



26 ESIC

2023

A REVIEW OF THE NOTION OF CREATIVE TOURISM

Pozzi, A.; (corresponding Author) Wassler, P.; Cavallone, M.; Danovi, A.

Department Of Management – University Of Bergamo (Italy)

ABSTRACT

During the last decades, the search for new development models led academics and practitioners to view creativity as a new and valuable resource to improve the competitiveness and differentiation of destinations and attractions. The concept of creative tourism has emerged and grown in popularity, and academics have started to explain its key elements. Different conceptualisations have emphasised the co-creation process on which this new form of tourism is based; the exploitation of both tangible and intangible resources of the destinations (cultural, natural, personal/individual, etc.) through participative/interactive/hands-on activities; and the process of acquiring/improving knowledge and skills on the part of tourists. However, the concept is still subject to ambiguity and shares many features with both educational and experiential tourism. Defining the distinguishing elements of creative tourism is therefore essential for its understanding. This study expands the knowledge of creative tourism, going beyond the general notions of creativity and creativity-centred economic approaches recalled in academic literature. We reviewed different formulations in academic literature and propose a new conceptualization that focuses on differentiating elements from educational and experiential tourism. We also applied existing theoretical frameworks – i.e., the '4Ps') and 'Four-C' models – and explained why creative tourism can be considered a specific expression of creativity on tourism.

Key Words: Creativity, Creative Tourism, Experiential Tourism, Educational Tourism

INTRODUCTION

During the last decades, the search for new development models led academics and practitioners to view creativity as a new and valuable resource to improve the competitiveness and differentiation of cities and regions. Creativity-centred economic approaches – ‘creative cities’ (Landry, 1990), ‘creative industries’ (DCMS, 1998) and ‘creative class’ (Florida, 2002) – have gained increasing attention among policymakers. Despite their popularity, academics have often criticised these models due to their lack of

real contribution to territorial development and their vagueness (Peck, 2005; Rogerson, 2006; Pratt, 2008; Vanolo, 2008; Atkinson & Easthope, 2009). In tourism, destinations have begun to consider creativity to increase their distinctiveness in the market (Richards & Raymond, 2000; Richards & Wilson, 2006; Richards, 2011).

The concept of creative tourism has emerged and grown in popularity, and academics have started to explain its key elements (Duxbury & Richards, 2019). Different conceptualisations have emphasised the co-creation process on which this new form of tourism is based (Richards & Raymond, 2000; Richards, 2018); the exploitation of both tangible and intangible resources of the destinations (cultural, natural, personal/individual, etc.) through participative/interactive/hands-on activities (Den Dekker & Tabbers, 2012; Jelinčić & Žuvela, 2012); and the process of acquiring/improving knowledge and skills on the part of tourists (Raymond, 2007). However, the concept is still subject to ambiguity (Tan et al., 2013) and shares many features with both educational and experiential tourism. Defining the distinguishing elements of creative tourism is therefore essential for its understanding.

This paper aims to review and expand the knowledge of creative tourism, going beyond the general notions of creativity and creativity-centred economic approaches recalled in academic literature (Richards & Wilson, 2007; Richards, 2011; Tan et al., 2013; Tan et al., 2014). Section 1.2 presents the general theoretical frameworks and the leading views on creativity, from the economy-based theories to more recent (but still quite elusive) concepts of ‘creative industries’, ‘creative cities’ and ‘creative people/class’. In the second section (1.3), we focus on creative tourism. We review the different formulations in academic literature and identify the unique characteristics. The analysis of the attributes that share with educational and experiential tourism allows us to provide a new conceptualisation. The section concludes by connecting the definition with the general theoretical frameworks of creativity and explaining why creative tourism can be considered a particular expression of creativity in tourism.

CREATIVITY AS A SOURCE FOR VALUE CREATION

What is creativity? A review of existing theories

Creativity is a concept that researchers from different disciplines have often used, making thus challenging to put forth a universal definition (Klausen, 2010). Despite its elusiveness, there is a consensus that creativity involves producing something new, meaningful, or valuable to the creator (Ericsson, 1999; Weisberg, 2006).

Theoretical conceptualisations distinguish between Big-C and little-c creativity (Kaufman & Beghetto, 2009). The former refers to the creative genius of individuals that produce unambiguous exceptional works, such as Einstein or Beethoven (Gardner, 1993). The latter focuses on the creativity of everyday life, i.e., experiences and expressions accessible to almost anyone; for instance, the novel way a home cook includes ingredients in a recipe (Richards, 2007). Kaufman & Beghetto (2009) proposed two additional categories, proposing the Four-C model. Figure 1.1 presents the four proposed types of creativity and their corresponding definition. As seen from the figure, Mini-c creativity links with the learning process at its initial stage, e.g., when students make a new

metaphor or learn a new concept. This additional category highlights the creative process involved in developing personal knowledge, which is also the basis of little-c and Big-C creativity (Beghetto & Kaufman, 2007). On the other side of the spectrum, Pro-c creativity categorises individuals who undertake creative activities at a professional level but have not yet achieved remarkable Big-C contribution in their domain; for instance, a professional artist who has not yet attained (or may never attain) eminent status (Kotzbelt *et al.*, 2010).

