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Abstract

Agricultural shows are community-based festivals that represent a majority of festivals staged in rural destinations within Australia. Recent anecdotal evidence indicates their survival is being threatened. Declines in the overall number of shows and visitor attendance have been widely reported, yet an analysis of the reason for these declines has not been investigated. Agricultural shows are managed by volunteers within not-for-profit show societies who are finding it difficult to survive in an increasingly competitive and challenging external environment. Little is understood about these show societies, their volunteer managers and the management effectiveness. This study has addressed these gaps by investigating show society management effectiveness by means of a marketing concept paradigm.

A case study method employing qualitative in-depth interviews with key show society members and other stakeholders was conducted on one agricultural show. Findings reveal that this show society is managed by volunteers whose primary involvement motivation is based upon self-interest in one or more components of the show. The majority of these individuals do not have management skills and expertise required to manage a festival and whilst it is important to note their volunteering contribution, it is this lack of skills and knowledge that has prevented a systematic approach to management. There is no attempt at consumer research, strategic planning, organisational planning or volunteer recruitment. The show programs do not change to reflect the current needs of the community, rather what is affordable, who can organise it and what has always been done. As a result, the case study show society is not employing a marketing concept orientation but a product concept orientation. This study concludes that without this focus, the show society will be ill equipped to meet changing customer demands and stay abreast of competitors. To assist agricultural shows to manage future challenges and adopt a marketing concept, a theoretical model has been proposed that incorporates existing frameworks and this study’s findings.
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Introduction

Agricultural shows are festival experiences held once a year in country and metropolitan areas throughout Australia. From their beginnings in the 1820s, these shows became significant community celebrations reflecting the corresponding importance of agricultural practice and produce. Despite the length of time that agricultural shows have existed within Australian society, little is known about their management. The few existing studies focus on their history, the trends affecting them and the contributions they have made to Australian culture and society. These studies reveal their colourful history and their past and current significance within country towns throughout Australia.

Recent evidence indicates a growing climate of concern about the future and indeed the present state of the country agricultural show. Some of these shows have ceased operation altogether, while others have experienced declining attendance, a lack of volunteer support, and a struggle to remain relevant to the communities they seek to represent. These problems are indicative of a concern for their long-term sustainability but show organisers are often at a loss as to how to deal with the situation they find themselves in (Truss, 2002).

In these circumstances, market forces would see a festival disappear. But country shows are more than just festival experiences. According to Darian-Smith and Wills (1999:p.59), agricultural shows have a very ‘special place’ in Australian history and culture, particularly in country towns where they provide community identity and a link to a town’s heritage and agricultural industry. Given the economic and social dislocations and restructuring, the challenges of drought and climate change that confront rural economies and communities at present, agricultural shows may have an ongoing leadership role contributing to the social identity and economic vitality of the communities they represent.
This study provides an investigation into current management of agricultural shows. Given the reported declines being experienced by agricultural shows, there is a need to understand how shows are managed and how those responsible are addressing these declines. An exploratory case study of one agricultural show’s management and its relation to the community was conducted. This case study has provided an in-depth analysis of the show’s history and management practices examined with a parallel focus on show community trends and issues. As far as is known, this is the only investigation of its kind to date and therefore adds to the existing body of knowledge not only for agricultural shows but also for non-profit community-based festival management.

Based upon current scholarly thought and business practice, the philosophy or ‘lens’ that provides the focus for this study is the ‘marketing theoretical concept’. While often referred to as a marketing philosophy, the marketing concept is a business management strategy that seeks to orientate all business operations toward the customer. Both academic and business circles, as this thesis will discuss, consider the marketing concept the most effective means for an enterprise to remain viable and relevant. Limited studies (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999; Australian Council of Agricultural Societies (ACAS), 2000) indicate that show organisers currently adopt a ‘product concept orientation’, a marketing philosophy that centres on the product – in this case the agricultural show. By adopting a product concept orientation, current market needs are not always taken into account, often resulting in a stale or unpopular experience that does not stay abreast of community interests.

Although a few studies have investigated the adoption of a marketing concept within the festival sector, none has focussed on the agricultural show. Further, these have not sought to provide a means for festival organisers to change their management focus away from a product to a marketing concept. This is important within the community festival sector, as festival organisers often lack resources and are volunteer-driven (Hede and Rentschler, 2007). The present study has addressed these gaps in the research literature.
This chapter provides a synopsis of this study. First, a background to the research is provided. In this section a backdrop to agricultural shows provides definition, description and a summary of challenges faced by show management. A brief overview of the case study community and its agricultural show is also provided in this section. Context to the study is provided by placing agricultural shows within the festival sector and describing the community-based festival and community development. This contextual discussion also provides an understanding of agricultural shows’ importance as vehicles for creating community cohesion. Further, this section outlines a rationale for this research by drawing on the wider festival marketing and management literature. Second, this chapter provides a discussion of the research problem, its purpose and research objectives. The third and final section of this chapter outlines the study’s methodology, including a section on limitations.

1.2. Background to the Research

This study has undertaken an extensive review of existing academic and industry literature on the marketing theory concept and the adoption of this concept in the festival marketing literature. In addition a review of the festival volunteer and festival management literature has been undertaken. To understand agricultural show history and current show management and marketing practices, an exhaustive review of the historical accounts and academic literature on agricultural shows was also conducted. The limited number of agricultural show industry reports was also accessed. This review uncovered several gaps in the literature. First, there is no research that explains how agricultural shows are managed. More specifically, in the face of declining attendance and community interest, how show programs are created and then communicated to potential customers is not known. Second, limited conceptual and empirical focus on the marketing concept exists within the festival literature, revealing a gap that specifically relates to the adoption of the marketing concept within agricultural show management. Third, these
studies do not provide a model or framework that provides for the adoption of a marketing concept.

Few studies and only a limited number of academic papers have focussed on the agricultural show and none of these has provided a definition of what constitutes an agricultural show. The following definition was developed and then further refined for this thesis (Meyer 2004: p.1):

An agricultural show is a community-based festival that seeks to promote and celebrate agricultural endeavours and produce as well as providing social and recreational opportunities that are relevant to a community.

Country agricultural shows exist in non metropolitan areas of Australia, primarily within rural and regional towns. According to the Federal Council of Agricultural Societies (FCAS) (2006a) more than 70 per cent of shows in Australia are held in towns with populations of fewer than 5,000 people. Although a significant percentage, this study determined that obtaining an accurate picture of the current number of shows within Australia is difficult. No accurate data is collected on an annual basis and as such only estimates can be relied upon.

Based upon only two published studies conducted on Australian agricultural shows, an indication of the size of the agricultural show scene can be established. Darian-Smith and Wills (1999) distributed 657 surveys to all agricultural show committees in Australia. This figure indicates the number of shows during this time. In 2000, a study commissioned by the Australian Council of Agricultural Societies (ACAS) indicated that the national figure was 617 (ACAS, 2000). Both figures incorporate all agricultural shows, including the large Royal shows. Based on these studies alone, it is clear that decline in the number of shows was being experienced. Although not published, a survey conducted by the FCAS (2005) indicated that there were 554 country shows held in Australia in 2005. Fader (2007) argues that this figure is not reliable as it is based upon those show committees that responded to the survey. However anecdotal evidence, but without quantification, supports the position that
Agricultural shows are continuing to decline in number and attendance (Cuthbertson, 2001; Harris, 2001; Truss, 2001a, Truss, 2001b, Bolling, 2003; Murray, 2003; Briggs, 2004).

The *show movement* is a term used to describe the overall show experience, the plethora of volunteers who plan, manage and provide operational support for the show, the competitors who exhibit and compete, and the entertainers who travel around the show circuit. Not all of these individuals are local community representatives as competitors, and the show entertainment often follow the show circuit designed to maximise these features of the show. This ‘movement’ is quite complex in structure. Figure 1 provides a diagrammatic representation of how the show movement exists at the present time within Australia. This structure is further discussed in Chapter Two.
Country agricultural shows are managed by agricultural show societies, not-for-profit associations that comprise volunteer members from within the communities where the show exists. The members of these societies are then elected to the positions of the show management committee. The roles on the committee are numerous but are performed on a voluntary basis. Historical accounts indicate that in the past there was enormous prestige associated with being part of the show management committee.

More recent information indicates that, like the shows themselves, the number of show society volunteers is in decline (Sweeney, 2002). Current anecdotal evidence (Harris, 2001; Dowdell, 2002; Bolling, 2003) suggests that declining pools of volunteers are a result of aging members of show committees and an outward migration of younger community members who are seeking employment as a result of changing economic conditions. Further, show societies are ‘finding that they need to act much more as small businesses in the way they plan for each show and
approach their long term futures’ (Truss, 2002. p.1), yet recognise that the skills to do this are lacking.

Agricultural show societies are facing many challenges. Many of the challenges identified are based upon media reports but in essence these can be summarised into three points as follows:

1. declining show attendance and number of shows held in Australia;
2. declining volunteer management pool;
3. the need for more professionalism in show management.

While much has been written in the media about these challenges, and some attention to these is evident in existing studies, little is known about how show societies plan and manage agricultural shows. No studies have been conducted to address this gap in knowledge.

1.3. The Study Context

i. The Festival Sector and Community-Based Festivals

The definition of agricultural shows provided above encompasses the term festival, a type of leisure experience considered part of the tourism sector - commonly referred to as the ‘events industry’ (Jago and Shaw, 1998; Bowdin, et al., 2006; Monga, 2006). The events industry includes many types and themes of events that have been defined in numerous ways. There is limited agreement in the existing literature, when describing and defining events, on standardised terms, definitions or categories of use (Bowdin et al., 2006, p.1). This often results in overlaps and, frankly, some confusion. It is not the purpose of this thesis to describe or add to this debate. Acknowledging this as an issue, this study has adopted the term festival to categorise and describe an agricultural show.
There is general agreement in the festival literature (Getz 1997; Goldblatt, 2002; Bowdin et al., 2006; Allen et al., 2005) that the ‘events industry’ comprises an experience referred to as a festival. Festivals originate from within the community in response to a need or desire to celebrate a community’s unique identity (Small et al., 2005) and have been defined as ‘themed public occasions designed to occur for a limited duration that celebrates valued aspects of a community’s way of life’ (Douglas et al., 2001: p. 358). This signifies the importance of festivals to the communities they represent, recognising uniqueness and value to a particular group or groups of people. As such, festival themes and programs cannot be copied as the elements within them represent the community within which the festival takes place.

The festival sector has received increased recognition in Australia particularly due to its contribution to increased tourism visitation within destinations. According to Hede, Derry and Jago, (2002) festivals supplement a destination’s range of tourist attractions and provide a focus for media coverage, leading to the prospect of repeat visitation. Further, the authors state that festivals have become an important part of the tourism strategies of many destinations. This contribution tends to take place with larger festivals such as mega, hallmark and major festivals, as depicted in Figure 2, although local community festivals have also been the focus of tourism interest. Local community festivals however generally attract smaller numbers of tourists compared to the local community. This is the case with agricultural shows. The link between tourism and festivals is discussed further in this thesis.

