

**BA INTERNATIONAL FESTIVAL AND EVENTS MANAGEMENT**

**HONOURS DISSERTATION**

*SESSION 2018/2019*

*TRIMESTER 2*

TITLE

*SLÁINTE MHATH! AN EXAMINATION OF DRINKING CULTURE IN SCOTLAND AND THE SOCIOCULTURAL AND PERSONAL IMPACTS UPON PIPE BAND EVENTS*

AUTHOR

*AMY FENTON*

*40167206*

SUPERVISOR

*LYNN WATERSTON*

# Declaration

I declare that the work undertaken for this BA Dissertation has been undertaken by myself and the final Dissertation produced by me. The work has not been submitted in part or in whole in regard to any other academic qualification.

Title of Dissertation: Sláinte mhath! An examination of drinking culture in Scotland and the sociocultural and personal impacts upon pipe band events.

Name:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

# Abstract

# Acknowledgements

There are several people I must thank for their help in my dissertation. Firstly, my heartfelt thanks go to my supervisor Lynn Waterston. Lynn has been extremely patient, helpful and supportive over the course of this study and I am certain that I would not have been able to complete this without her unwavering support.

Secondly, I must thank my family and boyfriend for listening to many a rant and breakdown over my dissertation and for their constant love and encouragement over my time at university. Without their help, advice and support – I would not be where I am today.

Thirdly, I must extend special thanks to Jack Holmes, who proofread my dissertation for wont of nothing more than to be a good friend and to whom I am eternally grateful.

Fourthly, I must thank Angus McKenzie. His support over the course of fourth year during my struggle with mental health has been second to none and I must extend my most heartfelt thanks for keeping me sane.

Finally, I wish to thank the seven best friends I could have ever wished for. Without them, university would not have been half as much fun, and I could not have asked for seven better friends to end my time at Napier with.

I dedicate this work to all the members of the pipe band community, particularly the Vale of Atholl Pipe Band. This dissertation would not have existed without them and it is to them that I raise a glass. Sláinte mhath and I’ll see you in the beer tent!

Table of Contents

[Declaration i](#_Toc5128498)

[Abstract ii](#_Toc5128499)

[Acknowledgements iii](#_Toc5128500)

[Index of Figures vi](#_Toc5128501)

[Index of Tables vi](#_Toc5128502)

[Chapter One – Introduction – 1148 words 1](#_Toc5128503)

[1.1 Introduction 1](#_Toc5128504)

[1.2 Background 1](#_Toc5128505)

[1.2.1 Pipe Band Events 1](#_Toc5128506)

[1.2.2 Scottish Government Publications 1](#_Toc5128507)

[1.3 Rationale for Chosen Topic 2](#_Toc5128508)

[1.4 Methodology 3](#_Toc5128509)

[1.5 Overall Aim 3](#_Toc5128510)

[1.6 Objectives 3](#_Toc5128511)

[1.7 Summary of Chapters 4](#_Toc5128512)

[Chapter Two – Literature Review – 2837 words 5](#_Toc5128513)

[2.1 Introduction 5](#_Toc5128514)

[2.2 Drinking Culture 5](#_Toc5128515)

[2.2.1 Defining Drinking Culture 5](#_Toc5128516)

[2.2.2 Typologies of Drinking Cultures 6](#_Toc5128517)

[2.3 Event Impacts 8](#_Toc5128518)

[2.3.1 Social Impacts 8](#_Toc5128519)

[2.3.2 Cultural Impacts 9](#_Toc5128520)

[2.3.3 Personal Impacts 10](#_Toc5128521)

[2.4 Alcohol at Events 11](#_Toc5128522)

[2.4.1 Research Surrounding Alcohol at Events 11](#_Toc5128523)

[2.5 Chapter Summary 13](#_Toc5128524)

[Chapter Three – Methodology – 2865 words 14](#_Toc5128525)

[3.1 Introduction 14](#_Toc5128526)

[3.2 Primary and Secondary Data 14](#_Toc5128527)

[3.2.1 Secondary Data 14](#_Toc5128528)

[3.2.2 Primary Data 15](#_Toc5128529)

[3.3 Qualitative & Quantitative Data 15](#_Toc5128530)

[3.3.1 Qualitative Data 16](#_Toc5128531)

[3.3.2 Quantitative Data 16](#_Toc5128532)

[3.4 Adopted Research Methods 17](#_Toc5128533)

[3.4.1 Research Methods of Other Studies 17](#_Toc5128534)

[3.4.2 Adopted Quantitative Method 18](#_Toc5128535)

[3.4.3 Adopted Qualitative Method 19](#_Toc5128536)

[3.5 Sampling 19](#_Toc5128537)

[3.6 Data Analysis 20](#_Toc5128538)

[3.7 Ethical Considerations 20](#_Toc5128539)

[3.8 Limitations to the Study 20](#_Toc5128540)

[3.9 Validity, Reliability & Generalisability 21](#_Toc5128541)

[3.9.1 Validity 21](#_Toc5128542)

[3.9.2 Reliability 21](#_Toc5128543)

[3.9.2 Generalisability 21](#_Toc5128544)

[3.10 Chapter Summary 22](#_Toc5128545)

[Chapter Four – Data Findings – 1537 words 23](#_Toc5128546)

[4.1 Introduction 23](#_Toc5128547)

[4.2 Survey Demographic Information 23](#_Toc5128548)

[4.3 Survey Results 26](#_Toc5128549)

[4.3.1 Alcohol Consumption 26](#_Toc5128550)

[4.2.2 Where Alcohol is Purchased 27](#_Toc5128551)

[4.3.3 Place of Purchase Motivations 27](#_Toc5128552)

[4.3.4 Reasons for Not Drinking 28](#_Toc5128553)

[4.3.5 Is Drinking Necessary? 28](#_Toc5128554)

[4.3.6 Does Alcohol Affect Event Perception? 29](#_Toc5128555)

[4.3.7 Biggest Issues at the Majors 30](#_Toc5128556)

[4.3.8 Which Definition Best Fits Scotland’s Drinking Culture? 31](#_Toc5128557)

[4.4 Interview Results 33](#_Toc5128558)

[4.4.1 Question 2 – Community Involvement 33](#_Toc5128559)

[4.4.2 Question 3 – Community Pride 33](#_Toc5128560)

[4.4.3 Question 4 – Community Concerns 33](#_Toc5128561)

[4.4.4 Question 5 – Community Disruption 33](#_Toc5128562)

[4.4.5 Questions 6 and 7 – Alcohol Management and Strategy 34](#_Toc5128563)

[4.4.6 Question 8 – Piping and Drumming Uptake 34](#_Toc5128564)

[4.4.7 Question 9 – Other Notable Impacts 34](#_Toc5128565)

[4.5 Chapter Summary 34](#_Toc5128566)

[Chapter Five – Data Analysis -2481 words 35](#_Toc5128567)

[5.1 Introduction 35](#_Toc5128568)

[5.2 Drinking Culture 35](#_Toc5128569)

[5.2.1 Scottish Drinking Culture 35](#_Toc5128570)

[5.2.2 Pipe Band Drinking Culture 36](#_Toc5128571)

[5.3 Event Impacts 36](#_Toc5128572)

[5.3.1 Sociocultural Impacts 37](#_Toc5128573)

[5.3.2 Personal Impacts 38](#_Toc5128574)

[5.3.3 Alcohol at Events 39](#_Toc5128575)

[5.4 Chapter Summary 41](#_Toc5128576)

[Chapter Six – Conclusions and Recommendations -1121 words 42](#_Toc5128577)

[6.1 Introduction 42](#_Toc5128578)

[6.2 Overview of Approach 42](#_Toc5128579)

[6.3 Summary of Key Findings 42](#_Toc5128580)

[6.4 Recommendations 43](#_Toc5128581)

[6.5 Beneficiaries 43](#_Toc5128582)

[6.6 Limitations 44](#_Toc5128583)

[6.7 Future Research Opportunities 44](#_Toc5128584)

[References 46](#_Toc5128585)

[Appendices 56](#_Toc5128586)

[Appendix 1: Pilot Study for Non Playing Members of Pipe Band Community 56](#_Toc5128587)

[Appendix 2: Final Survey for Band Members 57](#_Toc5128588)

[Appendix 3: Interview Questions for Event Organisers 59](#_Toc5128589)

[Appendix 4: Informed Consent Form 60](#_Toc5128590)

# Index of Figures

Figure 2.1 : Cultural Web…………………………………………………………………………... 5

Figure 2.2: Social Impacts Model…………………………………………………………………. 8

Figure 4.1: Respondents Percentage by Country……………………………………………… 23

Figure 4.2: Gender of Respondents……………………………………………………………... 24

Figure 4.3: Ages of Respondents……………………………………………...………………… 25

Figure 4.4: Question 5 from survey – Do you drink alcohol at these events?...................... 26

Figure 4.5: Question 6 - Do you buy alcohol there or do you take it with you?.....................27

Figure 4.6: Question 7 – is it necessary to drink to enjoy the day?...................................... 28

# Index of Tables

Table 4.1: Attendance of Respondents at each of the Majors……………………………...... 25

Table 4.2: Alcohol Purchase Motivators………………………………………………………… 27

Table 4.3: Motivators for not drinking……………………………………………………………. 28

Table 4.4: Reasons for whether or not alcohol consumption is necessary at the Majors…. 29

Table 4.5: Question 8 - Aspects of the Majors which affect event perception……………… 29

Table 4.6: Question 9 - What are some of the biggest issues with alcohol at these events? ……………………………………………………………………………………………………….. 30

Table 4.7: Question 10 – Which of these definitions best fit the Scottish drinking culture?.. 31

# Chapter One – Introduction – 1148 words

## Introduction

This chapter provides an outline for the purpose of this study. Firstly, the chosen topic will be justified, followed by an in-depth background to the study. This will include a background to pipe band events and what research currently exists surrounding alcohol consumption. The following chapter outline the overall aim including research objectives before summarising the research methods.

