

2014

Film tourism: the pre-production perspective. A case study of Visit Somerset and the Hollywood story of Glastonbury

Semley, N.

Semley, N. and Busby, G. (2014) 'Film tourism: the pre-production perspective. A case study of Visit Somerset and the Hollywood story of Glastonbury', *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice*, 6(2), p.23-53

<http://hdl.handle.net/10026.1/11738>

Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice
University of Plymouth

All content in PEARL is protected by copyright law. Author manuscripts are made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the details provided on the item record or document. In the absence of an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher or author.

**Film tourism: the pre-production perspective. A case study of
Visit Somerset and the Hollywood story of Glastonbury.**

Natalie Semley and Graham Busby

Abstract

Film tourism has been researched now for many years and the consequences of post-production are clear. However, there has been little opportunity to explore the perceptions of filming, pre-production, until now. Using a case study approach to the making of one particular Hollywood film on a rural location, the paper focuses on evaluating the business of film tourism and establishing the *perceived* impacts of film tourism from advanced practitioners and local residents, respectively. Two stages of data collection were adopted during pre-production: elite interviews and focus groups. The findings reveal that the role of each practitioner shapes their level of understanding and knowledge about the myths of Glastonbury, and their evaluation of the debate surrounding creative accuracy versus commercial creativity. Concern over the costs of film-induced travel were also noted, and echoed by residents. However, for residents, uncertainty, a lack of detailed knowledge, and scepticism about the film's content proved more significant, rather than pre-existing issues faced by the town and expressed by the practitioners. Therefore, it is suggested that practitioners should forge partnerships through tourism collaboration but at the same time they need to manage local residents to ensure they respond to their concerns surrounding corporate takeovers and the commercialisation of their culture, rather than just issues of congestion and transportation.

Keywords: Film tourism; Film-induced travel; Glastonbury; tourism impacts; resident perception; pre-production.

Introduction

This paper provides a case study approach to the making of one particular Hollywood film on a rural location in England's West Country. The aim of the paper is to discover the perceived impacts before filming and script finalisation, to determine both expert understanding and resident opinions about the film's development. Involvement with the Destination Marketing Organisation (DMO), *Visit Somerset*, from early on, provided the researchers with this unique opportunity. The DMO was in the process of diversifying their rural economic base to lead to a more sustainable form of local development through film tourism. In fact, when the researchers approached the DMO, a substantial effort was being made by the organisation to stimulate interest in the county, and to supplement the destinations existing portfolio, through the marketing of the film, pre-production.

The extensive marketing of the film, pre-production, was intended to raise awareness and rejuvenate the marketing strategy (Beeton 2005; Connell 2012). The film was, as stated by Hudson and Ritchie (2006), being used as a springboard for further marketing campaigns and the DMO viewed the potential opportunity of film tourism as a facet of their cultural tourism development, as discussed by Connell (2012). However, due to the strong marketing efforts and focus of the DMO to cultivate film tourism (Connell 2012) concern was starting to be expressed from the local residents about the role of film tourism. This concern appeared to present itself as speculation grew about the content of the film. It was supposed that residents' perception were reflective of Hornaday's (1994, cited in Connell 2012:1023) statement: 'film it there and they will come' even though there is no guarantee that film will encourage tourism (Beeton 2004) or that the local community understood 'what may or may not happen as a consequence of filming in their region' (Beeton 2008:9). The real nature of resident concern was therefore unknown, but of an interest to the DMO.

The research therefore aims to identify the pre-production anxieties that were already established within the local community as a result of the marketing efforts of the DMO. Furthermore, the paper aims to advance tourism knowledge in this field by determining the pre-production impacts of film tourism, which was not reviewed by Connell (2012), and to compare these *perceived* impacts with the *actual* impacts noted in a series of seminal sources (Beeton 2005; Connell 2005; Mordue 2001) as research has focused on the impacts from post-production exposure (Croy & Walker 2003) up until this point.

To accurately understand the nature and meaning of residents' concern towards film tourism, it is important to establish the extent of responsibility (as discussed by Beeton 2007, 2008) of the involved practitioners; namely the DMO and the film company. This is important because the DMO can capture promotion (Connell 2012) on a global scale through planned publicity (Cynthia & Beeton 2009) which may result in benefits for both the film and tourism industries, through mutual support (Cynthia & Beeton 2009). Alliances can also determine how to effectively manage other stakeholders and encourage them to adopt policies and further promote the

film. Therefore, the intention and level of responsibility of tourism collaboration is of interest to this study, as practitioners may wish to control local residents to achieve legacy (Beeton 2008). However, local residents may perceive such manipulation as unethical as it threatens the level of control they have over their cultural assets.

This paper, therefore, tells the story so far about the creation of the motion picture *Glastonbury: Isle of Light*. From determining knowledge from the film tourism literature, the current representations and cultural capital of Glastonbury will be discussed, alongside the conceptual development of the movie. The paper will also assess the nature of creative alliances, and resident perceptions towards the film's production by focusing on the appropriation of one specific place through film tourism: Glastonbury.

Film tourism

'Through movies, people are sometimes induced to visit what they have seen on the silver screen' (Riley, Baker & van Doren 1998:919), and having a destination featured in a movie is the ultimate in product placement (Morgan & Pritchard, 1998; Hudson & Ritchie 2006). Studies have shown that movies (and television programmes) increase visitor numbers to certain destinations (Connell 2005; Tooke & Baker, 1996; Riley & Van Doren, 1992, Riley *et al.*, 1998) or at least increased interest in these places (Benzine, 2005; Kim & Richardson, 2003; Carr, 2007). Therefore, from a DMO perspective film tourism can be seen as a driver of tourism development due to its potential to add value to a destination (Connell 2012).

Over the years much has been published about the classification and categorisation of film tourism (Beeton 2005; Connell 2012), and is defined here 'as tourist visits to a destination or attraction as a result of the destination being featured on television, video or the cinema screen' (Hudson & Ritchie 2006:387). In particular, Connell (2012) acknowledges the substantial amount of literature which has now been produced and provides a progress review of the film tourism literature to establish a collective understanding. It is not therefore intended to reiterate such an understanding here, but instead reflect upon Connell's (2012) comprehensive review and situate the current case study within the established body of knowledge.

From Connell's (2012) review, it is understood that the *perceived* and *actual* impacts of film tourism still require recognition in the literature, especially in terms of gaining the potential benefits and protecting the community and the environment film tourism effects (Connell 2012). Furthermore it can be ascertained that Glastonbury is by no means an unprepared destination. With the naming of the destination in the film title, the implications are already being discussed in the destination by a range of stakeholders. This case study therefore offers a unique feature that has not been reviewed by Connell (2012), as it will witness the 'transformation of a place to "cultural property"' (Weir 2002: 119, cited in Connell 2012:1040) and advance the film tourism literature through the unique qualities of pre-production access and place naming. Connell (2012) does, however, discuss the qualities and associated mythologies of landscape in film, which for Glastonbury is perceived as being central to the film narration.

In terms of the DMO's role in marketing film tourism and creating legacy (see Hudson & Ritchie 2006 and Beeton 2008 respectively) the DMO needs to consider how marketing opportunities can be exploited before the film release (Hudson and Ritchie 2006) and engage a stakeholder approach, whereby the local community supports the on-going development of film and film tourism (Connell 2012). Before release, this is not restricted to purely negotiating 'credits for being used in the film' (Hudson & Ritchie 2006:390) as *Visit Somerset* has been collaborating with the film company from the inception stage, before scripts have been finalised and production has begun. Therefore, from a supply-side perspective the focus of the research is to understand the consequences of the business of tourism in terms of destination marketing to determine, amongst other things, the responsibilities of the joint initiative which was unfolding in Somerset during 2013.

