

2014

An Anthropological Analysis of Canadian Music Festivals: Tournaments of Value, Modes of Festival Consumption, Tension, Conflict, and Struggle in the Context of Vancouver Island Music Festival

Gillian G. Moranz Ms.

University of Lethbridge, gillian.g.moranz@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/totem>

Recommended Citation

Moranz, Gillian G. Ms. (2014) "An Anthropological Analysis of Canadian Music Festivals: Tournaments of Value, Modes of Festival Consumption, Tension, Conflict, and Struggle in the Context of Vancouver Island Music Festival," *Totem: The University of Western Ontario Journal of Anthropology*: Vol. 22: Iss. 1, Article 8.

Available at: <http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/totem/vol22/iss1/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Totem: The University of Western Ontario Journal of Anthropology by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact kmarshal@uwo.ca.

An Anthropological Analysis of Canadian Music Festivals: Tournaments of Value, Modes of Festival Consumption, Tension, Conflict, and Struggle in the Context of Vancouver Island Music Festival

Abstract

During the summers of 2011/2012 I conducted research for my Undergraduate Thesis concerning folk, roots, and music festivals from British Columbia to Newfoundland. This study has focused on cultural elements of community, intention, performance, value, capital, and exchange, and was conducted within seventeen different festivals sites from western Canada to the Maritimes. The following paper represents one chapter of my final Thesis and showcases ethnographic and observational data collected at Vancouver Island Music Festival in Comox, British Columbia in July 2011.

Keywords

Tournaments of value, regimes of value, exchange, intent, performance, community, social dramas.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all of the festivals that agreed to contribute to this research and the coordinating bodies that continue to create such incredible and important spaces across the country. This study would not have been possible without your interest and accommodation, and I am deeply grateful for the kindness and warmth I received at every stop along the way. I would also like to thank every artist, attendee, volunteer, and coordinator who contributed to my fieldwork. Without these insightful conversations my research would have been nothing more than a long-winded road trip with little academic relevance. Last but not least, I would like to thank the external reader for your interest and engagement with the concepts, analysis, and conclusions presented in the following pages.

An Anthropological Analysis of Canadian Music Festivals: Tournaments of Value, Modes of Festival Consumption, Tension, Conflict, and Struggle in the Context of Vancouver Island Music Festival.

Gillian G. Moranz

Introduction

In many ways, Canadian folk, roots and music festivals can be understood as diverse and complex markets of exchange within which various goods and commodities of varying and subjective categories of value are exchanged and circulated. Many music festivals do reinforce and reproduce the logic of commodity based capitalism through acts of festival organization, event promotion, ticket sales, internal market systems (i.e.: vendors, festival products, merchandise), etc., which reinforce economically relevant roles according to larger society outside of the isolated and temporary social environment (i.e.: production, distribution, consumption). However, the exchanges that occur within these spaces are not strictly confined to those of market interactions. Although most music festivals require a certain amount of economic investment to attend, the exchanges that are enabled and facilitated by the events themselves are not confined to those of one-to-one economic transactions (even though they may be initiated by the economic act of purchasing a ticket). In other words, an individual may have to make an economic sacrifice to enter the 'market' (the festival) where certain commodities are available and circulated, but once they gain entry many commodities are exchanged and circulated through non-

economic means. The vast possibility for exchange through a single economic negotiation enables variation to manifest in terms of what can be defined as a commodity of value within a particular festival, and this mediates the interactions between different modes of consumption and exchange within the festival site.

Importantly, these types of spaces are often predisposed to become enormous canvases upon which different values of experience, expression, and interaction are symbolically inscribed. Therefore, a generalized 'framework' of common festival values would be insufficient to describe the dynamic nature of the value placed in these festival spaces, and the range and depth of experience possible within. The individuals I consider in this paper are oriented as participants within the festival experience and are established as consumers of the commodities circulated and exchanged within these spaces. This specific orientation will reflect the means through which these individuals are able to interact with the established rules of the festival, and influences the interactions that manifest between groups and individual participants. Given that the intent of attendance and value of activities offered within a particular event will vary considerably, these spaces can be identified as social arenas of struggle through which groups and individuals seek to legitimize their own means of appropriating various forms of capital that are circulated. These interactions can be observed through focusing on exchanges that occur within the festival grounds and the individual or collective modes of conduct that mediate them. However,

before moving into the bulk of my analysis it will be beneficial to turn to a brief definition of the term “festival” itself, as well as a short review of past and contemporary approaches to festival research and analysis.