## Background

### 1.2.1 Pipe Band Events

Pipe band competitions have existed since 1905 (RSPBA, 2018), with the governing body – The Royal Scottish Pipe Band Association – founded in 1930 to devise one set of rules for competitions and to organise all of the major competitions (RSPBA, 2018). Today there are five major competitions – the British, Scottish, European, UK and World Championships – taking place across Scotland and Northern Ireland (the UK Championships are hosted in Belfast). These competitions take place over the summer months, culminating in the World Championships in August, a two day event seeing approximately 220 bands from across the globe take to Glasgow Green to compete across nine ability grades (The Worlds, 2018). Approximately 40% of competitors are under 25 (The Worlds, 2018). This study will focus on the major competitions and not include data from the minor competitions (Highland Games).

### 1.2.2 Scottish Government Publications

In 2008, the Scottish Government published a paper titled “Changing Scotland’s Relationship with Alcohol” which looks at the nation’s alcohol misuse (Scottish Government, 2009). This was the first time that the extent of the nation’s problem was documented – resulting in the government framework which aimed to tackle the problem. The report outlined 40 measures aiming to reduce consumption, promote positive attitudes towards alcohol and better treatment for alcoholics and current support systems (Scottish Government, 2017).

At a framework review, it was concluded that some measures were successful and could be linked to “declining rates of alcohol-related hospitalisations and deaths” (Scottish Government, 2017).There is still a further need for action due to the significant difference in alcohol related mortality and morbidity between Scotland and England and Wales (Scottish Government, 2017).

This report is one of many pieces of literature which deals with the effects of alcohol on society with authors such as Cherpitel, Korcha, Witbrodt and Ye (2018) and Measham (2006) examining this area. Many of these research areas examine the harm caused by alcohol (Moos & Moos, 2007; Huang, Hunter & Francescutti, 2012). It is important to understand what harm alcohol can do to the human body, but also important to examine what impact alcohol can have upon an event, with alcohol consumption rife at events such as T in the Park (Buchan, 2016).

## Rationale for Chosen Topic

The idea of a “drinking culture” is one that has become more prominent over recent years (Ahren et al, 2008; Mäkelä, Tigerstedt & Mustonen, 2012; Savic et al 2016). Much of the literature surrounding this topic focuses solely on European mainland countries and the link to health and wellbeing but has little literature surrounding a direct link to events (Bjarnason et al, 2003; Stickley et al, 2011).

There is substantial research into alcohol consumption at events, with a main focus of music festivals (van Gemert et al, 2011; Lyne & Galloway, 2012; Jenkinson, Bowring, Dietze, Hellard & Lim, 2014). Similar to drinking culture literature, there is little research which examines the direct impacts of alcohol at events. This is an area the author would like to research in detail, with a focus on sociocultural and personal impacts. Sociocultural impacts link to the direct social and cultural effects on the host community (Bowdin et al, 2011). Personal impacts relate to the event experience of attendees across three dimensions – behaviour, moods and cognition (Getz, 2008).

The author’s choice to examine pipe band events was motivated by personal involvement in the pipe band community due to competing in one of the top flight bands. Having competed for nearly a decade, the author has often noticed the place which alcohol holds at a competition, with many band members spending a large part of their day in the beer tent. This has led to underage drinking and heavily intoxicated players during the prize giving ceremony (massed bands). There is also a lack of academic research surrounding pipe bands, although there is some literature around Scottish cultural events (Ruting & Li, 2011).

While allowing a deeper understanding of both drinking culture and the direct impacts of alcohol consumption at pipe band events, the study provides recommendations for event managers for these events surrounding alcohol control strategies and areas for further research.

## Methodology

To achieve the objectives the study combines both primary and secondary research. Secondary research is used through the literature review by exploring and debating literature. This allows a deeper understanding and a further academic grasp of the subject area.

Primary research is conducted as a result of the literature review; this is a mixed methods approach involving interviews comprised of semi-structed questions with organisers of the Majors to obtain qualitative data and a survey sent to band members to gather quantitative data. A pilot study is conducted prior to the final survey.

## Overall Aim

The aim of this dissertation is to examine the drinking culture of Scotland and how the sociocultural and personal impacts affect alcohol consumption at pipe band competitions.

## Objectives

1. Complete a detailed and critical literature review to:
   1. Define a drinking culture and examine how this influences alcohol consumption at pipe band events
   2. Evaluate the literature surrounding sociocultural and personal event impacts and how these create a perception of an event.
2. Undertake a mixed methods approach to gain an understanding of the perceptions surrounding alcohol at events by:
   1. Conducting interviews with pipe band competition organisers to ascertain their views surrounding alcohol at these events.
   2. An online survey given to members of the pipe band community.
3. From the above findings, examine the impacts associated with alcohol at pipe band events and analyse the image these create of events.
4. Give recommendations to event managers based upon the findings surrounding alcohol strategies at events and areas for future academic research.

## 1.7 Summary of Chapters

This dissertation is structed as below:

* Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter will review and discuss academic literature to allow the researcher a deeper understanding of the topic whilst also identifying key concepts and gaps in knowledge.

* Chapter 3: Methodology

This chapter will outline and justify the research methods chosen. A discussion will follow as to how the data will be analysed.

* Chapter 4: Data Findings

This chapter will present the findings from the research in line with the key concepts established in chapter two.

* Chapter 5: Data Analysis

The findings will be discussed and will relate to the theories and frameworks identified by the literature review.

* Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations

This final chapter will provide a conclusion for the findings and a summary of the dissertation as a whole. This chapter will contain recommendations of areas for further academic research and strategies for dealing with the impacts of alcohol at pipe band events.

# Chapter Two – Literature Review – 2837 words

## 2.1 Introduction

This chapter examines literature surrounding drinking culture and event impacts. There will be a discussion of the research surrounding alcohol at events. The chapter is presented in subsections relating directly to the key themes. This chapter is designed to establish secondary data through academic journals and other sources which are helpful for this dissertation.

## 2.2 Drinking Culture

### *2.2.1 Defining Drinking Culture*

Many researchers agree that there is no one definition of drinking culture with Gordon, Heim and MacAskill (2012) noting that what actually constitutes a drinking culture is abstract and is up to individual interpretation. This has not stopped drinking culture being the focus of many research papers (Morgan, 1988; Järvinen, 2003; Ramstedt & Hope, 2003; Piacentini & Banister, 2009).

Ally, Lovatt, Meier, Brennan and Holmes (2016) suggest a drinking culture is a combination of the drinking practises linked to a specific society. This is corroborated by Savic, Room, Mugavin, Pennay and Livingston (2016) who believe that drinking culture is linked to the patterns of drinking and the rules surrounding them, specific to a national culture.

Ally et al (2016) and Savic et al (2016) contradict Gordon et al (2012), suggesting there are some basic elements outlining a drinking culture whilst perhaps not giving one overarching definition. This basic definition links to “The Cultural Web” (Johnson, Scholes, Whittington, Angwin and Regner, 2017).

**Figure 2.1:** Cultural Web, Johnson, Scholes, Whittington, Angwin and Regner (2017)

The web suggests rituals and routines are an important part of forming a culture, thus suggesting drinking patterns and the rules which surround them can be categorised as part of the rituals and routines segment of the “Cultural Web” (Johnson et al, 2017). It is suggested that the control systems which govern how alcohol can be consumed and sold - such as the Licencing (Scotland) Act 2005 (Licencing (Scotland) Act 2005, 2005) - fit into this framework under the control systems segment. This can be applied to the formation of a pipe band drinking culture – which is an organisation with its own distinct culture.

### *2.2.2 Typologies of Drinking Cultures*

The main research area surrounding drinking culture is the typologies. This forms most of the literature. There has been extensive research into the differing typologies of drinking cultures with research dating back as far as 1946. These cover a variety of topics, ranging from the primary form of alcohol consumed to how alcohol is used.

Bales (1946) lists four differing attitudes which seemed to affect alcoholism rates in different cultures. These are: complete abstinence, ritual attitude, utilitarian attitude and convivial drinking. Bales suggests that these attitudes affect subcultures identified within the national culture, one example being orthodox Jews and ritual drinking (Bales, 1946). This can be likened to pipe bands where bands could be seen as a subculture whereby convivial drinking is best suited (a culture in which alcohol is used to feel good however can lead to self-medicating and the furthering of self-interest (Bales, 1946)).

Many researchers have used Bales’ (1946) attitude categories as the basis for their own, with Pittman (1967) positing four more attitude categories: abstinent cultures, permissive cultures, ambivalent cultures and over permissive cultures. Pittman’s (1967) “abstinent cultures” label directly links back to Bales’ (1946) “complete abstinence”, highlighting that there are some cultures – particularly Middle Eastern cultures such as Kuwait and Saudi Arabia (QuitAlcohol.com, 2013) – where alcohol is prohibited due to religious beliefs. It is argued that “abstinent cultures” are not applicable to Scotland as alcohol is ingrained into the culture with whisky being one of the largest national exports – in 2017, whisky accounted for £4.36 billion of Scottish exports (Furby, 2018). Whisky tourism is a significant part of Scotland’s tourism industry (Spracklen, 2011).

Pittman’s (1967) “permissive cultures” links to Mizruchi and Perruchi’s (1970) “prescriptive culture” where alcohol consumption is wonted, but drunkenness is forbidden. This is personified through Italian wine culture where wine is consumed with meals but rarely consumed outside of this setting (Nierenberg, 2015). Over-permissive cultures where cultures are very liberal regarding drinking and the behaviours associated with drunkenness can often lead to a culture of binge drinking with Gordon et al (2012) stating that binge drinking levels in the UK among youth is the highest in Europe, with the UK in the top 30 worst countries for binge drinking in recent years (Donnelly & Gallagher, 2014). At a local level, this could be an accurate representation of pipe bands, where many members partake in binge drinking activities.

Ullman (1958) suggests that alcohol consumption can be integrated as part of the culture or unintegrated. Again, Italian culture of wine with meals is an integrated culture due to alcohol forming part of a normal mealtime. Countries such as the UK where alcohol consumption is not part of everyday life and typically consumed at weekends can be argued as an unintegrated culture.

Wet and dry cultures are the most well-known typology regarding drinking culture. This theory was outlined by Christie (1965) where he developed a scale with Denmark at one end and Finland at the other, where Denmark was characterised by the highest per capita consumption, the least restrictive control systems and a lower rate of public drunkenness. Finland was the opposite to this. This provides the basis for the wet and dry culture typology, with Denmark being a wet culture and Finland a dry culture. Bloomfield, Stockwell, Gmel and Rehn (2003) remark that in wet cultures, wine is often the drink of choice and that in dry cultures wine is consumed less.

