

Margarita Kuleva

**Transgressing the Borders:
Manifesta European Biennial and its New
Public in Russia**

WP 2014-07

Bielefeld University



Universität Bielefeld

St. Petersburg State University



***Centre for German and
European Studies (CGES)***



CGES Working Papers series includes publication of materials prepared within different activities of the Center for German and European Studies both in St. Petersburg and in Germany: The CGES supports educational programmes, research and scientific dialogues. In accordance with the CGES mission, the Working Papers are dedicated to the interdisciplinary studies of different aspects of German and European societies.

This paper was prepared as part of the PhD Fellowship Program of the CGES. The empirical data was collected in the framework of the project “Youth Solidarities and Generations of XXI Century: Meaning of Labor and Consumption” (Academic Foundation Program of the Higher School of Economics) and supported by Manifesta Foundation.

Margarita Kuleva (MA, soc.) is researcher at the Centre for Youth Studies and lecturer at the Department of Sociology, National Research University – Higher School of Economics in St. Petersburg; PhD-fellow of the CGES.

Contact: zhenevskaya@mail.ru



Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Who, how & for what: Studying the audience of contemporary art	4
Methodology	6
Social profile of Manifesta 10 visitors	7
Patterns of cultural consumption of the visitors and behavior at the exhibition ...	11
Manifesta 10 as a tourist destination.....	13
Discussion and conclusion.....	16
References	19

Introduction

This paper attempts to analyze the impact of Manifesta 10, held in St. Petersburg in the summer and autumn of 2014. This event was unique for both European and Russian art-worlds: The European Biennial of Contemporary art Manifesta is one of the top three biennale of contemporary art in Europe (along with dOCUMENTA and the Venice Biennale) and was the first exhibition of global scale held in St. Petersburg and in Russia as well. Founded in the year of establishment of the European Union, Manifesta has made the concept of European identity one of the central issues in its curatorial agenda [Vanderlinden, Filipovic 2005: 15]. In particular, the idea of decentralization was expressed in the principle of holding the biennale every two years in a new European city. These have been Rotterdam, Luxembourg, Ljubljana, Frankfurt, Murcia, Donostia-San Sebastian, Trentino-Alto Adige/Südtirol region, Limburg and St. Petersburg as the easternmost venue.

Like one of the main exhibits of the biennale, Francis Alys's «Lada Kopeika» crashed in the yard of the Hermitage, Manifesta in St. Petersburg was a collision. The two sides could not remain the same and had to transform: Manifesta came face-to-face with the institutional features of Russian administration, quite dissimilar from its Western peers. The hosting venue, The State Hermitage, also experienced stress, letting in a contemporary exhibition with curatorial principles which were very new to it. As a result, Manifesta produced huge multidimensional effect by forcing the local art community to rethink their identity because of the new global perspective. The other side of the impact is less visible changes in the processes of cultural consumption and mediation of art, which this article is devoted to. Usually segregated in such places as centers of contemporary art, galleries, so-called “loft-projects”, and “creative spaces”, which are exotic for many visitors, this was the first time that contemporary art became so visible to residents and tourists. This phenomenon was connected with symbolically valuable legitimation of the Hermitage, and a wide advertising campaign on the streets, in the media and social networks.

The central focus of this article is the analysis of the socio-demographic and cultural profile of Manifesta 10 visitors and its comparison with the European public of previous Manifestas and other contemporary art events that have been studied by various European researchers. In particular, the article will describe the three main issues: the social portrait of Russian and European public, their systems of cultural consumption, and global events in the field of art as tourist attractions.

Who, how & for what: Studying the audience of contemporary art

Sociological tradition tends to associate patterns of cultural consumption with the stratification characteristics of the audience, starting with classical works, for example, "The Theory of the Leisure Class» [Veblen 2005]. The P. Bourdieu approach, which dominates in modern studies of cultural consumption, connects the characteristics of cultural preferences and volumes of economic and cultural capital, first of all with the social origins of the audience and higher education [Bourdieu 1984, 1990]. The understanding of classical art (as well as contemporary) needs special competences and knowledge, hard to achieve without access to education. Bourdieu defines three types of artistic tastes, corresponding to different social positions of the agent. The «legitimate» taste is mostly associated with highbrow cultural consumption (for example, opera), when institutions of legitimation confirm the value of observed cultural objects, unlike in cases of middlebrow and "popular" tastes. Bourdieu's approach was confirmed empirically in several studies [for example, see DiMaggio 1996; DiMaggio and Mukhtar 2004].

The most popular critique addressed to Bourdieu's theory is the concept of omnivore consumer/snob, developed by Peterson and Kern: «Among highbrows, the snob is one who does not participate in any lowbrow or middlebrow activity (Levine 1988), while the omnivore is at least open to appreciating them all... I operationalize omnivorousness as a variable that can be measured as the number of middle- and lowbrow forms respondents choose» [Peterson, Kern 1996:901]. Another critique and addition to Bourdieu theory is the idea of cultural variety inside the class-based groups. For example, as shown by other researchers [Katz-Gerro 2002], belonging to a class does not fully explain consumption as it is influenced by national and local peculiarities, age, gender and ethnicity. Another research shows that involvement in the visual arts and socio-economic status are connected, but indirectly, through the ownership of art objects and their copies [Silva 2006:156].

