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ABSTRACT

A number of social and economic transformations have taken place in our society, calling for an alternative to the serial reproduction of culture in the form of standardized products and services. Creative Tourism is a branch of cultural tourism and allows for more active and authentic experiences with the local culture. The present study looks at traditional examples in Creative Tourism literature: producing arts and crafts during the course of a workshop or an event. The focus of the first part is to show that creativity not only exists as a product but also as a creative process. Going beyond the traditional perception of creativity in tourism, the archaeological sieving activity at Nash's House & New Place in Stratford-upon-Avon was chosen as a case study and this is incorporated in the second part of the present study. 23 interviews with visitors, volunteers and managers were conducted at the location in order to investigate whether the people involved in archaeological sieving are creating anything new and valuable. The outcome of the interviews confirms the literature on the creative process. The visitors explained that they had increased their pool of knowledge about archaeology and history as well as expanded their imagination about the past and the artefacts. Knowledge and imagination can be developed through the sense of touch, through guiding volunteers and through a curiosity for discovery. The study shows that the concept of creativity has to be repositioned in a much broader phenomenon.
I. INTRODUCTION

Europe in 30 days. Red hop-on, hop-off sightseeing buses everywhere no matter where you are; Paris, London, Berlin, Rome. Everybody is taking pictures of the Eiffel Tower, Tower Bridge, the Brandenburg Gate, the Colosseum. Click. Click. You listen to what the guide is telling you. Click. You have seen the city within an hour. Marvellous. Click. Click. There is no time to lose. On to the next location. Click. The red sightseeing bus is waiting...

Is this really what we want? Why do we travel at all?

Cities utilise culture as a resource to distinguish themselves from other cities on the "global catwalk" (Lorentzen, 2009, p. 843), in order to attract tourists worldwide and to foster growth and development (Jones & Evans, 2008). Within the scope of globalization, consumer mobility is increasing, travel is becoming a mass-consumer 'product' and standardized tourism products can be found nearly everywhere. However, as the example 'Europe in 30 days' shows, culture often leads to serial reproduction (Richards & Wilson, 2006) through which the cultural uniqueness - which was once the aim - disappears. Cultural tourism is becoming mass tourism.

Mass tourism provides superficial experiences which do not appear to satisfy consumers anymore (Wurzburger et al., 2010). Why should people travel at all if the destinations are marked by similar product and service offers they can also see at home? For many, leisure travel is about seeing the difference, the unknown, which Binkhorst & Dekker (2011) call "contra-structure" (p.316). Furthermore, Wurzburger et al. (2010) argue that consumers often lack the opportunity to be creative or imaginative and are unable to express themselves during their travels and for this reason cannot attach personal meaning and value to their experiences and this "leaves us feeling empty, as our spirit is not touched" (p.33). In postmodern society there have been transformations on both the consumption and the production sides, in general and tourism specifically, which call for an alternative to mass cultural tourism (Richards & Wilson, 2006). These transformations will next be outlined prior to introducing an alternative idea.

There are two important changes on the consumption side, these being: the rise of "skilled consumption" (Scitovsky, 1976); and a desire for more active, engaging experiences. Skilled consumption, such as attending craft workshops, gives visitors the opportunity to develop themselves further through learning new skills. It involves the consumer and offers a challenging and stimulating experience. Here, the stimulus comes from within a person as opposed to solely from external, cultural objects, which is the case with unskilled consumption. An example for this would be sitting on a hop-on, hop off bus for which only money is needed but no skills.
The rise of skilled consumption goes hand-in-hand with the second change on the consumption side, that is to say a desire to actively engage with the local culture rather than merely being a passive observer which Urry (2002) calls the "tourist gaze". The specific cultural features of a location can be better grasped when one is immersed in it. According to Wurzburger et al. (2010), it is the search for a meaning of one's actions and feelings, the quest for identity and the need for self-development which drives this cultural engagement. In other words, "being outside helps you look inside" (Wurzburger et al., 2010, p.36). Tourists want more than just to be driven around on a hop-on, hop-off bus; they are becoming more demanding. Additionally, the search for identity is underpinned by personal narratives which link various travel experiences with a unique life history that defines and possibly change the individual (Giddens, 1991).

Richards (2011) explains that it is the development of a postmodern society which serves as a ground for all the consumption trends described above. Postmodern society is characterized by the trend to choose just those consumption practices in particular which distinguish them from others and emphasize their lifestyle and identity. This does not only refer to personal possessions but also to leisure consumption such as tourism which is becoming increasingly important in our hedonic society (Lorentzen, 2009).

Appertaining to production, three major transformations have evolved, these being: the Experience Economy; the shift from tangible to intangible tourism resources making places more distinct; and the shift from high culture to authentic everyday culture. These trends are a response to the change of consumption patterns towards hedonism and identity creation described in the last section. According to Pine & Gilmore’s (1999) Experience Economy, there is an increasing need to engage the consumer by allocating themed experiences to products and services. For instance, restaurants, bars and shopping malls have their own themed environments and organise events or shows. By means of these highly unique and personal experiences (O'Dell, 2007), the consumer does not merely learn but is changed or transformed. According to Pine & Gilmore (1999), this transformation is the peak of economic value creation. By offering experiences, businesses and organisations can differentiate their offerings and fight increasing competition. It must be said that tourism is one of the strongest generators of experiences through which tourists construct their own personal travel story (Binkhorst & Dekker, 2009).

This growing importance of experiences goes hand-in-hand with another change, namely the shift from tangible (e.g. built heritage, museums) to intangible, cultural resources; symbols, themes, atmosphere, lifestyles, image, identity and narratives, to mention a few (Wurzburger et al., 2010). In other words, there has been a shift towards immaterial and experiential production (Marling et al., 2009). Consumers can change this intangible raw material into personal experiences by using their
own creativity. In this way, the place that allows the consumer to create an experience is always unique; it can break away from the image of a traditional tourism site and strengthen its identity.

The third transformation refers to the idea that knowledgeable tourists are becoming more attracted to authentic cultural experiences which provide an insight into the everyday culture of the locals. For example, shops and restaurants which are located hidden away in small streets are consequently unknown to the typical tourist. It is the ‘high’ culture, such as museums, important monuments and typical historic sites which attract mass cultural tourists.

O’Dell (2007) sums up the main argument of these transformations by saying: "...there is an understandable curiosity in people as experiencers rather than as receivers of different kinds of messages, as creators of meaning rather than interpreters and as actors rather than observers“ (p. 39).

All these economic and social transformations serve as a background to understanding the importance of an alternative to mass cultural tourism and to making the cultural sector aware of the necessity to find new means to interact with tourists. The answer is Creative Tourism which has emerged as a branch of cultural tourism. Richards & Raymond (2000) were the ones to coin the term in the year 2000, as "tourism which offers visitors the opportunity to develop their creative potential through active participation in courses and learning experiences which are characteristic of the holiday destination where they are undertaken“ (p.18). A second definition given by the UNESCO Creative Cities Network, during the first international conference on Creative Tourism in Santa Fe in 2006, states that "creative tourism is travel directed toward an engaged and authentic experience, with participative learning in the arts, heritage, or special character of a place, and it provides a connection with those who reside in this place and create this living culture“ (Wurzburger et al., 2010, p. 106).

There are four common elements in both definitions: first, an experience of the cultural content; second, participation in the cultural content; third, learning about the cultural content; fourth, the cultural content being an authentic characteristic of the destination.

To sum up, Creative Tourism is about “hands-on experiences that are culturally authentic“ (Wurzburger et al., 2010, p.18) and allows tourists to develop their creative potential and skills. These elements show that there is a response to the transformations in consumption and production (Fig.1).
The purpose of the present research is to answer two research questions. The first one looks at traditional examples of Creative Tourism which focus on producing an arts or crafts, for example during a workshop or an event. It will be questioned whether creativity can still exist in a different way if tourists are not creating a final product. This question will be answered through literature and will serve as a basis to investigate the second research question which is a case study for which interviews were conducted. This empirical research project goes beyond these traditional types of Creative Tourism and determines whether the term can be applied to something which does not involve an observable and tangible outcome, such as archaeology.

The structure is as follows: The chapter “Creative Tourism & Creativity” will answer the first research question; the chapter “Methodology” will describe the empirical research project; and the chapter “Case Analysis” will discuss the interview findings and incorporate them with the theory from the first chapter. This will be followed by a conclusion.
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Fig. 1. The shift from cultural to Creative Tourism (Wurzburger et al., 2010)
II. CREATIVE TOURISM & CREATIVITY

Many traditional examples of Creative Tourism show that tourists are creative by producing arts or crafts during a workshop or an event. However, what if the tourists are not creating a final product, can creativity still exist in a different way?

The literature review is divided into three parts: First, several traditional examples of Creative Tourism will be outlined. Applied to these examples, the typical characteristics of Creative Tourism will be clarified. Second, the various approaches to creativity will be examined; and third, the case study on public archaeology will be introduced.

Examples & Characteristics of Creative Tourism

There are various kinds of Creative Tourism. Arts & crafts and events are traditional examples which dominate Creative Tourism literature.
Crafts tourism offers craft workshops such as bone and wood carving, jewellery-making, pottery and weaving. According to Richards (1999), the concept of Creative Tourism grew from the EUROTEX craft project during which was discovered that the more consumers actually knew about the work involved in making a specific craft and the more they could 'look behind the scenes', the more value they would attach to the hand-made product and the more they were willing to pay for it. It was identified that tourists were becoming more interested in the authenticity of local culture as well as active learning experiences. Richards’ and Raymond's definition of Creative Tourism (see introduction) followed directly after this finding.

