

## PHASING IN STRATEGIC THOUGHT: THE CASE OF FOLK FESTIVALS

A. H. Walle  
Smithsonian Institution

### ABSTRACT

Marketers often fail to appreciate the strategic skills of those who work in the arts. This paper focuses upon the tactics of those involved in a specific arts activity: the folk festival. Viewing this profession as representative of the arts, perhaps we can learn to be more effective when interacting with such people as consultants and colleagues.

### INTRODUCTION

Those from the business disciplines often assume that modern management and marketing techniques provide universal tools and that all organizations should be directed by such techniques.

The arts are often pointed to as professions which can benefit from modern marketing techniques. According to the stereotypes of our era, people with an artistic bent often appear to be fuzzy minded, not strategic in their orientations, and are fertile ground for the marketer looking for new horizons and/or clients.

This paper argues, via an historic example, that people in the arts often embody a well thought out strategic orientation and use skillfully crafted tactics to achieve their goals. To portray this situation, I will narrow my focus and concentrate upon a specific type of event, the folk festival, and explore how such events are brought to the public.

By dealing with a specific activity in isolation, the issues involved can be explored in greater detail and the strategic implications more carefully examined. In addition, the achievements of those who present folk festivals can be spotlighted. Doing so is especially valuable in an era in which marketing and tourism professionals are teaming up with those in the arts who present cultural events which are intended to invigorate regional economies.

### THE FOLK FESTIVAL: AN HISTORIC OVERVIEW

Before proceeding, it is useful to briefly examine the modern folk festival and how this type of event has evolved. Folklore, as a discipline, has been in existence for over one hundred years. Largely inspired by the Romantic era, which typically celebrated the "noble yeoman" and the work of Jean Jacques Rousseau (whose theories of "the noble savage" led people to believe that civilization debased and crushed the human spirit), early folklorists were primarily concerned with salvaging aspects of humanity before they believed such traits would be destroyed by the onslaught of civilization.

As a result of the activities of such scholars, collectors, and fieldworkers, many examples of song, folk literature, traditions, and aspects of material culture were gathered and brought to the attention of the general public. As a result, tastes increasingly began to be influenced by folk art and literature; indeed, the "arts and crafts" movement--a major phenomena in the history of late 19th-early 20th century styles of furniture, home furnishings, and architecture etc.-- was directly inspired by such activities and orientations.

Eventually (in the 1930s) folk festivals sprang up (see Wilson & Udall 1983 for a brief history

of the folk festival); the popularity of such activities, however, seems to have waned during World War II. In the 1950s, furthermore, folk music aroused the suspicions of political conservatives who felt the music and those who sung it were subversive; indeed, certain notable performers (such as Pete Seeger) found themselves blacklisted during the McCarthy era. As a result, folklore and folk music experienced significant setbacks.

By the 1960s, however, a phenomena known as the "folk music revival" made a significant impact upon the popular culture of the era (and subsequent decades). Folk "revivalists" are performers who, while not actually "folk" themselves, sing traditional songs and/or perform in a folk style. During the revival era, various groups such as The New Cristy Minstrels, The Brothers Four and The Kingston Trio set the stage for a general public acceptance of folk music. Individual talents such as Bob Dylan and Joan Baez began to popularize a musical style which was less "polished" and more a reflection of how folk music was performed "in situ".

Riding this tide of popularity, one of the most famous folk festivals (the Newport Folk Festival) enjoyed a brief, but high profile existence during the 1960s. Although there may be subtle differences between Newport and the contemporary folk festival, the basic orientation was clearly in place at that time: the featured performers were actual "folk". If revivalist artists performed they were identified as such. Careful attention was made to place the achievements of the folk in a cultural as well as an artistic context; typically "presenters" (knowledgeable people who interface between the featured "folk" and the audience) were used to educate the public and reduce the stress experienced by the performers.

