2 km², has a population of 51,632 inhabitants (2014), four public libraries, 15 bookshops, five museums, two art galleries, and hosts four festivals every year, among which only Pordenonelegge is related to literature.

Plate 5.2: Pordenone (Source: Author)
Table 5.3: The two micro-contexts: Listowel and Pordenone (Source: Author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Listowel (WW)</th>
<th>Pordenone (PL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>33 km²</td>
<td>38.2 km²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>8,670 inhabitants (2014)</td>
<td>51,632 inhabitants (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public libraries in town</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book shops in town</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Museums in town</strong></td>
<td>4: (Listowel Military &amp; Historical Museum, Seanchai – Kerry Wrieters’ Museum, Lartigue Monorail &amp; Museum, Vinate Wireless Museum)</td>
<td>5: (Museo Civico d’Arte, Museo Civico di Storia Naturale Silvia Zenari, Museo Archeologico del Friuli Occidentale, Museo della Scienza Interattivo Multimediale, Museo Diocesano d’Arte Sacra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Art Galleries in town</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2: (PARCo - Pordenone Arte Contemporanea Galleria d’arte moderna e contemporanea ”Armando Pizzinato”, Galleria Harry Bertoia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Festivals in town</strong></td>
<td>5: Writers’ Week, Listowel Food fair, Listowel Military &amp; History festival, Listowel Horse racing &amp; Harvest Festival of Ireland, Sean Mccarthy weekend</td>
<td>4: (Pordenone Blues Festival, Pordenonelegge, Pordenone Silent Film Festival, Arlecchino Errante)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.2 Sampling the settings (the festivals)

The researcher had initially selected another Italian festival, however, was unable to agree to the conditions laid down by the festival organisation. This is explained in detail in the methodological limitations section 5.11. It is a non-probability sample and festivals were selected on the bases that they both meet the 10 operational criteria identified during the screening phase.

1. Geographical access: both WW and PL were selected because of their accessibility in terms of geographical proximity and access.

2. Frequency: they both run annually. For questions connected to the respondents’ willingness to attend the festival the following year, festivals needed to occur in 2017 and 2018, so they both needed to run annually.
3. Time interval: for practical data collection reasons, festivals needed to run at least two months apart to allow the researcher to attend both and to conduct follow-up interviews two-four weeks after each festival. WW runs in June and PL in September.

4. Duration of the festival: the length of time the researcher can spend in the field needed to be sufficiently long to collect enough data. Each festival lasts five days and the pilot studies deemed this period to be sufficient to reach a proper level of maximisation of data and saturation.

5. Year established: they both are long-established and well-known festivals: WW was launched in 1970 and PL in 2000.

6. Type: they are generic literary festivals, not dedicated to a specific type of literature, such as poetry or spoken words.

7. Audience scale and size: as mentioned, both WW and PL are small-scale peripheral festivals, set in small towns (see Chapter Six). In 2017, WW had 15,575 participants and PL had 120,000 (which compared to the local population could be considered a peripheral festival).

8. They both offer bookstalls which allow participants to accumulate objectified cultural capital in terms of book purchasing.

9. They both include writing awards, which allow participants to augment their institutionalised cultural capital.

10. Positionality of the researcher: Spradley (1980) argued that it is better not to be over-familiar with the field, so that every single detail is not ignored or taken for granted, nor to be too unfamiliar. The researcher being Italian and living in Ireland was familiar with the two cultures and countries but she had never
participated in WW or PL before the study, nor visited the two towns. Therefore, she was not over-familiar nor extremely unfamiliar with the two festivals.

Table 5.4: Sampling the festivals (Source: Author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the festival</th>
<th>Writers’ Week (WW)</th>
<th>Pordenonelegge (PL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographical access</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Writers’ Week</td>
<td>Festa del libro con gli autori (Feast of the book with authors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration (days)</td>
<td>5 + 1 evening</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time interval (month)</td>
<td>June</td>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>Annual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The year established</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small scale</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience’s size</td>
<td>15,575 participants (2017)</td>
<td>120,000 participants (2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Book stall(s)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positionality of the research</td>
<td>Not over-familiar nor extremely unfamiliar</td>
<td>Not over-familiar nor extremely unfamiliar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.3 Sampling the interviewees

Sampling the interviewees was a three-fold process involving the on-site short interviews during the festivals, post-festival follow-up in-depth interviews, and key informant interviews.

The on-site interviewees were recruited using a combination of purposive and snowball sampling. Snowball sampling is ‘perfectly compatible with purposive sampling’ (Denscombe, 2014, p. 43). As such, purposive sampling provided the broadest range of perspective on the subject begin studied (Yin, 2016), while the snowball sampling augmented the sample size. To augment the sample, participants who were recruited using purposive sampling were, therefore, asked to recommend further participants who might be available to participate in the interview and who would reflect a variety of characteristics in terms of age, gender, and occupational background. So, when selecting
the participants, the aim was to provide a high variety of demographic characteristics. These, however, do not necessarily reflect the whole festival audience profile. In one case, it was the participant (Maureen) who, after the successful interview, asked the researcher if she wanted to also interview her friend (Norah). While in another case, prior the interview, one participant (Nicole) recommended two authors, who were willing to participate (Evan and Simon).

Interviewee recruitment occurred while the festivals were taking place, in and around the public venues, both inside and outside, before and after the events (Appendix). The great variety of venues allowed for the recruitment of different types of participants and gave a good overview of the festival, even if the samples were not representative of the whole festival audiences. For example, during WW, the Community Centre hosted all children-only events, so the researcher went there to recruit participants who attended because of their children (see ‘Parents’ in Chapter Ten). They were approached and asked to take part in on-site interviews. Tactics of approaching potential interviewees included informal conversations about the festival events and authors. Before starting the interview, participants were informed about the project, about their rights in respect of consent, and were told how the information gathered would be stored.

The researcher approached 50 people both during WW and PL. In Listowel, a total of 45 participants participated in the on-site interviews (90%) and only two interviews were interrupted. In Pordenone, a total of 47 participants participated in the on-site interviews (94%) and one interview was interrupted. The researcher encountered difficulties in interviewing ‘Parents’ since they were reluctant to answer the questions and the majority did not finish the interview and did not have availability for a second in-depth interview.
The sample for the follow-up interviews was largely purposive because it started from the on-site sample and depended on those who expressed their consent to be available to participate in a follow-up in-depth interview and to be interviewed two-four weeks after the end of the festivals. It was also a snowball sampling. For instance, in Ireland, one in-depth interviewee was included because another respondent suggested her, and the interview was deemed to be appropriate and valuable. The snowball sampling was therefore used to maximise information and sample variation (Yin, 2016).

Finally, the key informant interviews were recruited using purposive sampling. Two key interviewees were selected per each festival. One was the festival director or chairperson and the other the co-ordinator of cultural activities in town or in the country.

5.7 Data collection

Data collection involved participant observations, 92 on-site short semi-structured interviews, 34 follow-up in-depth semi-structured interviews, and 4 in-depth key interviews conducted before and after the festivals. This section discusses the interviews and observations protocols and formats.

5.7.1 Participant observations

The findings from the observations contributed to strengthening the validity of the findings from the on-site interviews. Participant observation is mainly used by anthropologists and sociologists in order to understand the culture and behaviours of a group of people (Denscombe, 2010). According to Park, Daniels, Brayley, and Harmon (2010, p. 167), the participant observation method can also ‘be utilised in evaluating
visitor behaviours and impacts in festival and event contexts’. The researcher used the
emic perspective, usually associated with the interpretative social science paradigm,
according to which the view of the insider is used to understand the phenomenon
(Jennings, 2010). During both case studies, the researcher observed by participating in
the ‘normal setting’, defined by Descombe (2010, p. 207) as when ‘the researcher’s role
is known to certain ‘gatekeepers’ but is hidden from most of those in the setting’.
Accordingly, the researcher’s role was known to the festival organisers and managers
only.

Participant observations allowed the researcher to gather data relating to
audiences’ behaviours, overheard conversations and relevant comments (Park, Daniels,
Brayley, & Harmon, 2010), and on-site emotions (Mackellar, 2013). Ethics guidelines are
quite clear: ‘any use of the material should ensure that no one suffers as a result’ and ‘any
use of the material should avoid disclosing the identities of those involved’ (Denscombe,
2010, p. 209). Ethical considerations are further explained in the section 5.8.

Participant observations can be unstructured or structured (Wellington, 2015).
These observations were structured and, before data collection, a participant observation
protocol was developed. The protocol involved six steps following Jennings’ suggestions
(2010, p. 179): (1) ‘consider the research purpose’, (2) ‘decide which type of participant
observation will be used’, (3) ‘design the research methodology’, (4) ‘enter the field’, (5)
‘interpret the empirical materials’, (6) ‘report the findings’. As such, the researcher
followed specific guidelines for the field notes – also called ‘data collection instrument’,
or ‘checklist’ by Park, Daniels, Brayley, and Harmon (2010, p. 170), which allowed for
systematic and efficient data collection. The field notes’ guidelines followed Holloway,
Brown, and Shipway’s (2010) and Taylor, Bogdan, and DeVault’s suggestions (2016)
and included eight sections: event (type, ticket), space (venue), actors (participants’
gender, age, solo/group…), objects involved, time of the event, activity (behaviours and actions of the participants), feelings of the participants, and observer’s comments. The researcher took the field notes simultaneously during the events, and if this was not possible, she wrote them up as soon as possible afterwards (Denscombe, 2010; Taylor, Bogdan, & DeVault, 2016). Descriptions of settings and activities employed ‘descriptive and not evaluative words’ (Taylor, Bogdan, & DeVault, 2016, p. 87). While for the description of participants, the researcher documented ‘people’s gestures, nonverbal communications’, ‘clothing, hairstyles, jewellery, accessories, demeanor, and general appearance’ (Taylor, Bogdan, & DeVault, 2016, 2016, pp. 88-89). The researcher used some techniques suggested by Taylor, Bogdan, and DeVault (2016, p. 80) in recalling details, such as ‘pay attention’ and ‘shift focus’. She recorded her own behaviour in the field and noted what was not clear or understood about the audiences’ behaviours. With a few exceptions, the researcher took the field notes in her mother tongue (Italian), so she did not waste time translating. Finally, after the participant observations, an electronic copy of all the field notes was created. The days of data collection varied according to the festivals and the researcher’s resources: four days and one evening in Listowel and four days in Pordenone. Observations were made both in indoor and outdoor venues. Seven events were attended during WW and these differed by type (the opening night, one art exhibition, one evening event about storytelling, one morning walk, one poets’ corner, one living literature tour in the Seanchaí museum, and one formal lecture about art and education). In Italy, the researcher carried out observations during seven events (one formal lecture about literature with Sepulveda, the prize giving event for the best shop window, one formal lecture about philosophy, one afternoon event about pets, one Nel Nostro Tempo lecture, one evening event at the theatre about literature and cello, and one
The researcher organised the observations according to the time available, the locations of the venues, and the variety of event types covered.

### 5.7.2 On-site semi-structured interviews

The 92 on-site interviews were conducted for two main purposes. The first purpose was to have an overview of the audience and the nature of literary festivals. This allowed to answer the call for more empirical research on literary festival participants ‘asking why they are there and what their impressions are, and listening to the answers’ (Weber, 2018, p. 14). The second purpose was to recruit respondents for follow-up interviews.

The researcher gathered all the primary data herself and all the on-site interviews were conducted face-to-face, on the spot during the two festivals and in the festival venues. During WW, the interviews were conducted mainly in the local hotel. This was the main venue where participants could sit down, relax, and talk. Some interviews were conducted in other venues (three indoor and five outdoor): the main square, two different streets, the museum, the secondary school, the accommodation where the researcher was staying, in front of the hotel, and outside the Community Centre (Appendix 22). During PL, interviews were conducted in 13 locations (five indoor and eight outdoor): Palazzo Montereale Mantica, Spazio Incontri, Cinemazero, Palazzo Badini, Palazzo della Provincia, five different streets, outside the library, outside Loggia del Municipio, and the main square (Appendix 23). Overall, since the events of both festivals were concentrated in the town centres, the distances between venues were not excessive. This allowed the researcher to change venues for the on-site interviews and the observations and gain, therefore, a more complete picture of the festivals.

All the interviews were collected with the agreement of the festival organisers. Before every interview the researcher approached the participant; read the information
sheet in order to: ask if the participant was available to be interviewed, to inform him/her about the project and his/her rights, seek consent for participation in the survey, and for having their details stored. Before starting the interview, the researcher obtain their consent (see 5.8). During the interviews, informants were asked if they were available to participate in an in-depth interview after the festival. Contacts (name and telephone or e-mail) of those who signalled availability for further participation were securely kept by the researcher in a locked drawer in her office. In Ireland, 30, and in Italy, 38, on-site interviewees expressed their consent to be contacted for follow-up interviews.

As explained, due to the qualitative approach, the research did not attempt to generate statistical generalisations. Instead, interviewees were selected using purposive sampling ‘so that insights could be generated across a number of key groups’ (Quilgars, Elsinga, Jones, Toussaint, Ruonavaara, & Naumanen, 2009, p. 22). As far as possible, informants with different gender, age groups and social class were sought in each country in order to guarantee a maximum variation sample (Yin, 2016). A total of 45 and 47 participants were interviewed on-site in Ireland and Italy, respectively. The participants’ demographic information is provided in Chapter Eight.

The on-site interviews were designed to last between 10 and 15 minutes but in practice they were between 1.30 and 46.19 minutes in length during WW and between 5.23 and 19.50 minutes during PL, producing a total of 15.5 hours of data (7.4 hours in Ireland and 8.10 in Italy). A semi-structured interview guide was used to both ensure comparability in key topics as well as to allow respondents to voice their own experience. All questions of the guide were posed but, in accordance with most qualitative research (Quilgars, Elsinga, Jones, Toussaint, Ruonavaara, & Naumanen, 2009), they were not always asked in the same order. The 20 questions covered five areas: (1) demographic features, (2) pre-existing level of cultural capital, (3) motivation of participation,
meanings associated with the experience, and commitment to the festival, (4) insights into festival participation, such as the social context and the behavioural dimension, (5) self-perception of cultural capital development. The interviews started with the ice-breaker opening question which allowed the interviewee to start with a full answer, rather than a short one, on the relevant topic of the research (Yin, 2016). As such, after the formal introduction, the initial question ‘Are you enjoying the festival?’ proved to be a perfect opening to set an interpersonal tone. The Italian version was ‘Ti stai gustando il festival?’.

The verb ‘godere’ was not chosen for its possible offensive meaning and the translation ‘Ti piace il festival?’ was not chosen because it focuses more on the respondent’s perception of the quality of the festival production instead of the participant’s enjoyment. The initial question also set the typical conversational mode of the qualitative interview (Yin, 2016). After that, the first section included three questions about demographic features (origin, age bracket, occupation). The pre-existing level of cultural capital (institutionalised, objectified, and embodied) was investigated with six questions, and this was followed by four questions about the motivation for participation, meanings associated with the experience and commitment to the festival. Here, the self-perception of festival experience was explored with two open-ended questions: ‘What does the festival mean to you?’ and ‘If you had to describe the festival with three adjectives, which ones would you like to choose and why?’ Then, the fifth section explored festival participation in terms of the interviewee’s immediate group, events planned to attend, and behavioural dimension. The role of the social context was investigated with questions about identity, group attraction, and unique ethos of serious leisure (see Chapter Four). The last area asked about the first-self-perception of cultural capital development (with serious leisure personal enrichment and self-gratification-enjoyment) with two open questions. Moreover, the interviewees had to choose sentences that applied to them best.
For instance, they had to choose between ‘while I’m here, I’m discovering new things, expanding my knowledge, exploring new ideas’ and ‘while I’m here, I’m having great fun’. This helped the respondents to express their opinions on the topic. When asked to consider choices, the interviewees were given a separate sheet with all the options so they had time to compare them and choose.

As Mangen (1999, p. 117) argued, interviewing in a foreign language is ‘strenuous, because it quickly exposes any weakness of linguistic or cultural competence’. The fact that the researcher was a foreign interviewer during the WW festival in Ireland, and not a native interviewer, was taken into consideration in evaluating the data collected. To overcome this issue, all interviews were tape-recorded to allow the researcher to repeat hearings of the interviews conducted. Then, all interviews were transcribed and securely stored (see 5.8).

5.7.3 Follow-up in-depth semi-structured interviews

The follow-up interviews aimed to prompt the informants to reflect on the possible personal cultural benefits and rewards of their festival experience. They were all conducted by the researcher herself between two and four weeks after the end of the festivals (in 2017), with one exception. One interviewee was only available to be interviewed 11 weeks after the end of WW, and she was included in the sample. There is remarkably little guidance in the literature on the appropriate timing of conducting follow-up interviews after festivals or other arts activities. For instance, in their study of cultural capital development, Kisida, Greene, and Bowen (2014) conducted follow-up interviews with students with little notable difference from three to eight weeks after they had visited a museum.
The recruitment of the follow-up interviewees was carried out on-site, during the two festivals in the two countries. This allowed the researcher to meet the interviewees in person at least once. Then, most of the in-depth interviews were conducted face-to-face, when possible. The interviews were conducted in a place chosen in agreement with the interviewee to put him/her at ease, encouraging him/her to talk freely, and facilitating the interview. Public venues were preferred, and only three interviews in Ireland were conducted in private houses at the explicit request or requirement of the interviewee. The researcher took into account her safety and she did not encounter any impediment or difficulty in conducting the interviews in private houses. In Ireland, 12 out of 17 interviews were conducted face-to-face (65%) and six carried out by phone (35%). In Italy, only two were conducted by phone (12%), while 15 were face-to-face (88%).

All 34 interviews were in-depth and designed to last between 50 and 60 minutes but in practice, they lasted between 26.27 and 73.59 minutes in Ireland and between 25.11 and 72.24 minutes in Italy, for a total of 25.36 hours of recorded data (of which 12.5 hours in Ireland and 12.86 in Italy). Appendix 29 and 31 summarise the main features of the in-depth interviews.

Similar to the on-site interviews, a semi-structured guide was developed for the follow-up interviews in order to cover all the relevant topics and to ensure standardisation and comparability (Yin, 2016). As with the on-site interviews, the sequence of the questions was flexible. The follow-up questions were divided into two main parts, namely the Grand Tour questions and the interview questions.

In the Grand Tour questions, details about the demographic features of participants, if not asked during the on-site interviews, their previous levels of cultural capital (institutionalised, objectified and embodied), and insights into their participation
were investigated. The questions covered included: gender; age; ethnicity; origin; occupation; the highest level of education attained; possession of cultural goods; cultural participation; literary knowledge; skills; values and tastes; participation rates and commitment to the festivals studied, and immediate group.

In the second part, 16 questions covered the self-perception of cultural capital developed in all its three states, including field and non-field-specific cultural capital. They included all the eight indicators of cultural capital explained in Chapter Four. They were divided into five parts: (1) dimensions of festival participation and elements shaping cultural capital, (2) motivations for participation and meanings associated with the experience; (3) objectified cultural capital acquisition, (4) institutionalised cultural capital acquisition, (5) embodied cultural capital acquisition (Appendix 32 and 33). In the first part, the spatial, temporal, social dimensions of the experience and all the elements shaping cultural capital were explored, including any standout memories. The second part was useful to understand the motivations for participation, the commitment to the festival, and the meanings associated with the experience. It included the two questions suggested by Darrel during the pilot interview and a multiple-choice question. Here the interviewees had to choose among ten adjectives to describe their festival experience. The adjectives were formulated using Stebbins’ (2004) serious leisure to better understand the dimensions of seriousness, involvement, and enjoyment in leisure, as explained in Chapter Four. This was followed by two questions about objectified cultural capital acquisition, both field and non-field-specific. The fourth part investigated institutionalised cultural capital acquisition, while the last part focused on the embodied state and its development associated with the experience. Here, as illustrated in Chapter Four, questions covered all the six indicators (cultural participation, skills, cultural knowledge, values and personal enrichment, tastes and interests, and bodily hexis). The
serious leisure indicators (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008) were used for the development of the questions, such as ‘Has the image of yourself improved after the festival?’.

During the interviews, Yin’s (2016) best practices were followed so as to speak as little as possible, to be nondirective, to be neutral especially when participants expressed personal difficulties or criticism, and to try to maintain good rapport. Before the interviews, information sheets and consent forms were given to all the interviewees. Notes were taken during and after each interview; and in addition, the researcher recorded audios to document her key impressions of the interviews.

5.7.4 Key informant in-depth interviews

Four key informant in-depth interviews were also conducted: two in Ireland and two in Italy. The main purpose of the key informant interviews was to better understand the cultural contexts and the festivals. The interviews were mainly conducted face-to-face (three of them), while one was conducted on the phone. They were collected during and after the festivals in public places, such as public offices and bars. Before the interviews, information sheets and consent forms were given to all the interviewees. They lasted between 27 minutes to one hour, for a total of 3 hours of recorded data. All the interviews were recorded and, after data collection, securely stored. Details of the interviews are described in Table 5.7, and the lists of questions are in the Appendix. Key informant interviews were useful to have a bigger picture of the festivals, their organisation, programme content, educational mission, relationship with the town, and audiences. They are, therefore, integrated into the analysis to better understand the findings.
Table 5.7: The key informant interviews at a glance (Source: Author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role of the interviewee</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>How</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creative Ireland Kerry Co-ordinator of Kerry County Council</td>
<td>14/08/2017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>On the phone</td>
<td>43.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW chairperson</td>
<td>28/06/2017</td>
<td>Listowel</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>46.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL director</td>
<td>05/10/2017</td>
<td>Pordenone</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pordenone councillor for cultural activities</td>
<td>14/09/2017</td>
<td>Pordenone</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>27.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.8 Ethical considerations

As mentioned previously, the researcher considered ethical issues which can arise in any study and at any stage of the research (Creswell, 2003). Permission to carry out the study was obtained from TU Dublin. The researcher applied to the DIT Research Ethics Committee and a formal confirmation was received by email on 28 April 2017 from the Chair DIT Research Ethics Committee. Thus, the research conforms to the ethical standard required by TU Dublin. Before the data collection, the researcher approached the festival organisers to explain the research, gave them the information sheet and the consent form. In this way, they were informed about the project and their rights and permission to involve the festivals in the study were explained and sought. They were asked to give their consent to take part in the study and the researcher explained to them how the information gathered was to be stored.

The observations were, therefore, done with the agreement and consent of the festival organisers. No attempt was made to manipulate the behaviour of the participants. Respect, sensitivity and tact were always used during interviews. Questions about age, ethnicity, occupation and educational level or any other question related to social class were handled with due sensitivity. During the on-site interviews, the researcher had a name tag with the DIT logo in order to be identified. The information and consent notes
were printed on institutional headed paper. These tools served to indicate the purpose of the study and to reassure informants. The interviewees were fully informed about the nature of the research and their role therein. Their right to anonymity was stressed, and they were offered the chance to discontinue their involvement if they chose to do so at any point. No person participated unless their informed consent was gained.

Observations and interviews were mainly collected in public or semi-public spaces, such as hotels, pubs, cafés, squares, museums. Only a few interviews were carried out in private houses because of the interviewees’ requests. Anyhow, public venues were preferred. Potential risks were, therefore, minimised by the researcher taking due care while in public places. In addition, she took note of health and safety notices while inside buildings (e.g. taking note of fire exits) and she informed herself as to the availability of first aid stations as a precautionary measure. She tried always to minimise potential risks for her personal safety at all times, by e.g. working in public places, in well-lit venues and in daylight hours, etc. She made herself known to festival staff and she knew who to turn to if the need arose. She carried a mobile phone at all times. Furthermore, she always informed her supervisor when she was going into the field, and she checked in with her supervisor on a regular basis. She ensured that her supervisor had her mobile number. In support of the observations and to help the reader to have a better insight of the festivals and their audiences, some pictures of WW and PL are included in the following chapters. These pictures were provided by the organisers, who gave written consent to include them in the thesis, or taken by the researcher only where people cannot be recognised.
5.9 Data analysis

After explaining data collection, this section delves into data analysis, which was conducted with thematic analysis. The researcher had to analyse the participant observations and 44 hours of interviews (including on-site, follow-up, and key interviews). Thematic analysis was employed to observe key themes in the observation field notes and the transcribed interview recordings. Data analysis was supported by the use of Excel and NVivo, a CAQDAS (Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software) programme (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Here it is worth noting that the two interview data sets are referred to as OS for on-site interviews and FU for follow-up interviews in the findings chapters.

5.9.1 Thematic analysis

Why thematic analysis? Thematic analysis (TA) is a method of data analysis useful for identifying, organizing, and creating themes across a data set, which are patterns of meaning (Braun & Clarke, 2006, 2015). It was chosen as a method because it is a flexible and accessible method of qualitative data analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2015). Accordingly, the two main reasons why it has been employed were accessibility and flexibility. TA allowed the researcher to identify those patterns relevant to answer the research questions. Also, TA had other advantages, such as the fact that it does not require technical knowledge, is easily grasped, and is a useful method for analysing the perspectives of different interviewees (Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules, 2017). Finally, TA emphasises the context, includes thematic maps, and does not require peer checking (Vaismoradi, Turunen, & Bondas, 2013). Therefore, TA was a method well suitable for this research.

What does conducting thematic analysis mean? Conducting thematic analysis means having a clear and constituent rationale for organising patterns of meanings and
analysing them (Braun & Clarke, 2015). Firstly, the interviews were transcribed in a specific consistent way. They were transcribed orthographically, reproducing also the sounds, hesitations, repetitions, false starts, cut-offs in speech [indicated with the dash (-)], long pauses [indicated with three full-stops in a row (...)], and pauses and hesitations such as ‘ehm’, ‘beh’, ‘mah’, ‘mm’. The transcripts were not edited, and the researcher decided to use quoted data verbatim so the reader can have a realistic perception of them. Moreover, the researcher included comments, incidents, and body language e.g. laughing [indicated with italic text]. When the audio was inaudible the researcher used three asterisks in a row (***)

Secondly, the analysis was divided into the six TA phases (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The researcher first familiarized herself with the data by listening to the audio several times and making quick notes. Then, she created initial codes relevant to answer the research questions, using what Saldaña (2013) called ‘open coding’. As the literature says, there are two types of TA: inductive and theoretical. The study undertaken was analysed with a theoretical TA because it is strongly linked to the research aim (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Here the researcher developed the categories of codes. So, she reviewed the coded data and identified similarities between codes. She searched, reviewed, and named the key themes (Figure 5.4) that captured the most relevant elements of the data in relation to the research questions (Nowell, Norris, White, & Moules, 2017). As such, a theme includes the key elements that answer a research aim (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013). The final phase of TA concerns the production of a report (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thus, the researcher wrote the entire thesis and produced summaries on the pilot studies. Quotes from the interviews were linked to the literature (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013) and interpreted in light of the literature review.
Data from the participant observations were examined using Excel and Word. The researcher reviewed, synthesised, and systematised the field notes. Excel and NVivo software were used to analyse the interview transcripts. NVivo allowed the researcher to save her data records, both the audio and the transcriptions of the interviews, to build knowledge of the data through coding, and to store coded references to the data with nodes (Saldaña, 2013). Moreover, with Excel and NVivo, the researcher could insert variable-type information (values and attributes) relating to the cases in terms of demographic details and responses to categorical questions (Creswell, 2016; Saldaña, 2013). NVivo was also useful to run the coding query and to show relationships between items (Bazeley & Jackson, 2013). The coding process resulted in the formation of nine themes which played a role in the process of cultural capital development associated with festival participation: cultural capital development, states and types of cultural capital developed, respondents’ demographics, the role of previous cultural resources, the behavioural and emotional dimensions, the role of the social context, the role of time, the role of space, the role of the festival features. An overview of the nine themes and their subthemes is presented in Figure 5.4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural capital development</th>
<th>States and types of cultural capital developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural Capital Acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stimulus for further cultural capital acquisition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reinforcement of pre-existing cultural capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institutionalised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Objectified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Embodied</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Field-specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Non-field-specific</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ demographics</th>
<th>The role of previous resources</th>
<th>The behavioural and emotional dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Gender</td>
<td>• Economic</td>
<td>• How to behave in the festival setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethnicity</td>
<td>• Cultural</td>
<td>• Multi-sensory activity (the body and its senses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age</td>
<td>• Engagement with literature</td>
<td>• Depending on the event and the venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Origin</td>
<td>• Involvement in the festival</td>
<td>• The enjoyment factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Occupational group</td>
<td>• Motivations for participating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Asceticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The role of the social context</th>
<th>The role of time</th>
<th>The role of space</th>
<th>The role of the festival features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Group composition (Known group interactions)</td>
<td>• Length of the festival (when cultural capital acquisition occurred)</td>
<td>• Physical atmosphere</td>
<td>• Type of event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Solitary disposition</td>
<td>• How much time cultural capital acquisition took to develop</td>
<td>• Town</td>
<td>• Bookstalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Formal external interactions (performers)</td>
<td>• Perseverance of the cultural capital developed</td>
<td>• Festival venues</td>
<td>• Cost of ticket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Informal external interactions (other participants)</td>
<td>• Free time / holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5.4: Overview of identified themes and subthemes of the findings

(Source: Author)
5.10 Data management plan

Research findings will be disseminated to academic peers and future professional experts, policymakers, and festival directors. It will be possible for academic peers and future professional experts to conduct further research using the findings of this study. The findings will be disseminated via papers submitted to international, peer-reviewed journals and presented in international conference presentations. Furthermore, this project will be useful for policymakers to offer an overview of all the national literary festivals and understand their cultural values and meanings in the local area. With this study, policymakers can further the understanding of the role of literary festivals in working with communities and stakeholders to encourage reading and literacy. Finally, this study’s findings can help festival directors and organisers to understand their audiences, the impacts of festival features on participants and, therefore, improve future festival events.

5.11 Methodological limitations

In all research projects, there are limitations and in this study several limitations arose. For instance, regarding the sample, as already mentioned, the first Italian festival approached did not take part in this study. So, according to the criteria explained in 5.6.2, PL was chosen as a case study.

Moreover, regarding data collection, the ability to make observations was limited because of time restrictions (they needed to be carried out during the festivals) and the researcher was alone. Similarly, interviewing on-site during WW and PL was energy and time consuming, and the researcher had to organise the days carefully. To overcome this limit the researcher took breaks, recorded the interviews and her impressions of them to
allow multiple listening. Moreover, researching in settings where people are relaxing, socialising, eating and drinking alcohol might not be easy. Thus, the researcher used techniques to introduce herself and start the on-site interviews without being annoying or invasive. She tried not to interrupt people who were chatting and approached possible respondents with a positive attitude and smiling. Problems connected to drinking alcohol were not found.

Furthermore, issues of working in foreign languages arose. Firstly, data collection was sometimes in a foreign language (English in Ireland – since the researcher is Italian). For example, one limitation encountered was that the researcher, being an Italian native speaker, sometimes failed to ask clarifying questions to confirm her understanding during the Listowel fieldwork. This is common in a qualitative study on cultural matters (Yin, 2016). Secondly, data analysis in a foreign language (English for Irish data). Thirdly, data analysis involved two different languages (Italian and English). The difficulties of working with more than one language and problems of linguistic competence cannot be underestimated in cross-cultural qualitative research (Mangen, 1999). To minimise this issue, researchers should have both subject expertise as well as linguistic competence. The researcher can speak both Italian and English. However, the knowledge of a foreign language may be necessary but not a sufficient requisite for cultural understanding (Mangen, 1999). Therefore, following Lawrence’s (1988) suggestion, this study used interviews in the informants’ language, putting the linguistic onus on the researcher and not on the informants (Mangen, 1999), and interviewees were all tape-recorded to allow multiple listening, even with native speakers. Finally, the findings were examined by the researcher’s supervisor, who is an English native speaker with knowledge of Italian, and were translated into English with the help of a specialised translator. Also, the Italian verbatim citations and their English translations are presented side by side to allow
triangulation for Italian speakers (Yin, 2016). Overall, writing a PhD in a foreign language is not easy. The researcher received help from her supervisor, who is native speaker, and she also improved her English during the PhD and obtained the TEFL certification to teach English to non-native speakers.

Furthermore, another limitation is working on a complicated topic, since defining the concept of cultural capital is not easy. The researcher spent the first two years of her PhD intensively studying Bourdieu’s works and correlated academic materials. She also attended a PhD module on Bourdieu (PGRE 9015 Social theory reading group) and presented two papers at sociological conferences (the BSA and the SAI conference), where she endeavoured to broaden her knowledge about Bourdieu’s theory and cultural capital. Finally, operationalising the complicated concept of cultural capital was not easy. The researcher had to find solutions to overcome the limitations of operationalisation of cultural capital embodiment in festival settings. After reviewing several theories and indicators, Stebbins’ concept of serious leisure was integrated with cultural capital theory to address this problem of operationalisation, as explained in Chapter Four.

5.12 Summary

While the previous chapters explore the theoretical framework, this chapter provides an overview of the research methodology and methods employed in the study. It starts by highlighting the research aims and objectives. The general purpose of this research is to understand if and how literary festival participation shapes adult participants’ cultural capital. It is a small-scale study with one Irish (Writers’ Week in Listowel) and one Italian (Pordenonelegge in Pordenone) case and it includes the Dublin Book Festival and the Mountains to Sea dlr Book Festival as pilot studies. The research question is: How does literary festival participation shape individual cultural capital?
The philosophical underpinnings and the research approach and design are outlined. The researcher adopts an interpretivist approach, the epistemological assumption is intersubjective with the emic perspective, so that the study prioritises the world of the informants and their point of views. The ontological assumption is that of multiple realities where reality is subjective and relative. The study has a value-laden nature, which emphasises the interpretation of participants’ values and beliefs play a crucial role in the research process as well as the researcher’s values and beliefs. The study, which is exploratory in nature, employs the qualitative approach to understand the phenomenon in terms of the meanings participants bring to it. Moreover, the research’s aim is not to prove existing theories, but to investigate new aspects of individual cultural capital acquisition associated with literary festivals. As such, the study, with inductive logic, starts from known premises and produces context-bound information which further the understanding of the phenomenon studied. A multiple case study approach is selected, however, the aim is not to compare the two cases but to provide a better understanding of the phenomenon studied in different cultural contexts (Ireland and Italy). The research involves a non-probability sample since the aim is not to measure nor to create the basis for generalisation but to foster the understanding of a process. The issues of validity and reliability are, therefore, explored.

Then, the methodology and methods of data collection are outlined, including the screening phase, the pilot study phase, and the main study phase. The observations made at five Irish literary festivals during the screening phase produced a set of 10 operational criteria, which were then used to select two festivals as cases.

Furthermore, the five stages of sampling are illustrated. The first stage involves the purposive sampling of two different cultural macro-contexts (the countries – Ireland and Italy) and micro-contexts (the towns – Listowel and Pordenone). The second stage is
the purposive sampling of two similar festivals as settings (Pordenonelegge and Writers’ Week). Finally, the three last stages include a combination of purposive and snowball sampling for the interviewees. The latter includes three sets: one for the on-site interviews, one for the follow-up in-depth interviews, and another for the key informant interviews. As such, data collection involves participant observations, on-site interviews, follow-up interviews, and key interviews. This is followed by the ethical considerations and details of data analysis. The chapter concludes by addressing methodological limitations.

Table 5.8: Visual representation of the research methodology and methods
(Source: Author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does literary festival participation shape individual cultural capital?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Philosophical framework</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research theory</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research design</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Epistemology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Axiology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methodology</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time horizon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Methods for data collection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools for data analysis</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

‘Cities, villages, libraries, community centres, bookshops, magazines, non-profit organisations, online communities, even Twitter, now organise their own [literary] festivals’

(Weber, 2018, p. 4)
CHAPTER 6

LITERARY FESTIVALS AT A GLANCE

6 Introduction

This chapter presents a situational analysis of literary festivals addressing objective 2d: to examine the evolution of Irish and Italian literary festivals (1969 – 2017), and to present the two case studies for in-depth study. Thus, it is divided into two parts. Firstly, it observes the current scenario of literary festivals in Ireland and in Italy. In Chapter Five, there is a description of the macro cultural contexts (the Countries), while here, the analysis maps all the Irish and Italian literary festivals. In doing so, it discusses their historical evolution, and with reference to the 2017 data describes their geographic profile, seasonal distribution, frequency and duration, public subvention, and organisation. Secondly, it provides an overview of the two case studies, the Irish festival Writers’ Week (WW) in Listowel and the Italian festival Pordenonelegge (PL) in Pordenone.

6.1 Literary festivals in Ireland and in Italy

It is not easy to map all the literary festivals in Ireland and Italy. To create a full map of Irish festivals the researcher used several web sites (Books Ireland Magazine; Ireland.com; Irish Times, 2015, 2016; Literaryfestivals.co.uk, 2017; Munster Literature Centre; Sarah Webb Blog; The Wordfoolery Blog; Words Ireland Literary Festivals; Words Ireland Writing Festivals), personal contacts, and key interviews. Similarly, for
the Italian festivals, the researcher consulted several web sites (AbeBooks; Circolo letterario BellAmi; Idee di viaggio; Il chiasmo dei libri; Il Libraio, 2017; Libri e scrittori; Oubliette Magazine; Touring Club Italiano), and key interviews.

6.1.1 Historical evolution

In Ireland, the first festival that contained a literature section was the Liberties Festival Dublin, launched in 1969, while the first festival dedicated entirely to literature, Listowel Writers’ Week, dates back to 1970. After that, in 1984, Limerick Literary Festival (formerly known as Kate O’Brien Weekend) was launched, followed by the Cúirt International Festival of Literature in 1985. The John Hewitt International Summer School was founded in 1987 and all the other Irish literary festivals were launched after that. From then on, there was minimal activity until the middle of the 1990s, when they began to prosper all over Ireland. In 2017 there were 59 festivals. Amongst the existing festivals, it is possible to find several different types of festivals. Amongst the ones that make the type explicit in their names, ‘literary festivals’ are the most common, followed by ‘book festivals’ and then ‘literature festivals’ or ‘festivals of literature’. However, as previously said, even if scholars tried to define the differences among types of festivals, there is no unanimous understanding.

In contrast, literary festivals in Italy started twenty years later, in 1995, with Festival Internazionale di Poesia of Genoa. After that, Festivaletteratura of Mantua (1997), Andersen Festival of Sestri Levante (1998), Scrittorincittá – Briciole (1999) and Suq (1999) were launched. Literary festivals first appeared in north-west Italy (Liguria, Lombardy and Piedmont). All the other literary festivals were founded after 2000. In 2017 there were 94 festivals. Some of them are very popular, while others are lesser-known.
What is most curious is that it is not possible to subdivide the types of festivals since most Italian literary festivals do not include the type-labels as the Irish festivals do.

All the above means that the number of festivals in Ireland is higher than the Italian one per head of population. In 2016, Ireland had 4,724,720 inhabitants and Italy 60,665,551 (Eurostat, 2015). Moreover, the Irish expansion of festivals is in line with the proliferation of literary festivals internationally, while in Italy it happened a decade later. In both countries, the festival peak occurred in 2013, as Figure 6.1 shows. The reasons for this peak could be the recovery after the economic crisis of 2008 (Guerzoni, Lissoni, Mussapi, Ramos, & Ranieri, 2015). Figure 6.1 shows the historical trend of literary festivals in Ireland (coloured in green) and in Italy (coloured in blue) per first edition. The start dates of some festivals are unknown (16 in Ireland and 6 in Italy).

