10 Rules of engagement at intangible cultural heritage events

Laura Hodsdon, Lolita Ozoliņa,
and Antine Zijlstra

Closed roads or temporary signage indicate an event is taking place; opportunities to consume and participate by purchasing street food or crafts take over public space; funfairs and bandstands are filled with audiences; spectators watch floats and bands go by, or performers on stage. These scenarios are readily navigable for those familiar with Western majority norms, not least in identifying who is performer, who is audience, and what the most appropriate way of engaging (or not) might be. But in European minority cultures' intangible cultural heritage (ICH) events, around the edges of these normative practices are sites of ambiguity or negotiation, of micro-moments where relevant behavioural codes are not always available. It is here that the 'rules' of where and how to engage when one's role is *not* clearly navigable are negotiated: where, perhaps, an illusory resemblance to normative behaviour (such as a group of people singing a song) seems to invite a normative response (such as clapping appreciatively), which could turn out to be the 'wrong' one in that particular circumstance (the 'correct' behaviour would have been to sing along). Individuals from one group moving within the space of another could manifest misaligned behavioural codes and expectations of the nature of the relationship. In this chapter we explore performative and participative interactions at ICH events, as actors with varying levels of cultural know-how interact.

Navigating intercultural encounters

Key to this inter-group interaction is *knowing what to do* as an outsider. Many theories and lenses have been applied to intercultural interaction, from Hofstede (2001) to Bhabha (1994), Goffman (1963, 2022) and Bourdieu (1972). For Bourdieu, a habitus derived from different societal fields results in practices that are 'immediately intelligible and foreseeable' to individuals within that habitus (Bourdieu [1972] 2008: 80). Familiarity with the habitus 'presupposes […] mastery of a common code' (Bourdieu [1972] 2008: 81); the micro-level behavioural repertoire as explored by Goffman, who 'determined that all interactions are underpinned by unstated patterns in communication, i.e. rules of engagement, that are based on shared codes of behaviour' (Collett 2007: 2). These patterns are constantly at play within a habitus, but 'in intercultural contexts participants have differing understandings of these rules of engagement leading to differing interpretations of communicative behaviours' (Collett 2007: 2).

For those operating with different cultural understandings, while these common codes may overlap due to other shared cultural contexts or hybrid identities, contexts where the habitus could contain unfamiliar practices offer potential for misalignment. In everyday interactions between groups, Putnam's (1995) conception of social capital as providing bonding and bridging potential between communities has provided ways to think about newcomers' engagement (e.g. Gieling, Vermeij & Haartsen 2017); and Savage (2014) and others (cf. Haartsen & Stockdale 2018) have considered the negotiations of newcomers as a process of 'elective belonging'. Elective belonging 'pitches choice against history, as the migrant consumer rubs up against dwellers with historical attachments to place' (Savage 2014: 30) and as such draws out the inherently differing positionalities of insiders and outsiders, and their implicit codes of micro-behaviour along with them.

As such, implications of this increased mobility relate to newcomers' 'cultural competence' (e.g. Cloke, Goodwin & Milbourne 1998) to navigate between contexts successfully, important in fostering positive inter-group relations. Cresswell considers the potential for contestation when one group is in a space that is not seen as 'for them' (Cresswell 1996). As he notes, micro-behaviours are spatially as well as interpersonally shaped: 'When we are silent in the library or kneeling in the church we are "reading" the place', a practice which is 'informed by the always already existing meanings of the place' that indicate 'what is the appropriate thing to do' (Cresswell 1996: 16). This ability to 'read the room' is important since the habitus 'attempts to get away from the idea of formal rules and toward strategies. People in their actions simply act as they think they are supposed to' (Cresswell 1996: 156). But as Meissner describes, even when actors 'realize that their attitudes and behavior are inappropriate in an altered environment, it is not easily possible for them to adapt': since 'the habitus is "a product of history", it "ensures the active presence of past experiences" (Bourdieu 1990 [1980]: 54), and so actors still behave and think in ways which were appropriate in the "original" situation in which their habitus was formed' (Meissner 2018: 238). Meissner's discussion relates to intergenerational perspectives on ICH, but these observations are readily applicable to outsiders' interactions, too; and it is clear how they relate to more temporally and spatially delimited moments of encounter. Edensor has considered spatial and social 'rules' in the context of tourism, arguing that tourists seek the everyday rather than the exotic, and as such when they 'enter particular stages, they are usually informed by pre-existing discursive, practical, embodied norms which help to guide their performative orientations and achieve a working consensus about what to do' (Edensor 2007: 202). Elsewhere in tourism studies, there have been attempts to produce guidelines for visitors in situations of intercultural encounter (Cole 2007; Liljeblad 2015); these have tended to focus on Western visitors to the Global South (e.g. Crang 2015), where the politics of difference is likely to be more stark. There have also been applications of notions of habitus and social capital to ICH (e.g. Arcodia & Whitford 2006; Brownett 2018; Drápala 2020; Finkel 2010; Meissner 2018), which tend to draw out distinctiveness at an intra-group level, but has not explicitly interrogated the porousness, or not, of the habitus in relation to outsiders who may interact with it in subtle or substantive ways.