As the 1960s wore on and the age of the counterculture came to full flower, folk music (or folk-like music) became a major force of social change and the protest music of the era. Performers included those who catered to a circumscribed audience (as Bob Dylan did during his early career), and others such as Peter Paul and Mary who appealed to a more mainstream market. As was the case during the McCarthy era, folk music and protest against the status quo became connected in the public mind; this time, however, the music and its performers were not blacklisted. In addition, many members of the counterculture embraced what they felt was a "folk" lifestyle and asserted such an existence was a preferable alternative to mainstream middleclass life.

Eventually, as is the case with most fads, the popularity of folk music and folk culture faded as a major, mainstream phenomena. Interest in the folk and their culture, however, did not die out completely; it became a province of a smaller group, but one which has stronger loyalties than those who merely follow the fad of the moment.

#### AN EMERGING CRISIS

As the memories of the 1960s faded and members of the baby boomer counterculture acquired families, debts, and other responsibilities, their ability to attend folk festivals changed. Due to economic pressures, furthermore, the money needed to present folk festivals became harder and harder to come by.

As it happened, the financial crisis faced by those who were interested in presenting folk festivals coincided with economic crises faced by other institutions and by geographic areas. In specific, various states, regions, and parks became interested in encouraging tourism. The developmental staff of such organizations tended to feel that tourism could be encouraged if specific events of interest to the public were staged. Folk festivals, an activity of broad public interest which caters to diverse tastes, emerged as a viable option for encouraging various people to visit a specific location. Much of the literature regarding festivals, in general, (Getz 1991) and folk festivals, in specific, (Wilson & Udall 1983) has overtly embraced a marketing perspective and orientation; thus, folk festivals were poised to serve in this capacity..

A major problem existed, however; although various organizations interested in economic

development were willing to present folk festivals, they did not have the expertise required to make such events successful. Folk festivals are complicated events and they are not particularly analogous to other cultural events which celebrate "high" or mainstream culture. Without the ability to acquire such knowledge and skill, the would-be sponsor risked the doom of failure.

To capitalize upon this situation, those who present folk festivals have devised at least two distinct ways to transfer the required expertise to such groups. One, typified by the National Council For The Traditional Arts' National Folk Festival, goes to the group involved and teaches them the rudiments of festival production on its own turf. An alternative, represented by the Smithsonian's Festival Of American Folklife, brings people from various regions to its Washington D. C. festival and often teaches these people how to successfully present festivals once they return home.

This paper will compare and contrast these two means of providing outside groups with the skills required for the presentation of a successful folk festival. The broader implications of these examples will also be discussed.

#### THE NATIONAL FOLK FESTIVAL: TRAINING PEOPLE ON THEIR OWN TURF

The longest running, and according to many, the most prestigious of all major folk festivals is the National Folk Festival. Founded over 50 years ago, the festival has had an evolving existence and one which responded to circumstance and opportunity. In the earliest phase of its existence, the festival was held in a different city each year. Eventually, the festival found a permanent home at Wolf Trap, a cultural and entertainment complex which serves the greater Washington, D. C. community. Washington is an area where there is a strong grassroots interest in folklore and folk music and the festival was successful in that environment even if the D. C. area has such an abundance of folk events that, perhaps, the National lost some of its notoriety. This became especially true after the Festival Of American Folklife emerged in the 1970s as a major cultural event.

Although the National was experiencing a shifting role in the cultural milieu of Washington, no changes were made until another type of crisis emerged; Wolf Trap was destroyed by fire in the early 1980s and the National Folk Festival no longer had a home.

As a result of these unforeseen circumstances, the National went back on the road. Today it remains there even though Wolf Trap is rebuilt and back in operation. While in the early years the festival had a one-year visit at a location, however, the festival now makes a three year commitment. This longer time frame allows the staff of the National Council For The Traditional Arts (NCTA) ample opportunity to train the local people so they will be able to continue a free standing festival after the National moves on to a new location.