Figure 6.1: Historical trend of the birth of literary festivals in Ireland and Italy per first edition (Source: Author)
6.1.2 Geographical distribution

As mentioned, in 2017, there were 59 literary festivals in Ireland. The province with the most festivals was Munster (21 festivals), followed by Leinster (20), Connacht (11), and finally Ulster with only seven festivals. The geographical distribution per county was very uneven, with 14 festivals located in County Dublin and 10 in County Cork (Figure 6.2). The other festivals were spread all around the island in a rather uniform way, but with no more than three festivals in any other county. Thus, even if the Irish expansion of festivals started on the West coast, the current scenario sees the majority of literary festivals on the South and East coasts, reflecting the population density reported by Census in 2011 (Central Statistics Office Ireland, 2011). Moreover, on the East coast, especially in County Dublin, many festivals take place in locations where deceased, well renowned, Irish writers and poets were born. So, even if the academic literature claims that literary festivals usually celebrate living writers, Irish festivals do not neglect the importance of commemorating famous dead authors (Rossetti, 2017). Finally, the location of festivals reflects the distribution of cultural awards, such as the UNESCO City of Literature (Dublin) and the European Capitals of Culture (Dublin, Cork, Galway).

![Figure 6.2: Geographical distribution of Irish literary festivals per county and province in 2017 (Source: Author)](image-url)
In Italy, the distribution of festivals is different. While in Ireland most of the festivals are in the south and east (Munster and Leinster), in Italy they are more dispersed, with 12 in Piemonte, 11 in Emilia Romagna, eight in Puglia and in Toscana, seven in Lombardia and in Sardegna (Figure 6.3). Even if they are geographically distributed across the entire peninsula, it is possible to affirm that the north (48 festivals in 2017, of which 24 in north-east and 24 in north-west) is richer in literary festivals than the centre (23 festivals), the south (14), and the islands (12). This is in line with the evolution of festivals in Italy that started in the north-west. This geographical distribution is perfectly in line with the current population density. The division of areas and the population density follow the 2011 Population Housing Census (ISTAT, 2011). The festivals’ distribution also reflects the four European Capitals of Cultural awards in Italy, of which three are in north-middle Italy (Florence in Toscana, Genoa in Liguria, Bologna in Emilia Romagna) and only one in the south (Matera in Basilicata).

Figure 6.3: Geographical distribution of Italian literary festivals per province and area in 2017 (Source: Author)
6.1.3 Seasonal distribution

Almost all festivals in both countries run annually. As Figure 6.4 shows, in Ireland, most of the festivals run in October, June, July, and November. Even if there is a continuous and systematic supply of festivals throughout the year, there are peaks in summer (with the exception of August) and autumn. The supply is lower in winter from December to February. In Italy, there is a high peak of festivals in June, followed by September, May, and July. While the months with less festivals are December, January, and April (Figure 6.4). In both countries, summer and autumn are, therefore, the richer festival seasons probably because of the good weather and the presence of holiday time, while the peak in September - October is high probably because of the end of the summer vacations. In winter, the festival supply is lower probably because of the weather and work commitments. The only month in which there are no festivals in both countries is December.

Figure 6.4: Seasonal distribution of Irish and Italian literary festivals per month in 2017 (Source: Author)
6.1.4 Frequency and duration

In both countries, the average duration of the festivals is three or five days, usually one weekend. In 2017, in Ireland, the shortest festival was Towers and Tales Lismore Story Festival, which lasted only one day. While the longest festival was the Out to Lunch Festival, which lasted 23 days. In Italy, the shortest festival in 2017 was I Boreali which lasted only one day, while the longest were Festival Giallo Garda and Librinfestival which lasted one entire year. Nevertheless, in both countries the concept of festival is similar, as a short and defined moment of celebration that lasts between three and five days (Figure 6.5).

Figure 6.5: Average duration of Irish and Italian literary festivals per days in 2017
(Source: Author)

6.1.5 Public funders

In Ireland, several public institutions fund literary festivals, for example, the Arts Council, which as part of its 2016-2025 strategy funds festivals that prioritise two policy areas, namely ‘The Artist’ and ‘Public Engagement’. Other public funders are the Department of Arts, Heritage, Regional, Rural and Gaeltacht Affairs, Fáilte Ireland, and City and
County Councils. Dublin city festivals are also supported by the Dublin UNESCO City of Literature which offers some festival funding.

In Italy, public funding comes from the Ministero dei Beni e delle Attivitá Culturali, the Region, the Province, the Municipality and/or the City. A few festivals are also sponsored by the European Union, the Italian Republic, Embassies, European Parliament, Senate of the Italian republic, UNESCO, Ministry of foreign affairs, the Chamber of commerce, Ministry of Education University and Research. However, no specific data or studies on the relative importance of public and private investments in literary festivals in the two countries are available.

### 6.2 Introduction to the study festivals

The second part of this chapter is devoted to describing the two case studies: the Irish festival Writers’ Week (WW) in Listowel and the Italian festival Pordenonelegge (PL) in Pordenone. It provides information about the origins of the festivals, their organisations, the relationship that the festivals have with the towns, the programmes, and the sale of books.
Table 6.1: WW and PL in numbers (Sources: WW and PL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 2017</th>
<th>WW</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time</strong></td>
<td>31&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; May – 4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; June 2017</td>
<td>13&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; – 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year</strong></td>
<td>46&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>18&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of days</strong></td>
<td>4 + 1 evening</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Audience’s size</strong></td>
<td>15,575</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Friends of the festival</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of volunteers</strong></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of tickets sold</strong></td>
<td>7,000 (among which 100 Festival Tickets)</td>
<td>6,188 to the Amici (the others were free)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of sponsors</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of authors/ performers</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of permanent bookstalls</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of venues</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of events - total</strong></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of workshops during the festival</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of people who attended the literary workshops</strong></td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exhibitions during the festival</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of literary awards</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1 (film writing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr of festival shops</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Budget</strong></td>
<td>37% Public Funding 23% Private Sponsorship 40% Ticket Sales</td>
<td>40% Public Funding 51% Private Sponsorship 9% Donations from Amici di Pordenonelegge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2.1 The origins of the festivals

WW and PL have different origins. WW was founded by four Kerry authors to promote north Kerry writers and the storytelling tradition, according to the WW’s chairperson.

The festival manager confirmed that WW ‘was put together by a group of writers from the Listowel area as there is a rich literary heritage around here. This group wanted a festival that gave platforms for emerging writers, for established writers to read to their audiences and to provide workshops for learning writing’ (personal communication with WW manager). The WW’s chairperson explained that originally the festival was on for the full week and the founders felt there were already too many festivals, so they decided to call it ‘Writers’ Week’. Nowadays it is not just a week for writers, but it is a festival...
for readers, illustrators, poets, actors and everyone who is connected to the written word, according to the WW’s chairperson.

Plate 6.1: PL (Source: PL)

In contrast, the pordenonelegge.it project began in 2000 as an initiative of the president of the Chamber of Commerce of Pordenone. The desire was to draw attention to the tourism and cultural potential of the city of Pordenone, until then known exclusively for its purely economic and manufacturing functions. Later, in 2013, the Pordenonelegge.it Foundation was founded. The festival director explained that the title PL was created so that ‘you understand where it is and that Pordenone reads’, and that it is not just a manufacturing city. PL is a ‘feast of the book - festa del libro’ because there are no events with deceased authors, but only with living writers and there is always the possibility of buying the book, said the festival director. However, PL is also a ‘festival’. ‘For an event
to be considered a festival it was once necessary that it lasted at least five days, so we decided to make PL last between three and five days’ (PL director).

Plate 6.2: WW programme (Source: WW) Plate 6.3: PL programme (Source: PL)

6.2.2 The festival organisations

In 2017, the WW committee included: one president, vice presidents, literary advisors, directors, chairperson, festival managers, treasures, one intern, children’s festival manager, accommodation manager, festival team, festival photographer, and design & printing department. The festival team also included 48 volunteers. WW featured 116 (of which 12 were workshops) events in 33 venues. The budget derived from 37% public funding, including Kerry County Council, the Arts Council, Failte Ireland, 23% private sponsorship, and 40% ticket sales. The private sponsors were 60 local business and restaurants. Similarly, in 2017, the PL committee was made of: one director, literary
advisors (curatori), collaborators, secretary and administration officers, press office manager, web site manager, and design & printing managers. It has 150 volunteers, called Angeli. It featured 232 events in 41 venues. The budget was divided into 40% public funding, including Pordenone Turismo, 51% private sponsorship by 94 sponsors, including the Rai TV station and local business, and 9% private donations by Amici.

6.2.3 The festivals and the towns

While Listowel is very connected to literature, being the birthplace of many writers, such as John B Keane, Pordenone is more artistic and more connected to architecture. The councillor for cultural activities, explained that Pordenone is an ancient town, some palaces were built in 1200-1400, like the church and the town hall, and all the external walls are painted. For this reason, Pordenone is called ‘the painted city’. Moreover, Listowel is smaller than Pordenone and accordingly WW audience’s size is smaller than PL’s. However, in the context of Ireland and Italy, both towns are relatively small and peripherally located, so that they can be considered peripheral festivals, (Giorgi, 2011b; Stewart, 2013). In 2017, the festivals’ venues were spread all around the towns and both Listowel and Pordenone were decorated with colourful banners or flags in the streets which helped to create a festive atmosphere. PL had more venues (41), both outdoor and indoor, having more events and authors. WW had fewer (33), with the Listowel Arms Hotel as the main venue.
The roles that the festivals play in the towns are quite similar. The chairperson described WW not as a ‘bookselling festival’ but highlighted its business function as a ‘platform’ for emerging writers and its educational function being to encourage readers and ‘Listowel younger generations ‘to try new artists’. The Creative Ireland Kerry co-ordinator of the Kerry County Council also observed that WW plays an important educational role in the County, which has a strong literary heritage. She said that besides providing ‘a platform to showcase the work of writers’ and encouraging ‘the interaction between writers and the audience’, the festival is important for emerging writers and practitioners to improve their writing skills with workshops and mentoring opportunities.

The WW chairperson also mentioned that most of the participants are domestic tourists coming from county Dublin and they enjoy ‘the intimacy of the festival and they like strolling around Listowel’. This means that WW is a source of tourism and allows tourists
to discover Listowel. She also added that these people ‘arrive as tourists but leave as locals (...) because the town and the festival recognise how important this is: people will judge the town based on their festival experience’. Similarly, PL is a cultural reference point for the city and the region and has initiated many cultural associations, according to the city’s councillor for cultural activities. He also said that PL is the festival of the city, it both integrates, and identifies itself with the city. The festival plays different roles: it is the driving force of knowledge, of cultural development, and central to the development of the city’s economy, in terms of tourism, trade and the world of work and entrepreneurship. Likewise, the festival director said that PL was created to improve the image of Pordenone, since nobody knew where it was located, and it lacked a positive image. The PL director also said that the town has changed since the launch of the festival. Before PL, there was only a bookshop in town while now there are six bookshops and even a university.

Plate 6.5: Pordenone town map (Source: PL)
6.2.4 The 2017 programmes

Overall, the festival programmes were similar but differed in a few respects. The WW events were divided into the following categories: walking tour, reading, literature & theatre, book launches, music, literary, art exhibition, poetry & music, literary pub trail, theatre, poetry, storytelling, art workshop, lecture, in conversation, comedy, poetry & sport, evening theatre, portraiture event, education, crime, Irish language, bus tour, and open mic event. The chairperson explained that the committee tries ‘to connect events linked with literature because this is how it started, and we want to follow the tradition’. Nevertheless, she said that they encourage people ‘not only to write but to perform and to share the written word’, with, for example, plays (the WW chairperson, 2017). Even though the festival chairperson said that WW is not just for writers, compared to PL, the focus is much more on writing and performing than reading. During WW there were 12 literary workshops about novel, memoir and non-fiction, comedy, poetry, creative writing, short fiction, theatre and songwriting. The workshops were first introduced for local writers in 1971 by Bryan MacMahon. Finally, there were also 16 literary awards, some of which are for primary school children, adults with special needs and Irish prisoners overseas.

In PL, the events were divided into 11 key cultural themes, namely Arcipelago Treccani - the Italian language; art and architecture; get closer; exercises... of reading; kids’ books, literature; in our time; staged words; poetry; science, philosophy and history; and Italian travel. The events did not include open mics, bus or walking tours and workshops. However, the tourist office offered the possibility for participants to rent audio guides to visit the city.

As regards the cost, in Italy all the events were free of charge, so participants had to queue, sometimes for hours. The only way they could skip the queue was to become
an ‘Amico’ of PL and pay 25, 35, or 55 euro in order to reserve respectively 4, 7, or 12 seats. In contrast, in WW most of the events cost 15 euro, some were free, other cost five, 10, 12, or 30 euro. So, participants did not have to queue. There were concessions and two special tickets. Firstly, the Festival Ticket at 130 euro, which gave access to all literary events. Secondly, the Daily Ticket at 50 euro, which gave access to all literary events on any one day. The three-day workshops cost 185 euro and the two-day workshops cost 140 euro. All workshops run concurrently so participants could book only one.

It is also important to observe that both festivals have strong pedagogic missions which might have played a role in participants’ cultural capital development. For example, WW was the first festival to introduce workshops, awards and competitions in Ireland. The Creative Writing Workshops were first introduced in 1971, then literary awards and competitions. WW aims to promote literature for established and emerging authors, instil a love for literature in the younger generations and encourage adults to perform with open-mics, poetry performances, and pub plays, said the chairperson. Also, the Creative Ireland Kerry co-ordinator of Kerry County Council observed that WW plays an important educational role in the County, which has a strong literary heritage. She said that the festival is important for emerging writers and practitioners to improve their writing skills with workshops and mentoring opportunities. Likewise, PL’s goals are to increase reading, because ‘if one reads, one is a better person’ (festival director). Therefore, ‘PL is above all reading’ and this is why PL works with schools and organises writing workshops for adults during the year, said the PL director.
Plate 6.6: WW programme at a glance (Source: WW)

Plate 6.7: Two pages of the PL programme (Source: PL)
6.2.5 The sale of books

In 2017, in Listowel, there were bookstalls where the participants could buy books, the limited-edition portfolio, the festival notebook, and the winners’ anthology. However, the bookstalls were available only after the individual events. Thus, they were not permanent. There was also the possibility to buy paintings at the art exhibition in the local theatre. In contrast, during PL there were four permanent bookstalls and one bookshop. However, it was not possible to buy paintings or other cultural goods. Moreover, PL has a permanent bookshop during the five days where the audience can buy souvenirs with the festival logo like t-shirts, cups, pens, books or aprons.

Plate 6.8: The sale of books at PL (Source: PL)
6.3 Summary

This chapter gives a general overview of the current scenario of literary festivals, by mapping all the Irish and Italian literary festivals. Notably, the analysis reveals that in Ireland festivals started to proliferate earlier and now they are more numerous than in Italy if compared to the whole population. The chapter concluded by presenting the two case studies, WW and PL. Both festivals have a strong pedagogic mission: promoting reading and writing. They feature different types of events, including writing awards, and offer bookstalls where participants can buy books. Thus, one might ask if the festivals succeed in their mission. Can they foster knowledge, skills, and values in their audiences? Can they promote book purchasing? Can they shape participants’ behaviours? So, can individual cultural capital be developed during these festivals? The following chapters present the findings of this study.
‘To date, the role that festivals play in forming, maintaining and shaping cultural capital is under-researched’

(Wilks & Quinn, 2016, p. 35)
CHAPTER 7

CULTURAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT

7 Introduction

The findings chapters present the results of the participant observations, the on-site (OS), follow-up (FU), and key informant interviews conducted during and after the Writers’ Week (WW) in Ireland and Pordenonelegge (PL) in Italy. As explained previously, the researcher collected 45 interviews on-site during WW and 47 during PL. Moreover, she conducted 17 follow-up interviews in Ireland and 17 in Italy, and four key informant interviews. The names of the interviewees have been altered to protect anonymity. As explained in Chapter Five, the data revealed nine key themes and they are presented in three chapters: Chapters Seven, Eight, and Nine.

The first findings chapter focuses on the first two key themes: cultural capital development, and the states and types of cultural capital acquired by the interviewees (Figure 7.1). Thus, it first explores the interviewees’ cultural capital development associated with festival participation. Then, it illustrates the three states (institutionalised, objectified, embodied) and the two types (field-specific and non-field-specific) of cultural capital that participants acquired.
7.1. Cultural capital development associated with festival participation

As explained in Chapter Five, the first theme identified by the findings answers the key question: have respondents acquired cultural capital? Interviewees reported that they had developed their cultural capital to different degrees and in several ways. When asked if they thought they had learned anything, most respondents answered positively. A majority (71% FU) argued that the festival had contributed to their education because ‘you always learn something’ (Rosa), and ‘you have never finished learning’ (April). Interviewees, therefore, perceived knowledge creation. ‘Now, we should clarify the meaning of learning, but you always learn’ (Filippo). Cecilia argued that during the festival ‘you get enriched personally’. Lisa went further, claiming that knowledge acquisition occurs because ‘you come here to learn something’. However, it was not only a process of learning. There are examples of wider cultural capital development, for instance, participants accumulated cultural goods, enhanced their cultural participation levels, and acquired skills. Also, according to Giorgio, participation is always worth it and it can generate new tastes.
‘Certainly, going to a festival doesn’t take anything away from you and it gives you a lot. It is definitely something more than a person… whether it is a bit of thinking, some information that stays with you, or a feeling, or a passion that you discover from scratch, certainly it is useful for a person to make him/her grow up and mature’ (Giorgio)

‘Di sicuro andare ad un festival non ti toglie niente e ti dà molto. Di sicuro è una cosa in più che una persona… che sia un minimo ragionamento, informazione, che ti rimane o sensazione o che tu scopra da zero una tua passione, di sicuro serve ad una persona che la fa crescere e maturare’ (Giorgio)

However, sometimes, cultural capital acquisition did not occur during the actual festivals. Instead, it seemed that WW and PL sparked interests and stimuli that enhanced cultural capital development once the festivals were over. In other words, people were stimulated to acquire cultural capital after the festivals. For example, Lucy was surprisingly inspired to consider reading new genres because an event ‘really changed my concept of poetry and literature and reading (…), it makes you look at things differently’. These new interests and curiosities, sparked by the festivals, led participants to reflect on what they had listened to, researched, or read. As Elisa explained, the festival made her ‘think, not immediately (…) [but] after you re-elaborate [what you’ve listened to]’. Similarly, Orlaith was inspired to consider starting to write. She observed that ‘I don’t write poetry now, but I feel like I could maybe, it [the event] kind of switched on a little part of my brain that I might put a few sentences down and write something’. Giacomo (PL) explained that during an event the author quoted a science fiction writer and this ‘is something that I promised myself to investigate further’.

Meanwhile, for others, it was much more a process of reinforcing pre-existing cultural resources. It was a process of ‘confirming your thinking, it’s assuring’ (Nicole). Thus, festival participation was seen as a reinforcement of previous knowledge and tastes, especially about ‘something that I was interested in even before’ (Fabrizio) or a previous
interest about music ‘that has grown even more’ (Leonardo). For Melissa, participation was not enough to impact on her reading habits: ‘[the festival] may have given me some insights but let’s say (...) if he [the author] talks about war for example, (...) I will never get a war book, it’s not really my genre, romantic novels or something about illness, I cannot stand it’. In other words, participation did not lead to a development of new tastes, but it ‘confirms what you enjoy’ (Jimmy). Also, participation reinforced pre-existing values. For instance, the festival reinforced Giacomo’s ideas about politics, because ‘[the journalist] strengthened [my idea] because I was clearly opposed. It was a way of thinking that I did not share’. This confirmation process occurred during different types of events. For instance, Maggie observed that ‘I don’t think there was anything new for me, even in the workshop, I think it articulated very well, you know, things that I knew already’. Similarly, Franco explained that during an event about schooling and education ‘it was confirmed for me that my opinion is shared (...) and my thinking was not out of the ordinary’.

Finally, a few interviewees initially claimed that they did not learn anything new or life-changing and then later contradicted themselves. For instance, Theresa first answered negatively to the question if participating in WW helped her to learn anything new. Then, during the interview, she changed her opinion: ‘I suppose I have learned more about the writers at the Seanchaí centre (...) where they lived, how many children they had, how they died, you know stuff like that... that I didn’t know’. This means that the learning was not intentional and only became conscious during the interview. Nevertheless, there were no examples of decrease of cultural capital.

After having understood that cultural capital associated with festival participation was developed, the next question is: what state and type of cultural capital have respondents
acquired? The following section, delving into the second theme of the findings, explores the states (the institutionalised, objectified, and embodied states) and types (field-specific, associated with literature, and non-field-specific cultural capital) of cultural capital that interviewees developed.

7.2. Institutionalised cultural capital development

Institutionalised cultural capital development in terms of academic qualifications or credentials is not expected in a festival context. However, participants could take part in literary competitions and acquire recognition of cultural competence. For instance, Missy said that she enjoyed the festival because she was one of the winners of a writing competition. According to her, winning the competition was a huge recognition of her writing. She described it as a ‘great achievement’ that conferred ‘a sense of pride’. Therefore, for Missy, the prize was an acquisition of institutionalised cultural capital. This also had a positive outcome on her embodied cultural capital, particularly on her writing skills. The achievement helped to increase her self-confidence as a writer and ‘it encourages me to write more’ because ‘someone recognises that I can write’ (Missy). So, this is an example of how the acquisition of institutionalised cultural capital led to a development of the embodied state, in terms of tastes and values. Furthermore, the acquisition of institutionalised cultural capital also led to an increase in Missy’s economic capital, since she received 1,000 euro. She used the money to develop her social capital, by travelling to see her grandchildren for the first time. However, she said that, for her, the educational qualification was more valuable than the economic prize. All this recalls Bourdieu’s [2002 (1986)] conversions of capital.
‘I have two grandchildren in America I have never seen, so I booked tickets for America with the money I won, (...) [but] a certificate meant more to me than the money’ (Missy)

Nevertheless, the writing award was not always perceived as an acquisition of institutionalised cultural capital per se, even though it was seen as extremely satisfying and perceived as valuable symbolic capital. For instance, for Simone, winning the writing award was a source of ‘satisfaction, (...) a confirmation of the fact that what I write is interesting to someone else and not just simply to myself’. However, Michele saw his award just as a bonus, not as something that was useful for his career. He argued that winning the writing contest was ‘an incentive to continue working on these issues, (...) I can include it in my curriculum but, since I do so many different things, honestly I don’t think that [it’ll be useful] for me’.

7.3. Objectified cultural capital development

The acquisition of objectified cultural capital refers to the accumulation of cultural goods such as books and paintings. As explained in Chapter Six, it was possible to buy books during both WW and PL. Book purchasing during the festivals was high, with 54% of OS respondents having already bought at least one book before being interviewed on-site. Book purchasers were primarily women (60% OS), in their 40s (28% OS) or 50s (28% OS), with different levels of institutionalised cultural capital (30% postgraduate degree and 26% diploma, OS), and recurrent participants (74% OS). Therefore, it seems that the more participants attended the festival, the more likely they were to buy books for themselves or for other people. An in-depth analysis revealed that most of the respondents (47% FU) bought more than 10 books in the last 12 months and bought between two and
five books (60% of the respondents) during the festivals. This means that WW and PL are important sources of objectified cultural capital acquisition in terms of books.

Plate 7.1: The sale of books in Pordenone (Source: PL)

The reasons why participants bought books were diverse. Some said they decided to buy books because they wanted to ‘read them in the wintertime’ (Jimmy) or as presents for friends and family members, such as ‘my daughter, who couldn’t attend’ (Paolo). Others argued that the primary reason was the fact of having seen the author, as Molly said, ‘we saw Richard Ford, [he] was there and we bought his book and I read it after he had spoken at the festival’, or the fact they ‘could see [and listen] how [the writer] reads [the book and]’ (Norah). Others bought books because they could not find them anywhere else, such as a book published by a local publisher: ‘I saw it and I said I had to buy it’ (Michele). Those who defined themselves as writers also said that they bought books because they ‘wanted to support [their peers]’ (Simon). For others, the price was an incentive: I bought it (…) because it cost [only] 10 euro’ (Mario). Finally, Norah said that while she did not
buy any books during the festival, she ‘downloaded 13 books [afterwards] as a result [of the recommendations she received during the festival]’.

While books were the only type of cultural goods that participants could purchase in Pordenone, in Listowel, participants could buy paintings at 250 euro each during an event held in the main theatre. Maureen was the only respondent who bought two of those paintings. She also bought two prints in a local antique shop. She explained that the reason why she bought the prints was because she ‘liked them’, while she bought the two paintings because ‘the paintings were on the walls and three of the paintings were talking to me, I really liked them, I just got two of them’. When the researcher asked her what buying the paintings meant to her, Maureen answered saying that ‘it means, besides my books, […] that I have something beautiful to look at every day’.

Plate 7.2: The sale of paintings in Listowel (Source: WW)
7.4. Embodied cultural capital development

This section explores what respondents perceived themselves to have developed as embodied cultural capital. Investigating embodied cultural capital was much more complicated than investigating the other two states. As explained in Chapter Four, the study employs Stebbins’ serious leisure to further understand cultural capital embodiment, and the findings are presented following the six indicators of the embodied state: cultural knowledge; skills and abilities; tastes and interests; cultural participation; values and personal enrichment; and bodily hexis. Put into a table, the main findings appear like this:

Table 7.1: States and types of embodied cultural capital (Source: Author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States / Types</th>
<th>Field-specific</th>
<th>Non-field-specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural knowledge</td>
<td>• Authors&lt;br&gt;• Books&lt;br&gt;• Genres&lt;br&gt;• Fund for writers&lt;br&gt;• Writing styles</td>
<td>• Points of view&lt;br&gt;• Local cultural heritage&lt;br&gt;• General cultural topics (e.g. religion, history, philosophy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills and abilities</td>
<td>• Start writing or writing differently</td>
<td>• Ability to be alone&lt;br&gt;• To manage crowds&lt;br&gt;• Social skills&lt;br&gt;• Sense of orientation and ability to give directions&lt;br&gt;• How to give a workshop or facilitate an event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tastes and interests</td>
<td>• Read more or differently&lt;br&gt;• Ideas for new writing projects</td>
<td>• Local people and the town as place to visit&lt;br&gt;• Work in the cultural sector&lt;br&gt;• Likelihood for more cultural participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural participation</td>
<td>• Participate in WW and PL again&lt;br&gt;• Participate in other literary festivals</td>
<td>• Visit local cultural attractions&lt;br&gt;• Attend an art course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural values</td>
<td>• Personal enrichment&lt;br&gt;• Self-image</td>
<td>• Personal enrichment&lt;br&gt;• Self-image&lt;br&gt;• Reflections on pre-existing values, e.g. social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily hexis</td>
<td>• Self-expression</td>
<td>• Attitude change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.4.1. Cultural knowledge

In terms of what they learned and discovered, interviewees argued that they increased their field-specific literary knowledge of books, authors, and literary genres. For instance, Jimmy gained an insight into writing styles because ‘it’s just language and image and you know the nourishment you get from writing, that’s what I took away from that’. ‘On a literary level, [during PL, a person] sees what goes on’, observed Lisa. Other participants discovered something about a specific author’s life, such as ‘when I was at Richard Forbes’ talk, I learned about his relationship with his parents’ (Rita), or about the distinction between literary genres, for example ‘the difference between fiction and memoir’ (George). From an author’s point of view, participants had the occasion to share information with their peers about funds, ‘how to create a piece of art’ (Evan) or get an insight into ‘different ways of writing’ (Missy).

Participants not only learned about literature but also about other general cultural topics. For instance, Alessandra claimed that during an event about philosophy she discovered ‘some themes I had never seen before’. For Maria ‘it was a nice morning of (...) politics, very interesting!’ Others learned something about religion, such as ‘something from the perspective of those who believe because (...) I do not believe so much’ (Pietro). Through festival participation, they claimed that they had also acquired knowledge about people, and their stories. April spoke about being among ‘enjoyable, friendly people’.

‘[I have] learned that life (...) is charming (...) the simple life that they portray in Kerry. They talked a lot about the past, you know, it’s charming, it’s good to appreciate what you have. The people were very open and easy to talk to, and it’s important to keep that sense of openness. And really to be kind to, talk to other people and pay attention to stories is important’ (April).

Cognitive fulfilment was considered personal enrichment. The festivals were described as a moment when participants could improve how they look at different perspectives, as
they are ‘interesting moment[s] to widen the horizon of every day’ (Franco). For instance, ‘Fergal Keane is an international correspondent and (...) this year he was talking about Ireland but normally he would be speaking about the Congo or the Middle East and I can learn from him’ (Norah), so the event was perceived as ‘very informative’ (Bryan). Similarly, Simon went to an event about Irish dancing because he wanted ‘to see [it] in a new perspective through the eyes of the author and actor’. Therefore, the festival was described as ‘inspirational’ (Meghan), it ‘makes you look [at] things differently’ (Lucy). As Letizia argued, the festival ‘open[s] up your mind with different opinions from yours that you can also take into consideration’, because ‘if you listen to people, you are listening to different points of view’ (Molly). For instance, Missy, originally from a border county in Ireland, claimed the festival ‘allowed me to understand southern people’, especially Kerry people, who she now thinks ‘are so friendly and gentle and nice and such wonderful singers and writers’ (Missy). Also, Mark argued that at the festival ‘you hear different perspectives on writing and different perspective on life’.

Plate 7.3: PL (Source: PL)
Another point that emerged from the findings was that interviewees learned about local heritage, past and present, especially in Ireland. They discovered and learned about local writers, stories, buildings such as the writer’s museum, history, customs and people. Here it is important to remember that, as mentioned in Chapter Six, Listowel is very connected to literature, being the birthplace of many writers such as John B Keane. For instance, Jimmy expanded his knowledge during the street walks as they contain ‘information about local writers, about local stories, all that sort of… local stories, a lot of people wouldn’t know’. Likewise, Missy was positively surprised about discovering that black and white pudding is square-shaped and not round in Listowel.

‘I had never seen squared black and white pudding before (...) I bought it. My husband said ‘what’s this?’ I said ‘black pudding’. ‘Not at all. It can’t be squared, black pudding’, I said ‘it can [be] in Listowel’ (Missy)

It is interesting to note that the discovery of local heritage was not unique to international or domestic tourists but also to locals. For example, Dennis, a local participant, said that he went to the Seanchaí museum for the first time and ‘I just found the information there, there were a lot of writers that I was aware [of] from the town but didn’t know anything about and it was just interesting to get a little bit insight into their background and their lives’. In addition, the festival was the perfect occasion to discover the town and its history for new residents. For example, Cassie, who has been living in Listowel for 10 years, took notes during the bus tour because she ‘didn’t grow up in Listowel [and she] wouldn’t have a clue of the local history’. She described the tour as ‘very handy, very educational’. Also in Italy, respondents discovered local heritage mainly in terms of participation in local attractions and exhibitions, as explained in 7.4.4.
7.4.2. Skills and abilities

Respondents also acquired skills and abilities, although the findings from the two case studies differ in this respect. In Ireland, most of the respondents who perceived an improvement in their skills argued that they were related to literature, and specifically writing. In Italy, respondents referred to social skills. At WW, some interviewees said that after the festival they started to write.

‘I tried to write a short story. I wrote two paragraphs then I said, no you cannot write, put it away. I came away from [WW] that I was so motivated, I wanted to write, you know, I wanted to write. I tried, but I’m not a writer, really’ (Norah)

For others, the festival was ‘inspirational’ (Orlaith), it gave them the confidence that they could start writing, maybe ‘just my own diary’ (Meghan), or poems. Some other respondents advocated that the festival participation helped them to learn how to write a new genre. For instance, Rita learned ‘how to write a song’ during the writing workshop. She wrote the lyrics of three songs, and for ‘one of the songs I’m trying to find somebody to write music for it (…) and I’m trying to get people to perform it because I want to have
it recorded and I’m going to submit it to the Eurovision contest in Ireland’ (Rita). Unlike WW, in Pordenone, only one respondent observed that the festival helped her to develop writing skills, because ‘I’m also interested in writing, so I took it [PL] as, let’s say, inspiration’ (Simona). She realised that the author has a different approach to writing since ‘his novel is structured to be a story, while I write more free thoughts, but it was interesting to see another perspective’. Therefore, after PL, she felt inspired ‘to write a more complex story’ (Simona).

Participants also developed skills not related to literature, especially social skills. For instance, according to Rosa, the festival was an ‘opening’ where she could ‘interact with people’.

‘[The festival] opens your mind because you are among people and how you look at yourself, how you relate with the other, (...) I mean I feel good alone, I don’t suffer from loneliness, (...) I’m never alone, I’m with me. Instead, loneliness is seen as something bad, and so I had to try to get among people also to interact, otherwise I’m home alone, so then when I’m queueing sometimes I interact, I exchange words, otherwise I could be invisible’ (Rosa)

‘[Il festival] ti apre la mente perché tu sei in mezzo alla gente e come tu ti guardassi, come ti rapporti con lei (...) Nel senso che io sono una persona (...) che sta bene da sola, non soffro di solitudine (...) io non sono mai da sola, sono con me. Invece la solitudine è vista come qualcosa di brutto, e quindi ho dovuto cercare di mettermi in mezzo alla gente per anche interagire, che altrimenti sono a casa da sola, e quindi quando sono in mezzo alle code delle volte interagisco, scambio la parola, se no per me potrei essere invisibile’ (Rosa)

Similarly, Sonia learned ‘a little bit more how to interact with people, or to communicate better’. She said that during the years the festival has ‘changed me a lot, I was more introvert before, and Pordenonelegge has helped me to open up more to people’. Thus, the festival encouraged participants to be more open and social while ‘standing in the queue waiting, talking’ (Beatrice). Simona, being a volunteer, realised that by providing
information to participants she had ‘reduced the shyness I feel talking to strangers, (...) and this experience made me… I wouldn’t say change myself, but it helped me to bring out a side of my personality that I didn’t think I had’. According to Molly, the festival was a social occasion that increased ‘my comfort zone in interacting with people socially’. In contrast, for Ashlyn, participating at the festival on her own was a pleasant discovery of being able to accept and like her own company.

‘I found that being by myself, I enjoyed that, I have never done it before, travelling alone… from that point of view, I enjoyed being by myself and having learned something of myself from that, I was quite comfortable in going to things by myself, it didn’t bother me at all the fact I was alone. (...) I wasn’t bored, I didn’t wish it was over, I enjoyed all of it so, you know, I could go to an event, and walk into the room and be by myself and not (...) [feel] uncomfortable, it didn’t bother me, I was quite happy and I don’t think I would have known it by myself because I would have to [go to] places in groups with friends or partners or whatever, so it was kind of a nice thing to do by myself’ (Ashlyn)

7.4.3. Tastes and interests

The development of tastes and interests was mainly related to literature and reading. Interviewees mentioned that they tended to read more after the festival, both this year and in previous years. For instance, Cassie said that WW encouraged her to read more as ‘I’m more interested to look at books than I have been’. ‘I came home and I immediately read the book’, said Beatrice. ‘Yes, in effect you want to read more [after the festival] (...) I can only read in the evening, sometimes I struggle, but it certainly encourages you to read’ (Giacomo). The reason why participants have started to read more is often unknown to them. ‘It could be just general exposure to people reading, and books and words’ (Evan). For others like Simona, it is clear why participants read more after the festival: ‘Pordenonelegge makes you want to read, that is, you get caught up in the euphoria of the moment, from the harmony that is there and everything and therefore, according to me, it also leads you to take up your reading’. According to Giulio, it is ‘an instinctive thing,
you come back from a concert and you want to sing, you come back from the cinema and you want to watch…, when you see soccer [on TV] you want to play’. Or, as Mario noted, it might be ‘inevitably, if you buy books, you’ve spent money and then look at what you bought’.

Festival participation also encouraged participants to read different genres, authors, or ‘read something that I wouldn’t have chosen without the festival’ (Annamaria). Ashlyn started to ‘read different things (…) such as ‘memory fiction that [I] wouldn’t normally [read]’. Likewise, Paolo ‘last year became interested in this book on minority religions in the Middle East’, Cecilia is ‘interested in botany now’, while Pietro ‘wasn’t used to reading historical treatises, [usually] I read fantasy and novels. Then I saw an event on World War I that opened up a sector that I didn’t consider before’. Therefore, festival participation modified the ‘type of authors that you would read’ (Molly). For instance, now ‘I read biography, I can read them [in a] much more intelligent way’ (George). ‘[The festival] leads you to develop an interest that you wouldn’t have otherwise. It’s an opportunity to get closer to the world of literature’, explained Nicola. Lucy said that she did not want to attend a poetry event, but after the event, she exclaimed that ‘actually I was blown away, actually it really changed my concept of poetry and literature and reading because I didn’t know what to expect’. Rachele even explained that she attends the festival to get new ideas for reading.

‘[I attend the festival] I also come here very often in order to get new ideas for reading. Topics that otherwise I wouldn’t look for in bookstores. (...) Here you have the opportunity to attend events and understand topics that perhaps you would never have taken on’ (Rachele)

‘Molto spesso vengo qui anche proprio per avere nuovi spunti di lettura. Argomenti che altrimenti non cercherei libreria. (...) Qui si ha la possibilità di assistere a eventi e capire argomenti che forse non avrebbe mai affrontato’ (Rachele)
Norah also pointed out that, when she is at the festival, she is more likely to buy certain kinds of books than others. So, participation has an impact on her taste and choice of books to buy because ‘I find that if I go to the festival and I see the person I’m more likely to buy their stuff there if I know how they write and how they speak and what kind of persons they are’ (Norah). Here, it is possible to see that the acquisition of a new interest for a specific author has led to an accumulation of objectified cultural capital.

For writers or aspiring writers, the festival was an occasion where they could discover and pick up new ideas for their writing projects. As April mentioned, she took notes ‘about a lady and a man that were sitting beside me at the open mic session. The lady was very possessive of her man. She didn’t like other women sitting around him (…)’. Now April would like to write a short story about that woman because ‘I thought it was interesting, because everybody was very nice and open, and I thought she was a silly woman. (…) I think I’ll call it [the short story]: The underbelly of the literary festival’.

**7.4.4. Cultural participation**

There were also examples of cultural capital development in terms of increases in cultural participation. Attending WW and PL led to an increase in four types of cultural participation: in the same festival, in other literary festivals, in visiting local cultural attractions, and in other forms of arts. Firstly, respondents emphasised their willingness to participate in the study festivals again in the future. Almost everyone was satisfied with the festivals such that they would like to ‘make an effort to go again soon’ (Bryan). They wanted to go back the following year because every year it has a different programme so ‘every year you want to come back’ (Alice). Hans even said he does not want to attend other festivals, ‘probably I’ll try to go back to Pordenone, I don’t expect other festivals
to be as nice as this’. Also Cassie said that after participating at WW, she is more aware of her interest in it, and she wants to visit the festival again.