Those encountering an ICH practice for the first time will draw upon their own discursive and embodied norms and assumptions. These may be, but are not always, the result of an open reflexivity towards the ICH and those that practise it. An outsider's positionality is likely to be underpinned by various narratives that exaggerate differences or erase them (Hodsdon & Moenandar, this volume). (In this chapter as elsewhere in this book, we use 'insider' and 'outsider' as relative terms sitting on a spectrum, and in using the terms to imply two distinct groups we do not suggest that everyone present can be clearly designated as one or the other [although some can] – see Hodsdon, this volume.) As Bhabha describes it, the 'terms of cultural engagement, whether antagonistic or affiliative, are produced performatively' (Bhabha 1994: 3). And indeed, the corollary of getting it 'right' within a habitus is that the very act of being 'deviant from group rules' might be what creates and cements one's outsider status (Becker 1963). So whether conceived of as bodies in and/or out of place (or both simultaneously), nostalgic or elective belonging, or outsiders seeking to act within an unfamiliar habitus, in the encounter with minority culture is the potential for negotiation at the level of behaviour, at specific moments in time. In this chapter, we focus on these behavioural performances at the intersection of familiar insiders and unfamiliar outsiders in the ICH practice, reflecting on some of the sorts of encounters described elsewhere in this volume in space (Frears & Hodsdon) and in language and identity (Zijlstra, Aardema & Moenandar) to consider more explicitly the sociological, day-to-day interactions in the context of inter-group contact and individuals navigating their way through these encounters.

Why intercultural encounters might matter

Cultural *faux pas* seem perhaps to be inevitable. One individual at Padstow May Day in Cornwall, who was not an insider but had connections within Padstow, considered that behavioural transgression did happen within a clearly defined behavioural code, which is 'strict: there are rules' which are policed by insiders, since 'you''ll be told otherwise, if you step over the mark' (K8). A Padstow insider (K88) felt that normative cultural codes – those of a shared habitus – should guide the behaviour of those unfamiliar with May Day, where 'You read the room, and you take your social cues and as long as you can read whats going on, you gradually get a bit braver'. They point out that this is true in any intercultural encounter, since 'it's like that anywhere really, not just us', and the consequence is minor, as 'if you overstep the mark, someone will tell you'. For those with cultural and social capital in the minority heritage context, ramifications may indeed be inconsequential. But even in a small interaction, there is a social advantage to adhering to the rules: both the momentary 'direct profit derived from doing what the rule prescribes' but also 'secondary benefits such as […] prestige and respect' (Bourdieu [1972] 2008: 22). So what of those with no such social currency to spend? For a newcomer seeking to integrate within a place longer term, erosion of social capital could have deeper consequences. Insiders may reinforce practical or discursive boundaries, and the newcomer may self-police and withdraw to avoid further erosion of social capital,

or to avoid embarrassment. Even trivial incidents are potential fodder for 'us and them' narratives. Inter-group contact theory (Allport 1954) posits that a negative experience with a member of another group 'is often mobilized to produce and justify powerful negative generalizations about the whole population that the minority individual is seen to represent' (Valentine 2008: 332). And crucially, intergroup contact theory suggests that

> Positive encounters with individuals from minority groups do not necessarily change people's opinions about groups as a whole for the better with the same speed and permanence as negative encounters. In other words, in the context of negative encounters minority individuals are perceived to represent members of a wider social group, but in positive encounters minority individuals tend to be read only as individuals.
>
> (Valentine 2008: 332)

As Hall & Pretty (2008) describe, for example, in the context of contested land between farmers and newcomers, even minor transgressions 'reduced trust and increased feelings of suspicion towards non-farmers', with the effect that 'narratives of the public's poor behaviour […] further eroded feelings of goodwill' (Hall & Pretty 2008: 4). The importance of inter-group context, although downplayed by the Padstow interviewee above, thus raises the stakes for seemingly trivial moments to impact narratives, perspectives, and understandings between majority and minority actors within the ecosystem. Are outsiders entering an unfamiliar habitus, with the commensurate need to 'learn the rules'? Or is this an everyday encounter on which one can rely on one's existing socio-cultural capital? How do outsiders know which situation they are in, and what is expected of them if they are to be an ethical social actor? In the next section we consider how outsiders negotiate how to 'get involved' in our case study contexts.