The “Festival”: A Brief Definition and Literature Review

Gibson and Connell have pointed out that a significant amount of ambiguity surrounds notions of what constitutes a ‘festival’ in contemporary terms:

“Some are community festivals that emerge from dedicated local people and only in time come to attract audiences beyond the immediate locality. Others are primarily commercial – essentially full-blown open air concerts, organized by metropolitan promoters, that may even be foisted on places and play little role in regional development, despite high ticket costs. At high commercial festivals the roster of acts is crucial, compared with local festivals which place higher priority on community building and are keen to showcase local talent without need for big name imported acts.” (Gibson and Connell, 2012:4)

In most academic contexts festivals can be loosely understood as places where many aspects of daily life are largely suspended and attendees indulge in the festive activities

presented by the event in question. Victor Turner suggests that a festival space can often become “a place that is no place, and a time that is no time, even where that place is a city’s main plazas, and that time can be found on an ecclesiastical calendar” (Turner in Falassi, 1987:76). Within these spaces,

“We are seeing society in its subjunctive mood... its mood of feeling, willing, and desiring, its mood of fantasizing, its playful mood: not in its indicative mood, where it tries to apply reason to human action and systematize the relationship between ends and means in industry and bureaucracy.” (1987: 76)

Alessandro Falassi also concerns himself with the definition and morphology of ‘modern’ academic approaches to various types of festival experiences, suggesting that,

“[T]he definition that can be inferred from the works of scholars who have dealt with festival while studying social and ritual events from the viewpoint of various disciplines such as comparative religion, anthropology, social psychology, folklore, and sociology indicates that festival commonly means *a periodically recurrent, social occasion in which, through a multiplicity of forms and a series of coordinated events, participate directly or indirectly and to various degrees, all members of a community, united by ethnic, linguistic,*

religious, historical bonds, and sharing a worldview.” (Original emphasis. 1987:2)

Throughout his text Falassi underlines numerous types of festivals ranging from folk arts to fine arts and religious and secular, and describes different values established within the constructed spaces in question.

Linda Wilks (2009), in a study of three different music festivals in England offers her own definition, which echoes Turner, stating that a festival is,

“An event where people come together in a specific location away from their normal day-to-day life for an extended but bounded period of time in order to enjoy a coherent set of entertainment or activities.”
(Wilks 2009:15)

Both of Falassi and Wilks are clearly influenced by Turner, and highlight important characteristics of the festivals included in this study. Wilks emphasizes the formation of a temporary community that operates by means outside of everyday experiences. That is, the notion that general routines of daily life are interrupted in favor of entering this temporary and constructed festival environment. Falassi stresses “community” itself, and a “shared worldview” through emphasizing the common threads that connect those who attend/create these events (whether they are based on music, social milieu, escapism, religious beliefs, etc). However, it remains to be seen whether community is actually experienced in this way.

A different strain of festival research concerns how these events are developed and integrated into market economies. Donald Getz (2010) summarizes much of this literature, and suggests that

“The core phenomenon is actually the festival experience and meanings attached to it. People create festivals for specific purposes, and one’s experience of a festival provides meaning. As well, festivals have importance and multiple meanings within societies and cultures that transcend individual experiences. To fully understand and create knowledge about festivals it is also necessary to consider who produces them and why, how they are planned and managed, why people attend (or do not), their outcomes on multiple levels, and the dynamic forces shaping individual festivals and festival populations.”
(2010:19-20)

He describes recent approaches to festival studies in terms of three major categories: 1) roles, meanings, and impacts of festival in society and culture, 2) festival tourism, and 3) festival management (2010:2). Getz notes that,

“Recently, scholars within and outside the traditional disciplines have been examining festivals with

regard to an increasing variety of issues: their roles in establishing place and group identity; the social and cultural impacts of festivals and festival tourism; creation of social and cultural capital through festival production; fostering the arts and preserving traditions; and a variety of personal outcomes from participation in festivals, including learning, acquired social and cultural capital, and healthfulness. The value and worth of festivals to society and culture has been addressed, as well as the imputed need for festivity, but research on these important issues has been slim.” (2010:4-5)

In general, he argues that much of the discourse on festival tourism has been concerned with outcomes (such as economic impacts) and motivation, especially in terms of marketing and evaluation. Much of the literature related to event tourism is of specific interest to festival managers and appeals to notions of consumer motivation and event evaluation. However, Getz states that, “descriptions and evaluations of specific festivals do not usually enter the academic literature and do not necessarily generate new knowledge” (2010:5). Much of this research has been published in mainstream tourism journals, and there has not been much crossover to broader academic perspectives on the subject. In regards to social and cultural significance of

festivals, Getz recognizes that sociological and cultural anthropological theory/methodology prevails, but suggests that there is little evidence that our understanding of these events as social/cultural phenomenon (and the experiences of those who attend) is being firmly rooted and interconnected within these disciplines (2010:20).