‘I’m becoming more aware [of] what I like now, I’m going to research next year and I’ll go to things that I missed out (…) From this edition, from hearing some other people what I missed out, I’m going to really put a lot into it next year to be sure I won’t miss out (…) because this year I just came along, I don’t even think I read the programme’ (Cassie)

Secondly, the likelihood of participating in more literary festivals increased, for example, April would like to go to the Kinsale Literary Festival in County Cork and George to Hindley in the UK. Notably, a few respondents had already participated in another festival by the time the follow-up interviews were held, because of what they learned in Listowel. As Jimmy explained, ‘in some festivals you would see someone that you like, then you maybe see him in another festival and it’s because they are new writers, so you make a quick decision to go there sometimes’. Ashlyn said that she went to a literary event in Carlow the week after the WW because she discovered two authors were doing an event there. She explained that from now on she will attend more literary festivals because she is interested in literature, reading and writing and she is curious to see the differences among the festivals.

‘Because I think it is a very nice way of spending time. Because I read so much and I’m impressed by authors and I want to hear what they have to say, so I think, you know, I found the whole Listowel thing that, like I said before, that I’d probably had my brain working and it was nice, it was nice to go to an event and listen to people talking about things that I’m interested in but I’ve definitely enjoyed (…) to see what are they like in comparison’ (Ashlyn)

Thirdly, during the days of the festival, participants increased their cultural participation by visiting local cultural heritage, such as ‘the lodge of the town hall that was open to the public’ (Mario) or the ‘church’ (Michele). So, the festival ‘allows you to discover Pordenone’ (Michele). Local people even discovered something about their own towns.
For example, Dennis, a local resident, said he had never gone to the Seanchaí museum, and the festival gave him the occasion to do so.

‘Having a timetable and saying: ‘yes this is happening at 11’, ‘I will do it now this weekend’, ‘this is happening’, that was one of the reason I decided to go (...) it’s good to know stuff about the local area, I just wanted to know more’ (Dennis)

Likewise, Alice visited the ‘exhibition of mosaics’, and Melissa the council hall.

‘Last year, I remember that my mother was also there and it was Saturday morning (...) and I saw it open (the town hall and the council chamber) (...) and my mother was very happy, she said, in many years I’ve never been able to enter, then, as well as the other collateral exhibitions, we saw the mosaics, which my daughter likes (...) [and] the one by Lucart which is near the library’ (Melissa)

‘L’anno scorso, che mi ricordo che c’era anche mia mamma ed era sabato mattina, (...) e l’ho visto aperto (il municipio e la sala consigliare) (...) e anche mia mamma è stata molto contenta, che ha detto, in tanto anni non sono mai riuscita ad entrare, poi, anche le altre mostre collaterali, abbiamo visto i mosaici, che a mia figlia piacciono (...) [e] quello della Lucart che è vicino alla biblioteca’ (Melissa)

Plate 7.5: The Seanchaí, Kerry Literary & Cultural Centre in Listowel

(Source: Author)
Finally, respondents increased their likelihood of participating in cultural activities more generally. The festivals influenced the participants ‘to participate in cultural events’ (Nicola). For instance, after the event of Cристиччи, ‘you feel like going to see his story in the theatre’ (Beatrice). Missy started to attend a painting course. She observed that probably the reason why she decided to start the course was that after the festival ‘my brain was working better’ and ‘I went for the company of the women’. So, she appreciated more the company of a group ‘rather than painting your paintings on your own’ (Missy). So, festival participation enhanced social interactions, which, in turn, increased cultural participation.

7.4.5. Values and personal enrichment

Another indicator of the embodied state concerns the values that shape peoples’ philosophies of life. The findings show if and how respondents perceived a change in their values, especially their self-image. Perspectives on how the festivals affected respondents’ self-image were extremely varied. An in-depth analysis revealed that half of the interviewees (50% FU) thought festival participation is not enough to significantly impact their self-image. For Giacomo, PL ‘is not something that marks me so deeply’. According to Alice, ‘for a month you say how nice it was, but after that it’s going to be forgotten until next year, that is, it’s not that it improves my life, as I said, life is hard’. On the contrary, 23% (FU) of the interviewees felt invigorated and regenerated through participation. For example, Dennis was one participant who said that his self-image as [an] art lover improved.

‘Just identifying myself as someone who enjoys the arts and things and the writing… not writing myself but enjoying reading and the theatre and what goes on, and I suppose I like being identified as one who likes that side of the festival’ (Dennis)
Similarly, April perceived an improved self-image as an Irish citizen, since ‘it’s good to be proud of where you come from, and to be proud of how things used to be done and it’s good, culturally is good for your life’, while according to Leonardo, ‘it enriches you inside (...) on an intellectual level’.

‘Definitely the fact of taking part... of going to listen to something when I can, this gives me satisfaction and I say at least I try to nurture a little... a part that I had left aside, a bit of myself, books, literature, knowledge’ (Giovanna)  

‘Sicuramente il fatto di partecipare... di andare a sentire qualcosa quando riesco mi dà soddisfazione e dico almeno cero di coltivare un po’... una parte che avevo accantonato un po’ di me stessa, i libri, la letteratura, la conoscenza’ (Giovanna)

For published authors, the festival increased their self-image as writers as to ‘feel more connected to my fellow writers so that gives you a positive self-esteem’ (Simon). While for Serena, the festival slightly improved her self-image: ‘my attitude has improved, my approach to the book, but [only] 20% [can] be attributed to the festival, but it is a factor of personal growth, of maturation, of old age’.

So, the festivals encouraged participants to reflect on their values. Melissa gave a concrete example of how she reflected on her previous value about social media.

‘Yesterday I participated in an event where they were talking about nostalgia, they spoke about the use of message technology. (...) since I’m pretty much against all social media and technologies... listening to them talk about their use nowadays has made me change my mind a little. They were drawing a parallel between the fact of

‘Ho partecipato ieri ad un evento dove si parlava di nostalgia, parlavano riguardo l’utilizzo della tecnologia dei messaggi (...) siccome sono abbastanza contraria a tutti i social e tecnologie... ascoltare loro sull’utilizzo che hanno oggi mi hanno fatto un po’ cambiare idee. Mettevano in parallelo il fatto di scambiarvi messaggi ad un
In addition, findings give insights into how the festival led to personal enrichment and fulfilment. Respondents’ perspectives about personal enrichment associated with festival participation varied greatly. On one hand, some argued that the festivals improved the quality of their lives. For instance, Giulio noted that ‘every time you read a book, that you participate [at an event], that you see a movie, [this] adds something more [to your life], always’. ‘Being surrounded by that positive energy’ (Evan) led you to ‘feel probably enriched, fulfilled, happier after than I have been’ (Norah), and to ‘come away with a smile on your face’ (Marcie). They described the festival experience as ‘something for my soul, for my spiritual self, rather than my physical self’ (Norah). Teresa said ‘since I’m a compulsive reader (...) the festival gave me the opportunity to meet other authors, other ways of thinking and therefore it enriched my life’. For them, the festivals were ‘fulfilling’ (Jimmy), ‘very pleasant’ (April), ‘a cultural need’ (Katia), ‘uplifting’ (Molly), that can ‘energise me’ (Jimmy), ‘enrich [your life] a little bit’ (April). On the other hand, others argued that it is ‘exaggerated’ (Giorgio) to claim that festival participation can lead to personal enrichment or make your life more amusing. For instance, Leonardo thinks that the festival ‘doesn’t make life any more interesting, but it can create interests in your life’. Similarly, Serena said that PL ‘has not revolutionised my life’ and Maureen described WW as an ‘added bonus’ to her life.

‘I wouldn’t go there if I felt it wasn’t improving my life but I don’t look at it as something that improves my life, I want to look at it as something that I want to go to, to be part of, to enjoy myself, if something is funny, it’s grand, it’s an added bonus, but if I can make it serious, I’m delighted’ (Maureen)
7.4.6. Bodily hexis (self-expression and attitudes)

Finally, the findings give insights into the last indicator of the embodied state: bodily hexis. For example, respondents described how they perceived individual self-expression through participation, especially in Ireland. Observations and interviews revealed that respondents developed their cultural capital by reading their works at the open-mic sessions. The open mic sessions gave the participants ‘the idea that you can also do it because it’s just ordinary people who are expressing themselves through poetry and through songs’ (Jane), so the festival inspired self-confidence.

Moreover, there are also examples of attitude change, especially in Italy. For example, Camilla explained that she is more conscious of her way of wearing perfumes after an event in 2015.

‘Two years ago I went to a meeting that talked about the importance of perfume, in the sense that very often we tend to forget about our senses (...) later I thought about it and it’s true, we remember a moment, something special because we associate it with a taste or a smell’ (Camilla)

‘Due anni fa sono stata ad un incontro che parlava dell’importanza del profumo, nel senso che molto spesso tendiamo a dimenticarci dei nostri sensi (...) dopo c’ho riflettuto ed è vero, dopo noi ricordiamo un attimo qualcosa di particolare perché lo associamo a un gusto o ad un odore’ (Camilla)

Similarly, Mario attended an event and acquired new information on food labels, ‘the author gave some information, a community regulation that regulates labelling in Europe (...) that I did not know about’. Mario argued that, after that event, he changed his way of checking the labels: ‘I tried it before, but I didn’t know what I was doing, for example, the calorie count’. So he says that the festival ‘gave me something more’, and modified his way of shopping. However, Mario also said that the festival only ‘encouraged those things I was doing before’.
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7.5. Summary

Findings show that cultural capital development associated with festival participation occurred. However, for some respondents, it was a stimulus to acquire cultural capital at a later point. So, cultural capital development occurred after the festival, particularly in respect of knowledge and taste acquisition, in conscious and deliberate ways through reading, research and discussion. Differently, for others, it was more reinforcement of pre-existing knowledge, tastes, or values.

Claiming that cultural capital can be acquired means that its three states can be shaped and developed. Participants accumulated objectified cultural capital by acquiring books or other cultural goods, such as paintings. Taking part in a writing competition was perceived as an accumulation of institutionalised cultural capital only by some. As regards the embodied state, participants felt that they gained knowledge from the festivals. This development of knowledge mainly related to literature, such as authors and books, and general cultural knowledge, for example, religion, politics or philosophy. In particular, some locals discovered something new about their cultural heritage. Respondents also argued that they had developed some skills, especially writing or social skills. Some of them increased their participation in the study festivals, in other literary festivals, and in other cultural activities. Moreover, they modified some of their values, especially in terms of self-image improvement. Finally, examples of bodily hexis development were found in respect of both self-expression and attitude change.

All the above reveals that cultural capital was developed in different ways, which led to differing degrees, states, and types of cultural capital acquisition. The following chapters present the findings concerning the ways in which respondents developed their cultural capital and the elements that played a role in this process.
CHAPTER 8
THE INTERNAL ELEMENTS SHAPING CULTURAL CAPITAL

8 Introduction

After observing that cultural capital was acquired in the studied festivals, this chapter now gives insights into how and under what circumstances cultural capital was developed. As such, it discusses respondents’ demographics, their pre-existing levels of capitals, and behavioural and emotional dimensions. It begins by presenting the respondents’ demographics in terms of gender, age, ethnicity, origin, and occupational group. Then, it discusses the interviewees’ pre-existing levels of capitals, especially cultural capital in all its three states (institutionalised, objectified and embodied). Here, it also presents the levels of asceticism and motivations to attend. Finally, the chapter concludes by exploring participants’ behavioural and emotional dimensions, considering the role of the body and the enjoyment factor (Figure 8.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents’ demographics</th>
<th>The role of previous resources</th>
<th>The behavioural and emotional dimensions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Gender</td>
<td>• Economic</td>
<td>• How to behave in the festival setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ethnicity</td>
<td>• Cultural</td>
<td>• Multi-sensory activity (the body and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Age</td>
<td>• Engagement with</td>
<td>its senses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Origin</td>
<td>literature</td>
<td>• Depending on the event and the venue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Occupational group</td>
<td>• Involvement in the festival</td>
<td>• The enjoyment factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Motivations for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Asceticism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.1: The key themes and subthemes explored in Chapter Eight
(Source: Author)
8.1 Respondents’ demographics

In investigating the respondents’ demographics, the aim is to provide an overview of the study sample and investigate how personal characteristics shaped festival participation and cultural capital development.

As regards gender, female interviewees predominated (59% OS). Participant observations revealed that gender sometimes influenced how participants experienced the festivals and acquired cultural capital. For instance, in Listowel, female participants were more likely to attend daytime events, while male participants predominated in events in pubs during the evenings. For example, Laura, a respondent, during a private conversation with the researcher, said that she was not comfortable to go alone to the pub for the evening events. Likewise, the WW chairperson said that the gender mix varied depending on the event. This suggests that the occasions to acquire cultural capital in festivals might differ between men and women.

All respondents were Caucasian, except one in Pordenone. Most of them were aged in their 50s (29% OS), 60s (22% OS), or 40s (19% OS), as Figure 8.2 shows. However, in Pordenone the sample was younger than in Listowel, since there were several participants (15% OS) in their 20s. For some, age seemed to play a role in their festival experiences and cultural capital acquisition. For instance, Peter said: ‘I’m too old to learn new things’.

![Figure 8.2: Respondents’ age groups (Source: Author)](image-url)
With regards to participants’ origin, data from the two case studies differed. In Ireland (Figure 8.3), more than half of them (64% OS) were domestic tourists, with most coming from County Dublin (24% OS), or from the Munster counties of Cork (17% OS) and Limerick (10% OS). While 29% (OS) were locals and regionals. The sample included only three international tourists, all from the UK. This is in line with how the WW chairperson described the audience: mainly regional, from county Kerry, or from Dublin, and a few international. In contrast, in Italy (Figure 8.4), respondents were mainly locals (40% OS), from the province of Pordenone, or regional (26% OS) from Friuli Venezia Giulia. However, there were also some domestic tourists primarily from the Veneto. The sample included only one international tourist from Germany. This confirms what the festival director said: participants mainly come from the north of Italy. In fact, while PL is seen as an international festival, ‘the audience has never been international’ (Councillor for cultural activities in Pordenone).

The data showed that both tourists and locals acquired cultural capital, but what they learned, and why, differed. Tourists learned about local culture and traditions during the festivals, such as ‘squared black and white pudding’ (Missy). While locals and new residents learned new information about their towns. For instance, Cassie ‘didn’t grow up in Listowel [and she] wouldn’t have a clue of the local history’ she learned about the history of the town. Theresa and Dennis, local participants, said that they went for their first time to the writers’ museum in town and they learned about the local writers. Thus, the festivals allowed local residents to get to know their towns better.
Finally, the occupations of the participants differed in the two festivals. In Ireland, most had highly ranked occupations (34%) such as manager and professional, jobs connected to literature (32%) such as writer and librarian, or they were retired (27%). While in Italy, respondents had mainly unskilled occupations (33%) like service worker and labourer, or jobs connected to literature (28%) such as journalist and teacher, as Figure 8.5 shows. However, respondents developed their cultural capital irrespective of the nature of their occupation or their level of pre-existing economic capital. The following section explores the role of economic capital in shaping cultural capital.
8.2 The role of economic capital

Observational data revealed that pre-existing levels of economic capital shaped how participants experienced the festivals. For instance, in WW, participants’ economic capital was a prerequisite since they had to pay for most of the events, which cost 15 euro. This, in turn, shaped the opportunities participants had to develop their cultural capital. This was not the case in Italy, where all events were free of charge. Furthermore, economic capital was also a necessary means for objectified cultural capital accumulation, like buying paintings in Listowel which were sold at 250 euro each.

Besides economic capital, social and cultural capital also played a role in the process of cultural capital development. While the role of the social context is explored in Chapter Nine, the following section presents the findings of the role of pre-existing cultural resources.
8.3 Respondents’ pre-existing levels of cultural capital

The findings showed that respondents mainly possessed high cultural capital, but there were also some interviewees who possessed low cultural capital. The exploration of all the three states is presented as follows.

Plate 8.1: Participants at WW (Source: WW)

The level of institutionalised cultural capital was very heterogeneous, with 26% (OS) of respondents holding a postgraduate degree, 24% (OS) a diploma, 22% (OS) a bachelor’s degree, and 17% (OS) a leaving certificate. Considering leaving certificate to be low cultural capital, bachelor and doctoral qualifications to be high cultural capital, and diploma as medium cultural capital, respondents mainly possessed high institutionalised cultural capital. However, it is important to note that data from the two case studies slightly differed (Figure 8.7). In Ireland, respondents possessed higher levels of institutionalised cultural capital, while in Italy, there were sizeable percentages of medium (34% OS), and low cultural capital (19% OS).
Furthermore, as regards the pre-existing levels of the objectified state, half of the interviewees claimed to possess hundreds of books (54% OS). Fewer claimed to own thousands of books (15% OS), while just 6% (OS) said they owned less than 50 books. As explained in Chapter Five, data collection included 92 (45 WW and 47 PL) on-site interviews and 34 (17 WW and 17 PL) follow-up interviews. The follow-up in-depth analysis revealed that most respondents (47% FU) bought more than 10 books in the last 12 months, while only 6% (FU) of them had not bought any. Besides books, more than half of the respondents claimed to possess paintings (71% FU), musical instruments (56% FU), while a few said they owned pieces of art (35% FU). This reveals that the whole sample had quite high pre-existing levels of objectified cultural capital.

As regards the embodied state, the findings provided insights into respondents’ pre-existing levels of cultural knowledge. Almost every participant could name at least one author on the festival programme. As Shane observed, every participant ‘has a deep appreciation of literature. I’ve noticed that people are very well-read, the compensation ranges wildly over a literary terrain that people know very well’ (Shane). However, they

Figure 8.7: Respondents’ pre-existing levels of institutionalised cultural capital
(Source: Author)
did not read any specific books before the festival by way of preparation. In fact, not all the respondents were strong readers.

Levels of engagement with the literary world were diverse. As regards their previous skills and abilities, respondents were not all writers, since 61% (OS) declared themselves not to be involved in writing. However, 24% (OS) had been published, and 6% (OS) claimed to be aspiring authors. Moreover, most were able to speak foreign languages, (59% FU) and some could play an instrument (21% FU). Moreover, reading habits varied, with most of them (28% FU among those who answered) usually reading up to five books per year, or between 11-20 books (28% FU). Moreover, data between the festivals varied, with most respondents in Ireland reading between 11-20 books (44% FU) and up to five books per year in Italy (45% FU). While the PL director claimed that most participants are reading enthusiasts, in Ireland reading levels appeared to be higher than the Italian ones.

Interviewees were also asked to describe their cultural tastes besides reading and writing. The hobbies most cited related to music, such as singing or playing an instrument, and sports such as walking. Notably, in Italy, respondents expressed their likelihood to undertake solitary activities such as swimming, cooking, or watching TV. However, most interviewees were interested in watching and talking to people, not just in the festival context but more generally. The WW chairperson said that participants are ‘culturally curious’. Some of them were interested in learning about other people, maybe for professional curiosity, such as the song-writer Evan, who is ‘interested in what people create, especially their poetry or their music’. Others were just curious about people’s behaviours, such as George: ‘I enjoy audience watching, I like to see, why there are certain men here and so many women?! I don’t know! (…) Why people chose different things?’. Findings also suggested that this curiosity and open-minded attitude makes
participation more likely. For instance, Franco observed that he is ‘curious by nature and so [he is] interested in everything. For me, what is new is a stimulus. (...) The festival is a stimulus because it gives you an opening to technological, political and cultural aspects and therefore it is a very wide field’. Similarly, Giacomo defined himself as ‘a rather curious person’, as did Giorgio.

‘People approach the festival if they belong to a certain starting point (...) [Participants have an] attitude that culture and these events are a benefit to the person. You like being there. Listening to new things... creating a cultural background, feeding your own soul, inwardness (...). you go there if you have some beliefs, if you are open to new things, to listen, deepen... and then you go there and satisfy your curiosity, to get to know both new things and different worlds’ (Giorgio)

‘Le persone si avvicinano al festival se culturalmente fanno parte di una certa base (...) [le persone hanno un] atteggiamento che la cultura e questi eventi siano un beneficio per la persona. Ti piace stare lì. Sentire cose nuove... creazione bagaglio culturale, un feeding, un dare da mangiare alla propria anima, interiorità (…), vai lì se hai alcune convinzioni, se sei aperto a cose nuove, di ascoltare, approfondire e poi vai lì e metti in pratica la tua caratteristica di essere curioso, sia di conoscere cose nuove sia di conoscere mondi diversi’ (Giorgio)

All these tastes, knowledge, and interests shaped how respondents selected events to attend. They mainly attended events because of some previous taste or interest. For instance, Anna enjoyed an event about world wars as she ‘love[s] wars and history’. Interviewees explained that they ‘go only to the event I’m interested in’ (Paolo), ‘because I love these things’ (Letizia). Teresa said ‘what did not interest me? Just books or advice on healthy eating, on fashion... I did not really follow them because they did not interest me’. For instance, Cassie did the walking tour in town to discover ‘who lived there’ because she wanted to learn about Listowel. The pre-existing taste, sometimes, led to an accumulation of objectified cultural capital. For instance, Ettore, after attending an event
about history and journalism, said ‘[my partner and I] are interested in reading history books, so we bought a book from this journalist’.

As regards their previous levels of general cultural participation, most of the respondents were not strong literary festival-goers. In fact, 60% (OS) of them had not attended any other literary festival in the last 12 months, while only 15% (OS) attended another literary festival, and 13% (OS) attended between two - five literary festivals. The ones who did, mainly attended music or arts festivals. Furthermore, during the in-depth interviews, respondents were also asked about their regular participation in concerts, opera, theatre, cinema, art galleries and museums. Findings showed that respondents often participated in cinema (47% FU), sometimes concerts (35% FU), museums (53% FU), or theatre (38% FU), and rarely art galleries (35% FU), but they have never gone to opera (65% FU). Rather, they generally visited cultural attractions that are considered to be middle or low brow. However, it is important to notice that Irish respondents participated more regularly in theatre and art galleries than Italians (Figure 8.8).

![Figure 8.8: Respondents’ pre-existing levels of cultural participation](image)

(Source: Author)
Findings also yielded insight into respondents’ cultural values. Some described themselves as passionate readers. Even though not all of them were avid readers, they valued literature and reading as important and amusing activities. According to them, books ‘can open your mind’ (Alessandra), ‘I find answers in the books that are useful to me’ (Michele) so ‘through reading one comes into contact with knowledge’ (Filippo), ‘it is a fact of knowledge, of updating’ (Marco). They claimed that reading is ‘like a second nature’ (Laura), ‘a part of me’ (Robert), ‘it’s something that you learn when you are young’ (Peter), which allows you to escape reality (Alison), to imagine different worlds (Dennis) and to ‘experience the world through somebody else’s eyes’ (Julianne). Literature is also an ‘escape’ (Rosa), ‘an elegant way to isolate myself, a nice way to make my own business and travel’ (Simone), it is ‘a nice thing to pass the time’ (Melissa) and ‘to live so many lives’ (Elisa).

While for some, ‘buying books means nothing - reading books means enriching you’ (George), for others book possession is fundamental. Buying books means to ‘invest money in something useful, productive’ (Paolo), to make ‘a cultural investment’ (Giorgio), it ‘is just my thing’ (Robert). It means you can ‘deepen a topic’ (Michele). For writers, buying books also means that ‘it is fair, not for the publisher, but for the author’ (Melissa). Owning a physical book means ‘feel it and keep it’ (Theresa), it becomes part of the furniture as ‘the house wouldn’t be complete without books’ (Dennis). ‘I like to see them there [at home] and being able to take one and reread it’ (Melissa). So, owning books allows you to re-read them several times, to pass them on ‘sharing the experience with other people’ (Julianne).
8.3.1 Involvement in the festival and motivations for participating

Besides different levels of engagement with literature, levels of involvement with the festivals were also heterogeneous in both festivals. The observations and interviews revealed that the respondents were audience members with different degrees of involvement in the organisation and programme of the festivals. Among in-depth interviewees, a few were involved in the festival programme (Rita and Evan were speakers at WW), and in the festival organisation (Simona and Sonia were volunteers at PL). This reveals that levels of involvement were diverse, and they reflected different motivations for participating in the festivals and state/types of cultural capital acquired.

For instance, there were examples of skills development among those respondents who were more involved in the festival programme or organisation. Rita discovered that she is able to facilitate an event. Similarly, Evan learned that he is able to give a workshop to children on song writing. In Pordenone, the two respondents who were also volunteers developed some non-literature related skills over the years: Simona improved her orienteering skills and ability to give directions.

‘I also improved my sense of direction because I’m not particularly good at giving directions, but during Pordenonelegge I’ve improved this aspect a lot. (...) Unfortunately, I don’t know all the places in Pordenone, such as the buildings, the auditoriums, and so on, so this was also an opportunity to review and learn again which buildings are in Pordenone’ (Simona)

‘Ho anche migliorato un po’ il senso dell’orientamento perché io non sono particolarmente brava a dare indicazioni ma a Pordenonelegge ho migliorato molto questo aspetto (…) purtroppo non conoscendo tutti i posti di Pordenone, come i palazzi, gli auditori, e via dicendo, questa è stata anche un’occasione per ripetere ed imparare di nuovo i palazzi e gli edifici che ci sono a Pordenone’ (Simona)

Different degrees of involvement also shaped how festival participation led to changes in people’s tastes about their life choices. For example, after years of volunteering, Sonia
has begun to think that in the future she would like to work ‘in the world of culture, that is, a museum or an exhibition or a cultural festival’. So, PL influenced her interests for her future career.

8.3.2 Motivations for participating and levels of asceticism

Motivations for participating were many and sometimes they overlapped. For instance, the PL director said that people participate in the festival because they see their favourite authors or discover new ones. The councillor for cultural activities of Pordenone also added that some participants are not literary oriented, they merely attend PL to ‘see and live the town’. In line with the literature reviewed in Chapter Three, there were examples of all the eight categories of reasons to attend a literary festival: social, hedonistic, curiosity, aesthetic, intellectual, affective, coincidence, and duty (Figure 8.9). These motivations often overlapped.

Figure 8.9: Motivations for participating in the festivals (Source: Author)
It has been said that most people were culturally curious and selected events to attend according to their previous interests and tastes. However, levels of willingness to develop cultural capital, what Négrier (2015) called asceticism, varied greatly such that it begged the question: did respondents hope and plan to acquire cultural capital? In other words, was the cultural capital acquisition identified as planned or unexpected? The data showed that it was mainly unexpected. Observations and interviews revealed that only 29% (FU) of participants explicitly said that they wanted to learn and that they planned cultural capital acquisition. Sometimes an intention to learn explained their participation, ‘that’s why I came really’ (Theresa). Also, Norah said the festival contributed to her education ‘in a small way, not in a huge way. Education is education, I suppose, it’s hard to quantify, but it does. That’s why I go’. Similarly, Maureen outlined her need to be intellectually stimulated saying that ‘I just find I need mental stimulation and if the festival helps me to be mentally stimulated that’s grand’.

On the contrary, for most of the respondents (71% FU) the development of knowledge was an unplanned outcome of the experience. As Meghan explained, the festival ‘helped my enjoyment, I didn’t go for the purpose of fostering my education’. Thus, very often learning was accidental – ‘I didn’t realise I would have learned coming here, but I did learn quite a bit from the two people that I have heard’ (Bryan). Therefore, cultural capital development was spontaneous and unexpected. ‘You see the world from different points of views (...) but never for the reasons you think, it’s always the accidental, the serendipitous that you get’ (Bryan). Nicola also went further saying that this unplanned interest acquisition can lead to further cultural capital accumulation, after the festival. ‘When I go back home, I’ll look for the general ideas of the authors I’ve heard’. Camilla agreed, saying that PL ‘gives you the curiosity, to read whenever you will
have time or desire’. This means that the development of a new taste led to the accumulation of knowledge, which occurred once PL was over.

8.4 Performing at the festivals: the behavioural dimension

This section presents the findings concerning the behavioural dimension of festival participation. As seen in Chapter Three, festival participation is an intense period that is out of the ordinary. For five days PL and WW enabled people to attend literary events, buy books, and talk about cultural topics. Observations showed that the experience comprised people engaging in various actions, in many spaces, during diverse moments with many sounds, colours, smells according to the different events and activities. So, how did they behave while at the festival? What did they spend their time doing? Observing and interviewing participants on-site while the festivals were on-going yielded insights into the ways in which cultural capital became embodied through people’s participation. Respondents could be seen to be actively using their participation to shape their experiences in particular ways.

From observation, it was clear that tacit understanding about how to behave in the festival setting prevailed. Everyone was very polite, behaving in an ‘appropriate’ way for literary festivals. For example, they did not talk during the performances and they raised their hands to ask questions. During an event in Pordenone, when a woman interrupted the performer to ask three questions the other participants looked at her in astonishment for what they perceived to be her lack of respect.

The observations also revealed that the festival was a multi-sensory activity: during PL participants performed in various ways. They listened, talked, wrote, ate, drank, walked, nodded, clapped, read, looked around and engaged with the performers,
the other participants and the town in different ways. Depending on how they behaved and consumed the festival, they developed their cultural capital in different ways.

The audience behaved differently depending on the nature of the event and the venue. Some events were more casual in nature or were held in big outdoor venues, so people felt free to chat or walk away in the middle of the performance, always maintaining a minimum decorum and respect for the author and the other spectators. Other events were more formal, like the evening events in the theatre, or sometimes the venue was very small so, for example, participants did not want to disturb the performers by walking away.

‘The one [event] about philosophy, I’m telling you I do not even remember what they were talking about, I was thinking so much about my own stuff, we [my sister and I] also wanted to leave but it seemed... the room was also small... we did not want to disturb’ (Alice)

‘Quello lì [l’evento] di filosofia, ma ti dico non mi ricordo neanche più di cosa parlava, pensavo talmente ai fatti miei, volevamo [io e mia sorella] anche uscire ma ci sembrava... la sala era anche piccolina... non volevamo fare la figura di uscire’ (Alice)

For most of the interviewees, the importance of the experience relied on seeing the performance, meeting and listening to the authors. As Katia claimed, ‘I always learn a lot of things from what I see’. Dennis observed, ‘even the stuff we were seeing, like the authors in the Seanchaí, (…) just educated me about the places in the town and the people that came into town because they are just stories as well’. The act of listening also appeared to be relevant for some interviewees, especially when they connected the action of listening to reflecting and learning. For instance, Susanna said ‘when I listen to the authors I always get to know things that maybe I didn’t know, or knew only in a superficial way’. Simon said he is dyslexic and ‘that’s probably why I go to listen to a lot of poetry and go to the theatre, because I can consume literature in a different way’.
attending literary festivals, listening and talking about literature is his way of developing cultural capital.

Plate 8.2: Participants at PL (Source: PL)

On the contrary, for others, the act of listening was less significant. When the researcher asked Beatrice about the event she had attended with her daughter, she answered: ‘I just listened’. Some interviewees even claimed to be bored and to have ‘yawned’ (Mario) during some events. For instance, Camilla said she almost ‘fell asleep’ during the event with the cello, ‘because I like classical music but only if it involves the piano, while like this… [just the cello] no’. During the Sepulveda event, a man closed his eyes because he was tired and another snored. The observations revealed that some respondents engaged with the festival simply by walking around the town. For instance, Laura, an international tourist from London, explained that her parents moved to London from Tralee and that she did not know the area nor her second cousins, whom she met during the festival, very well. She said that while she was walking in the streets in Listowel, she was thinking about her mother while discovering the town.

‘Was my mum here? Did my mum see this? What she saw *** you know what I mean, I’m walking [in] her footsteps in a way, you know, looking [at] things with her eyes, what she really felt, what she enjoyed’ (Laura)
In contrast, some respondents co-created their festival experience by interacting with other participants. The observations revealed that respondents were performers while they were talking with other audience members and locals, by, for instance, chatting about the festival programme or exchanging opinion about books. They also became performers while asking questions and interacting with the festival speakers during and between the formal events. Respondents were even engaged in more performative practices. For instance, Alice enjoyed an event because the performer asked the audience to sing some songs like a choir, and the interaction increased her enjoyment. Participants also engaged in other activities, such as writing. Notably, 28% (OS) of the respondents claimed to have taken written notes. As Pamela said, ‘strangely I saw so many people taking notes, [people] of any age. This is an environment that I don’t know yet. I could understand the boy or girl who takes notes for their study or research, but there was also a 60-year-old lady taking notes!’ The respondents who took notes explained that during the festival ‘you are given stimuli, I take note and then I deepen them at home. It is very stimulating
from this point of view’ (Giacomo). They wrote ‘points of reflection about things that maybe I had never thought of before’ (Letizia) or ‘some reading advice, some quotes from authors of books that were mentioned during the meetings’ (Rita). Thus, the reasons for taking notes were diverse. Some people argued that they took notes as food for thought about ‘things that were new to [them as] you go to literary events because it helps you to see things from a fresh point of view’ (Shane). Others claimed that notes were useful because they were interested in the topic and they found the speech valuable. So, for instance Bryan took notes ‘because he [the author] addressed issues I’m interested [in] as well myself, he talked about the violence’ (Bryan). Other reasons were more practical: for example, Alison took notes because she wanted to write a poem about something she overheard, and Nicola took notes for job purposes, as he ‘had to do a report for [his] company’.

All the above shows how respondents were engaged in several actions that involved different senses. The complex dynamics of the engagement with the environment, both social and physical, help to further understand how respondents acquired, and especially embodied, cultural capital.

8.4.1 The enjoyment factor

In Chapter Seven, it could be seen that for some, the festival was a serious experience that resulted in them learning something new, while for others it was mainly a hedonistic activity. The observations revealed that very often these two dimensions overlapped. Moreover, all the respondents claimed that they found enjoyment in participating. Respondents argued that they were enjoying the festival because ‘it is something out of the ordinary, different from the normal, which one doesn’t usually see in these areas’ (Mario), with a nice and sociable ‘atmosphere’ (Giacomo). PL is something different to
do, like a ‘feast’ (Alice), ‘an opportunity to break the daily routine and devote ourselves to thinking about things that we have forgotten in normal life’ (Franco). The festival can relax you and bring happiness because ‘you are laughing, you are thinking, you are making new connections, (…) there’s plenty of jokes being shared, plenty of thoughtful moments’ (Alice).

Plate 8.4: Participants at PL (source: PL)

As seen previously, some respondents mentioned that they attended the festivals mainly for hedonistic reasons. For example, Meghan argued that the festival ‘helped my enjoyment, I didn’t go for the purpose of fostering my education’. Accordingly, they mainly chose ‘enjoyable’ (41% FU) as an adjective to describe the experiences, in preference to ‘satisfying’ (20%), ‘fulfilling’ (15%), and ‘gratifying’ (6%). Nevertheless, half of the interviewees chose the sentences ‘while I’m here I’m discovering new things, expanding my knowledge and exploring new ideas’ (50% OS) instead of ‘while I’m here I’m having great fun’ (9% OS). As such, respondents highlighted the cognitive fulfilment
more than the amusing and sociable dimensions of the festivals, choosing, for example, the sentence ‘the festival makes me think’ (46% OS), over ‘the festival makes me feel good’ (24% OS). However, they were discovering new things as they were enjoying the festival. For instance, George said that he attended the WW ‘pour mon plaisir, for my pleasure. Purely that, pure enlightenment, to learn new things’. For him, enjoyment is ‘stretching my mind and having another point of view of something I have not considered before’ (George). Thus, for most people, enjoyment and cultural capital acquisition were closely connected. Some said: ‘I’m learning because I’m enjoying’ (Fiona). Equally, for others ‘discovering new things makes me feel good’ (Ettore), accordingly, ‘I’m discovering [new things] so I’m having fun’ (Melissa). Hence, ‘fun is not completely disconnected from discovering new things’ (Mario). In other words, respondents argued that they acquired cultural capital because the festivals were enjoyable, and the festivals were enjoyable because they learned something new. Acquiring cultural capital and enjoyment are, therefore, ‘two wheels of the same bicycle’ (Shane). The recreational and social dimension of the experience was emphasised also by the PL director, who said that the public brings home a ‘positive experience, some say it’s great to stand in line because you know people with the same interests and passions’. This leisure activity may influence stimuli and knowledge creation because it is an enjoyable moment. So, the festivals were both serious leisure and recreational activities, as Giacomo explained.

‘Generally [the festival] is an activity that you like, this is not a professional activity, it is something that one does for pleasure, for leisure, I live it very intensely ... yes it is a chance to grow, to have stimuli, to listen to interesting people (...), but it is still a playful, recreational thing’ (Giacomo)

‘In generale [il festival] è un’attività che a piace, questa non è un’attività professionale, è una cosa che uno fa per piacere, per svago, io la vivo molto... sì è una possibilità per crescere, di avere stimoli, di sentire persone interessanti (...) però è comunque una cosa giocosa, di svago’ (Giacomo)
8.5 Summary

This chapter presents the findings of how internal elements shaped cultural capital development: respondents’ demographics, behavioural dimension, involvement, and the role of pre-existing resources. Findings suggested that respondents’ demographics, previous levels of capitals, the use of the body, and levels of involvement shaped their participation and, in turn, their cultural capital development. Interviewees were mainly high cultural capital individuals, but there were also examples of very low cultural capital respondents. These findings also showed how cultural capital was acquired by the respondents and how it was embodied through practice. Cultural capital development occurred in different ways according to different participants. Different levels of engagement in literature, involvement in the festivals, motivations to attend the festivals echoed different degrees of asceticism/willingness to acquire cultural capital. However, cultural capital development was mainly unplanned. Moreover, participants performed and consumed the festival differently, which allowed them to get in touch with different ways of developing their cultural capital. People acquired cultural capital through several actions, such as watching, listening, talking, walking, drinking, eating and writing. Festival participation was, therefore, a multi-sensory activity. The festival allowed participants to develop their cultural capital in dynamic ways. Participants were performers and the role of the body was crucial in their process of cultural capital development. Yet participants did not merely engage in physical involvement, but also intellectual and cognitive involvement which affected their embodied cultural capital development. Finally, cultural capital development and enjoyment were interlinked factors in the festival experience: people had fun because they acquired cultural resources, and they acquired cultural resources because they had fun.
CHAPTER 9

THE EXTERNAL ELEMENTS SHAPING CULTURAL CAPITAL

9 Introduction

This chapter explores the last four key themes that emerged from the findings and relate to the role that external elements play in the process of cultural capital generation. Here, the context in which cultural capital acquisition occurred is considered, taking account of the role of the social context, time, space, and festival features (Figure 9.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The role of the social context</th>
<th>The role of time</th>
<th>The role of space</th>
<th>The role of the festival features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group composition (Known group interactions)</td>
<td>Length of the festival (when cultural capital acquisition occurred)</td>
<td>Physical atmosphere</td>
<td>Type of event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solitary disposition</td>
<td>How much time cultural capital acquisition took to develop</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>Bookstalls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal external interactions (with speakers)</td>
<td>Perseverance of the cultural capital developed</td>
<td>Festival venues</td>
<td>Cost of ticket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal external interactions (with other participants)</td>
<td>Free time / holiday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9.1: The key themes and subthemes explored in Chapter Nine

(Source: Author)
9.1 The social context

Several elements shaped how respondents acquired cultural capital and the social context was one of them. Sometimes, the social atmosphere seemed key to shaping the whole festival experience because it made the moment enjoyable. Respondents described the atmosphere as ‘magical’ (Fiona), ‘friendly’ (Jane), and ‘safe’ (Maureen).