Outsider participation at events in Cornwall, Frisia, and the Livonian Coast

In this chapter we consider live cultural events from Cornwall, Frisia, and Latvia, all of which contain, to varying extents, both normative and more local or esoteric elements (see Appendix 1). The Livonian Festival has taken place in the village of Mazirbe on the Livonian Coast since 1989. As well as exhibitions, discussions, and book presentations, there is a market selling handicrafts and traditional Livonian foods such as carrot pies (*sūr kak*) and smoked fish; there is also a procession to the shore to offer a garland to the Sea Mother, an important figure in Livonian mythology, and a bonfire on the beach, both accompanied by songs in Livonian. *Iepenloftspul* (*Open air theatre*) Jorwert's first production, *The Bells of Jorwert,* was organised to raise money for new bells for the village church; over the years the company has grown and became more professional, and the performance repertoire changed to adaptations of well-known books and films, becoming a household name in the region and beyond. In Cornwall, Golowan in Penzance

and May Day in Padstow are local events both linked to the solar calendar, whether an unbroken tradition (Padstow) or revived (Penzance), with elements reflecting a pre-globalised, more esoteric context sitting alongside funfairs, food, and craft stalls.

Insider and outsider bodies

Negotiations at the edges of the events can take place fairly literally at a spatial level, reflecting a social jostling for space particularly characteristic of touristic locations in these marginal rural regions, explored in depth by Frears and Hodsdon (this volume). In part, this reflects the increased volume of people in public space – as one Golowan attendee was aware: 'I don't want to be one of those extra bodies that's getting in the way' (K80). Some holiday homeowners at May Day were aware of their outsiderness (as well as the contestedness of their presence in this space, beset by a housing crisis driven in no small part by temporary residents and tourism) and acted accordingly, so 'we always try and stay on the periphery and not get too close' (K13). But signals of when to 'stay on the periphery' are not always clear. At Golowan, the Serpent Dance is a participatory dance that (conga-like) collects additional bodies as it winds through the streets of Penzance. Here, the implications of not getting it right – of *not* taking part when the dance approaches – are potentially dangerous. In an interaction that Frears and Hodsdon discuss in more detail elsewhere in this volume, insiders performing the Serpent Dance can be unforgiving towards bodies in the way that risk being 'trampled on' (K81), and need to be told to move aside. Working out where to put one's body has potential physical as well as social consequences.

Similarly, at the Livonian Festival, dancers in traditional costumes to the side of the main stage join hands in a large circle to perform a Latvian folk dance. The dance is recognisable to Latvians, Livonian or not, and so a shared habitus between majority and minority cultures indicates how and when to join in. But for non-Latvian attendees, the rules of this habitus are not available. Our field notes show that one of the UK research team attending the Festival joined in the circle, whereas another observed 'I feel like I'm gawping, so stand a distance away to watch. I'm still feeling embarrassed that I was possibly intruding, when my colleague bounds up breathlessly and says "I joined in the dance!"' (Field notes). Different interpretations of the 'right' thing to do (based too, of course, on different personal characteristics) led to opposite behaviours. Later, participants process to the seashore, following a leader with the Livonian flag and a choir in traditional costume. For those without previous festival experience, it is unknown where the procession will head; but the gathering of people clearly designates the procession as the 'next thing' on the programme rather than a performance to be gazed upon. Indeed, 'going with the flow' and becoming a passive part of communal proceedings may in itself be an attractive aspect of the event, even without previous knowledge or information. In Padstow, these 'rules' do not apply. Finding oneself in the path of the oncoming procession, one should, as in Penzance, move aside – but the invitation to join in is far from clear-cut. Padstow insiders we spoke to indicate that this

'grammar of exclusion' (Eriksen 2015; see Moenandar, Moran-Nae & Hodsdon, this volume) is chiefly practical, since 'You keep getting the band separated from the Oss, which is really frustrating, because then the singers can't hear the music because a lot of people have come in between' (K88).

The 'rules', then, are event-contingent: as one Cornish stakeholder put it, 'if you don't do the Serpent Dance, you get in the way. There are other times, when throwing yourself into it is the wrong thing to do' (K91). In terms of embodied behaviours, although the processional format that forms a core part of both Livonian and Cornish events seems to inscribe clear roles, the know-how and capital that may be gained from getting it right at one event cannot necessarily be transferred to another.