A community festival is a themed public occasion designed to occur for a limited duration that celebrates valued aspects of a community’s way of life and is organised and staged by the community for the community. ‘Community festivals, usually receive the smallest patronage [attendance], have smaller operating budgets and are usually organised by non-profit groups and community volunteers and attendance data is not always collected or readily available’ (Bowdin et al.,

```
However, it is community festivals that represent the largest grouping of festivals (Getz, 1997).

As community celebrations, festivals can only be truly understood, evolve from and in turn reflect the values of the groups who create and stage them (Getz and Frisby, 1988: p. 22). They create linkages between individuals and groups within a community and between a community and the world (Getz, 1989). As such, community festivals are also said to produce a range of benefits (Getz, 1997; Mayfield and Crompton, 1995; Higham and Ritchie, 2001; Derrett, 2003; Bowdin et al., 2006). These potential benefits range from broader economic and promotional opportunities for the community, such as promoting the community’s locale as a destination and attracting visitors, to opportunities for community wellbeing. Community well being benefits include creating a vibrant community and sense of place, engendering pride, strengthening a feeling of belonging and preserving culture, encouraging tolerance and diversity, providing opportunities for recreation and socialisation, increasing social equity and exposing community members to new ideas, experiences and education.

Focussing on these latter community wellbeing effects, community festivals have the potential to realise social capital opportunities. Social capital can be accumulated when people interact with each other in neighbourhoods, local associations and a range of informal and formal meeting places (Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), 2000), such as those provided by community festivals. When festival themes are representations of the heritage of the community, they can celebrate and strengthen important community values. Taken with these benefits is the notion that the organisers of community-based festivals, often volunteers from within the community, provide further opportunities for learning, socialising and developing strong community relationships. Social capital is often measured in a community based upon the levels of volunteerism. Volunteerism indicates community participation and ‘active citizenship’ (ABS, 2002). Community festivals rely on volunteers not only for their operational elements but also for their management.
Henceforth the terms *festival* and *community festival* will be used within this thesis to refer to this sector and the agricultural show’s classification. Figure 2 indicates the relationship between the festivals sector and agricultural shows in Australia. Agricultural shows can be classified within three areas within this analysis. First, an agricultural show can be classified as a ‘hallmark’ festival. In this classification are those agricultural shows that are staged within large cities, predominantly as Royal Shows. Hallmark festivals are strongly associated with their location and as such as well known for this association. Hallmark agricultural shows attract not only those within the community but also large numbers of visitors, have large operating budgets managed by paid employees and attract wide media attention and a significant number of sponsors. The management of this type of agricultural show usually organises and stages other festival and business experiences (conferences, exhibitions and so on) on-site or lease their site to other businesses. These provide other income opportunities offered by ownership of the site during ‘non-show time’. An example of these hallmark festivals is the Sydney Royal Easter Show.

Second, and similar to hallmark festivals, is the ‘major’ festival. This type of festival is major because it attracts large numbers of both residents and visitors. These agricultural shows are usually held within metropolitan cities or major destinations such as Cairns, Queensland. This type of agricultural show has similar characteristics to those previously described above.

Third within this diagram is the local agricultural show, staged predominantly within country towns and classified as a ‘local’ or ‘community festival’. This type of agricultural show is small in scale compared to those already described. Like most community festivals, local agricultural shows are managed by volunteers within the community, have small operating budgets and seek to attract the community first and foremost. Even though many of these agricultural shows own and have to maintain their showground site, little more is known about their management.
Despite the distinctions made above to describe agricultural shows, there are strong linkages between the hallmark, royal shows and the community agricultural show. The successful competitors at the local community agricultural show often move to other local nearby shows and then finally the Royal to further their competitive success. This is not only traditional but quite commonplace, resulting in a staggered show calendar in various regions within the state/territory show circuit ultimately finishing with the hallmark Royal show in each capital city in Australia.
Figure 2: Classification of Festivals and Their Linkages to Agricultural Shows

‘Mega’ e.g. Olympic Games
Characteristics:
- Significant attendance within and external to host community
- Major international media and sponsor attention and exposure
- “One off” in destination, usually government involvement as high levels of infrastructure required

Hallmark: e.g. Sydney Royal Easter Show.
Characteristics:
- Recognition, named by destination only
- Significant attendance within & outside community
- Annual event; organised by festival professionals or

Major: e.g. Bowral Tulip Time.
Characteristics:
- Attracts large numbers
- Local media attention
- Occurs annually
- Usually organised by combination of community/local council and/or professional festival organisers

Local/Community festival: e.g. Thirlmere Steam Festival, market days
Characteristics:
- Usually organised by volunteers from within local community
- For local community Usually related to community history or feature
- All have heavy reliance on volunteers for operations

Leisure Experiences
Tourism Experiences
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Agricultural Shows in Australia
Royal Agricultural Show in each Australian State/Territory
Metropolitan Agricultural Shows: E.g. Castle Hill, Penrith
Individual Country Agricultural Shows
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ii. Community and Community Development

The definition of an agricultural show provided above also encompasses the word *community*, a term also used to describe the festival genre under investigation. The concept of community has many definitions and a varied understanding (Lockie and Bourke, 2001). According to Bourke (2001: p.118) the way in which a community is defined determines the way it is understood. In her analysis of rural communities Bourke (2001) explores the varied meanings of the word particularly amongst community sociologists and, by doing so, reveals the complexities associated with its definition. The first group of definitions is termed ‘traditional’ as these definitions have been associated with a description of locality of residence, allowing those who study a community to determine who belongs to it. This notion does not consider that an individual’s family, work and residence may be scattered in many geographical areas resulting in an association with many communities. Second, there are ‘critical’ perspectives of what constitutes a community. Critical perspectives focus on power, class, conflict and change within communities. The last group constitutes more contemporary perspectives of community. Concentrating more significantly on the dynamics of power relations, these contemporary perspectives recognise that a community is not homogeneous; rather it represents individuals who bring with them different characteristics that entail a dynamic and diverse entity (Bourke, 2001).

By analysing these views of what constitutes community, this study has adopted a traditional meaning of community, one centred on locality. The study focus is one local agricultural show and its residents who are the targeted audience for local community shows and comprise the management committee. Adopting this traditional perspective of community assists in establishing understandings of geographical and historical perspectives on it. The findings discuss how this locality has altered over time demographically and economically, resulting in changing group structures.
Yet, contemporary perspectives are also relevant to this study as these allow for a greater analysis of how the community ‘operates’ and who or what is important. The study of the power relations within the community and the different characteristics of those who live there contribute to an understanding of show appeal and management.

While community festivals studies do not always define the term *community* (Chacko and Schaffer, 1993; Higham and Ritchie, 2001; Pegg, 2002), others have encompassed *community* into a wider term, that of *community development* (Getz and Frisby, 1988; Getz, 1989). Community development is a process that can lead to the enhancement of local democracy, the creation of self-reliant attitudes and actions and improvement in the social infrastructure of the community (Murphy, 1985, Getz and Frisby, 1988: p. 22). Getz (1989) states the extent of community development brought about by festivals is attributed to several factors. First, the festival organisation needs to maintain control over the festival. This means that those who plan and manage it are not outsiders or professional businesses. By maintaining control, the festival organisation is more likely to meet community needs. The second factor Getz (1989) describes is meeting community needs. As communities are dynamic, festival organisations need to be aware of the current values of the community in order for the festival to remain significant within it. The third factor Getz (1989) identifies is that festival organisations need to ensure that local leadership and inter-organisational networks are fostered, and that festival planning is comprehensive, taking into account the social, cultural, economic and environmental dimensions of the community. These factors present conceptual understandings of community development within the festival sector and are analysed in the findings of this study.

1.4. Study Rationale

According to Getz and Frisby (1988), a common reason for festival failure or decline points to management effectiveness and through this the potential importance of
the adoption of a marketing concept. Getz and Frisby (1988), Frisby and Getz (1989) and Getz (2000) consistently argue that management effectiveness is required for the successful staging of community festivals. These authors acknowledge that as community festivals tend to be organised by community groups or associations that are not-for-profit in nature, management effectiveness cannot be based on profit generation but rather on achieving specific objectives. Further, they state that festival management will be influenced by the skills of those involved, the size of the community and therefore the ability to draw in volunteers - and the relevance of the festival theme and program. However, they believe that ‘the concept of management effectiveness would necessitate the development of measures that cover the intent of the festival and the perceptions, motivations and satisfaction of festival goers’ (Getz and Frisby 1988: p.23). These three factors, whilst not acknowledged as such, are components of the marketing concept philosophy.

In a more recent exploratory study amongst festival organisers of the incidences and causes of festival failure, Getz (2002) found that ‘inadequate marketing’, ‘incompetent management’, ‘lack of sponsorship’ and ‘over reliance on one source of revenue’ were considered the most significant factors likely to cause festival failure. External factors were also considered such as the weather and competition from other festivals. While these findings shed light on causes of failure, the study itself provides a framework for investigation of causes based upon the management of a festival – how the festival organisation plans, its strategies and its programs, its human and financial resources, how it confronts external challenges and the organisational culture it possesses. It is these features of the festival organisation that provide a means to understand what and how decisions are made. No such study has been conducted on agricultural shows.

Since the 1950s marketing theorists have proposed that the adoption of a marketing concept greatly affects business performance, long-term business success and profitability (see, for example, Levitt 1960; Felton, 1969; McGee and Spiro, 1988; Payne, 1988; Webster, 1988; Narver and Slater 1990; Ruekert, 1992;
Gainer and Padanyi, 2005). Marketing concept adoption leads to the development of business strategy formulation centred on customer needs and wants. Yet even though it is termed a ‘marketing’ concept, it is underpinned by a strategic management philosophy. The few studies (Mayfield and Crompton, 1995; Lade, 2001; Mehmetoglu and Ellingson, 2005) conducted on this concept within the festival sector identify the need to implement a marketing theoretical concept, seen as the key to ensuring the long-term viability of festivals.

The marketing concept has been applied in many industries, including services and non-profit organisations. Empirical studies have developed frameworks or models to test the marketing concept’s adoption, and whilst these contribute to wider understanding, they are only relevant if they are applied in the industries and/or organisations they represent (Morgan 1996). Looking specifically within the festival literature, three separate studies have focussed on the adoption of the marketing concept amongst festival organisers. The first study, conducted by Mayfield and Crompton (1995), provides an analysis of what constitutes a marketing concept for a festival as a means of testing the use of the concept amongst festival organisers in the United States. This analysis framework has been further developed by Lade (2001) and more recently Mehmetoglu and Ellingson (2005). Whilst these authors add to an understanding of how festivals are planned and managed using the marketing concept, no studies have been undertaken on agricultural shows, nor has there been the development of a model that would allow for this marketing philosophy to be adopted.

Therefore, this review of the literature reveals three intellectual gaps. First, no study has been conducted on the adoption of the marketing concept within agricultural show management. Second, the management practices of agricultural shows are not understood. Finally, there is no theoretical model that can be used to apply the marketing concept that will contribute to management effectiveness of a festival.
1.5. The Research Problem

From the background to this study it is clear that there is a need to investigate a means for developing the long-term viability of agricultural shows in Australia. Hence this research will answer a significant issue: how can show societies incorporate the marketing concept into their management practices? This aim suggests a need to investigate how shows are managed and develop a means by which a marketing concept can be adopted.

1.6. Research Objectives

The study had five main objectives:

1. to provide a comprehensive review of the agricultural show and festival literature to identify the current state of theory and practice

2. to identify key constructs for the management of sustainable agricultural shows using a marketing concept paradigm

3. to investigate how show societies manage agricultural shows

4. to develop a model suitable for show societies to use as a management tool for future shows that incorporates the marketing concept.

1.7. Significance of the Research

This study makes a number of important contributions. First, the results will contribute to an understanding of the ‘show movement’ and in particular the management of agricultural shows. Second, the findings from this study can be used to add to the small but significant knowledge of the adoption of a marketing concept and management effectiveness amongst festival organisers, by focussing on one theme of a long-standing festival, the agricultural show. Third, this research
has enables the development of a model that aims to offer a means to effectively manage agricultural shows by using a marketing concept orientation. Last, this study will contribute to the limited knowledge of festival volunteer management.

1.8. Methodology

A case study approach has been adopted for this study in order to provide an in-depth understanding of current management effectiveness of agricultural show societies. Yin (1994: p.13) defines a case study as ‘an empirical enquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real life context, especially when the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not clearly evident’. Unlike other forms of research, case study investigations use multiple sources of information including observation, interviews, reports and other documents to analyse, describe and explore the case to obtain greater insights (Finn et al., 2000; Veal, 2006). As such, multi-method approaches were used to research the target population, analyse the data and draw conclusions. Document analysis set the background to the case study and the history and current operations of the show society involved. Secondary data developed a community profile for the case study community. Researcher observation during the show, other show society events and show society meetings enabled greater understanding of committee dynamics and relationships, as well as building a greater understanding of community participation. Informal interviews with other stakeholder groups were undertaken to obtain a greater understanding of case study show issues and universal show society issues.

Primary data was obtained from in-depth, semi-structured (ethnographic) interviews conducted with a total of seven participants drawn from the show society management committee, show competitors and an advertiser/ sponsor of the show. The research questions within the in-depth interviews were informed by the academic literature within the festival management and marketing areas. Two studies (Getz and Frisby, 1988; Mayfield and Crompton, 1995) were identified as crucial. First, Mayfield and Crompton (1995), whose study originally developed an
understanding of marketing concept adoption within festival management, assisted with an understanding of what the marketing concept entailed. Their study developed a list of items within three dimensions seen as indicators of marketing concept adoption. Second, Getz and Frisby’s (1988) community festival management study resulted in the development of a four-staged systems-based approach to festival management effectiveness.

Festival management (Getz and Frisby, 1988) and marketing studies (Mayfield and Crompton, 1995) have hypothesised that community festival success is attributed to the size of a community. That is, the larger the community, the larger the pool of people to draw into the festival’s management and attendance. To test this, the case study community chosen for this study was selected on the basis that it had a growing population. Further, Mayfield and Crompton (1995) believed that the adoption of a marketing concept was more likely if the festival had been in operation for a significant period of time, implying that currency of target market needs and wants were constantly assessed and responded to. Their study found this not to be the case. This study sought to further explore this notion. As such, the case study show selected has been staged over a significant period of time. The name of this community and the show will remain confidential. In order to protect identity, the fictional name of ‘Anytown’ was created.

The case study show is held in a local government area (LGA) that has experienced a consistent growth rate over more than a decade. In 2006 the population of this LGA was approximately 40,000 people (id Consulting, 2007). The township where the show is held has a population of 3,081. From 1996 to 2006 the LGA’s population increased by 21%. Increases have occurred due to a number of factors including the area’s rural lifestyle, location relatively near to a major metropolitan area and attractiveness to new residents who are seeking affordable housing. Consequently the LGA has a community with a high proportion of youth and young adults. In 2001 68% of the population was under 49 years of age. Approximately 36% of the population has some form of educational qualification of which 22% was vocational. Employment is at 65% with the major sectors being in wholesale and retail trade.
(19%), education, and health and community services (16%) and manufacturing (14%). Compared to the 1996 census, numbers of those employed in agriculture, forestry, fishing and mining have declined by 26%. Key agricultural ventures are in market gardens, lavender farms, small olive groves, bee keeping, orchards, and dairying and poultry undertakings.

The show itself operates over two-days and, albeit not consistently, has been present in the community since 1880. In terms of overall show society membership there are approximately 230 members, who pay an annual membership of $15 which is just less than the current price for entrance to the show. To be a committee member, show membership is required. Show membership entitles a person to free entry for the period of the show each year.

The show society and community selected for this case study therefore, provide an opportunity to analyse the relationship between population size and community volunteer involvement and attendance as well as relevance of the show program to changing community demographics. Analysing these external factors is complimented by the investigation of how the show society internally manages the show experience.

1.9. Limitations

Case study research, and thus this study, has limitations. First, the findings from this study cannot be generalised to all agricultural shows and their management (Jennings, 2001). Therefore the findings of this study are specific to this case and during this time. As is the nature of a case study, findings provide detailed insights into how the case agricultural show is managed. Other methods of data collected provide understandings and validation of the anecdotal information and observations made in other agricultural show studies. Further research is required to broaden this study’s findings across all show societies in Australia.
Second, the case study research process is subjective due to the involvement of the researcher and therefore allows for bias (Jennings, 2001). This was overcome by study respondents checking their own interviews to remove any inaccuracies and researcher bias (Stake, 1994: p.115).

Third, limitations with the research instrument were experienced. The in-depth interviews were pilot-tested with a representative from another show society to ensure clarity of questions. Any anomalies were adjusted. However after two interviews, other factors not included in the original questions were identified by the respondents. To overcome this situation, questions were developed on these factors were incorporated into future interviews to ensure other respondents answered these questions.

1.10. Thesis Structure Overview

This thesis is organised into seven chapters further outlined in this section. The first chapter introduces and provides a brief summary of this study of management effectiveness of agricultural show management. This is analysed by adopting a marketing concept orientation. Agricultural shows are defined and explained in relation to their significance within Australian communities and the relationship they have within the broader festival sector. Issues and challenges currently being reported are also detailed. Further, this chapter outlines the research objectives and methodology adopted for this study.

Chapter Two provides a detailed analysis of agricultural show research conducted across Australia and abroad. This examination indicates that challenges faced by these show societies are internal to their organisations and that external environment changes within their communities have resulted in structural change to demographic and economic characteristics.

Chapter Three consists of a review of the academic literature deemed relevant to this study and seeks to identify through this process any gaps in knowledge relevant
to this study. Several themes are explored. First, the marketing concept is probed focussing on its conceptualisation, definition and empirical testing. Within this, the marketing concept as it applies to service enterprises including those of a not-for-profit nature, narrow the focus towards community-based festival organisations. Second, the literature that investigates festival management and marketing, specifically the marketing concept, is detailed. Last, as agricultural shows are managed by volunteers, the literature on festival volunteers is reviewed.

The methodology employed for this study is detailed in Chapter Four. Within this chapter a rationale for the chosen case method is provided together with a detailed description of the research process undertaken. The approach taken to analyse the data and limitations of the study conclude this chapter.

Chapter Five provides the findings for this study. Utilising the adopted conceptual frameworks and models (Getz and Frisby, 1988; Mayfield and Crompton 1995) that guided the research instrument’s creation, this chapter describes the current practices of the case study show society.

Chapter Six discusses the findings by analysing the management effectiveness of agricultural show societies. A critique of adopted models and frameworks is provided including their inadequacies. A proposed model for management effectiveness incorporating the marketing concept philosophy for agricultural show management is provided in this chapter.

The final chapter provides conclusions and implications of the findings as these relate to the management effectiveness of agricultural show societies. The implications of the findings for long-term sustainability of agricultural shows provide a future approach to how show societies can manage the challenges that they currently face. Further, recommendations for future research in the specific area of agricultural shows and potential future application are provided.
1.11. Summary

This chapter has presented a background to this research indicating the current gaps in the literature and the existing knowledge on agricultural shows. From this information, the research problem has been clarified as the need to investigate a means for developing the long-term viability of agricultural shows in Australia. This chapter has provided an outline of the research study purpose and objectives developed that formed the basis of this investigation. Based on the information presented, the significance of this research has been outlined. A summation of the chosen case study approach has been provided with a brief overview of study limitations. Last, this chapter has provided an outline for the structure of this thesis.
CHAPTER TWO: RESEARCH CONTEXT

2.1. Introduction

By using a marketing concept paradigm, the current management effectiveness of agricultural shows in Australia is being investigated in this study. In order to provide context to this research, this chapter presents the studies, papers and reports on agricultural shows. First, this chapter presents a brief history of agricultural shows in Australia. Within this examination, the significance of agricultural shows as social and economic forces within communities in country Australia will be outlined. Second, this chapter states the existing scholarly works and industry reports on agricultural shows both within Australia and abroad. Further, based on these sources, current show society challenges are analysed. This chapter will argue that show societies operate within a dynamic environment where far-reaching economic and demographic change has occurred. Internal challenges identified from existing reports and expert opinion outlined in this chapter may prevent show societies from addressing external threats. Last, this chapter identifies a knowledge gap on agricultural show society management.

2.2. Agricultural Show Research

An agricultural show has been defined in this study as a community-based festival that promotes and celebrates agricultural endeavours and produce as well as providing social and recreational opportunities for a community (Meyer 2004). Even though agricultural shows have been operating in Australia since European settlement, there is a lack of comprehensive, accurate information on the number of shows, their attendance patterns and, importantly, how show societies manage these experiences. This section will provide an overview of the existing information, industry reports and studies that have been conducted on agricultural shows. Further, this section provides an analysis of agricultural shows drawn from existing studies and reports.
i. Brief History and Significance of Agricultural Shows in Australia

Most of us are fully aware that agricultural shows are one of the accepted institutions of the English speaking world. They are a traditional part of the country image and have a pride of place on the rural calendar for over a century. They are in fact a part of life ... (Street, 1982: p.3).

Descriptive accounts, reports and the few studies that have been conducted reveal that agricultural shows have been a tradition in Australia since the 1820s as European settlement expanded (Darian-Smith and Wills 1999: p.1). When agriculture became an important economic activity, area of business opportunity and employer, agricultural shows then flourished across Australia (Broome and Jackomas 1998; Darian-Smith and Wills 1999; ACAS, 2000). Originally staged to ‘protect animals’ (FCAS, 2006a), agricultural shows developed as a vehicle for agricultural and produce display and were established to ‘set and improve the standards of livestock and produce (Sheater, 1979, p.29). At the end of the nineteenth century, agricultural shows evolved to include displays of industrial machinery, competitions showcasing human skill, cultural activities and displays from other countries. These features now represent the ‘model’ of a modern-day agricultural show, encompassing many themes and including a wider focus of entertainment and leisure (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999; ACAS, 2000). In 1999 according to Darian-Smith and Wills (1999: p.45), there were twenty-seven different types of activities being staged at agricultural shows in Australia. Table 1 lists these.
The historic, social and economic importance of the annual show in country centres cannot be overestimated (Crabtree, 1980, p.39)

Agricultural shows became important from a social perspective, bringing communities together when they were and continue to be geographically isolated. Within country towns in particular, agricultural shows exemplify and promote a strong sense of identity for the communities they represent (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999; ACAS, 2000; FCAS, 2006a). During the 1960s, agricultural shows were described as ‘almost a characteristic feature of Australian life’ (Gilder, sourced in Broome and Jackomos, 1998: p.21). FCAS (2006a: p. 3) argue that the contribution an agricultural show makes to the community, to the ‘togetherness of a town or region and the demonstration of local attributes’, is perhaps the most difficult to measure. The FCAS state (2006a: p.3):

The show provides a time for relaxation and fun and a place where the folk from the country meet and mix to network with the people from the town. This is an annual opportunity to appreciate complementary worth and recognise synergy of the whole community.
An estimated 10.7 million visits are made to agricultural shows throughout Australia each year, representing one of the major types of festivals Australians participate in (ACAS, 2000: p.21). Possibly due to larger populations, a much higher attendance at metropolitan shows, (approximately 3.5 million) occurs in comparison with those within country areas (approximately 7.2 million).

Agricultural shows have many positive social impacts. First, historical accounts describe agricultural shows as a ‘mirror’ and representation of their communities. As such they were described as strong community ‘binders’ (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999; ACAS, 2000). Agricultural shows were seen by their communities as the constant and important representation of its history, existence and pride (Street, 1981). Second, shows occur annually creating a sense of excitement and anticipation by the community who are encouraged to participate in the competitions and leisure activities provided. Third, shows encourage the community to become involved in the show organisation and its management. Those who volunteered for this were afforded strong linkages, relative prestige and, within the group, opportunities for further social engagement.

Being community festivals, agricultural shows primarily seek to attract their local communities as competitors and attendees by celebrating skills, agricultural and artistic achievements and endeavours. In this sense, agricultural shows are also a catalyst for commercial activity in which the latest technology, new ideas and productive processes are presented and demonstrated (FCAS, 2006a). Agricultural shows also bring in competitors from nearby regions, who travel the ‘show circuit’ seeking to obtain enough experience to compete at the more prestigious Royal shows. Another characteristic of agricultural shows is ‘sideshow alley’, the travelling operators of amusements and rides. These individuals and their families provide opportunities for accommodation and other service providers to gain extra business. FCAS (2006a: p.2) state:
Show time is one week in the year when the ‘no vacancy’ sign is always on display. The arrival of the showmen alone – some 350 vehicles, 600 permanent staff, plus families and the need to employ about 300 casuals – is a good start.

This description is attributed to the larger and more significant shows; however, this observation provides further insights into the significance of the annual agricultural show from an economic perspective. ACAS (2000) identify that agricultural shows within Australia contribute an estimated $400 million to the Australian economy each year (ACAS, 2000: p.27). Half this amount is generated by country shows. According to a further assessment of this revenue, direct visitor spending contributes A$214 million; multiplier effects generated from this add a further A$118 million and income directly generated through the agricultural societies themselves amounts to A$106 million.

Government has acknowledged the importance of agricultural shows within community life (Truss, 2001a; New South Wales Legislative Assembly 2003).

Country shows and the show societies behind them therefore make an important contribution to their local and regional economies in many ways. However, as I stated earlier, country shows are not simply about money, economics and industry. It is no exaggeration to say that country shows encapsulate the qualities of the local town or region in which they are located. They are a showcase for the produce of the primary producers of the town or region; they are a meeting point for the people of the town or region; they are an important communication mechanism for the communities they serve; and they allow old friends to catch up and exchange gossip, yarn to one another.

(New South Wales, Australia, Legislative Assembly 2003)

With few exceptions, mainly descriptive histories of specific shows or show societies exist. These are useful in identifying the development and content of shows as well
as the personalities that were and are involved. It is through these existing accounts that a rich history is presented of specific communities as well as nations.

**ii. Agricultural Show Societies**

Agricultural shows are organised and staged by ‘agricultural show societies’. The purpose of an agricultural society is to:

> promote, encourage and assist the development of agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, industrial, rural, technological, commercial and mineral sources of Australia and the relevant state including the education and cultural exchange intrastate, interstate and internationally. (Ernst and Young, 2003: p.2)

As voluntary organisations, show societies are not-for-profit and are defined as charities, resulting in an exception for Goods and Services Tax (GST). Their role is said to be an ‘integral part of agricultural and rural life in Australia’ (Pickering, 1979: p.4) as these groups not only represented an important economic activity and its display of excellence, but also created many social and community benefits for their locale. Further, show societies have wide responsibilities. Apart from the management of the annual show, these groups also manage the showground site, either owned by the society or the government, with the society acting as a trustee of the land. In New South Wales since 1976, the state government has allocated grants and loans to assist with the improvements of the showgrounds (Crabtree, 1980) but it is clear from the comments made by Crosio (1986, p.10), then a New South Wales minister, that more needed to be done by the show societies themselves.

> the future viability of showgrounds lies in their use by a much wider section of the community. The multi use of showgrounds is essential to meet maintenance costs. The showgrounds are an extremely costly item to maintain and much greater emphasis needs to be placed on the collection of adequate fees and charges from those who use them’
Thus maintenance costs of often aging infrastructure exemplify the responsibility the show society has for any upgrades. Seymour (2006) indicates that one of the major reasons shows themselves are staged is to fund work undertaken to meet the objectives of the show societies. These objectives include bridging the city and regional and rural communities, showcasing the best produce, and celebrating the achievements of their communities.

*It takes a lot of hard work by many people to run a country show.*

(New South Wales Legislative Assembly 2003)

The ‘hard work’ is done by agricultural show society members who are drawn from within the local community and are often comprised of persons who have had connections with the show movement and with agricultural practice. Often these individuals continue the role based on generations of family tradition. According to FCAS (2006a: p.3), tradition is an attribute of the country show movement. This translates into membership as many show societies have second- and third-generation members and committee members. Being part of the show and its management was therefore learnt and handed down to family members. At present, membership is estimated to be approximately 330,000 people who pay between $15 and $20 per year ‘serving their communities in this way’ (FCAS 2006a: p.1).

Show society committee members who manage the show and those who are involved in on-the-ground support are all volunteers (FCAS, 2006a). An unpublished telephone survey conducted by FCAS (Fader, 2007) estimates the extent of this volunteer commitment. Committee members are said to contribute more than 1.2 million hours of time, estimated to be worth approximately $A36 million per annum based upon a $20 per hour rate. During the show period, these volunteer managers are supported by judges, stewards, grounds staff, gate keepers and other
volunteers from within the community. Apart from the tradition of being a part of the show why these volunteers continue to be involved is unknown.

In New South Wales, there has been a concerted effort to recruit newer and younger members of the community into the show movement. This has resulted in the establishment of show society ‘Youth Groups’ in approximately twenty show societies in New South Wales (YARN, 2007). These groups aim to assist their local show societies with competitions and activities, stewarding and social functions. They also learn procedures and assist with junior judging competitions, Miss Showgirl and Rural Achiever/Ambassador Competitions. According to YARN (2007) many of these groups have been instrumental in revitalising aspects of their shows. The Miss Showgirl competition, not seen as a beauty pageant, has traditionally been a means by which young women were encouraged to become a part of the show society. Other competitions such as the rural achiever awards, also aims to attract younger members to show society involvement and the promotion of agriculture.

Piecing together the ‘show movement’ reveals quite a complex structure. Figure 1 in Chapter One provides a diagrammatic representation of how the show movement exists in Australia at the present time. There are two national bodies. The ACAS predominantly represents the Royal shows and the FCAS represents country shows. The FCAS, formed in 1968 (Agricultural Societies Council of New South Wales, 1978), is drawn from state and territory show societies who meet to discuss the interests of country shows. Within larger states, in this structure are the regional show ‘groups’. These groups are arranged to provide human and in kind support for the show societies within them, with each group having a representative on the state or territory association. Each grouping then has several individual shows based upon location are staged during allocated dates each year, managed by each respective show society (Bennet, 2006).

Beyond this structure it is not known how the individual show society currently plan and manage their show or their respective society, although tradition is possibly a contributing factor. In 1979, an Agricultural Show Handbook was prepared by the
Agricultural Societies Council of New South Wales, the state body that provides an umbrella for all the shows in that state. This document provides a detailed outline of how show societies were required to operate at the time. Appendix 1a provides a table of contents that lists the topics covered and Appendices 1b-d provide excerpts from this document.

First, Appendix 1b is a constitutional template for show societies to complete. Amongst other matters, this provides an outline of show society committee composition, stating that the management committee should consist of up to twenty five members (including the President and five vice presidents –three of whom must be the chairman of the horse and horticultural sections committees (1979, p.20) while an executive committee includes all the vice presidents and the president, an executive secretary, honorary treasurer, honorary secretary and three members selected from the management committee ‘by their own number’. From this prescription, a show society simply adds its name to the document and its constitution is formed.

Second, Appendix 1c provides an extract from a ‘Show Secretary’s Handbook’ that aims to guide how the annual show is to be planned. This description is also prescriptive however is based upon how and when top order forms, set up sub-committees and select judges. There is no suggestion here of developing show programs that vary from this prescription, rather it assumes that each show will feature the same competitions and activities. Last, Appendix 1d provides an agreement with the Showman’s Guild for the provision of entertainment. This latter excerpt is discussed further in this thesis.

This handbook provides the only description of show society structure and means of operation and according to the Agricultural Societies Council of New South Wales is updated as required. How much this is used as a guiding tool in New South Wales is not known.
Recognition of the requirement to change the organisation and presentation of agricultural shows was identified by Agricultural Societies Council of New South Wales in 1982. Street, President of this society at this time states (1982: p.3):

_We live in a time of radical change, much of it unfortunately not necessarily being for the good of the community. We must however be conscious of the need to keep up to date, to be prepared to innovate and to change where change is necessary in order to meet today’s demands._

This research aims to identify if this recommendation has been applied.

**iii. Academic Literature and Industry Reports on Agricultural Shows.**

A thorough review of the academic literature indicates few journal articles or industry reports on agricultural shows and societies either overseas or within Australia. Those that have been identified provide eclectic themes that are identified and discussed below.

**Descriptive Histories of Agricultural Shows**

The most common theme in the literature involves descriptive histories of specific shows and more commonly the development of show societies. For instance, Anderson (2003) analyses the history of the Sydney Royal Agricultural Show in order to describe ‘white nation building’. Hillison and Bryant (2001) provide an analysis of the history and purposes of agricultural societies in the United States of America while White (2000) describes the history of Western Australian agricultural show societies. These and others identified for this study provide interesting international and historical perspectives of agricultural shows, their communities and origins.

**Issues and Specific Features of Agricultural Shows**

Another common feature of the literature on agricultural shows is the discussion of issues surrounding or characteristics of, these festivals by focussing on a particular
theme. Webb (2005) for instance, analyses the spread of infectious diseases amongst animals via agricultural shows in the United Kingdom. The issue of contagious diseases is currently being faced within Australia. The equine influenza virus and its potential spread throughout Australia have resulted in restrictions of horse movements and as such some agricultural shows, reliant on horse exhibition and competition, have chosen not to proceed (Lewis, 2007).

Risk management at agricultural shows is the focus of Mitchell’s study (2005). Agricultural shows, like other outdoor festivals, are not only places of entertainment but public spaces and workplaces. As such the staging of these festivals can potentially cause hazards to those who visit and work on site, particularly when animals and equipment is involved. Mitchell (2005) analyses visitor and festival management perception of risk and highlights the challenges faced by the organisers of agricultural shows in providing quality visitor experiences. In Australia increased recognition of risk as an important issue for agricultural shows has prompted the development of a *Code of Practice for Risk Management of Agricultural Shows and Carnivals* (2004) while an online management system was developed by LeisureNet (2005) specifically for show societies. Risk management and through this, occupational health and safety legislation, has created additional administrative and regulatory requirements and additional costs for show societies (Truss, 2001b.).

Holloway, (2004, 2005) discusses the ability of agricultural shows to be vehicles for education and information. In particular, Holloway points to the negative public perceptions that exist in the United Kingdom and the lack of awareness of agriculture and produce amongst non-farming people. Negative public perceptions have arisen from the presence of agricultural disease such as bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) and foot-and-mouth disease, genetic engineering and land degradation (Ollenburg, 2006). Further, Holloway, (2004, 2005) states that non-farming individuals have a lack of knowledge of farming and food whilst farmers themselves are seen as a group to be re-educated on farming practices. Based on interviews with United Kingdom agricultural show managers Holloway describes
how shows fulfil the objective of promoting agriculture and changing existing negative public perceptions. Holloway’s discussion reveals a progressive and positive approach taken by agricultural show societies. He states (2005: p.132):

The sites and events at agricultural shows present important opportunities for agricultural societies to engage in re-imaging agriculture to the public, in ways which they feel will increase public understanding of UK farmers and farming. There is a persistent feeling that such a re-imaging will be associated with a heightened sympathy for farmers which could be translated into greater consumption of UK grown food. Processes of ‘informing’ non-farming publics have therefore been engaged in by agricultural societies, in explicit attempts to establish a ‘connection’ with the non-farmers and to represent farming in specific ways. The image of farming thus being constructed is one which stresses environmental awareness and stewardship, the position of farming as important to the conservation of an attractive countryside, and the production of welfare friendly, high quality safe food. At times it also presents the continuation of a viable farming sector as important to a sense of national identity and security.

Holloway’s study and analysis portrays show society management as progressive and innovative. First, the study identifies show societies as public relations advocates leading the way in relevant, current issues and thus possessing an important role in the communities they represent. Second, Holloway suggests that in order to achieve this and re-image, agriculture show society managers are seeking input from the community and reacting to this input by developing educational and entertaining programs that reflect current interests. This description and analysis presents a different view to that outlined by an earlier study by Henning.

Agricultural Show Case Studies

Henning (1998) conducted an investigation into the future role and direction of agricultural shows in the United Kingdom. He sought to investigate how agricultural
shows were managed in North America and as such, his study provides insights into agricultural shows operations in both geographic areas. He describes the many management issues faced by United Kingdom agricultural show societies, possessing limited knowledge and access to information. Current trends on show attendance, the larger market and show society operations, he states, are not known. Further, Henning’s study states that United Kingdom agricultural shows were experiencing declining attendance.

By researching ten agricultural shows in North America, Henning uncovered a more sophisticated approach to show management and appeal compared with those in the United Kingdom. First, North American show societies, whilst varied in structure, all have clear visions in terms of educating and entertaining visitors about agriculture. Second, shows in North America are becoming larger with smaller shows experiencing difficulties surviving. Third, he reports the demand for more specialised shows that focus on one theme, rather than a broad approach to agriculture. Fourth, Henning reported that show organisers had accurate knowledge of visitors obtained through regular surveys and that they used this information to respond to visitor needs. Last, Henning states that most show organisers in North America are committed to quality service. All of these factors indicate that North American show societies are not afraid to embrace change and their practices of identifying customer needs and responding to these, indicate the adoption of a marketing concept.

Henning’s study, while focussed away from Australia, provides an analysis of show society management issues and operations in two other geographic areas during the 1990s. Combined with the more recent investigation provided by Holloway (2004, 2005) that portrays a more positive situation, a useful comparison with agricultural shows in Australia has the potential to convey common challenges. If commonality does exist, there are opportunities for collaboration in addressing these challenges through suitable forums such as the Royal Society of the Commonwealth (RSC), a representational agricultural show body for
Commonwealth nations. Further, commonality if found may be symptomatic of all agricultural show societies rather than being limited to one geographic area.

Getz, in his text *Event Management and Event Tourism* (1997) provides a case analysis of the Calgary Exhibition and Stampede. This annual, hallmark festival is described as a ten-day rodeo, festival and fair. Like Australian agricultural shows, the Stampede has been in operation for over a century and is attended by over one million people, both local residents and tourists. The focus of the Stampede case is associated with the need for and collection of market research to assist not only in meeting ever-changing customer needs and creating effective marketing activities, but also to develop long-term strategic plans. The Stampede case illustrates the type and variety of research undertaken by the governing association that can afford to dedicate financial resources to this endeavour. In terms of size, experiences and resources, the Stampede can be compared to a Royal agricultural show rather than a country agricultural show. Throughout his text, Getz refers to the Stampede as an example of a festival, but the description of management of the not-for-profit association is not detailed.

**Current Trends and Developments**

Edwards (2006), once General Manager of the Calgary Stampede, provides an analysis of trends in North American agricultural shows. Edwards highlights the challenges shows are facing from external competitors and other leisure interests and argues the importance of developing strategies that reflect community values and the important role of strategic planning. He also highlights the need to embrace change. His paper indicates that smaller shows in North America are experiencing external challenges that are placing pressure on the smaller shows to become more professional.

An address by Seymour (2006), President of the Royal Agricultural Society of Victoria, Australia (RASV), outlines several issues focussed primarily on the need for change within show societies. He states that agricultural show societies could be
more effective if they make changes in keeping with their stakeholders’ needs. According to Seymour, prior to the 1990s there was no perception of the need to change and no urgency to implement change. After the 1990s, he argues, the relevance of the country show and of societies to rural and regional communities was called into serious question. Further, he indicates the experiences of declining entries at competitions, declining attendance at shows, and escalating costs of operation. The combination of these factors was ‘quickly dragging the industry down’ (Seymour, 2006: p.53). This analysis not only portrays a situation that appears similar to that described by Henning (1998) in the United Kingdom, but also highlights significant issues for show societies.