Gibson and Connell’s book *Music Festivals and Regional Development in Australia* (2012) provides an interesting analysis of the dynamic role and significance of festivals in regional development. The majority of their research draws on the author’s own experiences studying and working with festivals in rural areas and small towns where festivals contribute notably to the local economy as well as to the local cultural fabric. Gibson and Connell state that,

“Academic and applied consultancy research on the social, cultural and economic dimensions of festivals has concurrently expanded. Festivals have been shown to draw communities together to celebrate local cultures (Duffy 2000); to involve people of disparate geographical origins whose community is catalyzed by highly specialized passions, shared pastimes, or intense fandom (Mackeller 2009a; Begg 2011); or simply to entertain large numbers of people. Festivals can also include and exclude people by

drawing boundaries around ‘community’, through subcultural affiliation, pre-requisite knowledge to appreciate narrow music styles, specialist knowledge required for entry (in the case of, for instance, raves) or meaningful participation. They can annoy local residents by generating traffic, pollution and congestion; and by attracting ‘unwanted’ types of people (often revealing as much about the local residents’ imaged picture of themselves as of the behaviour of the festival goers).” (Gibson and Connell, 2012:3)

This provides interesting insight into the different means through which festivals have been academically approached as temporary and consciously constructed spaces and sheds light on specific tensions that can manifest through the construction of these spaces. However, the authors also state that, even though the field of festival studies has expanded, most studies have tended to be highly specialized and are conducted to suit specific needs (i.e., consultancy research funded by the festivals themselves), to reflect the disciplinary background/perspectives of those undertaking the study, or have examined a single festival held in one specific place (2012:4-5). They contend that little has been written concerning the

“*interrelationship* between economic, environmental and

cultural dimensions of festivals – about how festivals could and are being used to promote local and regional development in the broadest sense, and what kinds of political and social issues are at stake.” (2012:5)

The authors suggest that their research seeks to fill this ‘gap’, and assert that this type of “synthetic analysis” in terms of regional development is needed, and this need can be identified through the interactions between festival organizers and host communities within which they exist (2012:5). With this brief overview of festival definition and previous academic attention I will now move into the bulk of my analysis concerning intent of attendance, commodities of value, and exchange within Vancouver Island Music Festival.

Festival Values and Intent of Attendance

Many folk, roots, and music festivals in Canada are commonly (and perhaps stereotypically) associated with a more-or-less generalized set of values, usually emphasizing connectivity and expansion through community, artistic creativity, inclusiveness, collaboration, environmental consciousness, etc. Stressing the importance of values surrounding inclusiveness, collaboration, and acceptance of difference should not lead one to believe that anyone who takes the time to show up will be unanimously accepted into the festival niche. This is not the case, nor is it true that certain values are ubiquitous and mandatory, although most festivals do have a distinct ‘fingerprint’ expressing a clearly defined set

of values which may or may not be recognized by the people that attend or perform. During the course of my research I have identified an overarching and dynamic consistency that seems to run through differing sets of values placed in various contexts of these festival spaces. This speaks of individual's desire to participate in the festival experience in alignment with the way that *those particular individuals understand the values of the event themselves*. An individual's own rationalization of attendance may vary from closely to marginally connected to the intent of the space (as defined by those who coordinate the events), and the interaction between these varied levels of association is where notable moments of tension and conflict can occur. Individuals who attend these festivals selectively associate themselves with established values of the event and/or impose their own values onto the festival. In this sense, the underlying structure of value and intent constructed by these spaces can be understood as a predetermined 'grid' within which value and meaning can be defined, situated, fostered, and exchanged. Some types of value will fit easily into the spaces in the grid established by the festival, while other types may experience a higher amount of resistance in terms of intention, expression, interaction, and conduct.

As previously addressed, although many music-oriented festivals are generally considered a fantastic 'deal' to the consumer (one can purchase access to a great amount of music and social activity for a small investment), the exchanges that are enabled and facilitated by the events themselves are

not confined to the economic field. An individual makes an economic sacrifice to enter the market where a broad array of valued commodities are circulated and exchanged. The possibility for exchange through a single economic negotiation enables a great deal of variation to manifest concerning commodities of value as defined by general attendees, and allows for the establishment of different modes of exchange within.

Festivals as Tournaments of Value

In order to expand on this in relation to the individuals who attend these events it will be useful to address concepts surrounding commoditization and exchange defined by Arjun Appadurai (1986). These types of festivals can be closely associated with Appadurai's concept of tournaments of value, in that they are "complex periodic events that are removed in some culturally well-defined way from the routines of economic life" (1986:21) and accommodate "commoditization by diversion", where value (although not necessarily monetary value) is increased or enhanced by placing esteemed commodities in distinct and perhaps unfamiliar contexts (1986:28). These tournaments of value exist within a culturally and socially constituted regime of value, within which cultural meaning (in terms of value and exchange) is created and put into action in a culturally and socially significant way. In other words, the festival (as a tournament of value) is socially and culturally constructed within the broader regime of value that is defined by accepted modes of capitalist exchange, the logic behind these exchanges, and the relations that exist between them. This does not