Visible outsider performances

A key means to co-ordinate the performance of insiderness is through costume, signalling licence to participate and perform (see Michael (1998) for costume as shibboleth). This has implications should outsiders attempt to literally put on that identity for the day, or to introduce other semantically loaded dress. Two visitors to May Day had seen Padstonians wearing traditional all-white with a red or blue bandana: one felt that they had misunderstood the 'rules' as 'I'm not wearing white'; while another thought that their red and blue jumper could mean that 'people won't know if I'm on their team or not'. The interviewer's explanation that only Padstonians wear white only compounded the sense of cultural misalignment: 'I'm so confused by this whole thing, I've no idea what's going on [laughs]' (K28, K29). This failure to identify a deliberate mechanism by which their outsiderness is constructed and reinforced points to the onus on outsiders to determine appropriate participation. Nevertheless, stallholders in town selling hats and sunglasses also stocked bandanas – in red, blue, and other colours – the commercial setting implying an invitation for anyone to purchase and perform insiderness. One Padstonian insider felt that this was for the outsider to self-police on the basis of their ethical stance, suggesting that if someone wants to 'pretend to be local that's on their conscience really' (K86). Bandana-wearing but non-white-wearing attendees tread an ambiguous visual line between liminal insiderness and appropriative outsiderness.

On other occasions, clothing may be less linked to identity, but nevertheless inadvertently signal outsiderness. One Frisian respondent said that they could identify an outsider because they turned up to an outdoor theatre event in summer clothes rather than with a coat and blanket (F76). And an insider from Penzance felt the town's seasonal festivals were 'anarchic' – literally, free from rule – and described how '[At the revived spring festival] May Horns, a pile of dinosaurs turned up' (K82). But despite the claims for anarchy, costume is nevertheless subject to implicit rules: 'it was made really clear to them […] that if they wanted a dinosaur procession they were welcome to sort one out with the Council'. For this respondent, for whom the paganesque elements of Penzance's events were profoundly meaningful, 'it's not an opportunity to just dress up, we're dressing up to participate in something'. But the implicitness of these rules is stark. When the interviewer points out that 'people can just turn up dressed up', the respondent agrees, saying, 'yeah, they can'.

But, the interviewer concludes, 'you're saying not as a dinosaur?' to which she replies, 'yeah'. The interviewee assumes that the out-group transgressors are local teenagers, constructing the in-group as those with official, town council-sanctioned authority. Here, outsiderness is based on, and policed by, the unwritten rules of those who feel ownership of the event. This uneasy co-existence of anarchy and rules is one in which the *savoir faire* needed to navigate the distinction is gained not from a Cornish, or even Penzancian, identity; but from an insider-organiser's socio-cultural capital with institutional sanction from the Council. More confusing still, the respondent felt that dinosaurs *would* be welcome at Golowan, the marking of Midsummer – perhaps the non-normative 'rules' are implicit and emergent even to those who articulate them. For respondents from other regions, the meaning of the event is likewise paramount. One Livonian insider who was clear that 'the Festival should be open to everyone' nevertheless expressed the impact of superficial engagement in visceral terms: 'It hurts me that there are people at the Livonian festival who do not understand where they have come to' (L5). Where ownership of the ICH is profoundly felt, behavioural transgressions based on different or incomplete interpretations of the code can have affective, negative consequences.

'Invitations'…

Other times, 'invitations' can provide guidance. These might simply indicate whether or not to (know to) turn up. Several tourists at Golowan had no idea that it was taking place and were visiting Penzance by chance; but this is in part deliberate, as an organiser pointed out, 'we're very lean on our marketing, because we don't need to. The cohort that wants to come and participate and engage […] exists already' (K92). Similarly, at village events on the Livonian Coast, one organiser 'doesn't make a poster and doesn't invite anyone' since 'those who know, come' (L24). This results in a mixed audience: 'There are locals [who come]. But also visitors to Kolkasrags who wonder what's going on!' (L3). At the Livonian Festival, the fact of free admission is in itself taken to be an invitation and an implicit statement of inclusivity, meaning 'people just have to come. They are not divided between our own and strangers' (L4). Another Livonian insider suggests that 'strangers don't come here – if they do, it's through someone they know' (L39) – the need for an invitation from a friend or family member implying a degree of insiderness. Invitations to participate rather than just spectate may also rely on insider connections. One Penzance-born member of the Golowan Band (K83), a folk ensemble that plays throughout the event and others in Penzance, recounted how their desire for band membership was initially stymied by a lack of know-how: 'I was like "how can I do this?" I didn't know how to join'. But as a friend of the band leader, they asked and were told 'just turn up to the practices, and play the tunes and practise the processing bit'. They 'had discovered folk music' at university, so possessed the cultural capital of being able to play an instrument and knowledge of folk music conventions. Participation, therefore, while explicitly open, in this instance relied on significant existing social and cultural capital. Likewise, a Frisian respondent claims that while everybody should be able to participate in theatre

productions, nevertheless Dutch-speaking actors should fit the play and the charac-ter, and 'certain skills are necessary (singing, acting, (learning to) speak the Frisian language etc.)' (F46). This limit to participation linked to cultural competence from elsewhere in the cultural field has been noted in other forms of ICH (e.g. Oras & Powell 2022). Participation is explicitly open, but implicitly limited.

Other invitations are subtler (and might be described as 'inclusion shibboleths', to use Michael's (1998) term). At May Day, a Padstonian wearing white holding a collection tin was giving out printed leaflets containing the words to the song that accompanies the procession, including bold-typed choruses, an instruction to join in familiar at least to anyone who has attended a Christian church service. By accepting this 'invitation' and singing along with the insiders, an outsider's behavioural engagement can shift from spectator to performer. And yet, despite this clear signal of the rules, one of the research team observed that 'it never actu-ally occurs to me to join in' (Field notes). This may partly be explained by being alone in contrast to the communal nature of the song; but such *self*-construction of outsiderness may risk perpetuating a narrative that visitors are unwelcome, poten-tially exacerbating any division between groups. So when a songsheet formatted in precisely the same manner was given out at the Livonian Festival for the hymn *My Fatherland* (*Min Izāmō*) in Livonian, the same person wrote in their field notes:

> My first instinct is to not join in – but I remember the flyer with the words to
> the May Day song and how I *chose* to exclude myself. Deliberately, I join in.
> Of course I don't know the tune or how to pronounce the words: but the tune
> is a standard Western hymn/anthem-style so is easy to pick up.
>
> (Field notes)

As with the Golowan band member above, cultural capital also comes into play: 'I've been in choirs all my life so am confident singing aloud, not concerned that I will be heard' (Field notes). Inclusion via song sheets is, according to Livonian insiders, a deliberate strategy (and as Ernštreits et al. argue in this volume, a key means that the Livonian language is transmitted): 'they even give us the lyrics so we can follow along' (L33); or seen to be a desirable one, as in one Livonian inter-viewee's suggestion to 'involve the public more' by 'hand[ing] out the leaflets with the lyrics on them' (L39).

…secrets

Despite widespread inclusive signalling, particularly through music, participation is not infinitely open. Event insiders work in various ways to construct aspects of events that can only be experienced by insiders. Drápala has noted the control of information to this end, and observes,

> the awareness of identity and integrity of a particular group and thus […] the
> stability of the social structure […] is reinforced, for example, with the use of

various forms of limited access to essential information and knowledge (for both the community members and outsiders).

(2020: 124)

At Golowan, not all activities are included in the comprehensive-seeming programme distributed in print and online. This may relate to spatial practicalities (as Frears & Hodsdon suggest, this volume); but it is also integral to the performance of the event. One Golowan insider describes the pleasure of 'happening to be at the right place at the right time, or catching something on the wind and following it' as 'an intrinsic part of the spirit of Mazey Day' (K78). Yet while this spontaneity implies a tourist may be just as likely to be able to participate as an insider, the same interviewee goes on to explain that, although 'it's not like somebody's keeping a secret from anyone', nevertheless these are things 'which you'd like to not publicise, so there aren't tens of thousands of people observing something that is more participatory' (K78). There is a trace of self-contradiction here, between the desire not to be exclusive and the act of constructing implicit boundaries. As another Golowan insider suggests, 'you've got to know, and you've got to be there' (K81). For those who happen not to know, this lack of information can create the sense they are missing out. One Penzance resident who moved to Cornwall as an adult (K39) expresses the feeling that 'There's something good going on that I don't know about'. While they attribute this to an oversight of programming – 'I've got the programme but it hasn't quite got the timings for the bands and things'– as the previous quotation shows, this not only a deliberate act by insiders, but also indicates the complexity of insiderness, where even local residents can feel excluded. This 'accidental' exclusivity, an integral and desirable aspect of the event for some, operates for insiders as a mechanism to reinforce their ownership via their own exclusive participation. Finkel describes similar processes at the Up Helly Aa Viking festival on Shetland that ensure certain activities are for insiders while stopping just short of explicitly saying so. Attendees at after-parties 'are all invited guests', so 'very few non-community members can attend them without a strong local connection' (Finkel 2010: 280). And at the celidh there is no caller (Finkel 2010), meaning those who are there must explicitly rely on their cultural capital to determine whether they may take part or must watch from the sidelines. These practices contrast with the town council-run International Mining and Pasty Festival in Redruth, Cornwall. In a town whose fortunes have downturned sharply since its height as a mining centre in the 19th century, the event's outward-facing purpose to revise narratives about the town (K89, K90) leads to a comprehensive openness designed at making as visible and accessible an event as possible. One of the organisers felt that because it is a 'new tradition', there is 'less likelihood that there will be things that are hidden away that people don't know about' (K89, K90). The implicit, somewhat organic mechanisms that create a grammar of exclusion are seemingly interlinked with the non-institutionalised, embedded practices that constitute the shaping and maintaining of ICH ownership.

Language

Language can also be a way for outsiders to negotiate participation performatively: but again, risks to erosion of social capital abound. One Livonian respondent frames language performance as an explicitly ethical issue, wondering whether 'it would be useful to think about the code of ethics of the Livonian Republic' and considering what such a code might contain. They suggest 'When you are on the Livonian coast and you meet people, you should say hello, preferably in Livonian' (L3). This gesture is not communicative but performative. As such, poor performances are subject to gatekeeping such that some people may be 'afraid to say hello the wrong way' (L1). This fear was also voiced by Frisian and Cornish respondents, one relating a friend learning Frisian who worries that 'if she makes a mistake people might laugh' (F46). One Dutch respondent living on the Livonian Coast felt an ethical need to connect with Livonian culture, 'You have to know the history of the place to live there', but was less clear that this extended to language, since 'It would be a bit strange if we started speaking in Livonian' (L54). This reticence is not, as might be expected, related to the ethics of learning a language that is primarily symbolic, as being potentially appropriation rather than communication, since this same Dutch respondent felt that the ethical situation would be similar if they had moved within the Netherlands to Frisia, where Frisian is spoken in everyday communication: 'You shouldn't pretend to be Frisian and try to speak their language' (L54). And yet, many Frisian respondents were clear that this *is* precisely what they would expect. One respondent felt that Dutch people who moved to Frisia should 'do a mandatory course' (F15), and another that people 'should at least try to understand it' (F31). This applies to participation in theatre events no less than integration into Frisian society in general (explored in detail by Zijlstra, Aardema & Moenandar, this volume), and some respondents are clear that this comprises an explicit exclusion criterion for outsider attendance: 'The performance is meant for people who understand Frisian. Dutch visitors know the performance is in Frisian and (usually) will be able to follow along. If they can't, they shouldn't come' (F98). And while there was some gatekeeping from insiders disapproving of those who get the language wrong, these were generally outweighed by those who appreciated the effort (see O'Rourke & DePalma 2017), such as one Frisian relating a Dutch incomer acting in a play, commending the fact he performed in Frisian as being 'very brave', not least since he 'had to say "pjutteboartersplak"' – the audience *did* seemingly laugh as the learner above feared, but this interviewee felt they 'found that hilarious because it was so difficult to say' but in an appreciative way, 'But he did it and it was amazing' (F41). It seems that there is as much self-policing by outsiders through fear of 'getting it wrong' as there is gatekeeping by insiders. Either way, the potential benefits to social capital (and for potential to be involved in ICH) of taking the risk are clear: 'A colleague of mine is […] now living in a Frisian village, and he started talking [Frisian] as well, and he now joins everything, the sports, the parades, volunteer work. Then you are in the community' (F103).

Discussion: the 'rules of engagement'

One year, a confused motorist who tried to force his car through the crowd at Golowan

> …didn't feel like he was part of the community, but through his own ig-norant choice decided that him driving somewhere through a town full of people celebrating something was more [important]. I just thought it's a real shame: if he'd just switch his engine off, sat on his bonnet, and watched the fireworks he would have had a much more enjoyable time […] What I like about Penzance – and I have experienced this in other places as well – is when people just go, "No. Different rules of engagement. This isn't a road for you to drive through, and we're not going to get out the way. This is a community, having a firework display to celebrate Mazey Eve, and you can wait" [laughs].
>
> (K78)

As this chapter has shown, knowing these 'different rules of engagement' is not always as simple as relying on normative Western cultural capital (since the rules may be older, or derived from elsewhere), nor looking them up (since they are almost always implicit). Indeed, we found very few examples of explicit rules relating to ICH; those that existed mainly related to planning rules for building development. Yet, while the space afforded by the implicit and so more fluid, emergent articulation of how to be-have has the potential to limit and exclude, it also opens the potential to negotiate and include. As one Livonian insider put it, 'if someone drives in from the outside, they have to accept the rules of this place […] the protection of the cultural space comes down to the fact that the rules must be respected' (L2). Our analysis shows that these negotiations of how to get it 'right' take place in different domains, from the discursive – whether and when to learn and speak up in the minority language, and how to interpret often-implicit invitations to include or exclude oneself; to the more embodied – through dress, and through taking part (or not) in processions and other ritual activities.