‘You meet people from other festivals, and it’s relaxed, when you work, it’s a day away from work and I’m interested in all that and it’s a good past-time, it’s a good recreation, it’s a good holiday, it’s good to chill out, to go out of town and drink something’ (Jimmy)

Some noted that there was a cultural atmosphere in town, seeing that the ‘people who sit at that bar are people who read’ (Giulio). Thus, it seemed that the social atmosphere played an important role in their participation.

‘Yes, [The festival is] a cultural environment in which there is actually a basic topic to discuss with people, both with your friends before the meeting, you can discuss what will be debated, or if you are queueing and you ask the person in front of you to save you a seat and then you ask them their opinion, I mean there are things that come out, maybe even discussions about topics that you would not have in a café with friends’ (Giorgio)

This friendly and relaxed social atmosphere played a role in respondents’ cultural capital development. Observations and interviews showed how participants interacted, engaged, and related to the speakers and to other people, including other participants. As regards their group composition, Figure 9.2 shows that almost half of the interviewees were
attending the festival alone (45% OS), while the other half were attending in a group, primarily with friends in Ireland and with their families in Italy.

Indeed, the group composition, and the social context more generally, played a role in cultural capital acquisition. For example, interviewees attending the festivals with their children, sometimes said that they were there for them. They did not attend any adult-oriented events but only the ones for children. ‘I’d like to attend [events for adults], but I can’t’ (Luca). Their participation was therefore shaped by the parental role they were playing at the festival. This also clearly shaped their possibilities and ways of developing their cultural capital.

Figure 9.2: Respondents’ group composition (Source: Author)

Here it is fundamental to highlight that the social dimension was considered differently in the two festival settings. In Listowel, the social context was perceived to be more important than in Pordenone. Respondents had to choose between the sentences ‘I’m happy to be spending quality time here’ and ‘I’m happy to relax and meet people’. Among those who answered at WW, the majority chose the latter (42% OS) or both the statements (39% OS). WW was also perceived as an occasion to create social connections. Several
people said they made friends thanks to the workshops as then ‘you bump into faces because the place is so small’ (Dennis). Others said they created friendships over the years and became part of the ‘Listowel family’ (Orlaith). As the WW chairperson said, ‘there is a core group of people that come and meet just in Listowel every year’. Thus, at the WW, most participants felt part of a community, ‘like a big family’ (Lucy). Here, social distinction was not perceived. Only a few felt excluded, as Theresa who said: ‘[there are] a lot of cultural people, not like me, coming for all the buzz’.

In contrast, in Pordenone, most of the respondents (78% OS) chose the sentence ‘I’m happy to be spending quality time here’ over ‘I’m happy to relax and meet people’ (5% OS). They justified their preference saying that ‘there are moments that I prefer to be on my own’ (Francesca). They prefer to attend alone because ‘I want to do what I want’ (Rosa), ‘alone I have more freedom to choose the events’ (Alessandra), ‘deciding with friends is complicated’ (Lisa). As Sara explained, ‘if you come with someone who does not give a damn, then it’s better if he stays at home’. So, ‘usually we tend to always do everything in a group but sometimes we need to make personal reflections without complications’ (Elisa). These people are ‘little led to personal relationships’ (Mario) and ‘I’m fine with me and I don’t need anyone’ (Rosa). Moreover, these participants enjoyed their solo participation because they wanted to focus on the formal performance, whereas ‘in a group, one comes to exchange opinions, [and there is a risk of] diverting [attention] away from the actual event’ (Mario).

Irrespective of whether participants were alone or with others, they could be seen to be acquiring knowledge through socialising and exchanging opinions. So, networking was extremely rewarding in terms of knowledge creation, and respondents played an active role in how they interacted and engaged with other people. For instance, according to
Leonardo, attending the festival means you ‘enrich your cultural baggage, exchange topics and opinions, meet people, (...) it’s a way to share the passion, what do you think, what do I think’. As such, the relaxing and social atmosphere led to informal learning. ‘It’s not that culture is just reading a book, or just going to school (...) when you interact with people you always have something to learn and this is part of the culture’ (Leonardo). Mario commented that even if you are a ‘passive participant’, you can share information with other people about the festival and this is self-rewarding.

‘In the evening I met two uncles who had been to various events and we went to a bar and we talked about what we saw and even if I did not actively participate, they told me about Severigni and Corona, in the end I think that (...) participating in an event even just as a passive participant is like saying if you stay home you wouldn’t see, you wouldn’t breathe the same atmosphere, it’s always worth it, even for the international appeal’ (Mario)

‘Alla sera ho incontrato due zii che erano andati a vari incontri e siamo andati in un locale e abbiamo parlato di cosa si era visto e anche se non ho partecipato attivamente, mi hanno detto di Severigni e di Corona, alla fine secondo me (...) partecipare ad una manifestazione così anche da passivo è, come dire, stai a casa non vedresti, non respireresti la stessa atmosfera, ne vale sempre la pena, anche il respiro internazionale’ (Mario)

Evan, a songwriter, explained how he developed his literary knowledge by engaging with his peers.

‘Just by talking to peers, you get that feeling of being part of a community and I got some advice from some of [those] people so I learned something about being an artist, I guess, because people there are in a slightly different area than me so, you know, learning… you can learn from each other’ (Evan).

Similarly, Missy observed that this feeling of being part of a community influenced her knowledge creation, since ‘I met people and their attitudes were completely different to mine, you know. So, I learned from them’, both as a writer ‘and as a person too’.
The social interaction between the audiences and the speakers was perceived as particularly crucial. Respondents claimed to be interested in listening to well-known authors because ‘it’s fascinating to hear their insights and to see that they are human too and they are vulnerable (...) you get to see the real side of them’ (Anita). Moreover, several interviewees claimed that they were interested in listening to well-known authors because of their great reputation: ‘I most like listening to thoughtful experienced people who have written for many years and whose books I have read in the past, like Colm Toibin, Richard Forbes’ (George). In other words, well-known authors were considered to be people of culture, from whom one can learn, people who have ‘the most tools’ (Katia), ‘experts who know better’ (Mario), ‘people who have rationality, culture’ (Giorgio), ‘intellectuals’ (Teresa). As Stephanie explained, ‘I know there are going to be serious writers and I know they’re going to be interviewed by serious people’. ‘It is always better to hear educated people than ignorant people’ (Katia). Thus, the festival was ‘a kind of academic environment in a way, with erudite people’ (Alison). A writer can create ‘intelligent discussions’ (Melissa), is ‘a non-authoritarian but authoritative person who proves to have real knowledge, I am inclined to think that he speaks without prejudices’ (Teresa). For those respondents, ‘the person who fascinates you maybe enriches you more’ (Leonardo).

Plate 9.1: Participants at PL (Source: PL)
On the contrary, some respondents claimed that they preferred events that gave an opportunity to network with other audience members. Some preferred the open mic sessions in Listowel to the talks with the well-known authors because during these events the ‘magic happens’, said Simon. The open mic sessions allowed him to discover ‘somebody that I have never heard before’. He likes ‘listening to the people that are not necessarily famous (…) because I don’t give a shit [about the well-known authors], so that’s why I go to Listowel each year, so that’s what I enjoyed the most’ (Simon).

Similarly, Nick argued that he attended the WW only for the open-mic events.

‘[Because] you can aspire to be the well-known people but there’s not a lot of learning about how to write from them, they are well-published, sometimes you get great ideas from people who are at the similar place [as in other audience members during the festival] as yourself, I like the format of that, since you don’t know what you’re going to hear and you can learn from people’ (Nick)

Finally, there was also an example of how the cultural capital acquired was converted into an improvement of social capital. During an in-depth interview, Cassie opened up with the researcher saying that her husband had ‘a break down’. She participated in the event about mental health to acquire knowledge about how to help her husband and observed that she learned useful information on depression from the event.

9.2 The temporal dimension

Alongside the social factor, the temporal dimension also impacted how participants lived the experiences and how they developed their cultural capital. In Chapter Seven, it was explained that respondents acquired cultural capital during the festivals, or they were stimulated to acquire it after the festivals. As such, the length of the festival played a role, and while some people perceived cultural capital development, for others the festivals
were simply too short in duration to make a difference to their cultural capital. For them, cultural capital generation requires time and effort. So, cultural capital was acquired ‘immediately after [the festivals], and after a while’ (Elena). For Teresa, the festival was self-rewarding ‘because we discussed our interpretations at home, with whoever was with me. It seems to me that something has remained with me’. In other words, the process of knowledge creation continued after the festival.

Besides expressing their opinions on when cultural capital development occurred, interviewees also discussed how much time it took to generate. The frequency of participation was very high: 71% (OS) of the respondents defined themselves as recurrent participants, having attended the festival more than once, while only 28% (OS) were first-time participants. Even the PL director observed that most of the audience participants are recurrent and very loyal: ‘those who come once will be back again for sure, it is a recurring appointment’. In addition, the WW chairperson said that writers and ‘the older people are returners’, because ‘they have a bit of money to spend’. Accordingly, PL was considered to be a recurrent occasion to be with ‘myself (Serena), or ‘our thing’ (Alice), a ‘moment of union, for the family’ (Luca) which people go to every year. As Rachele said, the festival became ‘a reference point to share three days away from our families, away from work’. Also, perseverance and commitment were quite high: half of the respondents (54% OS) attended between two and five events in total during their time at the 2017 festivals. Several interviewees attended more than 10 events (16% OS), while almost nobody (8% OS) attended only one event. However, there is an important difference in the number of days spent at the festivals. While in Ireland most respondents spent five days (29% OS), in Italy most of them spent only one day (34% OS). Notably, all cohorts acquired cultural capital. Even for people attending the festivals for the first time it was an occasion of cultural capital generation. However, there were some
differences in cultural capital development. Observations and interviews revealed that repeat and first-time participants acquired different states of cultural capital. Repeat participants developed their tastes and interests more than first-time participants. In contrast, the latter developed their cultural participation and institutionalised cultural capital more than repeat participants. Moreover, while cultural participation was developed mostly by participants who spent one or two days at the festivals, skills, abilities, and values were developed more by participants who spent in excess of three days at the festivals.

![Figure 9.4: Respondents’ time commitment to the festivals (Source: Author)](image)

Furthermore, findings presented that cultural capital acquisition produced both short and long-term outcomes. For example, Camilla permanently changed her way of wearing perfumes after one event. Jimmy ‘still remember[ed] [the speaker] reading the poem, because it’s (...) nourishment you get from writing, that’s what I took away from that’. For others, cultural capital accumulation was only short-term. For instance, during the in-depth interviews, Giacomo and Bryan did not recall the notes that they had taken. Giulio
‘went to the palace, the town hall, the avenue, now I don’t remember what it’s called, but it’s a historical avenue’. So, even though he visited a local cultural attraction, he forgot what he had seen. Giorgio explained how the fact of reading more after the festival is only temporary and does not last: ‘in the following days [after the festival, I start to read more], I take the book, then I get lost [I stop] (...) because I have to study so I don’t have the will and time to do anything else [such as read books]’.

Finally, in Chapter Eight, the enjoyment factor was illustrated as an implied dimension of the festival experience. Connected to this, it is important to see that the experiences were carried out in people’s free time. Sometimes, the festivals were seen as ‘a holiday’ (Fiona), ‘a leisure weekend’ (Beatrice), as an opportunity ‘to disconnect from routine’ (Simone), or ‘to leave the house for a walk’ (Filippo), as a ‘chill-out’ in their free time (Jimmy) that ‘is important to me’ (Molly). Meghan said that ‘I prefer [going to a literary festival] than going for a spa treatment or anything like that. It’s my idea of [a] day out’. The nice ‘weather helped a lot because it was good (...) it’s nice to sit here and have a chat and just meet people who are interested in the literature, the poetry, the drama it’s great’. This relaxed and enjoyable atmosphere played a role in how they perceived the experience. For instance, Evan explained that ‘it was not just the event itself, it was getting down to Kerry, away from everything and being amongst a group of creative artists people’ (Evan). It was, therefore, an ‘interesting holiday with a cultural theme’ (George). Some participants even took days off work in order to attend the festival. Sara takes days off every year because she is ‘crazy’ for it, the festival is a tradition for her. Several others mentioned that the festival has become a traditional holiday. Rita, a tourist from Siena, defined the festival as a ‘paradise’, ‘a splendid place (...) let’s say that for me and my friends [it] has become a reference point to share three days away from our families, away from work’. Even though the festival is something out of the ordinary,
something that happens only once a year, for some it is also a tradition, ‘a recurring appointment’ (Annamaria), ‘an event that we look forward with joy all year’ (Alice). The festival was perceived as a holiday even for locals who felt ‘like a tourist in my city, something that ... a tourist, and [not like someone] who lives the city out of necessity’ (Melissa).

9.3 The spatial dimension

The spatial dimension within which the festival events were staged also influenced how participants interacted, performed, and acquired cultural capital. An important factor that appeared relevant was the physical atmosphere of the environment. So, the characteristics of the towns played a role. For example, as mentioned in Chapter Six, Listowel is very connected to literature, being the birthplace of many writers such as John B Keane. Thus, in Listowel, there are several cultural attractions connected to literature, such as the writers’ museum, the John B Keane pub and statue. This encouraged participants to acquire knowledge and interests about, or increase participation in, field-specific cultural capital: local literature. Similarly, in Pordenone, participants had opportunities to learn about and visit some art exhibitions while the festival was on-going.

Plate 9.2: Listowel and WW (Source: Author)
Furthermore, the small scale of the towns was considered to be important. Giorgio said that the atmosphere in Pordenone was pleasant because ‘the city is perfect [to host the festival], since it is small and the festival takes place in the centre, it is not like going to a shed, so for sure the environment is appreciated’. Likewise, as the chairperson said, what people like most about WW is the intimacy of the location. Listowel, as a ‘tiny town’, allows the readers to meet the authors in casual ways. This is why there are many participants from Dublin, because ‘they like the intimacy and strolling around’ since venues are not more than 10 minutes from each other and ‘they like to meet up with people they met before’. Thus, the small scale of the towns helped the development of social networking and, in turn, cultural capital acquisition. Also, the festivals transformed the towns. ‘Pordenone is a small city, after one day you’ve seen it all. But what happens in those five days of the festival is a magical thing (...) and it’s something that changes the city’ (the PL director). For some, the nice atmosphere even lead to repeat visitation, and so an increase of cultural participation, as ‘the emotions, the city, if the previous year it was a sunny day (...) and it engaged you, you feel cuddled by the city, maybe the year after, regardless of the events, you are motivated to go’ (Giorgio).

Plate 9.3: Pordenone and PL (Source: PL)
Furthermore, the characteristics and the locations of the festival venues helped shape how participants acquired cultural capital. Teresa mentioned the liveability of the venues, observing that she enjoyed the events because they ‘were liveable, (…) in an environment where you can listen to the person, where you can understand [the performer] and not be oppressed by the crowd’. Local inhabitants such as Theresa and Darrel, went to the Writers’ Museum in Listowel for the first time because a festival event was held there. The festival gave them the opportunity to actually go and discover the museum. In this respect, selecting which events to attend was a crucial element of participation, influencing how people experienced the festival and creating occasions to acquire cultural capital. For example, as shown in Chapter Five, in Pordenone the venues for the children-oriented events were mainly in the library (Biblioteca Civica) in the main square, near the permanent bookstall. Observations suggested that this might have enhanced book purchasing by adult participants attending only children-oriented events. In contrast, at the WW, the events for the children were almost all held at the Community Centre, a separate venue located apart from the adult events, as the town map shows. This means that the adult respondents attending only children-oriented events, because of their group composition, did not have many opportunities to get in contact with adult-oriented events.

Plate 9.4: The main venue of WW (Source: Author)
9.4 Festival features

Alongside the location of the venues, other important festival features that shaped respondents’ cultural capital were, for example, the type of events, the bookstalls, and the tickets.

As described in Chapter Six, the festival programmes were a bit different: while WW featured walking tours, workshops, and open mic sessions, PL included more lectures and debates about general cultural topics, such as philosophy, religion, and science. Observations and interviews revealed that the type of events, the literary genres, or the topic discussed shaped how participants experienced the festivals and what they gained from the experiences. For instance, during writing workshops, participants can learn ‘how to write songs’ (Rita). During the walking tours, cultural capital acquisition was unplanned because ‘you’ll never know what you’ll see or hear’ (Fiona). Fiona observed a speaker during a walking tour because she wanted to ‘tell [my husband] how to perform’. She has also learned about the local writer Brian McMahon and ‘his attitude and his approach to teaching’ because her ‘daughter is a teacher and I’m going to tell her to change her ways’ (Fiona).

During the open mic sessions, ‘people get to share [their own poems or short stories]’ (Evan). For instance, Jimmy read a poem because in the last few years he has realised that ‘the more you read, the more you become comfortable at it’, so the festival gave him an opportunity to practice and ‘become more comfortable in reading in public (…) even if most people don’t really concentrate, they drink and have a chat and you read’ (Jimmy). Similarly, Maggie read a poem because she writes for this purpose, ‘in order to express myself’. She explained that receiving feedback was not important, the main goal ‘was just about participating’.
In Pordenone, Alice said that she attended an event about philosophy only because there were free seats, but she ‘honestly didn’t understand anything’. Similarly, Mario said that he went only to ‘light’ events:

‘It might be simplistic but I see it [the festival] a bit as a form of entertainment, I mean you come here to see something different, in the end it’s fun (...) perhaps because I filter them [the events], in the sense that I choose the light ones’ (Mario)

‘Sarà riduttivo ma io lo vedo un po’ come divertissement, cioè vieni qua per vedere altro, alla fine è divertente (...) forse perché io li filtro [gli eventi], nel senso che scelgo quelli leggeri’ (Mario)

Furthermore, observational data showed that the presence and location of the bookstalls shaped how participants’ accumulated objectified cultural capital. As explained in Chapter Six, while in Pordenone, there were four permanent bookstalls that might have encouraged people to buy books, in Listowel there were no permanent bookstalls. The chairperson explained that WW is not ‘a big selling festival, we don’t have a big festival tent where we sell books’. In 2017, there were book stalls only after the events. However, there was also the possibility to buy paintings at the art exhibition in the local theatre. This allowed participants to acquire non-field-specific cultural capital.

Finally, the cost of the tickets also influenced how respondents participated and, in turn, how and what kind of cultural capital they acquired. As a matter of fact, as illustrated in Chapter Six, while in Listowel most of the events cost 15 euro and participants did not have to queue, in Pordenone most of the events were free of charge and participants had to spend hours queueing. Observations and interviews showed that queueing was sometimes an occasion to listen, chat, and exchange opinions. For example, Francesca said that the festival enriches you ‘on a cultural level because you come into contact with people [the authors] who are usually difficult to meet, and on a personal
level, because it’s still nice to listen to others chatting while queueing, because in the end, the problems are always the same’. While there are multiple examples of how economic capital increased cultural capital, via the expenses for the tickets or the prices of the books bought, very obviously there is also an example of how cultural capital increased economic capital. For instance, Missy won a 1,000-euro prize while winning a writing award.

9.5 Summary

Findings revealed that the acquisition of cultural capital was heavily influenced by social, spatial, and temporal factors, as well as by festival features. Even though most respondents participated in the festivals on their own, the process of cultural capital development through festival participation was very social. Participants claimed that being part of a community influenced their development of knowledge, skills, and tastes formation. Even though many, especially in Italy, preferred a solitary experience, the social atmosphere played an important role in the process of cultural capital development. Participants acquired cultural capital by listening and watching well-known writers whose reputation created knowledge distinction. Also, participants developed cultural capital by engaging with ordinary people, such as other participants or members of the local community.

Also, the spatial context impacted how participants experienced the festivals and developed cultural capital, in terms of the characteristics of the towns and the festival venues. Festival participation enabled participants to engage with the town. They could discover and learn about local cultural heritage thought walking tours, visiting local exhibitions, or attending events at local museums.
Moreover, the temporal context influenced cultural capital development. Participants acquired cultural capital during and after the festivals. Both first-time and repeat participants developed cultural capital. Thus, cultural capital development occurred even after participating in the festivals once. Furthermore, the festival was attended during participants’ free time and it was often considered a holiday. Also, there are examples of both long and short-term cultural capital development.

Finally, festival features, such as the type of event, the bookstalls, and the type of ticket, shaped how cultural capital was acquired. For instance, attending an open mic session, as a self-expression moment, led to a different cultural capital development than participating at a workshop or a walking tour.
DISCUSSION

‘Tell me and I forget. Teach me and I remember. Involve me and I learn’

(Xun Kuang, book 8, the Xunzi, 818 A.D.)
CHAPTER 10

LITERARY FESTIVALS AS ARENAS FOR
CULTURAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT

10 Introduction
This chapter concentrates on interpreting the findings in light of relevant literature. Literary festivals are an increasingly significant component of cultural consumption nowadays. They play a variety of important social, cultural, economic, and political functions, yet scholars ask for more research on the cultural benefits gained through festival participation and how festivals generate cultural capital. This study’s findings provide important contributions to this debate. This chapter is dedicated to answering the main research question: How does literary festival participation shape individual cultural capital? Drawing from the nine themes of the findings explained in Chapter Seven, Eight, and Nine, this chapter discusses three core conceptual issues and, therefore, is divided into three sections (Figure 10.1). Firstly, it discusses if literary festivals can be arenas for cultural capital development. Here, the chapter discusses which state and what types of cultural capital participants can acquire, which were explained in Chapter Seven. Secondly, it explores the internal factors that may shape cultural capital development, explained in Chapter Eight: respondents’ demographics, their previous levels of capital, the behavioural dimension of the experience, consciousness, the levels of involvement, and the role of enjoyment and asceticism. As a matter of fact, it is argued that individual cultural capital acquisition is heavily influenced by participants’ personal features and by what they bring to their festival experiences. The discussion also provides insights into
the process of cultural capital embodiment. Here cultural capital is integrated with Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective, explained in Chapter Four. Drawing on the serious leisure perspective, respondents are clustered into Literary Festival Careers, and a Literary Festival Involvement Scale is generated. This scale is useful to understand the roles played by festival involvement and asceticism in developing cultural capital. Thirdly, the chapter discusses the role of external elements in the process of cultural capital acquisition, explained in Chapter Nine. There is an investigation of both structural (in terms of national cultural context, festival features, time, and space) and interpersonal elements (the social context). For instance, it discusses if participants had enough time during a festival to acquire cultural capital, where, and with whom they developed it. Finally, the chapter concludes by presenting a conceptual model of the development of cultural capital associated with festival participation to guide further research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>States and types of cultural capital developed</th>
<th>Insights into the internal elements</th>
<th>Insights into the external elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural capital was acquired</td>
<td>• Demographic features</td>
<td>• Social context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Beyond literary capital</td>
<td>• The behavioural dimension</td>
<td>• Literary knowledge distinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not only informational capital</td>
<td>• Body consciousness</td>
<td>• Cultural context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural capital reinforcement</td>
<td>• Literary Festival Careers</td>
<td>• Temporal dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural capital stimulation</td>
<td>• Literary Festival Involvement scale</td>
<td>• Acquisition during and after the festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Economic capital</td>
<td>• Perseverance not needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pre-existing cultural capital</td>
<td>• Short and long-term outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>High cultural capital is not a prerequisite for access</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <em>High cultural capital is not a prerequisite for fulfilment</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prior taste or interest</td>
<td>• Spatial dimension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enjoyment and asceticism</td>
<td>• Festival features</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 10.1: The three core conceptual issues and relationships among the themes**

(Source: Author)
10.1 States and types of cultural capital that participants developed

Most studies on cultural capital focus on how cultural capital shapes everyday lives and cultural participation and, therefore, further enquiry on the nature of the process of cultural capital acquisition is needed (Jeannotte 2004 [2003]). For instance, ‘missing in this debate [on cultural capital] has been a rigorous examination of how children actually acquire cultural capital when it is not provided by their families’ (Kisida, Greene & Bowen, 2014, p. 281). Similarly, cultural capital acquisition in adulthood is under-researched. For example, some scholars (Friedman, 2014; Holt, 1988; Lahire, 2007) have explored acculturation at work. Since ‘cultural capital is not a static asset but a resource that be can honed through the lifecourse’ (Friedman, 2014, p. 31), this cumulative process creates a ‘circuit of cultural capital’ (Savage, Warde & Devine, 2005, p. 41) and opens up possibilities to study cultural capital development in other contexts. Thus, answering the call for more studies on the process of cultural capital acquisition (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014; Prior, 2005) and personal development through event participation (Getz & Page, 2016), this research asks if WW and PL are arenas for participants to acquire cultural capital.

Did respondents acquire cultural capital? Yes. In both festivals, interviewees acquired all the three states (institutionalised, objectified, and embodied) and the two types (field-specific and non-field-specific) of cultural capital. Respondents mainly developed the embodied state, acquiring literary knowledge. For instance, Beatrice learned something new about an author, Cristicchi. ‘Now I know what the subject of his last book was’, she said. Likewise, Molly observed that she discovered the ‘local literature’ and the festival ‘increased our knowledge of the Kerry storytellers’. Attending the festival led to knowledge creation as ‘cultural baggage because you see something you don’t know about’ (Leonardo). Apart from cognitive fulfilment, the festivals were
also opportunities for ‘ethical reflection’ (Driscoll, 2014, p. 192), where participants improved their values, such as self-image (McClinchey, 2013).

Moreover, similar to participants at the Sidmouth folk festival who developed their skills (Morgan, 2008), respondents claimed to have developed their writing skills (Driscoll, 2014). There were other examples of abilities developed by the respondents, such as reading in public, facilitating an event, and become friendlier. The latter reinforces the importance of the social rewards of festival activities (Duffy & Waitt, 2011; Quinn, 2013; Wilks & Quinn, 2016). Here findings showed how participation can encourage people to be more open with others (McClinchey, 2013). Thus, this thesis yields insights into how skills can be acquired, thereby addressing criticisms of Bourdieu for failures to adequately explain how cultural capital is acquired ‘even though the accumulation of capital is a central aspect of his framework’ (Noble & Watkins, 2003, p. 521).

There were also examples of interviewees who modified their bodily hexis because of festival participation. This is an important finding that points to the long-term and in-depth benefits of literary festivals for participants in terms of attitude change and one observation of Organ, Koenig-Lewis, Palmer, and Probert (2015) in respect of food festivals. Furthermore, similarly to the Whitby Goth festival that contributed to the ‘construction and expression of self’ (Goulding & Saren, 2009, p. 27), WW and PL were arenas for self-expression.

Moreover, just as serious participants at Australian folk festivals increased their cultural participation in folk clubs and festivals (Begg, 2011), this study shows how literary festivals can increase participants’ cultural participation, by, for example, attending more literary festivals or other cultural activities. WW and PL were also
occasions to accumulate objectified cultural capital, by purchasing physical cultural goods (Begg, 2011), especially books.

Furthermore, there are examples of institutionalised cultural capital development. As explained in Chapter Two, in Bourdieu’s (1993b) view, an artist is an artist when (s)he is recognised as such by others after a process of field-specific competition and selection. Accordingly, being recognised as a writer is a matter of power and position-taking in the literary field (Sapiro, 2016b; Weber, 2018). Findings supported this view with some respondents perceiving the act of winning a writing contest as an accumulation of institutionalised cultural capital and a form of prestige, which is, therefore, connected to the concept of symbolic capital. However, this study emphasises that winning an award during a literary festival does not always increase institutionalised capital. Winning the writing awards in WW and PL was a form of prestige and recognition in the literary field only for some respondents. It depended on how it was perceived by the winners, how they valued the competition, and their engagement with literary culture.

Finally, there are some examples of conversions amongst the four forms of capital: cultural, social, economic, and symbolic (as explained in: 7.2, 7.4.4, 9.1, and 9.4). This reinforces the view that Bourdieu’s concepts are interconnected (Grenfell, 2008).

### 10.1.1 Beyond literary capital acquisition

As previously explained, interviewees acquired field-specific cultural capital (such as information about books, authors or genres, writing skills, willingness to read different genres, and participation to literary attractions), what Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret and Seiler (2015) called literary capital. However, while some scholars (Driscoll, 2014; Kruger, 2019; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015; Weber, 2018) focused only on literary capital acquisition, this study goes a step further. It found that respondents also developed
their general cultural capital, such as participation and knowledge about local heritage, social skills, broad cultural knowledge, and cultural tastes not related to literature (Table 10.1). For example, Nicola learned that ‘the right to be forgotten, which they [the authors] mentioned today in the discussion, I did not know existed’. This non-field-specific cultural capital is similar to what Bourdieu called non-curricular general culture (1984 [1979], p. 23), or what Karlsen (2009) called acquisition of knowledge via music (linked to a broader concept of general education). Thus, WW and PL were vehicles for ‘common knowledge generation’ (Chwe, 1998, p. 47), and opportunities for education about culture (McClinchey, 2013; Merfeld-Langston, 2010). A literary festival ‘enriches your way of seeing, of reasoning, of thinking, of reflecting. It expands the vision of life’, said Elia. Thus, this thesis agrees with Stewart (2010, p. 93) in arguing that ‘it is no longer adequate to examine and attribute value to writers’ festivals exclusively in literary terms’. WW and PL were found to be examples of ‘alternative education providers’ (Driscoll, 2014, p. 172). This also means that the variety of their programmes and the nature of festival participation allowed respondents to acquire different types of cultural resources, considered both high and low cultural capital. Thus, the festivals are not only ‘instances of high art production’ (Stewart, 2009, p. 17).
Table 10.1: Beyond literary capital acquisition (Source: Author)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State / Type</th>
<th>Examples of Field-Specific Cultural Capital Developed</th>
<th>Examples of Non-Field-Specific Cultural Capital Developed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalised cultural capital</td>
<td>• Winning a writing award</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectified cultural capital</td>
<td>• Books purchased</td>
<td>• Paintings purchased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Embodied cultural capital (Cultural knowledge) | • New writers  
• New books  
• New genres  
• Funds for writers  
• Writing styles | • Different point of views  
• General cultural topics, i.e. religion and philosophy  
• Human nature  
• The town (local heritage and attractions) and local inhabitants |
| Embodied cultural capital (Skills and abilities) | • Writing skills (write more, write better, start writing) | • To facilitate an event or give a workshop  
• To be alone  
• To be more social  
• To manage crowds  
• To give directions |
| Embodied cultural capital (Tastes and interests) | • Read more  
• Read differently  
• New ideas for writing projects | • To work in the cultural sector |
| Embodied cultural capital (Cultural participation) | • More WW/PL participation  
• More literary festival participation | • More cultural courses  
• Visit local attractions |
| Embodied cultural capital (Values and personal enrichment) | • Literary cognitive fulfilment | • Soul enriched  
• Self-image improved  
• Reflections of pre-existing values, i.e. social media |
| Embodied cultural capital (Bodily hexis) | • Self-expression developed | • Attitude changed, i.e. how to wear perfumes and how to better read labels |

10.1.2 Not only informational capital acquisition

Remarkably, almost all respondents claimed to have acquired knowledge (see Chapter 7, 7.1). Most of the respondents claimed that festival participation contributed to their education. On first analysis, it might be argued that the term informational capital acquisition seems to define the process better than the term cultural capital acquisition. Indeed, Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992), and later Prieur and Savage (2013), suggested
that cultural capital should be called informational capital. Nevertheless, even though respondents mostly acquired cultural knowledge, they also developed skills and abilities (Driscoll, 2014), tastes and interests (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014). For instance, Mario observed that thanks to the festival, he developed his ‘personal relationship’ skills, because ‘inevitably when you are among people, maybe because there are people you know or you want to chat a bit, you always end up doing networking, which you wouldn’t do by staying at home’. Moreover, respondents developed their cultural participation and bodily hexis (Organ, Koenig-Lewis, Palmer, & Probert, 2015). For example, Giorgio explained that he participated in two other literary festivals in the last few years because ‘probably going (…) to Pordenonelegge introduced me to this type of event’, so he went to the ones in Padua and in Udine. WW and PL were also moments to accumulate institutionalised and objectified cultural capital. Thus, this study agrees with Kruger (2019, p. 189) who argued that literary festivals ‘play a significant role in encouraging and increasing purchasing behaviours [of literary works], which is vital to the viability and continuation of the arts industry’. Thus, while the term informational capital gives partial insights, it does not capture the full cultural capital acquisition process. In other words, even though a link between the process of cultural capital acquisition and the act of learning must be acknowledged, the entire process of cultural capital generation associated with festival participation is much more complex.

**10.1.3 Reinforcement of the embodied state**

Notably, some participants did not acquire new cultural capital, but they felt that the embodied state that they already possessed was reinforced. The festival ‘opens you up to new ideas, but it also reinforces your existing ones’ (April). In other words, for some, festival participation did not lead to cultural capital accumulation but to a reinforcement
of their previous knowledge, skills, tastes and values. This is in line with Stebbins’ (1994) view that knowledge, skills and values are necessary preconditions for liberal arts hobbies and are used in the activity to discover new ideas or ‘to maintain them’ (p. 178).

10.1.4 Stimulus to acquire cultural capital after the festivals

While this study agrees with Yaish and Katz-Gerro (2010) that tastes can shape cultural participation, it goes a step further, suggesting that festival participation can, in turn, generate new cultural stimuli and interests. Some respondents claimed that festival participation sparked new interests in them, almost entirely related to literature. For example, Cecilia said that the festival gave her ‘the desire to deepen certain topics’. This reflects Ganzeboom’s (1982) cycle of Bourdieu, Darbel, and Schnapper’s (1991 [1966]) view that interests in art, including literature, are learned instead of inherited. These new interests, sparked by festival participation, led to further objectified or embodied cultural capital acquisition after the festivals. Thus, WW and PL were moments of stimulation to acquire further cultural capital after the festivals, just as the Crystal Bridges Museum of American Art motivated some students to acquire cultural capital after their visits (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014). Therefore, this study agrees with Kisida, Greene, and Bowen (2014, p. 293) in arguing that ‘participation in cultural activities may spark a genuine interest in learning and thinking more deeply about the world’. Moreover, it supports Kruger’s (2019) view that literary festivals stimulate behavioural intentions towards literary arts. Indeed, literary festivals ‘have the potential to increase and stimulate supplementary behavioural intentions in the form of greater awareness of the arts, increased purchasing behaviour of literary works, increased travel to support the literary arts and greater personal involvement’ (Kruger, 2019, p. 189). It also supports Bourdieu’s view of cultural capital development as a cyclical process. In fact, cultural capital
acquisition associated with festival participation is an on-going process for participants (Wilks, 2009).

All the above suggests that literary festival participation can shape individual cultural capital. Thus, this thesis agrees with those scholars who argue that a literary festival is ‘a distinctive experience that confers cultural capital on attendees’ (Johanson & Freeman, 2012, p. 312). The findings clearly showed cultural capital being reinforced, stimulated, and acquired. In contrast, no negative experiences or decreases in cultural capital were reported. Moreover, respondents acquired all the three states (embodied, objectified, and institutionalised) and the two types (field-specific and non-field-specific) of cultural capital (Figure 10.2).

![Diagram: Reinforcement, stimulation, and acquisition of cultural capital](Source: Author)
10.2 Internal elements

As mentioned in Chapter Two, it is fundamental to investigate how cultural capital is acquired (Prieur & Savage, 2013). For Bourdieu (2002 [1986]), cultural capital can be acquired according to ‘the period, the society, and the social class’ (p. 86). Thus, he acknowledged that time (period), social context (society), and personal features (such as social class) are relevant factors that may shape agents’ embodied state. Moreover, according to Bourdieu (1984 [1979]), structural elements, such as social fields and personal elements, such as capital and habitus, are inseparable and interconnected. The data revealed that participation involved several overlapping dimensions, being an ‘active involvement-physical, emotional, intellectual and social’ (Ommundsen, 2009, p. 21). The findings also showed that in this scenario cultural capital development was a very complex process. The data revealed some elements that shaped the opportunities and ways in which respondents embodied cultural capital and these are clustered into internal and external elements. Internal elements were: demographic features (e.g. age, gender, and origin), the behavioural dimension (e.g. how participants physically engaged with the environment), the festival career and level of involvement in the festival, the pre-existing stock of economic and cultural capital (including taste), and the enjoyment factor (the emotional involvement). External elements included: the cultural and social contexts, festival features, and the spatial and temporal dimensions. The following sections discuss first the internal elements and then the external elements, answering the call for more studies on literary festival audience members’ experience (Weber, 2018).
10.2.1 Demographic features

This thesis supports scholars in festival studies arguing that personal features like demographics influence festival participation and its cultural outcomes on participants (Axelsen & Swan, 2010). For example, the starting point in determining visitors’ behavioural intentions [like increased art purchases and appreciation, acquired after literary festival participation] is understanding the visitors’ attributes, i.e. their socio-demographic (…) characteristics’ (Kruger, 2019, p. 191). The findings helped, therefore, to fill the gap in knowledge about the profile of literary festival audiences (Mintel, 2011).

In line with the literature, women predominated (Driscoll, 2014). Thus, this thesis supports the theory of the feminisation of literary culture (Ommundsen, 2009) and the Italian reading Index (ISTAT, 2011), which claims that the most avid readers are women. Moreover, this study suggests that gender shaped the ways people participated in the festivals, in terms of, for instance, the events they attended.

Moreover, most of the respondents were older adults. This is underpinned by the literature which says that literary festival audiences are middle-aged (Weber, 2018). Thus, age was another element that shaped the ways people participated in the festivals and acquired cultural capital.

Furthermore, the data differed from the literature regarding the origin of the participants. Scholars say that participants are usually locals or regionals (Bonciarelli, 2007; Driscoll, 2014; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015; Weber, 2018). In PL, 40% of the interviewees were locals, but, in WW, 64% were domestic tourists. Here, the findings also showed that origin, like gender and age, shaped cultural capital development.

As regards the occupational groups of festival participants, there is no general agreement in the literature. Some scholars (Driscoll, 2014; Ommundsen, 2009; Weber,
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2018) argue that they are mainly middle-brow participants, while others (Giorgi, 2011b) claim that they also include non-middlebrow tastemakers. The data from the two case studies here differed. While in Listowel most participants had highly ranked occupations, in Pordenone occupational groups varied. A final aspect is that all the respondents, except one in Italy, were Caucasian. This pattern echoes the literature of ‘very white’ literary festivals (Weber, 2018, p. 195), suggesting that barriers to participation in Western literary festivals exist.

10.2.2 The behavioural dimension: insights into cultural capital embodiment

The observations shed light on what really occurred during the festivals and the behavioural dimensions of the participants. Delving into cultural capital embodiment in WW and PL, this study answers the call for more studies about embodied information in serious leisure (Cox, Griffin, & Hartel, 2017), serious participants’ behaviour during events (Mackellar, 2009), and embodiment into consumption studies (Boden & Williams, 2002).

Observational data showed that during WW and PL, participants engaged in different actions and the role of the body was crucial. They listened, talked, ate, drank, walked, and watched. They knew how to behave, and they modified their behaviour in accordance with the situation. Some participants took notes, highlighting the quasi-scholastic atmosphere of the festivals, similar to conferences (Johanson & Freeman, 2012). These actions shaped their experiences and, in turn, the opportunities and ways in which they developed their cultural capital. From one perspective, attending a literary festival may look like attending a performance, such as a conference or a theatre show (Johanson & Freeman, 2012). During formal festival events, audience members sit down, in front of a stage, looking at and listening to speakers. Just like during conferences,
festival participants can ask questions, use a microphone, shake hands with the speakers, read the programme, smell the books, or take notes. Just like during theatre shows, they can clap, touch the tickets or the money, close their eyes, drink, eat, and laugh. As a matter of fact, ‘the creation of the [festival] space moves beyond designing a space that functions practically, into creating an atmosphere that people can tangibly experience’ (Lea, 2006, p. 62). The data showed that respondents were tangibly engaging with the physical space and the two main senses employed were sight and hearing. However, attending a literary festival is a more complex experience that also includes the moments between the formal events, which are not necessarily in the festival venues. These moments included, for instance, walking around the town during the breaks, reading at home in the evenings, or even travelling to the venue.