Scholarly research also conceptualises the different forms through which creativity can be expressed. Rhodes (1961) and, later, Taylor (1998) and Runco (2004) identified four categories (the '4Ps' of creativity):

- The 'creative person' refers to individuals with creative potential.
- The 'creative product' is the tangible or intangible outcome of human action.
- The 'creative process' is the individual's mental mechanism and the actions that allow the emergence of new resources and generate the outcome.
- The 'creative environment' is the socio-cultural context in which the person is embedded and can foster (or not) the creative potential while recognising (or not) the tangible output as creative.

From economic theories to creativity-centred approaches for economic development

The consensus on the previous conceptualisations does not imply that the theories on creativity are alike. Rubenson and Runco (1992; 1995) were among the first to approach creativity from an economic perspective. They assumed that individuals invest in their creative potential only if they expect to receive benefits larger than the imposed costs (including psychic and temporal). The benefits can derive from the usefulness of creativity in individuals' work, as happens in those jobs that demand it (e.g., researchers, artists, etc.). Alternatively, it can be personal, as individuals may decide to increase their creative potential for its value in social contexts. The innovative element here is that the creative activity – defined as the "production of specific creative acts, discoveries, or innovations" (Rubenson & Runco, 1992:139) – is viewed as an economic good. It can be evaluated in terms of a rate (such as creative acts per unit of time) and put on the market. Sternberg and Lubart (1992, 1995) attempted to explain the investment in creative behaviours. They advocate creativity sometimes results when individuals metaphorically 'buy low and sell high'. People can decide to invest in an innovative idea – which, in the beginning, tends to be low-accepted despite its usefulness – because of the opportunity to make profits when the idea becomes widely accepted.

Applying creativity in the economy is not limited to the theories mentioned above. In the late 90s, the increasing commodification of goods and services in the globalised market led businesses, cities, and regions to find new solutions to seek distinctiveness and competitiveness (Richards, 2001; Mommaas, 2009). This process triggered an increasing interest towards strategies based on a valorisation of creativity in its broader sense (Ray, 1998; Evans, 2003; Pantzar & Shove, 2005; Jackson & Murphy, 2006; Andersson & Thomsen, 2008; Ashworth & Page, 2011). The concepts of 'creative industry', 'creative

city' and 'creative people/class' appeared in both academic papers and agendas of policymakers. All rely on the idea that creativity can be used to improve the competitiveness of regions and cities. They emphasise different elements to achieve this goal: new and emerging industrial sectors ('creative industries') (DCMS, 1998; Rogerson, 2006); a model for re-valorisation of cities and public spaces ('creative cities' (Landry, 1990; Landry & Bianchini, 1995); or a new class of individuals that can foster the development of territories thanks to their creative potential ('creative people/class') (Florida, 2002; Moss, 2017). Despite their popularity, attempts to develop creativity-centred policies have often failed to achieve higher economic growth and/or solve social problems (McGranahan & Wojan, 2007; Atkinson & Easthope; 2009). Additionally, 'creative industry', 'creative city' and 'creative people/class' concepts rarely refer to the general frameworks (the 'Four-C' and the '4Ps' models) and/or specific theories, generating some ambiguity about what creativity is and how cities and regions can exploit this resource.

CREATIVITY IN TOURISM

The emergence of creative tourism

Pearce and Butler (1993) introduced the concept of creativity in tourism literature. Drawing from the preliminary studies on creativity, they emphasised its role as a potential source for tourism development without further clarification. The later works of Creighton (1995) and Daniel (1996), while describing niche cultural tourism practices from anthropological and sociological perspectives, anticipated to some extent the key concepts – i.e., engagement with local people, active learning – that are at the basis of the definition of creative tourism provided by Richards and Raymond (2000). They defined this practice as a form of “tourism which offers visitors the opportunity to develop their creative potential through active participation in courses and learning experiences which are characteristic of the holiday destination where they are undertaken” (Richards & Raymond, 2000:18).

Creighton (1995) described a popular workshop on *tetsumugi* (hand weaving) held in a remote area of the Japanese Alps. The week-long residential seminar was entirely organised and managed by a former Tokyo company employee and his wife, who found a way to create an appealing experience based on the rediscovery of Japanese traditions. The author remarked on what made this seminar so popular, with many participants waiting several years to get in. It allowed women to express their creativity by making their own craft items and reflect on their conditions and role in modern society. The vacationing women – the only ones who were admitted – lived together, learned, and experienced the traditional silk-weaving culture and not just the technique. By reappropriating an activity that had once constrained Japanese women, they made a new experience of themselves.

In Daniel's work (1996) we can also found the 'need' to reappropriate the past and those cultural manifestations that locals have lost or neglected for the sake of being accepted. In author's cross-cultural analysis of artistic performances in Haiti, Cuba and Senegal, Daniel observed that popular local songs and dances were often simulated (or performed

as 'unrealistic') in tourism settings for the pleasure of visitors. However, there were still occasions where dances were 'authentic; in Cuba, for instance, performers of 'Batarumba' could experience their artistic freedom and creativity more fully in tourism environments than in traditional contexts because of the political and economic restrictions. Tourists could play a central role in this process, as they could stimulate creativity. For instance, performers could experiment with variations and create while 'assisting' travellers in dancing their version or imitation. Starting from these observations, Daniel (1996) argued that tourism settings could help artists and tourists to be creative, allowing spontaneity and improvisation.

We can draw some preliminary considerations from the studies of Creighton (1995) and Daniel (1996):

- Creativity in tourism is not strictly within the activity, it is also a personal trait that suppliers and travellers can exploit.
- The tourism experience – i.e., the activity performed (which needs to be active), the interaction between tourists and locals, and the environment/setting – can stimulate individuals' creativity.
- Being creative means spontaneity, involvement, creation and, definitively, making a new experience of self.

Creative tourism: a review of the different definitions in recent literature

Richards & Raymond (2000) first defined creative tourism as a form of travelling that "offers visitors the opportunity to develop their creative potential through active participation in courses and learning experiences which are characteristic of the holiday destination where they are undertaken" (Richards & Raymond, 2000:18). The conceptualisation reflects the shift from standardised tourism consumption involving the gaze to new tourism practices based on active participation (Buhalis, 2001). Creativity is defined as a personal resource that leads to self-development when stimulated and developed. In other terms, through creative tourism, visitors interact and learn by doing instead of watching the destination's attractions; in doing so, they make new experiences for themselves and improve their skills.

In 2006, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) Creative Cities Network proposed a further conceptualisation and defined creative tourism as a "travel directed toward an engaged and authentic experience, with participative learning in the arts, heritage, or special character of a place, and it provides a connection with those who reside in this place and creates this living culture" (UNESCO, 2006:3). This formulation views creative tourism as a cultural tourism practice where travellers have an active role instead of being passive observers, and can learn about the place, its living culture, and the people who live there. Creativity is considered a resource that local managers should use to evolve and create new proposals (UNESCO, 2006), not a personal trait that travellers can exploit through the experience. We can argue that UNESCO's definition is more of an attempt to relabel cultural tourism, making it more attractive, rather than identifying a new tourism segment.

Raymond (2007) proposed a new conceptualisation based on the practical experience of 'Creative Tourism New Zealand' (CTNZ). This initiative attempted to make creative tourism a sustainable business on the island. The author re-defined creative tourism as a

“more sustainable form of tourism that provides an authentic feel for a local culture through informal, hands-on workshops and creative experiences” (Raymond, 2007: 146). This formulation systematises and advances previous definitions by adding concrete elements on how to develop creative tourism, i.e.:

- Hands-on activities allow travellers to engage with local culture by creating something.
- Friendly and informal environments make them spontaneous and express their creativity.
- The interaction with locals creates opportunities for conversations before, during and after the activity.

Raymond (2007) also introduced sustainability as a new element. Creative tourism can be sustainable because it is based on endogenous (and not imported) resources. By exploiting their skills, values and traditions, locals can create new proposals that also help to preserve their cultural heritage and generates economic value for the territory.

Academics proposed further conceptualisations in the following years. Den Dekker and Tabbers (2012) defined creative tourism as a practice that offers visitors the opportunity to be part of the destination they are visiting. They argued that developing activities where tourists can be creative is insufficient because travellers continuously interact with people and the surroundings during their holiday. It is, therefore, necessary to create a socio-cultural environment that can foster the creative potential of both locals and travellers and favours a continuing dialogue between these two groups. Jelinčić & Žuvela (2012), starting from their reflections on re-branding two Croatian destinations (Dubrovnik and Zagreb) through creativity, understood it as a new type of tourism in which cultural, natural, and personal resources are valued and enriched to provide visitors more engaging experiences. Although cultural heritage remained central in their discourse on creative tourism, they remarked on the need to consider all the resources that characterise the area and develop models and strategies that suit the local context. The authors presented the cases of Dubrovnik and Zagreb to explain why to consider all the tangible and intangible assets of a destination: the former is a mass tourism destination with both natural and cultural attractions, and the latter is mainly a cultural destination with creative/cultural industries (whose potential needed to be exploited). Richards (2018) pointed out creative tourism is a knowledge-based practice where travellers, suppliers, and destinations work together to generate new experiences. While remarking on the need to create a favourable environment – as suggested by Dekker and Tabbers (2012) – he stressed that creative tourism is not a supply-led process but implies a dialogue between all groups and active involvement of travellers in (co)creating their experience.

We can summarise the key elements (both recurring and distinctive) of creative tourism in the definitions provided by academics through the years as follows:

- Creative tourism allows tourists to improve their skills and knowledge by learning by doing and encourages spontaneity and creativity.
- It requires both travellers and suppliers to work together to produce something new and valuable for both groups – in other terms, to be creative.
- It implies the interaction among travellers, suppliers, and locals in designing and doing the experience (co-creation process).
- It uses both tangible and intangible resources of the destination (e.g., cultural, natural, personal/individual, etc.), which can be exploited through

participative/interactive/hands-on activities and not on imported/exogenous capital.

- It needs a favourable environment that can foster the creative potential of locals and travellers and favour a continuing dialogue between these groups.

To clarify the concept of creative tourism, we must go beyond reviewing existing definitions and highlight the distinguishing elements. In the next section, we analyse the differences between educational and experiential tourism, with which creative tourism has much in common.

A special form of educational and experiential tourism? Common and distinguishing features of creative tourism

The creative tourism concept holds some resonance with educational tourism, as both emphasise tourists' engagement in learning experiences (Richards & Raymond, 2006). Richards (2011) argued that the difference lies in the level of involvement: higher in creative tourism, as it includes educational activities where guests and hosts exchange knowledge; lower in educational travels, where proponents transmit new competencies to participants during more formal experiences – i.e., structured around an educational programme (Pitman et al., 2010). We can argue that this distinction may be limiting.

Pitman et al. (2012: 221) described educational tourism as a “deliberate and explicit learning experience”. It requires the tourists’ active participation and willingness to acquire new competencies and skills (Paige & Vande Berg, 2012; McGladdery & Lubbe, 2017). This practice also needs to be structured at a level of adequate education. Suppliers must consider the skills and competencies of (actual and potential) participants and respond to ensure a fruitful exchange of knowledge (Árnason, 2010). Therefore, many activities from different tourist segments fall under the umbrella of educational tourism: exchange trips for students, study tours for adults, training workshops for professionals, cultural/nature-based/gastronomic guided tours, courses, and workshops, etc. (Ritchie, 2003). Creative tourism can also be a form of education travel because it relies on “an exchange of knowledge and skills between guest and host” (Richards, 2011: 35). We can argue that the main difference between these two practices does not lie in the level of involvement. Both creative and educational experiences require active participation from travellers, who are stimulated to acquire new competencies through interaction with locals. What distinguishes them is the type of activity, which can be creative and educational or only educational.

Only hands-on activities fall under the umbrella of creative tourism. Suppliers use local resources (e.g., gastronomy, cultural customs) to create a favourable environment and develop an experience that allows travellers to produce something new and meaningful or valuable for them – e.g., a local dish or a personal version of a typical dance (Ericsson, 1999; Weisberg; 2006). In other terms, to be creative. Other learning activities that are not structured to encourage creativity (e.g., courses and tours) fall into educational tourism. For instance, students attending a language course abroad can use their creativity to learn basic grammatical rules and gain confidence in speaking at the beginning. However, this ability is limited to the individual; in other terms, creativity is not (or is poorly) fostered by suppliers and the environment.

Creative tourism has more in common with experiential tourism. This concept emerged in the late 1990s drawing from the research on the so-called ‘experience economy’ – a new type of economic offering that goes beyond traditional products and services (Pine and Gilmore (1999) –, and identifies “[...] a memorable, unique and extraordinary economic [tourist] offering, resulting from a staged co-created process based on the business and the destination’s intentional enhancement of the guest’s perceptions and feelings for value creation purposes” (Tur, 2016: 50). In reviewing the key elements of creative and experiential tourism, these concepts appear to be very close:

- *Creative and experiential tourism are co-created.* Co-creation is about the joint development of travellers' and suppliers' offerings (Prahalad and Ramaswamy, 2004). Experiential tourism requires intentional participation on the part of tourists that is enhanced by the suppliers, as happens in arts or crafts workshops where tutors stimulate the active participation of guests (Campos et al., 2015). Creative tourism also relies on the interaction among travellers, suppliers, and/or locals in designing and doing the experience (Richards & Raymond, 2000; Richards, 2018). The interplay is a prerequisite for exploiting the creative potential of all participants.
- *Creative and experiential tourism pay large attention to the experience setting.* The environment where the experience is staged is crucial to engage travellers. In creative tourism, the setting fosters creativity, spontaneity, and improvisation (Daniel, 1996). For example, cooking classes hosted in private homes allow guests access to local spaces and customs, turning the experience into more than learning how to prepare typical recipes. The same happens in experiential tourism, where suppliers orchestrate complete themes derived from a combination of ‘front’ – the place of both workers and guests – and ‘back’ regions – where workers retire between performances to prepare and relax – to involve each guest in the experience (MacCannell, 1973; Tur, 2016).
- *Creative and experiential tourism implies physical, emotional, and /or mental engagement.* An experiential offering intentionally enhances sensory and/or emotional features to deeply engage travellers, e.g., through physical or intellectual challenges, participative and extreme sports, interactive activities, etc. (Azevedo, 2009). The same happens in creative tourism, which creates opportunities for travellers to apply creativity and feel emotionally and mentally involved (Richards & Wilson, 2006; Morgan, 2007).

Creative and experiential tourism share many common features but have some differences. Creative tourism implies participation and co-creation in which a particular set of complex emotions and abilities related to creativity, learning and self-development are developed. Experiential tourism exploits all sensory or emotional features, including the basic ones such as happiness, relaxation, etc., and does not necessarily require the participation of travellers. In this sense, we can view creative tourism as a sub-type of experiential tourism.

Additionally, creative tourism is based on endogenous resources, while experiential tourism can also use imported tangible and intangible assets. Learning tango in Argentina, with local performers in the ‘original’ traditional settings, can be considered a creative tourism opportunity and an experiential offering. Attending a pizza workshop in London with Italian pizza makers cannot be labelled as creative because the experience is not anchored to local roots (despite pizza being a popular dish in the UK capital city), and it

also depends on imported/exogenous resources (e.g., the pizza makers, the ingredients, the recipe)

If we consider common and differentiating elements of the three practices previously analysed, creative and educational tourism comprises learning activities, but only those requiring creativity at all levels can fall under the umbrella of creative tourism. Co-creation, physical, emotional, and /or mental engagement, and experiential setting are common attributes of experiential and creative tourism. Only the latter requires individuals' creativity, with travellers that experience first-hand activities based on unique resources of the destination. Starting from these elements, we can propose a new definition:

Creative tourism is a form of experiential and educational tourism, which involves a set of emotions and abilities related to creativity, engagement, interaction and learning that are exploited through co-created hands-on activities based on the unique resources of the destination.

1.3.4 Linking creative tourism with general theoretical frameworks

The previous analysis clarifies the key and distinguishing elements of creative tourism in the academic literature. A further step is needed to achieve adequate comprehension. Existing studies often recalled general frameworks of creativity – the '4Ps' and 'Four-C' models presented – to provide the theoretical background while not explaining the relationships with creative tourism (e.g., Tan et al., 2013; Ross et al., 2017).

To advance its comprehension, we can connect these models with the concept of creative tourism. This practice should foster individual creativity (the 'person') through hands-on activities based on a mutual exchange between travellers and suppliers (the 'process') that take place in a favourable tourism setting (the 'environment'). Combining these three elements allows travellers to produce something new, which can be a tangible or intangible outcome ('the product'). For instance, in a bakery workshop people learn how to make bread. Hosting this activity in private houses, where locals and guests co-work and experience together the entire traditional baking process, can make this activity creative. Guests learn how to prepare local bread, reflect on local traditions and food habits, and make a new experience of themselves; hosts experiment with the traditional recipe with variations and create while 'assisting' travellers.

Additionally, we can say that creative tourism is a particular expression of creativity in tourism. Visiting the works of Cesar Manrique in Lanzarote or tasting the extraordinary recipes of the starred chef Enrico Bartolini¹, for instance, cannot be included among creative tourism experiences. These activities do not involve any emotions and abilities related to creativity and interaction on the part of travellers; they 'passively' enjoy (and not co-create) the creative works of an artist/chef. Creativity acts in the 'background' (Duxbury & Richards, 2019). In other terms, it is a resource of the destination to be exploited within the industry and used to achieve differentiation in the tourism market. For instance, in the late 90s, the Singapore Tourism Board promoted the 'New Asia-Singapore Cuisine' as one of its marketing campaign's pillars to convey new images and

¹ Enrico Bartolini is an Italian chef and food entrepreneur. He is the most-awarded Michelin-star chef in Italy and ranks second in the world. For further information: www.enricobartolini.net.

an identity attractive to tourists and residents (Chang & Lim, 2004). The Board invited local and foreign chefs to use their imagination and develop new creative ideas starting from the pre-existing culinary knowledge and local food. This initiative increased fine dining options for travellers and brand Singapore as a gourmet destination (Chaney & Ryan, 2012).

Creative tourism happens only when travellers actively participate in being/becoming creative. Creativity is here a 'focal' activity (Duxbury & Richards, 2019), just as the entire experience is structured to involve a set of emotions and abilities related to creativity, involvement, interaction and learning that are exploited through co-created hands-on activities. For instance, 'Creative tourism network' website² enlist many experiences where creativity is a focal activity, e.g., the 'Tapas workshop' in Barcelona (Spain), the 'Painting on High' experience in Quito (Ecuador), and the 'Antemoro papermaking' activity in Madagascar. There are also destinations' websites that focus on this type of proposal. 'Creative Iceland'³, for example, provides opportunities for travellers to work and learn with artists and artisans, such as wood carving, Icelandic knitting, and knife-making workshops (Richards & Duxbury, 2021).

1.4 CONCLUSIONS

The main goal of this paper was to review and expand the existing knowledge on creative tourism. We started by clarifying the concept of creativity, which is the individual's ability to produce something new, meaningful, or valuable to the creator. Academics proposed two frameworks that explain the level of individuals' creativity and the forms through which it can be expressed. The 'Four-C' model acknowledges everybody's potential to be creative and offers a developmental trajectory from genius to subjective creativity. The '4Ps' model explains the four components of creativity: the person, the product, the process and the environment.

Exploiting creativity can also lead to economic benefits. In other words, the outcome of the creative act of people can turn into a good to be traded in the market. The terms 'creative industry', 'creative city' and 'creative people/class' appeared in scientific papers and agendas of policymakers to indicate strategies aimed at fostering economic development through creativity. Each suggested a different path: maximising the potential of new and emerging creative industries, developing models to re-valorise cities and public spaces, or attracting a new class of creative individuals. Despite their popularity, academics criticised the above strategies for their real contribution to economic growth and their ambiguity.

Having clarified the notion of creativity, we then focused on creative tourism. Academics recognise it as a co-created process where travellers improve their skills and knowledge through hands-on activities based on the unique resources of the destination. Existing literature identified its key attributes while leaving some ambiguities in differentiating elements from educational and experiential tourism. Both creative and educational experiences comprise learning activities, but only those requiring creativity at all levels

² For further information: www.creativetourismnetwork.org.

³ For further information: <https://creativeiceland.is>.

can fall under the umbrella of creative tourism. This practice also shares with experiential tourism some key attributes – i.e., co-creation, physical, emotional, and/or mental engagement, and experiential setting. Only creative tourism requires individuals' creativity, with travellers that experience first-hand activities based on the unique resources of the destination. Therefore, we proposed a new definition, which views creative tourism as a sub-form of experiential and educational tourism involving emotions and abilities related to creativity, engagement, and learning that are exploited through co-created hands-on activities based on unique resources of the destination.

Another significant ambiguity in academic studies concerns creativity's role in the tourism experience. Applying existing theoretical frameworks – i.e., the '4Ps' and 'Four-C' models – suggested creativity acts in the 'background' or as 'focal' activity. In the former, it stimulates innovation within the industry; this happens, for instance, when the creative work of a chef or an artist turns into an attraction for tourists. In the latter, it is exploited within the entire experience to involve travellers in being/becoming creative. Given the definition of creative tourism, only these activities fall under the umbrella of this practice.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, L. and Thomsen, B. S. (2008). “Performative experiments and cultural re-planning – Recapturing the spectacle of the city”, *Nordic Journal of Architectural Research*, 20, pp. 39-51.
- Árnason, P. (2010). *Thoughts on Educational (Geo) Tourism*. University of Iceland: hornafjörður rural research centre, Háskóli Íslands.
- Ashworth, G. and Page, S. J. (2011). “Urban tourism research: Recent progress and current paradoxes”, *Tourism Management*, 32(1), pp. 1-15.
- Atkinson, R., and Easthope, H. (2009). “The consequences of the creative class: The pursuit of creativity strategies in Australia’s cities”, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 33, pp. 64–79.
- Azevedo, A. (2009). “Designing unique and memorable experiences: Co-creation and the “surprise” factor”, paper presented at the *III Congresso Internacional de Turismo de Leiria e Oeste – 2009*, Leiria, Portugal.
- Beghetto, R. A., and Kaufman, J. C. (2007). “Toward a Broader Conception of Creativity: A Case for ‘mini-c’ Creativity”, *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 1(2), pp.73–79.
- Buhalis, D. (2001). “The tourism phenomenon: The new tourist and consumer”, In C. Wahab & S. Cooper (Eds.), *Tourism in the age of globalisation* (pp. 69–96). London: Routledge.
- Campos, A. C., Mendes, J., Pinto, P., and Scott, N. (2015). “Co-creation of tourist experiences: a literature review”, *Current Issues in Tourism*, 21(4), pp. 369-400.
- Chang, T. C., and S. Y. Lim (2004). “Geographical Imaginations of 'New Asia-Singapore’”, *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 86(3), pp.165-185.
- Chaney, S., and Ryan, C. (2012). “Analyzing the evolution of Singapore’s World Gourmet Summit: An example of gastronomic tourism”, *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 31, pp.309–318.
- Creighton, M. R. (1995). “Japanese craft tourism: Liberating the crane wife”, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22, pp.463–478.
- Daniel, Y. P. (1996). “Tourism dance performances authenticity and creativity”, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, pp. 780–797.
- DCMS (1998). *Creative industries mapping document*. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