Both Edwards and Seymour provide an understanding of current concerns and issues surrounding agricultural show management. These include the need for organisational cultural change, for shows to reflect current community values and the need for more sophisticated business practices. Seymour (2006) believes that agricultural show societies need to plan for and measure success by introducing business modelling and planning to move from the old management mind-set to becoming innovators. Seymour’s arguments suggest a lack of these activities currently exists. He argues that the future objectives for show societies should be:

- the provision of leadership in matters relating to agriculture, show societies and shows;
- developing the community and responding to the needs of customers;
- focussing on key issues that are relevant to customers and members;
- promoting education and agricultural careers; and
- organising high quality and relevant competitions.

Seymour (2006) also provides a summary of a stakeholder survey conducted by the RASV. Unfortunately the original study was not obtainable. Table 2 provides a summary of key information drawn from Seymour’s paper. The survey found 60% of respondents either ‘disagreed’ or ‘strongly disagreed’ that shows were increasing in importance. Despite this, 69% ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’ that shows
strengthen connections between city and rural communities. In their opinion, current show experiences focus on rides and other amusements (41%) and to a lesser extent, competitions (33%). This indicates an imbalance of the traditional agricultural focus toward a more carnival focus. Future show focus should be on competitions (30%) or educational displays (32%): 56% ‘strongly agree’ that agricultural shows have a future role to play in agricultural education. Therefore, a common theme to future improvement of agricultural shows is concentrating on education and restoring the focus onto agriculture.

Table 2: Findings from the RASV Stakeholder Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increasing importance of shows to rural, regional and urban areas</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(disagree or strongly disagree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural societies are critical to the success of agricultural businesses</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows provide an important showcase of rural activities to the city</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows strengthen the connections between city people and rural and regional Victorians</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(agree or strongly agree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows currently focussed on attractions such as rides and amusements.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows currently focussed on competitions.</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the future shows should focus on educational displays.</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the future shows should focus on competitions.</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the future shows have a role to play in agricultural education.</td>
<td>56 strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32 agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seymour, 2006

Darian-Smith and Wills (1999) provide an analysis of the ‘first financial and cultural role of agricultural shows in Australia’ providing an insight into Australian show society views and challenges based upon informed guesswork and/or opinions of show society representatives. A detailed overview of agricultural show history from
the perspective of respondents and recent show trends is provided in this study’s report.

In 2000, the ACAS commissioned research in order to focus government attention on the show movement in Australia and obtain government financial support. The result is a description and quantification of the social and estimated economic contributions the show movement makes in Australia.

Whilst the above discussion outlines the extent of research and analysis of agricultural shows, it should be noted that festival studies with an agricultural theme have also been conducted. The developments of Farmer’s Markets (Marr and Gast, 1995; Dore and Frew, 2000) and Field Days (Meyer, 2001) have revealed these experiences bring together the community and appear to possess more sophistication in their organisation and staging than a typical agricultural show. Farmers Markets, usually held once a month and therefore occur more frequently than an agricultural show, allow not only opportunities to view predominantly local produce but the opportunity to taste and purchase it.

Agricultural Field Days involve the exhibition and sale of products related to the growing and harvesting of agricultural produce (Dore and Frew 2000: pp.233-234). These field days whilst closely related to agricultural shows tend to have a purely commercial focus. Yet unlike agricultural shows there appears to be a growing interest in exhibiting and attending these Field Days (Dore and Frew 2000). Interestingly Field Days seen as competitors by many show societies (ACAS 2000) are promoted by agricultural societies at the state level.

Thus for this chapter’s analysis has provided background and context to agricultural shows in Australia and abroad. Further analysis of Australian studies adds weight to the discussion by providing details of current understandings of external environmental challenges and perceptions facing agricultural show societies. The following provides a summary of these sources.
A historical and current analysis of the number of agricultural shows is an important indicator identifying whether decline in show numbers is being experienced in Australia. Obtaining this information is a challenge as no reliable data is collected on an annual basis. In 1994-1995, the ABS conducted a survey on recreational services in Australia. Involved in this survey on employment characteristics, income streams and amounts were agricultural shows. The classification, including services such as historic railways, dance halls and amusement and theme parks, is referred to other recreational services. Published information does not allow for a specific focus on agricultural shows.

Based on estimates, a breakdown of the number of agricultural shows by state and territory is provided in Table 3. This indicates that all states and territories, with the exclusion of the Northern Territory and Queensland, have experienced a decline in the number of shows currently in operation. New South Wales has the largest number of agricultural shows but has also experiences the largest decrease.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Shows (2000)</th>
<th>Per cent</th>
<th>Number of Shows (est. 2007)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Australia</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasmania</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Territory</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>617</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>588</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ACAS 2000: p.15; Various State and Territory Agricultural Show Web Sites

A decline in the number of shows being staged within Australia is evident. In 1999, there were 657 agricultural shows in Australia (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999) and the following year this dropped to 617 shows (ACAS, 2000). Anecdotal evidence suggests that this figure has continued to decline (Cuthbertson, 2001; Harris, 2001; Bolling, 2003; Briggs, 2004) along with attendance numbers. FCAS (2005), in an
annual survey of country shows, indicates that during 2005 there were 564 country shows.

FCAS seeks to obtain show data each year from country agricultural show societies. This includes admission charges, membership fees and numbers, gate takings, income from covered commercial exhibits and outside exhibits. In addition to this, each show society is asked to include population data for their community and attendance at the show that year. Fader (2007), states that the reliability of this data reflects the diligence of the individual show society. The issue of reliable data is cited as a common problem in grasping an understanding of the show movement and one yet to be addressed.

Agricultural show societies obtain their revenue from a number of sources. Figure 3 provides an analysis of estimated direct revenue at country agricultural shows. This indicates a heavy reliance on revenue drawn from admissions (75 %). An estimated 5% of revenue is received from other sources including sponsorship and membership of the show societies. This is in contrast with metropolitan shows where 32 % of revenue is drawn upon admissions, 17 % from commercial space both during the show and non-show time, and 7% from sponsorship and membership (ACAS, 2000: p.19).
The decline in the number of shows coupled with the reliance on admissions as a key source of revenue has resulted in significant lost revenue that is threatening the sustainability of many country shows. Reasons for this decline are not known although Darian-Smith and Wills (1999) did seek comments from show society representatives on what they perceived to be the reasons for decline or increases in attendance. These are summarised in Table 4.

Figure 3: Direct Revenue at Rural Agricultural Shows (Estimates)
Source: ACAS 2000: p.19
Table 4: Common Reasons for Attendance Increases and Declines at Agricultural Shows In Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Increases in Attendance</th>
<th>Reasons for Decline in Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o Population growth</td>
<td>● Lack of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Improved quality of show and/or program of events</td>
<td>● Rural economy decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Show becoming more family-oriented</td>
<td>● Static or declining population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o More community involvement</td>
<td>● Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Increased sponsorship</td>
<td>● Young people not interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Expanding number of attractions</td>
<td>● Competition from other attractions (such as theme parks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Introduction of a night program</td>
<td>● People preferring other activities (such as sport)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Improved administration</td>
<td>● Weather conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Active show committee</td>
<td>● General economic recession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Better exhibitor privileges</td>
<td>● Remote location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Focus on local exhibits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Good advertisements and public relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Link with other events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Prize money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Changed date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Modernisation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999: p. 38

An analysis of Table 4 indicates a relationship between marketing and increased patronage. The reasons given for increasing attendance are heavily based upon increased marketing activity or a seemingly more customer-focused and therefore marketing concept application to program elements. On the other hand, the reasons cited for decline appear to be attributing ‘blame’ to external factors. This analysis provides some understanding of the mind-set of the respondents and their reluctance for change.

Apart from declining numbers of shows and attendance, the agricultural show reports and other sources point to a number of challenges. Seymour states: ‘agricultural societies and shows must consider a range of external and internal pressures when preparing for the future’ (2006: p.53). Analysing the external challenges first, academic studies indicate that there have been many changes in the external environment within which show societies operate. Many academic studies have signified that rural and regional areas throughout the developed
world, including Australia, have experienced societal and economic restructuring (see for instance Cheers and Luloff, 2001; Reid, 2003). This restructuring has resulted in far-reaching changes to the communities involved.

First, recent, rapid change to agricultural practices have culminated in a more sophisticated and technology-driven agricultural industry. Originally rural communities grew and prospered largely as a result of expanding agricultural production or the servicing of that production. Over time changing agricultural practices and the rapid uptake of sophisticated and technology-driven means of production altered the composition and operation of the agricultural industry. In addition, government policy during the 1980s and 1990s favoured deregulation, the reduction and abolition of tariffs, and globalisation (Higham and Ritchie, 2001). Changing agricultural practices have often contributed to unemployment, which has led to a vicious circle of outward migration, reduced services and a marginalisation of the economic viability of many rural communities (Long et al., 1990; Gill, 1991; Bramwell and Lane, 1994; Butler et al., 1999). Additionally, declining terms of trade, drops in average real farm income and debt servicing ratios are also indicators of the declining importance of agriculture in regional economies (Moxham and Jay, 2000). Added to this is the burden of changing climatic conditions in many rural areas, with drought seriously impeding the financial viability and success of agricultural activities and businesses (Reid, 2003).

Second, these changes have led to demographic shifts within community populations. The loss of public services, high unemployment levels and the consequential out-migration of younger, better educated members of these communities have collectively endangered the social fabric and structure of rural areas (OECD, 1993; Butler et al., 1999). This depopulation has manifested itself through the out-migration of mainly younger people, rather than of whole families, with the result that the remaining local population being typically an aged one (Knight, 1996). Agricultural show society representatives indicated that declines were attributed to a decline within the rural economy; proximity to expanding
urban area; retirement to the area; unemployment; and an aging population (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999: p.6).

Third, demographic shifts have also effected a change to societal attitudes and the presence of competing leisure interests and opportunities. Dahms and McComb (1999) indicate that there has been an inward migration from those seeking lifestyle changes, increased living space and an ‘aesthetic sense of the rural life’ (Burnley and Murphy, 1995). The authors term this the concept of ‘counter-urbanisation’. The same level of commitment or attachment to agriculture is not present within these individuals, who bring with them different interests and attitudes towards leisure. Australian counter-urbanisation has tended to focus along coastal environments on the margins of metropolitan ‘commutersheds’ and mountainous areas (Hugo, 1994). This has tended to involve the movement of Australian retirees rather than those seeking employment. Rural areas are also seen as attractive to migrants or those seeking permanent residency due to government policy (Grieve and Tonts 1996). Although not as significant as out-migration, counter-urbanisation, whilst adding to population numbers, has altered community composition and cohesion. These more recent arrivals have been exposed to a broader range of leisure experiences resulting in a wider, less cohesive range of interests and attitudes. Further, technological advances, better and more efficient transport access and increased competition from other festivals have provided opportunities to pursue leisure interests in other environments, including the home. Combined, these trends have reduced opportunities for community interaction by people with common interests and attitudes.

Being aware of and able to respond to these changes is crucial to any business involved in attracting a consumer market. Many show societies, whilst being aware of these changes, have an inability to confidently deal with the situation they find themselves in (ACAS, 2000). It is these external factors and an inability to confront them confidently that have contributed to declining interest in agricultural shows (Sweeney, 2002).
Other external challenges are related to legal responsibilities imposed on all festival organisations. In the past, these community festivals did not have to deal with public liability insurance, risk management, occupational health and safety and security. To those involved in agricultural shows, more experienced in the field of agriculture rather than business, this poses an enormous challenge (Sweeney, 2002; Truss, 2002).

Apart from the vast changes to the external environment, there are internal challenges involving the show societies themselves. A discussion of these challenges provides an insight into what is known about show society management. First, the composition of show societies is representative of an aging population. These individuals who have dedicated many years to the show society are unable to continue their commitment to the organisation of these shows because of their age (ACAS 2000; Dowdell, 2002; Bolling, 2003). The following expresses this situation:

*The Rupanyup Show, which is 121 years old, nearly folded three years ago. Before that it was run by Vicky South, a grey haired woman with a quiet manner who is also adept at driving a tractor. She was the president of the show committee. There was no vice-president. One year she was also the treasurer. In the end, she just couldn’t go on and the show lapsed.*

(Flanagan 2007: p.3)

The ACAS study (2000) indicates that younger people are reluctant to take on show society roles due to the different lifestyles, employment commitments and competing demands for their time. Seymour (2006: p.54), on the other hand, states that show societies should aim to satisfy the younger volunteers’ needs for ‘contribution, respect and socialisation’. This suggests that views or contributions of younger members are not being heard, and there is reluctance for change, whether this is to ‘how things are done’ or to the show program itself.
Show societies are reluctant to change the experience offered in the show program in any significant manner or to improve the overall quality of the shows (ACAS, 2000; Seymour, 2006). Whilst some are concerned that change will lose the agricultural theme or flavour of the show (ACAS, 2000), others have recognised the need to adapt to consumer expectations (Seymour, 2006). Seymour (2006: p.54) describes the need for show societies to become accountable for their actions, deliver on organisational needs, develop their skills and learn to adapt to change.

Second, volunteers who comprise show society management are largely untrained and inexperienced in aspects of planning and managing festivals. Difficulties in administration and management, finance and marketing (Sweeney, 2002: p.60) are being experienced, with show societies largely unable to deal with these demands. There is little evidence of research or the development of customer-driven strategies within show societies (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999; ACAS, 2000). Research to determine market characteristics, customer demographics, size (unless based upon estimates), satisfaction and competitor activity or to garner a broader understanding of market needs is not being conducted (ACAS, 2000: p.7). Further, accurate data on show attendance, revenue and overall operational matters is lacking.

Recognition of the lack of management skills saw the development of the ‘ShowSkills’ program, initiated through the ACAS and funded by the Federal Government in 2001-2003 (Truss, 2002). ShowSkills was essentially a training program delivered throughout Australia to 354 show societies, involving 114 two day workshops delivered to 1,125 show committee members. Key training areas...
identified and delivered included the business management cycle, attracting and keeping people, understanding finances, reducing risks, building relationships and using information. Following this training participants reported resistance for change amongst members of show societies that did not attend the training to change practices and procedures. Further the issue of attracting and retaining volunteers, particularly younger community members, remained a challenge. Despite the reported success of these workshops, the ShowSkills Advisory Committee (2004: p.3) recognised that the task of managing changes to culture, policies and practices is complicated and difficult.

Therefore anecdotal evidence, the few research reports and expert opinions outlined in this chapter indicate that show societies are facing enormous change within their communities and within their operations. In particular show societies struggle with business management, resist change, do not have access to consumer research and have difficulty attracting volunteers. The knowledge and recognition of these internal challenges does not provide an understanding of how agricultural shows are planned and managed.

2.3. Summary

This chapter has outlined the academic literature and reports that present an understanding of agricultural shows. These have provided some valuable insights into the rich tapestry that comprises the history of shows and an indication of the value these festivals have contributed to their respective communities. Further, as country agricultural shows operate in dynamic environments this chapter has sought to provide a brief analysis of the changing patterns of employment, industry development and community issues facing rural and regional Australia. These have no doubt contributed to the external and internal challenges show societies face. Further, internal challenges are creating barriers to a means of addressing those that are external. The limited body of existing research presented and discussed in this chapter reveals no understanding of how agricultural shows are managed and therefore a gap in the literature that this study seeks to fill.
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH PARADIGMS – THE LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1. Introduction

This chapter discusses and evaluates the scholarly literature that has provided an important theoretical background to the development of this study. There are three key areas within the academic literature. These are represented in Figure 3. First, the marketing concept is described as a philosophy of business and as a key component within the overall strategic marketing process. In this section the evolution of marketing theory is discussed and the services marketing literature is reviewed. Second, the literature on festival management and marketing is discussed, particularly focussing on non-profit and community-based organisations, representative of agricultural show societies. Whilst there is a growing body of research surrounding festivals as a whole, this chapter will demonstrate that little attention has been given to the adoption of the marketing concept. Few studies have explored festival management particularly within the not-for-profit community-based festival domain.

Figure 4: Themes within the Academic Literature
Third, agricultural shows like many community-based festivals rely heavily on volunteers for their management and operations. The significance of the role of the volunteer in the management of an agricultural show (and indeed most festivals) has implications for the organisational culture and the management skills and expertise obtained through those who volunteer. Understanding why individuals volunteer and their overall motivation resulted in a need to study the existing knowledge on leisure and festival volunteers. This then forms the third theme of this chapter.

3.2. The Marketing Concept

The primary focus of this study is to analyse the management effectiveness of agricultural shows from a marketing concept paradigm. Marketing concept theory was originally developed in the 1950s by John McKitterick from General Electric (Haywood 1990; Brown, 1995; Miller and Layton, 2000). He originally conceptualised the marketing concept and then implemented it within business as a guide to strategy. A marketing concept recognises that the primary reason for a product or service to exist is to satisfy customer needs. Identifying and monitoring customer needs significantly relies upon market knowledge and therefore the use of market research as a basis for the development of the product or service. Through this knowledge and process, organisational objectives, strategies and activities are then focussed on meeting customer needs, including the development of the customer offering. While often referred to as a marketing philosophy, the marketing concept is thus a business management strategy that seeks to orientate all business operations toward the customer. This concept is depicted in Figure 5.
The relationship between marketing and management was further highlighted by Druker (1954: pp.36 -37):

Marketing is the distinguishing, the unique function of business .....it is the whole business seen from the customer’s point of view....There is only one valid definition of business purpose: to create a satisfied customer: It is the customer who determines what the business is.

By highlighting the significance of the customer, Druker elevated marketing as a unique function of business. It is this basic and yet logical statement that formed the basis of what is known as the marketing concept. The importance of a marketing concept began to be seen as paramount not only as a marketing philosophy but also one of significance to management culture and overall success.

Many studies have since added to the debate on the significance of adopting a marketing concept. Of note, Levitt (1960) refers to ‘marketing myopia’, a term he describes as failing to respond to the changing needs and wants of customers, predicting that businesses would eventually fail. In order to adopt a marketing
concept, Levitt argued that business must develop ‘backwards’, beginning with an identification of customer needs and ensuring the delivery of satisfaction. Levitt’s seminal paper encapsulates the essence of modern marketing for academics and practitioners (Brown 1995), while Kotler and Levy (1969) expanded the need for the marketing concept’s adoption to include all organisations, be they government or non-profit.

Since the 1960s the marketing concept has continued to dominate or frame the academic literature and texts on marketing (see, for example, Houston 1986; McGee and Spiro, 1988; Payne, 1988; Webster, 1988; Kotler, et al., 1989; Stanton et al., 1992; Brown 1995; Perreaut and McCarthy, 1999; Miller and Layton, 2000).

The discussion above provides an overview of the theory. However, there has been a variety of terms employed to essentially signify the same concept. Shapiro (1988) refers to several terms that convey the same meaning, namely, customer orientation, market-driven, and close to customer. For the purposes of this study, the term marketing concept has been utilised, as this was the original term utilised by business practitioners and researchers. The term marketing orientation is described as the process of adopting a marketing concept within a business or organisation (Estaban et al. 2001).

Despite the varied ways of defining the concept and its application, Estaban, et al. (2001: p. 2005) indicate that the marketing concept involves:

1. customer orientation which argues knowledge of what customers want or need before developing an idea
2. profitability of marketing operations
3. developing an organisational structure which focuses on customer needs.

The second feature above implies a profit focus, one that does not comply with non-profit organisations but rather with business. Getz, (2007) argues however that these types of organisations should be referred to as not for profit as the goal of
achieving operational profits enables the organisation to inject financial resources into its future.

Payne (1988) and Morgan (1996) state that the marketing concept philosophy is usually presented as one of a number of management philosophies not all of which are truly representative of the marketing concept. Both authors observe that current practice presented in the literature indicates that while enterprises may be aware of and have an understanding of the marketing concept, the philosophy they adopt is not consistent with this. Rather, what these enterprises possess is a range of conflicting management orientations and associated attitudes (Payne, 1988). This suggests barriers to adopting a marketing concept that arise from several factors, including the history of the enterprise, the background of its hierarchy, the amount of power of each organisational function and the environment in which the enterprise operates (Payne 1988: p.47). Gainer and Padanyi, (2005) whose study focussed on non profit organisations, found that managers need to develop a market oriented culture from the operational levels in order to deal with these barriers.

The alternative philosophy to the marketing concept is the ‘product’ concept. The product concept focuses on the enterprise’s output and the volume of sales of this output (Miller and Layton, 2000). It presupposes that the product will be successful if it is of high quality and if the market is aware of it. These two philosophies are represented diagrammatically in Figure 6 by conceptually distinguishing the processes involved in bringing a ‘product’ to market if this product is a festival. This analysis provides a simplified understanding of these two conceptual approaches.

The product concept, as indicated in Figure 6, sees an enterprise as focussing primarily on the product or the service being offered. This concept has an inward focus, assuming that consumers prefer existing products and the job of management is to develop good versions of this (Kotler et al., 2006: p.25). Moving clockwise in the product concept orientation, the enterprise develops the product (in this case a festival experience), creates awareness and relies on sales for its
revenue. Little focus, if any, exists on target market wants and needs. Identifying customer needs is a critical feature of a marketing concept orientation. The marketing concept cycle in Figure 6 indicates that a constant monitoring of the market is required in order to ensure the offering remains consistent and opportunities are identified. As markets evolve so too does the offering. By constantly reviewing market needs and characteristics, a marketing concept orientation leads to a much more viable approach to the development and staging of a festival.
Since the introduction of the marketing concept and its widespread use as a theory and business practice, there has been considerable academic focus on its usefulness, relevance and importance for business success (Sachs and Benson, 1978; Bennett and Cooper, 1979; Baligh and Burton, 1979; Brownlie and Saren, 1992; Brown, 1995). Conceptual papers and empirical studies have sought to discredit and/or question the marketing concept, and while it is not this study’s focus to explore these criticisms, the fact that this constant review and questioning have occurred has been seen as an indication of the health of the marketing discipline (Morgan, 1996). Brown (1995: p.13) provides a comprehensive understanding of the various concerns and criticisms expressed in the literature. He concludes that the marketing concept is ‘not the be-all and end-all’ of management, but it is ‘extremely important’ and ‘has its place’.

There continues to be enormous support in academe for the marketing concept as a powerful marketing philosophy. In order to understand its value as a business philosophy and provide a means of implementing it within an enterprise, considerable empirical evidence across industry sectors in many different economies of various sizes and product focuses has been obtained (see, for
example, Hise, 1965; Barksdale and Darden 1971; Konopa and Calabro 1971; Lamb and Crompton, 1981; Peterson, 1989; Kohli and Jaworski, 1990; Narver and Slater, 1990; Ruekert, 1992). These studies conclude that business performance is higher and a stronger commitment by employees to the business is evident when this concept is adopted.

The most notable and widely sourced approaches to measurement of the marketing concept were developed by Kohli and Jaworski (1990) and Narver and Slater (1990). These authors not only investigated the use of the marketing concept but also developed models in order to study its adoption within an enterprise.

The Kohli and Jaworski study (1990) used in-depth interviews with 62 marketing and non-marketing managers in four United States cities across industrial, consumer and service industries in large and small organisations. Their study developed three core components: customer focus, coordinated marketing and profitability. Kohli and Jaworski (1990) concluded that a marketing concept orientation consists of three elements: intelligence generation, dissemination and responsiveness. All of these are framed by an understanding of the broader market and the target market, the provision of this information within all business functions, and ensuring that the business can act upon it.

Using quantitative measures, Narver and Slater (1990; Slater and Narver, 2000), focusing on large corporations in North America developed a three component framework similar to Kohli and Jaworski’s (1990). Based upon business behaviour using a one-dimension construct, they determined that the components of marketing concept orientation are customer orientation, competitor orientation and interfunctional coordination. These are based on the notion that the business focuses its attention on gathering information and then responding to the needs of the customer, monitors competition and develops a coordinated responsive business structure that meets customer needs. Narver and Slater (1990) therefore indicate that this approach is not just the responsibility of one function of the business but that all need to be centred on the customer.
Essentially these two foci have been described by the authors differently but not in opposition to each other. Kohli and Jaworski (1990) focus on the information process while Narver and Slater (1990) refer to organisational culture (Estaban et al., 2001). Kohli and Jaworski (1990) developed an operational model, while Narver and Slater (1990) argue that it is cultural behaviour within the enterprise that drives marketing concept orientation. These concepts and models have subsequently been employed by other researchers across different economic sectors, indicating the value of their work and their contribution to understanding and testing of this theory.

3.3. Adopting a Marketing Concept within Services

Services marketing theory grew from the original marketing concept that was conceptualised and empirically tested through analysis of manufacturing businesses. Service sectors like tourism and, within this, festivals now represent a significant presence and greater economic importance, particularly in developed countries (Estaban et al., 2001; Hooley et. al., 2003). As a result, academic focus on services marketing has grown.

Festivals are defined as service experiences. They are not tangible goods. Therefore an analysis of the literature within the services marketing domain provides closer analysis of this theory of the theme of this research. A definition of a service adopted for this study is ‘any act, performance or experience that one party can offer to another: one that is essentially intangible and does not result in any ownership of anything (Lovelock et al., 2004: p. 5). With the adoption of this definition, a festival can be seen as a service. Festivals are offered only when they are staged, once a year in the case of an agricultural show, without providing ownership of anything tangible. ‘Purchasing’ a service such as a festival provides the purchaser the right to experience something that is intangible: elements of leisure interests and needs. Whilst some services offer consumers tangible
elements (in the case of festivals, tickets for entry, purchase of souvenirs and so on), these are representations of the experience and are an element of the service that provides evidence of the experience. Those who study services conclude that their marketing should be considered as a distinct field (Brown et al., 1993; Hooley et al., 2003).

The study of services marketing in the context of the marketing concept (Estaban et al., 2001; Kasper, 2001) has led to similar outcomes to those in non-service sectors. Findings consistently support the marketing concept. Within services, the adoption of a marketing concept improves results, creates more positive consumer satisfaction and obtains important internal organisation advantages (Estaban et al., 2001; Matear, et al, 2002). Marketing concept studies undertaken within the services sector are many, and amongst these there is widespread acknowledgement of its value.

Community festival organisations are not for profit and as such, are not driven by the same profit motivations as those in business. Whilst these bodies have more qualitative objectives (Gainer and Padanyi (2005), being customer-driven is still important. An examination of marketing concept success in not-for-profit or non-profit organisations identified similar outcomes. Andreason (1982) analysed why some non-profit organisations struggle to remain financially viable. He argues that these organisations adopt a product concept orientation. ‘Key indicators’ that determine whether non-profit organisations adopt a marketing concept orientation are provided in Table 5.
Table 5: Determining Adoption of A Marketing Concept For Non-Profit Organisations

1. The offering and the organisation are developed according to what the customer needs and wants.
2. Do not assume consumers are ignorant.
3. Do not overemphasise promotion as a means of achieving results.
4. Use consumer research to determine objectives and strategies.
5. Develop tailored marketing strategies for each market segment.
6. Consider all competition for business.
7. Select marketing staff based upon research and consumer knowledge, not product knowledge.

Source: Andreason, 1982

Since Andreason’s paper, several academic studies have emerged that examine the adoption of the marketing concept within the not-for-profit services sector (for example, Lovelock and Weinburg, 1984; Shoham, et al., 2006). Scholars have argued that not-for-profit organisations need to adopt such models to guide them towards professional management and the management of volunteers (Shoham, et al., 2006).

Gainer and Padanyi (2005) who analyse both organisational culture and non-profit service organisations found that adopting a marketing concept orientation improves performance. Their study employed several measurement scales that also sought to assess the implications for an organisation’s culture in the development of a market orientation. Thus through their work and others, the marketing concept is still considered relevant regardless of its profit or non profit focus or whether it be in non service or service enterprise.

Gainer and Padanyi’s study (2005) sought to examine a means to introduce the marketing concept within an organisation that did not embrace it. Acknowledging the potential for employee resistance to change, the authors suggest that the first step to adopting a marketing concept orientation is to introduce customer-orientated activities rather than seeking to change the organisational culture. This approach, they argue, will minimise the risk to human and financial resources often
associated with imposing cultural change in a deliberate, top-down manner. In this regard, their paper addresses the challenges associated with implementing cultural change. However, in terms of recommendations and their applicability to all non-profit organisations, several points should be noted about their study. First, respondents were professional managers, not volunteers, who are more likely to be aware of the marketing concept philosophy. Second, the study focussed on non-profit organisations that have large operating budgets, employing paid employees. Last, the study assumes that management are willing to adopt and change to this approach. In smaller, less professional organisations, where management knowledge and experience may not be present, the ability to implement a marketing concept in this manner may not be appropriate, or may be more difficult to implement.

3.4. Festival Management and Marketing

The extensive and increasing body of knowledge on festivals highlights that the majority of festivals start out or remain as community-based, managed by not-for-profit organisations that have primarily developed from a community grassroots connection (Getz and Frisby 1988; Getz 1993; Higham and Ritchie 2001). This means that festivals are staged primarily for and by the community that has some connection and reference point to the theme of the festival. Unlike more recently developed community festivals that have been ‘created’ for purposes such as economic development, destination development and enhancement, more traditional festivals such as agricultural shows have evolved to become local community binders, enriching the lives of those within the local community for various reasons already referred to in this thesis (Getz and Frisby, 1988; Janiskee and Drews, 1998; Xie, 2004).

This section of Chapter Two presents the academic literature on festival management and festival marketing. Festival management at a community level is driven by non-profit groups, and it is these bodies that are responsible for
developing objectives and overall strategies for the festival, including the adoption of a marketing concept. The culture of the organisation also influences how these are carried out.

i. Festival Management

A few researchers have begun to examine what it takes for events to survive and prosper and for event organisations to become permanent institutions (Getz, 2007: p.295).

The origins, management and effectiveness of community festivals is not well understood despite the fact that it is through the festival organisation that decisions are made on every aspect of a festival’s conception, planning and management (Getz and Frisby, 1988; Frisby and Getz, 1989; Getz 1993, 2007). Getz and Frisby (1988) argue that in terms of effectiveness, community festivals, like other not-for-profit service organisations, cannot be measured by profit generation and as such measuring ‘success’ poses a challenge. Frisby, (1983, cited in Getz and Frisby 1988 p.23) analysed organisational structure in relation to overall effectiveness. Her findings indicate that the more professional and business-like the structure of the voluntary organisation, the more likely the organisation will achieve its objectives and obtain a greater share of resources.

Hede and Rentshler’s mentoring effectiveness study (2007) that focuses on regional arts festivals in Victoria, Australia, sought to identify areas of management perceived to be of importance to the volunteer festival managers. They state (2007, p.167):

Volunteer festival managers perform a diverse range of activities, including strategic planning, human resource management, marketing, fundraising via grant applications, ticketing and merchandising, stakeholder management, festival programming and tourism development and planning- all while volunteering their services to the festivals, and all within the context of artistic direction and within a management framework.
Their study recognises that these regional arts festival managers not only perform such diverse functions but that the skills required to be effective as managers of a festival may be lacking. Based upon six festival case studies, festival managers identified seven management areas of concern. These were ‘strategic development’, ‘stakeholder relationships’, ‘audience development’, ‘branding the festival’, ‘decision making skills’, ‘financial considerations’, and ‘human resource management’. These management areas were nominated by regional festival managers as those that they required support and skill development. Similar areas were identified in the ShowSkills program discussed in Chapter Two. These findings indicate that festival managers do not necessarily possess all the management skills required to plan and manage a festival. The study does not however explain how festivals are managed.

Getz and Frisby (1988) discuss a systematic approach to determining festival effectiveness. This is depicted in Figure 7. Referring to this ‘open system diagnosis’, Getz (2007: p.266) suggests this framework as a means of identifying problems and improving efficiency and effectiveness. The framework depicted in Figure 7 provides a theoretical understanding of how a festival could manage its planning and operations using an approach developed from more generic theoretical models of management (Getz and Frisby, 1988). The framework suggests a four-stage flow process.

First, an external environment analysis can be conducted based upon some degree of knowledge and research. According to Getz (2007: p.93), festival failure may arise from a poor fit with the environment. He cites examples of this misalignment: the festival not being able to attract interest or support from the host community; and a lack of key contacts or internal management deficiencies. Thus the external environment consisting of many ‘actors and forces’ can affect an organisation’s ability to build and maintain successful relationships (Kotler, et al., 2006: p.114). Further, an understanding of the external environment is crucial to planning and obtaining resources needed to stage the festival. The external environment is also
the source of community festival ‘outputs’. At this level, effectiveness can be evaluated by the ability of the festival organisation to obtain resources and sustain support.

Community context identifies the social and cultural life of the community together with an analysis of economic and political factors. Knowledge of these can contribute to festival effectiveness. The organisation’s ability to draw on community resources through existing networks and the ‘uncertainty’ and ‘complexity’ of these allow festival organisations to determine the stability and predictability of the overall environment.

Not a specific feature of this system diagnosis, but relevant to an external analysis, is the notion of competition. Rather than narrowing competition to other similar experiences, Kotler, et al. (2006) argues that every business faces four levels of competition. First, a business can view its competitors as offering similar services and products. This is referred to as ‘product form’ competition. Second, a business can view its competitors as possessing the same type or ‘class’ of products and services. Third, ‘general competition’ adopts a broader analysis that would see a business competing with all products and services that supply the same type of product or service. Last, ‘budget competition’ is based upon other products and services that are similar in price to, but may be totally different to the business offering. Lack of consideration of competitive forces within this systems diagnosis reveals a gap in the framework.

Second within the system’s diagnosis, the ability to react to and embrace external environmental factors allows a festival organisation with its resources (referred to as ‘inputs’). These influencing resources are human, financial, material and facility. These provide the means of developing the festival experience. Third, ‘inputs’ are then transformed into intra-organisational processes, the manner in which the festival organisation can assess its effectiveness and develop its operations from a planning, organising, influencing and controlling process. Intra-organisational processes as Figure 7 indicates outline specific areas within each function.
Although there is no real evidence to support the notion that strategic planning or operational planning results in more sustainable festivals or organisations, the development of mission statements, goals and strategies is what festival organisations should strive for and implement in order to become more professional and to measure effectiveness (Getz, 2007: p.274). Further, Spiropoulos, Gargalianos and Sotiriadou (2006) state that not only has strategic planning and management of festivals grown, but that community festivals are required to perform these functions in conjunction with an assessment and in cooperation with various stakeholder groups. The planning or objective setting for
the organisation and the festival is developed based upon research and management’s understanding of these factors and what they see as important - not necessarily profit. Getz (2007) states that as a future-oriented process, planning and, therefore, decision making within the festival sector are often made in an irrational manner. Further, he states that decisions made in the present are often influenced by previous decisions.

Within this stage, leadership is identified as an influencing factor. The notion of leadership has been explored by Lade (2001) and Ensor, Robertson and Ali-Knight (2007). Lade’s study is discussed in the following section on marketing concept adoption. Ensor, Robertson and Ali-Knight’s study (2007) involving three festival ‘experts’ to identify the key success factors for creative and innovative festivals. A total of six categories were developed from the findings of this study. These are provided with their sub categories in Table 6. As leaders themselves it was not surprising to learn that these respondents identified leadership as the most significant category and within this independence, freedom and developing a non business oriented culture. The fourth category linked to leadership, is decision making styles indicating within the sub category the leader’s influence on decision-making. These combined with funding and the history of the festival are seen by the authors as the barriers to affect change. Focus of the festival, the second category implies a marketing concept driven approach as it identifies the audience of the festival as well as artistic needs. Cohesion and mutual appreciation of the local community is identified as the third category. These two latter categories are seen by the authors as the issues affecting support for creativity and innovation.
Table 6: List of Key Categories and Sub Categories of Successful Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Sub categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Freedom from external pressures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organisational culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Focus</td>
<td>Audience-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Artistically-driven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Relationship with local Community</td>
<td>Mutual appreciation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of major divisions within the local community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Decision-making style</td>
<td>Decision making style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Influences on decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Funding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>History of the Festival</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ensor, Robertson and Ali-Knight, 2007 p. 228.

Referring to Figure 7, fourth are ‘outputs’, the final stage of effectiveness measurement. According to Getz and Frisby (1988), organisational effectiveness involves achieving objectives, the ability for the organisation to survive and evidence of internal cohesion. Environmental effectiveness is measured by the festival’s contribution to benefits or costs to the social, economic and environment of the community.

The systematic framework outlined in Figure 7, is complex and, according to Getz and Frisby (1988), would require a considerable research effort to test fully. This study is an attempt to do so.

Getz and Frisby’s (1988) found less formal management operations within the community festivals that participated in their study. From selected results, 31% of festivals had paid staff, indicating the majority relied significantly on volunteers; 43% had a marketing plan; and 40% had carried out a visitor survey of some kind. Some level of planning was shown to have taken place as 74% of festivals indicated they had formal goals and objectives. However, there was an indication that little thought had been given to organisational efficiency despite the desire to produce ‘a
good experience’ (Getz 1993). Some respondents indicated that more formal and professional approaches to festival management would result in higher costs, more work and less enjoyment. This implies and acknowledges that the character of the operations and management was deliberate rather than based on ignorance or lack of skills. This comment also provides some insights into the motivations of festival management volunteers, who become involved for non-monetary return. Enjoyment is a term used. Despite the fact that Getz and Frisby (1989) identify management training as a recommendation for festival organisation members, the level of skills and training of respondents was not identified.

Getz and Frisby, (1988) concluded their findings with several hypotheses designed to shape the case study research that followed. First, they proposed that ‘management sophistication in festivals is more likely related to the size of the community than the age of the event’ (Getz and Frisby, 1988: p.27). This they argue is because larger sized communities potentially have larger numbers and more skilled community members who possess the required levels of skill and a greater number of people from which to recruit volunteers. This hypothesis assumes community members want to be or are given the opportunity to become involved in the festival’s management. Second, Getz and Frisby (1988) suggest that festivals move through an evolutionary process where small and unsophisticated festival programs go through cycles of success and decline, or fail completely, partly due to volunteer problems. Volunteers either ‘burned out’ and left the organisation or the number of volunteers required to stage the festival was difficult to sustain. Declines were also likely to result in a ‘stale’ product. Third, as a whole, the systems diagnosis allows for an analysis of the effectiveness of festival organisation, although the organisation itself may not be able to assess this. Getz and Frisby (1988) note that determining which of the four stages described within this system’s diagnosis is appropriate for any particular festival is not possible. Any use of this tool requires the opinions and views of the festival organisation and its community.