Plate 10.1: PL participants walking around the town (Source: PL)

During these moments, people engaged with each other. The findings revealed literary festivals to be intense interplays of actors. People chat, share ideas and opinions, move across venues and spaces, and engage with the environment. This study agrees with
Jordan (2016, p. 50) in arguing that with ‘the decoration of the site, and programming throughout the day and night’ festivals can create a sense of community and ‘immersive experiences’. Very often participants were immersed and involved in the performance (Fabiani, 2011; Sherry Jr, Kozinets, & Borghini, 2013), in ways that included asking questions during the events, singing with the speakers, or even being the main performers at the open mics. Participants were not mere spectators but actively used their participation to shape their experiences. So, WW and PL are examples of arenas of performative practices (Lucas & Wright, 2013) where respondents co-create their experience. This supports Robertson and Yeoman’s (2014, p. 324) view that in literary festivals ‘the writer is increasingly inviting reader participation and the opportunity to share in the narrative’. This ‘placing audiences within the action changes their relationship from spectator to actor’ (Jordan, 2016, p. 51).

Participant observations revealed that WW and PL were multi-sensory experiences (Jordan, 2016), and bodily experiences allowed cultural resources to be embodied (Duffy & Waitt, 2011; Lea, 2006). Here, using serious leisure ideas introduced an emphasis on the senses and encouraged an analysis of how engagement was sensory and cultural capital was embodied through senses. People walked around the venues in the town, saw the local heritage, listened to the speakers and to other participants, talked with each other, ate and drank the local food, touched books, and wrote notes. All this means that Stebbins’ (2013) serious leisure theory was useful to further understandings of the strong link between the sentient body and the environment. During the festivals, spaces were perceived as possessing visual, auditory, tactile, and olfactory properties. Sensory experiences were important because every experience is based on our bodies (Matteucci, 2016). The sentient body was employed in the festival experience and played a vital role in how respondents acquired cultural capital.
10.2.3 Bodily consciousness

The data revealed that cultural capital acquisition was mainly unplanned but occurred both consciously and unconsciously. They also showed that sometimes respondents became conscious of their cultural capital acquisition only during the interviews upon reflection, and the process occurred with a degree of bodily consciousness. Observational data revealed that cultural capital embodiment did not always occur consciously. However, since it passed through respondents’ bodies, it involved what O’Connor (2007, p. 131) called ‘bodily intentionality’. As a matter of fact, ‘we are in constant engagement with the world, even before we are cognitively aware of it’ (Lea, 2006, p. 61). As explained in Chapter Two, cultural capital embodiment is an ‘incorporation’ of culture ‘converted into an integral part of the person, into a habitus’ (2002 [1986], p. 85). Thus, this assimilation of culture passes through the body and its senses. The embodied state is interconnected to the concept of habitus, which is internalised by the agent. Bourdieu’s concept of hexis defines how cultural values and beliefs are internalised onto agents’ bodies. As Cox, Griffin and Hartel (2017, p. 18) argued while studying embodiment in serious leisure, ‘when we sit reading a book or hunched over a desktop it seems that information is linked to static, disembodied symbolic activities. In reality there is always an embodied aspect of it’. The findings, therefore, suggest that serious leisure was useful to understand the degree of bodily consciousness in cultural capital embodiment in festivals, where activities require the use of the body, because it provides insight into the ways cultural capital is consciously embodied through the senses.

10.2.4 Clustering participants into literary festival careers

‘Academic researchers are now engaging thoughtfully with literary festivals at a conceptual, theoretical level, but there is still scant research that builds on empirical
audience data to analyse literary festivals’ significance for the people who attend: asking why they are there and what their impressions are, and listening to their answers’ (Weber, 2018, p. 14). This study provides useful insights into literary festival participants’ motivations and levels of involvement. As such, another element that shaped cultural capital was the very important matter of participants’ levels of involvement in the festival. Bourdieu (2002 [1986], p. 85) argued that cultural capital development requires ‘effort’, ‘sacrifice’, and ‘personal cost’. However, he did not fully explain these concepts and their role in the process of cultural capital acquisition. Chapter Four asked whether the serious leisure perspective might be useful to further understandings of the complex process of cultural capital development in festivals. The findings revealed that the serious leisure perspective and the concept of career can be helpful to enhance the understanding of the nature of literary festival audiences, their motivations, involvement, and levels of asceticism to acquire cultural capital.

Like Weber (2018), who refuted the concept of a ‘typical’ literary festival audience member, this study contends that in WW and PL, there was a mix of participants with different degrees of involvement in the festival. It would appear that involvement in the festival and personal motivations segmented the audience better than socio-cultural identity markers, like age, gender, or level of education attained. Similar to Weber (2018, p. 68), this thesis suggests that literary festival participants are ‘both self-interested agents, accruing and mobilising capital, and more intrinsically motivated readers, seeking enjoyment and catharsis’ (Weber, 2018, p. 83).

However, while Weber (2018) classified audience members into three functions: spectators, festival-goers and festival participants, according to their level of active or passive engagement with the festival, this study suggests that a more comprehensive approach is required to capture the varieties of active and passive engagement. It
advocates thinking about a continuum of involvement, drawing on the serious leisure perspective. In other words, it argues that describing the audience according to their levels of involvement prompts a more detailed audience segmentation. Using the findings, it is possible to group the interviewees into 11 clusters. While Weber (2018) talks about functions of the audience member (as explained in 3.1.1), this study refers to literary festival careers. Often the 11 careers overlap since participants could participate with different motivations or in different group compositions over the course of the festivals. Cohorts seek inspiration from types of leisurists identified by Stebbins (2001; 1982; 1994), and they are employed here to describe the study sample in terms of participation, commitment, and literary festival careers. So, the concept of literary festival career is similar to Stebbins’ leisure career, but not identical. While Stebbins’ (2007) idea of career refers to different levels of knowledge, skills, and attributes, literary festival careers are characterised by different levels of involvement in the festival, motivations to attend (which are connected to the group composition and the origin), and asceticism/willingness to acquire cultural capital. They refer to the roles that the respondents had at the festivals. Nevertheless, without seeking inspiration from the serious leisure perspective it would not be possible to produce these literary festival careers.

i. **Incidental.** This was the smallest cluster. Incidental participants attended the festival by chance, as they were in town for other reasons. Therefore, they did not attend any competitions or workshops. They were not literary festival-goers, and their knowledge of literature varied. So, they were not necessarily readers. They attended the festival with at least another person. Karl (WW) and Pamela (PL) were examples of Incidental participants, as they ‘were in town for another reason’ (Karl, WW).
ii. **Supporter.** Supporter participants had different previous literary knowledge and various degrees of interest in reading and writing. They were mainly locals or domestic tourists, not literary festival-goers and without a great passion for the festival. Thus, they did not attend any workshops or competitions. Their participation was both one-off and recurrent, but they lacked effort and commitment - they did not seek a literary festival career. They merely attended for duty, to support another person (Jeannotte, 2000), such as in the case of Bryan (WW) and Beatrice (PL). Thus, they did not attend the festival alone, but with another person. They supported another participant, usually a family member or a friend, or a speaker involved in the festival programme or production. So, they attended with different degrees of ‘sense of interpersonal obligation’ (Stebbins, 1992, p. 59).

iii. **Parent.** Parents participated with their family or only with their children (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014). Parents were mainly women aged in their 30s or 40s. They were mostly local or regional. They possessed low or high literary knowledge, but they were not necessarily passionate readers. They did not attend the festival for themselves but only for their children (as casual leisurists, without serious pursuits). They attended the festival only for a few days, not taking part in any competition or workshop. Their function was a support function for their children, as they recognised the value of the festival in increasing reading and writing taste in children (Jeannotte, 2000). Examples of Parents were Marcie (WW) and Giovanna (PL).

iv. **Local.** This was the biggest cluster and the most heterogeneous. These participants lived locally. They were not necessarily passionate readers but attended the festival occasionally or every year because they were passionate about it. They attended the festival alone, as a couple or in a group. Most of them were retired, female, and in their 60s. They attended the festival mainly for hedonistic or social reasons (as casual
leisurists or hobbyists-consumers), but also for aesthetic and intellectual motivations (as hobbyists-buffs). Locals, such as Cassie (WW) and Alice (PL), were typically curious people and proud of the festival as a local attraction. The festival was mainly an opportunity to relax and meet people, but they were also interested in the speakers or the topics of the events. Most of them did not attend any competitions or workshops, but some of them took notes and bought books.

v. **Purposeful Tourist.** Purposeful Tourists were middle-aged, well-educated participants who were not necessarily great literary festival-goers but were willing to travel some distance to attend the festival. So, they were curious or interested in the festival and they spent several days there. They attended the festival alone or with someone else. They were domestic or international tourists who possessed lots of books but did not necessarily write. They travelled merely for the pleasure of sensory stimulation and social reasons (as hobbyists-consumers). A few of them also attended as hobbyist-buffs, considering themselves more or less knowledgeable experts and defining the festival as satisfying or gratifying. Examples of Purposeful Tourists were George (WW), from London, and Silvia (PL) from Siena.

vi. **Passionate Reader.** This was the second biggest cluster. Passionate Readers were mainly middle-aged women. They were passionate about literature and reading, they possessed a lot of books, but they did not write. They were mostly recurrent participants who spent the full five days at the festival, without taking part in any workshop or competition. They attended as hobbyist-consumers for entertainment reasons, or as hobbyist-buffs when they considered themselves as experts on books. They attended the festival with a group of friends. They claimed that the festival made them feel good and they described it as a satisfying experience. Norah (WW) and Camilla (PL) were examples of Passionate Readers.
vii. **Aspiring Writer.** Aspiring Writers were participants who were passionate about literature and writing. They were dabblers or novices who someday would like to become amateurs or even professionals (published authors). They were mainly tourists, aged between 41-50 years-old, with medium-high educational qualifications. They were interested in the festival and had several motivations to attend, although the main one was learning from well-established authors. Their primary interest lay in the writing, so they attended the festival also to improve their writing skills. They took notes during the events and attended workshops. They mainly defined the festival experience as enjoyable. Most of them were solo participants, such as Maggie (WW) and Ashlyn (WW).

viii. **Professional.** Professionals were practitioners (published writers) who were not part of the festival crew, but who attended the festival simply as participants. They were authors, so writing was their profession and they possessed lots of books. They were passionate about literature. They attended the festival to learn from their peers, to create contacts, to meet some well-published authors or to simply enjoy the atmosphere. In any case, intellectual motivations usually prevailed. They were solo participants, domestic tourists, and literary festival-goers. Most of them were recurrent participants, who spent several days at the festival, without taking part in a competition, but some of them attended workshops and took notes. Professionals were Simon (WW) and Serena (PL).

ix. **Competitor.** Competitors were amateurs or new authors who participated in writing competitions during the festival. They participated in the competitions for economic reasons, prestige, or merely fun and curiosity. Some valued the writing awards a lot and took part in the competitions to be recognised as artists in the literary field (Sapiro, 2016b; Weber, 2018). They were male or female of any age. Most of them were not
local residents, nor international tourists, but regional residents or domestic tourists. They were passionate about literature and writing. They attended the festival only because of the writing competition, so they were solo participants. Missy (WW) and Michele (PL) were Competitors.

x. Volunteer. Volunteers were project-based and serious leisurists involved in the festival production, who also attended events as regular audience members. They were mainly older people in WW and young people in PL. They possessed different levels of literary knowledge and have built a strong connection with the festival during the years. This relationship with the festival had an impact on their private lives and sometimes also on their attitudes, tastes or career interests. Examples of Volunteers were Sara (PL) and Sonia (PL).

xi. Devotee. Devotees were practitioners (published writers) who were partially involved in the festival organisation (as moderators or speakers). They also attended other events as regular audience members because they were passionate about literature and writing. They were generally well-educated recurrent tourists, who spent several days at the festival without taking part in any competition. They attended the festival mainly because of economic reasons - the festival payed them for their performances. They were usually interested in listening to their peers because of their profession. They were strong literary festival-goers but they did not necessarily prefer the statement ‘the festival makes me think’ instead of ‘it makes me feel good’. So, attending the festival was not only a job for these participants. Examples of Devotees were Rita (WW) and Evan (WW).

These 11 careers revealed that there are different ways of participating in literary festivals, where people perform different roles. Participants can have different levels of
involvement and can associate different meanings to the festivals. This means that they have different needs, reasons, and levels of enthusiasm to acquire cultural capital. These levels of involvement, alongside motivations and group compositions, can also change during the course of the festival or during the life cycle of the participant. For instance, people can participate as ‘Parents’ one day and ‘Passionate Readers’ the following day, or as ‘Supporters’ one year and ‘Aspiring writers’ the following year. So, literary festival careers often overlap and they show that the reality of literary festival participation is dynamic, very complex and difficult to grasp.

10.2.5 The literary festival involvement scale

Here, it is important to note that this thesis provides a contribution to academic knowledge by using leisure studies to advance event studies. As explained in Chapter Four, for the first time, Stebbins’ serious leisure, and especially its indicators, have been used to understand and operationalise cultural capital in the literary festival context. Thus, this thesis shows that there are clear links between Stebbins’ serious leisure and cultural embodiment since they seem to refer to similar concepts. So, this study conceptualises serious leisure and cultural embodiment as similar concepts. At the same time, just like other studies (Begg, 2011; Brown, 2007; Frew, 2006; Hannam & Halewood, 2006; Kim, 2005; Mackellar, 2009) understood festivals as serious leisure, this thesis also conceptualise literary festivals as a form of leisure with different degrees of seriousness. Some scholars have investigated how serious leisure shapes cultural capital. For instance, Dunlap (2009, p. 417) examined communal meals ‘as leisure that showcase the accumulation of cultural capital related to food’. Similarly, this study shows how festival participation shaped knowledge, skills, taste, cultural good purchasing, and accumulation
of educational qualifications. So, WW and PL were good examples of how serious leisure can produce cultural capital (Beedie & Hudson, 2003; Begg, 2011; Dunlap, 2009).

However, respondents were found to have differing levels of casual and serious pursuits. Consequently, people attended the festivals for both, often overlapping, asceticism and hedonism purposes. Thus, they experienced the festivals differently, with various degrees of seriousness and fun. In order to capture this diversity, this study proposes the Literary Festival Involvement Scale (Figure 10.4), which delineates the type of festival careers and levels of involvement in the festival. It draws on Stebbins’ types of leisurists and the SLPI scale explained in Chapter Four. Seeking inspiration from the serious leisure perspective was useful for better understanding the role of participant involvement in the festivals. Like in the SLPI scale, literary festival careers range from the respondents who merely had a curiosity for the festival, and did not seek self-realisation, to the respondents who had serious pursuits. However, while in the SLPI scale levels of involvement can peak at any point and careers are characterised by different levels of knowledge and skills, this study findings revealed that literary festival participation is an extremely complex and dynamic leisure activity and different levels of involvement prompt a better segmentation of the audiences. The literary festival careers are useful to further understand the role of involvement with the festival and asceticism to acquire cultural capital. As a matter of fact, ‘event experiences are interactions between a visitor and the event environment (both social, physical, and service), requiring some degree of active involvement’ (Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016, p. 278). Literary festival involvement increases from Incidentals to Supporters, then Parents, Locals, Purposeful Tourists, Passionate Readers, Aspiring Writers, Professionals, Competitors, Volunteers, and finally to Devotees. All career types are audience members, but Volunteers and Devotees are also involved in the festival production, while Competitors
are involved in the festival programme. Professionals and Aspiring Writers are practitioners, while the other careers are simply audience members with lower levels of involvement in the festivals. Nevertheless, as explained, these 11 careers may overlap and boundaries are very flexible and blurred.

Clustering participants into literary festival careers was useful to understand the role of involvement in the process of cultural capital development. As a matter of fact, there is reason to believe that careers and levels of involvement can shape individual cultural capital acquisition at literary festivals. Respondents acquired cultural capital with or without serious pursuits. However, even though it is not possible to create strict divisions, there is reason to believe that participants with the same literary festival career shared similarities in terms of festival participation and cultural capital development. This supports Organ, Koenig-Lewis, Palmer, & Probert’s (2015, p. 84) view that ‘[food festival] visitors’ prior involvement with local food, engagement at a festival, emotions evoked [shaped] future food purchasing intentions, as well as behaviour’. This study’s findings revealed that cultural capital development was not the same for every participant. It differed in ways that relate to the 11 careers. For instance, objectified cultural capital was mainly accumulated by Professionals and Passionate Readers.

As regards the embodied state, knowledge and tastes were the cultural capital indicators that were most developed. Skills were developed by those who already write, such as Aspiring Writers, Professionals and Devotees. Incidental participants, Supporters and Parents did not acquire a lot of cultural capital and defined the festival experience as ‘enjoyable’. In contrast, Passionate Readers, Purposeful Tourists and Professionals developed more cultural capital and described the festival as ‘fulfilling’, ‘satisfying’ or ‘gratifying’. Here it can be noted that Stebbins’ definitions of
fun/enjoyable/satisfying/fulfilling/gratifying leisure activity were useful to further understand the role of enjoyment and asceticism in the process of cultural capital development in festivals.

Noticeably, people involved in festival production (Volunteers and Devotees) claimed to have developed some skills and abilities that the other careers did not. They acquired these skills while they were performing their role of volunteers or speakers, and not as mere audience members. For example, Sonia, a volunteer in PL, improved how to manage crowds and work in a team. ‘The experience of Pordenolegge will be useful to me, I don’t know how, but it’s always teamwork, working in a group’, said Sonia. As explained, there were similarities in cultural capital acquisition among people within the same career. However, due to the complexity of the matter, this study does not claim that higher levels of involvements can lead to higher levels of cultural capital development. Findings are not sufficient to reveal a substantial difference among the careers. What is clear is that there were similarities of cultural capital development depending on the literary festival career and that the SLPI scale is beneficial in exploring Bourdieu’s (2002 [1986], p. 85) cultural capital characteristic of ‘effort’, ‘sacrifice’ and levels of engagement/involvement and enjoyment/asceticism in the process of cultural capital development.
10.2.6 The role of economic capital

The findings revealed that participants’ pre-existing levels of economic capital shaped their cultural capital development. For instance, participants needed enough financial resources to purchase books or paintings and buy tickets. This was extremely evident in Ireland, where most of the events cost 15 euro. According to Bourdieu (2002 [1986]), more economic capital is a prerequisite to obtaining more cultural capital. Thus, respondents with highly ranked occupations should have acquired more cultural capital than the others. However, the data showed that highly ranked occupations, such as manager, professional, or jobs connected to literature, did not necessarily lead to more
cultural capital acquisition. While economic capital played a role in shaping participation, the relationship between pre-existing economic and cultural capital development was very complex. The findings revealed that participants with both high and low economic capital developed their cultural capital. This occurred, of course, in differing ways, motivations, and situations. This calls into question Bourdieu’s (2002 [1986]) view of the role of economic resources in the process of cultural capital acquisition.

10.2.7 The role of pre-existing cultural capital

Another element that shaped how participants acquired cultural capital was their pre-existing stock of cultural resources. The findings revealed three main elements connected with the levels of pre-existing cultural capital.

Firstly, high cultural capital was not a prerequisite for accessing the festivals since there were a few people with low pre-existing cultural capital. As previously discussed, WW and PL audiences mainly possessed high pre-existing levels of cultural capital. However, there were examples of participants with low cultural capital resources. Thus, there is reason to think that nowadays there might be an increase of non-middlebrow tastemakers in festivals with different levels of pre-existing cultural capital (Giorgi, 2011b). This would mean that we might be experiencing a differentiation in the consumption of some literary festivals. Beedie and Huston (2003, p. 639) argued that nowadays ‘mountain adventures are likely to become more accessible and achievable for more people (…) [and] this is consistent with Bourdieu’s (1986) concept of cultural capital as the determinant of social distinction’. Similarly, from the findings it seems that literary festivals are becoming more accessible. This calls into question the information-processing or cognitive theory, and the assumption that cultural knowledge is a prerequisite for access and appreciation of art attendance (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979],
Ganzeboom, 1982; Sullivan, 2007). It also raises doubts about the view that literary festival audiences are always well-educated (Driscoll, 2014; Mintel, 2011; Kim, Cheng, & O’Leary, 2007; Sapiro, 2016). So, it opens up the possibility that access might not be limited only to those who possess a certain level of cultural capital, although this will need to be further explored. For example, while this study suggests that nowadays we might be experiencing an omnivorous audience in literary festivals (Peterson & Kern, 1996), the findings are not sufficient to reveal if the audience has cosmopolitan cultural capital (Prieur & Savage, 2013).

As regards the embodied state, extant literature says that literary festival participants are usually readers and the majority also writers (Ommundsen, 2009). However, while in both festivals there was a ‘bookish community’ (Driscoll, 2014, p. 165), findings showed that not all of the respondents were avid readers, especially in PL. This supports the statistics on national reading indexes explained in Chapter Five (Compendium, 2016): Irish people read more than Italians. A more in-depth analysis also revealed that reading habits varied and participants possessed a complex and heterogeneous engagement with literary culture (Weber, 2018). Only a few participants were also writers, including aspiring, or emerging writers. So, they were not all avid readers and the majority were not writers. WW and PL are festivals that also attract non-readers. Thus, WW and PL are not dedicated exclusively to art connoisseurs and are not forms of Bourdieusian snobbish exclusion. This reflects Lurie’s (2004) argument of a current shift in participation to include not only passionate lovers of literature but also a more general audience. However, while according to Lurie, this shift is due to the fact that literary festivals now are more ‘up there on the social calendar’ (p. 10), this study argues that the features of the audience members and their reasons for participation could be much more complex than previously acknowledged.
Secondly, high cultural capital was not a prerequisite for fulfilment since people with low resources also acquired cultural capital. Even though high cultural capital was not a prerequisite for accessing the festival, it would appear that participants consume literary festivals differently because of different levels of pre-existing cultural capital. In line with the literature, respondents consumed WW and PL and enjoyed different aspects of them because of different ‘personal and professional history of engagement with literature, prior knowledge, level of education, social engagement with literary communities, participation in other festivals, and, of course, personality’ (Weber, 2018, p. 91). Findings revealed that previous levels of cultural capital strongly correlated with how they enjoyed and lived their experiences and, in turn, how they acquired cultural capital.

Nevertheless, according to Holt (1998), people with high cultural capital and low cultural capital consume leisure differently because they value different dimensions of the experience. For high cultural capital individuals, participation is a resource for personal achievement (self-actualisation), while for low cultural capital people, participation is a social resource (autotelic sociality). One might ask if different levels of cultural capital lead to different cultural capital acquisition associated with literary festival participation. Data revealed that strict dichotomies between self-actualisation and autotelic sociality depending on the pre-existing level of cultural capital did not exist. Instead, WW and PL were sources of personal enrichment and fulfilment for participants with different levels of pre-existing cultural capital, and not only high cultural capital participants. As explained, findings identified 11 literary festival careers. It would appear that participants consumed the festivals, and accumulated cultural capital, differently mainly according to their careers. However, differently from Stebbins’ idea of career, participants within the same literary festival career possessed different levels of cultural
capital. It goes without saying that high cultural capital respondents were not the only ones to acquire cultural resources. Some low cultural capital individuals acquired cultural capital during the festivals or were stimulated to acquire cultural capital after the festivals. However, this is only an exploratory study and the findings are not sufficient to answer this question. The reality of literary festival participation is deeply intricate, with different levels of engagement, motivations to attend, willingness to acquire cultural capital, and several other elements shaping participation. What was clear was that both high and low cultural capital individuals developed their cultural resources.

Finally, in most cases, a pre-existing taste or interest shaped cultural capital development. Something that stood out among the findings was the fact that respondents were curious by nature, especially interested in stories and listening and talking to people. This curiosity and interest led in certain cases to cultural capital accumulation. For example, Meghan enjoyed the event with ‘Brian Macmannon because he was a teacher and I could identify myself in that and I read his book’. According to Giorgio, ‘obviously you have to select the ones [events] you are interested in, already knowing that you will see what you have selected and in which you are interested, this is already a reason why it is beautiful and that you deepen something that interests you, I rarely manage to hear random things’. Thus, there is reason to believe that the cognitive dimension of a literary festival experience relates to an individual’s interests and previous knowledge (Weber, 2018). How participants lived the festivals, and how cultural capital was acquired were partially influenced by what participants brought to their festival experiences, especially in terms of interests and tastes (Merfeld-Langston, 2010). The data showed that festival participation reflected a previous passion, taste, interest or necessity. As mentioned earlier, there was little active preparation before the festival but previously acquired resources were influential to some extent. This pre-existing taste was not necessary, but
it was often present, in various degrees. Thus, some tastes (passions, preferences) or interests (curiosity, attractions) were often preconditions for participation, and so they preceded participation (Yaish & Katz-Gerro, 2010).

10.2.8 Asceticism and enjoyment as implied dimensions of literary festivals

Festival scholars recognise that both intellectual-educational and emotional involvement (Omundsen, 2009), like entertainment (Semrad, 2018), are elements of festival participation. However, nowadays some scholars argue that contemporary audiences attend festivals for hedonistic purposes and not for asceticism (Négrier, 2015), and that the entertainment and social aspects are more important than the intellectual dimension of literary festival experience (Meehan, 2005). This does not seem to apply to WW and PL. This study delves into the respondents’ levels of asceticism and how these shaped their cultural capital development. As mentioned previously with the Literary Festival Involvement Scale, motivations to acquire cultural capital were multiple and often overlapped. This was clear, for instance, when respondents explained why they purchased books. However, cultural capital acquisition was mainly spontaneous and unexpected rather than planned. For example, they discovered by accident an appreciation for a new genre, ‘participating randomly in free talks and (…) listening to someone you didn’t think you could be attracted by and, instead, you find it interesting… so you are encouraged to read something about that author’, said Serena. So, this study agrees with Lampel’s (2011) view that festivals can be environments of ‘predictable unpredictability’ (p. 342), where participants can build cultural capital that they were not expecting to acquire.

Furthermore, the data suggested that often hedonism and asceticism were two sides of the same coin. So, here there is a suggestion that attending a literary festival can be serious and fun at the same time. Respondents attended for both serious and hedonistic
purposes (see literary festival careers), and these often overlapped. So, during the festivals, they perceived their participation as both fun and serious in differing degrees. Attending the festival is ‘relaxing’ (Alice), it ‘creates serenity’ (Alice) and people can have ‘so many laughs’ (Leonardo). However, at the same time, Susanna observed, ‘I am learning new things because it is a pleasant moment. It’s not going to school’. As a matter of fact, ‘the embodied experience of liveness [at events] involves an ongoing and dynamic process through which things, forces and feelings momentarily combine, clash or coalesce’ (Herbon, 2017, p. v). Indeed, respondents expressed their emotional involvement. However, some sought sensory stimulation and others serious fulfilment. Accordingly, they described the festivals as enjoyable but also satisfying and fulfilling (Stebbins, 2004). This thesis supports Stebbins’ view that leisure activities, with or without serious pursuit, give the hedonic rewards of self-gratification: ‘the activity is fun to do’ (Stebbins, 1997, p. 21). This is visible in this study findings which strongly suggest that creating a dichotomy between these two dimensions is extremely reductive and overly simplistic. If people have fun and enjoy the experience, it does not necessarily mean that they do not acquire cultural resources. It would appear that the reality of literary festival participation often incorporates both the dimensions of the experience in varying degrees. Alongside intellectual involvement, emotions like enjoyment and fun are crucial parts of literary festival experiences. As such, the dualities ‘mind and body, reason and emotion’ need to overcome, or at least be brought together ‘into closer alignment’ (Boden & Williams, 2002, p. 497). Here, it can be argued that that, once again, Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective was useful to further the understanding of the complex dynamics of cultural capital embodiment in festivals. To sum up, Figure 10.5 presents all the internal elements shaping participants’ cultural capital associated with festival participation.
10.3 External elements

External elements are subdivided into structural and interpersonal. Interpersonal elements refer to the social context (known-group, informal external, and formal external interactions). Structural elements include: the national cultural context, the temporal dimension (e.g. first-repeat participant, number of days spent at the festival, and number
of events), the spatial dimension (e.g. types of venues), and festival features (e.g. types of events, and tickets).

10.3.1 The influence of the social context

This study concurs with the literature (Axelsen & Swan, 2010; Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016; Morgan, 2008; Packer & Ballantyne, 2010) in arguing that a crucial element that shapes the festival experience is the social context. The study festivals were ‘friendly’, ‘safe’, ‘relaxed’, and ‘cultural’. The enjoyable atmosphere has even led to repeat participation for some. The role of the social environment was a key finding and was in line with the literature. The findings supported the importance of socialisation in leisure (Stebbins, 1982), and in festival-going experiences (Bowen & Daniels, 2005; Chacko & Schaffer, 1993; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Nicholson & Pearce, 2001). Festival scholars argue that ‘artists and audiences mix more freely in a festive environment, creating a sense of community and involvement that is lacking in theatres, galleries and concert halls’ (Jordan, 2016, p.46). The case studies confirmed that festivals are gatherings of people and occasions for socialisation (Getz & Page, 2016; Guerzoni, Lissoni, Mussapi, Ramos, & Ranieri, 2015; Quinn, 2013). In Ireland, respondents even claimed to have created friendships through the workshops, or from having repeatedly attended the festival over a number of years. This reflects the sense of belonging to a ‘literary community’ and ‘bookish community’ in literary festivals (Driscoll, 2014; McAleese, 2018). It also recalls Putnam’s concept of bonding social capital and Stebbins’ (2013) idea of the social world in serious leisure, where members create a community and share a condition of sameness.

However, while researchers claim that festivals are defined by their communal nature (Quinn, 2013; Getz, 2016), the data showed that most interviewees were solo
participants, and some were even searching for solitude. As such, while some participants argued that social interaction was sought after and led to cultural capital development, for others, solitude was what was most felt (or appreciated). For example, they prefer to attend alone because ‘alone I have more freedom to choose the events’ (Alessandra) and ‘deciding with friends is complicated’ (Lisa). Therefore, for some, the festivals were solo experiences, where participants sought isolation. This was especially the case in Italy. For these, the intellectual stimulation and cognitive fulfilment were valued more than social interaction. Ashlyn even acquired skills related to solitude - she has learned how to ‘be alone’.

However, this does not mean that social interaction was not present. Instead, it appears that cultural capital development occurred through indirect social interaction. Examples were when respondents purchased books, visited the local town hall, or did some research after the festivals. Thus, even though they did not actively seek out social interaction, their cultural capital development was still shaped by the social context, directly and indirectly (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]). ‘We are always learning until we go to the grave, we are educated by the people we meet, people we talk to’, as Molly observed. It would appear that literary festivals are arenas for social interaction (Quinn, 2013), but the findings suggested that connections and interplays in literary festivals might be different than in other types of festivals, like music or food festivals, and need to be better explored.

Indeed, social interactions in WW and PL played a crucial role in shaping participants’ cultural capital (Bentley, 2003; Wilks, 2009). This supports the thesis that cultural capital can be acquired through socialisation, as Bourdieu (1984 [1979]) suggested. Cultural capital was acquired ‘through the multiple interactions people engage in concerning taste’ (Friedman, 2011, pp. 357-358). Different types of social interactions
fostered cultural capital acquisition, both known group (with family and friends) and external interactions (Bowen & Daniels, 2005; Chacko & Schaffer, 1993; Crompton & McKay, 1997; Nicholson & Pearce, 2001). Known-group interactions were among participants who knew each other. This recalls bonding social capital. Informal external interactions (among participants who did not know each other) were also a source of cultural capital acquisition, including people watching. Finally, formal external interactions were between the speakers and their public, or between devotees. This recalls bridging social capital. For example, professional networking among peers, or listening to the speakers were both perceived to be ways of sourcing information. As a matter of fact, the authors presenting at the festivals were considered ‘high-profile guests’ (Driscoll, 2014, p. 165), ‘experts of the field’ (Paolo) from whom one can learn. To sum up, both bonding and bridging social capital examples were found during the festivals and they both played a role in the process of cultural capital development.

10.3.2 Literary knowledge distinction

According to Bourdieu (1984 [1979]), social origin marks differentiation of cultural capital, creating, for instance, three taste zones. Social origin, therefore, creates inequalities and hierarchical social positions. Several studies on literary festivals have explored social distinction, tensions, and power dynamics using the concept of the literary field (Ommundsen, 2009; Weber, 2018). They conceptualise the literary festival as a literary field where readers, writers, publishers, and policymakers seek to position themselves. As explained above, in WW and PL, speakers were recognised as erudite and cultured people, from whom some audience members differentiated themselves. Even though this study is not an exploration of cultural capital as a marker of distinction, it is impossible not to notice that the diversification of tastemakers and abilities among
participants created literary knowledge distinction. Participants with higher literary knowledge were understood to out-rank the others. In other words, field-specific cultural capital was a marker of distinction, where participants with high literary capital dominated the others. In Listowel, knowledge distinction even had a spatial pattern: the well-known authors held their events at the hotel while the open mic sessions for aspiring authors were in the pubs. Some participants enjoyed the open-mics more than the formal events because at the open-mics they did not perceive any knowledge distinction. For example, Jane observed that ‘learning should be interactive and I think this [the open mic section] gives you the idea that you can do it too because it’s just ordinary people who are expressing themselves through poetry and through songs’. Thus, there were manifestations of power, strictly connected to literary capital. Nevertheless, this study is not an investigation of cultural capital accumulation to understand social stratification.

10.3.3 Reflections on the general cultural context

As mentioned previously, this thesis is not a comparison between the case studies nor between the two cultures. However, the two cultural contexts were taken into consideration and the findings revealed differences in cultural capital development depending on the cultural context of the country. As previously observed (Weber, 2018), a literary festival experience and outcomes are shaped by the individual’s cultural resources (see 10.2.7), and the general cultural background more generally. In the findings chapters, it has been observed that in Ireland respondents possessed higher levels of institutionalised cultural capital, while in Italy there were several respondents with medium or low institutionalised cultural capital (see 8.3). Also, the Irish reading levels were higher than the Italian ones. Similarly, cultural participation rates in highbrow cultural practices, such as theatre and art galleries, were higher in Ireland than in Italy.
(see 8.3 and Figure 8.8). All these data are in line with the national cultural statistics explained in Chapter Five (see 5.6.1). The national cultural differences reflected respondents’ individual stocks of cultural capital. So, both respondents’ individual pre-existing cultural capital and indirectly the national cultural contexts shaped their cultural capital development. For instance, in Ireland, there were examples of writing skills being developed through festival participation: respondents started writing or started to write a different genre (see 7.4.2). While in Italy, only one respondent observed that PL helped her to develop her writing skills. Another example concerned how festival participation shaped levels of cultural capital participation. For instance, in Ireland, cultural participation development occurred both during and after WW, while in Italy occurred only during PL. Institutionalised cultural capital development also reflected the national cultural context. While in Ireland, Missy recognised the writing award as prestige and formal qualification (therefore, an accumulation of institutionalised cultural capital), in Italy, Michele did not perceive the award as a formal and valuable recognition (as explained in 7.2). Finally, the objectified state also reflected the general cultural context. In Ireland there were examples of books and paintings purchasing, in Italy respondents only bought books during PL. All this suggests that the individual cultural resources, and indirectly the national cultural contexts, shaped respondents’ cultural capital development.

10.3.4 The temporal dimension

In line with Axelsen and Swan’s (2010) view, time was a factor that played a role in respondents’ festival experiences and shaped their cultural capital. The analysis of the role of time includes three main elements. The first one is the time when the cultural capital acquisition occurred (before, during or after the festival; and during or between
the events). Scholars (Karlsen, 2009; Wilks and Quinn, 2016) claim that festival participation can lead to knowledge formation and this thesis explores how festival participation leads to cultural capital development. However, does it occur before, during or after festival participation? The data showed that cultural capital development happened both during and after participation (see Chapter 9). Some interviewees said that they acquired cultural capital during the festival events, at debates, in workshops, on walking tours, etc. Others acquired it between the events while chatting or queueing. Sometimes cultural capital development did not occur during the festival events themselves but at another point in the day elsewhere in the town, while, for instance, talking to locals or strolling around and visiting local cultural attractions. Finally, others claimed to have developed their cultural capital, for example in terms of knowledge, skills or cultural participation after the festival, when they were back home, by talking to relatives or thinking and searching for new information related to books or authors. For instance, Maureen observed that WW gave the participants ‘just something that I can reflect on, in a later stage’.

Furthermore, it would appear that the states of cultural capital acquired varied depending on the timing. For instance, the institutionalised state was only accumulated during the festivals, while the objectified state both during and after. Regarding the embodied state, cultural participation, knowledge, skills, and taste acquisition occurred both during and after the festivals. Meanwhile, values development and attitude change often happened after the festivals. As mentioned previously, there was little active preparation for festival participation. So, almost nobody acquired cultural capital before the festival in order to attend it, for instance reading a book in preparation for the festival. Therefore, the cultural capital acquired beforehand refers to the prior stock of cultural resources that the participants possessed before the festival. All this suggests that festival
participation might shape individual cultural capital during and after the experience and that the cultural outcomes of festivals go beyond the participation. This calls into question the idea that festivals are temporally and spatially bound.

The second role that time played was manifest in how much time the cultural capital development took to generate (for instance, the number of days spent at the festivals, the number of events attended, and the degree of perseverance in attending the festivals). In both festivals, most participants were recurrent participants. This means that they were mainly loyal participants, usually with a passion or an interest in the festivals. The findings showed that the more participants attended the festival, the more likely they were to accumulate objectified cultural capital. However, it is not possible to claim that repeat participants acquired more cultural capital than first-time participants. While some participants needed time to acquire cultural capital, others did not need it at all. Even first-time participants, who spent only one day at the festivals, could acquire cultural capital, by for example purchasing a book, or visiting the local exhibition. Instead, the findings showed that first and repeat participants acquired different cultural capital than first-time participants. Thus, frequency and time spent at the festivals shaped the states of cultural capital acquired. Overall, the findings showed that some participants developed cultural capital even by attending the festival once. Therefore, it is not always correct to claim that cultural capital development necessarily needs time to occur. This calls into question Bourdieu’s (2002 [1986]) argument that it takes time to acquire cultural capital, as explained in Chapter Two. Instead, this study suggests that this process of cultural capital development might be similar to what Stebbins (2015) called edutainment: people acquire information in short-term pleasurable activities. Moreover, this study takes a step further suggesting that the edutainment in literary festivals might not be merely knowledge creation. It would appear that participants can also acquire skills, increase their cultural
participation, or even accumulate objectified or institutionalise cultural capital with short-term participation. It, therefore, calls into question the interpretation that skills, tastes, and values can only be achieved through education and serious study (Merfeld-Langston, 2010; Stebbins, 2015).