The staff of the National Council For The Traditional Arts, led by Joe Wilson, targets parks hoping to expand their cultural programming and cities which have recently rebuilt their downtowns and seek to present activities to draw the public. This kind of tactic has recently been described in the tourism marketing literature as one of the alternative methods for changing a negative image with which a community is saddled (Ahmed 1991). The NCTA has been pursuing such state of the art tourism marketing tactics since the early 1980s. Closely linked to economic development, cultural tourism strategies which parallel those of the NCTA are in place internationally; The European Conference On Culture Tourism And Regional Development, for example, is active in devising ways to use cultural tourism to advance economic agendas (Jafari 1992). Thus, the NCTA and its work is consistent with modern marketing thought regarding festivals and their economic/marketing functions.

As a result of the needs of their partners, the NCTA consciously decided to stay three years at one location in order to provide the local staff with the "critical mass" of experience they would need to maintain a festival after the National Folk Festival departed. This strategy has met with an success.

The first festival held after the Wolf Trap fire was staged in 1983. The location was The Cayahoga National Recreation Area, a part of the National Park network which is located near Cleveland, Ohio. The location was ideal because a pool of veterans of folk festival work (such as Al McKenney) lived in the area. Ohio State University, only 100 miles away, had important folklorists such as Pat Mullens on the faculty. The Ohio Arts Council had folklorists such as Tim Lloyd on staff. Most importantly, however, was the fact that Kent State University-- only 20 minutes drive from the festival site--had long held its own folk festival. As a result, Joe Wilson and the NCTA staff (including Meg Glaser, Pete and Arlene Reiniger, and Rich Kennedy) were able to tap a wide array of local talent when they came to Ohio. Much of this talent, furthermore, had previously worked as a unit presenting folk festivals.

The three year stay at Cayahoga Valley was crucial for the evolution of the National Recreation Area's cultural programming, the NCTA, and the National Folk Festival, itself. Not only did the experience gained allow the Recreation Area set up the infrastructure and procedures required to maintain a festival after the National left, the NCTA developed the skills required to teach others how to successfully present festivals.

Using their experiences with the National Folk Festival as the raw material for the book Folk Festivals: A Handbook For Organization And Management (1983), Wilson had long sought to provide others with the skills needed to present folk festivals. Starting in 1983 at Cayahoga, however, he turned his attention from writing to hands on training via the National Folk Festival.

In retrospect, we can see how good a choice the Cayahoga Valley was. Today the local Cayahoga Festival (produced under the direction of John Reynolds) has replaced the National; it made the transition in a natural and productive way and it has emerged as a major tourist attraction for Northcentral Ohio. In addition, many of the staff, recruited in National Folk Festival days, have remained with the Cayahoga Festival. Thus, a major goal of the NCTA--helping free-standing festivals to establish themselves--has been achieved.

In spite of this success, the NCTA had not yet been put to the true test; could the National Folk Festival successfully spawn an ongoing event in areas where there was no pre-existent folk festival in the immediate area. Or would the NCTA require the help of an established festival (and the network it creates) to establish an ongoing locally produced event?

These abilities were tested between the years 1987 and 1989 when the Festival was located in Lowell Massachusetts. In the 19th century, Lowell was a major industrial city, a role it maintained until after World War II. Changing demographics and industrial patterns, however, led to economic decline. In the 1980s, the National Park Service acquired many of the old buildings of this early industrial era and adapted them for recreational use. An urban, not a rural park, it celebrates the achievements of people, not the wonders of nature.

As time went on, the National Park Service and the people of Lowell felt a major event was needed to introduce the general public to the benefits the park and the city had to offer. As a result, the NCTA agreed to hold The National Folk Festival in Lowell starting in 1987. In this case, however, the NCTA did not have an established network of local, seasoned staff in place to help them run the festival.

In spite of such obstacles, the NCTA worked with the National Park Service and park administrators such as Sandy Walters and with various Lowell community groups. Initially, the NCTA was responsible for the vast majority of organizing and it provided (and/or helped recruit) the key staff members who both planned the festival and actually ran it.

As time went on, however, local people and the National Park Service took on more and more responsibility until, by the last year the lion's share of the work was performed in Lowell. Thus, the

NCTA transferred the skills needed to run a major tourist attraction, but did so slowly enough so that local organizations had a good chance of success in establishing their own festival as an ongoing event.