Further research found these hypotheses to be accurate (Frisby and Getz, 1989). Festivals were found to be operating in ‘highly uncertain environments’ where the biggest problems were to acquire financial and human resources (1989: p.10). Their findings led to the development of a cyclical two-dimensional model for non-profit festival organisations, shown in Figure 8 (Getz, 1993). This model suggests that non-profit festival organisations move toward being more professional as the size of the community grows, accompanied by the resources possessed. The model suggests that once a festival organisation is established, as time moves forward, there is greater formality and increasing professionalism. The model also allows for a return to the previous stage if there is a failure or loss of resources (Getz, 2007).

Building upon these and other study findings conducted in non-service, service and non-profit organisations, Getz (1993) explores the concept of culture within the festival organisation, an area of research where he believes much more attention is still required (Getz, 2007). His conceptual paper (1993) suggests techniques and models that can be used to measure success or failure of a festival organisation, as well as a way to explore and theorise organisational change. Getz further refers to the influence of the age and resources of a festival organisation, but attributes differences in festival organisations to what he refers to as intangibles like leadership, community context and the background, values and attitudes of members of the festival organisation. These characteristics or factors provide a useful means of investigating community festivals.
In a survey conducted independently with festival professionals, respondents were asked to indicate the incidence and causes of festival failure or other serious problems (Getz, 2000). Among reasons for failure, the largest category of items relate to marketing/planning (specifically inadequate marketing or promotion), ‘lack of advance or strategic planning’, and ‘inattention to program or service quality’. Other categories not rated as highly are human resources; financial resources; and organisational culture. Getz notes (2002: p.212) that human resource problems were not highly important as a category but the problem of ‘volunteer burnout’ and ‘incompetent festival managers or staff’ represents a significant threat to festival success. Within the organisational culture category, ‘lack of strong leadership’, ‘internal division’ and ‘unwillingness to make necessary change’ was nominated as reasons for failure. External factors, such as the weather, regulation and competition, can be seen as outside the control of the festival committee. Excluding the weather, however, these factors can be managed if those in charge have the capacity to anticipate changes and develop strategies to respond to them. He states (2002: p. 212) that if festival managers are incompetent, management systems will be inadequate.

From these aforementioned studies on festival management, the concept of organisational culture is significant in understanding how these volunteer bodies are managed. Handy (1988: p. 83), in his analysis of voluntary organisations, indicates that history plays a large part in their design and existing culture:

> Many voluntary organisations are lumbered with inherited cultures and traditions which may no longer be appropriate to the task in hand, and with structures and systems that would not be reinvented like that if they did not already exist.

Handy’s statement indicates the strength of organisational culture within voluntary bodies that have a long history, like those of agricultural show societies, and further discusses the reluctance in this environment for change. Handy believes that
voluntary organisations change only when ‘they are frightened’ and when the costs of no change vastly exceed the risks. As such similarities between Handy’s (1988) and Getz’s (2002) statements are consistent with those of Gainer and Padanyi (2005) and reflect the importance conveyed in marketing concept studies of organisational culture. Seymour (2006), as outlined in Chapter Two, identified the reluctance for change amongst agricultural show societies, not for profit associations that are steeped in history and tradition in Australia. These concepts are therefore important and are explored in this study.
ii. Festival Marketing

The following presents the studies that focus specifically on festival marketing, in particular the marketing concept. Festivals are said to adopt a product concept orientation (Getz, 2007) indicating that despite widespread recognition in non-festival sectors of the need to adopt marketing concept has not occurred. As a pioneer of festival research, Getz (1997: p.250) defined marketing for festivals as:

*The process of employing the marketing mix to attain organisational goals through creating value for clients and customers. The organisation must adopt a marketing orientation that stresses the building of mutually beneficial relationships and the maintenance of competitive advantage.*

Limited empirical research has been conducted on the adoption of the marketing concept within festival organisations. The three studies that have done this are summarised in Table 6.
Table 7: Summary of Studies Conducted to Evaluate the Adoption of a Marketing Concept Amongst Festival Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors and Year of Publication</th>
<th>Research objectives</th>
<th>Method and sample size</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mayfield and Crompton, 1995</strong></td>
<td>1. Determine level of adoption of the marketing concept. 2. Identify dimensions of the marketing concept. 3. Identify selected attributes of festivals and characteristics the festival organisers’ to explain differences.</td>
<td>1. Literature review 2. Focus group interviews with festival organisers 3. Mailed ‘self-report measuring instrument’ using a series of rating scales. 4. Sample: 291 festival managers in Texas.</td>
<td>3. Development of a three-dimensional framework to assess marketing concept adoption. 4. Festivals have partially adopted the marketing concept. 5. Resources are needed to adopt a marketing concept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lade, 2001; Lade and Jackson, 2004</strong></td>
<td>1. Does a market orientation in the development of regional festivals contribute significantly to its success?</td>
<td>1. Literature review 2. Case study utilising two regional festivals in Victoria, Australia using Mayfield and Crompton’s dimensions. 3. Two in-depth interviews</td>
<td>1. Market orientation within regional festival development is important. 2. Application of market-oriented activities with a product-oriented festival may assist similar outcomes. 3. Of similar importance are:  - planning and management activities;  - local community involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mehmetoglu and Ellingson, 2005.</strong></td>
<td>1. How do festival organisations view the marketing concept as a management philosophy?</td>
<td>1. Literature review 2. Semi-structured telephone interviews with 13 festival organisations deemed small scale in Norway using Kohli and Jaworski’s (1990) framework.</td>
<td>1. Market intelligence activities are being carried out and disseminated in simplified manner. 2. Other dimension results indicate that market orientation is not being carried out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mayfield and Crompton (1995) first conceptualised the marketing concept for festivals. Their study was limited to festivals that operated annually, exceeded two days, and consisted of multiple experiences within the one festival. Further they sought to include a broad range of festival themes and those organised and staged within and by communities. A list of items that are representative of the adoption of a marketing concept was initially devised based upon studies previously undertaken on the marketing concept in other industries (Konopa and Calabro, 1971; Crompton and Lamb, 1986; Ruekert, 1992; Jarowski and Kohli, 1993). From this initial list, fine tuning based upon expert opinion obtained from focus group interviews developed the final framework as shown in Table 7. Rating scales were developed on which respondents checked off appropriate positions to best reflect their views on the organisation of other festivals and then their own.

The three ‘dimensions’ of application of the marketing concept: visitor orientation, pre-experience assessment and post-experience evaluation, were developed based upon focus group responses. Mayfield and Crompton (1995: p.21) argued that all the formed dimensions were compatible with the marketing concept although some may be more critical than others. The following is provided to explain each dimension and its application.
Table 8: Items Comprising Market Orientation Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 1:</strong> Visitor Orientation</td>
<td>Listen to opinions of visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use visitor information to improve quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop objectives based upon visitor needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use visitor information to develop ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain ideas from visitors to improve the event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand visitor needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value visitor input in planning new attractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep promises made to visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respond to visitor needs in creating activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 2:</strong> Pre-experience Assessment</td>
<td>Use market research to identify different markets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage in market research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a strategy that relies on market research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 3:</strong> Post-experience Evaluation</td>
<td>Measure visitor satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solicit complaints from visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use visitor feedback to measure advertising effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure service quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Mayfield and Crompton, 1995: p.19

The first dimension, ‘visitor orientation’, contains items that relate to the understanding and use of relationships with visitors/attendees in the development of content and marketing objectives for the festival. The second dimension, ‘pre-experience assessment’, focuses on the broader understanding of the market rather than those who have attended the festival in the past. Specifically, the focus of this dimension is the understanding of potential markets, the use of market research and the development of marketing strategy that encompass this research. The use of the term *pre-experience* is based upon the determination of market expectations for such an event. Ruekert’s terminology (1992) for this dimension is *strategy development*, considered a more accurate portrayal of its content.

Each component of festival planning needs to flow from a current understanding of existing markets and their needs. The development of festival programs and marketing initiatives should flow from this information. Dimension three, ‘post-experience evaluation’, relates to the experience of quality and satisfaction as well as the measurement of the effectiveness of marketing programs developed to inform potential visitors of the festival.
Research and information are required for each dimension. Wood (2004: 135) in her analysis of the marketing information needs for the festival sector discusses nine areas, eight of which are consistent with the dimensions conceived by Mayfield and Crompton (1995). These are:

- setting objectives
- macro environment analysis
- customer analysis, segmentation and targeting strategy
- customer satisfaction
- customer expectations
- competitor analysis and positioning
- tactical marketing decisions
- wider impacts
- long-term planning.

The inclusion of wider impacts is not the focus of these dimensions but is useful in identifying overall festival purpose. Wood (2004) states that few festival organisations know what they have or need and how to obtain it.

In addition to developing an instrument to measure adoption of the marketing concept, Mayfield and Crompton (1995) sought to test several hypotheses in relation to the marketing of festivals. First, they hypothesised that the existence of a marketing plan positively affects a marketing concept adoption. It can be argued that the existence of a plan does not necessarily indicate this as the contents can indicate some degree of planning rather than the development of customer-focussed objectives. Second, the authors hypothesised a link between the use of the marketing concept and the length of time the festival had been operating. The longer the festival was operating, they proposed, the more likely that the festival had adopted a marketing concept. This hypothesis was found to be
void. Their findings suggest the opposite; that is, the more established a festival the less likely it would adopt a marketing concept.

Further, their study proposed and concluded that the degree of sponsorship support, the presence of full-time employees as compared to the number of volunteers and the greater the festival attendance, degree of revenue and financial support positively affects the adoption of a marketing concept. Another characteristic considered important is the size of the community that the festival was staged within. Community size has come into discussion in other festival studies already referred to (Getz and Frisby, 1988; Frisby and Getz, 1989; Getz 1993, 2002) supporting the notion that the larger the community the more likely a marketing concept is adopted. Mayfield and Crompton (1995) were able to conclude that the greater the resources (financial, human and community) festival organisers have, the more sophisticated the marketing practices adopted.

Their study is important for a number of reasons. First, it provides an initial analysis of the significance of adopting a marketing concept within the festival domain. Second, the study provides a useful framework that can be employed and further developed to measure the adoption of a marketing concept with festivals in other geographical areas. This framework was developed through the analysis of other empirical studies in other sectors and adapts it for the festival sector through both qualitative and quantitative measures. Based upon the marketing concept literature discussed earlier in this chapter, it is important to develop an industry specific framework. Third, it is still the only comprehensive study that investigates the adoption of the marketing concept amongst festival organisations.

Applying Mayfield and Crompton’s framework and bringing the study into an Australian context, Lade (2001) conducted a case study analysis of two regional festivals in order to determine key success factors. Lade suggests that recently conceptualised festivals are often developed to create more attractive destinations and boost economies as well as bringing in more community opportunities to engage in leisure and entertainment pursuits to a regional community. Often they do not ‘lead to the success originally anticipated by
organisers’ (Lade and Jackson, 2004: p.1) because they do not necessarily represent or provide a connection with community history or identity.

Lade (2001) found that in addition to a strong marketing concept orientation, success factors can be categorised as: (1) community involvement and support; (2) management and planning functions; and (3) marketing strategies. Factors one and two are consistent with the system’s analysis proposed by Getz and Frisby (1989) for festival management effectiveness. The two regional festival organisers within Lade’s study agreed that these characteristics were influential to festival success and interacted with each other to varying degrees. For example, community involvement and support became significant when a festival was well developed rather than as an impetus for the festival and its program. This contradicts the notion of marketing concept orientation where the community as the market for the festival drives its need and content. Festival development, Lade (2001) suggests, occurs on a continuum ranging between full market concept orientation and product concept orientation and that it is possible to achieve festival success (based upon objectives) by not utilising a full marketing concept orientation. Adoption of a marketing concept assisted in the management and planning functions particularly in developing detailed planning, feasibility, identification of market needs, and setting festival objectives. The commitment and dynamic, visionary leadership of the festival organiser was also seen to lead to festival success.

Lade’s study found that the longer a festival was in operation, the more likely it was to adopt a market orientation to remain successful. This is in contrast to Mayfield and Crompton’s (1995) findings. Both regional festivals studied by Lade (2001) had been operating for approximately fifteen years, have full-time employees (although like many festivals rely heavily on volunteers) and had different geneses. One festival that was seen to adopt a marketing concept from its initial conceptualisation, conducted market research into the viability of the festival concept prior to the festival’s staging within the local community and, undertook a competitor analysis. The second festival initially adopted a product concept orientation and developed from an identification of the lack of sporting events within the
regional community. This festival found itself struggling with attendance and decided to become more market-oriented in order to continue to attract customers. As the two festivals chosen for this study began with different orientations, Lade indicates that even if a marketing concept is not initially adopted, festival management can embrace this philosophy in order to remain viable and successful. Further, her study draws in the importance of the planning and management functions linked to strong leadership, characteristics identified by Getz and Frisby (1989). These latter characteristics develop an organisation’s culture and the marketing philosophy adopted.

Mehmetoglu and Ellingsen’s (2005) study focussed on small-scale festivals in Norway. The study found that none of the 13 festivals employed a marketing concept. The authors developed a three-scale dimension based upon Kohli and Jaworski’s (1990) study using similar dimensions to those of Mayfield and Crompton (1995). These are ‘market intelligence generation’, ‘market intelligence dissemination’ and ‘responsiveness to market intelligence’. Mehmetoglu and Ellingsen (2005) concluded that the degree of marketing concept adoption was based upon sufficient resources to pay skilled staff and have the time to carry out required activities, implying that volunteer driven management did not allow for marketing concept adoption.

Their study proposes eight conditions that predict marketing concept adoption, two of which are related to those of Mayfield and Crompton (1995). These are the age of the festival and the number of paid staff. Other conditions are related to tourism factors (attracting tourists, degree of international tourists) whilst others are linked to management factors. The authors suggest that the greater the skills of staff, the nature of the organisations (a privatised model instead of a community-based, non-profit) and the decline in attendance at the festival determine whether the marketing concept is adopted.

This review of the festival management and marketing concept literature clearly identifies a need for more research in this field. There are several reasons for this. First, many of studies were conducted during the 1980s and 1990s. More recent analysis is required to not
only determine current operations but also note if practices have changed. Lade (2001), Getz (2002) and, more recently, Mehmetoglu and Ellingson (2005) have added to current understanding although these do not provide a thorough analysis of all requirements seen as important to this study, in particular an analysis of agricultural show management and the nature of volunteer management within festival organisations. Second, those studies that focus on the marketing concept, while indicating a lack of adoption of this philosophy, do not examine how this can be developed in a practical manner within festival organisations. Third, a relationship between festival management and the adoption of a marketing concept philosophy needs to link culture and leadership strongly into the analysis.

3.5. Festival Volunteer Management

Agricultural show societies are non-profit organisations who rely on volunteers. For the purposes of this study, volunteers are described as

*People who give unpaid help in the form of time, service or skills.*

Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2005

It is now well recognised that volunteers are a valuable festival resource (Slaughter, 2002; Pegg, 2002). The ABS survey (1997) on Australian cultural trends found that approximately 200,000 people nationwide identified as being involved in organising cultural festivals. While this study is limited to one type of festival, it does provide a quantitative perspective on the number of festival volunteers in a given year. As volunteers, individuals are not paid for their time, service or skills. Unlike paid staff, therefore, volunteers are motivated by other factors and considerations. This assumes that an understanding of volunteer motivation is important in enhancing satisfaction with the volunteering experience and ensuring that those who do volunteer are retained (Slaughter, 2002; Monga, 2006).
Green and Chalip (1998) suggest that monitoring volunteer motivations over time can identify changes to ensure that volunteers remain satisfied with their volunteering experience and therefore encourage retention. Yet, according to Slaughter (2002), many festival volunteer motivation studies do not necessarily distinguish between one off and long term volunteers. This is possibly due to the focus these studies have on mega or major festival experiences that may not take place more than once, rather than smaller, community festivals such as agricultural shows.

Slaughter (2002) sought to explore the motivations of long-term volunteers and thereby provide some insights into whether these festival volunteers differ to those of festival volunteers in general. Slaughter defines a long term festival volunteer as ‘a person who has volunteered at the same event for at least five consecutive years’ (2002: p.235). As a result, his study is significant to agricultural show research, not only for this focus, but also because part of his sample was drawn from agricultural show volunteers. As such, a more detailed analysis of his research is required.

Slaughter developed a self completion postal questionnaire using a 24 item five point Likert scale to develop his findings in addition to collecting demographic data, a feature of his research that is interesting on its own. The majority of respondents (64%) were aged over 50. The highest proportion of respondents (38%) was employed full time. Retired respondents comprised the second largest group (27%) based upon employment. The number of years that respondents had volunteered for the same festival ranged from 5 years to 57 years. Based upon these findings alone, similarities exist based upon knowledge of agricultural show volunteers, particularly in terms of age and length of service. Unfortunately a more detailed analysis by festival is not provided, in particular, what role these volunteers played.

Table 9 provides the statements ranked in order of importance that comprised Slaughter’s Long Term Event Volunteer Motivation Scale (LTEVMS). Findings indicate different perspectives of volunteer motivation compared to those of studies conducted on other
festival volunteers. Statements that most respondents agreed with suggest that volunteers are motivated primarily by the belief that they are contributing to society by ‘doing something worthwhile’ ‘creating a better society’ and ‘giving something back to the community’. These statements can be defined as representative of altruism. Altruism, the desire to help others, does not appear to be an important motivator in the findings of other festival volunteer studies (Monga, 2006). Rather, these have indicated that volunteers will exchange their services for personal interests, the need for influence, social status, social recognition or elaboration of social networks (Edwards 2005). In Slaughter’s study, these motivations are found at the other end of the lowest ranking reasons. Few long-term volunteers are motivated because they feel it is an expectation or for material incentives such as uniforms. In relation to agricultural shows, items ‘I want to continue a family tradition of volunteering’ and ‘being a volunteer with this organisation is considered prestigious’ were also ranked low.

Table 9: Slaughter’s Long Term Event Volunteer Motivation Scale (LTEVMS) Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest ranking reasons</th>
<th>Lowest ranking reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel I am doing something worthwhile.</td>
<td>I am expected to volunteer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe volunteering creates a better society.</td>
<td>I want to continue a family tradition of volunteering.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to interact with others.</td>
<td>I have more free time than I used to have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have benefited from this organisation and I want to give something back to the community.</td>
<td>Being a volunteer with this organisation is considered prestigious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My skills are needed.</td>
<td>Most people in my community volunteer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering broadens my horizons.</td>
<td>I like the ‘extras’ given to volunteers (e.g. uniforms).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to work with different people.</td>
<td>I want the opportunity to meet paid employees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering makes me feel better about myself.</td>
<td>I did not have anything else to do with my time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monga (2006), using a similar method and not restricting his study to either long term or one off volunteers, found the most significant factor in deciding to volunteer was the interest or previous involvement in the festival’s theme. Further, Monga (2006) states that the more passion or attachment a volunteer possesses for the festival theme or activity, the stronger the likelihood the volunteer will remain involved. Edwards (2005: p.5) noted that viewing volunteers in this way was important because ‘it raises the notion of self-interestedness, turning the focus onto the volunteer and what they get out of volunteering rather than the contribution they make to the wider community’.

Based on these studies, there is no consensus in volunteer motivation characteristics. What can be stated, despite the variety of possible motivations, is that festival volunteers are not motivated by one factor alone but rather multiple reasons. Therefore those who seek to recruit festival volunteers must be prepared to address a variety of motivations (Farrell et al., 1998; Monga, 2006) within one festival experience.

As a result of non–remuneration, volunteers can terminate their involvement much more easily than in a paid job (Elstad, 2003; Monga, 2006). This feature of non-payment has other ramifications: high turnover of volunteer staff or retention of volunteers (Hanlon and Jago 2004) and varying levels of dependability (Cuskelly, et al., 2004). Elstad (2003), whose study of a major jazz festival in Norway investigated the reasons volunteers ‘quit’ their involvement at a festival, found that the longer a volunteer had worked at a festival, the higher the likelihood that they would continue their commitment. She also concluded that the level and amount of work carried out affected volunteers’ reasons for quitting as did volunteer involvement in the development of goals, strategy and organisation. The more involved the volunteer felt in these areas, the more ownership and value the volunteer possessed in regard to the festival and its organisation.

Little is understood about those volunteers who are directly involved in the management of a festival. There is however widespread acknowledgement that those festivals that rely on
volunteers for the management aspects as well as operations require suitable levels of competence in ‘running’ the festival. While festival volunteer managers possess a range of skills, these may not be those associated with festival management (Hede and Rentschier, 2007). Getz and Frisby (1988) found that community festivals primarily operated by volunteers require training and technical support in the development of management plans and research due to the lack of expertise and time that volunteers have to carry out these activities. Further, they state small and unsophisticated festival organisations go through cycles of success and decline, or fail completely partly due to volunteer problems. Their study found that ‘valued’ volunteers either ‘burnt out’ and left the organisation or the need for numbers of volunteers was difficult to sustain. A relationship between management sophistication and larger sized communities was put forward, arguing that there is a larger volunteer pool to recruit from and the possibility that more community members will possess the required level of skills.

As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Getz and Frisby (1989) focussed on community festivals that are driven predominantly but not exclusively driven by volunteers and as such their study is significant to this research. Other festival volunteer studies allude to festival volunteer management (for instance, Monga, 2006) but only one study has solely focussed on festival volunteer management. Hede and Rentschier (2007: p. 158), whose study is discussed in section one of this chapter, state that little interest has been directed to volunteers that manage festivals and therefore their study moves forward in addressing a gap in knowledge. As agricultural shows are solely managed and operated by volunteers, it is anticipated that this study will add to this knowledge.

3.6. Summary

The marketing concept is well recognised and, since the 1950s, a well researched philosophy within service and non-service industries. As this chapter has indicated, its focus within the festival literature is limited, and no studies have emerged that focus on agricultural shows. The significance of organisational culture and access of information on the market are
considered crucial to its implementation. The premise of this concept within festival management is that organisations charged with the creation of the festival experience develop themes and programs that are in demand. Implementing the marketing concept within festival organisations requires research on the market and development of festival objectives and strategies aimed at meeting customer needs. These themes have been discussed in this chapter and the various studies described. Within this discussion, Mayfield and Crompton’s (1995) study has been explored in some detail as their findings have made a significant contribution to the development of this study’s research parameters.

An analysis of community festival management literature indicates few studies that have investigated both an analysis of community festival management and the adoption of a marketing concept. Only Lade’s study (2001) has developed a relationship between the two areas of festival management. Findings from these festival management studies indicate that community festivals may not adopt common business management practices, as described by Getz and Frisby (1988), including the marketing concept. This may be due to a lack of skills on the part of the volunteer management and the recognition that these not-for-profit organisations have limited financial resources to conduct research. Getz and Frisby’s (1988) festival management study developed a systems-based approach to their analysis of community festival effectiveness. This framework has been described within this chapter and has contributed to the development of research enquiries for this study.

Further, this review of the literature has indicated several areas requiring further investigation seen as crucial to festival success. These success factors are attributed to the size of the community, the age of the festival, use of volunteers (as opposed to paid staff) and the presence of market research. These aforementioned factors are said to influence the presence of a marketing concept and festival management success and, as a result, have been explored in this study.

The final section of this chapter has focused on the festival volunteer studies. With one exception, these have not focused solely on the festival volunteer manager; however,
findings reveal that motivation to be a festival volunteer is predominantly driven by self-interest. As agricultural show societies are entirely managed by volunteers, the literature presented in this chapter has added to the current investigation but has also revealed gaps in existing knowledge.
CHAPTER FOUR: RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1. Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the current management effectiveness of agricultural show societies in Australia by utilising a marketing concept paradigm. As outlined in Chapter Three, the marketing concept is an empirically tested marketing philosophy which if applied allows an enterprise to maintain relevance to the market. A review of the literature has found very little adoption of this concept in the festival sector and that agricultural shows have not been within this limited focus. The research context presented in Chapter Two indicates that currently few, if any; agricultural show societies adopt a marketing concept. However, no research has validated this. As a result of this research gap, this study seeks to provide a benchmark by which to analyse and evaluate this phenomenon utilising the instrument developed by Mayfield and Crompton (1995). Existing marketing concept studies point to the link between organisational culture as a means of implementing this. This implies the nature of the organisation requires investigation. Further, Chapter Three in presenting the few studies on festival management indicates that effectiveness relies on a number of factors described as complex, within a systems diagnosis developed by Getz and Frisby (1988). This investigation seeks to adopt both frameworks and address these gaps in knowledge for agricultural shows.

This chapter outlines the theoretical position taken by this study and describes the chosen research methods and procedures undertaken. For the purposes of this research, a qualitative approach in the form of a case study method was adopted utilising in-depth interviews. This method was considered most suitable due to the nature of the investigation and depth of information required. The case study method also involved document analysis, informal interviews with industry specialists, and observation. The selection of case focus and respondents is provided in this chapter along with analysis methods and delimitations.
4.2. Research Analytical Approach: Phenomenology

The theoretical position this study adopted is one based upon phenomenology. Phenomenology is attributed to the work of Edmund Husserl (1960) and later Alfred Schultz (1972). Husserl’s intention in developing a phenomenological position was to develop a means for describing and classifying subjective experiences of what he referred to as the ‘life world’. Schultz developed a phenomenological approach as a method of incorporating details of experience at the everyday life level (Goulding, 2005). In essence phenomenology means ‘the study of how people describe things and experience them through their senses’ (Patton, 1990: p.69), particularly how individuals make situations meaningful. A phenomenological approach allows for enlarged and deeper explanations of a situation from the respondent’s perspective (Goulding, 2005). It allows respondents to explain their own ‘reality’, using their own understandings of what and how a situation occurs. There is no right or wrong; rather, it is the opinions and interpretations of situations that are sought and seen as ‘fact’.

Organisations operate with a number of stakeholder groups and with various external and internal factors affecting their management. This study sought to understand the current management effectiveness of an agricultural show society as seen by three groups of stakeholders. Getz (1997: p.15) states that:

*Stakeholders’ are those people and groups with a stake in the event and its outcomes, including all groups participating in the event production, sponsors and grant-givers, community representatives, and anyone impacted by the event.*

There are many stakeholder groups associated with an agricultural show. These are depicted in Figure 9. Not all stakeholders were targeted as the focus was to uncover management effectiveness and marketing concept adoption by the case study show society. First, for this study representatives of the show society, who manage the show, specifically
members of the management committee, were identified as significant to understanding how the show is managed. Second, the competitors/exhibitors at the show were selected as another stakeholder group as these individuals provide much of the appeal for the show and contribute financially to it. Third, advertisers/sponsors who also donate financial resources to the show were identified as another significant stakeholder group. Other stakeholders, such as the local government authority, were also informally interviewed. The aim was to uncover understandings of how shows are managed and the meanings these stakeholders attribute to this. Those groups selected for this study were asked to comment on the volunteers and community groups who support the show although no interviews were conducted with such a stakeholder. Informal interviews were conducted with representatives of the community who did not attend and who attended the show. Those who attended were also observed during a show.

Figure 9: Agricultural Show Major Stakeholder groups
Understanding and interpreting meanings underpins phenomenological methodology (Finn et al., 2000). Further, by adopting this approach, this study was able to uncover the actual management operations and the understandings of those involved of these operations, and within these, determined how effective show society management is. Within this examination of management effectiveness is marketing concept analysis.

According to Goulding (2005: p.301), phenomenology has been used in organisational and consumer research and within the field of marketing in order to develop an understanding of complex issues that may not be immediately implicit in surface responses. Applying this to the current study of how a non-profit community organisation conducts its business using a marketing concept approach indicates that phenomenology is appropriate as an analytical approach.

4.3. Case Method

An instrumental case study approach has been adapted to this research as it plays a supportive and exploratory role in facilitating understanding of the phenomena (Stake, 2000: p.437). An exploratory case study takes a very broad view of the phenomenon being investigated in order to gather information to build a description of what is taking place (Bouma, 2000). Thus a case study method selected as the most appropriate method for this study, can provide an insight into the management effectiveness of an existing show society by using a marketing concept paradigm.

Case studies can be the basis of substantive research projects in their own right (Yin, 1994) and are considered particularly suitable in business research as the method’s adoption allows for investigation of the workings of an organisation (Veal, 2005), in this case a community volunteer organisation. A case method can involve the study of a single example of a phenomenon being researched in its real-life context especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (Yin, 1994: p.13). According to
Perry (1998) researchers can use one case if the appropriateness of two or more theories can be tested within the case. As this study seeks to investigate the marketing concept paradigm while evaluating management effectiveness using the framework proposed by Getz and Frisby (1988), this justifies a single case choice. Although a number of cases would provide greater certainty towards the investigation, Yin (1989) states that generally the number of cases is not stipulated when using this method; rather the decision for this is made by the researcher based upon their own abilities, the research questions and theories being investigated. The recognition that organisations are complex entities and that tradition and history have played an important role in the show society management a single case was identified as appropriate. Further, as the case study method aims to provide richness in data, not relying on a single data collection method (Finn et al., 2000), a combination of methods was used to address the complexity of the phenomenon and to triangulate to improve validity. Considering this and the nature of the study, one case was seen as providing the information richness for the study, a fundamental consideration in deciding the number of cases (Perry, 1998). In view of all these factors, the study of one case was considered a suitable and appropriate research approach (Veal, 2005).

4.4. Justification of Case Choice

Random sampling of case choice is not recommended in case study methodology. Eisenhardt, cited in Perry (1998), states that random selection is neither necessary nor preferable. Case study selection is thus purposeful and involves using replication logic. The choice of case study focus for this study was determined based upon a number of criteria. These are detailed as follows:

1. The limited studies conducted on agricultural shows within Australia suggest that the decline in attendance and volunteer support for agricultural shows is due to declining rural populations. From this proposition, the choice of case study was based upon a community that has an increasing population and is located near to (day trip distance
of no more than two hours travelling) a major metropolitan area. This major metropolitan area was seen to be an important source of visitation to the selected show.

2. The case study choice was also determined by the length of time that the show had been operating. The researcher sought to test Mayfield and Crompton’s (1995) hypothesis that the longer a festival had been operating, the more likely its management was utilising a marketing concept orientation. The rationale for this hypothesis was based upon the notion that if a festival had been able to operate for a long period of time, its management was able to identify and meet the ever-changing needs of the market.

   Historical records have shown that agricultural shows have been operating in Australia since 1820, when the first show society was formed (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999: p.1). Therefore the case study show had to have been operating for a period of 100 years or more to qualify to be chosen for this study.

3. As this study is focussed upon country or rural agricultural shows, the chosen case study had to be focussed on a community and area that was classified as ‘rural’. Rural was determined by the Australian Bureau of Statistics’ (ABS) (1996) definition of population size and an area that was promoted or perceived as rural.

4. The last criteria adopted were based upon agriculture as an economic feature of the community. The chosen case study community had to possess a history and/or a presence of agriculture as an industry bringing in employment opportunities and community wellbeing as a result.

Based upon this series of criteria, an agricultural show matrix, shown in Table 8, was developed to identify the most suitable case study. Information was obtained from the ABS for population and industry data, relevant LGA web sites and reports, and, if available, show
society web sites and printed material. Seven separate communities were investigated and from this analysis, a show and community were selected as the case study focus that complied with the criteria as outlined. These have been identified in Table 10 as Anytown 11-7. For the purposes of maintaining confidentiality, the actual names of these communities have been withheld. The fictional name of ‘Anytown 1’ has been adopted for the case study community and applied to this study.
Table 10: Agricultural Show Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARACTERISTICS</th>
<th>ANYTOWN 1 SHOW</th>
<th>ANYTOWN 2 SHOW</th>
<th>ANYTOWN 3 SHOW</th>
<th>ANYTOWN 4 SHOW</th>
<th>ANYTOWN 5 SHOW</th>
<th>ANYTOWN 6 SHOW</th>
<th>ANYTOWN 7 SHOW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA</td>
<td>Has an area 255,665 hectares and 2,556.65 square kilometres.</td>
<td>LGA covers approximately 2,800 square kilometres.</td>
<td>LGA has an area of 54.5 square kilometres.</td>
<td>LGA covers 9,000 square kilometres.</td>
<td>LGA covers an area of 3373 square kilometres.</td>
<td>LGA Total area of 5,896 sq km</td>
<td>Covers an area of 1640 square kilometres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT LOCAL POPULATION</td>
<td>Est. 39,843 in 2003. Anytown 1 itself has a population of 3,081.</td>
<td>63,700 estimated as at 2003</td>
<td>22,186. as at 2003 est. 21,268</td>
<td>Total LGA 2003 18,4588, 637 in Anytown 4</td>
<td>LGA 33,576 est. in 2003. 1113 in Anytown 5 (3.9 % of total LGA)</td>
<td>6,101 in 1996 current 5,987 est. as at 2003</td>
<td>LGA. Est. in 2003 24,776. Anytown 7 was 15,383 in 1996.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GROWTH OR DECLINE OF POPULATION</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LABOUR FORCE MAKE-UP</td>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade (19.3%) followed by education/health and community services (16%) and manufacturing (14.5%). Between 1996 and 2001 smaller share of persons employed in agriculture, forestry and fishing and mining (3.2 % decrease)</td>
<td>Most employed in retail trade (13.7%), manufacturing (13.1 %) construction (11.4%). Agriculture employs 4% of the population, reflecting a decrease from 1986 of -4%.</td>
<td>Retail trade, health and community services and personal and other services make up the major areas of employment.</td>
<td>Retail trade, agriculture/forestry/fishing (16.3%), followed by retail (14.5%)</td>
<td>High levels of unemployment with significant population aged over 60 years.</td>
<td>Employment focuses upon retail trade and construction.</td>
<td>Agriculture and horticulture play a key role in the economy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF YEARS SHOW OPERATION</td>
<td>126 Years</td>
<td>127 years</td>
<td>101 years</td>
<td>124 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>137 years</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2006 LGA and show society websites and printed information
4.5. Qualitative Research

Qualitative research refers to an interpretive method of collecting and analysing data to explore and explain a phenomenon. (Walsh, 2003: p.67)

In the study of marketing as a discipline, qualitative methods have become accepted by both academics and practitioners as an appropriate means to gain valid insights, develop theory and aid effective decision making (Goulding, 2005: p.295).

Studies conducted to investigate the marketing concept’s adoption by business have historically been conducted using quantitative research methods (Hise, 1965; Narver and Slater, 1990; Ruekert, 1992; Gainer and Padanyi, 2005), primarily in the form of questionnaire surveys, seeking to establish wide application of results to particular industry sectors. These studies interviewed marketing managers or ‘experts’ in marketing who were familiar with the concepts of marketing and business practice. Further, respondents were often selected based upon their marketing experience and training.

One disadvantage of these quantitative studies is that they assumed via questioning that the respondent is familiar with the terminology used. Further, marketing concept quantitative studies have tended to apply a Likert scale on which respondents ‘check off’ appropriate positions to best reflect their views (see for instance, Narver and Slater, 1990; Ruekert, 1992). This raises the notion of possible respondent bias. Not only do these statements assume knowledge of terms used but may influence respondents to answer in a manner that complies with the particular statement rather than reporting what takes place using their own words. In the case of volunteer festival management, it was felt that this was not appropriate. Management within the community festival area is largely dominated by volunteers, who are drawn into their roles not necessarily by their business
experience or ‘know-how’. Further, as no study exists that explains how shows are managed, in-depth responses using the respondent’s own words were seen as highly appropriate.

Veal (2005: p.26) states that although there is vigorous debate between proponents of both qualitative and quantitative methods of research, quantitative research should be based on initial exploratory qualitative work. Mayfield and Crompton (1995), the pioneers of marketing concept analysis within the festival domain, took this approach. Their study was the first attempt to understand marketing operations within festival organisations, and even though they drew from the knowledge obtained from similar studies in other industries, the first stage of their research plan was focus groups. The results of these focus groups assisted in the development of a self-completion questionnaire.

More recent festival studies investigating the adoption of a marketing concept have not followed a quantitative approach. Lade (2004) adopted a qualitative method in her case study of two regional festivals in Victoria, Australia. As a basis of her study, Lade used Mayfield and Crompton’s (1995) ‘dimensions’ to develop in-depth interviews with two festival organisers, one from each festival. Lade (2004: pp.3-4) states:

*The nature of this research required factors considered by festival organisers to be critical factors to be determined and thus the in depth interview method encouraged a more informal and effective flow of information to occur. Further the less structured format also enabled the researcher to encourage respondents to expand on their response.*

In-depth interviews were also conducted by Mehmetoglu and Ellingson (2005) whose study involved 13 festivals in Norway. Both studies used qualitative research as a tool to develop greater insights and understandings of what takes place within the festival’s management, allowing respondents to articulate their understandings
and meanings as to how their festivals operate. The qualitative approach to their study allowed for rapport between interviewer and respondent to be established as a way of developing confidence in providing rich information.

Despite this more recent use of qualitative research approaches within this field, there were several factors why a qualitative method was adopted for this study. First, qualitative approaches allow the interviewer an opportunity to develop rapport and trust with the respondents, while providing for a flow of information. This was seen as crucial to this study, as the aim was to obtain information that may have been seen as difficult to share due to the nature of small communities. Second, this study sought to obtain rich and detailed data that would allow an understanding of management effectiveness and marketing concept adoption from the understandings of the respondents based on guided questions. Further, there is a lack of research on agricultural show management, which indicates the need for detailed understanding. Third, qualitative approaches also allow for issues and information to be disclosed that the researcher may not have identified. Due to these factors, a qualitative method was the most appropriate way of carrying out this investigation.

4.6. Research Procedures

The study adopted a multi-method approach to research the target population and to develop a greater understanding of the community and the show movement in Australia.
i. Document Analysis

Document analysis was considered important in setting the background to the case study and the chosen show society’s history, current operations, and to develop a community profile for the chosen community. Documents obtained ranged from data sources such as ABS census data to develop the show matrix, as well as the selected community LGA, to specific Anytown 1 Show schedules studied to reveal changing programs during the existence of the show. Show schedules provide an overview of each year’s program as well as the membership and support gained via advertising.

A comparison of the 1936 Anytown 1 Show Schedule with the most recent issue at the time (2006) was conducted. Other documents from the show society that were initially sought were marketing and operational plans developed and used by the show society. This request revealed that no such documents were produced. Other records of the show society, such as visitor attendance and competitor information, are not regularly or systematically collected. The study found that attendance records have only been collected for the last two years but these do not accurately represent show attendance.

A history of Anytown 1 Show launched at the 2006 show has been analysed. Other historic descriptions and documents provided by the Anytown 1 Visitor Information Office presented information on the development of the community, its agricultural history and way of life. The Anytown 1 Historical Society provided media articles dating back to the 1920s.

Other document analysis involved reviewing media sources such as newspaper articles and media releases as well as publicly available documents from national and state show society associations, government departments, the FCAS and the New South Wales Government Hansard. These documents provided an excellent
understanding of government policy, debate, support for and trends affecting agricultural shows in Australia. Media articles monitored throughout the research process provided an analysis of the situations and developments of other agricultural shows.

ii. Informal interviews with Industry Experts

