

Discussion Paper 2021/08

The European Capital of Culture: A review of the academic evidence

Oriane Nermond, Neil Lee, Dave
O'Brien

July 2021

London School of Economics and Political Science;
University of Edinburgh

ISBN: 978-1-913095-44-4

Supported by



UK Research
and Innovation



About the Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre

The Creative Industries Policy and Evidence Centre (PEC) works to support the growth of the UK's Creative Industries through the production of independent and authoritative evidence and policy advice.

Led by Nesta and funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council as part of the UK Government's Industrial Strategy, the Centre comprises of a consortium of universities from across the UK (Birmingham; Cardiff; Edinburgh; Glasgow; Work Foundation at Lancaster University; LSE; Manchester; Newcastle; Sussex; Ulster). The PEC works with a diverse range of industry partners including the Creative Industries Federation.

For more details visit <http://www.pec.ac.uk> and [@CreativePEC](https://twitter.com/CreativePEC)

About the authors

Oriane Nermond¹; Neil Lee¹; Dave O'Brien²

1. London School of Economics and Political Science; Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE; o.nermond@lse.ac.uk)
2. University of Edinburgh, Old College, South Bridge, Edinburgh. EH8 9YL

Abstract:

It is often claimed that cultural festivals and events will bring about major economic and social changes. The European Capital of Culture has been one of the most prominent of these cultural festivals – being conducted in a different European city, or set of cities, each year since 1985. A fairly rich body of evidence now exists on the impact of the Capital of Culture on local economies. This paper reviews this literature and synthesises the implications for policy. Studies suggest that while cultural festivals have many merits and may contribute to wellbeing, they tend to have limited, temporary impacts on local economies. We argue that while these festivals often have significant merit as cultural events, there is little justification for claims of economic transformation. As the UK's own City of Culture programme takes place in Coventry in 2021, the limits of economic impact are a crucial note of caution for this, and future, hosts.

Key Words: Capital of Culture; Festivals; Major events

Introduction

The European Capital of Culture (ECOC) is an important programme of cultural events. Originally called European City of Culture, the programme has run each year since 1985, and 62 cities across Europe have been chosen as hosts. The host city puts on a series of events as part of a programme which is part city-branding, part civic organisation, and part economic development strategy. The goal of the programme is not just cultural, but also economic, and it is seen as a powerful tool in the regeneration of local economies. When bidding for the ECOC many cities and regions assert that it is likely to lead to a structural transformation in the local economy towards higher level economic activity - in particular to the creative industries (Griffiths, 2006).

The ECOC programme has become one of the most studied festivals in the world and a large evidence base has developed which considers the impact of the ECOC in different local contexts. Policy evaluations and academic literature have provided important findings regarding the ECOC's potential impact on local economies (Garcia

and Cox, 2013). This includes studies which consider the impact on life satisfaction, tourism, GDP, employment and creative industries. This literature also provides some important lessons about other, similar programmes such as the UK City of Culture (UKCOC).

This paper reviews the academic literature on the economic impact of the programme and synthesises the implications for policy. We find no evidence to support claims of long-term, transformative impacts on local economies. Hosting ECOC offers clear benefits to the tourism sector, particularly in the short term, but these benefits are often disconnected from the claims that creative and cultural industries will be boosted by a year as ECOC. Overall the economic case for an ECOC is not well supported by the literature, even as it has become a dominant rationale in many parts of policy on ECOC (and hosting cultural festivals following the ECOC model, such as the UKCOC).

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Section two gives background on the ECOC, its history and similarity with the UK City of Culture. Section three reviews the academic evidence on the ECOC and its local economic impact. Section four concludes with implications for policy.

Background to the ECOC

The ECOC began in 1985 as part of the broader Creative Europe strategy. The initial iterations of the event, in the form of City of Culture, saw hosts in the 'traditional' cultural powerhouses including Athens, Florence, Amsterdam, Berlin, and Paris. The programme has changed significantly since then. Since 2006 the states are directly responsible for selecting the city which will host and organise the events (Fox and Rampton, 2019). Two member states host the ECOC programme each year and nominate host cities. The host holds the title for one year and during this year organises a range of events and spectacles related to culture.

Table 1. European Capitals of Culture since 2010

2010	Essen (Ruhr) (Germany)	Istanbul (Turkey)	Pécs (Hungary)
2011	Turku (Finland)	Tallinn (Estonia)	
2012	Guimarães (Portugal)	Maribor (Slovenia)	
2013	Marseille (France)	Košice (Slovakia)	
2014	Riga (Latvia)	Umeå (Sweden)	
2015	Mons (Belgium)	Plzeň (Czech Republic)	
2016	San Sebastián (Spain)	Wrocław (Poland)	
2017	Aarhus (Denmark)	Pahos (Cyprus)	

2018	Leeuwarden (Netherlands)	Valletta (Malta)	
2019	Matera (Italy)	Plovdiv (Bulgaria)	
2020	Rijeka (Croatia)	Galway (Ireland)	

Note: Ruhr 2010 was a regional, rather than an urban event. Rijeka and Galway's term was extended into April 2021 due to Covid.

The scheme has proved popular with cities (Falk and Hagsten, 2017; Richards and Rotariu, 2007; Palmer and Richards, 2007) as demonstrated by the increasing number willing to be of candidates (Garcia and Cox, 2013). Selection is via a bidding process staggered over two years. Cities have to submit a proposal which is examined by a panel of experts on culture. The panel agrees on shortlisted candidates which have to submit a more detailed application for the final phase of the selection process. Once the city is selected, it has four years to prepare the programme. During these four years the European Commission and the panel help the city to prepare. Most of the funding comes from the city itself, although there is a small conditional contribution of the European Union called the Melina Mercouri Prize. The panel decides whether or not to give "the Prize" which is currently 1.5 million euros.

Throughout the years, the programme selection and funding process has evolved. Garcia and Cox (2013) identify four fundamental changes in the programme. Firstly, the ambitions and objectives of the programme have broadened over time. Originally the programme aimed to "highlight the cultural wealth and diversity of the cities of Europe whilst emphasising their shared cultural heritage and the vitality of the arts" (European Commission Website). Since the 1990s, bidding cities have often emphasized the potential impact on the regional economy (Garcia and Cox, 2013). Secondly, the geopolitical and demographic characteristics of host cities have changed. Whilst capitals such as Athens hosted the programmes in its early years, smaller cities have increasingly staged the programme. In addition, cities have increasingly tended to involve surrounding areas and progressively the programme has been transformed into a regional one. Essen 2010 perfectly illustrates this tendency by involving the whole Ruhr in the process (Fox and Rampton, 2018). Thirdly, the funding of the programme has changed. Cities which were designated as the ECOC used to receive the "Prize" unconditionally. Since 2007, the funds are awarded on a conditional basis depending on the recommendations of the panel after the monitoring phase. The city receives the funds at least 3 months before the start of the event. In the forthcoming round (2020-2033) the monitoring process will be stricter and the funding will be fully granted to the city at the end of the event to ensure the city keeps to its commitment. In addition, the total amount spent by cities has also gradually increased over the years. On average, cities spent 25 million euros between 1985 and 1994 and 60 million between 2007- 2019. However, significant spending discrepancies exist between cities (Garcia and Cox, 2013). For instance, Liverpool spent 166 million on the ECOC, over 100 million more than the average. Finally, the European Commission, building on the evaluation conducted by Palmer/Rae Associates (2004), now requires a systematic evaluation of the programme and emphasises the need to embed the ECOC in a broader strategy.

After Liverpool 2008, the UK government decided to run a similar national programme. It established the UK City of Culture and every 4 years a city is designated following a bidding process to stage cultural events for one year. Since its implementation 3 cities have been awarded the title of City of Culture: Derry~Londonderry (2013), Hull (2017) and Coventry, which is hosting the event in 2021. The programme is expected by some to gain considerable importance in the UK since Brexit. As the British Council notes, "The UK City of Culture can do more than raise the profile of a city within the UK, and the profile of culture within the city: it's an opportunity to project a new facet of the UK around the world" (British Council, 2017). The rationale for the UK City of Culture is embedded in notions of economic impact and 'step change' for the host city (Campbell and O'Brien 2019), an element that is crucial in understanding the objectives of both the ECOC and UKCOC.

Despite the wide variety of objectives and strategies (Fox, Rampton, 2016; Garcia, Cox, 2013), host cities normally have an economic aim (Garcia and Cox, 2013; Campbell, 2011; Liu, 2014a). Phrases such as "economic development" or "economic contribution" are repeatedly used in bids (Garcia and Cox, 2013). One of the criteria taken into account for selecting the city is: "the plans to strengthen the capacity of the cultural and creative sectors, including developing long-term links between the cultural, economic and social sectors in the candidate city;" (European Commission Website). Therefore, both the European Commission and the bidding cities consider the programme as tool to develop their creative economy.

Culture is expected to contribute to economic development in several ways. Firstly, by attracting tourism, and thus increasing related industries and creating jobs (Liu, 2014). Much of the research is focused on the mechanisms underlying the relationship between culture related events and tourism. Scholars suggest marketing the city around culture renders it more dynamic and endows it with an important cultural potential (see Liu, 2014a for a literature review). Secondly, the programme claims associations with a growth in creative and cultural sectors. The definition of creative and cultural sectors is often fuzzy (OECD, 2018); however, as the report published by the OECD states, creative industries' output is both culturally meaningful and functional at the same time, "such as ergonomics, nutritional value, user safety and comfort, persuasive capacity, or skills acquisition" (OECD, 2018). Griffiths (2006), through a discourse analysis of the policy documents, provides an analysis of the justifications put forward by cities in their bids. The development of creative and cultural industries and the creation of jobs along with bonding communities were at the core of the justifications of three UK cities bidding to host the 2008 ECOC programme. Mons ECOC bid illustrates particularly well this association between creative industries and cultural industries. "The overall concept of the Mons ECoC ('Where technology meets culture') reflects the local economic development strategy pursued in recent years which has facilitated the attraction of high-technology employers, such as Google, Microsoft, IBM, Hewlett-Packard and Cisco" (Garcia and Cox, 2013). Another illustration is provided by Campbell (2011) who reports that according to Liverpool's the bidding document, 13,200 jobs in the cultural and creative industries sectors were to be created if the city hosted the programme. Therefore, there is a strong assumption that the programme will automatically create jobs in these sectors and as a consequence foster the economic growth of a region.

Methodology

There are essentially two types of ECOC studies. Some focus on a specific city and trace out the intervention. While these can investigate the nuance and detail behind a specific intervention, it is hard to draw overall conclusions about impact. Others tend to use Eurostat regional data to investigate the average effect of hosting the ECOC.

The initial focus of this article was on the recent academic literature which looks at the average effect of hosting the ECOC with a particular look at those which investigate the long-term impact as the aim of the article was to investigate the general tendency and draw policy recommendations for future cities which aimed at hosting similar festival. While these studies can show the overall benefits (or otherwise) of the ECOC, they do little to clarify the mechanisms through which this operates and, by necessity, present an average effect. In addition, as suggested by several scholars already, there has been too little monitoring, evaluation and long-term investigation of the impacts of the ECOC (Palmer/Rae Associates, 2004; Garcia and Cox, 2013; Richard, 2015; Fox and Rampton, 2019). Indeed, the literature on the effects of ECOC in the regional economy of hosting regions is relatively sparse and mainly composed of case studies. Since 2013, only 4 academic research papers and one report have focused on analysing the impact of the ECOC at the aggregate level. Therefore, the focus has been extended to also include the literature which focuses on a specific city.

Only anglophone literature was included in this review creating a risk of missing out important findings published in other European languages. However, our conclusions are similar to those published in the Gracia and Cox report (2013) which included both anglophone non-anglophone literature.

The impact of the Capital of Culture

Evaluating ECOC

Evaluating ECOC raises some methodological problems. First of all, the 'treatment' is diverse – there are different types of strategy, and it isn't clear whether all of these strategies have the same impact. Six strategies have been identified whilst reviewing the ECORYS programme evaluation report: those focused on attraction of tourism, development of the cultural sector, a community focus, development of culture, sport and tourism, urban regeneration, and the development of cultural and creative industries. The diversity of these create challenges in empirical work because the impact of a strategy aimed at urban regeneration is likely to be different to one focusing on tourism. A second empirical challenge is identifying an appropriate counterfactual (i.e. making a comparison with a non-treated city). The problem here is that cities are not chosen randomly to participate in ECOC, but instead those which make the best case are selected. Decision makers might choose a particular city in part because they think

that city is likely to do well in the future anyway. This makes assessing causality from ECOC challenging.

Overall impact: Local GDP

The evidence on the impact of ECOC on local economies is mixed. Whilst some scholars find a positive impact on GDP per capita (Gomes and Librero-Cano 2018) or tourism (Bernardino, et al. 2018; Falk and Hagsten, 2017); others argue the programme has no impact or even a negative impact on the host economy (Steiner et al. 2015; Bergsgard and Vassenden; 2011; Campbell, 2011).

Most studies of the economic impact of ECOC are case studies (Falk and Hagsten, 2017). However, some scholars provide interesting insight into the impact of the programme on regional economies. Two studies investigate the impacts of the programme on GDP and GDP per capita but find extremely contrasting results. Steiner et al. (2015) find that the correlation between hosting the programme and the GDP per capita is not statistically significant, suggesting that there is no impact in both the short-term and the long-term. On the contrary, Gomes and Librero-Cano (2018) find a positive effect of the programme on the GDP per capita. These scholars argue that even though they use a similar methodology - difference in differences (DiD)- as Steiner et al (2015) they improve the study design by using the finer NUTS 3 level instead of the NUTS 2 level. Furthermore, they use the bidding regions as a control group rather than all the regions. But there are two major limitations to this approach. Firstly, while candidate cities might be initially more similar to the chosen city than the average city, so provide a better counterfactual, they are still not chosen. Secondly, NUTS3 is a relatively small geographical area and one which is defined for governmental reasons, rather than functional. Some cities involved their surroundings in the programme (Garcia and Cox, 2013; Falk and Hagsten, 2017). Palmer and Richard (2009) note "The Luxemburg case also highlights the growing role played by regional issues in the ECOC, a trend highlighted by the 'takeover' of the Essen ECOC for 2010 by the wider Ruhr region." Indeed, Essen 2010 included the whole Ruhr. Over the course of the year, each city in this region hosted events during a specific week (Falk and Hagsten, 2017). Consequently, using the NUTS 2 level to explore the impacts of the programme is sometimes better than NUTS 3. Given the contrasting results of the ECOC impact evaluations in terms of GDP per capita, it is hard to conclude on both the short- and long-term impacts of the event. In short, while there is one study providing evidence for a positive medium-term economic impact, the balance of evidence is less convincing.

ECOC programme and tourism demand

In comparison with the contrasting results of the literature presented above, evaluations that aim to estimate the impact of the programme on tourism demand seem to agree that there is a positive short-term impact of the programme. Several studies estimate the impact of the event on overnight stays but rely mainly on qualitative data or case studies (García and Cox, 2013; Herrero et al. 2006; Hughes et al. 2003; Vareiro, et al. 2016). These studies establish a positive effect of the ECOC on the number of overnight stays in the year of the event, however, they do not necessarily provide evidence on the long run (Garcia and Cox, 2013). Falk and Hagsten (2017) suggest a long-term impact of the ECOC programme. They use a similar methodology to Gomes and Librero-Cano (2018)

and Steiner et. Al (2015), namely a difference-in-differences estimator, but they also adopt a quantile estimator, along with non-parametric propensity score-matching. The quantile estimator has the advantage of decreasing the impact of the potential outliers on the result of the regression. They also acknowledge the important differences between budgets and the diversity of strategies and objectives by running the DiD for each host city. Using the quantile estimator, they find a positive impact of the programme on the number of overnight stays. However, different results arise depending on whether the standard DiD or the quantile DiD estimator is used. With the DiD estimator, they estimate a 15% increase of overnight stays in the year of the event and an 11% increase in the following year. But this effect does not persist - they find no significant increase two years after the event. Their study is particularly interesting as they acknowledge the heterogeneity between cities' budgets and strategies which could potentially influence the effects of the programme. They find no correlation between the DiD estimator and the budget of the event, suggesting that the budget does not determine the impact on tourism. They conclude by saying that "Overall, the cultural capital event does not lead to a long-term increase in tourism demand measured as the number of overnight stays in the majority of cases." (Falk and Hagsten: 2017). In this same paper, they also highlight the important differences in terms of strategies and budget between different ECOC, which makes it hard to evaluate.

To conclude, it seems that the literature on the impact of the ECOC and tourism shares the conclusion of Garcia and Cox (2013), which establishes that there is an impact during the year of the event but that this is not sustained.

The impact of ECOC on employment

Despite the strong emphasis in bidding documents on job creation (Griffith, 2008; Garcia and Cox, 2013) few studies have investigated the role of the ECOC programme in terms of sustained job creation. In the ex-post evaluation of Maribor 2012, Srakar and Vecco (2012) found a negative impact of the ECOC on employment. They give three possible explanations for this surprising result: firstly, the effect of the crisis felt in 2012; secondly, the creation of part-time and temporary jobs in the year prior to and during the event; or, thirdly, an issue with the statistical model. The authors highlight that even though they find evidence of negative impacts, a more refined econometric model should be implemented in order to conclude on the relationship between employment and the programme. Gomes and Librero-Cano (2018) investigate the impact of the programme on employment in what they call "relevant sectors", namely construction, accommodation and food services, as well as arts, entertainment and recreation. They find no statistically significant relationship between hosting the ECOC programme and employment. We found no research focusing specifically on the impacts of the programme on employment.

The impact of ECOC on the creative industries

There is a discrepancy between the emphasis of the bidding document on developing their creative industries and the results of research (Garcia and Cox, 2013, Campbell and O'Brien 2019). Garcia and Cox illustrate these aspects by citing Liverpool 2008 as a city focusing on growth in creative industries. The impact in terms of creative industries is made more difficult to capture by a lack of a common definition of the sector. In

addition, a lot of the arguments put forward emphasise hard to quantify effects, such as an increase in cooperation between businesses or with the public sectors. Bergsgard and Vassenden's (2011) research on the impact of the Stavanger 2008 programme on the cultural field found that, since only a tenth of the respondents to the survey recognised an impact of the programme on the creative sector, there was no clear evidence that there was more cooperation between actors of this sector. Campbell (2011) investigates this relationship by interviewing 27 practitioners in the creatives sectors. All of them conclude the programme had little impact on their operations. This shows a lack of connection between the programme and local businesses. Garcia and Cox (2013) concluded by saying "Given their persistent prominence in cultural policy discourse at a global level, it is likely that bidding cities will continue to make the case for the role that the ECoC can play in developing creative industries. However, it is clear, even from the small amount of evidence available on this issue, that for such development to be successful there has to be, at a minimum, a sustained and tangible plan for the role the ECoC is expected to play in such development". To conclude, there is a lack of robust evidence regarding the impact of the programme on the employment in creative sectors. There is an important discrepancy between the policy-makers' expectations in terms of job creations and the number of studies that have tried to capture the effects on employment.

Conclusions

The ECOC has become an important cultural festival and a literature has developed evaluating its economic impact. This paper has reviewed the literature on the economic impact of the ECOC – a literature with implications for other related programmes such as the UKCOC. The results suggest that the economic impact of ECOC is neither large nor sustained – the balance of evidence on GDP suggests no effect, the few studies which consider jobs show no impact, and a specific impact on the creative industries seems unlikely. Studies do, however, find strong evidence for an increase in tourism demand although this is not sustained over the medium-term. Moreover, while economic development is often cited as one rationale for ECOC it is clearly not the only one. There is an important social and cultural justification for festivals which we have not considered in this review.

What are the implications of these studies for host cities? First of all, it suggests a need to be realistic about what the impact of ECOC. The ECOC is often a worthwhile, but temporary, celebration of the city and its culture. It does not need to have any transformative impact to be worthwhile.

Second, using local resources and promoting the art scenes and the industries of the city is another way to better contribute to the local economic development. A policy which targets distant industries without looking at the already existing resources might not benefit the region in itself. Whilst looking at other ECOC to learn from what has been done previously is critical to establish such long-term events, there is a need to avoid setting up standardized objectives which do not necessarily fit with the urban milieu (Czarnitzki and Hottenrott, 2009; Lee and Rodriguez-Pose, 2014) and do not take into account the particularity of the local context.

Third, a better definition of the creative sectors and the objectives of the ECOC could at least lead to a better evaluation of the programme. As noted early on by Palmer/Rae Associates (2004) and later by Garcia and Cox (2013), cities often formulate vague objectives and include the development of the creative sectors without addressing the question of the definition. Given the assumption that culture foster automatically creativity and innovation in different sectors such as arts, science or computer science, policy-makers tend to vaguely formulate their expectations. They use broad categories do not enable a proper evaluation of the programme results. For instance, if a city states that the aim is to develop the regional printing industries, the ECOC events should be oriented towards the development of these specific industries

Fourth, while the impact might be small this doesn't mean that no attention should be paid to legacy. But the legacy might be in terms of improved organisation structures or cultural development, rather than a short-term economic shock. A number of studies we reviewed suggested that working with local SMEs, charities and communities organisations at an earlier stage might improve the process.

Finally, the literature on ECOC suggests problems with the instrumentalist economic argument behind the use of cultural events. While there is little evidence on the economic impact of cultural events, there are plenty of other, non-economic reasons for these festivals.

Creative Industries Policy & Evidence Centre

Led by **nesta**

Table 1. Aggregate impact studies and evaluations of the ECOC since 2013

Study	Methodology	Dependent variables	Result	Notes
Steiner, Frey and Host, (2015) European Capitals of Culture and life satisfaction	<p>Difference-in-differences Treatment group: 28 cities (1990-2009)</p> <p>Control group: Nuts 2 not exposed to the treatment 4 years before hosting the event to 2 years after.</p> <p>Year fixed effects and region fixed effects</p> <p>Set of macro-economic control variables (population density, sectoral shares and human capital).</p>	GDP per capita.	<p>No impact (when controlling for the initial difference of the GDP per capita). Positive without controlling for initial difference</p>	<p>Strength: control for the initial differences and include control variables</p> <p>Weakness: does not take into account unobservable differences between treatment and control city.</p>
Steiner, Frey and Host, (2015) European Capitals of Culture and life satisfaction	<p>Difference-in-differences Treatment group: 24 cities Life satisfaction survey.</p> <p>Control for individual characteristics and regional factors (regional GDP).</p>	Life satisfaction	<p>Negative impact Hosting the event is associated with a 0.9-point decrease on the four points scale of the self-declared life satisfaction.</p>	<p>Strength: first study to look at these elements. Control for individual and regional characteristics.</p> <p>Weakness: does not take into account unobservable differences between treatment and control city.</p>

<p>Gomes and Librero-Cano (2018) Evaluating three decades of the European Capital of Culture programme: a difference in differences approach</p>	<p>Difference-in-differences Treatment group: NUTS 3 level which hosted the programme between 1985 to 2012 Control group: runners-up cities. Study the impact over the period of 2 years before and 5 years after the event.</p>	<p>GDP per capita</p>	<p>Positive impact Hosting the CoC is associated with a 4.5 % increase of the regional GDP per capita on the overall period</p>	<p>Weakness: no control variables. Does not control for the initial level of GDP per capita in the regions.</p>
<p>Gomes and Librero-Cano (2018) Evaluating three decades of the European Capital of Culture programme: a difference in differences approach</p>	<p>Difference-in-differences Treatment group: NUTS 3 level which hosted the programme between 1985 to 2012 Control group: runners-up cities. 5 years after the event.</p>	<p>Value added and employment in certain sectors (Construction; Accommodation & food services and Arts, entertainment & recreation).</p>	<p>No impact The levels of employment in the different sectors are not statistically associated with hosting the CoC suggesting that the programme does not impact the level of employment in these sectors.</p>	<p>Weakness: The authors acknowledge their results regarding the impacts on the employment in different sectors are not robust enough because of the lack of data.</p>
<p>Falk and Hagsten (2017) Measuring the impact of the European Capital of Culture programme on overnight stays: evidence for the last two decades</p>	<p>Difference-in-differences with a non-parametric propensity score matching to build the treatment group and the control group. Treatment group: 34 cities which hosted the programme.</p>	<p>Local tourism demand: overnight stays</p>	<p>Positive impact Hosting the programme is associated with 8% increase of the overnight stays during the year of the event. The impact is more significant for second-tier cities with cultural</p>	<p>Strength: To our knowledge, this study is the only one to consider the heterogeneity of the programme's impact on local tourism demand.</p>

<p>Report Garcia and Cox (2013) European Capital of Culture: success strategies and long-term effects</p>	<p>Investigate the long-term impacts on the overnight stays through collecting data on tourism and expressing them as a percentage of the overnight stays as a total per year of the percentage of the CoC year.</p>	<p>Tourisms: Long term impacts on overnight stays.</p>	<p>heritage and touristic assets than for industrial cities such as Marseilles or Liverpool.</p> <p>Mixed result Most of the cities experience an overnight stays' increase during the year of the event and by a decrease in the following years. Only 6 cities out of 36 have experienced an increase of overnight stays the year of the event and the year after. 3 of these cities were capitals with already a high capacity to welcome tourists.</p>	
<p>Report Garcia and Cox (2013) European Capital of Culture: success</p>	<p>Literature review</p>	<p>Creative industries</p>	<p>No impact Despite the lack of evidence, the programme is unlikely</p>	<p>As stated by the authors, there are few papers on these subjects and the literature review rely</p>

strategies and long-term effects			to enhance the development of creative industries unless it is embedded in a broader strategy.	mainly on the example of Liverpool.
----------------------------------	--	--	--	-------------------------------------

Table 2. Qualitative impact studies and evaluations of the ECOC since 2013

Study		Case studies	Variables	Methodology	Results
<p>Bernardino, Freitas Santos and Ribeiro (2018) The legacy of European Capitals of Culture to the "smartness" of cities: The case of Guimarães 2012</p>	Long term	Guimarães 2012	Tourism, image improvement and change in the structure of the economy (enhancing creativity).	10 semi-structured interviews conducted with experts in Guimarães and Braga. The data collected were triangulated with other reports published by the Universidade do Minho.	<p>Positive impact on tourism</p> <p>A small impact on the structure of the economy Less than expected. Only small businesses settled after the event (probably due to the role of the university rather than to the programme).</p>
<p>Ecorys evaluations (2018, 2017, 2016, 2015 and 2014)</p>	Short-term	All ECOC from 2013-2017	Creative industries Tourism Legacy	Surveys, Interviews, Background research and Qualitative data from reports	<p>Overall small impacts on creative industries Some cities make explicit in their objectives to develop their creative industries (ex. Kosice 2013). Most of them don't.</p>

					<p>An increase of tourism the year of the event Different level depending on the strategies (between 5% and 30% increase). Small impact if the strategy is not clearly stated and early enough (ex. San Sebastian, 2016).</p> <p>Lack of legacy strategy Some cities have a clear strategy with specific actions (ex. Mons 2015, Kosice, 2013). Otherwise the authors highlight a missing opportunity to benefit from the programme.</p>
Srakar and Vecco 2012	Short-term	Maribor 2012	Tourism and employment	<i>Ex-Post evaluation</i>	Negative impact on employment:

<p>Ex-ante versus ex-post: comparison of the effects of the European Capital of Culture Maribor 2012 on tourism and employment</p>			<p>before hosting the programme were accurate.</p>	<p>Difference-in-differences Treatment group: 6 cities part of the programme</p>	<p>Decrease of 980 total self-employed and employed people.</p> <p>Positive impact on tourism: Mainly in Maribor.</p>
<p>Bergsgard and Vassenden 2011 The legacy of Stavanger as Capital of Culture in Europe 2008: watershed or puff of wind?</p>	<p>Long-term</p>	<p>Stavanger 2008</p>	<p>Creative and the cultural sectors.</p>	<p>43 interviews from persons in cultural organisations which received the funds and others which did not receive the funds, artists in residency during the event and some cultural producers.</p>	<p>Small impact Only 13% of the respondents said CoC contributed to “new collaboration”, “new international contacts”, “better economic situation”, or “the company a boost”. 2/3 of the respondents asserted the programme has no impact at all.</p>
<p>Campbell (2011) Creative industries in a European Capital of Culture,</p>	<p>Long-term</p>	<p>Liverpool 2008</p>	<p>Creative sectors and creativity.</p>	<p>27 interviews with actors of different cultural sectors identified by DCMS.</p>	<p>No impact The respondents mainly explained that they were not</p>

International Journal of Cultural Policy					involved with the programme.
Impact 08 (2009) Liverpool's Creative Industries: understanding the impact of the Liverpool European Capital of Culture on the city region's creative industries	Long-term	Liverpool 2008	Creative industries	2 online survey, open-ended consultation and telephone interviews	Positive impact Improve the image of the city creative sector. Raise doubts over the capacity the city has to support the sector on the long run.
Garcia, Melville, Cox (2010) Creating an impact: Liverpool's experience as European Capital of Culture Final report		Liverpool 2008	Employment	Interviews	Small positive impact Increase of the employment before 2008 but still lower than the UK's average.

Creative Industries Policy & Evidence Centre

Led by **nesta**

Acknowledgements

This paper was funded by the AHRC Policy and Evidence Centre for the Creative Industries.

Disclaimer

This is a Discussion Paper published by the Creative Industries' Policy and Evidence Centre (hereafter the PEC). All PEC Discussion Papers have been peer reviewed prior to publication. In keeping with normal academic practice, responsibility for the views expressed in this paper, and the interpretation of any evidence presented, lies with the authors. These views and interpretations may not be shared by the Director of the PEC or the editor of the Discussion Paper series. Readers who wish to challenge the evidence and/or interpretations provided are encouraged to do so by contacting the lead author directly and/or by writing to the PEC's Discussion Paper Editor and Research Director at Bruce.Tether@manchester.ac.uk.

Supported by



UK Research
and Innovation



References

- Bergsgard, N.A and Vassenden, A. (2011) The legacy of Stavanger as Capital of Culture in Europe 2008: watershed or puff of wind? *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(3), 301-320
- Bernardino, B. Santos J.F. and Ribeiro, C. (2018) The legacy of European Capitals of Culture to the “smartness” of cities: The case of Guimarães 2012, *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism*, 19 (2), 138-166
- Boland, P. (2010) ‘Capital of Culture - you must be having a laugh!’ Challenging the official rhetoric of Liverpool as the 2008 European cultural capital, *Social & Cultural Geography*, 11(7), 628-645
- Campbell, P. (2011) Creative industries in a European Capital Of Culture, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(5), 510–522
- European Capital of Culture Website
https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/creative-europe/actions/capitals-culture_en
- Falk, M. and Hagsten, E. (2017) Measuring the impact of the European Capital of Culture programme on overnight stays: evidence for the last two decades, *European Planning Studies*, 25(12), 2175-2191.
- Fox, T. and Rampton, J. (2019) Ex-post evaluation of the 2018 European capitals of culture. Evaluation consortium for Education, Culture, Training and Innovation. Report.
- Garcia, B. Cox, T. (2013) European Capital of Culture: success strategies and long-term effect. Directorate General for Internal Policies, Policy Department B: Structural and Cohesion Policies, 229
- Gomes P. Librero-Cano A. (2018) Evaluating three decades of the European Capital of Culture programme: a difference-in-differences approach, *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 42, 57-73
- Griffiths, R. (2006). City/culture discourses: Evidence from the competition to select the European Capital of Culture 2008. *European Planning Studies*, 14(4), 415–430. doi:10.1080/ 09654310500421048
- Griffiths, R. (2006). City/culture discourses: Evidence from the competition to select the European Capital of Culture 2008. *European Planning Studies*, 14(4), 415–430. doi:10.1080/ 09654310500421048
- Herrero, L. C. Sanz, J. Á. Devesa, M. Bedate, A. and Del Barrio, M. J. (2006). The economic impact of cultural events: A case-study of Salamanca 2002, European Capital of Culture. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 13(1), 41–57
- Hughes, H., Allen, D., & Wasik, D. (2003). The significance of “European Capital of Culture” for tourism and culture: The case of Krakow 2000. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 5(3), 12–23.

- Hudec O., Remoaldo, P., Urban ěíková, N. and Ribeiro, J. (2019) Stepping Out of the Shadows: Legacy of the European Capitals of Culture, Guimarães 2012 and Košice 2013. *Sustainability*, 11, 1469.
- Srakar, A. and Vecco, M. (2017). Ex-ante versus ex-post: Comparison of the effects of the European Capital of Culture Maribor 2012 on tourism and employment. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 41 (2), 197–214
- Steiner, L., Frey, B., & Hotz, S. (2015). European capitals of culture and life satisfaction. *Urban studies*, 52(2), 374-394.
- Palmer/Rae Associates, (2004). European Cities and Capitals of Culture. Available at http://ec.europa.eu/culture/keydocuments/doc926_en.htm
- Myerscough, J(1994), European Cities of Culture and Cultural Months. EU Commission Working document, 256
- Richard, G. (2014), Evaluating the European Capital of Culture that Never Was: Brabantstad 2018, *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 7(2), 199-133
- Vareiro, L., Santos, J. F., Remoaldo, P. C., & Ribeiro, J. C. (2016). Evaluating the Guimarães 2012 European Capital of Culture: National and international tourists' behaviors and perceptions. *Event Management*, 20(1), 81–97
- UK city of culture reflects the global identity of UK cities (2017) *British Council* retrieved from <https://www.britishcouncil.org/research-policy-insight/insight-articles/city-culture-reflects>

PEC Consortium

The PEC is led by innovation foundation Nesta and involves a consortium of UK-wide universities, comprising Birmingham; Cardiff; Edinburgh; Glasgow; Work Foundation at Lancaster University; LSE; Manchester; Newcastle; Sussex, and Ulster. The PEC's Director and Principal Investigator is Hasan Bakhshi, who is also Executive Director, Creative Economy and Data Analytics at Nesta.

For more details visit <http://www.pec.ac.uk> and [@CreativePEC](#)