One can argue that it might take time to acquire cultural resources that stay long-term. As such, the third temporal dimension was the degree to which the acquired cultural capital endured. This has only been partially investigated, due to the complexity of the issue, and only a few insights are offered. Bourdieu (2002 [1986], p. 83) stated that capital has a ‘tendency to persist in its being’ and the manner in which culture is acquired perpetuates in the manner of using it (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]). The findings partially supported this view since there was evidence of both short and long-term development. For instance, some experienced long-term cultural capital development. For Norah, the personal enrichment and fulfilment she gained from WW, lasted beyond the duration of the festival, because ‘you get information that you use in your life [and] (…) it makes a difference to your life’. In contrast, for others the learning did not last till the follow-up interviews. Once again serious leisure was useful to better understand cultural capital embodiment in festivals since this short-term knowledge acquisition can be linked to what Stebbins (2015) called edutainment, which is not serious and long-lasting fulfilment. Thus, this thesis suggests that short-term cultural capital development it might be similar to Stebbins’ concept of edutainment.

Among long-term outcomes, some respondents highlighted their prolonged relationship with the festivals studied. WW and PL were one-off occasions for some but, for others, they became embodied into the routine, annual lifestyles. All of this suggests that literary festivals do matter. There is reason to believe that they are not isolated moments in time. They can become part of routine lifestyles of participants’ lives.
10.3.5 The spatial dimension

As explained in the Literature Review section, the role of space is also crucial in the process of cultural capital embodiment in festival settings, since the human body and its environment are inseparable, and participants can become immersed in the festival environment (Herborn, 2017).

Festival spaces did not include merely the event venues, but the entire towns. As a matter of fact, ‘the locative context of a literary festival is an important characteristic in determining how it operates and is experienced’ (Weber, 2018, p. 7). Thus, taking geographic specificity into account is fundamental. Both WW and PL are peripheral festivals (Steward, 2013) held in small towns, so they are open to the local context for their festival content. Observational data revealed that the links between the towns and the festivals were strong, and not only in terms of their programme with local celebrities. As Quinn and Wilks (2017) said, during the days of a small-scale festival, the town can become the festival itself. There is a special transformation of the town, which becomes the festival, and the festival becomes the town. During WW and PL, the spirits of the festivals invaded the two small towns. The diffusion was evident both materially, with coloured banners hanging on the streets, and immaterially, with the presence of a festival atmosphere, in the guise of sounds, colours, and smells. As such, ‘decorating the festival venue removes as many reminders of the humdrum world as possible creating a message that this space will, for a limited time, obey different rules, welcome different people, symbolise something new or other; something festive’ (Jordan, 2016, p.45). All this shaped how participants acquired cultural capital.

The festival venues, spread all over the towns, allowed participants to enter, discover, and learn about local heritage and culture (Cassell, Lema, & Agrusa, 2010). In
this way, some respondents acquired knowledge about local monuments, museums, churches, or exhibitions, and developed their cultural participation. Some locals even felt like tourists in their own town, discovering something new about the local monuments. For example, Theresa explained that she went for the first time to the Seanchaí museum because of to a live literature event. She went because ‘it’s important to learn about the town, that’s why I came really’.

A noticeable factor was that while participants came to Listowel and Pordenone primarily (or only) for the festivals, they ended up acquiring cultural capital not only during the formal events of the programmes in the festival venues but also in other spaces in town. Thus, indirectly the festivals enhanced participation and knowledge about the local tangible heritage that had no connection with the festivals. This suggests that literary festivals allow participants to discover cultural traditions as they are moments where cultural heritage is displayed, shared, learned and embodied. Yet, much scope remains to further investigate how literary festivals enact, display, and allow cultural heritage to be transmitted. This thesis has only begun to address this topic by providing a few useful insights.

10.3.6 The influence of festival features

In the Love of Art (Bourdieu, Darbel, & Schnapper, 1991 [1966]) and in Distinction (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]), Bourdieu argued that the structure and design of artistic and cultural institutions create barriers of participation, excluding those people who do not possess enough cultural capital. As explored in Chapter Four, nowadays, there is a similar debate concerning literary festivals. While some scholars argue that literary festivals are serious moments of intellectual discussion (Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015), others claim that nowadays they promote themselves primarily as entertainments due to
their commercial agenda (Driscoll, 2014). In doing so, they do not satisfy the audience’s willingness to be educated and intellectually stimulated (Ommundsen, 2009). The study undertaken here brings some insights to this debate. Firstly, as explained, respondents possessed diverse levels of pre-existing cultural capital, so WW and PL were accessible to a range of people. Secondly, WW and PL were not primarily about entertainment: they allowed and encouraged participants’ cultural capital development. While Giorgi (2011b, p. 37) said that ‘literary festivals place emphasis on entertainment’, both WW and PL promote themselves as learning arenas for children and adults since one of their aims is to foster literature and culture. Evidence suggests that they encourage participants to think hard, reflect, and engage in intellectual discussions through events such as awards or workshops. Thus, there is reason to believe that, for some literary festivals, part of their agenda is to transfer cultural capital to the audiences (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014; Weber, 2018). However, the findings also showed that this process was uneven. The festival features shaped participants’ experiences (Cole & Chancellor, 2009; Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016; Morgan, 2008) and created different conditions and opportunities for participants to acquire cultural resources. For example, Jimmy observed that he learned about local authors during the walking tour because he is a writer and ‘a lot of novels in Ireland at the moment they write the same way, about the locals (…) [it is important] to be aware of that (…) because you know better the context of the local stories (…) that’s why I did the walking tour’ (Jimmy) (see 9.4). This means that WW and PL themselves played a role in shaping, maintaining, and developing participants’ cultural capital. For instance, the competitions allowed institutionalised cultural capital accumulation, bookstalls made objectified cultural capital acquisition possible, the programme content, the price of tickets, and the duration and location of the festivals influenced how participants embodied cultural capital. Chapter Six explained how WW
and PL programmes differed, with PL featuring more events about general cultural culture, like religion and philosophy. Thus, one might ask whether PL participants acquired more non-field-specific cultural capital than WW respondents. Findings included examples of field and non-field-specific cultural capital in both festivals and weighting the two is not the purpose of this thesis. What is evident is that, as explained in 10.1.1, respondents in both festivals acquired both types of cultural capital. This suggests that all kinds of literary festivals might be ‘education providers’ (Driscoll, 2014, p. 153) promoting literature and general culture.

The influence of the festival features, the social and cultural contexts, the temporal and the spatial dimensions together constitute the external elements that can shape literary festival participants’ cultural capital. They are graphically illustrated in Figure 10.6.

![Figure 10.6: The external elements shaping participants’ cultural capital](Source: Author)
10.4 A Model of cultural capital development associated with literary festival participation

Similarly to Noble and Watkins (2003, p. 539), who argued that ‘Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of habitus can be elaborated by returning to the question of acquisition’, this thesis suggests that the concept of cultural capital can be further understood by exploring its acquisition process. Following Yaish and Katz-Gerro’s (2010) research on taste, Ganzeboom’s (1982) works, and studies on festival experiences (Geus, Richards, & Toe poel, 2016), this thesis develops theory in the area by suggesting a model of cultural capital development associated with literary festival participation (Figure 10.7). The model can be a tool to guide further research in the area of festival participation and outcomes.

Geus, Richards, and Toe poel (2016, p. 277) argued that the event experience is ‘an interaction between an individual and the event environment (both physical and social), modified by the level of engagement or involvement, involving multiple experiential elements and outputs (such as satisfaction, emotions, behaviors, cognition, memories and learning), that can happen at any point in the event journey’. Elsewhere, Ommundsen (2009, p. 21) considered literary festival participation as ‘active involvement - physical, emotional, intellectual and social’. Similarly, this thesis contends that literary festival participation is an extremely complex and dynamic activity, and from the findings it is possible to identify the elements that shaped how participants developed their cultural capital, both external: festival features, the social context, the cultural context, the temporal and the spatial dimensions; and internal elements: pre-existing economic and cultural capital, demographic features, behavioural dimension, literary festival career and involvement in the festival, and enjoyment & asceticism (Figure 10.7). Taking into
account all of these elements helps to shed light on the complexity of festival participation dimensions.

The serious leisure perspective can be used as a valuable theory to overcome the problems of conceptualisation and operationalisation of cultural capital in festival contexts. As such, serious leisure and cultural embodiment refer to the same concepts so the indicators can be used in tandem in festival contexts. Moreover, the whole serious leisure perspective can be used to further the understanding of the role of enjoyment, asceticism, body, involvement, time, and consciousness of cultural capital acquisition in festival settings. This means that it can be possible to both conceptualise festivals as serious leisure as well as conceptualise serious leisure and cultural embodiment as similar concepts. This study suggests that Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure perspective is a suitable analytical framework for understanding cultural capital embodiment associated with festival participation. In using it, this research makes important contributions to existing cultural sociology, festival and tourism literature.

‘Festivals are an increasingly common feature of culture life’ (Jordan, 2016, p. 45) and, therefore, it is important to explore their outcomes on audiences. This study shows how literary festivals generate cultural outcomes, in terms of cultural capital acquisition, on participants. Because of festival participation, cultural capital can be reinforced, stimulated, or acquired (Figure 10.7). Thus, this thesis agrees with Johanson and Freeman (2012, p. 312) in conceiving a literary festival as ‘a distinctive experience that confers cultural capital on attendees’. The findings of this study did not identify examples of a decrease in cultural capital due to festival participation.

- If cultural capital is reinforced, it means that the pre-existing level is maintained and strengthened.
• If cultural capital is stimulated, it means that festival participation creates a new interest that, in turn, creates an acquisition of further cultural capital after the festival (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014; Kruger, 2019).

• If cultural capital is acquired, it means that the institutionalised, objectified and the embodied states existing before festival participation are further developed through participation. Thus, literary festival participation shapes individual cultural capital with a direct accumulation of cultural capital. The direct acquisition of cultural capital concerns mainly the objectified and the embodied states. Very rarely, is there a direct development of the institutionalised state (only in cases perceived as such by the agent).

All the three states and the two types of cultural capital can be acquired through literary festival participation (Figure 10.7). In conclusion, festival participation is both shaped by, and can shape, participants’ cultural capital.
Figure 10.7: Model of cultural capital development associated with literary festival participation (Source: Author)
10.5 Summary

In this chapter, the findings have been discussed in light of extant literature. The two festivals were arenas for cultural capital acquisition or stimulus. However, for some participants, it was more a matter of reinforcing previously held cultural capital. What is clear from this study is that literary festivals can be valuable experiences, and can be arenas for cultural capital acquisition. Thus, the thesis helps to frame a deeper understanding of the nature of cultural capital developed by participants attending literary festivals, and the cultural value of festivals as consumption practices. Here, the thesis advances theory by presenting a new conceptual model of the development of cultural capital associated with literary festival participation to guide further research. This study suggests that festival participation is both shaped by, and shapes, participants’ cultural capital. It is an in-depth analysis of cultural capital circularity in festivals: cultural capital pre-existing cultural capital shapes participation, ‘at which further cultural capital is developed’ (Wilks, 2009, p. 271). Thus, this research updates Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital by investigating and approaching it differently.

This study contends that the study audience was omnivorous and possessed differing levels of pre-existing cultural capital and willingness to develop their cultural capital. Thus, it questions the view that, nowadays, people participate in literary festivals merely for social/hedonistic reasons (Meehan, 2005; Négrier, 2017) and that festivals are not arenas for cultural capital development (Fumaroli, 1991). In contrast, this thesis suggests that asceticism and hedonism are often interlinked and that the intricate process of cultural capital development in festivals refutes strict dichotomies and generalisations.

Respondents acquired all the three states and the two types of cultural capital, to different degrees and in different manners. Participants developed their field-specific [literary capital (Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015)] and non-field-specific cultural
capital (Bourdieu, 1984 [1979]). Thus, even though most scholars (Kruger, 2019; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015) focused on literary capital acquisition in festivals, this study takes a step forward and shows that cultural capital development goes beyond the mere acquisition of literary capital.

Moreover, even though respondents primarily accumulated knowledge, it would be simplistic to describe the process as mere informational capital acquisition. The process of how literary festival participation shapes adult audiences’ cultural capital is much more complex. This complexity is characterised by the variety of ways in which cultural capital is maintained and developed.

Furthermore, the findings showed that certain elements shaped how participants experienced the festivals and their cultural capital development (Figure 10.7): internal intrapersonal elements (demographic features, behavioural dimension, enjoyment & asceticism, literary festival career & involvement, and pre-existing economic and cultural capital), external interpersonal elements (the social context), and external structural elements (the cultural context, the temporal and spatial dimensions, and festival features).

Finally, the findings revealed that while literary festivals can be considered serious leisure activities, at the same time Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure perspective is also a useful theory to overcome the limits of conceptualisation and operationalisation of cultural capital in festival contexts. By integrating the two theories this thesis suggests that the concepts of Literary Festival Career and Literary Festival Involvement Scale are valuable tools to segment the audiences and further the understating of the role of involvement in acquiring cultural capital in literary festivals. However, while Stebbins’ idea of career focuses on a development of knowledge and skills, the findings showed the concept of career in literary festivals needs to be broadened since participation is extremely complex and dynamic. The thesis argues that the serious leisure perspective is
also useful to throw light on the role of the body, engagement with the physical environment, time, and consciousness in cultural capital development in festivals.
CONCLUSIONS

‘If the soul has food for study and learning, nothing is more delightful than an old age of leisure... Leisure consists in all those virtuous activities by which a man [woman] grows morally, intellectually, and spiritually’

(Cicero, in Falk, Packer, & Benckendorff, 2012, p. 915)
CHAPTER 11

CONCLUSIONS

11 Introduction

This final chapter presents the contributions to knowledge of this study, its research implications, limitations, and suggestions for further studies. Since the 1990s, arts festivals have spread worldwide (Quinn, 2019). Nowadays they are ‘one of the main players on the stage of modern cultural consumption’ (McGillivray & Frew, 2015, p. 2650). Scholars argue that we are experiencing an explosion of festivals and traditional forms of celebration and social gatherings are now labelled as festivals (Ronström, 2016). This explosion of festivals has created the current tendency of ‘festivalisation of events’ in western societies where cultural productions are arranged ‘in a festival-like way’ (Ronström, 2016, p. 67). This festivalisation process has been interpreted by some scholars as representing a decline of aesthetic culture into commercialisation (Négrier, 2015). There is a concern that festivalisation ‘is driven by market factors rather than aesthetic’ forces (Jordan, 2016, p. 51). This suggests a need to focus on the cultural value of festivals.

Indeed, literary festivals are an important part of this scenario. From 1949, the year in which the oldest still-surviving literary festival in Europe was founded, over 450 festivals have proliferated worldwide (Weber, 2018). Literary festivals are very important elements in the current scenario of cultural consumption. They perform political, communicative, educational and social functions as they engage the audience in literary and political debates (Merfeld-Langston, 2010; Weber, 2015). However, the concern
about the process of festivalisation of culture also pertains to literary festivals, with some scholars arguing that people attend mainly for hedonistic/social reasons (Meehan, 2005) and that literary festivals promote themselves primarily as entertainment (Giorgi, 2011b; Ommundsen, 2009). According to these scholars, the proliferation of literary festivals is limiting how they contribute to creating and developing cultural capital (Driscoll, 2014).

In contrast, other researchers argue that literary festivals remain important arenas for cultural capital acquisition (Robertson and Yeoman, 2014; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015). Overall, however, the role of festivals in maintaining and shaping audience’s cultural capital is under-researched (Szabó, 2015; Wilks & Quinn, 2016). Specifically, there is minimal research on the process of cultural consumption that participants engage in while taking part in literary festivals (Weber, 2018). More work is needed to interrogate the audience experience, identify the cultural benefits generated, and to ascertain the cultural value of literary festivals. Thus, researching literary festivals and asking whether if/how they foster cultural capital development is very relevant.

This thesis contributes to the debate exploring the cultural value of literary festivals for adult participants by using Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital. The study helps to frame a deeper understanding of the nature of literary festivals in the current landscape of cultural consumption, building theory on how participants can acquire cultural capital associated with participation.

Here, it is important to note that the concept of cultural capital has been extensively used across several disciplines. Nowadays, cultural capital is an important concept in the field of cultural sociology and beyond. However, it is an ambiguous term that Bourdieu has never defined clearly (Prieur & Savage, 2011) and existing scholarly discussion has understood and interpreted it in different ways (Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002), including festival studies (Friedman, 2014; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret &
Seiler, 2015). Moreover, Bourdieu theorised and applied the concept of cultural capital in the French scenario of the 1960s. Thus, cultural capital needs to be updated (Lamont & Lareau, 1988; Prior, 2005) and much empirical investigation is needed (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014). In addition, there is no general agreement on the best way to operationalise cultural capital, especially in its embodied state, and scholars are not agreed on the indicators to use for this purpose (Vryonides, 2007).

11.1 Research aim

In all his works, Bourdieu tried to answer the question: ‘how and why people come to be thinking and acting as they do?’ (Grenfell, 2008, p. 59). He wanted to explain how people’s actions and beliefs shape class distinction and social inequalities. Similarly, this study explores how thoughts and actions of literary festival participants (what really occurs during participation) shape their cultural capital. The aim is to understand if being at a festival helps them to develop their cultural capital. The main research question is: how does literary festival participation shape individual cultural capital? To answer this question, three aims and a number of objectives were identified. Firstly, this study aimed to contribute to an enhanced understanding of Bourdieu’s cultural capital. Here, the concept of cultural capital is reviewed, including how it has evolved since Bourdieu’s definition. Secondly, the thesis aims to consider how Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital might be usefully applied to the festival context. It explores literary festivals and their relationship to the concept of cultural capital. The study asks whether Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure perspective could be helpful in understanding and operationalising cultural capital in festival settings. The thesis also examines the evolution of Irish and Italian literary festivals. Thirdly, this study aims to understand if and how literary festival
participation shapes individual cultural capital. The study aims, therefore, to understand if and how individual cultural capital is developed and embodied through participation in literary festivals with an analysis of one Irish (Writers Week) and one Italian (Pordenonelegge) case.

This study is inductive as it investigates existing literature on cultural capital and seeks to develop theory on the area in a new setting: literary festivals. The aim is not to test a theory nor to measure a behaviour with some pre-existing hypotheses but instead, to build theory by exploring the dynamics of individual cultural capital acquisition in the festival context. The contributions of this research are both theoretical and methodological.

11.2 Literary festivals

The first contribution of this thesis concerns literary festivals. This study contributes to advancing knowledge about literary festivals which are under-researched (Johanson & Freeman, 2012; Ommundsen, 2009). It helps to better understand the complexity of literary festival participation and the nature of literary festival participants. The literary festival audience is under-researched (Mintel, 2011) and findings to date differ on such characteristics as cultural resources and economic status. This study agrees with scholars in conceiving of the literary festival audience as being predominantly female and middle aged/older adults. Notably, they have also been studied mainly by women and one might ask why this is the case. It might reflect the predominance of female participants and the feminisation of literary culture (Ommundsen, 2009), explained in Chapter Three. Moreover, while literature to date has suggested that high cultural and economic resources predominate among literary festival participants, this study suggests that even though...
most of the participants possess high cultural and economic capital, a few possess low cultural resources. It would appear that cultural capital does not seem to be a prerequisite for accessing literary festivals. Therefore, literary festivals may not represent only the high/middle class anymore but may see a shift in their audiences to include people who might be described as not passionately interested in literature and non-middlebrow tastemakers (Giorgi, 2011b; Lurie, 2004). Thus, there is reason to believe that audience members are becoming omnivorous (Peterson & Kern, 1996). However, the findings were not sufficient to understand if the audience possessed cosmopolitan cultural capital (Prieur & Savage, 2013).

Furthermore, studies to date have not produced consistent or comprehensive understandings of the literary festival audience (Mintel, 2011; Weber, 2018). To redress this shortcoming in the literature, the findings of this study have been used to construct a literary festival career and involvement scale. While agreeing with Weber (2018, p. 80) in conceiving of the absence of a ‘typical’ audience member in literary festivals, the study provides a more comprehensive approach to segmenting the participants seeking inspiration from Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure perspective. Drawing on Stebbins (2007) ideas of leisure career and the serious leisure perspective involvement scale, this study suggests that participants can be clustered into 11 literary festival careers that create the literary festival involvement scale. However, while Stebbins defined the concept of career as a personal role shaped by a continuum of different levels of knowledge and skills, this study reveals that the reality of literary festival participation is much more complex and dynamic. Thus, this thesis broadens Stebbins’ concepts of career and involvement to better understand literary festival participation and the nature of the audiences. All this suggests that a typical literary festival participant does not exist since participants possess different levels of involvement and motivations for participating.
Furthermore, this study suggests that literary festival experience is deeply intricate. In Chapter Two, it was explained that festivals have been conceptualised as liminal spaces where rituals include physical and social spaces (Jaimangal-Jones, Pritchard, & Morgan, 2010; Lucas & Wright, 2013; Pielichaty, 2015; Turner, 1984). For instance, Ravenscroft and Matteucci (2003, p. 1) conceptualised festivals as ‘carnivalesque inversions of the everyday’. Festivals have also been theorised as heterotopic temporal and spatial spaces (Quinn & Wilks, 2017). This study provides insights into the temporal, spatial, and social dimensions of literary festivals. It suggests that, even though literary festivals occur perhaps only once a year for a short period of time, they can have high levels of return and loyal participation. Thus, it would appear that, for some people, festivals are not merely liminal moments out of the ordinary, but are important parts of their lifestyles, featuring as recurrent meetings, and recurrent holidays. This raises doubts about conceiving of literary festivals necessarily as liminal spaces, spatially and temporally bounded. This thesis opens up the possibility that some participants can see literary festivals as very meaningful parts of their lives and not be out of the ordinary and unusual occasions.

Furthermore, the findings showed that WW and PL transformed the two towns. This suggests that even though small-scale literary festivals take place in specific venues, they shape the entire town. This is supporting existing findings like the spatial transformative potential of festivals (Quinn & Wilks, 2017). As identified in the literature, the town and the spatial dimension also shapes festival participation. However, very few studies have examined how space and the interaction with the physical environment play a role in cultural capital acquisition in festivals. Thus, this thesis may help enhance research in this area.
As a matter of fact, this study provides insight into the behavioural dimension of participants. It answers the call for more studies about embodiment in serious leisure (Cox, Griffin, & Hartel, 2017), serious participants’ behaviour during events (Mackellar, 2009), and embodiment into consumption studies (Boden & Williams, 2002). As such, very few studies have explored corporeality of festivals (Cummings & Herbert, 2015; Henry, 2000; Lea, 2006) and the embodiment of knowledge through festival participation (Duffy & Waitt, 2011; Karlsen, 2009). Adding to Herborn’s (2007) findings about the dynamic entanglement between the environment and participants’ bodies, this thesis helps enhance the understanding of the body and its relationship with cultural capital embodiment in festival settings.

The festival atmosphere was seen as extremely complex, comprising social, physical, and emotional elements. Past results have shown that festival atmosphere is an element of the experience (Axelsen & Swan, 2010). This study extends these findings through an investigation of all the components of literary festivals. It suggests that the social atmosphere, the colours, the sounds, the spaces, the festival features, the enjoyment, and the use of the body within the physical environment are all elements that describe literary festivals. Literary festival atmosphere is, therefore, social, intellectual/cognitive, physical/behavioural, structural, and affective/aesthetic/emotional.

Finally, this study shows how literary festivals are ‘immersive experiences’ (Jordan, 2016, p. 50) where participants can be involved in the performance (Fabiani, 2011; Lucas & Wright, 2013). As such, the social context was perceived by the respondents as a key factor shaping participation and cultural capital development. Participants engage with each other, performing and co-creating their own experiences. However, especially in Italy, several respondents were searching for solitude more than social interaction. Thus, it would appear that literary festivals are social gatherings, where
people meet to discuss about literature, but, for some people, they are occasions to be alone in a crowd. Thus, literary festivals create the social conditions where people can feel safe to be alone.

11.2.1 Literary festivals as arenas for cultural capital acquisition

As mentioned earlier, literary festivals have proliferated worldwide (Weber, 2018). They have become forms of literary tourism and creative tourism (Mintel, 2011). This tourismification of literary festivals was caused, among many other factors, by the fact that festivals are expanding their programmes with, for example, children’s events (Robertson & Yeoman, 2014), school-based events (Ommundsen, 2009), music entertainment, theatre performances, art exhibitions, or walking tours, and this is increasing their appeal to a more extensive public (Mintel, 2011; Stewart, 2013). This proliferation of literary festivals and the expansion of their programmes has been criticised by some scholars who understand it as an example of culture being festivalised (Meehan, 2005; Négrier, 2015). According to them, this current practice shows the decline of aesthetic culture into commercialisation (Jordan, 2016). This study’s findings can be employed to throw light on this debate.

This thesis questions the view of conceiving literary festivals as lesser forms of aesthetic culture and merely hedonistic and social activities (Meehan, 2005; Négrier, 2015). In contrast, this study suggests that literary festivals are an important part of cultural consumption and they promote cultural sustainability. It explores whether adults can acquire cultural capital through participating in a cultural activity outside the standard institutionalised educational curriculum. The data revealed that it is possible. Therefore, it answers the call for more studies on the process of cultural capital acquisition (Kisida,
Greene, & Bowen, 2014; Prior, 2005), the literary festival audience (Kruger, 2019), and personal development through event participation (Getz & Page, 2016).

While this study agrees with Yaish and Katz-Gerro (2010) that tastes can shape cultural participation, it also argues that there is reason to believe that festival participation can, in turn, generate new cultural stimuli and interest (Kisida, Greene, & Bowen, 2014). So, this study concurs with the existing literature (Driscoll, 2014; Kruger, 2019; Robertson & Yeoman, 2014; Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015) in arguing that literary festival participants can develop their field-specific cultural capital, literary capital, by learning new literary notions, increasing their literary tastes, acquiring literary skills, buying books, or winning writing awards. Literary festivals are, therefore, arenas where participants can enhance, or at least gain an introduction, to literature and develop an interest in it (Merfeld-Langston, 2010).

In addition, this study takes a step further. It suggests that participants might also acquire non-field-specific cultural capital, such as, for instance, knowledge about different topics, general cultural participation, social skills, and general cultural values. Thus, while this study’s findings agree with Kruger’s (2019) view of literary festivals as stimuli for literary arts development, they also argue that literary festivals are arenas for general cultural resources acquisition.

Furthermore, this study suggests that festival participation can shape all the three states of cultural capital: institutionalised, objectified, and embodied cultural capital. Thus, it would be simplistic to describe this process as informational capital development, as suggested by Bourdieu (1992) and Prieur and Savage (2013). The process of cultural capital acquisition is much more complex.

This study also explores the intricate dynamics of cultural capital acquisition, identifies the elements that play a role in the process, and proposes a new model of
cultural capital development associated with literary festival participation. This model is presented as a tool to guide further research in the area of festival participation, cultural capital in leisure, and the cultural value of festivals. Here the key argument is that cultural capital can be reinforced, stimulated, or acquired through participation. Several internal and external elements can shape this very complex and dynamic process. By developing and using this model, this study has been able to investigate the complicated process of cultural capital acquisition and provide new evidence on what really occurs at literary festivals. Literary festivals are intense and dynamic moments and it would appear that several elements play a role in participants’ cultural capital development. This study’s findings reveal how the process of cultural capital development can be shaped by internal elements (demographic features, the behavioural dimension, the enjoyment factor, the literary festival career and involvement factor, the pre-existing stocks of cultural and economic capital) and external elements (the festival features, the social and cultural contexts, the spatial and the temporal dimensions). Here, the study concurs with scholars claiming that festivals are social gatherings and the findings reveal that the concept of social capital, both bonding and bridging, play an important role in the process of cultural capital development. Including this model in the festival literature furthers understanding of the elements of literary festival participation, conceptualises literary festival participants in a new and distinct way, and enhances the understanding of the cultural outcomes of literary festivals on audiences. Moreover, including this model in cultural capital research broadens the understanding of the process of cultural capital acquisition in an informal and under-explored settings (festivals), and enhances the interpretation and operationalisation of cultural capital in festival contexts.

To sum up, this study contributes to the debate on the cultural value of festivals in the current landscape of cultural consumption, building theory on the cultural meanings
of literary festivals. This thesis reveals the cultural importance of literary festivals in showing, for instance, that most participants are loyal to the festivals and some are devoted to the extent of taking days off work. Literary festivals are seen as holidays, even for locals. They are recurrent opportunities for people to relax, socialise, learn, buy books, and discover new cities and their local heritage. Literary festivals are arenas for participants to learn, share and reflect on cultural topics, discover new interests, develop skills, and acquire cultural resources more generally. They can shape participants’ relations to culture and their individual cultural resources, even long-term. Literary festivals allow culture, in all its forms, to be shared, maintained, reinforced, and passed on.

11.3 New perspectives on Bourdieu’s cultural capital

The second key contribution of this thesis concerns the concept of cultural capital. Scholars (Prieur & Savage, 2013) argue that Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital is outdated, since he theorised it in the French cultural context in the 1960s. Moreover, researchers claim that there is considerable theoretical confusion in the conceptualisation of cultural capital (Friedman, 2014) and have significantly criticised and questioned it. Cultural capital is an ambiguous concept, especially in its embodied state (Prieur & Savage, 2011; Webb, Schirato, & Danaher, 2002). Moreover, cultural capital is not uniformly used in the festival literature (Getz & Page, 2016; Wilks & Quinn, 2016). Literature on events and festivals use different terms, such as cultural impacts or outcomes, to refer to cultural capital.

While this researcher agrees that Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital merits critique, she contends that it continues to be a valuable and pertinent theory. The
researcher believes that the concept of cultural capital is still a useful concept to analyse and understand society and social practices. Bourdieu’s concepts of cultural capital, taste, practice, distinction, social capital, and embodiment are indeed still valid research tools. For instance, this study suggests that using cultural capital as a conceptual framework can help to understand how literary festivals contribute to cultural sustainability. However, the researcher agrees with the view that cultural capital needs to be updated. This study updates and explores Bourdieu’s concept of cultural capital in a new way, focusing on the acquisition process, and in an under-researched context, festivals. It provides an in-depth exploration of how individual cultural capital can be acquired through festival participation. It further explains how participants can shape their pre-existing cultural resources through literary festival participation. The cultural capital they acquire, or are stimulated to acquire, is not limited to the literary field but can be used by participants in other fields, such as religion, music, education, theatre, technology, or politics. This reflects ‘the cycle where cultural capital is added to cultural capital’ (Bourdieu, 1977 [1973], p. 493), Ganzeboom’s (1982) cycle of cultural knowledge-appreciation-participation, and the circularity of cultural capital in festival settings (Wilks, 2009). Thus, this study yields further insights into the ‘personal empowerment’ theme of research on cultural capital (Jeannotte, 2004 [2003], p. 8). The research argues, therefore, that literary festivals can be arenas for cultural capital development and stimuli for acquiring further cultural capital once they are over. Thus, while Bourdieu (2002 [1986]) stressed that cultural capital is mainly acquired in childhood through socialisation with family and school, a key argument of this study is that cultural capital can be further developed beyond the field of education and occupation and outside formal learning arenas. Cultural capital can be acquired in adulthood through various cultural activities including festivals. The cultural capital acquired enhances cultural knowledge and skills,
develops cultural tastes and interests, shapes bodily hexis, increases cultural participation, and augments educational qualifications and cultural goods ownership. This study adopts, therefore, a different approach for examining cultural capital. It explores how it is developed outside family, schooling, and the occupational field, providing an empirical investigation of an under-researched context: festivals.

Furthermore, this thesis answers Sullivan’s (2002) call for more studies of cultural capital outside France to consider the issues of ‘temporality’ and ‘peculiarity’ (Grenfell, 2008, p.78). It shows how festival participation shapes pre-existing individual cultural capital. The findings provide insight into cultural capital development in two different countries: Ireland and Italy and show how cultural capital development is shaped by the respondents’ individual pre-existing cultural capital, which reflected the general cultural context. Thus, the individual and national cultural background modified cultural capital acquisition associated with festival participation.

Moreover, it would appear that high levels of cultural capital are not necessary preconditions to acquire further cultural capital. The findings show that both low and high cultural capital individuals developed their cultural capital. This calls into question Holt’s (1998) view that only high cultural capital individuals can gain self-actualisation and personal enrichment through leisure, while low cultural capital people merely gain autotelic sociality.

Finally, even though this study does not focus on how cultural capital creates distinction, a few insights into the power dynamics in literary festivals can be pointed out. Bourdieu [1984 (1979)] argued that cultural capital is a marker of social distinction and inequality since it depends heavily on the social origin of the agent and how (s)he acquired it within the family in the earliest years of life. According to him, cultural capital is then acquired over time outside family, like in school or at work, but is always shaped by the
agent’s social class. This primacy of social origin, therefore, creates social positions, inequalities and even shapes tastes and interests, creating three taste zones based on social class. Some scholars (Ommundsen, 2009; Weber, 2018) explored power, social domination and inequalities in literary festivals. They describe literary festivals as arenas for distinction and occasions where writers and readers compete for legitimacy in the literary field. Indeed, this study findings showed there to be power dynamics in WW and PL, especially between audience members and speakers, and among writers, who sought to position themselves in the literary field. However, from the findings, it also appears that literary capital created tensions and marked distinction much more than social origin does. This suggests that field-specific cultural capital, the literary capital (Sapiro, Picaud, Pacouret & Seiler, 2015), can be understood as an important form of domination: different stocks of literary capital created knowledge distinction. This study started to address this topic but further studies on how, for instance, cultural capital acquired at festivals creates inequalities are needed.

11.3.1 Using the serious leisure perspective to conceptualise cultural capital and cultural embodiment in festival settings

Using serious leisure indicators, and more generally seeking inspiration from the serious leisure perspective as a whole, this thesis contends that Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective is a useful theory to further understand cultural capital in festival contexts and overcome the theoretical confusion of the concept of cultural capital. This thesis suggests that Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure perspective provides a valuable framework to better understand the elements of use of the body and physical engagement with the environment, consciousness, time, effort/asceticism, involvement, enjoyment, and pre-existing cultural resources during cultural capital acquisition and embodiment in festivals.
As such, a key contribution of this research is to use the serious leisure perspective to further understand the role of literary festival participation in shaping, building, and reinforcing participants’ cultural capital.

The serious leisure perspective helps to better understand the ‘hierarchies of cultural value – ‘hard thinking’ vs entertainment (…) – and the far from simple question of where festival culture fits within these binaries’ (Ommundsen, 2009, p. 32). Indeed, participating in festivals is fun and participants possess different levels of emotional engagement (Geus, Richards, & Toepoel, 2016). However, since some scholars (Négrier, 2015, Meehan, 2005) argue that people now participate in festivals mainly for social/hedonistic reasons and not to learn or acquire cultural resources, the hedonistic element of festival participation needs to be explored. To better understand these complex dynamics and if/how enjoyment shape cultural capital acquisition, Stebbins’ interpretations of serious fulfilment and casual edutainment (with the definitions of fun, enjoyable, satisfying, fulfilling, and gratifying activity) turned out to be valuable tools.

This thesis argues that the educational/intellectual and hedonistic dimensions are both implied dimensions of the literary festival experience and are strictly connected.

However, the ways in which participants experienced the festivals were uneven, especially in terms of enjoyment/asceticism and involvement. This study shows how the serious leisure perspective is also valuable to fully understand the role of involvement in cultural capital acquisition. The various levels of involvement with the festival and different motivations for participation create the Literary Festival Careers. These careers derive from on Stebbins’ serious leisure perspective and the idea of leisure career and are useful to understand the levels of involvement of participants. This study suggests that these careers can be plotted onto the Literary Festival Involvement scale to fully understand the complexity and dynamism of participants’ involvement levels and how
involvement and hedonism/asceticism shape cultural capital. By clustering participants into Literary Festival Careers, this study contributes to the debate on the nature of literary festival audiences, an under-researched topic (Mintel, 2011).

In addition, this study reveals how Stebbins’ concepts of serious fulfilment and casual edutainment are valuable tools to throw light on the role of time in the process of cultural capital acquisition. This thesis questions Bourdieu’s (2002 [1986]) argument that it takes time to acquire cultural capital. Findings revealed that both repeat and first-time participants acquired cultural capital. This suggests that cultural capital might not necessarily need time in order to be acquired, at least in festival contexts. People can buy books, visit local heritage, or learn something new without perseverance and repeat participation. This study, therefore, provides an exploration on the nature of festivals. It suggests that literary festivals are intense moments where time and space are condensed. It would appear that festivals allow culture to be displayed, shared, and acquired. Furthermore, this study suggests that Stebbins’ (2015) concept of edutainment can better define this process: people acquire knowledge in short-term pleasurable activities. Moreover, this study takes a step further in arguing that edutainment in literary festivals is not merely knowledge creation as Stebbins (2015) suggested, but participants can also acquire tastes, values, increment their participation or even accumulate objectified cultural capital with short-term participation. This highlights a shortcoming in the serious leisure perspective, suggesting that edutainment at literary festivals goes beyond knowledge acquisition.

Furthermore, it would appear that the engagement with the physical environment is another element that can shape cultural capital acquisition during festival participation. Here again, the serious leisure perspective turned out to be a valuable theory to fully explore how cultural capital can be embodied in festival contexts. While this study
concur with Bourdieu in conceiving of cultural capital acquisition as a conscious and unconscious process, it also shows how cultural capital is embodied through sensory bodies. This means that cultural capital embodiment usually involves what O’Connor (2007, p. 131) called ‘bodily intentionality’ in serious leisure: cultural capital is embodied with different degrees of bodily consciousness. Here, through festival participation, as a multi-sensory experience, there is an ‘incorporation’ of culture ‘converted into an integral part of the person’ (Bourdieu, 2002 [1986], p. 85). Cultural capital is embodied and incorporated through bodily experiences and senses during festival participation, such as visiting the local monument and learning while listening, seeing, and experiencing the festival as a whole. Thus, this is an indication that participants can embody cultural capital without necessarily making a mental conscious effort, rather it appears to occur always with a degree of bodily consciousness.

To sum up, this study’s findings would not have been produced without using Stebbins’ work on serious leisure. However, this study identifies shortcomings in the serious leisure perspective. Besides broadening the concepts of career, involvement, and edutainment, this study also broadens the concept of cultural resources acquired through leisure. While Stebbins focuses on how leisurists acquire knowledge and skills related to the activity, this study suggests that literary festival participants can acquire cultural resources both related to the activity (field-specific cultural capital) and general culture (non-field-specific cultural capital).

11.3.2 Using serious leisure to operationalise cultural embodiment in festival settings

Cultural capital has been operationalised in different ways and up to now there is no general agreement on the best indicators, especially of the embodied state (Vryonides,
This methodological confusion also applies to cultural capital operationalisation in festival contexts. This study uses serious leisure indicators in tandem with embodied cultural capital indicators to operationalise the embodied state of cultural capital in festivals. Thus, it argues that seeking inspiration from Stebbins’ (1982) serious leisure indicators can overcome cultural capital operationalisation limitations, in festival contexts at least. Some serious leisure indicators can be useful to operationalise cultural embodiment: perseverance, effort, personal enrichment, self-actualisation, self-expression (abilities and individual), self-image, and re-creation (Gould, Moore, McGuire, & Stebbins, 2008). These serious leisure indicators can overcome the limit of operationalisation of the embodied state by being integrated with the characteristics of: frequency in participating in cultural activities, cultural competence, reading habits, art participation and interests, self-cultivation, Bildung, manners and dispositions of the mind and the body. Seeking inspiration from serious leisure, this study identifies six qualitative indicators of cultural embodiment in festivals: cultural knowledge, skills and abilities, tastes and interests, cultural participation, values and personal enrichment, and bodily hexis (self-expression and attitudes). Thus, this thesis contends that serious leisure helps develop a set of indicators that could be adopted by researchers to study the embodied cultural capital in festivals. This is a key methodological contribution of this study.