As part of the in-depth nature of the chosen case, insights were obtained into the show movement and the specific community through a number of informal interviews. These included:

- Informal Interview 1: An interview with the Public Affairs Manager, Royal Agricultural Society;
- Informal Interview 2: Meetings and email correspondence with the Senior Policy Officer, Federal Council of Agricultural Societies;
- Informal Interview 3: An interview with the Tourism Manager of the Anytown 1 Visitor Information Office;
- Informal Interviews 4 and 5: Interviews with several key personnel from the Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry.

As a result of media coverage of this study during April and May, 2007, the researcher conducted several radio interviews. These provided an opportunity to access information from other show society representatives throughout Australia. Where possible, transcripts of these interviews were obtained.

iii. Researcher Observation

Veal (2005) maintains that observation is a simple research method, yet one neglected in business research. In order to add to the case study method, this study employed observation on an informal and careful basis of what was happening in
several different times and settings. Table 11 provides an analysis of when observations took place and their settings.

Table 11: Description of Observation Conducted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>WHAT WAS BEING OBSERVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Saturday January 7, 2006</td>
<td>Anytown 1 Showground</td>
<td>Anytown 1 Annual Rodeo organised by the Anytown 1 Show Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday September 13, 2006</td>
<td>Anytown 1 Show monthly meeting</td>
<td>Committee members (including several respondents) conducting the regular meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday October 14, 2006</td>
<td>Anytown 1 Showground</td>
<td>Anytown 1 Show</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to these observations by the researcher, three other agricultural shows were attended during the time of the research investigation.

4.7. Research Instrument Design and Implementation

The following section provides a description of the research design and implementation for the chosen case study. The systematic framework for evaluating community festival management effectiveness developed by Getz and Frisby (1988) and the measurement instrument developed by Mayfield and Crompton (1995) were used to develop the in-depth interview schedule.

4.8. Questionnaire Design and Administration

In order to conduct the case study, an in-depth, semi-structured (ethnographic) interview method was utilised. This method was selected as it is characterised by its breadth and depth (Fontana and Frey, 2000; Veal, 2005). A selection of individuals involved in one show was interviewed. It was anticipated that the information obtained from each respondent would vary considerably and in complex ways and possibly be unique in nature and structure (Veal 2005). Semi-
structured interviews, when utilised in qualitative research, ‘remain within the genre of conversation’ (Jennings, 2001: p.162).

A list of questions was developed as a ‘prompt’ to ensure that all issues and topics required were covered across all participants and also to ensure structure was maintained. This method also allows for the respondent to indicate other factors not considered prior to the interview.

In order to obtain depth of knowledge and different stakeholder opinions, three questionnaire ‘prompt’ lists were developed to focus on the three different roles of respondents (i.e. show society member, competitor/exhibitor and advertiser/sponsor). These are provided in Appendix 3.

The content of each interview was based upon the Getz and Frisby (1988) community festival management effectiveness system framework and the dimensions created by Mayfield and Crompton (1995) to determine the marketing concept. Additional questions on festival volunteers were developed based upon the literature review. It was also considered important to gauge the perception of each respondent interviewed on the future of the show and the agricultural show movement generally. Interviews were designed to last approximately one to two hours; however, some respondents were extremely willing to discuss questions in great detail. As a result some interviews lasted over three hours.

An initial pilot test of the show society questionnaire prompt was conducted on Saturday November 19, 2005 with the secretary of another show society in northern New South Wales. Based on this, the instrument was further refined to ensure clarity.

A total of seven interviews were conducted. Four respondents interviewed were members of the show society. Two competitors/exhibitors and one advertisers/sponsors were interviewed.
4.9. Interviewer Recruitment and Selection

Applying non-probability sampling methods, a combination of purposive and snowball sampling approaches was used to select respondents (Jennings 2001). Even though the sample size was small (seven respondents in total), these two sampling techniques were required to obtain access to, and information from, the type of individuals (and their role/s) considered as essential for this study.

Contact was made with the president of the show society in writing initially (see Appendix 2) and then followed by a telephone conversation. Following this initial approach, Anytown 1 Show Society met at their next scheduled meeting date and, after discussion, agreed to participate in this study. Once the show society had agreed to participate, a ‘purposive’ sampling method (Jennings, 2001) was adopted by selecting and subsequently approaching two members of the show society to seek their involvement in the study. It was considered that these respondents have specialised knowledge. These respondents hold the positions of president and secretary. Further these roles were seen as crucial to the planning and management of the show, particularly in relation to the focus of leadership as well as operational and management issues. The Secretary was contacted by telephone once the approval to proceed had been granted from the president. Interview dates and times were then set.

The ‘snowball’ sampling technique (Jennings, 2001) was then adopted to assist in identifying ‘network connections’ for other potential respondents. This method greatly assisted in allowing access to names of persons who were also committee members, and subsequently contact details of competitors and exhibitors. As a final approach, purposive sampling (Jennings, 2001) was utilised to conduct the final interview with advertisers/sponsor. Using the Show Schedule (2005), a business that appeared as both an advertiser and sponsor was approached and agreed to participate.
A total of seven interviews were conducted over the period from December 2005 to May 2006. Most interviews were conducted during December either at the show society office or in the homes of the respondent, locations where each respondent felt more comfortable.

Permission was obtained from all participants. All respondents were sent a copy of the respective interview to facilitate interviewer crosscheck for accuracy. No changes were required.

4.10. Methods of Recording and Analysis of Data

Each interview was audio taped and then transcribed verbatim into a Microsoft Word document to enable a more precise analysis of each interview to be carried out. According to Jennings (2001: p.196) qualitative analysis involves the organisation of like categories as well as the development of relationships and process frameworks based upon constant comparison of text-based data. Six codes were developed by arranging and evaluating interview transcripts in relation to the adopted systematic framework of festival management effectiveness developed by Getz and Frisby (1988) and the dimensions of marketing concept adoption developed by Mayfield and Crompton (1995). Further analysis was undertaken pertaining to information obtained on volunteers. These are outlined in Figure 10.

Analysis of interview transcripts and document analysis were completed manually. As the researcher was familiar with the interview transcripts and there were a limited number of interviews conducted, manually analysing the findings was both possible and practical.
4.11 Reliability and Validity

Several areas related to reliability were identified in this study. First, the in-depth interview prompt lists were developed primarily based on Getz and Frisby’s (1988) framework of community festival management effectiveness and the marketing concept adoption criteria described by Mayfield and Crompton (1995). In order to communicate this to the target group, questions were developed using objective, non-leading questions designed to gain honest and accurate details from respondents. Definitions of a ‘volunteer’ and ‘competitor’ were given during each interview in order to obtain consistent feedback in these areas. The researcher sought to use language that respondents were comfortable with, used in everyday speech. Technical terms or words used as jargon were avoided to prevent confusion but also to not lead the respondent to answer in certain ways.
Second, in-depth interviews and case study research are subjective due to the involvement of the researcher and therefore allow for potential bias (Jennings, 2001). This was overcome by study respondents checking their own interviews to remove any inaccuracies and researcher bias (Stake, 1994; p.115). In addition, as respondents were encouraged to elaborate further during the interviews this may have influenced some responses. However, the method chosen is designed to allow each respondent to freely discuss interview questions, and provide more scope or direction for the research. As such, there were opportunities during the interviews to develop further discussion that were unique or not applicable to each respondent.

Third, the flexible nature of in-depth interviews meant that the time taken to cover all the required areas was extensive. In order to ensure that respondents were not limited in their answers and felt comfortable with the researcher, the length of time taken for interviews was extensive.

4.12 Delimitations

Case study research, and thus this study, has limitations. First, the findings from this study cannot be generalised to all agricultural shows and their management (Jennings, 2001). Therefore the findings of this study are unique to this specific case and during this time. As is the nature of a case study, findings provide detailed insights into how the case agricultural show is managed. Other methods of data collected provide understandings and validation of the anecdotal information and observations made in other agricultural show studies. Broader analysis obtained from show society research, anecdotal information and informal interviews with experts indicate similar experiences are occurring throughout the show movement.

Second, a limited number of interviews were conducted for this study. Although respondents were drawn from the show society committee, competitors/exhibitors and an advertiser/sponsor, a larger number of respondents would add greater detail to this study’s findings.
Third, limitations with the research instrument were experienced. The in-depth interviews were pilot tested with a representative from another show society to ensure clarity of questions. Any anomalies were adjusted. However after two interviews, other factors not included in the original questions were identified by the respondents. To overcome this situation, these questions were added to future interviews to ensure other respondents answered these questions.

4.13. Summary

This chapter has described the theoretical position this study has taken, the chosen case study method and procedures undertaken. The method undertaken to select the case study was described based on several criteria. The use of a qualitative in-depth interview method has been rationalised as the most suitable, with the recognition that the research is exploratory and seeks to obtain detailed information on current show management practices. In-depth interviews allow for less structured responses and the opportunity to obtain information that may have not been considered. The research problem and objectives for this study were answered using this described method and research procedures.
CHAPTER FIVE: AGRICULTURAL SHOWS- IS THEIR MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVE?

5.1. Introduction

This chapter presents the findings from both secondary and primary research sources. Section one describes the Anytown 1 Show. Sections two to five present the findings using the four stages of Getz and Frisbee’s (1988) systematic diagnosis framework for the evaluation of management effectiveness in community festival organisations as outlined in Chapter Three of this thesis. This diagnostic tool is described by the authors as complex, yet it was found to be a useful measurement tool to assess the case study show society’s effectiveness.

Last, section six of this chapter presents the findings for the marketing concept’s adoption. Mayfield and Crompton’s (1995) dimensions framework was utilised to assess the adoption of marketing concept within the case study show society. The findings are presented under each of these three dimensions. This chapter concludes with a commentary of the findings.

5.2. Description of Show

Historic records indicate that the Anytown 1 Show has been operating, although not continuously, in the community since 1880, when the first agricultural society was formed (Ross, 2006). At this time, the Anytown 1 community consisted of several dairies and small farms. There was a period during the 1890s when community focus was on the construction of a railway and, as a result, interest in the agricultural show and the show society lapsed. According to Ross (2006), the show was held intermittently. The Anytown 1 Show Society was formed in 1934 and became incorporated in 1988. The show is staged in Anytown 1 Showground that features showground ovals, a hall and other buildings, and is owned by the show society. The showground is closely positioned to the Anytown 1 Football Oval, owned by local council.
In order to determine how the Anytown 1 Show has evolved, relevant documents such as annual reports were sought from the show society. The only records of the show’s history provide a list of past presidents, committee members and its ‘show schedules’. Show ‘schedules’ or programs provide an analysis of the activities and competitions as well as community supporters of each show. Within these schedules are businesses and community group advertisements. As such, show schedules provide an important ‘picture’ of the evolution of the show as they reflect the community interests and values of the time. These show schedules are not produced in large quantities or widely distributed due to the cost of printing. Unfortunately the show society does not possess all show schedules (Ross, 2006) as few of these historic documents have survived.

Ross’s (2006) analysis of the history of Anytown 1 Show provides a description of the content of existing show schedules. Table 10 summarises these show features. From this analysis, the Anytown 1 Show presented a variety of competitions and activities surrounding agricultural endeavour and opportunities for social interaction within the community. Table 10 indicates that only poultry exhibitions and competitions have been continuously operating from 1935 to the present time. Other show features appear for different lengths of time although Ross does not comment on this.

What is not clear is how specific activities were introduced and why. Ross’s historical account of the show suggests the program activities were driven by individuals and their commitment to a particular feature. When that individual/s left, retired or passed away, the feature did not continue. Certainly some features of the show were removed and then resumed over the period the show society has been operating, again with no indication why. For instance, no cattle were present in 2005; this was apparently due to no volunteer willingness to organise this, although anecdotal information suggests that those willing to organise this particular competition were not welcome.
Table 12: Summary of Features of the Anytown 1 Show Program 1935 –Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of event/competition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 1952</td>
<td>Hunting events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 1957</td>
<td>Milking Contest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 1960</td>
<td>Pigeon exhibitions and competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 1973</td>
<td>Show Ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 1976</td>
<td>Dog Shows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 1990</td>
<td>Trotting events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 - 2006</td>
<td>Poultry exhibitions and competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936 - 1937</td>
<td>Weight Judging for Bullocks and Sheep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Bird section with canaries and budgerigars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Home Garden Competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 - 1941</td>
<td>Draught Horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953 - 1983</td>
<td>Olympic Horse Jumping Contest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Rodeo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965 - 2005</td>
<td>Pony Club events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989 - 1994</td>
<td>Goat section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992 - 2000</td>
<td>Primary Schools Horse Relay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991 - 2005</td>
<td>Fireworks Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 - 2001</td>
<td>Alpaca Section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 - 2000</td>
<td>Animal Farm and Children’s Pet Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 - 1998</td>
<td>Battle of the Bush Fire Brigades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 - 2004</td>
<td>Vintage Car Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 - 2004</td>
<td>Sheep Section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ross, 2006

Access to the Anytown 1 Show schedules for 1936 and 2005 revealed the activities and competitions that took place during each show. Table 13 outlines these. The term classes refer to the number of competitions within a certain field.
Table 13: Anytown 1 Show Schedule of Events 1935 and 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1935</th>
<th>2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grand Parade – Official opening</td>
<td>Woodchop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horse competitions (82 classes including hunting and trotting events)</td>
<td>Horse events (343 classes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle races</td>
<td>Ute Muster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle Judging and Milk contest (22 classes)</td>
<td>Ceramics (14 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy and agricultural produce and vegetables (45 classes)*</td>
<td>Produce (17 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry and Pigeons (61 classes)</td>
<td>Poultry (111 classes)+ junior classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog judging (14 breeds)</td>
<td>Art (5 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit (40 classes)*</td>
<td>Pot plants (17 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooking (26 classes)*</td>
<td>Cookery (27 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jams, jellies and preserves (36 classes)*</td>
<td>Jams and preserves (17 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needlework (20 classes)*</td>
<td>Needlework (38 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cut flowers (40 classes)*</td>
<td>Flowers (29 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School children’s work (25 classes)*</td>
<td>Junior art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home gardening competition</td>
<td>Amateur photography (19 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird section</td>
<td>Scrapbook (4 classes)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Sporting events</td>
<td>Kennel club display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Show Ball</td>
<td>Alpaca display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm Machinery Displays</td>
<td>Australian Reptile Display</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sheep shearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vintage cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fireworks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Showgirl competition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Anytown 1 Show Schedules 1936 and 2005
* indicates pavilion entries.
Competitions staged at the Anytown 1 Show in 1936 compared to 2005 reveal an enormous increase in horse events (343 different competitions in 2005 as compared to 82 in 1935). Similarly, there were more poultry events during 2005 as compared to 1935. This may be reflected by the current committee management volunteers – two of whom have an interest and business in horses and one who is interested in poultry. Further, horse competitions now comprise the largest form of competitor revenue for the show. With the 2007 equine influenza outbreak, horses were prevented from being moved to any location to prevent further spread of this disease (Lewis, 2007). As horse competitions are such a large and income-generating source for the Anytown 1 Show, the annual 2007 show was cancelled.

The pavilion (or hall) at an agricultural show displays all the produce and creative and artistic endeavours. An analysis of both show schedules reveals the variety of pavilion entries was more extensive in 2005. During the 1935 show, most of the pavilion entries were involved with cookery and produce. Table 13 indicates more variety of competitions and exhibitions in the current show program in comparison to organised social occasions. This indicates a number of changes. First, from the comments given by those with a long connection with the show (Respondents 3 and 4), there was an important community social feature at past shows. The 1936 show program indicates more school presence, social functions (show ball) and a grand parade. This is in contrast to the present show program where attendance is not participatory but more passive, encouraging observation of displays and competitions. Further, current entertainment (fireworks, a Ute muster) is passive in nature. Therefore an important difference is fewer community-building activities. An explanation for the increased variety in pavilion competitions may be due to the involvement of the current stewards.

Second, as the community has grown and changed, reflecting less connectivity with agriculture and more opportunities to engage socially away from the show, these show features do not seem as important. Further, as will be discussed later, there are fewer volunteers to organise such events.
The 1936 show schedule reveals a very different perspective to the current show schedule. First observations reveal changes to the time that the show was held. In 1936 the show schedule indicates that the show took place during March on Tuesday and Wednesday. Ross (2006), in concurrence with the week day feature, states that from 1936 until 1962, the show was held on Wednesdays and Thursdays. Although not consistent with the actual days, what this indicates is the significance of the show within the community.

It was such an important event that the schools, stores, banks and offices were closed on Wednesdays and half the day on Thursday. (Ross, 2006: p.15)

According to Ross (2006) from 1962 until 1966 the Anytown 1 Show was moved to Fridays and Saturdays, possibly indicating community employment practices and signifying less importance of the show. There is no information to explain why this took place. During 1975 to 1979, the show was staged over three days, Friday and the weekend. This suggests significant interest and commitment to the show to enable a program and volunteer support to have a three day festival.

Table 14 provides a list of the dates that the Anytown 1 show was held from 1975 until the present time. There are a few gaps in this information and some conflict with the length of time stated that the show was staged. Ross (2006) states that the show was staged over only two days from 1980 yet the dates provided in Table 14 indicate a three day festival during some years. Table 14 reveals that the Anytown 1 show was staged either in March or February each year until 1994 when it was moved to October. This was due to the rain experienced during March and the needs of the neighbouring football club. Ross (2006) states that show society members were involved with both the show and the football club, and there was much conflict during this time. This division continued when the show was held in October. Further, this change of month meant that the Anytown 1 Show was
excluded from the Royal circuit (Ross, 2006). At the present time, the show is held on the weekend and during the month of October.

Table 14: Month and Date of the Anytown 1 Show 1979-2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>March 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>March 14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>March 27-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>March 19-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>February 26-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>March 31 –April 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>March 15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>March 28-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>March 25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>March 23-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>March 22-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>March 21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>March 20-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>October 22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>October 22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>October 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>October 17-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>October 16-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>October 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>October 13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>October 12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>October 11-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>October 09-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>October 08-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>October 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>No Show</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1936 show schedule’s foreword states:

*In again presenting this schedule for our Annual Show the committee recommends the same for your careful consideration, hoping you will find many items of interest to you and to ensure making record entries. As you are aware our agricultural show is the shop window of our district, and I request that people in town and district strive to make it so, as it is undoubtedly the best advertisement.* (Anytown 1 Show Schedule, 1936: 16)

This extract and further analysis of the 1936 program reveal the show’s significance within the community. Advertisements within the 1936 show schedule suggest that the show was attended not only by locals but members from other communities who required accommodation. Exhibit 1 is an example of an advertisement that provides indications of this as well as signifying the importance occasion the show presented.
COMMERCIAL HOTEL

ANYTOWN 1

NOT HERE TO-DAY WITH
A BLARE OF TRUMPETS,
AND GONE TOMORROW,
BUT……

Here for the Past Ten Years,

and STILL GIVING that

COMFORT

AND

SERVICE

That has Gained and Retained……

THOUSANDS OF CUSTOMERS

VISITORS to ANYTOWN 1 SHOW are ASSURED of that same

SERVICE and COMFORT

for which

THE COMMERCIAL IS FAMOUS

THROUGHOUT THE STATE

A.R. DAVISON, Proprietor

Phone – Anytown 1 116

Exhibit 1: Advertisement in Anytown 1 Show Schedule, 1936.
The Anytown 1 Show provided a sense of occasion when the community dressed in their 'finest' and gathered together to celebrate community endeavours and achievements, as Exhibit 2 suggests.

Exhibit 2: Anytown 1 Show Being Held in 1880 on its Original Site
Source: Brown, 1992 and Ross, 2006
Ross (2006: p.26) provides an account of this sense of occasion:

> When Hugh and I were young, the highlight of the year was the Anytown 1 Show; we all had new outfits including hats and gloves.

In order to understand current show relevance, in-depth interview questionnaires incorporated a question that allowed for a description of Anytown 1 Show. Researcher observation noted that there was some uncertainty involved in these descriptions. Further, responses varied. Some described it in terms of the showground’s land size and compared it to other nearby shows:

> I would say it was a small – quite a small show if you were comparing, say, with some of the bigger ones like the Royal and the bigger state shows - it’s quite small, but it has everything in it. (Respondent 6)

or signifying its purpose and what the show features in some way:

> Anytown 1 Show. It’s, to me, the ability for the local community to participate in an event and showcase their talents. (Respondent 1)
Respondent 3 indicated the show had changed enormously since his family became involved:

Well Anytown 1 Show - its been a nice little show for as long as I can remember which is quite a few years now, and it’s a gathering – most probably earlier – of local farmers- but not so much now. But that’s how it all started off, it was just an event in Anytown 1 that just sort of fits in and now it’s sort of made to fit in with the (October) Festival and things like that, as part of a week or whatever in terms of different events that are on in the town, but Anytown 1 Show has always been, it’s been here for 70 years, not that I’m that old, but it’s a big part of my life. The whole emphasis on that era of the show was the social gathering. Like the committee were all people that come in to share ideas and to share a common purpose and it was very social. Today the show – I don’t think is anywhere like that at all, I think people, you know, I think it’s supposed to depict the character of the community isn’t it? I mean the idea of an agricultural show, but I think probably local representation is probably not as good as it could be. I think people come to the show now instead of to share the ideas and things like that they – a lot of people come to be entertained.

Others focussed on what it used to mean:

And the show was perceived as the event of the year, you know, people - always as a kid, as a young person, mum would buy a new dress for us all and, you know, everyone would be dressed up in their Sunday best suits and it was the event of the year. (Respondent 4)

Although varied, the descriptions had some common themes – size of the show, community focus and importance, as well as community change. There was widespread acceptance that the community and agricultural practice/industry had changed significantly and this had impacted upon the Anytown 1 Show. Comparisons to larger more regional or metropolitan shows were based upon land size (and therefore ability to ‘do more’) and popularity due to larger populations
and volunteer pools to draw from to attend and organise shows. This is despite the recognition that the Anytown 1 community is growing. No respondent presented the show from a consumer’s perspective by applying terms such as excitement, variety and so on, even though, as indicated by Respondent 3 above, the perception is that people come to be entertained.

The following discussion draws on the system framework developed by Getz and Frisby (1988) and discussed in Chapter Two of this thesis.

5.3. External environment

Within this stage, the areas of ‘community context’, ‘networking’, ‘uncertainty’ and ‘complexity’ are analysed as these refer to ability to recognise and manage change. The findings of each of these are outlined below.

i. Case Study ‘Community Context’

Community context refers to the social, cultural, political and economic life of the community (Getz and Frisby, 1988). This section details the main findings from the secondary research obtained predominantly from the ABS census information to provide an overview of Anytown 1 and document analysis of historical accounts and descriptions of Anytown 1. Document analysis of the history of the Anytown 1 community provides information about its early settlement and the important contribution the agricultural industry made to the way of life of the population. Several personal and historical accounts and descriptions provide an interesting comparison and contrast to current community profiles that follow.

The early settlers around Anytown 1 developed the area for cattle, sheep and dairying when the growth of barley, maize, potatoes and wheat and other grains became unsuccessful through rust. Supplies of other foods such as milk, eggs and beef were established mainly for the small community but later for the nearby city’s growing population (Brown, 1992). These businesses needed transport that was provided through coaches, horses and bullock wagons that in turn needed farriers,
blacksmiths, coach builders and wheelwrights’ trades in order to sustain them. As these endeavours expanded, more people settled to see the town develop into an important agricultural community. During the 1940s, advertisements were placed in local newspapers (see Exhibit 3) by real estate agents as agriculture was a sought after business venture to attract the sale of land.

Dairy production eventually became the main agricultural focus. A private company, the Farmers and Dairymen’s Milk Co, formed in 1890, owned Anytown 1’s creamery built in 1900 at a time when the town already had a ‘reputation for producing high quality cream and butter’ (Ross, 2003). Even though this enterprise did not survive after c.1906, the dairy farmers did for many reasons. First, Anytown 1’s dairy industry had the benefit of being on the Great Southern Railway and with access to good water supplies. Second, it is reasonably close to the city and overseas distribution facilities.
Deregulation of the sector in 2000 affected many dairies throughout Australia by removing subsidies. This, coupled with periods of drought and low prices, saw many dairies close down or bought out by larger enterprises. Large parcels of land were then subdivided to provide for housing. At present there is only one large dairy producer in the Anytown 1 district. This dairy does not attend the Anytown 1 Show.

Life in this community during the 1930s is described in the following personal account:
My mother like others was busy from sun up to sun down. Not only did she have her own young family to cook, wash and care for without the modern conveniences of electricity but several city girls who made up the ‘Land Army’ workforce. Vegetables were plentiful, the milk and eggs part of farm life, we always had a healthy table….Delicious stewed peaches, plums and apricots were tasty accompaniments to steamed puddings and bread and butter custards. Hours were spent in the kitchen peeling, preparing and cooking preserves and jams. Our cosy kitchen stove was always bubbling with some delightful goodies, while our mother usually managed to include the whole family in the joys of producing, and devouring her wonderful home cooking. A small number of hens provided fresh eggs which were used for breakfasts with bacon and sausages for hearty meals to sustain the workers. Extra eggs were quickly and deftly turned into light sponges, or pancakes with maple syrup. (Brown 1992: p.22)

It is through this description that not only a typical life is described but also one where these practices were seen as valuable assets of the community’s women who were to display their talents at the annual show.

Over the years, the Anytown 1 Show Society gathered a strong backbone of enthusiastic supporters from people on the land... more banded together to stage successful Shows and Rodeos on an annual basis. With other families, they worked side by side for the betterment of the grounds and amenities. In earlier times just after the war these same people purchased and built the show hall, the biggest in the area. (Brown, 1992: p.28)

The level of community support and enthusiasm for the show and the showground during this time is apparent from this description. Further, working together for a common reason also afforded families and individuals the opportunity to forge strong community ties.
Current Community Context

The local government area (LGA) within which Anytown 1 is situated consists of 255,665 hectares (id Consulting, 2002: p.3). Despite increasing housing and pressures from industrial development, the LGA is surrounded by national parks and rural pastures and is promoted as one that embraces ‘rural living’. Yet the LGA has experienced consistent growth since 1986 when the majority of the population (80%) arrived in the area. Table 15 reveals that in 2001, the population was almost 40,000 people. In the 2006 census, where preliminary results are currently available, the population is 40,343. (id Consulting, 2007). The population of Anytown 1 itself is 3,081 (id Consulting, 2002). From 1996 to 2006 the LGA’s population increased by 21%. This population increase has been occurring for approximately twenty years, as the area’s rural lifestyle and location next to a major metropolitan area is attractive to new residents who are seeking affordable housing.

Consequently the LGA has a ‘young’ community. Table 15 indicates that in 2001, 68% of the population was less than 49 years of age. Demands for development in the area, attributed to the lower cost of land and housing (Anytown 1 Shire Council, 2002), present many future challenges that accompany this growth. A comment by Respondent 3 illustrates this change:

*Well more people were involved because there were more people involved in rural things. It’s all gone, I mean all these hills, all this property behind my dad and my grandfather, you know, all that hill, it’s all got fencing on it now, big houses.*
Table 15: Age Structure and Population of the Anytown 1 Shire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group (years)</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>2,835</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 11</td>
<td>4,630</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 to 17</td>
<td>3,924</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 24</td>
<td>3,138</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 34</td>
<td>4,924</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 49</td>
<td>8,846</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>4,403</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td>2,227</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 84</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 and over</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36,956</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


It is the rural lifestyle of the area that attracts new residents. The council plans for appropriate growth of towns whilst retaining a rural character and lifestyle (Anytown 1 Council, 2002: p.58).

During 2001, approximately 36% of the population had some form of educational qualification, revealing a relatively skilled and educated workforce mainly in vocational education (22%), and 65% of the population was in the labour force with a mix of different industry sources for employment. Table 16 provides an analysis of the industry structure of the community’s workforce. In 2001, the major employment sectors were not in agriculture but in wholesale and retail trade (19.3%), education, health and community services (16%) and manufacturing (14.5%) (id Consulting, 2002). Further, almost 70% of the community now works outside it, resulting in extended travel time to and from work (Anytown 1 Shire Council, 2002).
Table 16: The Industry Structure of the Anytown 1 Shire Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry (employed persons)</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>1996</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing and mining</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2,460</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas and water</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>3,288</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and storage</td>
<td>948</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication services</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance insurance and business services</td>
<td>1,810</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public admin and defence</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education health and community services</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, personal services, cafes etc</td>
<td>1,561</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not classifiable, not stated</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,023</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


As Table 16 indicates, compared to the 1996 census, those employed in agriculture, forestry, fishing and mining declined by 26%. At the present time, predominant agricultural ventures are in market gardens, bee keeping, orchards, olive groves, lavender farms, and dairying and poultry undertakings. The focus is becoming more hobby farm rather than larger undertakings as subdivisions are sold for housing.

iii. Complexity and Uncertainty – Analysing Competition

According to Getz and Frisby (1988), complexity refers to the relationship between the organisation and its community which includes linkages with other organisations that may result in competition, linkages or no competition. Support for the show is generated from other businesses and organisations that provide volunteers and financial support in terms of sponsorship and advertising space.
Essentially the relationship that the show society has with some groups is not positive. Of note, is the Anytown 1 council:

_We had a good relationship with the council years ago but it sort of – they’ve got expenses and so have we, and I think we just sort of – we slipped away, they’ve parted their way, we parted our way._ (Respondent 2)

The relationship between council and the show society is a long and complicated one. Historical accounts indicate that many of those on the show management committee held elected positions on council. This was a time when the relationship between the show society and the council was positive. When show society members were also members of the football club, owned by the council, relationships began to deteriorate. A strong commitment to football has for some members of the community become more important than the show, and council actions have inflated this. The council has removed buildings erected by show volunteers from this site, has pressured the movement of the show to another period of time to enable the grounds to be restored for the football season, and created financial strain on the show society by demanding payment for lights erected on the showground site. Ross (2006) explains:

_Public lighting was installed on the Society’s land so that footballers could train at night. When an agreement regarding the football club’s use of the show society’s land could not be reached it was resolved to meet the demands of Anytown 1 Council and to purchase the lights from Council at a cost of $26,612. The show society no longer receives any special dispensation from local government._ (Ross, 2006: p.42)

As the football grounds are situated next to the showground, the football ground is utilised during the show, at a cost to the show society. However, the council restrict its usage. According to Respondent 2, at present all the council do for the show society is promote use of the showground hall that can be hired to the
general public during non-show time, and attend the show as an exhibitor to distribute information to the community.

One area that creates complexity for an organisation is competition. While this is mentioned in the description of this stage of Getz and Frisby’s (1988) framework, it is not given significant focus and thus may be overlooked in future research. Competition was defined for respondents as ‘other events or activities that may impact on people attending the show’. All respondents identified that Anytown 1 Show had competition. Competition for the Anytown 1 show can be translated into many levels. These are depicted in Figure 11.

![Figure 11: Competitor Analysis – Anytown 1 Show](image_url)

Adapted from Kotler, et al., 2006 p.119

- **Budget Considerations** – other needs equivalent in cost
- **General Competition** – other leisure interests including shopping, sport, movies, home entertainment.
- **Product Category Competition** – other festivals at the same time such as the art exhibition in the LGA and the Bathurst Formula One
- **Product Form Competition** – field days, other agricultural shows staged at the same time or during similar periods seen as better quality, farmer’s markets.
First, there is direct competition known as ‘product form competition’ (Kotler, et al., 2006, p.119 -120), that which is categorised as a festival with an agricultural theme, and occurs at the same time as the show takes place during October. Anytown 1 Show occurs during October. Its close proximity to a major metropolitan area allowed its staging to be closely linked to the Royal Show. Some respondents indicated that the show committee of the time made the decision after a few wet years of the show during March. The weather affected attendance and when the opportunity to move the show was offered by the state agricultural society, it was felt that this would assist the show. Respondents who commented on this change of timing believe that it has had a negative effect on attendance and competition. At the present time, the Anytown 1 Show is held at the end of the school holidays and there are some who believe this is not favourable to including school participation. Therefore the timing of the show was influenced by external factors rather than the best time for consumers.

‘Direct’ competition from other festivals need not be restricted to those within the LGA. Any similarly themed festivals that are accessible within a comfortable drive from the area are also direct competition. At the same time as Anytown 1 Show there is another show located closer to the metropolitan area:

_We only clash with one other show and that’s Castle Hill, but we run on alternative days_. (Respondent 1)

This comment means that the same competitions are not held on the same day even though both shows are held during the same weekend. There are also agricultural shows on every weekend in the show region which can affect the community’s intentions to attend. As Anytown 1 Show is small, other shows may be seen as more exciting or attractive if the Anytown 1 Show does not appeal. There are also other agricultural experiences held during the same time period, such as farmers or produce markets. These do not intend to replicate the show
formula, but may be seen as a more attractive option to a consumer who likes to
taste and purchase produce in this environment. Anytown 1 Show does not do this.

Second is indirect competition or ‘product category competition’, still a festival
experience that involves other themes or activities not necessarily located close by.
In this category the consumer weighs up alternative options and selects that which
is more desired if any. There have been several other festival experiences offered
during the same time as Anytown 1 Show, not all within the LGA.

There are events that are put on at the same time so that you’ve
got Bathurst races on for instance the same week end as our
show there will be people who choose to go to Bathurst races
because they may be racing fans and they think ‘ Oh, I’ll go to
Bathurst Races’ or you know, the show’s ho hum. (Respondent 1)

Respondent 3 saw the availability of other activities and attractions in nearby towns
as a major competitor to the show.

Anytown 1 and a lot of other little towns are too close to the city
already, there are too many other things to do, well not too
many, there’s so many other things to do. I mean its not too far
to go to the coast, its not too far to go into town…and it’s a big
place. The lights sparkle every day, not once a year. So it’s hard
to compete with that. (Respondent 3)

In addition, in the last 10 years the Anytown 1 Shire has held a month long festival
during October that includes Anytown 1 Show (Informal Interview 3). The aim was
to umbrella the Anytown 1 Show (and other smaller festivals) and would enable
Anytown 1 to benefit from the council promotion. In reality, this has created more
competition for the show as there are other festivals occurring during the same
weekend (Informal Interview 3). In addition to attendance there is competition for
sponsorship and advertising as all the festivals held during the month-long festival
are seeking financial and in kind support from businesses and other organisations.
This also has the potential to affect volunteer support.
It was felt that having a month-long festival limited people’s ability to attend every experience due to financial considerations.

Well there are a lot of events in the October festival. Which you know it can be a positive thing or a negative thing. Last year they did – Wirrimbirra did … arts and crafts, being out there on the same day as our show, which was very disappointing. I wasn’t aware that there was anything going this year. But I suppose if you look at the scheme of things there’s something on every weekend all through October and I suppose everyone’s only got a limited amount of money … to spend. But then again I don’t think any of those events would be as big as the show, maybe just Shire Day maybe. (Respondent 4)

The attraction referred to above could theoretically be involved in the Anytown 1 Show as it is a nature reserve that sells native plants and has native animals living within it. Involvement in Anytown 1 Show could create complementarities and cross-promotional opportunities.

Third and further removed from Anytown 1 Show but still seen as competition, is ‘general competition’. This would include any activity or experience that competes with the show, seen as more valuable, desired or significant than the show. General competition is judged upon available leisure time and what is considered more valued by the consumer. In this category the consumer may judge activities such as sporting competitions, home entertainment and the like as more valuable depending upon their level of interest, knowledge and previous experience of Anytown 1 Show. Entertainment accessible within the home and the ability of technology to provide leisure opportunities categorise it as competition. Further, the lifestyles of the community within Anytown 1 Shire have changed significantly since the show was the major or only drawcard for leisure and education.

The last competitor category is ‘budget competition’, seen as a financial consideration rather than solely a focus on available leisure time. In this category the consumer chooses the experience that is affordable – not all are possible – and
selects that which appears better value for the fulfilment of the identified need. Applying this category, the interest in experiencing an agricultural show may see the consumer choosing only one rather than all offered. Similarly other activities including staying home may appear more desirable. Competition as an external force therefore occurs in a much wider context.

Historic information indicates that the Anytown 1 Show did not face these competitor challenges in the past. As described earlier in this chapter, the show was the important occasion of the year bringing the entire community together. With an inward migration of new members to the community, coupled with the presence of other festivals and broader competitor opportunities brought about by technological advances and improved roads and reduced travelling times, the show does face enormous competitor challenges. Knowledge of competitors is therefore an important factor in developing a strong festival in order to capture the desired consumer market.

Uncertainty refers to the degree to which the show society’s environment is stable and predictable. Findings indicate that this show society is working within a less stable and predictable environment. The community has grown and changed, agriculture is not as significant as an employer, and the community can access other interests more easily. Further, this study found that competition is a constant and ever-changing threat. There is no real understanding of this within the show society.

iv. Networks

Networks, as the word suggests, involves the ability of the festival organisation to tap into and sustain existing support and resources from within the community. The respondents involved on the show committee varied in their indications of whether this was being done effectively or not. There is certainly support from some quarters of the community, particularly those who have a long connection with it. This support tends to be based upon volunteer time rather than financial or
in kind support. Newer businesses were less likely to be involved. Some respondents questioned and were not able to determine why certain businesses that had obvious connections with agriculture were not involved in the show.

One important relationship already discussed that is in some disarray is between the Anytown 1 Council and the show society. Current relationships, as opposed to those of the past, are not positive. Some show committee respondents believe this is partly due to local government bodies employing senior people from outside the community. The common view is that these people do not understand the show and its needs. If this is the case, then these individuals are similar to those who have moved or are moving into the community, with little connection with agriculture and rural life. However, this may not be reflected in those who are elected to council.

An analysis of the early history of the Anytown 1 Show (Brown, 1992; Ross, 2006) reveals the relationship with the council was very different. Those elected on council tended to be those within the agricultural sector and who lived within the community. Indeed, these people were also heavily involved in the show management committee, signifying the importance of the show. Ross (2006: p.44) states:

_In the first half of the twentieth century show societies invariably mirrored the politics within a locality._

The close proximity of the showground to the football oval that is owned by the council does present some challenges for the show society. Any activities that may impact on the oval require prior approval and fees. The show society use the oval during the show, and despite their non-profit nature are required to pay a fee for its use and also ensure that any damage to the grounds is repaired. There is, therefore, a poor relationship between the council and the show society.
Looking outside the community and within the show movement, the Secretary has built up links with those in her position in the neighbouring show societies that form the regional networks developed within the state. The state society developed show regions to create opportunities and networks for information and resource sharing:

*I think it was basically done a very long time ago. I've always known about the groups since I've been helping (10 years). But I think it's been a bit of a mutual support thing.* (Respondent 1)

This has been a good connection as it develops contacts, skills and extends support.

*Show societies are in groups, I'm not sure if I've got one – one of the little books – and if you look in it, it has the groups, what shows are in each group and then you can look through and you can find out when the shows are at every show society in the state. But our group that we're in group 5 and they're very supportive of each other, we have group meetings and we all help each other. So that if there's a show society that looks like it will fold without a lot of help people rally around and help.* (Respondent 1)

This network is a positive way of ensuring information flows, and resources are provided to each show society involved. Support given ranges from administrative knowledge and skills development, to providing trophies for the show. The networks are also important from a social perspective for those involved.

Another important part of the show network is the Showman’s Guild of Australasia. This guild was established in 1910 (Fader, 2007) and is said to ‘represent the owners and operators of the amusement machines, games and food outlets that follow the agricultural show circuit’ (Ray, 2006). The amusements are often referred to as ‘sideshow alley’ (Broome and Jackomas, 1998), and the guild has influenced which amusements attend which shows and other festivals. Appendix 1d provides a description of the involvement of the Guild and the manner in which show societies
in New South Wales should conduct business. Whilst this has changed since its introduction, this body has continued to have a monopoly on the provision of rides, the prices charged to consumers and the rent that they are prepared to pay to the show societies, without any real pressure to improve the quality of the experiences offered. From an entertainment perspective the show society involved does not know until the day the show starts what amusements they will receive, resulting in what some have referred to as a ‘lottery’ (Murray, 2003). This behaviour has recently come under the scrutiny of the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) who ‘forced the guild to adopt a code of conduct’ (Ray, 2006). In describing this situation, this factor can also be listed under complexity and uncertainty. However, the Anytown 1 Show Society does try to manage the current situation by meeting with the Guild.

It’s a little bit difficult with the Showmen’s Guild because we don’t always have – well we don’t have the say of what the Showmen’s Guild is going to bring. But we try – President has a meeting and tries to encourage them to bring things for all age groups, so that you’ve got rides that are suitable for little people because it’s no fun if they come and they say, ‘well there’s not a ride for me’. (Respondent 1)

Others stated that there were so many opportunities for the show to grow by involving like-minded community-based and business-based organisations that were not being tapped into. Respondent 7 kept using the phrase ‘you scratch my back, I’ll scratch yours’ in her approach to working within the community. This respondent indicated that giving suggestions and seeking other business linkages resulted in tension:

If I went to the Anytown 1 Show and said, ‘Hey, you should be doing this,’ What happens? You’re upsetting them and you don’t want to upset people’. (Respondent 7)
5.4. Inputs (Human, Financial and Material Resources)

The inputs to a community festival organisation are drawn from the opportunities and linkages formed in the external environment.

i. Human Resources

Show society members and other community-based organisations not only provide the ‘on the day’ support, but also completely manage, organise and stage the show.

First, respondents were asked about their own recruitment as a volunteer, their motivation and the role they played as a volunteer for the show. In these questions, respondents were asked to indicate how they became involved in the Anytown 1 Show and, if relevant, other shows. This served to determine each respondent’s relationship to the show and in particular identify how they became involved with the show’s management.

There is a perception that volunteers in non-profit community festivals (and indeed the volunteer sector as a whole) contribute their time for some personal feelings of community wellbeing commonly described as altruism. There was some evidence of altruism in this study; however, this was also linked to self-interest, suggesting that volunteers within this study are not motivated by one factor only. For instance, Respondent 1 has been the secretary of the show society for five years is also a chief steward in the Poultry Competition (where her husband’s and her interests lie) and competes and assists at other regional shows. Respondent 1 is also a volunteer for other non-show community organisations, such as the Girl Guides and the St John’s Ambulance Service. This respondent talked about her upbringing that taught her the importance of being community-minded:
And I think I came from - it might sound an odd thing to say - but I came from a family where I grew up with dolls and bandages and my father was very heavily into St John’s Ambulance and taught first aid. So we grew up in a family where you were likely to be disrupted at any time with somebody saying, ‘Well, doctor gave me this bandage and dressing. Can you put it on for me?’ and my mother was a nurse as well. So we grew up in a family that did things in the community. And I think that sort of just carried on. (Respondent 1)

Limited demographic information was collected from the show management committee volunteers. Of the four respondents, two were aged between 45-54 years and two were aged between 55-64 years of age. All have undertaken secondary education and mainly vocational education. None of the show committee respondents has been or is employed in a management role. There is one exception: Respondent 4 is a registered nurse. Three of the four management committee members involved in the study work full time in non-agricultural sectors. In addition to full time work, Respondent 2 co-owns a horse stud with his partner who is the show society’s treasurer and ring mistress.

The second section concerning volunteers related to other show volunteers who are those who assisted with operational aspects. Respondents were asked to indicate how many people were involved in the show’s operations and their perceptions of how and why they became involved. It was clear from the responses gained to these questions that there is no clear agreement on the number of people involved, who they represent or how they are recruited. The exception to this is within areas that the respective respondent had some dealings. The number of volunteers given varied from between 70 to over 100 people. This suggests a lack of knowledge, control, planning and management and uncertainty of these volunteers.

Findings indicate that there are numerous individuals and other community organisations who give their time and skills during the two day show. These community organisations are not listed in the Show Schedule but are acknowledged as an entire group. As mentioned, not all respondents were aware of who these
groups/organisations were except Respondent 1 and 2, the secretary and the president of the show society. Respondents 3, 4 and 6 expressed a perception that these volunteer organisations are motivated by the financial return their particular organisation receives for assisting at the show. Not all respondents agreed that this was appropriate.

These volunteer groups are used to staff several areas of the show. The barbeque, for instance, is staffed by the Anytown 1 Football Club who receives all monies raised for their club. How this club became chosen or was approached is unknown however, considering the past tense relationship with this football club, this situation can be seen as positive. Other volunteer groups are asked to collect payment for entry.

Whilst this support is important for these operational functions from a staffing perspective, it does present some significant management issues. Payment for entry is an important revenue source for the show and as such needs to be collected effectively and efficiently. The entry fee is also a means of monitoring visitor attendance. Personal experience showed that an entry fee is not always charged and not because of any pre-arrangement. Others visitors reported that they were not charged a full entry fee. These experiences not only indicate revenue sources but suggest that some show operations need to be better managed. Those volunteers involved in particular operations may not identify their role as important as their voluntary organisation is not always the beneficiary of the roles they perform.

A common theme about show volunteers discussed by all respondents is the ability to manage the show from both a management and operational basis with falling numbers of volunteer managers. Observation undertaken for this study indicated that the show meetings were poorly attended. The current committee is made up of much smaller numbers of people than in previous years. At present there are twelve people on the committee. To illustrate these changes, in 1935, the show
society had 24 vice-presidents and 27 committee members. By 1938 there were 25 men and 25 women on the show committee (Ross, 2006).

Since 1935, there have been seven presidents of the Anytown 1 Show. According to Ross (2006) there were two presidents who held this position for extensive periods of time. The first held the position from 1935 to 1961, a period of 27 years, the longest period for this show society. The second held the role for a period of 18 years from 1969 to 1987.

Despite current volunteer involvement, attracting or recruiting volunteers was seen as a challenge and one of the reasons why future shows were threatened. When respondents were asked their opinion as to why this was occurring, several challenges were expressed. First, respondents felt that the time commitment required was not possible for most people in today’s society. Respondent 4 stated that in terms of hours of time required during the show,

\[50 \text{ something hours over four days, I mean it's horrendous.}\]

(Respondent 4)

are required. There was a sense of life being more complex, life had changed and people did not have the time or energy to volunteer as they did in the past.

Yes, whether they work outside the area, they’re just busy with other things now aren’t they? Don’t you think? Just life in general is different to what it was back then. People are busy with their kids and haven’t any time, that was their main thing for not getting involved was lack of time for one reason or another isn’t it. (Respondent 4)

Second, people’s employment location affects not only their relationship with agriculture but also their time. Respondent 3 who grew up in Anytown 1 stated that work and the show in the past were inextricably linked as agriculture was the
means of employment. Those in agricultural businesses or employment organised the show after their day of work once a month where the meetings were rotated around the local pubs. However as the nature of employment has changed and fewer large land holdings remain, the connections with agriculture are less common. Respondent 1 stated:

Yes I think you’ll always get the people who’ve grown up with that background. (Respondent 1)

Third, volunteer involvement was seen to be affected by the changes in the population demographics of the community. Young people, it was thought, are not interested in volunteering or do not have the time to commit due to their study schedules. Respondent 1 stated:

There’s a thought that young people today don’t want to be involved and they see that as something for older people to do.

Coupled with this view is the concern that young people lack the ‘old-fashioned’ skills older members of the community possessed and as such could not become involved. At a show meeting a show committee member stated:

Girls today do not know how to make a cake from scratch. They do not learn how things are made – it’s easier to buy things ready-made.

This reflects a shift in community values that is much broader than just what this community is experiencing. However, it also reflects an attitude held by those involved in the show not developing programs and competitions reflecting current practice, skill and interest.
Increases in the population have resulted in an inward migration of people with no connections with the show movement or agriculture.

*I think over the years it has changed, there’s a lot of new people moved into the town and they seem to be more suburbia people, they still live in the district but years ago we’d give everyone a sort of – 80 per cent of people would come to the gate, and now it’s probably 20 per cent. They still live in the town but they seem to be more suburbia, upper-class people.* (Respondent 2)

If the prime motivation for being a show volunteer is self-or personal interest, less interest from within the community for the show may provide a link towards an unwillingness to become a volunteer. In the past, the role of a committee member carried with it a certain prestige due to the importance of agriculture in the community as well as the festival itself. As these personal interests are not widely held within the community, it appears that prestige no longer plays a role in people’s reasons for being involved in the show.

The inability to attract new members to the show management committee is evident. Respondent comments also suggest that there is not a good understanding of why people volunteer. For instance, the need for newer members to come in and not only support the current committee but contribute their ideas was discussed by Respondent 4:

*I’d like to have a few more committee with some fresh ideas. Get some new people in, that’s always a lot better, you don’t get that stale – I’m not saying we’re stale, but new people coming in they’ve got different ideas – yes, we tried, but that’s one of those things with show committees people just don’t want to seem to be a part of it any more because there’s too much other activities they can do outside a show to be tied in.*

All current volunteer respondents expressed the fact that they had been encouraged to become involved via a family member or friend who was themselves
involved in the show. If numbers involved decline due to a lack of interest, then these volunteers may not be able to draw people in as before. Yet this willingness to welcome new members was not supported by interviews conducted with non-committee respondents and other remarks made by other stakeholders. These persons, willing to give their time (and in many cases expertise) sensed a lack of welcome for new ideas and a reluctance for change.

*I’m frightened that I’m going to step on someone’s toes. And to step on people’s toes it makes it very difficult because some people then end up holding grudges and I don’t like that sort of scene so I try and keep my words to myself. (Respondent 7)*

Thus volunteer motivation and recruitment plays a significant role in the show’s future.

Findings reveal that the length of time respondents have been involved in Anytown 1 Show and the show movement generally depends largely upon their age and family’s connection with the show. The longest serving committee member, Respondent 3, has been involved in the show for 46 years. This is due to his family’s farming history over several generations and is reflected in committee representation and years of family service to the show society. This respondent, like his parents and grandparents, has held almost every role in the show executive except president. He is reluctant to take on this role and indicated his commitment now is based upon a desire not to see the show cease to operate.

Other respondents indicated their involvement ranged from between eight to fifteen years. Some respondents have been involved in other shows in other communities and developed a connection to this show through this experience. Even though Respondents 1, 2, and 3 have a management position on the show committee, they also manage at least one area of the show. Knowledge of show
competitions and operations is seen as paramount to being involved. To understand, this Respondent 2 stated:

*Say you wanted to do my job, I do all the on show and all the performers, well I’d take you to one side, it would be two or three years. You’d sort of just basically become an understudy.*

(Respondent 2)

Other respondents indicated their initial involvement with the show was based upon their interest in a particular feature of the show. For example, Respondent 5 recollected her involvement after marrying into a local family, after migrating from Europe as a young child. Despite her son’s brief participation as a competitor, it was not until her personal involvement in the pavilion as a competitor that her interest grew.

*I was interested in the competition part of it in the pavilion, so that’s where I sort of got involved, I thought, ‘well you know, this is good, we’ll have a go at it and see how we go, if we don’t like it we can soon forget it.*

(Respondent 5)

This comment indicates that interest is the reason for involvement in the show. As stated, most show committee members exhibit/compete at the Anytown 1 Show and other agricultural and special interest exhibitions. This keen interest in a particular area of the show was so significant to some that they stated that they did not know or really care what other events and competitions took place at the show. In their minds, their part of the show was most important. Further if it was not for this interest they would not attend the show or volunteer for it.

Respondents 3 and 4 acknowledged that this narrow view of the show led to specific agendas. For instance an analysis of the show program (refer to Table 13) reveals an increase in the number of horse classes in the current show. The
revenue from this part of the show is significant. Yet some respondents believed that those on the committee who own a horse stud have driven this.

Initial volunteer involvement was stimulated usually through the encouragement of a friend or family member who either competed, or was on a show committee. Having knowledge of their chosen interest was seen as an asset and skill that could be drawn upon. No efforts are made to attract volunteers by any other means. The findings indicate that it was mostly through their interest in a particular area that show society members had their first experience with a show. That is, respondents became involved primarily because of their interest, not to become volunteers and ‘help out’. There was some expectation that knowledge of the interest was significant – more significant than management skills or an understanding of the entire show experience.

ii. Financial, Material and Facility Resources

This section discusses the financial, material and facility resources that are owned and/or managed by the show society of Anytown. The show society as a not-for-profit organisation is in a strong financial position according to the respondents on the show management committee. This is not, however, due to the show’s success but rather is due to the revenue received from other non-show activities and the use of the showgrounds and hall during other times of the year. The showground, which the show society owns outright, attracts other community groups who use these grounds for sport during the week. The show society has made a conscious decision to raise funds to pay off the cost of lights that allow the use of the showground to be extended beyond the daylight hours. There is some controversy here as council were to pay for this also:
Because the council said, ‘Either you pay for them or we pull them down,’ that was just before our show. But they were put up with public money, including money that was left from a deceased estate, it’s a bit sad. But we have almost paid our lights off. So that has been our big aim, was to pay for those lights so that they’re fully paid for and keeping the show society in a very financially viable situation so we can pay to put on our show. (Respondent 1)

Having these lights has meant that the show society has a stream of revenue:

We’ve got lights on the field so we charge them X amount of dollars. I think it costs about $9 an hour to run the lights, we charge them $25. So we do make a possibility of a gain on that back oval as well as the hall. (Respondent 2)

There is no doubt that the financial costs associated with maintaining the facilities and equipment of the showground are large. A recent state government grant was given for the maintenance of the hall that greatly assisted with these costs. The labour and materials associated with these upgrades in the past were provided free of charge by the community and more specifically by the show committee members.

As there is no paid staff, the show society’s office is not open every day or during business hours. The office is equipped with the standard office equipment: a computer, telephone, facsimile machine and photocopier. Within the office are filing cabinets that house past show schedules and current files.

5.5. Intra-organisational Processes

Intra-organisational processes relate to the basic management functions of planning, organising, influencing and controlling. Depending upon the
organisation’s ability to garner support from the external environment and the human and financial resources available, the festival organisation can start to plan and manage the show.

i. Planning

The planning function includes goal setting, decision making and marketing. As this study focuses on the show itself, questions were limited to the planning and management of this only. Other activities that the show society organises, such as the rodeo and strategies aimed at attracting other forms of revenue, were not investigated specifically although information on these was uncovered and discussed on a generic basis. It is clear, however, that the show society does not prepare a strategic plan for its total operations.

Respondents were asked several questions regarding how the show is planned and the decision-making methods that are in place. In addition, respondents were asked whether the show sought to achieve certain objectives each year, to describe how planning for the show takes place each year and how activities and events are determined.

Findings reveal that the Anytown 1 Show Society has essentially operated since its origins in the same manner.

I don’t think it’s changed from any other year, we just realise that the show comes up, we just start our plan that I’ve had for the last six years, we just instigate that and we just build on from there, and everyone just sort of knows what their role is. We check, double check whatever, come up with different ideas, yes, let’s throw them in there, no, let’s take them out. (Respondent 2)

A review of the two show programs (or schedules) does indicate that there have been changes to the program (refer to Table 13) but as records do not provide detail, there is no way of determining why these changes took place. In current
show operations there was some evidence to suggest that activities and events do not occur if there is no one to organise them. For example, this occurred with the cattle/livestock during 2005 and the Show Girl Competition removed from the schedule as there was no one to organise this component of the show. Therefore, if a part of the show lacks support then it is removed.

This study reveals that there are no attempts at formal or informal organisational or operational planning. There is no evidence of mission statements or a conscious effort to describe the purpose of the organisation. When questioned on setting objectives, Respondent 1 stated:

*I think we’ve just been too busy: no we really haven’t sat down – and that’s an idea that we should be looking at - is setting down objectives.*

This indicates that developing objectives is not seen as a priority or a common practice.

*It just seems to take care of itself, I imagine it’s we’ve worked together that long. Everyone seems to know what their role is.* (Respondent 2)

The manner of show ‘planning’ is undertaken after the previous show has concluded and involves an assessment of the show, rather than planning in a structured or objective manner. The assessment involves the show committee’s personal opinion of ‘how things went’ based upon feedback and their interpretation of the show.
Virtually we start after the end of the previous show, everyone looks around for activities, entertainment that we think may enhance the show for the next year, and that’s all brought together at different show meetings. If there’s something really good that we think, ‘Oh yes, we can afford that’. We look at all these wonderful things and we think, ‘No, that’s outside our budget’. But if it’s within our budget we’ll lock that in early, as early as we can. And, yes, we start working and looking at the show and we always sit down after the show and say, ‘Right, what went well, how did the section go, were there any major hiccups, were there anything that we need to improve?’. (Respondent 1)

In terms of committee gathering, communication and decision making, there is a monthly meeting organised every first Wednesday evening with an agenda, minutes taken and financial statements presented. These are the only records taken of decision making even though some respondents felt that this was just a ‘rubber stamping exercise’. Outside this monthly meeting, each chief steward meets with their own subcommittee to decide upon their own part of the show. These subcommittee members rarely attend the monthly meeting, relying on their stewards to advise them on relevant matters. These people then determine what their individual area provides in terms of competition (through the development of a ‘schedule’), involve people as assistants (other volunteers known as ‘stewards’), and organise sponsors and the overall management of their part of the show. No variation to this formula occurs.

That’s up to the people – the stewards for those sections, for those events. They do their own program, it’s not discussed at the meetings generally, the programs or what they’re going to do. The only things that are really discussed at our committee meetings are things about the buildings, about the insurances, about other, you know, they rent out the field to the football and stuff like that. Just maintenance issues. (Respondent 4)
This approach, however, results in disunity within the committee and as an approach to the show as a festival. One committee member described their feelings:

_I was a bit shocked by everyone’s disinterest I suppose in our pavilion, there’s no support I suppose, you know, for each other a lot of the time, if I can be a bit critical there, and I found it segregated._ (Respondent 4)

To illustrate decision-making processes, Respondent 1 discussed the reintroduction of a Show Girl competition during 2005. The Show Girl competition has not been included in the show program for forty years. The reason it was reintroduced was due to the encouragement of another agricultural show society’s youth committee member. With this person’s support in the entire organisation of this part of the show, this competition was reintroduced. This example indicates that decisions are made to include or remove items or activities at the show based upon availability of individuals to ‘take on the role’ and of the personality of this individual to influence outcomes. Decisions are not made based upon evaluations of show experiences or knowledge of interest from within the community.

There is no formal organisational structure. This will be commented on in the next section. The Secretary and the Treasurer are involved with the overall management and operations from the president’s instructions. The Secretary communicates any requirements on an operational basis, although it is clear that there is no consistent, reliable or requested record keeping.

Each year, the show society president primarily determines the main entertainment. The exception to this is the provision of rides and general amusements, which is controlled by the Showman’s Guild. The Showman’s Guild determines the types of amusements that attend each agricultural show. The president seeks to engage a variety of amusements and rides in order to cater for a variety of age groups, who _may_ attend the show.
A common feature of entertainment, controlled and organised by the show society, is fireworks. This display and other forms of performances are determined primarily by the president through the executive and based upon available funds. As most respondents exhibit and compete at other shows, they often consider ideas for inclusion based upon what works and does not work at these other shows. In addition, those activities that may cause concern such as the ‘ute muster’ are dropped rather than being managed effectively – not that it is clear how and why this was introduced in the show program.

Being driven by self-interest may lead to the planning function being run according to personal interests rather than what consumer interests are. This also highlights a narrow view of the show experience, illustrated by comments made by Respondent 6:

_Everybody thinks their own area is the most important, and depending on how strong the other personalities are, some are likely to get overridden, and that part of the show will predominate. And I think this is where changing people – if somebody said, ‘Oh, that’s it, had enough,’ whoever takes over would have to be very strong to keep that end of the show going._

The entire show experience is seen as one comprised of just isolated events and show experiences rather than a whole event. If planning is done in this manner then the overall show experience can be affected.

_The show’s diversified. The show’s big, it’s got to have all the other things in it. The thing is that the necessary thing with the show society is to have people that can go through the whole lot and enjoy the lot of them, not just one._ (Respondent 3)
The self-interest expressed by some respondents can also have significant ramifications for how the show is managed and perceived, and how its future is determined depending upon the influence these individuals have.

Marketing, another area requiring planning, is essentially perceived as promotion or even more narrowly, advertising. The publicity officer is not necessarily involved in this activity and certainly the respondents as a group had limited understanding of marketing. No planning takes place for marketing. As such this section is limited to the discussion of promotion. Promotion can play an important role in alerting potential customers and other target market members to a festival. In the past, the community looked forward to the show as an important community festival, as it was often the only form of leisure afforded to them.

With competing festivals and interest levels, creating awareness and communication play an important role. Anytown 1 Show Society has several groups within the community that need to be communicated with in the preparation for and lead-up to the show. These include potential competitors, sponsors and advertisers and, of course, those who may be targeted to attend the show. Respondents indicated the type and the extent of promotion that was undertaken by the show society. Importantly this was used to identify the show society’s awareness of the perceived target market/s and understanding of effectiveness of this promotion, to be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

Except for the distribution of the competitor entries that are sent to potential interested parties on their request or distributed through the tourist information office, A4 posters and advertising in the local media, both newspapers and radio, essentially make up promotional activity. A banner with the show name and dates is erected on the major road coming into Anytown 1:
We have a variety of ways that we do that and one is our big banners that get put up obviously, but as well as that there are advertisements that we do in the local papers. There are also advertisements on the radio, and we do give away passes to the show for the radio to hand out in competitions, and the IMAG, a monthly magazine, we put an ad in that as well, and that went quite well so we feel we’ll do that again. (Respondent 1)

There is no evaluation conducted on the effectiveness of the promotional activities. Respondent 2 indicated that this is measured by attendance:

I’d insist, through the people that we get here in numbers, it speaks for itself.

Spending on promotion applies a percentage-based approach to budgeting:

We sort of keep it on past years, so around about two-and-a-half, three thousand dollars. It doesn’t seem like a lot of money but it is when your show expenses are say 24, that’s just to run a show, to run our radio we’ve got to picture $3,000, that’s what we’ve got to spend to – a lot of money. So $3,000 out of a show, budget of 24, that’s a lot of money when you work it on a percentage. (Respondent 2)

In addition to describing the type of promotion and its costs, some comments were made regarding the adequacy and level of show promotion that takes place:

I don’t really think we do much promotion, would you though, for the show? (Respondent 4)
Of note is that Respondents 3 and 4 were not really aware of the type of promotion that takes place. It should be noted that Respondent 3 is the Publicity Officer. This is another indication of the manner in which the show is managed.

In terms of marketing strategy or planning, there is no evidence of this and certainly no understanding of community attitudes and interests that guide the marketing or overall show planning.

ii. Organising

This section describes how the show society is structured and the various responsibilities and specialisation of the volunteer managers and committee members as ‘staff.’ As such there is a slight overlap with the inputs of human resources already discussed. Findings reveal that the structure the Anytown 1 Show Society has remained the same with the exception of its size, that is, the number of volunteers involved.

The 1936 show schedule reveals that there was one president and 29 vice-presidents supported by 27 committee members. From this schedule there appears to be more actual position titles, such as ‘Official Measurer’ and three ‘Protest’ committee members. There are 17 members on the current committee, even though it seems that not all contribute the same amount of time or commit the considered required level of support. In terms of overall membership, there are 19 life members, 175 members and 41 junior members (Anytown 1 Show, 2005). It should be noted that the names of these members suggest membership of the same family.

The observed organisational structure of Anytown 1 Show Society is based upon how the show is managed rather than overall show society management. As mentioned, the show society does more than just the show. However it appears that other operations are managed by the show society executive. Operations are those on-the-ground activities that provide for the where, how and who of the
festival. The current show society committee includes an executive, with president, vice-president (which involves three individuals) secretary and treasurer. The treasurer is also the associate secretary, the hall booking officer and the ring mistress, as well as being married to the president. There is also a position of publicity officer. As with most executives, decision making takes place within this group, however, with essentially six people, as some people hold several roles. In reality, based upon observation, the role of vice-president is a token one, and the role of publicity officer, whilst important, does not seem to be involved in overall decision making. This limits control and decision making to three people.

The show society committee is then divided into specialised areas (or subcommittees) related to the activities/events to be staged. At the time of conducting this research, there were three (3) subcommittees: for the horse events and competitions, the poultry competition/s and exhibition and the exhibition hall. The volunteers who are responsible for these areas are called chief stewards and they determine what their individual area provides in terms of competition (through the development of a “schedule”), involve people as assistants (other volunteers known as “stewards”), and organise sponsors and the overall management of this part of the show. Figure 12 provides a diagrammatic representation of Anytown 1 Show Society, a structure that only operates for the show, not other activities such as the rodeo.

![Figure 12: Diagrammatic Representation (Organisational Chart) of Anytown 1 Show Society](image-url)
Respondents were asked to identify who is involved in the operations and how these operations are determined. Respondent 3, who has had a long connection with Anytown 1 Show, indicated that the major difference between early operations and the present time is the pool of volunteers involved in the show. This indicates that little if anything has changed.

The Secretary and the Treasurer manage the overall management and operations under the president's instructions. Based upon observation, three individuals are in control of the show overall or relinquish control if there does not appear to be a need for them to be involved. This delegation is passed on to individuals who have the knowledge and responsibility for the function, indicating that specialised knowledge and experience of an area are important. The Secretary communicates any requirements on an operational basis in terms of signage, training, preparation of risk management manuals and so on.

A large part of the show society’s operations is not directly involved with the show itself but with the maintenance of the show ground. Even though the Anytown 1 Show Society owns the showground where the show is staged each year, ownership means that the maintenance and improvements of the grounds are conducted by the society. The most recent costs were the floodlights (total cost $27,000) which have almost been paid for and the rebuilding of the show hall wall (funds provided by the NSW Government totalling $20,000). The rodeo, now a separate one-day event, seems to be the pride and joy of the president and the Treasurer (his wife) who, from all who reported on this event, are the drivers of it. The president is very proud of this event, in particular in its appeal to outsiders of the community, its relative ease of organisation (two people organise it with support on the day from the show society committee) and its ability to make money.

Except for those legal liability issues relating to insurance and risk management imposed on all festivals externally, it is clear that there is no consistent, reliable or requested record keeping. The only exceptions are the records kept for the horse events and competitions. Again, there is an external requirement for the Chief
Steward (or Ring Mistress) to keep records for the horse events in order for competitors to prove their eligibility for Royal shows. In other competitions and events the number of competitors and their details are kept only if those responsible consider it essential. Respondents on the executive committee were not aware whether others kept records, what records were kept if any, or indeed where they would be stored. This indicates that there is a lack of identified need for this information and that the onus of this information collection is left up to the individual involved. Changes within the volunteer management would result in little if any information on what takes place.

Little information, if any, is communicated in any systematic manner at committee meetings other than financial statements and maintenance issues.

_The only things that are really discussed at our committee meetings are things about the buildings, about the insurances, about other, you know, they rent out the field to the football and stuff like that. Just maintenance issues_ (Respondent 4)

Therefore no record is kept through minute taking of the procedures or occurrences of specific sections of the show planning and operations. There are enormous gaps and inconsistencies in tracking information on show events, competitors and the like. It also appears that these issues are not discussed. The chief stewards who determine their own areas of operation are not required to provide any details of decision making and/or record keeping, nor is there any sense of their being somehow accountable for their decisions. This means that the show’s operational structure is disjointed and does not provide for clear channels of communication to all involved. Further, there are enormous gaps and inconsistencies in tracking information on show events, competitors and the like.

It is only the show schedules that provide a written history of each show’s features, competitions and sponsors. As not all respondents have had extensive years of
service at this particular show, there seemed to be a lack of awareness of what previous shows featured, and why any changes to a program took place.

To assist with the show’s operation, community organisations like sports clubs and emergency service volunteers are invited to be involved. The president seeks their involvement because the show committee does not have the ability to carry out all operations themselves. These community organisations provide support roles such as the collection of entry fees, first aid and managing the barbeque. It is not clear how much training takes place with the volunteers to ensure correct procedures are carried out and to explain the reasons for these. Any training conducted would be informal.

During interviewing and as a result of informal discussions and observations with the secretary and president of the show society, some recent operational challenges were highlighted. These operational challenges have been imposed upon the society (and are requirements of all show societies in Australia) based upon risk management, occupational health and safety and public liability insurance requirements. Some of these operational challenges facing show societies have been dealt with in a wider show society approach. However, they have added to the financial and human resource burden of the show, and have meant more time is required to comply with these requirements and the need for skills development in order to complete these effectively.

The Anytown 1 Show is part of a wider network of regional shows that includes 16 other show societies. These show societies have been organised not only around their location but also to ensure that there are no show date clashes. Other show regional groups may offer their show experiences at the same time as other show region shows. The distances between shows and the regions may not necessarily be extensive. This can result in shows competing for not only patronage but also competitors. On a positive note, this system does encourage the regional show societies to support one another and create their own show circuit.
iii. Influencing and Controlling

According to Getz and Frisby (1988: p.24), the influencing process is ‘related to leadership and the exercise of power’. Controlling relates to budgeting and financial control. Therefore, combining the two indicates that those in influence determine the manner in which the budget is spent as well as the way the organisation operates. Planning strategy, organisation and decision making are reflections of leadership and leadership style. These factors also emerge in the analysis of organisational culture. It is these features of the show society that are discussed in this section.

When organising a festival, the leader is often the festival manager. This person may be the sole decision maker, perhaps reporting to a board of directors or owners. It is also possible that there is more than one leader within a community organisation. In community festivals, the role of the leader is much broader as this person usually requires the support of a management committee who are likely to be volunteers. In these situations, the leader may even be elected to the role. As community festivals are drawn from within the community, there is the perception that this person is well respected, is liked and has the influence to achieve the festival’s objectives. Within some community festival organisations, this person is remunerated (Lade 2001). This is not the case for a country agricultural show. The role of a leader is therefore crucial to the festival’s success.

As leadership is seen as important to this study, questions in the in-depth interviews sought to identify the presence of a leader and what role this leader plays, how much influence they yield and how well respected they are. In some circumstances the person or persons who are leaders may not be the person given the highest office level which in the case of an agricultural show society is the president. Generally, the leader is the person or persons who make the decisions on management structure, policy issues and procedures. This implies that the person who is the leader has the power and influence to not only make decisions but also
ensure that the decisions are carried out. In order to assess these factors, respondents were asked to indicate who makes the decisions about what happens at the show and to describe this person. The official leader of the show society was interviewed in this study, so his opinions were sought as to how he ‘operates’ and likes to manage overall show society matters.

According to the perceived structure of the show society described in the previous section, the entire executive committee performs some type of leadership role as they drive their own areas and ensure that programs are carried out. Similarly the chief stewards are leaders in their own area in regard to outsiders. The actual show society president may not be seen or involved in their particular focus of the show. Acknowledging this, however, this study sought to understand the president’s role as the festival manager.

Focussing firstly on those not in the roles of president, findings reveal varied responses to questions on leadership. Respondent 5 did not comment at all as she chooses not to attend committee meetings and therefore felt unqualified to make a statement. Respondent 1 who works closely with the president defined the role of a leader and also discussed how the leader should operate.

_But I think the leadership – it comes from the top down – there’s this very strong leadership and support. And that comes down from the president. And I think if you’ve got an excellent president it follows through and everyone stays really well linked together._

This response also implies that this is the way the president operates. The president of the Anytown 1 Show Society is seen as the leader, the one in charge and the one who has control and power. It is possible, however, that this control and power are shared. This is discussed further below.
Respondent 1 described the qualities of the current president; terms include ‘hardworking’, ‘always available’ and ‘puts the show society first’. These comments indicate a favourable attitude toward the individual involved and the level of dedication given. The current president has been elected to this role for approximately seven years and has not been challenged in it. There may be several reasons for this; however, it is likely that this is due to the small number of people who become involved in the show overall and are willing to take on the most prominent role.

In comparison with other show presidents, seven years is a relatively short period of time, and as such the role the president plays may evolve if his commitment and the show remain. There is also the perception that change of leadership may not be a good idea. First there is someone who wants to do it and, second, they know what they are doing:

*If somebody says, “Yes, alright I’ll do it,” or they’ve been doing it for five, six, seven years, they know what they’re doing, they’re doing a good job, they’re quite happy to keep doing it, okay. That’s the way a lot of it works because sometimes if you look down the list of presidents they’ve been 15, 16, 17 years that they’ve been doing it because – I find it interesting looking at the roll down at Anytown 1 If you look at the latest names on there and then jump up, ‘Oh that must have been father,’ because different initial, same surname, and you see the same names, there’s probably four or five names up there, it might be a different initial but you see the same families who are involved, and really it’s their show.* (Respondent 6)

Respondent 6 draws on many observations. First, there is the fact that this president is willing to take on the role. Second, it indicates the level of commitment and length of service made by previous show presidents and that these people tend to be from the same families. Analysing the current list of show society members also reveals the same family names. The link these families have with the community and agriculture is significant; however, unlike in previous years this is
not currently reflected in show committee membership. This could be due to the lack of interest by current generations of these families or a disapproval of how the show is managed at present. Respondent 6’s comment ‘and really it’s their show’ implies that if someone is ready to put all the effort into this, they should be in charge and receive the recognition and prestige for it. However, it is the community’s show not the president’s.

Comparisons between ‘what was’ and ‘what is now’ indicate that the role of president has changed over time. Respondent 3’s connection with and admitted bias towards this role is highlighted:

*My dad was president for many years, I mean, when I say ‘the boss’ there’s, how do you put it? You’d have committee meetings but if something had to be done that decision wasn’t questioned, ever, it was just what needs to be done.*

Respondents 3 and 4 believe that the role of the leader is also connected to the role of being a figurehead in the community. These respondents do not see this occurring at present. The role of president has therefore changed in their minds to be more of a ‘hands-on person’ rather than a spokesperson for the show or significant individual in the community. There is evidence to suggest that the current president is not one to ‘step into the spotlight’, preferring to stay in the background and asking other committee members to attend external show meetings, make approaches to members of Parliament and so on.

Unlike a more autocratic approach to the role, the current perception is one involving input from all the committee.

*Well there’s a difference. People don’t expect the president to make all the decisions now I don’t think. I think people would expect a bit more of a consensus of opinion.* (Respondent 4)
It appears that the current show committee have a harmonious relationship and get along with each other.

I don’t think I’ve ever had a decision where (the president) had to use a casting vote. I don’t think that’s ever arisen. People talk it through and then we’ll take a vote, and it’s surprising how unanimous the votes are at times. People will talk it through, we may not always agree with each other’s point of view but there’s no hitch, falling out of, ‘Oh look that person’s so dreadful they voted against me’. It’s not that. We look at it on an issue basis of, ‘Well that person felt really strongly about that issue’. And sometimes it makes us pause and think and we look at the issues in it a little bit more closely before we vote. (Respondent 1)

Others portray relationships within the committee differently. These respondents indicate that there may be a power struggle when decisions are made and this can cause some tension:

Whoever is looking after livestock and whoever is looking after the ponies, the horses, poultry and the other animals, theirs is the most important of course. Everybody thinks their own area is the most important, and depending on how strong the other personalities are, some are likely to get overridden, and that part of the show will predominate. (Respondent 6)

Over the study’s life, observations and comments made by some respondents indicate that one part of the show does predominate. As the show schedule (2005) reveals there are a large number of horse events. Horse events are managed by the show society treasurer who is married to the president. The treasurer is also the ring mistress who ultimately is responsible for these events based upon the way the show is organised and managed.
We’re only doing it because we see it as part of the show, an important part of the show we feel, but we’re not – you know, it’s not our business, it’s not our hobby essentially or anything like that, you know. Whereas the [treasurer and president], they run, you know a horse stud, but you know she works at horse lessons and that’s their livelihood as well – part of their livelihood. (Respondent 4)

What is surmised from this is that the president and the treasurer have the ultimate power and influence within the show society. It is these two individuals who have developed a new organisational culture within the show society. Despite the comments made to question this, no one challenges the decisions they make even though it is clear that these decisions are not agreed upon. There is no doubt that there is a certain respect for these individuals, particularly for the time and commitment they devote to the show society:

They’re very enthusiastic and they work extremely hard for the show society. (Respondent 6)

However, there is also evidence to indicate that in particular the treasurer should not be questioned.

Like I tried pointing out to [treasurer] one time and then I thought I overstepped my ground so I thought at the time I better not say anything. (Respondent 7)

It is possible that because of their huge commitment and success in maintaining the show’s financial viability, no one wants to challenge this for fear that the individuals may walk away from the show and the implications within the community. Respondent 7 as earlier stated commented that other views are not accepted. The outcome is that if views are not heard, those who may become involved in the show committee will not do so. There is also unwillingness on the part of those on the
committee to become involved and attend meetings. Few people attend and attracting people was seen as

\[ \textit{a struggle. Yes, it’s a big struggle. (Respondent 4)} \]

Attending meetings to Respondent 3 meant having a say in decision making, and it was not clear whether this was occurring:

\[ \textit{You won’t have a meeting if you haven’t got people involved in decision making} \]

Second, the views of the president were sought. The president was asked to comment on how decisions were made. From his comments the president is happy for the various show stewards to look after their own areas:

\[ \textit{They do look to me for a lot of guidance and decision making. But I mean I still like them to be in – yes, to have their input into it – and he is then left to concentrate on other matters. Basically it comes from the committee, me, being the president, well I have the casting vote, but without blowing my horn, the committee does allow me to make a lot of decisions without sort of them being involved in it. Sometimes you’ve just got to make that on-the spur-of-the-moment decision. The committee does take a lot of weight into what I say, which is good, but I mean at the end of the day the committee has a vote, yes, if they agree with it we just go with it. (Respondent 2)} \]

What is clear here is that the president carried much influence and power. It is interesting to note his acknowledgement of this when asked how he would describe himself:
A pretty tough one I suppose – oh, I’ve always been very independent, I think maybe probably going back to those years in the army, I became an individual then, if the challenge was set down I always took it by the horns and went for it. I don’t seem to let things worry me because worrying is not going to solve any problem. I’m just basic confident yes, just do it this way if I think it’s the right way, just go for it. I think that comes out of my army training. (Respondent 2)

From his comments above, the president likes to work in his way and more or less as an individual. Yet it is clear that he has the respect of those on the executive, in particular the Secretary. His close relationship with the treasurer and the manner in which matters are controlled indicates that two people share the leadership role. The president is well liked and performs the leadership role of president but prefers to adopt a ‘hands-on role’ and is happy to sit in the background. His wife who is the treasurer appears to have enormous influence both in and outside the show committee, particularly relating to the horse events, which dominate and bring in significant revenue for the show.

iv. Revenue Sources

There are several revenue sources that the show society draws in which enable it to remain financially viable. These are all conducted during non-show time:

- rental of the Agricultural Show hall
- rental of the oval
- the Annual Anytown 1 Rodeo
- membership of the show society

These revenue sources discussed below.

As there are very few community hall facilities within Anytown, the hall is hired for many functions and activities. Similarly the oval in the showgrounds provides
another location for sports, and as the lights are operating, this extends its usage and brings in a regular stream of revenue.

The largest source of finance comes from the annual rodeo that takes place in early January. The rodeo used to be part of the show itself but was separated.

*It’s been running about five years, and it was a decision – there had been a rodeo in Anytown 1 before and we just talked it out at a meeting and we thought, oh well, yes, we thought we could do it, and it’s turned out to be quite an exciting day for everyone and something that I think the community enjoys. And being on in the holidays, the school holidays is a plus. Sure, there are a lot of people go away but it’s something for those who don’t go away and some people who come for holidays …* (Respondent 1)

This brings in attendees and competitors from outside the community and is most successful, operating with less financial cost and bringing in more revenue than the show:

*Not like your rodeo with $15,000 or $20,000 in actual cash sponsorship.* (Respondent 2)

In addition, the rodeo operates over one day – the show is over two - and the number of people required to stage it is far less than the show, primarily because it is focussed on one type of event.

Membership is another, albeit small area of revenue. The reason it does not contribute a great deal is due to the numbers of people who are members. According to Ross (2006: p.44), over the past seventy years total membership of the show society has varied between 250 and 500. However, this figure has dropped in recent years. During 2006 there were 18 life members of the show society who do not pay. During the same year, there were 170 adult members and twenty junior members. Currently the show society comprises membership from within and
outside the community based upon an annual fee of $A15 for adults, $7.50 for aged pensioners and junior members (present membership cost), and from this membership the committee is drawn.

Table 17 presents the 2006 admission charges and membership rates for the Anytown 1 Show Society. The cost of entry is almost the same as membership and this therefore is an encouragement to those who may pay membership and be entitled to entry over the two days that the show is staged for the same cost as membership.

Table 17: Admission and Membership Charges – Anytown 1 Show 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Admission Charge Category</th>
<th>Entry Charge ($)</th>
<th>Membership ($)</th>
<th>Revenue from Membership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members/Life Members</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Members:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>2,550*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aged Pensioners</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Children</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children under 5</td>
<td>Free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Pass (2 adults + 3 children)</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Anytown 1 Show Society: 2006

There is no indication whether the adults who are members are aged pensioners or full-fee payers. Therefore revenue is estimated at the highest possible amount.

The show itself does not create a large financial return:

Yes, it would have to be 70 per cent through the gate, the rest attractions...Yes, we don't get a lot of cash income for the sponsorship of our show. Mostly donations in regards to trophies and fees. (Respondent 2)

Competitors and exhibitors pay an entry fee to compete even though this cost is kept low to attract competitors. To exhibit in the pavilion for instance costs $1 per entry. However all competitors must also pay an entry fee to the show unless they
are members. In terms of revenue from the show the largest source of income after the entry is derived from the horse events.

*Horses would have to be our biggest drawcard, like the horse events itself, we have five rings on a Saturday and four rings on a Sunday, so we’re – nine judges. It not only brings in four or five thousand dollar entry fees it’s got entry on the gate as well ... So you’ve four or five hundred horses running around and also they prop the gate up coming in too.* (Respondent 2)

Any activities that take place to raise funds such as the barbeque are not for the show society. This was seen as wrong by some respondents who felt that the show needed to recoup all funds generated in order to manage the show society’s ever-increasing costs. Others, such as Respondents 1 and 2 felt it was important for the show to give something to the community particularly in return for support.

*So we’re helping to support other community organisations at the same time, mindful that if we help them, well the whole area’s going to be better.* (Respondent 1)

There is a certain degree of goodwill given to the show from existing businesses in Anytown 1 and the local media in the broader region. This comes in the form of sponsorship dollars and a window display of the poster created for promotional purposes. The sponsorship contributions are organised by the show stewards for their own areas of operation. These are mainly made up of small amounts of money donated for the prizes. Other businesses may take an advertisement in the show schedule although a limited number of these are produced, limiting the exposure of the business involved.

### 5.6. Outputs

Outputs are the final area of measuring effectiveness and focus on two areas, those of organisational and triple bottom line environmental effectiveness including the
impact the festival has on the community. This study sought to measure the Anytown 1 Show Society’s current management effectiveness. An organisation is dependent on the management skills of its human resources and their ability to identify change and plan for it. When analysing organisational effectiveness, the areas of goal attainment, survivability and internal cohesion are useful in this evaluation.

Findings indicate that current managers do not appear to see the need for management skills or expertise; rather they see an interest in a particular aspect of agriculture as being of paramount importance. Further, motivation to be involved in the show is primarily driven by personal interests and knowledge of a particular area of the show. There is also evidence of a lack of cohesion within this circle of individuals. However, this is overshadowed by their great deal of commitment driven by different motivations. This, coupled with the way in which the show is structured and operationalised, has implications for the show’s management. The structure forces those involved to be narrow in their show focus, ignoring or not taking an interest in other areas. Change may not be considered if this leads to a change in program that jeopardises a show member’s interests. It suggests that new ideas are not welcome at the cost of personal interests.

The show management committee do not necessarily possess the management skills required to manage a show. Findings indicate that respondents’ experience or application of common management practices in terms of formal planning, decision making, organising and staging a festival are minimal. Little documentation exists to monitor changes in the market or record what takes place at each show unless required by external players. There appears to be an enormous amount of goodwill on their behalf but a sense of reluctance and yet an inability to change how things are done. Most of the management committee believed that current problems occur due to external forces, outside of their control. These external forces are a lack of volunteer support, disinterest within the broader community and increasing insurance costs. These were things that they felt they could not control. It is
suggested that a move towards a more professional and business management approach may assist future success.

There are a small number of people involved in the committee at the present time who are responsible for the management of the organisation. The need for more volunteers was a common complaint, and yet there is little done to recruit new members into the show committee. The findings indicate that this is a major challenge that the show society is facing, and yet the current management practices and organisational culture indicate that these factors are negatively influencing more involvement from other community members.

Using the systems diagnostic framework, the only area of effectiveness is in terms of financial, material and facilities inputs. The show society is in a strong financial position and manages its facilities, its showground, well. All other aspects indicate areas that require management review. Based upon its current financial situation, the organisation can survive, however not due to its primary function of staging an agricultural show. Revenue from the show primarily comes from entry to the show, with less contributed by competitors, exhibitors and sponsors/advertisers. This reliance on revenue means that the show cannot resource the following year’s show adequately if attendance declines. Whilst other events and activities occur throughout the year to raise revenue for the show society, there are costs of maintaining the buildings and grounds that the show society owns. Costs of exhibiting and competing are kept to a minimum as these provide a backdrop of entertainment for the show, and increases may result in lower participation.

The second area of effectiveness relates to social, economic and ecological impacts of the festival. This was not the primary focus of this study. However, from an analysis of the history of the festival and its current ‘performance’, it is clear that the festival has lost a great deal of its popularity and prestige in the community due to several factors that can be deduced from the current community profile and respondent comments.
The whole emphasis on that era of the show was the social gathering. Like the committee were all people that come in to share ideas and to share a common purpose and it was very social. Today the show – I don’t think is anywhere like that at all, I think people, you know, I think it’s supposed to depict the character of the community isn’t it? I mean the idea of an agricultural show, but I think probably local representation is probably not as good as it could be. I think people come to the show now instead of to share the ideas and things like that they – a lot of people come to be entertained. (Respondent 4)

Therefore the show does not provide a positive social impact on the community except for a limited number of individuals. As the number of people attending the show is in decline or stagnant, it does not provide the economic benefits that festivals are commonly said to contribute the community in which they are staged. It is possible that the rodeo does this, although this festival does not provide an extension into other businesses due to its lasting for one day alone where food and drink are consumed. Only those businesses which set up stalls at the rodeo obtain a benefit.

In terms of tourism impact, the show does bring in a limited number of ‘outsiders’ in terms of competitors. There is no indication of the effect these people have on developing tourism in the community. Similarly there is no effort made in conducting an evaluation of visitor experiences to gauge visitor impact. The local visitor centre assists where possible to distribute information locally, however the budget it has is limited (Informal interview 3)

5.6. Application of the Marketing Concept Framework

The marketing concept framework adopted for this study was developed by Mayfield and Crompton (1995) and is discussed in Chapter Two of this study’s report. Essentially their study developed three dimensions that are said to
determine whether a festival adopts a marketing concept or not. Within these are factors that dictate each dimension. These dimensions and items were used to guide the questions developed for the in-depth interviews, and the findings are summarised below.

i. Visitor Orientation

There are nine items within this dimension. In order to summarise findings, all items relate to collecting information and using it to develop the festival program and experience. Table 18 indicates that only one item is being carried out by the Show Society, that is, ‘keep promises made to visitors’. This is done by promoting and delivering the show experience offered. No information is collected on visitors to Anytown 1 Show. Very little information is collected on visitor attendance, satisfaction or overall market needs. Respondents stated that letters of complaints to the show society are from disgruntled people. There is some loose recording of visitor numbers based upon entry but these are not accurately collected.

Table 18: Outcomes of Adopting Visitor Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1: Visitor orientation</td>
<td>Listen to opinions of visitors</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use visitor information to improve quality</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop objectives based upon visitor needs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use visitor information to develop ideas</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obtain ideas from visitors to improve the event</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand visitor needs</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value visitor input in planning new attractions</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep promises made to visitors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respond to visitor needs in creating activities</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. Pre Experience Assessment

There are four items in this dimension. Findings indicate that there is no market research conducted by the show society in the community on what an agricultural show represents, and what interests those in this market. It is probable, however,
that this is not conducted due to lack of management expertise and knowledge as well as limited financial resources.

There is no evidence of marketing planning except the repetition of ‘what we have always done’ or a trial of something ‘affordable’ with no measurement of marketing success. The show program that indicates the show experience changes only if volunteers required to carry out an activity are not there or if a show committee representative believes a new idea will work based upon what takes place at other shows visited.

Findings indicate that there is an overall understanding of changing demographics and interests within the current community but no indication of investigating this further. Some respondents felt strongly that societal changes have had a marked impact on show attendance either as spectators or competitors. This indicates recognition by the show society of the downturn in interest levels in the show amongst the present community. There is a view that the skills displayed at shows are not skills that younger members of the community possess because the skills are not taught or valued any longer.

*Well because they want to be entertained and they’re coming to entertainments. A lot of people come through the pavilion and not be the least bit interested in seeing a whole lot of craft and cakes, and not really appreciate – they wouldn’t appreciate what effort that’s gone into it for that person to grow it and exhibit it. I don’t know, but the emphasis is not on rural things I suppose. Maybe we’re drifting away from the rural emphasis.*

(Respondent 4)

This has resulted, in the minds of the show committee, in fewer competitors and a downturn in interest in attending the show. Further, the show committee does recognise the segments that attend or may attend the show (families, teenagers and so on) and try to provide show attractions that appeal to these groups. However, these are once again based upon committee member opinions.
You’ve got a whole diverse range of people, there are family groups, there are individuals. What brings them to the show can be very different. So we try to keep in mind that you have that huge range of people with different expectations of what the show is about and what they want to do at the show. (Respondent 1)

Table 19 provides the outcomes of this dimension indicating that none of these items is carried out.

Table 19: Outcomes of Adopting Pre-Experience Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2:</td>
<td>Pre-experience Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use market research to identify different markets</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Engage in market research</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct research</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a strategy that relies on market research</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. Post Experience Evaluation

Post experience evaluation involves four items. These all relate to measuring levels of satisfaction and promotional evaluation; and Table 20 provides an analysis of the outcomes of this dimension. Findings indicate that visitor feedback is not collected. No attempt to gather information or measure customer satisfaction is made. This was investigated by questioning respondents on feedback obtained from customers and competitors/exhibitors. Findings indicate that if feedback is obtained, it comes via verbal comments with limited feedback made in writing. It is clear, however, that the onus of feedback is on the customer.

The reason for not collecting information on satisfaction was not given by all respondents. There is some evidence to suggest that this is not done due to the lack of management skills and human resources. Respondent 1 saw this task as difficult:
Sometimes people come up to you and say, “Oh look, great show, we’ve had a terrific time, it’s wonderful”. You get quite a bit of that. We have thought about how we could do it but it’s a little bit hard to give someone a feedback form. Where you’ve got such large numbers coming through the gate. We’ve thought about it though and it would be good to get a bit more feedback. (Respondent 1)

Another factor concerning feedback is the attitude to any feedback provided, particularly when it is negative:

We get a lot of feedback from losers, but you get that anywhere no matter what the competition is. Every now and then we might receive letters that people say, “Yes, the show was great”. Maybe could we do something a little bit earlier or a little bit later in regards to the show, but it’s not negative feedback, it’s just a bit of feedback where people take a bit of time to write a letter and say, yes, it was great it was the first time we attended. (Respondent 2)

Despite the recognition that those complaints are made, they are largely ignored or not dealt with:

They might do a bit of – because this year I think we did get a lot of complaints about the show. There was some negative feedback and we don’t know how we’re going to approach that with our committee. (Respondent 4)

Show stewards who initiate some form of information collection (as it is not required by all unless from external sources) from their exhibitors and/ or competitors have the ability to monitor changes, repeat customers and could initiate some form of feedback, but do not. Respondent 1 believes that
It’s easier to get feedback from the competitors. Because you’ve got the competitors who are at the rings and we get a lot of feedback afterwards. Little notes saying, Thanks for all the hard work, had a wonderful time at the show.

This feedback is not relayed to the committee or recorded in any systematic manner.

The findings reveal that the show society does not have a promotion or marketing plan. The research found that decisions on promotion were based upon what had been done in the past and any variations were based upon a committee member suggesting an alternative or new idea. Ideas for promotions come from the committee members who might identify a certain new opportunity. Others may happen by chance. Methods are used each year based upon their cost.

Table 20: Outcomes of Adopting Post-Experience Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3: Post-experience Evaluation</td>
<td>Measure visitor satisfaction</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solicit complaints from visitors</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use visitor feedback to measure advertising effectiveness</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure service quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear however, that show societies like Anytown 1 are limited in their ability to develop extensive (and possibly targeted) promotional campaigns due to limited resources and lack of skills in this area. When asked about the evaluation or success of current promotion, Respondent 3 stated:

I don’t know, you’d have to ask someone like John Singleton. You know, is it worthwhile – I mean obviously it’s got to be worthwhile to him, he’s pretty well off, but what I’m saying is how do you know how good your promotions are. How do you know?
The notion of service quality, the last item in this dimension, is too far removed from current management thinking.

5.8. Summary

By applying the theoretical frameworks of Getz and Frisby (1988) and Mayfield and Crompton (1995), this chapter has provided a description of the main findings of this study. The application of these two frameworks is a most useful means of evaluating community-based festival organisation effectiveness applying a marketing concept orientation.

From these findings, conclusions can be drawn on the case study community and its agricultural show. The Anytown 1 Show Society, whilst financially viable, does not appear to be effective as a festival organisation. There is a lack of management skills amongst those in the show management committee who are driven in their involvement predominantly by their individual self-interest. This has created a poor management structure where decisions are not made with common objectives resulting in a disjointed festival experience. The perceptions of those on the committee are more significant than the needs of the target consumers who, in this case, are the community of Anytown.

A lack of management skills has resulted in no planning either at a strategic or operational level. The show experience is based upon what happened last year, if those volunteers who took responsibility for a specific show feature are available and willing to do so again. A lack of management skills has also manifested itself at an operational level where those involved in specific activities are solely responsible with little record keeping and knowledge of how decisions are made. This management structure and channel of operation is similar to the traditional way the show was managed. An analysis of show schedules indicates very little has changed. When changes of program did occur there is no record of determining reasons why, although it can be assumed that these changes were related to those
involved coming up with ideas or being able to implement them. Respondents indicated that the major difference between early operations and the present is the pool of volunteers involved in the management, operations and staging of the festival.

As the show experience is driven not by market interests and needs but by a repeat of ‘what we have always done’, it is clear that this show society has adopted a product concept orientation. Very little information is collected on visitor attendance, satisfaction or overall market needs. Complaints are seen as due to disgruntled competitors. There is no evidence of marketing planning except the repeat of ‘what we have always done’ or a trial of something ‘affordable’ with no measurement of marketing success.

Some respondents recognised, and felt strongly, that community changes have had a marked impact on show attendance, either as a spectator or competitor. This indicates recognition of the downturn in interest levels in the show amongst the present community. There is a view that the skills displayed at shows are not skills that younger members of the community possess because the skills are not taught or valued any longer. This has resulted, in the minds of the show committee, in fewer competitors and a downturn in interest in attending the show. Further, this has affected the volunteer pool required to manage the festival. The findings reveal that this pool is in decline, although little is done to recruit volunteers. Those who control and influence decisions do not accept criticism or welcome new ideas. These individuals view ‘outsiders’ (those who have not been involved with the show movement) as not possessing the skills and knowledge required to be involved.

As revenue for the show primarily comes from entry to the show and those who compete in horse events, with less contributed by other competitors, exhibitors and sponsors/advertisers, relying on entry alone means that the show cannot resource the following year’s show adequately should attendance decline. Whilst other competitions and activities occur throughout the year to raise revenue for the show society, there are costs of maintaining the buildings and grounds that the show
society owns. Costs of exhibiting and competing are kept to a minimum as these provide a backdrop of entertainment for the show and increases may result in lower participation. These practices present many operational challenges for the show society.

The organisational culture that exists within the show society indicates strong personalities that are influencing not only the show program but the degree of other changes, seen as a concern amongst some respondents. Change is required to many elements of show management in order to attract new volunteers to become involved and for the show to remain a positive community festival. There is a view that this is unlikely to take place with the current individuals in control of management. It is these individuals who are reluctant to change not only what is done but also how it is done. Few individuals in the community are likely to stand for the position of president, as they acknowledge the hard work being performed by the current president and his partner. However the remainder of the committee feel that this is the reason for a lack of change.
CHAPTER SIX: ANALYSING THE MANAGEMENT EFFECTIVENESS OF AGRICULTURAL SHOWS

6.1. Introduction

This chapter will further discuss research findings in relation to the literature review. First, a critique of the marketing concept literature pertinent to the planning, management and operation of festivals is provided. Second, the frameworks of Getz and Frisby (1988) and Mayfield and Crompton (1995) that were employed as a theoretical basis for this study are summarised with proposed alterations and additions for future research. As the authors of the two frameworks developed them in isolation, the employment of these within this study has contributed to a holistic evaluation of festival management effectiveness. Elements of both frameworks have contributed to the development of a model suitable for agricultural show societies to use as a management tool for future shows. This chapter introduces this model and its rationale.

6.2. Marketing Concept Adoption

i. Dimension 1: Visitor Orientation.

The items contained within this dimension relate to visitor information in the development of show content and marketing objectives. This dimension also highlights the importance of understanding visitor needs. In order to be able to achieve the items within this dimension, there needs to be a systematic method of collecting visitor opinions and input. Findings indicate that at the present time, input to the show program is provided solely from show society committee members, based either upon what they want to see featured or what was experienced at another community’s show. No evidence exists that customer input
is obtained. Further, and this is supported through the limited research and papers available (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999; ACAS, 2000; Seymour, 2006), there is a reluctance to change elements of the show stemming from the culture of the show society.

The collection of this series of items, if carried out effectively, is done through market research. This then would provide valuable information to show organisers for forthcoming festival content as well as specific marketing activities. To a show society whose management is not familiar with these terms and applications, this is a major challenge to overcome without external support. Further, considering the limited funds available to show societies, it is unlikely that external research firms would be recruited to assist in this regard. With limited experience, this can result in poorly designed and implemented research resulting in decisions not based upon reliable or accurate information. All these factors suggest that there is less likelihood of market research being conducted. Indeed, the study by Darian-Smith and Wills (1999) demonstrated a reliance on largely anecdotal information rather than any systematic collections of data.

According to ACAS (2000), agricultural show societies continue to provide an experience based upon tradition, either with little variance, or simply based upon what another show society is doing. An appreciation of the specific needs of the particular community being served is not understood or investigated. According to the literature, changes to show content that have occurred may have resulted in a boost to attendance figures but there is no evidence of real understanding of visitor needs being sought or obtained. Further, the literature indicates that while show societies are aware of their competitors, the management committees are at a loss as to how to deal with them. This is due primarily to the lack of information available (ACAS, 2000). This study supports these assertions. The Anytown 1 Show Society does not conduct any research or actively encourage feedback from those who patronise or compete at the show. Those customers who make complaints are seen as disgruntled. Whilst respondents stated there were not large numbers of complaints, the overall satisfaction with the show experience is not known. As
there have been declining attendances, there may be a growing number of dissatisfied customers who do not return. Further, negative word of mouth may be contributing to this decline.

ii. Dimension 2: Pre Experience Assessment

Pre experience assessment focuses on the understanding of potential markets, the use of market research and the development of marketing strategy that encompasses this research. This assessment would involve an analysis with the external environment as proposed by Getz and Frisby’s (1988) framework, yet not included within Mayfield and Crompton’s (1995) dimensions. Each component of the show’s inputs and intra-organisational processes should flow from a current understanding of the community context, knowledge and access to networks. Within this analysis is a recognition and reaction to competitors.

No evidence was uncovered to indicate that the Anytown 1 Show Society undertakes strategic or show planning. With no development of strategy or market research, it can be concluded that this dimension is not being undertaken. This is due to a lack of knowledge and experience within the show management committee. The show society’s organisational culture prevents such planning or change of approach to occur. Further, there is a perception amongst some respondents that this would add a greater burden to those involved on the management committee. A looser planning structure and less control of specific elements of the show are seen as a means of not alienating individuals. Despite this, findings indicate that two individuals within the show management, who are well respected by other committee members and admired for their dedication, dominate the overall decision making. Through this domination, there is enormous opposition to change. Change of program or ‘ways of doing things’ (for instance, the reintroduction of the Show Girl Competition) requires much persuasion. As fewer individuals are involved in the show management committee, change or a challenge to this is not likely to occur.
iii. Dimension 3: Post Experience Evaluation

This last dimension relates to the customer’s experience of quality and satisfaction with the show experience. Measurement of marketing program effectiveness is also required. This dimension can be achieved primarily from customer research. Complaint solicitation is another form of evaluating post experience. This dimension allows the show society to determine the success of the show from the customer’s viewpoint while providing information that can improve the overall experience the show provides.

Findings indicate that an evaluation of promotional effectiveness is not being conducted to determine levels of success for each initiative undertaken. Consequently, it is possible that the Anytown 1 Show Society may be allocating funds to promotion that are ineffective. Further, findings specify that decisions on promotion are based purely upon tradition, the understanding of committee members and what they can afford. Not all show committee members involved in this study were aware of the amount and types of promotion undertaken. This is a reflection of how decisions are made – in isolation and without full committee involvement. Promotional efforts, particularly within a not-for-profit festival organisation with limited funds, should be based on effective strategies. Evaluation of each initiative should be conducted to access its effectiveness.

6.3. Model Development and Rationale

Research findings indicate that the Anytown 1 Show Society does not adopt a marketing concept orientation but a product concept orientation. Marketing concept research on festivals (Mayfield and Crompton, 1995; Lade, 2001; Mehmetoglu and Ellingson, 2005) came to the same conclusions. Based upon an analysis of the organisation’s effectiveness, it is not likely to do this unless organisational change occurs. Organisational change is being prevented by the existing culture of the organisation dominated by two individual leaders. Despite
the need for more volunteer support, the findings indicate that new ideas are not welcome.

i. Current Management Approach

Figure 13 depicts the current approach to management of the Anytown 1 Show Society. Based upon research findings, the Anytown 1 Show Society adopts a product concept orientation. The model of product concept orientation provided in Chapter Three, forms the basis of the diagram in Figure 13. Modifications to this have been made based upon the Getz and Frisby (1988) model and the findings from this study. The model indicates within the circle the operational inputs or elements that are required in order to stage the festival. These are controlled by the show society. Each box that surrounds the circle depicts the current management process of planning and managing the show. As Figure 13 specifies, the central focus of the show society is the show. Findings indicate that the entire show experience is not viewed as such by some respondents; rather some only signify one part of it. Such a narrow focus is even more symptomatic of a product concept orientation, and causes a less cohesive approach to the experience.
Findings indicate that any efforts for show improvement are aimed at making the experience superior. Entry costs are seen as the hindrance to customer purchase. This rationale assumes that if costs are lower, more customers will attend the show. External environment factors, except existing networks, are not considered. The only exception to this is to apportion ‘blame’ to competition, community attitudes and lack of support for the current state of attendance and volunteer support.

Little variation of the show’s program takes place unless driven by volunteer management. The external environment factors identified in the literature as potential reasons for festival failure are not being taken into consideration when the show is being planned. While these external factors are largely outside the control of the show society, not adequately adapting to these may result in further declines (Getz, 2000, 2007). Findings indicate that knowledge of external environmental change is evident. However, these variables are not being
investigated or explored to determine current opportunities, or deal with issues that are present.

External factors also shape and influence the intra-organisational processes of the show society. The show society does not implement any changes to those intra-organisational processes that have ‘always’ been carried out. External factors, whilst often difficult to predict, can be managed effectively if those in charge have the capacity to research community needs and interests and develop strategies to respond to these changes. Current approaches to management of the show will not facilitate appropriate change to reflect the current community context. A lack of adequate intra-organisational processes adds to this. The long-term sustainability of the Anytown 1 show is therefore in jeopardy.

ii. Recommended Changes to Existing Frameworks

Mayfield and Crompton’s (1995) marketing concept dimensions framework provides an effective means of investigating whether a festival is utilising this approach within its management. It is proposed that modification to this may add to more effective marketing concept assessment. Proposed modifications are based upon research findings and the use of the Getz and Frisby (1988) framework.

Table 21 records the items from Mayfield and Crompton’s (1995) dimensions but contains the recommended modifications. Dimension 1 items have been clarified. Any similarities in meaning have been removed. Definitions have been refined. It is recommended that Dimension 2, pre experience assessment, be renamed to reflect Ruekert’s (1992) terminology, that of strategy development. This terminology is regarded as more appropriate to the items within this dimension. Within this second dimension, factors outlined in the Getz and Frisby (1988) framework has been incorporated. These are highlighted in italics in Table 21.
Table 21: Framework for Identifying Adoption of Marketing Concept Orientation for Festival Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 1:</td>
<td>Listen to opinions of visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor orientation</td>
<td>Use visitor information to improve festival quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop festival programs based upon visitor needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Understand visitor needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Value visitor input in planning new festival attractions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keep promises made to visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respond to visitor needs in creating activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 2:</td>
<td>Engage in market research to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Development</td>
<td>• identify current contexts (social and demographic; networks; economic);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• identify different markets and their needs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• assess competitor presence and activities;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a strategy that relies on market research:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop organisation and festival objectives;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Create festival experiences based upon market research and customer needs;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Target promotion towards identified customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension 3:</td>
<td>Measure visitor satisfaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post experience Evaluation</td>
<td>Solicit complaints from visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use visitor feedback to measure promotional effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure service quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Mayfield and Crompton (1995)

Getz and Frisby’s (1998) diagnostic tool employed for this research is considered a valuable and detailed framework to assess management effectiveness of community festivals. The detail provided within this framework is a major strength and provides, in essence, a step by step approach to evaluating effectiveness. Community festival organisations can employ this framework to assess their approach to festival management, although as Getz and Frisby (1988) point out, the opinions of festival management should not be the exclusive contributions to this analysis. Environmental effectiveness, a component of this framework, was not considered for this study as further social and economic impact assessment and broader community surveys would be required for this to be assessed adequately.
A weakness of this framework is that it does not provide sufficient detail in relation to the marketing concept. It is recommended that elements of this concept be incorporated into the external environment analysis component of this framework. The current framework identifies four factors: community context, uncertainty, networks and complexity. The community context factor is required to be expressed in further detail similar to that of factors of intra-organisational processes. Although Getz and Frisby (1988) outline what community context refers to (social and cultural life, social hierarchy politics and economic conditions), a customer needs investigation requires inclusion. Not all community festivals attract the community, and not all community members attend community festivals. Therefore an analysis of customer needs is recommended as an inclusion to this framework.

Further, the findings of this study have identified competition as an important area of external complexity and uncertainty. Findings indicate that much broader competitive forces impact on a festival and are not limited to those within the community. Therefore, it is recommended that a fifth factor, competition, be included in the first components of this framework.

iii. Proposed Model for Future Agricultural Show Management

As this study focussed on one type of community festival, the agricultural show, there was initial recognition of the need for a practical model to assist those volunteer managers who are responsible for the show to adopt this philosophy. By incorporating the open system diagnostic framework developed by Getz and Frisby (1988), this was achieved. This model is depicted in Figure 14. It recognises the key management processes required to organise for effective festival management whilst implementing the marketing concept. These are planning, organising, influencing and controlling. They are depicted as being within the control of the festival organisation by the enclosed box. Management functions are surrounded by a broken line, and their positioning within the model implies a need to develop
these in conjunction with the knowledge gained from research and understanding of the external environment. The external environment depiction contains the variables of the Getz and Frisby (1988) framework. The recommended inclusion of competition is also featured as a separate, yet significant consideration.

Further, within the external environment is the target market. As the marketing concept dictates, the target market informs the festival experience as well as how the festival organisation develops all functions to meet customer needs. Symbolically, the target market is the focus of the festival organisation and the festival experience. The festival concept developed by the festival organisation in this location implies that festival objectives and programs are developed based around an appeal to the target market. This is not to indicate that the theme of agriculture is less significant but rather that the experiences offered reflect interests of the target market.

Findings indicate that the Anytown 1 Show Society adopts a product concept orientation as depicted in Figure 13. The proposed model identified in Figure 14 provides the Anytown 1 Show Society with a means to become an effective festival organisation that embraces a marketing concept.
Figure 14: Model of Management Effectiveness and Marketing Concept Orientation for Festival Organisations
6.4. Summary

The relationship between existing academic frameworks of the marketing concept and festival management effectiveness and this study’s findings has been drawn together in this chapter. A detailed discussion of the marketing concept as framed by Mayfield and Crompton (1995) provides an analysis of the current operations of the Anytown 1 Show Society. This coupled with the few agricultural show studies indicates that show societies are employing a product concept orientation.

Combined with this knowledge and the findings of how the Anytown 1 Show Society manages the show, a model that seeks to guide the application of a marketing concept is provided. This model incorporates the open system framework developed by Getz and Frisby (1988), found not to be adopted by Anytown 1 Show Society. The model acknowledges the importance of market research and knowledge of the target market and the external environment.
CHAPTER SEVEN: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This final chapter of this thesis provides conclusions on the management effectiveness of agricultural show societies within Australia. As this study focussed on one case show and community, findings cannot automatically be applied across all show societies. However, this study can provide important conclusions for management effectiveness that can add to existing knowledge. Chapter Two highlighted the lack of agricultural show research that focuses on show society management and its effectiveness. This study has therefore added knowledge to this theme. Based upon the issues identified in Chapter Two’s and the research objectives for this study, this chapter provides two discussions. First, this chapter seeks to address the important considerations of declining numbers and attendance at agricultural shows in Australia. Second, this chapter will present proposed future research directions.

7.1. Agricultural Shows Adopt a Product Concept Orientation

The existing agricultural shows studies and analysis provided in Chapter Two indicate that the management of these festivals in Australia adopt a product concept orientation. Little if any market or consumer research is conducted on the community where the shows are staged and little variation exists in the show program from its inception. Consumer interests and changes of programs are not being adequately accounted for or implemented (ACAS, 2000; Seymour, 2006). Findings obtained from the case study show society follows this practice. This study found that the Anytown 1 show program has undergone little change except to indicate a decline in the number of social opportunities at more recent times. Show programs are developed based upon the influence and desire of the show committee members. Historic analysis reveals that elements of the show program were removed if individuals responsible were no longer willing or were unable to continue this involvement. Observation of current show organisational structure
indicates that there is little cohesion once program elements are decided upon. Further, findings indicate that show society management does not know or cannot articulate why changes in show programs have taken place.

The community in which the case study is focussed has undergone considerable demographic and economic structural change, and yet the needs of these community members are not being addressed; rather the community members are often blamed for their disinterest. Truss (2005: p.1) states:

*Constant adjustment is required to stay relevant to and in touch with all the changing groups in your community. But meeting the challenge opens the door to new opportunities, new volunteers and new groups who have an interest in attending.*

No research into community needs or customer satisfaction is being done to identify these. The show society tries to keep competition costs and entry fees low in order to attract participants and customers. The perception is that if the show is too expensive the community will not attend as cost is seen as a deterrent.

Holloway, (2004, 2005) indicates that changes in programs are being embraced by show society management in the United Kingdom. These changes have been developed in response to identified market needs of agricultural information and education at a time when the divide between rural and urban and farming and non-farming communities has created a lack of awareness and understanding of practices and achievements. The area of education is also identified by Seymour, (2006) for the Australian scene. In Australia, at a time of severe drought and concerns over climate change, Holloway’s findings as outlined in Chapter Two provide important themes for further research, whereas in the United Kingdom, show societies and in particular the show itself, can lead the way.
7.2. Adoption of a Marketing Concept is Dependent on Appropriate Organisational Structure and Culture

The marketing concept is a management strategy. Its implementation is required within the overall planning and organising functions of the festival organisation. If planning and other management functions are not conducted, adopting a marketing concept is not possible. Findings from this study illustrate that this, coupled with the way in which the show management is structured and operationalised, has implications for the show’s management and its ability to incorporate relevant consumer strategies. The current structure of the Anytown 1 Show Society, as depicted in Chapter Five, orients those involved to be narrow in their show focus, ignoring or not taking an interest in other areas. The existing culture of the organisation indicates reluctance for change in the show program and how this is operationalised.

The tradition and history of agricultural shows is a link to their organisational culture and reluctance for change. Handy (1988) who focussed on voluntary organisations discussed in Chapter Three, indicates those that possess long histories, like those of agricultural show societies, are reluctant to change, and only do so when ‘they are frightened’ and when the costs of no change vastly exceed the risks. Seymour (2006) supports this view, as outlined in Chapter Two. If the future of agricultural shows is being threatened a new approach to management is required. Therefore it is recommended that national bodies like the FCAS and the ACAS consider this issue further with a view to encouraging and supporting change and research throughout the show movement.
7.3. Management Effectiveness in Community Festivals is related to the Skills of the Volunteer Managers

Despite, or perhaps because of, their community base, Getz (1993: p.11) reports that festivals demonstrate considerable diversity in purpose, structure, management and output. Understanding the ways festivals are managed is a useful insight into their ability to cope in an increasingly competitive area of leisure and tourism. Little is understood about how agricultural shows are managed except through the acknowledgement of greater management complexity. According to Truss (cited in PDF Management, 2002: p. I), the planning and administration of shows are becoming more complex and time-consuming for show societies to manage their particular shows. Further, Truss (2002) states, ‘many committees are finding that they need to behave like small businesses in the way that they prepare for each show and plan for their long term futures’. This comment implies that currently show societies do not operate as businesses. Certainly efforts briefly outlined in Chapter Two to assist show societies to operationalise risk management and occupational health and safety, provide clear indications of this challenge.

This study revealed that the show management committee does not possess the management skills now required to manage an agricultural show, further compounded by the ever-changing external environment where consumers have different needs and there is greater competition. Findings indicate that seeking respondents’ experience and application of common management practices in terms of formal planning, decision making, organising and staging a festival are minimal. Little documentation exists to monitor changes in the market or record what takes place at each show unless required by external players.

There appears to be an enormous amount of good will on the part of the committee but a sense of reluctance and also an inability to change how things are done. Most of the management committee believed that current problems arise from external forces, outside of their control. External forces are a lack of volunteer support,
disinterest within the broader community and increasing insurance costs. These
were circumstances that, in their analysis, could not be controlled. The findings of
this study indicate that current managers do not see the need for upgraded
management skills or expertise; rather they see an interest in a particular aspect of
agriculture as being of paramount importance. Recent efforts by the ShowSkills
program, as discussed in Chapter Two, indicate that show society management
practices require skill development in the many intra-organisational processes
discussed. It is recommended that a move towards a more professional and
business management approach will assist the future success of the Anytown 1
Show.

The ShowSkills Program was an attempt to address these issues. However, this
study has found that the training did not penetrate into the entire show society
structure. A follow-up program is required with strong support from the FCAS and
all state and territory show associations. Further, it is recommended that a policy
and procedures document, similar to the concept developed in the Agricultural
Show Handbook (New South Wales Council of Agricultural Societies, 1979),
explained in Chapter Two with excerpts in Appendix 1, be produced at a national
level that can provide an accessible document for show societies to refer to as the
management of the show society and the show is realigned to become more
effective. Unlike the New South Wales version, this manual should be based along
the lines of the ShowSkills workbooks and provide practical tools for show societies
to conduct research and undertake other management functions.

However, these measures alone will not necessarily secure change to organisational
culture or show programs. This is due to the long history and traditions that show
societies have had in Australia. With the commitment of the FCAS and the ACAS for
change, an accreditation process, similar to that applied within other tourism
sectors, may provide a strong impetus for change.

The accreditation process has come to be seen as an important mechanism via
which standards of service and professionalism can be raised in tourism (Harris and
The development of a business accreditation manual for festival organisations in Western Australia by the industry association has already been developed. According to Carlson (2000: pp.118-119) the benefits of this include: providing festival organisations with a clear statement of policies, procedures, and instructions; leading to an improved control of operations and reducing variation in performance of duties, which enables better intercommunication; leading to the clarification of responsibility and reporting roles with the establishment of job descriptions and work instructions, which increases overall operational performance; leading individuals to a better understanding of what is expected of them, which improves output and employee moral; and lastly encourages businesses to review their capabilities regularly. This inevitably culminates in the clearer understanding and provision of customer requirements and is therefore a move towards the adoption of a marketing concept. By adopting the contents of a manual as described above, an organisation is accredited and thus derives the benefits of this. Such a process can be developed for show societies if supported by the FCAS and the ACAS with the financial assistance of the Commonwealth Government.

The introduction of youth committees that have been allowed to revitalise aspects of their shows (YARN, 2007) is another positive step forward and should be encouraged and supported. Associations such as the Agricultural Societies Council (ASC) Youth Group of New South Wales provide opportunities for young persons in communities across New South Wales to have a voice and become more actively involved in the show society. This formula should be adopted throughout Australia in conjunction with suitable training.

7.4. **Management Effectiveness is not influenced by the Size of a Community or the Age of a Festival**

This study has revealed that festival management effectiveness is linked to the adoption of a marketing concept and the implementation of appropriate intra-organisational processes. Studies conducted on festival management (Getz and
Frisby, 1988; Frisby and Getz, 1989; Getz, 1993) and adoption of a marketing concept (Mayfield and Crompton, 1995) suggest that the larger the community’s population, the larger the pool of volunteer support. The authors’ arguments are based upon the premise that larger sized communities potentially have more community members who possess the required levels of skill and a greater number of people from which to recruit volunteers. However, this assumes community members want to be engaged with or are given the opportunity to become involved in the festival’s management.

Although the population of the case study community is growing, the number of people involved on the show society committee is declining. A corresponding decline has occurred in employment within the agricultural industry, with fewer people having a connection or linkages to the agricultural history of the area. In this study, population size does not appear to have a positive influence on people’s involvement in a festival, this being an agricultural show. Linked with decreasing attendance, it appears that a younger, newly arrived community may not have the same connections with agriculture as their predecessors and therefore limited interest in the show as participants or volunteers. Further, this study points towards the show no longer producing festival experiences that meet the interests of the current population. However, population size does present an opportunity. As this community is represented by a young population, these people are capable of carrying out the roles required for the management of the show provided there are incentives and experiences that encourage them to participate. There is an opportunity for the show committee to explore the needs and wants of the community rather than just repeating the same formula each year.

Mayfield and Crompton (1995) developed the initial hypothesis that the longer a festival had been operating, the more likely its management had adopted a marketing concept philosophy. The rationale for this was that the length of time the festival had been in operation, the more likely it kept abreast of the market’s needs and interests. Their study found this to be void. In her analysis of two regional festivals, Lade (2001) found that adoption of a marketing concept either
began when the festival was conceived or was adopted after the festival was experiencing difficulties attracting consumers. The ACAS study (2000) and practitioner commentaries (Edwards, 2006; Seymour, 2006) indicate that despite their long history within their respective communities, agricultural shows are not producing show programs that meet current consumer needs.

7.5. The Size of a Community does not positively affect the Ability to Attract Volunteers

Agricultural shows as community festivals are characterised by a heavy reliance on volunteers for their management and organisation. The broader literature on rural communities in Australia indicates that their populations are generally in decline and newer members do not have the past agricultural connections. Studies of agricultural shows (Darian-Smith and Wills, 1999; ACAS, 2000) indicate that as populations are dwindling, there are fewer people to carry on the role of show committee member. Further, these studies indicate that the population of these communities is aging, with fewer people able to carry on the roles of show committee member. As such, the community’s population size positively influences the ability to attract volunteers. Further, as noted above, Getz and Frisby (1988) and Getz (1990) indicate that as the size of a community grows so does the ability to draw in volunteers who are skilled in management increases.

Based upon this notion, the current study selected a community experiencing population growth. Findings indicate that newly arrived community members have little connection with the community’s history and its traditional form of economic activity, agriculture, and therefore limited interest in the festival as participants, let alone volunteers. This study has shown that those currently involved in the agricultural show society are doing so predominantly due to their own self-interest. This indicates a similarity to the majority of other festival and leisure volunteer studies which have shown that volunteers will exchange their services for personal interests, the need for influence, social status, social recognition or elaboration of social networks (Edwards 2005). Slaughter’s study (2002) that included long term
volunteers from agricultural shows amongst its sample, does not comply with this study’s findings. However as stated in Chapter Three, it is not known what role these respondents played. If not involved in a management role, altruism may be a more significant motivation for those involved in operational agricultural shows. This area therefore requires further research.

Monga (2006) states that the more passion or attachment a volunteer possesses for the festival theme or activity, the stronger the likelihood the volunteer will remain involved. The implication of this raises the importance of determining current community interests in agriculture and offering these in the show experience. As current show management committee members are motivated in this way, developing a show program that appeals to the current community may result in similar outcomes.

7.6. Future Research Directions

The marketing concept focuses organisational attention on gathering information and constantly evaluating consumer needs and interests in order to create valuable festival experiences. This study has found that market needs, currently not being investigated, may not be considered if they lead to a change in program that jeopardises a show member’s interests. Findings indicate that new ideas are not welcome at the cost of personal interests.

A case study is a powerful tool in research. This method, due to its singular focus, cannot, of course, generalise findings across the area under investigation. However, a case study can play an important role in creating new knowledge, generating propositions or hypotheses and testing existing theories (Getz, 2007). This case study has achieved these outcomes.

As this study utilised a single case study of one agricultural show and its management, further research is recommended to substantiate the findings obtained. There are approximately 500 agricultural shows within country areas of
Australia at present (FCAS, 2005). Rather than targeting a large sample, several case studies within each state and territory will allow a comparison of results. Further, to assess the current perceptions of the show within each community and assess market interest, interviewing the local community should be incorporated in a quantitative analysis as part of these case studies.

The two theoretical frameworks adopted for this study’s research instrument have been effective tools to measure community festival management effectiveness and marketing concept adoption. As a result of the findings of this study, modifications have been proposed in Chapter Six. Incorporating these revised frameworks into future research will, it is anticipated, yield valuable information. As both frameworks were developed for festival research, their use is not limited to agricultural shows.

A theoretical model suitable for agricultural show societies to use as a management tool for future shows has been conceptualised from the literature review and research findings. This model incorporates the marketing concept. Future research can provide validity for this model if show societies utilise it as a management guide. The aim of the model is to assist show societies to redress current declines.

The contribution of this research may be demonstrated by these future research directions. It is intended that this research will provide valuable assistance to agricultural show societies primarily as a means of developing long-term sustainability.
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## Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD OR TERM</th>
<th>ADOPTED DEFINITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Show</td>
<td>An agricultural show is community-based festival that seeks to promote and celebrate agricultural endeavours and produce as well as providing social and recreational opportunities that are relevant to a community (Meyer, 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Show Society</td>
<td>An agricultural show society is a not-for-profit voluntary organisation that promotes, encourages and assists the development of agricultural, horticultural, viticultural, industrial, rural, technological, commercial and mineral resources of Australia and the relevant state, including the education and cultural exchange intrastate, interstate and internationally (based on Ernst and Young’s description, 2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community festival</td>
<td>A community festival is a themed public occasion designed to occur for a limited duration that celebrates valued aspects of a community’s way of life, and is organised and staged by the community for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Festival</td>
<td>Themed public occasions designed to occur for a limited duration that celebrate valued aspects of a community’s way of life (Douglas et al, 2001).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing concept</td>
<td>A marketing concept is a management philosophy that recognises the primary reason for a product or service to exist is to satisfy customer needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product concept</td>
<td>A product concept is a management philosophy that focuses on the enterprise’s product or service output and the volume of sales of this output (Miller and Layton, 2000).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>A service is any act, performance or experience that one party can offer to another: one that is essentially intangible and does not result in any ownership of anything (Lovelock et al 2004).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>A volunteer is a person who gives unpaid help in the form of time, service or skills (ABS, 2005).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. APPENDICES
Appendix 1: Excerpts from the Agricultural Show Handbook 1979
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated Societies</td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture House</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance Service at Shows</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Show - Preparation</td>
<td>89 - 92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A.S.C.: Affiliation and Insurances</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rain Protection</td>
<td>33 - 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Risk</td>
<td>37 - 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accident Fund</td>
<td>40 - 43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members Risk</td>
<td>44 - 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef Cattle Junior Judging Competition</td>
<td>58 - 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constitutions:</strong> Agricultural Societies Council of N.S.W.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>4 - 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society</td>
<td>11 - 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contests:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland Dancing</td>
<td>18 - 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep Tossing</td>
<td>84 - 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tent Pegging</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tug-o-War</td>
<td>74 - 77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Co-Operative Show Services</strong></td>
<td>78 - 83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dairy Cattle Junior Judging Competition</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directory</td>
<td>60 - 61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equestrian Federation of Australia</strong></td>
<td>99 - 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial Aid - N.S.W. Government</strong></td>
<td>54 - 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guild Shows</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement between the Showmen's Guild of Australia and the Agricultural Societies Council of N.S.W.</td>
<td>48 - 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hints for Stewards</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Printed Matter for Shows</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R.A.S.:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Wheat Competition</td>
<td>64 - 68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennel Control</td>
<td>72 - 73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb Carcass Competition</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show Girl Competition</td>
<td>69 - 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ribbon Suppliers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sales Tax Exemption</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secretaries and Show Dates</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Show Sections - Judges</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stamp Duty Exemption</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trotting at Shows</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25 - 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>93 - 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51 - 53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(CONSTITUTION OF PASTORAL, AGRICULTURAL, HORTICULTURAL AND INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION.)

CONSTITUTION
of the

1. TITLE:
The title of the Society shall be . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
and the Headquarters shall be at . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
where all meetings shall be held unless otherwise ordered by the Management or Executive Committee.

2. OBJECTS:
The objects of the Society shall be:

(a) To promote the development of the Agricultural, Horticultural and Industrial resources of the . . . . . . . . . . . . .
and surrounding districts.

(b) To hold Exhibitions and Gyakhanas on the . . . . . . . . .
Showground for the display of horses, cattle, dogs, poultry and other live stock, and Horticultural and agricultural produce of all kinds together with such other subjects of manufacture, product or the arts as may be determined.

(c) To promote such other objects as may tend to advancement of the Agricultural, Horticultural and Industrial interests of the State.

3. AFFILIATIONS:
To establish relations with Societies of a similar character in New South Wales by way of affiliation to the . . . . . .
Agricultural Societies Group and the Agricultural Societies Council of N.S.W.

4. MEMBERSHIP:
Any person may, by giving his name and address and by payment of the annual subscription to the Honorary Secretary, be duly constituted a Member and may have all the rights and privileges of membership.

Persons under 17 years of age may, by giving his name and address and by payment of the annual subscription to the Honorary Secretary, be duly constituted a Junior Member and may have all the rights and privileges of membership.

Any Firm or Company on paying the annual subscription shall have the privilege of nominating one of the members of such Firm or
Company who may then be entitled to, and exercise all rights attaching to, such membership, and may also be eligible for election to any office.

5. The Annual Subscription, due on ........ in each year, shall be determined by the Management Committee.

(a) Members shall be entitled to one pass, another transferable pass, free admission to the Show on all days, free use of the Members Car Park, and the free entry of children under 14 years of age.

(b) Junior Members under the age of seventeen years shall be entitled to one pass. Such Junior Members are not permitted to vote until full membership is attained.

6. HONORARY MEMBERS:

The Management Committee may elect persons to be Honorary Members of the Society. Such members may take part in discussion at all meetings of the Society but shall not be entitled to vote.

7. PRIVILEGES OF MEMBERSHIP:

The privileges of membership shall consist of the right to vote at all general meetings of the Society, free admission on production of member's ticket or badge for the current year to the Society's Show and to all other entertainment which may be held on the grounds by the Society.

Nothing in this rule shall limit the right of the Management Committee or its duly authorised officers to exclude members from any buildings used for administrative purposes, or from any portion or portions of the Showground for which, in the opinion of the Management Committee or its authorised Officer, such exclusion is at any time necessary for the proper control and management of any exhibition, or show or gathering or for any other reason that the Management Committee may think sufficient.

8. An alphabetical list of all members of the Society, with their respective address shall be kept at the office of the Society for the inspection of Members.

9. ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING:

The Annual General Meeting, of which not less than two weeks' notice shall be given to each member, shall be held not later than the 31st day of ...., at which the Annual Report, Income and Expenditure Account and Balance Sheet (duly audited) covering the twelve months ending .... shall be presented and considered, and the election of Office-bearers and Management Committee shall be conducted. Other business referred by the Management Committee or Executive Committee shall be considered. Members of the Society may also propose matters as recommendations for the consideration of the Management Committee.
10. **SPECIAL GENERAL MEETING:**

A Special General Meeting shall be convened by the Honorary Secretary when required by the President or any six members of the Management Committee, or on receipt by the Honorary Secretary of a requisition signed by ten duly qualified members of the Society requesting the Honorary Secretary call such meeting, and stating the objects for which such meeting is called. Each member shall have fourteen days' notice of such meetings.

11. **NOTICE OF MOTION TO BE GIVEN:**

No business other than formal as required by the rules, as stated in Clause 9, shall be entertained at the Annual General Meeting unless notice of such business shall have been given in writing to the Honorary Secretary at least twenty-one days prior to the date of such meeting.

12. **HOW QUESTIONS ARE TO BE DECIDED:**

The President shall be entitled to take the Chair at every General Meeting at which he is present, but in his absence a Vice-President shall be elected to take over the Chair. If at any duly constituted General Meeting neither the President nor any Vice-President is present or willing to act the members present shall choose another member of the Management Committee as Chairman, and if no member of the Management Committee is present or willing to act, then the members present shall choose one of their members to be Chairman.

The Chairman of a General Meeting may with the consent of the meeting adjourn any General Meeting from time to time and from place to place, but no business shall be transacted at any adjourned meeting other than the business left unfinished at the meeting from which the adjournment took place.

Every question submitted to a General Meeting shall be decided in the first instance by a show of hands, and in the case of an equality of votes the Chairman shall both on a show of hands and at a poll have a casting vote in addition to the vote to which he may be entitled as a member.

No member shall be entitled to be present or to vote at any meeting or upon a poll or be reckoned in a quorum unless he be a financial member within the meaning of this Constitution.

13. **OFFICE BEARERS, MANAGEMENT AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES:**

The Society shall be under the management of a Committee consisting of up to twenty five members (including the President and five Vice-Presidents -- three of whom shall be the Chairman of the Horse Section Committee and the Horticulture Section Committee) and all of whom shall retire annually but shall be eligible for re-election.
If a vacancy occurs in the Management Committee the seat shall be filled by an appointment by the Committee.

The Executive Committee shall consist of the President, the five Vice-Presidents, the Executive Secretary, Honorary Treasurer, Honorary Secretary and three members to be elected by the Management Committee from their own number.

The Executive Committee shall, unless otherwise provided, derive its powers from the Management Committee and shall have power to deal with matters of urgency between meetings of the Management Committee. The actions of the Executive Committee shall be the subject of reports to and confirmation by the Management Committee, except in cases where the Management Committee has authorised the Executive Committee to take action.

The Management Committee may appoint Patrons who may be ex-officio members of the Management Committee.

The Management Committee shall, upon the recommendation of an Appointments Sub-Committee of five of its members, have the power to appoint, for such period and upon such terms as it deems fit, to remove an Honorary Secretary and Honorary Treasurer who may not be members of the Management Committee. These two officers shall be ex-officio members of the Management Committee if not elected members of such Committee. It shall also have similar powers in respect to paid personnel, administrative or otherwise, including an Executive Secretary, a Deputy Treasurer and an Auditor. Duties of the Executive Secretary, who shall be an ex-officio member of the Management and Executive Committees, shall be as determined from time to time by the President or Management Committee.

14. MODE OF ELECTION:

If nominations are equal to or less than the number of positions to be filled, the nominees shall be declared elected. In the event of insufficient nominations, the vacant positions shall be filled by the Management Committee in the manner provided for casual vacancies. Any member may be nominated for one or more positions but upon election to an office, his nominations for other positions shall be disregarded.

If nominations exceed the number of positions to be filled, a ballot shall be taken in the following manner:

A list of all members nominated which form the ballot paper shall be given to members present, who shall strike out all names except the names of the candidates for whom they wish to vote.

The members present at the Annual General Meeting shall appoint a Returning Officer and two or more Scrutineers who shall count the ballot papers and advise the meeting of the results.
15. VALIDITY OF VOTING PAPERS:

In the event of any question arising as to the validity of a voting paper, the Returning Officer shall be the sole judge as to whether it should be accepted or rejected.

16. NON ATTENDANCE:

If the President or a Vice-President or any member of the Management Committee be absent from three (3) consecutive meetings of the Committee, he shall ipso-facto cease to be an office-bearer unless he has been granted leave of absence by the Management Committee.

17. FILLING CASUAL VACANCIES:

Vacancies caused by death, resignation or non-attendance of office bearers shall be filled by the Management Committee at the meeting next after that on which such vacancy is reported.

18. THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE'S POWERS:

(a) The Management Committee shall have control of the income and expenditure of the funds and of all the property of the Society and also of the management of all the Society's affairs and concern.

(b) The Management Committee shall have power to make rules and by-laws for the conduct of its business and the business of the Society generally, provided that the same be consistent with the objects of the Society.

19. THE HONORARY TREASURER:

The Honorary Treasurer or his deputy shall be in attendance at the Showground to receive the gate money and any other moneys and arrange for its being deposited in the Society's bank.

The Honorary Treasurer's duties shall include the following:

(a) To cause all moneys received to be paid into the Society's Bank Account and produce the deposit receipts to the Finance Committee at all meetings;

(b) To cause to be prepared a statement of receipts and expenditure for the year ending ............... in each year, together with the Balance Sheet showing the liabilities and assets of the Society at the close of the period, signed by the Treasurer and duly certified as correct by the Auditor, and submit same to the Finance Committee prior to the Annual General Meeting; and

(c) To prepare a report and financial statement after each function held at the ground.
20. **THE HONORARY SECRETARY:**

Except in matters of official routine, the Honorary Secretary shall in no case act upon his own responsibility nor shall he, unless under the instructions of the Management Committee or a Committee in charge of any business or section, personally interfere in any way with the management or arrangement of such sections or business.

The Honorary Secretary shall exercise a general supervision over the work of the Society and shall convene when necessary, all meetings of the Committee and its sub-committees and see that all matters requiring the attention of those bodies are brought under their notice when they meet.

It shall be the duty of the Honorary Secretary in the conduct of his offices to carry out the following duties inter-alia:

(a) To attend all meetings of members and the Committee and to take minutes of the proceedings of each meeting in a book kept for that purpose; and

(b) To keep correct lists of the different office-bearers and Committee as well as copies of rules and by-laws of the Society and have such documents available to members at all times.

21. **RULES OF DEBATE:**

General Rules of Debate shall apply to all meetings.

22. **QUORUMS:**

At all general meetings of Members: fifteen shall form a quorum.

At all meetings of the Management Committee: eight shall form a quorum.

At all meetings of the Executive Committee: five shall form a quorum.

Should there not be a quorum present at any meeting, the members present may at the expiration of half an hour from the time appointed for the meeting, adjourn such meeting to such other time or date as they may decide, and if to some other date at least three days' notice shall be given to all those not then present.

23. **BORROWING POWERS:**

Without in any way limiting the generality of the clause "Management Committee's Powers", the Committee may from time to time at its discretion raise or borrow or secure the payment of any sums of money for the purpose of the Society.

24. **ALTERATION OF THIS CONSTITUTION:**

No alterations or amendments to this Constitution shall be made
unless by resolution of the members at a duly constituted Special General Meeting called especially for the purpose and of which all members shall have had notice and then only if such resolution is carried by a majority of seventy-five per cent of those members present personally and entitled to vote.

25. DISSOLUTION:

The Society shall be dissolved in the event of the membership being less than ten persons or upon the vote of a three-fourths majority of the members present at a Special Meeting convened to consider such questions. Upon dissolution, assets and funds on hand may, after payment of all expenses and liabilities, be handed over to such registered or exempted charity as a majority of the members present at a General Meeting may decide.

ADDENDUM:

The first Annual General Meeting of the Society as provided in Clause 9 herein, shall be held in the year .......

(date) ...............
Appendix 1c

The following notes are extracts from a "Show Secretary's Handbook compiled by Rev. J. Parsh and Mrs. C. Faulk of the Far North Coast Group.

This is a useful guide for those involved in the preparation of an Annual Show.

ANNUAL ROUTINE:

To be adjusted to suit individual Societies.

7th MONTH PRIOR TO SHOW:

Call Sub-Committees together (over a period of the next 2 or 3 months) to revise schedules and suggest judges and obtain necessary additional stewards. Liaise with Chief Steward of Dog Section or Kennel Club re judge(s). Dog judges contracts must be finalised ready to be attached to draft schedule also contact your R.A.S.K.C. representative regarding attendance at show.

6th MONTH PRIOR TO SHOW:

Continue with Sub-Committee meetings. Send space applications if applicable, also regular donation letters. Send draft trotting schedule to Trotting Authority of N.S.W. for approval (if a combined group schedule is printed send the approved copy to Group Secretary early for printing) two copies must be sent to Trotting Authority of printed schedule before distribution. Send draft Dog Schedule and judges contract to R.A.S.K.C. to arrive not later than 3 months prior to show (otherwise your dog show will be cancelled) for approval and when printed send them two copies prior to distribution. Membership tickets may be ordered from printers.

5th MONTH PRIOR TO SHOW:

The judges for all sections of the show must be nominated. The judges for the cattle section (beef and dairy) usually nominated by the breed societies. Judges nominated must then be written to. Those reasonably close at hand can simply be invited to officiate, and it is a simple courtesy to ask them what charge they will make for doing the task, but those living any great distance are not actually invited, but are told that they have been nominated, and asked if they are available to come, what travelling, judging fees and accommodation they will require. If the following monthly meeting approves their charges then they are officially invited to judge. Subsequently, complimentary tickets, judges lapel badge, and directions regarding accommodation booked are forwarded to the judges. Complimentary tickets are also sent to the patrons, honorary officers, trotting supervisor and area jumping steward. If printing your own schedules allow ample time for duplication and distribution. If having schedules printed by outside agent finalize all copy and check numbers required by keeping a list of prior year.

4th MONTH PRIOR TO SHOW:

89
Schedule(s) to be approved by committee prior to printing. Schedule copy to printer. (It is good to set a "dead line" for printer to meet.) Launch Miss Show Girl Contest, approach regular sponsors for prizes, invite judges arrange venue for judging. Check ribbons left over from last show, bring number up to usual quantity adding any new classes and deleting where necessary.

REVISED STATIONERY ORDER:
Letterheads envelopes receipt books, exhibit tags, post entry tickets and vouchers, jam stickers, prize cards 1st, 2nd, 3rd, Champion, Reserve Champion, Highly Commended, Special Prize, complimentary tickets, luncheon tickets, admittance tickets, members tickets if not already ordered, also Fat Bullock and Fat Pig tickets, jumping sheets from E.P.A.

3RD MONTH PRIOR TO SHOW:
Distribute Schedules and entry forms.
Get recommendations for official opener [several preferences].
Arrange amplification of show.
Order all prize ribbons, again set a "dead line" for ribbons to be delivered having made sure that all details of ribbons have been made clear to supplier.
Don't forget to keep up the supply of lapel ribbons, especially for judges as these are not handed back following shows. Do not include dates on ribbon wording.

2ND MONTH PRIOR TO SHOW:
At Show Society meeting check progress of response by judges, reminders re working bees to prepare grounds.
Arrange date for show month meeting, this is usually advanced to enable all recommendations from Committees to be finalised.
During this month attend to all space enquiries by phone or mail, allocate trade passes as required. Liaise with space committee re allocation. Apply for liquor licences no later than three weeks before the show.
Additional staff engaged if required.
Arrange for Gatekeepers, Parking Attendants, Nightwatchmen, Bar Managers and assistants.
Forward exhibitor tickets and stickers etc. Close entries (if applicable).
Prepare prize cards as required for all sections.
Arrange ring entertainment - special attractions - fireworks etc.

1ST MONTH: (assuming show is at end of month)
Finalize all judges appointments. Hold Ring Committee meeting, draw up ring programme. Chief Ring Steward to arrange stewards duties, marshalls, pick-up-men etc.
Finalise Grand Parade, official opener, Miss Show Girl parade and presentation also memento gifts for girls and judges.
Print ring programme. Check liquor booth arrangements (supplies, staff etc.). Dog entries to be catalogued, trotting sheets duplicated also dressage sheets. Prepare all section "boxes" sort out ribbons for each section, a pavilion box would consist of:- Schedules, exhibit books, judges book, lapel tags for stewards, pencils and biros, prize cards, [a few blanks], string, pins, clips, etc. Finalise all entries (other than post entries). Invite necessary V.I.P.'s and forward
complimentary tickets.

WEEK OF SHOW:

Check and replenish stationery requirements: pencils, biros, paper clips, bull dog clips, folders, pins, safety pins, thumb tacks etc. Settle into showground office at your convenience; having made sure you have taken all needs. Arrange all moneys required for change and prizemoney to be drawn. Meet sideshow representative also space steward re sittings. Liaise with Chief Stewards in all sections also police re illegal money machines, brief and issue change, schedules, tickets, signs etc. to "post nomination" ladies. Proceed with the conduct of show, dealing with problems as they come, always with a "smiling and cheerful" countenance. Routine matters, apart from receiving moneys, issuing luncheon and attendance tickets are - broken water pipes, power failures, overflowing and malfunctioning toilets, dissatisfied customers, irascible sideshowmen, lost children, brawling drunks, lost wallets and dogs, found wallets (empty) etc. etc. (oh joy). Liaise with press re furnishing results for publication. Where possible join in the "hospitalities" during show. Pay prizemoney during show where possible. The collection of moneys and the balancing of receipts before leaving the grounds each night.

FOLLOWING SHOW:

Progressively clean up, sort out gear returned from showground, return exhibits sent by mail or rail and pack away ribbons etc. for next year. Prepare for and hold "post mortem" meeting. List all matters carefully for recommendations to incoming committee. Make up prizemoney not paid at show then write up prizemoney book. Finalise prizemoney as soon as possible after show. Advertise for any prizewinners (local) to collect when ready and post out of district prizemoney. Pay show accounts as approved by committee meeting. Before end of financial year check unclaimed prizemoney from previous year and rebank. Post all receipts up to date for Membership, rents, donations and advertising, send accounts for any outstanding. Send letters of thanks to all judges and workers. Close off books and hand over to the Auditor as soon as possible. According to Societies constitution declare all committee positions vacant and advertise for nominations from among financial members (some societies do this only every three years) allow time for a postal ballot if necessary - avoid this at all costs -. Accept nominations, conduct ballot if necessary. Call annual meeting advertising in local paper at least (as per constitution) days before meeting.

GENERAL:

At all times be on the look-out for sponsors; approach as many firms as possible. Make sure all auxiliary services are contacted prior to show by phone or letter e.g. Police, Shire/Council, Railway, Garbage disposal, Tuck Office, Banks, Vet. Officers, P.M.G., Ambulance.
At all times check on insurance policies, fire etc. and public risk, members risk are essential, the latter are mostly held with A.S.C. Applications for increases in charges for sideshows must be in writing to the Showmens' Guild for their annual Easter meeting in Sydney.

* * * * *

RIBBON SUPPLIERS

Pennant Products,
49 Little La trobe Street,
MELBOURNE. VIC. 3000
(03) 347.1452

Gay Print,
Keeva Road,
RINGABA. NSW 2404
0672422 ask for B0K

Helmer Bros.,
57 Union Street,
NEWCASTLE. NSW 2300
(049) 2.3653

* * * * *
Appendix 1d

**GUILD SHOWS**

Guild shows are those where the ground space in the defined amusement area is allocated on a priority basis to financial members of the Showmen’s Guild of Australasia.

The Guild guarantees the rental of all stalls, riding devices and side shows and also the behaviour of all members.

In the case of complaints received about the conduct of Showmen, the Guild reserves the right to discipline its own members.

The Guild Delegates will allocate positions in the amusement area and, if requested, will collect all rentals and charges and pay same to the Show Society prior to the completion of the show.

Guild members receive priority on all Guild Showgrounds. This does not mean that non-members are precluded from operating, if space is available non-members are allotted sites after the needs of the members have been satisfied.

Guild members will not sell foodstuffs other than those which are recognised as the traditional showmen’s lines.

The general terms and conditions stated in the Agreement between the Showmen’s Guild of Australasia and the Agricultural Societies Council of N.S.W. to be complied with by both parties.

**AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SHOWMEN’S GUILD OF AUSTRALIA AND THE AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES COUNCIL OF N.S.W.**

*It is mutually agreed that:*

1. The Agricultural Societies Council of N.S.W. recognise the Showmen’s Guild of Australasia. All Show Societies affiliated with the Council will give preference to members of the Guild in the defined Amusement Area. No shows are to be granted space in direct opposition to side shows located in the defined area. Where space in the defined area is not fully occupied by members of the Showmen’s Guild of Australasia, Guild delegates will allocate remaining space to non-Guild members.

2. Affiliated Show Societies shall have the right to ban the sale of foodstuffs by showmen. However, when this right to ban is exercised, it shall not apply to Fairy Floss, Dogwood Dogs, Waffles, Doughnuts, Toffee Apples and Snow Cones which are recognised as exclusive Showmen’s lines. Any Showman contravening this clause on any Showground shall forfeit his space at the next Show of those Societies.

3. Show Societies may allocate space to local and other approved organisations to conduct their particular enterprise. Such
organisations may operate only in areas allotted by the Society, and are excluded from the defined Amusement Area.

4. Where an affiliated Society proposes to alter the layout of its defined Amusement Area, the new layout shall be discussed with Guild delegates at its current year's Show. The agreed new layout will then operate from the next year's Show. In the event of a dispute over any layout, full particulars are to be sent to the Secretary of the Agricultural Societies Council of N.S.W. and/or the Trustees of the relevant Showground who will arrange for arbitration. Should circumstances beyond the control of the Show Society require alteration to the layout, the matter shall be immediately reported to the Council for discussions with the Guild.

5. In the case of any dispute between any Society and the Guild which requires immediate resolution, such dispute will be arbitrated upon by a committee of no less than three members appointed by the Show Society concerned and a committee of not less than three members appointed by the Guild Representative at that Show. In the case of major disputes which cannot be resolved in this way, the Executive of the Agricultural Societies Council or its appointees acting on behalf of the relevant Society should meet with the Executive of the Showmen's Guild or its appointees and arbitrate accordingly.

6. For the purpose of fixing rentals, charges etc., periodic meetings should take place between Guild Members and individual Societies or Groups of Societies. Where a Society, or the Guild, requires to alter such rentals, charges etc., then a letter of notification should give notice to this effect, be addressed to the Head Office of the body, and give not less than 9 months notice.

7. Show Societies reserve the right to make a reasonable charge for the use of electricity, camping and toilet facilities on the Showgrounds where Showmen are in occupation.

* * * * * * *
Appendix 2: Communication with President of the Anytown 1 Show Society

October 1, 2005

President
Anytown 1 District Agricultural, Horticultural and Industrial Society Inc.
P.O. Box 34
Anytown 1 NSW 2571

“Modelling Rural Agricultural Shows: A Marketing Concept Framework”

Dear

I am writing to you to invite you to participate in a research project investigating the marketing practices of rural agricultural shows. We met briefly at the recent Anytown 1 Show. The purpose of the study is to understand rural shows and identify potential for improvements for the marketing of shows in Australia.

I am conducting this study to meet the requirements for the degree in Master of Commerce at the University of Western Sydney (phone 4620 3408) under the supervision of Dr. Jim Mitchell, School of Management at the University of Western Sydney (phone 4620 3316). I have extensive experience in the tourism sector including research, events and marketing roles. I am currently lecturing in the Tourism Management Program at the University of Western Sydney.

If you decide to support this project, you will be asked to participate in an interview lasting for approximately 1-2 hours at a time and place of your convenience. The interview will discuss your role in the rural agricultural show; the current activities carried out to plan and stage the show and internal and external factors you see as having an impact on your show’s operations. With your permission, the interviews will be audio taped to allow me to later analyse the information. Copies of the research findings will be available at the completion of the research.

Any information or personal details gathered in the course of the study are confidential. No individual will be identified in any publication of the results. To ensure strict confidentiality of data, only I or my supervisors Dr Jim Mitchell and Mr Geoffrey Lee will have access to the information.

If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw from further participation in the research at any time without having to give a reason and without consequence.
Shortly, I will telephone you to seek your approval; however in the meantime please do not hesitate to contact me directly to discuss the objectives of my study or any aspect of the research process.

Yours sincerely

Paula Meyer

Lecturer in Tourism Management
University of Western Sydney
Direct line: (02) 4620 3408
Mobile: 0403 184494
Email: p.meyer@uws.edu.au

Note: This study has been approved by the University of Western Sydney Human Research Ethics Committee. If you have any complaints or reservations about the ethical conduct of the research, you may contact the Ethics Committee through the Research Ethics Officer, Ms Kay Buckley (telephone 47360883 or email k.buckley@uws.edu.au). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated fully, and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix 3: Questionnaire Prompts

Questionnaire for Rural Agricultural Shows Research
Show Society

Introductions
Description and purpose of the research

Interview Overview
Record start time:  _____________________________________
Name of Respondent:  ________________________________ 

1. How would you describe the Anytown 1 Show?

2. What are the parts of your show that make it different?

I am interested in people’s involvement in the show; may I ask a few questions?

How long have you been involved in the Anytown 1 Show?

How did you become involved in the show?

What motivated you to become involved in the show?

How would you describe your involvement?

Has your involvement changed over time?

Who makes the decisions about what happens at the show?

1. How would you describe this person?

2. How do you think others would describe you?

3. Are all those involved in the show volunteers? By volunteers, I mean people who give unpaid help in the form of time, service or skills.

4. How many of these people/volunteers are involved in the show’s various operations, for example, committee members, volunteers, stall holders?

5. Can you explain how these people/volunteers become involved in the show and for what reason?

6. Does the show seek to reach certain objectives every year?
7. Does Anytown 1 Show have any competitors? By competitors I mean other events or activities that may impact on people attending the show.

8. Besides the show itself, what other activities does the show society do during the year?

9. Has this changed over time? Why?

Now I would like to learn about what happened at the show this year.

How would you describe planning for the show?

How did you decide on the activities and events at this year’s show?

10. Could you describe the type of people that came to the show?

11. In your experience, have they changed over time?

12. Do you think the show activities and events appeal to the people who came to the show? Why?

13. Have you had any feedback from these visitors?

14. Can you tell me how the show is promoted?

15. How do you set your budget for the promotional activities?

16. Do you think the promotion works?

17. How would you improve it?

18. What do you think stops people from coming to the show?

19. How was the entry fee worked out?

20. If you could improve anything at the show, what would it be?

21. How is the cost of competing and exhibition worked out?

22. Have you had any feedback from exhibitors and competitors?

23. What are the most popular types of activities at the show?

24. Could you describe the break-up of show revenues?

25. Where do you think the show makes the most money?
26. Where do you think the show makes the least money

27. Do you keep information on the numbers of visitors?

28. Do you keep information on the numbers of competitors?

29. Do you keep information on the numbers of exhibitors each year?

30. Is there a written history (or copies of show programs)? May I please borrow these?

Lastly, I would like to ask you about the challenges you see this show in the future. Can you describe them?

In your opinion what do you see in the future for agricultural shows in Australia?

Thank you for your time.
Questionnaire for Rural Agricultural Shows Research
Exhibitor/ Competitor

Introductions
Description and purpose of the research

Interview Overview
Record start time: _____________________________________
Name of Respondent: _____________________________________

1. How would you describe the Anytown 1 Show?

2. Do you attend other agricultural shows? If so how does Anytown 1 Show compare?

3. What are the parts of the show that make it different to other rural agricultural shows?

4. I am interested in people’s involvement in the show; may I ask a few questions?

5. How long have you been a competitor/exhibitor at the Anytown 1 Show?

6. How did you first become involved in the show?

7. How would you describe your involvement?

8. Why do you compete/exhibit at Anytown 1 Show?

9. In your opinion who makes the decisions about what happens at the show each year?

10. How would you describe this/these person/s?

11. Are there any factors that may impact on your participation in the show in the future?

12. Now I would like to learn about what happened at the show this year.

13. How did you first find out about the show this year?

14. What do you think about the cost of competing/exhibition?

15. Do you get asked for any feedback from the show organisers?
16. Would you like to comment on the competitors’/exhibitors’ side of the operation?

17. Why do you think people come to Anytown 1 Show?

18. Do you think the show activities and events appeal to the people who came to the show? Why?

19. How would you describe the type of people who come to Anytown 1 Show?

20. What do you think stops people from coming to the show?

21. In your opinion what do you see in the future for agricultural shows in Australia?

Thank you for your time.
Questionnaire for Rural Agricultural Shows Research
Advertiser/Exhibitor

Introductions

Description and purpose of the research

Interview Overview

Record start time: _____________________________________

Name of Respondent: ___________________________________

1. How would you describe your business?
2. How long have you been operating this business in the Anytown 1 community?
3. How would you describe your clientele?
4. Can you please explain the type of advertising you conduct on an annual basis?
5. Can you please explain the type of sponsorship you conduct on an annual basis?
6. What other promotion do you do on an annual basis?
7. What is the overall aim of these promotions?
8. Do you believe this promotional activity achieves this?
9. I have asked you to be involved in this research because of your sponsorship of and advertising within Anytown 1 Show program.
10. Can you please describe your business’s sponsorship for the Anytown 1 Show?
11. Can you please describe your business’s advertising for the Anytown 1 Show?
12. How many times, or for how long have you been doing this?
13. Has this changed over time to your knowledge?
14. Can you explain the reasons why you carry out this promotion?
15. Is there a relationship between your business and what the Anytown 1 Show represents/offers? If so, what is this relationship?
16. What does Anytown 1 Show represent to your business?
17. What involvement, other than promotion of your business, has you or your business had in Anytown 1 Show?

18. Do you attend Anytown 1 Show annually? For what reasons?

19. Are there any factors that may impact on your business being a sponsor or advertiser in the future?

20. How does your business benefit from this promotion?

 Thank you for your time.