- Den Dekker, T., and Tabbers, M. (2012) "From Creative Crowds to Creative Tourism: A search for creative tourism in small and medium sized cities", *Journal of Tourism Consumption and practice*, 4(2), pp.129–132.
- Duxbury, N., Richards, G. (Eds.) (2019), *A Research Agenda for Creative Tourism*, Cheltenham. UK: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Ericsson, K. A. (1999). "Creative expertise as superior reproducible performance: Innovative and flexible aspects of expert performance", *Psychological Inquiry*, 10, pp.329-333.
- Evans, G. (2003). "Hard branding the culture city: From Prado to Prada", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27, pp. 417–440.
- Florida, R. (2002). *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Creating minds*. New York: Basic Books.
- Jackson, J., and Murphy, P. (2006). "Clusters in regional tourism: An Australian case", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33, pp. 1018–1035.
- Jelinčić, D. A., and Žuvela, A. (2012). "Facing the challenge? Creative tourism in Croatia", *Journal of Tourism Consumption and Practice*, 4(2), pp.78-90.
- Kaufman, J. C., and Beghetto, R. A. (2009). "Beyond big and little: The four C model of creativity", *Review of General Psychology*, 13, pp.1-12.
- Klausen, S. H. (2010). "The notion of creativity revisited: A philosophical perspective on creativity research", *Creativity Research Journal*, 22, pp.347–360.
- Kotzbelt, A., Beghetto, R. A., and Runco, M. A. (2010). "Theories of Creativity", in Kaufman J. C., and Sternberg, R. J. (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Creativity* (pp.20-47). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Landry, C. (1990). *The creative city & its cultural economy*. Glasgow: Glasgow Development Agency.
- Landry, C. and Bianchini, F. (1995). *The creative city*. London, UK: Demos in association with Comedia.
- MacCannell, D. (1973). "Staged Authenticity: Arrangements of Social Space in Tourist Settings", *American Journal of Sociology*, 79(3), pp. 589-603.
- McGladdery, C.A. (2016). *The relationship between international educational tourism and global learning in South African high school learners*, Doctoral Thesis, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
- McGranahan, D., and Wojan, T. (2007). "Recasting the creative class to examine growth processes in rural and urban countie". *Regional Studies*, 41, pp.1–20.
- Mommaas, H. (2009). "City, culture and identity: The city as third space". Paper presented at the *Cultural Policy and Management Conference*, Istanbul Bilgi University, November.
- Morgan, M. (2007). "Festival spaces and the visitor experience", In J. Casado-Diaz, M. Everett, and S. Wilson (Eds.), *Social and cultural change: Making space(s) for leisure and tourism* (pp. 113–130). Eastbourne: Lesiure Studies Association.
- Moss, G. (2017). *Artistic Enclaves in the Post-Industrial City. A Case Study of Lawrenceville Pittsburgh*. Cham, CH: Springer International Publishing AG.
- OECD (2005). *Culture and Local Development*. Paris: OECD.
- Paige, R.M. and Vande Berg, M. (2012), "Why students are not learning abroad", In Vande Berg, M., Paige, R.M. and Lou, K.H. (Eds), *Student Learning ABROAD: What are Students are Learning, What They're not, and What We can Do About It* (pp. 29-60). Stylus, Sterling.
- Pantzar, M. and Shove, E. (2005). *Manufacturing leisure. Innovations in happiness, wellbeing and fun*. Helsinki: National Consumer Research Centre.
- Pitman, T., Broomhall, S., McEwan, J. and Majocho, E. (2010). "Adult learning in educational tourism", *Australian Journal of Adult Learning*, Vol. 50 No. 2, pp. 219-238.

- Prahalad, C. K., and Ramaswamy, V. (2004). *The Future of Competition: Co-Creating Unique Value with Customers*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- Pratt, A. C. (2008). "Creative cities: The cultural industries and the creative class", *Geografiska Annaler: Series B, Human Geography*, 90, pp. 107–117.
- Pearce, D., and Butler, R. (Eds.) (1993). *Tourism Research: Critiques and Challenges*. London: Routledge.
- Peck, J. (2005). "Struggling with the creative class", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29, pp. 740–770.
- Pine II, J., and Gilmore, J. H. (1999). *The Experience Economy: Work is a Theatre and Every Business a Stage*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Ray, C. (1998). "Culture, intellectual property and territorial rural development", *Sociologia Ruralis*, 38, pp. 3-20.
- Raymond, C. (2007). "Creative tourism New Zealand: The practical challenges of developing creative tourism", in G. Richards and J. Wilson (Eds.), *Tourism, creativity and development* (pp. 145–157). London: Routledge.
- Rhodes, M. (1961). "An analysis of creativity", *Phi Delta Kappan*, 42, pp. 305–310.
- Richards, G. (2001). "The market for cultural attractions", in G. Richards (Ed.), *Cultural attractions, European tourism* (pp. 31–53). Wallingford: CABI.
- Richards, G. (2011). "Creativity and tourism: The state of the art", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 38(4), pp. 1225-1253.
- Richards, G. (2018). "Tourism, an underestimated driving force for the creative economy", pre-publication version of a paper for the UNCTAD Creative Economy Report. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/324646491_Tourism_an_underestimated_driving_force_for_the_creative_economy.
- Richards, G., and Raymond, C. (2000). "Creative tourism", *ATLAS News*, 23, pp. 16–20.
- Richards, G., and Wilson, J. (2006). "Developing creativity in tourist experiences: A solution to the serial reproduction of culture?", *Tourism Management*, 27, pp. 1408–1413.
- Richards, G. and Duxbury, N. (2021) "Trajectories and trends in creative tourism: Where are we headed?", In Duxbury, N., Claudia Pato Carvalho and Sara Albino (Eds.) *Creative Tourism: Activating Cultural Resources and Engaging Creative Travellers*. Wallingford: CABI.
- Ritchie, B.W. (2003). *Managing Educational Tourism*. Clevedon: Channel View Publications.
- Rogerson, C. M. (2006). "Creative industries and urban tourism: South African perspectives", *Urban Forum*, 17(2), pp. 149–166.
- Ross, D., Saxena, G., Correia, F. and Deutz, P. (2017). "Archaeological tourism: A creative approach", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 67, pp. 37-47.
- Rubenson, D. L., and Runco, M. A. (1992). "The psychoeconomic approach to creativity", *New Ideas in Psychology*, 10, pp. 131-147.
- Rubenson, D. L., and Runco, M. A. (1995). "The psychoeconomic view of creative work in groups and organizations", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 4, pp. 232- 241.
- Runco, M. A. (2004). "Creativity", *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, pp.657– 687.
- Smith, C. (1998). *Creative Britain*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Sternberg, R. J., and Lubart, T. I. (1992). "Buy low and sell high: An investment approach to creativity", *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1, pp. 1-5.
- Sternberg, R. J., and Lubart, T. I. (1995). *Defying the crowd: Cultivating creativity in a culture of conformity*. New York: Free Press.
- Tan, S-K., Kung, S-F., Luh, D-B. (2013). "A model of 'creative experience' in creative tourism", *Annals of Tourism Research*, 41, pp. 153–174.

- Tan, S-K., Luh, D-B., and Kung, S-F. (2014). "A taxonomy of creative tourists in creative tourism", *Tourism Management*, 42, pp. 248-259.
- Taylor, C. (1988). "Various approaches to and definitions of creativity", in R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The nature of creativity: Contemporary psychological perspectives*, pp. 99-121). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tur, N. (2016). "Experiential Tourism: A strategy for improving Competitiveness", Doctoral Thesis, UIB. Available at: https://dspace.uib.es/xmlui/bitstream/handle/11201/149019/Tur_Mari_Natalia.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y.
- UNESCO. (2006). "Towards Sustainable Strategies for Creative Tourism", Discussion Report of the Planning Meeting for 2008 *International Conference on Creative Tourism Santa Fe*, New Mexico, USA October 25-27, 2006.
- Vanolo, A. (2008). "The image of the creative city: Some reflections on urban branding in Turin", *Cities*, 25(6), pp. 370-382.
- Weisberg, R. W. (2006). *Creativity: Understanding innovation in problem solving, science, invention, and the arts*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.