Room and Mäkelä (2000) argue that the wet/dry typology is one that is becoming outdated. As alcohol consumption per capita falls across wine drinking cultures and consumption per capita increasing across Northern Europe, Room and Mäkelä (2000) argue that the wet and dry labels make less sense where consumption levels merge. Cultures that can be labelled “abstinent” could be labelled as a “dry culture” which can be problematic as it can create a false image of a country and its relationship with alcohol. This poses the question of how useful it is to use these labels in current times as it provides an estimation of a culture and its relationship with alcohol which may be inaccurate.

## 2.3 Event Impacts

### *2.3.1 Social Impacts*

Wallstam, Ioannides and Pettersson (2018, p.4) define a social impact as “any positive or negative change in peoples’ lives affected by clearly discernible agent”. They explain that social impacts cover a variety of topics including conditions in which people live to their general wellbeing and happiness (Wallstam et al, 2018). This highlights that social impacts relate to the host community (Deery & Jago, 2010). This highlights that pipe band events can have a significant effect on the host community, which could in turn affect the wellbeing and happiness of the community.

Small (2007) provides a model for visualising social impacts, conceptualising how the host community is affected by an event. This model helps contextualise the impact that an event can create from the perspective of the host community; positing the idea that an event manager can predict the potential impacts generated by their event. This is a useful model as this helps event managers to negate any negative impacts, therefore improving community morale around pipe band events. Examples of this could be noise due to bagpipes and drums and frustration around any road closures.



**Figure 2.2:** Social Impact Model, Small (2007)

Bladen, Kennell, Abson and Wilde (2012) noted that there is a relatively small amount of research concerning social impacts when compared to its economic and environmental counterparts. This suggests that many researchers are excluding valuable information surrounding host community relationships and the event, coupled with the perceptions that the host community create as a result of the event. Craik (1998) argues that social impacts are likely to be more important than economic impacts, positing that it is imperative to look at how the host community is affected before looking to the economy. If the host community feel that they have a lower quality of life due to the event, this may affect long-term success (Fredline, 2000). This is validated by Getz and Page (2016, p. 375) where it is observed that this feeling “… could destroy community pride and lead to opposition to events”.

Social impacts can be measured using a variety of methods, with one being social exchange theory. Wang and Pfister (2008) noted that social exchange theory was useful in obtaining the attitudes of residents. This is influenced by the residents’ values and personality – whilst not being a representation of residents’ knowledge of tourism/event impacts. While this theory has been widely used, McGehee and Andereck (2004) have suggested that research using this theory have often has too much of a focus on an economic perspective. This could prove unhelpful for obtaining attitudes surrounding an event, as it does not place enough importance on the responses of the host community, suggesting that organisers may put economic development of the host community before the views of the residents. This could be applied to pipe band events as while the community may enjoy the event, it may not bring enough positive economic impact into the community and therefore organisers may no longer wish to host this event.

### *2.3.2 Cultural Impacts*

Cultural impacts at events vary greatly due to the ambiguity of how culture can be represented. Snowball (2008) emphases that there is a ceaseless list of different cultural events, suggesting that cultural representation can vary between events. Colombo (2016) highlights different distinctive cultural events create differing impacts which are related to culture, the country or the host community.

There is extensive research into the sociocultural impacts of an event, with many studies using a particular case study ranging from European Cities of Culture (Liu, 2013) to the Singapore Grand Prix (Cheng & Jarvis, 2010). Liu (2013) noted that during the 2008 European City of Culture in Liverpool, many residents were encouraged to take part in cultural events that took place around the city. As pipe band events are a cultural event which represent Scottish national culture, a similar effect may take place.

Conversely, Willems-Braun (1994) argues that event participation is often undertaken as a way of differentiating from others and can lead to the exclusion of others. This is highlighted through the example of pipe bands themselves – as only they participate in the Majors and it is primarily band members for whom the competitions are organised.

Colombo (2016) notes that typically the evaluation of cultural impacts has been difficult due to cultural impacts often being combined with other impact categories – such as social, resulting in the term sociocultural. In her 2016 study, Colombo outlined a Cultural Impact Perception model, to allow measurement and analysis of cultural impacts which are created by events. The model uses five cultural categories ranging from information about the culture to the preservation of cultural traditions which are then analysed by the attendees’ perceptions and profile. This allows for an objective analysis of the impacts to be carried out, and examine any parallels between the perceptions of the host community and the initial intentions of the organisers. Similar to social exchange theory, this can be a helpful model due to the organisers being able to delve deeper and understand if there are any areas in which attitudes between attendees and organisers differ and allows these areas to be addressed.

### *2.3.3 Personal Impacts*

Personal impacts are known as the event experience of the attendee. Bladen et al (2012) state a positive experience may be articulated through happiness, the event exceeding an attendee’s expectations or an attitudinal or major personal change in lifestyle, personality and/or values. They express that a negative event experience may be shown through a view of poor value for money, a total lack of satisfaction with the event, failure to meet attendees’ expectation and having no wish to repeat the event experience. Berridge (2007) supports this by highlighting that previous event experiences influence choices about whether to attend an event – a negative experience is likely to influence the choice of nonattendance.

Event experience has been divided into two forms – active and passive. Haywood, Braham, Kew, Spink, Capenerhurst and Henry (1995) note in a passive sense that event attendees are involved in the consumption of the event and all that comes with it (for example performances and goods produced for them). Berridge (2007) highlights in an active sense the attendee has an involvement in the production of the event experience (for example competing in one of the Majors).

Buswell (2004) comments event experience is linked to three key factors; time, flow and expression. Time provides a chronological order which provides a period in which visitors can engage freely in chosen activities. Whilst partaking in these activities, participants go through feelings at different stages of experiences – corresponding with the second key factor, flow. Here, the goal is to achieve the best and most satisfying experience when a state of peak flow is reached (Buswell, 2004). Satisfaction is reached through interactive engagement in an activity, however, through research the researcher has concluded there is no one list of attributes to guarantee satisfaction.

Csikszentmihalyi (1991) argues due to the attendee’s personal interpretation of what is satisfying to them, different activities will equally provide optimal flow experiences. Wahlers and Etzek (1985) agree, saying experience choices are often related to the level of stimulation within an attendee, with some experiences being avoided altogether (Lepp & Gibson, 2003) – suggesting if the event is not satisfying to the attendee, they will have a negative experience and may not return; linking back to Berridge’s (2007) event experiences categories.

## 2.4 Alcohol at Events

### *2.4.1 Research Surrounding Alcohol at Events*

According to Martinus, McAlaney, McLaughlin and Smith (2009), much of the British research surround alcohol at events has a focus on the nightclub scene. Martinus et al (2009) state this is due to music festivals being reluctant to support any academic research which may bring negative publicity and a conflict of commercial interest. Much of the research surrounding American drinking at events revolves around students drinking on campus (Neighbours, Walters, Lee, Vader, Vehige, Szgethy & Dejong, 2007; Perkins, Haines & Rice, 2005), and much of the work surrounding mainland Europe examines drinking among young people (Kloep, Hendry, Ingebrigtsen, Glendinning & Espnes, 2001) and there are several studies which follow similar research methods to American studies (Wicki, Kuntsche & Gmel, 2010).

Literature focuses on alcohol across a number of different events, with Kadiri (2018) noting alcohol often fuels violence between spectators at sporting events. This can be translated to music festivals and events, where there are also concerns surrounding alcohol. Events such as “Bands On The Square” in Barnoldswick, exemplify the detrimental effects that alcohol has had on their events, with “Bands On The Square” highlighting the event has been predominately been based upon attendees bringing their own alcohol with them, they had a large number of incidents in 2017 with young people and some adults unable to handle their alcohol consumption (Duggan, 2018). In 2000 “Roskilde” resulted in nine deaths and eighteen injuries due to overcrowding and alcohol consumption (Mykleton, 2011). This highlights that alcohol often has negative consequences on the overall perception of an event, evidenced by residents of Barnoldswick calling for the local council to refuse the event licence for 2019.

In a study conducted by Rowley and Williams (2008), alcohol is deemed to be an integral part of a music festival experience. This is substantiated by alcohol brands sponsoring music festivals, with examples being T in the Park sponsored by Tennent’s Lager (European Sponsorship Association, 2015) and the Reading Festival sponsored by Carlsberg and Somersby Cider (Reading Festival, 2019). This has been backed up by Bellis, Hughes and Lowey (2002) observing music and dancing events are associated with the highest level of alcohol consumption. Alcohol sponsorship is not limited to festivals, with the 2018 European Pipe Band Championships being sponsored by Benromach Speyside Single Malt Scotch Whisky (Piping at Forres, 2018). This adds to the image that alcohol is synonymous with pipe bands, and posits the idea that alcohol has a prevalent role during the event.

This is substantiated by Raineri and Earl (2005) whose “patrons’ perceptions” study surrounding crowd management for outdoor music festivals highlighting that intoxicated individuals can dangerous. This emphasises the need for alcohol control strategies. Harris, Edwards and Homel (2014) report that there has been some effort to control alcohol consumption in Australia with the formation of the Ministerial Council on Drug Strategy. This represents a significant change in the attitudes toward alcohol related problems. This council has similar intentions to the afore mentioned 2009 paper published by the Scottish Government, providing a framework for the reduction of Scottish alcohol misuse. It can be argued that more can be done to implement these strategies across a wider area due to the morbidity and mortality rates in Scotland being much higher than England and Wales (Scottish Government, 2017).

## 2.5 Chapter Summary

Having read the literature surrounding the research topic, there is a definite need for more research surrounding alcohol at music events. There was no research to link drinking cultures to alcohol consumption at events to the best of the author’s knowledge.

This chapter examined the three key research areas and some of the key typologies and theories linked to them. The theories presented in this chapter will be used to analyse the data collected from the research stage.

## 

# Chapter Three – Methodology – 2865 words

## 3.1 Introduction

This chapter forms a discussion concerning research methods. This chapter discusses the data collection methods for this study and a justification as to why they were chosen. Within this chapter, the research approach used while researching is examined alongside any ethical considerations.