suggest that every instance of commodity exchange assumes a “complete cultural sharing of assumptions, but rather the degree of value coherence may be highly variable from situation to situation, and from commodity to commodity” (1986:15). Much variation exists within a designated regime of value, and this can create tension within and between interacting groups and individuals in a specific tournament of value. The root of this tension is often grounded in the fact that “not all parties share the same *interest* in any specific regime of value, nor are the interests of any two parties in a given exchange identical” (1986:57). In this sense, Appadurai suggests that a regime of value often demonstrates both high and low “sharing of standards by the parties to a particular commodity exchange” (1986:15).

This brings the discussion to the sorts of exchanges that occur within these festive tournaments of value, and how these modes of exchange interact with the socially and culturally constructed regime of value within which these tournaments exist. Appadurai states that a commodity can be understood as “any thing intended for exchange”, and suggests that the analysis should move beyond preoccupation with the product, production and intent of the producer, and instead focus on the dynamics of the *exchanges themselves* rather than on the commodities in question (1986:9). Although this shifts the focus away from the *production* of the commodity, Appadurai still acknowledges the importance of understanding commodities according to their “*total* trajectory from production, through exchange/distribution, to

consumption” (1986:13). By using these two concepts in conjunction with each other one can showcase how the actual exchanges can often be more informative than the products themselves, while acknowledging how significance and value are cumulatively attributed to commodities through the total course of production to consumption.

Live music itself is a commodity circulated and exchanged within all music festival spaces included in this study, but participants do not necessarily connect its value to the purchase price of their ticket. Music and live performance are generally highly valued within these spaces, and these ‘festival elements’ are established as valuable within these festival spaces by the coordinators and musicians, and are validated by the consumption of participants. Therefore, live acts of musical performance are designated as valuable within these festive tournaments of value, which are socially constructed within the regime of value of greater society. However, a regime of value does not simply designate music and performance as valuable, but perpetuates the social and cultural values that create the possibility for them to be understood as such by engaging groups and individuals. Appadurai states that “logistics of small communities are intimately tied to larger regimes of value defined by large-scale polities”, (1986:30) suggesting that music and performance are assigned a certain cultural and social significance within a particular tournament of value because of a larger predisposition for this construction (or rejection) of value outside of the tournament itself. I turn now

to a consideration of some of these ideas in the context of my own research.

Modes of Festival Consumption

In his book entitled *Musicking* (1998) Christopher Small states that the term “musicking” can be analytically beneficial in various academic and non-academic contexts, and suggests that it can be applied to any activity involving musical performance. Small states that,

“To music is to take part, in any capacity, in a musical performance, whether by performing, by listening, by rehearsing or practicing, by providing material for performance (what is called composing), or by dancing.” (Small, 1998:8)

In addition, Small contends that “musicking” can be understood as an activity that individuals actively relate to and use to engage with the rest of the world.

“The act of musicking establishes in the place where it is happening a set of relationships, and it is in those relationships that the meaning of the act lies. They are to be found not only between those organized sounds which are conventionally thought of as being the stuff of musical meaning but also between the people who are taking part, in whatever capacity, in the performance...” (1998:13)

The act of making music in front of live audiences creates a commodity intended for exchange. This exchange is initiated between the spectator and performer by transmitting the collectively constructed product from performer to audience, and this musical product is circulated among the engaging group of onlookers. This exchange usually triggers some sort of palpable response (be it awed silence, dancing, disinterested chatter, blatant dislike, etc.), which can, in some cases, be circulated back to the musicians/artists. This process of “musicking” initiates a cycle of action and reaction from which exchange can either gain momentum or dwindle and cease altogether. Still, the ability of a participant to influence the production of music in this context is clearly limited (especially in larger festivals). Importantly, there are certain modes of expressing dislike that are largely taboo in a festival setting. I have never witnessed a festival audience convey blatant dislike to the extent of ‘booing’ or chastising a performer while on stage, and this is something that is largely circumscribed through the accepted modes of audience conduct within these spaces. These implicit rules are most evident on the rare occasions when they are challenged. For example, in 2010 I attended the Calgary Folk Music Festival and watched a performance on the Main Stage by The Swell Season, an Irish/Czech duo composed of Glen Hansard and Markéta Irglová whose popularity soared after the release of their film (and widely celebrated soundtrack) “Once”. The audience was clearly engaged in the performance, but after the musicians had

performed one of their most popular songs “Falling Slowly” the audience lost interest and began to ignore the performance, talking amongst themselves and disengaging in the exchanges occurring between producer and consumer. The Main Stage field at Calgary Folk Music Festival is very large, and when it is full of people talking the noise and chatter can quickly overwhelm the stage itself. After struggling through one song, disrupted by the disinterested chatter of the crowd, Glen Hansard openly chastised the audience, and challenged their conduct with the statement: “You call yourselves a folk festival?” The audience, chastened, drew themselves to attention, and most individuals resumed a quiet, attentive state (whether they were interested in the music or not) while some decided to leave the area to find different commodities of exchange within the festival space or to resume their own forms of sociability.

This example is interesting because it highlights the fact that there are very specific modes of conduct associated with the exchange of these live music commodities and this conduct is largely circumscribed by the values determined by the coordinators and the musicians. Hansard’s comment “you call yourselves a folk festival?” speaks directly to the respectful conduct that is expected at these types of events, and suggests that the actions of the audience were not acceptable ways to express disinterest in a performance. In general, it seems that musicians have certain expectations of folk fest audiences, which may differ from other venues such as pubs and bars. In an interview at Calgary Folk Music Festival with Andrew Dale from the

Newfoundland-based band The Once, he affirmed that:

“...The thing about the folk festival audiences, its like, to them its just its either good music or not. Like, the genre, the style, whether it is one person with an acoustic guitar or an eight-piece band, it doesn’t matter to those audiences, all they care about is: “I connect to this music. I like the people on stage, and I like what they’re doing”, and that’s it. That’s all that matters.” (July 2011)

However, if groups/individuals are unable to foster a continuous connection with these commodities they are expected to signal this respectfully and through means that do not take away from the experience of others.

It is important to note that music and performance are not unanimously designated as ‘valuable’ within these spaces, and there is nothing inherently ‘in’ the music itself that defines it as a valuable commodity. For example, the long-standing divide between popular and classical music cannot be attributed to inherent qualities of the music itself, but rather must be recognized as qualities that are defined through social and cultural processes of constructing and situating meaning. In regards to the festival experiences in question, certain musical and performative commodities are defined as valuable by their interactions with the embodied systems of value possessed by the coordinators that construct the space and the engaging individuals in attendance. These

individual values are highly influenced by the overarching regime of value of broader society, and define the condition of possibility for the creation of value within a particular musical exchange, be it technical proficiency, sincerity, important subject matter, historical significance, popular attention, etc. Thus, while to a degree, value may be mutually constituted by performer and audience via the circulation of a musical commodity, audiences are more limited than performers in contributing to the exchange itself, and respectful conduct is expected even when the music is not valued.

Still, groups and individuals who attend these events have varying intentions, which define personal and collective systems of value within these tournaments through which various types of valued commodities are circulated and exchanged. That is, people attend music festivals for specific reasons (which may or may not align with the values of the festival as established through the coordinators), and to distill desired experiences or exchanges not strictly defined by consumption of musical commodities. When placed within the context of a specific tournament of value this can demonstrate Appadurai's claim that a regime of value does not imply complete alignment of cultural assumptions (in relation to the festival in question and the participating individuals), and that the level of value coherence may vary from situation to situation, and from commodity to commodity (1986:15). This variation is often the source of tension that can manifest due to the fact that not all parties share the same *interest* in any specific tournament of value. For example, some systems of value

place great significance on the artistic aspect of music and performance (as a form of capital), while others are more tied to the unique social environment that is created within the festival grounds.

These different values of attendance are not mutually exclusive, and many groups and individuals are drawn to these spaces by the opportunity to expose themselves to various valued experiences within a unique, socially, and artistically oriented environment. Difference in value can sometimes cause conflict within these tournaments, resulting in tension between those who consider their own intent of attendance as aligned with the official discourse of the festival as designed by chief producers of the capital: the coordinators and musicians (i.e., through value placed on music and performance) and those who impose their own values onto the event in question (i.e., those whose attendance is more geared towards the socially unique 'party' atmosphere). Within the broader regime of value, the economic transaction that permits entry into these events warrants groups and individuals the right to participate in a way that resonates with their own system of value while (ideally) adhering to the rules and regulations that govern the particular tournament of value (and society in general). Interactions between the manifested actions of contrasting systems of value can result in confrontation between actors within these spaces. However, difference and variation does not have to result in overt conflict, and instances can occur where individual intention is deemed peripheral by interactions and exchanges between

different systems of value. In other examples, different spheres of activity can meet at a crossroads of disjuncture, and these opposing groups will compete in the tournament of value for the proper way to interact with the commodity exchange in a given context.

To illustrate these ideas, I present an example from my experiences at the Vancouver Island Music Festival in Comox Valley, BC in July of 2011. Throughout the weekend I was camped next to a group composed of a middle-aged single mother, her daughter, her niece, and four or five of their friends. Most of the kids were around 16-17 years old and, therefore, were not supposed to drink alcohol. By the last day of the event we had witnessed great deal of partying, incredible feats of under-aged drinking, unforgettable demonstrations of teenage intoxication, and intense sociability with all its ups and downs. As the festival progressed I noted that this group seemed to be at the campsite every time I passed by, and after a few inquiries I learned that nobody left this campsite unless it was to go swim at the river or wander through the campground. After asking some questions about the music at the event it became clear that this group was not attending with performance, art, or community—as defined by organizers at least—in mind. The mother stated that she was a fan of groups like Motley Crüe, while the kids did not respond with any interest in talking about music. This was something I found puzzling. Even if these events are considered great ‘deals’ in terms of gaining access to dozens of performers for the average price of one concert ticket, why would anyone pay

money to attend a festival such as this to simply do the things they could do camping in the woods for free (like roast hot dogs, drink beer, swim in the river, etc)? When I approached the mother with this question she responded,

“It’s the different kinds of people that keep us coming back. We started coming because I was working with [the company that used to cater the festival], and we’ve been coming back ever since.”
(July 2011)

This example demonstrates that this particular group highly valued aspects of the social ‘scene’ within the festival setting (which for them was where community was constructed), and largely disregarded the musical side of the equation. This sort of response was mirrored by several other groups predominantly comprised of under-aged individuals, suggesting that a portion of the festival demographic (particularly individuals aged 14-18) attended the festival with the intent to carouse and socialize in a unique and fleeting social environment, where public consumption of controlled substances (alcohol and/or drugs)—much more difficult in other contexts—would seem to be possible. Importantly, this type of intent of attendance is recognized and labeled as something that needs to be controlled and regulated by the organizers of these events (which they manage with varying degrees of success). In contrast with this, the Lunenburg Folk Harbour Festival in Lunenburg, NS is an explicitly ‘dry’ event, prohibiting the sale or

consumption of any alcoholic beverages on site at any time. This greatly influences the social atmosphere of the festival, and impacts the nature of the audience who attend (who seem to be weighted towards the 25 + age demographic). Lunenburg is widely known among musicians and participants for its attentive audiences and respectful conduct, and many partially attribute this to the festival's regulation of the desire to 'carouse' in the explicitly musically oriented space. However, Lunenburg is not the norm in this sense, and many festivals must continuously negotiate how to regulate the consumption of recreational substances while attempting to maintain (and enforce) conduct that the coordinating bodies deem acceptable within the spaces they construct.

Another example from the Vancouver Island Music Festival will illustrate how consumption of live music can take different forms and create tension and conflict between participants. Randy Newman was a major headliner at Vancouver Island Music Festival in 2011 and attracted the older demographic who had loved him since the 1960's. By and large, these were the groups and individuals that you would find sitting on the grass in the Concert Bowl, soaking in his performance from start to finish and thoroughly engaging in the exchanges occurring between audience and performer through attentive listening and vigorous applause. Importantly, the Concert Bowl is organized in a very specific fashion, designating certain areas for dancing (off to the sides of the field) and certain areas for sitting (in the center of the field). A number

of the younger attendees (spanning from young childhood to early 20's) also had a major connection to Newman's Disney *Toy Story* classic "You've Got A Friend In Me".

While the older fans mentioned above were quietly seated listening to Randy Newman's performance, crowds of younger attendees began to pour into the Concert Bowl in anticipation of this song. These younger groups were extremely enthusiastic about the fact that Randy Newman was on stage, and moved towards the Main Stage with a definite draw to the performance and with little regard for the whether they were in an area designated for dancing or sitting.

It appeared to me that many were under the influence of alcohol, and they quickly managed to disrupt the respectful silence that the performance had evoked from the audience up to this point. Many of the younger individuals tried to get as close to the stage as possible, and some even began chanting Randy's name in unison to show their excitement. It was clear that the seated groups were unsure of whether or not this enthusiasm was sincere or cynical, and a notable tension dominated the atmosphere for several minutes. I was seated on the ground about 20 meters from the front of the stage. A boy who seemed to be in his late teens walked as close as he could to the performance, and ended up standing directly in front of a middle-aged man seated beside me. The older man displayed frustration with the boy's lack of consideration, and tugged at his pant-leg, briskly requesting that he sit down or move to the back. The boy was clearly intoxicated, but simply looked at the man sitting on the ground and said "I'm sorry, it's just... this is my

childhood up on stage!” At that moment Randy Newman struck the first notes of ‘You’ve Got a Friend In Me’, and whatever conflict may have been in the works seemed to dissipate, as a more vigorous youthful mode of consumption won in this particular tournament of value (for those youth and others willing to accept this shift). For the three-minute duration of that song the younger demographic appeared victorious, and for a short period of time the noisy, intoxicated youth were allowed to dominate the atmosphere of the Concert Bowl. Interestingly, while—as noted above—negative assessments of performers by the audience are generally sharply policed and controlled by musicians and the audience itself, there is more tolerance for a range of ‘positive’ forms of consumption here, even if those may negatively impact the enjoyment of consumers who do not share in this style of participation.

This observational example showcases significant interaction between two contrasting systems of value, which was negotiated through varying types of value—or modes of consumption—placed within Randy Newman’s musical performance. As stated above, this variation can create tension, which is often rooted in the fact that “not all parties share the same *interest* in any specific regime of value” (Appadurai, 1986:57). In this particular example, tension was created by the different means of expressing value in Randy Newman’s performance, and one was confronted and repressed through the other’s interaction with the performance itself. In addition, as discussed above, the degree of “value coherence” within a regime of value may be

highly variable depending on the commodity in question and the situation in which it is addressed (1986:15). Randy Newman’s performance was designated as significant within specific systems of value because of individual and collective connections to the artist or to a particular work of said artist. Even though many of the younger groups/individuals did not hang around the Concert Bowl for any other performances that evening, they made sure to catch Randy Newman to engage in a musical exchange that they deemed valuable and significant.

The initial ambiguity regarding the intention of the younger groups was assessed by the older demographic already attending the performance, and questions of cynicism and sincerity played a major role in creating the initial tensions. These interactions can be interpreted further using theories presented by Goffman (1959). He defines performance as “all the activity of an individual which occurs during a period marked by his [or her] continuous presence before a particular set of observers and which has some influence on the observers” (1959:22). In this sense, individuals are always performing their own embodied notions of ‘self’ through the use of their expressive equipment, (1959:22) and it is this projection of the self and the way that the projection is received that defines the interactions, exchanges, and judgments that can occur between a given individual and those around them. A cynical performance occurs when the performer is not genuinely invested in his/her own performance, and consciously or unconsciously exhibits ‘disbelief’ in his/her own actions. Contrastingly, a sincere performance

demonstrates authentic investment by the performing individual, showcasing sincerity and integrity through their self-projection (1959:17-18). Purposeful expression by a given individual must encompass palpable action that others may witness, which projects a voluntary representation of that particular individual that would pass unnoticed if it were not for the deliberate performance designated to showcase that particular trait/characteristic (1959:30-33).

In the context of the above example, the younger groups flooding into the Concert Bowl performed certain personal expressions that initially made the older demographic question the sincerity of their performances. Many were loud and disruptive, chanted Randy's name in unison and moved towards the stage with little consideration for those seated and already engaged with the performance. To an unknowing onlooker unaware of the motivations of the younger groups this could be observed as a form of E.P. Thompson's concept of 'rough music', a 17th century English term denoting "a rude cacophony, with or without more elaborate ritual, which usually directed mockery or hostility against individuals who offended against certain community norms" (Thompson, 1993:467). However, misinterpretation to this degree would have likely spurred a 'retaliation' of rough music from groups in the older generation and caused the conflict to rapidly escalate. As the tension began to build it became obvious that many members of the older groups were assessing the expressive equipment of the younger demographic. The tension between these two parties

seems to be largely connected to the idea that attendees have specific 'rights', acquired through economic investment to engage with the space in a desired manner that reflects their own system of value. That is, most (if not all) individuals involved in this example purchased tickets to the festival, and were exercising some sort of entitlement to interact with the space via means that align with their own system of value. The tension in this example manifested as a result of these differences, and the older generation, seemingly unwilling to retaliate or engage on a collective level against this conduct, allowed the younger groups to triumph in this particular tournament of value.

Like Goffman, Victor Turner maintains that human beings are "self performing animals" ("Homo Performans") who come to know 'selves' and 'others' better through the phenomenon of performance (1987:12). In addition, 'communities' can come to know themselves better through performances by groups of 'others' (1987: 13). In the context of a music festival, individuals who associate themselves with a particular intent of attendance and consequent mode of conduct may understand their own independent system of values as defined through alignment or disjuncture from various groups and individuals around them. This gives way to moments of "harmonic and disharmonic social processes, arising in situations of conflict", which Turner has termed "social dramas" (1987: 27). These social dramas have four distinct phases (breach, crisis, redressive action, and reintegration) (1987:4) through which the

existing social structure is usually altered in some way (oppositions may become alliances, status positions may change, norms/values may be re-evaluated, etc.) (1987:26-27). Although the example presented above does not demonstrate a successful illustration of a social drama, it can aid the recognition of how different parties involved manage conflict within performance-oriented areas of the festival sub-field, as well as provide an opportunity to critique Turner's notion of 'community' in this context.

The 'breach' of the social drama occurred when the younger groups first entered the Concert Bowl and began to disrupt the performance that was already in progress. The 'crisis' began to emerge as groups and individuals within the older demographic started to react to this disruptive behavior, and the tension between these groups began to manifest. 'Redressive action' can be identified in the exchange between the young boy and the older man tugging on his pant-leg. By asking the boy to sit down or move to the back the older man was establishing the sort of conduct that *he* considered appropriate in this situation and attempted to instill this in the conduct of the boy. However, this is where Turner's concept of the social drama was unsuccessful in this case. The redressive action failed, the youth ignored the older groups accepted means of engaging with a performance, and the older individuals were expected to put up with this conduct for the duration of the show. This is where Turner's notion of 'community' becomes problematic in this case as well. As Verid Amit (2010) has suggested, placing an

emphasis on 'sameness' in the context of community renders the term uselessly vague in terms of analytical merit. For Amit, "community" does not have to represent a complete sharing of values, but rather should be understood in terms of the uncertainties that can arise in the interaction between the notion and the actualization of different forms of sociation. Therefore, Turner's assertion that these four stages of social dramas should reinstate consensus and collegiality is not supported here, and the tensions that manifested were not necessarily resolved but rather were accepted, and enabled the conduct of one group to triumph over that of another. This further enforces Appadurai's assertion that different parties will showcase different interests in a specific regime or tournament of value, and the interests of any two parties engaging in a given exchange or mode of consumption will not be identical (1986:57). In turn, this further supports Amit's understanding of community as a term that denotes significant ambiguities in terms of the ideal and the actualization of association.

These examples have attempted to demonstrate the importance of focusing on the dynamics of the actual *consumption* of a particular commodity, while recognizing the varying significance that can be embedded within the commodity itself. Of course, circulated goods are significant within any given market of exchange, and, as Appadurai points out, it is crucial to acknowledge the "total trajectory" of the commodity in question in order to gain a deeper understanding of the cumulative value placed within a particular product (1986:13). In the context of musical and

performative consumption in live settings the creation of value is largely connected to the exchanges themselves as well as to the interactions between those consuming said commodity. John Blacking points out that,

“Art does not consist of products, but of the processes by which people make sense of certain kinds of activity and experience. Music is available-for-use, and musical value resides not in any piece or style of music, but in the way that people address themselves to listening and performance.” (2001:21)

In this sense, one can understand how consumption within a given exchange is subjective, how value constructed and expressed via this process will be variable within a particular regime or tournament of value, and how tension and conflict can manifest as a result of this variability. By focusing largely on the process (production and consumption) rather than only on the ‘product’, one is able to identify the means through which different (and sometimes contrasting) systems of value can coexist through the emergent qualities of a musical performance.

Conclusions

In terms of attendees and general participants, the expressions of value and intentions of attendance within these festive tournaments of value are in no way aligned, and do not represent complete value coherence between individuals. Some strictly attend these events for the social atmosphere that they are likely to encounter, while others are drawn to the event through

more ‘artistically based’ incentives. Importantly, there are defined modes of conduct that are understood as acceptable within these spaces (as defined by the coordinating bodies and performing musicians), and audiences are generally disciplined and limited in producing or influencing performances themselves (i.e., through ‘negative’ behaviour). For some, the experience is characterized by finding spaces to ignore the coordinators’ and performers’ definitions of music appreciation preferring instead to stress sociability involving types of freedom (i.e.: underage drinking) that are not as accessible in other contexts. In addition, different modes of conduct associated with positively consuming a musical commodity can demonstrate disjuncture of value, and construct notable tension and conflict through different means of consuming a commodity and interacting with said exchange. Therefore, values are not simply constructed through the production or exchanging of commodities, but rather are significantly expressed through ways of consuming these valued commodities as well.

References Cited

- Amit, V. 2010. Community as “Good to Think With”: The Productiveness of Strategic Ambiguities. *Anthropologica* 52(2):357-375.
- Appadurai, A. 1986. *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in cultural perspective*. Cambridge: Press Syndicate of the University of Cambridge.
- Blacking, J. 2001. *Popular Culture: Production and Consumption*. Making Artistic Popular Music: The Goal of True Folk. C Lee Harrington

- and Denise D Bielby, eds. Pp. 19-23. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Falassi, A. 1987. *Time out of time: essays on the festival*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Press.
- Getz, D. 2010. The Nature and Scope of Festival Studies. In *International Journal of Event Management Research* 5(1):1-47.
- Gibson, C. and J. Connell. 2012. *Music Festivals and Regional Development in Australia*. England: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Goffman, E. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell Publishing Group.
- Small, C. 1998. *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening (in English)*. Hanover: University Press of New England.
- Thompson, E.P. 1993. *Customs in Common*. New York: The New Press.
- Turner, V. 1987. *The Anthropology of Performance*. New York: PAJ Publications.
- Wilks, L. 2009. *Initiations, interactions, cognoscenti: social and cultural capital in the music festival experience*. PhD dissertation, The Open University.