Moreover, while most researchers have used quantitative methods to operationalise serious leisure, this thesis advocates the use of qualitative methods in line with researchers like Brown (2007), and Lamont, Kennelly, and Moyle (2014). The qualitative approach was found to be valuable in understanding the complex dynamics of festival experience and personal outcomes. Thus, this thesis contends that qualitative
methods can fully explore serious leisure and its personal rewards, at least in festival contexts.

To sum up, the process of the research and the theoretical and methodological contributions can be visually represented as follow:

---

**Figure 11.1: Visual representation of the research process and the theoretical and methodological contributions (Source: Author)**
11.4 Practical implications

Getz and Page (2016, p. 610) argue that it is important to ‘examine how [festival] design can influence experience and behaviour’. This study can help festival managers and organisers to further the understanding of the role that festival features and attributes like tickets, venues, and programme content, play in shaping audiences’ experiences and cultural benefits. This can help them to better understand the meanings of festivals for their participants, and influence how they design and improve successful future festivals.

In addition, this study can be useful to policy makers. Public institutions are investing in literary events but too often investment decisions are not informed by research evidence (Meehan, 2011). The situational analysis of this research provides insights into the national scenario of literary festivals in Ireland and in Italy. Moreover, it enhances the understanding of the nature of their audiences with the concepts of the Literary Festival Careers and the Literary Festival Involvement scale. These concepts can raise awareness among policymakers of the very complex nature of literary festival audiences.

In addition, this thesis provides empirical evidence of the cultural value of literary festivals and how adult participants can learn and acquire cultural resources through participation. This research proposes the model of cultural capital development associated with literary festival participation as a tool for further understanding all of the elements that play a role in that process. Even though this is a qualitative study which does not aim to measure cultural capital or to create generalisations, it can be replicated using the model of cultural capital development suggested here. Thus, this study informs current policy thinking about the value and importance of literary festivals as arenas for cultural sustainability: cultural capital can be reinforced, stimulated, and acquired. Therefore, this thesis suggests that, since literary festivals are settings where people can acquire
knowledge, develop tastes and preferences that continue into the longer term, these social gatherings might be used as platforms to educate participants and disseminate educational messages. Additionally, the findings show how literary festivals are settings for selling books. This can help festival organisers to increase book sales.

11.5 Limitations of the study

This section presents the limitations of this study. One limitation concerns economic capital. Even though the role of pre-existing economic capital was included in this research, it could have been better explored, by, for instance, gathering details about the respondents’ incomes. Due to the complexity of the topics, the big volume of data, and time restrictions, the analysis of the role of economic capital was relatively underexplored. However, it was sufficient for the study, but certainly, further studies on cultural capital in festivals could pay more attention to the role of economic capital. Similarly, the role of social capital and class could be better explored in further research.

This thesis included the role of social relations, especially the group composition during the festivals, but more details on the respondents’ social capital could have been included, providing a more comprehensive understanding of the role of social relationships.

Furthermore, Bourdieu and most of the studies concerning cultural capital focus mainly on children’s cultural capital and education attainment. As explained, Bourdieu (2002 [1986]) claimed that children’s cultural capital reflects parental level of cultural capital. Thus, in most studies (Vryonides, 2007), cultural capital indicators include the whole cultural capital produced by the family background. This thesis explores the respondents’ pre-existing levels of cultural capital, but it does not include their families’ cultural capitals because of time restriction and because of the increased complexity of
the findings that could be produced. Further studies could better explore the role of family cultural capital on the respondents’ cultural capital development. Moreover, this study does not include respondents under 18 and further enquiry could include all age groups to have a more comprehensive analysis of the entire audience.

In addition, as anticipated, this study takes into consideration how the type of event shapes cultural capital, analysing for instance cultural capital acquired during walking tours, writing awards, talks, or open mics. However, it does not deeply explore the type of literature, book, and writer. A further study is needed to better unravel the role played by the actual type of programme content on participants’ cultural capital development.

Finally, even while a few observations on power and inequalities have been presented in this study, the thesis does not deeply focus on understanding cultural capital as a marker of distinction. Bourdieu’s work on cultural capital can be used to explore power domination, and many studies on festivals, including literary festivals, have conceptualised festivals as moments where people seek to position themselves (Ommundsen, 2009; Weber, 2018). It was never the intention of this study to contribute to debates on cultural capital and power. Rather the motivation was to address the under-researched subject of if and how adults can acquire cultural capital through participation in festivals.

11.6 Future research recommendations
This section presents future research recommendations. Firstly, as mentioned earlier, future research enquiries should investigate further the role of economic capital and social capital in the process of cultural capital acquisition in festivals. In the case of social
capital, particular attention could be usefully paid to investigate solitude in festival contexts. The findings show that there was solitude in WW and PL, but this does not necessarily mean that solo participants acquired more or less cultural capital than those who attended the festivals in a group. A further analysis should consider in more detail the role of group composition, the concept of loneliness, and social interactions in literary festivals.

Secondly, as mentioned earlier, two other elements shaping cultural capital have not been fully explored: the parental cultural capital and the programme content. Future research should investigate them more deeply. For instance, a future study can focus on the differences of cultural capital acquisition depending on the literary genre of the festival event. Moreover, the findings showed that there were also people with low cultural capital, so there is a reason to believe that nowadays the audience is omnivorous (Peterson and Kern, 1996). However, more studies on the nature of the audience are needed, for instance, to fully understand if it possesses cosmopolitan cultural capital (Prieur & Savage, 2013).

Thirdly, these findings show that repeat and first-time participants acquire different cultural capital at festivals. Further research should focus more on the role of frequency and temporal dimensions at festivals and the outcomes of participation. This study began to investigate how outcomes differed between repeat and first-time participants, but further enquiry is needed to better understand all outcomes.

Furthermore, this study has begun to explore festival participation, the concept and the dimensions of festival atmosphere, providing theoretical contribution on the elements in play during festival participation, including the social atmosphere, the enjoyment factor, and the engagement with the physical environment. Much more work on the concept of festival atmosphere is needed and on the emotional dimension, beside
hedonism. Also, the role of the sensory body and the behavioural dimension of festivals merits further research.

Moreover, further exploration of how cultural capital is acquired through festival participation is likely to be worthwhile and can be conducted in other literary festivals. Future studies can use the concepts of literary festival career and the literary festival involvement scale to understand the nature of their audiences. Further querying of cultural capital development in different cultural contexts in other countries is another potentially interesting line of enquiry. This thesis proposes a model of cultural capital development associated with literary festival participation as a means of guiding further research in other literary festivals or in other countries. This model can be a valuable tool to explore cultural capital acquisition in different cultural contexts and in different festivals, in the literary field. Moreover, it could be used to research other types of festivals, for instance, music, food, dance, film festivals or even sport festivals. Further research could test and verify if the model of cultural capital development associated with festival participation suggested here can be usefully applied in other types of festivals.

Future querying of cultural capital development as shaped by gender is another potential line of enquiry. It has been explained how literary festivals are mainly female leisure activities. This thesis started to address the role of gender in the process of cultural capital acquisition and future studies could further explore this topic in other festival contexts.

Finally, while these thesis findings only reveal a development, stimulation and reinforcement of respondents’ cultural capital, further studies could focus on researching whether there is a decrease of cultural capital. Negative experience might lead to a decrease of cultural resources. If such a cultural capital decrease occurs, future studies should investigate the elements that play a role in this process, when, and how it occurs.
11.7 Conclusion

Literary festivals are an important element of cultural consumption practices and now it seems that they are becoming even more important as they attract a wider and more omnivorous audience. Besides their political, economic, and social functions, they play a significant cultural function by maintaining, shaping, transmitting, and developing our cultural resources. During these intense and enjoyable moments participants can engage in different ways with other people and with the physical environment. By attending literary festivals participants can learn, develop skills, explore new places, reflect on their values, purchase cultural goods, and even increase their educational qualifications. It is crucial to be aware of the cultural value of literary festivals. As a result, researching literary festivals is important and future research should focus more on these meaningful cultural practices. After all, Cicero (in Falk, Ballantyne, Packer, & Benckendorff, 2012, p. 915) was right: ‘leisure [including literary festival participation] consists in all those virtuous activities by which a man [/woman] grows morally, intellectually, and spiritually’. This can make lives worth living.
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APPENDICES
Appendix 1: Research note on supply and public support of cultural activities in Ireland and Italy

In Ireland, national cultural institutions, such as museums and art galleries, operate a policy of free admission and have education departments that offer workshops, symposia, teacher training and lectures. There are also several annual projects, such as Culture Night and National Heritage Week, designed to encourage cultural participation. However, all the national cultural institutions are now challenged by budget cuts and staffing restrictions (Compendium, 2016). One Irish city, Dublin, has been awarded as a Unesco City of Literature designation and three cities have been European Capitals of Culture: Dublin (1991), Cork (2005) and Galway (2020) (Eurostat, 2015). In contrast, in Italy, even if there is no free admission for national cultural institutions, several initiatives have been undertaken to foster participation, for instance the White Nights, the Museum Night, the Heritage Weeks, and the Feats of Music (Compendium, 2016). In Italy, there are no Unesco Cities of Literature but four cities have been designated as European Capitals of Culture: Florence (1986), Bologna (2000), Genoa (2004), and Matera (2019) (Eurostat, 2015). In 2007, the Italian Association of Publishers’ Studies Office carried out a census of all initiatives that relate to the promotion of reading and identified 193 manifestations, including authors’ presentations, fairs, festivals, and prizes (Bonciarelli, 2007). Unfortunately, the most recent data dates from 2009, when the Osservatorio Italiano Festival ed Eventi Culturali observed that there were 927 cultural festivals in Italy (Guerzoni et al., 2015). As regards the public support for cultural activities, in 2009, the Irish government expenditure on culture per capita was 42.61 Euro (0.40 %) while in Italy it was 117.00 Euro (90%) (Compendium, 2016). The public funding for the cultural sector 2001-2014 saw Irish expenditure on the arts increase up until 2007 and then decrease until 2014. Meanwhile, the expenditure of the Italian Ministry of Heritage and Cultural Activities decreased from 2001-2014 at which point it increased slightly (Compendium, 2016). In 2013, 62% of the public cultural expenditure in Ireland was for cultural heritage (monuments, museums, archives, libraries, heritage and folk culture), 15 % for performing arts (music, theatre, dance), 8% for audio-visual and multimedia, 2% for visual arts (photography, architecture), 2% for interdisciplinary (cultural education, cultural relations abroad) (Compendium, 2016).

(Source: Author)
Appendix 2: Research note on cultural participation in Ireland and Italy

In Ireland, the Arts Audiences 2014 survey reported that cultural participation increased from 2013 to 2014, except in the case of opera. Participation at plays, and at art galleries remain the two largest activities numerically in 2013 and cinema in 2014. While in Italy, the SIAE attendance survey of 2014 observed that the slowdown caused by the economic crisis since 2011 was still progressing, with the sole exception of dance (ISTAT, 2011). The ISTAT participation survey 2000-2014 reported that in 2014, most Italians participated in cinema, followed by museums and exhibitions, theatre, concerts, and finally classical music concerts (ISTAT, 2011). More recently, Compendium (2015) reported that Italians mainly participated in cinema, while Irish levels of participation in cinema, live performances and cultural sites are all very high.

(Source: Author)
Appendix 3: Research note on reading index and education attainment in Ireland and Italy

Ireland has a strong literary heritage, with many internationally famous writers and poets, and it remains a nation of writers and passionate readers even today. The OECD’s Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) (2018) revealed that in 2015 Ireland and Finland were the two countries with the highest number of readers. ‘Irish readers are like no others in the world’ said Barry in ‘The Journal’ (2016), while the 2014-15 Joint National Readership Survey claimed that 4 in 5 adults in Ireland read a newspaper regularly (Stack, 2015). The Carnegie Survey (2011) also reported that in 2011, three-quarters of Irish people used public libraries. Even the youngest generations are no exception. They seemed to be among the best online readers in 2015, according to the OECD’s PISA results (2015). In contrast, in Italy, the reading index is lower. ISTAT (2011) reported that in 2009 only 45.1% of the population aged 6 and over said they had read at least one book. However, the Italian reading index remains low, compared with most other European countries (Compendium, 2016). ISTAT claimed that the most avid readers are found among people aged 65-74 (19.8%), among women (16%), with a peak between those aged 65-74 (22.1%), among graduates (24.4%) and among executives, entrepreneurs and freelancers (19.8%) and retirees (18.7%). Geographically, the highest shares of strong readers are found in the North West (19.5%) and in the North East (18.3%). Moreover, according to ISTAT, in 2009, 89.2% of families claimed to own books: 62.5% owned a maximum of 100 books (28.9% up to 25 books, 33.6% from 26 to 100 books), just over a quarter said they owned more than 100 books (26.7%), while 10.3% (2 million and 474 thousand families) said they did not own any. As regards educational attainment, in Ireland the percentage of the population with tertiary education (37.7 %) is much higher than in Italy (15.7 %), which, on the contrary, has a higher level of people with less than primary and lower secondary education (41.6 %, Ireland 24.6) (Eurostat, 2015). Even the most recent survey of Compendium (2018) reported that among people aged 30-34 tertiary educational attainment in 2018 in Italy was 27.8% while in Ireland it was 56.3%, higher than the European average (40.7%). Similarly, the adult participation rate in education and training in 2018 (Compendium, 2018) showed the Italian percentage (8.1%) to be lower than the European (11.1%), while the Irish is higher (12.5%).

(Source: Author)
## Appendix 4: Screening phase methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the festival</th>
<th>CÚIRT International festival of literature (from now on called Curt)</th>
<th>International Literature Festival Dublin (from now on called ILFD)</th>
<th>Howth Literary Arts Festival (from now on called Howth)</th>
<th>Bloomsday Festival (from now on called Bloomsday)</th>
<th>Zinrich Dalkey Book Festival (from now on called Dalkey)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of festival</strong></td>
<td>International literature festival</td>
<td>International literature festival</td>
<td>Literary Arts festival</td>
<td>Festival about one Author (James Joyce)</td>
<td>Book festival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td>Galway</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Howth (Dublin)</td>
<td>Dublin</td>
<td>Dalkey (Dublin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Are there Friends?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of observer</strong></td>
<td>Total participation (the researcher’s role is kept secret), complete participant with complete membership. The researcher is foreign, a tourist and an attendee.</td>
<td>Participation in the normal setting (the researcher’s role is known to certain “gatekeepers”, but is hidden from most of those in the setting), participant as observer with active membership. The researcher is a festival volunteer and an attendee.</td>
<td>Total participation (the researcher’s role is kept secret), complete participant with complete membership. The researcher is foreign, a tourist and an attendee.</td>
<td>Total participation (the researcher’s role is kept secret), complete participant with complete membership. The researcher is a foreign attendee.</td>
<td>Total participation (the researcher’s role is kept secret), complete participant with complete membership. The researcher is foreign, a tourist and an attendee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of part. Observ</strong></td>
<td>2 days (Saturday 23rd and Sunday 24th)</td>
<td>5 days (Saturday 21st, Sunday 22nd, Friday 27th, Saturday 28th and Sunday 29th)+ 1 night (Monday 30th)</td>
<td>1 day (Friday 10th)</td>
<td>2 days (Tuesday 14th, Thursday 16th)</td>
<td>2 days (Saturday 18th and Sunday 19th)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nr events attended</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Types of events attended</strong></td>
<td>2 panel discussion (with readings and Q&amp;A)</td>
<td>1 poetry reading + discussion</td>
<td>4 panel discussion</td>
<td>2 panel discussions</td>
<td>3 panel discussions (interview in conversation with…)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 brunch with theatre performance, live music and poetry reading</td>
<td>1 science lecture + Q&amp;A</td>
<td>1 audio performance</td>
<td>1 lecture + music performance</td>
<td>1 theatre performance with wine tasting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 poetry reading</td>
<td>1 theatre performance</td>
<td>1 poetry performance</td>
<td>1 walking tour</td>
<td>1 lecturer + preparation and food tastings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 live music</td>
<td>1 poetry performance</td>
<td>1 live music</td>
<td>1 reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 panel discussion (interview in conversation with…)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tickets</strong></td>
<td>2 paid €10/8</td>
<td>5 paid €10/8</td>
<td>2 paid €10/8</td>
<td>1 paid €5</td>
<td>2 paid €10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 paid €12/10</td>
<td>1 paid €10</td>
<td>1 paid €20</td>
<td>1 paid €10</td>
<td>1 paid €12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(all free as volunteer)</td>
<td>4 free</td>
<td>1 free</td>
<td>1 free</td>
<td>1 paid €15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Venues</strong></td>
<td>3 inside</td>
<td>9 inside</td>
<td>2 inside</td>
<td>2 inside</td>
<td>4 inside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 outside</td>
<td>1 outside</td>
<td>2 outside</td>
<td>1 outside</td>
<td>1 outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
Appendix 5: The Dublin Book Festival unstructured interview guide

1. Gender, age, residence, first time/repeat, job (related to writing?)
2. Are you planning to buy any books (or anything)?
3. Why have you come to the festival today?
4. Attending the festival says a lot about who you are?
5. Have you discovered or learned something new?
6. Can you feel yourself enriched after the festival experience?
7. Do you think the festival can increase you cultural resources?
8. Do you think the festival can spark an interest in reading or writing?
9. Do you think you have acquired any new skills?
10. Are you satisfied with you experience?
11. Would you like to recommend or visit the festival again?

(Source: Author)
Appendix 6: The Dublin Book Festival questionnaire

Dear Festival Guest,

Thank you for your interest in this research project. This questionnaire is addressed to people who have attended the Dublin Book Festival this year. We would be interested in finding out why you decided to attend, what you have learned, and what you enjoyed about the festival. What you tell us may be of use to the festival organisers, to improve the future editions.

This is a research project of the Dublin Institute of Technology. It is being led by Giulia Rossetti, and her supervisor Dr. Bernadette Quinn. The Dublin Book Festival organisers have given permission for the research to be carried out. Any personal details you provide will be stored securely and not passed on to anyone not connected with this research project. You will not be identified by your name in any report. If you afterward decide you would prefer us to destroy any of your details, please inform us and we will immediately comply with your request.

If you would like to know more about this research, Giulia Rossetti or Dr. Bernadette Quinn can be contacted at: Phone: 00353(0)1402516, E-mail: giulia.rossetti@mydit.ie

Kind regards, Giulia Rossetti

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of participant</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How many years have you attended the Dublin Book Festival?</td>
<td>2. Including yourself, how many people are in your immediate group?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Every year since the beginning</td>
<td>[ ] 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Almost every year since the beginning</td>
<td>[ ] 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Occasionally</td>
<td>[ ] 2–5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] This is the first year I have attended the festival</td>
<td>[ ] 5–10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Who are they?</th>
<th>4. In this year’s festival, how many events have you planned to attend?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] family (parents / children…)</td>
<td>[ ] 1 – 5 events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] friends</td>
<td>[ ] 6 – 10 events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] girlfriend/ partner</td>
<td>[ ] More than 10 events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Are you a “Friend” of the festival?</th>
<th>6. How many other literary festivals have you attended in the last 12 months?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Yes</td>
<td>[ ] 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] No</td>
<td>[ ] 5-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] more than 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. How many books have you read in the last 12 months?</th>
<th>8. Are you a writer/ blogger/ poet/ song writer or similar?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 1-5</td>
<td>[ ] yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] 5-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] more than 10</td>
<td>[ ] no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socio-Cultural Profile of the Audience</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Are you:</td>
<td>10. Are you:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] female</td>
<td>[ ] White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] male</td>
<td>[ ] Hispanic or Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Dublin</td>
<td>[ ] 18-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] other city in Ireland (Cork, Galway, Limerick…)</td>
<td>[ ] 20-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Northern Ireland</td>
<td>[ ] 30-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] the UK</td>
<td>[ ] 40-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] other country in Europe</td>
<td>[ ] 50-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] outside Europe</td>
<td>[ ] 60-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] 70-79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. What is the highest level of education you have attained?</th>
<th>14. What is your main occupation?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ ] No formal qualifications</td>
<td>[ ] Manager/administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Undergraduate degree</td>
<td>[ ] Professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ ] Tradesperson or related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my experience at the Dublin Book Festival</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can feel myself enriched after the festival experience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thanks to the festival I more open-minded now</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This festival made me feel happy</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have learned several interesting new things</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The festival was an opportunity to spark my interest in a particular topic</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending the festival allows me to spend time with my family/friends</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending the festival says a lot about who I am</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel a strong sense of belonging to the festival</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intention to Recommend**

24. Would you recommend others visit this festival?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Do not know yet

**Recurrent Participation**

25. Would you probably visit this festival again next year?
- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Do not know yet

Thank you for your participation and enjoy the festival!

(Source: Author)
Appendix 7: the Mountains to Sea DLR Book Festival semi-structured interview guide

Female / male | White, Black, Latino, Asian...
---
1. Did you enjoy the event?  
2. For how many years have you attended this festival?  
3. Are you alone or with someone?  
   a. How many people are in your group and who are they?  
4. How many festival events do you plan to attend/have you attended this year?  
   Which ones?  
5. Do you live here in Dun Laoghaire?  
   a. If not, where?  
6. What age bracket best describes you? (20s, 30s, 40s, 50s…)  
7. How many other literary festivals have you attended in the last 12 months, if any?  
8. How many books do you own more or less? (1-20/ 20-50…)  
9. What is the highest level of education you have attained?  
10. What is your main occupation?  
11. Do you write professionally (or would you like to)?  
12. Do you think you are a passionate reader?  
13. Why have you decided to come to the festival today?  
14. Was it hard to find the time to come to the festival today?  
15. Do you enjoy interacting with other participants and do you think you share the same ideals with them?  
16. Are you planning to buy (or have you already bought) any books during the festival?  
17. Have you taken any notes?  
18. Was the event interesting?  
19. Thinking about yourself here at the festival. Which of these sentences apply to be your best? There are no wrong or right answers.

**WHILE I AM HERE...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I’m discovering new things, expanding my knowledge, exploring new ideas</th>
<th>I’m having great fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The festival says something about who I am</td>
<td>I realise I’m not really into this literary scene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The festival doesn’t make me feel ‘enriched’</td>
<td>The festival is satisfying my curiosity and sparking new cultural interests in me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m happy to be spending quality time here</td>
<td>I’m just taking a break from my usual routine, to relax and meet people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel I don’t belong to this intellectual community</td>
<td>I can show my knowledge and abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m being entertained</td>
<td>I’m mentally stimulated and becoming informed. I feel more cultured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m improving my skills and abilities. I feel invigorated</td>
<td>I enjoy it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
Appendix 8: The participant observation protocol for the two pilot studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>GOAL:</strong> what do I want to understand?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME:</strong> (day + hour)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPACE:</strong> location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVENT:</strong> type of the event if any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTORS:</strong> the people in the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACTIVITY:</strong> attendees’ behaviours</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJECTS:</strong> in the field</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEELINGS:</strong> of the participants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBSERVER’S COMMENTS:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
Appendix 9: Information sheet for festival organisers (WW)

The Dublin Institute of Technology Research Project

Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital

Dear Writers’ Week,

Thank you for your interest in this research project. It is being led by Giulia Rossetti, and her supervisor Dr. Bernadette Quinn. The aim of the study is to understand more about the festival audience. The study asks: who is the audience, why do they attend, what and how do they learn through participation.

We would like to conduct on-site short interviews during the Writers’ Week, in/ around the venues of the festival. People will be approached verbally before or after the events, and they will be asked e.g. what they have enjoyed about the festival, what they have learned, and why they have decided to attend. The type of participant will also be investigated, e.g. first-time or repeat (loyal), local or tourist, solo or in a group, male or female. Finally, the act or desire of purchasing of books during the festival will be asked.

All the respondents will be adult participants over 18 years old. The on-site interviews will be likely to last between 10 and 15 minutes.

No emotional or psychological harm will be deliberately invoked to respondents. Questions about age, occupation and educational level or any other question related to social class will be handled with sensitivity for the respondents’ feelings. The researcher will have a DIT badge in order to be identified. The badge will also indicate the purpose of the survey and it will give reassurance to the respondents. The interviewees will be fully informed about the nature of the research and their role, as well as they will be given the right to anonymity, and offered the chance to be able to discontinue their involvement if they chose to do so at a later date. Informed consent will be gained. During the on-site short interviews, people might be asked if they are available to participate in follow-up in-depth interviews. Contacts (name and telephone or e-mail) of the subjects who will sign to be available for further participation in the research. Any personal details the respondents provide will be stored securely and not passed on to anyone not connected with this research project. Respondents will not be identified by their name in any report.

The results of this study will be used for an academic study and future publications. What they tell us may also contribute to the Writers’ Week cultural policy development and could be of use to the Writers’ Week organisers.

The attached consent form will be kept in the confidence of the researcher.

For more information please contact Giulia Rossetti or Dr. Bernadette Quinn at:

Dublin Institute of Technology, College of Arts & Tourism, Cathal Brugha St., Dublin 1.

Phone: 00353(0)14023537 E-mail: giulia.rossetti@mydit.ie

Kind regards,

Giulia Rossetti

(Source: Author)
Appendix 10: Information sheet for festival organisers (PL)

The Dublin Institute of Technology Research Project

Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital

Gentile Pordenonelegge,
Questo progetto di ricerca é condotto da Giulia Rossetti e da Dr. Bernadette Quinn. Il progetto consiste in un’analisi internazionale di festival italiani ed irlandesi dedicati alla letteratura. L’oggetto di studio é investigare l’audience e i benefici educativi che i partecipanti ricavano dalla partecipazione ad un festival letterario, in termini di aumento di capitale culturale. Lo studio comprende domande quali: chi sono i visitatori, quali sono le motivazioni che li spingono a partecipare, come e quali impatti culturali ed educativi il festival ha sui partecipanti.

La ricerca prevede brevi interviste sul posto durante l’edizione 2017 di Pordenonelegge, vicino e nelle aree del festival. I soggetti saranno approcciati verbalmente prima o dopo gli eventi e gli sarà chiesto, per esempio, quale aspetto hanno apprezzato di piú del festival, che cosa hanno imparato, perché hanno deciso di partecipare. La tipologia di partecipante sarà inoltre indagata.

Per esempio, le domande copriranno elementi come l’età, il sesso, se si tratta di un visitatore fedele che frequenta il festival da varie edizioni oppure se é la sua prima visita, se é un cittadino locale oppure un turista domestico o internazionale, se partecipa da solo o in gruppo. Per esempio, verrà indagata anche l’inclinazione a comperare libri. Tutti gli intervistati saranno adulti, over 18 anni. Le interviste dureranno all’incirca tra i 10 e i 15 minuti e saranno registrate. Le interviste saranno condotte dalla dottoranda.

La ricerca non prevede nessun costo monetario da parte del festival. Sará chiesto semplicemente di permettere alla ricercatrice di partecipare ad alcuni eventi per poter avere una migliore visione complessiva dell’audience. Si chiede inoltre il permesso di scattare alcune foto durante il festival, durante o dopo gli eventi. Stia la foto che le interviste saranno condotte senza creare disagi né per l’organizzazione del festival né per i visitatori.

Nessun danno emotivo o psicologico sarà deliberatamente causato ai soggetti intervistati. Domande su età, professione e livello di istruzione o di qualsiasi altra questione relativa alla classe sociale saranno trattate con sensibilità per non urtare i sentimenti degli intervistati. La ricercatrice avrà un tessertino universitario al fine di essere identificata. Il tessertino servirà anche ad indicare lo scopo del sondaggio e rassicurerà gli intervistati. Gli intervistati saranno pienamente informati circa la natura della ricerca e il loro ruolo, così come avranno il diritto di anonimato, e gli sarà offerta la possibilità di essere in grado di interrompere il loro coinvolgimento, anche in un secondo momento. Prima delle interviste sarà ottenuto il consenso da parte degli intervistati. Durante le brevi interviste sul posto, potrebbe essere chiesto agli intervistati se sono disponibili a partecipare ad interviste successive. Contatti (nome e recapito telefonico o e-mail) dei soggetti che si renderanno disponibili ad ulteriori interviste non saranno trasmessi a coloro che non sono collegati con questo progetto di ricerca. Gli intervistati non saranno identificati con il loro nome in qualsiasi rapporto. I risultati di questo studio saranno utilizzati per una tesi di dottorato e per possibili pubblicazioni accademiche future. I risultati possono inoltre contribuire allo sviluppo della politica culturale ed educativa di Pordenonelegge e potrebbero essere utili agli organizzatori dello stesso. Il modulo di consenso, allegato al presente documento, sarà conservato dalla ricercatrice e non passato a terzi.

Per ulteriori informazioni contattare Giulia Rossetti o Dr. Bernadette Quinn all’indirizzo: Dublin Institute of Technology, College of Arts & Tourism, Cathal Brugha St., Dublin 1.Telefono fisso: 00353 14023537  Cellulare irlandese (con WhatsApp): 00353 87 4690840 E-mail: giulia.rossetti@mydit.ie Cordiali saluti, Giulia Rossetti

(Source: Author)
Appendix 11: Consent form for festival organisers (WW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CONSENT FORM</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Researcher’s Name:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Title:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giulia Rossetti</td>
<td>Miss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty/School/Department:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title of Study:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD Researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To be completed by the Listowel Writers’ Week:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Have you been fully informed/read the information sheet about this study?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have you received satisfactory answers to all your questions?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have you received enough information about this study and any associated health and safety implications if applicable?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• at any time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• without giving a reason for withdrawing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• without affecting your future relationship with the Institute</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you agree to take part in this study the results of which are likely to be published?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Have you been informed that this consent form shall be kept in the confidence of the researcher?</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Signed ____________________________ Date __________________ |
| Name in Block Letters and Staff Role |  |
| ___________________________________________________________ |  |
| Signature of Researcher __________________________ Date ________________ |  |

(Source: Author)
## MODULO DI CONSENSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titolo:</th>
<th>Miss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ricercatrice:</td>
<td>Giulia Rossetti</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facoltà/Università/Dipartimento:</th>
<th>College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Titolo di studio:</td>
<td>Ricercatrice dottoranda – PhD researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progetto:**
Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital

**Da completare da parte del Festival Pordenonelegge**

1. É stato pienamente informato/ ha letto il foglio informativo su questo studio? SI/NO
2. Ha avuto l’opportunità di fare domande e di discutere riguardo questo studio? SI/NO
3. Ha ricevuto risposte soddisfacenti a tutte le sue domande? SI/NO
4. Ha ricevuto abbastanza informazioni riguardo questo studio ed eventuali implicazioni per la salute e la sicurezza, se presenti? SI/NO

1. Si rende conto che é libero di ritirarsi da questo studio?
   - In ogni momento
   - Senza dare una ragione per il ritiro
   - Senza influenzare il suo futuro rapporto con l’Istituto

2. É d’accordo a prendere parte a questo studio i cui risultati potrebbero essere pubblicati? SI/NO
3. É stato informato del fatto che questo modulo di consenso sarà conservato dalla ricercatrice? SI/NO

| Firma _____________________________________ | Data ________________ |
| Nome in Stampatello e Ruolo nel Festival | ______________________________________________________________ |

| Firma della ricercatrice ________________________ | Data ________________ |

(Source: Author)
Appendix 13: Information sheet for the respondents / on-site interviews (WW)

The Dublin Institute of Technology Research Project
Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital:

Dear Festival Guest,
Thank you for your interest in this research project of the Dublin Institute of Technology. It is being led by Giulia Rossetti, and her supervisor Dr. Bernadette Quinn. The Writers’ Week organisers have given permission for the research to be carried out. We are interviewing people who have attended the Writers’ Week this year. We would be interested in talking to you to find out why you decided to attend, what you have learned, and what you enjoyed about the festival. What you tell us may be of use to the festival organisers, to improve the future editions.

The interview will be recorded and it will last between 10 and 15 minutes. Any personal details you provide will be stored securely and not passed on to anyone not connected with this research project. You will not be identified by your name in any report. The results of this study will be used for an academic study and future publications. You are free to withdraw from this study at any time, without giving a reason for withdrawing, and without affecting your future relationship with the Institute. If you afterward decide you would prefer us to destroy any of your details, please inform us and we will immediately comply with your request.

If you would like to know more about this research, Giulia Rossetti or Dr. Bernadette Quinn can be contacted at:

Dublin Institute of Technology
College of Arts & Tourism
Cathal Brugha St.
Dublin 1
Phone: 00353(0)14021516
E-mail: giulia.rossetti@mydit.ie

Kind regards,
Giulia Rossetti

(Source: Author)
Progetto di Ricerca del Dublin Institute of Technology
Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital

Gentile partecipante al festival,

La ringraziamo per il suo interesse in questo progetto di ricerca del Dublin Institute of Technology. È condotto da Giulia Rossetti e dalla sua supervisor Dr. Bernadette Quinn. Gli organizzatori di Pordenonelegge hanno dato il permesso di poter svolgere tale studio. Stiamo intervistando chi ha partecipato a Pordenonelegge quest anno. Siamo interessati a parlare con lei per sapere per quale motivo ha deciso di andare al festival, che cosa ha imparato e che cosa le è piaciuto del festival. Quello che ci dice potrà essere utilizzato dagli organizzatori del festival per migliorare le future edizioni.

L’intervista durerà circa 10-15 minuti e sarà registrata.

Domande su età, professione e livello di istruzione o di qualsiasi altra questione relativa alla classe sociale saranno trattate con sensibilità per non urtare i suoi sentimenti. Tutti i dati personali forniti verranno conservati in modo sicuro e non trasmessi a chi non sia collegato a questo progetto di ricerca. Lei non sarà identificato col suo nome in alcun report.

I risultati di questa ricerca saranno utilizzati in uno studio e future pubblicazioni accademiche.

Nel caso volesse ritirarsi da questo studio, anche in un secondo momento, la preghiamo di informarci e noi immediatamente rispetteremo la sua richiesta. La sua scelta non influenzerà il suo futuro rapporto con l’Istituto.

Per ulteriori informazioni riguardo la ricerca contattare Giulia Rossetti o Dr. Bernadette Quinn

Dublin Institute of Technology,
College of Arts & Tourism, Cathal Brugha St., Dublin 1
Phone: 00353(0)1402516
E-mail: giulia.rossetti@mydit.ie
Cordiali saluti,

Giulia Rossetti

(Source: Author)
## Appendix 15: Consent form for the respondents / on-site interviews (WW)

**CONSENT FORM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher’s Name:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giulia Rossetti</td>
<td>Miss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/School/Department:</th>
<th>Title of Study:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology</td>
<td>PhD Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project:**
Literary Festival Consumption and the Development of Audience’s Cultural Capital

**To be completed by the interviewee**

1. Have you been fully informed/read the information sheet about this study? **YES/NO**
2. Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study? **YES/NO**
3. Have you received satisfactory answers to all your questions? **YES/NO**
4. Have you received enough information about this study and any associated health and safety implications if applicable? **YES/NO**
5. Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study?
   - at any time
   - without giving a reason for withdrawing
   - without affecting your future relationship with the Institute **YES/NO**
6. Do you agree to take part in this study the results of which are likely to be published? **YES/NO**
7. Have you been informed that this consent form shall be kept in the confidence of the researcher? **YES/NO**

Later in this research study, I will conduct interviews about the festival experience. Would you like to participate? 