The chapter introduces primary and secondary data collection methods, and a conversation concerning qualitative and quantitative research methods will justify the chosen data collection methods. These methods have been chosen in accordance with the research aim and objectives outlined in chapter one - which include a mixed methods approach utilising secondary data collection through a critical literature review, and primary data collection through the use of surveys and interviews.

## 3.2 Primary and Secondary Data

To achieve the research aim it is important to use both primary and secondary data.

### *3.2.1 Secondary Data*

Bryman and Bell (2015) state that secondary data is data which is analysed by someone who has not written the data. Secondary data may not have a direct link to the research topic and has been collected for a separate purpose (Bryman & Bell, 2015), with Saunders, Lewis and Thornhill (2012) highlighting secondary data is aimed towards a much wider audience. Examples of secondary data include books, journal articles, reports and newspaper articles (Saunders et al, 2012).

Secondary data comes with advantages – one being it has a huge cost and time saving benefit. This offers the possibility of access to high quality data from hundreds of different studies and archives at little to no cost (Saunders et al, 2012; Bryman & Bell, 2015). Windle (2010) notes while this may save time, it may also be a hindrance due to spending more time understanding other researchers’ methods and variable definitions. Sometimes the original study may have serious shortcomings in design and/or data collection which may cause problems for the secondary researcher (Windle, 2010).

The data quality is another advantage, as much of the data used most often for secondary data analysis is exceptionally high, through methods such as arduous sampling methods and collecting a large data set to give the most accurate representation of the sample (Bryman & Bell, 2015). This poses some problems when the data becomes outdated and may provide a different narrative to current data (Young, 2015).

While secondary data is helpful in providing context and a theoretical basis for an issue, it will not provide a full and in-depth picture of the issue. In this study, secondary data has been presented in the form of a literature review where key theories and typologies have been identified and will be used in data analysis.

### *3.2.2 Primary Data*

Primary data is the original data gathered by the researcher for the purpose of their study (Adams, Khan & Raeside, 2014). There are a number of ways in which primary data can be collected with the most common being surveys, interviews and case studies (Adams et al, 2014). Other data collection methods include focus groups and observation (Saunders et al, 2012). For this study, surveys and interviews have been chosen as primary data collection methods.

Primary data comes with its advantages – namely the data is collected specifically for the study and will be most beneficial to the researcher as this will allow them to meet their research aims and objectives (Institute for Work & Health, 2015). This implies that the information will be relevant and recent, making findings more accurate. Primary data can be anonymous, with many data archives stipulating primary data must be anonymous (Parry & Mauthner, 2004). It is argued that anonymity may make participation more attractive to respondents as they can be more honest and not have their answers linked back to them personally.

While being an important part of many research projects, primary data can be time consuming and expensive to collect compared to secondary data (Hox & Bioije, 2005). Primary data relies on the willingness of participants to respond, with Bowling (2005) stating self-completion surveys are more likely to be responded to with honest answers. Primary data collection allows for the possibility of misinterpretation of the questions or ambiguity of questions (Mathers, Fox & Hunn, 2007).

## 3.3 Qualitative & Quantitative Data

Qualitative and quantitative data can be categorised as opinions and statistics respectively (Goodman, 2010). It is important when conducting a study that the researcher makes an informed choice about which method they wish to use to ensure success. The way in which data is to be analysed and represented dictates data collection methods, with some studies requiring a large amount of data while others require less but more detailed data.

### *3.3.1 Qualitative Data*

Qualitative research methods are described by Myers (2009) as the understanding of people and the sociocultural circumstances in which they live. Nachmias and Worth-Nachmias (2008) note this data requires more involvement from the participants due to the attempt from the researcher to understand their behaviours, values, beliefs and emotions. Qualitative data provides depth and a more illustrative result, with Anderson (2010) noting this can be useful in describing settings.

One example of a qualitative research method is the use of interviews, in which interviews can delve deeper into respondents’ answers. This eliminates some of the possibility of misinterpretation of questions but can however introduce bias if the interviewer uses leading questions. This may be combatted with rigorous interviewer training (Crawford, 1997).

### *3.3.2 Quantitative Data*

Quantitative research methods often require a large sample in order to generate enough data for effective statistical comparison. This is advantageous as it allows the researcher to measure responses against a limited set of questions for comparison (Yilmaz, 2013). Bryman and Bell (2015) note quantitative data gives an insight into the overall perception or beliefs of a sample of a larger population. Yilmaz (2013) notes while these methods provide statistical data, there is no depth to allow insight into the participants’ feelings and experiences.

An example of quantitative data collection is a survey. Surveys are a very popular data collection method when gathering data from a large population. It is important a survey obtains a high response rate as this will allow for a large data set with greater accuracy and reliability (Baruch & Holtom, 2008). The data collected from these surveys can be easily analysed and represented in a way which is easy to understand and intuitive - such as graphs and charts (Maciejewski, 2011). While surveys are a useful tool in quantitative data collection, they can be problematic when gathering data due to the sample size is often much larger than qualitative data collection methods (Patton, 1990).

## 3.4 Adopted Research Methods

A mixed method approach has been chosen for this study, due to the wish to gather both statistical data and opinions. Johnson, Onwuegbuzie and Turner (2007) define a mixed methods approach as an approach to knowledge which aims to examine multiple viewpoints which includes qualitative and quantitative data.

The study uses primary, secondary, qualitative and quantitative data. The study uses secondary data within the literature review to provide valuable insight into the existing research. This was conducted to identify key theories, themes and typologies, and to provide a theoretical grounding for the research methods utilised in this study. The literature review identified that more research was required around alcohol at music events, and there was no research linking drinking culture to alcohol consumption at events. This study has chosen to employ a survey and interviews as primary data collection methods.

### *3.4.1 Research Methods of Other Studies*

Many of the recent studies surrounding drinking culture since 2010 have used a quantitative approach to gain statistics. Authors such as Raitasalo, Homila and Mäkelä (2011), and Allamani, Voller, Pepe, Baccini, Massini and Cipriani (2014) use quantitative methods to ascertain their findings. Raitasalo et al (2011) mention using a general population survey. Only one research paper used a mixed methods approach – Härkönen, Törrönen, Mustonen and Mäkelä (2013) used both qualitative and quantitative data to focus on patterns of drinking occasions and contexts.

Across most research papers regarding event impacts, a questionnaire has been used to ascertain the opinions of the residents. Researchers including Andersson and Lundberg (2013), Baker, Meyer and Chebat (2013) and Aref and Redzuan (2017) have used surveys to gather data from participants. Waitt (2003) employed interviews to gather an extra dimension of information and allow for a deeper understanding of results.

Much of the research around alcohol at events includes surveys (Lim, Hellard, Hocking & Aitken, 2008; Martinus et al, 2010; Kinnunen, Uhmavaara & Jääskeläinen, 2017). This poses the question to what extent data collected by a self-reporting questionnaire will be reliable, as alcohol consumption could be argued as an area where bias may be an issue and data may not be accurate or honest. Glovannucchi, Colditz, Stampfer, Rimm, Litin, Sampson and Willett (1991) argue a self-reporting questionnaire can actually be a useful way of providing estimates regarding alcohol consumption.

### *3.4.2 Adopted Quantitative Method*

The literature review provided the basis for the questions used as part of quantitative data collection. Quantitative data collection used an online survey, hosted on NOVI Survey and distributed on Facebook. The survey was prefaced by a pilot study (see appendix 1), to identify any potential problems with the final survey (Hassan, Schattner & Mazza, 2006). This was also distributed on Facebook - specifically asking for pipe band parents, friends and family to trial the questions. This was done to gather the opinions around the intended questions for the final survey with a sample group who still had some involvement with the pipe band community. Facebook was chosen as the distributing medium to keep costs low.

The final survey (see appendix two) allowed the researcher to gather a large amount of primary data in a relatively short amount of time. The survey aimed to gather pipe band major event attendees’ general consensus around alcohol consumption at these events as well as what they thought was the best definition of the Scottish drinking culture. The survey consisted of three demographic questions and seven main questions, with an optional comment box to finish. Questions three, four, five and six allowed for the respondent to give comments with questions one, two and seven were closed.

The survey was written this way to allow the respondents to give their honest thoughts, as well as allowing the most common issues with alcohol consumption to be identified. The researcher decided a minimum of 100 completed responses would be ample to come to a proper conclusion. A large sample size was chosen so as to allow the results to be representative of the general population (Marshall, 1996).

Due to the widespread and international nature of the pipe band community, the survey was conducted online and shared across a number of piping and drumming groups to reach as many potential respondents as possible. This is an advantage of using an online survey.

International responses were allowed as within most bands there is an international nationality (other than Scottish) therefore the researcher decided to not exclude these responses, giving an objective view of the data. This is an advantage as it can give the researcher a wide range of data for more accurate data analysis.

### *3.4.3 Adopted Qualitative Method*

The decision was taken to include semi-structured interviews with the Majors event organisers to include information on the sociocultural impacts upon the host community. Semi-structured interviews were chosen to allow a guided conversation to take place but allow opportunities to delve deeper into answers (Brace, 2004). Interviews provided the opportunity to present the organisers with the information gathered in the survey and ascertain if the ideas proposed linked to the opinions of the organisers. The interview comprised of ten questions, written after the analysis of the data generated by the survey. The questions looked more into the community opinions of the Majors (see appendix three).

## 3.5 Sampling

For this study, a snowball sampling approach was taken for the quantitative data collection. Snowball sampling is defined by Vogt (1999) as a technique for finding respondents by which one respondent can give a second name and so on. This type of sampling was chosen to maximise potential respondents.

The survey link was shared onto the researcher’s personal Facebook page, which asked friends and family to share the post to encourage as many respondents as possible. The link was also shared on a piping and drumming group with over 4000 members which asked people to share the link with their pipe band friends. The use of Facebook meant that the survey could be disturbed quickly and easily with no costs and was able to reach as large a sample group as possible. The survey was kept completely anonymous so the researcher could not link any of the information given to any respondents.

As the interviews were exclusively used for event organisers, the interview sample approach was much more selective. This is an example of purposive sampling where a particular group of individuals from a cultural domain are investigated (Tongco, 2007). Black (2010) states that this is a technique used by researchers where through good judgement, a representative sample can be obtained. Purposive sampling was used to exclusively gather event managers’ opinions.