Today the heir of the National Folk Festival is the Lowell Festival. It is local in nature and is a major and successful tourist attraction and cultural event. Although independent, the NCTA has not cut the Lowell Festival off "cold turkey". When required, support in the form of consulting and technical aid are provided. Since the NCTA maintains a network of qualified support staff, furthermore, the Lowell Festival is in a position to hire people as needed with the aid and advise of its NCTA contacts.

In addition, the NCTA is in close contact with a variety of folk performers, craftspeople, etc. and helps the Lowell Festival to recruit the talent required to present a major folk festival.

After its three years at Lowell, the National Folk Festival went to Johnstown Pennsylvania (completing the three year run in 1992). As in Cayahoga and Lowell, the NCTA staff worked not only to make the festival successful in ad hoc terms on a year to year basis, they strove to make it a conduit through which the skills required to establish an on going festival could be transferred to a new group of people in a new location.

It is too early to know if Johnstown will have equally good fortune in establishing an ongoing event when no longer under the umbrella of the National Folk Festival; based on earlier events in Ohio and Massachusetts, however, I predict success. Starting in 1993, the National Folk Festival begins a three year run in Chattanooga, Tennessee, a city which has largely rebuilt its downtown and needs to 'get the word out'. The festival, and the grassroots training it provides, continues to go on.

Since going on the road, therefore, the National Folk Festival has touched 4 distinct regions of the country and provided the expertise required for cultural organizations in these regions to establish local, free standing festivals. Even though these new cultural events are independent, the NCTA continues to help as required in order to insure success. Thus, the National Folk Festival has emerged as more than a yearly ad hoc event. A major goal of the festival is to disseminate skills required for local groups to successfully present major cultural events.

This strategy allows the fairly small financial resources of the National Council For The Traditional Arts to exert a greater impact than they otherwise would have been the case.

#### THE FESTIVAL OF AMERICAN FOLKLIFE: BRINGING PEOPLE TO AN EVENT

While the National Folk Festival has gone out to other people and taught them in their "own backyard", the Smithsonian Institution's Festival Of American Folklife is always held in Washington, D. C. Although one might initially feel this would prevent the Smithsonian's Folklife program from providing grassroots assistance, this is hardly the case.

Founded in the 1960s as an eclectic event by Ralph Rinzler (who had earlier been involved with the Newport Folk Festival) the Festival of American Folklife eventually came to focus on a circumscribed universe of discourse each year. Typically, (although exceptions exist) the Festival features one state of the union (or a territory governed by the United States) and one foreign country (or somewhat self-contained region of the world outside of the U.S.). As a result, the festival began to bring together large numbers of people from specific places.

Although it did not initially intend to do so, the festival, creates an environment where numerous people from specific areas work under the guidance of professionals who routinely present festivals. As a result, on occasion the Festival has been the catalyst by which ongoing cultural events have been established.

In the early 1980s, for example, three folklorists/museum workers (Marsha McDowell, Ku Dewhurst, and Yvonne Lockwood) approached the Smithsonian to see if it would be willing to feature Michigan as part of the Festival Of American Folklife. Their ultimate goal was foster support for an ongoing festival to be held in Michigan each summer.

The timing was ideal; Michigan was preparing to celebrate its sesquicentennial in 1987 and sharing the lore of the state with the nation at large (via a festival in Washington) seemed to be a good idea. Ultimately, the state of Michigan funded the Smithsonian program in Washington. Afterwards, much of the Michigan program was remounted in East Lansing, Michigan; the local program was supported with a consortium of private and public funds.

Although there was little coordinated assistance from the Smithsonian during the remounting, much of the fieldwork and research was reused. Although some changes in the program book were made, for example, it largely duplicated the Smithsonian's program. In Marsha McDowell's words: "...because the bulk of the work had been done, there was not as much work to do as if we had had to start from scratch". (personal letter:1992).