Different researchers have made attempts to classify cultural consumers based on a portfolio of their leisure preferences [see Roose 2008, Roose et al., Meuleman, Savage 2012; Chan, Goldthorpe 2007]. L. Hanquinet develops the approach of cultural profiles: "I argue that cultural profiles have to be considered as a 'bricolage' between several classifying registers or cultural repertoires that order and give meanings to practices and tastes" [Hanquinet 2013: 795]. Particularly, using multi correspondence analysis this research defines six cultural profiles of Belgian museum visitors. Two of them could be considered as the audience of contemporary art: profile 6, conceptualized as «art-lovers» are interested in contemporary art alongside with all other cultural activities; profile 3, described as «cultural progressists»: "highly educated people aged less than 35 who have an artistic background are over-represented. They build their lifestyle in a way opposed to the one of classically cultured visitors (cluster 1). Nevertheless, their attraction to high culture is

visible through the attendance at art places (contemporary art places, etc.) and their taste for contemporary art (rather than impressionism), which seems in line with the idea of a reconfiguration of cultural capital” (Ibid: 806).

The large-scale art events such as Manifesta and other biennales is a special subject for cultural consumption research. Several researchers highlighted the increasing popularity and importance of global art-events as a cultural form during recent decades [Bagdadli, Arrigoni 2005; Rodner et al. 2011]. The idea of global art-events fits into the logic of the “creative economy”, attracting the attention of tourists, and promotes the development of the territories where they take place [Vogel 2010; Oakley 2004]. Consequently, the visitors to large-scale art-events have specific features: the first, the bigger events could involve a broader public than museums and galleries, because of extended advertising opportunities, the second, global art-events are connected with their design as tourist attractions and means of promotion and branding of the city.

Manifesta as a case is even more specific: one of the most basic principles of the biennale is the construction of dialogues with different kinds of audience and the involvement of various city spaces in the biennale program: «Education, discursive projects, and public program are an important and integrated part of each Manifesta Biennial... Presented in a range of public spaces such as parks, stations, cinemas and other locations, these program intend to embed themselves in the cultural, social and political structure of the city in the hope of implementing the Manifesta 10 project in a more diversified, urban subculture» [Fijen 2014: 18]. Thus, Manifesta acts as a reflexive cultural actor trying to fight social inequality in the access to contemporary art.

A little sociological research has been carried out in the footsteps of Manifesta. They reveal key characteristics of European visitors to the Biennale¹, on which I focus in the paper. In particular, Manifesta 7 in north Italy and Manifesta 9 [Moons et al. 2013] in Belgium were the object of sociological investigation [Pechlaner, Lange 2008]. Both research projects apply quantitative methodology: formalized interviews with visitors (n=1394 in Italy and n=600 in case of Belgium).

Manifesta 9 in Genk, Limburg, entitled «In the deep of the modern» was a site-specific art event focused on coalmining industry which is very central in the region, for example, the main venue was situated in an abandoned mine. According to survey results, this connection was important for attracting the local public: one in five of Genk inhabitants visited the exhibition [Moon et al. 2013: 113]. As was found also, 27% of visitors were professionally connected with mining, but only 4% are those, who actually work in the mines [Ibid: 111]. Moon et al. characterize Manifesta 9 audience as «typical cultural participants»: the average income level (slightly higher than the mean across Belgium) allows them to be categorized as middle class, the majority of visitors have a broad interest in visual arts and visit exhibitions, theatre and dancing performances regularly. More than 30 percent of the visitors were older than 45 years [Ibid, 108].

¹ Author thanks Manifesta Foundation kindly grant her access to reports data

The share of art-professionals wasn't too big: 3000 visitors during the opening days are less than 3% of overall visitors (100866). In terms of geography, the majority of visitors came from the area of less than 500 km: 45% visitors are Belgian, 32% came from the Netherlands. The visitors evaluated the exhibition quite highly: the mean is 8/10 and about 25% gave 9/10 grade.

Manifesta 7 audience profile has a lot of common with Belgian one. Thus, the majority of visitors are interested in contemporary art (48%) and visit contemporary art exhibitions more often than once in a month (43%) and only 3% never attend to them [Pechlaner, Lange 2008:2-4]. What is more interesting, for more than 20%, Manifesta was the main reason to come to Italy. Similar to Manifesta 9, about a half of visitors were local (35% live in Province Bolzano and 42% in Trento). Another 21% came from other regions of Italy and 37% from abroad, mostly from the countries closest to the north of Italy – Germany (34%), Austria (21%) and other European countries – Netherlands, Belgium [Ibid: 15].

The gender proportion is slightly misbalanced towards female visitors: 57%/43%. The research allowed defining a few same-sized age groups of early and middle adulthood, which make up the majority: 25-35 (25%), 35-45 (20%), 45-55 (26%). The other age groups were represented relatively poorly: youth (12% of age 18-25 and 3% of under 18s) and elderly people (10% in age of 55-65 and only 4% of older than 65). What is dissimilar with Belgian data, the engagement of art-professionals, which has an enormous share of 18%.