## 3.6 Data Analysis

Data analysis is carried out using frequency counts and thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is useful in qualitative data analysis - using an exploratory thematic analysis approach, the researcher read every response to identity key ideas, themes and trends (Guest, MacQueen & Namey, 2012). This has been chosen due to the survey and interview design, where many open ended questions have been chosen therefore highlighting the need to use exploratory thematic analysis for qualitative data.

Frequency counts are useful in collating statistics from quantitative data (Morgan, 1993). This has been chosen to help gather statistics from the closed questions from the survey to compare findings between different impacts, drinking rates and alcohol purchase places.

## 3.7 Ethical Considerations

The questions for the survey and the interview were written in accordance with Edinburgh Napier University Research Integrity Guidelines. All participants were made aware of the purpose of the study and were required to fill out an informed consent form before participating (Edinburgh Napier University, 2018) (see appendix four). This ensured that all participants were aware of any risks that may be involved and allowed them to make an informed choice about participating.

Participants were made aware participation was voluntary and they were able to withdraw at any time. This ensured that they were not coerced into participation which is against university guidelines (Edinburgh Napier University, 2018).

It was made clear any data they have provided up until the point of withdrawal may be used in the study. The survey was completely anonymous, and all responses and interview audio recordings and transcripts were kept completely confidential. These were stored in a password protected file in a locked room to protect respondents’ identities (Edinburgh Napier University, 2018) and destroyed after study completion.

## 3.8 Limitations to the Study

The survey response rate is anticipated to be the biggest limitation to this dissertation. A low response rate would not allow enough data to be generated for detailed analysis to take place, however this was combated by the inclusion of a short statement explaining the importance of a high response rate and a summary of the topic.

Another limitation anticipated is the cost of travelling to interviews. The researcher preferred to conduct face to face interviews due to finding this easier, therefore travelling costs were inevitable. It is hoped that three interviews could be undertaken in one day due to close proximity.

Honesty in answering questions is a potential limitation due to the sensitive nature of self-reporting alcohol consumption, however it is stressed in the participant information sheet of the survey that honesty was valued, and this would greatly benefit the researcher and the data set generated.

## 3.9 Validity, Reliability & Generalisability

### *3.9.1 Validity*

Ali and Yusof (2011) state to assess the validity of data collected, one turns to the experts in this field. However, often these experts can be inconsistent. In this case, the experts can be seen to be the band members as they have first-hand experience of the Majors and the issues which surround them.

### *3.9.2 Reliability*

Spencer, Ritchie, Lewis and Dillon (2003) highlight for a study to be reliable, a second researcher must be able to replicate the study to achieve the same results. However, some authors disagree, stating that reliability has no place in qualitative research (Golafshani, 2003). In this case, reliability is important due to the quantitative data used in combination with qualitative.

### *3.9.2 Generalisability*

Generalisability refers to the extent to which the findings of the study reflect upon the wider population (Polit & Hungler, 1991). This however may difficult to apply to qualitative data due to this being the opinions of a group of individuals. It can be argued there is a lack of generalisability due to the application of these findings being applicable to one specific community.

## 3.10 Chapter Summary

After an analysis of primary and secondary data, and qualitative and quantitative data the researcher decided that a mixed method approach was the most appropriate. This allowed for a large number of participants’ responses to be analysed in comparison with the evidence identified in the literature review. The primary research aimed to examine the drinking culture of Scotland and how this impacts upon events, with a specific focus on Major pipe band events. The interviews aimed to examine the sociocultural impacts associated with these events. The research has been conducted ethically, with the opportunity for participants to withdraw at any time. The research collected for this study will be used for this study alone and destroyed after study submission.

# Chapter Four – Data Findings – 1537 words

## 4.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the primary data collected during the research period. The data is presented in this chapter and discussed in the next. This chapter includes a discussion of the data collected in terms of alcohol purchase, alcohol consumption at major pipe band events, the biggest issues identified for the host community, how alcohol influences the event experience and which definition best fits the Scottish drinking culture. There is an overview of the demographic information of the respondents. All percentages have been rounded to the nearest first decimal place so the final total may not be exactly 100%.

4.2 Survey Demographic Information

There were over 200 responses overall however the unfinished responses were filtered out. Of this number, 66.3% were completed. This figure represents a good response rate as this has allowed for international data to be gathered, giving an objective view to the findings.

Figure 4.1 highlights the geographic areas which have been included in this data analysis.

**Figure 4.1:** Respondents Percentage by Country

As shown in figure 4.1, 67% of respondents were Scottish, with the second largest group being Northern Ireland. This fits in line with general pipe band demographics with many of the top-flight bands being from Scotland and Northern Ireland. Milosavljevic (2009) notes that this is due to Scottish immigration in the 17th century, taking Scottish culture to different parts of the world and resulting in the creation of pipe bands across the globe.

**Figure 4.2:** Gender of Respondents

Of the 177 respondents, 58 (33%) were female and 119 (67%) were male, as shown in figure 4.2. This is accurate as a representation of gender diversity within bands, with Between 25-35% of pipers and drummers are female (Pipes|Drums.com, 2018).

**Figure 4.3:** Ages of Respondents

**Figure 4:** Gender of Respondents

18-24 year olds made up the largest proportion of the sample, as shown in figure 4.3. This correlates to the large number of 18-24 year olds who currently compete, with a large number of young adults competing across the highest grades.

Table 4.1 notes the attendance at each of the Majors. These figures are an accurate representation of actual event attendance due to the distance required to travel for some bands to attend the Europeans and UK Championships. This suggests that the percentage of those who drink may vary between Majors due to the distance required to travel to these events; further journeys may have a lower drinking rate.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Competition** | **Count** | **Percentage** |
| British Championships  (Paisley) | 158 | 89.3% |
| Scottish Championships  (Dumbarton) | 155 | 87.6% |
| UK Championships  (Belfast) | 135 | 76.3% |
| European Championships  (Forres) | 141 | 79.7% |
| World Championships  (Glasgow Green) | 176 | 99.4% |

**Table 4.1:** Attendance of Respondents at each of the Majors

## 4.3 Survey Results

### 4.3.1 Alcohol Consumption

The survey first asked if respondents drank alcohol at the Majors. 92.7% responded yes.

**Figure 4.4:** Question 5 from survey – Do you drink alcohol at these events?

This corresponds to the culture of pipe band drinking, where the majority of players have a drink due to this being a normal part of the pipe band culture. One respondent noted “it’s part of the culture and … is what makes pipe band sociable and enjoyable places to go”.

### 4.2.2 Where Alcohol is Purchased

Question 6 asked those who said they drank where they purchased their alcohol.

11.9%

9.6%

71.2%

**Figure 4.5:** Question 6 - Do you buy alcohol there or do you take it with you?

### 4.3.3 Place of Purchase Motivations

A variety of motivators came to light during the research period, highlighted in table 4.2. These were taken from the 164 respondents who said they consumed alcohol. Some respondents provided more than one motivator.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Motivator** | **Count** | **Percentage** |
| Money Saving | 11 | 6.7% |
| Price of Alcohol | 79 | 48.2% |
| More Convenient to Buy There | 8 | 4.9% |
| Lack of Availability | 4 | 2.4% |
| Social Aspect | 44 | 26.8% |
| Beer Tent Queues | 13 | 7.9% |
| Local Shops | 1 | 0.6% |
| Dietary Requirements | 2 | 1.2% |
| Social Norm (to do both) | 5 | 3.0% |
| Legality of Bringing Own Alcohol | 6 | 3.7% |
| Event Experience | 2 | 1.2% |
| Time Factor | 3 | 1.8% |
| Limit Alcohol Intake | 1 | 0.6% |

**Table 4.2:** Alcohol Purchase Motivators

### 4.3.4 Reasons for Not Drinking

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Motivator** | **Count** | **Percentage** |
| Personal Choice (but do drink alcohol at other times) | 3 | 23.1% |
| Don’t Drink | 2 | 1.2% |
| Driving  **Table 4.3:** Motivators for not drinking | 1 | 0.6% |

13 respondents replied that they do not consume alcohol at these events. Question 6 allowed these respondents to give a reason for their choice. Seven gave reasons for their decisions, which are shown in table 4.3. The percentages shown in table 4.3 are taken from these 13 respondents.

### 4.3.5 Is Drinking Necessary?

Question 7 asked respondents whether drinking was necessary to enjoy the day. There were three options; yes, no and unsure.

**Figure 4.6:** Question 7 – is it necessary to drink to enjoy the day?

The question went on to ask respondents to give a reason for their answer, once again some respondents gave more than one reason. These reasons are shown in table 4.4.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reason** | **Count** | **Percentage** |
| Social Activity | 57 | 32.2% |
| Networking | 6 | 3.4% |
| Not Necessary | 29 | 14.1% |
| Relaxation | 14 | 7.9% |
| Driving | 5 | 2.8% |
| Fun After Competing | 11 | 6.2% |
| Main Focus is Competing | 7 | 4.0% |
| Go with People who don’t Drink | 2 | 1.1% |
| Not Acceptable to get Drunk | 2 | 1.1% |
| Passes Time | 2 | 1.1% |
| Biggest Events of the Competition Season | 1 | 0.6% |
| Looking After Someone | 3 | 1.7% |
| Choice | 15 | 8.5% |
| Part of Pipe Band Culture | 9 | 5.1% |

**Table 4.4:** Reasons for whether or not alcohol consumption is necessary at the Majors

Several respondents noted during their pipe band careers there is often a desire among young people socialise in the beer tent as this is the main gathering point. Numerous respondents note that drinking culture varies from band to band, with one response highlighting “I’ve played for several bands and have seen different alcohol policies, one didn’t let us drink at all and most have had a ‘no drinking before playing’ rule. These rules are usually set by the pipe major.”

