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Abstract

This is an ethnomusicological study of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, undertaken from 2010 to 2013. *Piobaireachd* is accepted as the classical music for the Highland bagpipe, arising out of ancient Scottish history. Current literature on *piobaireachd* presents the past as objective, historically accurate and sacrosanct, expressed in performance. However, this research argues that the past may also be a social construction arranged in, and influenced by, the present. It builds on the work of others in ethnomusicology, anthropology, and social sciences, theorising that *piobaireachd* should be explored within a contemporary and global cultural framework.

The methodology for this paper is informed by an ethnographic research design that employs in-depth interviews with culture bearers and participant observation, while also relying on insider understanding and extant literature. Thematic analysis of data induced an interpretive theoretical framework, which allowed for triangulation of findings, and the ensuing discussion. Central to this theory were three key themes, music as culture, authenticity, and localisation, which were explored in an accepted music-culture research model.

Chapters 1, 2 and 3 respectively offer introductory information and scene setting, a review of the relevant literature, and the research methodology employed. Chapters 4, 5 and 6, respectively provide discussion and results of data relative to an exploration of sound, material and visual culture, and social and cultural transmission. *Piobaireachd* in New Zealand was found to have some unique characteristics reflected in ‘authentic’ sounds and concepts that drive performance. Material and visual culture presented a number of distinct localised interpretations of authenticity in *piobaireachd*, ranging from the materials that produce sound, to attire and choreographed behaviour, to cultural symbols within performance contexts. The social and cultural transmission of *piobaireachd* offered clear indications of local influences on definitions of cultural authenticity, including authorities, transcultural interaction, and local history. Chapter 7 brings these findings together and offers conclusive interpretations of these outcomes.
The culture of piobaireachd in New Zealand is dynamic, subjective and constantly renegotiated by individuals and groups. It occurs within a milieu of complex social hierarchies, diverse overlapping communities, and temporal contradictions that centre on notions of authenticity, musicality and lineage. These findings contrast with participant beliefs and existing literature that suggest piobaireachd to be impartially, objectively, and universally defined and practiced. Authenticity is contested, negotiated and maintained through various cultural practices which are based around transmission, authorisation, and comparison - ultimately disseminated to the New Zealand piobaireachd community via a complex network of interaction. In such interactions objectivity meets subjectivity, past meets present, local meets global, and individual meets community.

Despite being previously defined as the continuation of historical lineages of Scottish culture, piobaireachd in New Zealand can be seen as a contemporary construction comprised of contested, debated, and accepted definitions of authentic culture, that are subjective and reflective of contemporary New Zealand. Such findings demonstrate a complexity when considering the past from the present, where the present is reflected in the past. Future research is recommended to comparatively analyse the qualities of piobaireachd and Highland bagpiping cultural practices within, between, through, and across varying local and temporal communities and contexts. This will help determine depth of contemporary local practices, and allow us to better understand piobaireachd today.
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Glossary

**Bag:** Component that stores air fed from the performer and supplies it to the sound pipes. For the Scottish Highland bagpipe, the bag is inflated from a mouthpiece and blowpipe, and air is supplied to the reeds by squeezing the bag against the body of the performer with one arm (Donaldson 2005, 3).

**Bagpipe:** A reeded woodwind instrument where a bag stores air fed from the performer, and supplies it to sounding pipes (Baines 1960, 12).

**Bronze Medal, Silver Medal, Gold Medal, Silver Chanter, Clasp:** Prizes offered at competitive performance festivals for winning performances in prestigious events. Pipers will also use these terms to refer to competitive performance festivals.

**Canntaireachd (‘singing’ ‘sing’):** Refers to the oral mnemonic, rehearsal, and communication of musical content for performers, in pedagogical interactions, through sung vocables (see Fatone 2010).

**Chanter:** The melodic sound pipe of the bagpipe (Baines 1960, 16-21). Also used colloquially to refer to the melodic sound pipe of the Scottish Highland bagpipe (pipe chanter), as well as the practice chanter (practice chanter), depending on context. Can be used to refer directly to the chanter sound, “the chanter’s a bit sharp”. See Donaldson (2005, illustration 1 and 2) for a picture and anatomy of the Scottish Highland bagpipe, and of the practice chanter.

**Crunluath:** A particular section in the later stages of certain tunes from the piobaireachd repertoire. The term ‘crunluath’ may also refer to a specific combination of grace notes combined into a particular type of ornament, the crunluath (see Cannon 1988, 35). The ornament is used throughout the section, thus a Crunluath (section) is full of crunluaths (ornaments). Pipers will colloquially refer to Crunluath and crunluath without explicitly delineating, however it is implied in context. Likewise Crunluath a mach (‘mach’) refers to both a section and an ornament too. As an ornament, the ‘a mach’ is a similar combination of grace notes to the standard crunluath. Where it is used, it is always the final section within performance of a tune (see Cannon 1988, 35, 59). Pipers will sometimes refer to the Crunluath a mach or their crunluath a mach ornaments as ‘machs’.

**Dithis:** A particular section in the early to middle stages of certain tunes from the piobaireachd repertoire.

**Doubling:** Name of a ‘variation’ or section of a particular tune from the piobaireachd repertoire (i.e. Doubling of the Ground, or Taorluath Doubling). The term ‘doubling’ is also used to describe a combination of grace notes, which combine to form an ornament comprised of several grace notes (i.e. “his doublings sounded good”, or “my E doublings are a little untidy”).

**Drone:** Sound pipe that produces the harmonic tone accompanying the sound of the chanter for certain bagpipes, including the Scottish Highland bagpipe (Baines 1960, 21-23). Used to
refer to one of the harmonic sound pipes of the Scottish Highland bagpipe (i.e. bass drone, tenor drone), while ‘drones’ is used in the plural sense. Can also be used to refer directly to the drone sound in a singular or plural sense, “the drones are off”, or “the bass drone is too loud”. See Donaldson (2005 illustration 1) for a picture and anatomy of the Scottish Highland bagpipe.

**Flashes**: Sock garters that hold the hose, and *sgian dubh*, in place just below the knee.

**Ground** (*‘Urlar’*): Name of the first section of any particular tune from the *piobaireachd* repertoire.

**Hose**: Knee length socks worn by pipers.

**Juniors** (*‘junior competitions’*): A small-scale competitive performance festival for lower ranked pipers.

**Nationals**: Colloquial term for the Royal New Zealand Pipe Band Championships, held annually. Not a major focus of this research (see Milosavljevic 2009).

**New Zealand Championships** (*‘NZ champs’*): Championship titles offered for specific competitive events. The New Zealand championship events are offered at different competitive festival on an annual basis.

**Oban, Argyllshire Gathering, Inverness, Northern Meeting, Skye, London, Glenfiddich, Braemar**: Names of competitive performance festivals in the UK often referred to by place name or association rather than by full festival title. These are considered the most revered performance contexts in the world (McKerrell 2005, 27).

**Piobaireachd** (*‘pibroch’ ‘ceòl mòr’ ‘big music’*): Commonly considered the classical music of the Scottish Highland bagpipe – although this definition is challenged throughout. It is distinct from ‘light music’, which encompasses military marches, dance tunes, and song airs. ‘Piobaireachd’ refers to a category of musical repertoire. ‘Piobaireachd’ is also a word to denote a single piece from the *piobaireachd* repertoire, and its use may be both plural and singular. Further, the term ‘piobaireachd’ is used by pipers to refer to a particular performance of a particular *piobaireachd* from the *piobaireachd* repertoire. Where used in this study, ‘*piobaireachd*’ is embedded within context.

**Pipe** (*‘Pipes’*): Colloquial word used to describe the bagpipes.

**Pipers’ brogues** (*‘brogues’*): Dress shoes with long laces that are tied around a piper’s calves.

**Practice**: A term synonymous with rehearsal, but is also a kind of self-learning where the performer memorises and refines their performance ability.

**Reed**: Component within the sound pipe that produces the accompanying sound as its tongue vibrates when air is forced over/through it. Used to refer to one of the reeds within each of the sound pipes, and therefore such terms as ‘*chanter reed’*, ‘*practice chanter reed’*, ‘*drone reed’*, ‘*bass drone reed’*, ‘*tenor drone reed’*, or simply ‘reed’, may be used. See Donaldson (2005 illustration 3 and 4) for pictures of reeds for the Scottish Highland bagpipe.
**Score** (‘manuscript’ ‘notation’): Refers to the coded symbols, in hand written copies, photocopies, published collections, or digital copies, which represent the repertoire of the bagpiper.

**Scottish Highland bagpipe** (‘Great Highland bagpipe’ ‘Great Highland warpipe’ ‘Highland bagpipe’ ‘piob mhor’): The most widely known of bagpipes (Cheape 1999, 10). This definition is from a very much Westernised perspective (see Baines 1960).

**Scottish Highland bagpiper** (‘Highland bagpiper’ ‘Highland piper’ ‘piper’): Refers to someone who is a performer on the Scottish Highland bagpipe.

**Scottish Highland bagpiping** (‘Highland bagpiping’ ‘Highland piping’ ‘piping’): Refers to the act of performing on the Highland bagpipe, and also argued throughout to be a musical culture.

**Sgian dubh**: A small ceremonial sock-knife worn by pipers.

**Solo bagpipe**: A singular Scottish Highland bagpipe. Also used to colloquially refer to the Scottish Highland bagpipe in competitive solo piping.

**Solo piper**: By definition, a singular Scottish Highland bagpiper. Also the colloquial name for a competitive solo Highland bagpiper.

**Solo piping**: By definition, the act of performing on the Scottish Highland bagpipe as an individual, as opposed to in an ensemble. Also the colloquial name for competitive solo Highland bagpipe performance.

**Sporran**: A pouch worn on the front of the kilt for storage.

**Taorluath**: A particular section in the middle to later stages of certain tunes from the piobaireachd repertoire. ‘Taorluath’ may also refer to a specific combination of grace notes combined into a particular type of ornament, the taorluath. The ornament is used throughout the section, thus a Taorluath (section) is full of taorluaths (ornaments) (see Cannon 1988, 35, 58). Pipers will colloquially refer to Taorluath and taorluath without explicitly delineating, however it is implied in context.

**The board**: Designated space/area where performers march, walk or stand during presentation of their musical performance. Often used colloquially by pipers to refer to the space where musical performances are presented competitively.

**Tune** (‘piece’): Also refers to a singular piece from any extant repertoire “she played a good tune”. Its use depends on context.

**Tuning** (‘tuned’ ‘tune’): Refers to the act of manipulating the dimensions and material properties of the instrument in order to acquire an ideal sound aesthetic (Cannon 1988, 14).

**Waipu, Wellington, Turakina, Hastings, Claidhmor, Christchurch, Dunedin**: As with the above, although these are major competitive performance festivals in New Zealand.

**Worlds**: Colloquial term for the World Pipe Band Championships, held annually in Glasgow. Not a major focus of this research.
Chapter 1 - Introduction

1.1 An Ethnographic Introduction: Three Scenarios

Scenario 1: The Common Room, St Andrews College, Christchurch, New Zealand, October 20\textsuperscript{th} 2012. The Highland Piping Society of Canterbury Silver Chanter Solo Piping Competitions.

Dissonant tones erupted from the instrument and filled the room. Then, in a rapid, smooth and well-practiced action, the performer tucked the bag under his arm, placed both hands on the chanter, following which the tones harmonised and sounded in unison. The piercing sound of the chanter emerged over the top of the drones as he finally achieved full instrumental function. Flickering his fingers up and down the chanter, and using various combinations of fingers covering and uncovering finger holes, he produced a brief and scintillating flourish of tones, in sequence, against the constant sound of the drones. Reaching up with his hand he began to tune the drones to the chanter, taking his time. While he was tuning, his posture remained upright, and his face expressed focus and attention to the job at hand. He walked, without any particular purpose or drive, casually around the extent of the board, placing a foot in front of the other occasionally, seemingly without any beat or cue. His tuning period took 2 minutes and 36 seconds, its end marked by holding and pausing on Low A for an extended period of time, the standard aural cue in piobaireachd performance for ‘I’m about to begin’.

Scenario 2: Outside the competition secretary’s tent, Lindisfarne College, Hastings, New Zealand, April 24\textsuperscript{th} 2011. The Hawkes Bay Highland Games Solo Piping Competitions.

Their performances over, the pipers congregated near the secretary’s tent in a manner that demonstrated both anxiety and intrigue from each individual. They stood there for nearly 15 minutes talking, laughing, complimenting, critiquing, comparing, and participating in other social interactions. The reports were delivered to the secretary, an act immediately noticed by the group, yet they presented an air of indifference and inconsequence to such an act. After several more minutes the secretary presented a sheet of paper with printed text and stuck it to a noticeboard placed immediately to the right of the tent. The group moved towards the
noticeboard as one in order to read the results for the New Zealand championship piobaireachd event for 2012.


The piper walked out on to the board, in front of an audience of some 50 people. As she walked towards the board the anticipation of her performance by the audience caused the sound of their interaction to cease, and the ambient noise within the performance arena fell to a deathly silence. Her footsteps made a distinctive woody ‘clop’ with each step as her brogues hit the floor, walking with an air of purpose and confidence. She crossed the board and extended her hand to the judges, sitting behind their desk, and was greeted with a handshake and a smile. Words were exchanged regarding the piobaireachd she was due to play. Turning to face the audience she looked resplendent in her attire, which included her black polished piper’s brogues and continued to her Glengarry bonnet. Her pipes on her shoulder, she began blowing into the bag and within a matter of seconds it was noticeably inflated. With a quick squeeze she engaged the instrument.

1.2 Piobaireachd Synopsis

The three scenarios above are formalised extracts from ethnographic field notes gathered from 2010 to 2013. These are accounts of participant observations that have focused on social and cultural interactions during musical performances of piobaireachd. They are included to generate intrigue and to offer the reader insight as to why piobaireachd within New Zealand has been the focus of such a detailed cultural investigation. They indicate a complexity and density of cultural custom and phenomena that are components of contemporary piobaireachd performance within New Zealand.

‘Piobaireachd’ (anglicised as ‘pibroch’) is a Gaelic term that translates literally to ‘pipering’, what pipers’ do, the act of piping (Donaldson 2000, 4). Cooke describes ‘piobaireachd’ as: “A term used since the 18th century to denote that part of the Highland bagpipe repertory known otherwise as ceòl mór (‘great music’) or a single item of that repertory” (Cooke n.d). ‘Ceòl mór’ is a term that translates literally to ‘big music’, which scholars have suggested is used by Gaelic speakers to denote a particular Highland bagpipe repertory that follows a
relatively strict musical form (Cannon 1988, 46). In this sense, ‘ceòl mór’ is distinct from ‘ceòl beag’, which translates literally to ‘small music’, and encompasses a different repertoire comprised of dance tunes, song airs and military marches (Cooke 1975-1976, 93). However, neither ‘ceòl mór’ nor ‘ceòl beag’ are terms commonly used by pipers today. Rather, ‘piobaireachd’ has come to replace ‘ceòl mór’ as a title for the ceòl mór repertoire, while ‘light music’ has come to replace ‘ceòl beag’ to describe that repertoire (Cooke 1975, 93; Cannon 1988, 46; Dickson 2005, 8; Donaldson 2005, 27). The origins of such a change appear to have been facilitated by organisations founded at the start of the 20th century that used ‘piobaireachd’ in their titles and who focused predominantly on the ceòl mór repertoire within their raison d'être (Cooke n.d). Thus ‘piobaireachd’ is synonymous with ‘pibroch’, with ‘ceòl mór’ and with ‘big music’, all of which are considered to refer to the same repertoire of music for the Highland bagpipe. In the piping community however ‘piobaireachd’ is the most accepted term to describe such music (Cannon 1988, 46).

In order to be consistent, this dissertation employs ‘piobaireachd’ as a term that encompasses ‘ceòl mór’, ‘pibroch’, and ‘big music’. ‘Piobaireachd’ is used by performers, and by scholars to refer to a style, category and genre of musical repertoire for the Highland bagpipe (described below). ‘Piobaireachd’ is also a word to denote a single piece from the piobaireachd repertoire, and its use may be both plural and singular. Pipers will also refer to a particular performance of a particular piobaireachd from the piobaireachd repertoire using the term ‘piobaireachd’. While such use of terms within this research could be problematic and confusing for the reader, this is precisely the type of role that ‘piobaireachd’ fulfils as a term for Highland pipers today. Where possible, use of ‘piobaireachd’ will be given as much explanation as possible, and supplemented at times with such terms as ‘repertoire’, ‘collection’, ‘score notation’, ‘tune’, ‘piece’, and ‘performance’. However, it need be noted that where it is used in this study, the definition of ‘piobaireachd’ will be embedded within context.

As a category, style, and genre of Highland bagpipe music, piobaireachd is defined (in academic discourse and in written sources instructing instrumental performance) as the ‘classical music of the Highland bagpipe’, based upon a ‘theme and variations structure’ (Donaldson 2000, 467; Donaldson 2005, 27; Dickson 2006 7-8; Cheape 2008, 3). Despite uncertain origins, piobaireachd is understood by scholars, and by an increasing number of cultural participants, as the original music performed on the Highland bagpipe (Cheape 1999, 62-73; Cheape 2008, 141-145). Further material regarding the origins of piobaireachd can be
found in Chapter 2, and the reader is also directed to Cheape (1999 and 2008), Donaldson (2000 and 2005), and Dickson (2006 and 2009) for further detail. These definitions are accepted and celebrated, positioning *piobaireachd* as older and by default, more original, traditional and authentic than light music. *Piobaireachd* is considered distinct, and different from light music and is treated by performers and authorities of *piobaireachd* accordingly (Cannon 1988, 45). In essence, this division is based on light music being music with a function, be it dancing, marching or singing. *Piobaireachd*, on the other hand, is by and large considered music to listen to and to admire (Cheape 1999, 17).

Today, *piobaireachd* and light music are the predominant categories of repertoire considered ‘traditional’ for the Highland bagpipe. This suggests a division between traditional repertoire and presumably modern repertoire. Various examples of ‘modern’ and ‘contemporary’ Highland piping exist, usually featuring instrumentation or musical content commonly found within other musics but not directly associated with the Scottish Highland origin. As it stands, a number of differing formats exist, including those considered ‘traditional’, ‘contemporary’ and ‘exotic’ (or their equivalent) by cultural insiders to Highland piping in New Zealand. Tagg attempts to explain that all music can be considered divided into three differing types: ‘art’, ‘popular’, and ‘traditional’ (Tagg 1982, 41). Such an attempt has met criticism and has not been applied to Highland piping in any comprehensive manner. *Piobaireachd* would be a difficult case study for Tagg’s (1982) categorisation, as it can arguably be considered both ‘art’ music and ‘traditional’ music, thus supporting Middleton’s (1990) criticism of attempts by others to categorise music universally.

There are two main arrangements of performers for Highland piping in New Zealand. The pipe band is an ensemble comprised of both Highland pipers and drummers and within New Zealand, pipe bands are the main vehicle for Highland bagpipe performance, with over 90 pipe bands nationwide representing more than 1,500 bagpipers (Milosavljevic 2009, 2). Also commonly seen are solo performers either busking in urban centres or at tourist sites, or performing for either civic or private ceremonies (Donaldson 2005, 1). Predominantly, the majority of piping heard in public, either through pipe bands or solo pipers, comprises light music (Cannon 1988, 46). Particularly well known examples of light music include ‘Amazing Grace’, ‘Scotland the Brave’, and ‘Flower of Scotland’, among many others. Such examples are commonplace items within a piper’s repertoire and can be regularly heard at funerals, weddings, civic parades, ANZAC day services, New Years Eve celebrations, and even large-scale sports events within New Zealand (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012, 40-41). Examples
are also commonly observed in mainstream media through televised news coverage and television shows, as well as major cinematic blockbuster movies such as ‘Brave Heart’.

*Piobaireachd*, on the other hand, is rarely heard within public or mainstream media, being obscure and conspicuous in its absence from the public sphere. It is almost exclusively performed by an elite minority of pipers to other pipers and to supporters of piping (Donaldson 2005, 2, 27). It is performed in events that are largely out of the public arena (Coleman 2003, 133), in spaces that are reserved for *piobaireachd* performance. The format of performance is often governed by competitive standards involving a density of custom outlined at the start of this chapter (Section 1.1). *Piobaireachd* is performed exclusively by solo Highland pipers, although examples of pipe bands performing *piobaireachd* do exist, notably Simon Fraser University Pipe Band performing ‘Fields of Gold’ (Simon Fraser University Pipe Band 2009). However, *piobaireachd* is arguably characterised by its ability to reflect the individual performer, as opposed to a pipe band, which represents the collective ensemble or group guided by the musical direction of the group’s leaders. As such, any ensemble performance of *piobaireachd* ceases to be considered ‘traditional’ and is automatically considered ‘contemporary’ or ‘exotic’ by authorities of *piobaireachd* performance. Thus *piobaireachd* is accepted as an enigmatic style of music: rarely heard by the public, exclusive to the Highland piping community, reserved for virtuoso individual performers, and considered the epitome of traditional, classical, and authentic Highland bagpiping.

There is a prevailing competitive arrangement to contemporary *piobaireachd* performances (Donaldson 2005, 20-27). This arose as a response to the Proscription Act (1746 to 1782), which discouraged many aspects of traditional Highland culture, following the failed Jacobite rebellion (Cannon 1988, 74; Cheape 1999, 70). The Highland Society of London was established in 1778 aiming to preserve traditional Highland culture, including piping, in order to rescue it from ‘oblivion’ (Dickson 2006, 7). The society set up annual competitions for solo Highland bagpipe performance as a means to promote such interests, the first of these being held in 1781 (Dickson 2006, 75). A large number of the pipers who competed at the early competitions had been performers, employed through the pre-Jacobite hereditary clan system (see Collinson 1975 and Donaldson 2000 for further information). Many of them were now in the service of military officers in Highland regiments in the British Army - the beginnings of what would later become the pipe band movement (Collinson 1975, 180). Such early competitions initially involved only *piobaireachd* events but, in time, came to include airs and
dancing tunes transferred from the folk tradition and military marches emergent within the increasingly active Highland regiments (Collinson 1975, 182; Donaldson 2000, 26). These competitions became integrated into the emerging Highland games movement of the mid 19th century. Highland games are institutional festivals for many local communities in Scotland, implicitly associated with the romanticisation of all things ‘Highland’ in Victorian Britain. These festivals featured displays of the ‘traditional’ customs of the Highlands prior to the Proscription Act, including solo piping competitions. By the late 19th century, Highland Games had become prominent attractions in local Scotland, attracting visitors from far afield, and important for local area tourism (MacInnes 1989; Donaldson 2005, 20, 24-25; Dickson 2006, 183; McCullough 2011). Such festivals and competitive piping have prevailed in Scotland and remain a widespread part of local community economy and cultural identity, particularly in the summer months. Competition has become the predominant context for formal *piobaireachd* performance in Scotland, drawing pipers from as far afield as North America, Australia and New Zealand (Cheape 1999, 74; McKerrell 2005, 27).

The above discussion has provided an overview of the definition of *piobaireachd* within academia and the Highland piping community in general. This provides the reader with context for understanding *piobaireachd* as the focus of this research. The following section provides a brief discussion offering the reader insight and background information regarding *piobaireachd* and contemporary New Zealand society. It includes a brief New Zealand history of Highland piping and *piobaireachd*, a foregrounding of *piobaireachd* competitions within New Zealand, as well as a discussion of where *piobaireachd* fits within New Zealand and the Highland piping community.

### 1.3 New Zealand Context

New Zealand has a history of Highland piping since the second voyage of Captain Cook to the South Pacific, when the Scottish Highland bagpipe was performed at Dusky Bay (now Dusky Sound) in April 1773 to apparently facilitate interaction between the ship’s crew and a group of resident Māori (Agnew 2001, 1). There is little known about what music was played in this interaction, and speculation regarding whether it included *piobaireachd* is beyond the purpose of this research.

In the early 1840s, Scottish migration to New Zealand began, with notable migrant settlements in Waipu, Turakina, Dunedin, and Invercargill (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012,
Despite such known settlement, Highland piping is seldom recorded in newspaper articles prior to the early 1860s (Wellington Independent 1848, 3). This may be due to a number of factors, including: (1) Highland pipers were not present, refuted by some (Coleman 1996); (2) Highland piping was not noteworthy, perhaps not as symbolic of Scottishness as it is today (Trevor-Roper 1983); (3) These communities were largely conservative Lowland Scottish Presbyterian who held Highland bagpipes in little regard, and therefore did not use them; and (4) records of Highland piping prior to 1863 may not have survived (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012, 43). The following discussion offers a brief historical overview of Highland piping within New Zealand, and is not an in-depth historical study of the foundation of piobaireachd.

Definitive records of Highland piping emerge in the 1860s after a more eclectic mix of Scots (including people from the highlands, lowlands, Presbyterians, Catholics, gold miners, missionaries and shepherds) began to arrive in New Zealand, largely driven by the discovery of gold in Central Otago in 1861 (Coleman 1996, 16). This altered the dynamic of many of the small utopian pioneering and very much religious communities (such as Dunedin) to become more poly-Scottish, particularly due to the influx of Scots and their descendants via Australia and America (Coleman 1996, 17). The first annual Highland Games were held in New Zealand in 1863 in Dunedin, and were soon followed by other such festivals both within Otago (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012, 43-44) and across New Zealand (Pearce 1976, 161). By 1864, these Scottish festivals had come to include competitive solo Highland piping within their events, with piobaireachd being a noted addition (Coleman 1996, 584). Here begins the known history of piobaireachd within New Zealand.

During the 19th century, communities of Scottish settlers were established across New Zealand particularly in rural areas (Condliffe 1957). The presence of Scots in these communities influenced Highland games becoming a regular community event, often associated with Agricultural and Pastoral festivals, firmly tying Scottish cultural identity to many rural communities (McKinnon 2012). The Highland games movement continued to develop, and festivals in New Zealand came to include not just events associated with Highland Scottish culture, such as competitive solo Highland piping, Highland dancing and ‘strongman’ events, they also included many other forms of community celebration, such as float parades, show queen competitions, and track and field events (Appendix 1a).

Organisation of track and field events came under the auspices of the newly established New Zealand Athletic Union in 1903 and Highland piping and dancing events were briefly
absorbed by this organisation as well. However, following the banning of a number of performers for ‘disciplinary’ reasons, pipers and dancers met and decided to form their own administrative organisation, the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand. Formed in 1908, this organisation continues to provide administration for solo Highland piping competitions within New Zealand, including *piobaireachd* (Nicholson 1983, 7-8).

*Piobaireachd* has been a part of solo Highland piping in New Zealand since the early beginnings of the Highland games movement. Coleman (1996), and Milosavljevic and Johnson (2012), have shown that the result of such grassroots festivals for celebrating Scottish cultural identity fostered the development of Highland piping within various locales around New Zealand. Initially, Highland piping was restricted to Gaelic speaking Scots and their descendants. However, by the end of the 19th century, clusters of Highland pipers began to grow within specific communities, allowing for the establishment of New Zealand’s first civilian pipe band in Invercargill in 1896 (Milosavljevic 2009, 54). This provided a more open and less exclusive means for those who were not Gaelic speakers or descendants of Highland Scots to access and learn Highland piping. The result was a significant increase in the number of Highland pipers and a greater diversity in their ancestry and heritage, with transmission no longer exclusive and off-limits (Coleman 1996, 482; Weir 2002, 11).

Settlement of Scots in New Zealand continued throughout the 20th century, bringing to New Zealand several prize winning and revered pipers from Scotland, such as James Centre and George Yardley (Thompson and Ogilvie 2010, 12). In 1934, the first New Zealand piper travelled to Scotland to compete in Highland games and to receive instruction. Following the Second World War other New Zealand pipers followed suit, namely Neville McKay, Ian McKay, Lewis Turrell, and Allan Dodd, the latter two achieving some success in competition in Scotland (Thompson and Ogilvie 2010, 22). On return to New Zealand, the McKay brothers subsequently established the New Zealand Piobaireachd Society. Now known as Comunn na Piobaireachd, this organisation provides a social framework for the fostering and development of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand (Thompson and Ogilvie 2010, 23).

Today, it is understood, within New Zealand, that *piobaireachd* performers from New Zealand are of quality. This stems from a competitive structure to Highland piping in New Zealand which dates back to the establishment of local Highland games in the mid 19th century, as well a history of New Zealand pipers travelling to compete in *piobaireachd* competitions in Scotland and meeting with considerable success (Coleman 2003, 152;
Thomson and Ogilvie 2010; see Table 6.1). Particular pipers of note include Allan Dodd, Lewis Turrell, John Hanning, Donald Bain, Murray Henderson, Greg Wilson, and Richard Hawke. Such individuals have been venerated as authorities regarding *piobaireachd* performance internationally (at least from a New Zealand pipers point of view). Their accessibility and influence within New Zealand, through organisations such as Scottish, Highland, and Caledonian Societies, the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, and Comunn na Piobaireachd, are well celebrated today as being integral to the growth and development of *piobaireachd* nationally. While these national organisations are vital for maintaining international standards, ultimately, responsibility for Highland piping culture appears to rest with local community organisations (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012).

The growth of Highland piping within New Zealand has thus involved *piobaireachd* from its origins in the mid 19th century. Today *piobaireachd* is a significant part of solo Highland piping in New Zealand, common at junior solo piping competitions, regional solo piping championships, and solo piping recitals. However, outside of solo piping, *piobaireachd* is relatively unknown, treated as peripheral by many Highland pipers and cultural participants who are not interested in competitive solo performance and generally unknown in wider society (Coleman 2003, 133). In New Zealand, *piobaireachd* is widely understood within the Highland bagpiping community as the original, classical and traditional music for the instrument, and as music that embodies an ancient heritage, lineage and history for Highland piping.

Highland piping has been shown to be a part of New Zealand’s cultural climate today, often seen at parades and civic ceremonies. It predominantly entails performances that are considered traditional forms. By definition, Highland piping in New Zealand can be treated as a culture with solo piping, pipe bands and other performer arrangements considered as subcultures of Highland piping, each with their own customs and boundaries for performance (Hebdige 1979, 1-4; Hirsch *et al.* 1988, 396).
Table 1.1 Typical arrangements of Highland bagpipe use in New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scottish Highland bagpiping in New Zealand</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Solo piping</td>
<td>Pipe bands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g. Busking, competitive solo performance, Highland dancing, funeral, wedding, welcoming ceremony</td>
<td>E.g. ANZAC Day parade, graduation parades, Christmas parade, protest marches, rugby game, festival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern styles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g. Rock bands, popular music, folk music, ‘hybrid’ styles.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a subculture of Highland piping, solo piping includes performances of light music, *piobaireachd*, and on rare occasions some less ‘traditional’ Highland bagpipe music such as Breton music (Paterson 2009, 241). In this manner solo piping can be considered made up of differing styles of music.

Table 1.2 Styles of music for solo piping in New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Solo Piping in New Zealand</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Piobaireachd</strong></td>
<td><strong>Light music</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g. ‘His Fathers Lament for Donald Ban MacKenzie’</td>
<td>E.g. ‘Susan McLeod’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modern styles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.g. ‘Busindre Reel’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we can see that *piobaireachd* exists within a complex cultural framework embedded within the subculture of solo piping, itself a part of the culture of Scottish Highland bagpiping. *Piobaireachd* is understood by the Highland piping community in New Zealand as a traditional style of music for the Highland bagpipe, an understanding that stems from a variety of factors. Music historians define *piobaireachd* as the traditional, original, and classical style of Highland bagpipe music (Dickson 2006, 7). Musicologists identify *piobaireachd* as being based upon a theme and variations type structure, in an extended and complex form (Cannon 1988, 55-67). It is accepted that *piobaireachd* performers are also performers of other styles of solo Highland bagpipe music, as well as other arrangements of Highland pipers such as pipe bands (Milosavljevic 2009, 42). *Piobaireachd* is considered but a small part of the total Highland bagpipe repertoire, accepted as the purest, rarest, and most authentic form of Highland bagpipe music available today (Cannon 1988, 46).

1.4 Further Investigation

A number of problematic areas that require further investigation have been identified during these preliminary discussions. While scholars have defined *piobaireachd* in historical and
musicological terms, widely accepted as accurate, they do little to explain *piobaireachd* in cultural terms (as outlined in Section 1.1). Such limited definitions are used extensively, often in an ad-hoc manner, with little discussion of their meaning. These definitions appear to provide vague description of *piobaireachd* from a phenomenological view. For example, the sounds that cultural participants make, the behaviour that make those sounds, and the concepts behind such behaviour and sounds are unexplored. Terms such as ‘traditional’, ‘classical’, and ‘original’ are considered embodied within *piobaireachd*, yet the properties of this embodiment are elusive. Other terms such as ‘theme and variation’, ‘extended and complex form’, and ‘binary and tertiary’ are employed for musicological description. However, they do not describe the meaning or content of *piobaireachd* in a manner that details the behaviour or actions of performers, or cultural participants. Since solo piping can be considered a subculture of Highland piping, it also theoretically possible that *piobaireachd* can be considered a subculture of solo piping. This may go some way to understanding *piobaireachd* beyond history and musicology, focusing on a more ethnocentric viewpoint.

Based on this argument, this study attempts to describe *piobaireachd* within New Zealand today, from a cultural insider’s point of view.

Beyond exploring *piobaireachd* as a subculture of solo piping, there has been little discussion as to how *piobaireachd* comes to be a part of contemporary society. *Piobaireachd* has been a stable part of Highland piping culture within New Zealand since it first emerged in the mid 19th century. At no point, however, does there appear to have been a role for *piobaireachd* within wider society. Although organisers of *piobaireachd* events do not explicitly attempt to make performances exclusive, the only participants who are present generally appear to be other Highland bagpipers and their supporters, and thus there appears to be no public following. The purpose of *piobaireachd*, and the forces that have not only brought it to New Zealand, but have also maintained and fostered its continued existence throughout the history of Highland piping in New Zealand, are unaccounted for. Significantly, while there is a body of work concerning Highland piping socially and historically, there has been little exploration of *piobaireachd* in a cultural or contemporary sense. Thus this research will also investigate the importance, role, and purpose of *piobaireachd* as a potential subculture of solo piping, and as a current ‘traditional’ music in contemporary New Zealand society.

Furthermore, terms such as ‘traditional’, ‘classical’, ‘original’, ‘heritage’, ‘lineage’, ‘authentic’, and ‘history’ are frequently used to refer to, and define, *piobaireachd*. Such terms strongly invoke and imply a manifestation of the past embodied within the present for
piobaireachd within New Zealand. As little research has focused on the contemporary cultural practices associated with piobaireachd, how such concepts about the past are arranged within the present is unexplored and requires further consideration. In particular how historical understandings about piobaireachd are celebrated, enacted, manifested, and demonstrated in contemporary and modern performance, and from where such understandings are informed and influenced, is a primary concern. For example, the boundaries of ‘piobaireachd’ within New Zealand are expected to revolve around notions of custom, tradition, and authenticity, all of which are likely to be informed by the cultural past. Such references to the past could include: wearing a ‘traditional’ kilt, displaying ‘established’ performance behaviour, playing tunes that are known to commemorate an ‘historical’ event, ownership and use of ‘antique’ instruments, referring to piobaireachd as a ‘classical’ music, demonstrating belonging to a ‘lineage’ of knowledge, understanding how a tune should be performed as established by ‘precedent’, and demonstrating ‘authentic’ sound. How the past is a part of the present, and how the present celebrates the past is unknown and unexplored. Therefore, this research will also consider the relationship between the cultural past and the cultural present for piobaireachd in New Zealand.

Although there is a strong body of existing research concerning the history and musicological definition of piobaireachd within Scotland, little material has regarded piobaireachd outside of Scotland in any serious light. Piobaireachd emerged in New Zealand some 150 years ago, brought by immigrant Scots who came seeking opportunities, adventure, and freedom, and perhaps a better way of life. These settler Scots brought with them Highland piping culture as they would have practiced at the time. This culture was not only passed on to their descendants, they also passed Highland piping and piobaireachd on to other subsequent generations of New Zealanders (Coleman 1996). However, given the vast geographic separation between New Zealand and Scotland, given the differences in Scottish and New Zealand societies in the past and at present, given the known variety of cultural influences within New Zealand, and given that cultural divergence is a known factor for musical culture in isolation, whether piobaireachd in New Zealand is reflective and representative of New Zealand remains unknown. There appears to be little research focusing on piobaireachd or Highland piping outside of Scotland, and any focus has not included discussion of contemporary cultural practices from the time of research. Therefore, this study will explore the localisation of piobaireachd within New Zealand in present Highland piping culture. At the same time it will also consider the contemporary relationship between piobaireachd within Scotland and New Zealand. This will necessarily involve an exploration of both
connection and disconnection in relation to social boundaries. Such a focus will act as a case study for piobaireachd in other international locations.

Each of these four major concerns are interrelated and interwoven, threaded amongst each other, where the contemporary culture of piobaireachd within New Zealand ties them all together and becomes the primary focus. This requires understanding of the definition, the role, the cultural past, and the potential localisation of piobaireachd within New Zealand today.

1.5 Thesis Structure

In the following chapter, a review of literature relative to these topics will be presented in order to establish what previous research has been conducted, and how this may, or may not, address these concerns. This in turn will further inform the direction of this research. The literature review (Chapter 2) will narrow the focus into research questions, derived from these preliminary observations and concerns. The generation of such questions will determine the overall direction of this research, and an appropriate methodology to meet and explore this is presented in Chapter 3. This methodology will use an accepted research design in the field of ethnomusicology, informed by academic discourse, and includes the development of a theoretical construct to provide the framework for a cultural consideration of contemporary piobaireachd within New Zealand. This methodology will require three analytical chapters (Chapter 4, 5 and 6) where data, analysis, results, and discussions are presented relative to the research focus. The research is completed by presentation of an overall conclusion (Chapter 7) that addresses the issues raised in Chapters 1, 2 and 3, and explored in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Appendices offer relevant materials that, although essential for confirmation and transparency of findings, are not required in the main body of this thesis. Such a thesis structure developed following the induction of an investigative theory to consider this research (see Subsection 3.1.7 below). The reader is referred to the Table of Contents for further clarity.
Chapter 2 - Literature Review

This chapter reviews the relevant literature related to this research topic to determine whether the issues identified in Chapter 1 can be addressed through the previous work of others. This review also contributes to scholarship on Scottish studies, cultural studies and ethnomusicological thought in this field. It builds upon the content offered in Chapter 1 and seeks to comprehend and contextualise the research concerns within academic discourse. The primary aim of this review is to better understand and clearly identify the limitations of literature (and knowledge) regarding *piobaireachd*, and to help determine research questions and direction for this thesis. The main body of the review is contained in Sections 2.1 to 2.3.

### 2.1 *Piobaireachd* in New Zealand

Despite an exhaustive review of publicly available bibliographic resources, no literature was found that specifically investigated *piobaireachd* within New Zealand culturally. A small number of books, theses, articles, and publicly available documents do, however, dedicate some discussion within their contents to *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. These are explored and discussed below.

In 1996, Coleman focused on the transmigration of the Highland bagpipe to the lower South Island of New Zealand, and the transmission of its use between individuals and generations of performers. As a natural part of her work, Coleman included discussion of the changing social conditions within New Zealand that lead to the establishment of pockets of Highland pipers. These developed from the Scots who settled in New Zealand in the 19th century and who ultimately influenced the emergence of a culture of Highland bagpiping within local communities. Coleman showed how Highland piping was practiced by, and exclusively passed on, by Gaelic speaking Scots and their descendants during this time. She also described the formation of the Southern Hemisphere’s first civilian pipe band in Invercargill in 1896 which brought in a new era for Highland piping in New Zealand, where access to pedagogy was more available, and an increasingly diverse mix of people, from a variety of cultural origins, became involved in Highland bagpipe culture. The need for pipe bands to grow and, to recruit and foster performers was the primary driver for such expansion.
Coleman’s (1996) focus is on social changes to transmission for Highland bagpiping, and she examines in particular the period from 1840 until 1940. Her thesis was the first to draw attention to Highland bagpiping in New Zealand as an academic focus. This research was greatly aided by a data gathering approach, which was reliant upon insider knowledge, an enviable network of contacts and informants, and an ability to negotiate the complexity of kinship relationships within the history of Highland piping families in New Zealand. Ultimately, her work showed that Highland piping within New Zealand was affected by societal changes, establishing a firm link between New Zealand society and Highland piping.

*Piobaireachd*, while not a primary focus of Coleman’s research, was included within her discussion of Highland piping, and for this, credit and acknowledgement are given. She neither set out to broach *piobaireachd*, nor deliberately avoided discussing it, instead naturally including it within her work as a central component of Highland bagpiping in New Zealand. Coleman (1996), however, provides little discussion of the cultural content of *piobaireachd* or Highland piping: whether sounds that performers make, clothing that performers wear, or the manner in which performance and culture is adopted, passed, and retained within New Zealand. Furthermore, she does not provide a discussion of the relevance of her findings to the contemporary culture of Highland piping in New Zealand at the time of her research. This limits the usefulness of such work for the current discussion.

However, Coleman’s (1996) extensive data collection is accessible within the appendices of her thesis. These appendices contain records of Highland piping events including the festival, the performer, as well as the tune being performed. A number of these records are from the mid 19th century, and match the emergence of Highland piping within New Zealand. Many of these records include *piobaireachd* as a small part of the performance repertoire, as well as light music. This database, conveniently categorised for access and consideration, has been invaluable to this research, as will become evident.

Coleman (2003) also published ‘*Ceòl Mòr* of the South: Theme and variations on an immigrant music culture’. Here she explores the changing nature of Highland bagpiping transmission within New Zealand as presented in her thesis. Although ‘*Ceòl Mòr*’ is a part of this chapter’s title, *piobaireachd* is primarily employed to provide a structural framework for delivering the logic of her presentation. Essentially, artistic license frames this work within the accepted musicological structure of *piobaireachd* (e.g. ‘theme and variations’). This is
not, however, a cultural investigation of *piobaireachd*. In illustrating changes in transmission for Highland bagpiping and in acknowledging the success of a number of New Zealand pipers in Scotland, Coleman implies a distinct New Zealand bagpiping and *piobaireachd* identity. Yet despite such a bold claim, she offers little further cultural interpretation of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand.

Milosavljevic and Johnson (2012) explore the role of organisations for the development, maintenance and current state (at the time of publication) of Highland bagpiping within Otago, New Zealand. Their article focuses on an analysis of the historical and continued influence of local, national and international organisations over Highland piping within Otago, as a case study for Highland piping communities within New Zealand and elsewhere. Grounded in ethnomusicology, they present a discussion of agencies contributing to Highland piping culture within a local community in New Zealand, contextualised within a contemporary framework that shows the findings of their work relevant to the culture of Highland piping today. Their investigation primarily relies on data available in collected and collated historical documents, organisational histories, newspaper articles, and document archives.

Similar to Coleman (1996), Milosavljevic and Johnson (2012) establish a strong link between Highland piping and New Zealand society, predominantly facilitated through local organisations that lay the foundation for Highland piping culture today. They demonstrate that national organisations were significant in the administration of cultural events within New Zealand, international organisations were significant in their influence over contemporary performance, and yet it was local voluntary organisations that provided the structure and support to deliver homogeneity and quality of Highland bagpiping within New Zealand. Their work not only suggests a strong link to New Zealand society for Highland piping, it also suggests localisation in the definition, boundaries, and histories of Highland bagpiping in New Zealand.

While Milosavljevic and Johnson (2012) do not deliberately exclude *piobaireachd* from discussion, their focus is on Highland bagpiping on the whole, and only a cursory mention of *piobaireachd* is made in this article. Their brief discussion primarily focuses on the role of Comunn na Piobaireachd as an organisation for the development, fostering and growth of *piobaireachd* performance in Otago, as well as in other regions of New Zealand. Other than this, Milosavljevic and Johnson (2012) offer little further discussion of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand.
Zealand. However, their discussion of the importance of organisations as major factors that have influenced the historical and contemporary culture of Highland piping in Otago, and (as a result) New Zealand, does provide several useful precedents. Predominantly these include a methodology for the consideration of Highland bagpiping in cultural terms, a focus on the relationship between wider society and Highland bagpipe culture in the present, and the potential localisation of Highland bagpiping culture to, and within, New Zealand.

Milosavljevic’s (2009) ethnography of the Royal New Zealand Pipe Band Championships held in Auckland in 2008 shows another side of piping in New Zealand, and helps show the background to the current research. This thesis centres on the contemporary culture of pipe bands within New Zealand, seeking to establish whether pipe bands represent and reflect New Zealand in their cultural practices, observed in the context of the national pipe band championships. He makes limited discussion of piobaireachd however, establishing that pipe band repertoire is restricted to light music or contemporary styles, and that solo piping and pipe bands are distinctive subcultures of Highland piping in New Zealand (Milosavljevic 2009, 42).

Milosavljevic (2009) indicates an intrinsic link between pipe bands and the communities they come from, exist within, and perform for. He shows that local, regional, and national cultural identities are evident and presented through the activities and presence of pipe bands in New Zealand. Identifying clear and evident localisation of pipe bands to a New Zealand context, he establishes that Highland piping can reflect the various local contexts it exists within. On the one hand, this may appear immediately applicable to piobaireachd within New Zealand as a part of Highland piping culture. However, Milosavljevic’s finding is reliant on a place for pipe bands within the wider community and society, a feature that piobaireachd arguably does not appear to have. Many of the cultural practices of pipe bands in New Zealand cross over to piobaireachd due to a number of shared cultural traits, and therefore at times, this will be useful for explanation of piobaireachd. Milosavljevic (2009) will also be of some limited use for drawing parallels between piobaireachd and pipe bands, as a part of Highland piping in New Zealand today.

While these exist as examples of academic studies applying thorough methodology and challenging theory in their content, a number of other publications also exist that are significant and important for any cultural study of piobaireachd within New Zealand. The ‘Jubilee History’ of the Highland Piping Society of Canterbury (Thompson and Ogilvie 2010)
is of particular importance. The authors, on behalf of the society, provide a brief yet well-written and accessible organisational history. This book particularly focuses on biographical information and previous events that have affected the current state of the Highland Piping Society of Canterbury. As well as this, significant cultural background information is provided, establishing the content of Highland piping culture and its influences for Canterbury, but also many of which extend and can be applied to Highland piping in New Zealand. The authors offer a balance of musical, social, cultural and political history, which is rare in items of this nature, and for this they need be commended.

While *piobaireachd* is not a primary focus, Thompson and Ogilvie (2010) are a particularly useful resource for historical information. They present a strong collection of biographies for past and present cultural participants of note for Highland piping in Canterbury. Many of these are hugely influential cultural figures for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand today. They also make frequent reference to a relationship between Highland piping in Scotland and New Zealand beginning in 1862, enacted through individuals and organisations. Further, they contextualise *piobaireachd* within solo piping and Highland bagpiping (albeit in musicological terms) and provide some discussion of the cultural history of *piobaireachd* in the form of tunes performed, venues for performance, organisations arranging performances, audience participation in performances, and reception of performances within context.

A similar publication to Thompson and Ogilvie (2010) is Nicholson (1983) who presents a history of the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand. Here, an overview of organisational history for this association is offered. However, Nicholson chooses to focus more on the political history of this group, and offers only limited social and cultural history of Highland piping in New Zealand. Yet, given that they are arguably the most influential piping organisation in New Zealand, maintain administrative control over competitive solo piping performance, and are central to *piobaireachd* performance, this manuscript has some value. Of note is the early history of the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, and the role that this group played in organising for leading pipers to settle within, and visit New Zealand in the early 20th century. This organisation has been significantly influential for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand since 1908, and thus will provide useful information for a cultural study of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. For the current study however, Nicholson offers little practical discussion of *piobaireachd*, and therefore is only acknowledged and resourced sparingly.
Other, similar histories of Highland piping in New Zealand exist, namely Thomas (1953) and Weir (2002). Their texts and their discussions however are limited to pipe bands, and while crossovers do exist between pipe bands and *piobaireachd* the contents of these works are limited for the current study. In this regard they match Nicholson (1983) to a degree, particularly where there is a predominant focus on organisational and political history, often featuring records and discussion of committee membership and group leadership, with no discussion of the culture or community that these organisations administer and exist within.

On a somewhat divergent topic, nonetheless related to *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, Grant (2013) examines and discusses the history of ladies pipe bands from a gender critical point of view. This thesis identifies gender discrimination that occurred within the Highland piping community within New Zealand where women were not allowed to perform, and where they were treated as a novelty rather than a serious and accepted part of mainstream Highland piping culture. She shows that these issues continued within the Highland piping community long after they began to be settled in mainstream society. However, Grant (2013) does not focus on *piobaireachd* or solo piping, and similar to Milosavljevic (2009) chooses to analyse the better known, more public, and more accessible pipe band component of Highland bagpiping in New Zealand.

While these works have contributed to the study of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, they all fall short of explicitly exploring *piobaireachd* at the time of research in cultural terms. Little is understood regarding what *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand entails aside from the embodiment of the cultural past and a theme and variations structure (along with other historical and musicological definitions). For example where *piobaireachd* is performed, to whom and for what purpose, and the sounds and spectacles of such performances are unknown, yet assumed to be similar to that for Highland piping culture in general. However, the items mentioned above have indicated that *piobaireachd* is distinct from light music and that solo piping is distinct from pipe bands in New Zealand. There is a contradiction in the discussion of *piobaireachd* where it is treated as but another part of Highland piping culture perhaps unworthy of focused exploration, yet it is also recognised as holding a special place within Highland piping culture. Having explored literature that discusses *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, focus now turns towards works that consider *piobaireachd* and Highland piping from a more Scottish-centred point of view, as well as from the perspective of other nations.
2.2 *Piobaireachd* beyond New Zealand

There is a considerable body of literature on Highland piping that predominantly focuses on repertoire, history, musicology, and organology. While a number include some discussion on *piobaireachd*, the majority focus on Highland piping as a musical tradition. Those that explicitly focus on *piobaireachd* are few with the majority being Scottish centred. These form the focus of the initial discussion of this section.

Collected, collated, and printed score manuscript collections of Highland bagpipe music have been published since 1784 when MacDonald’s ‘A Collection of Highland Vocal Airs’ was produced. These have often included description and discussion of the history of the Highland bagpipe instrument, its music, and describe how both should be performed relative to the presented musical repertoire. Manuscript collections that appear to be the most widely dispersed and referenced include those of MacDonald (1803), MacDonald (1822), MacLeod (1828), MacKay (1838), Ross (1869), Glen (1876), Glen (1880), Thomason (1896), Logan and Company (1901), The Piobaireachd Society (1904), Campbell (1909), The Piobaireachd Society (1925), Campbell (1948), MacNeill and Pearston (1953), MacLeod (1954), The Scots Guards (1954), and Ross (1959).

As perhaps the best known and most influential of these, The Piobaireachd Society (1925) is worth discussing. This collection is by and large considered the *piobaireachd* performer’s ‘bible’ due to the extent of its coverage of the known *piobaireachd* repertoire. Its content offers the reader “Tunes edited by Comunn na Piobaireachd (The Piobaireachd Society [Scotland]) in staff and CANNTAIREACHD notations with a Preface and Explanatory Notes” (The Piobaireachd Society 1985, i). Within this collection a cursory discussion of other manuscript collections and their compilers is provided, and the notation and setting of tunes is briefly considered (The Piobaireachd Society 1985, ii-v). Generally however the majority of the content is score manuscript notation, with inconsistent and brief editorial discussions regarding the historical background of specific tunes.

This interpretation is consistent with many of the score collections reviewed and interpreted for the present study. Others provide a limited history of *piobaireachd* in Scotland as preface to a collection of *piobaireachd* scores (Ross 1959, 2-5) as well as taxonomy for the classification of *piobaireachd* repertoire in musicological terms (Campbell 1948, 13-19). Despite this information, these manuscript collections offer inconsistent and brief histories of *piobaireachd* that are of little value to the present study. This likely reflects the intent of
publishers, to distribute these collections to piping enthusiasts whose interest in piobaireachd is likely to be sated by such information. Much of their material, however, is confusing and contradictory to the researcher, and appears to be based upon a series of romanticised folk tales, editorial stories, and hearsay, accepted by authors and editors in the 19th century and inspiring the continuation of this legacy into the 20th (Blankenhorn 1978).

This point of view is primarily a result of the investigations of others who have critically appraised and interpreted this material in the context of known Scottish history. The first to approach the history of piobaireachd from a more scientific and critical standpoint, and beyond simply providing a collection of repertoire, was Grant (1915). Grant’s strength lay in his insider interpretation of piobaireachd through the application of a structure that questioned the history of Highland piping in Scotland. In this sense he challenged previous research and widely held concepts of the history of piobaireachd and Highland piping and provided a refreshing insider account of Highland bagpipe culture. Grant focused on the historical and the musicological elements of piobaireachd as understood and practiced at the time of research, content that had not been presented in any earlier published works. He dedicated the entire manuscript to exploring piobaireachd as a distinct aspect of Highland piping. While little of Grant’s (1915) work is immediately informative for a contemporary cultural study of piobaireachd in New Zealand, it does bear discussion as a crucial foundation piece for an academic discourse regarding piobaireachd.

Little else appears to have been published until the emergence of Highland bagpipe scholars from the ‘Edinburgh School’ in the mid twentieth century (Dickson 2009a, 1). Perhaps they were sparked by Baines’ (1960) seminal work, simply titled ‘Bagpipes’ which provides a present (at the time of publication) map of the distribution of the bagpipe within and across Eurasia and Northern Africa, and which offers a ground breaking organological taxonomy of bagpipes of the world (Baines 1960).

Lorimer’s ‘Studies in Pibroch I’ was published in the periodical ‘Scottish Studies’ (Lorimer 1962) and established a precedent for the scholarly exploration of the ‘mysterious’ phenomenon that is piobaireachd (Cannon 1995, 6). Lorimer published a subsequent and similar article in 1964. In both articles he analyses the musical metre of piobaireachd by focusing on the compositional methods used by the suggested composers of individual tunes, taking care in his analysis of piobaireachd, and investigating piobaireachd in terms of bar, phrase, and tune structure. These articles question the existing and influential format of
piobaireachd manuscript, dominated by western notation styles found in all of the most widely dispersed piobaireachd manuscript collections. Lorimer (1962 and 1964) not only provide the first significant application of academic musicological analysis to piobaireachd, they also included significant discussion of history in a multidisciplinary approach, setting a precedent for future research.

Collinson (1966) closely followed, producing an anthology of national and traditional music of Scotland. More importantly he published a useful and logical discussion of the history and development of the Highland bagpipe from prehistory to the present (as it was known at the time). Here Collinson (1975) provided discussion of piobaireachd as a style of music synonymous with the emergence of the Highland bagpipe and charts Highland piping and piobaireachd alongside societal developments leading to the discussion of piping in the ‘present’.

Cooke (1972) proposed that the notation of piobaireachd is problematic, and shows that despite the best and most thorough efforts of the transcriber, there exist significant interpretive differences between differing transcriptions of the same tune. This is significant because it called for questions regarding the treatment of manuscript collections as gospel and brought to the fore the expression and interpretation which is synonymous with piobaireachd. Following the work of Lorimer, Collinson and Cooke, a number of other scholars of Highland piping emerged. Some examples of this scholarship include Blankenhorn (1978), Campsie (1980), Cannon (1980, 1988, and 2009), Chambers (1981), Haddow (1982), Cooke (1986), MacInnes (1988 and 2009), Buisman (1995), MacDonald (1995), McKay (1996), Brown (1998 and 2009), Cheape (1999; 2007 and 2009), Campbell (2001), McKerrell (2005 and 2009), McLellan (2007 and 2009), Forrest (2008), Dickson (2009a and 2009b), MacKenzie (2009), Paterson (2009), and Sanger (2009). While these are commendable studies in their own right, offering a variety of investigations of the Highland bagpipe and its use, a review of their contents determined that they offered minor relevance to a cultural analysis of piobaireachd within New Zealand and thus are reviewed no further. They are, however cited and embedded in the reference lists of this thesis, used to confirm or contradict findings in analytical chapters, and available as a citation for those who wish to explore them further.

Excluded from those mentioned above are a number of useful publications which require acknowledgement for the cultural study of piobaireachd in New Zealand. Cannon offers a brief literature review of piobaireachd related material in an attempt to summarise “...past,
present and future directions of research...” (Cannon 1995, 1) acknowledging a lack of information concerning cultural studies of *piobaireachd* (Cannon 1995, 7). Gibson (1998) focuses on social changes within Scotland that affected the course of history for the Highland bagpipe from 1745 to 1945, and maps out events which dramatically affected *piobaireachd* due to the lasting impact of significant social upheaval in the Scottish Highlands. Lastly, Dickson (2009) presents an edited volume that draws together an array of authors and topics with a focus on music, history and tradition. The reality however is that this publication does much more, it combines perhaps the most diverse methodological analyses of Highland bagpiping to date, indicating increasing scholarship regarding the consideration of the Highland bagpipe and *piobaireachd*, providing the strongest response to Cannon’s (1995) call for a greater cultural focus.

A further group of publications have been singled out for discussion here due to their relevance to the current study. Donaldson (2000) offers an historical guide to Highland bagpiping in Scotland, mapping its past alongside newspaper and manuscript material regarding the pipers of yesteryear, and the social and cultural developments that have influenced the Highland bagpipe in Scotland. Cheape (2008) describes the emergence of the Highland bagpipe alongside *piobaireachd* under patronage from medieval Highland society, declaring a link between the origins of *piobaireachd* and the Highland bagpipe, the earliest known performers of both, and wider Gaelic society. He ultimately argues that the highland bagpipe and *piobaireachd* were ‘grafted’ onto the earlier bardic traditions of poetry and song (Cheape 2008, 66). Both Donaldson (2000) and Cheape (2008) successfully contest the concept of ‘tradition’ for Highland piping (and therefore *piobaireachd*), exploring its link to changing social and cultural conditions in Scotland. Together, they suggest that ‘tradition’ for Highland piping is not faithful to an ancient and unwavering definition, rather, that ‘tradition’ has changed as the world in which it exists changes.

Donaldson (2005) provides an albeit brief, yet highly informative insiders ‘guide’ to Highland bagpipers which outlines many of the aural aspects of *piobaireachd* performance in lay terms that are easy to access and within a cultural overview discussion. He then moves on to describing the most highly influential Highland pipers (within Scotland) from the past century in accordance with their standing within the Highland piping community (in Scotland). This is a useful and supportive guide for many aspects of the aural practices of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, although it falls short of providing a discussion beyond sound and history.
Dickson (2006) is one of the few published ethnographies available that concerns Highland bagpiping, although the author himself calls it a ‘social history of piping’. Dickson focuses on Highland piping in South Uist from the early 17th century until the mid 19th century, employing an ethnographic approach to investigate the relationship between ‘traditional Gaelic’ and ‘mainstream community’ contexts of piping in order to understand why piping is the way it is (Dickson 2006, 2). In terms of piping, Dickson’s scope is much broader than just *piobaireachd*, where he focuses on biographical information acquired through interviews with tradition bearers. Yet his findings and discussion bears significant relation to *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. Dickson (2006) successfully illustrates insider perspectives to social history in South Uist and challenges cultural understandings of the past by opening a discussion of similar concerns to those raised in Chapter 1 of the current thesis.

McKerrell is an ethnomusicologist and an accomplished Highland bagpiper whose thesis focused on sound aesthetics for contemporary competitive solo pipers (McKerrell 2005). His article ‘Sound Performing: Sound Aesthetics among Competitive Pipers’ explores expressions of self through instrumental sound for performers on the bagpipe, and relates this to collective understandings of sound aesthetics practiced by Highland pipers today. McKerrell (2011a) very much focuses on a mixed methodological approach involving in particular acoustemology (acoustic knowledge) and ethnography. While this article offers limited discussion of *piobaireachd*, together with McKerell’s other works (2005, 2009, 2011b) it establishes a successful methodological approach for the analysis of contemporary Highland bagpiping culture. These works provide a useful foundation for any potential study of contemporary *piobaireachd* cultural practices within New Zealand.

Fatone (2010) offers an ethnomusicological analysis of *canntaireachd*, the vocable oral transmission of *piobaireachd* most frequently used in pedagogical interactions. Her focus is on the embodiment of sound through bodily movement, and vice versa, as observed in learning contexts for *piobaireachd*. She brings to light an understanding of very many obscure cultural practices in the form of aural and visual expression and intermodal imagery for the transmission of *piobaireachd* in contemporary Highland bagpipe culture. The strength of her work, as with McKerrell, is that she does this from the point of view of the cultural participant, engaging in transmission processes as an active party. This internal perspective of *piobaireachd* transmission has also identified unique cultural practices for *piobaireachd* as distinct from light music through cultural investigation, as opposed to musicological analysis.
Credit is given to the work of those cited above as being influential and providing significant
guidance for the consideration of *piobaireachd* in a contemporary sense, yet they do have a
number of limitations. All of these studies have considered *piobaireachd* as the classical
music (or similar) of the Highland bagpipe, without querying the definition of such terms.
How such a term as ‘classical’ is understood, applied, and embodied within *piobaireachd*
today is unexplored. Further, they all treat *piobaireachd* by and large as a form of music, with
all (excepting Fatone 2010) failing to acknowledge that compared to light music,*
*piobaireachd* has distinctly different cultural practices. Lastly, and perhaps the biggest
criticism, is that while these have provided a significant body of work regarding Highland
piping and *piobaireachd* within Scotland, they have largely ignored the globalisation of
Highland piping which has seen the bagpipe emerge on every inhabited continent, adopted by
a diversity of peoples, and functioning today within a multitude of cultural contexts
internationally. Their lack of acknowledgement of their Scottish-centred discussion of
Highland piping limits the relevance of their work to this research, and also limits the
accessibility and validity of their work to those who are concerned about Highland piping and
*piobaireachd* outside of Scotland.

A small number of manuscripts have focused on Highland piping internationally. Gibson’s
and Bone: A Survey of Immigrant Bagpipes and Regional Pipe-making in Nova Scotia, 1820-
1920’ are of particular note. Both offer in-depth scholarship regarding the history of Highland
piping in Canada, in particular Nova Scotia. Gibson identified the demise of dance tradition
within Scotland, yet the retention of that tradition within Nova Scotia, the localisation of
piping music in the form of musical repertoire, instrumental technique, and performance
tempo, and the emergence of a local cultural identity embedded within Highland bagpiping
(Gibson 2002, 299-300). Shears (2009) likewise provides a brief history of Highland bagpipe
manufacturing in Nova Scotia, establishing distinct and unique instruments made to a
divergent concept of ‘true’ Highland bagpipe organology from that which developed in
Scotland during the 18th and 19th centuries (Shears 2009, 69). Ultimately, both Gibson
(2002) and Shears (2009) determine that localisation of tradition, authority and authenticity
for Highland piping outside of Scotland allows for a more critical view of ‘sacrosanct’
Highland piping ‘tradition(s)’ within Scotland. *Piobaireachd* is not a major part of their
discussion. However, as an aspect of Highland piping culture today, and as a celebrated
‘survival story’ of Highland piping history, both authors imply *piobaireachd* to be a part of
such a critical transnational view, and open the door for further investigation of localisation of concepts of the cultural past. Both however, fail to comprehend the contemporary culture of Highland piping at the time of research, either within Nova Scotia or in Scotland.

Loten (1995) is a more obscure example of scholarship on Highland piping outside of Scotland. While this work is less known, it is an exceptional ethnomusicological analysis and critique of contemporary solo piping observed at Highland games in Maxville, Ontario, Canada. This work comprises a festival ethnography that analyses how cultural phenomena embody concepts of tradition for Highland pipers within a community outside of Scotland. Loten (1995) introduces the concept of Canadian Scottish piping, implying the emergence of a distinct North American Highland piping cultural identity. She establishes a clear link between concepts of ‘tradition’, social order, and individual interpretation, employing a mixed methods approach to data gathering and analysis that allows her to triangulate accurate and credible findings. Ultimately her focus is on aesthetics of sound, but in the process identifies that sound cannot be understood fully, void of cultural context. Loten (1995) offers perhaps the most refreshing example of academic work for the present study. Her treatment of Highland bagpiping and solo piping as musical culture, her focus on Highland piping culture outside of Scotland, and within a localised setting, her concern for contemporary performance as opposed to history, her search for cultural definitions rather than abstract musicological classifications, and her critical treatment of the cultural past embodied within the cultural present, are all exemplary.

Loten (1995) however still has limited application to a cultural study of piobaireachd within New Zealand as outlined in Chapter 1. This is due to her limited exploration of concepts of the cultural past within the cultural present, and the reverse role of the influence of cultural present on interpretations of the cultural past. She makes limited discussion of piobaireachd, choosing to relegate it to musicological and historical definition rather than cultural practice. Loten embraces the local culture of Highland piping demonstrated in her festival ethnography but does not contextualise her study within a global cultural framework. Lastly, her study focuses on Highland piping in Ontario, Canada, which is in many ways similar to Highland piping in New Zealand by being influenced and informed by migration, diaspora, and globalisation. Yet, these cultures are arguably different, particularly with regards to local cultural history, function, participation, custom, and organisation.
Ho Wai-Chung (2001) considered the role, function and development of Highland bagpiping in Hong Kong, tracking its local history through the changing socio-political landscape of Hong Kong from the establishment of British colonial rule in 1842 through to its handover to administration from China in 1997. He centred on the changing place of Highland piping and the changing role of Highland pipers within Hong Kong. Largely informed by qualitative data gathering, Ho Wai-Chung (2001) provides a simple yet valuable overview of a local cultural history of Highland piping. In this sense it illustrates the diversity of Highland bagpiping cultures in their traditions, customs, and practices which he argues are on the one hand true to Highland piping within Scotland, yet are at the same time divergent from it. Ho Wai-Chung serves as a justification for exploring cultures of Highland bagpiping in other parts of the Highland piping diaspora.

This section has explored the available literature relevant to the present study, in order to establish what has previously been written regarding piobaireachd external to a New Zealand context. While a wealth of other work has been identified relating to aspects of Highland bagpipe culture, few examples have dedicated their focus to exploring piobaireachd culturally, beyond accepted and perpetuated historical and musicological definitions. Few have included any discussion of Highland bagpiping in New Zealand, let alone piobaireachd in New Zealand, with the exception of McKerrell who provides a cursory suggestion of the influence and reverence for one particular style of piobaireachd that is a feature of New Zealand pipers (McKerrell 2009, 284). Few have also taken into account Highland bagpiping or piobaireachd beyond New Zealand and outside of Scotland, largely ignoring transnational cultures and perhaps erroneously assuming that Highland piping elsewhere is not worthy of mention. Few appear to have considered a focus on the current cultural content of Highland bagpiping, with some choosing to replicate and maintain essentially debunked myths surrounding the origin of the Highland bagpipe and piobaireachd. Others repeat well-established historical and musicological definitions of piobaireachd without consideration of those definitions and their meanings to culture. Hence there is a substantial lack of scholarship exploring piobaireachd as a cultural phenomenon in a present context. Despite this critical review, the world of piobaireachd owes a considerable debt to those scholars described above for the wealth of knowledge and current discourse on piobaireachd explored throughout this chapter. Without access to such previous works an understanding and critique of piobaireachd scholarship would not have been argued in such depth.
2.3 Scottish Culture and Diaspora

Finally an exploration of the literature beyond Highland bagpiping is provided below. This primarily concerns Scottish cultural diaspora as well studies of diaspora and music, in order to understand how the cultural past might play out in the cultural present for piobaireachd in New Zealand.

A number of recent studies have focused on the influence and activities of Scottish migrants within New Zealand. Excluding those mentioned above (Coleman 1996; Milosavljevic 2009; Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012; and Grant 2013) a small number hold some relevance for a cultural study of piobaireachd in New Zealand. ‘The Heather and the Fern: Scottish Migration and New Zealand Settlement’ (Brooking and Coleman 2003) is an edited volume of nine essays focusing on the history and contribution of Scottish migration to New Zealand. Yet more than this, these essays paint a different picture of the Scottish migrant than had previously been understood, contributing to a discussion of opportunistic, deliberate and elective migration as opposed to commonly held perceptions that immigration was the result of forced and necessary departure from Scotland. They also indicate a history of Scottish influence and culture within New Zealand that is unlike that of anywhere else, and is therefore unique and localised to New Zealand.

This point is supported by (MacKenzie and Patterson 2011) who argue against homogeneity of Scottish cultural identity in historical studies. They advise that research should go beyond the mundane assumption of homogeneity of global Scottish culture and suggest scholarship rather focus on the distinctive local heritage of Scots (and their culture) within their various realms, domains, and societies. MacKenzie and Patterson also contribute to this debate:

> Historians and social scientists should never become so obsessed with their own specialised patches that they do not recognise the essential need for comparative studies, comparative in terms of geographical regions, of different disciplines, and of a diversity of ethnicities. Those who concentrate on Britain itself must accept the fact that the British experience cannot be separated from the global incidence of these migrant and settlement patterns. Reciprocities and inter-connections represent the very essence of global history, as well as the essential clues to understanding the national experience within modern political boundaries (MacKenzie and Patterson 2011, 153).

While this is obviously aimed at previous scholarship of British experiences, the quote holds true for previous scholarship of Highland bagpiping. Many studies appear to focus on Highland bagpiping, its definition, its music, and its history within Scotland as representative of Highland piping in all its various and interpreted forms. They appear to ignore heterogeneous Highland piping history, heritage, and culture both within Scotland (as
Dickson 2006 illustrated) and internationally (Loten 1995; Milosavljevic 2009) and have analysed Highland piping as isolated, unaffected and plastic; rather than interconnected, dynamic and fluid. MacKenzie and Patterson (2011) provide a criticism of research on ‘Scottishness’ that appears to be transferable and applicable to scholarship regarding the Highland bagpipe, and which should encourage a more lateral approach to research on Highland piping within a contemporary and global context.

MacKenzie (2011) continues on his own in ‘Scots in New Zealand and Elsewhere in the British Empire: An International Perspective’ where he criticises academics who have acknowledged in passing the legacy of Scottish cultural influence for diverse and globalised aspects of (perceived) Scottishness, such as Highland games. He also illustrates the association of a number of aspects of Scottish culture (such as Highland piping) with the foundation, heritage, and ancestry of contemporary New Zealand society and that such practices bear symbolic national significance within New Zealand, and are also presented in representations of New Zealand abroad (MacKenzie 2011, 171). This exposes a failing of Highland piping literature in that existing scholarship has focused on the capacity (current and historical) of Highland piping to present internationally a demonstration of Scottish national identity, yet they have not been able to recognise, acknowledge or assess the way in which Highland piping is capable of demonstrating cultural identities external to Scottish national identity. New Zealand Highland bagpiping has previously been shown to be representative of New Zealand (Milosavljevic 2009) and the cultures and histories of Highland bagpiping around the world are potentially imbued with cultural interpretations of us (adoptee), and them (adopted).

‘Turakina's Highland Games: Maintaining a Gaelic Tradition?’ (Patterson 2012) articulates the Highland games movement in contemporary New Zealand society, offering a history of a Highland games festival, viewed through the critical lens of an academic approach. Patterson challenges what he calls the ‘purity’ of Highland games within New Zealand against that within Scotland, a comparative study that is interesting but perhaps limited in its analysis. Yet the most influential aspects of Patterson’s (2012) article include his discussion of manifestations of interpreted ‘Scottish Highland culture’ by initial pioneering settlers and by subsequent generations of New Zealand residents, and further, his acknowledgment of an interconnectedness between the current Highland Games in Turakina, and those within Scotland, facilitated through individual cultural participants. Patterson (2012) is important for a cultural study of piobaireachd in New Zealand as he illustrates how performances of solo
piping within competitive events at Highland games can become wrapped up in local (New Zealand) cultural heritage and identity. Others (Nicholson 1983; Coleman 1996; and Thompson and Ogilvie 2010) have demonstrated Highland games to have been, and continue to be, hugely influential for the emergence, development, and maintenance of solo piping, (and thus for piobaireachd) within New Zealand over the past 150 years.

Any further discussion of Scottish culture in New Zealand requires an understanding of links to ‘homeland’. Regardless of how ‘homeland’ is interpreted, cultural origins claimed by people can be explored through the concept of ‘diaspora’. Initially used as a concept of belonging to homeland by Jewish peoples (Sheffer 2003, 9), ‘diaspora’ has become a dominant focus of recent scholarship in cultural studies. Brubaker’s (2005) ‘The ‘Diaspora’ Diaspora’ offers a history of use for ‘diaspora’ within cultural studies. Building upon the existing work of cultural anthropologists (such as Hall 1990; Tölölyan 1991, Clifford 1994; Cohen 1997; Gilroy 1997) he succinctly shows ‘diaspora’ to now be understood as a stance or point of view rather than an objective entity (Brubaker 2005, 13).

There is a significant body of work exploring music and diaspora that is clearly embedded within the field of ethnomusicology (Glasser 1995; Shelemay 1998; Monson 2000; Ramnarine 2004; Stokes 2004; Turino 2007). Slobin (2003) provides an overview of studies on music and diaspora, emerging into ethnomusicological discourse through the concept of ‘deterritorialisation’ – a core principle in the analysis of identity (Slobin 2003, 285). He contends that as a term, ‘diaspora’ evades universal and objective definition due to its concern for such disparate and subjective concepts as ‘identity’ and ‘culture’ articulating this best with, “the music itself becomes a kind of homeland to the musician’s compounded sense of diaspora” (Slobin 2003, 289-290).

This concern for music within a contemporary ‘deterritorialised’ world has been the growing focus of music-cultural studies. Such varied studies as Kartomi (1981), Finnegan (1989), Slobin (1992), Stokes (1994), Román-Velázquez (1999), Clayton (2001), Eisentraut (2001), Hesmondhalgh and Negus (2002), Nettl (2005), Biddle and Knights (2007), and Scott-Maxwell (2008) can arguably be seen to have contributed to, and now belonging within, the ever-burgeoning field of music-diaspora studies. Given the relatively recent origins of human settlement, all people within New Zealand can claim links to various domestic and international ‘homelands’ (Leckie 1998; Fraser 2000; Belich 2001; Howe 2003; Bedford and Ho 2008; Trlin et al. 2010) thus contextually supporting the scholarly understanding of
‘diaspora’. In this sense the study of various transnational diaspora within New Zealand is well established and substantial, involving a binary focus on both belonging to diaspora, and the complexity of residing within a home geographically disconnected from ‘homeland’. In particular a number of scholars have paid specific attention to the Scottish diaspora in practice in New Zealand, including Brooking (2006), McCarthy (2006), Sullivan (2010), Bueltmann (2011), and Harper (2011). Others have considered Scottish culture localised and acculturated in differing parts of the world, contributing to a discourse on Scottish diaspora. This includes the works of Donaldson (1986), MacRae (2000), Kay (2006), Prentis (2011), Vance (2011), and Thomson (2013), which have expressed the translocation of Scottish culture, and unique interpretations of Scottish culture within the Scottish diaspora.

In-line with Slobin’s (2003) claim for ethnomusicologists having an increasing concern for diaspora and music, recent examples of research on diaspora and music within New Zealand include Zemke-White (2001), Shuker (2007), Zuberi (2007), Mackley-Crump (2012), and Johnson (2013). Such works have made clear the unique and distinctively indefinable multiculturalism that exists within contemporary New Zealand society. This cultural ‘melting pot’ is considered unique, providing exceptional opportunity for studying the transplantation, adoption, creation, and maintenance of musical-diaspora. However, despite such works as above, Johnson notes:

There is a distinct lack of attention for the musical history of indigenous peoples of Aotearoa/New Zealand, and for that of the many other musical cultures and sub-cultures that contribute to this multicultural musical nation (Johnson 2010, 3).

Research focusing on diaspora, culture and music has contributed to an understanding of the ‘many voices’ (Johnson 2010) of contemporary music-culture relationships within New Zealand and around the world (Scott-Maxwell 2008). However, despite acknowledgement of Highland bagpiping in cultural terms (Loten 1995; Ho Wai-Chung 2001; McKerrell 2005; Dickson 2006; Milosavljevic 2009; and Grant 2013), little research has considered a relationship between Highland bagpiping and contemporary cultural diaspora. Given that ‘deteritorialisation’ is a central tenet for culture and music studies, there is a surprising scarcity of knowledge regarding piobaireachd in a contemporary global context.

2.4 Research Questions

The outcome of the review has identified that no literature provides a suitable cultural definition of piobaireachd. Similarly there has been no literature exploring piobaireachd as a
contemporary cultural phenomenon. Further, the literature that has mentioned *piobaireachd* within New Zealand offers little cultural insight. However, a number of works have been identified challenging notions of cultural objectivity, legacy, tradition and identity for Highland bagpiping and for Scottish culture within a global context. While these offer a limited discussion on the cultural place of *piobaireachd*, no published works provide a definitive investigation and understanding of *piobaireachd* culturally.

This identifies a number of questions for further investigation. Given the lack of participation from the wider public, and limited participation from within the Highland piping community identified in Chapter 1, the first question asks ‘What is the place of *piobaireachd* within contemporary New Zealand society?’ As scholars appear to accept *piobaireachd* as embodying the sacrosanct cultural past, there is also a need to question how the cultural past is defined for *piobaireachd* within contemporary New Zealand society. The third question asks whether *piobaireachd* has been localised to New Zealand, and if so, how is this observed and represented? A final and overarching question explores, how can *piobaireachd* be defined in cultural terms? Such questions cannot be answered further through existing literature. Having identified the limitations of existing research and generated relevant questions for further exploration, the focus now turns to the development of an appropriate research methodology to answer these questions and address the concerns outlined in Chapter 1.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

This chapter builds on the synopsis and concerns offered in Chapter 1, as well as the review of literature and identified research questions in Chapter 2. It presents a research methodology explaining how data were gathered and analysed, and provides the theoretical framework for their interpretation. Prior to the presentation of results and discussion chapters, the limitations of this research methodology are discussed.

3.1 Research Methods

An argument that *piobaireachd* in New Zealand may be culturally misrepresented and misunderstood grounds this research within ethnomusicology. It draws upon ideas regarding ‘music as culture’ in order to produce findings that are valid and relevant (Merriam 1977, 202, 204; Herndon and McLeod 1979; Nettl 2005). Moreover:

> Ethnomusicologists believe that music must be understood… as a product of human society … [and] are interested in the way in which a society musically defines itself, in its taxonomies of music, its ideas of what music does, how it should be, and also in the way a society changes its music, relates to, absorbs, and influences other musics (Nettl 2005 12-13).

The strength of ethnomusicological research for *piobaireachd* is the exploration of music as culture in order to understand “musical change, less in terms of the events than in the processes”, allowing for a case study investigation of behaviour in relation to ‘music’, however it is defined (Nettl 2005, 13).

A mixed methods approach informs research design supported by insider experience and literature to identify, consider and develop this research topic on *piobaireachd*. An inductive ethnographic approach encompassed *piobaireachd* as a current musical culture within New Zealand. Data collection involved fieldwork, survey, participant observation, insider ethnography, extended interviews, and historical research. Thematic analysis of preliminary data led to a review of literature and development of a theoretical framework, which informed and determined research direction.
Participant observation and extended interviews are the primary data gathering methods, as these are recognised as offering the greatest external validity in this approach, providing the richest and most informative material (Atkinson and Hammersley 2007, 126, 131). This allowed for an investigation of contemporary cultural practices evident for piobaireachd in New Zealand, and a study of the perspectives of those who participate. These primary methods were supported by existing research relative to the topic, as well as the researcher’s extensive insider knowledge of the field.

Insider knowledge and a preliminary review of literature provided initial scoping and allowed for the generation of a methodological framework, consistent with an inductive approach (Brewer 2000, 8; Guest et al. 2011, 7). The University of Otago, Human Ethics Committee granted ethical approval for this study (Appendix 3a). Preliminary data gathering facilitated the gradual emergence of preliminary research themes. This enabled the induction of investigative theory that was subsequently applied to the data, and helped define the scope of this topic. Interview and observational data were gathered from June 2011 until September 2013, while thematic analysis spanned from June 2011 until December 2013. The methodology required for the gathering and analysing of these data is discussed below.

3.1.1 Ethnography
Ethnography explores cultural phenomena by generating data that reflect the system of meanings in the lives of a cultural group. It achieves this by engaging a qualitative research design that represents, through written description, the culture of a people (Brewer 2000, 1). Ethnography is the methodological approach for this research allowing for a variety of data considering piobaireachd cultural practices within a contemporary context (Wood et al. 2007, 870). Such methodology is an accepted and preferred approach within ethnomusicological research (Merriam 1967; Seeger 1987; Rice 1994).

Existing scholarship regarding piobaireachd (introduced in Chapter 2) appears to celebrate secondary source research, revolving around musical and historical analyses, lacking a clear and evident cultural consideration of piobaireachd. Ethnography counters such limited, removed and repetitive research, strongly supporting the exploration of piobaireachd in more culturally accurate terms (Geertz 1973; Van Maanen 1988; Turino 1990; Society for Ethnomusicology 1994; Clifford 1997; Harrison 1997; Nettl 2005; Barz and Cooley 2008; Kippen 2008; Kisliuk 2008; Stock and Chiener 2008; Titon 2008; Wong 2008; Fetterman 2010).
Ethnography “usually involves the researcher participating, overtly or covertly, in people’s daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, and/or asking questions through informal interviews, collecting documents and artefacts”. Ultimately this entails “gathering whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the emerging focus of inquiry” (Atkinson and Hammersley 2007, 3). Such a definition is applicable to ethnomusicology and is applied to this investigation of *piobaireachd* cultural practices by: gathering observational data in the context of where they ‘naturally’ occur, as opposed to within a ‘laboratory’ type setting; gathering data through participant observation and interview recording; initiating data gathering without a clear research design or theoretical construct (both being applied following initial data analysis); studying smaller cultural groups as representing wider cultural concerns; and by data analysis focusing on the “meanings, functions, and consequences” of the data gathered, both internally to the context of the ethnography, and to wider contexts. Such a process is an accepted ethnographic research model within academia (Atkinson and Hammersley 2007, 3).

Ethnographic methodology allows for the ‘triangulation’ of findings from varied data gathering techniques and the convergence of themes from data analysis (Yin 1994, 92). Such “triangulation is basic in ethnographic research. It is at the heart of ethnographic validity, testing one source of information against another to strip away alternative explanations and attempt to prove a hypothesis” (Fetterman 2010, 94). Triangulation is a key component of this research, enabled through the mixed methods approach outlined above and throughout this presentation of research methodology, offering accurate findings from ethnographic research (Atkinson and Hammersley 2007, 126, 131).

Ethnography is a description based upon the researcher’s interpretation of the research subject (Geertz 1973, 319). This interpretation requires a focus on the occurrence of phenomena within context (Geertz 1973, 322-324). These phenomena then become written subjects within the work of researchers, and therefore need to be considered in reference to their dynamic nature at the time they occur, as well as when they are being interpreted by the researcher, and by the reader. As written descriptions, they are limited representations of the phenomena that they depict (Geertz 1973, 326-329). Ethnography involves small-scale study of larger considerations, often focusing on phenomena, which transpire within a social, or cultural collective to be representative of wider concerns without having to research those wider concerns in their entirety (Geertz 1973, 329-331).
An ethnographic approach is “the observation of and the description (and representation) of cultural practices”, while ethnographic fieldwork is the “observational and experiential portion of the ethnographic process”. Here “the ethnographer engages living individuals as a means toward learning about a given musical-cultural practice”, in this instance, *piobaireachd* within contemporary New Zealand society. Such fieldwork “positions scholars as social actors within the very cultural phenomenon they study” and requires “meaningful face-to-face interaction with other individuals” (Barz and Cooley 2008a, 4). Here lies the dilemma for ethnographies, whether they depict ‘culture’ (Van Maanen 1988, 3), or whether ethnographies are reflective of researcher (Barz and Cooley 2008a, 14; Barz 2008; Kisliuk 2008; Stock and Chiener 2008; Titon 2008; Wong 2008). The design used in the current study incorporates both views, being an ethnography of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand informed by literature, interviews, and observations and guided by the researcher’s insider experience.

3.1.2 Insider Ethnography

Given this experiential element to ethnography characterised by researcher immersion within the culture of study, a discussion of the researcher’s position within a reflexive consideration is demanded for the sake of validity. In this context, articulating the position of the researcher in relation to the research provides transparency regarding the methodology, discussion, and results found within this research.

It is likely that a different researcher will generate differing data depending on the sources available, the time they were accessed, and the relationship of that researcher with these sources. It is also accepted that interpretation of this research will reflect the reader’s judgement of the presentation of the results and discussion as it relates to *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. In this sense, this presentation involves a multi-levelled series of interpretations, from the interview participant, to the researcher, to the reader (Brewer 2000, 105, 124; Rabinow 2007, 450). Hence the reader is also a necessary part of this research, and their interpretation of this is also reflective of their experiences, their circumstances, and their temporal context.

As a means to counter these limitations, there is a need to position the researcher in reference to the research (Brewer 2000, 127). This benefits the validity of the research by at least offering an explanation for why the research is the way it is (Rabinow 2007, 451). For the benefit of the reader, it offers transparency of the researcher’s relationship with data,
explaining the processes leading to the gathering and analysis of data, and the theoretical concerns and findings of this research (Rabinow 2007, 451). In the following sections reflection on the data gathering processes is provided, while immediately below an open account of researcher relationship to this research is described.

The researcher is a Scottish Highland bagpiper with over 20 years of experience as a performer within New Zealand. He has been involved in solo piping competitions for the duration of that time, is a current A Graded solo piping competitor with a number of competitive successes to his name, is a pupil of piping tutors, and is also a tutor of a number of current and former pipers within New Zealand. An accredited adjudicator of solo piping competitions he regularly fulfils this function within the South Island. As a former committee member of a number of Highland piping organisations he holds membership within a selection of local, regional, national, and offshore Highland piping organisations. Furthermore, he has been a member of a number of pipe bands within the South Island of New Zealand during that time and has performed with these bands across New Zealand. He has taught at instructional seminars and workshops for Highland pipers and pipe bands, and has performed in a variety of contexts such as busking, graduation parades, protest marches, ANZAC Day parades, delegate visits, weddings, funerals, and marketing campaigns. An experienced performer on the Highland bagpipe for a number of contemporary performance ensembles including glam-rock, folk-rock, and traditional-folk.

The researcher has approximately 15 years of experience with *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. He has performed *piobaireachd* and participated in *piobaireachd* performances in a number of cultural settings and locations within New Zealand. Competitively successful in *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand, he has learnt *piobaireachd* from a variety of local, regional, national, and visiting international authorities, and has taught *piobaireachd* to a number of local pipers. He has passed the Advanced Certificate in Highland Bagpiping with an endorsement in *piobaireachd* through the Royal New Zealand Pipe Bands Association, College of Piping and Drumming.

As a researcher and scholar he holds Bachelor of Music, Postgraduate Diploma in Music, and Master of Arts degrees in ethnomusicology, having consistently focused on differing aspects of Highland piping within New Zealand. Academic pursuits have seen him present at academic conferences held within New Zealand, Australia, China, and Scotland, some of which has included *piobaireachd*. Research fieldwork has included Highland piping across
New Zealand, as well as within Scotland and the United States of America. Academic manuscripts (including thesis, journal article, and conference abstracts) on Highland bagpiping in New Zealand have undergone peer review and are in the public domain (Milosavljevic 2009; Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012). It is hoped that the above offers the reader of this research presentation greater understanding and provides transparency regarding the researcher perspectives and experience presented through ethnography, and that rather than coming across as being boastful, it may explain why the research is the way it is.

In many respects the researcher is considered an insider to piobaireachd within New Zealand and has an intimate knowledge of this topic. This provides him with ample authority to undertake this research and to interpret its findings. Insider knowledge has been useful in many ways, providing an initial set of cultural observations that informed the early stages of research. His insider experience brings a large network of contacts and known contexts from which to gather data, allowing ease of access to elusive and prestigious authority figures within the cultural community being studied. This insider understanding has aided in a critical evaluation of existing publications regarding piobaireachd and provides the reader emic knowledge of the research topic.

On the other hand, there are limitations to the researcher’s ‘insiderness’. He is known within the community of Scottish Highland bagpipers in New Zealand (Thompson and Ogilvie 2010) as an individual who has undertaken data gathering for research purposes, and produced research, notably from 2007 to 2012 (Milosavljevic 2007; Milosavljevic 2009; Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012). This has not always offered a glowing discussion of the social and cultural aspects of Highland piping within New Zealand. Further, the Highland piping community within New Zealand is arguably representative of New Zealand (Milosavljevic 2009), and thus as a researcher, he faces the ‘ivory tower’ disconnect that researchers can face when having to justify and explain their research within the field.

Having been an active participant in Scottish Highland bagpiping from 1992 to 2010, the researcher has been less active of late in order to meet the demands of tertiary study. This invariably affects his reputation within Scottish Highland bagpiping and makes him more of an outsider today than previously, influencing his status within the social structure of Scottish Highland bagpiping and piobaireachd within New Zealand, particularly given that no other cultural participants are undertaking similar research. His associations with certain cultural figures and agencies may be unpopular and perhaps contentious to certain groups or
individuals in the cultural community. The researcher’s previous experiences in *piobaireachd* in New Zealand have created an individual cultural identity based upon participation, reputation and associations within that context. Lastly, the researchers distinctive surname is markedly ‘abnormal’ within the Scottish Highland bagpiping community within New Zealand, where the majority of cultural participants feature Scottish surnames. This is a necessary part of his individual cultural identity and a distinctive marker of his unique insider cultural position, yet clearly is also a marker of difference and ‘outsiderness’.

Using insider experience to identify where (and when) *piobaireachd* cultural practices within New Zealand occur allows for specific examples to be selected for data gathering. This insider knowledge is crucial, given the relatively clandestine cultural practices of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, offering enhanced access to ethnographic fieldwork contexts and perspectives that might not normally be available to a researcher without such insider experience. Alternatively, this insider knowledge can also blind the researcher to many points of discussion for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand that he may take for granted, and that someone with differing ‘insiderness’ might include in their research. As such, this is both a strength and limitation of ethnography for this study, reflecting an inevitable subjective researcher influence on this research, offering intimate ‘local’ knowledge interwoven with pre-existing cultural bias (Rabinow 2007, 450).

At a basic level, ethnography can be seen to revolve around the position of the ethnographer within an insider/outsider dichotomy (Nettl 2005; Hellawell 2011). In relation to this ethnography the researcher may be considered an insider, yet is also an outsider to many contexts, settings, and individuals. The actual insider/outsider perspectives that have generated and contributed to this research can be considered a representation of the researcher, deriving from his participation within and understanding of the ethnographic field, both prior to and during the course of this research. Undertaking such research from both an inside and an outside perspective is not straightforward as the researcher assumes the guise of a cultural participant (Watt and Scott-Jones 2010, 110).

Stock and Chiener argue insider status to be “a recognition of commonly held cultural values, expressive norms, and local knowledge” with an intrinsic concern for the field, where insiders are accepted “not as strangers but as individuals already emplaced in a pre-existing web of social responsibilities” (Stock and Chiener 2008, 113). Rice also argues that “it is cultures with boundaries that define the positioning of insiders and outsiders” within a binary
arrangement relative to the field (Rice 2008, 54). This binary however has been argued to be ‘false’ and a poor attempt at transparency, where the lines between insider and outsider, emic and etic are blurred (Herndon 1993, 77; Wong 2008, 77, 83). Ethnography delineates the researcher from the non-researcher and is a part of their identity within the field. Thus the act of participant observation alters social dynamics in response. In this context ethnographers can be at best only partial outsiders or insiders (Herndon 1993; Rice 2008; Wong 2008).

Rather than insider or outsider perspectives, Rice argues knowledge to be a process, where the act of cultural engagement places all participants within “the hermeneutic arc” where they “move from pre-understandings to explanation to new understandings’ (Rice 2008, 58). All participants (researcher or not) thus constantly provide cultural practices with changing values and dynamic social boundaries, where the insider or the outsider is “anyone and everyone” (Wong 2008, 83). Thus the ‘true’ outsider or insider is an arbitrary concept, at least in application within this study. As an alternative to the standard insider/outsider dichotomy, this study supports an insider to outsider continuum, where the ethnographer can fulfil both roles at the same time. The ethnographer’s position in this continuum is dependent on the spectrum of cultural information under interpretation and the perspective that interpretation is being made from, be it by the researcher regarding the culture, or by the non-researcher regarding the ethnographer.

The use of insider knowledge is integral for this study as it: determines the application of existing knowledge to the culture for study, guides the selection of cultural information sources where data will be sought, identifies appropriate means of participant observation, assists in the interpretation of data, aids in the application of findings to the ethnographic subject, identifies cultural sensitivity within the data, and can determine the limitations of itself. However, due to the already identified issues regarding subjectivity, it is necessary to note that insider knowledge has not been a primary source of data for this study. It suggests a transparent framework that supports the gathering and analysis of primary source material, but ultimately this research is the result of other data gathering methods. Thus insider knowledge has been treated with a degree of circumspection and prudence, used sparingly and tentatively within the analysis of data, to aid in its interpretation, but not to generate primary source data in itself.

Despite this care and concern, returning to a basic definition of reflexivity, this research is nonetheless an insider ethnography, complete with jargon, with bias, and with subjectivity.
Others have extensively debated the limitations and strengths of insider versus outsider ethnography where it is now argued that a comprehensive ethnography is incomplete without contributions from both an insider and outsider perspective (Geertz 1973; Nettl 2005; O’Reilly 2009; Naake et al. 2012). As described above, this research identifies and uses both approaches to data gathering and analysis. Prior to beginning fieldwork, concerns surrounding “what and where to start observing” will immediately need addressing (Watt and Scott-Jones 2010, 109). Selection of the starting point in this research was identified by accepted ethnographic methods, guided by insider understanding. These methods are described below.

3.1.3 Participant Observation
In the context of this study there is a need to understand *piobaireachd* in association with the knowledge of cultural participants rather than ‘armchair researchers’. Ethnography involves experience-based fieldwork, observing the subject from such a cultural participant's viewpoint in order to best understand it and also allow for the use of other methods to gather data (Brewer 2000, 27; Titon 2008, 87). This involves extended interviews, historical material and insider experience. Participant observation is a defining feature of ethnography where “what we see through our eyes, how we see it, and how we represent what we see, is crucial in constructing as true a picture as we possibly can of the research culture we are privileged to study” (Watt and Scott-Jones 2010, 107). It requires cultural immersion within the research subject in order to gain an insider perspective (Scott-Jones 2010, 7; Watt and Scott-Jones 2010, 108, 110). Following immersion and participation, data gathering involves documenting “interpretations, social meanings, and activities” facilitated through watching, listening, experiencing, and sharing within the subject. Participant observation involves three key phases including the descriptive phase, where observations attempt to be all encompassing of cultural phenomena; the focused phase, where analysis of descriptive observations allow for a narrowing of observational attention; and lastly the selective phase, where focused observations inform and allow for a cynosure within an ethnographic study (Spradley 1980, 33). Thus, by participating within the subject the researcher becomes the ‘instrument’ for data gathering (Brewer 2000, 33, 59; Shelemay 2001, 23). Howell (1972) offers a model for undertaking participant observation, which begins with establishing a rapport with the subject; interacting within, and integrating into, the subject field prior to recording observational data; before finally analysing data (Howell 1972, 392-403). Such an approach for data gathering affords sufficient external validity enabling accurate and authoritative analysis when provided with reflexivity (Yin 1994, 35; Schmuckler 2001, 419).
Geertz stresses that ethnography should involve a ‘thick description’ of all aspects relating to observed cultural phenomena (Geertz 1973, 319). Focusing on the meaning of the phenomena, rather than just its occurrence (or manifestation), thick description not only acknowledges cultural phenomena it intricately describes it alongside the context, understanding, description, and definition of minute detail. Thick description affords successful analysis of cultural phenomena, incorporating data that allows for the interpretation of meaning and context (Denzin 2001, 53-54). During the course of this research thick description is employed for documenting participant observation sourced data. This allows for a consideration of an accurate ‘local’ meaning for piobaireachd, rather than an inaccurate decontextualised interpretation.

Participant observations were undertaken during piobaireachd ‘musicking’, a concept provided by Small where:

> The act of musicking establishes in the place where it is happening a set of relationships, and it is in those relation-ships that the meaning of the act lies. They are to be found not only be-tween those organized sounds which are conventionally thought of as being the stuff of musical meaning but also between the people who are taking part, in whatever capacity, in the performance; and they model, or stand as metaphor for, ideal relationships as the participants in the perfor-mance imagine them to be: relationships be-tween person and person, be-tween individual and society, between humanity and the natural world and even perhaps the supernatural world (Small 1998, 13).

For piobaireachd, insider experience indicates that ‘musicking’ can encompass a variety of contexts beyond the formal presentation of musical performance alone including pedagogical interactions between individuals and within groups, as well as individual performance rehearsal (practising). Beyond this, audio recordings can also be deemed ‘musicking’. However, the extent of access and use of recordings is a difficult aspect of culture to evaluate. As a necessary limitation this thesis will not include participant observation that involves the act of listening to recordings of piobaireachd for recreation or for pleasure. However, recordings are encompassed within pedagogical, practice and performance ‘musicking’ contexts.

For this research musicking contexts are considered as ‘contact zones’ - the key times, spaces, and contexts where interaction between cultures and communities occurs (Pratt 1991; Bendrups 2008). Elschek (2001) and Bendrups (2008) argue that musicking sites (festivals) are ideal case studies and offer an easily accessible forum to culturally significant events for ethnographic research. Piccard and Robinson (2006) suggest that festivals “utilise, create and transform social spaces” and “constitute spaces organised by alternate norms of behaviour”
giving further significance to the content of the musicking site (Piccard and Robinson 2006, 11). Festivals become heterogenous transcultural “spaces characterised by a multitude of actors, images, ideologies and aesthetic models” (Piccard and Robinson, 2006, 18). They transcend their own immediate context, giving significance and meaning much further afield than the elements that explicitly constitute them. They can represent ‘authentic’ examples of culture and will accordingly influence definitions of ‘authenticity’ for participants. As a part of participant observation, this research will therefore include an exploration of musicking sites.

In selecting ethnographic fieldwork settings to conduct participant observations care was exercised to include a variety of performance, pedagogical, and practice contexts – the places where the researcher understands that piobaireachd musicking will occur. Undertaking observations over an extended period of time (June 2010 to September 2013) and within an array of settings (piobaireachd musicking in local, regional and national contexts) allows for substantial scope and accuracy when describing culture.

Performances are accessed through either solo piping competitions or within non-competitive recitals as the researcher’s prior knowledge deems these to be sufficiently representative of piobaireachd in contemporary New Zealand. Such performances are in a variety of settings and locations, including local ‘junior’ solo piping competitions, regional centre solo piping championship competitions, and Highland piping recitals. Observation of performances involved fieldwork in Christchurch (21-23 October 2011; 20-21 October 2012; 24 March 2012), Hastings (7-8 April 2012), Dunedin (17 April 2012; 2-3 June 2012; 2 September 2012) and Balclutha (26 August 2012).

Practicing occurs in private and informal arrangements often in the homes of pipers, in the context of solo piping competitions and recitals (as specified above) where performers rehearse immediately prior to performance, and in pedagogical contexts where individuals formally share knowledge. Pupils digest the theoretical knowledge imparted to them by their tutor, and attempt to transfer and refine this into an ideal performance through practice. Observation of practice is undertaken alongside performance and pedagogy. Such pedagogical contexts for observation include formalised group learning interactions in Methven (15-20 January 2012 and 4 May 2013) and dyadic pedagogical interactions between individuals in Dunedin (7 May 2013) and Christchurch (18-20 September 2013).
Data gathering and analysis primarily juxtapose participant observations against interviewing key culture bearers, transcribing interviews, and analysing preliminary data. These participant observations are manifest within ethnographic field notes, photographs, and documents gathered in the field. Field notes provide a thick description of the cultural and social observations. Photographs detail environment, material objects, visual aspects, social interactions, and cultural symbols. Many thanks are extended to the companies and individuals who have granted me permission to use their images in order to illustrate the discussion within this thesis - they are acknowledged throughout. Official documents, including programmes and competition schedules are provided by organisations for use in certain contexts and present information regarding musicking (Small 1998). These data are analysed and presented within this research.

As participant observation accounts for only one approach of data gathering within ethnography, a means for gathering further qualitative data was also required. This was achieved through extended face-to-face interviews with selected culture bearers, recorded digitally, and transcribed later. This allows for a triangulation of findings from data that more accurately represent piobaireachd cultural phenomena within New Zealand rather than relying on participant observations alone.

### 3.1.4 Interviews

Extended interviews are selected as a primary method for gathering ethnographic data, offering detailed and rich qualitative material. Fetterman (2010) postulates, “the interview is the ethnographer’s most important data-gathering technique. Interviews explain and put into a larger context what the ethnographer sees and explains” (Fetterman 2010, 40). They are a commonly used form of data gathering within ethnographic research and are complementary to other data gathered in ethnography, particularly participant observation (Brewer 2000, 2, 59). Yin argues that the collection of qualitative data for case studies can involve interview methods in combination with participant observation (Yin 1994, 78). Interviews provide insight into “human affairs” and can lead to discovery of more information than was intended, aiding the researcher in finding other significant sources of material (Yin 1994, 85). They allow the researcher to look for consistency or contradictions between the opinions and actions of participants, yet at the same time it need be noted that interview data may not always support data gathered by participant observation (Brewer 2000, 65).
Interviews yield data by utilising “the expressive power of language”, interpreted in two ways (Atkinson and Hammersley 2007, 126). Firstly an interview can be examined for content that directly relates to cultural phenomena referenced through language. Secondly interviews can be read for what they might reveal about the people who produce them (Atkinson and Hammersley 2007, 124-125). Given the considerations outlined in the research questions above, both types of interview data will be analysed in this research.

A variety of approaches include formal and informal interviews (Spradley 1980, 123-124), structured and unstructured interviews, and use of either open or closed questions (Brewer 2000, 63-66). For this research a “natural conversation” about piobaireachd within New Zealand will reveal rich data concerning both collective and individualised perceptions. It has been accepted that such a conversation would best develop from an extended, formal, and yet unstructured interview approach using open-ended questions. This approach provides a depth of data, delivered through freedom of response for interview participants, offering greater exploration of interview topics, and greater accuracy of findings (Brewer 2000, 65-66). The generation of 10 hours of interviews was considered to likely offer sufficient data saturation to generate findings with the support of other data gathering techniques.

A selection method is therefore required that offers an impartial, yet focused (purposive) process for choosing potential interview participants and that reflects the unexplored hierarchical nature of contemporary piobaireachd. Given this research focus, and an ethnographic methodology, purposive sampling was considered, and has been accepted, as the process that will most likely identify individuals with the greatest capacity to speak to this topic (Devers and Frankel, 2000). The Comunn na Piobaireachd Gold Medal and Clasp competitions from the Hawkes Bay Easter Highland Games are considered the pinnacle of piobaireachd career performance in New Zealand (Wilkes 2008). A database of competitive results was accessed and the winners of these two annual events for the years 2003 – 2012 provides a purposive sample of 17 potential interview participants. These individuals are considered to reflect the hierarchical nature and prevailing competitive arrangement of contemporary piobaireachd within New Zealand. Their recent success in these events identifies them as elite contemporary performers, important given that this research is an exploration of piobaireachd within a contemporary national setting. Such individuals are evident culture bearers, having recently been deemed to embody authentic piobaireachd in New Zealand due to this competitive success. They compete at the highest national level; have also participated in Highland piping in Scotland; and are likely to be the individuals
within New Zealand with the greatest perspective of contemporary international *piobaireachd* standards. Their status as former winners in these events provides them with leadership roles in the local cultural community, exposing them to the inner workings of *piobaireachd* musicking in New Zealand. Therefore, they are arguably the local figures most qualified to speak about distinct local characteristics in contemporary *piobaireachd* musicking within New Zealand. While there are considerably more proponents of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, this selection process allowed for a degree of impartiality, reducing the potential for researcher selection bias in participant recruitment.

Insider knowledge and the cultural network of pipers in New Zealand allowed the researcher to directly correspond with thirteen of these identified individuals, using a variety of methods (digital media or telephone). The other four potential participants did not respond, or were either unwilling, or unable to take part in this study. The researcher began contacting and arranging for participant interviews in June 2011. All interviews were undertaken in Christchurch between June 2011 and October 2012. All interviewed participants completed ethical consent forms, confirming their willingness to participate in this research (see Appendix 3a). These interviews were recorded digitally and ranged in duration from 40 minutes, to one hour and 40 minutes. Interviews were undertaken within such settings as private schools, pubs, cafes, and the homes of interview participants. They focused on the current cultural practices of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand but also included *piobaireachd* beyond New Zealand, the cultural past, and Scottish Highland bagpiping in general. Interviews followed an organic structure, growing from initial questions to encompass the participant’s experiences and opinions regarding *piobaireachd* within New Zealand (a sample of the interview format is provided in Appendix 3b). Following the recording of interviews, the researcher transcribed them in their entirety. An initial thematic exploration (described below) of eight transcribed interviews, alongside participant observations, identified that data saturation had been realised, given that they had generated in excess of 10 hours of qualitative material, and that no further themes could be extracted.

In order to meet the ethical guidelines established by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee, and also to be sensitive to the intimate nature of the solo piping community, the anonymity of these interview participants is protected. They are given a number (from 1 to 8), which provided them a pseudonym (i.e. Participant 1), consistently applied to their responses throughout the analytical chapters of this thesis. Further, as interview participants often divulged sensitive information about others, individuals referenced in interviews were given a
pseudonym to protect their interests. These pseudonyms were dependent on how individuals were referred to (i.e. Piper A, Tutor X, or International Authority B), and are only applicable within each quote provided, as consistency of identity for referenced individuals was not necessary and would potentially contravene any anonymity.

As a part of reflexivity, interview participants may be profiled and categorised collectively, but it is important for their anonymity to not divulge any specific details regarding their individual characteristics or experiences. All 8 were former winners of either the Comunn na Piobaireachd Gold Medal or Gold Clasp at the Hawke’s Bay Highland Games from 2003 to 2013. All 8 happened to be within Christchurch (New Zealand) between June 2011 and September 2013, and were willing and able to participate within this research. The youngest of these participants is approximately 20 years of age, and the oldest is approximately 60. All of these interview participants have participated and performed outside of New Zealand, with one being born and growing up in Scotland. One of the participants was a woman, and as such her responses have been treated as though she were male in order to protect her anonymity yet retain the quality of her responses. Two of these participants have met with considerable success in solo competition in Scotland, being former winners of either the Gold Medal *piobaireachd* event at the Argyllshire Gathering or the Northern Meeting. All participants are tutors of other Highland bagpipers, have themselves been pupils of *piobaireachd* and Highland piping authorities, are active members of a variety of piping organisations within varying contexts (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012), and have intrinsic links and vested interests within the Highland bagpiping community and the ethnographic subject (Milosavljevic 2009).

Concerns about the validity of interview methods exist.

> When we talk to people, it is not uncommon for them to leave gaps or silences in their narrative. People sometimes have a tendency to sanitize or censor, to tell us only what they want us to know; they tell us a version of a story. What people say, and what they actually think, feel or do can be quite different. This can create gaps or silences in the data and sustained participant observation can help in filling in these gaps or contradictions (Watt and Scott-Jones 2010, 110).

However, Brewer also argues that this ‘reactive effect’ arises in all research where people know they are ‘research subject’ (Brewer 2000, 65). Such considerations expose some of the limitations of interviews, yet recognise that this limitation is inevitable and allows this research to accurately analyse the opinions of cultural participants (Emerson *et al.* 1995, 3). Data within the interviews varies significantly where some of the participants required little encouragement in detailing their experience with *piobaireachd*, while others were more
circumspect in their responses, requiring the researcher be more interactive. Rather than an abnormal reactionary response, the researcher believes that this reflects the individual character and persona of the participants.

3.1.5 Historical Method

Research focusing on the cultural past within the present would not be complete without the inclusion of historical material. In anthropology, history is understood as a social system of “cultural products that represent particular positioned points of view that are always constrained by a host of situational variables” and thus “the new history in anthropology emphasizes that any history is culturally constructed” (Marshall 1994, 972). Rice has suggested that the historical construction of musical culture can be considered a key ‘formative process’ and an integral part of ethnomusicology. He contends that “historical construction” comprises two important processes: the process of change with the passage of time and the process of reencountering and recreating the forms and legacy of the past in each moment of the present” (Rice 1987, 474-475).

The issue for this research is that a review of literature has identified a bounty of existing works presenting definitions of piobaireachd through historical musicology that poorly define piobaireachd in cultural terms within contemporary New Zealand. A paucity of any research that considers the social and cultural arrangement of piobaireachd and Highland bagpiping further compounds this issue. There is a wealth of research on piobaireachd and Highland bagpiping history, that is widely dispersed and readily available, and that attempts to portray piobaireachd objectively. Yet these have by and large ignored the globalisation (and subsequent localisation) of piobaireachd and other aspects of Highland bagpiping, have overlooked cultural practices that accompany sound and organology (such as dress, choreography and transmission), and have avoided discussing piobaireachd within a contemporary sense. Therefore, existing studies hold little application within the current study and need to be treated with circumspection.

A limited history of piobaireachd within New Zealand has been provided in Chapter 1, while elsewhere in this thesis further historical discussion is presented. However, there is no ‘history’ section, and this study is not a ‘history’ of piobaireachd. The researcher interprets that such an approach will falsely claim the objective understanding of the cultural past within this research. However, for this study, such literature is often the only source of historical knowledge and at times appropriately explains data. In order to address such a conflict, this
thesis uses literature in order to better understand the data gained from interviews and participant observations, to assist in understanding piobaireachd within a contemporary New Zealand context.

Data are prioritised where participant observations and interview responses are primary, and where existing materials regarding piobaireachd are treated as secondary. However, such secondary sources are not arbitrary for this research, being vital for interpreting primary data. This is an investigation of the contemporary culture of piobaireachd within New Zealand as explored through observed contemporary cultural practices, and interviewed elite contemporary performers. Any detailed and focused discussion that accepts a flawed and objective view of history negates the integrity of the insider ethnography that has already determined limitations for the use and usefulness of such sources to the research subject.

3.1.6 Thematic Analysis
The inductive design of this research is driven by data gathered from the exploration of piobaireachd as a musical culture (Brewer 2000, 8; Guest et al. 2011, 7). It employs ‘thematic analysis’ to establish and refine the initial scope of ethnographic investigation (Braun and Clarke 2006, 4). Such a method involves familiarisation with, and transcription of, the gathered research data (Braun and Clarke 2006, 16-18). The researcher then codes, collates and arranges these data categorically into candidate research themes that are then reclassified within various super and sub-categories (Braun and Clarke 2006, 19-20). Themes are checked for a ‘coherent pattern’ of collated data to determine suitability and validity for research. Themes are then defined, before being formalised and presented within a specific document (Braun and Clarke 2006, 20-23).

This thematic analysis leads to further exploration of literature (Chapter 2), which, in turn, leads to the development of theory specific to this study (Section 3.2). This involves interpreting data codes for their semantic and essentialist content, a process synonymous with inductive approach and thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke 2006, 9, 13-14). For this study, interview data were examined using discourse analysis for content offering cultural descriptions of piobaireachd. Of particular interest were responses that related to participants’ cultural experience and perspective. Analysis of participant observations centred on piobaireachd musicking, specifically those that contributed to a description and discussion of culture. Images taken by the researcher during fieldwork, as well as those generously supplied with permission from Lyn McHugh from Celtic Kiwi Photography, Easton Bagpipes and
Highland Supplies, and Gannaway – the Bagpipe Centre, complimented participant observations. Both interview data and participant observations were cross-referenced to check for consistency or contradictions in the opinions and the behaviour of cultural participants. Beyond this, they were also compared to written and graphic bagpiping literature to best explain and understand their meaning. This approach allowed for a triangulation of results to confirm consistent and valid information.

This analysis identified a substantial amount of material encompassing varying cultural elements of *piobaireachd*. These include musical, aural, material, visual, social, historical, conceptual, and political components. Identification of these elements demanded a requisite theory for explanation of data relative to the ideas of others, and to allow the identification and definition of dominant themes that would explore the research topic in-depth. This analytical approach accommodated the current cultural consideration of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, the results of which are presented in Chapters 4, 5 and 6. Thematic analysis identified potential topics for further exploration where the ideas of others contributed towards the development of a theory to inform results and discussion.

### 3.1.7 Theory: an Interpretive Framework

Merriam’s (1964) model for the anthropology of music is a theoretical model for contemporary ethnomusicology (Titon 1984; Rice 1987; Shelemay 2001; Nettl 2005). Rather than critiquing the theory behind Merriam’s model, this research interprets it as an appropriate means to categorise data gathered within a theoretical framework, and challenge further theory generated for this specific research (Subsections 3.1.8-3.1.11 below). Merriam defines his model as “study on three analytical levels – conceptualization about music, behaviour in relation to music, and music sound itself. The first and third levels are connected to provide for the constantly changing, dynamic nature exhibited by all music systems” (Merriam 1964, 32). In response to limitations with existing work concerning *piobaireachd*, Merriam contends that “instead of focusing attention upon a single aspect of music study” (i.e. historical musicology) his research design “enables and even forces the investigator to seek an integrated understanding of the phenomena we call music” (Merriam 1964, 34).

The interpretive framework developed for this thesis is the direct result of application of Merriam's tripartite model to the thematically analysed data. To begin, this thesis explores how *piobaireachd* is characterised by music sound within cultural context, comprised of an organised and interpretive set of aural qualities (Merriam 1964, 33). Ample studies within
ethnomusicological discourse acknowledge the importance of sound as a research focus (Schafer 1977; Feld 1982; Qureshi 1987; Slobin 1993; Duffy 1999; Taylor 2001; Meintjes 2003; Scott-Maxwell 2008). Given a paucity of cultural research on contemporary piobaireachd sound and its sound components, and given the difficulties in observing sound, analysis of piobaireachd sound primarily focuses on interview responses, while using other data to support and contribute to the discussion.

Merriam’s second level of analysis relates to the music behaviour of people in producing such sound (Merriam 1964, 33). Piobaireachd sound is produced in association with a range of behaviours in relation to material objects (instrument, attire, arena) and visual behaviours (posture and movement). Therefore as a secondary level of analysis, this research investigates the material and visual culture that gives meaning to piobaireachd sound. The meaning of such material and visual culture for piobaireachd is unknown, although other scholars suggest that musical behaviour in relation to material and visual factors is insightful and informative for ethnomusicological research (Baily 1977; de Vale 1977; Tsuge 1983; Stockmann 1991; Johnson 1995). A distinctive ambivalence for material and visual aspects of piobaireachd within the interview responses means that this level of analysis is more reliant on data gathered through participant observation.

Merriam’s final level of analysis is the “conceptualization about music.” As this study ultimately aims to explore the social value, the cultural parameters, and the informing factors for piobaireachd within New Zealand today, this level of analysis will be particularly informative. Merriam posits that “it is at this level that the values about music are found, and it is precisely these values that filter upward through the system to effect the final product [sound]” (Merriam 1964, 33). These values are what this research is interested in: their phenomenological manifestation, their cultural meaning, and their dissemination within the research subject. As such, rather than attempting to make sense of the plethora of musical concepts applicable to piobaireachd, the final level of analysis focuses on its cultural transmission, as affected by social processes. Existing ethnomusicological studies have identified such social processes as definitive and informing for musical cultures (Middleton 1990; Gerstn 1998; Keister 2008; Cohen 2009; Donaghy 2011). This level of analysis is complex, demanding depth and breadth from all sources of data.

As in Merriam’s theoretical model, each of these levels are interrelated and co-dependent (1964). Further, they are comprised of sublevels of analysis within the cultural bounds of
piobaireachd. Exploration of data relating to sound comprises analytical sublevels focusing on instrument sound, technical sound, and musical concepts. Interpreting data relating to material and visual culture results in the analysis of performance attire, performance choreography, participant property, the material and visual aspects of performance context, and materials involved in the demonstration and interpretation of sound. Meanwhile the investigation of social and cultural transmission was facilitated through analysis of transmission processes, authorisation processes, global cultural flow, and local cultural change. As with the main analytical levels, these sublevels are all interrelated and codependent, an approach that is sympathetic with Merriam’s theoretical model (Merriam 1964; Rice 1987, 470).

These analytical levels and their sublevels drive the presentation of results and discussion within analytical chapters - appropriate, given its use in thematic analysis. These chapters are thus threefold and examine sound, material and visual culture, as well as social and cultural transmission. Research questions that arise from the literature review (Chapter 2) are also refined to produce induced theory (Sections 3.1.8 to 3.1.11 below).

3.1.8 (Sub)culture
Merriam’s (1964) model frames the cultural exploration of piobaireachd allowing for ‘musical style’ to be interpreted as culture. This approach requires a means for determining how culture should be understood and defined. Since the publication of Merriam (1964), music as culture has been increasingly researched by case studies, where music has been treated as culture, within a global mosaic of musics as culture (Nettl 2005, 252). It seems commonplace to accept that music can be seen as culture, and yet an application of this principle has not been performed on piobaireachd. As a result of the shortcomings of literature and the data gathered and analysed thematically for this research, the question of ‘how is piobaireachd defined as music as culture?’ seems poignant at first.

Much of the literature on the study of music in culture involves the ways in which humans use music, which is therefore said to carry out certain functions in human society. It may be reasonable to assume that people everywhere have used music to do certain things, and at the same that they thought that music, acting on its own, as it were, was capable of doing something to them (Nettl 2005, 259).

Such an approach naturally asks what signs and symbols, behaviours and concepts, values and meanings, processes and products define piobaireachd beyond the pre-existing understanding of it as musical ‘style’. It may focus on “the way in which music functions within, or is a part of culture. The concepts of music and the ways in which people behave ‘musically’” (Nettl
This focus would contribute to understanding the musical subject, similar musical subjects, music, and human behaviour.

While this may be an achievable approach, it would ignore recent scholarship that has increasingly focused on music as being caught within webs of global to local exchanges that treat music as a part of super, inter and sub-culturation. The global flow of information within, across, through, and around interconnected and dynamic social and cultural boundaries is an accepted and now expected research paradigm (Slobin 1992 and 1993; Stokes 1994; Clayton 2001; Nettl 2005; Biddle and Knights 2007). Given the persuasive strength of these researchers, and the logic of their arguments, their consistent use of cultural studies for analysing music demonstrates that music is culture and thus there is a need for piobaireachd to be considered as embedded within a global cultural context.

Building upon the work of cultural anthropologist Appadurai’s (1990) ‘global cultural economy’, Slobin (1992) provides an appropriate definition of such a complexity suggesting “linkages, subordinations, import-export traffic, and other factors” within, between and external to musical cultures to be articulated and understood in “notions of overlaps, intersections, and nestings”. Drawing upon the concept of music as culture, Slobin calls for consideration of ‘micromusics’, through processes of sub, inter, and super-culturation, which he articulates as defining the complex nature of musical cultures within society (Slobin 1992 1-3). As such, the theoretical construct underpinning this research is that piobaireachd is a micromusic, operating as a subculture of Highland bagpiping. Beyond this it is also theorised to operate as an interculture as well as a superculture within, across, through, and around various imagined boundaries. How such theory is embedded within the definition, function, and meaning for piobaireachd in New Zealand is central to this investigation. This will allow for ‘styles’, ‘forms’, and ‘genres’ (or similar) of ‘music’ to be considered as subcultures.

**3.1.9 ‘Authenticity’**

In cultural anthropology, scholarship has focused on exploring and showing how core culturally definitive values exude the cultural past, the result of dynamic and ongoing social processes. An example of seminal manuscripts that argue for the disjuncture, fluidity and contention of the cultural past in the present include: Wagner (1981), Bloch (1977), Appadurai (1981), Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983), Trevor-Roper (1983), Anderson (1983), Rosenberg (1993), Moore (2002), and Mallon (2010). In ethnomusicology, such theories have been applied and have led to the exploration of notions of ‘tradition’ (or similar) being
understood as the result of social processes, and thus have provided a similar focus for understanding music culturally (Livingston 1999; Qureshi 2000; Moore 2002; Cohen 2009; Keister 2008; Burns 2008; Donaghy 2011; Gillan 2013).

Existing research on *piobaireachd* takes for granted the notions of ‘tradition’, ‘origin’, ‘classicism’, and ‘authenticity’ (see Chapter 2). They provide a prevailing understanding of Highland bagpiping, and thus *piobaireachd*, originating from Scotland. The purpose of this research is not to dispute such a claim. Such literature supposedly explains why performers wear the kilt and why they play certain styles of tune, as well as the history of *piobaireachd* composition, its traditional function, and its authentic practitioners. However they provide such a cursory discussion of notions of ‘cultural truth’ either in the present or in the past that questions relating to ‘What/why/where/when/how/who is/was *piobaireachd*?’ are difficult to answer through literature. In order to answer such questions relating to our experiences in culture Nettl believes that “all of us want to learn about the past, and its connection with the present and the future” (Nettl 2005, 201). Given that the musical present appears to be made up of references to the cultural past for music culture, how the past is embedded within contemporary *piobaireachd* is unknown.

Moore’s ‘Authenticity as Authentication’ analyses the concept of ‘authenticity’ for music, focusing not on the innate qualities of music, but on their perception by cultural participants. “Whether a performance is authentic... depends on who ‘we’ are”. Moore reached such a statement by making an assumption that “authenticity’ is a matter of interpretation which is made and fought for from within a cultural and, thus, historicised position” (Moore 2002, 209-210). His argument is for the subjective interpretation of ‘historically informed’ and subjective authentic qualities in music through the individual inevitably engaged in the social. Academic consideration of authenticity should thus, I believe, shift from consideration of the intention of various originators towards the activities of various perceivers, and should focus on the reasons they might have for finding, or failing to find, a particular performance authentic (Moore 2002, 220-221).

This research applies Moore’s notion of authenticity as being ascribed rather than inscribed for *piobaireachd*. Such an argument is sympathetic with the work of Wagner (1981), Bloch (1977), Appadurai (1981), Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983), Trevor-Roper (1983), Anderson (1983), Rosenberg (1993), Moore (2002), and Mallon (2010), mentioned above in the argument for the social construction of the cultural past. Wade suggests that notions of ‘tradition’ and ‘authenticity’ are often interchangeable, both sharing strong links with the cultural present and past (Wade 2009, 183). ‘History’ viewed in this way is the position this
research takes, particularly given the shortcomings of music-historical discourse for *piobaireachd* outlined in Chapter 2.

This study supports and builds upon the arguments of Moore (2002). His notions of authenticity being determined by either the individual, or the audience, or both, are worthy of further discussion. Caught between the individual and the collective then, the current research considers how authenticity is arranged and constructed for *piobaireachd*. However, his model for the tripartite analysis of authenticity is complex and not readily applicable to the data gathered for this study, particularly where the concepts of first, third and second person authentication are confusing for application. Moore assumes that ‘authenticity’ is arranged upon the ‘act of listening’, an interesting observation (Moore 2002, 210). Such a concept is worthy of consideration through the data gathered for this research, that when music is heard, authenticity may be constructed. Given that this research incorporates a focus on material and visual culture, and on social and cultural transmission, it is unknown whether authenticity may be ascribed outside of the ‘act of listening’ to sound in performance. As such this research investigates whether authenticity may also be endorsed further afield than hearing, theorising that it is arranged in all of the acts of cultural participation within social structure and interaction.

By focusing on authenticity embedded within the sound, material and visual culture, and social and cultural transmission of *piobaireachd*, understanding how the negotiation of ‘authenticity’ is arranged by the individual and the collective will be considered. Middleton argues that any analysis of music as culture demands investigation of ‘authenticity’ given that ‘cultural truth’ is what he believes to be the source of musical function and value (Middleton 1990, 127). Therefore, this investigation of authenticity will reveal useful information regarding how people perceive and arrange ‘authenticity’ for *piobaireachd*, as well as other musical cultures and their core historically informed values.

### 3.1.10 Localisation

In discussing the connection between the musical past and the musical present, Nettl (2005) offers:

> Ethnomusicologists, confronted with ideas about the past or changes of the present, wish to interpret these in terms of comparisons across cultures or in the context of the several domains of culture, seeking regularities or norms, and developing theories of ‘what happened’ or what may happen or in certain circumstances what (typically or normally) ‘happens’ (Nettl 2005, 290).
This cogent and insightful comment argues that the analysis of music as culture need take into account flow of knowledge over, across, through, within, and/or around 'domains of culture'. As previously explored in Section 2.1.3, there exists a discourse on music and diaspora and on diaspora within New Zealand, but little (if any research) of such research considering piobaireachd. Slobin suggested that the study of music at sub, inter, and super-cultural levels heed the global flow of culture, arguing “for a planet in flux, with a population that is creating imagined worlds’ based on the shifting -scapes” of Appadurai (1990) (Slobin 1992, 5). Wade illustrates the now commonplace acceptance of the prefix ‘trans-’ in ethnomusicological studies focusing on the “transcendence of boundaries by both people and music” (Wade 2009, 186). Kartomi proposes such a term as ‘transculturation’ replace ‘acculturation’ as “a process of cultural transformation marked by the influx of new culture elements”, and subsequently, “the loss or alteration of existing ones” (Kartomi 1981, 234). If piobaireachd is to be considered a culture based on notions of ‘authenticity’, and if culture is seen to flow across borders and boundaries, as is argued in core anthropological works, then a means for focusing on the flow of knowledge for piobaireachd across sub, inter, and super-cultural domains is welcomed.

Such an approach seems appropriate given the unknown social function of piobaireachd in New Zealand society. Highland bagpiping has previously been treated culturally (Loten 1995; Ho Wai-Chung 2001; Mc Kerrell 2005; Dickson 2006; Milosavljevic 2009; and Grant 2013) and in particular has been shown to operate as diaspora (Milosavljevic 2009, 15; Grant 2013, 8). This suggests that it need be considered beyond ethnic and ancestral divisions, as a superculture encompassing a variety of peoples, places, functions, forms, and musics around the world. This would then give a focus on the intercultural relationship with ‘homeland’, and on the subcultural characteristics of Highland bagpiping wherever it may exist. This would allow an investigation of the ‘transculturation’ of piobaireachd within New Zealand by identifying how it has been localised to a national setting.

Researching the global flow of culture requires an understanding of the processes of adoption, interpretation, function, and transmission of music between interconnected local musical scenes within a global framework of musical cultures. Such authors as Finnegan (1989), Stokes (1994), Román-Velázquez (1999), Eisentraut (2001), and Hesmondhalgh and Negus (2002) (among others) have explored this in some detail. While much of this scholarship has explored musics existing within a global/local cultural dichotomy, it often posits localisation as the opposition to globalisation (Biddle and Knights 2007). Biddle and Knights contend that
local/global binarism dominates contemporary studies yet is erroneously accepted as being interchangeable with ‘globalisation’, claiming that the role of the ‘national’ is often overlooked, and calling for a focus on the ‘imagined’ nation as an intermediary between the focus on the global and local (Biddle and Knights 2007a, 2). Rather than employing such a problematic term as ‘nation’ however, this research acknowledges Anderson (1983) by accepting that nationhood is imagined, focusing instead on localisation within the imagined bounds of ‘community’, in all its various forms, scales, and contexts.

Stokes (1994a) argues that ‘ethnicity, identity and music’ can be embroiled in music, wrapped up in the symbols, contexts and participation of ‘music’, which can construct a sense of place for people. Meanwhile Duffy (1999) contends that music can reflect more than just the explicit content of its sound, that the act of creating and listening to music can represent a great many places and peoples. This research theorises that the transplantation of *piobaireachd* to New Zealand, and its subsequent adoption within New Zealand have somehow transformed *piobaireachd* to be localised to that context today. This is a central tenet, given that ‘authenticity’ is central to transculturalism, and thus how ‘authenticity’ is informed, practiced and maintained within such a transcultural setting requires further investigation. As such, presentation and discussion of distinctive national identity within the bounds of subcultural practice is fundamental to this research. Furthermore, the diasporic, trans-cultural relationship of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand with Scotland will be considered. Nettl argues, “if there is anything really stable in the musics of the world, it is the constant existence of change” (Nettl 2005, 202). Whether *piobaireachd* is localised to New Zealand or not is an arbitrary approach here given existing scholarship on similar case studies. Rather, the focus here is on the perception of local characteristics of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand in association with notions of ‘authenticity’, subcultural exploration, and an evident diasporic and global flow of culture, best articulated as transculturalism.

### 3.1.11 Summary

If *piobaireachd* is found to be reflective of local cultural characteristics, if authenticity is embedded within all of the levels of analysis for *piobaireachd* and, if the value, function and meaning of *piobaireachd* is determined through the global flow of culture, then this research will argue for *piobaireachd* being arranged in a contemporary sense. Such an arrangement will likely be the result of social processes within local communities, around contested concepts of authenticity, through dynamic global transculturation. Furthermore, this will argue that ‘styles’, ‘genres’, ‘types’, ‘forms’ or ‘repertoires’ of music may also be considered
culturally through processes of localised authentic micromusicality, where definitions of the
cultural past (such as tradition and authenticity) are contested, dynamic, and temporary.
Lastly, such a finding will provide for a new understanding of *piobaireachd* beyond the
regular guise of ‘tradition for tradition’s sake’, determining that: it has a useful and necessary
function within society; values defining and driving it are contemporary, fluid and ever-
changing; its definition is variable, contestable and localised globally; and that as music,
*piobaireachd* is culture.

This completes the discussion of research methods used in order to produce this thesis. The
following chapter (Chapter 4) provides the results and discussion specifically relating to
sound within the interpretive framework described above. Prior to this however, it is
necessary to acknowledge that research (in any format) has design, descriptive and analytical
boundaries commonly accepted as limitations. The limitations relative to this research are
identified below.

### 3.2 Reflexive Limitations

This research design features the following limitations. Neither gender nor ethnicity were foci
of interview or observation data gathering, although they are evident within this material. Due
to the limitations of the sampling method and the concerns for anonymity for interview
participants such a study design would not afford an analysis of gender, which Grant (2013)
has shown to be a fruitful and emerging line of enquiry. Nor would ethnicity be an
appropriate topic to broach given the well-known status of the individuals represented in the
data. A number of other limitations are presented and embedded within the data gathering
methods provided above (Sections 3.1.1 to 3.1.6). These include the limits of participant
observation and interview approaches.

This research does not include analysis of *piobaireachd* musical notation; although musical
notation is used at times to assist with description and explanation. Notation is the
predominant means of collecting, storing and archiving *piobaireachd* repertoire, however,
scholars have eloquently shown that score notation is a crude and inaccurate depiction of how
*piobaireachd* is actually performed (Cooke 1972; McClellan 2009). In particular they argue
that notational transcriptions cannot accurately convey the musical concepts that are a
definitive part of *piobaireachd*. This is due to westernised notation promoting standardised
and simplistic transcriptions, which do not account for the variation, individualism and
expression that is a feature of *piobaireachd* (Cooke 1972; Cooke 1975-1976; Cooke 1986; Cannon 1995; MacDonald 1995; McClellan 2007; McClellan 2009). Further, it encourages the interpretation of a standard westernised scale, which does not account for the variety of intonations and scales (including major and natural scales, and just and harmonic tempering as examples) used amongst the piping community (MacPherson 1998). The reader is directed to Cooke (1972; 1975-1976; and 1986), Cannon (1995), MacDonald (1995), MacPherson (1998), and McClellan (2007 and 2009) for further argument against the validity of notation. Further, the social demands for pipers to receive oral instruction (*canntaireachd*) is arguably evidence of the shortcomings of notation for depicting *piobaireachd* (see Chambers 1981 and Fatone 2010). As it stands there is no accepted, clear and accurate means for the transcription of *piobaireachd* into notation. Given these limitations the researcher has included note names and codification where necessary to illustrate some of the more complex concepts definitive of contemporary *piobaireachd*, not explicit in musical notation. As ethnomusicology accepts that westernised notation does little to illustrate the cultural value of the music it represents, the focus of this research is on the internalised perceptions of *piobaireachd*, not on its structure.

Similarly, an acoustic analysis would require the researcher to gather recordings of performances presumably for comparing pipers in New Zealand to pipers in Scotland, or for comparing performances over time. Although comparative fieldwork in Scotland would allow such analysis, time constraints, logistics and funding limitations restricted the scope of this research to New Zealand as a case study. How to select certain performers as acoustically representative of national piping cultures is problematic due to piping culture revolving around subjective interpretations of performances within a competitive framework. Undertaking such recordings would also have considerable logistic issues relative to technological demands and performance quality beyond a competition context. It would require a secondary selection of participants willing to be recorded and comparatively analysed through this method. It would demand access to recording and analytical resources beyond the research parameters, and require notational transcription previously identified as limited. Such data may have altered whether interview participants perceptions and participant observations were ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ against quantifiable acoustic data. However, a qualitative fieldwork based approach could not consider the research topic outside of its cultural context, and thus acoustic analyses were precluded from this investigation. Finally, given the use of other accepted data gathering methods in the triangulation process, this approach may not have added any qualitative ethnographic content. While future studies may
compare quantifiable acoustic data of *piobaireachd* from location to location, from performer to performer, and/or over time, such an approach, was not a concern of this research.

The interpretive theoretical framework presented above (Section 3.1.7 to 3.1.11) is both strength and limitation. It is induced from the data, builds upon the work of others, and drives the cultural interpretation of *piobaireachd* within the given structure. While this research direction has clarity and strength in design, there is potential limitation to the interpretive boundaries of *piobaireachd* and the subsequent implications. Simply put, there may be other methodologies, also applicable, capable of generating a differing set of results and interpretations. However, an exploration and critique of alternative methodological approaches is beyond the scope of this thesis.

It is unknown whether a different researcher, given the same topic, data gathering methods, and theoretical construct, would generate the same results and interpretation – such is a limitation of ethnography. Thus this research is reflective of the researcher and his understanding and experiences relative to the research topic. In this sense it is revealing of its circumstances. These are multidimensional and involve: the time and time frame for research; the researcher’s personal circumstances; the methods developed for data gathering; the equipment and materials utilised; the sources that provide data; data that were gathered; data analysis used; the interpretive theoretical framework generated; and the various other factors that have influenced the completion of this research. It is a record of itself, and this methodology has hopefully offered the reader sufficient transparency in order for an understanding of its limitations to be gained and the factors influencing, informing and affecting the research and its interpretation. However, the changing perspectives of social sciences and humanities research will ultimately be the judge of the validity and limitations of this study in the course of time.
Chapter 4 - Interpreting *Piobaireachd* Sound

Ethnomusicological literature identifies sound as the paramount factor for music-cultural research (Merriam 1964). Some scholars have argued for “the primacy of sound as a modality of knowing and being in the world” (Feld 2000, 184), identifying a number of ways to analyse musical sound in cultural terms (Schafer 1977; Feld 1982; Feld 2000; Kruth and Stobart 2000; Feld 2003). This research primarily situates musical sound as the definitive aspect of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand (Merriam 1964, 32). Reinterpreting Merriam’s (1964) tripartite model as a theoretical framework for the study of music as culture, this research is not just a focus on sound, where later chapters will also explore material and visual culture for *piobaireachd*, as well as its social and cultural transmission. However, consistent with the methodological approach outlined in Chapter 3, this study begins by considering sound. It does this in a number of ways that include exploring interview responses, participant observations, resource materials, and insider knowledge, to provide a detailed description and analysis of *piobaireachd* sound. As a definitive component of music culture, this examination of sound then facilitates a discussion of authenticity and localisation relative to *piobaireachd* as culture in New Zealand.

Little is known of the cultural parameters of *piobaireachd* in terms of sound. Interview responses from culture bearers, as well as researcher insider experience, indicate that the production of *piobaireachd* sound is the primary goal of *piobaireachd* ‘musicking’ (Small 1998), identified by interview participants as ‘music’. Meanwhile McClellan refers to the aural qualities of *piobaireachd* as ‘inimitable', although he does not offer further definition of that sound (McClellan 2009, 331). Slobin (1993) contends that sounds can represent the cultures that influence their production and interpretation. Meanwhile Stokes (1994a) and Duffy (1999) claim that a variety of places and cultures can be represented and read in musical sound. It is feasible then that not only will ‘Scotland’ be represented in the sound of *piobaireachd*, but so too may New Zealand. In thematic analysis of interviews, and in following Merriam’s (1964) model, this has been the primary driver for creating a chapter that has focused on the exploration of *piobaireachd* sound, and is the justification for this occupying the primary position in the results and discussion of data.
A considerable amount of literature has studied piobaireachd using Westernised traditions of score analyses and melodic/harmonic relationships within specific canon of tunes, and the piobaireachd repertoire in general (Lorimer 1962 and 1964; Cooke 1972; Blankenhorn 1978; Haddow 1982). However: given a paucity of research on contemporary piobaireachd beyond musical description, in terms of sound and its perception; given that recording and transcription of music is not a part of the research design for this study; and given the demand for external validity; this chapter primarily focuses on interview responses, while using participant observations, literature, and insider knowledge to support and contribute to the discussion.

For ‘music’ to be identified by people, certain qualities of sound are required (Nettl 2005, 29). These qualities must be acceptable to cultural participants in order for them to accept sound as ‘music’. This gives musical sound a cultural value and requires an investigation of the concept of ‘authentic sound’ in the context of musical culture. ‘Music’ can include sounds that are not an obvious or explicit part of the definition of music for cultural outsiders (Nettl 2005, 34). Cultural immersion and qualititative data are thus necessary for an accurate exploration of musical sound. Further, ethnomusicological discourse requires cultural investigations extend beyond sonic experiences alone, to the ways in which sound ‘means’ and functions (Nettl 2005, 36). Therefore this chapter will not simply discuss the phenomenological presentation of sound, it will consider the values embedded within piobaireachd sound and the concepts that arrange and give it meaning. Given that this thesis treats music as culture, this chapter thus seeks to examine the sounds and their concepts that participants include in their definition of ‘music’ for piobaireachd in New Zealand, and the aural qualities that might distinguish piobaireachd from other forms of Highland bagpiping.

In order to do this, it explores sound for piobaireachd as separate from, yet nonetheless related to, material and visual culture, as well as social and cultural transmission.

This chapter primarily examines interview data with New Zealand piobaireachd culture bearers. These interviews include discussion of the sound that defines piobaireachd, which allows for a consideration and discussion of culture, authenticity and localisation within such sound and for piobaireachd in general. Piobaireachd revolves around the demonstration of sound, and according to interview participants, piobaireachd involves various sound components. This is most clearly expressed in the following quote:

[For piobaireachd] … you’re looking at a musical ideal from a bagpipe, technique and expression point of view, musical expression there’s a number of things that go in to make that up (Participant 5).
This statement is characteristic of interview participants’ consideration of piobaireachd sound. Supported by observations from the field and insider knowledge, this quote indicates piobaireachd sound being threefold, ‘bagpipe’, ‘technique’, and ‘expression’. Such responses were supported by documents gathered in the field that indicate that pipers often break sound into such components as ‘bagpipe’, ‘technique’, and ‘expression’ (Appendices 4a, 4b and 4c). Insider experience determines such concepts to be translated into three important components of sound. These include instrument sound as ‘bagpipe’, technical sound as ‘technique’, and musical concepts as ‘expression’. Therefore piobaireachd sound will be explored in this chapter through interview participants’ discussion of instrument sound, technical sound, and musical concepts.

Such sounds are distinctly different yet at the same time interrelated. Instrument sound involves the inherent aural characteristics of the instrument, encompassing chanter and drone sound. Technical sound relates to the aural articulation of notes and ornaments, heard within the demonstration of instrument sound. Musical concepts involve the organised arrangement of such technical sounds and therefore drive the production of technical sound and instrument sound. As such, there appears to be a complex system and hierarchy for the arrangement of piobaireachd sound.

The performance of a piobaireachd encompasses these three fundamental components. Yet, while they have been separated here for discussion, it is important to note that they never exist on their own, they are always considered within the overall presentation of a piobaireachd performance, being the singular presentation of a tune from within the piobaireachd repertoire, at a particular instance, by a particular individual. Correspondingly, this chapter is broken into three main sections based upon these components of piobaireachd sound. Each of these sections is then presented in subsections that comprise themes from the analysis of data. Predominantly these examine interview responses, while being supported by ethnographic observations, and existing research. These main sections are preceded by an ethnographic observation that contextualises piobaireachd sound in order to help to situate the reader in the researcher’s ‘shoes’ within the field, prior to the presentation of findings and discussion.
4.1 Ethnographic Observation


I am sitting in a room that would normally function as the senior common room for secondary school students. The room is abuzz with the sound of audience members quietly conversing amongst themselves, roughly 15 or so, privately talking about all manner of things in groups of no more than three or four. This audience sound has been gently building for the last 5 minutes, since the last competitor completed their tune, was applauded and left the room. Starting with just one private conversation and slowly building to a hubbub of many, the anticipation of the next performance, or perhaps the end of the performances, in this particular event has created a heightened level of conversation. With several more competitors to come in this event, a sizeable audience have disparately gathered here to hear the next performer, widely renowned as one of the greatest current performers in the world, and resident within New Zealand. While we wait, other sounds can be heard: several times a cell phone has sounded upon receiving a text message, a ranch slider door has gently rumbled open and closed as people use it as an entry point to the room, pages flick as people turn through their competition programs, the odd cough here and there, however mostly the ambient sounds are voices – Kiwi accents talking bagpiping ‘shop’.

The next performer walks into the room via a corridor, down some steps and across the board to greet the judges. He can be heard approaching, tassels ‘knocking’ against his sporran from the movement of walking, brogues striking the floor, making a familiar woody ‘clop’. The sound of his approach grows stronger and the audience sound gradually falls to a near silence, tense and anticipatory. After exchanging greetings with the judges the performer checks their tune. “Lament for the Departure of King James?” he asks in a barely audible voice from the distance I am sitting. “Yes that’s what we have here too” states one judge, as the other flicks through a published manuscript collection to the appropriate page. “Thank you” says the performer before turning and walking towards the middle of the board. He begins to take blow long deep breaths into his instrument, the air causing a very subtle ‘whistle’ for a couple of seconds as it is forced through the blowpipe.

He abruptly squeezes the bag and the pipes spring to life, each individual drone ‘whurring’ its own sound, which fills the room with a commotion of tones, sometimes clashing and
sometimes complimenting each other. A split second later, the disparate sounds of the drones unite, and a rich and mellow droning sound emerges. These initial drone sounds are joined by the sharp nasally tone of the chanter just moments later. The performer plays a sparkling yet brief flourish of notes, and then reaching up with one hand begins to tune his drones, while the other hand hold one note High A. Taking no more than forty-five seconds, he tweaks each individual drone, stopping every now and then to play another flourish in between brief bursts of tuning.

He then begins to play a series of notes, a sequence, a pattern, which is by definition an extract from a tune from the piobaireachd repertoire. But this is not the performance, he has not begun to play his tune, he is simply checking and listening to tuning of his instrument. After roughly two minutes worth of this faux tune, the piper returns to adjusting his instrument, much more efficiently and purposefully than before. Yet this time he seemingly takes more care in tuning, more cautiously perfecting the tweaking of his drones and soon enough they sing out with a ‘buzzing’ quality, filling the room with warm and vibrant tones. The chanter cuts through this ‘buzziness’, ringing around the walls of the room, clear and crisp, scything into my ears in complete sympathy with the drones. In total he spends three minutes and twenty-four seconds tuning his pipes. Then for the first time since engaging his instrument the piper pauses on one particular note for several seconds. This creates a sense of anticipation... holding... holding. The next moment he begins to play a sequence of notes that comes to transform into his tune – his piobaireachd.

A grace note leads us in after the pause. Grace notes precede theme notes as the ‘The Lament for the Departure of King James’ the whiteboard with the tune name written on it for the audience’s benefit reminding me. The name doesn’t ring a bell with me, but the theme of this tune does. I know this tune, or at least I have learnt it in the past, or maybe I started learning it and stopped. I can’t recite it all from memory right now but I know how it goes, and I find myself fingering the Ground along with the piper, reciting it to myself in my head as he plays it, becoming reacquainted with the tune, although admittedly I would perform it faster.

Embellishments ring out from the chanter, calling and almost echoing around the room in spite of the warm acoustic environment. He glides over shorter notes that partition long thematic notes – the notes carrying the tune. A rhythm emerges, based around patterns of note length and divisions of time. As far as I can tell these divisions are separated into groups of two, four, eight or sixteen, skilfully implied by the piper, by no means explicit. Each time he
plays a group, he pauses ever so slightly, exaggerating and marking these divisions as he goes. Whenever the piper finishes a group of sixteen, he makes such a pause, delivering a musical ‘comma’, ‘semicolon’ or ‘full stop’ like statement by doing so, as I would do if I were to perform this piece, although my pauses would perhaps be longer. The tune takes on a moving quality as the piper draws out certain long notes and hastens others, generating a fluctuating and varied rhythm. Passages of tune flow, following combinations of grace notes and embellishments, theme notes and non-theme notes, all subdivided in time around rhythm.

After two and a half minutes the piper concludes the first section. The First Variation (second section) begins. The tempo is immediately faster than the Ground and there is more of a driven metric feel to this section. Sometimes it appears that he is playing every second note in this section as longer than every first note, every fourth note slightly longer than every second note, and every eighth note slightly longer than every fourth note. Sometimes this is clear and sometimes it is not and it is difficult to know whether I simply can’t hear it or whether he simply is not doing it. Subtly, each subsequent repetition of the theme becomes shorter and shorter in duration, increasing the tempo section by section. The melodic theme of the tune rings through my ears and in my mind I know the preceding sections before they are even played, what they comprise and how I would play them. I anticipate his timing and rhythm of notes and query my own. Building and building in tempo and intensity of embellishments, his chanter sounds as if rippling and fizzing, with bright and vibrant grace notes, proud and true theme notes. The tune is completely and utterly his, entertaining this audience, he is selling this tune in a brilliant display of musicality.

Deep bellowing notes ring from the lower range of the chanter while the upper range offers scintillating chirps and sparkling clear notes. The instrument has remained unchanged, the chanter sound forcefully presenting the notes of the tune above the wall of sound produced by the incessant stability of the drone sound, right until the end. And then abruptly the last section is completed, faster than anticipated, but by no means out of place. The concluding fragment of the first section is repeated, as is custom. As the tune concludes, the piper, elongating the final note, squeezes the last of the air out of his bag and abruptly all the sound ceases. The performance lasted for just over 14 minutes during which time no other sound could be heard but the pipes ringing throughout the room, bouncing off the walls. For a brief moment there is absolute silence before the room is filled with applause as the piper walks off the board and out of the performance arena.
This is a formalised extract of participant observation, focusing on the aural demonstration of a *piobaireachd*, within the context of cultural participation. The transcript may lead the reader to ask: ‘How are the sounds produced?’ ‘What decorum governs the production of sound?’ ‘What sounds is the performer making?’ ‘What sound does the performer hope to produce?’ ‘What does the audience expect hear?’ ‘Who are the judges?’ and ‘What is the context of this performance?’ The answers to such questions will be explored throughout this chapter as well as Chapters 5 and 6. All interview participants who took part in qualitative interviews in this study have performed in such contexts and are well versed in the production of such performances. This chapter details their interview responses and contextualises and discusses these results relative to the fundamental generation of *piobaireachd* sound, as contextualised above. The following chapter sections present and discuss these participant interview results that are delivered in the methodological framework described in Chapter 3.

4.2 Instrument Sound

The sound of the Highland bagpipe is a particularly recognisable aural phenomenon (Cannon 1988, 1), that can have an attractive character (Paterson 2009, 239-243), and which implies a long history of development (Cheape 2008, 141). Other than McKerrell (2005) few researchers have investigated perceptions of instrument sound in contemporary Highland piping culture. Further there is no research that has considered such perspectives specifically relative to *piobaireachd* or to New Zealand. McKerrell’s approach involves a focused analysis of ‘sound, mode, and aesthetics’ for elite competitive Highland piping in Scotland – including substantial material relating to acoustics, timbre, tone, scale, pitch, mode, modal complex, repertoire, motif, and sound aesthetics. McKerrell (2005) also explores the importance of instrument sound relative to competitive solo light music performance in Scotland through interviews with elite performers. In particular he discusses in-depth the qualitative aspect of instrument sound with these participants and its capacity to represent them. While this thread is fundamental to McKerrell’s research, it does not investigate instrument sound directly in relation to *piobaireachd* or diaspora. The reader is guided to his thesis and manuscripts for further detail of such interpretation (McKerrell 2005, 2009, and 2011a).

While such an approach is insightful for McKerrell’s topic (2005), this research took a more holistic approach, investigating *piobaireachd* instrument sound in association with technical sound and musical concepts, as a part of a cultural consideration of *piobaireachd*. Here the
focus is on *piobaireachd* in New Zealand as the product of sound, material and visual culture, and social and cultural transmission, rather than a specific study of sound aesthetics. Appendices 4a, 4b, and 4c illustrate the importance of instrument sound as a part of the demonstration of *piobaireachd* performance. Recognised by interview participants, by ethnographic observation, by existing literature, and by insider experience as a characteristic and crucial aspect of Highland bagpiping, this section on instrument sounds considers aural characters of instrument. Instrument sounds are derived from a piper’s actions, the material components of instrument, and environmental factors within the performance arena, the material qualities of these being considered in Chapter 5. Thus there is a difference between instrument sound and other aural phenomena produced in the performance of *piobaireachd*, instrument sounds are considered the aural characteristics of bagpipe’s sound, not related to technical sounds or musical concepts.

There are two components to bagpipe sound, drone sound and chanter sound. These comprise: the pitches, timbres, and volumes of tones contributing to the chanter sound during a given performance; combined with the individual pitches, timbres, and volumes that contribute to the drone sound during a performance (Baines 1960, 16-23). As discussed in Chapter 5, a diversity of instrument sounds between performers is resultant from the variability and fluctuation of material factors, such as a piper’s individual performance actions, their combination of instrument components and those components unique qualities, and the conditions and acoustics of the performance arena. Thus instrument sounds used in *piobaireachd* performances are unlikely to have the same acoustic characteristics, being comprised of a unique combination of pitches, volumes and timbres of chanter and drone sounds (see McKerrell 2005).

### 4.2.1 Meaning and Production

Interview participants had particularly strong opinions regarding instrument sound when asked what *piobaireachd* meant to them. They indicated that the presentation of a good sounding instrument in performance meant they could enjoy a performance for its instrument sound, while also admire its demonstration technical sounds and musical concepts, either as a performer or audience member. In this manner, instrument sound appears to provide a foundation for the consideration of overall *piobaireachd* sound in performance. Participants offered consistent views on this matter. For example:

> I get a lot of satisfaction and enjoyment out of playing a good tune. Sometimes your instrument can do marvellous things. When you’ve got that sweet *piobaireachd* High G
or that ringing High A, you know if you’re playing the ‘Lament for the Earl of Antrim’ you’ve got your pipes humming and those little things like that that make it you know really special (Participant 1).

All participants indicated that listening to piobaireachd on a good sounding instrument provided them with a level of enjoyment and satisfaction that a poor sounding instrument could not. Yet, more importantly, they also suggested that the satisfaction and enjoyment they get from piobaireachd performances with such optimal instrument sound is a different kind of satisfaction than instrument sound for other formats of Highland piping, such as light music or pipe bands. Seemingly, there is some deep and complex notion of cultural authenticity of instrument sound embedded in piobaireachd performance, driving instrument sounds used in New Zealand, and distinctly different for piobaireachd than other musical ‘styles’ for the Highland bagpipe.

In further discussion with interview participants, several identified that good instrument sound was fundamental for good overall sound, which in turn was necessary in order for a performance to be considered authentic. They suggested that such an optimal instrument sound was the ‘bottom rung’ of an authentic piobaireachd performance, that an authentic piobaireachd performance was not possible on a poor sounding instrument:

When they blow up and start their tune, the instrument is most important and entry to the tune is real important. It’s hard to judge music with a poor pipe. Even when they’re tuning up just listening to see if they’ve got a good pipe and tune. The ideal is a clean melodic with pipes staying in tune the whole time, for the whole piobaireachd (Participant 3).

This illustrates the significance of instrument sound as the foundation for piobaireachd. Instrument is the first part of piobaireachd sound heard, and the first place where the aural interpretation of a piobaireachd performance is made. This clearly limits the production of piobaireachd sound to the Highland bagpipe instrument. Such an observation reflects the understanding of piobaireachd as the classical, traditional and original music for the Highland bagpipe.

In identifying a need for a ‘good pipe’ and differences between good and bad sounds, interview participants determine the importance of authenticity of instrument sound in an authentic performance. Further participant responses indicated that acquiring an authentic instrument sound required an intimate understanding of their instrumental performance actions, their instrument components, and how these two factors would combine in the
context of performance to create instrument sound. Some participants identified acquiring authentic instrument sound as a personal strength:

I actually get excited and because I guess not all pipers can actually maintain a good bagpipe and then get to the end of such a big tune (Participant 1).

While others indicated a struggle to acquire authentic instrument sound:

My main focus when I’m preparing is getting my pipes right is not something I get easily. So in the tune up room I’m mainly focusing on, trying to get the chanter settled in. I’ve been struggling with getting my kitty litter just right, and so I’m blowing up and the top hand’s sharp I’ve got to keep playing to get a bit of moisture in there (Participant 2).

Such responses intimate that demonstrating authentic instrument sound is a result of their individual performance abilities, skills, and knowledge, enabled through their unique instrument performance actions, instrument components and the performance environment.

When further asked about difficulties in achieving ideal ‘pipe’ sound, some participants were more willing than others to share their experiences:

I’ve had a few drones going out of tune ... you know 10 minutes to go but I try and keep going. Sometimes I have thought about stopping but just keep going and then ended up with a fourth or something like that. You don’t know what’s happening in the competition but if you stop halfway through they’ll put a line through your name immediately (Participant 3).

Such statements not only speak for the difficulty in maintaining an ideal instrument sound during performance, but also illustrate the difficulties and dilemmas that other performers face for instrument sound. This suggests that authenticity in relation to instrument sound is a major concern of all pipers both before, and during, performances of piobaireachd. One participant was particularly willing to share his experiences and approaches for authenticity of instrument sound:

I wasn’t 100% happy … piobaireachd High G was a little sharp and I had to control it as I played, which put me off … I had to ease off the pressure from my arm to keep it under control, or as under control as I could… I think the conditions of the room led to some issues, being that it was freezing cold. And much colder in the tuning room and such like, it was quite difficult to settle … Potentially, it was just a little bit of a shock I guess. I felt I had to play quite a long time on the board to decide what was happening with the drones. They moved a little bit throughout and they actually settled towards the end of the tune. More so than in the middle, which was fine… I’d rather they stayed solid the whole time but that’s kind of the constant battle that you’re aiming towards… Most of the time they tend to start drifting about 2 variations from the end when you’re just starting the Taorluath Doubling and you can hear that it’s not quite right so you start to adjust your blowing a little bit. It could go either way. If you’ve played too long you might have to start easing off because the moisture’s hitting, or blowing harder as your chanter’s flattening off … so you start to adjust a little bit, and then you’ve got to do that whilst you continually try to phrase the tune properly. In terms of getting them so that they’ll hit that sweet spot on the board. It wasn’t quite right and I was taking too long, so I took a bit of a gamble and started when I thought they were ok. But I could hear the drones unsettling and going adrift and I thought ‘argh’ I hadn’t quite hit it. It never drifts that much to be completely horrible. So I wasn’t particularly worried that it wasn’t right. So that’s really
it when I’m on the board. If the chanter is flat, I’ll just play for a little bit to see if it will come up to the drones (Participant 6).

This detailed description of the instrument tuning process prior to performance, the difficulties in maintaining instrument sound during performance, and the reflection back on prior performances was unique amongst participants taking part in this study. Sharing his instrument sound anxieties and issues, Participant 6 demonstrated just how important instrument sound is for pipers who perform piobaireachd within New Zealand. Such information clearly relays to the reader the complexity of concepts and approaches that pipers use to generate and maintain instrument sound for piobaireachd.

As described above, pipers ready their instrument prior to performance, tuning them in relation to their understanding of authentic instrument sound. This understanding relates to perceptions of the ‘best’ performance actions, sound producing components, and performance conditions for the acquisition of authentic sound. They tune their pipes in the moments leading up to entering the performance arena, but also within the performance arena as a preliminary aspect of their performance (see figure 4.1), prior to beginning the formal presentation of their tunes.

In order to produce optimal instrument sound, pipers require an intimate knowledge of the nuances of their instruments and the sounds they can produce from their particular performance actions, within particular performance conditions. Several interview participants indicated the importance of piobaireachd for Highland piping in New Zealand as they felt it

Figure 4.1 Pipers tuning their drones immediately prior to piobaireachd performance, Source: author, Dunedin (2-3 June 2012).
improved ability to both understand and to acquire authentic sound for Highland bagpiping beyond *piobaireachd*:

I was always taught, that when you get into *piobaireachd* that it will have a direct impact on your light music and then I learnt how important it was to blow a steady bagpipe. It did have a direct impact on my light music. At the same time I learnt to love it and really get into it (Participant 1).

This was typical of the majority of participants. It provides interesting insight into *piobaireachd* being a style of performance that requires considerable stamina and physical exertion in order to maintain a consistent instrument sound through ‘blowing a steady bagpipe’. Likewise a different participant also indicated that their motivation for learning *piobaireachd* was to improve their blowing and instrument sound:

The main reason was to improve my overall playing… I came here and found out I was not really even close to these guys on a solo level… ‘I’ve got to sort my blowing and my pipes have got to be better’ (Participant 6).

Statements such as these show that *piobaireachd* is seen as being beneficial for developing good instrumental performance actions leading to steady, strong, and consistent blowing. These are ultimately considered major contributing factors in the production of authentic instrument sound for *piobaireachd* performance. Such steadiness, strength, and consistency is a feature sought after in participants across all formats of Highland piping within New Zealand, particularly pipe bands, where the strains of extended and repetitive performances can be demanding.

Figure 4.2 Pipers performance actions including blowing into and squeezing the bag. Source: Lyn McHugh (Celtic Kiwi Photography).
Participants considered the instrument sound heard in a *piobaireachd* performance to be related to the pre-existing development of performance actions, developed prior to learning *piobaireachd*, in the early stages of a piper’s career. One participant commented:

> I developed into it straight away but I was about 15 when I formally began. I didn’t rush into it, but I was confident on the pipes and competing and then started at *piobaireachd* (Participant 3).

Another participant voiced similar arguments:

> I think older learners, think ‘maybe I’ve got more potential’ and ‘it’d be better if I play *piobaireachd.*’ They can blow better … I think people come to it later for a vast number of reasons. … I think you’re more developed at a later stage to appreciate a good sounding bagpipe (Participant 5).

These responses suggest a need for steady blowing, a confidence in bagpipe performance, and a greater development of instrument sound aesthetics and appreciation. While these are not necessarily fundamental requirements for *piobaireachd* performance, they are accepted by most as being inherent of authentic *piobaireachd* performance.

These contrasting statements do not necessarily imply conflicting views about the role of *piobaireachd* within the Highland piping community in New Zealand. Rather, they suggest a clear link between *piobaireachd*, instrument sound and Highland piping culture in general, where *piobaireachd* is beneficial for developing instrument sound, and where *piobaireachd* performances themselves benefit from a previously developed understanding of, and skill in producing, instrument sound. *Piobaireachd* is seen by these participants as a mechanism for improving a piper’s performance actions in general, but also for refining a piper’s instrument to sound appropriate for all forms of bagpipe performance. Whether such arguments regarding the importance of *piobaireachd* for instrument sound also holds true for Highland bagpiping beyond New Zealand (e.g. Scotland) is unknown. No research has previously acknowledged the value of *piobaireachd* for conditioning the body and ‘training the ear’ of pipers.

These interview participants consistently indicate that authenticity of instrument sound is a concept both individually understood and socially demonstrated. As performers, they frequently strive to present authentic instrument sound in *piobaireachd* performance, yet, they identify that presentation and definition of such authenticity differs from performer to performer. For them, authentic instrument sound is that which is good, optimal and faithful to previously established cultural aesthetics of instrument sound. Further, in obtaining such instrument sound, performers are able to demonstrate instrumental proficiency and a capacity
to blow steady and for an extended period of time. This is both a necessity in achieving authentic instrument sound for *piobaireachd*, and a performative strength and attribute sought after in Highland pipers beyond the performance of *piobaireachd*. In the context of competitive performance, they indicate that adjudicators and audiences arrange performances within a hierarchy of demonstrated cultural authenticity that necessarily involves a consideration of instrument sound as a part of performance. Therefore, the concept of authentic instrument sound in *piobaireachd* performance appears to be both individually subjective and arranged hierarchically in social settings.

4.2.2 Materials, International Differences, Change

Responses from interview participants occasionally featured discussion of authentic sounding instrument components, more of which is presented in Chapter 5 with a focus on material culture. Explicitly opening up about such material components that produce an authentic instrument sound was not a consistent feature of interviews, with only two participants providing details:

[I’m using a] sheepskin bag, [and a] cane bass. You hear the competing pipers say that it comes down to that last 5% and so I’ve been really working on that (Participant 1).

I’ve recently acquired a set of 1880ish MacDougall’s. … I prefer them in terms of the tone of the wood and the character and the richness of sound. That’s something you don’t get with modern instruments. The tuning of them though is a lot less forgiving, the MacDougall’s settle a lot quicker but it’s the most minute tuning to get that steady tuning (Participant 6).

Such statements could be read as placing priority for the production of instrument sound on the components that make up a pipers instrument. There is an unofficial hierarchy of instrument components based on their attributed capacity to generate optimal instrument sounds. Although most interview participants weren’t specifically asked about their instrument components, they generally implied that instrument components were not the primary factors that determined authenticity of instrument sound. Rather, participants place a greater priority on their performance actions and abilities to modify their instrument components, than they do on their instrument components themselves. That is, how an instrument sounds, is often more to do with the capabilities of the performer, than it is to do with the quality of the instrument – in much the same way that how a car is driven is a greater reflection on the driver than it is on the car itself.
One interview participant indicated reed making to be a marker of knowledge of how authentic instrument sound is defined, determining that crafting good sounding reeds demonstrated a deeper knowledge of instrument components and sounds:

Piper X, he was a very talented player. He made his own drone reeds, cane drone reeds, I don’t know whether he made his own chanter reeds, he didn’t at the time, but he was going to move on to that, and he kept a really beautiful sounding bagpipe … I remember hearing him play a few times, and what a talent, what a really lovely player (Participant 5).

Such a statement shows how important the ability to adjust and modify components of instrument is for achieving an ideal instrument sound. Further, this comment and those above also highlight the preference some pipers have for ‘traditional’ components and their contribution to authentic instrument sound, a point supported by McKerrell’s analysis of competitive solo pipers in Scotland (McKerrell 2011a). Pipers take responsibility for the quality of their instrument sound in performance where being able to maintain a stable, consistent, and quality-sounding instrument is the ultimate aim. When they are unable to achieve such an aural outcome, they will either alter their performance actions to better suit their instrument components, or, manipulate or change their existing instrument components to better suit their performance actions, both instances being in relation to socially held definitions of authentic instrument sound.

All of the interview participants had also spent some time in Scotland, and participated in piobaireachd performances whilst there. They were asked to comparatively reflect on their experiences regarding instrument sound in New Zealand and Scotland. Some spoke of better instrument sound heard for piobaireachd in Scotland:

Yeah there’s definitely a top level of about 20 guys over there that are just on their day, they get their pipes so good and instrument sort of sets the tune off… so you just let the music wash over you whereas someone who’s pipes aren’t as good … it doesn’t happen the same (Participant 2).

Yeah I think the biggest battle we have here is the battle with the environment. Same old story, go to somewhere like Dunedin, you’ll come away thinking ‘gee I wish I’d done a bit more practice before that’. Whereas having a season in Scotland, a lot of the hard work [practice] done over the winter months so everyone’s banging it out weekend after weekend (Participant 3).

Go back to that live streaming the other night, those pipes [in Scotland] were just fantastic. It’s always a bit of a wake up call when you hear a good instrument, a good tune and that sort of thing and you always go back and second guess what you’ve got going. Could you refine it a bit more. It’s that whole exposure of it, far more exposure on a far more regular basis to it (Participant 4).
While other participants suggested that conditions for performance in Scotland made acquiring authentic instrument sound more of a difficulty than in New Zealand:

Anywhere you go in the world there’s different conditions. You’ve got to work with what we’ve got really so just trying to practice with leading up, trying to get a feel for what your pipes are going to do in certain conditions. A New Zealand summer and you might be able to get 30 – 50 minutes out of your pipes whereas a cold day up in Inverness in Scotland you’ll probably only get 20 minutes so that’s just knowing your conditions yeah, and working around it (Participant 3).

I enjoy indoors more … It’s just better. Obviously I do go outside and often that’s the case over in Scotland, a lot of its outside. But yeah most of the big events like the silver and gold medals are indoors. So most of the big ones will be indoors… It’s probably just the culture there, with the highland games so yeah quite a few highland games with plenty of things happening, field events, highland dancing all in the one park you know which is a good attraction and stuff and a good spectacle. Yeah I enjoy the Highland games a lot and sometimes playing is not quite so enjoyable if it’s raining and they stick with it outside so sometimes it’s rough but there’s plenty of good outdoor games as well that are very pleasant to play at (Participant 5).

The above responses indicate that interview participants believe instrument sound for piobaireachd performance in Scotland is usually better than instrument sound heard in New Zealand. Yet, paradoxically instrument sound in Scotland was also more susceptible to poor environmental conditions that in New Zealand. They attributed these observations with a greater number of performance contexts in Scotland than in New Zealand, where the majority were held outdoors and exposed to Scotland’s specific weather conditions. In New Zealand there are fewer performance opportunities and the majority of these are indoor competitions (see figure 4.3).

While talking about international differences for instrument sound, one participant had the following interesting comments to add.

I judged the Victoria Gold Medal in Australia and that was very interesting… The standard was pretty bad, it was more or less band pipes in your face… things like that are quite frightening. No finesse at all but I think we’re miles ahead of the Aussies in terms of standards (Participant 1).

This indicates that New Zealand’s piobaireachd instrument sound is less like that of other formats of Highland piping in New Zealand, while in Australia piobaireachd instruments appear to sound more like pipe band instruments, at least according to Participant 1.
When asked whether *piobaireachd* in New Zealand was undergoing or had undergone changes, several participants indicated that improvements in the standard of instrument sound were key for allowing an improvement in overall *piobaireachd* performance standards in New Zealand.

[Today, there are] more players that can play a good tune. The standard of the instrument’s sound is better than when I was a kid. When my dad was playing, there were a lot of pipes that weren’t up to standard. I think it’s better and technically I think [there are] more people working harder at it (Participant 2).

With the quality of the instruments I think it [*piobaireachd*] is starting to become more accessible (Participant 4).

These comments suggest that participants believe instrument sound has changed, and is continuing to change, for the better. These changes seem to be associated with greater access to better sounding instrument components than in the past, which participants believe has resulted in more stable, consistent and authentic instrument sounds for *piobaireachd* performance today. Such changes are seen as being good for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand as they have meant that performances today are at a higher standard of instrument sound than they presumably have been in the past. Comparative perspectives such as these are explored further in Chapter 6. Such an improvement however is seen to have made *piobaireachd* more accessible to cultural participants due to a greater variety of instrument components that are
generally lower in price and more widely dispersed. This has allowed pipers to produce more stable, more consistent and therefore more authentic instrument sounds in *piobaireachd* performance within New Zealand, and is believed to have lead to an increased appreciation of *piobaireachd* within the Highland piping community.

When asked how they thought *piobaireachd* related to other formats of Highland piping, a number of interview participants discussed instrument sound in providing fairly strong responses in the negative:

> I don’t think it fits into pipe bands at all. Even when I think about *piobaireachd* I think about a different instrument, like pipe bands are all about volume and clarity and all that sort of carry on. When I think about *piobaireachd*, it’s more about finesse, it’s a lovely sweet gift that you’re trying to create. They are completely separate things. I don’t think you can link them (Participant 1).

> I think when the public hear piping they hear the sound of the instrument, they don’t actually hear ‘the tune’. They would have no concept of it. *Piobaireachd*-wise they wouldn’t understand it, they wouldn’t be able to get past the sound of the tune, there’s no recognisable melody for them, but that’s part of the attraction for the pipes, people like the sound (Participant 5).

Participants clearly differentiated the instrument sounds suitable for *piobaireachd* performance from those appropriate for other forms of Highland bagpiping in New Zealand. They consider the various formats of Highland bagpiping to have differing instrument sound standards to *piobaireachd* sound, determining that *piobaireachd* instruments need to sound different, ‘sweet’ and with more ‘finesse’ than pipe band instruments for example. However, they offered no further definition of how this could be achieved.

### 4.2.2 Summary

These participant responses provide cultural insider interpretation regarding the key instrument sound component of *piobaireachd* sound, definitive for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. Such insights offer unique and detailed interpretations of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand relative to the framework for this study. It is interesting to observe that, while there is some consistency of interpretation of instrument sound amongst these participants, there is also at times disjuncture in how such interpretations are weighted. From the perspective of interpreting instrument sound, participant responses provide support for the localisation of *piobaireachd* to New Zealand. They do this through considering unique localised characteristics for instrument sound authenticity, particularly how it is defined and achieved relative to New Zealand. In doing so this illustrates the parameters of instrument sound for
piobaireachd in cultural terms, and partially contributes to the consideration of piobaireachd as a subculture of Highland bagpiping.

While interview participants identified that piobaireachd performance allows pipers to showcase their interpretation of authentic instrument sound, this also implies that such pipers understand what authentic instrument sound is within New Zealand. Further, it intimates that they know how to acquire this through their instrument materials and performance actions relative to the local performance conditions and contexts. Such local conditions often have an impact on the way pipers produce instrument sound for piobaireachd within New Zealand, and differ from the conditions for performance in Scotland. At the same time they also acknowledged that the standard of instrument sound practiced in Scotland is of a higher standard, in their own terms ‘better’ and thus more authentic than instrument sound in New Zealand.

Participants suggested that, in New Zealand, knowledge of how to produce authentic sound in piobaireachd also extends beyond piobaireachd, and influences how pipers understand and practice instrument sound for other formats of Highland piping, such as light music and pipe band performance. They clearly see that piobaireachd is an important part of Highland piping in New Zealand as it allows them to demonstrate their specific interpretations of authentic instrument sound, in a demanding and more testing forum of authentic performance than other formats of Highland piping in New Zealand. As such, authentic instrument sound, proven in piobaireachd performance, often means more than that produced in light music or in pipe bands. Furthermore, they believed that piobaireachd performances encourage the development of ideal performance actions in pipers, and encourage pipers to gain intimate understandings of their instruments and how they can generate authentic instrument sound with certain instrument components. Particularly important is a need to do so in varying performance conditions – a skill that they consider to be of benefit for instrumental performances within other formats of Highland piping in New Zealand.

Notions of authenticity drive the way in which participants practice instrument sound, and beliefs about authentic instrument sound play a major part in determining how performances are interpreted. Authentic instrument sound is fundamental for a ‘good’ piobaireachd performance. One of the ways in which meaning is embodied in performance is through demonstrating an understanding of authenticity within instrument sound, allowing participants to value that performance over others as more faithful to cultural authenticity.
Moore (2002) argues that authenticity can be defined in two distinct ways, either culturally authentic according to the individual, or to the collective. For cultural participants, their unique interpretations of what constitutes authentic instrument sound for *piobaireachd* performance are informed by previous authentic instrument sounds they have experienced in cultural participation in the past. In this way, interview participants indicate that the cultural past is manifested within instrument sound. However, while interview participants have indicated that cultural authenticity is a major factor in the performance and transmission of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, authenticity of instrument sound remains undefined.

Lastly, interview participants indicate that differences exist between New Zealand and Scotland regarding the frequency of, and conditions for, performance. While the participants who had performed in Scotland were consistent in suggesting differences in the sound of *piobaireachd* instruments between New Zealand and Scotland, they did not discuss what those differences were in terms of sound beyond being ‘better’, and thus more authentic. This does, however, indicate that authenticity of instrument sound in New Zealand is driven by a transcultural relationship determining that instrument sound in Scotland is more authentic, and thus provides the benchmark of quality. Yet, while some interview participants have implied that *piobaireachd* instrument sound has been localised to New Zealand, such localised sound characteristics embodied within the sound itself remain elusive. Perhaps a comparative analysis such as that of McKerrell (2005 and 2011a) would offer quantifiable data in terms of acoustics for comparison of such potential localisation. As it stands however, an acoustemological analysis is beyond the intention of this research.

Thus, this exploration of instrument sound as component of *piobaireachd* sound demonstrates that *piobaireachd* is more than simply a style of music, determining that not only is *piobaireachd* instrument sound different from that of other formats of Highland piping, but also determining that there are differences in instrument sound for *piobaireachd* in Scotland and New Zealand, as well as elsewhere (Australia). Yet, while such responses considered instrument sound as a major component, they also inferred the other components of *piobaireachd* sound are important to *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. As one of these further components, discussion of technical sound is presented in the following section.
4.3 Technical Sound

Technical sound is a fundamental component to Highland bagpiping, providing the articulation of melody on the bagpipe chanter (McKerrell 2011a, 171). Existing literature makes reference to finger technique as a function and behaviour of pipers that produces the articulation of technical sounds (Cannon 1988, 30-36; Brown 2009, 43-45; Forrest 2009, 90). A wide range of accepted Highland piping tutorial books consistently indicate the importance of technical sound as fundamental for Highland piping (MacNeill and Pearston 1953; Macleod 2001; MacLellan 2003). Further, Appendices 4a, 4b, and 4c suggest that technical sounds are an important aspect of performance. On the Highland bagpipe, technical sound cannot be demonstrated without instrument sound, and as a component of sound, technical sound is thus an important aspect of piobaireachd. McKerrell acknowledges this in briefly discussing ornamentation in his analysis of sound aesthetics for competitive solo pipers in Scotland, and yet he regards this as tangential to his research and explores it no further (McKerrell 2005, 96-97). As little existing research has focused on technical sound in piobaireachd performance, particularly relative to cultural authenticity and localisation, this section explores technical sound in more detail.

As with instrument sound, technical sounds are distinct from other aural phenomena produced in the performance of a tune. Technical sounds are attributed to the aural articulation of melodic sounds alone, and refer specifically to the aural character of a piper’s finger technique producing such melodic sounds in performance. Technical sounds can neither be considered instrument sound, as they are dependent on the fingers articulating sounds from an already established instrument sound, nor can they be considered musical concepts. They are both the fingered phonetic of musical concepts and also determine how musical concepts are demonstrated in sound. For the purposes of this research, technical sounds are aural phenomena that comprise the notes and ornaments heard within the tune of a particular piobaireachd performance, as derived from the finger technique of pipers. In this chapter such technical sound is discussed as being comprised of two components: note sound and ornament sound.

While interview participants indicated that there were three key components of piobaireachd sound (instrument sound, technical sound, and musical concepts) the detail of the responses given for each component varied. Of all of these, technical sound generated the least number of responses and the least detail and as such this section is the shortest within this chapter. Further reflection on such a limited number of responses is provided later.
4.3.1 Considering Technical Sound

The need to demonstrate good technique was consistently described as an important component of performance, alongside instrument sound and musical concepts. In this regard technical sounds were accepted by participants, and supported by the literature (Cannon, 1988, 31-36), as the articulation of chanter sounds within performance, presented as notes and ornaments. Examples of common cultural terms for such ornaments discussed in the interviews include ‘gracenote’, ‘taorluath’, ‘crunluath’, ‘birl’, ‘airdrie’, and ‘throw on D’ as well as such notes as ‘theme notes’, ‘cut notes’ and ‘non thematic notes’. Cannon (1988, 31-35) identifies such terms being used for Highland bagpiping presumably written from his point of view in Scotland, as do other authors such as Collinson (1975) and Donaldson (2000 and 2005). Such use of terms in interviews indicates a consistency of terminology for *piobaireachd* technical sound between New Zealand and Scotland. A detailed anthology and description of *piobaireachd* terminology is beyond the scope and intent of this thesis, however such an observation at least offers grounds for some discussion of *piobaireachd* terminology, which will be presented later in the chapter.

Clear articulation of such notes and ornaments was a key focus for interview participants, requiring rapid, controlled and well-practised finger technique.

Technique is something [important] in *piobaireachd* as well. I wouldn’t say I’m perfect either but I do a fair bit of technique practice on *crunluaths* to make sure I’m hearing all the sounds (Participant 3).

Participants indicated that quality technical sounds were a necessity for the *piobaireachd* performance to be considered acceptable in terms of its sound. In order to consistently produce such quality technique, pipers acknowledged the need to also refine the sound of their notes and ornaments within other formats of Highland piping, such as light music and pipe bands. As *piobaireachd* is considerably longer and more demanding of consistency in technique, they felt that *piobaireachd* was useful for improving authenticity of technical sounds for all Highland piping in New Zealand in general:

My way of learning *piobaireachd* wasn’t necessarily because I liked *piobaireachd* initially, it was the benefits of playing *piobaireachd* would help with my playing of other music. So that’s how it started and then I learnt a lot about my technique and the execution of it (Participant 1.)

So I could throw my fingers around a little bit but I really came here [New Zealand] and I found out I was not even close to these guys on a solo level. I thought ‘if I’m going to compete I’ve got to play *piobaireachd*, I’ve got to improve my technique [technical sounds]’ (Participant 6).
Piobaireachd is fantastic, fantastic for everything to do with piping – stamina, technique, it’s good (Participant 8).

Thus piobaireachd appears to fulfill a role as an important pathway for the development of good Highland piping finger technique. Such responses suggest that piobaireachd is an important factor for high level Highland piping performance development, at least with regard to these pipers being representative of the current elite Highland pipers in New Zealand today.

Participants reflected on their self-perceived abilities, or in some cases inabilities, to produce acceptable piobaireachd technical sound – many believing that they had strengths in certain areas and weaknesses in others, expressed through their reflection on being able to articulate notes and ornaments in performance. Comments in support of technical sounds as a personal attribute include:

I think my strengths in piobaireachd are very strict technique. I look for tunes, which probably try and match my strengths. I quite enjoy the gutsy crunluath a machs. I’ve got a really strong bottom hand so I’m actually quite relaxed at the ends of the tunes, so a tune like ‘In Praise of Morag’, where there’s like 50 million crunluath a machs [hyperbole], I love those tunes… you know a hundred taorluaths, a hundred taorluath a machs, crunluaths, crunluath a machs (Participant 1).

Technique isn’t so much of an issue now, I won’t shy away from a tune if it looks complex or whatever, I would rather give it a crack than not (Participant 6).

While responses suggesting an inability to demonstrate good technical sounds included:

There’s always these little bits of technique that you know are not quite so [good] for me [like] the aidrie to E, sometimes I kind of think ‘oh yeah that’s not quite crisp enough’ or stuff like that. Sometimes I have a tendency to get a bit stilted with the Taorluath (Participant 2).

I don’t know what happened to my bottom hand, but the Ground and variations were good, but I got to the mach and I’ve never been able to make a noise like I did when I was trying to play some a machs, it was incredible (Participant 7).

These excerpts clearly illustrate differences in the abilities of participants to produce technical sounds, where some consider themselves able to produce optimal ornaments and notes, and others are more reserved about their capabilities. Ultimately, such statements support an argument for technical sound being an important part of piobaireachd performance, and demonstrate one of the ways in which individual performers and their performances differ in sound, further supporting McKerrell (2005).
Differences in ability to produce technical sound imply limitations in a piper’s perceived performance ability. Where these limitations in producing technical sound are acknowledged by a piper, they appear to have a bearing on the piper’s choice of, and affinity for, tunes within the *piobaireachd* repertoire. This is particularly due to the musical concepts within a tune dictating the technical sounds required in the performance of that tune. For example:

‘Patrick Og MacCrimmon[‘s Lament]’ is probably my favourite of all tunes. I think technically there’s a challenge with it so technically the movements and trying to get your *piobaireachd* G really nice [are a feature of that tune] (Participant 2).

I swithered on ‘Lament for MacSwan of Roaig’. I’ve always had issues with *birls* in general. They’ve always been a weakness in my playing. So I avoided playing tunes with *birls* and I though ‘I can’t expect to be on a Clasp board and avoid tunes with *birls* it’s just silly.’ So I worked on the *birl* and it’s fine. I think I looked at ‘Lament for MacSwan of Roaig’ and instantly dismissed it because [I thought] ‘too many bloody *birls*, I’ll look at the other ones first’ (Participant 6).

Oh ‘The Daughter’s Lament’ is an absolute cracker of a tune to play. Heaps of High G’s in it, throws to High G. Absolute nightmare (Participant 7).

The performance of *piobaireachd* thus appears to expose a piper’s limitations for producing technical sounds, while at the same time showcase their technical abilities. *Piobaireachd* sound makes them aware of, and encourages them to correct any, shortcomings in instrumental performance both for *piobaireachd*, and for other forms of Highland piping. As a result, participants felt that *piobaireachd* was useful as it enhanced their ability to produce good technical sounds for Highland piping in general, while it also allowed them to demonstrate their strengths in technique.
Participants acknowledged that the demonstration of technical sounds could be either good or bad within a performance. Bad technical sound could be an inherent weakness in technical skill, or it could simply be a momentary or random error. While such errors could occur at any point within a tune, they are generally attributed to a lack of practice and proficiency in delivering consistent technique within a performance. Some participants offered links between the amount of practice undertaken prior to performance, and the demonstration of good technical sound within that performance.

I guess I am relaxed at the end and I do a lot of technique practice to make sure I can handle it (Participant 1).

I wouldn’t say I’m perfect either but yeah I do a fair bit of technique practice on crunluaths just to make sure I’m hearing all the sounds in there (Participant 3).

These comments suggest that good technical sounds are the result of practice resolving identified limitations in technique for that particular piper, and are a component of authentic piobaireachd sound. As good technical sounds equate to authentic technical sounds, these results, together with insider experience, support a link between practice, technical sound, and authenticity of performance.

Figure 4.5 A piper practicing finger technique on the practice chanter. Source: author, Methven (17 January 2012).

Participants were asked questions regarding technique specific to New Zealand. Two participants indicated that through the consideration of technical sounds, pipers in New Zealand might perform piobaireachd differently than elsewhere:
Here in New Zealand some people struggle with technique either in the *Crunluath* or the *[Crunluath]* a *Mach* or something like that, sometimes letting themselves down in that (Participant 3).

And yeah in some places you had Tutor X, and those guys coming up and teaching. And yeah they were slightly chunkier in technique potentially. I think it comes back to Tutor X who’s got a kernel of truth on things but in actual fact he extrapolates that on what he’s been taught you get a different interpretation of what’s right which is where we’ve gone in some places in New Zealand (Participant 5).

While such reflections were insightful they were rare in the interviews, with most participants equivocal as to whether technical sounds were different in New Zealand or not. Such limited reflections suggested that in the past technical sounds used in *piobaireachd* might have been localised within New Zealand. They were, however, dismissive as to whether this reflected New Zealand or specific New Zealand regions, as well as whether it represented New Zealand in any way. Rather, they preferred to associate this observation with the influence of particular individuals in a certain area, which they did not consider to be reflective of New Zealand. Despite further prompting, participants remained reticent and unsure with such discussion of localised technique, offering little further information.

Most participants considered that technical sounds heard for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand today were consistent both within, and external to New Zealand. Such an observation is supportive of an objective definition for *piobaireachd* based upon the literature that describes and defines *piobaireachd* musically in Scotland. However, localisation of technical sound within New Zealand does have precedent as indicated in these interviews. Further, Dickson (2006) describes how, in a local Highland piping tradition, distinct differences in technique were characteristic of performers. He continues to point out that such localised traits became considered flaws and errors in contrast to true and authentic technical sounds as a national homogeneity of Highland piping in Scotland took shape. This exposed local culture to its distinctiveness and allowed for such ‘flawed’ cultural practices to be acknowledged and eventually stamped out (Dickson 2006, 105-123). Later in this thesis (Chapter 6) discussion of such change relative to *piobaireachd* in New Zealand will be provided.

**4.3.2 Summary**

Similar to instrument sound, interview responses provided the framework of discussion regarding technical sounds embedded in the performance of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. Regarding technical sound, there is evidence for both consistency and variation of
interpretation with participants providing some support for localisation in the past, and yet also denying localisation of technical sounds to New Zealand in the present.

Participants identified that *piobaireachd* performance allows pipers to showcase their capacity for demonstrating good technical sound, and how this also provided both the framework and a benchmark for achievement within subsequent performances, both within *piobaireachd* and for Highland bagpiping in general. These responses provide a model for authenticity of technical sound extending beyond *piobaireachd*, influencing other forms of Highland piping in New Zealand, including light music and pipe bands.

Authenticity of sound for *piobaireachd* performance demands demonstration of a standard of variety, and standard of technical sounds, that are not evident in other forms of Highland piping in New Zealand. Interview participants consider *piobaireachd* performance to encourage development of ideal finger technique in pipers, allowing them to gain a deeper understanding of technical sounds that are evident in the authentic articulation of notes and ornaments. This personal development is considered to be of benefit for *piobaireachd* performers who also perform within the various styles of Highland piping in New Zealand in general. Given the influence of these interview participants as culture bearers, standards of technique for *piobaireachd* are thus likely to have an influence on the standards of technical sound for Highland bagpiping in New Zealand in general.

The authentic production of technical sound appears to be the primary driver for practicing finger technique and choosing repertoire to perform. It also plays a major part in determining how *piobaireachd* performances are interpreted, where good technical sound is a necessity for authentic performance. Meaning is embodied in performance through the demonstration of authentic technical sound, allowing cultural participants to value one performance as being more valid and true than another. The cultural past is thus manifest within technical sounds used for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. Yet while interview participants have indicated that authenticity of sound is a major factor in *piobaireachd* performance, authenticity of technical sound remains to be defined.

Interview participants suggested that differences exist in the technical sounds of performers, relating to their strengths and weaknesses in articulating notes and ornaments, resultant from their physiological attributes. While some participants indicated an historical localisation of technical sound within New Zealand, these participants also suggested that such localisation
was no longer evident. While they also acknowledged differences between pipers today and between regional communities of pipers in the past in terms of technical sound, they did not actually define those differences in terms of sound aside from being ‘chunkier’ and ‘more deliberate’. To the performer such a description might necessarily relate to the dexterity and agility of a piper’s finger technique, yet it does not necessarily speak to the localisation of aural authenticity for *piobaireachd* as a musical culture in New Zealand, as such localisation still awaits definition.

As mentioned, data for discussion in this section was considerably more limited than for other components of *piobaireachd* sound. There may be a number of reasons contributing to a lack of responses from interview participants on this matter. Insider knowledge suggests that pipers generally consider technical sounds to be predetermined by the physiological attributes of a piper’s finger technique, but also by the amount of practice rehearsal they dedicated to perfecting their articulation of technical sounds. For cultural participants, these factors are not necessarily connected to such concepts as place, isolation from Scotland, or identity. They simply see technical sound as the aural articulation of a tune’s melody on the Highland bagpipe. A localised phonetic of authentic finger technique is not necessarily a concept interview participants appear to have given much thought to, which also appears to be reflected by McKerrell’s ambivalence towards technical sound in his study on the aural identity of competitive solo performers in Scotland (McKerrell 2005)

Although this section regarding technical sound is limited, it does identify the importance of analysing finger technique. These technical sounds rely on the physiological attributes of a piper’s finger technique as opposed to the material characteristics of the instrument. In particular, technical sounds in a performance are consecutive and are dependent on a consistency of technique throughout the performance of a tune, not just at specific moments. Given the likelihood of minor technical sound differences between performers, between performances, and inconsistent discrepancies within performances, the technical sounds heard within a performance are unlikely to be identical, as each is comprised of a unique combination of note sounds and ornament sounds specific to a given performance, by a given performer. Therefore, the technical sound given within performance is inseparable from a performers technical abilities and personal strengths, which are inevitably related to their physiological attributes, the instruction they have received, the practice they have undertaken, and thus their performance identity.
The discussion above has shown that technical sound is a significant aspect of sound for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. Yet, while technical sound is characteristic and necessary within performance, ultimately it primarily serves as the articulation of musical concepts through the generation of melodic sounds. Therefore, instrument sound operates as the foundation for technical sound, and technical sound then operates as the foundation for musical concepts in performance. As the last remaining aspect of *piobaireachd* sound, the discussion now turns to musical concepts.

### 4.4 Musical Concepts

Interview participants indicated that the sounds of instrument and technique used for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand had the capacity to be different in New Zealand, although they fell short of explicitly indicating how. Participants were particularly descriptive when discussing musical concepts in *piobaireachd*, more so than in relation to instrument sound and technical sound. This may be due to musical concepts being the most distinctive aspect of *piobaireachd* sound within a given performance.

Some scholars have written of musical concepts that define *piobaireachd*, indicating their complexity and distinction from light music (Cannon 1988, 55-72; McClellan 2009, 303-357). However, little research has considered the perceptions of the musical concepts that supposedly define *piobaireachd* through conversation with culture bearers. Examples exist of westernised score analyses to show differences between tune settings, between parts of the *piobaireachd* repertoire, and to other styles of music. Such adherence to analysing the notation of music in the absence of cultural context perpetuates a divide between understanding the form and origins of music (e.g. history and musicology), and understanding the function and meaning of music (e.g. anthropology and ethnomusicology) (Merriam 1964). This chapter seeks to explore perceptions of authenticity and localisation through the descriptions of culture bearers for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand.

Appendices 4a, 4b, and 4c imply a complexity to musical concepts for *piobaireachd* performance, as do Appendices 4d, 4e, and 4f, which detail interpretations of score notation of specific tunes from the *piobaireachd* repertoire. Such complexity is further acknowledged by the following quote:

> It’s quite different isn’t it. [In] light music, there are more beats, they’re faster tunes, marching tunes, strathspeys, reel, tunes [that are] going. Whereas [in] *piobaireachd*
there’s no real beat or anything is there? You can’t march to piobaireachd. So yeah, two quite different disciplines (Participant 3).

Such participant descriptions, and previously discussed components of instrument and technical sounds, suggest that musical concepts in piobaireachd are complex and interwoven. Existing literature, ethnographic observations, interview responses, as well as insider experience determine that musical concepts are a definitive feature of piobaireachd. As a driving force for, and product of technical sounds and instrument sound, musical concepts are thus a necessary part of any cultural study of authenticity and localisation embedded within piobaireachd sound.

Nettl (2005) argues that, for a study of musical culture to be of value, it must include an understanding of the definition and conceptualisations of ‘music’ (Nettl 2005, 17). In order to be meaningful, any cultural study of piobaireachd must therefore explore the concepts that drive participants to create sounds and give meaning to those sounds. For Nettl (2005), ‘musical concept’ is the meaning and the value behind the phenomenological sounds of music.

Concept involves the way people think about music in the broadest terms, considering, for example, what power it has, what value, what fundamental function … thus sound, which we usually call the music “itself,” is in this context no more the primary focus of attention … (Nettl 2005, 37).

Merriam (1964) also considers that musical concepts are the most fruitful for ethnomusicological enquiry: “Without concepts about music… music sound cannot be produced. It is at this level that the values about music are found, and it is precisely these values that filter upward through the system to effect the final product” (Meriam 1964, 33).

While performances are comprised of technical and instrument sound, underlying these are concepts that determine the ‘musical’ content of the performance, giving meaning to both sounds, yet also being reliant on these sounds in order to be demonstrated. For piobaireachd, these musical concepts are the arrangement of a combination of specific ornaments and notes, best considered as either repertoire or expression concepts, or the ‘grammar’ and ‘syntax’ of musical culture (Nettl 2005, 69). While sounds are presented through instrument operation and finger technique, ultimately the musical concepts for piobaireachd determine what sounds a piper attempts to produce in performance, and thus an understanding of piobaireachd sound requires an understanding of instrument and technical sound, and the concepts that give meaning to those sounds in culture. Musical concepts underpin performance entirely; they dictate both what the tune is, as well as how it will be performed.
In essence this section focuses on the musical concepts that define *piobaireachd* through discussion with culture bearers.

For this section, musical concepts are the arrangements and timings of notes and ornaments, as a rendition of existing tunes from the *piobaireachd* repertoire, and as an expression of self for the performer. Musical concepts for *piobaireachd* are the result of two differing musical elements: repertoire, the ‘what is played’ of a performance in terms of notes and ornaments, known as the ‘tune’; and expression, the ‘how it is played’ of performance in terms of the presentation of that sequence of notes and ornaments over the duration of a performance. These two concepts encompass the ‘what is played and how it is played’ of performance, consideration of which allows for further discussion of notions of musicality and style, authenticity and preference, and accessibility and understanding. Hence the first two subsections set the scene for discussion of musical concepts relative to the theoretical concerns of this research.

### 4.4.1 Repertoire Concepts

Repertoire concepts relate to the ‘what is played’ in terms of the notes and ornaments presented within a performance. Comprising this notion of repertoire concepts are cultural terms such as ‘tune’, ‘theme’, ‘setting’, and ‘structure’ which determine the notes and ornaments used within any given performance.

‘Tune’ is the term used to describe one particular item from the *piobaireachd* repertoire. Participants use it freely to refer to such pieces in discussion with each other, and it was used extensively in responses to interview questions. For instance:

- You know that seems to apply to most tunes you learn (Participant 1).
- Yeah I do quite enjoy that tune. It’s a melodic tune, pretty long I guess (Participant 3).
- Yep. So I want a really nice melodic tune (Participant 4).

Such quotes illustrate this point and the reader is directed to Appendices 4d, 4e, and 4f for examples of the score notation of specific tunes displaying the notes and ornaments within that tune. A tune is comprised of further repertoire concepts, which were also used by participants in interviews. Predominantly a ‘tune’ is a result of varying repetitions of a given tune’s theme.
‘Theme’ is a descriptor relating to the specific sequence of notes that are repeated and are characteristic of a given tune. For example:

There are some basic rules, like showing the theme notes and that sort of thing (Participant 7).

In many ways ‘theme’ represents individual tunes. For example the theme of the tune ‘Lament for the Departure of King James’ is:


Figure 4.6 Musical notation of the theme of ‘Lament for the Departure of King James’. See Appendix 4d for illustration of this theme within overall tune score notation.

Meanwhile the theme for ‘Mackintosh’s Lament’ is:


Figure 4.7 Musical notation of the theme of ‘Mackintosh’s Lament’. See Appendix 4e for illustration of this theme within overall tune score notation.

Each individual note within the theme is referred to as a theme note.

I think as a teacher there are some basic rules, like your 2 bar phrasing and showing the theme notes and that sort of thing (Participant 2).
In order for a performance of a tune to be correct and thus authentic, theme notes must be performed in sequential order in association with how the theme is set within each section of the tune. The theme of the tune does not change within a performance, it is consistent across all sections of the tune (although is more obscure in some sections of a tune than others), and is unique to that particular tune as a part of the piobaireachd repertoire. Each section of the tune features a different setting of that tune’s theme using various ornaments and non-theme notes, where ‘setting’ refers to the ornaments and notes that surround the theme notes within each sequence. Each sequence represents a section of the tune where the use and arrangement of ornaments and non-theme notes change from section to section, thus creating variety amongst each section of the tune. Each section features the theme in its entirety (see Appendix 4d for illustration of the various settings of the theme within the various sections of ‘Lament for the Departure of King James’).

The setting of the theme can also vary between versions of the same tune in accordance with the differing interpretation of the individuals who transcribed the tune:

I usually find that for some reason I like the Angus MacKay settings of tunes so quite often if there's a choice I’ll go down that path. Like ‘Lord Lovat’s Lament’, I play the Angus MacKay setting so I kind of think I would prefer his settings (Participant 2).

Setting’ is then a representation of the authority an individual has for claiming that the theme should be arranged in a specific way within the overall structure of the tune (see Appendix 4f for illustration of differing settings of the same tune as illustrated within the score). ‘Setting’ is thus the way in which the theme is arranged with other notes and with ornaments within specific sections of a tune.

Each section of a tune is a part of the tunes overall structure. Several participants discussed structure as an important concept, where structure is ultimately the type and number of different ways the theme is arranged within the particular setting of the theme (see Appendix 4d for illustration of the structure within score).

In terms of the structure it’s quite an easy tune to play because of the way it’s designed (Participant 5).

These sections have titles that refer to their arrangement of the theme and their respective order within the performance of the tune.

Sometimes I have a tendency to get a bit stilted with the Taorluath (Participant 2).

Yeah it’s quite a few variations, not sure if you know it or if you play it but yeah (Participant 3).
No not necessarily. No his take would be on the length of notes, the lay out of the Ground and what we’re trying to do with the Ground (Participant 4).

Yeah certainly in a tune, like in your Dithis type movements, if you’re too obvious in your Strong Medium Medium Strong, then you’re actually not playing music, you’re playing to a formula, so it needs to be modified (Participant 5).

Structural terms such as Taorluath, Ground, and Dithis refer to the specific arrangement of the theme within what pipers refer to the variations of the theme, or the sections of the tune, where one variation corresponds with one setting of the theme.

Score notations of piobaireachd predetermine repertoire concepts in musicking (see Appendices 4d and 4e for indications of theme, setting, and structure in different tunes). Terms such as ‘tune’, ‘theme’, ‘setting’ and ‘structure’, and their own terminology were frequently used by interview participants, and the author’s insider experience indicates that they are used extensively by piobaireachd participants in New Zealand in order to discuss the ‘what is played’ regarding their technical sounds, as a part of their instrument sound, embedded within their overall piobaireachd performance sound. As with terminology for technical sounds, terminology for repertoire concepts in New Zealand appears to be consistent with that used in Scotland as indicated by Collinson (1975), Cannon (1988) and Donaldson (2000 and 2005).

However, while repertoire concepts are of considerable importance for determining the notes and ornaments that are presented within performance, they do not account for the ‘how it is played’. Ultimately participants saw their repertoire concepts as parts of piobaireachd performance that allow pipers to demonstrate expressions concepts.

4.4.2 Expression Concepts
Beyond repertoire concepts that determine ‘what is played’ in terms of notes and ornaments in performance, interview participants also indicated a wealth of information relating to ‘how it is played’. Unlike repertoire concepts, these were not predetermined by the score notations, but were implied and open for unique interpretation by performers. In this regard, ‘expression’ was seen as the ability to take the repertoire concepts of a tune and convert them into a performance that was more than simply the performance of notes within a theme, within a sectional arrangement of theme note, non-theme note and ornament, within an overall tune structure. Expression is the fundamental capacity to perform the repertoire
concepts of a tune in an intimate and expressive manner. In determining authenticity of piobaireachd sound such expression is a crucial musical aspect:

I think as a judge you're looking at a musical ideal, and you're looking at it from a bagpipe, technique and expression point of view, musical expression… (Participant 5).

Expression is an overarching concept that is widely used within the piobaireachd and Highland bagpiping community in New Zealand to encompass such key terms such as ‘tempo’, ‘pulsing’, ‘phrasing’, and ‘rhythm’. These concepts personalise the performance of notes and ornaments arranged within repertoire concepts, and heard through technical sounds and instrument sound, implying the definitive importance of expression within authentic piobaireachd performances.

Repertoire concepts demonstrated in a performance are expressed individually through the duration of the performance. A specific tune generally always consists of the same theme regardless of how its sections are arranged. The speed at which each section is performed indicates the tempo of that section, and in the sequence of sections of the tune this determines the overall tempo balance of the tune. It is tempo that allows pipers to express the tune:

It means you play a bit slower with a lament whereas a salute and marches or whatever, you just go at them a wee bit more in terms of aggressiveness and just generally faster (Participant 3).

‘Tempo’ is used to describe the speed at which certain sections of the tune are performed, and the overall speed at which the tune is performed. Ultimately ‘tempo’ relates to the amount of time spent performing a note or ornament, within the thematic sequence of notes, within a section of the tune, and within the overall performance of that tune. In this regard tempo is not how long the duration of the performance is, rather tempo is the consideration of the content of the repertoire concepts of a tune, relative to the duration of its performance. As each section of the tune is performed, pipers slowly increase in tempo, playing the thematic sequence in its entirety over shorter and shorter durations (see Appendix 4d discussing sectional structure of the ‘Lament for the Departure of King James’ indicating how long each section took to perform).

Aside from tempo, expression concepts also include pulsing, which relates to the emphasis placed on theme notes and the non-theme notes and ornaments that surround them within the sections of a tune. This emphasis is a result of the amount of time spent on notes and ornaments in relation to other notes and ornaments, within an overall balance of pulses within a specific section:
The Brown/Nicol style is set and gives a formula for how you would approach a tune as such, just looking at your pulses and just working it from there (Participant 4).

I remember Scottish Performer A saying “what is all this Strong Medium Medium Strong stuff that Authority X bangs on about” so I played a couple of recordings of Authority X and said “you can see a Strong Medium Medium Strong pulse in this tune that he’s playing” (Participant 5).

Pulsing ultimately refers to the comparative emphasis of theme notes within each sectional repetition of the theme of the tune. Pipers pulse the notes and ornaments within their tune as a means to mark divisions and boundaries within the thematic sequence within a section. In order to achieve this pipers’ draw out certain notes and ornaments, and hasten others within the overall tempo of that section of the tune, creating urgency and delay within the sequential performance of that section.

Using the expression concept of pulsing, pipers are then able to combine pulses to form subsections of the section of a tune, creating what are commonly known as ‘phrases’.

And again if I go back to what you do with your pulses and your phrases… (Participant 5).

Quite often I get a comment that maybe I’m not showing the 2 bar phrasing well enough and I sort of get into one bar phrasing (Participant 2).

Whereas Authority Y was very much down the line of “here’s the musical phrase and you can play it out how you want, but here’s the theme note that we’re after.” (Participant 4).

Phrasing refers to the overall pattern and balance of pulsing within the tune, where some pulses are more emphasised than others. A tune such as ‘Lament for the Departure of King James’ for instance can be phrased in a number of ways through the use of pulses. The following code indicates how each pulse in the first section of the tune might be phrased, using pulses for the thematic sequence from the Ground of the tune as indicated below this code.

Line 1 - / [ ^ ^ ^ | ^ ^ | ^ | ^ ^ | ^ ^ ^ | ^ ^ ]
Line 2 - / [ ^ ^ | ^ ^ | ^ ^ | ^ | ^ ^ | ^ ^ ]
Line 3 - / [ ^ | ^ ^ | ^ ^ | ^ ^ | ^ ^ | ^ ^ ]
Line 4 - / [ ^ ^ | ^ ^ | ^ | ^ ^ | ^ ^ ]

Where / represents the start of a line, [ represents the start of a two bar phrase, and | represents the start of a bar, corresponding with the score notation. Further, where ^ represents a regular pulse, ^ represents a delayed pulse, ^ marks a pulse at the end bar slightly more delayed than ^; ^ marks a pulse slightly more delayed at the end of the two bar phrase than ^; ^ marks a pulse at the end of the line slightly more delayed than ^; and ^ marks the most delayed pulse
in the Ground at the very end of the Ground. And where each ^ type marks each theme note within the following matching thematic sequence.

Line 1 – B B D D E E B B G G F F E E B B
Line 2 – B B D D E E B B G G F F E E B B
Line 3 – D D E E F F B B G G F F E E B B
Line 4 – F F E E D D B B E E D D E E B B

Figure 4.8 Musical notation of the theme for ‘Lament for the Departure of King James’ with bars indicated, 2 bar phrases indicated using ‘(‘ as a symbol, and lines indicated using ‘/’ as a symbol. Please refer to the coding above for depiction of a potential pulsing and phrasing pattern within this tune. See Appendix 4d for illustration of the above theme within the score notation of ‘Lament for the Departure of King James’.

Phrasing relies on pulsing and tempo in order to create such boundaries within the performance of the repertoire concepts of a tune. Within each section of the tune, such a phrasing pattern as that indicated above may be used to break the tune’s theme into thematic sections, strengthening emphasis on certain notes and ornaments, and weakening others.

As a result of tempo, pulsing and phrasing, a performer is able to create rhythm within their performance from the balance of emphasising the length and articulation of notes and ornaments within sections of the tune.

I’ve got to improve my rhythm, my phrasing (Participant 6).

For *piobaireachd*, rhythm is not the driving metric beat it is in light music, but rather it is considered to be an implied gradual balance of tempo, pulsing and phrasing within the sections of a tune, where each section has a different rhythm that can be achieved through the pulsing and phrasing of that section. Rhythm is a particularly difficult expression concept to
discuss as pulsing, phrasing and tempo may be present in a performance, and yet without regularity in those expression concepts, a westernised definition of rhythm may not be evident to the performer or the audience participant.

This discussion of expression concepts presents the complexity of the musical concepts that define *piobaireachd*, illustrating its substantial difference to other music for the Highland bagpipe and its special treatment by Highland pipers. McClellan (2009) writes of *piobaireachd*:

…it’s peculiar mix of power and vulnerability moved me, and its elusive sense of forward suspension in time fascinated me… It is common to hear the suggestion that only a properly initiated few can truly appreciate *piobaireachd*, and pipers often cite rhythm as the heart of that mystery (McClellan 2009, 303).

While such a description is intriguing and expresses his first impressions of hearing *piobaireachd*, such a colourful interpretation of its aural power was not suggested in interview responses with participants for this study. Despite this, in identifying what he calls ‘the rhythmic structure’ and ‘rhythmic practice’ of *piobaireachd* McClellan describes rhythm through the use of similar terminology as presented here in this analysis of interview responses. This indicates a consistency of expressive terminology between *piobaireachd* in New Zealand and Scotland. McClellan also paints a picture of such concepts around repertoire and expression not only being consistent with their use in Scotland, but also being consistent in their conceptualisation in Scotland throughout time, or at least since the year 1760 (McClellan 2009, 325).

McClellan’s chapter is particularly useful here in that he supports the musical concepts for *piobaireachd* being markedly different from other forms of music “pibroch speaks its own language with its own peculiar assumptions about basic notions of rhythm like pulse, metre, and formal structure” (McClellan 2009, 328). Such consistency between his observations and those presented here is indicative for *piobaireachd* being conceptualised substantially differently and understood by very few both within New Zealand and within Scotland, and suggests strong transcultural parallels. Yet McClellan offers no discussion of variance for musical concepts or similar, and no discussion of *piobaireachd* within a globalised setting. His description is seemingly expected to be objective. Meanwhile in the same edited volume McKerrell (2009) provides a cursory mention of *piobaireachd* performers in New Zealand adhering to one particular style of rhythm and expression, although he offers little further support for his observation (McKerrell 2009, 284). This is discussed further in the summary of musical concepts, Section 4.4.6.
Ultimately expression concepts allow for individuals to present the repertoire concepts of a given tune in individual and unique ways within any given performance, a point supported by McKerrell (2005) in his analysis of light music. However, neither repertoire concepts nor expression concepts exist separately. Both are methods for analysing the way in which technical sounds are performed through instrument sound for a performance. Participants did not discuss the definition of these terms in any great length. Rather, they discussed the ways in which such concepts as repertoire and expression allowed them to consider whether a specific *piobaireachd* performance was culturally acceptable or not, in much the same way as they considered technical sound and instrument sound to be either good or bad. While it would be interesting to further discuss repertoire and expression concepts in great detail, such musicological definitions of *piobaireachd* are beyond the aims of this research. Rather, in pursuing the localisation of cultural authenticity for *piobaireachd* relative to New Zealand, focus now turns to how participants consider musical concepts in cultural terms within performances.

### 4.4.3 Musicality, Feeling, Style

Interview participants indicated that *piobaireachd* is ultimately the demonstration of repertoire concepts and expression concepts through technical and instrument sound. Where combined, these components of *piobaireachd* sound allowed cultural participants to assess the ‘musicality’ of a performance. Where aspects of repertoire concepts for a performance were ‘right’ according to the tune, theme, setting, and structure; and where expression concepts were ‘right’ according to the tempo, pulses, phrasing, and rhythm; and where each was demonstrated consistently and in accordance with how it ‘should’ be performed; interview participants thought that a performance could then be deemed ‘musical’. Discussion of how tunes ‘should’ be performed and how they are deemed to be ‘right’ will be given below, however, for now, attention turns to this notion of ‘musicality’.

Some exemplary responses regarding such ‘musicality’ include:

- It’s all about trying to get the music out of it I guess rather than let it drag on. Yeah that’s what I always try and do, try to get the music out of every variation (Participant 3).

- It’s much more about musical expression and interpretation of the tune, so as a musical performer you’ve sold the performance, you need to sell your performance (Participant 5).
I’ve also really enjoyed playing ‘Catherine’s Lament’ again it was one of the tunes which for a couple of years I was playing extremely well and just felt really in control playing it quite musically (Participant 7.)

‘Musicality’ is seen as the manner in which a performer does or does not inject expression concepts into their performance of repertoire concepts, through their technical sounds and instrument sounds. Yet confusingly, participants also refer to score notations as ‘music’, to performance in general as ‘music’, and to *piobaireachd* as ‘music’. In the context of this discussion however, ‘musicality’ is the special aspect of performance that is demonstrated through expression concepts. A performance is ‘musical’ when the person listening to it can recognise that there is something beyond repertoire concepts within the performance, that it is being expressed in some way.

Such ‘music’ can be good or bad, and further, the ‘musicality’ presented in a performance can be interpreted as being more obscure, or more mainstream in how it is expressed. Generally, ‘bad’ musicality is the result of expression concepts that do not appear to follow a pattern, or have any consistency, within a section of the performed tune.

Participants indicated that performances that featured ‘musicality’ were able to demonstrate ‘feeling’ and emotion, and that as performers themselves, they attempted to inject such aspects into their performances. For instance:

> I think it’s not going to happen overnight. You know you’re trying to show some of the feeling as opposed to playing black and white notes. So you know if you’re swelling on a note or you’re jumping off notes they need to understand why and describe that sort of feeling … (Participant 1).

> Probably the most memorable or moving performances are ones that have touched me emotionally I think (Participant 2).

> They’re quite often sad tunes, laments, and so you’re just trying to get that sadness coming out in the way you play it (Participant 3).

In order to make a performance have feeling or be emotive, participants use expression concepts to turn a tune into a performance that attempts to demonstrate musicality. Participant 3 offered the following:

> Yeah it’s tough to do but my game plan is usually to make laments seem sad so just sit back and ‘feel’, so some of the short notes you play them quite soft, quite round, get a bit of softness about it. Rather than playing the notes hard or anything like that. So it’s just a bit of feel into it. Whereas your salutes, to get the aggressiveness, just make sure it’s not too slow (Participant 3).
In this way, these New Zealand *piobaireachd* performers use expression concepts such as tempo, pulsing, phrasing, and rhythm to emphasise certain notes and ornaments within the sections of a tune, creating what they consider as ‘feeling’ and ‘emotion’ in their performances.

Performances that are unable to demonstrate expressive concepts are deemed to be ‘mechanical’. To pipers, this is the antithesis of ‘musical’; it is void of expression concepts in the demonstration of repertoire concepts, whereas ‘musicality’ is the ability to demonstrate expression. This relates back to whether expression concepts are evident in repertoire concepts of a given performance, where the absence of expression concepts is correct on paper, but incorrect in practice. Participants offered:

> You know you’re trying to show some of the feeling as opposed to playing black and white notes. Sort of feeling rather than just saying “that’s a crotchet, and that’s a quaver, and that’s how you play it”, [that’s] a very mechanical way (Participant 1).

> But sometimes you actually get a bit mechanical with them instead of showing the music so it’s a bit of a trade off I think (Participant 2).

> It’s got to be melodic and you know something that the listener can sit back and enjoy the music, rather than being a chore for the listener (Participant 3).

Therefore, for interview participants, ‘musicality’ or ‘music’ in the performance of *piobaireachd* is not simply implied in instrumental sound, or technical sound, or in repertoire concepts. Rather, ‘musicality’ is the ability to demonstrate an understanding of how a tune should be performed by using expression concepts, which display some concept of emotion and ‘feeling’ embodied within sound. These expression concepts are the aspects of ‘how a tune is played’, from the repertoire concepts indicating ‘what the tune is’, through the use of technical sounds, and presented through instrument sound.

Meanwhile, ‘style’ is used to address similarities and differences in the musical concepts in *piobaireachd* performance by attributing patterns of ascribed musicality to particular identities. For example, where one performer demonstrates musicality within one performance, this can become associated to a particular style. That is, ‘style’ is the association of a consistency of expression concepts to a particular identity:

> He seems to have a very definitive way of how he’s got it in his mind, his own style (Participant 3).

> Some tunes you’ll branch out and hear alternatives and suss out alternatives but certainly from my end I’ve just stuck to one style. You know I’ve never wanted to confuse myself (Participant 4).
You see who’s playing that doesn’t mirror your own style but is not a million miles away from that so you can see what else you can do. I think it’s also important to learn the differences in the tune so you can do it like this or you can do it like that (Participant 5).

‘Style’ is the consistent demonstration of expression concepts where they coincide with particular repertoire concepts. For example, where one particular participant performs their ‘E Cadences’ using the same timing of notes, could be seen as a basic demonstration of style. Likewise, using the same ‘Strong Medium Medium Strong’ pulsing pattern emphasis throughout variations could also be seen as a demonstration of style as could the ‘Strong’ pulse or pause that a piper does or does not put between variations of the tune. All in all, there are many expression concepts that demonstrate style when regularly performed through repertoire concepts.

As with such terms as feeling and musicality, such concepts as those relating to expression and repertoire, and both technical and instrument sounds, ‘style’ can either be considered good or bad, or rather, right or wrong. Within a performance, participants attribute bad style to musicality and expression that is not accepted or ‘authentic’ within the context of performance, whereas good style is musicality and expression that is. These results thus indicate that methods for interpreting and demonstrating expressive concepts within tunes are both shared and disagreed upon by participants within the piobaireachd community in New Zealand through the consideration of authenticity.

‘Style’, ‘musicality’, and ‘feeling’ are not inherent or depicted in the score notation of piobaireachd, unlike repertoire concepts. They are musical concepts that are to be interpreted from the score with the assistance of a tutor, other pipers, and other such individuals who understand how to perform piobaireachd. The point here is that interpretation of these musical concepts within a tune is really only part of the battle, with demonstration ultimately being the final goal. Pipers use tutors and others as a benchmark against which they compare their demonstration of a tune with the demonstration of that tune by others. More regarding such transmission relative to New Zealand will be discussed in Chapter 6. However, not all performances of a tune feature acceptable musical concepts, and therefore a hierarchy of authority allows pipers to negotiate the sources from which they gain their musical concepts for a tune. For example:

When you’re learning a tune it’s the challenge of ‘how am I going to phrase this?’ and trying to find just the sources for a tune. So there’s a challenge in getting a tune from the page, so you can play it on the pipes memorised and expressed so I kind of like that challenge (Participant 2).
Here’s this tune. Here’s how it goes. Watch this bit and this bit. You can do this that and the next thing. Here, here and here. Now away you go and learn it (Participant 5).

I still need guidance to make sure I’m doing things right. Less than in the past, I don’t need as much guidance as I once did (Participant 7).

In this way individuals demonstrate ‘musicality’, ‘feeling’, and ‘style’ when they consistently present certain expressive concepts as a part of musicality, or rather, that participants interpret style from the musicality demonstrated by a performer within a performance. As implied by the previous quote, style allows cultural participants to attribute musicality to certain individuals and groups of individuals in association with how they are considered to demonstrate ‘music’.

Within New Zealand ‘musicality’, ‘feeling’, and ‘style’ are used to describe the parts of *piobaireachd* sound that reflect the subjective understanding of how to perform *piobaireachd* authentically. Beyond instrument sound, technical sound, and repertoire concepts, ‘expression’ allows performers to showcase their understanding of the musical concepts of *piobaireachd*, their ability to interpret and demonstrate expression concepts from the repertoire concepts of a tune, and their affiliation to a particular musical style as a method for demonstrating expression concepts. ‘Musicality’, ‘feeling’, and ‘style’ are inherent in the performance of *piobaireachd*.

While these terms do not appear to differ in definition from their use in Scotland, in application these terms are the crux of this discussion on musical concepts. As suggested by McKerrell (2009, 284), and as implied by Coleman (2003), is there a New Zealand style of *piobaireachd* sound? From the material presented thus far there is no definitive answer. Continuing with thematic discussion of *piobaireachd* sound, this question continues to demand consideration.

### 4.4.4 Preference and Difference

Interview participants responded strongly when asked about what makes a performance good or not. They often referred to previously described aesthetics of instrument sound, technical sound, repertoire concepts, and expression concepts as well as concepts of musicality, feeling, and style as being necessary elements of a good performance. For example:

Some people would all sound really good, but for another *piobaireachd* player, there would be little nuances of phrasing or holding notes or just the clarity in the technique perhaps that you go, ‘yeah that kind of does it for me’ (Participant 2).
I think that you learn a lot when you’re judging, learn about ‘well what am I looking for, what am I wishing this performer would do to make it a really good performance’ (Participant 5)?

It’s just so musical, you can easily sing along to it and play it. I found it quite a natural tune to play, and I’ve had good success with it that always gives good memories… It’s only a small tune but I had quite good control of it and therefore enjoyed it and could play it well (Participant 7).

These comments suggest that they had a preference for certain attributes of performance, being the result of combined musical concepts presented. This notion of playing a tune ‘well’, or the performance of that tune being ‘good’ is referred to by participants as the quality which they strive to demonstrate in their performances, as a kind of goal in performance that is both ideal for them as individuals, and is ideal for combined audience appreciation. This matches Moore’s contention that authenticity is both an individually and socially defined concept (Moore 2002).

However, interview participants challenged the notion of an objective definition for authenticity of musical concepts, where they indicated that differences in preference were evident. Whether a participant considered musical concepts in a performance to be good or bad was the result of various factors, and demonstrated in the following responses:

I probably had a bit much of a break after Scotland and assumed it would all still be all locked in the brain but I just had a couple of wee moments where I played a linking note a Low A instead of a Low G. Then I had one complete note error where I played a D instead of an E but it still kind of fitted and Judge X forgave me for it which was pretty generous (Participant 2).

I think the danger is a wee bit not committing to one style and actually getting a bit torn between different styles you know. Say one tune that has a mix of different styles, that’s where you run into problems and you do hear that at times. You know competitors that do that (Participant 4).

Um if you’re not well practiced at it then things are going to go wrong on the competition platform (Participant 5).

Thus bad musical concepts appear to be the result of a performer being under-practiced at performing ‘musically’ and not being sufficiently familiar with the repertoire and expression concepts that are requisite for authentic *piobaireachd* sound. This infers that performers have a taste or preference for certain musical concepts, and an aversion or distaste for others, depending on the repertoire and expression concepts that comprise relevant musical concepts.

Interview participants believed that this preference was informed by several influences:

Well quite often it’s just the way you’ve been taught isn’t it, the way you’ve been passed down the knowledge of the tunes, the information (Participant 3).
There are different schools, you play it this way or you play it that way. But what is the right way very easy to get confused. If you hear someone play it one way and then someone play it a totally different way, who’s right or wrong? There’s reasons for different schools (Participant 4).

This is how I got it from my teacher, therefore this is how I’m going to give it to you (Participant 5).

These suggest that the preference participants have for certain musical concepts within the performance of *piobaireachd*, both as performers and as audience members, is a result of the transmission of authentic cultural practices through pedagogy, practice and their performance experiences. Chapter 6 will consider such transmission in more depth. However, this preference for certain styles over other styles affords participants the capacity to determine which performances ‘speak’ to the same musical language as their own, and ultimately which performances they consider to be more or less authentic than others. This facilitates a social negotiation of authenticity in the context of performance, particularly where the event is competitive, where one performance will be matched against another for its demonstration of authentic sound. This conceptualisation of authenticity guides performers in how they choose to demonstrate musical concepts within their performances of *piobaireachd*, and is a result of their understanding of musical concepts as being good or bad relative to their own experiences.

As a result of such varying understandings of what acceptable musical concepts are within the performance of *piobaireachd*, differences in preference for one style over another are common amongst cultural participants, as indicated in the following quotes:

I went on for the Clasp in Hastings, I had to tell Judge X “well look I’m playing four ‘heeruns’ here” and he didn’t know otherwise so he made a note of that, and when Judge Y judged down in Dunedin his reply was “well that is the way it should be played” (Participant 1).

You go along and you hear somebody playing a tune in quite a different way and so who’s right and who’s wrong (Participant 5)?

Such quotes illustrate differences in the preference for musical concepts demonstrated within performance. These differences are based on understandings of style attributed to specific individuals who come to have specific methods for demonstrating musical concepts associated to them. More often than not these individuals act as authorities, where a particular style of musical concepts come to represent them in the performances of others:

If I need guidance on how a tune goes I’ll usually see Authority C, and quite often he refers with Authority A as well if he’s not 100% sure. He will give Authority A a call or even Authority D sometimes as well just to make sure we’re on the right track (Participant 3).
I mean you take ‘The Daughter’s Lament’ and look at the difference between what Authority X was doing with the tune and what Authority Y was doing with the tune, they’re totally different. Although in saying that I guess the style thing is set and gives a formula for how you would approach a tune as such, just looking at your pulses and just working it from there (Participant 4).

Some of Donald McLeod’s stuff is different and a lot softer, the connecting notes or the joint passing notes are not severely dealt with, not saying the Brown/Nicol stuff deals with them severely, I think there’s a lot more latitude in the Brown/Nicol stuff … you have to be really careful that you don’t cut it too much. The Donald McLeod style is almost a bit samey, almost. It’s almost a piobaireachd by numbers. It’s not quite that, but it is a lot more samey (Participant 5).

The above responses not only describe the differences in musical concepts that are used within performances of piobaireachd, they also describe the ways in which style is attributed to certain individuals or groups of individuals. Further, such comments also indicate disjuncture in how participants view certain individuals as authorities of authentic performance, and certain others as not. Further information regarding authorities will be discussed in Chapter 6.

Understanding differences in the style of performing musical concepts were identified by interview participants as necessary for determining whether the musical concepts demonstrated in a performance, were authentic or not. Participants frequently referred to existing standards for authentic musical concepts, and indicated that they would use these as benchmarks to determine either their own performances of musical concepts or that of others. For example:

For a lot of tunes, there are four or five different acceptable ways of playing them, and even amongst the top players there’s quite different styles, there’s a player that hold his Low A’s after his taorluath quite a lot but he’s one of the top players, and so that’s quite acceptable for him to do it. But if it’s someone else then it’s not the done thing. But he probably does it in a way where probably the tune flows a bit (Participant 2).

As Authority A would say “you can play it like that if you want”. That’s his standard line then you hear it in other styles and you think ‘oh that’s really nice’. You can get an appreciation of the different schools, different styles. There’s no one that’s definitely right or wrong (Participant 4).

I’ll listen to what you play, and then I’ll think, you know, ‘how does that add up’ (Participant 5)?

These responses suggest that participants use their understandings of ‘right’ and ‘wrong’ musical concepts to negotiate the authenticity of piobaireachd performances, to identify the performances they think are the best, and to personally arrange a hierarchy of authenticity of musical concepts demonstrated through performance.
In discussing how they actually assess the authenticity of musical concepts participants offered a variety of responses:

Yeah just a different emphasis. Cadences definitely a wee bit. I know myself if I played ‘Caber Feidh Gu Brath’ out of the Brown/Nicol style it would just be different. And again if I go back to what you do with your pulses and your phrases. If you liken it to a 2 bar phrase in a 2/4 [March]. You sort of mark the start and the end of the phrase. Within the Donald MacLeod style at times you tend to get a bit of a break up just within those phrases. It’s just very subtle but yeah just listening to it the other day I thought ‘right yeah that’s definitely a Donald MacLeod style’ (Participant 4).

We place a lot of reliance on ‘that’s what is played but how do we play it?’ from a recognised tutor who says well you know “this is the way you should play this” whereas I say “look actually it’s more about a left and right of arc, and if you’re anywhere in between there depending on your preference, and as long as you’re consistent, and it makes musical sense, you can’t be wrong” (Participant 5).

I’ll say, “I like what’s happening in this one” or “maybe if I do that here” and if you can start to do that and it works then people won’t slap you for it (Participant 6).

Accordingly, participants assess and practice authentic musical concepts differently. Some look for consistency in styles between performers and authorities, while others try to see an acceptable range for musical concepts within a tune, and determine whether the performance is within this range. Without necessarily knowing why, some participants will enjoy certain performances, and not enjoy others - likely to be based on factors that they understand as musical concepts, but which they often cannot pinpoint to a particular method or approach for such expression.

Significant differences in how musical concepts for the same tune are presented by differing performers were remarked upon by two participants:

Sometimes you hear someone play your favourite and you don’t like it, but then you hear someone else and you think ‘oh I like that’. But you’re more critical listening to the tunes that are your favourites because you have a preference for how you like that tune. Whereas, the gold medal this year in Scotland, there were tunes that were not really well known tunes and I really loved the performances both times, it was fantastic because there were so many slightly different versions of tunes and variations of how people were treating things and I found it really interesting to hear what other people were doing, particularly with the bits I’d struggled with (Participant 2).

I think that’s the beauty of the Inverness Northern Meeting where you’ve got set tunes put out each year and you get the same tunes presented differently. A day’s listening for instance, you get 25-30 gold medal tunes. You get the same tune presented a multitude of different ways. And generally you’ve only, if you’ve played that tune, you’ve only got about one style (Participant 4).

These responses indicate the complexity of musical concepts, in that performers appear to demonstrate a variety of ways to express the repertoire concepts of the tunes they perform.
Such performances suggest complexity and variation in how performers present *piobaireachd* sound.

Despite recognising the performance of musical concepts within an acceptable framework in *piobaireachd*, some participants explicitly indicated that imitation and mimicry were negative attributes of musical concepts and not a part of authentic performance:

If you bang away and try to imitate recordings and things like that you know you’re only busking really. You’re not really gaining sort of an in-depth knowledge of a style or a particular way (Participant 4).

I don’t think you’re ever actually copying, but you’re using that as much as possible as a guide. I’ll say “well I prefer what he’s doing there but I don’t like what he’s doing up here, I like this, I like that” (Participant 6).

While such quotes appear to contradict previous responses suggesting that musical concepts follow certain styles and methods in their demonstration within authentic performances, participants continued to determine that authenticity of musical concepts was particularly a matter of referencing an authority, but not explicitly copying them in their musical concepts within specific tunes:

Whereas Authority B was very much down the line of “here’s the musical phrase and you can play it out how you want, but here’s the theme note that we’re after” (Participant 4).

Therefore, good musical concepts appear to be accepted as those which fit within an established range of methods for stylistic approach in performance, but which do not explicitly follow the exact approach of others for the tune.

Participants were explicitly asked whether differences existed in *piobaireachd* performances between New Zealand and Scotland, and some chose to identify musical concepts as one of the ways in which they do differ. For example Participant 1 chose to demonstrate such differences through their approach to performing repertoire concepts for a specific tune through expression concepts:

And ‘The Battle of the Strome’ is a very good example. I used to hold the E cadences. [sings] ‘eeee yun bra’. Just before I went to Scotland I found that that’s not how it’s played in the competition circuit, Tutor X ... cuts the cadence straight to the Low A – ‘ee yun bra’. That made a big difference so I had to adjust and that’s how everyone played it [in Scotland] so lucky I did that (Participant 1).

Meanwhile Participant 2 chose to mention the way performers in Scotland demonstrated such differences in their approach to performing repertoire concepts for a specific tune:

Anyway it’s got these pause things, so deciding how I was going to play those. [sings] ‘shuv eee, shuv eee, shuv aee, shun dun, shun do, shun daeee, shun do, shun dun’. And I
really liked it. In Scotland most had ignored it like that and were playing it as you would a normal variation (Participant 2).

Comments such as these suggest significant differences in how performers in Scotland demonstrate musical concepts compared to New Zealand performers. However, while these participants were willing to suggest such national differences in style existed, other participants were less supportive. When asked whether differences existed in the style of *piobaireachd* performed in New Zealand participants responded:

> Not really we’re on the same page I think. There’s not a dramatic contrast from what the Scots are doing compared with what we’re doing. We’re lucky enough to have a few big names here in New Zealand that know how it’s done in terms of passing on their knowledge (Participant 3).

Such sentiments were shared by many participants who believe that *piobaireachd* in New Zealand is on a par with *piobaireachd* in Scotland in terms of performance style, as demonstrated through musical concepts. Therefore participants offered contradictory information regarding whether musical concepts used for performance in New Zealand were different from those used in Scotland. Yet even a partial acceptance of differences is worth considering further. One of the ways participants considered such differences to be demonstrative was in the accessibility of specific *piobaireachd* tunes to performers, and accessibility of *piobaireachd* performances in general to non-performers.

### 4.4.5 Accessibility

Participants frequently referred to specific tunes that they felt they either had a proficiency or difficulty in performing, or tunes that they enjoyed listening to:

> A tune I personally felt I’d play quite well was ‘The Park Piobaireachd’ [setting] number 2 which I think is beautiful (Participant 2).

> ‘Lament for the Children’, ‘Lament for Patrick Og MacCrimmon’, maybe ‘The Unjust Incarceration’, sometimes I hear the ‘Unjust’ and I think that is an amazing tune, I hear it other times and I think ‘what a pile of crap’ it’s sort of strange (Participant 7).

> My favourite tune to compete with would be ‘The Battle of Auldearn’, I really like the variations in it. I’ve played that tune for a very long time. Some of the tunes are great, ‘Caber Feidh Gu Brath’, a Donald McLeod tune, I really enjoy, very melodic, an enjoyable tune (Participant 8).

They were particularly willing to express their preferences for the repertoire concepts within some tunes as being ‘beautiful’, ‘amazing’, ‘melodic’, and ‘enjoyable’. The qualities in these tunes that lead to them being considered in this way were not specifically addressed by
interview questions, however several participants indicated that they find certain repertoire concepts better suited to them. For example:

I actually really enjoy some of those tunes like ‘Glengarry’s March’, with Low G’s and B’s that are quite forceful (Participant 1).

‘The Little Spree’ is good ‘cos it’s not too long and I think quite melodious. There’s a variation that’s got a different timing to any other tune that I’ve had before, is it the Dithis variation and in the music it’s actually written differently in the second and the third lines to the first line and it’s got these two extra sort of pause notes… and I really liked it like that (Participant 2).

But if I like the Crunluath it tends to have a bearing on whether I like the tune. I think you know, maybe that’s kind of weird, I don’t know. But I’ve got to like the Ground, and the style of the tune is very important in order to decide whether I’m going to continue learning it (Participant 6).

Participants could not clearly articulate why they felt they had a particular penchant for some repertoire concepts over others, but they felt that it was likely related to the way people responded to their performances of those tunes. Some participants indicated personal issues with expression and repertoire concepts within specific tunes:

I was not particularly great at ‘MacCrimmon’s Sweetheart’, I don’t play that particularly well. I’ve never just got it right. The Ground and the first couple of variations and I don’t know it’s never felt like a settled tune for me. I was never fully happy with that tune (Participant 6).

‘The Big Spree’. It’s one I’ve changed a bit over the years, I’ve really struggled with that (Participant 2).

I look back now and think ‘gee, ‘Corrienessan’s even as a first tune, was a pretty tall ask’. There’s far easier tunes I’m teaching now that can convey the story of piobaireachd or the layout of piobaireachd in a far less complicated way than ‘Corrienessan’s’ (Participant 4).

Such responses present the difficulties that participants have in coupling expression concepts with repertoire concepts in the interpretation and demonstration of a given tune. The use of notes and ornaments as a part of the ‘tune’ in the form of theme, setting, and structure of the tune are not always applicable to the understanding of, and ability to demonstrate, tempo, pulses, phrasing, and rhythm in a tune for a particular performer. These issues ultimately lead performers to favour certain tunes from the piobaireachd repertoire over others, and undoubtedly have an impact on their interpretation of performances of those tunes; specifically how musical concepts are demonstrated and interpreted. Interview participants suggested:

Yeah there’s tunes on the list that I look at that don’t really grab me so I’ll put them to one side and learn other ones … there are some that don’t grab me straight away but yeah (Participant 1).
What I find is that some tunes fit and some tunes, there’s just something about some tunes I just find easier and other tunes I just battle with (Participant 2).

Sometimes you just play a tune and you haven’t really got on top of it, whether memory wise or you just don’t kind of handle it very well. Some tunes you just don’t play well (Participant 7).

The use of tunes relative to New Zealand is also further discussed in Chapter 6. However it is evident that despite having a preference for one tune over another, participants were clearly able to show that they were competent in identifying tunes that they thought were better tunes, and which they were capable of performing more authentically in their interpretation of musical concepts and in the subsequent interpretation of that tune by members of the audience. This also indicated that others had differing penchants and preferences for tunes.

This capacity to either understand, or not, the musical concepts that should be evident in *piobaireachd* performance is the result of whether performers and audience members can grasp the musical concepts that should be demonstrated. Interview participants indicated that differences in musical concepts presented in *piobaireachd*, necessary for authentic performance, were evident:

If you know how to play it then you probably enjoy listening to it a bit more. And if you know the tunes as well, if you know the *piobaireachd* the competitor’s playing then you can follow them and ride it with them. But I do enjoy listening to *piobaireachd* I know and *piobaireachd* I don’t know, sometimes even I get a bit lost in a *piobaireachd* I don’t know (Participant 3).

And I remember Piper X, and I remember playing and him saying, “hey what is all this Strong Medium Medium Strong stuff that Authority Y bangs on about”. But then I worked on him quite hard and he went for lessons from Authority Y and eventually he did get it because it is there if you’re looking for it and you understand what it is, but it’s not there if you’re not looking for it and it’s not whacking you in the face and you think you can hear it. And you know I can get up and play the same tune and that’s good but I can’t point to anything that’s going wrong, but actually Piper Z’s playing better and the main reason would be because it’s much more musical expression and interpretation of the tune (Participant 5).

I was told that it was very good, I obviously have a good ear for tunes (Participant 6).

Quotes such as those above indicate that these participants consider the understanding of musical concepts to be a crucial factor in the interpretation and appreciation of *piobaireachd* performance. Likewise, they thought that lacking an understanding of the musical concepts underpinning the performance of *piobaireachd*, made it inaccessible, particularly to audience members and to other potential performers of *piobaireachd*:

I went to a seminar once, and Authority X asked the group “does anyone know what *piobaireachd* is” and this lady answered “slow boring music”. I remember he was greatly offended, and that was the attitude (Participant 1).
I think for a lot of people it has a negative connotation perhaps, with some of the older generation, they’ll say “oh no, it’s long and boring” (Participant 2).

If you know how to play *piobaireachd* you can obviously relate to what people are trying to do with their interpretations, the structure and the format of the tunes. You know what’s happening and what’s coming up for the *Crunluath* or *Taorluath*. Whereas for some people it’s just 20 minutes of slow music. It didn’t grab me straight away. Um it is something that I had developed and learnt to enjoy. I was younger and I had these slow and boring type perceptions but once you start to get into it you realise what you can do with it, it’s a great form of music (Participant 3).

I think when the vast majority of the public hear piping they hear the sound of the instrument, they don’t actually hear the tune. They would have no concept of it, apart from whether it’s slow, fast, or otherwise. *Piobaireachd*-wise they wouldn’t understand it, they wouldn’t be able to get past the sound of the tune, there’s no recognisable melody for them (Participant 5).

Some audience members and cultural participants then simply do not comprehend or understand the musical concepts that inform *piobaireachd* performance. Such limited appreciation of *piobaireachd* through a lack of understanding of the musical concepts behind *piobaireachd* performance is likely the main contributing factor to low audience participation in *piobaireachd* performances, and low levels of subcultural practice by participants within the wider Highland piping cultural community in New Zealand. The audience for a bagpipe performance expect instrument sound and technical sound, but the musical concepts that accompany *piobaireachd* performance appear to be too obscure for most Highland bagpiping enthusiasts, who may not have an understanding of those musical concepts. McClellan considers this to partially be the result of abstract and implicit rhythm in *piobaireachd* (McClellan 2009). In this sense then the inaccessibility of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand appears to be similar to that within Scotland, assuming that this is the point of view from which McClellan (2009) writes.

Participants confirmed this in discussing components of instrument sound. For *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, instrument sound is not vastly different from that used in other forms of Highland bagpiping. Technical sounds for *piobaireachd*, while more intricate and complex, particularly regarding ornaments, are generally the same kind of principle as technical sounds in other forms of Highland bagpiping. However, the musical concepts for *piobaireachd* were vastly different and more abstract in nature and design, particularly from other forms of Highland bagpiping. It was this that interview participants felt made *piobaireachd* inaccessible to the majority of Highland bagpiping enthusiasts. Asked to compare the level of accessibility and the amount of participation in *piobaireachd* events between New Zealand and Scotland, they felt that appreciation by non-performers was about the same, and that
Piobaireachd musical concepts were just as obscure in wider Highland bagpiping in Scotland as in New Zealand. However, they did determine that there were a greater number of contexts for performance of piobaireachd in Scotland and this may provide greater opportunity for piobaireachd to be accessed and understood by a greater number and proportion of cultural participants. Thus comparatively, piobaireachd within New Zealand may be considered more obscure within the local Highland bagpiping community and wider society than it is in Scotland.

Interview participants ultimately considered that through musical concepts, piobaireachd was a highly enjoyable form of music for performance, referring to the aesthetic quality of good musical concepts as a type of ‘high art’:

You can just sort of let the music wash over you (Participant 2).

It’s got to be melodic and, you know, something that the listener can sit back and enjoy rather than being a chore for the listener (Participant 3).

You’ve got this unbelievable beautiful music that can come out of a pipe with a piobaireachd, which you don’t get in an MSR (Participant 6).

That sort of high-level sort of musical appreciation sort of thing (Participant 7).

These participants clearly convey that good piobaireachd performances have some form of cultural value, an authenticity and beauty that simply cannot be matched by other forms of Highland piping within New Zealand. These interview participants, as representative of piobaireachd performers, have thus indicated the value of piobaireachd to them, that it enables a higher level of appreciation and instrumental function, and a truer and more valued tradition of musical performance, through the interpretation and demonstration of musical concepts in performance.

When further queried about such notions of high art and perfection in Highland piping though piobaireachd, several participants offered insightful comments:

It’s not about the prizes, it’s all about reaching that musical idiom, and you’ll never ever reach it. So I think you know, if you’re playing a cracking tune, you’re playing really well, people will respect you for it. And you know that’s all you can do really (Participant 1).

So I think we always set our sights too low, and fail to achieve that. Whereas if we set it high, and we’re always striving to get that, no one will get there but always striving to get there then we’ve always got something. It comes from our expectations from performance (Participant 5).
It’s the hair on the back of your neck stuff. That’s what you’re looking for. And I think you’re always looking for that, even if you play amazingly, there’s always something you can do slightly different, to make it better (Participant 6).

And I just try to play the perfect tune, it’s always something you can strive to do better. You can continually improve so there’s that sort of challenge aspect to it. It’s the whole mental side of it, practice, preparation and a good challenge (Participant 7).

Here, we can finally see what appears to be the ultimate goal of performers of piobaireachd, the ideal musical performance. This is the aural manifestation of cultural authenticity, the sum of their authentic sound components, interpreted and demonstrated by them as individuals, presented to individuals within audience in performance, and judged against existing piobaireachd sound standards in order to measure the value of a performance, and the value of a performers knowledge. Success in performance is measured by the response from audience members, whether that performance is competitive or not. However, for interview participants, their driving force for cultural participation in piobaireachd does not appear to be success measured in this way, it is personally identified success. ‘The perfect performance’, as indicated in the comments above is an ideal performance, it is musical perfection, and it is the perfect demonstration of musical concepts. Yet this idiom is beyond reach, is not achievable, but something to which they strive, something which they compare themselves to, and something which allows them to constantly interpret and reinterpret the musical concepts requisite for good performance. Authentic sound is the embodiment of perfect sound.

4.4.6 Summary
This discussion of musical concepts has been facilitated through the responses of interview participants, through ethnographic observations conducted in the field, through reference and comparison to literature, and through insider experience. As the last component of the ‘enigma’ that is piobaireachd sound in New Zealand, musical concepts have been a dense and complex topic to discuss. They have required significant scene setting in order to be understood. They have not always leant themselves to piobaireachd being considered as culture or allowed authenticity to be defined relative to New Zealand. Detailed descriptions of musical concepts for piobaireachd are not evident in published literature, probably due to the complexity of repertoire concepts and expression concepts, and the variety of styles and differences in opinion that are held both socially and individually by participants, as demonstrated throughout this section. According to interview participants there appears to be no specific right or wrong way to demonstrate musical concepts, no explicitly correct or
incorrect style, and no one way to define authenticity for musical concepts. Participants’ understandings of *piobaireachd* musical concepts are learnt and shaped by the experiences they have had as individuals, including formal training with authorities, and audience participation in the performances of others. *Piobaireachd* performance requires pipers to demonstrate differing interpretations of musical concepts based upon the understanding they have of those musical concepts that have been informed by their experiences. Performance then allows audience members to reinterpret this through the performance of musical concepts, underpinned by the way in which notes and ornaments are arranged (repertoire concepts) played over time (expression concepts).

Such musical concepts allow pipers to demonstrate association, affiliation and identity through the interpretation of ‘style’ of musical concepts, particularly expression concepts, heard within their performances. Audience members then compare those musical concepts heard within performance, with their own understandings of musical concepts, informing their interpretation of whether that performance is acceptable or not, or rather, appropriate for the performance context, and therefore whether it is authentic or not. Musical concepts also allow audience members to interpret the ‘style’ of a performance within a system for political negotiation, where a performance that demonstrates acceptable musical concepts is therefore more authentic than a performance that does not. As a part of the process however, performances also contribute to this process in that each performance of *piobaireachd* can influence audience members’ understandings of *piobaireachd* musical concepts, thus further influencing the individual practice and social demonstration of authenticity through performance.

Through this somewhat detailed discussion of generic *piobaireachd* musical concepts, the cultural past appears to be embedded in the authenticity of *piobaireachd* sound, and this is expressed in New Zealand in a number of ways. Notions of how to interpret and how to demonstrate *piobaireachd* are predetermined for performers and audience members by their experiences in the past. Participants rely on these past experiences to inform their understanding of what is authentic in performance and what is not. Repertoire concepts are informed by bound and published manuscript score collections that dictate what notes and ornaments to play and in what order, for each specific tune from the *piobaireachd* repertoire. Musical concepts including expression concepts, musicality and style are interpreted by the association of a performance to certain existing examples that serve as precedent for how authenticity in the present can be demonstrated and interpreted. While participants indicated
that performers should stick to existing styles as established by performers who have gone before them, they have also indicated that performers should not mimic or copy the expression concepts, musicality and style of others. Therefore, through the consideration of musical concepts, authenticity for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand revolves around the notion of being originally unoriginal, taking musical concepts that already have precedent, and presenting them in a way that is both familiar and fresh at the same time. Therefore, the cultural past is well represented in the musical concepts of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand.

Discussion of participant responses given above has shown that participants acknowledge differences between performers in the way pipers’ present musical concepts in their *piobaireachd* performances. These differences relate both to repertoire concepts, and to expression concepts, culminating in demonstrations of musicality and style. The musicality and style of one performer may be significantly different from that of another performer, and the ways in which they differ allow participants in the performance to determine the authenticity of each performance. Considering that differences in musical concepts are expected between performers, interview participants were asked whether there was a difference in musical concepts between performers in New Zealand and performers in Scotland, with the expectation that if they believed *piobaireachd* musical concepts had been localised to New Zealand they would allude to it, without being led to do so. Some interview participants were willing to demonstrate how pipers in Scotland in general used different musical concepts to their own, and some felt there were differences in how tunes were performed in terms of musical concepts in New Zealand and Scotland. However, interview participants were not willing to go the next step to suggest that musical concepts for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand in any way represented New Zealand, were typical of New Zealand performers, or were the result of some form of localisation. In fact many suggested that musical concepts in both New Zealand and Scotland share considerable similarities and felt that New Zealand *piobaireachd* was in more or less words ‘identical’ to that in Scotland. Therefore, while participants alluded to differences between *piobaireachd* musical concepts in New Zealand and Scotland, no convincing argument can be made for New Zealand pipers having localised musical concepts in relation to national homogeneity. While further exploration of localisation of musical concepts in terms of repertoire and expression in performances by New Zealand pipers compared to Scottish pipers may reveal some evidence or possible support for such a theory, the focus and design of such an investigation is beyond the scope of the current research.
It may be that repertoire concepts in the form of ‘tunes’, or rather the tunes that are used are another way in which New Zealand has localised *piobaireachd*. There may be evidence for specific tunes from the repertoire being used more in New Zealand than they are elsewhere, or alternatively, specific tunes being shied away from, along the same lines. Yet interview participants and insider information do not support such speculation. Interestingly, McKerrell (2009) makes reference to a ‘New Zealand style’ of performance where he considers New Zealand pipers to subscribe to the Nicol/Brown style, also known as the ‘Bobs of Balmoral’ style (McKerrell 2009, 284). Paradoxically, while many interview participants in the current study described influence from the Nicol/Brown style, they did not confirm sole adherence to this, often citing a number of other influential styles, including Donald Macleod. McKerrell’s claim is likely made from the viewpoint of Scotland and his interviews with culture bearers in that context (McKerrell 2005). He does, however, touch on popular conceptions of style as being attributed to certain individuals as authoritative figures, and attributes ‘good’ and therefore authentic musical style to New Zealand performers (2009, 284). Although, his comments assume the pipers he has experienced represent New Zealand pipers, he provides no further information to support this claim. While some interview participants indicated subscription to the Brown/Nicol style of performance, interview responses from this study suggest that this is not a defining feature of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand for cultural participants, and that this was no different to the style of performers in Scotland.

4.5 Interpreting *Piobaireachd* Sound: Summary

This chapter has presented, described and explained interview participant data; together with support from ethnographic observations, existing literature, and insider experience; to analyse sound as a definitive component contributing to an understanding of authenticity for *piobaireachd* as culture in New Zealand. While it has been useful to break *piobaireachd* sound down into its three components of instrument sound, technical sound, and musical concepts, they are not considered as separate entities in the context of performance. Rather, they are interrelated and co-dependent. Instrument sound is meaningless without technical sound and musical concepts. Technical sound is driven by musical concepts yet not possible without instrument sound. Musical concepts are the product of technical sounds, resultant from instrument sound. Considered through the complete sound of performance, *piobaireachd* sound is instrument sound, technical sound, and musical concept combined.
There is a display to *piobaireachd* performance in the form of an aural spectacle, which is a result of the combined notions of authentic instrument sound, authentic technical sound, and authentic musical concepts contributing to authentic *piobaireachd* sound. It is clear that there is some skill required in attaining such authenticity in sound from the various sound components, and that understanding, ability and demonstration are required in order to achieve authentic sound. At the same time, it is clear from participants’ responses that, while instrument sound and technical sound are necessities of performance, ultimately *piobaireachd* sound is defined by musical concepts that exist within, and are displayed through, instrument sound and technical sounds. This prioritising of sound elements can be seen as having musical concepts paramount, with ideal technical sounds fundamental to musical concepts, and instrument sound fundamental to both (see Figure 4.5).

![Diagram of prioritised aural components of *piobaireachd* sound.](image)

Instrument sound then acts as the foundation for technical sound and musical concepts, and technical sound acts as a foundation for musical concepts. The presentation of musical concepts is ultimately judged through the demonstration of technical sound and instrument sound, and in this way bears some similarity to Merriam’s (1964) model for the study of music as culture. The way in which interview participants discuss and appear to conceive differences in the arrangement and organisation of sound for *piobaireachd* offers substantial support for *piobaireachd* being more than just ‘a theme and variations structure’ and ‘the classical music of the Highland bagpipe’.
The discussion provided in this chapter indicates a micromusicality to *piobaireachd*, embedded in all of the various components of its aural demonstration, and in the customs that give rise to the production of sound in performance. Not only are instrument sound, technical sound, and musical concepts for *piobaireachd* linked together, interview participants indicate that they are also linked to sound components for other styles of Highland bagpiping, while also suggesting that they are different. For these participants, authentic sounds demonstrated in *piobaireachd* are more authentic than sounds in other forms and styles of Highland bagpipe music. Furthermore, an ability to demonstrate authenticity of sound in *piobaireachd* is indicative of an ability to demonstrate authenticity in Highland bagpipe culture in general. Beyond similarities and differences between *piobaireachd* in New Zealand and Highland bagpiping in New Zealand, there are consistencies and contrasts between the sound of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand and in Scotland, indicating a transcultural association that requires an investigation beyond sound to comprehend. This chapter suggests a subcultural sound for *piobaireachd* as a part of Highland bagpiping culture in New Zealand.

Through the discussion of the various components of *piobaireachd* sound we can see that *piobaireachd* is an important part of Highland piping in New Zealand as it provides pipers with a higher purpose, attempting to perform better each time, and in the process redefining the standards for authenticity of sound components for both *piobaireachd* and Highland bagpiping in general. Acceptable instrument sound requires pipers constantly retune and readjust their bagpipes to suit their individual performance actions, instrument materials and local conditions. Acceptable technical sounds demand control and speed, and are the perceived result of practice and training. Acceptable musical concepts are the result of understanding and comprehension of styles and musicality. *Piobaireachd* sound differs between pipers, who have varying strengths and weaknesses in their ability to produce instrument sound, technical sound and musical concepts. This is important because it allows pipers to perform *piobaireachd* as individuals whilst they strive to produce an idealistic authentic *piobaireachd* sound. Yet this definition of authenticity is not objective. How one performer might consider a tune to be authentically performed may be different from another piper. One piper may prefer to play ‘Lament for the Departure of King James’ at a much slower speed than a different piper. Thus through focusing on sound, authenticity has been shown to be subjective and individually understood. Yet ultimately some concepts of authenticity also appear to be socially held, collectively enforced through competition.
For *piobaireachd* performers in New Zealand, *piobaireachd* is a classical form, a high art for Highland pipers who practice it. The standards by which pipers measure the sound of others in performance indicates that it holds a special place in Highland piping culture in New Zealand as ‘the classical music of the Highland bagpipe’, synonymous with what others have written regarding its place in Highland bagpiping in general. In this regard *piobaireachd* is seen as the pinnacle of solo Highland bagpipe performance, where authenticity is the expression of mastered instrument sound, technical sound, and musical concepts. These components of sound are more complex and more demanding for *piobaireachd* than for the performance of other forms of Highland piping. Therefore, mastery and authenticity of *piobaireachd* sound is linked with authority in the Highland piping community, a point that will be explored further in Chapter 6.

Beyond performers of *piobaireachd* however, the concepts that give rise to musical sound are abstract and difficult to understand. This status as the classical music of the Highland bagpipe gives *piobaireachd* sound greater cultural value to subcultural participants than the sound of other forms of Highland bagpiping in New Zealand, and allows participants to place that sound on a pedestal. Yet at the same time it also makes *piobaireachd* less accessible to others by demanding such high standards of performance and performer requirements in order to produce and understand aural authenticity. Interview participants see this as fundamental to *piobaireachd* being the minority and marginal activity that it is within the Highland bagpiping community. In New Zealand however, a paucity of performance contexts compared with Scotland makes *piobaireachd* significantly more inaccessible to non-performers and furthers its abstraction to the Highland bagpiping community in New Zealand and to wider New Zealand society. Meanwhile this position of *piobaireachd* as central and highly valued to the pipers that participate in performances is key. The influence of *piobaireachd* sound on the sound of other subcultural styles of Highland piping is also likely to be significant, given the prominence of these participants within the Highland piping community in New Zealand. This is explored further in Chapter 6.

The demonstration of *piobaireachd* sound is symbolic and imbued with references to the cultural past, embedded in such concepts as ‘right’ and ‘wrong’, ‘good’ and ‘bad’, as well as ‘authentic’. Participant understandings of *piobaireachd* performances in the present are gained through their experiences from the past, which inform their ability to distinguish authentic sounds from sounds that are not acceptable. According to Moore (2002), authenticity is a subjective interpretation and a social process rather than an inherent quality.
of sound. For *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, authenticity is an individually understood benchmark derived from the sounds that an individual has previously experienced and understood within an authentic social context. Authenticity for *piobaireachd* sound involves balancing chanter sound with drone sound, clear articulation of notes and ornaments, as well as demonstrating acceptable musicality and style. Therefore the distinctive sounds of the Highland bagpipe not only represent notions of Scottish cultural heritage and Scottish identity within New Zealand (see Milosavljevic 2009; Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012), the sound of the bagpipe during *piobaireachd* performance carries much deeper and richer meanings, particularly those that relate to authenticity and the cultural past. ‘Authenticity’ of *piobaireachd* sound acts as an ideal standard of performance, and therefore ideas about authentic *piobaireachd* sound play a major role in determining how *piobaireachd* is interpreted. This includes ‘good’ sound being fundamental for authentic performance, essentially determining its social acceptability. The cultural past is embodied in performance by demonstrating an understanding of ‘authenticity’ within the various aspects of performance sound. This allows participants’ to structure performances within a social hierarchy that determines which performance holds greater cultural value and which performer is given cultural authority.

Despite interview participants indicating that the cultural past is manifested within the *piobaireachd* sound used in current *piobaireachd* performance within New Zealand, they have done so without actually defining this manifestation in terms of specific properties of sound. Thus, while some interview participants have indicated that cultural authenticity is a major factor in the arrangement of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, the specifics of such authenticity remain undefined. *Piobaireachd* sound is not authentic in itself, rather, for cultural participants its authenticity and value relates to how it is transmitted in performance, as well as in learning and rehearsing contexts. This is sympathetic with Moore (2002) and suggests that the circumstances of its social and cultural transmission are more important for authenticity of sound, than some innate quality of the music.

Interview participants indicated that differences exist between New Zealand and Scotland regarding *piobaireachd* sound. While some participants who had performed in Scotland at times argued for differences in *piobaireachd* sound between New Zealand and Scotland, they did not discuss what those differences were in terms of sound. Some suggested that conditions for performance may have impacted on the way instruments sound for *piobaireachd* performance in Scotland compared to within New Zealand, while others thought that musical
concepts practiced in New Zealand were at times different to those used by pipers in Scotland, perhaps supporting McKerrell (2009, 284). Yet, contradicting these statements were other suggestions that the standards for *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand are no different to those in Scotland and that we are on a par with them in terms of *piobaireachd* sound. Therefore, while some interview participants have implied that *piobaireachd* sound has been localised to New Zealand, such localisation remains undefined.

In attempting to compare what is known about *piobaireachd* (largely from a Scottish centred point of view) against what this chapter has uncovered about *piobaireachd* sound in New Zealand, difficulties arise. This is largely due to other researchers seemingly not grasping the transcultural nature of music in the postmodern world – a consideration now expected in ethnomusicological research (see Section 3.1.8). Authors from Cooke (1972) to McClellan (2009) have sought the universal definition of rhythm and form in *piobaireachd* in order to uncover its relationship to other musics and better understand its structure. Yet in focusing on historical development and musical definitions from a neutral and universal point of view, out of a time and place context, they have denied the existence of *piobaireachd* in globalised and contemporary settings. This chapter does not pertain to offer the answers to the questions such previous work has asked; it simply suggests that *piobaireachd* has not been understood in cultural terms. Presuming the universality of *piobaireachd* sound in a global and constantly changing world is an error, a misunderstanding, and a misrepresentation of music (see Kartomi 1981; Slobin 1992; Biddle and Knights 2007).

By focusing on authenticity for the sound of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand it can be seen that *piobaireachd* can be considered subculturally relative to Highland bagpiping within New Zealand. It embodies the cultural past in complex and varying ways, and is localised to New Zealand to some degree, although the aural properties of that localisation remain elusive. Ultimately, it has been shown that musical concepts, as the arrangement of sound, do more to define *piobaireachd* culturally than the innate qualities of sound alone. Without musical concepts, ‘*piobaireachd*’ is not demonstrated. Therefore, *piobaireachd* is aural phenomena and the concepts, meanings and values underpinning such sound. However, both *piobaireachd* as a sound and a concept is also reliant on material and visual culture as well as social and cultural transmission in order for that meaning to be applied.

Using interview responses has required a discussion of the technical components of authentic sound generation in order to provide the background and a forum for debating the differences
between *piobaireachd* in New Zealand and Scotland. The sections of this chapter have focused on the components of *piobaireachd* sound and predominantly what interview responses have suggested about these components. Where relevant, these have been supported or contradicted by ethnographic observations, relevant literature, and insider experience in order to triangulate results relative to the focus of this research. The following chapter now considers the material and visual factors that produce sound and provide it with cultural meaning and context.
Chapter 5 - Exploring Material and Visual Culture

Material objects and visual displays are key components of musical culture (Kartomi 1990; de Vale 1991; Leppert 1993; Dawe 2001; Johnson 2004). This chapter explores how piobaireachd extends beyond sound, encompassing material and visual factors. Further, it considers how such factors produce piobaireachd sound and give it meaning relative to music as culture. As such, it employs a framework informed by the original tripartite model of Merriam (1964) as described in Section 3.1.7, and is influenced by the works of others, including Baily (1977), de Vale (1977), Tsuge (1983), Stockmann (1991), and Johnson (1995). Merriam contends that cultural value is embedded within material and visual components of music production that participants experience, demonstrate, and interpret (Merriam 1964, 32, 45). Use of interview responses from culture bearers, ethnographic observations, literature, and insider experiences is consistent with the triangulation approach outlined in Chapter 3. This proposes that piobaireachd is not just sound, it accepts material and visual factors will also have cultural contribution to piobaireachd in New Zealand, producing meaning and value for participants, bound by decorum and concepts of cultural authenticity. Chapter 4 has established that piobaireachd sound is governed by concepts of cultural authenticity, which determine the aural characteristics evident within New Zealand. Chapter 6 explores how piobaireachd sound as well as material and visual culture for piobaireachd in New Zealand are linked to social and cultural transmission.

Although a number of authors have provided some discussion of material culture for Highland bagpiping, they have focused on historical and comparative studies, and do not offer further definition of material and visual culture for contemporary piobaireachd performance, either within New Zealand, or elsewhere (Collinson 1975, 125-201; MacInnes 1989, 68-72; McKerrell 2005; Brown 2009; Forrest 2009; Shears 2009). As material and visual factors are known to contribute to the cultural organisation of sound as music (Tsuge 1983; de Vale 1991; Dawe 2001), this chapter focuses on identifying and discussing material and visual factors specific to piobaireachd performance.

This chapter is congruent with Merriam’s (1964) model of musical culture where sound is a result of behaviour (Merriam 1964; Johnson 2004, 25; Donaghy 2011, 5). For example, “a
musical instrument is a physical object of music material culture; it is an artefact that is linked to music and to human behaviour in making that sound during performance” (Johnson 2004, 9). Further, “a musical instrument is more than wood, wires, and glue… the essence of the object lies in the meanings the [a] culture has assigned to it” (Linn 1991, xi). Authors such as de Vale (1991), Dawe (2001) and Johnson (2004) have established that musical instruments, as material objects, can be considered manifestations and symbols of the musical cultures in which they are embedded. Likewise, it is argued that sounds are more than just aural phenomena; they have cultural meaning that underpins their production and arrangement. For the purposes of this research, such musical behaviour is also argued to relate to other material and visual components of *piobaireachd* considered as culture, (see Chapter 3). This putative relationship between participants and material and visual culture requires investigation in order to better understand the context in which *piobaireachd* exists in relation to contemporary New Zealand society.

Material and visual factors are likely to provide context for *piobaireachd* sound that has a bearing on the interpretation of authenticity of performance. ‘Music’ requires certain characteristics in order for it to be ‘palatable’ to cultural participants (Nettl 2005, 29). Stokes (1994a) argues that music can construct a sense of place, and that this place is often represented in the symbols, contexts and participation in music. As these characteristics underpin the phenomena involved in music culture, an analysis of material and visual factors used within the context of musical performance will allow for an understanding of the links between music and its meaning (Gerstin 1998, 408-409). A presentation and discussion of data relative to material and visual factors is the underlying theme of this chapter. Given the scarcity of research on contemporary material and visual culture for *piobaireachd*, and a need for external validity, the sources include qualitative interviews, field observations, existing literature, and insider reflections (Yin 1994, 35; Schmuckler 2001, 419).

Following thematic analysis several aspects of material and visual culture were identified. These provide cultural context and a sense of belonging, produce and affect the demonstration and interpretation of *piobaireachd* sound, and display identity and association. Interviews with culture bearers provide opportunity for thematic discussion throughout this chapter. Ethnographic observations and insider experience also strongly contribute to the discussion. Appendices 5a, 5b and 5c provide illustrations of performance contexts to situate the reader within the performance environment. Considerable use of photographic material throughout the chapter supports the flow of information and verifies discussion. This mix of data
identified a number of thematic categories for discussion, and provides a flow from the discussion on *piobaireachd* sound, into a discussion of the material factors that produce and affect sound. The ethnographic observations, and insider knowledge, identified performance attire, performance choreography, and the property and possession of participants as areas for further investigation. An abundance of references to arena drove an investigation of their places, spaces, and material components as performance contexts. This chapter is structured accordingly into five sections that consider these components of material and visual culture. These sections include: producing and affecting sound, performance attire, performance choreography, property and possessions of participants, and performance context.

Although these five fundamental components have been isolated for discussion, it is necessary to understand that they do not exist on their own. Rather, they are considered within the overall presentation of a tune as a given performance. They are interrelated and inseparable from each other, and from sound, in *piobaireachd* performance. This chapter is not an all-encompassing, broad based anthology of all material and visual factors for *piobaireachd*. It explores a limited number of factors, accepted as contextually important, that allow for a contemporary consideration of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. Section 5.1 below provides descriptions and discussion from formalised ethnographic field notes related to material and visual factors for *piobaireachd*.

### 5.1 Ethnographic Observation


*I am sitting in a room that would normally function as the senior common room for secondary school students. There are approximately 30 people within the audience, mostly seated on couches that are arranged in a semicircle facing the centre of the room. Some sit in groups, others sit on their own, perhaps preferring their own company. Many are holding opened booklets, souvenir programmes that are official documents for the festival where this particular room is acting as a performance arena. An audience member appears to be asleep. In the centre of the room, and noticeably separate from the audience are two individuals, judges, dressed in Highland attire, seated at a desk with books and festival booklets open in front of them. They also have many pieces of paper on their desk, competitor lists and report*
sheets that they are filling out as both handwritten critique and praise for each performance that they witness. One of the judges is currently pouring through a book of significant size, a bound manuscript collection of piobaireachd scores. Over the course of several minutes as we sit, waiting for the next performer to arrive, several people individually stand up and leave the room and are replaced by others. My own programme is open to the page for this particular event, which details many aspects of the event I am watching, including the order of competitors, the time the event will be held, who the adjudicators of the event are, the arena it is held within, and the prize that is offered to pipers for the best piobaireachd performance. In the middle of the wall, at the back of the performance room, to the rear of the judge’s desk, is a clearly visible small table on which are placed a number of trophies and certificates. These appear to be meticulously arranged.

Several minutes pass and the next performer arrives, dressed head to toe in performance attire that includes noticeable use of shoes, socks, garters, a kilt, a sporran, a shirt, a waistcoat, a tie, and a hat. His particular attire is unique; the combination of components, colours, textures, and designs used by this performer in this event is distinct from that of other performers. He carries his bagpipes on his shoulder, green drone cords and tassels and a green bag cover compliment the rich dark colour of the African Blackwood, itself contrasted by bands of ivory. Entering the room from an adjoining passageway, he walks down into the space between the judges and the audience. Here, his body language noticeably changes, from relaxed and reserved to confident and proud, marked through posture and movement. He approaches the desk where the judges are seated. Words are exchanged and the judges turn to an appropriate page within the bound manuscript collection. They ready their notepads and pens as the performer returns to the centre of the room. He places the mouthpiece in his mouth and begins to inflate the bag. In several moments, and with a flick of arms, the bag is erect and tucked under his arm. He continues to blow into the bag producing the characteristic sound of the bagpipe (see Chapter 4) while his arm alternately squeezes the bag when he takes breaths. Within seconds of hoisting the instrument into place, the piper reaches up with one hand and begins tuning his drones, facing away from the judges. Members of the audience are facing each other, talking. Some walk into the audience seating area and sit down, and others get up and leave. One is holding and staring at their cell phone. The piper places both hands on his chanter, and, uncovering and covering the holes with specific combinations, produces instrument and technical sound, while he continues to face away from the judges.
After three minutes and twenty-four seconds he slowly turns to face the judges, with both hands on the chanter, holding one particular finger combination for several moments. Within a space of seconds the piper stares at the judges, they both look up and stare back at the piper. The audience, indifferent to the performer moments before, is now attentive and alert, their booklets in hand and open, nobody moves, no cell phones are in sight, nobody is standing, nobody is walking, nobody is sleeping. The piper’s head nods in the direction of the judges; the judges nod their heads back at the piper, who is still holding one particular note on the chanter. Then a split second later, the piper’s feet and fingers begin to move.

He begins to wander as he moves his fingers, using differing combinations of fingers on and off the chanter at any one time. The judges, on occasion, can be seen to write something on their report sheets. One judge in particular stares at the manuscript collection, the other stares at the piper. The audience remain attentive and focused, as do the judges. The piper moves his feet without purpose, wandering, meandering, strolling across the performance arena, head held high, rigid and upright, instrument perched upon his shoulder while his fingers flick on and off the chanter. The rhythm of his breathing and squeezing of the bag does not appear to match that of the movement of his fingers, nor does it match that of the movement of his feet, which is different again.

He continues operating his instrument for roughly ten minutes. The tempo of his breathing has remained unchanged, as has the tempo of the movement of his feet. His fingers however have been moving more and more regularly and rapidly, as the performance has progressed. The piper has noticeable sweat beads on his forehead and his face has reddened markedly over the duration of the performance. The judges have written on their separate report sheets many times, one judge continuing to stare at the performer, while the other continues to stare at the bound manuscript collection. The audience remain attentive; nobody has stood up, walked through, or moved suddenly.

After fourteen minutes since the piper first engaged his instrument he suddenly halts his wandering and turns to face the judges, who both stare at the performer. Moments later the piper ceases blowing into, and squeezing the bag, and no longer move his fingers or feet. For a brief moment he is stationary, the judges are stationary, the audience is stationary, we are stationary, all sound stops. The instrument becomes flaccid and he removes it from his pipers shoulder and in this moment of instrumental dismount, the piper nods to the judges, and they
nod back. He then strides out of the centre of the room and back down the corridor he came from, head held high, posture and movement emanating purpose. Applause is given. Members of the audience stand and move about. The judges converse with each other whilst simultaneously writing on their report sheets. Cell Phones are observed being used, booklets are placed down, and an audience member appears to be asleep.

This is a formalised extract of participant observation, focusing on the visual and material factors evident in the performance of piobaireachd, within the context of cultural participation. This transcript logically leads to the following questions: ‘What is the instrument made from?’ ‘Why does the performer dress in the way they do?’ ‘What are the books and booklets seen within the arena?’ ‘What are the trophies at the back of the room?’ ‘Why is the performance being given in this arena?’ and ‘What is the context of this performance?’ These are answered in this chapter, as well as within the content of Chapters 4 and 6. Interview participants and the researcher are well versed in content of such performances and are experienced and qualified to speak to the meaning of the material and visual factors evident. This chapter contextualises these results relative to the fundamental behaviour of cultural participants in the act of piobaireachd performance. The following sections provide the results and discussion generated by the exploration of material and visual culture within the methodological framework outlined in Chapter 3.

5.2 Materials Producing and Affecting Sound

The analysis of piobaireachd sound (Chapter 4) does not provide in-depth discussion of material objects. Music sound needs to be considered through holistic study of the “sound producing objects of material culture”, as a way of interpreting music through material objects, concepts and behaviour (Johnson 1995, 258, 266). This requires cultural exploration of material objects and material spaces that are likely to have a bearing on piobaireachd (Merriam 1964; Schafer 1977; Feld 1982; Small 1998).

Schafer (1977) coined the term ‘soundscape’ in reference to acoustic environments where sound is experienced. Introducing such concepts as ‘keynotes’, ‘sound signals’, and ‘soundmarks’, as well as a ‘lo-fi’ (more cluttered and ‘noisy’) to ‘hi-fi’ (more balanced and acoustically ‘ideal’) soundscape spectrum, Schafer’s treatise changed the way many researchers approached studies of hearing sound within space (Schafer 1977; Wrightson 2000, 10). Building upon Schafer (1977), Krause introduced a threefold classification for ‘basic
active acoustic sources’ in the space and place of hearing – biophony, geophony, and anthrophony (Krause 2008). Cultural meaning for musical performance can be linked to many factors, including space and context, “how and why the space for musicking is constituted has a bearing on who makes music, who hears it, and how it is heard” (Wood et al. 2007, 870). Wood et al. (2007) continue, “the venue of the concert is a material influence on how performances are staged and heard...” and offer, “...material spaces of music – their fabric, their economy, their sociality – are also what music is” (Wood et al. 2007, 871-872). Therefore the time, place, venue, audience, cost, music, view, costumes, lighting, interaction of performers with the audience, along with many other elements, not only affect the presentation and interpretation of performances, they can also influence the definition of culture from person to person.

Permezel and Duffy (2007) explain the importance of community interaction in the development of musicking sites, acknowledging, “festivals are events that are actively constructed by a local government, organisations and audiences as being about local communities situated in a particular place and celebrating a local communal identity”.

Through considering performance contexts and spaces, music reveals how people function, interact and experience their world (Permezel and Duffy 2007, 363). If musical performance is a part of culture, is representative of time and place, and is comprised of an amalgam of identities, then any musical performance is capable of representing, not only those individuals who participate within it, and those sources which have inspired it, but also the times and places that it exists within. Such ideas as these will be employed in this subsection (as well as in subsequent sections of the chapter) in order to consider the piobaireachd soundscape in New Zealand. Thus materials involved in music demonstration and interpretation affect sounds heard in the act of ‘musicking’ (Small 1998). This chapter focuses on performance and demonstration of piobaireachd.

A particular interview response implying importance of material objects is as follows:

As a judge you’re looking at a musical ideal, and you’re looking at it from a bagpipe, technique and expression point of view, musical expression, and there’s a number of things that go in to make that up (Participant 5).

This quote was also discussed in the analysis of sound, and is useful in a material context as it informs about a musical ideal and ‘the things that go in to make that up’. Participant 5 alludes to a number of factors contributing to the demonstration and interpretation of ideal musical sound in performance. Such culturally ideal sound is understood as authentic music, and this
chapter explores material objects and visual displays that give rise to musical sound and provide it with authentic cultural context and value.

Although sound exists as the primary concern of piobaireachd performance and drives the consideration of musical concepts, material and visual culture also influences production and interpretation of musical sound. The following section identifies material and visual components that produce and affect performance sound. Beginning with the acoustic environment, discussion then moves to organology, and finally, the performance actions of a piper – as factors that contribute to the production and experiential interpretation of authentic piobaireachd sound in New Zealand.

5.2.1 Performance Spaces

Piobaireachd performance is given in spaces that act as arena and stage, commonly known in competition contexts as ‘the board’, while in recitals such spaces are in essence the same, but have no formal terminology. There is a materiality to spaces for piobaireachd performance (see Appendices 5a, 5b and 5c as well as Figures 4.3, and 5.1). Arena are not only defined by the physical space in which a performance may be given, but also by the material and acoustic space, which for piobaireachd, is also a cultural and social space (see Section 5.6). For pipers, performance spaces affect musical sound in a number of ways through such ‘geophonic’ influences as acoustics, wind, temperature, moisture, and industrial noise, while ‘anthrophonic’ factors can include audience interaction and person generated background noise. These exist as contextual influences on sound within the performance arena (Krause 2008). Although ‘biophonic’ sounds (e.g. animals) may also be a factor for piobaireachd in New Zealand, in this research these were not observed to impact on the demonstration or interpretation of sound.

While temperature and humidity can have an impact on the performance of sound, this impact is primarily limited to materials that produce sound. Further discussion on this is presented in section 5.2.2 below. The following data reflect on the properties of arena that affect sound after it is produced.

While all interview participants reflected on performance spaces, they offered limited discussion of the impact of arena on produced sound. However, Participants 3 and 4 respectively implied that arena (as a material space) is important and can influence the
presentation of authentic sound. When asked of their opinions regarding the impact of arena acoustics on their performance sound they noted:

Yeah I’d say so. It’s just better. Obviously I do go outside and stuff too and often that’s the case over in Scotland, a lot of it’s outside. But yeah most of the big events like the silver and gold medals are indoors. So most of the big ones will be indoors (Participant 3).

Yep. Yeah I think the biggest battle we have here is the battle with the environment… So will you go to these games or these games or ‘should I do outdoor games if I know I’m competing indoors’. You know they’re completely different, Braemar compared to Inverness. Braemar you have to submit 8 tunes and get you tune picked on the board, and you turn up at 9am and the rain’s horizontal, it’s 10 degrees and you’re thinking ‘mmmmm ok’. And then that’s completely different from say Inverness where you’ve been two days there before at Eden Court [Northern Meeting at Inverness], it's just like a town hall environment (Participant 4).

The impact of the acoustic environment within such settings can have an impact on the interpretation of *piobaireachd*. For example, the echoic and resonant properties of an empty hall will have a noticeably differing influence on the sound of *piobaireachd* compared to a small room with a full audience. Likewise, performance in an unsheltered outdoor area with noticeable wind can also affect sound heard in performance, in comparison to sound produced in still air conditions associated with indoor arena (as inferred by Participants 3 and 4 above, see Figures 4.3 and 5.1 for illustration of indoor and outdoor arenas). Further, an environment with an audible electrical device may produce industrial noise that audibly interferes with *piobaireachd* sound.

The arena for ethnographic observation (Section 5.1) functions as the senior common room at a private school. What differentiates this space as a performance arena is time and context. The acoustic properties will vary depending on when the event occurs, and by its use. Thus, arenas are spaces within time defined by context, and the profile of an arena as a performance space is partly determined by its acoustic properties. Such spaces are also related to their local functions. This common room was purpose built for Saint Andrews College and thus is representative of that community. Its geophonic acoustic environment is unique due to the specific spatial dimensions and properties of this environment. Further the acoustic qualities of environment are also related to further changes and variables such as how many people are within the room, whether the refrigerator is operating, room temperature, outside vehicle noise, people moving, and the piper’s physical use of that space as they move (Section 5.4). Such factors reflect the spaces (and times) they exist within. Thus the acoustic environments in which *piobaireachd* performances are given are reflective of their function and use by local communities within New Zealand.
Figure 5.1 Two performance arenas. An outdoor performance ‘board’ (top) at the Hawke’s Bay Highland Games. Source: author, Hastings (7-8 April 2012). An indoor performance ‘board’ (bottom) at the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, Otago Centre annual piping championships. Source: author, Dunedin (2-3 June 2012).

5.2.2 Organology

While the acoustic environment of a given performance arena can uniquely affect piobaireachd sound produced in performance, the material components of the instrument also have a significant bearing on sound (Baines 1960, 111-122; Collinson 1975, 226-232; Cannon 1988, 10-20; Cheape 2008, 51-53). Baines (1960) in particular, provides a comprehensive overview of bagpipes of the world, including the Highland bagpipe. For the purposes of this study it is important to note that the design and components of the Highland bagpipe in New Zealand are generally consistent with that used by pipers in Scotland, North America, and
Australia, apart from those discussed below. In order to address such instrument components this section focuses on the material components of the bagpipe as the instrument for *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand.

Dawe has argued, “however much we study an instrument … we will never be able to capture the full meaning that it had for the people, society, culture, subculture, tribe, clan, family, or individual that produced it” (Dawe 2001, 228). Such a concept is extended here to focus on the use of material instrument in the production of *piobaireachd* sound.

The instrument used for *piobaireachd* performance is a material object (Cannon 1988, 11; Donaldson 2005, 1-8). Having the ‘best’ sounding and most stable bagpipe is important for performers of *piobaireachd*, as these characteristics tend to result in authentic instrument sound. Trends for instrument components (for example drone reeds, bagpipe bags, chanter, chanter reeds) can play a major part in determining the instrument sound during performance. Each reed vibrates as a result of air being forced through it, producing a sound within its own sound chamber (see The Bagpipe Place n.d). This sound travels through resonant chambers of drones and chanter and mix where they emerge into the external environment. This combined sound produces the instrument sound of performance (Section 4.2). Thus instrument sound is a direct result of the materiality of the instrument the piper is using.

In addition a piper’s instrument performance actions and the conditions of the performance environment will influence the material qualities of instrument components. Participants acknowledge the importance of this effect in a number of ways through their responses regarding instrument ‘setup’:

Well in terms of instrument for instance, the set up for solo instrument is poles apart from what you’re trying to achieve with a band instrument (Participant 4).

I think if you can play a perfect *piobaireachd* with perfectly set up pipes… You’ve got this unbelievable beautiful music that can come out of a pipe with a *piobaireachd*, which you don’t get in an MSR (Participant 6).

This concept of ‘setup’ determines that the components of an instrument are important and have a bearing on the authenticity of performance sound. Several interview participants also described the importance of specific components, although they were not consistent in how they were ranked by importance. The following four quotes exemplify such variation:

[I’m using a] sheepskin bag [and a] cane bass. You hear the competing pipers say that it comes down to that last 5% and so I’ve been really working on that (Participant 1).
I’ve been struggling with getting my kitty litter just right you know, and so I’m blowing up and the top hand’s sharp so I’ve just got to keep playing and get a bit of moisture in there and do your thing (Participant 2).

Piper X, and he was a very, very talented player, really talented. He made his own drone reeds, cane drone reeds, I don’t know whether he made his own chanter reeds, he didn’t at the time, but he was going to move on to that, and he kept a really beautiful sounding bagpipe (Participant 5).

I wasn’t 100% happy, more to do with the set up of the pipes… Well I’ve recently acquired a set of 1880ish MacDougalls. I’ve never had an old set with the ivory and the provenance attached to them… [I prefer them] in terms of the tone of the wood and the character and the richness of sound. That’s something you don’t get with modern instruments (Participant 6).

Such varying and limited responses are most likely a result of participants considering their preferences for instrument components as private and personal. It is also likely that pipers, in having a conversation about piobaireachd (as was the interview approach), considered instrument components as less important and at a lower level of importance than the specific aural qualities of sound and transmission of authentic performance.

![Peter Henderson Bagpipes, Model PH06. An example of a modern bagpipe made using African Blackwood for all of the sound producing components. Source: Easton Bagpipes and Highland Supplies. Permission to use this image was kindly granted by R. G. Hardie & Co. Ltd.](image)

The chanter has a reed embedded in the seat (see Figure 5.3) producing vibrations when air is forced through the reed. Various combinations of holes are covered and uncovered by fingers to produce the nine melodic notes of the bagpipe scale. One particular note unique to
piobaireachd (piobaireachd High G) means that pipers adjust their chanters specifically for piobaireachd before they perform. The drone reeds, embedded in their respective drones (see Figure 5.3), produce the background sound that is the harmonic accompaniment to the chanter. The reeds vibrate as air passes through them carrying the vibrations into the sound chamber of the drone (discussed by Participant 6 above). Where the air emerges from the drone it produces an individual drone sound, which combines with the chanter, and sound of the other drones to produce total instrument sound.

![Figure 5.3 Highland bagpipe chanter reed ‘seated’ in the chanter (left). Highland bagpipe drone reed ‘seated’ in the drone (right). Source: author, Dunedin (17 April 2012).](image)

For performers of piobaireachd, chanters and drones must perform authentically in terms of sound (see Chapter 4). As these components often need material adjustment for optimal performance pipers look for those qualities that produce optimal sound, but also demand less time and energy in maintenance. As instrumental sound qualities are a part of performance experience and become a part of performance identity (McKerrell 2005), types and makes of instrument component can become praised as being better than others (for example Participant 6 above preferring one particular make of bagpipe). Insider understanding identifies pipers commonly talk about product trends in instrument components, but, as noted, these conversations take a ‘backseat’ to discussion of piobaireachd sound. Further, in the presence of an audio recording device and inquisitive questions, interview participants may not have been as willing as normal to divulge their instrument component preferences.

Trends for instrument component use appear to be influenced by endorsement of key figures within the Scottish Highland bagpiping community, although no further data were gathered in
support of this. For examples of such endorsement of product the reader is directed to the following websites, Atherton Bagpipes (n.d) and Strathmore Bagpipes and Chanters (2011). Having an instrument comprised of the ‘best’ components available on the market can correspond to status and an acceptance that having such products will improve performance (see Participants 1, 5 and 6 above). Components differ between manufacturers, where unique dimensions and processes are used for production. The reputation of a component manufacturer is based upon the average performance of their product. The makers with the best reputation can enjoy strong demand for their product, however reputation differs depending on context. A piobaireachd performer will tend to select components that they believe will produce an authentic sound, will be consistent in producing that sound, and are capable of being manipulated to produce authentic sound (e.g. Participant 6 above). While New Zealand manufactured instrument components do exist, such components are not necessarily considered authentic sound producing materials to New Zealand pipers, simply because they come from New Zealand. Further discussion on New Zealand made instrument components will be provided later in this section and in Chapter 6.

In solo piping, instrument components made from natural materials are considered to produce more authentic sound (see Participant 1 above nominating sheepskin pipe bags and cane drone reeds as the pinnacle, also Participant 5 discussing cane reeds). There is an argument proffered by some that bags made from leather (see Figure 5.4) and drone reeds (see Figure 5.3) made from cane generate a more authentic sound than synthetic bags and reeds. Through insider understanding, the author is aware of a number of arguments for such superiority of hide bags and cane drone reeds for authentic piobaireachd performance. However the consensus for such choice is not universal, where it is known that a number of pipers also prefer synthetic pipe bags (see Figure 5.4) and drone reeds for sound quality (School of Piping n.d.a; School of Piping n.d.b). Further, there is a paucity of evidence for sound quality being superior for any form of reed construction (Paquier and Moyne 2005). While insider experience also indicates that there is considerable variety of opinion and judgements on authentic sounding materials (Lee and Sons Bagpipes n.d; PB News 2012) the author is not aware of any research applicable to piobaireachd in New Zealand. This appears to remain a matter of personal choice.
Controlling moisture content and condensation within the instrument is a known issue for *piobaireachd* performance (see Participant 2 above). The lengthy duration of *piobaireachd* expose instruments to greater cumulative moisture in the air blown from the piper than other styles of Highland bagpipe music. This moisture can condense and adversely affect instrument sound by altering the material properties of components. There are various moisture control systems used by pipers to combat these issues. Hence the acknowledgement by Participant 2, that a moisture control system (see Figure 5.5) employing ‘kitty litter’ (Calcium Bentonite granules) was an important factor that controlled sound quality for them. Moisture control is thus an option for pipers, and while not essential for performance, pipers risk authenticity of sound by ignoring moisture control issues that may arise.

Having the ‘best’ pipe bag, moisture control system, chanter, reeds, and bagpipe is a way of indicating that a piper’s knowledge is current with contemporary componentry in the bagpiping community and they have taken the time to improve their sound through the addition of new components. The use of, and demand for, New Zealand components is
influenced by those who promote the products and by those who supply them, and these instrument components are the fundamental hardware of the bagpipe. The ‘dimensions’ of component supply and performer demand are an unknown quantity, and are beyond the scope of this research.

Figure 5.5 Ross™ Suede Canister bagpipe bag with canister system extending out through zip access opening. Example of modern elaborate moisture control system, allowing pipers to alter amount of air and moisture content of air going to each reed. This particular system provides a tube to the chanter and drone stocks. Within the red canister the tubes are attached to are four chambers, one for each reed. Often canister chambers are filled with ‘kitty litter’ (Calcium Bentonite granules), which extracts moisture content from the air being supplied to the reeds, prolonging the length of time a piper may perform for before moisture accumulates and alters instrument sound. Source: Easton Bagpipes and Highland Supplies. Permission to use this image was kindly granted by Ross Bagpipe Bags Pty. Ltd.

Highland bagpipes are known to have instrument decoration or design in their construction. There is much variation in the quantity of decoration with some instruments far more ornate than others. They can range from modest wood and imitation ivory components to elaborate, fully engraved, nickel, silver and gold plate repoussé designs, with prices attributed to their material worth (see Figure 5.6).

This can show considerable visual variation within a range of products made by the same manufacturer, and also in comparison between manufacturers. While for some, such ornamentation clearly enhances the visual and physical aesthetic value of the instrument, there is no evidence that sound quality is associated with expense or expanse of ornamentation. The value of bagpipes is not solely indicated through appearance, and a number of pipers use bagpipes that have been inherited as either family or association heirlooms, that can bear significant cultural and social value through antiquity and provenance. These instruments can have a greater value to pipers than their financial worth. Only through materiality, sound qualities in performance, and provenance can the true
cultural value of an instrument be established. While no participants proffered any opinions regarding associations between monetary worth and sound quality of an instrument, it is necessary to acknowledge that how an instrument looks does not relate to the authenticity of its sound.

![Image of David Naill bagpipes model DN1 (top) and DN6 (bottom). Note the difference in quantity and detail of metal work and ornamentation of each instrument. DN1 model is worth approximately $2,650 (NZD) whereas the DN6 model is worth approximately $11,500 (NZD). Yet interestingly the African Blackwood and the dimensions for the two instruments are in theory identical, thus the sound of DN1 should in no way be inferior in sound to DN6. Source: Gannaway New Zealand - The Bagpipe Centre. Permission to use these images was kindly granted by David Naill & Co. Ltd.](image)

*Piobaireachd* is performed in a variety of arena, both indoors and outdoors. Indoor environments tend to be stable, providing shelter and thermal conditions where pipers are not exposed to extremes of climate. Outdoor environments are common for most competitive performances in Scotland, and are less common in New Zealand. Conditions in outdoor arena can thus vary dramatically and are susceptible to the vagaries of weather. Interview participants provided considerable description and opinion on performance environment:
Well, anywhere you go in the world there’s different conditions. You’ve got to work with what we’ve got really so just trying to practice with leading up, trying to get a feel for what your pipes are going to do in certain conditions. It might be different for a New Zealand summer and you might be able to get 30 – 50 minutes out of your pipes whereas a cold day up in Inverness in Scotland you’ll probably only get 20 minutes so that’s just knowing your conditions yeah, and working around it (Participant 3).

‘Will you go to these games or these games’ or ‘should I do outdoor games if I know I’m competing indoors?’ You know they’re completely different, Braemar compared to Inverness. Braemar you have to submit 8 tunes and get you tune picked on the board, and you turn up at 9am and the rain’s horizontal, it’s 10 degrees and you’re thinking ‘mnmnmn ok’. And then that’s completely different from say Inverness where you’ve been two days there before at Eden Court, it’s just like a town hall environment (Participant 4).

Pipers do not like to be exposed to extremes in temperature and inclement weather as this can alter the material qualities of their instrument and ultimately affect how the instrument sounds. In particular, previously tuned and balanced components of the instrument sound can often change pitch by varying amounts during changes in conditions, resulting in an unbalanced instrument sound. Loss of such balance equates to an out of tune instrument that has a major impact on the authenticity of sound in performance (Chapter 4). Conversely, a performance environment with stable and predictable conditions mitigates for such effects and offers some confidence that a tuned instrument will remain stable in performance. In New Zealand, the majority of piobaireachd performance spaces are indoors, which contrasts with Scotland where the majority are known to be outdoors:

There’ll be some conditions for competing in Scotland, especially Highland games you know there’s a few pretty rough wee locations, exposed, windy, cold, raining. Sometimes they’re not the most pleasant conditions whereas generally we don’t get that so much here in New Zealand, we don’t have so many outdoor competitions (Participant 3).

Participants established that controlling moisture content in their instrument was a major focus in the build up to performance. The differing performance environments clearly play a significant part in the operation of components within the instrument by altering their material qualities. The interpretation of participant responses (above), as well as insider experience, is clearly that indoor environments are the preferred option for piobaireachd performers in New Zealand. Such a preference is observed in the organisation of the Hawke’s Bay Highland Games in New Zealand where the piobaireachd events, traditionally held on an outdoor ‘board’, have recently been shifted indoors (note differences in performance environment in Figure 4.3, showing variation between indoor and outdoor boards at the Hawke’s Bay Highland Games).
The impact of weather conditions in Scotland requires more consideration in performance preparation than in New Zealand. This may be because of two reasons. Firstly, the competitive season in Scotland is much more intensive and involves a greater number of competitions than in New Zealand. Secondly, the Scottish performance spaces are at a much higher latitude (approximately 57° N) than those in New Zealand (approximately 41° S), and thus Scottish performance arena are more likely to expose pipers competing in the outdoor arena to greater vagaries of weather, particularly cold. Cold, unstable, and damp conditions are accepted as being adverse for optimal operation of bagpipes; while warm, stable and dry conditions are accepted as being more conducive to optimal performance. It is clear that an indoor arena has a greater opportunity to offer stability for performance, thus the material components of instruments and the instrument sound are intimately associated with performance arena and authenticity of performance.

Pipers prefer to try components in their instrument by purchasing these from a local supplier. There are known New Zealand manufacturers of bagpipe components that include bagpipes, drone reeds, chanter reeds, and bagpipe bags as well as blowpipes and moisture control systems (The New Zealand Bagpipe Company Limited n.d; Wilson Reeds n.d; Gannaway New Zealand - The Bagpipe Centre n.d). However, variations in business strategy, marketing, advertising and product supply make it difficult to estimate the actual number of suppliers and manufacturers. Although the use of locally made instrument components would be a defining feature of piobaireachd in New Zealand, there is no evidence found in this study that pipers favour the use of locally made components. Insider experience indicates that piobaireachd performers in New Zealand consistently prefer instrument components used by their peers in Scotland (such as McCallum Bagpipes n.d; Willie McCallum Piping n.d; David Naill and Company Limited 2013), and thus tend to choose those products (as indicated in Appendix 5d). These arguments relate to trends for the choice and the use of material components and their attributed authenticity of sound.

The use of instrument components for piobaireachd performance in New Zealand therefore relates to pipers having a preference for certain components as more authentic sounding in association with their attributed qualities, a result of their material characteristics. While manufacturers and suppliers of Highland bagpipe instrument components do exist within New Zealand, there is no evidence to suggest that piobaireachd instrument components within New Zealand are innately localised. That being said, the social influence of authorities, and their endorsement of certain makes and models of components as being the best sounding are
likely to have a strong impact on the trends for use of material components as discussed above, as well as the definition of authenticity of sound for local pipers. Further, the local conditions for performance demand that pipers take into consideration the environment when determining their set-up for future performances, in order to produce the most authentic sound. Such conditions are local to New Zealand and have been identified by interview participants as distinct from that elsewhere. Thus the set-up used for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand is reflective of New Zealand performance contexts, and therefore, reflective of New Zealand.

The above discussion has suggested that the materials that produce *piobaireachd* sound are much more than the Highland bagpipe instrument alone. Johnson contends:

> Ethnomusicology can contribute further to a study of musical instruments by examining these specific sound-producing objects of material culture in a holistic way, which does not exclude the performer or music. The main object of study should not be just the instrument itself, even when the main emphasis is on it, but the interrelationship between the instrument, performer, and music in the functional environment. The performer is, after all, essential to the event, and the music is the primary, though not, of course, the only function of the instrument… Musical instruments are not only part of music culture, they are very much part of a wider context where they can contribute directly to cultural analysis. It has been suggested here, therefore, that an ethnomusicology of musical instruments can offer an anthropology of instruments as part of a wider anthropology of music (Johnson 1995, 266-267).

More than simply the result of instrumental operation, *piobaireachd* has been shown, and will be further shown in the rest of this chapter, to be intrinsically linked to the people, spaces, objects, and contexts in which it can be found.

### 5.2.3 Instrument Performance Actions

While the materials of an instrument partly determine the sound that it produces, the performance characteristics of the piper that operates the instrument also plays a major role in how the instrument sounds. This relates to the material qualities of their instrument performance actions, namely the piper’s finger, blowing and squeezing technique, and ability to tune and control his or her instrument in performance (Cannon 1988, 14).

Although the materiality of finger technique is intrinsically linked to technical sound (see Chapter 4, Section 4.3), interviewees offered only limited discussion of such material factors. For example:

> I think my strengths in *piobaireachd* are very strict technique… I’ve got a really strong bottom hand so I’m actually quite relaxed at the ends of the tunes … and I do a lot of technique practice to make sure I can handle it (Participant 1).
Obviously technique is something in *piobaireachd* as well especially at the back end of tunes. Here in New Zealand some people struggle with technique… I wouldn’t say I’m perfect either but yeah I do a fair bit of technique practice … just to make sure I’m hearing all the sounds in there (Participant 3).

A piper’s fingers crucially produce the tones of the chanter, the part of the instrument that generates the melody for bagpipe performance. All melodic tones produced on the chanter are the result of combinations of holes being covered and uncovered on the chanter by the fingers (see Figure 4.4). These combinations are strict and there are no variants used, all Highland pipers use the same combinations of fingers to perform the same notes (Andrew Lenz’s Bagpipe Journey 2010).

There is variation amongst pipers in their understanding of the best material attributes of finger technique in relation to technical sound, although little work has focused on such differences in an academic field. Dickson (2006) notes historical variation in the definitions of authentic technical sound and material qualities of finger technique in Scotland (Dickson 2006, 105-123). Generally, however, pipers today appear to acknowledge that performance with rapid, controlled, and agile finger technique will correspond with a clearer articulation of note and tone for both notes and ornamentation. Such a belief is illustrated and described extensively in tutor books (such as MacNeill and Pearston 1953, 13-66) and explanatory Highland bagpiping resources (Cannon 1988, 31-36).

One participant in particular considered that localisation of finger technique may have existed in the past within New Zealand. Their response entails:

> And yeah they [Southland pipers] were slightly chunkier in technique potentially, but then that was very much still because, although they competed on the solo platform, they still came from the pipe band background. And they’d say “well this is what you do, this is how you do it” … So again I think it comes back to ‘Uncle Tom’ [a purported authority] who’s only got a kernel of truth on things. But in actual fact he extrapolates that on what he or she’s been taught and you get somewhere over here [a different take of what’s right] (Participant 5).

Such a response illustrates that regional differences in technique have previously been observed in Highland piping, in New Zealand. However, Participant 5 did not necessarily suggest that such difference remain today and thus exploring such regional distinctions for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand in interviews yielded no further support.

For some pipers, agility, speed, dexterity, and stamina of fingering can be influenced by temperature. This is a physiological phenomenon where it is known that optimal performance of any physical hand skill is in the domain of normal body temperature (Heus *et al.* 1995). As
temperature of the hands decreases, finger speed and agility diminishes. For pipers, part of the preparation for performance involves determining the adverse effect of ambient temperature on the hands. This is particularly relevant to cold weather. The experienced piper will pre-empt for such effects and maintain hand warmth with the use of gloves or heating devices in the immediate build-up to performance.

‘Blowing’, which includes both blowing into the instrument and squeezing the instrument, is the foundation upon which performance of the Scottish Highland bagpipe is based (see Figure 4.2). Blowing and finger technique encompass the necessary components which define Scottish Highland bagpiping, and once combined proficiency with these has been achieved, a performer is seen to have officially become a Scottish Highland bagpiper, but finger technique is pointless if instrumental sound cannot be achieved. The following two participants raise this concept:

If someone is good at piobaireachd they’re generally pretty good blowers and can sustain blowing for a long period of time (Participant 4).

I think older learners, if they come to it later they think ‘maybe I’ve got more potential, and it would be better if I play piobaireachd’. They can blow better … for piobaireachd playing (Participant 5).

A rhythmic and sequential blowing of air into, and squeezing air out of, the bag creates a constant pressure over the reeds, producing the instrument’s characteristic sound. In the hands of a skilled piper this air pressure and the corresponding sound of the instrument should remain steady and consistent over the duration of a performance for authentic instrument sound. While blowing is supported and demonstrated as an important material component of performance, no participants discussed in depth any definition of blowing and squeezing techniques.

Ethnographic observations and insider experience cannot identify any current local traits for blowing, squeezing, or for finger technique. These are most likely related to the physiological attributes of performers, and as Scottish and New Zealand performers are not known to be markedly different physiologically, there is no basis for such an argument. However, they are also related to cultural transmission, and thus will be discussed in Chapter 6.
Immediately prior to performance, pipers will spend between 30 seconds to 4 minutes tuning their drones to their chanter, and their chanter to their drones. This can be a complex process involving alteration of the material dimensions of the instrument through adjustable tuning features (such as tuning slides on the drones and adhesive tape on the chanter holes, see Figures 4.1 and 5.7 respectively) (Cannon 1988, 14). Further complexity can arise in preparation particularly where there are unstable and fluctuating geophonic influences, such as variations in wind, temperature, humidity, and the presence of rain. These factors challenge the skill of the piper to attain authentic instrument sound during the tuning process. One participant in particular offered a richness of description for this tuning process:

Well it’s something I’ve really really struggled with in recent times, to get it absolutely bang on. Like I said in Dunedin, it wasn’t quite right and I was taking too long, so I took a bit of a gamble and started when I thought they were ok. But I could hear the drones unsettling and going adrift and I thought ‘argh’ I hadn’t quite hit it. Well I did my practice sessions, and when I’ve done that [not tuned quite right] by the end of the tune it’s never absolutely horrendous, it’ll be ok. It never drifts that much to be completely horrible. So I wasn’t particularly worried that it wasn’t right. So that’s really it when I’m on the board. If the chanter is flat, I’ll just play for a little bit [warming up] to see if it will come up to the drones. I mean playing in the march this morning for example, they were absolutely spot on when the room went a little bit flat I just played a couple of tunes and they came up bang on to the drones, and I didn’t need to touch them, that would be the ultimate for the piobaireachd. I can’t see that happening [tomorrow] but I’ll see if they come up to where they were in the practice room, and if they aren’t just quite coming up then I’ll shift them a wee bit and play a little bit more before hand to see if that chanter is going to move any more. The danger there is that I know with the MacDougalls somewhere down the track in the tune the chanter might flatten off a wee bit so do I just shift the drones a wee bit and blow up now or not? Just trying to get a feel for the conditions in that little time slot you’ve got. But I don’t like to tune for a long time because I get anxious (Participant 6).
Once a tuned instrument sound has been established at the initiation of performance, environmental conditions can have an accumulative, and eventually adverse, effect on the material qualities of instrument components. The chanter’s sound will sharpen or flatten when air temperature increases or decreases respectively, and the drone sound can become discordant with the changing chanter sound, leading to an out of tune instrument. The same interview participant above explored this, and the control of such changing sound for piobaireachd performance in further detail:

High G, piobaireachd High G was a little sharp and I had to control it as I played, which put me off a little bit… I had to ease off the pressure from my arm a little bit to keep it under control, or as under col as I could… I think the conditions of the room led to some issues, being that it was freezing cold. And much colder in the tuning room and such like, it was quite difficult to settle, but the reed at the time was a little on the weak side. Potentially, it was just a little bit of a shock I guess. I felt I had to play quite a long time on the board to decide what was happening with the drones. They moved a little bit throughout and they actually settled towards the end of the tune. More so than in the middle, which was fine… I’d rather they stayed solid the whole time but that’s kind of the constant battle that you’re aiming towards… Most of the time they tend to start drifting about, 2 variations from the end when you’re just starting the Taorluath Doubling and you can hear that it’s not quite right so you start to adjust your blowing a little bit. It could go either way. If you’ve played too long you might have to you know start easing off because the moisture’s hitting or blowing harder as your chanter’s flattening off, bit of moisture hitting the drones, so you start to adjust a little bit, and then you’ve got to do that whilst you continually try to phrase the tune properly (Participant 6).

This participant response demonstrates the complexity of maintaining authentic instrument sound while the material qualities of their instrument components change during performance. Ethnographic observations and insider experience reveal that this process is common and challenging for all those who participate in piobaireachd performances, as all performance conditions have some impact on instrument components. The skill of a consummate piobaireachd performer is to recognise and pre-empt the conditions for performance, and prepare their instrument materials to attain, and maintain, authentic instrument sound. Such skill is the domain of a master instrumentalist intimate with their instrument, with their performance conditions, and with their instrument performance actions.

Regarding localisation of tuning, McClellan describes piobaireachd performances (presumably in Scotland) featuring up to 20 minutes of ‘ear wrenching tuning’ (McClellan 2009, 303). While such an observation contrasts significantly with the maximum 4 minutes allowed in New Zealand, insider experience acknowledges McClellan’s claim to be invalid for the majority of piobaireachd performances in Scotland today, which are bound by similar time restrictions to those within New Zealand.
5.2.4 Summary

This section has focused on the material factors that produce *piobaireachd* sound in New Zealand. Section 5.2.1 discussed the performance arena and its acoustic environment, Section 5.2.2 explored the instrument components and materials, and Section 5.2.3 looked at the role of a piper’s performance actions. Interview responses, ethnographic observations, insider experience, as well as literature and websites have allowed such an investigation. It has been established that the factors discussed above have a major bearing on the New Zealand *piobaireachd* soundscape (Schafer 1977), the primary cultural factor of *piobaireachd* as culture (Chapter 4).

Participants were particularly willing to discuss the qualities of *piobaireachd* sound in New Zealand (Chapter 4), and yet they offered limited responses for discussion of the material factors that contributed to authentic sound. Their responses regarding these material factors were not always consistent, demonstrating ambivalence towards the contribution of such factors. However, interview participants identified that the properties of a performance are partly determined by the material factors that produce sound. They acknowledged that these factors can be conducive to producing authentic sound when managed well by a piper, or alternatively can contribute to a substandard performance when not. Such responses indicate that performers consider, and attempt to predetermine, how the material factors that produce sound will combine to produce and affect sound within future performances. Participants articulated that the conditions for *piobaireachd* performance, the material quality of their own performance actions, and the material components that comprise their instruments, often meant that at times their performance sound could be unpredictable in its aural authenticity. Participants also felt that this unpredictability demanded a greater instrumental mastery and virtuosity for *piobaireachd* performance than for other styles of Highland bagpipe music. This meant that participation in *piobaireachd* allows performers to demonstrate that they have developed an understanding of material factors that produce authentic sound in a way that no other music for Highland piping within New Zealand can. Therefore they inferred the importance of *piobaireachd* for Highland piping in New Zealand and its status as a subculture through their responses. *Piobaireachd* benefits pipers’ understanding and production of Highland bagpipe sound through the consideration of the material factors that produce it, yet, at the same time, is also distinctly different from other Highland bagpipe music.
Interestingly, participants did not clearly articulate a sense of authenticity of material components for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. They acknowledged that authentic sound was a crucial part of any performance (as discussed in Chapter 4), yet they did not determine that there was a universal understanding of material components for authentic sound production. Some participants favoured certain components made from one material in accordance with a specific manufacturer’s production process, while others favoured another. Their preference for these material factors however, related to their understandings of the sound the materials produced, rather than some notion of material or visual aesthetic. They considered sound the result of the materials that are combined and that contribute to performance. Therefore, authenticity of sound producing materials relates more to the attributed sound qualities of the component and its social and cultural provenance, than it does to specific material qualities.

Interview responses, ethnographic observation and insider knowledge intimate that the endorsement and support of leading and influential cultural figures can have a bearing on a piper’s preference for material factors that produce and affect sound. This argument is explored further, and debated more extensively, in the following chapter (Chapter 6). This section has thus established a link between *piobaireachd* sound, the material factors that produce it, and the social and cultural transmission of *piobaireachd*, and it is this link that appears to be coined in terms of ‘authenticity’.

This section both supports and refutes an argument for the localisation of sound producing materials for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. The material components of the Highland bagpipe used by performers do not appear to be explicitly localised according to the data. However, New Zealand made instrument components are more likely to be used by New Zealand performers than performers from other nations. Similarly, the material qualities of the instrument performance actions of *piobaireachd* performers in New Zealand do not appear to demonstrate localisation of blowing, squeezing or finger technique, although there is some indication that localisation of such material factors has been evident in the past. There is, however, substantial evidence suggesting that the arena acoustics and conditions of performance environments for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand are distinct and reflective of New Zealand. These factors rely on the balance of both indoor and outdoor performance arenas, and are affected by local acoustic and weather environments, and thus New Zealand *piobaireachd* is clearly localised on the basis of the material qualities of the performance arena. Thus the sound producing materials for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand generate local soundscapes relative to the performances spaces used. While an individual soundscape is not
necessarily representative of localisation on a national scale, the exact combination of local soundscapes for *piobaireachd* performance restricted to New Zealand is. This provides further support for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand being unique and localised. The processes that have led to such localisation are further discussed in Chapter 6. The results and discussion in the following sections explores and debates the influence of other material aspects of *piobaireachd* performance within New Zealand, beyond the production of sound.

5.3 Performance Attire

This section focuses on material and visual components of performance attire as a crucial aspect of performance display. It considers variable descriptive terms as costume, clothing, garb, adornment, raiment, uniform, and dress (Tsuge 1983; Roach-Higgins and Eicher 1992, 1; Tirosh 2007, 51) as consistent with the term, ‘attire’, which is uniformly used in conjunction with ‘dress’ as the primary descriptors throughout this section. ‘Attire’ encompasses the customary materials the performer places on their body in the act of cultural performance. It is used to differentiate between clothing worn within context in general, and the formal performance clothing worn by pipers in the act of musical performance. Such a term implies a greater formality to the use of such materials and visual displays for *piobaireachd* performance.

MacInnes discusses Highland dress in Scotland and the influence and role of the Highland Societies of London and Scotland in establishing dress standards for solo bagpipe competition (MacInnes 1989, 68-72). Regarding performance attire in Scotland, Mc Kerrell also offers:

All solo pipers wear a kilt to compete and there is a dress code that has been developed since the earliest competitions. Nowadays, male pipers will generally wear a kilt, sporran, ‘ghillie’ brogues, hose, flashes, tie and kilt jacket to compete in. Various further adornments such as a waist belt, watch- chain, kilt pin, Glengarry or Balmoral-style hat etc. are dependent upon the individual’s sartorial style. Many competitions stipulate that competitors must wear Highland dress or risk not being allowed to play ... The situation for female pipers affords more individual leeway; usually with longer dresses and fewer jackets (McKerrell 2005, 27).

Attire is an accepted and expected part of formal *piobaireachd* performance and particularly includes the selection, arrangement and display of similar attire components by performers in New Zealand. While attire does not have a bearing on the *piobaireachd* sound that is produced in performance, it will be shown and discussed in this section that these displays provide cultural meaning and context for *piobaireachd* performance beyond sound production.
Though such attire is a necessary aspect of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, interview participants did not provide any substantive discussion regarding performance dress. Such ambivalence towards attire does not necessarily deny its importance; rather insider understanding indicates that participants consider attire so fundamental and universal that it does not broach the threshold of concern in conversation. These, albeit limited, interview responses are presented with photographic material sourced within the field, as well as other related resources in order to allow for discussion of performance attire.

Wearing ‘traditional’ Highland attire is an obvious visual feature of *piobaireachd* performance within New Zealand. This was consistently demonstrated during ethnographic fieldwork observations undertaken for this research, as shown in the following montage of *piobaireachd* performers (Figure 5.8). The importance of such attire for *piobaireachd* is described in the following comment:

So you know, if you’re going to play in a piping competition you do need to be properly dressed and you’re not just in your weekend gears, and you put it there and you give it its right place, the provenance that it deserves … you know if you’re playing at the Silver Chanter in Dunvegan and you’ve got your best ‘bib and tucker’ on… it just elevates it to that next level (Participant 5).

This quote indicates that attire creates a formal context that differentiates *piobaireachd* performance from other contexts for *piobaireachd* musicking, such as practice and pedagogy. Figure 5.8 illustrates such use of attire by pipers in the context of performance.

While the boundaries surrounding authentic use of attire are blurred, failure of a performer to meet such social and cultural expectations in the context of performance will likely have a negative impact. Participant 6 expressed such an observation:

You’ve got to be in the right frame of mind to play a *piobaireachd* and if you’re lazily dressed or scruffy you’ll play a scruffy *piobaireachd* (Participant 6).

This quote suggests a link between how a performer is dressed in terms of their attire, and how they perform in terms of sound. Yet clearly how a performer dresses has no relationship with how they actually sound. Rather, it seems more probable that attire used by a performer has an influence on the way their performance sound is interpreted by audience. This statement supports that of Participant 5 above, in implying that attire provides performers and participants alike with visual symbols that act as markers of formality and context for the authentic performance of *piobaireachd*. 
This formality is driven by notions of cultural authenticity, informed by an understanding that Highland folk did wear such attire in antiquity (Trevor-Roper 1983, 15-42), and therefore Highland pipers do wear, such attire (see further Dunbar 1962 and Trevor-Roper 1983). Both Dunbar (1962) and Trevor-Roper (1983) have successfully argued and shown that such traditional Highland dress, widely used and worn for cultural context today, is invented and based upon recreation and romantic historical notions. Nevertheless, it creates cultural context.
for performance in the display of formal performance attire, indicates such a differentiation between informal and formal performance, and posits the act of musicking in a popular cultural framework. Performance sound, while the primary aspect of *piobaireachd*, relies on a display of attire in order for it to be considered within cultural context. In this regard it is customary and cultural tradition for Highland bagpipers in New Zealand to wear such attire when performing, regardless of what subcultural context that performance is in, and particularly includes *piobaireachd*. In the following discussion, an exploration of that attire is given.

5.3.1 Displaying Attire

Unlike sound, there are regulations around performance attire for *piobaireachd* maintained by The Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand. This organisation is the self-proclaimed governing body for competitive solo bagpipe performance, also administering competitions for Highland dancing and Highland attire (Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand 2013a, 1). Their bylaws explicitly outline organisational aspects of performance, but also provide some definition of expected Highland attire for competitive Highland bagpipe performance. These bylaws state:

All competitors must be properly attired before being allowed to compete. Trews may be worn instead of kilt by male piping competitors who are subject to disability (Piping and Dancing Association 2013a, 2).

The following shall be the minimum standard of dress for pipers competing at Competitions conducted under Piping and Dancing Association Rules: The kilt must be worn correctly, length required 2.5 cm above centre of knee cap, hose shall be matching tartan or plain coloured walk socks. Plain shirt and matching tartan tie, or an appropriately coloured tie with doublet or jacket. Balmoral or Glengarry must be worn. Sporran will be worn by all male competitors. Wearing of sporran is optional for female pipers. In the case of younger pipers, sportcoats, blazers or regulation Band jerseys may replace the doublets, or a Pipe Band uniform may be worn. Note: The following attire must not be worn: Leather jackets, casual jerseys, short socks, shirt without tie, patterned shirt, kilts with uneven hems (Piping and Dancing Association 2013a, 6).

Suffice to say that ‘trews’ (tartan trousers) were not worn by any *piobaireachd* performers observed in the course of this research, and whether or not this means that pipers with ‘disability’ exist within New Zealand, is unknown. These regulations are mostly adhered to, although ethnographic observations and insider experience determine that they do not clearly define what attire is, and how it should be worn. For example, how a kilt is worn is variable. The appropriate height for wearing a kilt at the waist is not defined by these bylaws, whereas how low it may be at the knee is defined. Some leniency is afforded to performers and generally these regulations are not stringently enforced, it is up to the adjudicator of the
performance to officially acknowledge that a piper has failed to meet these ‘minimum standards’. Such an act would meet with some negativity from the wider piping community, where it is accepted that adjudicators tend to have a greater focus on overall presentation of a performance, including both sound and visual performance, rather than on the presentation of attire alone.

These official bylaws reveal much about attire for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand (Figure 5.8). Context is important when analysing attire used. In competition, the attire frequently seen is relatively standardised in accordance with these bylaws. Outside of competition a piper may wear whatever they wish when performing *piobaireachd* (for example in a recital) where there are no official bylaws governing attire. However, pipers generally still wear the competition standard of dress outside of competitive contexts.

These bylaws also allow pipers to demonstrate individualism through differing colours, patterns, designs and textures in various attire components (see Figures 5.8 and 5.9). Clear variations in the use, design, colour, texture, and pattern of such attire components as kilts, hats, jackets, shirts, socks, garters, sporran, belts, buckles, and decorative jewellery were commonly observed in the course of this ethnographic fieldwork. Differing attire style was observed from performer to performer, and from performance to performance, allowing pipers the capacity to combine attire components into an individualised and unique display of traditional dress that accompanies their performance.

Attire is relatively standardised for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, how one piper dresses may differ slightly from how another piper dresses, but is generally very similar. Figures 5.8 and 5.10 illustrate adherence to the official bylaws for solo pipers’ performance attire, as well as allowing individualism in pipers’ interpretation and demonstration of traditional Highland attire.

On the other hand, some pipers chose to present themselves for solo performance through attire that did not appear to meet the ‘minimum’ standards outlined in the official bylaws. Most frequently this involved not wearing hats, either indoors or outdoors, but also included wearing non-regulation socks, kilts too long or too short, pipers wearing patterned shirts, the use of stockings instead of socks, as well as some pipers not wearing ties. Therefore it appears that how pipers actually present themselves in performance attire relates more to a social and cultural arrangement of standards than to any official bylaws. Authentic performance attire, as
witnessed by existing styles presented by pipers during *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand, is likely to be influenced by several factors. Predominantly these include access to attire components within New Zealand, the association between attire and identity, and the fashions of attire in the form of corporate and formal clothing within society in general. Thus, attire standards appear to be more strongly maintained by social and cultural influences, rather than by any one organisation.

Unofficially, the implied regulations for attire used for *piobaireachd*, as observed and understood through fieldwork and insider experience, are as follows. The kilt should run in length from the small of the waist to the top half of the knee. The kilt will be woollen tartan and have detailing on it in the form of pleating at the back, where the material is folded and sewn, creating a texture and pattern out of the material. A kilt that is too short is noticeable by virtue of it appearing out of place amongst regular length kilts, as is a kilt that is too long. The kilt should be made from an ‘established’ tartan or if not, from one that is not too out of character with traditional kilts in terms of colour combinations and pattern. The bottom of kilt
jackets should sit just below the top of the kilt and be made out of a plain coloured material, generally sympathetic (in good taste) with the colours seen on the kilt. The tops of the socks are folded back over at least once, concealing the elastic of the garters. The top of the sock should rest just below the bottom of the knee. This presents a small section of the knee (no more than several centimetres) that is bare. The socks should be plain coloured and also sympathetic with the colours seen in the kilt tartan. Tartan socks (such as those referred to in the official bylaws) are seldom used today.

Garters (or ‘flashes’) hold the socks at height, and present a strip of colour emerging from the fold in the sock. The colour of the garter should be sympathetic with the colour of the kilt tartan, but may also contrast with the colour of the sock. Shoes are almost exclusively black formal shoes, known as brogues, although brown brogues are seen on rare occasions. Pipers’ brogues are favoured; they have no tongues but have extra-long laces, which are tied around the piper’s ankles and lower calves. The sporran will be made out of either real or fake leather or hide. Sporran all tend to be the same regulation size, circular, although smaller versions exist for very small pipers. The sporran will be fastened to the piper by a chain, cord or leather strap which runs from the back of the sporran, around to the bottom of the back of the piper. A kilt belt may be used, which sits over the top edge of the kilt. These belts are

Figure 5.10 Solo pipers performing as a group before solo competitions begin, including piohaireachd performances. Note the differences in colour, patterns, texture, and design of socks, kilts, sporrans, shirts, ties, decorative jewellery on hats, bagpipe bag covers, and drone cords; as well as varied use of attire components including waistcoats and jackets. Source: Lyn McHugh (Celtic Kiwi Photography).
exclusively black leather, several inches wide and have thick metal engraved buckles on them. Shirts are always tucked into the kilt. Shirts may be plain coloured, or they may have subtle vertical stripe patterns. Short sleeve and long sleeve shirts can be worn, and shirts with epaulettes are also seen, with long sleeve shirts treated as more formal.

Ties can have anything on them; there is no regulation for ties so long as they are not outlandish or garish in contrast with the rest of the attire being worn. Bow ties are acceptable. Waistcoats are frequently worn, although, as with suit jackets, should be sympathetic in colour to the kilt, and if worn with kilt jacket matching this as well. Hats come in two forms, the ‘balmoral’ and the ‘glengarry’, both are styles of bonnet with ribbons trailing at the back and generally made from dark colours. Hats are primarily worn when performing and imply either the intent to perform soon, or the immediate aftermath of a performance. Outside of performance they are not required. In terms of jackets, waistcoats, shirts and ties, the use of these for piping contexts tends to conform to the contemporary standard of wearing suits in corporate or formal contexts in wider society.

There are also formal and informal versions of attire. Generally white socks and long sleeve shirt with French cuff and cuff links are considered more formal. Similarly, black waistcoat and kilt jacket, and an even more formal version, the ‘Prince Charlie’ or ‘Coatee’ waistcoat and jacket combination with wing collared white shirt and bow tie, are also seen. A formal ‘dress’ sporran and a ‘day’ sporran may be used to differentiate formal performances from the informal. Likewise, there are dress tartans that can be used by some pipers for presentation at more formal performances. Generally speaking, however, the tartan used for performance comes down to preference of colour and overall appearance aesthetic of the performer, rather than consideration of whether the tartan is formal or not. While some pipers choose to not wear a hat for formal indoor events, this likely cites ‘old-fashioned’ etiquette within wider society that determines that leaving your hat on inside is ‘bad manners’. Generally the strongest marker for performer interpretation of event formality is the shirt, jacket, waistcoat, and tie.

The boundary between acceptable use of formal and informal attire is however, unclear. Events held at night tend to be considered acceptable for formal attire and are usually invitational events, elite competitions or recitals. Events held during daylight hours are more appropriate for less formal attire and are usually standard events with a more open field of performers. Piobaireachd events can be either held during the day, as in the case of the Gold
Medal Piobaireachd event at the Hawkes Bay Highland Games in 2013, or at night, as in the case of the Gold Clasp Piobaireachd event at the Hawkes Bay Highland Games in 2013. At the Gold Clasp Piobaireachd event, greater use of formal attire can be observed compared with the Gold Medal Piobaireachd event. Such an observation is supported by one of the participants who suggested that:

Certainly it seems to be formal and you can see that at the clasp, just with the way the people are dressing for the clasp, bow ties and that sort of thing, it’s quite a serious occasion and that’s great (Participant 6).

It needs to be noted that it is still acceptable to wear less-formal attire for such formal events, just as it is still acceptable to wear formal attire for events held during the day, and at time it is common to see both.

![Figure 5.11 Details of solo pipers’ kilts particularly the “pleating” or folding of the material. Also note differences in material, pattern, texture, and colour of the kilt as well as other aspects of attire such as shirts, shirtsleeve lengths, sporran chains; and varying use of waistcoats and kilt belts. Source: Lyn McHugh (Celtic Kiwi Photography).](image)

Although there are many forms of attire ornamentation they are not essential for performance. The *sgian dhuib* is a sock knife, which is tucked in to the top of the sock. Only one may be worn per piper, and either on the left or the right leg. *Sgian dhuib* can feature polished metal and gemstones, or a more humble wood and bone design. Kilts can be adorned with metallic kilt pins, clan symbols, medals, prizes, badges, ribbons, and tokens, and during performance kilts may have a number of these pinned to them. Some sporran feature highly polished metal, generally referred to as dress or formal sporran, while those less showy with more natural
colours on them considered day sporran. The chains that fasten the sporran again can be simple or elaborate in their design. The large metal buckle of the belt can be plain polished metal or ornately engraved and even bejewelled. On the tie, a metal tiepin may be worn, usually polished metal. On the hat, a polished metal clan crest or badge may be worn pinned to the left side. To an audience without knowledge of this ornamentation, the inclusion of ornamentation (or lack of it) may go relatively unnoticed compared to a discerning audience. Elite pipers are implicitly expected to have some ornamentation for their performance in front of a discerning audience.

As a further part of attire the instrument is also dressed. Bagpipes normally have ornate and coloured cords or ribbons that hold the drones together, with two hanging ends that drape down behind the instrument. As well as this, they also have pipe bag covers, which are essentially jackets for the bag of the instrument, which again can be ornate and coloured. Specific worded symbols and insignia are an observable part of performance attire. These are often be seen on the hat, tie or bag cover of a performer and display various affiliations and links between a piper and certain cultural groups and communities. For example, Figure 5.14 displays bag covers of differing pipers displaying differing insignia associated with differing pipe bands.
Other factors that influence attire in performance include duration, temperature and comfort. *Piobaireachd* performance is typically substantial in length and takes at a minimum approximately 10 minutes to complete. Wearing a heavy jacket can cause discomfort in the form of heat and excessive sweating, or can be cumbersome for the arm gripping the bagpipe bag for the duration of the performance. Some pipers choose to not wear a jacket. While most pipers will acknowledge that a *piobaireachd* performance is more formal than a light music performance, a number choose to wear a jacket for the added visual appearance of formality during their performance. Therefore, formality, tradition, duration, temperature and comfort, through such factors as arena, environment, and performance context have a bearing on how pipers presents themselves, alongside the interpretation of official and unofficial social and cultural standards.

Overall, a relative symmetry of appearance side to side is the standard, which is then slightly offset asymmetrically by the addition of a *sgian dubh*, the adornment of kilt with jewellery on the sides of the front of the kilt, the slight asymmetry of the kilt design itself, the wearing of the hat slightly leaning to the right side of the head and the presentation of the badge on the hat on the right side, and finally further offset by the addition of instrument which rests on the shoulder of the piper during performance.
One constant combination of attire across all formal performances is the use of a kilt, relatively formal shoes, and a buttoned shirt. Aside from this, many variations of attire standard are seen. One particular area where standards do acceptably differ is in the use of attire for male and female competitors. Notably, women pipers are afforded greater interpretive freedom of these standards than men. This appears to be consistent with standards in Scotland, a point supported by McKerrell (2005, 27). Depending on their gender, a piper may combine attire components differently and thus it is not uncommon then to find some women and men dressed alike or differently. For example, it is unacceptable for a man to not wear a tie, or sporran, and while it is formally unacceptable for a man to not wear a hat, some of the more influential pipers do not wear one. There is precedent for women to be allowed to compete without wearing a tie, hat, sporran, or socks, although these tend to be some of the more influential figures and are thus afforded leniency. A further discrepancy in attire use is between junior pipers and senior pipers. Pipers coming up through the ranks of solo competition are expected to strictly conform to the official regulations for performance attire.
outlined in bylaws, whereas an established piper has the authority and presence to interpret the bylaws a little more loosely, although standards require to meet social and cultural attire aesthetics.

As described and detailed above, pipers have available to them, and use, a variety components in their display of performance attire. Ethnographic observations revealed some consistency in the use of attire components, while at the same time indicated individualism in the colours, designs, patterns, textures, and use of such dress. Performers arrange their attire components in combination with others, allowing them to create individualised interpretations of customary and traditional attire, which accompanies their *piobaireachd* sound and provides it with a visual cultural context.

### 5.3.2 Interpreting Attire

Attire allows for the differentiation between performance musicking, and non-performance musicking. Pipers are free to interpret these unofficial standards for attire however they wish, but they are generally adhered to, mostly due to the risk of not complying resulting in a diminished interpretation of their performance and the unlikely event of sanction. Ultimately adjudicators of competitive events uphold standards of attire by determining when a performer has failed to meet acceptable standards. A judge will likely have a diminished interpretation of the merits of a performance where the pipers does not meet that judge’s standard, including attire. Participants also socially enforce the use of attire, by advising performers to comply and by critique of their displayed standards.

This use of attire is considered customary and cultural tradition for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. It does not affect the production of sound for performance; however, it is an expectation, as cultural participants consider such attire necessary for ‘authentic’ performance. Attire is therefore a necessary cultural aspect for *piobaireachd*, hence its detailed inclusion within this section. Authenticity for the use of attire appears to have changed however, where performers within the past century have been informed by apparently differing standards for appropriate dress (see Figure 5.15 compared to Figures 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10). The etiquette for performance attire thus appears to be dynamic, not static, changing over time. Furthermore, attempts by governing organisations to clearly outline regulations for attire have been shown to be inept at detailing the actual standard used in a contemporary sense. Yet, at the same time, this indicates past and on-going conflict between participants and cultural organisers where rules have been written and made explicit to
performers in order to establish ‘minimum standards’. Thus, there have been, and clearly still are, differing interpretations of authentic performance attire, evidenced by such historical conjecture as well as by varying displays of dress, as depicted and demonstrated in Subsection 5.3.1. These observations are consistent with literature suggesting notions of ‘traditional’ Highland attire are more contemporary than popularly regarded, referencing traditional Highland wear from prior to the mid 18th Century, but revamped to appear more noble and formal (see Dunbar 1962, and Trevor-Roper 1983). Therefore, discussion of attire reveals that ‘authentic’ attire is modern and contemporary rather than traditional and original, yet references an understood and accepted Scottish Highland cultural heritage for piobaireachd in New Zealand.

![Figure 5.15 Solo pipers from the Hastings Highland Games in 1952. Note use of attire for solo Highland bagpipe performance as represented by these pipers, some of whom were noted piobaireachd performers. Source: Thompson and Ogilvie (2010, 24).](image)

The combination of components used by performers allows for the visual demonstration of individualism and individual identity through their unique interpretation of authentic attire that they deem acceptable. Their choice and consistent use of attire components allow performers to create a visual display of their particular interpretation of authentic performance. For example, the use of a particular tartan (Figure 5.16) in performance was limited to one particular piper during field research and thus represented them in the cultural context. In this manner, unique aspects of attire allow a performer to have a visual performance identity, determining that they will dress in a particular way for performance.
This allows cultural participants to make associations between attire components and performer identity. A performer may always use the same combination of attire components when performing, meaning that particular combination of colours, patterns, textures, and designs is a representation of that piper’s identity.

Competition organisers will normally provide a document for participants to associate these numbers to particular performers’ names. This allows participants to associate another aspect of visual attire to performer identity in much the same way. Such a method for identifying pipers suggests that associating a performer's identity in conjunction with their performance is a crucial part of cultural practice. This is significant because it indicates that determining whether a performance is acceptable, appropriate or authentic is not simply a matter of performing. According to these findings, such an evaluation is also apparently a matter of identity and being identified, as well as their reputation as a performer.

While some pipers had distinctive and unique attire components however, it was generally the combined performance attire rather than any one component that allowed for individualism in the display of authentic dress. Two pipers wearing the same tartan could still be noticeably different through the use of other attire components, which would generate distinctive and unique individual performance attire (see Figure 5.18).

Therefore attire is more than just a formality; it is a performance in itself, a statement of individualism and taste in the interpretation of authentic performance attire within the confines of both official and unofficial standards for how pipers may dress. At a deeper level, the use of attire components also allows pipers to demonstrate, and participants to interpret, links between performers and cultural identities. Predominantly this process requires that participants identify that a performer has an association with certain groups and communities. Such interpretation of cultural identity can occur through the use of attire as a symbol of affiliation and association. There are two ways in which attire can allow for this, explicit and implicit depictions of links to specific cultural identities. For the first category, there are few items that explicitly depict such identity. These rely on the display of written or obvious connections to cultural groups, such as the use of words for a pipe band’s insignia, observed as being embroidered on performers’ bag covers and ties. For example, Figures 5.14 and 5.16 illustrate such explicit associations between performer and cultural identity in the use of specific worded insignia on the bag cover of their instrument, used as a part of overall attire in performance.
In contrast, implicit depictions of cultural affiliation and association can be interpreted from many aspects of a performer’s attire. For example, a performer’s use of a particular tartan in their attire infers a potential connection between the clan or group that tartan is associated with, and the piper that is using it. The use of the Fergusson tartan by a piper for example indicates that the piper may have a connection with the Fergusson clan, often such connections being ancestral and demonstrating individual cultural heritage. Alternatively, the use of a tartan by a piper in their performance attire may demonstrate an affiliation with a specific pipe band, given that pipe bands also use attire components in unique and individual
ways (Milosavljevic 2009, 133). For example, the two pipers shown in Figure 5.18 performing separately, yet with the same kilt, are known members of the Canterbury Caledonian Society Pipe Band, Christchurch (see Figure 5.19). The use of that tartan by those pipers acts as an implicit reference to their affiliation with that particular pipe band and their cultural identity as a group.

Figure 5.17 Number on the bottom left hand side of the kilt, which allows for participants to identify the performer. Source: Lyn McHugh (Celtic Kiwi Photography).

While tartan is an obvious example of the use of attire components as markers and symbols of cultural affiliation, likewise other components such as hatpins, kilt pins, and sporran can be associated in much the same way. Rarely, however, do pipers use the same combination of pipe band performance attire as their piobaireachd performance attire. They will usually choose to mix and match to suit their personal tastes and individualise their identity to such symbols of affiliation.

The use of attire for performance acts as a marker of formality and context. At another level it provides authenticity demanded by cultural participants. Beyond this, performance attire allows for the demonstration and interpretation of individualism and performer identity. At a deeper level, a piper’s use of attire in the context of piobaireachd can demonstrate a connection between that performer and other cultural identities. As with instrument components, locally (New Zealand) made attire components such as kilts, kilt jackets and waistcoats, socks, and hats are available. Whether a component of performance attire used for piobaireachd observed in the course of this study was made in New Zealand or not, was not
explicit through ethnographic observation. Generally, this indicates that the manufacture of locally made attire components bare no clearly visible connection to New Zealand. However, there are some attire components that are unique to New Zealand, such as the insignia for New Zealand pipe bands, and the unique attire components that can be associated to specific New Zealand pipe bands. This is an interesting connection given that interview participants explicitly indicated that *piobaireachd* plays no direct part in pipe band repertoire. Pipe bands clearly do have an influence on attire used for *piobaireachd* performance within New Zealand, and it has been previously shown that pipe band attire is one of the ways in which New Zealand identity can be depicted in pipe bands in New Zealand (Milosavljevic 2009, 133-138). Given that some pipers have difficulty accessing, purchasing and maintaining attire, the use of New Zealand pipe band supplied attire is likely to be relatively common amongst solo pipers, an argument supported by ethnographic observations and insider experience.

Figure 5.18 Examples of differing pipers wearing components from a pipe band uniform. Note the use of the kilt is consistent for both pipers, however pipers have varying and individualised use of other attire components such as shirts, sporrans, sporran chains, waistcoats, and ties. Source: Lyn McHugh (Celtic Kiwi Photography).

The influences that encourage a piper to dress the way they do can be complex and involve many factors that predominantly depend on the performers circumstances and access to attire, their performance identity and cultural affiliations, as well as their individual tastes and interpretations of acceptable dress. It must be acknowledged that many attire components, and combinations of components are associated with identities, and these connections between identities and the attire components discussed above are often informed by the past. However, a discussion regarding the historical association between such groups and such attire components is not within the focal boundaries of this research. Further information relative to the use of ‘traditional’ Highland attire in contemporary society can be found in the following
scholarly works Dunbar (1962) and Trevor-Roper (1983), although it appears further exploration remains to be undertaken on the attire of pipers within performance, not just for *piobaireachd*, but in Highland piping in a general sense and within any context.

![Image](image-url)

**Figure 5.19** The Canterbury Caledonian Society Pipe Band using the same kilt pattern, design, texture, and colour as performers in Figure 5.18. Source: Lyn McHugh (Celtic Kiwi Photography).

Tsuge (1983) discusses the use of traditional ‘raiment’ for traditional Japanese musicians, arguing that in his analysis of attire for performance “the concept of ‘performance’ bears after all a strong tendency toward ceremonialism… A traditional music performance clearly conveys then not only musical elements, but also social values and mores as well” (Tsuge 1983, 67). Tsuge reads a similar level of cultural complexity to the demonstration of attire in his field, and indicates that such a practice is not only useful for showing differences in formality and musical repertoire, but is also a text that can be read for its social and cultural content. This will be further discussed in Chapter 6. Ultimately, determining the arrangement and meaning of attire, beyond recognising it as a cultural ‘tradition’ and custom, relies on participants having an understanding of the association of attire components and their varying use, as symbols and markers of aesthetics, authenticity and cultural identity.

### 5.3.3 Summary

Attire worn for *piobaireachd* performances in New Zealand is governed by cultural custom and tradition. It differentiates formal performances from practice and pedagogy. Attire also acts as a symbol that represents a performer, as well as their affiliations and associations.
Many of the images gathered in this ethnography display considerable variation in attire components that can act as symbols and representations of local identity, demonstrating that authenticity of *piobaireachd* in terms of attire is subjective, not objective. While interview participants identified sound as the primary concern of subcultural participation, the attire that performers use, and the meaning behind such use of attire, cannot be divorced from sound. Within New Zealand, *piobaireachd* performance requires attire in order to allow sound to be considered musical and authentic in cultural context. Such a finding supports limited responses from interview participants due to attire being so necessary and fundamental that it did not feature in conversation, despite being such a clear and obvious part of cultural practice.

This discussion of performance attire has indicated that performers consider the standards of attire for *piobaireachd* to be more formal than for other forms of Highland bagpipe music. Performers appear to use more formal attire such formality appears to demonstrate greater value and prestige in *piobaireachd* participation. This suggests that *piobaireachd* is an important aspect of Highland piping in New Zealand, although it does not appear to demonstrate why *piobaireachd* is so important to participants. It also shows that *piobaireachd* extends beyond its ‘theme and variations’ definition to include a complexity of costume and dress that has a bearing on how ‘music’ is interpreted.

Authenticity of custom and cultural tradition appears to drive the use of attire for *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand. This authenticity, however, has been defined in different terms in the past in accordance with gathered photographic material and therefore authenticity appears to be dynamic and changing over time. Furthermore, the individually varied use of attire demonstrates that pipers have differences in interpreting authentic attire, suggesting that notions of authenticity for *piobaireachd* are subjective and contestable. Such findings support existing literature in suggesting that Highland attire is a contemporary recreational cultural construction that nonetheless is embedded with significant references to the cultural past.

Attire is evidently subject to influences from local groups and cultural identities. Frequently observed use of references to pipe bands in the attire of performers in the course of data gathering for this research suggests that *piobaireachd* is localised to some degree within New Zealand. While predominantly attire references notions of authentic and traditional Scottish Highland attire, forces of modernity and localisation unique to New Zealand have shaped the
attire that is used within that context to the point where explicit symbols of New Zealand cultural identities can be observed. Meanwhile the implicit associations between attire components and New Zealand cultural identities are more complex and difficult to decipher, they also reference localised cultural practices and demonstrate that *piobaireachd* in New Zealand has been localised to some degree. This concludes the focused discussion of *piobaireachd* performance attire. The chapter continues by exploring the choreography that New Zealand pipers use in *piobaireachd* as a different aspect of their performance display.

### 5.4 Performance Choreography

This section considers performance choreography as another key visual aspect of *piobaireachd* performance. In the context of this section, ‘choreography’ refers to the movement, etiquette and decorum displayed by pipers as they perform. The use of this term is consistent with existing discourse for ethnomusicology (Yung 1984; Leman and Godøy 2010, 3; Rahaim 2012; Gillan 2013, 367). In particular Gillan notes: “performers conceptualise physical gestures in various ways; they hold views on how they should or should not move when they perform; and they assign various meanings to physical gestures.” The bodily movements of a performer can be symbolic and intertwined in social systems expressed through sound, through gesture, and through posture. Ultimately he contends, “lineages are literally embodied in the ways performers, teachers, and students move” (Gillan 2013, 368-369). While lineage has not yet been a part of the discussion of this research (see Chapter 6), this section argues that there is an authenticity of choreographed behavior in the act of performance for *piobaireachd*, as distinct from other styles of Highland bagpipe music.

Choreographed behaviour is clearly evident during *piobaireachd* performance and particularly includes the movement and deportment of performers. As with performance attire, choreography does not affect sound that is produced in performance, but as will be shown, it is inseparable from sound and provides meaning and context for *piobaireachd* performance, and therefore demands investigation. Consistent with data for performance attire, interview responses focused primarily on performance sound and transmission, proffering only limited responses regarding choreographed movement. Interview participants did not choose to include any substantial discussion of performance choreography despite such behaviour being a necessary and evident aspect of *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand. Such banality towards choreography does not necessarily negate its significance. Rather, insider understanding suggests that pipers consider choreographed movement to be
such a baseline aspect of performance that it does not warrant discussion. Limited interview data is presented alongside photographic material gathered within the field, as well as reference material, in order to consider such choreography for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand.

5.4.1 **Choreographed Behaviour**

Pipers move when performing *piobaireachd*. This movement is choreographed and is a visible part of performance, observed as the noticeable movements and bodily behaviours of pipers during performance of *piobaireachd* within arena. Participant 5 inferred the importance of such choreographed behaviour as a part of performance:

> I’m sure if I judged I’d be hypercritical … ‘well what am I looking for, what am I wishing this performer would do to make it a really good performance, how are they getting about their performance, how are they tuning their drones, how are they doing that, what’s their demeanour on the board, where do they walk’ just all the small things. Piper X was a classic, looking at him tuning up, preparing prior to tuning up, and delivering a performance was pretty formidable stuff. He looked like he knew what he was doing and did know what he was doing, a master class in presenting a performance… and even watching a performance you will get that (Participant 5).

Yet there is little existing discourse focusing on the role of choreographed behaviour for pipers in the context of *piobaireachd* performance. Fatone (2010) discusses the use of hand and arm movement in the pedagogical use of *canntaireachd* for *piobaireachd*, but given that arms and hands are preoccupied with instrumental function in the act of performance, parallels between her study and this one are frustratingly absent.

Insider knowledge determines that choreographed movements and behaviour can be categorised in three ways, sound producing behaviour, walking or wandering, as well as deportment. Sound producing behaviour includes blowing into, and squeezing, the bagpipe bag (see Figure 4.2), as well as finger technique (see Figure 4.4), and pipers tuning their drones (as stated above by Participant 5 above and seen in Figure 4.1). Walking or wandering involves the characteristic meandering gait expected of pipers when performing *piobaireachd* that is a unique and defining aspect of such performance. Deportment involves the display of physical presence, demeanour, etiquette, and posture by a piper during *piobaireachd* performance. As described by Participant 5 (above), performers who are able to demonstrate professionalism and command authority and stage presence through their use of choreography demonstrate an authenticity of visual behaviour that can be the defining feature of an authentic performance. This notion of authenticity of choreography will be discussed below.
Sound producing behaviour involves the three visual movements of performers, blowing and squeezing into the bag (see Figure 4.2), finger technique (see Figure 4.4), and drone tuning (see Figure 4.1). As implied, these behaviours produce aspects of piobaireachd sound such as instrument sound, technical sound, and musical concepts. However, rather than these behaviours purely being governed by the sound they produce, they are also subject to concepts of acceptable display and presentation. For example, a piper who uses noticeably distracting blowing and squeezing technique by virtue of their breathing tempo being too rapid or inconsistent, will likely draw attention away from the authenticity of their performance attire and choreography, and further draw attention away from their demonstration of piobaireachd sound. Similarly, finger technique that is too flamboyant by virtue of fingers being raised excessively off the chanter may draw undue attention to technical sound. Further, drone tuning can be a performance in itself, where participants witness pipers refining their instrument immediately before performance, and where performers are open to criticism of their observed tuning methods. This can be particularly significant should a piper be having trouble or becoming frustrated with tuning their drones before performance, and where such frustration can be given away through agitated and clumsy tuning methods. Generally blowing and squeezing choreography that is consistent and subtle, and is not noticeably uncomfortable or taxing; finger technique that demonstrates flexibility and agility, and is not markedly different; and a tuning method that is relaxed, deliberate and precise appears to be preferred amongst cultural participants.

In piobaireachd performance, pipers can be seen to stroll in a pattern when on the stage within performance arena (see Appendices 5a, 5b, and 5c for illustration of performance arena and stage). This is a relaxed slow comfortable gait; essentially a meandering that is often referred to as walking or wandering by pipers, although an official term for such choreography does not seem to exist. Unlike sound producing behaviour, wandering does not (or at least should not) produce audible sound. Rather, wandering in a finite and predetermined performance space is a customary activity, in much the same way as dressing in performance attire is, providing formality, context and meaning for the interpretation of sound. The Piobaireachd Society offers the following regarding such wandering:

There is no defined rule for standing still or walking – but most pipers walk slowly in a circle. It is hard to stand in one place comfortably for a prolonged period, and possibly the effect of the piper moving also makes the experience more interesting for the listener, as the sound varies slightly as he/she moves (The Piobaireachd Society 2013a).

Such a quote implies little knowledge of why wandering is expected of performers, but it is nonetheless an evident part of performance. A piper will often use extracts of a differing
piobaireachd to the one they are about to perform when tuning his or her instrument prior to formally beginning performance of their tune. This can be confusing for some participants with limited knowledge as in essence they are hearing piobaireachd, but the formal performance of piobaireachd musical concepts has not yet begun. Wandering or walking allows participants to differentiate between tuning and such formal performance of musical concepts as performers tend to wander more regularly and in a circular pattern when formally performing, as opposed to when tuning where they usually stand still.

Figure 5.20 The wandering or walking used in the performance of piobaireachd by pipers in New Zealand. This particular image depicts a frontal and side shot of a particular piper’s gait for such performance choreography. Source: Lyn McHugh (Celtic Kiwi Photography).

Walking and wandering differs to marching in that pipers do not deliberately mark time with their feet. Rather, in the performance of piobaireachd, pipers are expected to do the opposite, they walk slowly off the beat using a gait that does not noticeably match up with the demonstration of musical concepts within their piobaireachd sound. This can be seen as a demonstration of virtuosity, which necessitates wandering and walking as second nature and an afterthought to the piper during performance. A piper who is noticeably wandering to pulsing pattern within their piobaireachd sound will lead participants to interpret that the piper does not have a sufficient grasp of the musical concepts appropriate for performance of a tune. Likewise, a piper who is walking or wandering with too great a pace in their steps will draw undue attention to their wandering method and detract from the interpretation of their piobaireachd sound. Generally wandering that is sure, consistent and natural, and is not
noticeably awkward or aligned with musical concepts in *piobaireachd* sound is considered to be the most accurate definition of authenticity of footwork.

![Figure 5.21 Differing pipers wandering or walking as a part of their choreography during *piobaireachd* performance. Note especially their gait for wandering or walking. Each of these performers was a competitor in the same event, and performed in succession. Source: Lyn McHugh (Celtic Kiwi Photography).](image)

Combined, sound producing behaviour and wandering demonstrate a diversity of visual rhythms in a *piobaireachd* performance. The breathing and squeezing technique of a piper will generally stay consistent in rhythm throughout, but will not match the musical concepts of the tune. Nor will their wandering pattern which needs to be ‘off the beat’ in order to be considered authentic. Only their fingers will match the rhythm of musical sound. This underpins a complexity of *piobaireachd* performance in its formal presentation, where such aspects of breathing and squeezing and wandering are generally consigned to the subconscious of a performer.

As the final aspect of performance choreography, deportment incorporates elements of physical presence, demeanour, etiquette, and posture used by a piper during their *piobaireachd* performance. Ultimately deportment relates to how pipers appear to present themselves beyond performance attire and other aspects of choreography already mentioned (see Figure 5.22 below for illustration of deportment). As with wandering, deportment does not actually produce *piobaireachd* sound, but it has a bearing on how participants interpret *piobaireachd* performances. For example, a piper who has a stooped posture, who leans to one side, and who has a demeanour that emits an air of anxiety and hesitance, will potentially present a deportment that detracts from their overall *piobaireachd* sound and visual performance display. On the other hand a piper who stands relatively upright, has a fairly
symmetrical stance and who emits an air of confidence may offer no cause for participants to question the authenticity of their performance display or piobaireachd sound.

Figure 5.22 Deportment of pipers’ observed performance choreography for piobaireachd within New Zealand. Each of these performers was a competitor in the same event and performed in succession. Source: Lyn McHugh (Celtic Kiwi Photography).

As another aspect of deportment, and as a part of etiquette in competitive performances, pipers usually acknowledge the judge or judges of the event prior to beginning their presentation of musical concepts through piobaireachd sound. They often do this by greeting and meeting the judges prior to tuning their drones, a formality which familiarises or reacquaints the judge with the performer. Such a formality also provides the performer and judge an opportunity to establish which setting of a tune the piper is about to perform, in order to be clear about expectations. Further, following tuning their drones performers may either salute with their right hand, or give the judge or judges a subtle nod of their head, to indicate that they are about to begin their performance proper. As well as this, pipers will also acknowledge the judges with a similar nod of the head or salute when they have completed their performance, and ceased the production of piobaireachd sound, prior to leaving the performance arena. Performers may also choose to not acknowledge the judge prior to formally beginning their tune, after tuning, instead, pausing on E or Low A for an extended period of time (approximately 5 seconds), which is an aural marker of intent to begin formal performance.

All of these aspects of choreography can be interpreted through the visual display of piobaireachd performance, although admittedly require significant insider knowledge in order to be interpreted. Ultimately performance for piobaireachd can be seen as the movement and posturing of performers within the context of performance. As with performance attire,
choreography has differing properties for different performers. For example one piper may have a strong blowing and squeezing technique as a part of their instrument performance actions, which will likely imply that they will have demonstrated more acceptable sound producing behaviours as a part of their performance choreography. Likewise, one piper may be adept at giving off an air of confidence in their posture, allowing them to present a more convincing visual display than a piper that does not have the same. Therefore, the use of choreography in piobaireachd performance in New Zealand acts as a means for participants to interpret piobaireachd performance beyond sound, as well as being a marker of formality and context, and a symbol of cultural authenticity. Performance choreography for piobaireachd within New Zealand is a visual display of performer behaviours that provide meaning and context for piobaireachd performance, allowing participants to differentiate between tuning and formal demonstration of repertoire, and determine authentic performances using visual aesthetics alongside aural aesthetics. While this has been a useful extension of Gillan (2013), it has not allowed for a discussion of localisation, although does determine unique and distinctive cultural practices that extend piobaireachd beyond its established ‘theme and variations’ and ‘classical music’ definitions.

5.4.2 Summary
This section has demonstrated that authenticity is embodied in the choreographed movement of pipers during piobaireachd performance. Such movement differs significantly from that demonstrated for other styles and forms of Highland bagpipe music, such as light music, where marching on the beat or standing still are the accepted practice. While performers often acknowledge judges and use a similar deportment in all forms of competitive solo Highland bagpipe music, the wandering used for piobaireachd performance in particular is unique. Performance choreography for piobaireachd is different to that of other Highland piping cultures within New Zealand. The meandering, known as wandering or walking, of performers demonstrates unique properties of choreography for piobaireachd, displaying a visual presence during performance that is not seen in other piping forms. While such performance choreography is a visible aspect of piobaireachd performance in New Zealand, a lack of content for discussion means that further consideration of this topic is not possible within this research. However, substantial insider experience can verify such displays exist, are governed by decorum and etiquette and have importance in creating presence and context for performance. Displays of performance choreography do not necessarily indicate the importance of piobaireachd; rather, the presence of this behaviour suggests that piobaireachd has unique and distinct subcultural practices.
This discussion of performance choreography demonstrates such *piobaireachd* cultural practices within New Zealand are governed by notions of authenticity that determine how acceptable performer behaviour may be defined in terms of decorum and etiquette. Although this research accepts that performance choreography is a customary formality, limited interview responses and a lack of any scholarship regarding Highland piping performance choreography means that little further can be described and discussed regarding authenticity of choreography. This would seem to support evidence for authenticity of cultural practice relating to standards for *piobaireachd* performance in Scotland, rather than localised standards to New Zealand.

According to the limited amount of information freely available in literature, there are no significant differences between authentic choreographed movement and behaviour for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, and that used beyond New Zealand (The Piobaireachd Society 2013a) a point that indicates a consistency of culture across vast geographic space. As such, there is no support for an argument of localisation of choreography for *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand. This finding is supported by insider experience, indicating performers within New Zealand do not practice a differing definition of authenticity of choreography than pipers from elsewhere. While localised choreography is not currently evident this may require further exploration, observations and in depth interviews for ultimate confirmation.

### 5.5 Property of Participants

Such displays of performance attire (Section 5.3) and choreographed behaviour (Section 5.4) in *piobaireachd* performance are demonstrations of formality and customs that are governed by cultural authenticity. Beyond attire and movement, Belk situates possessions of individuals as extensions of their cultural identity, while at the same time accepting that such possessions are also central to notions of cultural and social belonging within communities (Belk 2010, 1). Meanwhile, Hoskins posits “possessions … might be given an extraordinary significance by becoming entangled objects in the events of a person’s life and used as a vehicle for a sense of self” (Hosking 1998, 2). This section accepts objects that are the property of cultural participants also embody cultural authenticity, and that this authenticity can be localised. Such possessions contribute to the display of material and visual culture that may appear as mundane and everyday objects to cultural participants, but which nonetheless are useful
contexts for this research. This section explores how such objects bear significance for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. These material objects do not influence the production of sound within the context of performance, however they do have a bearing on the interpretation of performance sound by providing markers of cultural authenticity and tradition. Several categories of material objects have been identified using ethnographic observations, limited interview responses, and insider understanding. The following discussion explores the meaning of some of these material objects in the context of performance.

### 5.5.1 Reading Possessions

Performers physically store and carry their instruments in cases. As well as their instruments, pipers will carry all manner of items within their cases, or in other containers and bags that can also accompany them. Items include equipment and tools for the maintenance of their instrument, spare parts or exchangeable instrument components, learning and rehearsal materials including practice instruments and performance notes. Reference resources and repertoire depictions are also common and include collections of score manuscripts and printed performance programmes, as well as awards and acknowledgements, such as performance report sheets and trophies.

These items clearly carry cultural meaning for participants. Bagpipe instrument cases themselves are indications of status and their use by pipers in New Zealand is governed to a degree by trends and fashions that attribute style and functionality to particular products. Instrument cases fulfil several roles all at once. They need to provide protection to the bagpipes that are stored within, they need to offer ample room and storage for the various items that will accompany an instrument into the performance context, they need to be concise and easy to transport for performers who may be required to move between performance arena quickly, lastly there is a perceived need for these cases to be stylish and becoming of the instrument that they contain. As a result of such varying demands, a variety of instrument cases are available and are used by *piobaireachd* performing pipers within New Zealand.

Such cases vary in their construction and design. Some are made from rigid materials that offer the greatest protection but are not overly comfortable to carry, some are made from semi rigid materials which offer limited protection and limited comfort, and some are made from flaccid materials that offer little protection but are comfortable to carry. A greater capacity for
storage necessitates that some instrument cases will be bigger than others, and therefore usually more difficult to transport than smaller ones. A key consideration of pipers is the capacity to take their instruments with them as hand luggage on commercial aircraft, where the risk of damage to the instrument when being checked as baggage is accepted as a major concern. Smaller, lighter and less rigid cases that are easier to tuck into overhead compartments on airplanes appear to be preferred by pipers who have such requirements.

Figure 5.23 Differing instrument cases available to pipers, used for storing and carrying instruments and personal items to performances. Note, as of writing of this paper, the instrument case at top appears to be more favoured and sought after by performers. Source: Gannaway New Zealand - The Bagpipe Centre. Permission to use these images was kindly granted by Bagpiper Company Pty. Ltd. and R. G. Hardie & Co. Ltd.

Beyond their use as items for storing and carrying instruments, cases also fulfil a secondary function in the context of performance. Pipers use these cases and the items that accompany them to establish personal stations in the immediate build up to, and aftermath of, performance. Such stations act as the space where a performer has established their temporary base of operations surrounding performance. Items that are within this space are considered the property and possession of the case owner, and in this way the space in which they are found is personal and private. Such stations are important for discussion because their use in this manner becomes an extension of the piper (Hoskins 1998; Belk 2010). This use of such objects in the context of piobaireachd performance can yield some valuable data for this research, by providing a convenient clustering of material objects that belong to participants that may or may not be able to support the localisation of cultural authenticity.
While this discussion of bagpipe cases has been necessary to illustrate that such material objects can be considered the possession and property of participants, all participants in cultural practices (including performers and others) have the capacity to display material objects that demonstrate cultural value. For example adjudicators often carry manuscript collections with them to performance in order to use them to cross check the demonstration of repertoire concepts in performance. Tutors often bring items for the maintenance of instruments with them to performance contexts should they need to adjust and alter a participants instrument prior to performance.

Many of the objects identified as the property and possession of participants carry cultural value and provide meaning to participation. Two of the more frequently observed of these material objects are discussed here – report sheets and prizes, and repertoire depictions and reference documents. Report sheets and prizes act as acknowledgements of past performances. As a part of piobaireachd culture in New Zealand, report sheets are filled out by adjudicators of competitive performances which detail the judge’s interpretation of the performance, predominantly the strengths and faults that they perceive. Report sheets are hand written by the adjudicators of performance, during the course of performance, and made available to performers once the event has finished. Such report sheets acknowledge success of past performances and symbolise status and authority. In this manner past success can influence the interpretation of current piobaireachd performance authenticity.
Figure 5.25 Pipers using their cases and possessions as stations prior to, during, and in the aftermath of performance. Seen here are stations for four differing performers, two at the near end of the table, and two at the far end of the table. Source: author, Methven (4 May 2013).

Other than a cash award, competitive prizes carry status and can influence how performances are interpreted, particularly when they can be displayed in the presence of other participants. Report sheets and prizes can be seen as acknowledgements of performance authenticity. They can carry prestige and value, and represent performance feats that can command respect, can provide authority, and influence perceptions of performance authenticity when attributed to a particular performer by participants. Sometimes such items can be observed within an open pipe case, sometimes they can be associated with a piper by being in an around their station, and sometimes they can be observed being acquired and collected by a piper. These acknowledgements for *piobaireachd* performance, when observed, can attribute a level of authenticity to performance by allowing participants to accept prior peer evaluation of performance. If the performer has been authentic in the past, it can mean that they may be authentic in the present (or future).

Repertoire depictions and reference documents are material objects that belong to participants usually compiled together into document collections that aid in the demonstration and interpretation of *piobaireachd* musical concepts. In this regard they act as resources that can assist performers in the lead up to performance and participants in their interpretation of performance (for example judges). These come in various shapes and forms, from printed *piobaireachd* scores and manuscripts to event programs.
Pipers predominantly learn repertoire through the use of musical notation in combination with aural instruction. Such repertoire is written in the form of Westernised staff notation and is the predominant resource for the transmission of repertoire. Further, as a visual representation of repertoire, musical notation can be compiled in collections in bound and published volumes, plastic foolscape folders and loose piles of A4 photocopies, which are often seen within the station of performers or on the piobaireachd adjudicators desk in competitive performances (see left image, Figure 5.29).
Such resources were acknowledged consistently by all interview participants as significant material objects which assisted in the transmission of authentic cultural practices, as will be discussed more explicitly in Chapter 6. Regarding the cultural value of such resources:

I find the Kilberry book quite convenient because it’s just an A4 book, you can take it around everywhere, so it’s clearly written out. However there seems to be a lot more discrepancies in the Kilberry book as opposed to The Piobaireachd Society [books] so it always pays to look at both and then read the notes as well. … I know there’s that other book, the Binneas [is Boreraig] book as well (Participant 1).

Meanwhile Participant 6 also offered similar opinions:

Probably The Piobaireachd Society book is the book with the most accurate ‘what is played’, and then I’d superimpose the Binneas is Boreraig books on top of them because that’s a lot more closer to ‘how we would like to play it’ … I think it’s also important to learn the differences in the tune so you can do it like this or you can do it like that. So when you’re hearing it from a judging point of view you’re not saying “wrong”. Um there’s certain things I do with certain tunes that are not actually in ‘the book’, not in The Piobaireachd Society book anyway (Participant 6).

Initially, repertoire is introduced to pipers through scores in a pedagogical context, through the giving of a score from a tutor to a piper. This provides the piper access to a particular tune and allows the tutor to give instruction on best performance of that tune by the use of the
score as a visual aid. Upon acquiring a copy of the score, pipers will usually file these in storage folders. *Piobaireachd* scores will usually be filed separately from the scores of Highland bagpipe music repertoires within such folders.

Following pedagogy, that same score may be used again during practice and subsequent pedagogical sessions, as a means to assist in memorising that tune through the use (and authority) of its visual representation – the score. While formal competitive performance does permit the use of scores by the piper, they are usually present or nearby. In a piper’s instrument case at a competition for example, there may be a copy of a tune they will be performing in one of the events. The possession and ownership of a score indicates that the tune it represents is a part of that piper’s repertoire, and also implies that the tune may be a recent addition to that piper’s repertoire, given they have brought the score with them and are likely to use it as an aide memoire prior to performance. Whereas tunes that are more familiar and have been a part of a piper’s repertoire for a long time, tend to not require frequent referral to the score in order to reinforce and check interpretation.

The duration, detailed ornamentation and variation within individual *piobaireachd* often require a piper to bring the score to the arena for performance in the likelihood that they have to refer to it prior to performance, particularly given that some tunes are renowned as more difficult in terms of length, technical complexity, and musical expression. The presence of a visual representation of such a status bearing tune implies that it is a part of the repertoire of the piper the score belongs to, and therefore when observed and associated with a piper, can have an impact on the interpretation of their performance and their authority. Often, the more used a score appears, the longer it has been a part of that piper’s repertoire. This can indicate maturity of performance and career progression, depending on the tune. Further, the displayed collection of owned singular scores by a piper implies that they are all a part of their repertoire. These compiled and collected score notations then serve as a representation of the known repertoire of the piper that they belong to, indicating the maturity, capacity, and extent (or limitation) of that piper’s *piobaireachd* knowledge.

These copies of scores are usually made from bound and published collections of scores. Such bound collections allow for the convenient storage and access to the *piobaireachd* repertoire. Such bound collections are expensive to acquire and indicate more than just a fleeting interest in *piobaireachd* performance. Thus possession and ownership of bound collections of *piobaireachd* imply the significance and importance of *piobaireachd* to the pipers to which they belong, providing them with some material status. Such possession also implies the
importance of an acceptable, accurate, authoritative, and comprehensive collection of *piobaireachd* repertoire to a particular individual.

Collections of score also come in several ‘brands’ that represent the historical interpretation and understanding of repertoire by a particular figure who transposed them to staff notation in the first place (see Figure 5.28). These brands correspond to the popular name of such collections. For example, The Piobaireachd Society manuscript collection of scores is considered by some to be the ‘backbone’ of the existing *piobaireachd* repertoire due to the number of tunes it contains. However, it is recognised that some of the transposed score interpretations of individual tunes in The Piobaireachd Society collection may not be as ‘authentic’ as those found in the smaller Kilberry collection. Such concepts of the limitation of bagpipe staff notation are often associated with poor interpretations of tunes from Western score. Pipers may prefer a score collection such as Binneas is Boreraig (Ross 1959), which utilises a more unique codification for *piobaireachd* score. An individual’s preference for certain collections over others often depends on the tune, on the influences over that individual and their preference (see Chapter 6), and on access to these bound collections, revealing substantial information about that individual.

![Figure 5.28](image)

*Figure 5.28 Participants’ collections of score notations displayed in the context of performance as a part of their property. Source: author, Christchurch (18 September 2013).*

Score notations of tunes are usually annotated with coded markings by performers in pedagogical interactions that indicate how they should interpret the score in performance to produce authentic sounding musical concepts in accordance with their tutor’s instruction. These markings are individualised and for personal use, and therefore can be difficult to decipher however they do reveal crucial information about how the performer interprets
authentic performance from the score (see right image of Figure 5.29). This practice means that the display of manuscripts, both individually or in collections, can represent and depict the extent of piobaireachd knowledge and style of the individual musical concepts of the participant to whom they belong.

Due to varying attributed cultural authority, and differing depictions of personal authority, when observed and associated with a particular individual, the ownership and possession of such resources in the context of performance can have an influence on the interpretation of authenticity of piobaireachd and authority of an individual. Resources can symbolise and represent a hierarchy of authority where the more acceptable resources you have, the more ‘knowledge’ of piobaireachd you may be attributed to having. By association then, they allow cultural participants to attribute ability to interpret and demonstrate authenticity of musical concepts to the person who owns them.

Figure 5.29 Score notations belonging to participants. Image on left depicts the use of such material objects by judges of a piobaireachd event where they are checking the repertoire concepts being performed in accordance with the notation of that particular tune. Image on right indicates markings on the score which demonstrates that the participant this score belongs likely incorporates this tune into their repertoire, and visually displays the musical concepts they aim to apply to repertoire concepts of this tune. Source: author, Dunedin (2-3 June 2012).

While such items as resources and acknowledgements (as described above) do not factor into the actual production of piobaireachd performance sound and display on the board, they are a part of material and visual culture that indicates the presence of a hierarchy of material objects in accordance with status and authority. Participants interact socially in the context of performance, and in these interactions material objects that belong to participants are visible,
and potentially have an impact on the interpretation and demonstration of cultural practices. Pipers with the ‘best’, most valuable, or most appropriate possessions may be attributed with having more cultural authority than others, and therefore may be considered to embody cultural authenticity.

5.5.2 Summary
Reading the property of participants reveals useful information for the purposes of this research. It has been demonstrated above that these items belong to cultural participants for piobaireachd performance, are extensions of the participants they belong to, and represent their individual cultural identities and the associations that go with those identities, such as personal connections, affiliations, and influences. This is consistent with Hosking (1998) and Belk (2010) in suggesting the biographical texts that objects can harbour. On a different level, when observed, these material objects can also bear symbolic cultural value and provide authority and status to those that display them. Both levels of interpretation can influence the way in which participants interpret piobaireachd performances, ultimately allowing them to make an association between ownership of material objects and authenticity of cultural participants. Participants who display more culturally valuable material objects will likely be assumed to have greater levels of cultural authority and thus embody greater levels of cultural authenticity.

Material objects demonstrate piobaireachd to be a subcultural practice within New Zealand. Bound manuscript collections act as depictions of the piobaireachd repertoire and are common in solo piping performance contexts, but bound light music collections are rarely seen. The use of bound manuscript collections by performers and cultural participants demonstrates that greater scrutiny of performance interpretation and demonstration is applied to piobaireachd than to light music. This suggests a significant value of piobaireachd to Highland piping within New Zealand. Furthermore, the ways in which material objects are displayed and are used in performance contexts suggests that they bear significant cultural value and status, corresponding to authority for the person to who they belong, affecting the authenticity of their participation.

Material objects are governed by cultural authenticity for piobaireachd within New Zealand. This is evident in the hierarchy of material objects that are displayed in the context of performance. The display of useful maintenance tools, various interchangeable instrument components, certain components of attire, symbols of past successful performances, sought
after reference resources and depictions of performer repertoire, valuable learning and rehearsal materials, cultural relics such as bound manuscript collections and trophies, and current trends and fashions in the use of the best material objects provide greater authority and status to those that display them within the context of performance. This display can result in certain participants being attributed (by some) as having a greater interpretation of, and ability to demonstrate, cultural authenticity. Such a display can ultimately influence the ways in which piobaireachd performances are interpreted, as will be shown further in Chapter 6.

Material objects in the context of performance displayed limited indication of localisation of piobaireachd. For example the cultural value of report sheets and performance prizes that were displayed are expected to only be relevant and valuable within New Zealand. There is no reason to believe that such material objects will hold value outside of a New Zealand piobaireachd context. To New Zealand piobaireachd participants, such material objects bear status and authority, yet beyond New Zealand differing sets of objects that considered authentic local cultural items in their own respective cultures likely do the same. It is expected then that while the use of material objects as symbols and markers of status and authority for piobaireachd is not unique to New Zealand, the actual material objects that do fulfil this role are unique. Therefore, localisation of piobaireachd culture is evident through the consideration and interpretation of material objects as property and possessions of cultural participants.

5.6 Performance Contexts

While the previous sections account for much of the material and visual culture observed in the context of piobaireachd performance, there are other material and visual items that are characteristic of piobaireachd in New Zealand and which exist beyond displays of personal and cultural identity. Material and visual culture can define cultural context, discussed by Dawe (2001, 219-229), particularly in terms of being ‘entangled objects’ (Thomas 1991), where an argument is proffered for material objects affecting the meaning of musical sound where it is heard. Others have suggested that material objects and visual phenomena can affect not only the production of sound, but also its cultural meaning and value (Kartomi 1990; de Vale 1991; Leppert 1993; Dawe 2001; Johnson 2004). Further Wood et al. claim, “how and why the space for musicking is constituted has a bearing on who makes music, who hears it, and how it is heard” (Wood et al. 2007, 870). Both Stokes (1994a) and Duffy (1999)
contend that place can not only be explicitly read in the symbols of music production, but also that space and place can have an impact on the production of music, in terms of symbols, contexts and participation. Extending this, the following section describes and discusses the material objects that contribute to *piobaireachd* performance contexts in New Zealand. Such material objects appear to define performance contexts as arena for cultural practices where *piobaireachd* is demonstrated and interpreted.

Varying use of interview responses, photographic material, documents gathered in the field, and insider knowledge, is considered in relation to the discussion of material and visual culture that is evident within *piobaireachd* performance contexts. Interview participants identified specific material properties of such arena as being factors that defined these performance contexts and determined their hierarchy for *piobaireachd* culture within New Zealand. Insider experience suggests that material and visual culture for *piobaireachd* performance within New Zealand can act as symbols of performance contexts for all participants, and the exploration of this potential association is presented in the following.

### 5.6.1 Symbols of Context

Performance contexts are the physical spaces and arena within which *piobaireachd* sound and display is demonstrated and interpreted by cultural participants. These physical spaces can affect the production of performance sound, as discussed in Section 5.2. Beyond such production of sound however, performance contexts can also have a bearing on the interpretation of *piobaireachd* performance by participants in terms of both sound and display.

In conversation with culture bearers regarding *piobaireachd*, a substantial amount of referencing was made to performance contexts and a level of materiality attributed to them, as shown below. There were many ways in which interview participants referred to performance contexts: firstly they related to the various physical spaces which define performance contexts and which they exist within, while secondly participants focused on associating performance contexts with specific cultural objects. Performance contexts were associated with the places and spaces within which they exist. While interview participants defined these places and spaces consistently, they all chose to refer to performance contexts in relation to the geographical places where they were held. Two particularly exemplary responses relative to geographical location include:
I think your major competitions like Waipu, Hastings, Christchurch and Dunedin, which are probably the four majors these days, have all introduced piobaireachd at a lower level (Participant 2).

People didn’t travel from Dunedin to Hawkes Bay to do the Highland Games, or Invercargill to Waipu to do the games up there, or Turakina (Participant 5).

Such responses were typical for interview participants referring to these performance contexts within New Zealand. They were also consistent in reference to geographical performance contexts in Scotland:

[This tune] got picked at Inverness it was actually the first time it got picked in the entire year… this happened twice this year at Oban (Participant 1).

London and Oban and Inverness and Skye and wherever else that are on the circuit … Uist and Barra competitions, indoor competitions (Participant 5).

Such insider knowledge and perceptions demonstrate an association between performance contexts and the geographical locations in which they exist. By referring to geographical place, participants imply performance contexts. Such references need not detail the specificities of locations for performance, as these are implied within Highland piping vernacular for cultural participants. Reference to competitive piobaireachd performance in Christchurch for example infers the Highland Piping Society of Canterbury annual Silver Chanter solo piping competitions, held annually over the three day Labour Weekend in New Zealand at Saint Andrews College, Christchurch, New Zealand. In this way, pipers determine that the settlements that such festivals exist within act as important spaces for cultural practices to unfold.

Interview participants also identified that such performance contexts held differing status and were governed by a hierarchy that determined their value as arena for performance. A particular sample that summarise this observation comprises:

You know I’d argue that at Waipu, the piobaireachd event is the biggest event there [in New Zealand] (Participant 1).

I came from Hawke’s Bay and the Hastings Highland Games is the big piobaireachd competition [in New Zealand] (Participant 8).

This response indicates a hierarchy that governs how performance contexts are seen and valued as a cultural arena for piobaireachd within New Zealand. Meanwhile interview participants indicated an international hierarchy for such performance contexts:

Well Oban and Inverness, they’re the two big ones I guess. So to get into one of those, it’s a pretty big deal (Participant 3).
You’ve got Oban and Inverness and London and all those other competitions, which are a centrepiece for the world’s best pipers at that level to come in and do their thing (Participant 5).

These responses imply that performance contexts hold differing value to cultural participants. Participation in one performance context can hold greater cultural value than participation in another, and therefore performance contexts within New Zealand are embedded within a cultural hierarchy. Likewise, participants also noted that performance contexts in Scotland were bound to a similar hierarchy for their national piping culture. Further, these Scottish based performance contexts were attributed to being of the greatest value or importance to performers. Such observations clearly attribute varying levels of importance to participation in performance contexts.

Interview participants indicated such performance contexts were linked to material objects embedded in these geographically related arenas. These included the extent of participation in terms of numbers of performers and cultural participants, the layout and arrangement of performance contexts as acoustic arena for musical performance and theatres for performance display, and the offer of prizes and items in reward for participation. All interview participants consistently referred to prizes in particular. A focused selection of some of their responses referencing such prizes and indicating their value offered for performance includes:

The Clasp at Hastings, and the Gold Medal are real feature events you know for these young players to aspire to. So I think we’re actually starting to make it a really prestigious event. I think we’re really starting to build the prestige of not only our own fantastic events, the Gold Medal and the Clasp, but also we’ve got a lot of Kiwis competing in Scotland. So there’s a good core of Kiwis actually going to Scotland and actually getting prizes so I think there’s a lot of good things happening… I guess we produce these quality players and they win big prizes. We’ve got 5 or 6 Gold Medals… I think the obvious goal is to get the Gold Medal in Oban or Inverness. I think that would be more than a dream, I think it’s realistic if I can commit to it, it might take another 10 years for all I know (Participant 1).

Oban and Inverness, they’re the two big ones I guess. So to get into one of those, it’s a pretty big deal. They’re just perceived to be the big ones really. Winning any one of those is the pinnacle of solo piping really. So if you win one of those you go down in history as someone who won the gold medal. There’s quite a few events, that if you firstly get accepted into, and secondly win, it’s a huge milestone… Once you’ve won a gold medal you almost move into a different class, you’re respected as a gold medal winner in Scotland (Participant 3).

I think you’re probably held in high regard if you’ve won a clasp at Oban or Inverness versus winning the Silver Star or the former winners you know… I’m playing the Clasp next year … so my next goal is to try and play well there. I think it’s probably a realistic goal to win a Clasp in New Zealand, that probably the next logical goal in terms of New Zealand. Winning more piobaireachd at the competitions would also be nice but that’s kind of where I’m heading towards. And now that I’ve got a gold medal a clasp would be great. But past that a silver medal in Scotland if I can get back into the pot, if I can get
into the Silver Medal next year I might go back to Scotland and play in that (Participant 7).

All interview participants offered such responses, however these three in particular provided a level of detail that has been useful to illustrate the discussion at hand. The following quote from Participant 4 perhaps summarises this discussion most clearly and concisely.

If Piper X wins a Clasp at Inverness, which is in piping terms, the pinnacle, it can’t get any better than that (Participant 4).

Here, participants have indicated that silver and gold medal events, as well as clasp events at both the Argyllshire Gathering in Oban and Northern Meeting in Inverness are the pinnacle of piobaireachd performances for these New Zealand culture bearers, sentiments supported by other interview participants responses not detailed here, as well as insider understanding.

Material objects, such as medals, are items that bear significant status and authority to those who have received them, as well as to those who hope to receive them. Prizes appear to drive performances of piobaireachd and cultural participation in performance contexts, as indicated by Participant 1. Such prizes and the performance contexts they are attributed to are subject to hierarchical arrangement in terms of their cultural value, and acquisition of such prizes act as a cultural rite of passage for performers as indicated by Participant 2. Finally, authority and status can be determined by a piper’s prior performances within such hierarchical performance contexts in accordance with their acquisition of such prizes.

Therefore, material objects define performance contexts as arena where cultural practices transpire in the presence of participants within the piobaireachd cultural community in New Zealand. The material objects that define these spaces as cultural spaces for such specific times are diverse and numerous and can include venues, rooms and arena, stages and boards, adjudicators desks, audience seating arrangements, and participants themselves, as well as any of the material and visual factors discussed in Sections 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, and 5.5. However rather than discussing all of these objects, interview responses allow for a focused analysis of two categories that defined performance contexts as arena and which were particularly abundant in interviews.

Performance contexts have a bearing on the interpretation of piobaireachd performance by participants in terms of both sound and display, where some performance contexts are more prestigious and valued than others. Further, such performance contexts are governed by a hierarchy attributed to their value as arena, partly determined by the material objects that are
associated with them. A number of objects exist within performance contexts that mark these spaces as arena, such as the various physical spaces that define arena as well as specific material objects attributed to performance contexts.

There is a materiality to performance contexts for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. Such a factor is evident in the arrangement and layout of performance arena, always featuring a stage area or ‘board’ and an audience area; and when performances are competitive, also feature the presence of judges sitting separately from audience at a desk (see Figures 5.1 and 5.2 as well as Appendices 5a, 5b, and 5c for illustration of such performance spaces). Given the manner in which interview participants have clearly indicated there to be differences in the material objects associated with performance contexts in New Zealand and Scotland, localisation of *piobaireachd* culture is evident.

However, arenas are not only defined by the physical space in which performances are given, but also by the cultural and social context that such spaces provide. For example, the use and arrangement of performance spaces at recitals and competitive events is a reflection of the organisation of those performance contexts by individuals and groups. Greater discussion of this will be offered in Chapter 6, however, for the purposes of this discussion such arrangement and use of arena appears to be determined by context. For example, *piobaireachd* performances at the Hawke’s Bay Highland Games are exclusively given within the auditorium at the festival venue, Lindisfarne College, Hastings, New Zealand. Such exclusive and reserved use of performance arena for *piobaireachd* performance creates context surrounding performance in such spaces, and provides participants with an interpretation of that space as being exclusive for, attributed to, and therefore representative of, *piobaireachd* for cultural participants.

Further, because such performance arena are arranged and organised within the context of cultural festivals and celebrations, they become associated and representative spaces of the communities and cultural groups that participate within them. For example Lindisfarne College is the venue where the Hawke’s Bay Highland Games are held annually, and have been held annually for a number of years. This venue is transformed every Easter weekend into a temporary space for cultural festivity and celebration for the course of 3 days. The organisation of *piobaireachd* events at this festival provides cultural context for *piobaireachd* performances, which references the known origins of *piobaireachd* to participants and organisers in New Zealand. This provides a material space that has cultural context and cultural significance as an arena for *piobaireachd* performance.
Piobaireachd performance appears to be given in the more prestigious and formal arena within the context of festivals and celebrations of Scottish cultural identity and heritage within New Zealand in accordance with observations made in the field, as well as insider understanding. Generally for piobaireachd performance an acceptable arena is one where audience is comprised of participants with an interest in piobaireachd, where the conditions for performance are favourable for the performer and the audience, and where there is already an existing precedent for piobaireachd performance as a cultural site.

How arena are utilised can influence the interpretation of piobaireachd. For example, the use of an arena for a competitive piobaireachd event held indoors in 2012 that was deemed too cold for performance by a number of competitors in that event led to widespread criticism of event organisers from performers and participants alike. The use of an arena with too many distractions, with too higher temperature, with too many obstacles, with poor acoustics, with poor lighting, or with dimensions that are too small for example can lead to that arena being deemed inappropriate for use, and inauthentic in the context of piobaireachd performance.

Some performance contexts carry different cultural meaning for pipers. For example at the Hawkes Bay Highland Games, the Gold Medal piobaireachd competitive event is held within a given arena at a given time. This event requires qualification, where pipers must be either registered A Grade performers with the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, have received a prize in former Gold Medal piobaireachd events at the same festival in previous years, or that have previously won the qualifying Silver Medal piobaireachd competitive event. Pipers in the Gold Medal piobaireachd perform in that arena during that time, and therefore their performance indicates that they are qualified to compete in that event. Therefore performance within arena can influence perceptions of a piper’s status when the value of that arena is known.

5.6.2 Summary
Interview participants provided strong responses regarding material objects as being definitive of performance contexts. Generally they referred to such performance arenas as places where piobaireachd performance was given, but beyond this they also referred to them as arena where piobaireachd was provided in a cultural context. Arenas act as performance contexts within New Zealand, and are often defined by the material objects that are associated with them, such as prizes and venues. There appears to be a link between arena, prizes, and the
cultural value of performance context. Such material objects can be seen to define performance contexts for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand.

Relative to the aims of this study the following comments can be made. The material objects of performance context demonstrate that *piobaireachd* is a valued and important component of Highland piping in New Zealand. This is due to *piobaireachd* performances being given in more prestigious arena, *piobaireachd* prizes being more culturally symbolic and valuable to participants, and *piobaireachd* events and prizes representing Highland piping in ways that other styles of Highland bagpipe music do not. The material objects offered for *piobaireachd* performance are so valuable and prestigious for New Zealand performers that they would consider travelling to the other side of the world to acquire them, indicating the significant value of these items as markers of success and authority.

The authenticity of material objects associated with performance contexts differs between arena where the value of participating in one arena will feature performances that are considered to be more authentic than performances in other arena. Likewise, prizes can attribute greater levels of authenticity to those who acquire them through a given performance in a specific arena, attributing a level of authenticity to the fact that they participated in this event. The prestige and value of such material objects appears to be bound by notions of cultural authenticity, and thus participants indicate hierarchy govern perceptions of performance arena through material objects and spaces. However, no clear definition of authentic material qualities for any specific performance context emerged during the course of this investigation.

Such material culture of *piobaireachd* performance contexts demonstrates that *piobaireachd* is localised within New Zealand. New Zealand based performance contexts do not appear to hold as much prestige in their material qualities compared to certain Scottish performance contexts. Likewise the material prizes offered to pipers competing within such performance contexts are more valuable within Scotland than those within New Zealand. Hierarchy governs the value and prestige of performance contexts in association with the material objects, and while a ranking system for performance contexts is used across national boundaries, those within New Zealand appear to be of lesser value, thereby indicating that they are somehow different. Such difference however remains to be defined.

This section has focused on the material objects that define performance contexts of arena for cultural participants and is the final component of the exploration of material and visual
culture of *piobaireachd* that has followed on from the exploration of *piobaireachd* sound within New Zealand (Chapter 4). The final section that follows (Section 5.7) draws together the findings, debates and arguments from each of the previous chapter sections (5.1 to 5.6) to formulate an overall summary. This will reflect on the application of research theory to the material presented in this chapter.

### 5.7 Exploring Material and Visual Culture: Summary

This chapter has investigated the material and visual elements of *piobaireachd* performance within New Zealand, as a secondary level of analysis for considering *piobaireachd* as culture. It has drawn together a variety of thematic discussions that have emerged from interview and observational data analysis. These include the materials that produce and affect sound, visual and material aspects of performance attire, visual displays of performance choreography, the property and possessions of participants, and the material and visual characteristics of cultural contexts. Existing studies from a range of disciplines have allowed for an investigation of such varied themes when applied to data from participant interviews, ethnographic observations, existing literature, and insider experience. However, while such themes are separated here for discussion they are not experienced in isolation from each other. Nor are they experienced as separate from sound. Both *piobaireachd* sound components, and the components of material and visual culture are dependent on each other, governed by concepts of cultural authenticity that are both individually and socially understood. Therefore, *piobaireachd* within New Zealand is a result of the combined contribution of aural experiences, material objects, and visual displays in association with authentic culture.

Beginning with performance spaces and concluding with cultural contexts, this chapter has built on the work of others in arguing for material objects and visual displays being embedded within musical culture. As a result, *piobaireachd* has been shown to extend beyond sound, involving much more than a ‘theme and variations structure’, and ‘classical music’. Merriam argued for culture to be embedded within material and visual components of music production. Focusing on these factors as key objects and displays that cultural participants operate ‘musically’, this chapter has extended on the second level within Merriam’s (1964) model for the study of musical culture, focusing on the behaviours and actions of cultural participants. It has presented and discussed material and visual factors unique to *piobaireachd* and in some cases unique to New Zealand that supports *piobaireachd* being considered as a
subculture of solo Highland bagpiping, and as such is embedded within a complex hierarchy of micromusicality (Slobin 1992).

The extant discourse on Highland bagpiping and *piobaireachd* does not appear to have considered texts on material and visual content that offer further study and understanding of Highland bagpiping. *Piobaireachd* is much more than organised and arranged sound, it is objects, spaces, people, behaviours, conditions, and locations. Establishing a putative relationship between participants and material and visual culture, this chapter provides a more ethnocentric understanding of the phenomena wrapped up in *piobaireachd* musicking. It may appear to the outsider that attire is perhaps the most striking contribution to this material and visual display of culture, however, the lack of participant responses indicate that performance attire is not the raison d’être for their participation. Rather, acquisition and display of status bearing objects from, and performance within, nominated prestigious performance arena have priority as a driving force for performance. While there are other contributions to material and visual culture the information gathered from the responses, observations and experiences are strongly weighted towards acquisition and display of status bearing objects, such as trophies and prizes. In the following chapter, an understanding of the role of performance as an invaluable context for social and cultural transmission will be provided.

Whether future investigations that are more specifically focused on material and visual culture will argue for a similar weighting is unknown. The components described and displayed in this chapter can all be categorised within a ‘necessary’ framework of performance and thus carry importance for *piobaireachd* in many of its cultural contexts. Further investigations will hopefully consider the importance of these material and visual factors and consider the strength of their contributions to *piobaireachd* and to Highland bagpiping. Despite a considerable amount of data gathered during this research much of this is exploratory in nature, garnered by the use of ethnographic enquiry and as such there was no focus on balance of content, or weighting of contribution, to any of the investigated elements of *piobaireachd*.

Cultural authenticity is bound to the various aspects covered in this chapter. Pipers seek to act authentically in performance in order to receive prizes and accolades, and thus be deemed the most authentic piper within context. Such analysis has determined that some proficiency is required in demonstrating authenticity through the use of, and surrounded by, combined material and visual culture and the multitude of components that comprise it. Cultural
knowledge is necessary in order to not only utilise such components in order to be authentic in performance, but also to understand them. In the following chapter, a discussion of their informing factors will be presented. However, while such material and visual factors were deemed to be important through interview participant responses and ethnographic observations, ultimately performance sound was deemed to be the primary cultural feature of *piobaireachd*, and therefore discussion of material and visual culture has revolved around the manner in which performance context is developed. Material and visual culture therefore act as a foundation for the demonstration and interpretation of *piobaireachd* sound as a part of performance, providing cultural context within social events for the Highland bagpiping community.

*Piobaireachd* is valued and important in New Zealand. It is the most revered and demanding form of subcultural performance for demonstrating professionalism and formality, as evidenced through the investigation of such factors as participant display, sound producing materials, performance attire, performance choreography, and the property and possession of participants. Participation and performance within the spaces set aside for *piobaireachd* performance holds significant value for participants, and provides them with a means to acquire cultural authority and status. Material objects such as performance acknowledgements and repertoire depictions carry and command prestige and authority for those who wield them, as if they were cultural relics. Interview participants determine that *piobaireachd* is the most prestigious form of Highland piping within New Zealand.

*Piobaireachd* is a musical subculture, with its own rules, decorum, and etiquette. Cultural origins are cited through such factors as attire and manuscript collections, providing a mechanism for *piobaireachd* sound to be linked to concepts of cultural ‘tradition’, ‘heritage’ and ‘authenticity’ that are not necessarily an explicit part of the aural properties of performance. This offers a framework for participants’ interpretation of both visual and aural performance in association with understood concepts about the cultural past, such as traditional Highland dress. Material and visual factors also mark the cultural boundaries within performance through the use of spaces, times, and symbols. An overall level of formality is demanded for *piobaireachd* performance, which is linked to the attributed cultural value of objects and behaviours, value that is informed by precedent. The display of material and visual culture for Highland piping therefore not only represents notions of Scottish cultural heritage and Scottish identity within New Zealand, but also carries much more complex meanings, particularly in relation to authenticity and localisation.
As an ideal standard of performance for pipers to strive towards, ‘authenticity’ of performance display plays a role in the interpretation of performance, whether it is ‘acceptable’ or ‘unacceptable’, and where good performance display is a necessity in order for any performance to be considered good. The cultural past is ingrained in performance through demonstrating understanding of ‘authenticity’ within the various aspects of material and visual culture that contribute to it, allowing participants to arrange performances within a social hierarchy determining which performance and performer demonstrates greater cultural value. *Piobaireachd* remains a classical music, a high art for Highland pipers and participants who follow it, and the standards by which pipers measure the display of cultural authenticity and individual identity of others in performance indicates that the cultural past and the cultural present meet and are interpreted through *piobaireachd* musicking.

The findings of this chapter have determined that *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand is localised and distinct, to a degree. Physical dimensions of performance spaces, performance attire, and cultural contexts for performance reflect local culture and community unique to New Zealand. Participants acknowledge local performance contexts as different from those in Scotland as well as the unique character of local performance arenas, while performance attire linked to local cultural identities is displayed. Interview participants and literature acknowledged such components as being different to those for *piobaireachd* in Scotland. Meanwhile, locally manufactured instrument and attire materials were acknowledged as being available and being used, however, such local connections were not readily recognisable in material and visual terms during performance. A limited number of attire components displayed explicit connections to New Zealand, however attire was predominantly linked to popularly held notions of traditional Scottish Highland dress. The implicit association of attire components to local cultural groups and identities was evident, although discussion of such factors required significant insider understanding in order to be analysed. Data showed a mixture of evidence for and against localisation, however to discuss all acknowledged aspects of material and visual culture displayed would require significantly greater input from insider understanding than would be ideal. Mostly, interview participants acknowledged that *piobaireachd* in New Zealand was different from Scotland, although this difference was not clearly detailed or defined. Therefore, while localisation is evident in part, its definition remains elusive.
Ultimately it has been shown that influences behind material and visual factors and sound do more to define *piobaireachd* than their innate phenomenological qualities alone, where wearing a kilt cannot be said to depict *piobaireachd*, but the contextual meaning behind that behaviour does. Thus notions of authenticity, govern the use of material and visual culture for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, providing value and meaning to objects and behaviours, and influencing the interpretation of musical performance. Localised ‘authenticity’ is evident in the material and visual culture presented for discussion within this chapter, supporting an argument for the adoption and adaptation of *piobaireachd* cultural practices within New Zealand. However, there is strong evidence in support of maintained standards of cultural authenticity for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand being in accord with the contemporary standards practiced in Scotland, perhaps indicating current global cultural exchange between Scotland and New Zealand. These results and findings require a further level of analysis in order for the ‘forces’ that govern them to be best determined and investigated. This further analysis (Chapter 6) will explore how concepts of cultural authenticity are maintained within New Zealand, and transmitted between global piping communities.
Chapter 6 - Understanding Social and Cultural Transmission

Merriam describes three interconnected components to the study of musical culture: sound, behaviour, and concepts (Merriam 1964, 32). Reinterpreting Merriam’s model, this thesis has explored piobaireachd sound (Chapter 4), and the material and visual factors associated with musical behaviour (Chapter 5). Concepts of ‘authenticity’ have been shown to be primary drivers for such content, and have helped define piobaireachd in cultural terms, and as a subculture. Yet the social value, the cultural parameters, and the informing factors for piobaireachd within New Zealand today remain unexplained. As his third analytical approach, Merriam suggests that musical concepts provide “the values about music… and it is precisely these values that filter upward through the system to effect the final product [sound]” (Merriam 1964, 33). For this study, these values have been identified as authenticity embedded within sound, materials, and displays for piobaireachd performance (Chapter 4 and 5). Moore has shown that ‘authenticity’ is but a viewpoint, rather than a universal in music culture, that it is based on interpretations of the cultural past in the cultural present, and is the result of social processes (Moore 2002). Wagner (1981), Bloch (1977), Appadurai (1981), Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983), Trevor-Roper (1983), Anderson (1983), Rosenberg (1993), Moore (2002), and Mallon (2010), have shown that concepts of the cultural past (such as authenticity) are temporary, fluid and contentious within society; rather than objective, concrete and universal.

In light of such discourse, this research extends Merriam’s third level of analysis and seeks to understand the influences on cultural authenticity for piobaireachd in New Zealand, the factors that inform ‘the values about music’. Merriam determined that this can include “physical, social and verbal behaviour, but also … the concepts of what music is and should be” (Merriam 1964, 33). How piobaireachd in New Zealand ‘should be’ is interchangeable with concepts of authenticity for musical performance and cultural participation. Thematic analysis of interview and participant observation data shows that knowledge transmission, influential figures, contemporary standards (in Scotland), and the local history of Highland bagpiping are significant contributing factors to piobaireachd in New Zealand today. This facilitates a cynosure on the social and cultural transmission of piobaireachd within New Zealand, guiding the content and direction of this chapter.
Although a significant body of scholarly research exists on Highland bagpiping, and includes *piobaireachd*, seldom have authors provided an investigation of cultural authenticity, or such terms as ‘tradition’, ‘heritage’, lineage’ or ‘history’. Nor have they considered transculturalism, diaspora, and globalisation in their approaches. Perhaps this is due to few authors considering Highland bagpiping within contemporary society today and beyond Scotland. Of the few that have questioned standardised views of the cultural past, Dickson (2006) stands out. He takes a critical view of local piping traditions in the changing social environment of South Uist, located in the isolated islands of the Outer Hebrides of Scotland. Although this ethno-history bears some similarities to this study, the consideration of contemporary *piobaireachd*, either in New Zealand, South Uist, or elsewhere, is unexplored.

Existing research from discourse in ethnomusicology argues that social influences define musical culture, and reveal deeper knowledge about music than a study that might simply focus on phenomenological aspects (Middleton 1990; Bohlman 2004; Biddle and Knights 2007; O’Flynn 2007; Zuberi 2007). Central to this research is the concept of cultural authenticity – how it is defined, who defines it, and where their authority and knowledge comes from. Building upon the previous two chapters, and on ethnomusicological and anthropological discourse, this chapter particularly considers the transmission of cultural authenticity as being intertwined within social processes. Beginning with an ethnographic overview, which situates the reader within cultural context, this chapter moves to a discussion of cultural transmission, the arrangement of authority, transcultural flow, and perceptions of the cultural past in the present. These themes necessarily inform the sections of this chapter, each, in-turn, comprised of subsections.

### 6.1 Ethnographic Observation

Scenario 4: A Tutor’s office in a house, in Opawa, Christchurch, New Zealand, February 8th 2013. One-on-one *piobaireachd* tuition session between pupil and teacher. 8:07pm.

*I am sitting at a desk in a room that is the office, and teaching facility of a tutor of Highland bagpiping. The desk is to the side of the room and I am sitting behind it, with my back to the wall, facing the centre of the room. The desk is oval in shape, I am sitting at one of the sides of the table, and opposite sits the tutor. To his left is the pupil at the head of the table. Behind the tutor is the centre of the room. On the desk to my left is a desktop computer, idle, with its*
monitor off, facing both the tutor and the pupil. Attached to the computer is a webcam and microphone, which stand out in the uncluttered area around the computer.

Directly in front of the tutor is an open bound book of score notations, the particular page the book is open to is page 139. The title of the piece is written in Gaelic; beneath the title is its English translation ‘A Flame of Wrath for Patrick Caogach.’ The printed score notation comprises one of the open pages. Added to the score notation in pencil markings are various coded symbols and markings. Also in front of the tutor is a practice chanter lying on its side.

In front of the pupil is an A4 photocopied version of the score notation for this same tune. There are coded symbols and markings on this A4 copy too, although only part of the score has markings on it, the remainder of which the pupil is filling in as I watch. His symbols and markings, while not identical in shape and form of the tutors, correspond with the same places in the score notation. In the pupil’s hand is a pencil and an eraser. In front of the pupil is a practice chanter lying on its side.

As the pupil continues to copy these markings to their score I explore the room. At one end is a sideboard, atop sits a significant collection of CDs, numbering approximately 50. These CDs are arranged into a specific order. Predominantly there are two categories. One category of CD all has printed ‘The Donald MacLeod Piobaireachd Tutorials’ down their spines, while the other category has printed ‘Masters of Piobaireachd’. Also atop the sideboard is a small stereo system with cassette and CD inputs.

At the opposite end of the room is a bookcase stuffed full of books, magazines and periodicals, and manila folders with assorted documents within them. A number of books are bound collections of score notations, some specifically for piobaireachd, as indicated on their covers. Other books include seemingly organological content as indicated by their titles, such as ‘The Highland Bagpipe and its Music’ and The College of Piping Highland Bagpipe Tutor’. Many of the magazines and periodicals are editions of the ‘Piping Times’. The manila folders have specific individual’s names written on their covers, and within each is a differing assortment of notes and collection of score notations.

On the opposite side of the room to the desk is a table on top of which is a bagpipe case, open, with its contents showing. Inside is a disassembled set of bagpipes, a ‘Glengarry’ bonnet, a Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand membership certificate for the
As I return to the desk the pupil has finished transcribing symbols to their score. The tutor then begins to sing the melody of the tune to their pupil using syllables to replicate and articulate the commensurate technical sounds, which produce the musical concepts of this tune. The tutor finishes the first ‘line’ of the Ground. Then both the tutor and the pupil begin to sing the same ‘line’, the pupil matching the tutor syllable by syllable, their relative pitches not important, only the musical concepts that are articulated within their singing are. The tutor then repeats the same process with the second line, and then the third line, each time followed again by the addition of the voice of the student. Such a process takes no longer than 5 minutes.

Following this the tutor and pupil then take up their practice chanters and, still seated at the desk, perform the Ground together. Following this, the tutor then instructs the pupil to perform the Ground alone. Having just learnt the tune, the pupil’s fragile and limited knowledge of the musical concepts of the Ground of the tune are immediately obvious to the tutor and the tutor spends the next 20 minutes instructing the pupil regarding specific passages from within the Ground. During this time the pupil makes further additions to the symbols on their copy of the score.

After this the tutor then asks the pupil to practice the Ground of this tune throughout the coming week, by singing, using the practice chanter, and if confident enough, performing it on the bagpipes. The pupil agrees. Then the tutor directs the pupil to demonstrate their Strathspey on the Chanter, and with that, piobaireachd instruction ceases within this pedagogical encounter.

This is a formalised extract of participant observation, focusing on the transmission of knowledge for piobaireachd, within a one-on-one pedagogical interaction. This transcript logically may suggest to the reader the following questions: ‘What is the purpose of this tuition?’ ‘What is the significance of the computer and camera?’ ‘What is the value of the books and CDs?’ ‘What do the coded notations mean?’ ‘How does the pupil learn?’ and ‘What is the context of this interaction?’ These are considered in this chapter, and within
Chapters 4 and 5. All interview participants expressed familiarity with such transmission contexts as well as others, and are well qualified to provide data allowing for the analysis of social and cultural transmission for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. The following offer results and discussion that afford an understanding of such transmission, using the methodological framework outlined in Chapter 3.

### 6.2 Transmission

This section explores the transmission processes apparent for *piobaireachd*, relative to New Zealand. This employs Small’s (1998) concept of ‘musicking’ as a key informing theory for the identification of transmission contexts. He argues that music ought not to be considered an object for analysis, but a process. Coining the term ‘musicking’ to incorporate any activity relating to musical performance (Small 1998, 9), Small identifies two key types of processes: “first, those among the sounds that the musicians are making… and second, those among the people who are taking part” (Small 1998, 184). Such a concept drives this section and allows for a focus on the places where *piobaireachd* musicking occurs within New Zealand.

It is, however, necessary to point out the limitations of this section’s application of ‘musicking’ theory. Such a concept could also be used to identify the parameters that influence the political juxtapositioning of authority (see Section 6.3) beyond the demonstration and interpretation of *piobaireachd* ‘music’, outlined in Chapters 4 and 5. However, the necessary extent of such a potential application is unknown and may veer the research from the tripartite theoretical framework that it employs. Thus, ‘musicking’ is used to identify the contexts where *piobaireachd* music is demonstrated and interpreted by cultural participants in New Zealand.

Within contemporary culture, a key ‘musicking’ analysis might consider the use of recordings and new media (such as YouTube™) as a widely dispersed and readily accessible means for musicking today. Such developments have impacted on the transmission of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand today, as will be shown in this chapter. However, incorporating cultural participants whose only access to *piobaireachd* is through such media is impractical for the concerns of this thesis. Discussion of such media by cultural participants who participate in geographical ‘musicking’ contexts is provided within this section, and subsequent discussion throughout the rest of this chapter.
Three specific transmission processes emerged in the thematic analysis of data and are evident in this analysis of *piobaireachd* ‘musicking’. Descriptions and discussion of these are provided below, and they are referred to throughout the remainder of this chapter. The first of these is pedagogical, the second is practice rehearsal, and the third is musical performance, the aural, material, and visual content of which has already been discussed.

### 6.2.1 Pedagogy

For the purposes of this research, pedagogy is accepted as the formalised sharing of knowledge regarding how to perform *piobaireachd*. Interview participants were asked to reflect on their initial interests and pedagogical encounters regarding their exposure to *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. The following two responses highlight these initial learning experiences:

> I started when I was 8 off Tutor A… and then to Tutor B … probably 14 or 15 … Tutor B gave me my first *piobaireachd* [at 14 years of age]. ‘Correinessans Salute’ was my first one … as a first tune, it was a pretty tall ask’. There are far easier tunes, especially ones I’m teaching now that convey the story and layout of *piobaireachd* in a far less complicated way (Participant 4).

Interview participants described learning *piobaireachd* at a young age, providing context to the processes of learning, and describing a pathway of progress towards experience and skill as they established their *piobaireachd* performing careers. Commonly these pathways included ‘finding’ *piobaireachd* through their tutors, who provided them with an initial score and the means for its interpretation (see Figure 6.1).

Pipers change tutors relative to their needs as pupils. Where one tutor cannot meet the demands of a pupil, the pupil will eventually seek a new tutor with greater perceived authority to further the pupil’s career development. Each piper who performs *piobaireachd* in New Zealand will likely have had a number of tutors during their piping careers, with each tutor imparting further knowledge and ‘skills’ to their pupil. A piper’s understanding of *piobaireachd* can be considered as the sum of all of cultural knowledge imparted to them during the pedagogical interactions experienced during their careers.
In order to perform at certain prestigious events, there is a requirement to submit a number of tunes from selected lists constructed by relevant authorities. The following two responses were representative of interview responses relative to tune lists:

I generally … have a dabble with all of the set tunes and find out which ones I enjoy. And then I’ll pick my final four about six months before the competition, and then obviously submit those tunes at all the competitions (Participant 1).

When you get to my age and stage, for a lot of the lists that come out you will have played those tunes before … you’ve got a huge head start,” (Participant 5).

These indicate that the tune lists for such events require a piper be capable of performing certain tunes in order to compete. These lists are used for prestigious piobaireachd events both within Scotland, as well as within New Zealand (respectively The Piobaireachd Society 2013b; Comunn na Piobaireachd 2013a). A piper’s repertoire can reflect the various prestigious events that they have competed in over time. These lists essentially dictate to pipers a specific number of tunes extracted from the extant piobaireachd repertoire, demanding a specific combination of tunes from each performer at any given event. Pipers learn tunes from these lists and this process then drives their pedagogical interactions.

Pipers predominantly access the repertoire through collections of published score notations that are widely dispersed and available within the Highland bagpiping community. A typical interview participant discussion of such collections included:

because it’s just an A4 book, you can take it around everywhere, so it’s clearly written out. However there are a lot more discrepancies in the Kilberry book as opposed to The Piobaireachd Society so it always pays to look at both and then read the notes as well … Preferably [I use] The Piobaireachd Society collection … I know there’s the Binneas book as well (Participant 1).

The Piobaireachd Society book is the book with the most accurate ‘what is played’, and then I’d superimpose the Binneas is Borerai books on top because that’s a lot more closer to ‘how we would like to play it’. There’s certain things I do with certain tunes that are not actually in The Piobaireachd Society book but there are accepted variations from a Brown/Nicol [style] or John MacDonald [of Inverness style] or whatever it is. So that’s the way I’d approach it (Participant 5).

Such quotes not only confirm that pipers predominantly access the piobaireachd repertoire through collections of score notations, they also intimate that score notations do not indicate how to ‘authentically’ interpret the musical concepts within the tunes they depict. In order to address this issue, experienced pipers will use a range of differing scores for the same tune in order to triangulate the most appropriate way to interpret it from notation. Score notations are convenient because they can explicitly depict the repertoire concepts of a tune and provide pipers with a visual aid for use in pedagogy and practice.

The inadequacies of score notation, however, demand that pipers seek reference from more interactive sources of knowledge in order to interpret expression concepts ‘authentically’. This notion of authenticity is based upon a cultural understanding of how a tune ‘should’ be performed, where pipers require knowledge that will allow them to interpret the total musical concepts (both repertoire and expression) for specific tunes (Cooke 1972, 44; Cannon 1988, 70; McClellan 2009, 328).

Specific methods for determining how a tune’s musical concepts should be interpreted were discussed in interviews, including authoritative sources of such information. The first involved accessing specific individuals as authorities:

Obviously there’s a lot of different opinions about tunes, and the way it should be played … I used to hold the E cadences. ‘Eeee yun bra’ was the way Authority A used to sing it when he was out here doing a seminar … I asked Piper D … he cuts the cadence straight to the Low A – ‘Ee yun bra’ … and then obviously guys like Authority B and Authority C, guys you really respect that always clarify things. So you talk to people … Authority B … I’ve had a few lessons with him (Participant 1).

My next step would be to run it by Authority E … it’s a style thing more than anything… his take would be on the length of notes … maybe a Skype™ session and just making sure we’ve got the same take on it (Participant 4).

They also discussed recordings of a given authority performing or instructing and suggested they use these to guide their interpretation of a tune’s musical concepts:
Sometimes I just take the safe option of playing something that’s been recorded… I’ll get as many recordings of that tune as I can. I’ll actually have a good listen … Old John [MacDougall Gillies] singing it, so I got that recording … and so he cuts the cadence straight to the Low A – ‘Ee yun bra’. So that made a big difference… So yep [I get reference from] recordings (Participant 1).

There’s plenty of tapes around, or recordings around of various tunes, to see what people do with them… I’d hunt for some recordings of anyone who’s playing you respect … so you can see what else you can do (Participant 5).

This indicates that methods for accessing authoritative sources of knowledge were complex and involved a mixture of: spending time gaining imparted knowledge in the physical presence of an authority (see Figure 6.1); connecting with an authority virtually across geographic distance, as in the case of using Skype™, and/or; connecting with an authority virtually across time, as in the case of recordings. Responses indicated that the variety of information from these sources provided participants with an understanding of ‘how tunes should be played’ by combining both score notations with interactive and authoritative guidance for authentic interpretation.

‘Researching’ how tunes should be performed involved compiling all available information about a tune, the acceptable ways of performing it, and then determining which of these ways was the most appropriate and ideal for performance:

Obviously there’s a lot of different opinions about tunes, perspectives and the way it should be played… Certainly doing the research of the tune helps…you know we’ve all been there and played something which has got the wrong authority. And make sure that if there are some discrepancies there that you need to tell the judges… And so if I don’t research that I won’t know. So when I went on for the Clasp in Hastings I had to tell Judge A “well look I’m playing four ‘heeruns’ here” and he didn’t know otherwise so he made a note of that, and when Judge B judged down in Dunedin his reply was “well that is the way it should be played” (Participant 1).

While such a response provides this particular participant’s definition of ‘research’, it also illustrates that there are notable and marked differences in opinion regarding the authentic interpretation of tunes.

It is important to note that interview participants sought knowledge of how to perform from sources they considered most authoritative, and that these sources were not consistent across participants. One participant may have used a selection of score notations (see Figure 6.2), recordings, and authoritative individuals as sources of knowledge that differed from the sources used by another participant. This appears to be a point of tension in the community as to who is the ‘right’ authority regarding ‘authenticity’ of performance. Discussion of such notions of hierarchical arrangements of authority will be presented in Section 6.3.
Interestingly, interview participants also intimated that cultural participants could act as sources of information for others. For example, the quotes above describe interview participants interacting with judges, pipers and authorities as references and resources for the authentic interpretation of performance, using such individuals as sources of knowledge.

The learning process for pipers involves the negotiation of authoritative sources of knowledge regarding authentic performance. This is an attribution that appears to vary between individuals. While interview participants gave strong responses regarding their learning experiences, they also provided reflection on their experience as tutors and authorities regarding performance. The initial pedagogical process represents the formal introduction of a piper to piobaireachd, beginning with learning a tune, and incorporating it into that piper’s performance repertoire. However, given that individuals have differing styles and individual ways of interpreting and demonstrating musical concepts (as outlined in Section 4.4.3), not only does the tutor pass on repertoire to their pupils, they also pass individualised and unique styles for interpreting and demonstrating musical concepts within a tune. Regarding the introduction of pupils to piobaireachd, participants offered:

‘Glengarry’s Lament’ is probably my favourite ‘cos it’s what I started on. But ‘The Little Spree’ is good ‘cos it’s not too long and I think quite melodious. I think as a teacher there are some basic rules, like your 2 bar phrasing and showing the theme notes and that sort of thing, I guess you pass on your way to play. And if I get a tune I’m not that
comfortable with I just find a recording of a good player and if it sounds good to me, I’ll pass it on to them … I’ve started probably 10 of them on *piobaireachd* (Participant 2).

I’m teaching Pupil B at this stage… at an early stage, like I’m starting him on a *piobaireachd crunluath* and just get that developed at an early stage, and then get another embellishment which you use in light music like an *aidrie* or something, and get that started to develop at an early stage then you’ll say “show me your crunluath”, and I’ll just whack you out a *crunluath*, and that will just develop so it’s normal. My teacher told me it was easy (Participant 5).

This illustrates how experienced pipers influence subsequent generations of performers by passing on their particular understandings of authentic interpretation and performance. They also use recordings in unique and individual ways to define authenticity for themselves as authorities in pedagogical transactions. The personalisation of pedagogical content in accordance with the tutor’s understanding of authenticity can at times contrast with more collective understandings of authenticity as inherited and plastic, handed down through lineage (Collinson 1975, 201-203; Donaldson 2005, 13-15; Cheape 2009, 97-126). It is in such that encounters social negotiation of authority appears to take place.

Pedagogy is a transmission context where ‘authentic’ cultural practices are shared through the interpretation of knowledge from differing authoritative sources. Knowledge that is imparted in pedagogical interactions is individualised in accordance with the experiences the tutor has had over their career, and is inherited by the pupil in accordance with the experiences that they have had over their career. Beyond this, pedagogy may also be considered as sourcing and compiling information regarding authentic cultural practice by accessing databases of repertoire, such as score collections (Figure 6.2); and the knowledge to interpret that repertoire, such as authoritative figures, recorded instruction, and written descriptions. This process is twofold, and involves knowledge being imparted to, and inherited by, the individual. In this sense it is inferred that the vagaries of memorisation and recollection (Segalowitz *et al.* 2001; Dowling *et al.* 2002), as well as varying and dynamic arrangement of hierarchies between pedagogical interactions (Gerstin 1998; Keister 2008), mean that knowledge imparted from a source will differ in content (if only subtly) each time it is imparted. Likewise, given the differences in communication, perspective and situation of those inheriting such knowledge it is understood that interpretations of such knowledge will differ from individual to individual (Keil 1987).

Various authoritative sources for performing repertoire are referred to by pipers in order to best perform tunes. However, historical sources such as score notations and recordings may be out of context in a temporal sense, and current sources may be subject to interactive
uncertainties of memory and recall themselves. Pedagogy will only work as a transmission process when influenced by the vagaries of time; and memory, recall and uncertainty will likely have some part to play in interpretation and knowledge of authenticity. Accepting that memory and recall can vary considerably between people and for individuals over time (Segalowitz et al. 2001; Dowling et al. 2002), how a tutor demonstrates interpreted authenticity to their pupils can not only vary from tutor to tutor, but also from lesson to lesson. Likewise how a pupil interprets demonstrated authenticity will not only vary from pupil to pupil, but also from lesson to lesson. Therefore, pedagogy cannot deliver consistency of authentic knowledge. It does, however, facilitate personal interaction and negotiation between collective and individualised concepts of authenticity.

6.2.2 Practice
While the primary objective of pedagogy is sharing authentic interpretations of repertoire, practice focuses on the development of a pipers’ repertoire with the goal of formal performance. The knowledge that is sourced and compiled in the learning process for pipers informs their practice rehearsal routines:

Working through them with the manuscript and getting a feel for the tunes… working on the practice chanter or singing it … and taking it from there. … and then on the pipes… repetitions leading to competition, just as many run throughs as you can… technique practice on crunluaths and often practice as if I am on the board, putting myself under a bit of pressure… and have a performance run just at home (Participant 3).

So you’ve sung the tune over during the week, then towards the end of the week some polish.’ If you’re not well practiced at it then things are going to go wrong ‘cos your nerves kick in. I like to play a tune for a couple of months before I’d be happy to compete with it. I’ve always said, “make sure you’ve got your tunes for Hastings [Easter weekend] memorised by Christmas time [preceding]. So it’s a good couple of months to be really comfortable with a tune (Participant 5).

I’m better at it than I am at light music, whether that’s because I practice it more is hard to say… And I just try to play the perfect tune, it’s always something you can strive to do better. You can continually improve so there’s that sort of challenge aspect to it. It’s the whole mental side of it, practice, preparation and a good challenge (Participant 7).

Initially pipers will sing their tunes in order to familiarise and commit to memory the knowledge of musical concepts they have acquired in pedagogical interactions. Singing is an ideal learning method in this regard as it is less physically demanding than practice on the practice chanter or full Highland bagpipe, yet still offers the added bonus of an aural stimulus. In this context, singing acts purely as a mnemonic processing of authentic tune performance (Hughes 1991). Fatone (2010) provides further discussion of the singing process for learning and rehearsing musical concepts for piobaireachd.
When a tune has been committed to memory, pipers then use their practice chanters in order to become proficient with the technical sounds within the tune, in conjunction with the tune’s musical concepts (see Section 4.3 Technical Sounds). As a secondary method of practice, the practice chanter is again less physically demanding than the full Highland pipes, but involves identical finger technique in order to produce requisite technical sounds during their practice rehearsals (Donaldson 2005, 8; see Figure 4.5 as well as Figures 6.1, 6.8, 6.10).

The final step in practice involves using Highland bagpipes to incorporate these new musical concepts and technical sounds into an instrumental performance repertoire, combining them with other aspects of their performance identity such as instrument sound (Section 4.2, see also McKerrell 2005), and their visual and choreographed performances (Sections 5.2 and 5.3). The introduction of the practice chanter and the bagpipe combines both the continued aural mnemonic processing of ‘authentic’ repertoire performance as well as neurological conditioning for the production of technical sound. This culminates in transferring knowledge of authentic performance gained in pedagogy into the musical embodiment of that knowledge (see Figure 6.3).

Differences in the practice approaches employed by pipers between pedagogy and performance reflect the differences in information sourced in pedagogy, differences between pipers’ comprehensions of musical concepts, differences in pipers’ capacities to transfer musical concepts into technical sounds, and their differing and unique understandings of authentic musical performance. Further, it needs to be stressed that pipers have varying numbers of tunes to practice for upcoming performances, depending on the number of events, and the number of tunes they will need to learn in order to perform at such events. Practice can be time consuming, and the social commitments pipers have in their personal lives can have a bearing on the amount of practice undertaken (Donaldson 2005, 8-12).

Generally, the amount of practice a piper does, their methods for practicing, and their ability to transfer theoretical knowledge into practical performance will be reflected in their ability to perform, and pipers who are ‘better’ performers are often believed to have undertaken more and higher quality practice than those who are ‘lesser’ performers. This primacy for time is resultant from having to commit the authentic musical concepts that a piper has gained from pedagogy to memory, and the need to rehearse the expression of those musical concepts authentically in performance.
It could be argued that such practice is not a transmission process as it involves only one party, the piper. Ultimately, however, the practice context involves the development of an individualised interpretation of a tune using the information, resources and references provided to the piper about how to perform repertoire. Practice can be seen as a transmission context where a piper commits repertoire to memory, and then rehearses its authentic recollection. Practice is an intermediary between pedagogy and performance, allowing pipers to demonstrate ‘authenticity’ as they perform a tune from their memory. As memory and recall can vary between people and for individuals over time (Segalowitz et al. 2001; Dowling et al. 2002), how a piper demonstrates interpreted authenticity can not only vary from piper to piper, but also from rehearsal to rehearsal. As a crucial process, this appears to partly determine how a performer will demonstrate the components of performance (Chapters 4 and 5 respectively) and a substantial quantity of practice is therefore integral as a transmission context. While practice does not deliver consistency during rehearsal it does, however, facilitate personal interaction and negotiation between collective and individualised understandings of authenticity.

Practice is not only where a piper’s understanding of how to perform a tune authentically is committed to memory, it is also where recollection from memory is rehearsed. Therefore, practice serves as the context where (future) formal performances are constructed from various sourced and compiled interpretations of authenticity (made in the past) and is a means for refining and developing the presentation of a tune (or the presentations of tunes) from knowledge sourced and compiled by a performer.

The lines between practice and pedagogy are somewhat ‘blurred’, as there is likely crossover between accessing knowledge as learning, and accessing knowledge as re-acquaintance in the practice process. However, for the purposes of this research, practice is the transmission context where pipers develop their individualized interpretations and demonstrations of cultural authenticity, by negotiating and arranging their future performances within their interpretations of authentic frameworks. It is a means for refining and developing formal presentation of a tune from the knowledge imparted to, and inherited by, a performer. It is also a means for interpreted understanding of how to perform repertoire authentically, to memorise it, and to recall it ‘authentically’ in performance.
6.2.3 Performance

The transfer of knowledge into a formal performance by pipers takes considerable rehearsal time. Pipers will normally begin pedagogy for future performances many months in advance, and will rehearse in a regular schedule that normally includes an hour or more daily. By proportion, pedagogy likely contributes to ~15%, practice likely contributes to ~ 80%, and performance to ~ 5% of piobaireachd musicking time. Yet, despite performance making up the least proportion in terms of time, it is the primary objective of pedagogy and practice, and is definitive for piobaireachd.

Pipers build towards performances using pedagogy and practice to generate an authentic interpretation of repertoire. This can be observed in the following:

The last piobaireachd I performed publicly was at the Northern Meeting in Inverness, in the Silver Medal… I’ve been working away at that for the last year and from a set list of tunes… I ended up fourth in the Silver Medal… I’ve got commitments next year that will mean I won’t be able to play in the New Zealand Clasp, so I guess after Easter I will get onto the Silver Medal list for Scotland again (Participant 1).

I’ve got to make up my mind whether I go with bands or chase the solo scene. When you’ve been doing the solo thing, I was pretty lucky through the early 2000s… you know you think back, I’d be playing an hour and a half a day, come home at lunch time and just be playing and playing and playing. So the more playing you do the more confident and consistent you become with it all. Just being well prepared and well practiced. So we’ll wait and see about next year. I was seriously thinking about this year again (Participant 4).
Such a process is not only time consuming, it is also complex where pipers combine both pedagogy and practice in order to inform their performance content, discussed in Chapters 4 and 5. Aside from what is detailed in these chapters, performance can be considered to reflect the programmatic narratives that accompany tunes within the *piobaireachd* repertoire. Such narratives are often colourful and can influence the interpretation of expression concepts within a performance. A sample of responses includes:

I don’t really get into is the story behind the tunes, I’ve never really taken the time to work out what the tune is really all about. Stories in the manuscript are always hearsay. To be honest I don’t actually do any research into the tune (Participant 1).

I don’t really get involved in all that. Not so much the stories and backgrounds. Sometimes it’s good to know that but that’s not something I do with every tune or worry too much about. That’s sort of just the tune (Participant 3).

These responses indicate that performers accept programmatic narratives for tunes, although they insist that these are not a part of their demonstrations of authentic performance. They also intimated that performance was a matter of formally presenting (Chapters 4 and 5) their knowledge (interpretation) of authentic *piobaireachd* performance, as well as their capacity to demonstrate knowledge gained and developed through pedagogy and practice. In this sense, performances act as the ‘consummation’ of a piper’s prior musicking, and allow pipers to formally depict their (learnt and rehearsed) knowledge of authentic performance to an audience (Figure 6.5), as shaped by the pedagogical and practice transactions the piper has experienced.

Figure 6.4 A piper demonstrating, and therefore transmitting authenticity in performance. Source: author, Dunedin (17 April 2012).
Performance not only necessitates the demonstration of pipers’ individually varied interpretations of authenticity, it will also entail audience members interpreting such demonstrations. Competitive events are the predominant and most revered performance context for *piobaireachd*, as outlined in Chapter 1. As a result, performances are interpreted in line with, and revolve around, competitive standards. This allows the interpretation of a performance in relation to accepted cultural authenticity as defined in competitions.

Interview participants thought audience can have pre-established notions of cultural authenticity informing their interpretation of performance authenticity:

*A tune I personally felt I’d played quite well was ‘The Park Piobaireachd’ [#2] which I think is beautiful and I thought I had it pretty well down. But I got absolutely slated when I played it in the Gold Medal by the judges and they were like “oh no you haven’t got the way of this at all… I’d played it on and off for years, and I’ve had prizes with it before* (Participant 2).

*Authority A doesn’t really enjoy what I do [in performance] for some particular reason, he’s had a few words to me before…. He seems to have a very definitive way of how he’s got it in his mind, his own style…Obviously people do learn different *piobaireachd* in different ways. Different styles have developed and… there are different ways of performing tunes* (Participant 3).

Not only do cultural participants have pre-existing concepts of authentic performance, some can influence the outcome of competitive performance by acting as judges and authorities in the context of performance. In performance, definitions of authenticity can differ from individual to individual, and such differences (or similarities) are often brought to the fore. In this capacity, such authoritative individuals can influence the collective audience interpretation of a performance by labelling one performance as more authentic than another. However, such an influence contrasts with the obvious goal of performers, in that they will always attempt to perform as ‘authentically’ as possible. Therefore, ‘authenticity’ is subjective, interpretive, and affected by ‘forces’ beyond the control of the performer.

Performance necessitates demonstration of ‘authenticity’, as well as interpretation of that ‘authenticity’ by others, within a framework of individually and socially understood definitions of authentic performance (Moore 2002). In such interplay, between the individual and the collective, hierarchies of authority become apparent for both performers and for participants, and enact the transmission of authentic cultural standards to individuals present (Chapter 4 and 5).
Following performance, pipers will interpret both explicit and implicit feedback and fine-tune their repertoire for future performances with further rehearsal, and where necessary, with further pedagogy. They may perform these particular tunes again at later events, with each performance building upon previous feedback:

The worst performance of an entire tune... I was not particularly great at ‘MacCrimmon’s Sweetheart’, I don’t play that particularly well. I’ve never just got it right. The ground and the first couple of variations ... I played it ok at the Claidmorgh contest. Although I was never fully happy with that tune (Participant 6).

I’m a bit of a traditionalist, I kind of liken it a bit to test cricket. I kind of see that I have potential to go further with *piobaireachd* than with light music so that’s why I’ve focused on it more. I just try to play the perfect tune, something you can strive to do better. It’s the whole mental side of it, practice, preparation and a good challenge (Participant 7).

As performance necessitates demonstrations of interpreted authenticity by pipers, as well as interpretations of those demonstrations by audience, performance allows for informal sharing (as opposed to the formal sharing for pedagogy) of subjective definitions of authenticity – as presented by performers, and as arranged by participants. Performance then operates in a transmission context where cultural authenticity is arranged and negotiated through hierarchies. Cultural authenticity and cultural authority are transmitted through performance by not only performers, but also by other participants who interpret ‘authentic’ culture as both individuals and as groups in accordance with socio-cultural hierarchy (Moore 2002). Such contextually derived displays of authenticity and authority inform pipers’ pedagogy and practice following performance, and also inform participants’ definition of cultural authenticity as well as the hierarchy of authoritative sources regarding cultural authenticity.
While performance operates as the least temporally experienced transmission context for performers, it is clearly the most important as it not only informs an individuals concepts of authenticity, it also influences collective concepts of authenticity. The effect of a singular performance may have an influence not only on subsequent performances by a piper, but also on performances by others pipers, as well as interpretations by individuals and by groups of individuals, and ultimately may influence socially practiced definitions of cultural authenticity.

Performance is therefore a context for transmission, where understandings of authentic cultural practices are informally shared through the interpretation of musical performances as pipers’ attempt to perform ‘authentically’. In performance, transmission of such authenticity is not explicitly aimed at sharing acceptable ways of performing (as in pedagogy); rather, it is centred around the assertion and display of authenticity, where the properties of ‘authentic’ performance are implicit. Cultural authenticity is demonstrated in performance in individually varied forms, and is interpreted through both individual and collective understandings of authenticity that appear to be centred around sociocultural hierarchy of authority and status.

Performance may be defined as the demonstration of authenticity, not only informed by pedagogy and practice, but also informed by past performances. Performance may also be defined as the interpretation of formal repertoire presentation. Ultimately performance determines the pedagogical and practice experiences that pipers seek out, and has a major bearing on the standards by which piobaireachd is demonstrated, defined and understood culturally.

Given the vagaries of memorisation and recollection that contribute to performance (Segalowitz et al. 2001; Dowling et al. 2002), as well as the varying arrangement of institutional hierarchies that participate within performance contexts (Gerstin 1998; Keister 2008), the social definition of cultural authenticity will vary from performance to performance. Likewise, given the differences in communication, perspective and situation of those interpreting such performances it is expected that interpretations of authenticity will also differ from individual to individual, as they participate in performances. Thus performance cannot offer consistency of authenticity; it can, however, facilitate personal interaction and negotiation between collective and individualised understandings of authenticity, and allow for social hierarchies to be asserted.
6.2.4 Summary

Using the concept of ‘musicking’ this section has explored the contexts for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. Three key transmission contexts have been identified; pedagogy, practice and performance. Pedagogy allows for subjective definitions of authentic culture to be formally shared. Practice allows pipers to develop their demonstrations of cultural authenticity. Performance is where subjective definitions of authentic cultural practices are formally presented, informally shared, and socially ranked. Ultimately these transmission contexts allow individuals, audiences, and the wider community; to place performers, the methods by which they rehearse, and the sources that inform their definitions of authenticity; within a social hierarchy; that values certain definitions of authenticity as more ‘genuine’ than others; within differing contexts; and at differing times. These combined transmission processes (see Figure 6.6) allow definitions of culture to be arranged hierarchically within the community, and encompass *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. While the subcultural definition of *piobaireachd* to New Zealand has not been a major focus of this section, the discussion provided here has set the scene for an examination of social hierarchies that revolve around cultural authority, presented in the following section.

![Figure 6.6 Diagram showing the transmission process for individual pipers. Pedagogy informs practice, both of which in turn inform performance. Performance then informs pedagogy and practice. This process allows for the hierarchical arrangement of individuals within the community.](image)

This section has considered the contexts and processes for the transmission of authenticity for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. While *piobaireachd* is often referred to as the music performed on the Highland pipes in antiquity (Donaldson 2005, 80; Cheape 2009, 97-126), the discussion presented here indicates that concepts of an ancient past do not play into the contemporary transmission processes for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. Rather, the recent past appears to have the greatest bearing on not only how *piobaireachd* is transmitted,
but also on the content and interpretation of that transmission. This contrasts with notions of *piobaireachd* being ‘traditional’, ‘original’, ‘authentic’, and ‘historically informed’ and marks a ‘dynamic contact zone’ between the past and the present (Pratt 1991; Bendrups 2008). However, the sources of repertoire and knowledge are accepted as existing in the present only due to the continued transmission of culture from antiquity through the generations of culture bearers who have gone before, as well as those who recorded the musical concepts of *piobaireachd* for posterity.

In order to define transmission contexts for this study, this section has not focused on an analysis of comparison and contrast between *piobaireachd* within New Zealand and beyond (provided in Section 6.4). A feature of interview responses has been a lack of delineation between transmission contexts within New Zealand, and transmission contexts outside of New Zealand, particularly performances. This reflects interview participants for this study being past and current participants in *piobaireachd* musicking in Scotland, and demonstrates their wealth of knowledge, experience, and authority relative to this study.

### 6.3 Authorisation

Individuals demonstrate and interpret knowledge of culture, including authenticity, by participating in transmission processes (as outlined in Section 6.2). The previous section identified that cultural ‘authenticity’ for *piobaireachd* is not consistent among individuals and not consistent for the same individual over time. Given that cultural participants take part in transmission processes, with some recognised as cultural authorities, they will likely have a social impact on the processes and content of cultural transmission and authenticity.

This section discusses what Gerstin has eloquently summarised as “music making politics and politics making music” (1998, 385). He explores the relationship between music as a cultural process (Blacking 1973; Small 1998) and the socio-political arrangement of individuals within cultural communities (Gerstin 1998), identifying a clear link between authenticity and authority within Martinican bèlè culture. Donaghy likewise suggests “the politics of authority play a significant role in musical exchange and activities” (Donaghy 2011, 51). Similarly Keister explores the role of pedagogical encounters as sites for the transmission of concepts of tradition for Japanese music. He argues that notions of “distant, yet theoretically attainable, … artistic perfection” cause cultural participants to be in state of constant personal development, in a manner that is similar to how cultural participants view authenticity demonstrated within
*piobaireachd* performances (Keister 2008, 239). In the context of his paper, he places pedagogy as the most important site for cultural transmission, where he focuses on the imparting and inheriting of tradition within iemoto or ‘schools’ (Keister 2008, 239-241). This chapter acknowledges pedagogy as an important transmission process, alongside practice; however, performance ultimately acts as the site where authenticity is proven and where authority is arguably gained. Therefore, for this study, performance is given centre stage. This section explores the social arrangement of cultural authorities through the consideration of authenticity relative to *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. Further, as Jolly (1992), Moore (2002), and Mallon (2010) argue that cultural authenticity is a construct resultant from social processes; this section also considers the social arrangement of authenticity though the analysis of cultural authority. It reflects on the ways in which such authority is gained, the arrangement of authority within the performance community, and the influence of such authority. In particular, this debates the definition of cultural authenticity, the arrangement of such a definition, and the role of individuals and groups for authorising such a process for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand.

### 6.3.1 Gaining Authority

All interview participants offered strong responses regarding the individuals from whom they receive knowledge. A number of responses from the preceding section indicate that cultural participants have influence and affect how authenticity and culture is defined. This contributes to a discussion of authoritative individuals having an influential role within the community by imparting definitions of authenticity, inherited by others. Participants were asked how such authority is gained:

I’ve always defaulted to Authority A … Piper A first taught me *piobaireachd* and he was taught by Authority A, and I had a couple of lessons with Authority A as well. And he’s done so well with the sort of structure and it just seems to be tried and true (Participant 1).

[Authority is given to someone] by their results I think. And just the esteem I guess and obviously they’re teaching and stuff (Participant 2).

Piper A, he just seems to have this flamboyance and he just played for years and years and can do that. He’s got the ability and the respect to do that. Well once you’ve played your tunes and you’ve won some medals, you’ve gained the respect of your *piobaireachd* peers, you can build up knowledge on what you’re doing, … Then people won’t slap you for it because you have this background of prizes or winning or whatever (Participant 6).

These responses demonstrate the importance of performance as the context where the transmission of ‘authenticity’ can translate to the awarding of authority to the performer. Whether or not ‘authenticity’ has been transmitted within a performance depends on how it is
interpreted and received by participants in performance contexts. For performers, authority is gained through providing the most acceptable ‘authentic’ interpretation of piobaireachd within context, as determined by others, and as informed by transmission processes. Authoritative figures are individuals who have proven in performance that they have an understanding of authenticity. In this way ‘authority’ is the personal embodiment of past authentic performances, and thus the embodiment of cultural authenticity.

However, not all performance contexts are considered the same. Participants indicated that success within certain events provided individuals with greater authority than others:

I’ve always defaulted to Authority A because he’s there, doing it. He’s won three Clasps at Inverness, playing at the Glenfiddich. He’s in our era of competition, I’m sure Authority B and the likes of Authority C and that have got a wealth of knowledge to pass on, which they do, but I think as a competitor … get as much as you can from those that are there doing it (Participant 1).

It appears that the greater the prestige and value of the event to the cultural community, then the greater the authority that can be gained by performers. These prestigious events also appear to require a higher standard of cultural authenticity than others as well as a footing and social presence within the cultural community:

I had a really good year. I still think big prize, the one where I’m going to tick the box is still to come, personally… I think the obvious is to get the Gold Medal in Oban or Inverness. I think it might take another 10 years for all I know. So while I’m still improving I’ll keep travelling over there and spending hideous amounts of dollars, because it is financially very difficult and the time off work… So that’s the ultimate prize (Participant 1).

Once you get over there, you sort of get known amongst the judges. I guess if Piper A goes over there, they’re expecting that he is good there’s sort of an expectation in that way. If say someone that wasn’t known went over it would be quite hard for someone just to make their name over there, and that’s why it’s good to get over there and live and become known I think (Participant 2).

You need to serve an apprenticeship if you like, in Scotland, go across there, experience it, go in at the bottom rung and do your thing. When I say serve your apprenticeship … I mean you get over there and you are what you are. Don’t expect results straight up, if you’re the best player in New Zealand don’t expect to be the best player in Scotland… ‘get a Scottish track record’, it is about getting your name known, and getting it round the track, and for a fourth or a fifth prize, you might get the nod because you’re a known quantity (Participant 5).

This indicates events having varying cultural prestige and weighting. They award varying amounts of authority to those who succeed in demonstrating authenticity in performance and also demonstrate demands for authentic performance in more prestigious events often being higher and more competitive than less prestigious events. Participants felt that greater levels of cultural authority should be attributed to successful performers within more prestigious
events accordingly and, as such; an authoritative hierarchy corresponds with hierarchically weighted performance contexts. Ultimately, where a performer has succeeded in demonstrating authentic performance within a prestigious event this accomplishment can command greater respect for them than success at a less prestigious event (see Figure 6.7).

Number of performance successes can also have a bearing on the authority attributed to an individual, where it can also be accumulated for each successive demonstration of performance authenticity. A piper’s authority is a reflection of the weighting and number of performance successes they have had over their career. Given that performance is a prerequisite for the interpretation of ‘authenticity’ (see Section 6.2), such interpretations can only be made in hindsight, and therefore a piper’s authority is always historically informed. That is, interpretations can only be made after the fact.

Both the weight and number of authentic performances that have provided a performer with authority in the past, inform the total career authority of that performer in the present. Performers who have had a greater quantity and quality of performance success than others also tend to have greater authenticity attributed to their past performances, and therefore have greater authority in defining ‘authenticity’. However, a performer’s authority is not up to the performer to exude, but rather up to the community to recognise and accept.

These feats can also enable the contributing influences to that performance to receive authority and authenticity. These can include sources and methods for pedagogy and practice transmission, outlined in Section 6.2. Where their influence is known, this can correspond to an increase in authority for individuals who have fulfilled roles as authoritative sources of knowledge regarding authentic performance. Tutors can receive authority when their pupils succeed in performance, as can score collections, audio recordings, and methods for pedagogy and practice. For example, a performer might have used the Binneas is Boreraig repertoire notation (Ross 1959) and the Donald MacLeod instructional recordings (MacLeod 2002) as resources in pedagogy and practice prior to performance, and therefore such resources will be attributed as having authority. Authority can also be attributed to the specific aspects of sound production incorporated into a performance, including instrument sound, technical sound and musical concepts; as well as the material objects and visual behaviour that performers display, such as performance attire, and performance choreography. Furthermore, those who are connected with a performer can also receive authority simply through association. The pupil of a performer who is successful will likely gain some authority from simply being the
perceived inheritor of their tutor’s knowledge. As all cultural participants appear to have some connection to performers in some way (as outlined in Chapter 1 and as discussed in the following Subsection 6.3.2), this implies that all cultural participants can gain authority when pipers succeed in performance. Therefore, as an authorising process, performance has a much wider reaching influence, extending beyond the immediate context of the performance and the performer into the cultural community. While authentic performance is the key informing factor for transmission processes and their content; it is also the key informing factor for how individuals receive, and are attributed as having, authority.

Figure 6.7 A world champion piper from Saint Andrews College Pipe Band, New Zealand, who were winners of the juvenile grade at the World Pipe Band Championships 2013 (top). Such trophies (top and bottom) bear status and embody authority for those that are attributed with possessing them. While piobaireachd and pipe bands have been shown to not directly mix, success at the world pipe band championships for a New Zealand band within any grade provides members of that community with authority. Source: author, Christchurch (18 September 2013).
In a process consistent with authorisation of performers, these interpretations of authority do not rely on such other individuals and factors innately exuding them, rather they rely on the community recognising these individuals and factors as having authority, only evident where it is perceived and interpreted. That is, authority is gained through demonstrating cultural authenticity in performance, is accumulated based upon a piper’s past performances, is given to other individuals and to factors that are attributed as having influenced such performances, and therefore can be seen as the embodiment of authenticity and culture (Moore 2002). As described in Section 6.2, authority then has a flow on effect; it influences interpretations of authenticity in the context of performance, and ultimately influences the definition of cultural authenticity for piobaireachd, particularly given the role of authorities.

### 6.3.2 The Role of Authorities

In the discussion within Section 6.2 and Subsection 6.3.1, some individuals appear to have a major influence over the definition and transmission of authenticity within the community due to their authority. While authorities transmission of ‘authenticity’ in performance has been explored in Section 6.2 how they influence other members of the community, outside of performance, remains unexplored.

Insider understanding reveals that piobaireachd cultural participants are active members of community groups. Cultural participants form groups based around shared values between their members. They can involve as few as two individuals, or can include as many as the entire piobaireachd participant community, while also extending beyond the boundaries of piobaireachd musicking within New Zealand.

Participants were asked to nominate whether they were members of community cultural organisations – official groups for Highland bagpiping and/or piobaireachd. All participants acknowledged membership in some format:

- P and D [Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand], … grading committee as well [Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand - Region A centre re-grading committee], RNZPBA [Royal New Zealand Pipe Bands Association], the pipers club [Region A], the band [Pipe Band A], and the executive committee of the band [Pipe Band A], … CNP [Comunn na Piobaireachd], CPA in Scotland [the Competing Pipers Association] (Participant 1).

- CNP [Comunn na Piobaireachd], Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, Region A Pipers Club, Royal New Zealand Pipe Bands Association through Pipe Band A… in Scotland [member of the Competing Pipers Association] … I’ve asked myself “why have I not joined the Scottish Piobaireachd Society?” because I should be a member (Participant 2).
Participants are involved with a variety of cultural organisations. It is however, important to note that they are not the full representation of organisations involved in transmission processes for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. They are, but a representative sample of the organisations for which *piobaireachd* cultural participants in New Zealand hold membership. A discussion of some of the more ‘influential’ organisations for *piobaireachd* is presented below.

The Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand is the predominant organisation for arranging solo Highland bagpipe competitions within New Zealand, including *piobaireachd* (Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand 2013c, 1). This is primarily due to their self-proclaimed governance and assertive administration of solo Highland bagpipe competition, and this being the most prestigious and ‘traditional’ form of Highland bagpipe performance (Cannon 1988, 134-144; Donaldson 2005, 20-27). This centralised association defers arrangement of competitive events to regional organisations, either regional piping or Scottish cultural organisations affiliated with this group, or a regional branches. These regional organisations arrange solo piping events and allocate resources in accordance with the perceived demand for performance contexts within their respective regions. Other organisations also play a role in arranging *piobaireachd* events in conjunction with the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, such as Comunn na Piobaireachd and The Highland Piping Society of Canterbury, among others (Wilkes 2008, 3; Thompson and Ogilvie 2010, 35). For the purpose of this discussion, the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand officially determine the rules and regulations surrounding performance of *piobaireachd*, a designation they have self-assigned. A detailed discussion regarding the role and activities of this organisation in general is not the focus of this thesis and further information regarding its structure and function can be found in their constitution and bylaws on their website (Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand 2013b).

Comunn na Piobaireachd is an organisation dedicated to “fostering and encouraging the study and playing of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand” (Comunn na Piobaireachd n.d.a). They have a music committee who meet annually and who are charged with deciding and nominating the set list of tunes that pipers need to submit in order to compete at certain prestigious events (Comunn na Piobaireachd 2013a) including the Comunn na Piobaireachd Bronze, Silver, and Gold Medal *piobaireachd* events, as well as the elite Gold Clasp *piobaireachd* event at the annual Hawke’s Bay Easter Highland Games. They provide prizes for these events (Wilkes
2008) and also operate as a social organisation, providing *piobaireachd* related news and current affairs through their website, email service, and newsletters (Eade 2010).

Comunn na Piobaireachd act as a pedagogical institution by organising *piobaireachd* workshops for pipers where authorities give instruction to a group of performers (Eade 2010, 2), and as a source of knowledge regarding *piobaireachd* through the provision of information on their website, such as an index of instructional *piobaireachd* recordings (Comunn na Piobaireachd 2013b). They have nominated representatives involved in groups that provide financial assistance to pipers, such as the William Boyle Memorial Foundation (Comunn na Piobaireachd n.d.b). They collect membership fees from solo pipers and aim to return these funds to the piping community in ways they consider beneficial for the development of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand (Comunn na Piobaireachd n.d.c). As an influential society Comunn na Piobaireachd generate cultural context for *piobaireachd* transmission within New Zealand and are considered advocates for *piobaireachd* participation in New Zealand, offering membership that is not exclusive to performers and providing a community for interested parties (Eade 2010, 1).

The Highland Piping Society of Canterbury is an example of a piper’s social organisation whose raison d'être focuses on “promoting the growth and development of piping within the Canterbury region” (The Highland Piping Society of Canterbury 2013). They arrange informal meetings of pipers as well as competitive solo piping events, sanctioned by the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, predominantly within proximity of the city of Christchurch. They organise a number of these events throughout the year, offering pipers the opportunity to perform formally within competitive contexts. They also arrange for a number of recitals, which are not competitive where a small number of pipers formally present varying styles of Highland bagpipe music, including *piobaireachd*, to an audience of society members (Thompson and Ogilvie 2010, 189). The Highland Piping Society of Canterbury also has nominated representatives on the William Boyle Memorial Foundation committee (Comunn na Piobaireachd n.d.c). As with other organisations, they rely on the collection of membership fees in order to arrange such events and provide such services to the Highland piping community.

Other organisations that can play a role in transmission processes for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand include pipe bands, piping societies and clubs, as well as regional branches of national piping organisations that include the Piping and Dancing Association of New...
Zealand and the Royal New Zealand Pipe Bands Association. Local community cultural heritage groups such as Caledonian, Scottish, Highland, Gaelic, and even Agricultural and Pastoral societies can be involved (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012). Although their interest in piobaireachd is more limited, they provide context for the location of piobaireachd performances within a present day cultural framework that stems from celebrating Scottish cultural heritage within their respective communities.

Pipe bands are the predominant means of transmission for Highland piping within New Zealand:

> The vast majority of our teaching in New Zealand happens through the pipe band system (Participant 5).

Although pipe bands are the predominant means of pedagogical interaction for Highland piping within New Zealand, for most bands piobaireachd is not explicitly a part of their culture:

> I don’t think it fits into bands. When I think about piobaireachd I think a different instrument. It’s a lovely sweet gift that you’re trying to create. They are separate. I don’t think you can link them. There’s a lot of ignorance in pipe bands (Participant 1).

Most performers will receive their piobaireachd instruction outside of the main pipe band framework, from their own select tutor(s). However, many piobaireachd performers are involved with pipe bands, a point which is supported by only one interview participant not being a member of a pipe band, yet still being involved in the pipe band community. Many tutors of piobaireachd are also active members of pipe bands, or have strong associations with particular bands. Intercultural participation is common between solo piping and pipe bands within New Zealand, and thus while pipe bands have a limited relationship with piobaireachd within New Zealand, the relationship is evident nonetheless.

Tutors of solo piping, including piobaireachd, teach outside of pipe band settings, their pupils and these pupil’s supporters comprising a community of individuals bound by the inheritance of the tutor’s knowledge. While piobaireachd tutors will also teach other styles of Highland bagpipe music, the same cannot be said for most Highland piping tutors, the majority of whom will not teach piobaireachd, and as such, there is a greater number of light music teachers than there are piobaireachd teachers. Likewise, the majority of Highland bagpipe performers will not be performers of piobaireachd, yet all piobaireachd performers will by definition be Highland pipers, and be performers of other styles of Highland bagpipe music. Participants 3 and 5 acknowledge this:
Piobaireachd and bands? I think there are some aspects where they flow on so if someone is good at piobaireachd they’re generally pretty good blowers. They’re pretty used to performing and don’t have the performance psychology issues that someone that hasn’t got up and played by themselves has (Participant 3).

Piping is a minority activity in Scotland. The main vehicle that people see is the pipe band. They’ve got like-minded people and people of their own age, both sexes, it’s a bit more relevant. Whereas solo piping, and piobaireachd, you know there’s a lot of time with just you and your tutor. I think that piobaireachd is very much a minority activity (Participant 5).

As piobaireachd pipers perform other styles of Highland bagpipe music, and often interact within a general Highland piping cultural framework, including solo competitions and pipe bands, there is a clear link between Highland bagpiping culture and piobaireachd.

International piobaireachd and Highland piping organisations have no formal jurisdiction in New Zealand (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012), however, interview participants have indicated that they are members of these groups as well as groups within New Zealand. They pay membership fees to these organisations in order to access their resources, to travel to and compete within their events, to be a part of their social environment, to participate within their meetings and activities, and to receive news and updates regarding piping beyond New Zealand. A global relationship exists facilitated by membership within such organisations.

There are a considerable number of agencies, organisations, communities, groups, institutions, and other such clusters of cultural participants. Each operates within a variety of contexts, allowing cultural participants to congregate where shared experiences, affinities, and values act as identifiers of membership. For example, a pipe band is a community of interest based around a group cultural identity and identifiers include performance attire, ensemble heritage, and hailing from a localised area (Milosavljevic 2009, 133-138). On the other hand a piobaireachd tutor may have a number of pupils, which creates a community based around the tutor’s knowledge being imparted and inherited by its members (see Figure 6.8). The Otago Pipers Club is a group comprised of a number of Highland bagpipers and supporters of Highland bagpiping, mostly from the Otago region. Their provision of a performance context for piobaireachd in recitals, their efforts in holding educational community workshops for pipers within Otago, and their advocacy and representation on the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, Otago regional centre committee, provides them with a significant cultural role within their region (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012, 50-51). The Competing Pipers Association is the Scottish organisation that has established standards for solo Highland bagpipe competition within Scotland (Paterson 2009, 224). Interview
participants who have acknowledged their membership within such a group indicate their shared bonds with other members of that group (also supported by Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012, 59). Therefore, *piobaireachd* within New Zealand is influenced by a large and diverse number of groups facilitated through the presence and participation of their members within transmission processes.

![Figure 6.8 A pedagogical community revolving around authority of tutor (on the near left). Source: author, Methven (15 January 2012).](image)

Through transmission processes, cultural participants gain and accumulate authority. As individuals, their differing accumulated authorities allow for juxtapositioning within authoritative hierarchies for their communities, groups and organisations. This is enabled by such clusters comparing and contending each individual's authority, ultimately endorsing or denying one authority over another within the context of their gathering. This politicising of authority refers back to performance and the amount of authority an individual has accumulated according to the community (Gerstin 1998).

Derived from performance, this can clearly be seen within the grading and judging hierarchy of the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand. Pipers are assigned a grade in accordance with their previous performance successes, stemming from both light music and *piobaireachd* events. The most highly ranked of these is the A Grade, followed by B Grade, C Grade, D Grade, and Novice (Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand 2013a, 4). In order to be re-graded into a higher grade, the registered A Grade pipers within each nominated region will be invited to attend a regional re-grading committee meeting where they debate the merits of moving certain lower graded pipers up a grade. There are no
automatic criteria for being re-graded; it is up to those attending the meeting to decide whose grade should be adjusted where pipers with strong evidence of consistent and heavier weighted successes will likely be re-graded. In order to be successful in performance, a piper must demonstrate to the event adjudicator that their performance is the most authentic in terms of its aural and visual display. However, as has been demonstrated, authenticity is subjective. Further, various factors that are outlined in Chapters 4 and 5 affect performances. Judges interpret the quality of a performance based on many factors, including instrument sound, technical sound, musical concepts, performance attire, and performance behaviour. The definition of authenticity for each of these factors differs from individual to individual; therefore, performers may be successful in one event, but unsuccessful in another in accordance with their demonstration of authenticity and interpretation of this by adjudicators.

A Graded pipers are reviewed by their respective Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand regional centre committee, and recommended to the national council of this organisation to become adjudicators. They reviews the recommendation on the merits of the individual’s performance successes in order to determine whether they have demonstrated ample authenticity in their past performances to be capable of determining authenticity within future performances as an adjudicator. Although other politically determined authorising processes for individuals within the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand are evident, their detailed description is beyond the scope of this particular discussion. It is sufficient to acknowledge that further examples relative to this organisation exist (see Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand 2013a; 2013c) and have a bearing on the arrangement of authorities for piobaireachd in New Zealand.

Comunn na Piobaireachd’s music committee is made up of five members who determine the dynamic list of set tunes for the prestigious piobaireachd events held at the annual Hawke’s Bay Easter Highland Games (Eade 2010, 3). These five represent a selection of authorities of piobaireachd performance within New Zealand, some of whom were interview participants within this research. Such a small and exclusive committee demands that members have ample knowledge and understanding of the piobaireachd repertoire in order to be capable of determining the tunes. Demonstrating such authority regarding the piobaireachd repertoire relies on performance as a medium for the embodiment of authenticity where those individuals with the highest prestige have greater authority, and thus their comparative authorities allow them to be considered for involvement with this committee. That said, the committee is relatively small, membership changes infrequently, and there is potential to let
committee members maintain influence over the *piobaireachd* repertoire in New Zealand for a considerable number of years.

This is mirrored in the various other organisations and groups for Highland piping within New Zealand where an individual who is not a current performer can demonstrate authority through their former performance successes. An individual can also demonstrate authority through their associations with performers and transmission processes and therefore there is a putative pathway gaining authority regarding *piobaireachd*. While other examples can be identified they are not described or discussed in this section. It is sufficient to acknowledge that such processes for becoming an authority are based upon the politicisation of authenticity around transmission processes (Gerstin 1998; Keister 2008).

The perceived strength of an individual’s authority within communities may see them undertake varying leadership roles that can include: adjudicators, tutors, elite performers, administrators, officials, scholars, figureheads, managers, musical directors, management committee members, and leading community figures in general. There is a prerequisite for having authority, it must be proven in transmission processes and recognised by others. Leadership roles ultimately see some individuals assume culture-bearing positions within varying organisations (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012, 58), which can be viewed as groupings, clusters, ‘institutions’ (Cohen 2009), ‘schools’ (Keister 2008), but can ultimately be defined as ‘communities’ (Anderson 1983). These communities not only provide context for transmission and authorisation processes, their very existence fosters camaraderie and companionship amongst their members, and contributes to the development of cultural identity (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012). Authorisation processes facilitate an individual’s authority within a community, allowing them to hold some influence over others, and thus not all members of a community will have equal standing.

6.3.3 The Influence of Authorities
Gaining cultural authority allows individuals to assume leadership positions in groups and organisations associated with *piobaireachd*, principal agencies for the cultural maintenance of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. Once an individual has become established as a leader of a group, they will inevitably influence how the group functions, most commonly assuming positions as sources of information, decision makers, or role models. This may include serving on the music committee of Comunn na Piobaireachd, deciding which tunes are to be selected for the set lists for forthcoming prestigious *piobaireachd* events at the Hawke’s Bay
Highland Games. Here, individuals consider the extant tunes from the *piobaireachd* repertoire and ultimately select 8 tunes for the Clasp event, 8 different tunes for the Gold medal event, and a further 6 different tunes for the Silver medal event. The tune content of these lists change annually, arranged by the music committee in order of interpreted difficulty, where Silver Medal tunes are considered more ‘basic’ in their musical concepts than Gold Medal tunes, which are in turn more basic than Clasp tunes. Committee members debate the merits of certain tunes and ultimately decide on a final list. As individuals, their differing understandings of repertoire allow them to contribute to the decision making process. Such interpretations of the repertoire are informed by the individuals’ differing experiences within transmission processes over the course of their various careers for both *piobaireachd* and Highland piping in general.

A leadership position can also include being the tutor of several Highland bagpipe pupils, where an individual will impart their own inherited and interpreted understanding of authenticity. Pupils intending to compete in the *piobaireachd* events at the Hawke’s Bay Highland Games will be required to learn tunes from the set lists for these events in order to compete. Tutors will identify the tunes on the list with which they are familiar, and then likely advise their pupils to select tunes from this preferred and refined list. Tutors will have an impact on the repertoire of their pupil, prior to formally teaching them musical concepts where they instruct the pupil regarding performance using their own understanding of how a tune should be performed, and how pedagogy and practice should be undertaken. This is informed by the tutor’s own understanding gained throughout the course of their career and in this way a tutor passes on their unique and individualised knowledge of the *piobaireachd* repertoire, which is itself subject to the influence of other groups, such as Comunn na Piobaireachd.

A leadership position may also include being a performer, where an individual will formally present and demonstrate their knowledge of authentic performance to an audience. Pipers competing in the Gold Medal *piobaireachd* event at the Hawke’s Bay Highland Games will be required to submit to the event organisers a selection of 3 tunes from the nominated 8, from which one will be selected by the judges of the event immediately prior to performance (Wilkes 2008). However, these 3 tunes will be influenced by the pedagogical and practice transmission the performer has been involved in prior to performance, including the pedagogical content delivered by their tutor. Further, the selection of this tune by the judges also reflects upon their repertoire preference at the time. This performance will be given in
front of others, including judges, who will then determine the merits and weaknesses of the performance in terms of its demonstration of cultural authenticity and relies on participant’s understanding of cultural authenticity, as informed by transmission processes. Should this performance be chosen as the winning performance, the judges will have selected it in accordance with their own unique definitions of cultural authenticity, assuming no other motives are involved. In this context the successful performer can become the embodiment of cultural authenticity, as determined by the event judges. This creates a contextual standard by which others will measure and gain further understandings of cultural authenticity that is influenced: by a music committee who debate and agree upon tune lists; by tutors who have individualised understandings of how tunes should be performed; by performers who will perform a tune differently each and every time they perform; by judges who determine the best performance on the basis of their individual understandings of cultural authenticity; and by the individual audience members; all of whom interpret varying aspects of performance as being authentic or not.

These influences have been shown to flow from authoritative individuals down through to those who aspire to succeed, and who are most impressionable. These transmission processes are central for providing an understanding of cultural authenticity, and are subject to certain individual’s influence as a result of intrinsic politicisation, socially practiced perceptions of authority, and individually held understandings of authenticity. Not all cultural participants are equal, and ultimately some have more influence over how culture is defined than others.

Through success in performance individuals gain authority and influence, allowing them to acquire a political footing within groups and organisations. This grants them capacity to determine how authenticity may be defined by influencing the formal and informal standards for performance. This could include how instruments should sound, how performers should dress, what tunes need be nominated by a piper in order to perform in certain events, what information pupils need be given in order to perform well, and, what experience and abilities tutors should have in order to impart ‘authentic’ performance. Authorities, both deliberately and inadvertently, set standards for what constitutes authentic performance for the communities of *piobaireachd* participants within New Zealand (Moore 2002). These standards are not objective, and can be interpreted in various ways by individuals. For *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, there appears to be a balance between socially exemplified demonstrations, and individually understood definitions, of authenticity.
Groups can also be considered contestants for authority within the *piobaireachd* community – as facilitated through the success of their members in cultural performance. They appear to have a significant influence over the transmission of *piobaireachd* to their members, where leaders disseminate knowledge to group members. They inform, influence and shape their members’ definitions of cultural authenticity and thus groups have a significant interest in the outcome of their members’ performance. In such encounters, groups socially “spar” through demonstrations and interpretations of authenticity as they compete for the distribution of authority within the *piobaireachd* performance community. Such authorisation processes for groups are considered complex, in a state of competitive flux, where group members seek the most authentic examples of transmission, providing them with social capital (Moore 2002). This depicts a social structure, where performance success drives transmission processes, yet is also subject to the influence of both individuals and communities, who have interests in the outcomes of authorisation.

Sociological and anthropological theory argues that communities and their hierarchies revolve around the management and economy of ‘knowledge’ (Wenger *et al.* 2002, 6-10). Cultural knowledge for communities can be shared across such barriers as place (geography), interest (practice), and identity (communion) (Morris and Gilchrist 2011, 3). While communities are groups to which members feel a sense of belonging, such a sense is understood to be subjective and interpretive, and therefore imagined and constructed (Anderson 1983). Extending this concept of imagining communities beyond Anderson’s (1983) analysis of the nation, this discussion considers that *piobaireachd* communities can be analysed as ‘imagined’ around concepts, place, interest, and identity. However, it is necessary to note that for participants within such groups, the communities to which they belong are highly valued, based upon sacrosanct social capital. Therefore, any discussion should consider an ethnocentric perspective of community to understand social order, however that may be defined. As this research is ultimately ethnographic it can potentially generate an intimate and unfavourable critique of *piobaireachd* for cultural participants and therefore, such an analysis requires caution, sensitivity and discretion in the interests of cultural stakeholders.

Communities play a vital role in cultural administration and organisation for *piobaireachd*, both within New Zealand and abroad. One interview participant in particular provided in-depth discussion in support of this:

Yeah they have a big part to play. I think their mission statement is to promote piping or something like that. They’ve got a heavy involvement in the competing scene over there. So yeah every piper applies to them every year for a CPA grade … and then they give
everyone a grading, which can be a hard task trying to slot 60 or 70 pipers into a grading of A, B, and C, and then they make recommendations to the Northern Meeting and Oban about the pipers that are in form and those that aren’t. They don’t do the grading at the big competitions, CPA qualifies you for those events…. But New Zealand P and D, they sort of do the same, they grade pipers but in a little bit less structured way… Some competitions are a wee bit disorganised, that might be in Scotland or that might be here, it doesn’t matter who’s organising them. Generally here in New Zealand we’re ok I think, I haven’t had any real bad experiences in terms of competing and competition organising (Participant 3).

Likewise, participants also indicated that less formal clusters of individuals could also be important. Participant 4 in particular refers to the dyadic relationship between individuals with differing authority:

And it was really just Tutor A unveiling things. Tutor A was very much down the line of “here’s the musical phrase and you can play it out how you want but here’s the theme note that we’re after” and this basically gave me the license to do whatever I wanted. So all of a sudden it became much clearer. I know from Tutor A’s end it wasn’t until he went to Bob Brown that piobaireachd was presented to him that way … Tutor A used to go on about how the light just sort of went on when he went up to Bob Brown and the tune was presented in a different way. And certainly from my end the fact that Authority X is out of the same stable. Authority X’s had a huge influence from obviously Brown and Nicol, but obviously Tutor A as well, and Authority Y. So they all sort of, fortunately, talk the same language. It seemed to uncomplicate things a hell of a lot rather than this big mystery of piobaireachd (Participant 4).

Communities can range from nationwide agencies, such as the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, and the Competing Pipers Association within Scotland, to the small-scale dyadic relationships between individuals engaged in pedagogy. In all cases, interview participants referred to the authoritative hierarchy within these communities as being crucial to transmission processes. Such hierarchy ultimately entails power relationships being played out between members, where decisions relating to the management of knowledge and therefore the administration of cultural practices fall to those with the greatest cultural authority.

Communities exist within other communities as nested and overlapping social constructs (Porter et al. 2009, 1088; Balcan and Liang 2013, 1). Individuals within communities hold differing positions where membership is not equal among all who comprise the group, demanding a hierarchical social arrangement (Plummer 2010, 155). If the individuals who participate in piobaireachd within New Zealand can be considered a community, then they exist within the Highland piping community in New Zealand. If music committee members of Comumn na Piobaireachd can be considered a community, then they exist within the greater Comunn na Piobaireachd membership community. If a tutor and one of his or her pupils can be considered a dyadic community, then he or she exists within a pedagogical community
revolving around the tutor. The role of the individual, as an authority, a source of knowledge and an influence; within such overlapping, varied and imagined communities related to *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, is vital for the transmission of culture, and the authorisation of others as further influences over transmission. This self-fulfilling authorisation for leading performers, enables ‘authenticity’ to be considered ‘maintained’ for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand over the course of generations. Yet such a consideration contradicts the dynamics of changing authoritative hierarchies and the varying influences of the individual.

![Pipers interacting at a festival.](image)

*Figure 6.9 Pipers interacting at a festival. Behind such interaction, the overlapping, contact and contesting of authenticity and authority occurs for these individuals and their respective communities. Source: author, Hastings (8 April 2012).*

Performance enables politicisation, where community leaders and cultural participants select the performances that best represent what they understand to culturally authentic. Here a select few consider that they are ‘maintaining’ culture by awarding, and making leaders of, those who can demonstrate authenticity. This allows not only the performer, but also those who have had an influencing role on their performance success, to be given authority. Such individuals act as leaders, influencing and informing transmission processes and taking part in cultural administration, maintenance, and decision-making (Gerstin 1998; Keister 2008).

Performance also acts as a status awarding activity where success not only equates to authority for the performer, but also for those within the performer's communities. In this sense performance allows communities to negotiate hierarchies of individuals and groups in accordance with both socially practiced, and individually understood definitions of cultural
authenticity (Moore 2002; see Figure 6.9). Such politicising is inevitable where communities come into contact, overlap, and dispute the definition of authenticity. Therefore, performance is a crucial transmission process that ultimately allows for culture to be contested, negotiated, and defined within a dynamic and at times contentious social system based upon the demonstration and interpretation of authenticity in musical performance (Moore 2002).

6.3.4 Summary
The role of individuals and groups for piobaireachd and its transmission in New Zealand and the authorisation processes for groups and individuals reveal a complex social system, where performance success ultimately drives transmission processes, but where that success is subject to the influence of individuals and communities. Through performance, communities play out authorisation processes that see certain individuals, their beliefs, and their preferences being considered as the embodiment of cultural authenticity. This gives authority to individuals and allows them to influence the ways in which culture is defined within their communities.

The existence of Comunn na Piobaireachd indicates the importance of piobaireachd to the Highland piping community. There is no ‘Comunn na Ceòl Beag’ (light music society) within New Zealand, and thus the preservation of authentic piobaireachd cultural practices appears to have been of sufficient concern to lead to the establishment of this organisation in the past. Further, the authority of those who are leading members of Comunn na Piobaireachd extends beyond piobaireachd, often including leaders of other styles of Highland bagpiping in New Zealand. This community's existence, its roles, and the density of authority within its ranks are a tribute to the importance and prestige embedded in piobaireachd performance.

Authority awarded to individuals for success in piobaireachd performance is considerable and demonstrates that piobaireachd performance is highly valued as a means for not only demonstrating Highland piping cultural authenticity, and asserting authority and status. If a performer is an authority on piobaireachd, they will likely be an authority of other Highland bagpipe performance. In this manner, piobaireachd can not only be seen as a subculture of Highland piping in New Zealand but, also in a more critical light, as a political vehicle where performance success awards cultural participants with a stronger footing in Highland piping in general. Hence, it appears that piobaireachd in New Zealand is a result of influencing
factors from both the individual participant and collective communities of participants on a contextual basis.

As an understanding of the cultural past, ‘authenticity’ and similar concepts are central to the authorisation process, where individuals who are successful can be considered to embody such concepts. The dynamic nature of authorisation processes is reliant on performance success creating power play between individuals and communities, where such concepts of the cultural past are clearly subjective and interpretive in their definition. Their demonstration and interpretation in performance allows for the contention and contesting of authority, influence and standing within Highland piping communities linked to *piobaireachd*, and influences the transmission processes for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. As a result, community leaders determine how the cultural past is practiced in the cultural present. These individuals, both inadvertently and deliberately politicise *piobaireachd* in New Zealand on the basis of ‘preserving’ and ‘maintaining’ cultural authenticity. However, this section has shown authenticity to be a social construct that is both collectively practiced and individually understood, and is disseminated throughout communities through hierarchical arrangements of authority. Therefore, *piobaireachd* appears to exist on the cusp of the cultural present and the cultural past. A more detailed analysis of this observation will be presented in Section 6.5.

The findings presented here support the work of Gerstin (1998), Keister (2008) as well as Donaghy (2011) for the socio-political arrangement of the past in the present through transmission processes within musical cultures. The informing and influencing sources for such arrangement however have not specifically been addressed within this section. While interview participants did mention Scotland particularly as a place that factored into their discussion of groups and individuals, they often jumped between national contexts without any hesitation. This appears to belie a complex transcultural relationship for *piobaireachd* communities operating on varying bases; such as geography, interest and identity. What is evident is that transcultural transmission is facilitated through authorisation processes that allow certain individuals to manage knowledge and definitions of cultural authenticity for *piobaireachd* communities within New Zealand. The following sections address current and past transcultural flow in order to further understand the informing and influencing factors within New Zealand. As we do not yet know what parts both contemporary and historical transcultural influences have played in shaping *piobaireachd* within New Zealand today.
6.4 Transcultural Flows

In their responses interview participants’ referred constantly to Scotland. Such an observation is expected when such individuals are discussing music with origins in Scotland. However, interview participants were not necessarily discussing origins, rather contemporary relations between piobaireachd in New Zealand, and in Scotland. The work of cultural anthropologists such as Appadurai (1990), Hannerz (1996) and Clifford (1997) argue that such global relations can be understood within a framework that suggests the flow of cultural capital over the boundaries of community. These global cultural flows can be considered through transculturalism, and through the cultural levels at which music operates (Kartomi 1981; Appadurai 1990, 296; Slobin 1993). Scott-Maxwell (2008) argues that such transculturalism in music reflects the global and the local influences that contribute to its process, and can be found in the musical product. Meanwhile, Duffy (1999) contends that not only does music represent the places it comes from; it also represents and reflects the places and spaces it is heard within.

Building on the previous section, Wagner (1981) argues that people contour their cultures through influencing orthodox symbols, generating new values, in a similar manner to what Lévi-Strauss (1966) coined as ‘bricolage’. Transcultural flow is the driver of enquiry within this section. The comparison of piobaireachd sound, materials, visual displays, cultural transmission, and authorisation within New Zealand and Scotland is the initial focus of the investigation. Interview participants were asked specifically about their experiences and perspectives regarding piobaireachd in Scotland and how that relates to piobaireachd in New Zealand.

Often participants would begin discussing piobaireachd in Scotland without being directly asked to, referring to performance contexts, authoritative figures, aspirations and past experiences. These responses allowed for enquiry regarding Scotland as a cultural domain in which interview participants interacted, participated, and arranged themselves and their New Zealand communities. Such an observation implies a dependency on a relationship with Scotland for cultural participants within New Zealand. An exploration of such a relationship follows, beginning with a discussion of interview participants’ perceptions of Scotland, an analysis of participants’ understanding of transcultural interactions, and an exploration of explicit comparisons between piobaireachd in Scotland and New Zealand.
6.4.1 Perceptions of ‘Scotland’

Participants were asked to reflect on their perceptions of Scotland as an influencing factor, and the role of Scotland for piobaireachd within New Zealand. Responses developed following a relatively organic conversation about such influences. Many participants chose to identify Scotland as the home of Highland piping:

The tradition is there in Scotland, it’s where the pipes developed and Scotland’s the main place for piping. So that’s why I think all pipers go to Scotland. It’s the home of it, it’s like us with our rugby. They’ve got a lot of pipers and stuff … that’s probably why (Participant 3).

It’s the home of it. Just to be exposed to the sheer numbers of people playing. There’s different styles. The contact to make friendships and acquaintances with other pipers from all parts of the world. It’s a must I reckon (Participant 4).

Scotland’s where the home of piping is and the home of pipe bands, that’s where home is. The World Pipe Band Championships are in Scotland… Much as we’ve got our Clasp and Gold Medal competitions its not the same as Oban and Inverness, the Glenfiddich, the Silver Chanter or London (Participant 5).

There was an expectation for such responses given that Scotland is universally accepted as the country of origin for Highland piping culture, where the instrument was originally developed to perform piobaireachd within the Scottish Highlands (Cannon 1988, 46; Cheape 2008, 42; Dickson 2009a, 1). Piobaireachd is therefore identified as having its ‘home’ in Scotland.

As well as this, interview participants also considered piobaireachd in Scotland to differ from piobaireachd in New Zealand. Participant’s 3 and 4 above mention the quantity of Highland pipers being important. A further example includes:

Obviously there’s a lot more of them, the Scots. It’s pretty tough going and you’re competing in competitions that feature 20 or 30 great pipers that all want to win it. It could easily go any of 30 ways, every competition … comes down to small wee things (Participant 3).

Participants responded that there are considerably more Highland pipers in general, more solo pipers, and more piobaireachd performers in Scotland than in New Zealand. They considered this to be a significant factor in determining the importance of Scotland. Participants also indicated that there were differences in performance contexts between Scotland and New Zealand:

It’s the culture there … quite a few highland games with plenty of things happening, field events, highland dancing which is a good attraction and a good spectacle (Participant 3).

Note in particular Participant 3’s reference to Highland games, which are considered to be one of the original performance contexts for competitive Highland bagpipe performances (Collinson 1975, 180; Cannon 1988, 134; Donaldson 2005, 20). Given the role of the
Highland games in fostering the growth of competitive Highland piping, such performance contexts are the original format for competitive performances. Some interview participants felt that this meant performance opportunities in performance in Scotland were more valuable than those within New Zealand. The competition ‘season’ was also a defining feature for Highland piping in Scotland:

[I’d perform in New Zealand] probably 2 or 3 times [annually]. You get Hastings and if you’re getting into full mode for Scotland then obviously you’re looking at the build up for that. Hastings comes into play. Dunedin is well timed for Scotland. Whereas for Scotland, a lot of the hard work’s done over winter. So come summer everyone’s banging it every weekend. And then will you go to these games or these games (Participant 4).

Not only is the competition season important, so too are a greater frequency of performance opportunities as a defining feature of piping within Scotland. This greater number of performance contexts allowed for a wider audience for piobaireachd within Scotland than in New Zealand:

I think that there is a wider audience and a bigger following of piobaireachd in Scotland… certainly celebrating and taking piping in general to a far wider audience … you’ve got your bands and your folk music and you’ve also got a lot of piobaireachd recitals through Piping Live, it’s being sold out there (Participant 4).

I think one of the huge advantages Scotland’s is the environment. It’s really hard, and I struggle here for a piping environment to motivate me. So you’ve got to create that environment [in New Zealand] yourself. But we don’t have a competition season like they do in Scotland, they’ve got an on season and an off season if you’d like, so once you’ve done London in November you’ve really got a hiatus until May (Participant 5).

The Scottish season allows pipers to focus their musicking in waves, from pedagogy over winter, to performance over summer and offers pipers a greater variety of performance opportunities than those available within New Zealand:

And the frequency of competitions, I played at 24 or 25 competitions in that year [2009], which, compared to here it’s only Dunedin, Christchurch, Hastings, Waipu, Turakina, and Adelaide. What’s that? 6? … The cost of getting round to them all here is quite high. Whereas in Scotland there’s probably only one competition I flew to and that was the London competition, everything else you drove to or you took a ferry (Participant 7).

In Scotland, a concentration of performance opportunities contrasts significantly with the limited number of opportunities provided within New Zealand. The convenience of proximity for performance contexts within Scotland compared with New Zealand affords pipers the capacity to easily commute from the urban centres within Scotland to the venues for performance.

Interview participants also indicated that performance contexts within Scotland were different to those in New Zealand:
Oban and Inverness, the Glenfiddich, the Silver Chanter and London. Getting the world’s 10 best players turning up to a competition in New Zealand that competition would have great standing. The USA has the Metro Cup, the GS McLellan thing but I don’t think they’ve got the same merit as the major Scottish competitions. You’re rubbing shoulders with the best in the business… international competition …it’s about ‘who’s the best in the world’ (Participant 5).

Such a quote illustrates the prestige of performance contexts in Scotland in comparison to those in New Zealand. Interview participants saw success in performance contexts in Scotland as the international pinnacle of solo Highland bagpiping and indicated this to be more prestigious than performance contexts within New Zealand. This quote also indicates the standing of prestigious competitions on an international scale, drawing the world’s best solo Highland bagpipers to Scotland. Other interview participants repeated this:

We’ve got a few in New Zealand who are competitive, a good wee group of 5 or 6 top players that compete over on the big stages overseas. Obviously there’s a lot more Scots. It’s pretty tough going when you’re competing in competitions that feature 20 or 30 great pipers. In Scotland you come across quite a few Scots and Irish and there’s a few Frenchies, there’s a few Americans and Canadians as well, they’re all there in Scotland as well (Participant 3).

Such a quote not only shows that these competitions draw the best pipers from Scotland and New Zealand, they also draw the best pipers from around the world. Each performer attempts to best each other through giving authentic performance in pursuit of valuable and revered prizes. Participant 7 best articulated such a difference:

There’s just so many people, at such a high level [in Scotland], and you just don’t get that depth here [in New Zealand] at all (Participant 7).

Interviews were replete with such comparisons between New Zealand and Scotland leading these participants to determine that Scotland is the authentic home of Highland piping in general and that to be the best in the world, you have to beat the best in the world:

It’s like Igloos to Greenland. That’s where it came from and that’s where it’s set and you’re never really going to take it out of Scotland. Inverness and Oban and the Glenfiddich [invitational competition] are the pinnacle of piping, so that’s what we’re going to have to accept. It’s a bit unfortunate it’s on the other side of the world but that’s where the best competition is (Participant 8).

This indicates the importance of performance contexts within Scotland as centres of the Highland piping world, where standards are set and where the best performers in the world gravitate in order to prove themselves as top performers. McKerrell (2005) also points out such a view in comparing competitive Highland piping contexts around the world to those within Scotland:

The majority of very good Canadian players still travel annually to Scotland to compete, as do New Zealanders, Americans and Australians. Interestingly, Scottish players generally do not travel to other countries to compete at their own expense …because the
Scottish players feel that the most prestigious competitions are at home and … do not feel the need to travel. This has the effect of maintaining the position of the major Scottish events (Oban and Inverness in particular) as the most prestigious competitions anywhere in the world (McKerrell 2005, 27).

Interview participants saw Scotland as an authentic domain for piping that superseded New Zealand as an authentic performance context. Comparisons by interview participants offered consistent similarities and differences between Highland piping in Scotland and New Zealand. Scotland is the home of Highland piping - New Zealand is not. Highland piping originated in Scotland - not in New Zealand. There is a longer history of Highland piping in Scotland than in New Zealand. There is greater cultural heritage for Highland piping in Scotland than in New Zealand. There is greater cultural context for Highland piping in Scotland than in New Zealand. There are more performance opportunities in Scotland than in New Zealand. There are a greater number of performance contexts in Scotland than in New Zealand, and these are also of greater international prestige. There are a greater number of performers in Scotland than in New Zealand, and these are generally of greater quality. Participants also indicated that there was a greater quantity and quality of authorities, transmission processes, and cultural participants for *piobaireachd* in Scotland than in New Zealand. Overall, interview responses indicated that there was a greater place for Highland piping and *piobaireachd* within society in Scotland, and that this often meant a stronger following and participation in *piobaireachd* performances.

This likely relates to the cultural context for Highland piping in Scotland. *Piobaireachd* is understood as having emerged and functioned within Highland society alongside the Highland bagpipe. As a result it was inevitably a part of Gaelic culture that explains the widespread use of Gaelic language in Highland bagpipe and *piobaireachd* terminology Gaelic language (MacDonald 1995; Cheape 2009, 97-126). Cultural participants view these as indigenous to Scotland. These cultural and linguistic connections suggest a level of indigeneity for *piobaireachd* and Highland bagpiping relative to Scotland, while on the other hand determine that New Zealand cannot be ‘homeland’ to either.

These responses provide a wealth of comparative reflections between *piobaireachd* in New Zealand and Scotland. They are particularly telling for how participants view Scotland as the cultural motherland or homeland, a domain of boundless and intrinsic cultural authenticity, authority, and prestige, entrenched in internationally practiced Highland bagpipe history. New Zealand is viewed as a cultural colony, a diasporic community, and a domain of limited cultural authenticity, authority, and prestige, with a minor role to play in Highland bagpipe
history. Such an observation is reflected by existing scholarly work that has made Highland piping within Scotland a major focus, but has offered little discussion of Highland piping beyond Scotland.

These comparisons between Scotland and New Zealand appear to be entrenched in local cultural knowledge within the Highland bagpiping community in New Zealand:

I guess a part of it was again probably Piper X, being a reasonable influence. Him going to Scotland and hearing stories about it [his experience]. 2000 was my first trip ... I went for most of August and played at a few competitions and also went to Oban and listened to the Argyllshire gathering and up to Skye to listen to the tunes there (Participant 7).

Placing Highland piping within Scotland on a pedestal is common within both competitive solo piping, and pipe bands in New Zealand where, in order to be the best you can be, you need to learn from the best tutors in the world, challenge the best performers in the world, and perform within the best performance contexts in the world – all of which are considered to be in Scotland. This view of Highland piping in Scotland through the eyes of authoritative individuals within New Zealand, and the dissemination of knowledge by these individuals, means that such views are widely held by cultural participants. Such a perception of Scotland as the most revered and valued domain for Highland piping inspires and encourages Highland pipers within New Zealand to formally interact with Highland piping in Scotland.

Despite this, Highland piping is an accepted cultural practice in New Zealand with cultural components such as sound, material and visual culture, transmission processes, and local authorities identified. Therefore, New Zealand is also a home for Highland piping. This indicates a paradox regarding the cultural home for New Zealand pipers, that while Highland piping in Scotland is considered more culturally authentic, New Zealand is the place they hail from and where they call ‘home’. Such a dichotomy of authenticity and origin is discussed further in the following subsections.

6.4.2 Transcultural Interaction
The prestigious cultural context for Highland piping and piobaireachd in Scotland inspires New Zealand pipers to contact, interact, and participate within Highland piping in Scotland. Participants described a number of reasons for such interaction:

People can actually make money out of piping [in Scotland]... Being able to do the teaching allows you time to make the commitment to go... I’m teaching the band and say “well actually I’m going to take three weeks to go to Scotland”, and ok I don’t get paid but at least I can call the shots. It’s finding the time. Whereas a lot of [Scottish] pipers have jobs teaching pipes in schools ... that whole introducing piping into schools and
guys like Stuart Liddell teaching wee kids … there’s so much good teaching going on (Participant 2).

The whole thing, it is motivating, just being part of it and hearing the tunes and coming away, and thinking ‘that’s great’ you know…. It’s the home of it. To be exposed to the sheer numbers of people playing over there. There’s the different styles, the contact to make friendships and acquaintances from all around the world. To pick up influences for further down the track… it’s a must I reckon (Participant 4).

I think mainly because Scotland’s where the home of piping is and the home of pipe bands … The World Pipe Band Championships are in Scotland. We had Piper A when I was being brought up and Piper B in the heyday and Piper C and Piper D, and people ahead of me like Piper E and Piper F, sort of 5 or 10 years older than me … it’s good to have those [local] role models and think ‘ok they’ve gone to Scotland, they’ve done this, they’ve done that, I want to do that too’. So that sort of helps (Participant 5).

Such quotes demonstrate a variety of reasons for interacting with Scotland, predominantly stemming from interview participants seeking to further their careers as performers and authorities. A summary of such motivation includes: the opportunity for them to participate in, experience and understand ‘home’ and its purer definitions of cultural authenticity; the chance to further develop their piping careers beyond the limitations of Highland piping in New Zealand; to expand their repertoire and gain a more authentic understanding of how to perform it than they could through transmission processes isolated to New Zealand; the opportunity to make connections, associations and to network for future cultural interaction; and to be legendary performers in their own right as inspired by the inspirational pipers of generations before them.

These motivations encourage New Zealand pipers to make contacts and associations with individuals and their communities in Scotland in order to commit to either going there to participate in performance, and/or for engaging in formal learning from authorities within Scotland. Local organisations within New Zealand are supportive of such interaction, especially groups such as the William Boyle Memorial Foundation who provides funding for New Zealanders in order to cover travel costs, living costs, tuition costs, or any other costs related to travelling to, and participating within Highland piping in, Scotland (Thompson and Ogilvie 2010, 75-76). This means that within any given year a small group of pipers will travel to Scotland to perform in the competition circuit. The number of New Zealanders competing in Highland games in Scotland would never exceed 10 pipers, who travel to compete during the summer months. Further, as of writing this research, a small group of New Zealanders (approximately 4) live in Scotland on a more permanent basis in order to be participants within Highland piping at ‘home’. Such interaction not only involves performance, it also includes pedagogy, especially for those that are in Scotland during the
winter months. McKerrell offers a breakdown of the nationality of competitive pipers in Scotland, including New Zealanders (McKerrell 2011a, 168).

As all individuals have been shown to have connections and associations to other individuals within communities, participation in transmission processes in Scotland creates ‘contact zones’ between piobaireachd cultures and allows cultural participants to measure and compare the qualities of their respective cultures (Pratt 1991; Bendrups 2008). Interview participants were asked whether pipers represented New Zealand when in Scotland:

Yeah. I think Kiwis always have, but it’s been very few. I think Piper A went to Scotland in the 70s or 80s and then you’ve got Piper B and Piper C who have started making inroads there. And you sort of felt proud that they were representing New Zealand, not just themselves. And then in recent years Piper D, Piper E, myself. And now the likes of Piper F, Piper G, and Piper H over there. So you get this sort of following which I think has always been the plan, to get Kiwis to Scotland. And when they’re there they do represent New Zealand, not just themselves… they definitely see me as a Kiwi (Participant 1).

New Zealand pipers in Scotland can represent New Zealand Highland piping, enacted in terms of pride and patriotism. Such responses called for further enquiry regarding this representation and whether there were any national qualities that stood out for New Zealand pipers in Scotland:

I think Kiwi pipers are world renowned now, I think they’ve got a really good reputation and it probably comes down from the Piper As, Piper Bs, Piper Cs etcetera. We produce these quality players and they win big prizes. We’ve got 5 or 6 Gold Medals [see Table 6.1]. You know that’s something to be proud of. Kiwis do seem to have a lot of respect in Scotland. They seem to think we keep producing these quality players (Participant 1).

We’re on the same page I think. You know there’s not a dramatic contrast from what the Scots are doing compared with what we’re doing… we’ve got a few here that are competitive, a good wee group of 5 or 6 top players here that compete over on the big stages overseas. We’ve got a good few New Zealanders who can mix it as well… a lot of pipers that go to Scotland are pretty focused, so that’s maybe why a lot of Kiwis do well, we don’t go over there half assed, we go hard and get some results because of that (Participant 3).

The Canadians feature quite prominently at the Gold Medal level, less so at the Clasp level than the Kiwis... At the highest level I’d say we’re on a par with Scotland. They’ve got a shedload more people at the highest level than we do, we’ve got a much smaller crew here. I mean you can name them on one hand. Where they are superior to us I think is the number of junior players that start piobaireachd at an earlier age (Participant 5).

Such responses indicate that the identity of New Zealand pipers performing within in Scotland lies not in the differences between New Zealand pipers and Scottish pipers, but rather, in their distinct sameness. Given the success of New Zealand performers within performance contexts in Scotland since the 1950s (Table 6.1), there exists ample evidence to suggest that New Zealand pipers do perform well in Scotland, and are seen as good
performers. However, interview participants acknowledged this didn’t necessarily mean that the quality of a few performers in New Zealand equated to *piobaireachd* in New Zealand being on the same level as that within Scotland. Therefore participants not only understand that there are differences between *piobaireachd* in New Zealand and Scotland, but that also there are consistent standards across these differing *piobaireachd* cultures and their boundaries.

Cultural participants in New Zealand look towards Scotland as a cultural home, and yet understand New Zealand to be their actual home, where clear differences and similarities between exist. Given this, the contact between piping cultures appears to be a key area for investigating localisation of cultural authenticity. Interview participants were queried regarding why New Zealand pipers in Scotland tend to perform so well:

> If someone’s making a commitment to go to Scotland, they’re going pretty well prepared. The dollars are a lot higher [for New Zealanders] so generally a lot of good preparation can be done pretty easily in New Zealand to be able to hit the boards running over there. Piper A and those guys are always going well prepared. If you’re spending $5000 - $10,000 to go and compete, you’re going to be giving it your best shot really (Participant 4).

The performance success of New Zealanders in Scotland is resultant from a variety of factors. Predominantly the distance and cost of getting to Scotland means that New Zealand performers undertake considerable preparation prior to travelling to Scotland, and whilst there utilise their time in order to perform as authentically as possible within context. Performers work hard in order to qualify to compete in Scotland, and continued to work hard due to their responsibilities, pressures, and commitments. While interview participants feel that Highland piping in general differs between New Zealand and Scotland, definitions of cultural authenticity for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand are of a similar standard. To interview participants, this means that New Zealand performers strive for the same idealistic standards as Scottish performers.

Success in prestigious performance contexts in Scotland is the pinnacle of career achievements for solo Highland pipers. However, interview participants acknowledged that being successful was not just a matter of performing well, it was also dependent on how well your performance was received, requiring being accepted as a peer of Scotland’s best pipers, a major barrier to success. It was in their best interests to establish a social footing within the competitive solo piping community in Scotland in order to be in good standing for being judged ‘authentic’. Such an accomplishment takes time, and thus pipers need to spend
considerable duration taking part in transmission and authorisation processes in Scotland in order to acquire such status:

You need to serve an apprenticeship if you like, in Scotland. I mean you get over there and you are what you are, put yourself on the platform and see what happens. If you’re the best player in New Zealand don’t expect to be the best player in Scotland. You’ve also got a bench [of judges] who don’t know who this player is so you’re written off before you start. And there’s certainly those judges over there. You trial around the games and eventually some of those lesser judges will sort of recognise you, ‘you were at such and such games’, they do the games circuit as well as everyone else. [They’ll think] ‘heard them play there, they’re playing better now than they were there, [therefore] deserves a prize’. And you know that’s probably just the way it is (Participant 5).

Such bias amongst the solo Highland piping community in Scotland in determining authentic performances in competition in Scotland indicates that New Zealand performers need to spend considerable time becoming socially acquainted. This demands they return repeatedly to participate in Scotland in order to gain some level of sociocultural status as limited authority prior to their performances being considered culturally authentic. Such authority may be gained through repeated interaction in transmission and authorisation in Scotland. Success in performance is both a matter of hard work and luck for New Zealand performers, who appear to be at a disadvantage due to difficulties associated with the disjuncture between cultural and actual homes.

A number of elite New Zealand pipers will travel to Scotland, as a pilgrimage in order to gain greater cultural experience than they feel is available within New Zealand. They engage in transmission and take part in resultant authorisation from the outcome of performance participation. Pilgrimages take considerable time to see fruition, demand considerable costs in terms of finances, time and commitment, and see New Zealanders aim for a social progression through solo piping culture within Scotland. These pilgrimages ultimately result in participants gaining a ‘better’ understanding of the definition of cultural authenticity for Highland piping and *piobaireachd* within Scotland. Due to an acknowledged reverence for Highland piping in Scotland, and presence of participants from other nations, such a pilgrimage is also considered crucial for cultural participants as it allows them to contextualise Highland piping in New Zealand within a global framework.

Those who do not travel, may access higher quality Highland bagpiping in Scotland through the use of new media. Cultural participants utilise technology such as interactive software and hardware to access recordings and live streaming of performance events. New media allows for formal pedagogy and instructional material to be passed between tutors within Scotland and pupils within New Zealand. Examples include, accessing recorded video footage of pipers
from the Clasp event at Oban via YouTube™, and receiving tuition in New Zealand from a tutor in Scotland, via Skype™. This negates the geographic distance between Scotland and New Zealand and allows for the rapid transmission of musical culture in spite of vast isolation. However, accessing knowledge is not sufficient to gain authority, it can only be gained through performance. Thus, interview participants all indicated that winning major solo piping competitions in Scotland was the ultimate goal for their performance careers. The impact of these experiential interactions on New Zealand elite performers’ and on piobaireachd within New Zealand is unexplored, yet appears crucially linked to the transmission of authenticity and the authorisation of individuals. The following subsection considers the importance of such interaction between national piobaireachd cultures.

6.4.3 ‘Scotland’ Vs. ‘New Zealand’

Cultural participants in New Zealand follow the results of New Zealand pipers who are competing in Scotland:

Yeah I try and keep up with what’s happening over there… I’m always jumping on the piping websites and stuff. If you know there’s something big happening over there, I’ll wake up the next morning here and jump on to see what’s happened (Participant 3).

Cultural participants in New Zealand have an interest in the currently successful pipers in Scotland, following piping news in order to see who has recently won, and how that affects them. If they have recently been to Scotland, they can see whether anyone they associate with has been successful in performance, which provides them with some associational authority (Section 6.3). News can also glamorise and venerate successful performers even more, celebrating them within global Highland bagpipe networks that access such news and current affairs websites as Comunn na Piobaireachd (2013c), PBNews (2013) and Pipes/Drums (2013). This allows for international dissemination of transmission and authorisation processes in Scotland to the Highland piping community in New Zealand. Knowledge of the performance style of successful performers, and access to recordings of performances, offer participants access to current demonstrations of cultural authenticity within Scotland. This allows New Zealand pipers to redefine their individual understandings of cultural authenticity.

Reference to the ‘maintenance’ of Scottish standards for piobaireachd in New Zealand encouraged enquiry of how such a consistent utopian ‘authenticity’ exists over considerable geographic distance. Interview participants suggested:

We’re lucky enough to have a few pretty big names here in New Zealand that know how it’s done in terms of passing on their knowledge. The likes of Authority A, he’s doing great things… I’m not sure why [standards are maintained] but it’s good…isn’t it? We’re
a long way away but we’ve still got the culture here I guess but if you can do it and you want to do it then you can fly to Scotland, it’s not too far (Participant 3).

I think it’s helped to have people from Scotland early on travelling out to New Zealand and removing some of those barriers that we put in front of ourselves ‘hey we can never be that good’. I think you have to look at the post war periods where Piper A went across in the 50s, as well as Piper B, Piper C and Piper D and a few others as well no doubt that I’ve missed out. Piper A is the first one along with Piper D to achieve a fair amount of success, Piper A at Inverness and Piper D won the Marches and Piper A won the Strathspeys and Reels, and the Jig and the Gold Medal. And was second in the marches and I think Piper D was second in the Strathspey and Reel. So that’s been one of the most fantastic periods for the Kiwis. You know 1979 Piper E won the Gold Medal, Piper F won the Clasp at Inverness and I think Piper G was second in the Silver Medal, so that was pretty good. And I don’t know light music wise but Piper E in ’67 or ’68 winning three out of the four light music events at Oban and Inverness and I also think third in one of the Gold Medals. So there’s periods of time where we’ve had an individual who might do really well over a course of events, or a number of individuals that have done well… having those role models that go across and then play and have some success, then come back [to New Zealand] and play, and be those role models… that sort of helps (Participant 5).

Not only do New Zealand pipers in Scotland act as representatives of piping culture New Zealand, they also transmit understandings of cultural authenticity gained whilst in Scotland by becoming major authorities within New Zealand. New Zealand pipers who have been on successful pilgrimage within Scotland return home and often develop a public following within the Highland bagpipe community in New Zealand due to its small, close knit and intimate nature. By default, they will receive greater authority in New Zealand by simply having participated in Highland piping in Scotland. Those that have been successful in performance however are often placed on a pedestal and revered as global authorities regarding Highland piping to participants within New Zealand.

The belief that such a pilgrimage will provide these elite pipers with greater understanding of authenticity implies that pipers with such transcultural experience will have greater authority than others. This particularly relates to pipers who have been involved in the more revered of transmission processes, attending and performing within prestigious performance contexts, or receiving instruction from internationally renowned cultural authorities. However, most of all, those New Zealanders who have been successful performers in Scotland, will receive significant cultural authority within New Zealand. This often means that they will be elevated into leadership positions, become role models, be major influences, and be considered authorities regarding the definition of cultural authenticity within Scotland, and therefore, within New Zealand. They become experts, maestros, gurus, adjudicators, arbiters, executives, and a form of ‘aristocracy’ for Highland piping within New Zealand.
Through their transcultural authority they mediate contemporary standards of Highland piping in Scotland to cultural participants in New Zealand:

I think we’re very fortunate to have had the influence of Local Piper A, Local Piper B, the sort of generation that went before, Local Piper C, Local Piper D, Local Piper E, that sort of generation that have been and also the fact that the piobaireachd society [Comunn na Piobaireachd] has brought tutors out here to run workshop so there’s been a good strong influence over the years. And obviously recordings contribute as well, you can listen these days to all, whereas in the past maybe someone wouldn’t have had access to that sort of stuff you know (Participant 2).

We’re on the same page I think. We’re lucky enough to have a few pretty big names here in New Zealand that know how it’s done in terms of passing on their knowledge. Obviously there’s a lot more of them [top players] over there, the Scots. It’s pretty tough going round there. But we’ve got a good few New Zealanders who can mix it as well (Participant 3).

We’ve had Donald MacLeod out here, we’ve had Bob Brown out here, we’ve had Donald MacPherson, Don Morrison, and others, and they’ve all been quite different in their own rights. They can leave behind recordings of their sessions and stuff like that which live on obviously but if you were there and were part of that interaction [at the time] that’s obviously going to stay with you a lot longer. There’s no reason we can’t get a player from New Zealand winning at the highest level in the world consistently, look at Local Piper A. They can have a lasting legacy and say “look you know I’m just Joe Blow, yep I’ve had a bit of success in my career, but actually I’m just like you” and people say “well ok I can do this too”. It’s an attitudinal thing (Participant 5).

Clearly interview participants see the pipers who are proven authorities in Scotland as more authoritative in New Zealand, than individuals authorised within New Zealand alone. The interaction between piobaireachd in New Zealand and Scotland, through individuals participating in transmission processes, allows for the international transmission and dissemination of standards. One quote in particular sums this up well:

It allows us to raise the standard because you’ve got to work harder to shine over there than you do here (Participant 7).

Transcultural interaction therefore allows for global cultural flow from Scotland to New Zealand. This can be seen in the organisation of the music committee for Comunn na Piobaireachd and their selection of repertoire for prestigious events in New Zealand. They until the tune lists for the current year have been released for prestigious events in Scotland before determining the tune lists for performance within New Zealand. This indicates that they take into account repertoire currently being used in Scotland, and then use this to determine the repertoire that should be used in New Zealand. The exact criteria for such selection in New Zealand is unknown, however selection in Scotland is defined as follows:

The Music Committee is responsible for recommending the tunes to be played in the Silver and Gold Medal and in the Clasp and senior piobaireachd competitions at the Northern Meeting and the Argyllshire Gathering each year. The set tunes are normally also used for the Canadian Gold and Silver Medal and Irish Silver Medal competitions… The aim is to select tunes of roughly equal ‘weight’ or ‘difficulty’ that will be challenging
to competitors at the different levels and will also provide entertaining listening for audiences. Another aim is to explore the piobaireachd repertoire as extensively as possible over the years... It is usual for the settings of the tunes to be chosen from The Piobaireachd Society and Kilberry collections, but from time to time other settings are prescribed. It is always made clear, however, that alternative settings are acceptable provided that there is good authority for them, that judges are advised in advance if they are to be played and that copies of the music are provided by the competitors... The list of set tunes is published on The Piobaireachd Society’s website and in the piping press in the Spring of the year before they are due to be set so that competitors will be aware of them in good time... Each year the judges on The Piobaireachd Society’s register hold two informal meetings in order to explore and discuss different styles and settings of the tunes. Brief notes from these seminars are published on the website also... The set tunes are used widely throughout the world as the curriculum for study at piobaireachd workshops. The evidence is that a very wide range of tunes is played nowadays for which the setting of tunes must, in part, be responsible (The Piobaireachd Society n.d).

This process for repertoire selection is reliant on subjective understandings of repertoire by cultural authorities within Scotland. McKerrell has been particularly outspoken against such politicisation of contemporary repertoire within Scotland, and has called for such elitist and aristocratic bias to be abolished (McKerrell 2013). However the point of this discussion is not to critique but rather to indicate a process that is clearly politicised within Scotland, with such politicisation of repertoire also being evident by association within New Zealand.

This transcultural flow involves a disproportionate focus on the dissemination of standards within Scotland to New Zealand, with a minimal and limited reciprocal flow of standards within New Zealand to Scotland. Such an observation is consistent with contradictory responses from interview participants where piobaireachd in New Zealand is different from Scotland, while at the same time there are many similarities. There are more high-level pipers in Scotland, but proportionately New Zealand pipers are also very good. To be the best you have to beat the best in Scotland, but we have some of the best in New Zealand.

Ultimately such comparisons, contradictions, and paradoxes as described above allude to participants considering Scotland the ‘home’ of their culture in a way that New Zealand never can be. Technological developments since the 1950s afford New Zealanders increased access to Scotland today, using such technology in order to exceed the limitations of geographic isolation. Leading and aspiring New Zealand performers have taken travel opportunities and met with success in performance in the most challenging, competitive, prestigious, and revered performance contexts in the world, and have received due authority for such accomplishments. However, the influence of their changing transcultural interaction, and that of other international Highland piping cultures, has never been analysed. Such changes for piobaireachd in New Zealand are the focus of the following section.
The impact of transcultural interaction on Highland piping in New Zealand can be seen as both beneficial and tumultuous. New Zealand pipers’ participation in in Scotland appears to have limited impact on the culture of Highland piping in Scotland, yet, has major implications for Highland piping culture in New Zealand. Pilgrimage of pipers to Scotland can impact on the local and national ecology of cultural authority within New Zealand. Authority is challenged, hierarchies are rearranged, communities are renegotiated, transmission processes and their content are changed, and ultimately, cultural authenticity is redefined (Cohen 2009). However, such politicisation around cultural transmission is not a violent and abrasive process, but one of amicability and respect; where performance success is ultimately seen as the true measure of authority and understanding of authenticity; and where the bonds and boundaries of community may be challenged, but never severed by such a process.

The authority of these individuals allows them to mediate a ‘more authentic’ understanding of culture to impressionable individuals and communities in New Zealand, who seek to experience and understand cultural authenticity in the ‘most authentic’ terms. Such authenticity of authenticity is a complex notion involving considerable cultural transactions between individuals, each playing a role in the mediation, dissemination and transmission of subjective concepts of the past from the most revered authority to the most naive cultural participant (Moore 2002). Ultimately, the perceived strength of this is in the ‘maintenance’ of standards of authenticity for piobaireachd within New Zealand, but not in accordance with localised interpretations of authenticity. Rather, such transcultural authorisation appears to limit local authority and repress explicit localisation for piobaireachd within New Zealand. This also indicates that localisation is evident and requires transcultural interaction in order to be negated. Therefore localised traits are often seen as ‘flawed’ in comparison to the ‘pristine’ standards of current Highland bagpipe culture in Scotland, a point supported regarding pipe bands in New Zealand (Milosavljevic 2009, 145).

6.4.4 Summary

The transcultural interaction between piobaireachd in Scotland and New Zealand involves individuals from New Zealand engaging in transmission and authorisation processes for Highland piping in Scotland, meaning that not only do individuals come into contact, so to do subcultural communities. Such contact allows for dissemination of authentic culture from Scotland to New Zealand, mediated by individuals and communities, and allows for an
implicit politicisation of globalised concepts of cultural authenticity within the *piobaireachd* community in New Zealand.

A complex arrangement for the flow of culture within a global framework exists, in support of the work of Appadurai (1990), Hannerz (1996) and Clifford (1997). Contemporary definitions of cultural authenticity; and the transmission and authorisation processes that accompany them; are mediated, disseminated and transmitted from the aristocracy of *piobaireachd* within Scotland to the most amateur participant within New Zealand. Such transcultural interaction, transmission and dissemination show the influence of *piobaireachd* in Scotland over *piobaireachd* in New Zealand.

In New Zealand, *piobaireachd* is informed by, and subject to, international standards. Globalising of standards is resultant from the veneration and reverence of Highland piping culture within Scotland by cultural participants in New Zealand, as well as participants within other national Highland piping communities (McKerrell 2005, 27). This creates transcultural mediation and global cultural flow of ‘authenticity’ from Scotland. *Piobaireachd* is considered the most formal, revered, prestigious, and prized Highland bagpipe music to its practitioners; and further, cultural authorities for *piobaireachd* tend to be the revered Highland bagpiping cultural authorities. Therefore, *piobaireachd* facilitates the transmission and authorisation not only for standards of *piobaireachd* performance, but also plays a role in the transcultural transmission of Highland piping culture in general, within, to, and from, New Zealand.

Conceptualisations of ‘authenticity’ and ‘authority’ imply that culture has been handed down impartially, generation by generation through lineages of knowledge. The transcultural dissemination of ‘authenticity’ from *piobaireachd* in Scotland challenges the national and local ‘authenticities’ practiced within communities in New Zealand. Such a process is not direct and unmediated, but rather, is influenced and subject to the politicisation of culture by authorities both within Scotland and New Zealand. McKerrell’s (2013) questioning of set tunes suggests similar political and aristocratic arrangement for *piobaireachd* within Scotland. Critically, ‘authenticity’ for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand can be seen as a social construction based on the awarding and transmission of authority by, and between, individuals and communities which are interconnected, overlapping, dynamic, and imagined (Anderson 1983).
Technology and travel allow for global cultural flow through transcultural interaction and participation. While this has enabled globalisations, it is also evident that it has necessitated the localisation of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. This point is best expressed by the myriad of ways cultural participants identify differences between *piobaireachd* in Scotland and *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. Such findings raise two further points to consider. Is *piobaireachd* in New Zealand an extension or an abbreviation of *piobaireachd* in Scotland? Further, is *piobaireachd* in New Zealand a part of a *piobaireachd* diaspora, or alternatively an international annex of *piobaireachd* in Scotland? These will help determine whether *piobaireachd*, solo piping, and Highland piping in New Zealand are independent and self-driven, or subjects of, and governed by, contemporary external influences. Interview participants could not determine the answer to such concerns in relation to transcultural interaction, yet their responses indicate a unique balance for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand within a local-global cultural framework (Biddle and Knights 2007).

It would be easy to simply determine that the contemporary global cultural flow to New Zealand provides suitable findings for this thesis. It is plausible that localisation is a result of increasing accessibility of *piobaireachd* within Scotland today, making cultural participants in New Zealand more self-aware of differences across imagined boundaries of nationhood (Anderson 1983). However, the influence of the local cultural past for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand remains unexplored yet vital to concepts of authenticity (Moore 2002). This indicates a history of settlement, immigration, and isolation from the past to the present, which has also contributed to the shaping of culture here today. This is the cynosure of the following section.

### 6.5 Local Change

Transmission of the cultural past within the local Highland piping culture is underexplored in discourse. Dickson (2006) is one of the few scholars whose ethnographic work considers change when discussing local Highland piping traditions. In this book he argues for the loss of local tradition through the efforts of organisations, which sought to stamp out ‘backward’ cultural traits within South Uist. Such an effort was only possible due to changing social conditions within Scotland, largely influenced by technological developments. Meanwhile Coleman’s (1996) study of the changing role of transmission for Highland piping within New Zealand has also been a useful piece for contextualising the cultural past for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand today. Her analysis of changing social conditions which Highland piping had to confront is shown to have been a crucial period of growth for Highland piping in New
Zealand, and thus for *piobaireachd*. Lastly, Loten’s study of the “aesthetics of solo bagpipe music at the Glengarry Highland Games in Maxville, Ontario” is a useful text here. Her contention for the social and political arrangement of Highland piping authority in a Canadian case study recommends a concern for contemporary views of the cultural past (Loten 1995, 116).

Observing issues in the theory and method for the study of musical ‘change’, Blacking calls for “a theory of musical change that may be universally applied”, (Blacking 1977, 18). He considers that “music … obeys the laws of culture, and … through bodily experiences enables man to come to terms with the natural and cultural grounds of his being” (Blacking 1977, 5). “Changes in the patterns of music sounds and people's perceptions and evaluation of these changes, are vital evidence in developing a theory of music and music-making” (Blacking 1977, 23). Wagner (1981) considers the social processes and the structures that allow for cultural change to be established, working towards the transformation of culture. Similarly, Rosenberg’s (1993) ‘Transforming Tradition’ looks at the processes by which people change their cultures and he point out the significant part that local history plays for contemporary musical culture, offering a basis for cultural change (Rosenberg 1993a, 3). Regarding transformations, Feintuch offers, “music revivals recast the music – and culture – they refer to. They are actually musical transformations, a kind of reinvention” (Feintuch 1993, 184).

Livingstone considers these works in her development of a theory for music revival contending that ‘revivalists’ (or in this instance ‘traditionalists’) locate themselves as opposed to inauthenticity, and offer knowledge that “is grounded in reference to authenticity and historical fidelity” (Livingstone 1999, 66). Livingstone ultimately finds that concepts of history, authenticity and change are inseparable for musical change, and that music change signals “a coming together, a convergence of various circumstances and personal motivations centering on the fascination and emulation of a music culturally and historically distanced from the present”. As with this research, she identifies that cultural politics, fidelity, truth, and authenticity, “and the use of value-laden categorizations of musical practices and musical influences as “modern”, “traditional” or “global”” (Livingston 1999, 81).

This section considers the cultural past for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand today, as explored in interviews with culture bearers. Responses were relatively consistent from interview participants in acknowledging that necessary cultural changes have been made to make *piobaireachd* within New Zealand ‘better’ in terms of cultural authenticity, a process of
‘transformation’ and ‘revival’. Such a process implies an externalised comparison and a point of view that determines a need to ‘catch up’ with standards elsewhere.

6.5.1 Making Change and ‘Catching Up’

The history of Scottish settlement within New Zealand saw the first recorded Highland bagpipe performances regularly occurring from 1862 onwards. Records of Highland Games within communities such as Dunedin and Waipu from this era suggest that Highland games featured *piobaireachd* events for competitive solo piping (Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012, 43-44). Compared to the modern era, however, interaction and transmission between New Zealand and Scotland would have been minimal for piping culture due to significant geographic and travel isolation as well as the lack of telecommunications, and audio-recording technology so widely available today. This limited cultural exchange was driven by the tyranny of distance, cost, and length of travel, which were the norms of the day. With hindsight, the cultural participants’ understanding of localisation at the time is difficult to fathom but would have revolved around cultural transmission processes. There was perhaps only little or serendipitous cultural exchange as new migrants with bagpiping skills randomly arrived in the colony over time and eventually interacted with established local pipers. The arrival of culture bearers, establishment of pockets of Highland bagpiping within New Zealand, and the subsequent arrival of further Scottish born piping immigrants can clearly be seen as a process of globalisation. This is accepted and celebrated within New Zealand, however the localisation of Highland piping is unexplored and yet is a necessary topic for the analysis of contemporary *piobaireachd* in New Zealand today. In hindsight, given these tyrannies of distance and time, localisation of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand would likely have been at its zenith during this period of relative isolation in the mid-19th century. In the present context, current performers now counter the effects of localisation, interacting with Scottish culture bearers with relative ease, using a wide variety of resources, methods, and technologies which allow for transnational exchange of cultural information in very short period of time, and in a considerable quantity. This putative relationship between the cultural past and the cultural present is explored through interview data.

Participants were asked about the current state of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, which they generally considered to refer to the changing state of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand over time. This was not necessarily the intent of the question, however, it did provide a series of responses that illustrate the role of local history for *piobaireachd*. Interview participants
were then asked about the role of such distant cultural ancestry and its influence on \textit{piobaireachd} within New Zealand today. They were aware of long standing pipe bands from the twentieth century onwards, well established Highland games across the country, and communities within New Zealand that celebrate a strong historical connection with Scottish culture. Yet, despite an awareness of such links, few participants were able to provide detail and demonstrate an understanding of such history. Only one participant was able to respond regarding \textit{piobaireachd} culture prior to the beginning of the twentieth century:

If you’re looking at 1863 for the first games, where you’re talking about most of New Zealand being unsettled and there’s still a huge [spiritual] connection with the old country, with the home country. So there’s a lot of Scottish immigration prior to that, whether it’s direct from Scotland or via the Maritimes in Canada or wherever. So they bring that “my father played and he played in Scotland” sort of thing, or even “my Grandfather played” so that was definitely part of the culture that was brought (Participant 5).

Such a response indicates the importance of the ancestry and origin for the Highland piping community in the years immediately following initial Scottish settlement in New Zealand. Coleman (1996) explored the ‘transmigration’ of the Highland piping tradition to New Zealand and her results support the role of Scottish ancestry and kinship for exclusive participation in Highland piping culture. However, her findings suggest that the growth of pipe bands in New Zealand opened up Highland piping for participation from a more multicultural New Zealand society that was developing at the beginning of the twentieth century (Coleman 1996). \textit{Piobaireachd} would not have been immune from the influences of increased participation in Highland piping within New Zealand and the number of participants would likely have grown considerably during this time. Participant 5 continued:

When you transplant a culture from one place to another place it then starts developing in a different direction. We had a much more pioneering pressure placed on us with Maori Wars and all that sort of carry on, so things don’t develop exactly the same. Then you’ve got your Murdo McEnzies or your George Yardleys or your MacArthurs that come out and do their thing. You know they had a very small circle of influence because people didn’t travel from Dunedin to Hawkes bay to do the Highland Games or Invercargill to Waipu, or Turakina whereas now we’re very well-travelled and it’s more affordable so there’s a lot more cross pollination around the place (Participant 5).

Here, we can see acknowledgment of localisation resulting from the geographic, cultural and social isolation of New Zealand and Highland piping communities within New Zealand, from the authority and influence of Scotland as ‘home’. Further:

Those guys didn’t have as much impact as today. Murdo McKenzie was out for a while. Local Authority X was sent to Masterton to go and get lessons … But also we had George Yardley who came out in 1924, double Gold Medallist [Oban and Inverness] from 1910/1911. So he would have had an impact. James Centre came out, but spent more time in Australia. A guy that Local Authority X used to go to for lessons was Douglas MacArthur. He was a gruff old bugger apparently. Pretty tough times in the ‘30s…Why there’s been so much success? I think our forbearers have been quite proactive, such as Comunn na Piobaireachd getting those old boys
out, the Donald MacPhersons and Bob Browns out over a period of time, and at a period where it would cost a lot of money to get them out (Participant 5).

Participant 5’s responses however show that individuals who were visiting or newly settled from Scotland were the only point of contact to ‘authentic’ culture within Scotland for cultural participants from within New Zealand. Many of these individuals were encouraged to visit and settle within New Zealand by local piping organisations.

Dickson (2006) discusses the existence of local traditions of Highland piping in South Uist that predate the establishment of national cultural administration organisations, particularly The Piobaireachd Society in 1901 (The Piobaireachd Society 2013c). Here Dickson illustrates that the self-appointed responsibility of such an organisation was the ‘betterment’ of Highland piping practices in line with contemporary mainland piping culture (Dickson 2006). The efforts however resulted in the systematic destruction of ‘local’ cultural traits in favour of those from the mainland. His criticism centres on local cultural traits were informed by local cultural heritage and history that long predated the birth of such organisations, and their members (Dickson 2006). Thus, local cultural authenticity may have been more ‘authentically authentic’ than the more recently standardized “authenticity’ on the Scottish mainland. Nevertheless, the efforts of these national cultural organisations ultimately predominated (Dickson 2006).

The arrival and establishment of a piping community within New Zealand, is well covered by Coleman (1996). However, what is not known is the impact of subsequent pipers who immigrated to New Zealand after the establishment of such homogenising practices within Scotland, and their celebration today. How such individuals influenced pre-existing ‘transplanted’ cultural traits that were apparent within local communities is unknown. It seems likely that such organisations within Scotland and within New Zealand (Comunn na Piobaireachd) have, through their efforts to encourage ‘improvement’, successfully repressed and ultimately eliminated local and regional piping cultural identity within New Zealand.

From the 1860s until the end of the 19th century was the initial period of growth for Highland piping in New Zealand in general (Coleman 1996). However, the authority of individuals visiting from Scotland was clearly articulated by Participant 5 as superseding existing transmission and authority within New Zealand. This allowed for the transmission of ‘authentic’ culture from Scotland to New Zealand where it was interpreted as being more
authentic (or at least more currently acquired from the ‘source’) than the culture passed down by the earlier immigrants.

The period from the start of the twentieth century until the 1950s, when New Zealanders first started travelling to Scotland in order to undertake cultural pilgrimages, featured a number of visiting and settling authorities from Scotland. These included the following that were identified by the interview participants: Murdo McKenzie, George Yardley, James Centre, Angus MacAulay and Douglas MacArthur. These Scots had gained authority within ‘the homeland’ through performance success within the most prestigious events in Scotland, the Northern Meeting and the Argyllshire Gathering. Such figures were described as being key influences on the subsequent generation of New Zealand performers who asserted authority over *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. In transmitting their knowledge to cultural participants within New Zealand, such individuals venerated Scotland as the authentic home of Highland piping and inspired New Zealand pipers to pilgrimage to Scotland in order to experience, understand, and be authorised within the cultural ‘homeland’.

The cultural pilgrimage of New Zealand pipers returning to the ‘homeland’ heralded a new age for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand in the post-war period (WWII). Advances in technology meant that travel to Scotland from New Zealand took a shorter amount of time, was now considerably cheaper, and was more widely accessible to pipers within New Zealand. A number of New Zealand born pipers began the pattern of pilgrimages to Scotland in order to gain experience, exposure to, and knowledge of greater authenticity and meaning for their cultural participation in New Zealand, within a transcultural framework. Participant 4 supplied a concise discussion of the role of such individuals following the 1950s:

> So there was the Piper A, Piper B, Piper C generation, and then there was really Piper D and Piper E if you’re looking at age gaps down or whatever [generations]. So yeah if you take Piper F out of the New Zealand equation. Where would you put Piper G? He’d be the sort of Piper H era. Was he mid ‘60s? So I guess as role models, like competing in Scotland, Piper E, Piper F was over there, so I guess as direct role models to New Zealand pipers he wasn’t on the scene here (Participant 4).

This illustrates the role of New Zealand pipers who travelled to Scotland following the 1950s and who were participants within Highland piping in Scotland. This was followed by cultural participants within New Zealand who sought to contextualise the contact between New Zealand and Scotland within a framework of diaspora and global cultural identity (Pearce 1976; Brooking and Coleman 2003; McCarthy 2006) and allowed them to comparatively
understand authenticity of culture within New Zealand in relation to perceptions of ‘homeland’, ‘origin’ and ‘purity’.

The history of New Zealand pipers’ authorisation within Highland piping in Scotland can be readily seen through the successes of New Zealanders in the Gold Medal piobaireachd events at the Northern Meeting and the Argyllshire Gathering in Scotland. Participant 4 indicated such a record in response to the history of piobaireachd within New Zealand:

“Is there 6 gold medallists, is that what we have?” (Participant 4)

This response belies a nationalistic pride for New Zealand pipers in ‘against all odds’ travelling to the other side of the world, outperforming ‘the world’s best pipers’, and thus becoming the top performers of the day (see table 6.1 for indication of such a record of success).

**Table 6.1 New Zealand successes in the Gold Medal events at Northern Meeting (Inverness) and Argyllshire Gathering (Oban).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argyllshire Gathering – Oban</th>
<th>Northern Meeting - Inverness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980 Murray Henderson</td>
<td>1958 Lewis Turrell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987 John Hanning</td>
<td>1975 Murray Henderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Greg Wilson</td>
<td>1979 Donald Bain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Richard Hawke</td>
<td>1990 Greg Wilson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such individuals subsequently returned to New Zealand where their authorisation within Scotland leads to them being seen as authorities within New Zealand by default. The legend of their success inspired further generations of New Zealanders to do the same:

So then you take Piper A, and me, and Piper B’s a wee bit young but that band of players … Oh and Piper C so it’s almost sort of a bit of a resurgence. And then you’ve got your Piper D and Piper E’s and Piper F and Piper G over there doing it (Participant 4).

This illustrates the continued and on-going interaction of New Zealand pipers who physically participate with Highland piping in Scotland. The extent of New Zealanders preparing to travel to Scotland for future cultural participation is unknown, however interview participants all indicated that they either intend to, or will strive to do so within the future.

Participants were asked whether the presence of such individuals within certain geographic areas of New Zealand created a regionalisation of piobaireachd. Participant 4 indicated:

Back in the ‘80s I remember the Wellington scene was just a huge epicentre of piping, with Authority A, Authority B, Authority C, and Authority D. They had regular piobaireachd sessions (Participant 4).
Such reference to regionalisation however was limited to the past and interview participants were not able to suggest that regionalisation for *piobaireachd* was evident today. This implies an apparent decentralisation of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand where, according to interview participants, the transmission of culture within New Zealand is no longer bound to the limitations of geographical isolation. The role of telecommunications technology and nationwide cultural transmission appears to have repressed the regionalisation of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand to the extent where authorities today are widely available to all. Participant 5 supports such a point:

> Um right now, look, anyone in New Zealand could have access to you, anyone in New Zealand could have access to Local Authority A… or to Local Authority B, or to me, or to Local Authority C, or to anyone like that (Participant 5).

Such a quote indicates the importance of telecommunication technology for the dissemination, mediation, and maintenance of authentic culture through transmission processes. Rather than being achieved through objective definitions of authenticity however, such a process allows for the refreshing and reestablishment of political processes where individuals pit their authority and that of their communities against each other.

Such a limited quantity of reflections on cultural ancestry for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand indicate that the legacy of cultural translocation, transmission, and maintenance from the mid-19th century features little in the thoughts of cultural participants today. This ambivalence suggests that the history of piping within New Zealand, since its initial translocation, is of little consequence for such contemporary *piobaireachd* authorities. This does not imply that the cultural past for current pipers is irrelevant, rather it suggests, that the definitions, standards, and parameters of cultural practice from local history do not appear to inform transmission and authorisation within culture today.

Interview participants also discussed recent changes for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, constantly remarking on improvements and beneficial developments. When asked about the state of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand today Participant 1 replied:

> It’s obviously improved tenfold in the last decade. I remember when I was first learning *piobaireachd* and there were so many heinous performances really… I think it’s probably the best it’s been (Participant 1).

Participant 1 suggests that *piobaireachd* in New Zealand has improved as a result of what they perceive to be an increase in the standard of performances. He identified the reason for such an increase in quality:
There’s a lot more teaching going on and there’s been an increase in competition for everyone in general. There’s a lot of introduction on *piobaireachd* and getting people involved. At Hastings last year, I can’t remember the exact number but there were about 30 odd in the C Grade *piobaireachd* event. The Silver Medal was packed as well and I think we had a dozen in the Clasp. I think that there’s more educated people now myself included (Participant 1).

The continued expansion of Highland piping in New Zealand can be seen to include *piobaireachd*, where Participant 1 indicates that there are now more performers than in the past:

> I think we’re really starting to build the prestige of not only our own fantastic events, the Gold Medal and the Clasp, but also we’ve got a lot of Kiwis competing in Scotland. If we go back 10 years International Authority A came out and was so disappointed in the standard. He blatantly told everyone how bad it was and he really rattled some feathers there. I think maybe it’s just the fact that not many of us were actually exposed to what was happening on the world scene, and in Scotland. To some extent we still aren’t. It’s only really those seasonal competitors that travel to Scotland and see the quality of these players… So I suppose we’ve all actively taken on board that telling off and I think that there’s better teaching, and there’s far more understanding of *piobaireachd* than what there was (Participant 1).

The growth and increase in quality of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand can be seen to stem from the changing perception of *piobaireachd* by wider Highland piping cultural participants. This is due to changes in transmission processes for *piobaireachd*:

> There’s a lot of young [New Zealand] guys playing in Scotland, like Piper A and Piper B and Piper C, you know they’re teaching *piobaireachd* too so that’s fantastic that everyone takes an interest off the wider culture rather than just being really internally focused (Participant 1).

Participation in *piobaireachd* in Scotland by New Zealand pipers was seen by interview participants to have been beneficial for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand, as those pipers then subsequently pass on their knowledge to the cultural community within New Zealand:

> I know I can give the kids I teach a far better quality experience because of what I’ve gained in the last few years from going to Scotland… I think we need to make sure that the next generation of teaching are getting their kids excited about it and perhaps teaching them a bit earlier than it historically has been. Usually you’re in B Grade and think ‘oh I need to learn *piobaireachd*’. A lot of those kids that have that attitude actually hit a brick wall. So a lot more reinforcement of teaching and exposure is required (Participant 1).

Such a ‘positive’ development has involved changing the way in which formal pedagogical interactions for *piobaireachd* are provided to young pipers. Lastly Participant 1 was asked whether he had any concerns for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand today:

> The things that bother me are there are some teachers can’t tune their kids’ bagpipes and they’re teaching *piobaireachd* very slow, very deliberate and not the way I’d teach it. It’s just sort of note after note and a howling pipe and I think that’s sad because that would have a negative impact on a spectator and other pipers that might be interested in it (Participant 1).
This shows the pressures authoritative individuals place on *piobaireachd* transmission, and the subsequent authorisation that accompanies it. The role of recordings as an authoritative guide for interpreting *piobaireachd* scores was considered a key tool employed by all interview participants. Participants 5 offered a specific discussion of the role of such recordings:

[Recordings] are important, for a couple of reasons. The most obvious is because they give an idea of how a particular piper played a particular tune at one particular occasion. It’s a record, guiding us how a tune could be played. … It gives us an eye into piping of their era, say if it was recorded in 1973 you can hear it in their relative pitches and tempos if they’re accurate to what was played in the day… it’s a recording of one of the world’s greats at that time for posterity, but I think they’re relevant in that way, shape and form (Participant 5).

The role of recordings as authoritative sources is interesting. Although this response suggests a considerable level of authority for these recordings, they are essentially driven by performer interpretation and do not allow the participant to interact, argue, debate or discuss how best to perform with the source. As cultural contexts change over time, performance style and interpretation will also change. A constant and focused use of recordings does not account for such temporal dynamics and the variations that occur. Participant 5 best expresses this limitation:

We’re no less capable of playing music than those guys were before us. We don’t want to be stuck in a particular style, once we start being more blended rather than ‘I’m playing the Don MacLeod style’ or ‘Bob Brown style’, um ‘my style is better than your style’ I hope we start losing that and maturing and saying “actually this is what we could do with a tune” listen to how those recordings are playing and try to get inside their performance (Participant 5).

This infers a contradiction between originality of music performance and reverence for the authority of those who have gone before. In theory, such use of recordings as references guide performance, however, the lines between imitating and referencing a performer of the past are not clear, and thus it is up to the interpretation of the cultural participants who use them. Although the use of recordings is common they do hold some authority as a resource, informing cultural understandings for how tunes should be interpreted. Interestingly, it appears that such performance interpretation is also changing where comparison to the increasingly distant past is used but where there now appears to be a movement, at least within New Zealand, towards a contemporary definition of ‘musicality’.

This underpins a conflict for authenticity of *piobaireachd* today. ‘Lineage’, ‘tradition’, and ‘heritage’ of one particular brand of cultural authenticity have driven the construction of
communities where definitions of authenticity are considered to be held socially and revolve around community hierarchies (hereditary schools of piping). This is accepted for Highland piping and *piobaireachd* within Scotland (Collinson 1975, 201-203; Donaldson 2005, 13-15; Cheape 2009, 97-126) as well as within New Zealand (Coleman 1996). At the same time, however, there is an acute awareness that authenticity of *piobaireachd* today should be defined in terms that constitute definitions of ‘musicality’, ‘modernity’, and ‘perfection’. However both approaches fail to take in to account the subjectivity of the terms that drive them, a subjectivity of definitions of culture that is well explored and established within the social sciences and the humanities (Anderson 1983; Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Appadurai 1990; Moore 2002).

This means that authoritative sources are at best quasi or pseudo authorities. For example, an individual may be the most revered and influential authority within a community, yet they still rely on the use of score collections and recordings to contextualise their knowledge – a knowledge that is limited to their experiences and understanding (see Figure 6.10). A score collection (such as The Piobaireachd Society books) may be considered the most seminal of collections of repertoire, yet it still requires interpretation by an authority that uses recordings to assist them in their transmission of authentic performance. Recordings of the most prestigious and revered performer may be extremely useful in order for authorities to gain an understanding of the authentic performance of a tune, yet transmission from such a recorded source still requires the input from an authoritative individual (i.e. a judge or tutor), and the use a score collection. Thus authorities and authoritative sources of knowledge are only interpretive conduits whose sum of influence over transmission processes has shaped the definition of *piobaireachd* culture within New Zealand today.

Interview responses provided in this section allow for further discussion. These exemplary responses regarding the current state of *piobaireachd*, the perception of *piobaireachd*, and the influencing forces on *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, can be seen in a variety of ways. To begin with *piobaireachd* in New Zealand can generally be considered to have ‘improved’ over time, become ‘better’, and the quality of culture has ‘increased’. This has resulted from increased quantity of cultural participants who fulfil a variety of cultural roles. Such an increased participation has lead to an increase in prestige for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. Other participants’ responses offered further material on beneficial changes, increases in quality, and the reduction in cultural flaws and deficiencies, which are critically explored below.
Reflections from interview participants are interesting in their own right; yet together suggest a complexity for the arrangement of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand in its present form. Participants defined *piobaireachd* within New Zealand today in comparative ways. They suggested that in general it is better than it has been. However, their discussion of beneficial changes indicated that some cultural characteristics ‘had to’ be changed in order to make *piobaireachd* within New Zealand ‘better’. How participants were measuring these weaknesses and deficiencies of culture was not explicitly articulated, but were implicit within interview responses.

Understandings of making culture ‘better’ stem from determining apparent flaws for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand through the comparison of cultural practices within and across the boundaries of community. Most frequently this entailed participants comparing *piobaireachd* in New Zealand to *piobaireachd* in Scotland, but also on occasion included discussion of *piobaireachd* as practiced in Canada, Australia, and even France. These
comparisons focus on the apparent strengths and weaknesses of nationalised culture in order to determine which national *piobaireachd* community is doing things ‘better’ than others, and how such ‘improvements’ could be adopted, disseminated and maintained within New Zealand. The role of authority within cultural communities for such a process of ‘improvement’ was paramount: authorities identify these weaknesses and strengths; determine how to proceed; and adopt, disseminate and maintain the boundaries of culture.

This section is not complete without acknowledging and discussing the known existence of New Zealand composed *piobaireachd* repertoire. There is a small number of New Zealand composed *piobaireachd* tunes in existence and although some are archived in public resources they are difficult to find. The earliest of these identified tunes were published in 1934 and are titled ‘Late Donald Cameron of Lochiel 24th Chief of Clan Cameron’ (Appendix 6A); ‘Field Marshal Robert’s Warning’ (Appendix 6B); and ‘King Edward VII’ (Appendix 6C) all composed by Cameron. More recently composed tunes include ‘MacCrimmon’s Haunting’ composed by Gill and published in 1991; and the ‘Lament for Benjamin Lewis Turrell’ composed by Turrell and published in 1999. As well as these, a number of unpublished New Zealand *piobaireachd* are known and include ‘Salute to the Anniversary of the Province of Otago’ also known as ‘Lament for Donald McKinnon Bain’, ‘In Praise of Kuri Bush’ (both composed by Stewart), and ‘Salute to Sir Ian McKay’ (composed by Hore). While insider understanding acknowledges that some New Zealand cultural participants appear to know of these tunes (Hore 2001a – 2008c), such tunes were not mentioned by interview participants, are not known to have been used within the tune lists for prestigious competitions in New Zealand, and therefore do not appear to be considered as ‘authentic’ repertoire by the cultural community. Hore (2005) notes a “tendency for pipers to shun modern *piobaireachd* compositions” (Hore 2005, 19). This implies that such ambivalence to local cultural traits is a global phenomenon, practiced in other contemporary national piping communities. Hore’s (2001a – 2008c) exploration of the composers of bagpipe music in New Zealand is of great significance for the history of Highland piping in New Zealand. While it must be acknowledged that some tunes, such as the 6/8 march ‘Pipe Major Bill Boyle, New Zealand Scottish Regiment’, are light music tunes that are used and well celebrated within New Zealand today, the same cannot be said for New Zealand *piobaireachd*. The authenticity of these tunes’ musical concepts is beyond the analysis of this research.

Tunes have also been composed in Scotland in the relatively recent past, such as ‘The Field of Gold’ and ‘Cabar Feidh Gu Brath’, composed by MacLeod and published in 1979. Such
modern Scottish tunes are widely known of, heard, and are a common part of the *piobaireachd* repertoire within New Zealand. Therefore ‘traditional’, ‘authentic’ and ‘classic’ are concepts that (for whatever reason) appear to be attributed to tunes from Scotland, but not tunes from New Zealand. Coleman (1996) provides a sample of the *piobaireachd* repertoire from 1887 used in New Zealand competitions that bear striking similarity to the repertoire heard in New Zealand today (Coleman 1996, 238-247). The role of authorities, such as Comunn na Piobaireachd, may be the preservation of authentic repertoire for performance within prestigious performance contexts in New Zealand. However, the influence of such a process may be the shunning and even the loss of locally composed repertoire, arguably of significant importance to local cultural heritage.

Likewise, locally manufactured instruments are also acknowledged to a limited degree within the Highland piping community in New Zealand (Hore 1997a; 1997b; 1997c; 1998a; 1998b; 2000). Hore (1997 to 2000), in a series of published cultural periodicals, suggests a colourful history of local bagpipe manufacturers overcoming obstacles of distance and social unrest (e.g. war) utilising local materials to produce instruments. Such histories of local manufacture are not widely known, and their instruments have no known use by current *piobaireachd* pipers within New Zealand. Meanwhile the use of ‘classic’ instruments manufactured by such makers as MacDougall, Henderson/Glen, and Lawrie; alongside contemporary instruments manufactured by Naill, Strathmore, and McCallum, are common and widespread for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand today.

Such an embrace of repertoire composed, and organology manufactured within Scotland suggests an attributed lack of authenticity for New Zealand repertoire and organology, at least for *piobaireachd*. Little further is known of these local tunes and instruments and there is no publicly available anthology or reference source for their use today. These topics of repertoire and instrument heritage are considered as areas for further ethnographic investigation and exploration of the merits and importance for Highland piping in New Zealand and internationally.

Despite this evidence for localised cultural materials Scottish influences appear to predominate and remain the priority for most New Zealand *piobaireachd* cultural participants. Focusing on this context; the tools, methods, scope, distance, and requisite time for the transfer of culture from Scotland to New Zealand have changed; while the transmission of knowledge from culture of origin to cultural colony has not. Cultural forebears were likely to
have been concerned about being disconnected from home and becoming inauthentic, making the most of opportunities to reconnect to Scotland, utilising immigrants who could pass on authentic cultural practices and allow for *piobaireachd*, isolated and localised to New Zealand, to be superseded. This process remains today, where the knowledge of the contemporary culture in Scotland is more readily accessible to cultural participants in New Zealand, but ultimately is by definition the same process of globalisation.

Isolated from country of origin, disconnected from the cultural home, and existing within an unknown, unfamiliar and rapidly expanding sociocultural setting, the history of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand is likely to be rich with examples of localisation specific to New Zealand. Instead of celebrating such a history however, interview participants described at length efforts to negate explicitly different cultural traits within New Zealand as being necessary to make *piobaireachd* ‘better’. Such an observation demonstrates the reverence and importance of contemporary standards of ‘authentic’ Scottish performance flowing through transmission processes to cultural participants in New Zealand. On the surface it appears that the local cultural past holds little bearing on the local cultural present for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. This suggests that cultural participants perceive *piobaireachd* within New Zealand as a cultural colony, a diasporic community and a subject of *piobaireachd* within Scotland.

The continued and increasing participation of New Zealand performers in Scotland also perpetuates and deepens reverence to global contemporary standards of cultural authenticity and their transmission and authorisation processes. New Zealand pipers continue to travel to Scotland, and also to interact with Scottish sources of knowledge through international telecommunications. In the process they supersede local (New Zealand) authenticity and authority and refresh the informing process of culture from Scotland. This means that the history of Scottish settlement and the continued pilgrimages of New Zealand pipers to Scotland have created a history and invented tradition of global cultural flow. This is not driven by necessity, instead it is resultant from a perpetuated lack of awareness for existing local authenticity and authority. Ultimately this means a socio-political redefinition of authenticity for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand by authorities who have changing and dynamic influences over cultural communities.

*Piobaireachd* is argued to be culture, identified by unique aural, material, and visual factors, as well as unique transmission and authorisation processes, that distinguish its cultural
parameters from Highland bagpiping in general (Herndon and McLeod 1979). Further, *piobaireachd* can be defined as a ‘micromusic’, a “small musical unit in big music-cultures” (Slobin 1992). In this sense, *piobaireachd* is a subculture of solo Highland piping, Highland bagpiping culture in general, and other homogenous cultural identities, if such things can be said to exist (Anderson 1983; Zuberi 2007). *Piobaireachd* in New Zealand is also a subculture of the global *piobaireachd* superculture, an interculture of *piobaireachd* in Scotland, Canada, Australia, and France, and encompassed within a *piobaireachd* diaspora (Hall 1990; Cohen 1997). At a different level, *piobaireachd* in New Zealand acts as a superculture to smaller *piobaireachd* communities in New Zealand, revolving around authorities and agencies (Gerstin 1998; Keister 2008). Therefore, *piobaireachd* can be considered a sub, inter, and super-culture, observed through the practices and influences that shape *piobaireachd* in New Zealand today (Slobin 1992). This micromusic, diaspora, and transculturalism is not universal, static and immutable, rather, it is informed by divergent and disparate concepts of cultural authenticity and cultural authority.

In his research on authority and authenticity in Hawaiian Language and Vocal Performance, Donaghy (2011) contends that:

> While perceptions of authority and authenticity are based on historic construction, the models by which comparisons are made and perceptions formed are individually experienced. The acts of …performance are individual expressions that are negotiated and maintained through interaction with other members of society. While the perceptions of authority and authenticity of … performances are admittedly subjective, discourse about these aspects [is] reflective of the passion that burns in individuals to honour the historic aspects of … traditions, and benefits the continuation of these practices into the future (Donaghy 2011, 296).

This argument also applies to *piobaireachd* in New Zealand where ‘authenticity’ and ‘authority’ appear to be inseparable. ‘Authenticity’ is a point of view influenced and informed by cultural authority. ‘Authority’ is the embodiment of cultural authenticity. Performance is an expression of *piobaireachd* repertoire, informed by both individually and socially understood concepts of authentic culture (Moore 2002). Authenticity is not intrinsic in performance; it is an interpretation and perspective made by the listener. ‘Authenticity’ is both an individually and socially held perception of cultural truth, constructed in the present, yet informed by past interactions and experiences (Moore 2002). *Piobaireachd* cultural participants are not isolated and restricted to any one particular domain; they are well travelled, interconnected, and linked. Perceiving and transmitting an understanding of authenticity, participants enable transculturation and global flows of culture (Kartomi 1981; Appadurai 1990; Hannerz 1996; Clifford 1997).
Livingston (1999) argues for musical change being seen as a ‘coming together’, ‘a convergence’ of personal and social values embedded in contemporary views of the cultural past. Her work, and that of Feintuch (1993), Rosenberg (1993), consider ‘the revival’ or ‘transformation’ as an event to study. This section contends that piobaireachd in New Zealand is more a result of contemporary social influences than a continued and maintained lineage of cultural fact. Piobaireachd resides on the fringe of the local and the global, the present and the past, the individual and the collective, the social and the cultural. The revival or transformation is occurring ‘now’ through the musicking of cultural participants, it is not just an event to be studied in the past.

Piobaireachd can be seen most critically as a political tool, exploited and controlled by elite cultural authorities constantly vying for social position in their respective communities. It can be seen as a social construction born in the present, not in the past, although it is nevertheless informed by the interpretation of cultural precedent. Both of these views are however, ignorant of how cultural participants see, value, and practice piobaireachd. To them, it is traditional, classical, original, and historical; it is Scottish, Scottish Highland, Celtic, and Gaelic; and it is the most highly revered and inherently authentic form of Highland bagpiping.

6.5.2 Summary

The past for piobaireachd within New Zealand in part informs the present. Localised traits are seen as inauthentic and are considered by cultural participants to be resultant from the unfortunate isolation of New Zealand piobaireachd from Scottish piobaireachd. This is a belief that has been re-established throughout the history of piobaireachd within New Zealand, and continues to be re-established today. In such a critical viewpoint of local culture, participants deny prior acquired aspects of piobaireachd in favour of fresh information regarding authentic culture from Scotland, which is likely subject to the same transmission and authorisation processes as in New Zealand. Therefore, ‘authenticity’ can be seen as a perception of the cultural past that is practiced within the cultural present, within cultural communities that revolve around social and pseudo political hierarchies of individuals, that control the interpretation and demonstration of culture, as informed through global cultural flow.

As it stands, there is ample evidence for the historical localisation of piobaireachd within New Zealand. This has not been defined in celebrated terms, but rather painted in a negative
light by participants who see local distinction as backwards, introspective and inauthentic. Participants believe that only through refreshing the globalisation process can such localisation be repressed. However they fail to comprehend that localisation is resultant from globalisation. Local cultural tradition for adherence to standards of culture currently practiced within Scotland is the source of such ‘flawed’ views of local culture, where the dissemination of knowledge from Scotland to New Zealand requires transmission and authorisation processes that occur on local terms, within local communities, implicitly informed by the local past.

The work of others has previously identified the role of social change for local Highland piping performance, transmission and authority. The findings from this section suggest that the local cultural past has an informing and influential bearing on the arrangement of the local cultural present. Highland piping ‘traditions’ however, are not maintained faithfully, but are subject to global cultural flows, politicisation, and influenced by changes in technology. There exists a history of global cultural flow that *piobaireachd* within New Zealand today is built upon. Analysing this history reveals the social processes that have shaped, and that continue to shape *piobaireachd* in New Zealand today. This completes the evaluation and discussion of local history relative to *piobaireachd* performance in New Zealand and also completes the investigation of social and cultural transmission. In order to bring all threads together and clarify the findings for these four sections an overall chapter summary is now presented below.

### 6.6 Understanding Social and Cultural Transmission: Summary

Reinterpreting Merriam’s model, this chapter has explored the social and cultural transmission of *piobaireachd* as providing the musical concepts that drive the production of musical sound and musical behaviour. Predominantly this has involved the concept of ‘authenticity’ transmitted through musicking contexts. These are enacted and politicised by authorities that gain influence through socially proving their authenticity through performance. Primarily, contemporary standards of performance flow from Scotland to New Zealand through a select few individuals who manage knowledge and definitions of authenticity. There also exists, however, a local New Zealand history of *piobaireachd* that is treated with ambivalence and neglected by cultural authorities today that ultimately determine its social value.
Authenticity in *piobaireachd* is but a viewpoint, rather than a universal, based on socially informed interpretations of the cultural past in the cultural present. These are temporary, fluid and contentious; rather than objective, concrete and universal. They bind people together; yet can also drive them apart, creating a dynamic and ever-changing convergence and divergence of culture in a global and temporal framework. This chapter has investigated the perceived influences for contemporary performances of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand through attempting to understand social and cultural transmission. It has considered *piobaireachd* culturally; the factors have influenced definitions of cultural authenticity; and whether *piobaireachd* in New Zealand has been localised. Transmission, authorisation, transculturation, and local history; alongside sound, and material and visual culture; define *piobaireachd* as significantly different from other Highland bagpipe music. In this sense, it is argued that *piobaireachd* is culture. *Piobaireachd* in New Zealand is also significantly different from *piobaireachd* beyond New Zealand, and in this sense a *piobaireachd* diaspora is argued for, centred on Scotland as cultural home.

Authenticity, tradition, heritage, lineage, origin, classicism, and history, inform the contemporary arrangement and definition of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. However, such concepts of the cultural past are contentious, transitory, dynamic, and subjective, and suggest variation in the definition of *piobaireachd* from the accepted models. *Piobaireachd* is much more than ‘classical music’ and a ‘theme and variations’ structure. It is sound, objects, materials, behaviours, displays spaces, people, and concepts, arranged in the present from a changeable, politicised, and socially negotiated spectrum of local and global cultural pasts.

*Piobaireachd* in New Zealand is localised and unique. It is the result of a history of immigration, translocation, adoption, adaption, development, reconnection, transculturation, transmission, and authorisation – blended together and contested within the imagined bounds of nationhood. In many ways, this makes the sound, the material and visual culture, and the social and cultural transmission of *piobaireachd* within New Zealand unique, and what it is today. On the other hand, such a finding is likely no different for *piobaireachd* anywhere, and thus, questions relating to the authenticity of culture, and challenges to cultural understandings, can be considered for *piobaireachd* globally.

Evidently, *piobaireachd* serves an important function in contemporary New Zealand society. It is central to maintaining standards for Highland bagpiping, demanding a quality of aural and visual performance not matched in other forms of Highland bagpiping. *Piobaireachd*
participants are considered the elite performers within Highland piping culture, having the capacity to demonstrate a level of authenticity core to culture and community. *Piobaireachd* is a forum and a domain for social and political juxtapositioning within Highland bagpiping, allowing participants to claim transcultural associations, repress local flaws, and maintain cultural authenticity. It is a social construction and a means for participants to prove their authority for Highland bagpiping within a global cultural framework. Yet above all else, *piobaireachd* is sacrosanct, revered, and intrinsically ‘authentic’ to *piobaireachd* cultural participants, it is the manifestation of cultural ‘heritage’ within contemporary society. In the following chapter, the various threads and findings presented throughout this research are brought together and presented alongside discussion relating to theory and further research.
Chapter 7 - Conclusion

This research has considered *piobaireachd* in New Zealand as culture in contemporary society. It has questioned accepted definitions of *piobaireachd* as traditional, classical, and ancient, and challenged the rationale of its musicological categorisation. Primarily, this study has sought to understand how *piobaireachd* is practiced and conceptualised today by cultural participants in New Zealand.

Chapter 1 provides a synopsis, and a contextualisation of what is known about *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. Chapter 2 is a review of literature, determining the limitations of existing cultural knowledge regarding *piobaireachd*, and develops questions relative to concerns identified in Chapter 1. Chapter 3 describes and justifies the use of an investigative research methodology for the analysis of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. This research has employed an ethnographic methodology that investigated *piobaireachd* culturally, in order to understand its role within contemporary society, explore how the cultural past relates to the cultural present, and consider *piobaireachd* in a global contextual framework. Data regarding cultural practices and cultural perspectives were gathered by fieldwork between June 2011 and September 2013. A thematic analysis facilitated the emergence of three key themes: *piobaireachd* as culture within society, concepts of cultural authenticity, and consideration of localised culture. An accepted investigative framework was developed from existing models for the cultural study of music (Merriam 1964), which facilitated a focus on *piobaireachd* sound (Chapter 4), material and visual culture (Chapter 5), as well as social and cultural transmission (Chapter 6). The existing ideas of others were employed throughout to induce theory, analyse data, generate discussion and provide results relative to the emergent research themes, questions, and concerns.

Building on the work of others, this study has shown that *piobaireachd* extends beyond a definition as ‘traditional’ and ‘classical’ music, and beyond ‘theme and variation’, ‘extended and complex form’, and ‘binary and tertiary’ in structure. This study has shown that *piobaireachd* is comprised of aural, material and visual demonstrations, as well as social and cultural transmission processes. These distinguish *piobaireachd* from other forms and styles of Highland bagpiping. Music can be argued to be culture, with variable customs, objects,
materials, dress, and history depending on the peoples that use it (Merriam 1964; Herndon and McLeod 1979; Rice 1987; Slobin 1992; Nettl 2005). *Piobaireachd* has been shown to be much more than an historical and theoretical form of music; *piobaireachd* is culture.

*Piobaireachd* does not exist within any one isolated community of Highland bagpipers; rather, it is embedded within many communities that are dynamic and contestable, nested and overlapping. It can be found in many cultural contexts, from local social organisation recitals to the most revered performance contexts in the world. In this sense *piobaireachd* can be considered a micromusic, sub-culture, inter-culture, and super-culture. It also exists in a global trans-cultural context, having been translocated and adopted in New Zealand, Canada, Australia, and France (among others). Forces of globalisation brought *piobaireachd* to New Zealand in the 19th century, and since that time it has been localised, where its definition, function, transmission, and context is somewhat unique and distinct from Scotland. New Zealand is partly reflected in the sound, material and visual culture, and social and cultural transmission of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. Yet, despite such distinction, *piobaireachd* performers in New Zealand also appear to perform with remarkable similarity to performers in Scotland, as evidenced by competition results and participant responses. Therefore the localisation of *piobaireachd* to New Zealand can be seen, not only by its uniqueness from *piobaireachd* in Scotland, but also in its remarkable similarity.

In contemporary New Zealand society, *piobaireachd* appears notably absent and removed, transmitted in isolated contexts, out of the public eye, in the ‘inner-sanctum’ of solo piping (Coleman 2003, 133; Donaldson 2005, 2, 27). Yet this isolation is not deliberate, but a result of the perceived complexity, abstraction, and elitism of the aural, material and visual components to *piobaireachd* culture. ‘Authenticity’ is central to the demonstration, interpretation, definition, conceptualisation and value of *piobaireachd* for cultural participants. Precedent and past inform the present, as negotiated and arranged by cultural participants who interact in social hierarchies based around ‘authenticity’. In this sense, ‘authenticity’ is a view of the cultural truth, the cultural past, the way that *piobaireachd* should be demonstrated and interpreted, but is subject to the political influence of authorities and agencies, rather than being impartial, universal and objective. While the cultural past is embedded in the cultural present for *piobaireachd*, the cultural present is reflected in the parameters of the cultural past that define authenticity, in particular the social arrangement of *piobaireachd* today. The Highland bagpipe and *piobaireachd* are inevitably associated with
Scotland in aural and visual symbols. However, this thesis argues that they can also reflect New Zealand in their aural and visual properties.

Authenticity was a constant point of discussion throughout this research. *Piobaireachd* is governed by concepts of cultural authenticity, whether in New Zealand or in Scotland, whether in 1603 or in 2012. The pursuit of authenticity by cultural participants is an interesting concept and appears to be ‘never ending’. It is unlikely to be exclusive to *piobaireachd* and perhaps is a phenomenon intrinsic to most cultural pursuits. As the primary point of discussion, and as a concept that has driven much of the material presented in this study, ‘authenticity’ requires greater scrutiny and consideration. It may be inherent for participants within any culture to fundamentally seek to behave ‘authentically’ and make their culture ‘better’. Such a process inevitably creates the paradox between the influence of the past and the expectations of the present. Regardless of the outcome of such a process for culture, the motives of cultural participants are essentially pragmatic and positive where they endeavour to achieve the best for their culture and communities.

Moore’s (2002) treatise identified that ‘authenticity’ is not a quality of music that is innate and held within its content. Rather, he suggests that it is a point of view held by those who experience music. Authentic interpretations are more reflective of those that are applying it to music, than it is to the music itself. This study supports ‘authenticity’ as a subjective point of view that is both understood by individuals and by clusters of individuals, arranged upon the ‘act of listening’ (Moore 2002, 210). Moreover, this research contends that it is in the act of participation where authenticity is arranged, including listening. Precedent informs authenticity, it is based on an interpretation of the past that allows individuals to hold an understanding of ‘best practice’ in the present. In this sense, authenticity is a quality that people apply to culture when certain individually and socially acceptable aspects are presented and demonstrated.

Gerstin (1998), Keister (2008), and Donaghy (2011) argue that individuals with contestable and dynamic authority drive the definition of authenticity, having interests vested in the preservation and maintenance of social order within their communities. Such a finding is consistent with this study. Authenticity is a conceptual quality that is (interpretively) applied (or not) through the variably subjective, socially and politically contested, and constantly changing interpretation of the cultural past embedded within the cultural present. Through individuals, communities participate in transmission and authorisation processes, allow for
transculturation and global flow of culture, and enable reinterpretation of the past. Such contemporary influences on definitions of ‘authenticity’ ultimately indicate that ‘tradition’, ‘heritage’, ‘lineage’, ‘origin’, ‘classicism’, ‘history’, and other cultural truths are more contemporary than widely believed. That is not to suggest that such concepts do not reference the past, rather, that such references to the past are understood through subjective, politicised and biased arrangements of authority and transmission processes relative to the temporal context of today. Nor does it suggest that these concepts are unnecessary, useless or arbitrary, rather, they intimate a continuity of previously established qualities which drive culture (such as *piobaireachd*), providing meaning and purpose, offering focus and aspirations, and allowing clustering and grouping based on belonging and belief.

Rice (1987) contends that the historical construction of musical culture is fundamental to ethnomusicology, and maintains that music cultures can be studied out of time. An issue arises however when the researcher need consider history objectively in order to offer clear and chronologically ‘accurate’ accounts of the past, particularly where such cultural chronology is not universally understood by members of the same group. The cultural present is created from contesting understandings of the cultural past held by both individuals and groups. This occurs in contact zones where individual meets community, local meets global, and past meets present, taking place through cultural transmission and subsequent authorisation that ultimately determines what is ‘right’ and what is ‘wrong’, on a context-by-context basis. Authenticity (or similar) is not always defined in the same way, but it (or similar) is a constant driving factor for culture. This not only suggests that ‘authenticity’ may differ between individuals, between communities, between locations, and between cultures, but also that it differs for each of these over time. What is authentic today may be inauthentic tomorrow, what was authentic yesterday can be inauthentic today. Therefore, ‘authenticity’ is temporary, representative of the point in time when it was recognised by an individual in the act of cultural participation.

Authenticity embedded in culture offers a window into the past, but the view that it offers is at best refracted. Therefore, analyses of ‘authenticity’ can be revealing, not for what they tell us about our pasts, but for what they may tell us about ourselves in the present, and how we conceive and understand the past. Cultural meanings, values, and behaviours, and the factors and influences that shape them are not universal, static, and infinite cultural truths. Rather, they are scarce, invented, contestable, and dynamic; arranged, defined, and practiced in the cultural ‘now’, not the cultural ‘then’. 
Piobaireachd is an integral part of Highland piping in New Zealand today where participation can equate to the gaining of authority and the embodying of authenticity. Piobaireachd is understood as a ‘high art’, ‘classical music’ and the most potent proving ground for Highland pipers in New Zealand. It has core values that ‘preserve’ social order and cultural ‘tradition’ for the Highland piping community at large, regardless of how few cultural participants there may be. The flow-on effect of limited, yet highly influential participation in piobaireachd inevitably impacts Highland bagpiping culture in New Zealand through the authority of key individuals and their influence on cultural transmission and ‘authenticity’. Piobaireachd can arguably be considered to be connected to, and of importance to, New Zealand society due to the role it plays as a crucial and informing subculture of Highland piping, and the significant role that Highland piping has been shown to play for New Zealand communities and society in general (Milosavljevic 2009; Milosavljevic and Johnson 2012). This may explain its place within contemporary New Zealand society today.

The local history of piobaireachd in New Zealand is not explicitly celebrated. Participants reflect more on the changes that have made piobaireachd in New Zealand ‘better’ and more like piobaireachd in Scotland, where it exists in its ‘purest’, ‘truest’, and most ‘authentic’ form. However, there appears to be little discussion of whether such sacrosanct treatment of piobaireachd in Scotland is best practice for piobaireachd in New Zealand, or elsewhere for that matter. Such a consideration might attribute greater authenticity to other local cultures beyond Scotland, depending on how authenticity is defined. It is unknown whether these alternative arguments for authenticity have been raised or identified by piping authorities, either recently or in the past, and perhaps it is timely to investigate this in future research. This reflects Dickson’s (2006) findings for localised piping on the island of South Uist (Scotland), where he notes that external piping ‘authorities’ at the beginning of the 20th century eventually suppressed and eliminated localised cultural practices in the understanding that they were flawed and ‘deviant’ from their contemporary standards. Yet, he intimates that such local practices were authentic for the local community, and may have even been more ‘authentic’ than that practiced on the mainland at the time. It remains a controversial point whether such pockets of localisation may have been presenting piping in a historically ‘purer’ form or alternatively were ‘corrupted’ by localisation. Given that piobaireachd was a documented part of piping culture within New Zealand from as early as 1864 (Coleman 1996), and that this predates such developments as noted by Dickson (2006), the ‘authenticity’ of piobaireachd that came to New Zealand in the mid 19th century, and was
passed to subsequent generations, is unknown and unexplored. The role of champion Scottish pipers who migrated to New Zealand after such developments in Scotland is understood as having a major influence on contemporary cultural practices for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. How *piobaireachd* was practiced within New Zealand before their influence is unknown. It is plausible, however, that *piobaireachd* culture that came to New Zealand, was practiced here, and eventually deemed as ‘corrupt’, was theoretically more ‘authentic’ than that which replaced it.

Today, New Zealand pipers perform the same *piobaireachd* repertoire in much the same way as Scottish *piobaireachd* performers, at least in terms of sound, and in material and visual culture. This is in spite of acknowledged differences between the transmission, authority and history of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand and Scotland, and is often accredited to the legacy of past culture bearers. This process appears to have divided the history of *piobaireachd* in New Zealand into periods of varying importance. According to interview responses, the period from the mid 18th century until the start of the 20th century is of least importance, the period from the start of the 20th century until the middle of the 20th century is of moderate importance, and the period from the mid 20th century until the present day is the most important. However, this latter period is also where the flow of information between New Zealand and Scotland has been most direct, most rapid, most widely accessible, and most frequently occurring. It is unknown and unexplored how these accelerating changes to transmission over time have influenced the interpretation of *piobaireachd* temporally. However, it is likely that a tune composed in New Zealand today will never have contextual similarity to a tune composed in antiquity in Scotland.

*Piobaireachd* in New Zealand is described as being different, better, and more improved today than in the past. If this holds true, it has been diverging from its cultural origins and evolving towards contemporary cultural standards as practiced within Scotland. Globalisation and localisation have been present throughout the history of Highland bagpiping in New Zealand, through translocation, adoption, transmission, reconnection, and maintenance. Individuals undertake the responsibility of upholding the standards of culture in Scotland within their communities in New Zealand. Although telecommunications and travel technologies allow us to more readily connect to Scotland today, we appear to remain disconnected from ‘home’, continue to be ‘inauthentic’, and therefore must continue to reconnect to Scotland in order to remain ‘true’. Advances in technology have changed our ability to reconnect; yet they have not altered the reconnection process, which has been
underway since *piobaireachd* first came New Zealand. Yet this does not simply imply the localisation of *piobaireachd* to New Zealand, it also implies the dynamic nature of cultural authenticity within Scotland, likely subject to similar social arrangement as shown for New Zealand. A changing social and cultural landscape in Scotland is also likely to be a factor in the continued attribution of inauthenticity within New Zealand, where, as authenticity changes in Scotland, existing cultural authenticity within New Zealand becomes ‘outmoded’ and ‘localised’. Such a process is unexplored and beyond the scope of this research, although the reader is directed to Dickson (2006) for further consideration.

It is difficult to determine whether *piobaireachd* in New Zealand has been diverging to become less authentic than, or converging to become as authentic, as Scottish *piobaireachd*, or vice versa. This enigmatic notion is supported by a distinct lack of dialogue and debate regarding this topic within the cultural community in New Zealand, neither referenced by cultural participants nor experienced by the author during his extensive insider experiences. However, it seems likely that both *piobaireachd* in New Zealand and in Scotland are not only constantly diverging from each other, they are also diverging from their own pasts. Thus, it is arguable that *piobaireachd* in New Zealand may be more ‘authentic’ than *piobaireachd* within Scotland, yet this is not the consensus of cultural participants. They consider that there will always be perceived flaws and deficiencies in culture that can only be righted by making *piobaireachd* within New Zealand more like *piobaireachd* within Scotland today, which may be the primary driver behind transcultural contact and pilgrimage of New Zealand pipers to the cultural ‘home’. This perpetuates a diasporic relationship between *piobaireachd* in New Zealand and in Scotland.

*Piobaireachd* within New Zealand can be defined by its position within a spectrum of culture that features a unique and dynamic mix of local and global influences at any point in time. The role of contemporary Scottish standards for *piobaireachd* can be seen as particularly dominant and informative for *piobaireachd* within New Zealand. This involves a complex series of contemporary arrangements of cultural authenticity within Scotland, between Scotland and New Zealand, and finally within New Zealand. *Piobaireachd* is seen as ‘historical’, ‘traditional’ and ‘authentic’ to Highland bagpiping culture in New Zealand. This research argues that *piobaireachd* can be seen as a contemporary amalgamation of on-going, turbulent, and disparate politicisation within varying communities in dynamic and highly changeable transcultural contexts. However, cultural participants do not, and likely will not, see it in such a light. *Piobaireachd* can be considered a political tool and a social construction
born in the present, not in the past, by elite cultural authorities constantly vying for social position in their respective communities. However, such an argument is ignorant of how cultural participants see, value, and practice *piobaireachd*. It is traditional, it is Scottish Highland culture, and it is inherently authentic.

In the search for localised traits for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, future research will focus less on the phenomenological content of musical performance, and more on exploring the influence of distant cultural pasts for *piobaireachd* within the present. Such studies will demand a sentient approach that attempts to understand music not objectively, but through the subjective perceptions of cultural participants, who manage knowledge by determining the methods and content of social and cultural transmission, arranged within and across the bounds of community.

As an outcome, this study does not call for a change to how cultural participants consider *piobaireachd* in New Zealand. It does, however, propose that they at least conceptualise, discuss and acknowledge aspects of the cultural past for *piobaireachd* and for piping in New Zealand, such as local heritage and cultural ancestry. There is a history of individuals coming from the other side of the earth to New Zealand and practicing ‘authentic’ culture as best they could. While such culture may be considered flawed and outdated, it has nevertheless been integral and key in the development of the cultural present. This study suggests that cultural participants in *piobaireachd* and Highland piping in New Zealand aim for a balance that is able to celebrate the diversity of the local cultural past, whilst also striving to continue the pursuit of global excellence in performance.

There is much to be proud of in the history of *piobaireachd* performance and Highland piping in New Zealand. The ambivalence towards local culture masks a self-consciousness of cultural participants here (Milosavljevic 2009, 145) and mimics the treatment scholars have given piping culture beyond Scotland. Critically, little research has looked at the depth and diversity of adopted and ‘authentic’ Highland bagpiping around the world today. Such a study would understand global Highland piping culture (in all its various forms) to be a diaspora that interprets ‘culture’ in a diversity of ways, which references the social arrangement and negotiation of local and global cultural pasts in the present by individuals and communities internationally (see Milosavljevic 2009, 15; Grant 2013, 8). This global culture of Highland piping can be defined as a collection of local piping cultures that, through constant influence from authorities and communities within the confines of their imagined boundaries, interpret
the past in the present in differing, unique, dynamic, and distinctive ways. These allow them to arrange their own definitions of culture along the lines of ‘tradition’, ‘authenticity’, ‘heritage’, and ‘origin’.

As the place where the Highland bagpipe emerged, Scotland will always be considered the default ‘home’ of piobaireachd for cultural participants in New Zealand. This study, however, has also indicated that piobaireachd ‘homes’ can exist outside of Scotland, within and across the boundaries of the various local communities that practice it. These communities will interpret piobaireachd in terms of sound, material and visual culture, and social and cultural transmission in unique and distinct ways. Further, no matter how hard they may try to deny localisation, culture will inevitably present symbols of local influence, whether this is a korus pattern on a bagpipe bag cover, a soundscape associated with a particular performance space, or the teaching methods of a particular authority. This is resultant from imagined and actual separation of cultural communities coping with issues of divergence and isolation by focusing on maintaining ‘authenticity’, venerating authoritative sources of ‘authentic’ knowledge, and reconnecting to ‘authentic home’, however they can.

While historical and musicological studies are useful for showing where piobaireachd comes from (in part), and how it compares to other musics (in theory), ultimately they are incapable of explaining and defining what piobaireachd is, how it is performed, and how it is understood by cultural participants in contemporary society (see Chapter 2). This view of literature is perhaps a little cynical, given the way cultural participants have been shown to practice and describe piobaireachd. From the privileged and informed view of the ethnomusicologist, previous scholars and authors on piobaireachd have been ambivalent towards issues for music in contemporary society, and have failed to consider the ideas pertinent in ethnomusicology, anthropology, or social sciences. As such, there exists a paucity of research on Highland bagpiping and on the Highland bagpipe in a contemporary and globalised context, perhaps best illustrated by the Scottish centred views presented in Dickson’s (2009) edited volume, ‘The Highland Bagpipe: Music, History, Tradition’. Yet, others have identified the Highland bagpipe being used, and Highland bagpiping existing beyond Scotland (Loten 1995; Ho Wai-Chung 2001; Milosavljevic 2009). The Highland bagpipe is a truly globalised instrument, adopted and appropriated in many contexts that go beyond Scotland, together with aspects of its use such as instrument sound, musical concepts, performance attire, performance choreography, and cultural transmission. It is used to perform a diversity of local and localised styles of music, with varying function, use and
meaning in a global and contemporary context (Milosavljevic 2009, 137). Until research begins to accept such diversity, we will never truly understand the Highland bagpipe, its music, its history, or its tradition.

While the current research has explored and identified cultural authenticity for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand, further research should consider a conceptual model of *piobaireachd* in a dynamic global and temporal context. This direction will offer greater understanding of *piobaireachd* and may be applicable to other musical studies. The current research can be considered a step in this direction, and its research design may be useful and applicable to other case studies, to determine whether there are consistencies or contrasts with this study's findings.

As a final outcome of this study, there is a need for a concept that acknowledges the subjective social arrangement of the past in the present for ethnomusicological research. A term is required that encompasses the contention of other concepts such as ‘tradition’, ‘heritage’, ‘originality’, ‘history’, ‘classicism’, ‘lineage’, and ‘authenticity’ between individuals and groups. This concept will acknowledge and consolidate the seminal work of others, and the studies that have supported, employed and embraced their work. Such a concept will be welcomed in ethnomusicology, allowing researchers to treat music culture in the present, as constructed from contemporary understandings of the past, providing them with focus on contemporary music culture, and facilitating objective definitions of music being given the critique and enquiry they demand.

By considering transculturation and global flows of culture, others have described the transformation of tradition and musical revivals as points in time where change has occurred and convergence of culture has been achieved. This thesis argues that ‘transformation of tradition’ and ‘musical revival’ is constant. Further, it claims that, while the revival or transformation of culture provides convergence, it also necessitates cultural divergence, particularly from the recent past. Through music, the present and the past are constantly transformed. Change is not happening ‘then’, it is happening ‘now’. This change is where localisation of cultural authenticity for *piobaireachd* in New Zealand resides.
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Appendices

Based on an article printed in the BAY WEEKENDER in April 1993, amended and extended by Ken Tobin, July 2007.

WELCOME TO THE GAMES.

Welcome to the 43rd Hastings Highland Games, Lindisfarne College, Hastings.

This Saturday and Sunday brings you a very proud tradition for Hawke's Bay, the annual Highland Games proudly presented by the Hawke's Bay Centre of the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand which features the Australasian Premier Awards.

The Hastings Highland Games is regarded as the premier Piping and Dancing Competition in New Zealand and this year has attracted more than 1000 entries in the Highland Dancing and almost 500 in the Piping, the highest number of entrants for the last four years. Included in these entries are visiting Australian competitors.

With the very obvious Scottish influence in the Hastings Highland Games, it bears a resemblance to a Scottish Gathering at Braemar in Scotland. In fact, our Games are known by many as the 'Braemar of the South Pacific'.

A Little Bit of History:
The early Games involved many organisations such as Greater Hastings, Hawke's Bay Centre of NZ Piping and Dancing Association, Hastings Scots Society, Hastings Scots Highland Pipe Band, Hawke's Bay Scottish Pipe Band, Hawke's Bay Kennel Club and members of various sporting clubs and sponsors.

Over the years the Games consisted of Highland Dancing, Piping and Drumming, softball, kennel club parade, cycling, athletics, martial arts, archery, axe-craft, wrestling, sideshows and traditional Scottish events such as tossing the caber, sheaf tossing, and many more.

Started in 1951 the Hastings Highland Games fast became the most popular Scottish event in the Southern Hemisphere and put Hastings and Hawkes Bay on the map every Easter weekend. The Games were held at Nelson Park for the first two years, then moved to a larger venue at Windsor Park where they were conducted over three days. The Saturday and Monday were competition days and the Sunday Spectacular afternoon was devoted to displays by local and visiting bands, Scottish Country Dancers and various other organisations.

The athletic section of the Games was very strong and over the years included such greats as Peter Snell, Bill Ballie, John Davies, John Walker and Rod Dixon, to mention only a few, competing on an improvised grass track, as did the cyclists!

The first change of venue for the Games after Windsor Park was in 1986. When horse jumping and rugby league were introduced to the Games in 1985, and as at least become no longer viable on a grass track, it was decided to move to
Many piping competitors and officials will recall, as they moved between competition boards, having to dodge the horses leaping in and out of the arena! Horse jumping and rugby league did not prove to be successful additions to the programme and the Games moved once more to Nelson Park without them.

In addition, the founding organisation of the Games, Greater Hastings, ceased to exist after the 1986 games, leaving the Hastings City Council Public Relations and the Piping & Dancing Association to promote the Games. After 1987 and 1988 at Nelson Park, it was recognised that the Highland Games of old could no longer be sustained in the past form and the Hastings City Council withdrew its financial support for the event.

The Hawkes Bay Centre of the Piping and Dancing Association refused to let the Games die and took over the organising and promotion of the event. The Games were changed to a two day format and held at the YMCA Stadium in 1989 and then in 1990 settled into the now permanent venue at Lindisfarne College in Pakowhai Road, Hastings. This move has proved a very popular and ideal venue. The Games have since been organised by the Highland Games Committee which is a committee consisting mainly of members of the Piping and Dancing Association.

Today’s Games:
The Games of today depend greatly on support from sponsors. Without this form of support it would be more than difficult to maintain this important championship event and it would be a great loss for the dancers and pipers and for the opportunity of promoting Hawkes Bay.

Last year’s major sponsor, Trust Bank Central, is back for the 1993 event and the organisers appreciate their support in the running of the Hastings Highland Games.

Comunn na Piobaireachd:
In 1959 the first Comunn na Piobaireachd Gold Medal competition was held and in 1961 the Highland Society of London Trophy was presented to the winner for the first time. Also in 1961 Comunn na Piobaireachd New Zealand awarded the first Gold Clasp for a previous winner of the Gold Medal. The Hastings Highland Games is the only gathering outside Scotland to host the Premier Piping Event, the Comunn na Piobaireachd Gold Medal competition.

Piobaireachd is the name given to the classical music of the Highland Bagpipe. It is a highly developed form of music which had its beginning in the 16th Century and was brought to perfection by the famous MacCrimmon Family of Skye. It consists of a theme of groundwork followed by variations and has always been regarded by the expert piper as the highest expression of his or her art. Piobaireachd calls for years of careful study and has won admiration from musical experts of many countries.

Comunn na Piobaireachd (New Zealand) Inc. was formed to foster and encourage the study and playing of Piobaireachd in New Zealand and has the unique distinction of being affiliated with the Piobaireachd Society of Scotland. The latter Society was
formed in 1903 and enjoys Royal patronage. It is concerned with maintaining the traditional standard of the art of Pibhaireachd playing, through the publication of its collections of music and arranging classes of instruction and the provision of judges for the major competitions in Scotland.

The most coveted awards among pipers in Scotland are the Highland Society of London's Gold Medals, awarded each year for the playing of Pibhaireachd in competitions held at Inverness and Oban under the control of the Society. The Highland Society of London was formed in 1778 for the purpose of stimulating Highland culture and instituted the first competition in piping in 1781. The Society presented a silver statuette of a piper to Comunn na Piobaireachd (New Zealand) Inc. as a trophy for its competition which links it to the first competition held in 1781 and is now held at Inverness and Oban. The Gold Medal of Comunn na Piobaireachd (New Zealand) Inc. was designed by Mr George Bain, an eminent authority on Celtic art. It shows a piper of the period 1745 when pipers carried arms and played an instrument with two drones instead of the present three.

What's happening this year?
This year's Highland Games will see the introduction of craft stalls, food stalls, displays from St Johns Ambulance and the Fire Service, aerobics and a marching team. Both days you will also be able to see the very exciting traditional Scottish sports of tossing the caber and sheaf tossing. These two events will be running continuously.

**********

Since 1993:

Solo Drumming competitions were discontinued after 1989 due to lack of interest and reintroduced at the 2007 Games.

Following the 1993 Games the name was changed to the Hawkes Bay Highland Games.
Appendix 3a - University of Otago, Human Ethics Committee, letter of approval and consent form for participants

Professor H. Johnson
Department of Music
Division of Humanities

20 May 2011

Dear Professor Johnson,

I am writing to let you know that, at its recent meeting, the Ethics Committee considered your proposal entitled "Pibroch in NZ: Past, Present, Future".

As a result of that consideration, the current status of your proposal is: Approved

For your future reference, the Ethics Committee’s reference code for this project is: 11/119.

Approval is for up to three years. If this project has not been completed within three years from the date of this letter, re-approval must be requested. If the nature, consent, location, procedures or personnel of your approved application change, please advise me in writing.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Mr Gary White
Manager, Academic Committees
Tel 479 9250
Email: gary.white@otago.ac.nz

c.c. Professor H M Johnson Head Department of Music
CONSENT FORM FOR PARTICIPANTS

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand what it is about. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I know that:
1. My participation in the project is entirely voluntary;
2. I am free to withdraw from the project at any time without any disadvantage;
3. Personal identifying information [audio recordings] will be destroyed at the conclusion of the project but any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for at least five years;
4. This project involves an open-questioning technique. The general line of questioning includes information concerning my experience with pibroch in New Zealand. The precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the interview develops. I understand that in the event that the line of questioning develops in such a way that I feel hesitant or uncomfortable I may decline to answer any particular question(s) and/or may withdraw from the project without any disadvantage of any kind.
5. There shall be no discomfort or harm applied to myself.
6. I will receive no payment for my participation in this project.
7. The results of the project may be published and will be available in the University of Otago Library (Dunedin, New Zealand). Findings from this project will be made available to participants.
Application Form for ethical consideration of research and teaching proposals involving human participants

Which level of anonymity do you seek?

Full anonymity ☐ *Requested approval ☐ No anonymity ☐

I agree to take part in this project.

................................................................. .............................................
(Signature of participant) (Date)

*Requested approval is where we will only publish your personal information after contacting you and gaining your consent to do so.

This study has been approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee. If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the research you may contact the Committee through the Human Ethics Committee Administrator (ph 03 479 8256). Any issues you raise will be treated in confidence and investigated and you will be informed of the outcome.
Appendix 3b - Outline of Interview Questions

a) Open Ended Questions Seeking Extended Responses

Can you tell me about the most recent piobaireachd piece you’ve performed?
What aspects of piobaireachd in New Zealand stand out for you?
What is the current state of piobaireachd in New Zealand?
What does performing piobaireachd mean to you?

b) Questions Seeking More Factual Responses

How long have you been piping for?
Do you teach piping?
Are you a piping judge?
What organisations and agencies are you a member of?
Do you follow the results of piping competitions?
Do you listen to piobaireachd at home?
What is the ultimate achievement for performers of piobaireachd?
What future challenges does piobaireachd in New Zealand face?
Do you have any concerns about piobaireachd in New Zealand?

Interviewing technique to be interactive and responsive, to consider participant responses and pursue further information relative to piobaireachd in New Zealand.
Report sheet indicating consideration of the performance of a *piobaireachd* in terms of sound by an authority.

Instrument sound indicated with blue arrow
Musical concepts indicated with red arrow
Appendix 4b - Competitor report sheet from Hawke’s Bay Easter Highland Games Gold Medal *Piobaireachd* event, 2012

Report sheet indicating consideration of the performance of a *piobaireachd* in terms of sound by an authority.

Instrument sound indicated with blue arrow
Technical sound indicated with purple arrow
Musical concepts indicated with red arrow
Appendix 4c - Competitor report sheet from Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, Otago Centre, Annual Championship Competitions, Open Gold Medal Piobaireachd event, 2012

Report sheet indicating consideration of the performance of a piobaireachd in terms of sound by an authority.

Instrument sound indicated with blue arrow
Technical sound indicated with purple arrow
Musical concepts indicated with red arrow
Appendix 4d - Score notation of 'Lament for the Departure of King James' with repertoire concepts indicated and explained. Source: The Kilberry Book of Ceol Mor

Lament for the departure of King James
(Siubhal Sheumais)

No. 64
4, 4.
1. GROUND.

LINES
1.

2.

3.

II. VAR. 1. III. DOUBLING.

1.

2.

3.

IV. VAR. 2. V. DOUBLING.

1.

2.

3.

VI. VAR. 3. VII. DOUBLING.

1. 2. 3. etc. The rest can be read from Var. 2 and Doubling.

VIII. TAORLUATH. IX. DOUBLING. XL GRUNLUATH DOUBLING.

1.

2.

3.

X GRUNLUATH SINGLING.

1.

2.

3.

Abbreviations used:

Written.

Played.

Repertoire concepts

Score notation is full of indications of notes and ornaments.

The theme of the tune as the key melodic sequence is indicated by coloured arrows.

Each colour represents a different setting of the same theme with varying use of other notes and ornaments.

These settings form the sections of the tune I Ground, II Variation 1, III Variation 1 Doubling, IV Variation 2, V Variation 2 Doubling, VI Variation 3 VII Variation 3 Doubling, VIII Taorluath, IX Taorluath Doubling, X Crunluath, XI Crunluath Doubling – all of which involve varying use of the same thematic sequence and other notes and ornaments.

Expression concepts

Each section of the tune takes a different amount of time to perform. For the performance of this tune described in Section 4.1 and 5.1. Each section involved the following times, indicating a stepwise increase in tempo per section as recorded in field notes, characteristic of piobaireachd performance in New Zealand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Time (minutes: seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I Ground</td>
<td>2:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II Variation 1</td>
<td>1:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III Variation 1 Doubling</td>
<td>0:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV Variation 2</td>
<td>1:14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V Variation 2 Doubling</td>
<td>0:47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI Variation 3</td>
<td>1:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII Variation 3 Doubling</td>
<td>0:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII Taorluath</td>
<td>1:06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX Taorluath Doubling</td>
<td>0:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X Crunluath</td>
<td>1:04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI Crunluath Doubling</td>
<td>0:43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pulsing and phrasing in the Ground of the tune might follow the following pattern.

```
/ [ ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ^ ] [ ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ^ ]
/ [ ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ^ ] [ ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ^ ]
/ [ ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ^ ] [ ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ]
/ [ ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ^ ] [ ^ ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ] ^ ^ ]
```

Where / represents the start of a line, [ represents the start of a two bar phrase, and | represents the start of a bar, corresponding with the score notation. Further, where ^ represents a regular pulse, ^ represents a delayed pulse, ^ marks a pulse at the end bar slightly more delayed than ^; ^ marks a pulse slightly more delayed at the end of the two bar phrase than ^; ^ marks a pulse at the end of the line slightly more delayed than ^; and ^ marks the most delayed pulse in the Ground at the very end of the Ground. And where each ^ type marks each theme note within the following matching thematic sequence from the Ground.

```
BBDDEEBBGGFFEEBB
BBDDEEBBGGFFEEBB
DDEEFFBBGGFFEEBB
FFEEDDBBEEDDEEBB
```
Appendix 4e - Score notation of ‘Mackintosh’s Lament’ with repertoire concepts indicated and explained. Source: The Kilberry Book of Ceol Mor
**Repertoire concepts**

Score notation is full of indications of notes and ornaments.

The theme of the tune as the key melodic sequence is indicated by red arrows.

Each section of the tune has a differing title in the following order I Ground, II Variation 1, III Variation 2, IV Taorluath, V Taorluath Doubling, VI Crunluath, VII Crunluath Doubling – all of which involve varying use of the same thematic sequence and other notes and ornaments.

Score notation is full of indications of notes and ornaments.
Appendix 4f - Score notation of ‘Hector Maclean’s Warning’ with noted differences in setting indicated in the score and explained in text. Source: The Piobaireachd Society collection of manuscripts
Repertoire concepts

Score notation for the Ground (Urlar) uses numbers such as (1), (2), and (3) to indicate differences in tune setting. Likewise elsewhere in the score further numbers are used to indicate further differences. These differences are explained in the following ‘editorial notes’.

This offers pipers a variety of ways to interpret the tune in terms of its repertoire concepts. Note that the theme remains relatively unchanged despite differences in setting, leaving the tune theme consistent across settings. Pipers will use terms such as ‘The MacKay Setting’ or ‘The MacArthur Setting’ to refer to these different settings of the theme within the tune.
Appendix 5a - Birds-eye view depiction of an indoor competitive performance arena.

Blue coloured area is the stage or board of the performance arena, where the performer walks and wanders in the process of producing performance sound and visual display.

Orange coloured area is where the judges of the performance sit, the square representing a desk, and the circles representing the judges seated, facing the board.

Red coloured area is audience seating.

This particular arrangement of arena matches that used at the Piping and Dancing Association of New Zealand, Otago Centre annual solo piping championships, see Figure 5.1 for further imagery of this arena.
Appendix 5b - Birds-eye view depiction of an indoor recital performance arena.

Blue coloured area is the stage or board of the performance arena, where the performer walks and wanders in the process of producing performance sound and visual display.

Red coloured area is audience seating.

This particular arrangement of arena matches that frequently used by the Otago Pipers Club for indoor performance.
Appendix 5c - Birds-eye view depiction of an outdoor competitive performance arena.

Blue coloured area is the stage or board of the performance arena, where the performer walks and wanders in the process of producing performance sound and visual display.

Orange coloured area is where the judge of the performance sits, the square representing a tent.

Red coloured area is audience seating.

This particular arrangement of arena matches that used at the Hawke’s Bay Highland Games for outdoor performance, see Figure 5.1 for further imagery of this arena.
Appendix 5d - A bagpipe supply store’s catalogue. Source: Gannaway – The Bagpipe Centre

GANNWAY BAGPIPE BAGS

"Leather is the way to go anywhere in the World! Period. There is nothing that can substitute the tonal quality of leather." PM David Hilder, Dowco Triumph Street Pipe Band

With the World’s best Pipe Bands choosing leather over synthetic pipe bags, there’s little wonder that Gannaway Pipe Bags are proving so popular. The Gannaway Zip-bag offers pipers the advantage of achieving the tone that only leather can produce, while allowing access to the bag’s interior for moisture control systems and/or drone valves, with significantly reduced maintenance (compared to sheepskin pipe bags).

I enjoy playing the Gannaway pipe bag because it produces the resonance I want from the chanter and drones, it’s easy to maintain and it’s extremely comfortable under my arm, leaving my hands feeling free on the chanter. I highly recommend it to anyone.

Iain Speirs, Edinburgh
Gold Medalist (Northern Meeting & Argyllshire Gathering), Silver Chanter Winner (three times), Dunvegan Medallist.

Gannaway Regular - Small 9 3/4", Medium 10 1/2", Large 11 1/2" $205
Gannaway Zip Only - Small, Medium, Extended Medium, Large $255
Gannaway Zip & Collar - Small, Medium, Extended Medium, Large $295
Highlander Dressing (250ml) $15
Gannaway Bag Primer $7.50
Bag Tie-In Service $30

Dowco Triumph Street Pipe Band & Gannaway New Zealand

I have been playing the Gannaway products now for several years. It has helped us win several Championships, including the 2006 World Championships in Grade two as well as the North American Championships in Grade two. We have also been very successful with this product in grade one with having won ensemble and placing third in the Worlds 2009 qualifier. I have found this bag to be of superior quality, very comfortable and tonally exceptional.

The shape of the neck is second to none, and the ease of playing the bag in is fantastic. The bag can only be described as a “Sheep with benefits”. The zipper that Gannaway has perfected has so many uses that makes playing easier, from the ease of tying in to seasoning, and quick access to any kind of water system.

We have played this product in every extreme weather condition there is, from 40 degree heat, to very wet and raining, and on the Curling ice at the 2010 Olympic Games in Vancouver. I can say without question that this bag can handle it all very well with no sacrifice for sound or tone.

I would not hesitate to recommend this product to any band or soloist.

PM David Hilder

www.gannawaynz.co.nz

Gannaway New Zealand | 99 King Street, Temuka 7920 | gannaway.nz@xtra.co.nz | Ph. +64-3-615 5788

Gannaway Bags New Zealand RNZPBA Member Pricing. Please visit our Website for more Product Pricing as at January 2011
We're pleased to stock the world's finest Pipe Chanter, Practice Chanter, and Drone Reeds, as used by many of the world's best Pipers and Pipe Bands.

We individually test every reed that we sell, ensuring that our customers only receive reeds that suit their needs. How many times has your pipe band imported 50 reeds, only to find that a number of the reeds are not playable?

Tell us the strength of reed you require, the make (of chanter) that you will be playing it in, and we will select your reeds accordingly.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reeds</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warnock Pipe Chanter</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megarity Pipe Chanter</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd Pipe Chanter</td>
<td>$22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice Chanter (Red Plastic)</td>
<td>$16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance Tone Drone Reeds</td>
<td>$120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Drone Reeds</td>
<td>$145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RedWood Drone Reeds</td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezeedrone Reeds with Inverted Bass Tongue</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezeedrone Inverted Bass Reed only</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezeedrone Standard Bass Reed Only Reed only</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezeedrone Tenor Reed Only Reed only</td>
<td>$55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact us for a competitive band quote.

View our other Reeds Online at...
www.gannawaynz.co.nz

Gannaway New Zealand | 99 King Street, Temuka 7920 | gannaway.nz@xtra.co.nz | Ph. +64-3-615 5788
# BAGPIPE ACCESSORIES

## Blowpipes, Valves & Mouthpieces
- **Mouthpieces - large bore 3", 4", 5", 6"**
  - $20.00
- **Mouthpieces - large bore with valve 4", 5", 6"**
  - $28.00
- **Mouthpieces - Airstream 3 1/2", 4 1/2", 5 1/2"**
  - $39.50
- **Mouthpieces - Airstream replacement protectors**
  - $4.50
- **Mouthpieces - Practice Chanter**
  - $15.00
- **Drone Plugs - Ash Plugs**
  - $50.00
- **Drone Plugs - Shepherd Tone Enhancers**
  - $50.00
- **Hyland's In-line Valves**
  - $85.00
- **Valves - Līf Mac**
  - $24.00
- **Valves - Nail**
  - $7.50
- **Valves - Moose Valve**
  - $55.00

## Covers & Cords
- **Cords - Silk**
  - $50.00 / $65.00
- **Cords - Wool**
  - $35.00 / $50.00
- **Covers - Velvet**
  - $60.00 / $75.00
- **Dycem Anti Slip Patch**
  - $5.00

## Maintenance Items
- **Bore Oil - for inside drones**
  - $9.50
- **Brushes - Pipe Chanter**
  - $6.50
- **Dressing - Highlander 250ml**
  - $15.00
- **Dressing - Artight Seasoning**
  - $20.00
- **Drone Extenders - per set**
  - $25.00
- **Goose Adapter**
  - $16.50
- **Hemp - Yellow 50g**
  - $15.00
- **Hemp - Beeswax 50g**
  - $18.00
- **Hemp - Black Waxed 50g**
  - $18.00
- **Hoods (Reed protector)**
  - $15.00
- **Mops - Drone or Stock**
  - $9.50
- **Mops - Drone or Stock (Set of Four)**
  - $36.00
- **Mouthpiece Protector (2 Pack)**
  - $4.50
- **Reed Absorbers (12 pack)**
  - $8.50
- **Stoppers - Stock (4 in packet)**
  - $10.00
- **Stoppers - Drone (3 in packet)**
  - $7.50
- **Tape - Chanter (Black)**
  - $9.50
- **Tape - Chanter (Tunetape)**
  - $20.00
- **Wax - Black Cobbler's wax**
  - $8.50

## Moisture Control & Water Traps
- **V3 Drier System**
  - $195.00
- **Water Trap - tube & stock**
  - $65.00
- **Water Trap - tube and connector only, with permanent neck, will not kink**
  - $30.00

## Tuners & Metronomes
- **Metronome - Korg MA30**
  - $65.00
- **Tuner - Korg CA40 for individual sets of bagpipes**
  - $65.00
- **Tuner - HBT1 Bagpipe Tuner**
  - $240.00
- **Tuner - Daliards Bagpipe Tuner**
  - $800.00

## Pipe Cases
- **RG Hardie Piper's Case**
  - $270.00

More Accessories Online at...
www.gannawaynz.co.nz

Gannaway New Zealand | 99 King Street, Temuka 7920 | gannaway.nz@xtra.co.nz | Ph. +64-3-615 5788

Gannaway Accessories Pricing Subject to Change Without Notice Pricing as at January 2011
CHANTERS

Pipe Chanters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Band Sets</th>
<th>Singles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warmac II (Synthetic)</td>
<td>POA</td>
<td>$240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmac II - African Blackwood</td>
<td>POA</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warmock (Synthetic)</td>
<td>POA</td>
<td>$345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCallum (Synthetic)</td>
<td>POA</td>
<td>$260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 McCallum - African Blackwood Band</td>
<td>POA</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shepherd (Synthetic)</td>
<td>POA</td>
<td>$320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Henderson (Synthetic)</td>
<td>POA</td>
<td>$290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Henderson - ABW Solo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCallum African Blackwood Solo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naill - African Blackwood Solo</td>
<td></td>
<td>$650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are happy to make the different makes of Pipe Chanters available for comparison

Practice Chanters

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childs Standard Practice Chanter</td>
<td></td>
<td>$80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Practice Chanter</td>
<td></td>
<td>$90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Span Practice Chanter</td>
<td></td>
<td>$110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Span Practice Chanter - Im Ivory sole, nickel ferrule</td>
<td></td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**African Blackwood Long Span Practice Chanter</td>
<td>**Available on request</td>
<td>POA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Naill Long Span Practice Pipe Chanter (Poly) - Im Ivory sole, nickel ferrule</td>
<td></td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Practice Chanters include Reed

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Chanter (Technochanter)</td>
<td></td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Electronic Technopipes</td>
<td>**Available on request</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact us for a competitive band quote.

View our other Chanters Online at...

www.gannawaynz.co.nz

Gannaway New Zealand  | 99 King Street, Temuka 7920  | gannaway.nz@xtra.co.nz
Ph. +64-3-615 5788  | Fax +64-3-615 7552
Appendix 6a - Score notation for ‘The Late Donald Cameron of Lochiel 24th Chief of Clan Cameron’. Source: Cameron (1934)
Doubling of Faoiltush.

Crunluath.

Doubling of Crunluath.

repeat the Ular.

repeat the Ular.
Appendix 6b - Score notation for ‘Field Marshal Robert’s Warning’. Source: Cameron (1934)
Appendix 6c - Score notation for ‘King Edward VII’. Source: Cameron (1934)

King Edward VII - Pibroch.

Variations.

Tarluath.
Doubling of Turluath.

Crunluath.

Doubling of Crunluath.

repeat Ular.