Under usual circumstances it would have been difficult if not impossible for such a festival to become established. The startup costs would be high and nobody would know if the event would be successful. Under such conditions, getting a commitment to spend a large amount of money just to see if the project was viable would not be feasible.

On this one occasion, however, a major festival about Michigan was scheduled and funded. The costly fieldwork had already been done and paid for. The featured performers had been lined up. Given this situation, the state of Michigan had already paid such major costs when it underwrote the Festival of American Folklife. Essentially, all that was required was the extra money required to restage the festival in Michigan after the Washington, D. C. run was completed.

That is what happened. In 1985 a small 'dry run' festival was presented in East Lansing. Then, after the Festival of American Folklife closed in 1987, the participants were immediately transported to East Lansing, Michigan and the festival was remounted.

As a result of the success (and the interest garnered), the Festival Of Michigan Folklife was established as an ongoing event and has become a major tourist and cultural event in Michigan (and today is linked to a larger cultural event held in East Lansing during the summer).

Independent and free standing as it is, the Festival Of Michigan Folklife stays in close touch (albeit sometimes informally) with the Smithsonian and with the Festival Of American Folklife. Various staff members of the Festival of American Folklife, furthermore, often serve the Festival of Michigan Folklife in various capacities. In the early years of the Michigan Folk Festival, the scheduling was such that numerous staff from the Smithsonian technical crew worked for the Michigan festival; recent changes in the schedule, however, limit this participation today.

As was the case with the National Folk Festival, this early transfer of knowledge benefited from the fact that skilled and knowledgeable folklorists were on the staff of the group which received aid from the larger, more established organization; McDowell and Dewhurst are both well respected folklorists and had been so long before Michigan was featured at the Festival of American Folklife. Nonetheless, the Festival of American Folklife was able to help spawn a cultural event by bringing people to Washington and creating a cultural event in that location. Helping facilitate the Michigan remounting was also crucial.

In more recent years, the Festival Of American Folklife has generated interest among other groups, some of which initially lacked the professional knowledge of folklore which the Michigan Festival possessed. In 1990, for example, the U. S. Virgin Islands was featured at the Festival of American

Folklife. After the festival, various organizers and participants from the Virgin Islands contingent expressed an interest in establishing a Virgin Islands Festival and one was held in 1991.

As in the Michigan example, considerable research and organization had already been accomplished and much of the Virgin Islands festival was a "remounting" of what had been done in Washington. By presenting such materials on their "home turf", festival planners are able to assess if such cultural events prove to be popular enough to warrant being continued on a yearly basis or if they should be presented less frequently. In addition, since various of the Smithsonian professional staff had been involved with the Virgin Islands aspect of the Festival Of American Folklife, they were familiar with what was to be presented and could be drawn upon as resource people as required. This made the project cheaper and reduced the risks which would have existed if the festival had been built from scratch with an unseasoned staff.

In both the case of Michigan and the Virgin Islands, therefore, the Washington, D. C. based Festival Of American Folklife was able to help groups possessing limited experience and a minimum knowledge to experiment via a remounting of a major cultural event and present it at home after a successful run in D.C. The initial remounting, furthermore, provided what might be viewed as a market test to determine if such events would be viable on a permanent basis.

Without the cooperation and aid of the Festival of American Folklife, the professional expertise (and the funding) required to carry out such an experiment, the task would probably have been overwhelming. With the festival's cooperation, however, much expertise was provided and valuable experiments were conducted regarding the viability of establishing an ongoing festival. The experiments were affordable, furthermore, because they were able to capitalize upon existing work which had already been done.

Speaking generally, Richard Kurin (1992, pp.9-10), the director of the Center For Folklife Programs And Cultural Studies (which produces the Festival Of American Folklife) observes

...states and regions of the United States...have tried, sometimes quite successfully, to use.../participations in the Festival Of American Folklife/ as catalysts for research and educational activities, public service and policy debate. So too have other nations, perhaps most dramatically India, used their festival experience to mount similar presentations.

There is a cliché among those who produce the festival of American Folklife that "the festival never ends". The sentiment being expressed is that the event casts a long shadow and has profound impacts long after the dust of the summer presentation has settled. It is an apt saying.

#### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Viewing the experiences of the National Folk Festival, the Festival of American Folklife, and the various organizations they have helped, one fact becomes obvious: those who produce such events think strategically and they carefully deploy their resources so that maximum benefits can derive from them. Funding for the traditional (the technical name for "folk") arts has always been slim and today budgets are getting smaller and smaller. And yet, organizations which serve such roles are devising ways to reap multiple benefits from every dollar.

Today, as marketers search for new tasks to accomplish and for new clients to serve, the arts has emerged as one area of potential growth. Indeed, considerable work has already been accomplished in this area. In various articles and monographs (Andreasen 1984, Belk & Andreasen 1982, Andreasen 1991, for example) considerable effort has been made to demonstrate how various marketing tools and consumer behavior concepts can be employed by those in the arts.

A seemingly unstated assumption of much of this work is that those in the arts have trouble thinking strategically and that marketers have a significant opportunity to assume a leadership role, helping these people make their efforts more effective. This paper, in contrast, has emphasized the strategic orientation of those who produce such festivals. It is true that some folklorists have an ivory tower orientation, but such people usually do not choose to produce folk festivals. Indeed, the field of folklore is currently debating the legitimacy and the role of its applied wing; such soul searching is resulting in significant gains for those in applied activities such as festival production (see Cantwell, 1991, Seitel, 1991, Baron & Spitzer 1992, Walle N.D.). It has also shown how these folklorists are willing to strategically adjust the events they produce in order to serve the needs of their partners and thereby win cooperation.

Indeed, producers of folk festivals possess well thought out priorities; when they disagree with marketing and business consultants, it is not out of fuzzy mindedness, but is the result of profound differences in the stakeholders they primarily seek to serve. Marketers view their job as serving a group of stakeholders who are (or resemble) "customers". Marketers may be willing to respond to the needs of other groups (in this case the folk), but doing so is usually a concession made in order to pursue their mission of serving customers.

Folklorists, in contrast, seek to address the needs of traditional people; this is the primary stakeholder they wish to serve. Folklorists, in turn, are willing to cater to other stakeholders (such as "customers", "tourists", etc.), but doing so is viewed as an ad hoc activity contingent upon simultaneously and equitably serving the folk. Stemming from the field of folklore, Baron and Spitzer's Public Folklore (1992) demonstrates how that profession is developing the tools needed to interact in situations involving marketing while continuing to adhere to its primary purpose. A reflection of the strategic sciences, on the other hand, Donald Getz's Festivals, Special Events, And Tourism is firmly grounded in marketing theory and embraces a "4Ps" orientation. And yet, Getz points to folk festivals as a viable kind of event. Thus, folklorists are happy to work with marketers even though each profession serves a different group of primary clients.

General marketing theorists (and those who attempt to apply marketing to new situations without adjusting such concepts in relevant ways) fail to realize this fact and perhaps believe their methods and theories are universally superior to those of the folklorist. Doing so is misreading reality and will potentially lead to unhappy results. The marketer, for example, might want to eliminate an educational component of a folk festival on the grounds that the public (customers, attendees) doesn't want it. Folklorists, in contrast, may want to include such activities because they perceive that educating the public is crucial to the wellbeing of the folk, their primary stakeholder. To the marketer who primarily seeks to cater to festival attendees' overt desires, in contrast, such effort appears to be a waste of time and money and may even make the festival less attractive to the public (and should be purged for that reason).

What exists are two different professions which have different priorities. Neither marketers nor folklorists are "right"; instead each has a different, although legitimate, role. By realizing this fact, marketers will be better able to interact with folklorists as intelligent and informed colleagues. Indeed, in 1986 New York Folklore (a well respected journal) published a special issue devoted to marketing the folk arts. This special issue, furthermore, included an article on how to apply a 4Ps approach to the folk arts. (Walle 1986). Folklorists are aware that they can profit from marketing, but they wish to adopt marketing tactics as ad hoc tools which help them achieve their primary goal: advancing the cause of traditional people. By keeping this in mind, marketers will better understand folklorists and be better able to effectively negotiate with them.