### 4.3.6 Does Alcohol Affect Event Perception?

Question 8 asked respondents whether alcohol, any behaviours or any facilities had any influence on their individual perception of the event. The results of this are shown in table 4.5. Some respondents gave more than one answer.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reason** | **Count** | **Percentage** |
| Drunken Behaviour | 39 | 22.0% |
| Poor Beer Tent | 2 | 1.1% |
| More Focus on Drinking | 1 | 0.6% |
| No Effect | 119 | 67.2% |
| Prefer an Open Park | 1 | 0.6% |
| More Fun Environment | 4 | 2.3% |
| Behaviour at Massed Bands | 6 | 3.4% |
| Setting Poor Example to Under 18s | 6 | 3.4% |
| Time Wasting Activity (Necessary) | 1 | 0.6% |
| Professionalism | 2 | 1.1% |

**Table 4.5:** Question 8 - Aspects of the Majors which affect event perception

### 4.3.7 Biggest Issues at the Majors

Question 9 asked respondents to list some of the biggest issues associated with alcohol at the Majors. The issues are listed in table 4.6, with some respondents listing more than one issue.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Count** | **Percentage** |
| Litter | 94 | 53.1% |
| Lack of Availability of Alcohol | 1 | 0.6% |
| Poor Example to Younger Players/Poor Reputation of Band | 16 | 9.0% |
| Hangovers | 1 | 0.6% |
| No Issues | 28 | 15.8% |
| More Focus on Drinking than Playing | 3 | 1.7% |
| Price of Alcohol | 14 | 7.9% |
| Disorderly Behaviour | 40 | 22.6% |
| Beer Tent Queues | 4 | 2.3% |
| Smuggling of Alcohol into Event | 2 | 1.1% |
| Public Urination | 4 | 2.3% |
| Beer Tent Opening Hours | 2 | 1.1% |
| Community Disruption | 10 | 5.6% |
| Toilet Cleanliness | 4 | 2.3% |
| Underage Drinking | 3 | 1.7% |
| Size of Beer Tent Area | 4 | 2.3% |
| Aggression | 9 | 5.1% |
| Arguments | 1 | 0.6% |
| Potential for Damaged Instruments | 1 | 0.6% |

**Table 4.6:** Question 9 – What are some of the biggest issues with alcohol at these events?

Several respondents noted that litter may be the biggest issue due to laziness with one respondent noting that this is down to drinks “…being thrown to the ground when finished rather than just being binned; I blame people being lazy for this”.

### 4.3.8 Which Definition Best Fits Scotland’s Drinking Culture?

The final question asked respondents to choose the definition they felt best fitted the Scottish drinking culture. They were given five different definitions, chosen a result of the literature review so as to give a wide variety of options for respondents. The results are shown in table 4.7.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Definition** | **Count** | **Percentage** |
| Wet – alcohol is integrated into daily life and activities (e.g., is consumed with meals) and is widely available and accessible. In these cultures, abstinence rates are low, and wine is largely the beverage of choice. (Bloomfeld et al, 2003) | 55 | 31.1% |
| Dry – alcohol consumption is not as common during everyday activities (e.g., it is less frequently a part of meals) and access to alcohol is more restricted. Abstinence is more common, but when drinking occurs it is more likely to result in intoxication; moreover, wine consumption is less common. (Bloomfeld et al, 2003) | 48 | 27.1% |
| Over permissive – a culture where attitudes to drinking and the behaviours which occur when drunk are accepted. (Pittman, 1967) | 60 | 33.9% |
| Prescriptive – a culture where drinking is permitted but drunkenness is prohibited. (Mizruchi and Perruchi, 1970) | 13 | 7.3% |
| Abstinent – a culture where alcohol and drunken behaviour is forbidden (Bales, 1946) | 1 | 0.6% |

**Table 4.7:** Question 10 – Which of these definitions best fit the Scottish drinking culture?

## 4.4 Interview Results

The author contacted the organisers of each of the Majors, however it was only possible to conduct an interview with the organiser of the British Championships. The interview questions were written as a result of the results of the survey (see appendix 3). The first question asked how long the organiser had been involved with organising the event and is not included in the following discussion.

### 4.4.1 Question 2 – Community Involvement

The second question asked whether there was a lot of community involvement with the event. The interviewee replied that they try to engage the community by introducing ‘come and try sessions’ from different local sports and leisure clubs. This is done in the hopes to bring in a family audience who do not ordinarily come to a pipe band event. The organisers are also “trying to get the Highland Games section” to bring a different side to the event.

### 4.4.2 Question 3 – Community Pride

The third question asked if the community are proud of the Major. The interviewee replied yes – due to its large attendance. The event has the third largest attendance behind the World Championships and the Scottish Championships. The organisers note that the British Championships are the largest event in Renfrewshire.

### 4.4.3 Question 4 – Community Concerns

Question four looked at the concerns that the community had. The organisers were pleased that the community do not have any concerns. They note that they have “…never had any antisocial behaviour”, going as far to say they find band members to be very well behaved. The organisers work closely with Police Scotland, hosting multiagency meetings with other organisations to determine any issues and remedies to deal with these. Litter was not deemed to be any worse than at other events in the town so was not seen as a concern.

### 4.4.4 Question 5 – Community Disruption

Question five examined the disruption that faces the community. As the venue is on the outskirts of town there is very little disruption to the residents. Those who live in close proximity are given parking permits, and the organiser noted that the largest disruption is the traffic at the end of the day when band buses are leaving the park. The organisers state “that’s the biggest disruption, but that’s half an hour. There’s very minimal disruption.”

### 4.4.5 Questions 6 and 7 – Alcohol Management and Strategy

This question asked if the organiser felt that alcohol was something that was well managed at the Major. The organiser stated yes – as the onus is on the external licensee for food, drink and confectionary. The whole venue carries an alcohol licence therefore the licensee is responsible across the park, including band areas where bands can drink their own alcohol.

Question seven asked about the alcohol management strategy which again placed the onus on the external licensee. The organiser notes that the alcohol management strategy also incorporates normal licence standards such as correct alcohol measures, asking for identification and not serving anyone who is clearly intoxicated. The organiser stressed that this the licensee’s responsibility.

### 4.4.6 Question 8 – Piping and Drumming Uptake

This question asked if the organisers knew if there was any direct impact on the uptake of piping and drumming – this was unknown.

### 4.4.7 Question 9 – Other Notable Impacts

The final question asked the organisers if the Majors had any other notable impacts on the local community. Regarding the British Championships, the economic impact cannot be ignored. The event brought approximately £300,000 into the local economy, with band members taking advantage of the shuttle bus service provided by the organisers to go into the town centre after competing and spending money in the town itself. The organiser states “The total attender spend for last year’s pipe band was just under £470,000 and a direct economic impact of that one event is just over £300,000”.

## 4.5 Chapter Summary

This chapter presented the primary data collected via survey and interview. The survey was sent to the pipe band community via Facebook and collected responses from around the globe. The data examined reasons why band members take their own alcohol to the Majors or take advantage of the beer tents that are there, before asking which definition best fit the Scottish drinking culture. The interview was written as a result of the survey and aimed to ascertain whether any of the issues with the event that band members identified were deemed issues from the organisers. The data will be analysed in the following chapter.

# Chapter Five – Data Analysis -2481 words

## 5.1 Introduction

This chapter analyses the primary data presented in chapter four. This data is analysed in accordance with the frameworks and theories discussed in the literature review before providing conclusions and recommendations in the next chapter.

## 5.2 Drinking Culture

### 5.2.1 Scottish Drinking Culture

As identified in question 10 of the survey, 33.9% of respondents felt the ‘over permissive’ culture was the most accurate description of Scotland’s drinking culture (see table 4.7). This definition by Pittman (1967) highlights both drinking and drunk behaviours are accepted. This is juxtaposed by the 2004 Scottish Social Attitudes Survey where 46% of respondents said alcohol caused the most issues for Scotland (Bromley & Ormston, 2004), suggesting drunken behaviours are not tolerated. It is reasonable to assume a more accurate description of the Scottish drinking culture is a ‘prescriptive’ culture. Mizruchi and Perruchi (1970) note prescriptive cultures frown upon drunken behaviour but alcohol consumption is accepted. Former First Minister, Alex Salmond champions this - stating drinking culture had changed since his youth and that “people now go out drunk, having drunk cheap booze before” (Gander, 2014). Parkinson (2018) notes there has been a shift in that younger generations are not drinking as much, suggesting this may link to older generations.

As many more people are already intoxicated before continuing to drink in pubs and other establishments, this suggests there is an increase in alcohol related harm. Alcohol related hospital admissions are 4.4 times higher compared to the 1980s (BBC News, 2018). Alcohol is seen as a social lubricant with 39% of Scots surveyed by the 2013 Scottish Social Attitudes survey saying alcohol made social events easier to enjoy (ScotCen.org.uk, 2014). This ties back to the ‘prescriptive’ culture where alcohol is deemed an important part of socialising however intoxication is frowned upon.

The idea of alcohol as a social lubricant is noted in the survey, where respondents were asked if it is necessary to consume alcohol at the Majors. 64.4% noted it was necessary, with 32.2% stating it is a social activity – confirming the idea of a social lubricant. 1.1% of respondents highlighted it is not deemed acceptable to get drunk – also validating the ‘prescriptive’ drinking culture.

### 5.2.2 Pipe Band Drinking Culture

Within the Scottish drinking culture, it can be discerned there is a subculture of pipe band drinking. This is a unique culture with the overall Scottish culture, where drinking forms a huge part of group activities. This links back to the ‘Cultural Web’ (Johnson et al, 2017) where the rituals and routines of the pipe band community are to have a drink before competing and then drinking up to and including massed bands. This is noted in the survey where 92.7% of respondents drink alcohol at the majors, noting this is something that is simply part of pipe band culture.

Other respondents note that this culture varies from band to band – with some bands having a strict no alcohol policy and others adopt a relaxed approach. This suggests there are a variety of ‘control systems’ and even ‘power structures’ whereby pipe majors set rules for what is expected of band members before and after competing. While ultimately Scottish law governs how alcohol and intoxication is dealt with, pipe majors do have power over their band.

While it may be considered the norm to engage in alcohol consumption in pipe band culture, it is important to consider individual norms may differ from those of the band. These norms may not be held by every member of the group however the majority subscribe to the group norms (O’Reilly & Chatman, 1996). This links to the 7.3% of respondents who do not drink at the Majors – therefore not subscribing to the band norms of drinking.