Representation of Glastonbury

As with many destinations there are multiple representations of Glastonbury, from stereotypical images portrayed in films (Busby & Klug 2001) such as *Hot Fuzz* (2007), to recorded coverage of the Glastonbury Festival (Digance & Cusack 2001), and literature such as *The Bones of Avalon* (Rickman 2010). What many of these representations conjure up are the myths of Avalon, King Arthur, Joseph of

Arimathea and the Holy Grail which are comprehensively discussed by Jackson (1936), Digance and Cusack (2002), and Lyons (2014). Myths mean different things to different people. Perhaps surprisingly, given the way that myths have been extensively analysed by a number of academic disciplines, some academics still assume that the reader will know what is intended by this term, as in this article title from a journal: *The four service marketing myths – remnants of a goods-based, manufacturing model* (Vargo & Lusch 2004). From the perspective of globalisation, McMichael (1996), writing in the journal *Rural Sociology*, also includes the term in the article title but makes no attempt to operationalise it – the reader knows what is intended, it seems.

Many of the images of Glastonbury are based on myth. For example, the Holy Thorn is an iconic image which Joseph of Arimathea allegedly brought with him to Glastonbury (Digance & Cusack 2001) and a specimen of which can be found at The Church of the St John the Baptist (see Plate 1, below).

Plate 1. Church of St John
The Baptist, Glastonbury



Source: Author photo

'This Arthurian material is linked with the "Somerset Tradition" (alternative beliefs about Christianity, chiefly involving Joseph of Arimathea) in a "fringe Christian" nexus of beliefs' (Digance & Cusack 2001:264) (see Plate 2, below) discussion of which is outside the realms of this paper. In truth, so much is said to be written about Glastonbury that the myths are of uncertain value to the destination, because the 'myth and history are inextricably woven together' (Rahtz 1993:10, cited in Digance & Cusack 2002:263). Therefore in some instances Glastonbury is perceived as a contested site due to it being a 'much sought after sacred destination' (Digance & Cusack 2001:263).

Plate 2: Shop in Glastonbury High Street



Source: Author photo

The area is not alone in having multiple identities based upon myth. For example, consider Scotland and *Brigadoon* (1947), a Hollywood interpretation of a Scottish village and traditions: 'globally-recognised iconography enables a production team to reproduce Scotland in a form that will be readily-recognised by a global audience' (Voase 2012:81) and some DMOs avidly promote icons based on myths. After all, the Scottish tartan, as an icon, only really became recognised following the work of novelist Sir Walter Scott (McCrone *et al.* 1995). Elsewhere, the myth of a destination might be based on a single novel, written by somebody who never visited, the exemplar is, of course, a part of Romania known as Transylvania and the novel is *Dracula* (1897) (Shandley *et al.* 2006). Moreover the myth can be based on both literary and film legends, as noted by Buchmann (2006) via a case study of 'mythical tourism' in New Zealand. Based on Samuel Butler's tale of the Utopian society 'Erewhon' in 1872 and the set of 'Edoras' of the *Lord of the Rings* (2001, 2002, 2003)

movies, Buchmann (2006) investigated the purpose of myths in the promotion of New Zealand. This utilised both fact and fiction and facilitated tourism through the combination of 'existing geographical and botanical features with purely mythical ideas of a Utopian society hidden in the mountains' (Buchmann 2006:181), which heightened the reality of the myths for tourists.

Such a depiction led tourists to consume a range of locations, from scenery, property, and the homestead of the author to the associated film locations of *Lord of the Rings* (2001, 2002, 2003). This intrigue, however, brought notable challenges for the tourism industry and its stakeholders (Buchmann 2006) which should be reviewed by any rural destination considering film based tourism as a new avenue for promotion (Croy & Walker 2003). Quite often, film tourism is used to promote place and reinvigorate image, but often this comes at a cost (Croy & Walker 2003). This cost is evident via the impact of film tourism on place during and after promotion, including the way in which the cultural capital is presented and promoted.

Cultural capital

It is argued that the concept of cultural capital takes two forms: personal and destination-based. In the personal sense, the term seems to have first been used by Bourdieu and Passeron (1973) although a much wider audience was reached with the publication of Bourdieu's seminal work *Distinction* (1979) (English translation 1984). As an example of the relationship to tourism, Busby, Huang and Jarman (2013) have considered this at a seaside location. Less frequently, cultural capital has also come to relate to the inventory of 'assets' at a specific destination (Alzua *et al.* 1998; Busby & Meethan 2008). Glastonbury, Somerset, has many of these assets and film illustrates how they can be used to tell a story which, concomitantly, helps to promote the area. An initial movie site, established by writer / producer Daniel McNicoll, shows aspects of these assets found in Glastonbury (Galatia Films 2011).

The conceptual perspective to be examined is that of destination-based cultural capital. Busby and Meethan (2008) argue that there are two types: *latent*, almost always tangible and *potential* cultural capital, usually intangible. The latter is based on connections with authors, stories and particular localities although this form can

be juxtaposed with tangible heritage. Most destinations comprise latent and potential cultural capital; it just waits to be unlocked for the market. Almost invariably, this is a function of translation to the small and large screen. Ultimately, the place of a feature film can then be classified as a hallmark event (Riley & Van Doren 1992), a tourism inducing event (Croy & Walker 2003) that can then be used a tool for sustainable local economic development (Quinn 2006).

Interestingly, the 'film companies are themselves now actively involved in the marketing (and making) of locations as sites of tourist consumption' (Roberts 2012:136). However, this is not always of added value. For example, and more specifically in relation to Glastonbury, Roberts (2012) draws upon a direct connection with a location upon which a film production is based, or in some way associated, via the example of Nicolas Cage and his promotion of *The Sorcerer's Apprentice* (2010) at Glastonbury Abbey. Here, due to the nature of the film and the style of promotion, 'local residents were reported to be "horrified and disgusted" that such a sacred place has been allowed to be used to promote a film associated with "sorcery and magic"' (Robert 2012:137). Therefore, it is crucial to depict the story that is intended to be told, and ensure residents are familiar with the implications this may have upon the portrayal of their destination and historical mythologies to avoid dissonance (Beeton 2004).

Resident perceptions

In terms of understanding resident perceptions, the work of numerous authors has been consulted (Andereck & Vogt 2000; Brunt & Courtney 1999; Faulkner & Tideswell 1997; Lindberg & Johnson 1997; Williams & Lawson 2001; O'Neill *et al.* 2005) which portray a series of tourism impacts: economic, environmental and socio-cultural (Brown 1998). Meaningful knowledge can be generated from these studies as communal interpretations can be formed through mixed individual perceptions, and consequently cultural impacts may be perceived as being of little importance to local residents (Brunt & Courtney 1999). In the long term, these impacts threaten the extent to which ownership is expressed over the destination's cultural capital, and create contested cultures (Mordue 2001). These impacts may also alter the structure of the town's community overtime. Furthermore, to determine the broader

perspectives of the community and to understand the aspirations and concerns of those who will be impacted by the film's development and tourism potential, individual responses should be considered. Resident responses will determine who approves of the film's production and the future tourism potential the most, to those individuals who potentially will miss out on the long-term benefits of tourism altogether (Williams & Lawson 2001). It is perceived after all that if direct benefits of film tourism in the post-production process are perceived by the local community, positivity will prevail (Beeton 2008). Gaining such knowledge during the pre-production stage is beneficial, as the perceived impacts can be managed more effectively during the production and post-production stage, as key stakeholders can be encouraged to adopt policies and further promote their area through positivity. This is instead of visitors experiencing resentment and passive treatment (Beeton 2008) through dissonance (Beeton 2004) and negativity. Connell (2012) summarises the range of post-production impacts noted by various authors, however, no perceived pre-production impacts are noted. Therefore, to determine if key stakeholder could be brought in line to promote a destination positively is of interest to this paper.

Methodology

An applied approach to study film tourism (Connell 2012) was sought for this investigation to determine a real world understanding of the phenomenon. Although Connell (2012:1025) believes 'it is an apposite time' to move away from case studies 'to prompt a more critical understand of film tourism' a case study approach was adopted. This was due to the unique qualities of the investigation, covering new topics within the realm of film tourism, and the need to identify the perceptions of place naming within the film title, as imaginary locations will be used in filming, but some subconscious associations may still be evident. Furthermore, case study methods were deemed adaptable and were 'employed to identify a specific form of inquiry' (Gomm & Hammersley 2000:2). The knowledge of the particular was of interest to the investigation. Therefore the transferability of knowledge gained (Lincoln & Guba 2000) was of more importance than general statements which could be made.

Due to the papers focus on the business of film tourism and the *perceived* impacts of film tourism the case study adopted two stages of data collection. Each stage consisted of loosely structured research agendas (Gillham 2005) that allowed thematic interests and concerns to emerge (Bryman 2004), *pre-production*. Each stage of data collection also enabled a specific theme of film tourism to be investigated. The data were collected over a 4 month period in 2013 and involved a series of qualitative, *pre-production*, elite interviews and focus groups. The two approaches enabled the views of those who are especially knowledgeable (Gillham 2005) about the films production and marketing to become clear, alongside the community's hopes and desires, *before* filming began. The approaches also enabled the business of film tourism, and impacts of film tourism to be explored respectively. With this, due cognizance was also taken of Bramwell and Sharman's (1999) emphasis of individuals being involved early on in any tourism process.

The initial stage of data collection consisted of two elite interviews (Marshall & Rossman 1995; Gillham 2005) with 'advanced practitioners' (Gillham 2005:56) – the producer / screenwriter and marketer. The aim was to determine the experts understandings, intentions and knowledge of/and towards the myths of Glastonbury, as this has a distinctive value to the investigation (Gillham 2005). Both interviews were conducted in April 2013, with access and contact being initiated through the DMO. The sample, theoretically, consisted of the two most relevant practitioners to the research question (Flick 2000; Mason 2002), and the film's development.

The interviews were seen as a unique opportunity to determine the level of the expert understandings, intentions and knowledge of/and towards the myths of Glastonbury. Or otherwise, as put by Beeton (2007), determine the extent of corporate social responsibility established between the practitioners and the destination. The interviews, therefore, centred around two topics: the conceptual development of the film, and the actual development of the film, and resulted in approximately 2 hours of conversations, which were recorded and transcribed for data analysis.

A level of cognizance was necessary during this initial stage, as the screenwriter was in the privileged position of being able to tell the story he wanted and this clearly

drew on potential cultural capital. This was important, as when the screenwriter also happens to be the producer, the chances of elements being cut in the editing process may be reduced (the screenwriter's website shows further details – see Daniel McNicoll 2014). Compare this to the resident perceptions and a clearer, more balanced, understanding of the aspirations and challenges which lay ahead (for the marketer) became evident.

Consequently, the second stage of data collection consisted of two focus groups with key stakeholders (Veal 2006; Bryman 2004) – local residents and business owners from Glastonbury – which were undertaken in July 2013. The focus groups acted as a fact finding stage of data collection (Veal 2006), as it allowed residents to express their aspirations and concerns in detail (Cronin, 2001; Madriz, 2003) towards the film's development, in a permissive, non-threatening social environment (Krueger, 1994; Breen 2006). The significant priorities (Breen, 2006; Cronin, 2001) of respondents were allowed to surface, which resulted in approximately two and half hours of data being recorded (audio, not video, in accordance with Polgar & Thomas 1995) and transcribed for data analysis.

The sample was established through the nomination of participants, and was sourced through a neutral partner to both the researchers and the DMO, the Glastonbury Pilgrim Reception Centre. This sampling strategy has been seen in other focus group studies, and resulted in two groups that consisted of 6 and 7 people, respectively, as suggested by Cronin (2001). Furthermore, the strategy represented three factors: the nature of the research question, the range of people who needed to be included and the limitations imposed by time and cost (Kitzenger and Barbour 1999).

Consideration was also given to the location of the focus groups (Breen, 2006) and the need to employ an independent facilitator (Cronin 2001). This resulted in a familiar location, the Glastonbury Pilgrims Centre (see Plate 3), being chosen as it was deemed to be convenient for the participants (Breen, 2006) and two research assistants being employed. Research assistants were employed to act as facilitators in response to the DMO's concern over the perception of academics within the Glastonbury community (being stiff and out of touch with the community). One was

employed as the lead research assistant, who was instructed to act as the facilitator, and the other took a less influential role in data collection, as their primary role was to take detailed notes in order to aid transcription. The research questions were limited to three (see Table 1) in order to allow time for in-depth discussion (Cronin 2001), and the opening question was devised to draw all participants into the discussion early on.

Table 1: Focus group questions

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. What do you understand by the term 'impact'?2. How do you think the film Glastonbury: Isle of Light will impact on the area?3. What is the most significant aspiration and concern you hold about the filming? |
|---|

Plate 3: The Glastonbury Pilgrim Centre



Source: Author photo.

Data were analysed using the Framework Method (Ritchie and Spencer 1994; Brunt 1997) and NVivo 10 software (Bazeley 2007). This enabled good, systematic, qualitative analysis to be undertaken (Teo 1994; Brunt 1997), and allowed for themes to be inductively reconsidered and reworked through the process of 'sifting,

charting and sorting' (Teo 1994: 177). NVivo 10 then provided an appropriate set of tools to assist with the analysis of the qualitative data (Bazeley 2007).

Interviews and Focus Groups

The findings represent the outcome of two stages of data collection. Each of which represents the business of tourism and the *perceived* impacts of film tourism, respectively, in relation to the Hollywood story of Glastonbury. The findings discussed below contribute to the wider scholarship of film tourism, beyond the scope of Connell's (2012) progress review, as the pre-production perspective is articulate.

Elite interviews: The Conceptual Development of the Film

Glastonbury is found to be a mix of myth and fact as noted by Digance and Cusack (2002). Mythical in terms of what cannot be confirmed and factual in that those individuals, such as Geoffrey of Monmouth, lived and wrote. For the screenwriter, Glastonbury is an obsession that was developed through literature. Stemming from "the Vikings striking Arthur and their Knights and the table" (Screenwriter) to the origins of the story, where it was understood that Joseph of Arimathea was "an early disciple" (Screenwriter). A mixture of legends and traditions, with personal culture and experiences, created the screenwriter's passion for the storyline. In essence, the screenwriter "found the story, thought it was so amazing and needed to be told" (Screenwriter) so he became a film maker to tell the story of Glastonbury. However, for the marketer, Somerset (and Glastonbury) is seen as a tourism destination which requires effective management (through marketing) to capture tourist interests and to contend with neighbouring counties for business. Somerset was amid change, funding had been cut, and chance opportunities arose. Therefore, innovative ways of marketing on a shoe-string were sought which reflect Hudson and Ritchie's (2006) model for exploiting film marketing opportunities. This resulted in the DMO contacting the film company to create a partnership with the DMO to help to raise awareness about the myths of Glastonbury, as the tourism potential was foreseen alongside the "potential for inward investment into the economy" (Marketer).

Such collaboration represents partnerships as described by Cynthia and Beeton (2009). Furthermore, it was viewed as a necessity, because if the DMO did not

“chase up these ideas and these visions” (Marketer) then someone else may have; and since the stories “of the foundations of European Christianity” (Marketer) are perceived as “one of the greatest stories of our time” (Marketer) it was essential that the DMO was involved in the communications about the myths and facts of Glastonbury, itself. This background shapes the intent of the two practitioners towards the film’s development and represents their proactive approach (Beeton 2010), their level of understanding and knowledge about the myths and facts of Glastonbury; something which sculpts the content of these findings.

The Development of the Film

At the time of investigation, there was a “tug-of-war” (Screenwriter) being played out, as the script was in the process of being reviewed, re-sculptured, and polished. Therefore the opinions of the two practitioners reflect this situation as uncertainty was surrounding the script, the content of the film, and the future development of the film through the production process. This uncertainty included aspects surrounding the representations of facts and myths in the filming of Glastonbury: Isle of Light, as expressed below in Table 2.

For example, when talking about the current situation, the marketer articulated how the redevelopment process would focus on the commercial viability of the film, while the screenwriter weighed up the argument of creative accuracy versus commercial creativity, and the need to find a balance. These pre-production negotiations are unsurprising given the practitioner’s role in the development process, moving forward into production.

The pre-production negotiations are also reflective of Hudson and Ritchie’s (2006) work and the proposed obligation of experts to responsibly portray the cultural assets of a destination (Beeton 2007, 2010). Despite this uncertainty, both practitioners were eager to articulate the aim of the film and their aspirations for filming. In terms of the aim and development of the film, stark differences were noted. For the screenwriter, the aim of the film is to be as factual as possible, giving legitimacy to the truth of the legend. This is aspired towards, as the film company do not wish to “short-change” (Screenwriter) people about the history of Glastonbury.

Table 2: Practitioner perceptions of how facts and myths will be represented in the film

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Marketer | “As the story goes through a redevelopment ... we'll have to have a bit of sex, a bit of intrigue, you know, a bit of in-fighting and all of those things that make Hollywood what, what Hollywood is and make it commercially viable” |
| Screenwriter | “I want to focus on, just the basic traditional...history stuff...but it's a bit of a tug of war that takes place between writers and the studio... creative accuracy verses commercial creativity” |

Realism was perceived in the legends, and this is what they want to portray, which is framed by the authenticity debate already established in tourism studies (Connell 2012). The marketer on the other had identified the opportunities for publicity, not just for the DMO, but for the film to act and be seen as the catalyst for “big things” (Marketer) associated with this “grand project” (Marketer) throughout Somerset. Furthermore, the marketer desired additional opportunities for the region, including spin-offs from the film itself (behind the scenes book, new partnerships etc.) as noted by Beeton (2010) and Connell (2012). These aspirations reflect the intent of the practitioner and the power relations discussed by Connell (2012) between the filmmakers and the destination authorities. However, at the time of interview the screenwriter was actively involved in the marketing of the film, which presents blurred boundaries and situations which as Robert (2012) states, does not always add value. After all, the screenwriter’s first job is a film producer, not a marketer. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that such opportunities were not specifically articulated (other than for a companion documentary to place in conjunction with filming). Instead, the screenwriter only anticipates his own future, and his aspiration to explore the myths of Glastonbury further. Reflective of these aspirations, the screenwriter no longer desires to be an active part of the marketing team, as he feels “out of my comfort zone” (Screenwriter) and so, in the future the marketing experts will be left to complete the marketing, and he will focus on the film; because you have to “make a great movie” (Screenwriter) first, before you tell people about it. Consequently, the screenwriter no longer perceives that his interactions add value to the marketing campaign, and like Robert (2012) he acknowledges the pitfalls of such involvement.

Further differences were also evident with regards to the portrayal of the cultural icons and the image of Glastonbury in the film (see Table 3). The screenwriter,

rightly so, is inspired by the myth and aims to portray a factual interpretation of the entire journey of Joseph of Arimathea, whereas the marketer is focussed on the intentions of the film and the association it has with Somerset and Glastonbury, as opposed to the facts and comprehension behind the entire journey (see Table 4). This is not surprising, but it is interesting, as their views represent the approach each has towards production. The marketer represents an embedded approach towards production, while the screenwriter is semi-embedded (Cuff 2013).

Table 3: Overview of key findings from elite interviews

| | Marketer | Filmmaker |
|---|----------|-----------|
| Are they avidly promoting the cultural icons? | Yes | No |
| Are they reinvigorating image? | No | Yes |

Table 4: Practitioners focus during pre-production

| | Main focus |
|--------------|---|
| Marketer | The film, itself: “myths and legends surrounding Joseph of Arimathea [how he] came to Glastonbury on a pilgrimage two thousand years ago and buried the cup, or the two cups the sweat and the blood of Christ erm... on Wirrel Hill, and it’s you know, just really about his famous seed that he put into the ground and the holy thorn that grew out of it” |
| Screenwriter | The factual interpretation of the myth: “the story of Joseph... his journey from...the far east all the way up to Britain...and it and it really ties in well with the Druid and that’s what I discovered after I started researching, was that the Druids were really an interesting...I think a lot of is, is very, very misunderstood” |

During the pre-production process, both practitioners showed concern with the costs of film-induced travel for the local residents in Glastonbury, as tensions had been noted in the local community. From the marketer’s perspective, the costs were identified as being the impacts that the film itself will bring, reflective of Mordue’s (2001) paper. Affecting locals, the economy in general, the number of visitors on site, road traffic and transport network issues. From the screenwriter’s perspective, the production team have mixed viewing about this, and don’t know what to say. After all, if these costs become true, they (the production team) would have been successful. Such an honest diction contributes to the wider scholarship on the topic, as this open view about the business of film tourism has not been documented

before. At the same time both practitioners acknowledge the need for sensitivity and to avoid commerciality, as the purpose is not to be “selling...the cups of Christ” (Marketer). They instead wish to be responsible (Beeton 2008; Cynthia & Beeton 2009) and sensitive to the “history and the heritage of the area” (Marketer) while they utilise the destination-based cultural capital in the film; both latent and potential.

Simultaneously, the production team are conscious of the local concerns and they are taking them seriously. The hope is for positivity, whereby the long-term benefits prevail over the short-term costs, and the screenwriter believes that this could be felt, if the local residents viewed the “bigger picture” (Screenwriter) and were able to “balance out” (Screenwriter) their perspective, overtime. These long-term benefits (to the people of Glastonbury) would include more than just the location simply being used as an “extra” (Screenwriter). The benefits sought are new storytelling opportunities in the future, and the continued representation and connection with place (post-production) as the film company’s role is to keep the myth in the public eye. This after release initiative reflects those stated by Hudson and Ritchie (2006) and Beeton (2010). In the short-term, then, to minimise upset, the practitioners have articulated the need for effective communication throughout the pre-production process, with the local community in Glastonbury. The marketer believes that there is a need to educate local residents and provide them with adequate information and access to authorities to ensure “instant dialogue” (Marketer) can be achieved and that they feel as though they are being listened to. The screenwriter also believes in such dialogue, and suggested that “the doors open really” (Marketer) and enquire about the films development. Consequently, as Beeton (2008) notes, active engagement is required, hence why the DMO (and the screenwriter) actively encouraged this particular piece of research to be undertaken.

Now as the film develops further, partnerships are of importance, as noted by Cynthia and Beeton (2009). The film company (and the screenwriter) will endeavour to forge partnerships with Visit Somerset, the Glastonbury Abbey, the Welsh Language Board, and the Pilgrimage Centre. These partnerships will work together to minimise impacts and maximise the benefits felt by the local population. Partnerships will be established through tourism collaborations as noted by Cynthia and Beeton (2009). Furthermore, the marketer will manage the stakeholders directly

and indirectly to “support and enhance what we want to achieve” (Marketer) by ensuring they are ready for the impacts, once filming commences. This is important to note, even though the majority of the filming will not be on-site – as it was conveyed that place substitution would occur, and that filming was due to commence in New Zealand during 2013. Therefore precaution is required due to the naming of the destination in the film title and in relation to the myths of Glastonbury and the story of Joseph of Arimathea. Furthermore, the DMO (and marketer) intend to continue their roles to “push the news out” (Marketer) about the films development and to link the county (and its cultural capital) together as one. On the whole, these perceptions represent Riley and van Doren’s (1992) study, and the need to manage community impacts as noted by Beeton (2008).

Focus groups: General Impacts

Glastonbury has a diverse community, and the way in which the term impact is understood reflects this. From the focus groups, local residents suggest that an impact refers to change, it is a “harsh word...to suggest some kind of collision” (Respondent 4, Focus Group 2), and impacts upon “the town and the people that live in it” (Respondent 3, Focus Group 2). These impacts are segmented into three categories by the local community: social, economic and spiritual impacts (Respondents 6 & 7, Focus Group 1). There is no recognition for the environmental impacts that are noted by broader studies (Brown 1998). The spiritual dimension reflects the sacred aspect of the destination (Digance & Cusack 2001) and contributes to the broader understanding of film tourism impacts as such a dimension has not been noted before.

A number of general impacts concern the residents of Glastonbury, including the issue of transportation as noted in other destinations (Andereck & Vogt 2000; Faulkner & Tideswell 1997; Lindberg & Johnson 1997; Williams & Lawson 2001). For example, there is plenty of parking available in the town (and the car parks are viewed as a community asset), however, there is a lack of signage to out-of-town car parks; and this causes issues of traffic flow during peak season. Connections (to the train station) are another transport issue concerning the local community, alongside seasonality. Seasonality is described as being “like a pair of baggy knickers

(Laughter) [that] shrinks in the winter and then suddenly multiplies” (Respondent 5, Focus Group 2) in the summer. This issue, alongside high unemployment rates, and the concerns over how tourism feeds the economy create a range of unique impacts that concern the Glastonbury community which represents the extrinsic factors affecting tourism that may lead to negativity (Faulkner & Tideswell 1997; Hartmann 1986). From acknowledging these general impacts, it is clearer to comprehend the film-induced impacts that are perceived by a group of individuals, and determine if they are similar to other community concerns. However, at the forefront is the original contribution of this paper which refers to spirituality.

Perceived Film-induced Impacts

In terms of awareness, local residents articulated a range of perceptions about the films development, and its connection to the myths of Glastonbury. Each focus group pinpointed a range of topics surrounding the films development. However, within each group there were differing levels of uncertainty, knowledge and scepticism, as shown in Table 5, below.

Although the most significant aspects here are the level of uncertainty and the lack of knowledge expressed, there are some residents who have “had a good trawl through the website” (Respondent 4, Focus Group 2) to try and obtain some information. This show active behaviour (Carmichael 2000), and has resulted in the same respondent being positive about the films development as he “I got the passion from that guy that was talking on that video” (Respondent 4, Focus Group 2). The same respondent also makes reference to the “poetic licence” (Respondent 4, Focus Group 2) of the filmmaker and the level of adaptation that would be deemed acceptable. However, this individual was the only person to acknowledge this.

In terms of explaining the lack of knowledge and uncertainty surrounding the films development, it is worth reiterating that the script was not finalised, it was being redeveloped at the time of investigation. But, the DMO was heavily publicising the film through social media. This ambiguity meant that there was little certainty with the use of the Glastonbury myth in filming, and the residents were not relaxed about the implications the film may have upon their livelihoods, the destination, and the myth itself. This was despite the fact that there is no guarantee that film will

Table 5: Resident understanding about the film and myths of Glastonbury

| | Focus Group 1 | Focus Group 2 |
|--|---|---|
| The filming location (s) | <p>Uncertainty: “Is, Glastonbury [going to] be used?” (Respondent 3)</p> <p>Factual: the film will be shot in “New Zealand now... [the] choice of fantasy filmmakers” (Respondent 7)</p> | <p>Uncertainty: “well we don’t exactly, know, how much about Glastonbury is going to be part of the film, is... there’s going to be most emphasis of the characters rather than the place” (Respondent 2)</p> <p>Uncertainty: “Does anyone know how long they have until the filming is actually going to take place...in Glastonbury...any of it?” (Respondent 4)</p> |
| The myth of Glastonbury | <p>Lack of knowledge: “we don’t know very much about that period any way” (Respondent 6)</p> | <p>Familiarity: “it amplifies with the Abbey” (Respondent 1)</p> <p>Familiarity: “it’s a familiar story, you know, it’s one we’re all familiar with” (Respondent 4)</p> |
| The film content | <p>Lack of knowledge: “we know so little about what this film is really going to be and what angle they’re [going to] take” (Respondent 2)</p> <p>Uncertainty: “the word Glastonbury might... not even be mentioned in the film... [and] it might not even look like Glastonbury on the film” (Respondent 3)</p> | <p>Knowledgeable: “The content of this film is Joseph of Arimathea , that’s early Christianity, the early history of the town” (Respondent 5)</p> <p>Lack of knowledge: “I suppose I’m going from the name...I assume it will be celebrating Glastonbury as a place, an isle of light” (Respondent 6)</p> <p>Uncertainty: “it could be a 90 minute film and it could be 85 minutes of somewhere else completely and he finally arrives in Glastonbury, and that, and that’s all you see of it...When its written, it could be all about somebody’s journey...to get here...not...when they’re here” (Respondent 2)</p> |
| The commercialisation of the myth | <p>Humour: “I mean if Joseph is kick ass action hero then” (Respondent 7)</p> <p>Apprehension: “we don’t know how we will be represented... as a town...as a place of pilgrimage” (Respondent 4)</p> | <p>Confidence: “It’s certainly going to publicise [the] Holy Thorn” (Respondent 5)</p> <p>Humour: “Well we may get an influx of Joseph reborn of Arimathea” (Respondent 2)</p> |
| The perceived impacts of the finished film | <p>Realistic: “it all stems down to the content of this film, which none of us seem to know anything about” (Respondent 4)</p> <p>Speculative: “the impact of it can depend so much on the content of the film” (Respondent 7)</p> <p>Sceptical: “the Joseph of Arimathea story does connect with Glastonbury quite deliberately... the Arthur thing... is much more of [a] myth and covers the whole of Celtic Britain, you know from Brittany... up through Scotland and so it’s not going to have that...effect of drawing people to a specific place” (Respondent 2)</p> | <p>Realistic: “we don’t know until the film is completed exactly what slant Glastonbury is going to get from it, even if you read the script, when you see the final version it may not...have the same emphasis” (Respondent 2)</p> |

encourage tourism (Beeton 2004), yet it did not stop the local residents from speculating what the film-induced impacts may be (see Table 6). Such speculation builds upon Hornaday’s (1994, cited in Connell 2010) statement surrounding existing concerns of tourism, and is amplified by the respondent’s knowledge about other destinations that find themselves in the post-production stage. Examples include, but are not limited to, the impact of: Lord of the Rings (2001, 2002, 2003) on New Zealand, The Da Vinci Code (2006) on the Rosslyn Chapel, Braveheart (1995) on Scotland, War Horse (2011) on Dartmoor, and Hot Fuzz (2007) on Wells in Somerset. These examples caused speculation amongst the local community, due to the lack of factual information about the film and its content, but also form a point of reference for airing their observations.

From viewing Table 6 (below) it is evident that the community are, like noted within Beeton (2008), of the mind that they will have to manage the impacts of film tourism, especially in terms of overcrowding and changes in the visitor type. There is concern that film tourism will induce a different type of visitor to the town, which is possible given the work of Connell (2005). There are also a range of mixed views and contradictions noted in the text, which is no surprise given the knowledge of Mordue’s (2001) paper based upon the Hearbeat country and Connell’s (2005) analysis of the Isle of Mull.

Table 6: Residents perceptions about the potential film-induced impacts for Glastonbury

| | Focus Group 1 | Focus Group 2 |
|----------------|---|---|
| Tourism | <p>Volume of visitors: “attract more visitors... how we would cope with that...are we set up to receive a larger amount of visitors” (Respondent 3)</p> <p>Future uncertainty: “in terms of bringing tourism, if it doesn’t bring tourism [to Glastonbury]” (Respondent 7)</p> <p>Type of visitor: “who’s attracted to come here, because at the moment... [it is] a very strong contingent of pilgrims who come here, and whether that will change and how that impacts on us as well” (Respondent 5)</p> | <p>Volume of visitors: “what immediately came to me was numbers of visitors, just cause that adds a certain pressure to the town...and can it cope with the facilities and all that” (Respondent 6)</p> <p>Type of visitor: “It occurs to me that one of the things that might change is that the majority of people that come here... to Glastonbury... on a kind of a pilgrimage, as, as part of their spiritual journey [will change]... it may, may bring people here... [in a] more typical tourists kind of curiosity” (Respondent 4)</p> |
| Infrastructure | <p>Traffic: “is going to impact in terms of traffic... the car parking is an issue again, it will impact in terms of</p> | <p>Congestion: “The short term one [impact] is...congestion” (Respondent 2)</p> <p>New developments: “my fantasy</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| | <p>business” (Respondent 7) Accommodation: “I think that... the accommodation providers will have to pull their socks up” (Respondent 1)</p> | <p>perceives coach tours coming to beyond the Glastonbury Isle of Light path...demanding or expecting a certain degree of service” (Respondent 5) New developments: “maybe it does open up a possibility... a kinda interactive museum type space or something like that which gives... all the different perspectives” (Respondent 4)</p> |
| Reshaping the town | <p>Change: “Glastonbury has been through a lot of changes... when I came here in the 80’s which was Glastonbury’s sort of getting this new age community... Glastonbury has survived...it’s changed with it...and it will doubtless do that” (Respondent 2)</p> | <p>Change: “something here, will change... the perceptions of Glastonbury as well of what Glastonbury is” (Respondent 4) Energy of: “the energy will change surely with that influx of, of...huge numbers of people, which I, I think will probably happen” (Respondent 3) Rebalancing: “Glastonbury, most of its history is... Christianity, which I think has got a bit buried under... what you see on the high street...so I imagine the film might rebalance that a little bit” (Respondent 6)</p> |
| Raising awareness | <p>Of spirituality: “maybe more people motivated to see, seek out the early Christian side of things, you know, which I think is a positive thing” (Respondent 7) Of understanding: “I’m interested in more... about how this film is going to contribute to people’s historical understanding, cultural understanding, and spiritual understanding as well” (Respondent 2)</p> | <p>Of Spirituality: “you know the industry of... this town is spirituality, whatever label you attach to [it]... the fact that the film is about that... that’s an opportunity for us” (Respondent 1) Of spirituality: “another positive interest, it would be if people were to come here and find a deeper sense of meaning” (Respondent 5)</p> |
| Exploitation | <p>Of the name: “because of that festival thing, we are all very concerned with this concept of somebody taking something with the Glastonbury name” (Respondent 2)</p> | <p>Of the cultural capital: “we may see a whole forest of Holy Thorns after this” (Respondent 5) Commercialisation: “our apprehension is that some chain... will move in” (Respondent 6)</p> |
| Marketing | <p>The nature of: “because it’s not really the film that’s [going to] bring the tourists... it’s [going to] be the marketing of the film and the, the interest after the film” (Respondent 7) Publicity: “There’s no such thing as bad, bad publicity” (Respondent 5)</p> | <p>New opportunities: “we’ve got the chance to say, what we’re really about and have it heard” (Respondent 2) The nature of: “wouldn’t the... image that the film portrays, override what it really is... a powerful message which we will have to override” (Respondent 3)</p> |

To respond to these concerns, it is crucial for the advanced practitioners to depict the story that is intended to be told as early as possible, and ensure residents are

contented with the implications this may have upon the portrayal of their destination and historical mythologies. Even if residents are not familiar with the myth being told (as noted by Digance & Cusack 2001), there is a need to avoid dissonance (Beeton 2004) which may occur alongside resistance (Beeton 2008) if residents rely on their own interpretations of film-induced impacts that they perceive in other destinations.

Aspirations and Concerns

In terms of the most significant aspirations and concerns aired by the respondent, Table 7 and 8 (below) offer insight. These findings express that a range of opportunities and apprehensions exist within the community, which are similar to those stated by Beeton (2008) and Connell (2012).

Table 7: Residents aspirations for the filming of Glastonbury: Isle of Light

| Group | Respondent | The most significant aspiration is to... |
|-------|------------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Attract visitors who are vibrant and commercially sound |
| 1 | 2 | Increase the footfall to the town and the level of income |
| 1 | 6 | Bring people in to Glastonbury and create prosperity for local residents |
| 1 | 7 | Attract more (of the right kind of) tourists |
| 1 | 3 | Ensure the story has an impact upon an individual's consciousness |
| 1 | 4 | Encourage community cohesion by looking after the local heritage and generating a sense of balance |
| 1 | 5 | Ensure an economic boom is felt in Glastonbury through publicity |
| 2 | 1 | Shine a light on Glastonbury and ensure the town benefits from the film |
| 2 | 2 | Capture the community spirit by showing visitors how it is possible to live in diversity and unity |
| 2 | 4 | Capture the community spirit by showcasing harmony, through unity and diversity |
| 2 | 6 | Capture the community spirit by waving the flag for spirituality |
| 2 | 3 | Maintain the spiritual energy of Glastonbury |
| 2 | 5 | Improve transportation by developing better facilities for travelling to Glastonbury |

The two most frequently cited aspirations are: an increase (in volume) of tourism, and capturing the Glastonbury community spirit. The two main concerns are: the commercialisation of the myth and corporate takeovers as a result of the filming drawing investment from outside of Glastonbury. This particular concern was strongly contested within the focus groups as “the red line that I would draw would

be Starbucks and... anything that looks like that then, then, we would probably burn it down” (Respondent 6, Focus Group 1).

Table 8: Resident’s concern about the filming of Glastonbury: Isle of Light

| Group | Respondent | The most significant concern is the... |
|-------|------------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Commercialisation of the myth and the expansion of eating places |
| 1 | 2 | |
| 1 | 6 | |
| | | Commercialisation of the town through the content of the film |
| | | Commercialisation of the town, in general |
| 2 | 4 | Possibility for a corporate takeover, which would turn Glastonbury into a theme park |
| 2 | 5 | Possibility for a corporate takeover through the commercialisation of Glastonbury |
| 2 | 6 | Possibility for a corporate takeover, in general |
| 1 | 4 | Content of the film and the development of the town as a result |
| 1 | 7 | Content of the film, in general |
| 1 | 3 | Sensationalised marketing strategies that could cause conflict and issues of access |
| 1 | 5 | Traffic |
| 2 | 2 | Parking |
| 2 | 1 | That nothing will happen as a result of the film, leading to missed opportunities |
| 2 | 3 | Lack of local control in the development process |

This statement reveals an active and negative attitude as coined by Carmichael (2000), towards the potential of multi-national corporations infiltrating the town. Interestingly, the only common theme which emerged in both focus groups was the issue of transportation and parking, which was also noted as actual impacts by Beeton (2008). Even though it was not the most frequently cited concern, it is something which captured the minds of certain individuals. Therefore, it is a serious concern which should be considered further by the relevant authorities, as the issue existed prior to the conception of the film and represent an extension of impacts already found in tourism destinations, ‘although some of these [impacts] are more emphasised’ (Connell 2012:1020) through film tourism. After all, film tourism can accelerate the pace of community change which influences the level to which these impacts are felt (Beeton 2005) so the underlying impacts need to be addressed.

When considering these aspirations and concerns, it is noted that the impacts relate directly to the residents understanding of the term. Although the idea of a collision is not referred to specifically, the focus is placed upon the town and the people who live there, rather than the broader county. Furthermore, there is clear evidence of social, economic and spiritual impacts, with little reference to the environmental impacts which may occur. However, the costs and benefits were weighed up by some residents in terms of environmental costs; should solutions be sought to deal with the key issues. One example refers to the parking dilemma: "But, then... again it's like a plot of land would then have to be put over too...housing a car park, which is not very wonderful idea, but on the other hand they've got [to build it] somewhere" (Respondent 2, Focus Group 2). This dilemma, according to Faulkner and Tideswell (1997) could, however, represent the adverse environmental effect of community impacts.

As a result, it could be suggested that these aspirations and concerns are localised to the specific community under investigation. However, there are some general implications which could be considered by other DMOs when considering the development of film-induced tourism. These include the assumption about which impacts are perceived most commonly in the destination, as through this study it is evident that the practitioner's perceived parking and congestion to be their main concern (like Beeton 2008 and Mordue 2001). However, in reality it is a historical issue which was identified prior to the films conception. Instead, in relation to film-induced tourism, the main issues relate to commercialisation and corporate takeovers, as the Glastonbury community wished to remain independent and distinct, rather than become a homogenous society. This knowledge implies that residents need to be consulted prior to filming in any location to ensure the real concerns are acknowledged, which contributes new knowledge to film tourism discourse.

Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to evaluate the business of film tourism and establish the perceived impacts of film tourism from advanced practitioners and local residents, respectively. This was assessed through determining expert understanding of how the myths of Glastonbury will be conveyed in film during pre-production, and by

determining the aspirations and concerns of local residents towards film tourism before filming began.

The findings reveal that the business of tourism involves the formation of partnerships and collaboration between the film and tourism industry. Pre-production negotiations are important, and the responsibility of each expert involved during the initial stages of a film's development is paramount to the success of the film. Success is defined in terms of securing the local residents active positivity about filming in the future. It is also felt that stakeholders can be brought in line to promote a destination positively through strong marketing efforts established by the DMO and by offering instant dialogue to concerned stakeholders to avoid dissonance.

In terms of the perceived aspirations and concerns of film tourism, an increase in traffic and congestion, which were anticipated as a key concern prior to analysis (Connell 2012), were evident. However these anticipated concerns were not of great concern (as also noted by Busby, Brunt & Lund 2003) and were not pronounced as film-induced issues for the community. Instead traffic and congestion were defined as being a broader concern of the local community, as the impact had already previously been induced by tourism. In its place, the more specific perceived impacts of film tourism related to commercialisation and corporate takeovers. Local residents therefore articulated a desire for consultation prior to filming, to enable residents to air their concerns and perceived rights over the cultural capital of their destination. This is of importance because the DMO can correct their focus of concern and ensure that they addressing the real issues concerning the host population.

Such knowledge will lead to a stronger positive partnership being formed between the DMO and key stakeholders; from the pre-production stage through to the post-production experience. Therefore, it is believed that consulting residents at an early stage of pre-development is critical, especially when a DMO is in the process of diversifying their rural economic base, to lead to a more sustainable form of local development, through film-induced tourism. Care is, however, required when a marketing campaign is launched on the back of film because the image construction

may not be accurate and may lead to disappointment and antagonism within the local community. After all, as stated by Beeton (2008) simply marketing the destination is not enough, support is also required from the local community.

Caution is also required when making generalisation about these findings due to a case study approach being adopted. The findings are transferable, but not generalisable upon the wider scholarship pertaining film tourism, meaning that the case study has generated new knowledge, but has failed to offer a more critical understanding of film tourism, as desired by Connell (2012). Nevertheless, it is believed that the paper does add value to the knowledge of film tourism through destination specific impacts being identified, and the unique qualities of pre-production access and place naming. After all, this is the first study which has addressed the *perceived* impacts of film tourism from a pre-production, pre script finalisation, perspective.

References

- Alzua, A., O'Leary, J.T. & Morrison, A. (1998). Cultural and Heritage Tourism: identifying niches for international travellers. In *Journal of Tourism Studies*, 9, 2, 2-13.
- Andereck, K. L. & Vogt, C. A. (2000). The Relationship between Residents' Attitudes toward Tourism and Tourism Development Options. in *Journal of Travel Research*, 39, 1, 27–36.
- Basch C. (1987). Focus group interview: an underutilised research technique for improving theory and practice in health education. *Health Education Quarterly*, 14, 4, 411–448.
- Bazeley, P. (2007). *Qualitative Data Analysis with NVivo*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Beeton, S. (2004). Rural Tourism in Australia — Has the Gaze Altered? Tracking Rural Images through Film and Tourism Promotion. *International Journal of Tourism Research*. 6 (3), 125-135.
- Beeton, S. (2005). *Film-induced Tourism*. Clevedon: Chanel View Publications.
- Beeton, S. (2007). The good, the bad and the ugly: CSR, film and tourism. Two cases of filming in a small community. In *Tourism Review International*. 11, 2, 145-154.

- Beeton, S. (2008). Location, location, location: film corporations' social responsibilities. I *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*. 24, 2-3, 107-114.
- Benzine, A. (2005). *Lost Drives Sales for Lush Hawaii*. Available at: <http://www.tglive.com/NArticleDetails.asp?aid=3988>.
- Bergin, C., Talley, S., & Hamer, L. (2003). Prosocial behaviours of young adolescents: a focus group study. In *Journal of Adolescence*, 26,1, 13-32.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Bramwell, B., & Sharman, A. (1999). Collaboration in local tourism policymaking. In *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26, 2, 392-415.
- Breen, R.L. (2006). A practical guide to focus group research. In *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 30, 3, 463-475.
- Brown, F. (1998). *Tourism Reassessed: Blessing or Blight?* Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Brunt, P. (1997). *Market Research in Travel and Tourism*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Brunt, P., & Courtney, P. (1999). Host perceptions of sociocultural impacts. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26, 3, 493-515.
- Bryman, A. (2004, 4th ed). *Social Research Methods*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Busby, G., Brunt, P., & Lund, J. (2003). In Agatha Christie Country: resident perception of special interest tourism. In *Tourism*, 51,3, 287-300.
- Busby, G., Huang, R., & Jarman, R. (2013). The Stein Effect: an alternative film-induced tourism perspective. In *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 15, 6, 570–582.
- Busby, G., & Klug, J. (2001). Movie-induced tourism: the challenge of measurement and other issues. In *Journal of Vacation Marketing*, 7, 4, 316-332.
- Busby, G., & Meethan, K. (2008). Cultural Capital in Cornwall: Heritage and the Visitor, in P. Payton (Ed.). *Cornish Studies Sixteen*, 146-166. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.
- Buchmann, A. (2006). From Erewhon to Edoras: Tourism and Myths in New Zealand. In *Tourism Culture & Communication*, 6, 3, 181-189.
- Carey M. (1994). The group effect in focus groups: planning, implementing, and interpreting focus group research. In J. Morse (Ed) *Critical Issues in Qualitative Research Methods*. London: Sage Publications.

Carmichael, B. A. (2000). A Matrix Model for Resident Attitudes and Behaviours in a rapidly Changing Tourist Area. *Tourism Management*, 21 (6), 601-611.

Carr, H. (2007). Waiting for the Borat Effect. *Travel Trade Gazette*. Available at: <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hoh&AN=24412683&site=ehost-live>

Connell, J. (2005). What's the Story in Balamory?: The Impacts of a Children's TV Programme on Small Tourism Enterprises on the Isle of Mull, Scotland. In *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 13,3, 228-255.

Connell, J. (2012). Film tourism - evolution, progress and prospects. In *Tourism Management*. 33, 5, 1007-1029.

Cronin, A. (2001). Focus Groups. In Gilbert, N. (Ed) *Researching Social Life*. London: Sage Publications.

Croy, W. G., & Walker, R. D. (2003). Rural Tourism and Film – Issues for Strategic Regional Development. In (Ed) Hall, D. R., Roberts, L., & Mitchell, M. *New Directions in Rural Tourism* Farnham: Ashgate Publishing

Cruff, M. (2013). *Predicting Movie Success to Guide Film Tourism Investment*. Paper presented at the *Mixed Reality Conference 2013*, Scandinavia.

Cynthia, D. Beeton, S. (2009). Supporting independent film production through tourism collaboration. *Tourism Review International*. 13 (2). 113-119.

Daniel McNicoll (2014) Glastonbury Isle of Light. Available at: <http://danielmcnicoll.com/> viewed 23 July.

Digance, J. & Cusack, C. (2002). Glastonbury: a Tourist Town of All Seasons in (Ed) Dann, G. *The Tourist as a Metaphor of the Social World*. Wallingford: CABI.

Faulkner, B. & Tideswell, C. (1997). A Framework for Monitoring Community Impacts of Tourism. In *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 5, 1, 2-29.

Flick, U. (2002). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London SAGE Publications;

Gillham, B. (2005). *Research Interviewing: The range of techniques: A practical guide*. Maidenhead, Open University Press

Galatia Films (2011). *Glastonbury Isle of Light*. <http://issuu.com/galatiafilms/docs/glastonbury-media-kit-11/7>

Gomm, R. & Hammersley, M. (2000). Introduction. In Gomm, R. Hammersley, M. & Foster, P. (eds) *Case Study Methods: Key Issues, Key Texts*. London: SAGE Publications.

Hudson, S. & Ritchie, J. R. B. (2006). Promoting Destinations via Film Tourism: An Empirical Identification of Supporting Marketing Initiatives. In *Journal of Travel Research*, 44, 4, 387-396.

- Jackson, C. (1936). Joseph of Arimathea. In *The Journal of Religion*, 16, 3, 332-340.
- Kim, H. & Richardson, S. (2003). Motion Picture Impacts on Destination Images. In *Annals of Tourism Research*, 30, 1, 216-237.
- Kitzinger, J., & Barbour, R.S. (1999). Introduction: The Challenge and Promise of Focus Group. In Barbour, R.S. & Kitzinger, J. (eds) *Developing Focus Group Research: Politics, Theory, and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage .
- Krueger, R.A. (1994 2nd ed). *Focus Groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (2000). The Only Generalisation is: There is no Generalization. In Gomm, R. Hammersley, M. & Foster, P. (eds) *Case Study Methods: Key Issues, Key Texts*. London: Sage.
- Lindberg, K. & Johnson, R. L. (1997). Modelling Resident Attitudes Towards Tourism. In *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24, 2, 402-424.
- Lyons, W. J. (2014). *Joseph of Arimathea: A Study of Recent History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Madriz, E. (2003). Focus groups in feminist research. In Denzin, N.K, & Lincoln, Y.S. (eds) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. London: Sage Publications
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G.B. (1995). *Designing Qualitative Research*. 2nd edition. London: Sage Publications.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching*. London: Sage Publications.
- McCrone, D., Morris, A., & Kiely, R. (1995). *Scotland – The Brand: the making of Scottish Heritage*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McMichael, P. (1996). Globalization: Myths and Realities! In *Rural Sociology*, 61, 1, 25-55.
- Mordue, T. (2001). Performing and Directing Resident / Tourist Cultures in Heartbeat Country. In *Tourist Studies*, 1, 3, 233-252.
- Morgan, N. & Pritchard, A. (1998). *Tourism Promotion and Power: Creating Images, Creating Identities*. Chichester: John Wiley.
- O'Neill, K., Butts, S., & Busby, G. (2005). The Corellification of Cephallonian Tourism. In *Anatolia*, 16, 2, 207-226.
- Polgar S., & Thomas S. (1995 3rd ed). *Introduction to Research in the Health Sciences*. Melbourne: Churchill Livingstone.
- Rabiee, F. (2004). Focus-group interview and data analysis. In *Proceedings of the nutrition society*, 63, 4, 655.

Rickman, P. (2010). *The Bones of Avalon*. London: Corvus.

Ritchie, J., & Spencer, L. (1994). Qualitative Analysis for Applied Policy Research. In Bryman, A. & Burgess, R. G. (eds.) *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. London: Routledge.

Riley, R. Baker, D. & Van Doren, C. (1998). Movie Induced Tourism. In *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25, 4, 919-935.

Riley, R. & Van Doren, C. (1992). Movies as Tourism Promotion: A 'Pull' Factor in a 'Push' Location. In *Tourism Management*, 13, 3, 267-274.

Roberts, L. (2012). *Film, Mobility and Urban Space: A Cinematic Geography of Liverpool*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Hartmann, R. (1986). Tourism, seasonality and social change. In *Leisure Studies*, 5 1, 23-33.

Shandley, R., Jamal, T., & Tanaseb, A. (2006). Location Shooting and the Filmic Destination: Transylvanian Myths and the Post-Colonial Tourism Enterprise. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 4, 3, 137-158.

Teo, P. (1994). Assessing socio-cultural impacts: the case of Singapore. In *Tourism Management*, 15, 2, 126-136.

Tooke, N. & Baker, M. (1996). Seeing is Believing: The Effect of Film on Visitor Numbers to Screened Locations. In *Tourism Management*, 17, 2, 87-94.

Vargo, S.L., & Lusch, R.F. (2004). The four service marketing myths – remnants of a goods-based, manufacturing model. In *Journal of Service Research*, 6, 4, 324-335.

Veal, A. J. (2006 3rd ed). *Research Methods for Leisure and Tourism: A Practical Guide*. London: Prentice Hall.

Voase, R. (2012). Recognition, reputation and response: some critical thoughts on destinations and brands. In *Journal of Destination Marketing and Management*, 1, 1-2, 78-83.

Author details:

Dr Natalie Semley is Lecturer in Tourism Management at Plymouth University. Her research interests include visitor motivation, the impacts of tourism-related crime, and community responses.

Email: natalie.semley@plymouth.ac.uk

Dr Graham Busby is Associate Professor in Tourism Management at Plymouth University. His research interests are film-related tourism, literary tourism, rural tourism and the concept of tourism higher education.

Email: G.Busby@plymouth.ac.uk