To sum up, the European public of contemporary art in the case of Manifesta biennale could be described as the following: In terms of social-demographic profile, the visitors are in the middle-aged males and females (misbalanced towards females); they have higher education. In the case of Belgium, they have average income slightly higher than average across the country, in the case of Italy there is no direct data, but according to the data of the visitors planned consumption (restaurants and hotels) the situation could be similar. In terms of cultural consumption profile, in both cases visitors are active consumers of contemporary art and “highbrow” cultural activities in general. The analysis of Manifesta as a tourist attraction shows the popularity of short-distance tourism: the majority of non-locals came from the closest regions and countries to the destination.

Methodology

The empirical research of Manifesta 10 was conducted in July-September 2014 in St. Petersburg. The main method was the formalized interviews (questionnaire): 400 visitors were interviewed in three main locations of Manifesta 10: General Staff Building (235 interviews – 58,8%), Winter Palace (114 – 28,5%) and First Cadets Corpus (51 – 12, 8%).

The visitors were interviewed at the exit from the exhibition in the GSB and Cadets Corpus. In case of Winter Palace the interviews were collected in the

exact halls, where the Manifesta exhibits had been placed: exhibits were scattered throughout the building, which also has several exits.

The survey was conducted on selected days during July- September 2014: one day during weekend and one weekday at the peak of interest in the exhibition (July 2014); one day during the weekend and one weekday during a less popular tourist season (middle of August 2014), one day during the weekend and one weekday in September 2014 (an expected new wave of popularity of the biennale among St. Petersburg inhabitants). During each day session, approximately 80 questionnaires were collected. The respondents were selected using random sampling.

Social profile of Manifesta 10 visitors

The chapter draws the social-economic profile of Manifesta 10 visitors regarding age, gender and occupational status of the respondents. According to the survey, majority of visitors are female – 2/3. The Table 1 gives more specific information on the gender distribution across the M10 venues, generally reproducing the ratio seen in Table 1n; the gender disproportion gets especially visible in Cadets Corpus, where four out of five visitors were female.

Table 1 - Gender * Venues

		Gender		Total
		Female	Male	
Venue	GSB	150	81	231
		64,9%	35,1%	100,0%
	Winter Palace	77	35	112
		68,8%	31,3%	100,0%
	First Cadets Corpus	41	10	51
		80,4%	19,6%	100,0%
Total	Total	268	126	394
		68,0%	32,0%	100,0%

Source: Table by M.K.

The prevalence of women is not a big surprise – a few of studies of cultural consumption demonstrated that women are more active consumers of highbrow cultural activities [see for example, Silberberg 1995; Katz-Gerro 2002]. We also have seen a slight disproportion in studies of Manifesta. However, the massive gender misbalance apparently is primarily a Russian feature. Several researchers drew the similar situation [Илле 2002; Ананьев,

Папушина 2012]. As was mentioned in meta-study of big Russian museums, «during the 2000s ratio remains stable: 30% of men 70% of women with fluctuations in 1 - 2%» [Петрунина 2010: 65]. It can be assumed that these differences are related to the socialization of boys and girls in the Russian education system, which, according to Ярская-Смирнова, implicitly translates the dominant regime of gender: masculinity is associated with science, femininity with the humanities and arts.

The Table 2 shows the percentage of visitors in different age groups; we can see that young visitors prevail significantly (cumulative percent of interviewees of under 35 is 70%). It is important to note that gender balance in the most numerous age group (18 to 25 years) is even more shifted: 73,2% for females and consequently 26,8 for males. One of the initial hypotheses was the General Staff Building, as a specific site for contemporary art, would be more attractive for young visitors, while the older public would more likely visit traditional museums, like the Winter Palace. However, our data does not confirm this assumption: as shown in Table 2, in Winter Palace young people were also a majority; moreover, the percentage of the 18-25 years old age group is even higher than in the case of the GSB (40,4%).

Table 2 – Venue * Age of visitors

		Age of visitors					
		under 18	18-25	26-35	36-45	46-55	Older 56
GSB	Number of answers	14	79	67	30	19	24
	%	6,0%	33,9%	28,8%	12,9%	8,2%	10,3%
Winter Palace	Number of answers	8	46	23	21	6	10
	%	7,0%	40,4%	20,2%	18,4%	5,3%	8,8%
First Cadets Corpus	Number of answers	0	30	10	1	6	2
	%	0,0%	61,2%	20,4%	2,0%	12,2%	4,1%
Total	Number of answers	22	155	100	52	31	36
	%	5,6%	39,1%	25,3%	13,1%	7,8%	9,1%

Source: Table by M.K.

This data also shows significant differences from European ones. In particular, we can see that the group of young people 18-25 years old which was presented poorly in the case of Manifesta 7 are becoming the most numerous here (almost 40% of all the visitors). At the same time, the group of active cultural consumers in age of 46-55 is quite marginal here.

The latter also distinguishes visitors of Manifesta from other Russian art-events and museums. According to Илле 2002, St. Petersburg residents aged 40 to 60 years actively consume highbrow culture. Папушина identifies three main

age group of visitors to the museum of modern art PERMM, very similar to Manifesta 7 (visitors 45-59 up 24%). According to Ille, Petersburg residents aged 40 to 60 years actively consume highbrow culture. Папушина, 2012 identifies three main age group of visitors to the museum of modern art PERMM, very similar to Manifesta 7 (visitors aged 45-59 make up 24%). Lack of qualitative data does not allow a detailed analysis of the reasons why fewer people of this age group visited Manifesta , but it can be assumed, that the exhibition of contemporary art was too innovative for the older and perhaps more conservative group.