Although these differences are real and significant, the strategies of those who produce folk festivals reflect marketing techniques and are often influenced by them. Producers of folk festivals, furthermore, carefully adjust and evolve their product (the festival) in order to keep up with the times and attract a healthy number of attendees. In 1987, for example, Gillespie, writing in the tourism



marketing literature, pointed out the three separate types of people he believed attended folk festivals; they include:

1. Family Types: those looking for wholesome outdoor entertainment.
2. Folkniks: holdovers from the counter-culture of the 1960s.
3. Outlaws: disruptive people who are often indifferent to the event.

Although the situation is actually more complex than that, Gillespie's "time capsule" allows us to see how today's festival producers are attempting to significantly expand the market by subtly evolving the festival format.

Increasingly, folk festivals are aimed at what Gillespie calls Family Types. One technique which festival producers have widely adopted is to have a special area where there are activities specifically aimed at children. Such activities typically involve events like storytelling and crafts in which the child is allowed to participate with a traditional craftsman to pursue a craft or an art. By having activities directed at children, many more families can be added to the target market which the festival seeks to serve.

A second feature aimed at family types is the ubiquitous "foodways" program where traditional cooks provide an overview of folk cuisine (see Evans 1988). Using a format not unlike cooking shows on TV, the audience is taught how to cook certain popular dishes, and the instructions are spiced with stories of the traditional culture from which the food derives. Since everybody likes to eat, these programs are popular and emphasize aspects of domestic life to which the average attendee can relate.

Even if (as Gillespie indicates) there are numerous "outlaws" in attendance at a festival, they usually don't drift into the children's area or the foodways demonstrations; thus, such potentially disruptive people invariably choose to confine themselves in areas where they cause little difficulty.

It is also true that some attendees at folk festivals fit the description of what Gillespie calls Folkniks, but not that many--such people seem to be more at home at a Grateful Dead concert. Instead, folk festivals tend to attract a large number of middle aged people who developed a taste for folk music and traditional culture when they were young; in many cases, such people continue to maintain that interest. Not trying to recapture their youth or the past, these people's interests have deepened and matured over the years and in many cases, parents wish to share such experiences with their children. There is a profound difference between a folknik (perhaps identifiably as a typical Grateful Dead concert attendee) and a modern American whose tastes were shaped in the 1960s by the folk revival movement.

Much of the "shoptalk" and party conversation at events where applied folklorists get together, furthermore, involves forging techniques for broadening the range of people who attend folk festivals. Producers are aware that baby boomers, as a group, are a loyal target market; they are also aware that this group will eventually die out. As a result, much current thought and work concerns devising strategies which will perpetuate the interest in folk festivals even after future generations come to dominate. Such thinking is clearly parallel to the product life cycle literature in marketing which indicates products eventually and inevitably decline and need to be rethought, refined and redefined in order to maintain market share.

By viewing the ways in which folk festival producers strive to create events which can simultaneously serve and accommodate different target markets, we, as marketers, can learn from them and develop an understanding of how we can work with such people in mutually productive ways. indeed, even the practitioner literature of marketing and consumer behavior is beginning to include discussions of folk festivals as a viable marketing device (Walle ND).

Marketers must encourage such working relationships because folklorists have skills, experience, and connections which organizations need. Although marketers and folklorists embrace different goals and priorities, they often must work together. If marketers and the organizations with which they work forget this fact, working relationships and the benefits they provide may evaporate.

The case of folk festivals is a specific, historic example of how the arts and marketing can cooperate in meaningful and fruitful ways. Folk festivals are often cooperative ventures of professionals in the arts working hand in hand with organizations which employ a marketing perspective. As a result of this cooperation, the needs of both groups are served. Donald Getz put it well when he observed; "The folk festivals and antiestablishment events that were the stamp of this group [baby boomers] in the 1960s evolved into much more sophisticated arts and entertainment festivals" (1991 p.77).

Today various communities are seeking to encourage tourism and tourism marketing and the economic activity it brings via establishing annual festivals (Herman 1989) As a result, such activities are attracting the attention of marketers more than ever before. This historical account of the cooperation of folk festival producers and marketers is intended to provide clues to those who choose to work in arts marketing. Such consultants will benefit if they develop a healthy respect for their counterparts and realize that these people have evolved sophisticated strategies directed at a group of stakeholders who are not "customers". By keeping this in mind, marketers can better understand their counterparts and how to negotiate with them.

#### REFERENCES

- Ahmed, Zafar U., "Marketing Your Community: Correcting A Negative Image", Cornell Hotel And Restaurant Administration Quarterly. (vol 31/4 Feb. 1991) 24-27.
- Andersen, Malcolm J., "Problems with Tourism Development In Canada's Eastern Arctic". Journal Of Tourism Management (vol 12/3 Sept. 1991) 209-220.
- Andreasen, Alan "Life Status Changes And Changes In Consumer Preferences And Satisfaction", Journal Of Consumer Research 11:1 (Spring 1984), 784-794.
- Andreasen, Alan Expanding The Audience For The Performing Arts. (Arlington, Virginia: Seven Locks Press: 1991).
- Baron, Robert & Spitzer, Nickolas, (editors) Public Folklore (Washington D. C. Smithsonian Press)1992.
- Belk, Russell & Andreasen, Alan "The Effects Of Family Life Cycle On Arts Patronage" Journal Of Consumer Economics, vol 6 #2 (December 1982) 25-26.
- Cantwell, Robert. "Conjuring Culture: Ideology and Magic In the Festival Of American Folklife". Journal Of American Folklore (vol. 104: 1991) 148-163.
- Evans, Deane "Tourists 'Taste' America At Smithsonian 1988 Folklife Festival", Nation's Restaurant News, (vol. 22 #37 Sept. 12, 1988) F-26.
- Getz, Donald, Festivals, Special Events, And Tourism (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1991).
- Heerman, Mandy, "Getting Involved With Tourism" Inn Touch, (Vol. 6/4, April 1989). 13-14
- Gillespie, A., "Folk Festival And Festival Folk In 20th Century America", in Time Out Of Time, ed. by A. Falassi. (Albuquerque, New Mexico: University Of New Mexico Press, 1987).

- Jafari, Jafar. "Cultural Tourism And Regional Development". Annals Tourism Research (vol 19/3) 576-577.
- Kurin, Richard, "Festival Of American Folklife: Not Just A Festival" in Program: 1992 Festival Of American Folklife. Washington, D. C.:Smithsonian Institution, 1992).
- McDowell, Marsha Personal letter, 11/1992.
- Nash, Dennisen & Smith Valene L. "Anthropology And Tourism", Annals Of Travel Research (vol 18/1 1991) 12-25.
- Reiniger, Pete. Personal communications (1990,1991,1992).
- Rinzler, Ralph, Personal communication 1992).
- Seitel, Peter, ""Magic, Knowledge, And Irony In Scholarly Exchange: A comment On Robert Cantwell's Observations On The Festival Of American Folklife". Journal Of American Folklore (v 104: 1991) p495.
- Walle, A., "Mitigating Marketing: A Window Of Opportunity For Applied Folklorists", New York Folklore, (1986) 91-112.
- Walle, A., "Cultural Conservation: Public Sector Folklore And Its Rivals", Western Folklore, (1990) 261-275).
- Walle, A. "Sponsoring Folk Festivals..." (title tentative). To be published in American Demographics.
- Walle, A., "Tourism And Traditional People: Forging Equitable Strategies", Journal Of Travel Research (Winter 1993) 14-19.
- Walle, A., "Theoretical Vs. Applied Folklore: Apples Vs. Oranges". Western Folklore, forthcoming (n.d.).
- Wilson, Joe personal Communication (11/92).
- Wilson, Joe & Udall, L. Folk Festivals: A Handbook For Organization And Management. (Knoxville, Tennessee: University Of Tennessee press, 1982).