[ ] Yes  
[ ] No

Where do you live? ____________________________________________________
Telephone number: ______________________________________________________
E-mail / Address: _______________________________________________________

Name in Block
Letters______________________________________________________________

Signed ___________________________ Date ________________

Signature of Researcher _________________ Date ________________

(Source: Author)
Appendix 16: Consent form for the respondents / on-site interviews (PL)

MODULO DI CONSENSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ricercatrice:</th>
<th>Titolo:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giulia Rossetti</td>
<td>Miss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facoltà/Università/Dipartimento:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Titolo di studio:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ricercatrice dottoranda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Progetto:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Da completare da parte dell’intervistato</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. È stato pienamente informato/ ha letto il foglio informativo su questo studio? SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ha avuto l’opportunità di fare domande e di discutere riguardo questo studio? SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ha ricevuto risposte soddisfacenti a tutte le sue domande? SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ha ricevuto abbastanza informazioni riguardo questo studio ed eventuali implicazioni per la salute e la sicurezza, se presenti? SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Si rende conto che è libero di ritirarsi da questo studio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In ogni momento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senza dare una ragione per il ritiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senza influenzare il suo futuro rapporto con l’Istituto SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. È d’accordo a prendere parte a questo studio i cui risultati potrebbero essere pubblicati? SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. È stato informato del fatto che questo modulo di consenso sarà conservato dalla ricercatrice? SI/NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nelle settimane successive condurrò interviste sull’esperienza del festival. Le piacerebbe partecipare?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ SI ] [ NO ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Città/paese in cui abita

Numero di telefono _____________________________

Email ______________________ _______________________

Nome in stampatello____________________

Firma _______________ Data ______________________

Firma della ricercatrice _______________ Data ______________________

(Source: Author)
Appendix 17: The participant observation protocol for the two case studies

| **GOAL**: what do I want to understand?       |          |
| **TIME**: (day + hour)                        |          |
| **SPACE**: location                           |          |
| **EVENT**: name and type of the event, if any |          |
| **ACTIVITY**: what is occurring (presentation, reading, discussion...) |          |
| **ACTORS**: the people in the field (gender, age, ethnicity, dresses...) |          |
| **ACTION**: participants’ behaviours and feelings |          |
| **OBJECTS**: in the field                     |          |
| **OBSERVER’S COMMENTS**:                      |          |

(Source: Author)
### Appendix 18: On-site interviews (WW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NR</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>File duration (min)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Fantasy Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WW1OS</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>Wednesday 31(^{st}) May 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Darrel</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>46.19</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WW2OS</td>
<td>03.27</td>
<td>Thursday 1(^{st}) June 2017</td>
<td>The Seanchai Centre</td>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>03.28</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WW3OS</td>
<td>07.18</td>
<td>Thursday 1(^{st}) June 2017</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Anita</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WW4OS</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>Thursday 1(^{st}) June 2017</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Meghan</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WW6OS</td>
<td>07.12</td>
<td>Thursday 1(^{st}) June 2017</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Missy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WW7OS</td>
<td>07.30</td>
<td>Thursday 1(^{st}) June 2017</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Ashlyn</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>WW8OS</td>
<td>09.46</td>
<td>Thursday 1(^{st}) June 2017</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Sheila</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WW9OS</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>Thursday 1(^{st}) June 2017</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Alison</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WW10OS</td>
<td>02.57</td>
<td>Thursday 1(^{st}) June 2017</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WW11OS</td>
<td>09.11</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>In the square</td>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WW12OS</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>Outside of the Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Shane</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WW13OS</td>
<td>05.55</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>Outside of the Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Michelle</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WW14OS</td>
<td>02.34</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>Outside secondary school</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WW15OS</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>Outside secondary school</td>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>WW16OS</td>
<td>08.42</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>In the square</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WW17OS</td>
<td>09.21</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WW18OS</td>
<td>20.13</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>In the square</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>WW19OS</td>
<td>15.59</td>
<td>Friday 2(^{nd}) June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Maureen</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>WW20OS</td>
<td>16.24</td>
<td>Saturday 3(^{rd}) June 17</td>
<td>The researcher’s accommodation</td>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>WW21OS</td>
<td>09.57</td>
<td>Saturday 3(^{rd}) June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>01.27</td>
<td>Saturday 3(^{rd}) June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WW22OS</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Lucy</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>WW23OS</td>
<td>08.13</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Stephanie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>WW25OS</td>
<td>15.56</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Theresa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>WW26OS</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Orlaith</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>WW27OS</td>
<td>06.14</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Cassie</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>WW28OS</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>WW29OS</td>
<td>04.20</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>Listowel Community Ctr.</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>WW31OS</td>
<td>05.54</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>Listowel Community Ctr.</td>
<td>Veronica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>WW32OS</td>
<td>02.47</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>Listowel Community Ctr.</td>
<td>Milly</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>WW33OS</td>
<td>02.19</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>Listowel Community Ctr.</td>
<td>Cormac</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>WW34OS</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Peter</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>WW35OS</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Norah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>WW36OS</td>
<td>15.50</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>WW37OS</td>
<td>04.47</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>WW38OS</td>
<td>08.28</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>WW39OS</td>
<td>08.29</td>
<td>Saturday 3\textsuperscript{rd} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>WW40OS</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>WW41OS</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>WW42OS</td>
<td>03.55</td>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 17</td>
<td>Listowel Community Ctr.</td>
<td>Isabelle</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>WW43OS</td>
<td>02.40</td>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 17</td>
<td>Listowel Community Ctr.</td>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>WW44OS</td>
<td>09.46</td>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>WW45OS</td>
<td>08.42</td>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>WW46OS</td>
<td>09.43</td>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Juliane</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>WW47OS</td>
<td>01.30</td>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>WW48OS</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>Sunday 4\textsuperscript{th} June 17</td>
<td>The Listowel Arms Hotel</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NR</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>File duration (min)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Fantasy Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PL50OS</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>Thursday 14th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo Badini</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PL51OS</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>Thursday 14th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PL52OS</td>
<td>19.50</td>
<td>Thursday 14th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Katia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PL53OS</td>
<td>12.23</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Franco</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PL55OS</td>
<td>08.54</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Alessandra</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PL56OS</td>
<td>05.35</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Cinemazero</td>
<td>Simone</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PL57OS</td>
<td>08.01</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Sala Convegni</td>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PL58OS</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PL59OS</td>
<td>07.17</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo Montereale Mantica</td>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PL100OS</td>
<td>08.37</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Francesca</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PL61OS</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo Montereale Mantica</td>
<td>Federico</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PL62OS</td>
<td>10.47</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo Montereale Mantica</td>
<td>Filippo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PL63OS</td>
<td>08.58</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo Gregorisi</td>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PL64OS</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Square - book stall</td>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PL65OS</td>
<td>11.16</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Square - book stall</td>
<td>Elisa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PL66OS</td>
<td>07.50</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Ridotto del Teatro Verdi</td>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PL67OS</td>
<td>05.37</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Riccardo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>PL68OS</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>Friday 15th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Leonardo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>PL69OS</td>
<td>09.20</td>
<td>Saturday 16th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>PL70OS</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>Saturday 16th September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Cecilia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>PL71OS</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>Saturday 16th September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Giacomo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>PL72OS</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>Saturday 16th September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Nicola</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Date/Time</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Visited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>PL73OS</td>
<td>12.31</td>
<td>Saturday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Square - book stall</td>
<td>Ettore</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>PL74OS</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>Saturday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>PL75OS</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>Saturday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Palazzo della Provincia</td>
<td>Elia</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>PL76OS</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>Saturday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Square - book stall</td>
<td>Federica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>PL77OS</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>Saturday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Square - book stall</td>
<td>Pietro</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>PL78OS</td>
<td>10.59</td>
<td>Saturday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Spazio Incontri</td>
<td>Paolo</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>PL79OS</td>
<td>08.54</td>
<td>Saturday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Square - book stall</td>
<td>Annamaria</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>PL80OS</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>Saturday 16&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Teatro Verdi</td>
<td>Letizia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>PL81OS</td>
<td>12.38</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>PL83OS</td>
<td>08.30</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Square - book stall</td>
<td>Hans</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>PL84OS</td>
<td>08.39</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Square - book stall</td>
<td>Serena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>PL85OS</td>
<td>11.18</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Square - book stall</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>PL86OS</td>
<td>12.42</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Rachele</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>PL87OS</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Marco</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>PL88OS</td>
<td>10.03</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Loggia del Municipio</td>
<td>Giuliano</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>PL89OS</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Loggia del Municipio</td>
<td>Giulio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>PL90OS</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Elena</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>PL91OS</td>
<td>08.19</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Biblioteca Civica</td>
<td>Susanna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>PL92OS</td>
<td>07.24</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Biblioteca Civica</td>
<td>Giovanna</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>PL93OS</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Fabrizio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>PL94OS</td>
<td>05.34</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Biblioteca Civica</td>
<td>Luca</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>PL95OS</td>
<td>11.46</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Teatro Verdi</td>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>PL96OS</td>
<td>10.38</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Teatro Verdi</td>
<td>Giorgio</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>PL97OS</td>
<td>07.37</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>Teatro Verdi</td>
<td>Simona</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>PL99OS</td>
<td>05.23</td>
<td>Sunday 17&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; September 17</td>
<td>On the street</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
Appendix 20: The on-site semi-structured interview guide (WW)

1. Are you enjoying the festival?
2. Do you live here in Listowel?
   a. If not, where?
3. What age bracket best describes you? (20s, 30s, 40s, 50s...)
4. What is your main occupation?
5. What is the highest level of education you have attained?
6. How many books do you own more or less? (1-20/ 20-50...)
7. How many years have you attended this festival?
8. How many other literary festivals have you attended in the last 12 months, if any?
9. Do you write professionally (or would you like to)?
10. Do you think you are a passionate reader?
11. Why have you decided to come to the festival today?
12. Was it hard to find the time to come to the festival today? Did you have to give up some commitments to come here?
13. What does the festival mean to you?
14. If you had to describe the festival with 3 adjectives, which ones would you chose?
15. Are you alone or with someone?
   a. How many people are in your group and who are they?
16. How many festival events do you plan to attend/have you attended this year? Which ones?
17. Have you taken any notes?
18. Do you have the impression that you have learned something?
19. Are you planning to buy (or have you already bought) any books during the festival? Why?
20. Thinking about yourself here at the festival. Which of these sentences apply to be your best? There are no wrong or right answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The festival makes me think</th>
<th>The festival makes me feel good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’m discovering new things, expanding my knowledge, exploring new ideas</td>
<td>I’m having great fun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I realise that the festival is not really my thing</td>
<td>The festival is satisfying my curiosity and sparking new cultural interests in me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m happy to be spending quality time here</td>
<td>I’m happy to relax and meet people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
Appendix 21: The on-site semi-structured interview guide (PL)

1. Si sta gustando il festival?
2. Abita qui, a Pordenone?
   a. Se no, dove abita?
3. Quale fascia d’età la descrive meglio? (20, 30, 40, 50 anni...)
4. Che lavoro fa?
5. Qual è il livello di istruzione più alto che ha raggiunto?
6. Quanti libri possiede più o meno? (1-20/20-50...)
7. Da quanti anni frequenta il festival?
8. A quanti altri festival letterari è andata/o negli ultimi 12 mesi?
9. È una/o scrittrice/scrittore di professione (o le piacerebbe)?
10. Si ritiene una lettrice/un lettore appassionato?
11. Perché ha deciso di venire al festival oggi?
12. E’ stato difficile trovare il tempo per venire al festival oggi? Ha dovuto rinunciare a qualche impegno per venire qui?
13. Che cosa significa per lei il festival?
14. Se dovesse scegliere 3 aggettivi per descrivere il festival quali userebbe?
15. E’ da sola/o oppure con qualcuno?
   a. Se in gruppo, con quante persone e chi sono?
16. A quanti eventi ha intenzione di partecipare/o ha partecipato quest’anno? Quali sono?
17. Ha preso degli appunti?
18. Ha l’impressione di aver imparato qualcosa?
19. Ha intenzione di comprare (o ha già comprato) dei libri durante il festival? Perché?
20. Pensi a lei qui al festival. Quali di queste frasi le si addicono meglio? Non esistono risposte giuste o sbagliate.

**METRE SONO QUI...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Il festival mi fa pensare</th>
<th>Il festival mi fa sentire bene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sto scoprendo cose nuove, ampliando il mio sapere, esplorando nuove idee</td>
<td>Mi sto divertendo molto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sono felice di investire il mio tempo qui</td>
<td>Sono felice di rilassarmi e conoscere gente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi rendo conto che il festival in realtà non fa per me</td>
<td>Il festival soddisfa la mia curiosità e mi suscita nuovi interessi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
Appendix 22: Locations and time of the observations and on-site interviews (WW)

(Source: Author)
Appendix 23: Locations and time of the observations and on-site interviews (PL)

(Source: Author)
Dear Interviewee,

Thank you for your interest in this research project. This is a research project of the Dublin Institute of Technology. It is being led by Giulia Rossetti, and her supervisor Dr. Bernadette Quinn. The Writers’ Week organisers have given permission for the research to be carried out. We are interviewing people who attended the Writers’ Week this year. We would be interested in talking to you to find out why you decided to attend, what you have learned, and what you enjoyed about the festival. What you tell us may be of use to the festival organisers, to improve the future editions. The interview will be recorded and it will last between 20 and 40 minutes.

Any personal details you provide will be stored securely and not passed on to anyone not connected with this research project. You will not be identified by your name in any report. The results of this study will be used for an academic study and future publications. You are free to withdraw from this study at any time, without giving a reason for withdrawing, and without affecting your future relationship with the Institute. If you afterward decide you would prefer us to destroy any of your details, please inform us and we will immediately comply with your request. The attached consent form will be kept in the confidence of the researcher. If you would like to know more about this research, Giulia Rossetti or Dr. Bernadette Quinn can be contacted at:

Dublin Institute of Technology
College of Arts & Tourism
Cathal Brugha St.
Dublin 1
Phone: 00353(0)14021516
E-mail: giulia.rossetti@mydit.ie

Kind regards,

Giulia Rossetti

(Source: Author)
Progetto di Ricerca del Dublin Institute of Technology  
*Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital*

Gentile intervistato,

La ringraziamo per il suo interesse in questo progetto di ricerca del Dublin Institute of Technology. É condotto da Giulia Rossetti e dalla sua supervisor Dr. Bernadette Quinn. Gli organizzatori di Pordenonelegge hanno dato il permesso di poter svolgere tale studio. Stiamo intervistando chi ha partecipato a Pordenonelegge quest anno. Siamo interessati a parlare con lei per sapere per quale motivo ha deciso di andare al festival, che cosa ha imparato e che cosa le è piaciuto del festival. Quello che ci dice potrà essere utilizzato dagli organizzatori del festival per migliorare le future edizioni. L’intervista durerà circa 20-40 minuti e sarà registrata.

Domande su età, professione e livello di istruzione o di qualsiasi altra questione relativa alla classe sociale saranno trattate con sensibilità per non urtare i suoi sentimenti. Tutti i dati personali forniti verranno conservati in modo sicuro e non trasmessi a chi non sia collegato a questo progetto di ricerca. Lei non sarà identificato col suo nome in alcun report. I risultati di questa ricerca saranno utilizzati in uno studio e future pubblicazioni accademiche.

Nel caso volesse ritirarsi da questo studio, anche in un secondo momento, la preghiamo di informarci e noi immediatamente rispetteremo la sua richiesta. La sua scelta non influenzerà il suo futuro rapporto con l’Istituto. Il modulo di consenso, allegato al presente documento, sarà conservato dalla ricercatrice e non passato a terzi. Per ulteriori informazioni riguardo la ricerca contattare Giulia Rossetti o Dr. Bernadette Quinn.

Dublin Institute of Technology,  
College of Arts & Tourism,  
Cathal Brugha St., Dublin 1  
Phone: 00353(0)1402516  
E-mail: giulia.rossetti@mydit.ie  
Cordiali saluti,  
Giulia Rossetti

*(Source: Author)*
Appendix 26: Consent form for the respondents / follow-up interviews (WW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher’s Name:</th>
<th>Title:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giulia Rossetti</td>
<td>Miss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty/School/Department:</th>
<th>Title of Study:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology</td>
<td>PhD Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project:**
Literary Festival Consumption and the Development of Audience’s Cultural Capital

**To be completed by the interviewee**

2. Have you been fully informed/read the information sheet about this study?  
   - YES/NO

2. Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study?  
   - YES/NO

3. Have you received satisfactory answers to all your questions?  
   - YES/NO

4. Have you received enough information about this study and any associated health and safety implications if applicable?  
   - YES/NO

5. Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study?
   - at any time
   - without giving a reason for withdrawing
   - without affecting your future relationship with the Institute  
   - YES/NO

6. Do you agree to take part in this study the results of which are likely to be published?  
   - YES/NO

7. Have you been informed that this consent form shall be kept in the confidence of the researcher?  
   - YES/NO

Name in Block Letters________________________________________________________

Signed ___________________________ Date __________________

Signature of Researcher ___________________________ Date __________________

(Source: Author)
Appendix 27: Consent form for the respondents / follow-up interviews (PL)

MODULO DI CONSENSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ricercatrice:</th>
<th>Titolo:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giulia Rossetti</td>
<td>Miss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Facoltà/Università/Dipartimento:**
College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland

**Titolo di studio:**
Riceratrice dottoranda

**Progetto:**
Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital

**Da completare da parte dell’intervistato**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>È stato pienamente informato/ ha letto il foglio informativo su questo studio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ha avuto l’opportunità di fare domande e di discutere riguardo questo studio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Ha ricevuto risposte soddisfacenti a tutte le sue domande?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Ha ricevuto abbastanza informazioni riguardo questo studio ed eventuali implicazioni per la salute e la sicurezza, se presenti?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Si rende conto che é libero di ritirarsi da questo studio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• In ogni momento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Senza dare una ragione per il ritiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Senza influenzare il suo futuro rapporto con l’Istituto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>É d’accordo a prendere parte a questo studio i cui risultati potrebbero essere pubblicati?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SI/NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>È stato informato del fatto che questo modulo di consenso sarà conservato dalla ricercatrice?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nome in stampatello__________________________________________

Firma ____________________ Data ______________________

Firma della ricercatrice ____________ Data _____________________

(Source: Author)
Appendix 28: Pilot follow-up in-depth interview in English (WW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NR</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>File duration (min)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of contact</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WW1FU</td>
<td>52.56</td>
<td>17/06/2017</td>
<td>Darrel</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Dublin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)

Appendix 29: Follow-up in-depth interviews (WW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NR</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>File duration (min)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of contact</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>WW7FU</td>
<td>30.57</td>
<td>19/06/2017</td>
<td>Ashlyn</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Pub in Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>WW15FU</td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>20/06/2017</td>
<td>Maggie</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Her house in Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>WW17FU</td>
<td>27.52</td>
<td>20/06/2017</td>
<td>Molly</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>WW6FU</td>
<td>73.59</td>
<td>21/06/2017</td>
<td>Missy</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Her house in Skerries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>WW38FU</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>22/06/2017</td>
<td>Bryan</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>WW11FU</td>
<td>52.10</td>
<td>24/06/2017</td>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Dundalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>WW35FU</td>
<td>54.47</td>
<td>26/06/2017</td>
<td>Norah</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>WW19FU</td>
<td>40.08</td>
<td>26/06/2017</td>
<td>Maoreen</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Cork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>WW27FU</td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td>27/06/2017</td>
<td>Cassie</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Hotel in Listowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>WW18FU</td>
<td>59.54</td>
<td>27/06/2017</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Hotel in Listowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>WW49FU</td>
<td>29.24</td>
<td>27/06/2017</td>
<td>Marcie</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>House in Listowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>WW4FU</td>
<td>26.27</td>
<td>28/06/2017</td>
<td>Meghan</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>WW20FU</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>29/06/2017</td>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Museum in Limerick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>WW36FU</td>
<td>35.13</td>
<td>30/06/2017</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Office in Dublin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>WW48FU</td>
<td>46.32</td>
<td>02/07/2017</td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>WW28FU</td>
<td>48.13</td>
<td>03/07/2017</td>
<td>Evan</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>WW16FU</td>
<td>32.36</td>
<td>18/08/2017</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
### Appendix 30: Pilot follow-up in-depth interview in Italian (PL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NR</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>File duration (min)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of contact</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PL69FU</td>
<td>33.38</td>
<td>25/09/17</td>
<td>Maura</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)

### Appendix 31: Follow-up in-depth interviews (PL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NR</th>
<th>File Name</th>
<th>File duration (min)</th>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type of contact</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PL97FU</td>
<td>39.18</td>
<td>27/09/17</td>
<td>Simona</td>
<td>Video call</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PL58FU</td>
<td>32.03</td>
<td>28/09/17</td>
<td>Michele</td>
<td>Phone call</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>PL99FU</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>03/10/17</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PL89FU</td>
<td>27.07</td>
<td>03/10/17</td>
<td>Giulio</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Padua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PL51FU</td>
<td>72.24</td>
<td>04/10/17</td>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>PL78FU</td>
<td>57.27</td>
<td>04/10/17</td>
<td>Paolo</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>PL92FU</td>
<td>39.12 + 1.26</td>
<td>05/10/17</td>
<td>Giovanna</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PL85FU</td>
<td>50.45</td>
<td>05/10/17</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PL71FU</td>
<td>50.46</td>
<td>05/10/17</td>
<td>Giacomo</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PL64FU</td>
<td>50.01</td>
<td>05/10/17</td>
<td>Mario</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PL81FU</td>
<td>47.21</td>
<td>06/10/17</td>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>PL74FU</td>
<td>35.17</td>
<td>06/10/17</td>
<td>Melissa</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>PL68FU</td>
<td>54.51</td>
<td>06/10/17</td>
<td>Leonardo</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>PL59FU</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>07/10/17</td>
<td>Beatrice</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>PL95FU</td>
<td>41.38</td>
<td>07/10/17</td>
<td>Camilla</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>PL84FU</td>
<td>30.41</td>
<td>07/10/17</td>
<td>Serena</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Pordenone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>PL96FU</td>
<td>45.20 + 8.44</td>
<td>08/10/17</td>
<td>Giorgio</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Bar in Udine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
Appendix 32: The follow-up in-depth semi-structured interview guide (WW)

The Grand Tour Questions (if not asked during the on-site interviews)

*Are you: Female, Male?* (Not asked directly)
*Are you: Caucasian, Black, Asian, Other?* (Not asked directly)
2. Where do you live?
3. What is your main occupation?
4. What is the highest level of education you have attained? (Secondary, Diploma, Bachelor, Postgraduate, Doctoral)
5. How many books do you own, more or less? 0-50, 50-100, 100-1,000 (Hundreds), More than 1,000 (Thousands)
   a. How many books have you bought in the last 12 months? 0, 1-5, 5-10, More than 10
6. Do you own any musical instruments, paintings, pieces of art?
7. Are you a writer (did you get published) or aspiring writer?
8. How many languages do you speak?
9. Do you play any musical instruments?
10. Did you hear about any authors or books before the festival?
11. What type of festivals have you attended in the last 12 months, if any? None, Music, Food, Film, Dance, Arts, Politics, Other
   a. How many other literary festivals have you attended in the last 12 months, if any? 0, 1, 2-5, 5-10, Over 10
12. How often do you regularly attend concerts, opera, theatre, cinema, art galleries, and museums? (never, rarely, sometimes, often)
13. What is your favourite hobby? What do you do in your free time?
   a. Do you read a lot? / How many books per month?
   b. Did you read anything specifically for the festival before going there?
14. What does buying books mean to you?
   a. What do you like of you being interested in literature?
15. What does the festival mean to you?
16. For how many years have you attended the festival?
   a. Did you take part actively in the festival (volunteer, author…) this year?
17. How many days did you spend on the festival this year? 1, 2, 3, 4, 5
18. How many festival events did you attend this year? 1, 2-5, 5-10, more than 10
19. How many people were with you at the festival? And who were they?
   a. Would you have preferred to go alone / with someone? Why?
The Interview Questions

1. What do you remember of the festival? (any moments from the festival that are in etched your mind)
   a. If this was not your first time, what do you remember (any stand out memories) from previous editions of the festival?

2. During the days of the festival did you feel part of a community?
   a. During the festival did you chat with other people? What did you chat about?

3. Do you remember the reasons why you decided to attend the festival this year?

4. Were you glad you went? Why?
   a. Did you enjoy it? Why?
   b. What did you get out of it?

5. Please choose among: The festival was: ….. To what extent?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funny</th>
<th>Ok-ish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable</td>
<td>Not bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfying</td>
<td>Tiring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulfilling</td>
<td>Boring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratifying</td>
<td>Not for me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. During the festival how many books did you buy? Why have you bought them?

7. Did you buy anything during the festival (e.g. paintings, souvenirs…)?

8. Did you win a competition during the festival? If so, how was it?

9. Did you find yourself thinking about the festival afterwards?
   a. Has the image of yourself improved after the festival?

10. Did the festival allow you to understand different people, cultures, and views?

11. During the festival did you take any notes?

12. Do you think the festival has contributed to your education?
   a. Have you learned anything?
   b. Can you list at least 3 things that you have learned at the festival and that you didn’t know before?

13. Have you (started) writing anything since the festival (or would you like to)? Or if you were already a writer, do you think you have improved your writing skills during the festival or have you written more?

14. Have you started reading more after the festival?

15. After the festival, have you become interested in a new literary topic, or genre, or in a new cultural activity in which you were not interested before?
   a. Was there anything that inspired you?

16. Did attending this festival make you feel like attending other similar festivals [have you attended any other festival (or are you planning to)]?

(Source: Author)
Appendix 33: The follow-up in-depth semi-structured interview guide (PL)

**The Grand Tour Questions (if not asked during the on-site interviews)**

* Sesso: Femminia, Maschio? (Not asked directly)*  
* Etnia: Caucasica, Africana, Asiatica, Altro? (Not asked directly)*

1. Quale fascia d’età meglio ti descrive? (18-20, 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, 51-60...)  
2. Dove abiti?  
3. Che lavoro fai?  
4. Qual è il livello di istruzione più alto che hai raggiunto? (Licenza media, Licenza superior, Laurea triennale, Laurea specialistica, Dottorato)  
5. Quanti libri possiedi, più o meno? 0-50, 50-100, 100-1,000 (Centinaia), Più di 1,000 (Migliaia)  
   a. Quanti libri hai compato negli ultimi 12 mesi? 0, 1-5, 5-10, Più di 10  
6. Possiedi strumenti musicali, quadri, opere d’arte?  
7. Sei uno scrittore (hai pubblicato) o un aspirante scrittore?  
8. Quante lingue parli?  
9. Suoni qualche strumento musicale?  
10. Conoscevi alcuni autori o libri prima del festival?  
11. Quali festival hai frequentato negli ultimi 12 mesi? Nessuno, Musica, Cibo, Film, Danza, Arte, Politica, Altro  
   a. A quali altri festival di letteratura sei andato negli ultimi 12 mesi? 0, 1, 2-5, 5-10, Più di 10  
12. Di solito ogni quanto vai ai concerti, opera, teatro, cinema, gallerie d’arte, e musei? (mai, raramente, a volte, spesso)  
13. Qual è il tuo hobby preferito? Cosa fai nel tempo libero?  
   a. Leggi molto? / Quanti libri al mese?  
   b. Nei giorni o mesi prima del festival ha letto alcuni libri apposta per il festival?  
14. Cosa significa per te comperare libri?  
   a. Cosa ti piace del fatto di essere interessato alla letteratura?  
15. Che cosa significa per te il festival?  
16. Da quanti anni frequenti il festival?  
   a. Partecipi attivamente al festival (volontario, autore…)?  
17. Per quanti giorni sei stato al festival quest’anno? 1, 2, 3, 4, 5  
18. A quanti eventi hai partecipato quest anno? 1, 2-5, 5-10, più di 10  
19. Quante persone erano con te al festival? E chi erano?  
   a. Avresti preferito andarci da solo / con qualcuno? Perché?
The Interview Questions

1. Che cosa ricordi della tua esperienza del festival? (qualsiasi momento impresso nella memoria)
   a. Se questa non era la sua prima volta, che cosa ricordi delle edizioni precedenti?
2. Durante i giorni del festival ti sei sentito parte di una comunità?
   a. Durante il festival hai chiaccherato con altre persone? Riguardo a cosa?
3. Si ricorda il perché ha deciso di andare al festival quest’anno?
4. Sei contenta/o di esserci andata/o?
   a. Ti è piaciuto? Perché?
   b. Che cosa hai portato a casa da questa esperienza?
5. Per favore scegli tra: Il festival è stato: ..... Fino a che punto?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divertente</th>
<th>Cosí - cosí</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piacevole</td>
<td>Non male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soddisfacente</td>
<td>Stancante</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appagante</td>
<td>Noioso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratificante</td>
<td>Non per me</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Durante il festival quanti libri hai comperato? Perché?
7. Hai comperato qualcosa durante il festival (e.g. quadri, souvenirs…)?
8. Hai vinto un concorso durante il festival? Se sì, come è stato?
9. Si è trovato a pensare al festival giorni o settimane dopo?
   a. L’immagine di te stessa/o è migliorata dopo il festival?
10. Il festival ti ha permesso di comprendere diverse persone, culture o punti di vista?
11. Durante il festival hai preso degli appunti?
12. Credi che il festival ha contribuito alla tua formazione?
   a. Hai imparato qualcosa?
   b. Riesci ad elencare almeno 3 cose che hai imparato al festival e non sapevi prima?
13. Hai iniziato a scrivere dopo il festival (o ti piacerebbe)? Oppure se eri già una/o scrittrice/scrittore, pensi di aver migliorato la tua capacità di scrittura o hai scritto di più del solito?
14. Hai iniziato a leggere di più del solito dopo il festival?
15. Dopo il festival, ti sei interessata/o ad un nuovo argomento, ad un genere letterario, o una nuova attività culturale in cui non eri interessata/o prima?
   a. C’è stato qualcosa che ti ha ispirata/o?
16. Partecipare a questo festival ti ha fatto venire voglia di partecipare ad altri festival simili [hai partecipato (o stai programmato)]?

(Source: Author)
Appendix 34: Information sheet for key informant interviewees (WW)

The Dublin Institute of Technology Research Project

Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital:

Dear Interviewee,

Thank you for your interest in this research project. This is a research project of the Dublin Institute of Technology. It is being led by Giulia Rossetti, and her supervisor Dr. Bernadette Quinn. The Writer’s Week organisers have given permission for the research to be carried out. We are interviewing people who attend, work with or fund Irish literary festivals. We would be interested in talking to you to find out the current scenario of the literary festival sector, its historical evolution and its audience profile. What you tell us may be of use to the festival organisers, to improve the future editions. The interview will be recorded and it will last between 20 and 40 minutes.

Any personal details you provide will be stored securely and not passed on to anyone not connected with this research project. You will not be identified by your name in any report. The results of this study will be used for an academic study and future publications. You are free to withdraw from this study at any time, without giving a reason for withdrawing, and without affecting your future relationship with the Institute. If you afterward decide you would prefer us to destroy any of your details, please inform us and we will immediately comply with your request. The attached consent form will be kept in the confidence of the researcher. If you would like to know more about this research, Giulia Rossetti or Dr. Bernadette Quinn can be contacted at:

Dublin Institute of Technology
College of Arts & Tourism
Cathal Brugha St.
Dublin 1
Phone: 00353(0)14021516
E-mail: giulia.rossetti@mydit.ie

Kind regards,

Giulia Rossetti

(Source: Author)
Progetto di Ricerca del Dublin Institute of Technology

Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital

Gentile intervistato,
La ringraziamo per il suo interesse in questo progetto di ricerca del Dublin Institute of Technology. È condotto da Giulia Rossetti e dalla sua supervisor Dr. Bernadette Quinn. Gli organizzatori di Pordenonelegge hanno dato il permesso di poter svolgere tale studio. Stiamo intervistando chi ha partecipato, lavorato, o finanziato Pordenonelegge quest'anno. Siamo interessati a parlare con lei riguardo lo scenario attuale dei festival di letteratura, la loro evoluzione storica, e il profilo dell’audience. Quello che ci dice potrà essere utilizzato dagli organizzatori del festival per migliorare le future edizioni. L’intervista durerà circa 20-40 minuti e sarà registrata.
Tutti i dati personali forniti verranno conservati in modo sicuro e non trasmessi a chi non sia collegato a questo progetto di ricerca. Lei non sarà identificato col suo nome in alcun report. I risultati di questa ricerca saranno utilizzati in uno studio e future pubblicazioni accademiche.
Nel caso volesse ritirarsi da questo studio, anche in un secondo momento, la preghiamo di informarci e noi immediatamente rispetteremo la sua richiesta. La sua scelta non influenzerà il suo futuro rapporto con l’Istituto. Il modulo di consenso, allegato al presente documento, sarà conservato dalla ricercatrice e non passato a terzi.
Per ulteriori informazioni riguardo la ricerca contattare Giulia Rossetti o Dr. Bernadette Quinn
Dublin Institute of Technology,
College of Arts & Tourism,
Cathal Brugha St., Dublin 1
Phone: 00353(0)1402516
E-mail: giulia.rossetti@mydit.ie
Cordiali saluti,
Giulia Rossetti

(Source: Author)
Appendix 36: Consent form for key informant interviewees (WW)

CONSENT FORM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher’s Name:</th>
<th>Giulia Rossetti</th>
<th>Title:</th>
<th>Miss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/School/Department:</td>
<td>College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology</td>
<td>Title of Study:</td>
<td>PhD Researcher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project:**
Literary Festival Consumption and the Development of Audience’s Cultural Capital

**To be completed by the interviewee**

1. Have you been fully informed/read the information sheet about this study?  
   YES/NO

2. Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study?  
   YES/NO

3. Have you received satisfactory answers to all your questions?  
   YES/NO

4. Have you received enough information about this study and any associated health and safety implications if applicable?  
   YES/NO

5. Do you understand that you are free to withdraw from this study?  
   • at any time  
   • without giving a reason for withdrawing  
   • without affecting your future relationship with the Institute  
   YES/NO

6. Do you agree to take part in this study the results of which are likely to be published?  
   YES/NO

7. Have you been informed that this consent form shall be kept in the confidence of the researcher?  
   YES/NO

Name in Block Letters_____________________________________________________________

Signed ___________________________ Date __________________

Signature of Researcher ___________________________ Date __________________

(Source: Author)
Appendix 37: Consent form for key informant interviewees (PL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MODULO DI CONSENSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ricercatrice:</strong> Giulia Rossetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facoltá/Università/Dipartimento:</strong> College of Arts and Tourism, Dublin Institute of Technology, Ireland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Titolo di studio:</strong> Ricercatrice dottoranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progetto:</strong> Literary Festival Participation and the Development of Cultural Capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Da completare da parte dell’intervistato</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. È stato pienamente informato/ ha letto il foglio informativo su questo studio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ha avuto l’opportunità di fare domande e di discutere riguardo questo studio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ha ricevuto risposte soddisfacenti a tutte le sue domande?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ha ricevuto abbastanza informazioni riguardo questo studio ed eventuali implicazioni per la salute e la sicurezza, se presenti?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Si rende conto che é libero di ritirarsi da questo studio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In ogni momento</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senza dare una ragione per il ritiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Senza influenzare il suo futuro rapporto con l’Istituto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. É d’accordo a prendere parte a questo studio i cui risultati potrebbero essere pubblicati?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. É stato informato del fatto che questo modulo di consenso sarà conservato dalla ricercatrice?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nome in stampatello________________________________________

Firma ___________________________ Data ______________________

Firma della ricercatrice ___________ Data ______________________

(Source: Author)
Appendix 38: Key informant interview questions with Arts Officer, Kerry County Council

1. How many literary festivals are currently running in County Kerry?
2. Kerry has a strong literary heritage, what are the roles of literary festivals in this scenario?
3. Is there any kind of cooperation among them and/or with other literary festivals in Ireland?
4. Do you think there is a difference between literary festivals, literature festivals, book festivals, writers’ festivals or weeks? If so, which one?
5. Is there any study about literary events or festivals in Kerry or about educational programmes/impacts of these festivals? Please explain.
6. The literature says that literary fests can be sub-divided into ‘international’ and ‘peripheral’ (not only for their geographical location but also the programming) (Stewart, 2013, Giorgi, 2011b). So I wonder if this division really exists and how it is possible to define/describe the types of festivals. From the Kerry County Council perspective, what does “international” mean?
7. Do you have any information about the historical evolution of literary festivals in Kerry (where they were launched, how they developed—how this sector changed over the years)? Please explain.
9. Are there any trends particularly evident in the programming of literary festivals in recent years?
10. Which festivals are the most famous for their workshops/masterclasses/lectures?
11. How important do you think adult education (the role of literary festivals as arenas for cultural stimuli for adults) is for festival directors? Or they mainly focus on fostering children education?
12. From the Kerry County Council perspective, who is the literary festival-going public (main characteristics, motivations to attend…)? Do you have any information/data? Are there any signs that this is changing/has changed?
13. What is the public commitment in funding literary festivals in Kerry?

(Source: Author)
Appendix 39: Key informant interview questions with the WW chairperson

1. For how many years have you been part of the Writers’ Week team?
2. Do you know why it is called the Writers’ Week and not the Writers’ Festival?
3. Do you think there is a difference between book, writers, literature and literary festivals (or week)?
4. What is the story of the Writers’ Week?
5. Why it runs in June?
6. The festival focuses mainly of Irish literature. However, are topics such as politics, food, art, cinema, etc., (non-related to literature) important for the festival programme? How much?
7. Do you gather data on your audience members? Please explain.
8. This year there was a questionnaire, is it possible to see the results of it?
9. Do you know why people attend? Please explain.
10. In terms of profile, can you describe by age, gender balance, socio-economic status, group/ individual...
11. Do you know where your audience members come from?
12. Do you know if people return to the festival?
13. How would you describe your audience members in terms of their relationship with literature (passionate/ committed readers / casual readers)
14. What do you think audience members get out of the festival?
15. Festivals play important roles. Which ones are more important for the Writers’ Week?
16. To what extent is the festival a setting where people connect with each other?
17. Do you think audience members can find enjoyment in participating?
18. To what extent is the desire to learn a motivation to attend the festival?
19. The festival offers lots of workshops. How and why are they important?
20. Have you received any feedback about the workshops?
21. Do you have any evidence (data) that the festival is educational?
22. Usually, is there a Q&A section during the events, when audience members can actively participate asking questions? Please explain.
23. Have you seen audience members taking notes during the events?
24. How does the books sale work?
25. Do you have information about how many books were sold during the festival?

(Source: Author)
Appendix 40: Key informant interview questions with the PL director

1. Da quanti anni fa parte del team di Pordenonelegge?
2. Sa perché si chiama ‘Pordenonelegge’?
3. Perché Pordenonelegge è considerato una festa del libro con autori? E non un festival? Qual è la differenza tra festival letterario e festa del libro con autori?
4. Qual è la storia di Pordenonelegge? Come è nato?
5. Perché è a settembre?
6. Nonostante sia una una festa letteraria, eventi su politica, cucina, arte, cinema ecc. Sono importanti per Pordenonelegge? Perché e quanto?
7. Pordenonelegge è internazionale? Perché?
8. Come è suddiviso il budget delle entrate? É possibile accedere ai dati degli anni precedenti?
9. Quanti e quali studi (ricerche accademiche e non) sono stati fatti su Pordenonelegge negli anni precedenti?
10. Raccogliete dati sul pubblico? Se sì, come?
11. Quest anno raccogliete dati sul pubblico? Se sì, sarà possibile vedere i dati?
12. Quante persone hanno partecipato a Pordenonelegge nel 2016?
13. Sa perché la gente partecipa a Pordenonelegge?
14. Avete un profilo del pubblico, per età, sesso, nazionalità, istruzione, fidelizzazione, ecc?
15. Sa da dove viene il pubblico?
16. Sa se e quanti partecipanti ritornano a Pordenonelegge?
17. Come descriverebbe il pubblico riguardo la passione per la letteratura (accaniti / lettori casuali)?
18. Cosa pensa che i partecipanti portino a casa da Pordenonelegge?
19. I festival hanno diversi ruoli importanti. Quali sono più importanti per Pordenonelegge?
20. In che misura Pordenonelegge è un ambiente in cui le persone socializzano?
21. Che tipo di soddisfazione i partecipanti possano trovare nella partecipazione?
22. In che misura è la voglia di imparare una motivazione a partecipare a Pordenonelegge?
23. Ci sono diversi workshop e laboratori creativi per ragazzi e bambini durante Pordenonelegge. Perché e quanto sono importanti? E per gli adulti?
24. Avete dati che Pordenonelegge sia ‘educativo’ (non solo per bambini, ma anche per adulti)? C’è un programma ‘educativo’ per adulti?
25. Ci sono il concorso “Vetrina in Giallo” rivolto a tutti i negozi della città e le Premiazioni di Scrivere di Cinema Premio Alberto Farassino per ragazzi. Ci sono mai stati concorsi o premi letterari per adulti (poesia, prosa...)?
26. Di solito c’è spazio per le domande da pubblico alla fine degli eventi dove il pubblico può partecipare attivamente? Quanto sono importanti questi momenti per Pordenonelegge?
27. Ha mai visto persone tra il pubblico prendere note durante gli eventi?
28. Come funziona la vendita dei libri?
29. Ha informazioni riguardo quanti libri vengono venduti durante Pordenonelegge ogni anno?
30. Come funziona la vendita dei gadget? Come e perché sono importanti i gadget per Pordenonelegge?

(Source: Author)
### Appendix 41: Key informant interview questions with the cultural councillor of Pordenone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Come descriverebbe la situazione attuale dei festival di letteratura esistenti in Pordenone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. quanti sono,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. dove sono,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. se si riferiscono alla letteratura in generale o ad un genere specifico, come ad esempio la poesia,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. chi è il pubblico.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. È in possesso di dati riguardo i festival letterari in Pordenone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ci sono studi sui festival letterari in Pordenone e/o sui loro impatti educativi e culturali?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Qual è il ruolo (o i ruoli) dei festival letterari in Pordenone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In Pordenone, quali sono i festival più famosi per i loro workshops / lectio magistralis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quanto crede sia importante per i direttori dei festival letterari l’educazione degli adulti (il ruolo dei festival letterari come stimolo culturale per adulti)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Crede che i festival letterari si concentriano principalmente sull’educazione dei bambini (per esempio promozione della lettura e della scrittura)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Dal suo punto di vista, chi è il pubblico di Pordenone legge (caratteristiche principali, motivazioni per la partecipazione…)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Avete informazioni/dati sul pubblico di Pordenone legge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Secondo lei, il pubblico dei festival letterari sta cambiando (o è cambiato)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Qual è l’impegno pubblico nel finanziare i festival letterari in Pordenone?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Author)
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