Yet the analysis shows that the visitors of three locations have similar characteristics in terms of gender and age; however, I have observed significant differences in the place of visitors' residence (see Table 3). Most visitors to the General Staff and the First Cadets Corpus currently live in St. Petersburg (69.4% and 82, 5%), while the majority of the Winter Palace public were tourists from other cities. These differences can be explained by the status of the Winter Palace as the city's main tourist attraction, which causes the prevalence of tourists over locals in this venue.

Table 3 - Venue * City of residence

			City of residence		Total
			St. Petersburg	Other city	
Venue	GSB	Number of answers	163	72	235
		%	69,4%	30,6%	100,0%
	Winter Palace	Number of answers	20	94	114
		%	17,5%	82,5%	100,0%
	First Cadets Corpus	Number of answers	43	8	51
		%	84,3%	15,7%	100,0%
Total		Number of answers	226	174	400
		%	56,5%	43,5%	100,0%

Source: Table by M.K.

The distribution of employment status shows the following numbers: 46.3% of visitors have full-time jobs, 28, 6% are students (8.8% of them have part-time

jobs, 7.8% - retired (2.5% of them also have part time work), 10.6% are self-employed and entrepreneurs, 2.5% - unemployed.

Employed visitors were also asked about their profession and position. The classification used in the survey is based on the classification of occupations ISCO-88, which is one of the most commonly used classifications for survey purposes. I adjusted the classification to our study by adding a category "artist" / "engaged in the sphere of art". However, the share of art-professionals was not that big: 7, 5% of the overall public. One could assume, that the majority of professional visitors attended to Manifesta 10 during the opening days (they were not included in the sampling). According to official post-release of the Biennale, the number of professionals were 1,544, which give us less than 0,11% of overall visitors or 1,72% of only GSB visitors. This again distinguishes the Russian version of Manifesta from previous ones in Europe, where the wider, non-specialized public were less involved.

The largest group of employed visitors consists of highly qualified specialists involved in immaterial labor and the development of new technologies; in particular, among the representatives of this group there are 29 university lecturers and researchers, 19 IT-professionals, 15 designers and architects, 8 doctors.

More detailed analysis of the most numerous group shows an extremely high percentage of respondents with higher education (82.3% have a bachelor's degree and masters, 11.5% have a candidate of science degree or PhD candidate). Median per capita income for the group range from 16000-25000 rubles / month to 30,000-50,000 rubles / month, which allows us to assign this group to the lower strata of the middle class. One could also define this group as a post-Soviet version of the «creative class» [Florida 2002], with high cultural capital and lower volumes of financial capital.

The share of non-working visitors is also quite significant, amounting in the aggregate 26.6%. The data collected at the GSB during the "open-museum day" (a day when the entry to the museum is free) gave me an opportunity to analyze the availability of the exhibition for the low-income groups. The data from this day shows significant changes in the social composition of the audience. In particular, the number of unemployed students attending the exhibition increased by 8.5 percent, the number of students with part time jobs - by 5.1 percent. The latter indicates the existence of a hidden financial barrier to entry, which was not revealed by the question about the adequacy of the price of the ticket – only 3% of the visitors indicated that the price was too high.

To sum up, here are the main social characteristics of the Manifesta 10 audience: the majority of the visitors in all three venues were young people (70 percent of the visitors of up to 35 years); the majority of visitors were female (60 percent); the relatively new cultural spaces (Cadets Corpus and the General Staff Building) were more visible and attractive to the residents of St. Petersburg, while more than 80% of the audience of the famous Winter Palace were tourists; most visitors were educated professionals working in

knowledge-intensive sectors. The most popular profession were university lecturer / researcher.

Patterns of cultural consumption of the visitors and behavior at the exhibition

This chapter focuses on the nexus between the patterns of respondents' cultural consumption and their decision to visit M10 as well as their assessment of the exhibition.

Particularly, the visitors of Manifesta were asked questions about their interest in art, whether they had experience of art education during school years and adulthood. Most visitors to Manifesta had been in some way engaged in studying art: only 23,1% had no experience of art education in their entire lives.

The majority of visitors are at least interested in some forms of art; it is therefore surprising that our analysis of cultural consumption patterns reveals that the majority of interviewees visit cultural events rather rarely. The respondents were asked about attendance of classical music and opera events, events in other music genres, cinema, theatres, contemporary art exhibitions, and traditional museums. All these types of activities follow the similar pattern; here I present the results on contemporary art and traditional museums as an example:

Table 4 - Cultural consumption – museums and contemporary art exhibitions

	Museums and art before 1950s, %	Contemporary art, %
Once a year or less	26,4	38,1
Every six months	21,1	18,3
Every three months	20,6	18,0
Monthly	14,6	13,5
Several times in month and more often	17,3	12,0
Number of answers	398	399

Source: Table by M.K.

The data presented in the Table 4 shows that less than 32% of interviewees visit museums and exhibitions of classical art at least once a month. In case of contemporary art the percentage is even lower: only 25, 5% visitors come to the exhibitions monthly and more often. It is important to note that the percentage of non-visitors (those who visit once a year, less or never visited) is very high in both cases – 26,1% for museums and 38,1% for contemporary art.

The latter draws another distinction between the Russian and European audiences of contemporary art, where the majority of those, whom the researchers met at the expos were already motivated and engaged visitors of contemporary art familiar with the brand of Manifesta (let me re-emphasize, according to Pechlaner and Lange 20% of visitors intentionally came to Italy to see Manifesta).

A possible explanation is that the systems of distribution and consumption of contemporary art in

Europe and Russia are not equally developed and are at different stages: for the European countries, art-events of the global scale hardly could be called novel (for example, dOCUMENTA has been held in Kassel since 1955) and the public of these events has already formed, in Russia contemporary art was «legalized» only after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Besides Manifesta was not only the first event of international level, but the first event which came to be seen on the streets because of various performances and out-door installations, as well as huge promo-campaign (big orange boxes in the center of the city, advertisements in the subway, on billboards). Another proof of successful art-mediation is that 62,4% visitors from St. Petersburg and 91,1% visitors from other cities did not visit the General Staff Building before Manifesta (and 20,4%/63,4% had never heard about the GSB).

The analysis also demonstrates that the art-mediation was connected not only with mass media, but was two-stepped: 46,1% of overall visitors got information about Manifesta because of their friends and colleagues or other situations of word-of-mouth-communication. For example, one of interviewees mentioned her son as Manifesta mediator: «My son wouldn't stop talking about Manifesta» *(«Мой сын мне все уши прожужжал»), she said. Surprisingly, this source was also effective even for visitors from other cities.

Part of the empirical study was the assessment of visitors' satisfaction. We asked the interviewees to assess the exhibition on a scale of one to ten, where 1 is the lowest and 10 is the highest grade. The overall grade announces quite a high result – 7.6/10. The mode score was also very high – 8/10. However, the analysis revealed more or less significant differences in assessment across different groups of visitors. The factors of age, gender and city of residence, the frequency of visiting contemporary art exhibitions were not significant, despite the expectations: the initial hypothesis was that those visitors who attend contemporary art events more often would assess the exhibition higher.

What was counter intuitive is the observed correlation between the dates when the interviewee first got to know about the fact Manifesta 10 would take place in St. Petersburg and assessment of the exhibition. As the survey results demonstrate the significant difference between two groups: the group of early informed visitors, shows highest (8, 21) and the lowest (7,13) grades overall. The interpretation could be the following: those informed very early could also be those best informed about the debates preceding Manifesta, readers of professional art media, who could therefore be aware of the discussion of possible boycott of Manifesta. Those visitors, who got to know about Manifesta

10 about 6 month ago, could be called «fans» of the biennale – they were in the focus of a PR-campaign and hence could get detailed and attractive information through official channels of MANIFESTA 10 and many different magazines and other resources on lifestyle.

Thus, the research results underline significant difference between European and Russian visitors of global scale contemporary art events regarding visitors' cultural profiles. If the majority of the European audience are motivated regular visitors of contemporary art events (with a rather big percentage of art-professionals), Russian visitors are mostly newcomers, those who visit contemporary art exhibitions (as well as other highbrow events) very rarely or even never visited such events before. Considering the high positive assessment of the exhibition, this result looks promising for the development of contemporary art in Russia: the potential audience is much broader than those who are already involved in such cultural consumption

Manifesta 10 as a tourist destination

The focus of this chapter is a more detailed analysis of Manifesta 10 public from other cities (not from St. Petersburg). I describe particularly the features of the European biennale as a tourist destination, thus, I try to assess the tourist attraction of the exhibition.

As mentioned, the tourists from other cities are about half the total number of visitors (43.5%). However, the non-resident public is distributed over three main venues of Biennale unevenly: tourists are the main audience of the Winter Palace (82.5%), a third of the visitors of the General Staff (30.6%) and only a small part of those who came in First Cadets Corps (17.5%). The non-resident visitors group is divided into two big subgroups: visitors from other cities of Russia (58% of all non-residents) and foreign visitors.

Despite the expectations, the hypothesis of closeness (people from closer cities would visit the biennial more likely than people from the distant cities) doesn't work: only 1,7% came from Leningrad region, the closest area to St. Petersburg. Thus, the more detailed analysis of public from the cities of Russia indicates the greater number visitors from quite distant regions (see Table 5).

The analysis of visitors' distribution among cities of Russia indicates high dispersion: one-two visitors from each one represent 45 regions of the country here. The only exceptions are Rostov and Moscow regions. Rostov accounted for 5 visitors, which could be connected with many factors, which is not possible to define certainly without undertaking additional research, the possible interpretation is specifics of pr-campaign of the biennale.

Table 5 - Visitors from other cities of Russia

	Number of visitors		Number of visitors
Amur region	1	Penza region	1
Bashkortostan	1	Perm region	1
Belgorod region	2	Privolzhsky region	1
Vladimir region	1	Pskov	1
Volgograd region	2	Komi republic	1
Voronezh region	1	Crimea	1
Irkutsk	1	Marii-El Republic	1
Kemerovo region	3	Rostov region	5
Kirov region	2	Ryazan region	1
Krasnodar region	3	Samara region	2
Krasnoyarsk region	3	Saratov region	2
Kurgan region	2	Sverdlovsk region	1
Kursk region	1	Siberia federal region	1
Magadan region	1	Tatarstan	1
Mogilev region	1	Tver region	1
Mordovia	1	Ulyanovsk region	1
Moscow	17	Ural federal region	3
Moscow region	15	Khnatymansiysk region	1
Murmansk region	2	Central federal region	2
Nizhniy Novgorod	2	Chelyabinsk region	1
Novosibirsk region	4	Yakutia	1
Omsk region	1	Yaroslavl region	1
Orel region	1	All answers	104

Source: Table by M.K.

Moscow, presented by 32 visitors (33, 3% of visitors from the cities of Russia and 8% of overall visitors) is a more interesting case: Moscow interviewees came to St. Petersburg to visit Manifesta 10 despite higher density of cultural life related to contemporary art in their home town (for example, there are several institutions in Moscow, which are able to hold world class exhibitions - "Garage" museum and cultural cluster "Vinzavod" are among them).

The visitors from foreign countries could be also split into three groups: tourists from CIS-countries (Ukraine, Belorussia and others countries ex-members of Soviet Union, 11% of all visitors not from St. Petersburg), visitors from Europe (17%), in particular, the leading countries are Germany, Holland, Finland; other countries (12%, including visitors from the USA, Israel, South Korea).

The above distribution in countries and cities would have to recognize that the hypothesis of geographical closeness, which was adequate in Europe, does not work in the Russian case. In particular, it is clearly seen in the case of many Russian tourists from distant cities (3,000 km or more). The only exception to this may be visitors from Finland and Moscow, the closest locations to St. Petersburg.

The non-resident visitors were asked a set of additional questions; in order to learn more about their trip to St. Petersburg. In particular, I asked them about the purposes of their visit. The table 6 displays the majority of non-residents came to St. Petersburg for leisure purposes (cumulative percentage is 85,5%).

Table 6 - Purposes of visit to St. Petersburg

	Number of answers
Work	5,7
Tourism	62,6
Manifesta 10	8,0
Study	5,2
Visiting relatives and friends	14,9
Other	3,4
Number of answers	174

Source: Table by M.K.

Then one can define the large-scale group of «general interest» tourists (62, 6 %) and the smaller group of highly motivated Manifesta visitors (8%), which should be analyzed more carefully. But first it is important to mention that it would not be correct to remain with the opinion that Manifesta did not attract the «general interest» group to come to St. Petersburg. The collected data proves that 32,8% from the «general interest» group and 42,9% of those who were visiting friends/relatives knew about Manifesta 10 at least one month before the visit to St. Petersburg and could take it into account when planning their summer trips.

The analysis of the group of highly motivated visitors displays significant correlation between the purpose to see Manifesta 10, and the fact that the visitors were informed early about the exhibition: 28, 6% of that group received the information about 1 year ago, 64,3% - several month ago, and only 7,1% - one month ago. Most of representatives of this group are very similar to the

European public of Manifesta: most of them are from European countries, 92% of them have higher education, the income of 71, 4% is higher than 100000 rubles per month. This group is also «older» than the majority of visitors: 71, 4% is older than 35.

Another important feature of Manifesta visitors from the other cities is the personal connection with St. Petersburg inhabitants, which could be additional motivation for choosing St. Petersburg (and Manifesta 10) as a tourist destination. Despite the fact that only 14,9% mentioned visiting friends or relatives as the main purpose of their travel, 36,6% of tourist prefer to stay at friends' or relatives' houses.

Discussion and conclusion

In this paper I analyze the main social stratificational features and cultural consumption profile of Manifesta 10 visitors in comparison with the European public of global art events, primarily with previous editions of Manifesta Biennale.

Here I would like to summarize the results of empirical research of Manifesta 10 and then interpret in more detail the distinctions and similarities with European experience.

The majority of the visitors of Manifesta in all three main venues were young people - 70 percent of the visitors are less than 35 years old. There is gender disproportion, about 70% are female. New cultural spaces (Cadets Corpus and the General Staff Building) were more visible and attractive to the residents of St. Petersburg, while more than 80% of the audience of the famous Winter Palace were tourists. Most visitors were educated professionals working in knowledge-based sectors: the most popular professions were university lecturer / researcher, designer, it-worker.

Despite the expectations, the majority visitors of Manifesta are rare visitors of contemporary art events and museum exhibitions: more than 40% visit them once a year or even more rarely. The latter is a good proof of Manifesta success of contemporary art mediation: the biennale attracted not only tiny community of art lovers, but also a wider public. For example, 70% of the General staff building visitors attended it for the first time.

Half of the audience of Manifesta is from other cities: the quarter is from other regions of Russia, another quarter from other countries – mostly Europe. Important to note, that a big share of visitors was from Moscow, the capital city, and a place with a very active cultural life.

As a result of comparison, I found several similarities and significant differences in behavior and social features of Russian and European audiences. In particular, the research showed that in both cases the audience is socially homogeneous: just like European visitors most the majority of the Russian audience have higher education and level of income, which allow us to describe them as middle class (in the Russian case, lower strata of middle class). In terms of age groups, the Russian case is biased because of huge prevalence of younger public: 70% of visitors are up to 35, while the older

visitors are poorly represented. If the European audience consists of well-motivated contemporary art-lovers with a significant share of art-professionals, the majority of Russian visitors visit contemporary art exhibitions rarely or never. This result is promising for the Russian art-system, which is still in process of becoming institutionalized. Both European and Russian audiences combine local public and tourists from other regions in similar proportions. However, if the European edition of Manifesta attracts larger flows from neighboring regions, Manifesta 10 is characterized by a long tail: small groups from many distant locations.

I tend to explain the major distinctions between the two groups of visitors through the difference in process of institutionalization of contemporary art in Russia and Europe. As it was already mentioned above, Europeans are more familiar with the field of contemporary art. The status of contemporary art was legitimated by the traditional museums or other powerful institutions very early in comparison with Russia: Centre Georges-Pompidou was opened in 1977 and was initiated by the president of France, MuHKA of Antwerp, Belgium opened in 1980s on behalf of the ministry of culture; Mumok (Austria) was established in 1982 in front of classical palaces of Vienna (now together they are the famous Museum Quarter). By contrast, before 1991 in Russia contemporary art was an underground movement with only a few exceptions, because of the USSR's cultural policy suppressing it. Then, in 1992 the National Centre for Contemporary Art was opened in several cities in Russia (Moscow, St. Petersburg, Kaliningrad, Samara and others). However, the status and access to these cultural institutions are different in Russia and European countries: if mentioned above museums in Europe are main cultural attractions in their regions, located in the very centre of the city in buildings specially constructed for their purposes, the NCCA seems hidden and tiny in just one floor of a historical building on Liteiny prospect. Hence, we can see that for European countries contemporary art is a) a valuable part of cultural policy, legitimated by the state and heritage institutions; b) an ordinary part of the urban environment and, at the same time, an attraction for sightseeing. By contrast, in Russian cities (at least, in case of St. Petersburg) contemporary art is marginalized.

Thus, the difference between the social positions of contemporary art phenomena in Europe and Russia explains some distinctions in visitors' behavior. As a result, the audience of the European event in the case of Manifesta 7 contains 31% more regular visitors of contemporary art events. This factor also potentially explains the decrease of 45-55 age group in Russian case: this group was socialized and went to university in late Soviet times, when the access to contemporary art had only specific milieus of intellectuals or those who knew artists personally. This interpretation frame could be applied for explanation of the touristic features of Manifesta 10 and the previous issues: contemporary art centered tourism is much more popular in Europe than in Russia, where only 0,5% of overall public intentionally came to see Manifesta from other cities of Russia (in case of Manifesta 7 – more 20%).

The other factor rooted in deeper dissimilarities of European and Russian societies. First, I explain gender disproportion of Manifesta 10 public through

dominated gender regime and system of education connected with it, which define art as something more associated with femininity.

This factor of dissimilarities between European and Russian societies also could be a possible explanation for differences in global touristic perspective. As I previously mentioned, European Manifesta attracted massive flows from the neighbor regions, while Manifesta 10 visitors are highly dispersed in terms of their residence: in fact, in our sample we had only 1,7% from Leningrad region and one person from the city nearby – Pskov. First, the lack of visitors from Finland and Estonia could be connected with the border factor: the inhabitants of European countries had to apply for Russian visa for this trip. The second, hypothetically, the difference could be explained by the regional development of Russia and Europe. Europe is characterized by a high density of urban units and good transport links between them. This leads to the development of cultural ties between the cities and regional tourism. The latter does not happen in Russia with less density of urban population, where there is an explicit hierarchy between central and peripheral cities, resulting in the type of mobility between them, including tourism. However, this would explain the situation fully if the inhabitants of St. Petersburg do not visit an exhibition in Pskov, for example, but not the contrary. That is why I propose to include class-based criteria to this hypothetical model: potential Manifesta visitors with high volume of cultural capital tend to live in big cities (even more distant), they are represented less in small towns, close to St. Petersburg.

Finally, I would like to argue that based on some social features (first, gender, age and cultural experience), the public of Russian and European global contemporary art events is still very homogeneous, representatives of middle class with higher education and slightly above -average income. This put us again in Bourdieusian logic, we can see social background and taste are connected in two various institutional contexts. Yet, I do not think that the project of contemporary art and broader – the museum – democratization (whose strongest adept Manifesta is) has failed. In particular, Manifesta used many different forms of urban intervention, such as performances, sculptures, other installations, conceptual guided tours. All of them took contemporary art away from the symbolic border of the white cube and could attract other types of public.

I would like to include the complex research of museum-based and urban intervention-based activities of contemporary art and their public as a perspective for further investigation. Another constraint of current research is the lack of qualitative data that could help to see motives, meanings and feelings of the visitors and what is more important non-visitors of contemporary art. The long-term effects of Manifesta also need further research. In particular, one of the research results suggests that the potential public for contemporary art in St. Petersburg is much wider than those visitors who are already actively involved in the practices of consumption and mediation. Manifesta has symbolically linked the Hermitage as an institution of legitimate taste and places of contemporary art (various participants of the parallel program) and the possible impact is growth of active visitors of contemporary art.

References

1. Bagdadli, S., & Arrigoni, L. (2005). Strategic positioning of the Venice Biennial: Analysing the market for periodic contemporary art exhibitions. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 22-31.
2. Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. Harvard University Press.
3. Bourdieu, P., Darbel, A., & Schnapper, D. (1990). *The love of art: European art museums and their public*.
4. Chan, T. W., & Goldthorpe, J. H. (2007). Social stratification and cultural consumption: The visual arts in England. *Poetics*, 35(2), 168-190.
5. DiMaggio, P. (1996). Are art-museum visitors different from other people? The relationship between attendance and social and political attitudes in the United States. *Poetics*, 24(2), 161-180.
6. DiMaggio, P., & Mukhtar, T. (2004). Arts participation as cultural capital in the United States, 1982–2002: Signs of decline? *Poetics*, 32(2), 169-194.
7. Fijen, H. (2014). "What has to be done?" Manifesta 10, Two Decades of a European Biennial (1st ed.). In: K. König, E. Andreeva, E. Degot (2014). *Manifesta 10*. Köln: König, Walther.
8. Florida, R. L. (2002). *The rise of the creative class: And how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. Basic books.
9. Hanquinet, L. (2013). Visitors to modern and contemporary art museums: Towards a new sociology of 'cultural profiles'. *The Sociological Review*, 61(4), 790-813.
10. Katz-Gerro, T. (2002). Highbrow cultural consumption and class distinction in Italy, Israel, West Germany, Sweden, and the United States. *Social Forces*, 81(1), 207-229.
11. Meuleman, R., & Savage, M. (2013). A field analysis of cosmopolitan taste: Lessons from the Netherlands. *Cultural Sociology*, 7(2), 230-256.
12. Moons, A., Valgaeren, P., Van Oost, O., & Pauwels, C. (2013). *Ruimte Voor Hedendaagse Kunst in Limburg? Een onderzoek naar de betekenis en impact van de hedendaagse kunstinitiatieven Manifesta 9, Z33 en pit binnen een laatmoderne Limburgse samenleving*. Brussel: iMinds-SMIT, Vrije Universiteit Brussel.
13. Oakley, K. (2004). Not so cool Britannia the role of the creative industries in economic development. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 7(1), 67-77.
14. Peterson, R. A., & Kern, R. M. (1996). Changing highbrow taste: From snob to omnivore. *American Sociological Review*, 900-907.

15. Rodner, V. L., Omar, M., & Thomson, E. (2011). The brand-wagon: Emerging art markets and the Venice Biennale. *Marketing Intelligence & Planning*, 29(3), 319-336.
16. Roose, H. (2008). Many-voiced or unisono? An inquiry into motives for attendance and aesthetic dispositions of the audience attending classical concerts. *Acta Sociologica*, 51(3), 237-253.
17. Roose, H., van Eijck, K., & Lievens, J. (2012). Culture of distinction or culture of openness? Using a social space approach to analyze the social structuring of lifestyles. *Poetics*, 40(6), 491-513.
18. Silva, E. B. (2006). Distinction through visual art. *Cultural Trends*, 15(2-3), 141-158.
19. Silberberg, T. (1995). Cultural tourism and business opportunities for museums and heritage sites. *Tourism Management*, 16(5), 361-365
20. Vanderlinden, B., & Filipovic, E. (Eds.). (2005). *The Manifesta decade: Debates on contemporary art exhibitions and biennials in post-wall Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Mit Press.
21. Veblen, T. (2005). *The theory of the leisure class; An economic study of institutions*. Aakar Books.
22. Vogel, S. B. (2010). *Biennials: Art on a global scale*. Springer Verlag.
23. Папушина Ю. О, Ананьев М. «Тусовщики», «обогащающиеся духовно» и другие в музее современного искусства «permm» (г. Пермь): анализ публики одной выставки актуального искусства // Е. Г. Ясин (ред.). XIII Международная научная конференция по проблемам развития экономики и общества. – М.: Издательский дом НИУ ВШЭ. – 2012. – Т.2 – С. 447-453.
24. Илле М. Е. Петербуржцы в театрах, на концертах и выставках: исследование художественной жизни Санкт-Петербурга конца XX-начала XXI века. – Норма, 2008.
25. Петрунина Л. Я. Публика художественных музеев //Социологические исследования. – 2010. – №. 10. – С. 63-74.
26. Ярская-Смирнова Е. Р. Гендерная социализация в системе образования: скрытый учебный план //Личность и свобода.– Саратов. Гос. пед. ин. – 2001. – Т. 2002. – С. 192-195.



ZDES Working Papers

Arbeitspapiere des Zentrums für Deutschland- und Europastudien

Рабочие тетради Центра изучения Германии и Европы

Universität Bielefeld – Fakultät für Soziologie
Postfach 100131 – 33501 Bielefeld – Deutschland

Staatliche Universität St. Petersburg – 7/9 Universitetskaja Nab.
199034 St. Petersburg – Russland

<http://zdes.spbu.ru/>

info@zdes.spbu.ru