It seems, as one Cornwall stakeholder put it, that 'there are gauche things that can happen, when you don't know the rules' (K91). So for an individual encounter-ing ICH that is not theirs, there is a certain element of risk. Self-constructed outsid-erness, as in the examples above, can lead to a reticence to participate, particularly when fuelled by divisive narratives or stereotypes. Some tourists visiting Padstow on May Day (K28, K29) admitted, 'I'll be honest, there were mixed views [on] whether we should venture over here or not', explaining, 'One of our party thought it was all a bit too aggressive and decided to stay at home'. However, in the end their experience contradicted this assumption and they felt instead that 'it's really friendly, really really friendly - I don't know where they got that from'. The nega-tive narrative leads to ambiguity about whether May Day is somewhere they would be in place or out of place (Cresswell 1996). Although the relative exclusivity of

May Day does mean that there is less space for outsiders to negotiate participation than in Golowan, for example, the policing and self-policing of micro-moments of behaviour over time has become entrenched as a narrative of uncertain origin ('I don't know where they got that from') that is here directly overcome via positive inter-group contact.

There may also be discomfort that must be endured before sufficient *savoir faire* in the habitus is achieved. One Livonian newcomer to the Livonian Festival (L5) initially felt excluded: 'at the beginning when I went to the Festival, I didn't feel invited: it seemed that everyone knew each other'. But following the accumulation of social capital, 'that has changed over the years – the Livonian festival is when it feels like it's the Livonians in full bloom!'. One Frisian respondent felt that 'Everyone's welcome, but you do have to put in some effort. But when you go through town everyone greets you' (F114). Perhaps most risky of all is the potential for being told, perhaps publicly, and perhaps not pleasantly, that you have over-stepped the mark. A respondent on the Livonian Coast who is not Livonian felt that if 'there's an event, party, you come from somewhere else and you feel like you have been hit with a paddle on the head' as 'they don't accept anyone from somewhere else' (L62). Sitting with the discomfort of having transgressed a behavioural rule is perhaps an integral part of learning to encounter unfamiliar ICH practice appropriately; a discomfort that does not come easily to many, particularly those who carry privilege into such encounters (see Ginoza, Te Maro & Tweed, this volume). Although some situations pose a risk to capital or public 'face', on other occasions where an ICH practice does have potential for outsider involvement at both event and community level, this could potentially be a source of resilience for the minority culture. Livonian Festival organisers actively look to involve new participants, simply to engender sufficient participation for a practice to exist. Describing one village event at which 'Most of the people who turned up weren't locals', even though the organisers had 'called everybody', one respondent concluded this is because local people simply are 'not interested' in Livonian culture (L24). Another (L4) describes a demand for events that comes 'not from the Livonians themselves, but from the people who live next to them or have come to this environment', underlining the importance of outsider allyship in providing the resource, energy, and ownership required: 'The Livonians are maybe tired of carrying the burden' so that the resulting critical mass can then act as a catalyst for further interest and involvement. Likewise, a Frisian respondent pointed to the fact that 'The village is shrinking, the primary school is gone, so new villagers are very welcome' and advocated focusing on community life rather than identity: 'It doesn't matter where they come from, as long as they participate in village activities' (F88). For many, this inclusiveness – at the explicit level at least – is paramount: 'anyone who comes along and wants to join in and be part of it should be part of it' (K36).

As Relph has described, 'behavioural insideness' consists of being in a place and seeing it as a set of objects, views, and activities arranged in certain ways and having certain observable qualities, and which is closely linked to an existential insideness (Relph 1976: 53). Progress towards an increasingly insider position is not without ethical implications: as Savage argues, in relation to considerations of 'sustainable communities and social cohesion, it is important to be clear about

the different kinds of social ethics' between claims from outsiders whose elective belonging may be 'relatively unimportant for them to belong to a socially cohesive neighborhood' as opposed to those whose place-attachment is formed via historical dwelling and nostalgia (2014: 50). Indeed, as Massey describes and as our data show, places inherently pose 'the question of our living together' in 'an ever-shifting constellation of trajectories' that is political and which 'keeps always under scrutiny the play of the social relationships which construct them' (2005: 153). The reality, however, is that for newcomers or outsiders seeking to reconcile their own habitus with that which they encounter in a place, reflective awareness of that difference is a key pathway to good social relations in an ICH context: 'One of the fundamental effects of the orchestration of habitus is […] the harmonisation of agents' experiences and the continuous reinforcement that each of them receives from the expression, individual or collective (in festivals, for example)' (Bourdieu 1972: 80). In the context of ICH events, this means seeking ways to self-reflectively navigate the implicit codes of conduct specific to each event (i.e. on using one's ability to be 'heritage literate' (see Hodsdon, Ernštreits, Moenandar & Koreinik, this volume)). Despite the semblance of normativity, the presence of esoteric or local elements in ICH events often means that outsiders wishing to behave appropriately must self-discover affective, symbolic, or embodied signals to determine whether to get involved or not, and how to behave in this ambiguous context. The stakes, as we suggested at the outset of this chapter, may be small in each interaction, but cumulatively are not necessarily trivial. Overcoming over-zealous self-policing may be key to outsider contribution to a more resilient ICH; while self-reflective behaviour leading to positive inter-group contact could play a role in supporting good social relations between majority and minority groups. Majority individuals who seek to act appropriately in this context should remain poised to seek signals for their participation (or non-participation); to reflect on their positionality in an unfamiliar cultural space and act (or not) accordingly; and be prepared to be told when they are getting it wrong.

References

Allport G (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice* Cambridge: Addison-Wesley

Arcodia C and Whitford M (2006) 'Festival attendance and the development of social capital' *Journal of Convention & Event Tourism* 8(2): 1–18

Becker H (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance* Glencoe: Free Press

Bhabha H (1994) *The Location of Culture* London: Routledge

Bourdieu P (1990 [1980]) *The Logic of Practice* Stanford: Stanford University Press

Bourdieu P (2008 [1972]) 'Outline of a theory of practice' in Seidman S et al. (eds) *The New Social Theory Reader*: 80–86 London: Routledge

Brownett T (2018) 'Social capital and participation: The role of community arts festivals for generating well-being' *Journal of Applied Arts & Health* 9(1): 71–84

Cloke P, Goodwin M and Milbourne P (1998) 'Inside looking out; outside looking in. Different experiences of cultural competence in rural lifestyles' in Boyle P and Halfacree K (eds) *Migration into Rural Areas*: 134–150 Chichester: Wiley

Cole S (2007) 'Implementing and evaluating a code of conduct for visitors' *Tourism Management* 28(2): 443–451

Collett D (2007) 'Coming together: Power, rank and intercultural interaction. Developing inclusive approaches in higher education' *The International Journal of Diversity in Organizations, Communities, and Nations: Annual Review* 7(5): 17–25

Crang M (2015) 'Travelling ethics: Valuing harmony, habitat and heritage while consuming people and places' *Geoforum* 67: 194–203

Cresswell T (1996) *In Place/Out of Place: Geography, Ideology, and Transgression* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Drápala D (2020) 'Social capital and safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage: Theoretical concepts of departure and the potential of further research' *Ústav Etnológie a Sociálnej Antropológie* 68(2): 14

Edensor T (2007) 'Mundane mobilities, performances and spaces of tourism' *Social and Cultural Geography* 8(2): 199–215

Eriksen T (2015) *Culture seen as a commons: Osmosis, crossroads and the paradoxes of identity* International Migration Institute Working Paper 122 Oxford: University of Oxford

Finkel R (2010) '"Dancing around the ring of fire": Social capital, tourism resistance, and gender dichotomies at up Helly Aa in Lerwick, Shetland' *Event Management* 14(4): 275–285

Gieling J, Vermeij L and Haartsen T (2017) 'Beyond the local-newcomer divide: Village attachment in the era of mobilities' *Journal of Rural Studies* 55: 237–247

Goffman E (1963) *Behavior in Public Places* New York: The Free Press

Goffman E ([1959] 2022) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* London: Penguin

Haartsen T and Stockdale A (2018) 'S/Elective belonging: How rural newcomer families with children become stayers' *Population, Space and Place* 24(4): e2137

Hall J and Pretty J (2008) 'Unwritten, unspoken: How norms of rural conduct affect public good provision' in *Rural Futures: Dreams, Dilemmas, Dangers Conference*: 1–4 University of Plymouth

Hofstede G (2001) *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations* London: Sage

Liljeblad J (2015) 'Using Foucault to construct normative guidelines for an ethics of tourist–indigenous encounters' *Tourist Studies* 15(1): 65–85

Massey D (2005) *For Space* London: Sage

Meissner M (2018) 'Between social cohesion and social distinction: Intangible cultural heritage and sustainable social development' *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Heritage and Sustainable Development*: 235–244

Michael J (1998) '(Ad)dressing shibboleths: Costume and community in the south of France' *The Journal of American Folklore* 111(440): 146–172

Oras J and Powell S-R (2022) 'Intra- and inter-cultural, historical and modern: Gendered practices of seto leelo across time' in Tsurtsumia R (ed) *Women's Role in UNESCO-Recognized European Traditional Singing Practices. Koost Teona Lomsadze, toim Rusudan Tsurtsumia*: 240–258 Tbilisi: UNESCO Georgian National Commission

O'Rourke B and DePalma R (2017) 'Language-learning holidays: What motivates people to learn a minority language?' *International Journal of Multilingualism* 14(4): 332–349

Putnam R (1995) 'Bowling alone: America's declining social capital' *Journal of Democracy* 6(1): 65–78

Relph E (1976) *Place and Placelessness* London: Pion

Savage M (2014) *Cultural Capital and Elective Belonging: A British Case Study* Berlin: De Gruyter

Valentine G (2008) 'Living with difference: Reflections on geographies of encounter' *Progress in Human Geography* 32(3): 323–337