The overall drinking culture of pipe bands could be argued as ‘over permissive’ – something 33.9% of respondents highlighted as the Scottish drinking culture. This typology better suits the pipe band world where many respondents note drunken behaviour is not something that they view badly at these events – linking back to the idea that intoxication and the associated behaviours are accepted (Mizruchi & Perucchi, 1970).

## 5.3 Event Impacts

Much of the data collected highlighted both organisers and band members felt the Majors had no issues with alcohol. This was not a view shared by all respondents however, suggesting there must to some degree be issues with alcohol (Raineri & Earls, 2005).

### 5.3.1 Sociocultural Impacts

It can be discerned the pipe band Majors have both positive and negative sociocultural impacts for the host community.

Referring to the ‘Social Impact Model’ (Small, 2007) (see figure 2.2), the Majors provide entertainment and socialisation opportunities – suggesting a positive impact. This can be applied across all Majors, as the data collected from the organisers of the British Championships will be similar to the other Majors. It was also noted the community have immense pride for this event – creating community identity and cohesion. This is another area outlined by Small (2007), suggesting the Majors bring the community together, ensuring the success of the event. The host community do not feel like their quality of life is affected by the Majors, demonstrating a positive impact.

As stated by the organiser of the British Championships, the community have become more involved with the event, therefore increasing their exposure to cultural events. As the event is an example of traditional Scottish culture – this suggests a positive cultural impact as the visitors may not ordinarily have taken part. This links to the impact that the 2008 European City of Culture in Liverpool had upon the local residents and the uptake of cultural events as a result (Liu, 2013).

While having positive impacts, there equally are negative impacts. As identified by the band members survey: litter and community disruption were deemed the biggest issues. Litter was identified to be a problem by 53.1% of respondents with several noting there seems to be a distinct lack of bins. This is something contradicted by the organisers, noting this is no worse than at other events in the town. Laziness of visitors was something both band members and organisers commented on, stating this could be the root cause. Litter can be a severely negative impact, whereby it can create a poor image of the host community. This could influence a visitor’s decision to return to the event. Kolodko, Read and Taj (2016) note that litter has an effect on the wellbeing of the host community, something outlined by Wallstam et al (2018) as a social impact. The litter (comprising of beer bottles, cans and plastic cups) has a negative effect on community wellbeing and is a negative environmental effect.

Many organisations try to avoid the blame for litter, insinuating that it is purely the visitors who are to blame (Kolodko et al, 2016). This is not the case, with the British Championships organisers having the opportunity for a licensed bar area serving plastic cups. This suggests the litter is something the organisers actively engage with, causing a negative impact upon their host community. This highlights this is an issue for both band members and organisers to focus on to improve the wellbeing of the host community and reduce the amount of post event clean up required.

Community disruption was another impact which was identified by the band members. Band members did not specify was meant by community disruption, however the organisers noted the biggest issue with disruption was traffic. While this has been outlined as an issue which affects the community for a short time, this links to the ‘inconvenience’ and ‘personal frustration’ sections of the ‘Social Impacts Model’ (Small, 2007). This suggests the events do have an element of frustration as their daily routine may be affected by an extraordinary event. Regarding alcohol, traffic may cause an inconvenience as the increase in shuttle buses on the roads bringing band members into town centres to consume more alcohol outside the venue. The increase in traffic and the continued consumption of alcohol in town centres can be frustrating for locals due to the overcrowded amenities and large number of intoxicated people. This could be a motivation for other members of the public to use the event to cause unrest. This again ties back to the ‘personal frustration’ and ‘inconvenience’ branches of the ‘Social Impacts Model’ (Small, 2007).

### 5.3.2 Personal Impacts

The survey asked whether alcohol changed their perception of the Majors – 67.2%of respondents noted it did not. Of the 32.8% that said alcohol did affect event perception, 22.6% stated drunken behaviour was the most influential factor affecting event perception. One respondent noted drunken behaviour actually prevented them from returning to the Majors. This links to a negative event experience influencing future attendance as outlined by Berridge (2007). This is twofold, whereby respondents are not satisfied with the event and the failure of the event to meet expectations due to the alcohol consumption of others and therefore do not wish to return. Those who felt alcohol did not affect event perception may have been biased due to the possibility of being intoxicated themselves so are unable to accurately report.

Another factor affecting event perception was the professionalism of the band, with 1.1% of respondents noting the professionalism of bands is notably reduced after alcohol consumption. This is most highly noted during massed bands (the march past the chieftain of the Major and prize giving ceremony) when many bands have spent a considerable amount of time in the beer tent after competing. This supports material by Craypoe (2018) stating that professionalism levels should be no different from every day jobs. This will have an impact on event experience whereby both attendees and band members can have a poor image of the event due to band professionalism. Bladen et al (2012) note this could be argued as an example of poor event experience as a direct impact of alcohol. Band professionalism is something noted by the organisers to be something of little concern, as the band members are generally well behaved – however this does not seem to account for behaviours noticed exclusively by band members where organisers would not ordinarily have access (for example in the midst of massed bands). While this issue is only reported by a small number of respondents, this may be something which is more widespread but has been unreported due to the influence of alcohol at these events, making this area potentially biased.

### 5.3.3 Alcohol at Events

Alcohol at events has up to now been looked at with negative consequences in mind (Mykleton, 2010; Duggan, 2018). 15.8% of respondents highlighted there are no issues with alcohol at these events, however others noted several issues directly linked to alcohol at the Majors including aggression, underage drinking and the example set to younger band members. Some of the issues identified by the survey were categorically ambiguous (for example community disruption) and are mentioned elsewhere. As the survey reported a large number of issues, percentages here are small – however these issues may be more prevalent than is indicated.

Regarding aggression, McMurran (2011) notes this is not something that affects everyone – some are aggressive without alcohol and others will never be aggressive, even with alcohol consumption. This is corroborated by the 5.1% of respondents who reported aggression as a factor affecting event experience, suggesting that this is a small issue. One respondent stated that in some cases, aggression has been linked to homophobia. This however is contradicted by the 15.8% of respondents who did not note any issues, suggesting that aggression is not as widespread as first indicated.

1.7% of respondents replied that underage drinking was an issue, with Alcohol Focus Scotland (2015) substantiating this with 83% of 16-24 year olds consuming alcohol. This suggests that the issue of underage drinking is potentially larger than reported by the survey. Alcohol Focus Scotland (2015) highlight alcohol consumption at a young age can lead to problematic drinking in adulthood – linking to the idea of aggression, however there could be more serious health problems. Several respondents noted often underage drinkers cannot handle their alcohol consumption, therefore affecting the band’s reputation and potentially affecting event experience of others. This links to the issues seen at “Bands on The Square” concerning youth alcohol consumption (Duggan, 2018).

The poor example set to younger band members was an issue for 9.0% of respondents. This is outlined by some respondents as excessive alcohol consumption and the need to spend excessive time in the beer tent. As reported in the survey, those who drink reported they purchase alcohol both at the venue and beforehand therefore suggesting this is done to maximise alcohol consumption. This can lead to extreme drunken behaviour, noted to be one of the largest factors affecting event perception of patrons and the wider audience (Raineri & Earls, 2005). The idea of having an ‘open park’ as referred to by event organisers, reduces this issue and allows for a larger area in which socialising can occur.

This ties back to the formation of a culture – as seen in the “Cultural Web” (Johnson et al, 2017), where the example of behaviours exhibited by adults is an example of a symbol of the pipe band culture. Swidler (1986) notes symbols are not always physical entities which can be studied and can be the foundations of societal constitutions. This can be applied to pipe bands where the behaviours exhibited can be argued as the foundations of this society, however this may have negative connotations. Many respondents noted over the course of their time amongst pipe bands there was a desire among young people to join their adult counterparts in the beer tent as this is often the main social area, however to comply with licencing laws they are unable do so. This highlights the integral part alcohol forms in this culture, and this can bring about a negative view of the culture due to the exposure young children can have to the negative behaviours often associated with alcohol. This can also lead to notions alcohol must be consumed to be accepted as part of the culture. This is juxtaposed by the 7.3% of respondents who are part of the pipe band culture who do not drink and do not deem it necessary to enjoy the day.

## 5.4 Chapter Summary

This chapter examined the primary data collected by the researcher and applied theories and frameworks identified in the literature review. This chapter found the Scottish drinking culture is closely aligned with the ‘prescriptive’ culture (Mizruchi and Perruchi, 1970), and that this in turn influences the pipe band drinking culture. This is validated by some respondents noting the unacceptability of drunken behaviour at the Majors.

The research identified that band members highlighted more sociocultural issues such as the litter directly associated with alcohol consumption and these issues can have a detrimental effect on personal event perception for attendees. It was determined the drunken behaviours exhibited by older band members sets a negative example to young players, reinforcing the idea that alcohol is an integral part of the culture and is something that they must partake in the be accepted into this culture.

# Chapter Six – Conclusions and Recommendations -1121 words

## 6.1 Introduction

The overall aim of this study was to examine Scottish drinking culture and the sociocultural and personal impacts of alcohol at pipe band events. The objectives of this study involved undertaking a detailed literature review, conducting primary research through a survey for band members and interviews with event organisers and to examine the impacts associated with alcohol at these events from the results of primary research.

## 6.2 Overview of Approach

For this study, two types of data were used. Secondary data provided a theoretical basis, identifying key frameworks and theories to underpin the findings of the survey and interviews. The survey was written with these theories in mind to allow for accurate comparison and analysis to take place. The interview was written as a result of the survey responses, again with these theories in mind. The survey used snowball sampling to maximise potential responses from band members. The interview used purposive sampling as this was exclusively used to interview event organisers.

## 6.3 Summary of Key Findings

This study noted that the Scottish drinking culture closely aligned with the ‘prescriptive’ drinking culture. It was determined that pipe bands are part of a Scottish subculture, which has a separate ‘over permissive’ drinking culture suggesting that intoxication and intoxicated behaviours are something which are accepted in the community. The results showed that alcohol consumption is something which is popular at these events, with several respondents highlighting they do not consume alcohol. This cements the place of alcohol in the pipe band culture, highlighting that alcohol is an integral part of this.