Creative Tourism New Zealand, the most developed Creative Tourism network (Richards, 2010), can be used as a sound example for crafts tourism. The network of creative businesses offers informal interactive workshops on art, Maori culture, taste and nature to provide first-hand learning experiences. Their website reiterates the experiences that the tourists can encounter:

"Create your own bone carving, mosaic artwork, clay or woodturning souvenir; learn to make silver or green stone jewellery, a hand-forged knife, kiwiana paper art, felt from a selection of wool fleeces; meet the wine maker; make your own cheese, olive oil blend, or a delicious pavlova; spend a day learning about the New Zealand bush in an interactive way or weaving a traditional flax basket; get your inspiration from the New Zealand flora and fauna to create a unique painting or travel journal... “ (Creative Tourism NZ, 2010)
Ohridska & Ivanov (2010) give similar examples of Creative Tourism: one travels to Argentina to learn to dance tango; one travels to Russia to paint icons; one travels to France to cook traditional Provencal dishes; one travels to Australia to learn how to play the didgeridoo.

Barcelona Creative Tourism is a further example of Creative Tourism development but has a different approach to the one in New Zealand (Richards, 2010). It is a programme that offers support to creative visitors who want to express themselves creatively, for example by organising an artistic and creative activity such as a performance or an exhibition (Wurzburger et al. 2010). Through educational activities and exchanges, relationships between tourists and local artists can be strengthened. Examples for such educational projects include life-drawing courses, Catalan traditional painting, ceramic workshops and artistic glass workshops.

Cultural and creative events also belong to the sphere of Creative Tourism. For instance, during the local festival named Festes de Gràcia in Barcelona, people use recycled materials to resourcefully decorate the streets (Richards, 2010). Additionally, the Zinneke Parade in Brussels and the Fringe Festival in Edinburgh are further examples for performing arts, cultural and creative exchange. These kinds of arts festivals, being alive with music, dance, theatre and gastronomy, offer sensory experiences: tasting, hearing, seeing, smelling and feeling.

A similarity between crafts and events is that tourists not only look at how a ‘task’ is done, they do it themselves and at the same time learn about the local people and their culture. The ancient Chinese proverb by Confucius sums up this idea: “I hear and I forget, I see and I remember, I do and I understand” (Carravilla & Oliveira, 2004, p. 571). In other words, the more senses are involved, the more you learn. This message of the Chinese proverb is reflected in Creative Tourism. Further examples that can be seen as Creative Tourism are travel forms such as Work & Travel, Au-pair and Volunteer Tourism which are becoming more popular. During these travels, people spend a longer period of time in a different culture and it is not only about leisure consumption but about the experience of working there, too.

What these workshops and activities all have in common is that they are characteristics of the destination. It is these specific places that “provide the atmosphere that attaches the symbol of authenticity” (Ohridska-Olson & Ivanov, 2010, p. 3) to these creative experiences.

According to Richards (2010), there are two basic ways in which creative experiences can be implemented and offered to the tourist: either creativity can be used as a background for tourism, for example galleries, or as an activity, for example workshops (Fig.2). The first renders a location more creative in terms of its environment and the latter actively engages the consumer. Both offer an experience but the disparity is the degree of involvement (high vs. low). All these different types of creative experiences can be delivered by events, networks, partnerships and creative
entrepreneurs. Lorentzen (2009) emphasizes that “to be an experience product, there must be a certain relationship between the customer and the product” (p. 833). Creativity, innovativeness and cultural content of the product or service alone are not sufficient for creating an experience.

The idea of co-creation experience (Binkhorst & Dekker, 2009) between host and tourist is a unique and crucial aspect of Creative Tourism as together they create a cultural and creative outcome as a team. Whereas cultural tourists merely consume cultural content, creative tourists consume and produce cultural content. In other words, they are prosumers (Jenkins, 2006) of their own experiences and create their own travel narrative – for which there is endless freedom of expression. Consequently, not only does the local host produce the raw material for an experience but the consumer produces it as well and therefore a co-creation exists. Richards (2011) emphasizes the importance of guides who teach the tourists certain skills and provide knowledge which, in turn, contributes to a communal creativity. This idea follows closely the argument that creativity is both individual and socially-embedded and for this reason “creative expression is a form of cultural expression and...of cultural participation: engaging with cultural artefacts to produce new cultural artefacts...” (Glaveanu, 2010, p.48). Wurzburger et al. (2010) make an interesting contribution to the argument of co-creation by arguing that the attitudes of the tourist have a strong influence on the tourist experience, meaning that people who have a negative attitude towards the activity are
“prisoners of their thoughts” (p.57) and do not have the same learning experience as those who show an interest. In other words, interest, tolerance and motivation are a prerequisite for a successful co-creation.

It can be seen that the major societal transformations outlined at the beginning are reflected in the development of Creative Tourism. Craft workshops and cultural/creative events offer skilled consumption as well as authentic and engaging experiences. Each and every one of these creative experiences through participation in crafts and events gives tourists an opportunity to develop their skills, to self-reflect and to express themselves creatively enabling them to increase their creative potential and thus develop themselves. The alternative to mass cultural tourism, therefore, would be to apply creativity to commoditized cultural products and services to prevent the serial reproduction of culture which no longer seems to spark the interest of the tourist.

The advantage is that it is more difficult, if not impossible, to copy or imitate Creative Tourism experiences since they are unique to the individual. The tourist is responsible for creating his or her own context and the tourist activity can become ‘creative’ through the way in which s/he experiences and reacts to it intrinsically and therefore “the embeddedness of creative knowledge and skills is one of the arguments for developing creative tourism” (Richards, 2011, p. 8).

Wurzburger et al. (2010) underline that Creative Tourism should be regarded as a positive enhancement of mass cultural tourism rather than a mutual replacement. It is a new generation of tourism. Thus, nowadays, locations make use of the combination of culture and creativity in order to develop an identity; to distinguish themselves from other places and to promote innovation. Culture alone is no longer sufficient.

To sum up, there are four main characteristics of Creative Tourism (Richards, 2010). First, the tourists need to be given the chance to develop their own creative potential which is only possible if the place offers them the tools and creative raw material. Second, it is important for the tourist to be actively involved in the local culture so that there can be an authentic cultural exchange between the tourist, the place, and the local people and their culture. Third, it is equally important that creativity is linked to the specific cultural destination. Here, ideally, the destination should implement its endogenous creative assets, such as local traditions, skills and history and offer the creative raw material to the tourists. This is what makes the Creative Tourism experience unique. Finally, the development of "co-creation“ or "co-makership“ (Binkhorst & Dekker, 2009) between visitors and locals is indispensable for Creative Tourism. Both are involved in creating an experience – as a team.
In a personal email communication with C. Raymond (see Appendix 5) he said that Creative Tourism is “encouraging the differences between places and the people who live in them and sharing these differences with visitors in ways that both locals and visitors enjoy and benefit from.” And this is why we travel – to “live” these differences.

The Creative Turn - Approaches to Creativity

Tourism is only one example which shows the growing maelstrom of creativity in our society or as Richards & Wilson (2006) name it: the creative turn. Nowadays, one can see these creative developments reflected in a variety of spheres such as urban development, architecture, education, literature, theatre, to mention just a few. Tourism has been affected by the creative turn and “has itself become a creative arena for the development of skills and performance” (Richards, 2011, p. 3).

Defining creativity is problematic; there is strong disparity and therefore no widely-accepted definition exists (Richards, 2011). There is a vast amount of literature on creativity but the majority of studies are on psychology, education, business and work environments. Since the concept of Creative Tourism is still comparatively new, fewer studies have been found on creativity in tourism. However, common denominators of creativity - all of which are involved in the practice of tourism - will be looked into. Four aspects of creativity will be introduced, namely the creative person, the creative environment, the creative product and the creative process (Richards, 2011; Bleakley, 2004).

Creative Person

Historically, creativity was associated with the creative person and his or her artistic creativity, involving talents, abilities and skills (Richards, 2011; Landry, 2000). Examples of creative people are artists such as Picasso, Dalf or da Vinci, or scientists such as Einstein who made remarkable discoveries and inventions. The portrait of the "lone genius“ (p.49) of the 18th century defines these great creators as exceptional and superior (Glaveanu, 2010). Nowadays, the idea of a creative person has broadened. Creative people can be considered part of the creative class (Florida, 2002) which can include employers, employees, residents, customers or visitors working in the creative
industries (Hartley, 2005). These include advertising, architecture, art, crafts, design, fashion, film, music, performing arts, publishing, software, media and video games (Richards, 2011). The tourist industry is also considered to be a creative industry and creative tourists who have an interest in and engage in arts, are also creative people. Creativity as an individual phenomenon is only one side of the coin. Amabile (1983) argues that "the trait approach is incomplete, that creativity is best conceptualized not as a personality trait or a general ability but as behaviour resulting from particular constellations of personal characteristics, cognitive abilities, and social environments" (p. 358). The importance of paying attention to these social environments and cognitive abilities will be discussed below.

Creative Environment

As introduced above, it is important to see creativity not only as a personality trait but as a social phenomenon as well (Richards, 2011). In our contemporary society which is affected by the creative turn, there is an emphasis on the social context and the broader environment of creativity which Richards (2011) calls “socially embedded creativity” (p.2). This idea was also discussed on the section on “co-creation” between tourist and locals. Furthermore, Bleakley (2004) is one of many authors who recognize that the role of context has an influence on all three creative dimensions (person, product, process) because “creativity does not happen in a vacuum” (p. 464). In addition, Landry (2000) refers to the importance of the creative milieu in cities which is characterized by a cluster of creative people, creative industries, creative products, ideas and a multi-cultural street level culture. All of these together create a platform for creativity.

Creative Product (Outcome)

The most common definition of creativity recognizes that one is creative when one creates or produces something new and valuable (Bilton & Cummings, 2010; Glaveanu, 2010). The hallmarks are 'newness' and 'value'. Several synonyms for each of the two criteria can be found in the literature. Synonyms for 'new' include: different, original, innovative, unexpected, while synonyms for 'value' are: appropriate, meaningful, purposeful, utilitarian, useful and adaptive. Research shows that the above-mentioned definition is often used in relation to results and products (White, 2006). Dahlén (2008) agrees that the creative result is by far the most important aspect of creativity. Bilton
& Cummings (2010) argue that the value should not only have individual value but should be valuable in a broader social context as well. Moreover, they say that the outcome of creativity is not only new and valuable, it also transforms the way we think and live which in turn can bring us to the next level of situations for further creativity. Furthermore, Bleakley (2004) criticizes the criterion of value in the definition by arguing that it focuses too much on tangible products, results and work. He questions: "Does this mean that both play and daydreaming are not creative unless they can be applied, or demonstrate a product...?" (p. 465). Also art, which is not constrained by utilitarian concerns would then, in his interpretation, have to be excluded from this definition. For this reason, Bleakley comes up with a separate definition of creativity which focuses on the utilitarian value only, which is creativity as problem-solving, where the act of producing, or in his words perspiration, is being creative.

To apply the creative product to tourism, it should be said that various tourist attractions can be considered products (Richards, 2011), for example Monet's Garden in Giverny, France. However, as the traditional examples of Creative Tourism show, the tourists are creating a final observable and tangible product during the workshops or events; a craftwork in various forms – jewellery, knives, artwork, food, painting, recycled objects, etc. They create something individually and co-create collectively with the fellow tourists and the host.

The creative product was one side of the coin; the creative process is the other. This comes next.

Creative Process

According to a substantial amount of literature, the creative process is the path that leads to a creative outcome which is new and valuable (Unsworth & Clegg, 2010). There are many cognitive theories that give insight into thinking patterns, flows of ideas, behaviours and skills, all of which are part of the creative process. For example, in a review by Seng et al. (2008) the following descriptors of creativity were summed up: imagination, original ideas, self-expression, discovery, critical and divergent thought processes, active and high intellectual ability, motivation, flexibility, self-confidence, newness and uniqueness. A theme that reoccurred in all of these studies was imagination. Richards & Wilson (2006) use the Oxford English Dictionary definition of creativity which is about "being inventive, imaginative; showing imagination as well as routine skill" (p. 1212). Sternberg (2006) argues that a legislative thinking style is important for creativity, which is about thinking divergently in new ways. Similarly, Bilton & Cummings (2010) talk about a "bisociative" thinking style which tolerates contradictions and therefore fosters creativity.
Furthermore, one of Bleakley's (2004) definitions of creativity is *inspiration* which "is a product of living in imagination...“ (p. 471-472). This definition is part of the Romantic view of creativity and stands in opposition to the problem-solving view or *perspiration* mentioned above in the section on the creative product. Additionally, Bleakley (2004) argues that a subset of 'creativity as inspiration' is 'creativity as serendipity' where "fortunate chance seems to arise more often where there is 'preparedness' – openness to imaginative possibility“ (p.472). In other words, imagination can help create accidental discoveries.

Löfgren (2003) underlines the importance of developing and nurturing the capital of creativity in the new economy, or the experience economy, as described in the introduction. The search for creativity focuses on "techniques of imagination and imagineering“ (p. 246). He refers to this cult of imagination as fantasizing about new solutions and new ideas or "dreamovation“ (p. 246): imagination and dreams can foster innovation and creativity. Furthermore, Löfgren (2003) makes an interesting link between the power of imagination and storytelling which is about developing a narrative of the company, product, service or event. This idea can be connected to the shift from tangible to intangible assets, which was introduced at the beginning of the research project. A narrative or a story is a useful intangible asset for cultural entrepreneurs (Lounsbury & Glynn, 2001). Mossberg (2008) also argues that storytelling has become a global trend in the experience economy. It is increasingly common for a consumer to be immersed in a story – fictitious or real – around a product, an organization, a destination or a place which can give them an extraordinary experience. Immersion in a story can be strengthened through involvement, co-creation and guides. Some examples are: Disneyland; themed retail environments such as Selfridges in the UK; theatrical guided ghost tours in Edinburgh; or the themed hotels in Las Vegas. Mossberg (2008) argues that stories can attach meaning to people's lives; they involve us emotionally and stimulate our imagination. Particularly in tourism they are very useful because of the hedonic values, as opposed to utilitarian values, which are attached.

From a wide range of characteristics of creativity, the aspects of imagination, experience and stories show themselves to be a common hallmark in each of the studies mentioned above, related not to the observable creative product but to the creative processes which happen in people's minds – the path leading to the creative product. Landry (2000) sums up all of these ideas. He sees creativity as "a process of discovering and then enabling potential to unfold“ (p.11-12) and as "applied imagination using qualities like intelligence, inventiveness and learning along the way“ (p.12). In addition, he says that „being creative is an attitude of mind“ (p. 14) and "crucially creativity is a journey not a destination, a process not a status“ (p.14).

Richards (2011) uses tourist activities such as workshops and master classes as an example for the
creative process. During the workshops, they use their creative imagination and transform their ideas into a tangible result. The theory on the creative process serves as a basis for conducting the empirical research part of the present study. This will be introduced below.

**Transition to Case Study on Public Archaeology**

These four categories of creativity – creative person, creative environment, creative product and creative process – can be applied to the example of Creative Tourism New Zealand. The workshops allow the tourist to leave the place with a creative result. In order to arrive at the creative result, they have to engage in a creative process which involves the senses, thinking, imagination, ideas and learning. These are cognitive processes which take place in the minds of the tourists and are reflected in their behaviours. During the creative process and while finishing the creative outcome, one can consider the tourist as a creative person. Since none of this happens sitting alone in an atelier but together with a group of people involved in the same activity, the creativity is socially embedded. So, Creative Tourism activities offer this social context for creativity to grow.

To recall, the first research question was:

**Many traditional examples of Creative Tourism show that tourists are creative by producing arts or crafts during a workshop or an event. However, what if the tourists are not creating a final product, can creativity still exist in a different way?**

The answer is yes. Creativity does not only have to exist as a creative product but can also be seen as a creative process – everything that happens in the mind of the person.

A strong thread of literature on Creative Tourism focuses on traditional arts and crafts; creative performances and craft products such as sculptures, paintings and jewellery. In other words, there is mostly some kind of finished product at the end. The examples above on Creative Tourism New Zealand and Barcelona made this clear as well. Furthermore, Richards (2011) summarizes some literature from the *Annals of Tourism Research* on these early links between tourism and creativity. Studies included tourist activities such as traditional woodcarving, silk-weaving, dance and music performances and other local arts products. Moreover, film-induced tourism, music tourism and gastronomic tourism are some examples of creative industries that offer active learning experiences
and allow tourists to develop a creative outcome: a film, a song and a traditional dish. Richards (2011) points out that we have to look beyond the traditional perception of creativity in tourism that is related mainly to the arts and crafts products. The concept of creativity has to be repositioned in a much broader phenomenon. This approach will be taken in the case study of this research project.

There is little academic research on the direct connection between public archaeology and Creative Tourism. Archaeology belongs to the broader concept of heritage tourism which also includes museums, cathedrals, castles, monuments and art galleries. In terms of consumption, heritage tourism is traditionally passive and in terms of production, offers high-culture (see Fig.1) for the „white-collar“ visitors with high education and income. As talked about at the beginning of the essay, these two traits characterize mass cultural tourism: heritage tourism being merely a tourist gaze (Urry, 2002). However, especially within the scope of the Experience Economy, these traditional practices are being challenged (Wahlgren & Svanberg, 2008). In recent years, archaeology has increasingly become public-oriented and is trying to employ more than just heritage as their tangible cultural resource. Many organisations have found novel ways to represent history and involve the public. As Wahgren & Svanberg (2008) point out, public archaeology "strives to involve people in the making of history, with an aim towards more inclusive, and even democratic, pasts and collections“ (p. 241). They investigated several projects in which the public learned about the processes of archaeological investigation and interpretation. However, can digging up soil, to put it candidly, be considered Creative Tourism?

As a case study, the "Live Archaeological Dig for Shakespeare“ in Stratford-upon-Avon in the UK was chosen. It was selected for the following four reasons: first, because the historical and literacy figure of Shakespeare is characteristic of the destination thus making the place unique; second, because the organization offers the public to become involved in sieving soil and finding artefacts; third, because it goes beyond the traditional Creative Tourism examples of creating a final art or craft as an observable and tangible product; fourth, because the combination of heritage and creativity, traditionally seen as contradictory, is an innovative and interesting approach to be examined further.

The first two reasons, namely the place characteristic and the public involvement, were seen as prerequisites for doing empirical research on Creative Tourism. It has been learned that these two aspects are important 'traits' of Creative Tourism. During a personal email communication, G. Richards commented on the idea of this case study, by saying that: "It is certainly a different kind of
creative tourism. I think the important thing here is not to take too narrow a view of creativity. Creativity includes much more than just engaging in the classic types of creative activities in a destination."

To investigate whether the archaeological sieving can be termed as Creative Tourism, the following research question was developed, based on the most common definition of creativity: producing something new and valuable.

**Research Question 2:**

Can the archaeological sieving, which is part of the Live Archaeological Dig for Shakespeare in Stratford-upon-Avon, be considered supportive of Creative Tourism?

To answer this, the following questions will be investigated:

- Do the *tourists* believe that the sieving enables them to create anything new and valuable?
- Do the *volunteers* believe that the sieving enables them to create anything new and valuable?
- Do the *managers* believe that the tourists involved in the sieving create anything new and valuable?
- And do they believe that they are creating anything new and valuable through offering the archaeological sieving activity?

The reason why not only tourists but also volunteers and managers are included in this research is because Creative Tourism needs to be investigated from both the consumption as well as the production side.

Detailed information on the case study and methodology of the research will be described in the following chapter.
III. METHODOLOGY

The methodology section is divided into the following four parts: 1. setting; 2. method; 3. interview questions; and 4. method of data analysis.

Setting

The Live Archaeological Dig for Shakespeare at Nash's House & New Place on Chapel Street in Stratford-upon Avon in England was chosen as a case study for this research project. Nash's House & New Place is one of the five Shakespeare Houses which now belong to the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust; the world's leading charity in promoting William Shakespeare's works, life and times (Shakespeare Birthplace Trust, 2011).

In 1597, Shakespeare purchased Nash's House which was then his family home and continued to be so until his death in 1616. The Trust believes that Shakespeare wrote one of his later works there, including the Tempest. Adjacent to Nash's House, visitors can watch the live archaeological dig carried out by volunteers who have gone through professional training. The archaeological findings from 2011 are displayed in the form of an exhibition in Nash's House. At the far end of the garden there is a large, white, rectangular marquee where the sieving activity takes place. Here, volunteers are responsible for involving the public in the sieving. The sieving process will be now explained in detail: The sand, having been excavated from the dig site, is transported in wheelbarrows to the sieving marquee where the volunteer sits on a bench holding a large wooden sieving box in front of him. The sieving box is attached to a rack which stands on the ground (Fig. 3). The volunteer shovels one heap of sand into the sieve, shakes it until all the loose sand falls to the ground leaving the bigger pieces in the sieve to be examined more closely. Should a person want to take part in the sieving, the volunteer explains this process to him/her by presenting a tray (Fig.4) with some of the artefacts (man-made, e.g. spoon) and ecofacts (natural e.g. stone or bark) that have already been discovered and that could possibly be found in the sieve. They do this to enable the people to envisage what to look out for. The volunteers are there to provide the participants with information about the process, to answer questions and to talk about their own experiences. One reoccurring situation observed by the researcher was as follows: A volunteer was telling the participants how to distinguish stones from archaeological findings and explained that when an item is taken and knocked on the wood, if it gives a high-pitched sound then it is a stone and can be thrown away. However, when the sound is dull then the item can be put on the tray for further analysis by the volunteers.
Fig. 3. Sieving boxes

Fig. 4. Trays with artefacts and ecofacts
Method

Qualitative interviewing was the main method used to collect the data. A qualitative approach was chosen over a quantitative one for the subsequent reasons. The Dig for Shakespeare, used as a case study in the present project, is not only unique worldwide but also a recent programme that was started in April 2010. This means that no research has yet been conducted on the Dig for Shakespeare, so even if quantitative data were available they could not be generalized to a wider population. Due to the small sample size which can be taken from the Dig for Shakespeare, the researcher decided to concentrate not on the quantity of visitor responses but on their quality. Focusing on the quality denotes understanding the meaning attached to the people's actions, describing their behaviour and deriving interpretations (Kvale, 1996). In this way, cultural inferences or thick descriptions (Geertz, 1973) can be made and can give powerful insights into individuals. Thick descriptions are in-depth descriptions, which, compared to thin descriptions, take into account the cultural embedding, which is particularly interesting to investigate in the field of tourism. Thick descriptions also involve observing the interplay of relations between people, things, activities and meanings. With regard to the present study, this kind of interplay can be found between the participant, the guides, the sieve and the artefacts.

An interview approach was specifically chosen in preference to another qualitative research design, such as a survey, due to four major reasons (McNamara, 1999 & Kvale, 1996): First of all, interviews are very resource-intensive because one can profoundly investigate the story behind the person’s experiences. Furthermore, the researcher has the opportunity to uncover new ideas that had not previously been thought about and can directly ask for further elaboration or probe the ideas. In addition, interviewing is a personal form of research since one stands in direct relationship to the respondent. It allows for a two-way communication process during which the respondent can also ask questions should he or she be unsure about anything. It is also easier for the respondents to communicate their opinions or impressions verbally as opposed to writing them down on paper. The focus of the qualitative approach is on group interviews, but nonetheless also allowing for individual interviews should there be some people in the group who do not wish to participate. The goal was to interview the three following samples:

1. GROUP A: visitors (participants and non-participants in the sieving marquee)
2. GROUP B: volunteers
3. GROUP C: managers
A purposive sampling (Teddlie & Yu, 2007) method was used for GROUP A which means that, in this context, only tourists were interviewed. In the present study, a tourist is defined as somebody who does not live in Stratford-upon-Avon and is there only on a visit. The researcher attempted to select groups of different demographic characteristics (age, gender, nationality and occupation), based on subjective observation. These were assessed after the interview was conducted. The interviews were organized in a semi-structured manner (Gubrium & Holstein, 2001); constructed as a guided conversation to allow some flexibility. For recording the interviews, two different types of cameras with a video option were used. Before the interview began the respondents were asked for permission to record their anonymous voices. They were ensured that the data would be treated confidentially. During the interview, the camera was held in such a way that no faces were filmed.

**Interview Questions**

The interview questions varied slightly for each of the three samples (GROUP A, B and C) clearly because they played different roles in the field. However, the majority of the questions were open-ended; all closed-ended question that required a 'yes' or 'no' for an answer, necessitated further elaboration on the part of the respondent. The questions for GROUP A (visitors) and B (volunteers) can be summarized into two major clusters of topics (see Appendix 2 for exact questions):

1) Introduction to topic:
   - motivation for coming to Nash's House/New Place and the Live Archaeological Dig
   - thoughts about the sieving as an interactive event (whether they took part or not)

2) Perceived creativity as in creating something new and valuable:
   - enjoyment aspect of their visit/of the sieving
   - learning aspect of their visit/of the sieving
   - skills needed for sieving
   - contribution through sieving
   - added value of active participation, compared to observation
   - creation of anything new and valuable
   - personal preference when going on holiday: interactive workshops/events or museums, etc
   - comparison: sieving & painting workshop (similarity/difference with regard to creativity)
The last question was considered particularly important by the researcher for the reason that it gave the respondents the opportunity to picture „creativity“ in different ways and to relate this to their own experiences outside Nash's House. For GROUP C (managers), the interview questions adopted a different angle. The questions can be summarized into three major clusters of topics.

1) Motivation and reasons for involving the public  
2) Target group/visitor profile  
3) Thoughts about the visitors' creative experiences (see questions GROUP A & B)

All the questions described above were used for answering **Research Question 2**, to recall:

**Can the archaeological sieving, which is part of the Live Archaeological Dig for Shakespeare in Stratford-upon-Avon, be considered supportive of Creative Tourism?**

- Do the **tourists** believe that the sieving enables them to create anything new and valuable?  
- Do the **volunteers** believe that the sieving enables them to create anything new and valuable?  
- Do the **managers** believe that the tourists involved in the sieving create anything new and valuable?  
- And do they believe that they are creating anything new and valuable through offering the archaeological sieving activity?

**Method of Data Analysis**

After transcribing the interviews into textual data, **thematic coding** (Flick, 2003) was used to analyze the data for each group individually. Due to the fact that different cultures support different opinions/views, all themes, whether major or minor, were taken into consideration; the only condition was topic relevance. For this reason, the researcher prepared a detailed overview of the themes discussed during the interviews with each group. Every theme was given a name, or a code. Subsequently, the list of codes was clustered into similar categories and each of these was labelled with a new code. For each theme in each group it will be stated how many groups/individuals agreed/disagreed on a particular idea. The reason for this being that within a group not every member always participated equally. On some occasions, for example, only the father and mother spoke and the child hardly contributed at all. After developing a thematic structure for each group, it was possible to compare themes across groups and investigate whether each group has similar or different perspectives.
IV. CASE ANALYSIS

The researcher conducted 16 group interviews with visitors, 3 individual interviews with visitors, 2 group interviews with volunteers and 2 individual interviews with the operations manager and the town house manager. In total, 23 interviews were conducted with a total number of 58 people involved of which 41 were adults and 17 were children. 39 were female and 19 were male. Overall, 12 children actually participated in the sieving. There were no adults who actively took part but they were observing their children. The group sizes ranged from one to five people. The following three groups of respondents can be identified:

GROUP A: visitors → 19 interviews (52 people: 35 adults, 17 children)
GROUP B: volunteers → 2 interviews (4 people)
GROUP C: managers → 2 interviews (2 people)

On the following pages, "the sentences written in italics and framed by inverted commas“ highlight the wording articulated by some respondents. The sentences have not been modified meaning they could contain grammar mistakes. A repeated comment made within a group will be counted only once because it is assumed that, due to certain power relations within groups of families and friends, opinions might be biased. The responses are grouped in general themes which are divided into four parts: 1. archaeological sieving activity; 2. knowledge; 3. volunteers and senses; 4. imagination; and 5. a communal story. The first part looks at the production side, namely the public archaeology offered at Nash’s House. The second and fourth part discuss in what way the creative potential of visitors and volunteers is increasing during the archaeological sieving; the third part connects these two major themes; and the fifth part looks at the combination of visitors’ and hosts’ creativity, in other words, co-creation. All themes which will be discussed underline the theoretical finding that creativity can exist as a process.

1. Archaeological Sieving Activity

The operations manager Chloe M. explained that Heritage Lottery Funding decided to award Nash's House & New Place a grant for the sieving activity on the basis that it was spent on “improving the people's enjoyments.” The sieving should offer the visitors a new and different experience in the sense that they have the opportunity to engage in the process of archaeology. According to Chloe M., the sieving activity is about “their engagement, their enjoyment, their feelings and the project they can get involved with” and this enables them to “create a real experience in the marquee, for
In addition, the “learning and education aspects can be improved”, apart from having fun. The town house manager Debbie B. adds that “certainly they come here and have learnt a new skill” and refers to this as edutainment, a mixture of education and entertainment.

The idea of edutainment is consistent with theory on experience realms (Fig. 5) by Pine & Gilmore's (1999). They developed a model with four experience realms: the first realm is entertainment: passively absorbing and enjoying an experience; the second realm is educational: absorbing an experience through active participation which increases one's knowledge and skills. In order to achieve this, organizations need to offer activities that engage the mind and/or the body. If an event is not only about learning but is also fun, then the experience is called edutainment; the third realm is escapist: being immersed in a stimulating environment such as theme parks, casinos and computer games. As the word says, an escapist experience also entails one escaping to a different 'world' – either physically like going to a theme park or mentally as in a computer game; the fourth realm is aesthetic: being immersed in an environment but still remaining passive, for example visiting a museum. It has an effect on the person, leaving the environment unaffected. Pine & Gilmore (1999) argue that “companies can enhance the realness of an experience by blurring the boundaries between realms” (p. 38).

Fig. 5. Experience Realms (Pine & Gilmore, 1999)
Applied to Nash's House it should be said that the experiences offered are blurred. For one, there is a strong mixture between entertainment and education. The visitors can observe the happenings in the sieving marquee, talk to the volunteers, ask questions and be practical and do archaeology. However, the sieving offers an escapist experience as well. Being engaged, visitors can 'escape' to the historical past and Shakespeare's life and times. Furthermore, concerning the visitors who are only watching the happenings in the sieving marquee, without actively participating, one can argue that this could be an aesthetic experience for them – if they are being immersed.

Taken together, the sieving activity offers different experiences for different people. Thus, in this case the boundaries of the four experience realms are blurred making the whole experience more real and distinct (Pine & Gilmore, 1999).

Applying this idea directly to Creative Tourism, it can be said that through all these experiences which are themed around the figure of Shakespeare, Nash's House is promoting a unique place characteristic of Stratford-upon-Avon. The organization utilizes intangible cultural resources such as the city's identity - which is history and heritage - and narratives based on Shakespeare's life, works and times. The strength is the fact that these cultural assets are endogenous or inherited which offer the visitors an authentic experience. For these reasons, Nash's House is creating something valuable in terms of education for society and tourism. In addition, they are also creating something new. The idea of involving the public in archaeology and separating traditional heritage tourism from passive consumption is very innovative. In Stratford-upon-Avon the idea of public archaeology is entirely unique and in the U.K, according to the managers, the majority of digs are private digs; closed to the public. This also goes hand-in-hand with what the majority of tourists said, namely that they had never seen nor done anything like this before. Through the archaeological sieving experience, Nash's House offers an environment that enables visitors to develop their creative potential. Two major themes appeared during the interviews, namely ‘knowledge’ and ‘imagination’. Finally, the creativity of the visitors and the creativity of the volunteers supported by the creative environment in the sieving marquee, come together to create a ‘communal story’. The themes of knowledge, imagination and communal story will be subject of the next section.

2. Knowledge

The fact that the sieving activity offers an educational experience or edutainment is also reflected in the responses of the visitors. The majority of groups (11/19) recognized that the sieving experience contributes to a learning process and a pool of knowledge. Half of these comments were very similar in content for the reason that they were all related to learning about the work of the
archaeologist being a very gradual and detailed process. Following phrases were used: 'it gives you some idea'; 'seeing the reality'; 'it shows you'; 'helps to understand'; 'it tells us more'; 'insight'; 'interesting to see'; 'an awareness' and 'opportunity to be an archaeologist'. To provide an example, one man said: “It gives you some idea of the exactitude involved – the precision, the effort, the amount of effort for each find.“ Additionally, one volunteer also emphasized that visitors became aware that heritage and history is more than just a museum and archaeology is more than just finding things. The other half of the comments were directly related to learning about the artefacts; as one boy said: "I learned what to look for, what the things look like. “ To recall, the visitors can have a look at previously found artefacts and ecofacts which are lying in a tray. This gives them an idea of what to look out for.

Furthermore, all groups agreed that certain skills were needed for archaeological sieving. The skills most cited (eight times) were 'recognition and identification' of the artefacts; as one man said: "You have to know what you are looking for...it is actually quite a skilful business...You have to recognise a piece of pottery...You need training to identify artefacts...An archaeologist has to be very careful not to destroy what they are trying to preserve." Further skills mentioned were: 'patience'; 'knowledge' about archaeology/artefacts; 'exactitude or precision'; a command of the English language' to understand the volunteers; and 'physical mobility'. Volunteers also gain knowledge, but differently. For example, one volunteer explained what kind of new skills she had acquired: “...how to trail the soil away and how to attempt to keep the ground level, and how to do that carefully and look at what you are doing,... looking at different colours in the soil.” Another volunteer also described what he was learning: “I learn how to do the techniques, how to spot finds, all the various sorts of methods and processes that we have to go through to record our finds...”

Comparing the responses of visitors and volunteers, it is obvious that the visitors got an insight into the work of an archaeologist and an awareness for the fact that certain skills are needed. The volunteers, on the other hand, explained how they gathered in-depth skills. The reason for this difference is most probably due to the time of involvement in the sieving process. There was one woman who put forward an interesting argument by saying: “I think this might be different if you’d be doing this for longer. Because like in a choir you are part of a team, if you were here doing it all day everyday you'd be doing it collectively...I think that just for a 10-minute thing like this it might inspire for the future.” With the “10-minute thing” the woman was referring to the average time one is involved in sieving soil. She thereby implied that the sieving activity does not involve as much teamwork for the visitors. The example with the choir is very similar to the example on Creative Tourism workshops discussed in the literature review. In a workshop, one is also part of a team; one is involved for a longer time and learns in-depth skills.
However, we have to recall that creative tourism, according to Richards (2010), offers different levels of involvement (Fig. 2). A workshop for a few hours is the highest level of involvement and is most often directed to learning in-depth skills for creating a final craft. In the sieving marquee at Nash’s House visitors are also involved, but in a different way. Here, the emphasis is not on training the visitors to be professional archaeologists but to bring them closer to history and archaeology. In a follow-up email, the managers informed the researcher that they did not offer any workshops on Shakespeare and archaeology.

3. Volunteers and Senses

There are two sub-themes, 'importance of volunteers' and 'senses', that show how the educational experience at Nash’s House can be facilitated.

Visitors consider volunteers to be very important in the sieving marquee because they provide knowledge. They used words such as 'helping out', 'the lady told me' and 'they make you aware'. One mother pointed out the following: “I think he was very helpful actually. He was talking about the different grounds in general, which was very interesting. Then he was interested in what you were finding in your sieve and told you whether it was any use.” Without the volunteers, visitors would not know what to do unless they had any prior knowledge in archaeology and therefore, it is clear that they are enabling the visitors to learn.

Many senses are involved when participating in the sieving experience. Visitors recognized the importance of the senses, particularly touch. They used words such as 'feeling the soil', 'touching', 'tactile', 'practical' and 'hands-on'. One grandfather was telling his grandson: “I think you were learning because you were actually doing it. I was only watching. So, because you were using your hands, you were learning – what was a stone, what was mud. I could only watch. See, if you held it in your hand, you could feel it, couldn’t you? I could only watch what you were doing. But you knew.” In other words, being involved and feeling the soil provides added value and increases the learning experience. Another woman commented: ”It is more powerful to you as a person if you are involved ‘cos you are learning more powerfully than if it’s just talked at you ‘cos all of a sudden you are part of it...“ The volunteers supported the idea that this practical way of learning about archaeology is different from the information one gets from text books. The advantage of active consumption over passive consumption was mentioned several times and this idea is consistent with literature on the shift from cultural to Creative Tourism. Also, Chloe M. and Debbie B. were of the opinion that the participants are more likely to learn and understand because they are 'doing it, seeing it and hearing it'. Through this multi-sensory experience and the help of the volunteers, visitors can not only learn but also “live” and be immersed in the archaeological experience.
(Mossberg, 2008). It helps to increase the imagination of the visitors. This is related to the escapist experience realm introduced above. Visitors escape into the world or story of Shakespeare. In other words, senses are supportive of both the learning experience and increasing the imagination, as Lovata (2011) points out: “the act of touching has an especially important role in building a connection between past and present” (p.202).

4. Imagination

In the following section the theme of ‘imagination’ will be discussed. In addition, this theme is supported by a sub-theme, namely 'discovery'.

The theme of imagination was very prominent (12x) during the interviews with visitors. It was mentioned directly seven times using the word 'imagination' and five times it was implied (based on the researcher's interpretation). One woman who used the word 'imagination' said: “I was creative by imagining the whole background surrounded to what we were doing, to think about what we were doing, allows us to come up with ideas regarding our findings. It allows you to use your imagination and your intellect...you discover an artefact and you try to give it meaning, you give it life.” In addition, the other six comments were related to an ‘imagination’ of what the past could have been like or an ‘imagination’ of what they might find during the sieving.

There were five comments that did not specifically contain the word 'imagination', but were related to 'creating an historical narrative in the mind' or 'building up a picture'. For instance, one comment was: "Very creative. In the sense that they are having to look for things and match things up, and in that sense, creating history in their minds, and piecing things together...in the sense creating a timeline for the children...instead of making something with your hands you are creating something mentally." One answer in particular from an 11-year old girl distinguished itself from the rest of the comments because she was talking about her own made-up story saying: "It increases my creativity. If I write a story I can use it into my story to make it actually real life. For example if I would write a story about archaeology, I would know how it is and make my story really true and create it in that way...An archaeology story maybe. A boy goes and finds stones and it turns out to be something special." This shows that imagination is connected to storytelling; also supported by literature (Löfgren, 2003). Furthermore, one of the volunteers recognized that people who are involved in archaeological sieving “create a passion for history”. Another volunteer said that the participants are “creating some imagination in their own minds”. In addition, Chloe M. argued that the visitors were creative in the sense that they are “creating an experience for themselves”; and Debbie B. answered that the participants are “creating an interest” and can be “inspired to go away and be creative” in the form of reading a play or writing a poem.
To sum up, the participants – whether visitors or volunteers – create a passion, an imagination, an experience and an interest; all related to Shakespeare, history and archaeology. Landry (2000) makes an interesting comment here by saying that “creativity is not only about a continuous invention of the new, but also how to deal appropriately with the old” (p. 7).

Moreover, the theme of 'discovery' is strongly related to the themes of 'imagination' and 'senses'. Terms such as 'finding', 'evidence' and 'uncovering' were used as synonyms for 'discovery'. For example, one woman said: "If they find something they don't expect to find then that's creating."

Due to the fact that participants can sieve through soil and touch artefacts and ecofacts, it increases their curiosity to find something interesting; people try to imagine what they can find and are motivated to try. Similar expressions for 'curiosity' were 'anticipation' and 'excitement', as one man's answer was: "Anticipation of finding something new, something they have never found before."

In addition, three volunteers were of the opinion that finding the artefacts was the most interesting aspect of the sieving. For instance, one man said: "I like history but don't enjoy just sitting in a classroom and reading about it...I like this sort of...finding it."

The element of chance is also seen as a characteristic describing post-modern tourism (Marling et al., 2009). It makes the whole sieving event interesting, it is like gambling; one cannot anticipate the happenings. On the one hand, it can keep the people enthusiastic and motivated which in turn positively affects their learning and imagination. Sternberg (2006) also sees a positive connection between motivation and creativity. However, there are also a few children who were frustrated because it was often difficult to find something in the soil, like one boy said to his father: "I am frustrated because we couldn't find anything...looking through and nothing there. Just rocks, nothing special."

Only three groups were of the opinion that discovery was not creative. For example, one man said: "It's history we are looking at. It is already there, but it needs to be found, to be discovered...Are you being creative by discovering? No, creative for me is producing something new, something that hasn't been done before." However, one could disagree with this by arguing that archaeological sieving is about rediscovery and according to Sternberg (2006), "rediscovery might be judged to be creative with respect to the rediscoverer" (p.95). It is new and valuable to the rediscoverer and the society at the time of discovery. Also Picasso, the artist and conceptual innovator, said: "I don't seek, I find" (Galenson, 2010, p.356). Still, for some people being creative means producing something that has not existed before.

The major discussions on knowledge and imagination are consistent with what was found in the literature on creativity as a process. Although the visitors are not creating any tangible product in the sieving marquee, the visitors, volunteers and managers agreed that they are creative in a different sense. In this case, creativity is happening in the minds of the people and this supports the
cognitive theories on creativity in the literature. The participants are creating knowledge and imagination. Concerning knowledge, the visitors are gaining an insight into the world of archaeology. Although they do not learn specific in-depth skills, as do the volunteers, they are still aware that certain skills are needed for archaeological sieving and many could also imagine what effort and precision is involved in the whole process. Furthermore, the sieving activity can help both visitors and volunteers create an imagination of the past, of the objects they could find in the soil, of how the objects were used, etc. In other words, the imagination could be anything – fictitious or real. Especially the sense of touch, the help of the volunteers and the act of finding something, play an important role in sparking one's imagination.

Interestingly, the most common definition of creativity found in literature was, to recall: producing something new and valuable. This was mostly used for products. Despite the fact that the sieving activity does not result in any tangible product, it was still used during the interviews and it showed that the majority of people thought that creativity entails more than just a product. Also Sternberg (2006) agrees that ideas, for example, can be creative in terms of new and valuable. Knowledge and imagination are seen as something new and valuable but for oneself, personally. One could argue that the boundaries between creative product and process are blurred in this case. The creative process that developed during the sieving can also be seen as a personal “product” or “outcome”. People can reflect on themselves and can hopefully say that they have increased their creative potential through knowledge and imagination. It might even inspire them in the future to read a Shakespeare play, to write a poem, to go to the theatre, to learn more about archaeology, etc. Creativity as inspiration resulting from imagination is consistent with Bleakley's (2004) view. In other words, the creativity which happens in the minds of the people during the sieving experience is not limited to the place and to the few minutes they are involved; it goes beyond place and time. And this is very valuable for the individual.

5. A Communal Story

In the literature review it was discussed that co-creation was a crucial aspect of Creative Tourism. This characteristic is also reflected in the sieving activity at Nash's House. Half of the groups agreed that people who actively participate in the sieving contribute something to the organization. The word 'contribution' was not always directly used; instead phrases such as 'helping out', 'part of the process', 'piece information together', 'it went into the tray' or 'creating a museum' were used. As one elderly woman said: "They will be creating a little bit of a museum won't they, of the objects that they find? So they should be able to piece together a little bit of the history of this place. “ Similarly, a woman said to her daughter: „You have sieved a little bit which is a little bit less for somebody
“You have been part of a process, even if it’s only a small part...” Furthermore, Chloe M. and Debbie B. agreed that the visitors were co-creators of the experience in the sieving marquee because they were adding to the everyday work of the volunteers and could “contribute to the collection.” The idea of creative contributions is reflected in the literature as creativity which is socially-embedded and not solely the result of the individual (Richards, 2011).

Using their knowledge and imagination, supported by guides and senses, participants can co-create a unique and valuable experience with the volunteers in the sieving marquee. This is made possible because Nash’s House gives the visitors the raw material to develop their creative potential. Visitor and host are co-creating an authentic experience around a story – a story of the past; of Shakespeare. This idea is supported by G. Richards, one of the founders of the term Creative Tourism, during a personal email communication in which he says that they are “giving visitors the tools to create their own stories and creative experiences from the raw materials that are available at a specific location. This is great, because it means that both producer and consumer have to interact creatively in order to turn this into a tourist experience. Not just a dig, but a dig with a story.” When applied to theory, it is Löfgren (2003) who makes a link between imagination and storytelling. In the case of Nash’s House, storytelling refers to three aspects: the personal stories of the people, the intangible asset of story or narrative which the organization uses to attract visitors and the story they create together – here they are creating something valuable for their community. The unique aspect is that all these stories exist in an intangible form. However, as soon as people leave the sieving marquee, they can transform these intangible stories into something tangible such as writing a story or a poem.
Individuals travel for various reasons. One of them is culture. People want to escape their familiar environment and learn about a new culture – the people and their behaviour, their attitudes, their food, traditions and history. Does Europe in 30 days help one learn about these topics? Probably not. Europe comprises a diversity of cultures but nevertheless red hop-on, hop-off buses can be spotted on nearly every corner. Within the scope of globalization, the offer of these kinds of standardized products and services has increased, leading to the serial reproduction of culture. For many tourists, consuming standardized products has become too superficial and unsatisfactory. Social transformations show that people's demands are changing: they are looking for skilled consumption and more active, engaging experiences which foster self-development. The economy is reacting to these changes; reflected in the rise of staged experiences, the use of intangible cultural resources and the importance of authentic everyday culture. In this way, cities, places and organizations can better distinguish themselves and attract tourists. The emergence of Creative Tourism can be seen as an example that is reflected in these changes. It is a branch of cultural tourism whereby creativity is used as a tool to promote the culture of a place. Creative Tourism is one of many examples that is a reflection of the creative turn which shows just how important and useful creativity has become in a variety of fields. Creative Tourism is characterized by authentic place characteristics, engaging experiences and the opportunity for tourists to develop their creative potential and by the fact that host and tourist co-create an experience at the location. Examples of Creative Tourism developments like those in New Zealand and Barcelona show that creativity mostly pertains to arts and crafts and such events during which people produce a creative product. However, in order to look beyond the traditional perception of creativity in tourism, the archaeological sieving activity at Nash's House in Stratford-upon-Avon was chosen as a case study. Despite the fact that the tourists were not creating anything tangible during the sieving, they were perceived to be creative in a different way. Through being involved in archaeology, by using their sense of touch and being guided by the volunteers, they could increase their pool of knowledge not only about the work of archaeology but also about the various artefacts and ecofacts, Shakespeare and history of medieval Britain in general. Due to the fact that our past is defragmented and must be uncovered, people are forced to use imagination in order to build a personal story; anything from a correct timeline of history to a fantasy story about archaeology. Searching and discovering artefacts generates a degree of tension and curiosity which enables this imagination to grow. The results of the case study show that creativity can be a process, not only a product. The literature on creativity as a process concerning imagination, storytelling and inspiration, directly reflects and supports the outcome of the empirical research. This is an important implication for organisations offering public
archaeology. One should by no means underestimate how creative it can be and, since it all takes place in the minds of the people, it is also particularly powerful. Furthermore, knowledge and imagination which develop during the archaeological sieving would probably be powerful enough to develop into an inspiration beyond the event. In such a case it would have had a profound effect on the individual. To conclude, the archaeological sieving activity at Nash's House can be considered supportive of Creative Tourism because visitors and volunteers believe that the sieving enables them to create something new and valuable for themselves. The managers also agree that through offering new and valuable tools in the form of involvement in the sieving marquee, the equipment and the volunteers, they are enabling the participants to develop their creative potential. Although theory is certain that creativity can exist as a process, there were a few interviewees who were unsure, especially children. It was predominantly children who were participating in the sieving and their parents were watching. During the interviews, some children said they were not creative because they were not making any objects and not always discovering anything. Unfortunately, there was a lack of in-depth talk with the children which can be logically explained by general shyness of talking to strangers or power relations within families. It was their parents or guardians who were talking on their behalf or trying to give them ideas of what to say. This limitation of the present study calls for further research with children in Creative Tourism and public archaeology. It is known that children especially have great powers of imagination and a sense of fantasy and it would therefore be interesting to obtain an insight into their thoughts and creative minds through individual and group interviews with children only. Additionally, it would be of interest to see how creative processes that develop during archaeological sieving translate directly into observable or tangible outcomes. For example, letting the children express their newly gained knowledge and imagination in the form of painting a picture or an object, writing or telling a story or acting it out – all in relation to archaeology, Shakespeare and history. This would immediately show if the archaeological sieving had had an effect on them. And after all we have learnt it probably would have.
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1. Samples

GROUP A: visitors (19 interviews)

total number of people: 52
number of adults: 35
number of children: 17

访谈 1
number of people: 1
gender: female
age: 30
nationality: Chinese
occupation: Student at Sheffield

访谈 2:
number of people: 3 (family)
gender: male 2x, female 1x
age: father = 50; mother = 50; son = 19
nationality: Dutch
occupation: father = skipper, mother = secretary, son = student

访谈 3:
number of people: 1
gender: female
age: 75
nationality: British (local)
occupation: pensioner

访谈 4:
number of people: 2 (friends)
gender: female 2x
age: 30, 31
nationality: British (Kent)
occupation: manager at NHS; collections manager

访谈 5:
number of people: 2 (couple)
gender: male, female
age: male = 43; female = 37
nationality: British (Welsh)
occupation: male = financial advisor; female = salon owner

访谈 6:
number of people: 3 (friends)
gender: female 3x
age: 22, 22, 23
nationality: Chinese
occupation: students at Bath
Interview 7:
number of people: 1
gender: male 1x
age: 55
nationality: British (London)
occupation: actor at RSC

Interview 8:
number of people: 2 (couple)
gender: male, female
age: male = 50; female = 45
nationality: British (near London)
occupation: male = history lecturer at university; female = gardener

Interview 9:
number of people: 3 (mother & 2 children)
gender: female 2x; male 1x
age: mother = 40; children = 7 (son) & 9 (daughter)
nationality: British (live in China)
occupation: artist

Interview 10:
number of people: 3 (mother & 2 children)
gender: female 2x; male 1x
age: mother = 37; children = 7 (son) & 8 (daughter)
nationality: British (London)
occupation: consultant

Interview 11:
number of people: 4 (father, mother & 2 children)
gender: female 3x; male 1x
age: father = 43; mother = 39; children = 15 (older daughter); 8 (younger daughter)
nationality: British (Manchester)
occupation: mother = works in kindergarten; father = manager

Interview 12:
number of people: 4 (grandparents & grandson, granddaughter)
gender: male 2x; female 2x
age: grandparents = 60+
nationality: British (Birmingham)
occupation: grandmum = teacher; granddad = pastor

Interview 13:
number of people: 4 (father, mother, son, sister of mother)
gender: male 2x, female 2x
age: father = 44; mother = 39; son = 8; sister of mother = 37
nationality: British (mother), Irish (father), sister of mother = California
occupation: mother = teacher, father = police man
Interview 14:
number of people: 3 (mother & 2 children)
gender: female 2x; male 1x
age: mother = 38; son = 10; daughter = 13
nationality: Indian (living in Kent)
occupation: works at home

Interview 15:
number of people: 2 (mother and child)
gender: female 2x
age: mother = 35; daughter = 11
nationality: Indian
occupation: %

Interview 16:
number of people: 4 (father, mother, 2 boys)
gender: male 3x; female 1x
age: mother = 35; father = 40; younger son = 8; older son = 11
nationality: Italian
occupation: father = geologist

Interview 17:
number of people: 3 (mother, father, girl)
gender: male 1x, female 2x
age: mother = 30; father = 33; daughter = 7
nationality: Indian (living in London)
occupation: mother = caretaker, father %

Interview 18:
number of people: 5 (couple & friend, daughters 2x)
gender: male, female 4x
age: all 50, child: 10
nationality: American
occupation: females = nurses; male = US Navi

Interview 19:
number of people: 2 friends
gender: female
age: 25, 30
nationality: Turkish, Chilian
Occupation: Phd student; journalist
GROUP B: volunteers (2 interviews)

total number of people: 4

Interview 1:
number of people: 2
gender: female 2x
age: 24; 45
nationality: British

Interview 2:
number of people: 2
gender: male, female
age: male = 21, female = 24
nationality: British

GROUP C: managers (2 interviews)
total number of people: 2

Interview 1: Chloe M.
Occupation: operations manager

Interview 2: Debbie B.
Occupation: town house manager
2. Interview Questions

GROUP A and B: visitors and volunteers

1) Introductory part:
   - Why did you come to the Dig for Shakespeare? (Motivation)/ Why did you decide to be a volunteer at the Dig for Shakespeare?
   - What do you think of the idea that they offer a sieving marquee to involve the public in the Dig for Shakespeare?

2) Main part:
   - Did you like the sieving? Are you enjoying it so far?
   - Have you learned anything here so far? What?
   - Do you need any specific skills for the sieving? Which?
   - For visitors only: Did you have the feeling the volunteers helped you? How?
   - Do you think the people who take part in the sieving contribute anything (to the Trust)? How?
   - Do you think you were creative, as in creating anything new and valuable, during the sieving? How?
   - What do you think about the fact that you can actively participate in the sieving? Do you like it? Is it useful?
   - Who do you think learns more? People who watch or people who take part in the sieving? Why?
   - Imagine the following situation: you go to a workshop and make a painting. How would you compare this „creative work“ to the sieving? (similarities/ differences)
   - What do you prefer personally when you go on holiday? Interactive events like workshops or going to museums, theatre and historical sites? Why?
   - For visitors only: Have you ever seen a Live Archaeological Dig like this before? Have you done anything like this before?
   - To the members who did not participate: Was there a reason why you did not take part? Would you take part next time?
   - Do you think this event should only be for children?

GROUP C: managers

- How did you come up with the idea of the „Dig for Shakespeare“? And what were your motivations/goals, etc for this event?
- Why did you decide to involve the public in the Dig for Shakespeare?
- What makes this place unique?
- Some people can actually take part in the sieving process whereas others can watch. How would you compare their experiences (benefits of active participation, etc)?
- Who is your target group for this event?
- What kind of visitors do you get? Are the people who come here mostly tourists or locals / families or friends / young or old / which nationality, etc?
- What do you think are the visitors' motivations and expectations for coming to Nash's House?
- Would you say, that this event is unique to Stratford-upon-Avon and/or England? If yes, why?
- Do you enable the tourists to be creative, as in creating something new and valuable?
- Can the tourists be considered co-creators of the sieving experience?
3. Additional Information about Methodology

The data was gathered on three separate days (Saturday, Tuesday and Thursday) during the last week of July and the first week of August 2011. On each day, the researcher was present for approximately 3-4 hours, observing the happenings in the sieving marquee, monitoring the interaction between participants and volunteers and the participants’ actions during the sieving. Obtaining this kind of overview of the social interaction was especially important as the researcher could detect which of the group members were actually actively participating in the sieving and which ones were solely observing. After the people had finished in the sieving marquee, they were approached, whether or not they had actively participated. If the participants were children, the researcher made contact with the parents who had been watching their children doing the sieving.

The visitors were informed that the researcher was from the University of Warwick, currently working on her Master Thesis on tourism. In order not to bias them, the concept of "Creative Tourism" was not used. The majority of the visitors at the Dig for Shakespeare were groups of families or friends. Due to potential difficulties in separating the group members, especially families with young children, they were interviewed together. There were some cases where a group was approached and only one or two agreed to be interviewed.

The group interviews lasted from between 5 minutes to 20 minutes depending on the motivation and patience of the group. The interviews were either conducted on the benches outside in the garden or, in the case of rain, in the family archaeology marquee which was next to the sieving marquee. In general, the response rate was very high; only three out of the 19 groups of visitors who were approached gave a reason for not wanting to be interviewed.
4. Additional Interview Results

**General thoughts on the sieving activity**

11 comments on the sieving activity were in connection with the statement ‘it was nice for children’; as one woman said: "It does not really appeal to us because we are not family-oriented. Those kinds of things are amazing for children." The idea that 'it makes history more real' or that it is a 'good way to learn about history' was mentioned four times; as another woman said: "It is very important for children. They live history then in a way than just to read it in a book." ‘No time and no patience’ was also mentioned four times; to quote one woman: "I am here for sightseeing and culture and I have no patience in doing things like this...I do take part in things but not when I am only here for two three hours. “The following thoughts were each mentioned once: 'archaeology as a good way to actively engage people'; 'it gives you an idea of the exactitude involved'; 'fascinating to watch'; 'concern for protection of the artefacts'; 'a new experience'; 'good insight into work of an archaeologist'; 'a good idea but they could have done more'. Only two groups had a negative association with the activity such as "can't think of anything worse” and “I don't like doing underground things.”

**Sieving as a real experience?**

There were three groups that highlighted the fact that the sieving experience might not be real. In other words, they might 'put back the stuff' that people found before or they 'hide things in the sand'. One man pointed out that: “I don't think they would be inviting members of the public to have a go if they knew there was anything valuable in that soil.” Another lady commented that “I am sure everybody finds something because otherwise it is not going to work.” On the other hand, there was one man that said that it was 'too real' for the kids to be entertained and have fun because the chances of finding something “could be very very unlikely.” A volunteer supported this by saying that children often want to find gold. They want the “big wow factor.”

According to both groups of volunteers the sieving activity is organized solely for the public so that they can see what archaeology is, rather than watching it on TV. One student explained this as “breaking down the barriers between public and archaeology.” Another volunteer contributed to this statement by saying that they “are not creating any real record of history...cos a lot of it has been dug before...it is only really being done so that the public can do it...the main purpose is not archaeology.” The volunteers informed the researcher that the sieving began when the Heritage Lottery Fund offered a grant and that before then nothing had been sieved. The volunteers also confirmed what one visitor was expecting, namely that they would not allow visitors to sieve through soil in which they would expect to find something important.
Children

6 of the 19 groups were of the opinion that the sieving activity is solely for children. 6 separate groups thought the sieving activity should not only be for children. To quote one mother: “It should be for adults as well, but if we are with children, they do it and we don't. If we were here as a couple we might do it ourselves. They do it and we watch.” Other people had similar explanations for the fact that less adults take part, for instance: “it is nice when they go off themselves. They take ownership then.”; “maybe grown-ups lose their sense of curiosity and adventure when they grow older.”; “maybe they think it’s not real.” and “it takes a certain personality and encouragement.” According to both groups of volunteers, 70% - 85% were children taking part in the sieving. They mentioned some possible reasons for the lack of adults: adults are more reserved, prefer to watch and ask challenging questions, language barrier, they think it is something for the kids to do, etc.

According to the operations manager and town house manager, the sieving is supposed to be for all ages, not only for children. They also recognize that adults might be a bit more reserved and shy, and do not want to get their hands dirty. The town house manager commented on this with: “maybe we are not selling it right.” Nevertheless, ‘children’ is a market they want to appeal to because adults do not tend to think they can bring their children to the Shakespeare houses. According to the town house manager, they have an “audience development plan” which is about growing the more audience and responding to them. The researcher referred to this audience development plan in a follow-up question to both managers, asking whether they offer tourists (adults only) to join in for a several-day workshop on archaeology and Shakespeare, in which they gain in-depth knowledge about the whole process and learn how to dig and sieve professionally. The operations manager answered that they do not offer these kinds of workshops, only occasional lectures people can attend. In addition, they go out to groups (WI and U3A) and talk to them about the dig. The town house manager answered that they do have volunteers that come outside the local area and abroad who take part in digging and sieving from anything from a few days to a couple of weeks. The researcher was given the information that only five volunteers can work with one qualified archaeologist and that the cost of employing another archaeologist would be prohibitive.
Dear Jessica,

Thanks for your email about your thesis. This sounds really interesting, because it is certainly a different kind of creative tourism. I think the important thing here is not to take to narrow a view of creativity. Creativity includes much more than just engaging in the classic types of creative activities in a destination. From the description of your project what you are actually doing is giving visitors the tools to create their own stories and creative experiences from the raw materials that are available at a specific location. This is great, because it means that both producer and consumer have to interact creatively in order to turn this into a tourist experience. Not just a dig, but a dig with a story.

I have attached a copy of my latest article on this (just about to be published in the Annals of Tourism Research). Hopefully this will give you some more ideas. But if you want some feedback then feel free to send me your research.

Regards,

Greg

Department of Leisure Studies
Tilburg University
PO Box 90153
5000LE Tilburg
The Netherlands
00 31 13 466 4069
From: jessica pfanner [jessicapfanner@yahoo.de]
Sent: 29 August 2011 20:18
To: G.W. Richards
Subject: Is this Creative Tourism? (valuable input for my Master Thesis?)

Dear Grey Richards,

I am currently studying at the University of Warwick in the UK and doing my Master Thesis on Creative Tourism. I have been reading your work and it has inspired me a lot. I am really keen on your opinion about the following case study I have chosen for my research: I chose the „live archaeological dig for Shakespeare“ in Stratford-upon-Avon where visitors can actively participate in sieving soil and try to find artefacts. If they find anything important it goes into a tray to be examined further by the volunteers who work there. At the location, there is also an exhibition of the findings from last year. I conducted some interviews there, trying to investigate whether the participants thought they were creative as in creating anything new and valuable. Obviously, they are not creating anything tangible. However, I wanted to find out in what other ways they are creative. When I was doing my research there, it turned out that the visitors who were participating were mostly children and their parents were watching them.

Do you think this is Creative Tourism?

I am looking forward to some interesting ideas from your side. I would appreciate it a lot.

Thank you very much in advance.

PS: If you would like me to send you any official document or identification I am happy to do so. I would really like your input for my paper, just for academic assessment, no profiteering or publication.

Kind regards,
Jessica Pfanner
Hi Jessica and thank you for your message. I hope you are enjoying your studies in Creative Tourism.

When Greg Richards and I came up with the CT expression it was a result of two things. Firstly, Greg felt strongly that cultural tourism, although growing steadily within the tourism sector, was too often providing experiences that were superficial and unsatisfactory. Secondly, I had found through travelling myself that I particularly enjoyed experiences where I learnt something from local people that was relevant to their local culture and which they were passionate about. We put the two thoughts together and called this branch of cultural tourism, Creative Tourism. Our original definition is on the www.creativetourism.co.nz website.

Since then Creative Tourism New Zealand has been launched in 2003 as an attempt to develop a viable economic model for CT. In the process we have had to address a number of definitional issues. A couple of examples:

- One of our bone carving workshops is taught by Stefan who was born in Germany. We asked ourselves: can a traditional Maori craft, taught by someone who is not Maori even though by now he knows more about Maori traditions than many Maori themselves, count as CT? We decided that as long as a workshop was led by a Kiwi, even if not born here, it was acceptable: NZ has always been a land of migrants.

- Rugby, the game, has become an integral part of New Zealand culture, even though it originates from a town not far from Warwick! Could/should we offer any sort of rugby workshop here? We decide to offer a haka workshop since this was the distinctive element of New Zealand’s rugby tradition.

Meanwhile UNESCO launched its Creative Cities initiative in 2004 and subsequently, thanks to Santa Fe, one of their founding members, adopted Creative Tourism as one of the features of a Creative City. (See http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/ev.php-URL_ID=36746&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

This has significantly increased awareness of the concept, but also increased debate about its definition. For example, one of the Creative Cities, Barcelona, not only offers experiences led by local people and marketed to visitors, but also experiences led by creative visitors and marketed principally to local people. Should the latter count as CT?

From my perspective sitting here in New Zealand more than a decade after coming up with the term (to be precise Greg and I coined the expression on 24 January 2000 in a bar in Viana do Castelo in Portugal!), the exact definition, while of interest academically, is not the main point.

What matters is that globalisation has affected tourism like so much else, so that today a growing
number of tourism ‘products’ on offer in one place are barely distinguishable from those available in another. Taken to the extreme in such circumstances, why travel at all? For me, CT is about encouraging the differences between places and the people who live in them and sharing these differences with visitors in ways that both locals and visitors enjoy and benefit from.

So I’m not sure whether the Stratford experience you mention is really CT or not, but I’m also not sure if that matters too much. May I suggest that you ask yourself if the children participating are getting something worthwhile out of their experiences, and whether those running the dig are enjoying introducing the children to archaeology and the history of medieval Britain? If you think the answers are ‘yes’, and I think you can tell this quite quickly by the body language of tutors and participants even if this is not easy to quantify, then go for it and say its CT. If the experience seems contrived and/or just a way to make money, then just say ‘no’!

Good luck and best wishes,

Crispin

-----Original Message-----
From: jessica pfanner
Sent: Tuesday, August 30, 2011 6:49 AM
To: crispin@creativetourism.co.nz
Subject: Creative Tourism? (valuable input for my Master Thesis?)

Dear Crispin Raymond,

I am currently studying at the University of Warwick in the UK and doing my Master Thesis on Creative Tourism. I have been reading your work and it has inspired me a lot. I am really keen on your opinion about the following case study I have chosen for my research: I chose the „live archaeological dig for Shakespeare” in Stratford-upon-Avon where visitors can actively participate in sieving soil and try to find artefacts. If they find anything important it goes into a tray to be examined further by the volunteers who work there. At the location, there is also an exhibition of the findings from last year. I conducted some interviews there, trying to investigate whether the participants thought they were creative as in creating anything new and valuable. Obviously, they are not creating anything tangible. However, I wanted to find out in what other ways they are creative. When I was doing my research there, it turned out that the visitors who were participating were mostly children and their parents were watching them.

Do you think this is Creative Tourism? I am looking forward to some interesting ideas from your side. I would appreciate it a lot.

Thank you very much in advance.

PS: If you would like me to send you any official document or identification I am happy to do so. I would really like your input for my paper, just for academic assesment, no profiteering or publication.

Kind regards,

Jessica Pfanner
Hello Jessica,

I've spoken to my Line Manager and it'd fine for you to research your Masters here.

Would it be possible for us to get a copy of your findings when they're complete, as we'd be interested to see what our visitors thought?

When would you like to start your research?

Best wishes,

Chloe

Chloe Malendewicz
Operations Manager
Nash's House / New Place
07540412489
01789 292325

-----Original Message-----
From: jessica pfanner [mailto:jessicapfanner@yahoo.de]
Sent: 24 June 2011 16:37
To: Chloe Malendewicz
Subject: Research Master Thesis

Dear Ms Malendewicz,

I refer to our telephone call of yesterday afternoon, Thursday 23rd June.
I am a student at the University of Warwick and currently working on my Master thesis. My topic is Creative Tourism (definition: tourism which offers visitors the opportunity to develop their creative potential through active participation in courses and learning experiences which are characteristic of the destination). I am hoping to use the Shakespeare Birthplace Trust as my Case Study, more specifically, the Dig for Shakespeare as it actively involves the visitor.

The first part of my research would involve carrying out observation, which means I would need to be present at the site, participate in the sieving myself and observe the other participants and the guides and also take some notes. The second part of my research would involve several short group discussions, meaning I would need to talk to some of the visitors in groups of 2-5 for approximately 5 to 10 minutes depending on the flow of the discussion and how much time they have. This will happen after they have completed their visit.
The questions I would ask would be about:

- their motivations for joining in the sieving
- whether they are tourists or residents in Stratford
- what they learnt from this event
- what they liked about the event
- what they think about the interactive part (the sieving marquee) → whether it stimulated their creativity/mind
- their feelings/thoughts during the digging and sieving process
- what their opinions are about interactive events in general (e.g. workshops) compared to passive events (e.g. theatre, cinema)
- what they look for when visiting a new city (museums, theatre, workshops, etc)
- whether they think this event could have taken place anywhere else or whether it is unique to Stratford

Since I am still in the process of developing my research, I would of course send you the final version of my questionnaire. In case there is anything you yourself would be curious to know about in addition to the questions set out above and related to my topic, I could of course try to integrate the question(s) into my research.

The answers will be anonymous. I will just need to record the verbal conversation but no video will be used. Needless to say, I will inform the visitors beforehand and give them the freedom to decide if they want to participate in my research.

If possible, I would need to conduct my research between mid and end of July, latest would be the first week of August. I would need to calculate a few hours a day over a period of two to four days. Of course, this will depend on how many visitors I would be able to talk to and the responses I get.

Additionally, but not of primary importance, I would be more than happy to have the chance to organise a short interview (ca. 15 minutes) with one of the people responsible for this event. It would be about the motivation behind organizing such an interactive event with the public.

My Master thesis will be completed in September. You would be more than welcome to receive a copy.

I hope I could give you a rough idea about my research. In case you have any further questions, feel free to ask me. I am herewith asking for permission to conduct my research at the ‘Dig for Shakespeare’ event and I would so appreciate it if you could allow me to have this opportunity.

Thank you very much in advance. Looking forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

Jessica Pfanner