One of the main issues surrounding alcohol at pipe band events was reported to be litter. This was deemed to be an issue which both band members and event organisers are responsible for. While many respondents felt there were no major issues, there were several smaller issues such as underage drinking, band professionalism and community disruption highlighted. Many of these issues were categorically ambiguous, meaning that they could be both sociocultural impacts and the issues associated with alcohol.

The alcohol at these events data proved interesting as the want of underage players to socialise in the beer tent became apparent. This is something that has been noticed over the years by band members and is something that is still a large issue. It is apparent that the idea of an ‘open park’ is one that is better suited for socialising.

It has been noted that as the survey reported a large variety of impacts and issues that the percentages may underestimate the extent of some of these issues.

## 6.4 Recommendations

Based on the results, several recommendations can be made. Firstly, it would be advantageous for all pipe band events to be a fully licensed venue rather than one small area being fenced off. This would allow people to enjoy the full scope of the event whilst enjoying a drink and would also keep underage players from attempting to enter the beer tent. This is something which has been successful at the British Championships and can be implemented at other competitions.

Secondly, the introduction of reusable plastic cups is something which should be considered at these events. This is something that had been introduced at stadiums such as Murrayfield, where customers pay a deposit for the cup alongside their drink which they can have refilled during the course of their visit. Upon returning the cup to the bar, they are given their deposit back. This is something which may have initially high overhead costs but is something which can be reused across other competition with neutral branding. This will combat the issue of litter.

Thirdly, the introduction of policies to encourage more players to leave the beer tent before massed bands should be considered. This will allow for high band professionalism at all times - meaning that other issues such as aggression, public urination and disorderly behaviour at massed bands could be combated. This could be introduced by earlier closing times of bars, or by introducing a rigid schedule to ensure that bands have a set time to complete their march past. There is already some form of schedule however, this is very fluid and does not encourage members to actively participate.

## 6.5 Beneficiaries

The main beneficiary of this study is the event managers of the Majors, as this research is tailored towards them as a result of the survey detailing opinions of band members. Key trends identified in this study highlight that there are still some areas in which organisers can improve to make the overall event experience more enjoyable for band members and in turn ordinary event attendees. It is important that the organisers have accurate and recent information so as to understand areas of improvement for the upcoming season.

The pipe band governing body – The RSPBA – may also benefit from this study, as they can use this study to understand the role which alcohol plays in the pipe band culture. This could lead to policy changes surrounding bar opening times and player alcohol limits to ensure the success of massed bands which is not tarnished by intoxication.

## 6.6 Limitations

Limitations were expected during the course of this dissertation. As the topic of this study can be deemed sensitive, survey responses which are dishonest about alcohol consumption at these events may be an issue. To the best of the author’s knowledge, all data is valid and reliable – although the questions for the survey may have been misinterpreted which could affect reliability. This could also be true of the interview.

When contacting organisers for the interview, other limitations occurred. As the interviews took place in the busy lead up time to these events, it was difficult to contact several of the event organisers. As a result of this, only one event organiser interview was able to take place.

## 6.7 Future Research Opportunities

The unique nature of alcohol research means that there are still avenues to be explored. As there is very little academic research surrounding Scottish drinking culture in itself, this may be an area of interest for further research. This potential research could be beneficial for academics in creating a more accurate comparison amongst other European countries, providing more research to the already rich data surrounding Scandinavian drinking culture.

Pipe band drinking, and pipe bands in general are another area which are greatly under researched and it would be of great interest to the author and to event organisers to understand this unique culture further. Reflecting upon chapters two and four, it is clear that there is still a large gap in the understanding of alcohol at events in general. This suggests that this could be another area in which further research is required. This would be beneficial for event managers who can help to tighten alcohol policies where necessary for those events who allow attendees to bring their own alcohol.
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# Appendices

## Appendix 1: Pilot Study for Non Playing Members of Pipe Band Community

1. Have you attended any of the pipe band major competitions? (British, Scottish, UK, Europeans and/or Worlds?
2. Do you drink alcohol at these events?
3. Do you purchase alcohol at the event, or do you take it with you? *What motivates you to do so?*
4. Does alcohol change your perception of the event? (I.e. do you enjoy the majors more with a drink or do you still have a good experience without it?) *Please use the space below for additional comments*
5. What do you think are some of the biggest issues with alcohol at these events?
6. Which of these definitions do you feel best fits the Scottish drinking culture?
   * 1. Wet – alcohol is integrated into daily life and activities (eg is consumed with meals) and is widely available and accessible. In these cultures, abstinence rates are low, and wine is largely the beverage of choice.
     2. Dry – alcohol consumption is not as common during everyday activities (e.g., it is less frequently a part of meals) and access to alcohol is more restricted. Abstinence is more common, but when drinking occurs it is more likely to result in intoxication; moreover, wine consumption is less common.
     3. Over permissive – a culture where attitudes to drinking and the behaviours which occur when drunk are accepting
     4. Prescriptive – a culture where drinking is permitted but drunkenness is prohibited
     5. Abstinent – a culture where alcohol and drunken behaviour is forbidden
7. Thank you for being a part of this pilot study. As the final question, please let me know if you feel any of the questions can be improved before the final survey is sent out to band members!

## Appendix 2: Final Survey for Band Members

1. Are you…?

* Male
* Female
* Other

1. To which age group do you belong?

* 18-24
* 25-34
* 35-44
* 45-54
* 55+

1. Where do you come from?
2. Which of the Majors have you attended?

* The Scottish Championships
* The British Championships
* The UK Championships
* The European Championships
* The World Championships

1. Do you drink alcohol at these events?

* Yes
* No

1. Do you buy alcohol there or do you take it with you?

* Buy it there
* Take it with me
* Both
* Not Applicable

Please specify the reason

1. Do you think it is necessary to drink at these events or not?

* Yes
* No

Please give reasons for your answer

1. To what extent does alcohol affect how you view the event? *For example – does drunken behaviour put you off attending the Major?*
2. What do you think some of the biggest issues are with alcohol at these events? *(e.g. disorderly behaviour, litter, community disruption etc.)*
3. Which of these definitions do you feel best fits the Scottish drinking culture?

* Wet – alcohol is integrated into daily life and activities (e.g., is consumed with meals) and is widely available and accessible. In these cultures, abstinence rates are low, and wine is largely the beverage of choice
* Dry – alcohol consumption is not as common during everyday activities (e.g., it is less frequently a part of meals) and access to alcohol is more restricted. Abstinence is more common, but when drinking occurs it is more likely to result in intoxication; moreover, wine consumption is less common
* Over permissive – a culture where attitudes to drinking and the behaviours which occur when drunk are accepted.
* Prescriptive – a culture where drinking is permitted but drunkenness is prohibited.
* Abstinent – a culture where alcohol and drunken behaviour is forbidden

1. Thank you for being a part of this study. Please use the comment box for any additional comments you may have.

## Appendix 3: Interview Questions for Event Organisers

1. How long have you been involved with organising this event?
2. Do you have a lot of community involvement with this event?
3. Are the community proud of this event?
4. What are some of the main concerns that the community have with this event?
5. Does the event cause a lot of disruption for the community?
6. My dissertation has a focus on alcohol at these events – do you think that alcohol is something that is managed well at this event?
7. Can you explain your alcohol strategy to me? (e.g. what measures are in place to prevent disorderly behaviour/over consumption/attendees bringing their own with them?)
8. Do you know if there is any direct impact of the event of people taking up piping and drumming?
9. Are there any other notable impacts that the event has on the community?
10. Thank you for your time, do you have any other comments?

## Appendix 4: Informed Consent Form

|  |
| --- |
| **Participant Information Sheet** |
| **Study aim:** An examination of the drinking culture of Scotland and how this impacts upon events, with a specific focus on major pipe band events.  I am inviting you to take part in this study for my research for my dissertation. This is voluntary, so before deciding if you would like to take part please read the following information.  **What is the purpose of this study?**  The purpose of this study is to gather information from competition attendees about alcohol at the Majors.  **Why have I been contacted?**  You have been contacted for this study as you have are actively involved in the pipe band community and are at least 18 years old. If you are not a playing member of a band, please do **not** answer this survey as you are not eligible for this study.  **Do I have to take part?**  No. You can choose to take part or not. If you do decide to take part, you will be asked to sign a consent form, but you are free to leave the study at any time.  Should you decide to leave the study, any data collected may remain in the study, but no further data will be collected |
|  |
| **Will my response be kept private?** Yes. This survey is completely anonymous and any information received will be stored securely in a locked room in a password protected file. This will be deleted after I have completed my dissertation.  **If I have a problem what happens?** If you have any issues, you can contact the researcher who will try to answer any questions. You can also contact Lynn Waterston, the researcher’s supervisor. As already mentioned, should you decide to leave the study, any data collected may remain in the study, but no further data will be collected. **Who will carry out this research?** Miss Amy Fenton who is an Undergraduate Festival and Events Management student at Edinburgh Napier University. My contact details are below:  The Business School, Edinburgh Napier University, Craiglockhart Campus, 219 Colinton Rd, Edinburgh EH14 1DJ  Email: 40167206@live.napier.ac.uk  Lynn Waterston: [l.waterston@napier.ac.uk](mailto:l.waterston@napier.ac.uk)   |  | | --- | | **Informed Consent Form** | | Welcome to this study for my dissertation. The aim of this study is to gather data in order to look at the drinking culture of Scotland and how this impacts upon events, with a specific focus on major pipe band events.  **Please answer all questions as honestly as possible.** This makes a huge difference to the reliability of the data collected. The whole survey should take roughly 10-15 minutes to fully complete. **Please be aware that due to the legal drinking in Scotland being 18, you must be at least 18 to take part in this study.**  Before we begin, I have to ask you to consent to taking part and check that you understand what you are agreeing to take part in. I’ll be asking questions around the following topics:   * The consumption of alcohol at the Majors * The issues associated with alcohol at the Majors * Your perception of alcohol at events * Scottish drinking culture   There’re no right or wrong answers, I am interested in your opinion! |  1. **I can confirm I have read & understood the participant information sheet for the following study.**   *Yes*   1. **I understand that participation is voluntary, and I am free to withdraw at any time.** |
| *Yes*   1. **I agree that should I withdraw, any data collected up until that point may be used in the study, but no further data will be collected.**   *Yes*   1. **I agree to take part in this study.**   *Yes* |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |