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Abstract

This thesis investigates the effects, consequences and contested terrain emerging from alcohol sponsorship of sport in New Zealand. Drawing from the 2010 New Zealand Law Commission report addressing the alcohol issue in New Zealand, this research examined the sport sponsorship debate in relation to one specific recommendation calling for a ban on alcohol sponsorship of sport as part of a three stage process; (1) implementation of regulations based on Loi Evin in France, where sport sponsorship and advertising is banned from sporting arenas and visual mediums; (2) prohibition on alcohol advertising where 10% of participants are under the legal drinking age, including sporting arenas and (3) the eventual complete removal of alcohol sponsorship of sport.

Located within a cultural studies framework and employing a qualitative, multi-method approach including document analysis and interviews with key stakeholders, the results highlight the contested terrain of varying interests within particular sectors of New Zealand. Three key findings emerged: (1) alcohol companies have a long history of sponsoring sport and became more powerful following the banning of tobacco sponsorship of sport; (2) the issue of alcohol sponsorship of sport is a contested terrain where particular interest groups (e.g. alcohol companies, sport organisations, alcohol regulatory bodies and concerned citizens) offer different, often competing, perspectives (3) While many interest groups argue that alcohol sponsorship is the ‘lifeblood’ of sport there are both New Zealand and international examples (including Loi Evin in France) that demonstrate that sports need not be dependent on alcohol funding for survival. Overall, the study highlights how public policy issues serve as contested terrains of political, economic and cultural debate.
Acknowledgements

It would not have been possible to write this thesis without the help and support of a number of people around me. Firstly, to Professor Steve Jackson, an immense thanks for providing me, not only with the original idea for this project, but for all the hard work and support as I have slowly, but surely put pen to paper. Thank you also for all the editing and the time you have given to chat about the project or just life in general.

To Dr Mike Sam, thanks for all the help you provided, particularly in the early stages of my post grad studies and during the proposal period.

A great deal of thanks to the individuals who took the time to participate in my interviews, this time afforded to me was greatly appreciated. Additionally, to those who could not participate for various reasons, thank you for taking the time to consider my requests.

To Bex and Scott and Sam and Erin. Thanks heaps for the accommodation during my interview process, it was an absolute pleasure.

To Mum, Dad, Brendan and Anna, thanks for being an absolute champion of a family! I could not have done any of this without you guys around.

To Cath and Ian, many thanks for all the meals and kind hospitality over the years – and thank you Cath for bothering to read my early drafts, and without complaint!

To Sarah; thanks for all the support, injury treatment and motivational speeches as the finishing date was pushed further and further into 2012. We can finally put this chapter to bed!
# Table of Contents

Abstract ........................................................................................................................................... ii  
Acknowledgements ....................................................................................................................... iii  
Table of contents ............................................................................................................................ iv  
List of tables.................................................................................................................................... vi  

CHAPTER 1: New Zealand’s Drinking Culture ................................................................................ 1  
Alcohol in our lives: Curbing the harm (2010). ............................................................................ 3  
Rationale......................................................................................................................................... 6  
Significance....................................................................................................................................... 9  
Thesis Structure............................................................................................................................... 13  

CHAPTER 2: Review of Literature. ................................................................................................. 15  
Early History of Alcohol in Society.............................................................................................. 16  
A Brief History of Alcohol in New Zealand................................................................................ 18  
Sport Sponsorship.......................................................................................................................... 21  
Alcohol and Tobacco: Reviewing the issues................................................................................ 25  
  Consumption................................................................................................................................. 26  
  Marketing Alcohol & Tobacco.................................................................................................... 27  
  Regulations................................................................................................................................. 29  
The Tobacco, Sport, Sponsorship relationship............................................................................ 31  
The Move to Ban Tobacco Sponsorship...................................................................................... 35  
Sport, Sponsorship and Alcohol: Historical Mix.......................................................................... 37  
Modern Alcohol Sponsorship......................................................................................................... 43  
Regulation of Alcohol Sponsorship.............................................................................................. 54  
Alcohol Regulation in New Zealand............................................................................................ 59  

CHAPTER 3: Ingredients for Analysis............................................................................................ 64  
Cultural Studies............................................................................................................................... 65  
Cultural Studies and Sport............................................................................................................. 67
List of Tables

Table 1: National sport stars’ alcohol related incidents.................................................................51
Table 2: International sport stars’ alcohol related incidents............................................................52
Table 3: Organisations, job descriptions and pseudonyms of interviewees......................................73
CHAPTER 1: New Zealand’s Drinking Culture

“Like a drowned man, a fool, a madman. One draught above heat makes him a fool, the second mad’s him and the third drowns him” (Shakespeare, *Twelfth Night*, I.v. 422-424).

In William Shakespeare’s seventeenth century tragedy *Twelfth Night*, when questioned by the character Olivia, Feste the clown affirms the consequences of alcohol when mixed with men. Shakespeare was ambivalent towards alcohol. He enjoyed a drink but was evidently aware of the consequences it caused to oneself (Delahoyde, n.d.). Ironically, Shakespeare’s death was allegedly caused by a fever, which he developed after a ‘merry meeting’ where he drank too excess (Jamieson, n.d.).

While this thesis is not to gauge Shakespeare’s thoughts on alcohol, his concerns about its use are shared by many within present day society. This is in part because alcohol depresses the nervous system, impairs both motor ability and judgement, reduces endurance and as a diuretic can affect electrolyte balance causing dehydration (Mottram, 2005; Vamplew, 2005). Moreover, although not all alcohol problems are linked to mortality, violence and injury, evidence outlining the negative effects of the abuse of alcohol is abundant. Consider the following: in 2011 the harmful use of alcohol\(^1\) was estimated by the World Health Organisation (WHO) to cause 2.5 million deaths worldwide (WHO, 2011a). This accounted for 3.7% of global mortality and a net loss of life of 2.5 million years (WHO, 2011a). Additionally, alcohol was responsible for 4.4% of the global burden of disease, even when the effects of low to moderate alcohol consumption on mortality and morbidity were

---

\(^1\) The World Health Organisation (WHO), in their 2008 report entitled *Strategies to reduce the harmful use of alcohol* presented at the 61\(^{st}\) World Health Assembly use the phrase ‘harmful use of alcohol’ to refer only to the negative public health effects of consumption of alcoholic beverages without prejudice to religious beliefs and cultural norms in any way. I take the same stance.

Questions are being raised over alcohol’s place within contemporary society, and there are increasing concerns surrounding the negative impact of alcohol on New Zealand culture. The WHO (2011a) states that New Zealand is one of the few Southern Hemisphere countries with high consumption levels of alcohol\(^2\) resulting in a long list of negative consequences to society. One of the reasons for this is New Zealand’s lax liquor laws. The 1989 Sale of Liquor Act has made alcohol freely available in New Zealand; “A liquor licence is now easier to obtain; beer and wine can be sold in supermarkets; Sunday sales are permitted and the minimum drinking age has been reduced from 20 to 18 years” (ALAC, 2004).

Consider the following alcohol related episodes within New Zealand: in 1993 a group of youths beat West Auckland shopkeeper Navin Govind to death with baseball bats. In 2000, Mangere (a suburb of South Auckland) liquor store owner Shiu Prasad was stabbed to death. In June of 2005, 58 year old Bhagubhai Vaghela was shot during a robbery of an Auckland mini-mart. On the 22\(^{nd}\) of January 2008, 22 year old Krishna Naidu was stabbed to death in his family’s supermarket (Hume, 2008). Between 2007 and 2009, between 140 and 150 arrests were made as a result of the ‘Undie 500’ event.\(^3\) The common denominator of all of these offences was alcohol.

\(^2\)The WHO's most recent data on global alcohol consumption comes from 2005. Within the data, New Zealand (WHO best estimate) consumes between 7.50 and 9.99 litres of pure alcohol per capita annually. This level of consumption ranks substantially higher than the global average of 6.13 litres and places New Zealand within the ‘highest levels of consumption’ in the world (WHO, 2011a).

\(^3\)The Undie 500 was organised by the University of Canterbury’s Engineering Society (ENSOC). The students purchase cars under 500 dollars and decorate them according to a specified theme. They then convoy south to Dunedin, stopping at local pubs along the way. The common themes of arrest over the three year period were breaching the temporary liquor ban (which was put in place after 2007 to stop students gathering in large quantities and drinking on the streets), disorderly behaviour, obstruction and wilfully setting fire to property (McCorkindale, 2009). The event has been subsequently banned.
It was the death of Indian liquor store owner Navtej Singh that provoked the greatest public outcry for action against some of New Zealand’s liquor laws and our drinking culture. On the 7th of June 2008 at 9pm, Indian liquor store owner Navtej Singh was gunned down by three armed robbers. The assailants stole cash, phone cards and alcohol to the value of approximately four thousand dollars (Hume, 2008).

Alcohol in our lives: Curbing the harm (2010)

In response to Navtej Singh’s death and nationwide calls for change, the Labour government of New Zealand, under the then Labour Prime Minister Helen Clark, approached the NZ Law Commission tasking them with reviewing New Zealand’s liquor licensing laws (NZPA, 2009). From the outset, the NZ Law Commission issued a discussion paper on alcohol titled Alcohol in our lives: An issues paper on the reform of New Zealand’s liquor laws. This document, published in 2009, presented the key issues to the public so that they could make submissions based on the initial evidence. Predicated on public submissions, the commission published a report in April 2010 titled; Alcohol in our lives: Curbing the harm. Two causal links would underpin their inquiry. The first was the contribution that excessive use of alcohol led to law and order problems in New Zealand. The second being the serious health effects, injury and other harms caused by excessive alcohol consumption (NZPA, 2009).

Located within the report are a number of recommendations relating to the laws on alcohol in different echelons of society. Such recommendations were made after extensive research and consultation by the NZ Law Commission. They collected nearly three thousand

---

4 The New Zealand Law Commission is an independent crown entity. It is funded by the government and reviews areas of legislation that are outdated or need reforming or developing. Recommendations are presented to Parliament and published as a report (New Zealand Law Commission, 2011). The government makes the final decision on whether to make changes to the existing laws.

5 The New Zealand Law Commission studied the initial data from stories in the news and other mediums – including following police on some weekends. They concluded that liquor has become a serious source of social problems in New Zealand. New Zealand Police have found that through research based on their ‘Alco-link’ data, that a disproportionate use of police resources are required to clean up scenes of disorder, offending and saving intoxicated people from themselves (New Zealand Law Commission, 2010).
submissions from members of the public, retrieved evidence from academia and followed the on duty New Zealand Police on Saturday nights to get a first-hand account of the crisis (NZ Law Commission, 2010). Notably, the cover page of the NZ Law Commission’s report is compelling given that it draws a direct link between alcohol and sport. The photo is of an intoxicated person asleep on a park bench in the centre of Christchurch after the 2006 Super 14 rugby union semi-final between the Canterbury Crusaders of New Zealand and the Bulls from Pretoria, South Africa.

Such is the strength of the relationship between alcohol and sponsorship of sporting and cultural events in New Zealand, a chapter of the NZ Law Commission’s report is devoted to this alliance. Chapter 19 is titled; Advertising, sponsorship and the promotion of alcohol. Situated within chapter 19 are a range of submissions calling for stronger regulations towards advertising and sponsorship. The general consensus from public submissions within the NZ Law Commission report is that the advertising and sponsorship of alcohol should be severely reduced in New Zealand and should include warnings about the health risks. A majority urged the NZ Law Commission to consider reducing or removing alcohol sponsorship of sport completely. Contemplate the following submissions that capture the overall feeling in this context:

There is presently an intimate association of alcohol with sporting activity just as there was once with tobacco and say, motor sport. It is just not direct advertising and brand promotion. It is a thread that runs through the media.

Reduce marketing and advertising and sponsorship of sports events by the alcohol industry. Netball does fine when sponsored by a grocery chain.

---

6 2,281 out of 2,939 submissions commented on policy options about advertising and marketing. Of the 2,281 submissions, 86 percent supported banning or restricting all advertising of all alcohol in all media (NZ Law Commission, 2010, p.323).
7 Submission of Dr K.A Rodgers (Submission dated 6 August 2009).
8 Submission of Robyn Northey (Submission dated 1 October 2009). It is also noteworthy to point out that the New Zealand national netball team – also known as ‘The Silver Ferns’ are sponsored by grocery chain ‘New World.’
Alcohol brands sold in New Zealand are increasingly being marketed via sponsorship of music and sporting events. Alcohol sponsorship of clubs, sports events and rock concerts helps embed alcohol brands and products into the everyday lives of young people.⁹

These submissions highlight opposition to the role of alcohol marketing and sponsorship in sport and its role in the normalisation of drinking in society. For example, Lion Breweries New Zealand is responsible for the marketing and distribution of a number of beer brands including Steinlager which has been the official sponsor of New Zealand’s National Rugby team the All Blacks for 25 years (Fahy, 2011). Alcohol, including its marketing, sale and promotion has been part of the sport landscape for a number of decades. It is no coincidence that most sport trophies are cups, the original idea was to facilitate the drinking of the victorious team or athlete (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). The relationship between sport and alcohol is so strong that it would be unusual to view an event that was not associated in some capacity with an alcohol brand (McDaniel, Kinney & Chalip, 2001).

Conversely, a number of individuals and interest groups held very different views. They advocated for free market sensibilities and even defending the alcohol industry because of its key role in supporting sport. Consider the following comments which also formed part of the submissions to the NZ Law Commission:

The purpose of liquor advertising is to influence brand choice. While we understand that placing restrictions on liquor advertising is populist and easy to implement, there is no evidence that such measures will make a contribution to addressing the problem of youth drinking or risky drinking behaviours amongst adult New Zealanders.¹⁰

There is no reason why responsible producers of alcohol should be restricted from sponsorship. In fact many sports clubs in New Zealand rely heavily on the support of these sponsors.¹¹

On the basis of these submissions, the NZ Law Commission concluded chapter 19 by offering a number of recommendations. They state that the evidence associating drinking,

⁹ Submission of the New Zealand Drug Foundation (Submission dated 27 October 2009).
¹⁰ Submission of Lion Breweries (Submission dated 29 October 2009).
¹¹ Submission of Tony Woodcock (Submission dated 30 October 2009).
advertising and sponsorship is compelling, particularly regarding young people. In relation to sport, the commission recommends the complete removal of alcohol sponsorship of sport. They suggest this occur as part of a three stage process. Stage one involves implementing restrictions on alcohol sponsorship. This would be similar to measures adopted by France, which implemented Loi Evin (Rigaud & Craplet, 2004). This law, passed in 1991, attempts to both limit exposure to alcohol advertising and restrict content (NZ Law Commission, 2010). One of the effects of Loi Evin is that no alcohol advertising is allowed on television or in cinemas and no alcohol sponsorship of cultural or sport events is permitted (Rigaud & Craplet, 2004). The NZ Law Commission concludes that Loi Evin could not be implemented in full into the New Zealand context but parts of its law should be considered (NZ Law Commission, 2010).

Stage two of the process recommends that sport and cultural events should not be venues for alcohol advertising, given their high use by young people. Point 19.176 of the report states that

No producer or retailer should be able to provide alcohol-related branding, equipment or merchandise for any school or sporting, cultural or social club or activity or event where 10 percent or more of the participants are under the legal purchase age. This would include, for example, no advertising material in a sport club bar and no sponsorship messages displayed at sports grounds or other public venues hosting school age participants (NZ Law Commission, 2010, p. 358).

The third and final stage involves the implementation of heavier restrictions, including no alcohol related sponsorship of any cultural or sporting events or activities.

Rationale

The alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship is clearly a complex one – we might refer to it as a ‘contested terrain.’ According to Jackson and Scherer (2013, in press):
We can think of a contested terrain as a site of struggle not unlike a battlefield. Sometimes these struggles are small differences of opinions and perspectives, sometimes they are minor philosophical disagreements, but sometimes the result is major conflict and even violence and war. Ultimately contested terrains are about power struggles over physical, symbolic, ideological and moral/ethical principles, spaces and policies.

This study aims to contribute to our understanding of the key issues, debates, perceived constraints and solutions in relation to alcohol reform and specifically the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship in New Zealand. By doing this, it addresses the question of ‘what are the key points of contested perspectives, interests and evidence?’ That is, the alcohol sponsorship of sport debate is viewed as a site where particular interest groups debate, enact, negotiate and resist various cultural practices and policies.

As a result, this thesis examines the contested terrain of the debates associated with the 2010 NZ Law Commission report and its implications for alcohol sponsorship of sport. Alcohol is a product that when misused or abused poses a threat to society, yet receives much praise when it is aligned with sport, particularly with successful sporting teams such as the All Blacks or when it supports grassroots sport often leading to the perception that it is the ‘lifeblood’ of amateur club sport in New Zealand. Yet, alcohol can be seen on the sidelines of children’s sporting competitions and at sporting events that are attended by children – such as All Black matches. Thus, alcohol remains a strategic and unique site for studying the relationship between alcohol and sport and offers insight into the contested terrain of interests within the debate.

For example, alcohol companies tend to mask their product as a positive, natural and legitimate social commodity (cf. Casswell, 1995; Hill & Casswell in Heather & Stockwell, 2004). In turn, this enables breweries to align themselves with the admired traits associated with the particular sport or sportsperson(s) they sponsor. However, these strategies disguise the fact that: alcohol is a drug which, while legal, can cause enormous social harm.
Moreover, since sport is a site where both adults and children are present as both participants and spectators there is greater exposure to the sport-alcohol nexus (Palmer, 2011). As such, the overall research question for this study is:

**How does alcohol sponsorship of sport serve as a contested terrain in New Zealand?**

In order to answer this question, it is imperative to gain a socio-historical understanding of alcohol in society, including the development of its relationship with sport in New Zealand. As part of this socio-historical contextualisation it is useful to consider another controversial drug-related sponsorship of sport – that of tobacco. Although they are clearly different products, tobacco and alcohol share some commonalities especially in relation to debates about sport sponsorship. Moreover, the near complete exit of tobacco sponsorship of sport was seized upon by the alcohol industry as a strategic opportunity. Overall, this study aims to gain an understanding of the contested terrain of the alcohol sponsorship of sport by examining: (1) the history of the sport-alcohol relationship, (2) discourses associated with past, present and potential future social policies aimed at regulating the relationship, and (3) the perspectives of key stakeholders involved in the relationship. In light of this, four sub-questions have been developed to guide the study:

1) Socio-historically, what is the context of alcohol sponsorship of sport both globally and in New Zealand?

2) How does the history of the regulation of tobacco sponsorship of sport inform the regulation of alcohol sponsorship of sport?

3) How do the submissions to the NZ Law Commission’s report, and wider public discourses, illustrate the contested terrain? How do key stakeholders justify, defend, negotiate and/or challenge alcohol’s sponsorship of sport to serve their own interests?
4) What steps will or have been taken by government and sport stakeholders to meet the recommendations of the NZ Law Commission?

In attending to these research questions, I adopt a multi-method approach located within a cultural studies framework (Johnson, Chambers, Raghuram & Tincknell, 2004). To begin, I contextualise the socio-historical relationship of alcohol sponsorship of sport in order to highlight the economic and cultural links. Moreover, I draw particular attention to the case of tobacco sponsorship of sport in order to compare and contrast the similarities and differences in the debates associated with another controversial, but legal commodity which became the subject of social regulation. Finally, I use discourse analysis as a tool in order to understand the contested terrain. That is, the complex and competing positions of key stakeholders in the debate.

Although it has received some attention (c.f. Casswell & Maxwell, 2005; Collins & Vamplew, 2002; Hill & Casswell, 2004; Howard & Crompton, 2004; McEwan, Campbell & Swain, 2010; O’Brien & Kypri, 2008; Sperber, 2000; Vamplew, 2005), the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship is a relatively new topic of scholarly analysis, particularly within a New Zealand context. As such, this study may offer valuable insights and contribute to the paucity of literature.

Significance

The significance of this study can be categorised into three sections. First, the study informs our understanding of alcohol’s impact on health and social harm. While the purpose of this thesis is not to measure the health impact of alcohol sponsorship of sport, it is important to examine and acknowledge how this issue is used within the debates, including the kinds of evidence provided. Second, the study contributes to an informed understanding of alcohol
sponsorship of sport and lastly, the study offers insights on competing interests about the issue within society.

As previously noted, in 2011 the WHO published a report titled, *The global status report on alcohol and health* which presents some startling data. WHO estimates that 2 billion (one third) of people worldwide consume alcohol. Out of this, alcohol is said to cause 2.5 million deaths annually (WHO, 2011a). This accounted for 3.7% of global mortality and a net loss of life of 2.5 million years (WHO, 2011a). Additionally, alcohol was responsible for 4.4% of the global burden of disease, even when the effects of low to moderate alcohol consumption on mortality and morbidity were considered (WHO, 2008). The global cost of the harmful use of alcohol in 2002 was estimated to be between US $210 million and US $665 million (WHO, 2008). Furthermore, alcohol is responsible for a loss of 58.3 million Disability-Adjusted Life Years (DALYs) per year (WHO, 2004). The WHO defines DALYs as the sum of years of potential life lost due to premature mortality and the years of productive life lost due to disability.

However, alcohol consumption has health consequences other than mortality. Overall, there is a causal relationship between alcohol consumption and more than 60 types of disease or injury (WHO, 2004). The WHO states that 76.3 million people live with an alcohol related disease (WHO, 2004). Few people are aware that alcoholic beverages are classified as carcinogenic by the International Agency for Research on Cancer thus increasing the risk of cancers of the oral cavity and pharynx, oesophagus, stomach, liver, colon, rectum, and breast (Anderson, Chisholm & Fuhr, 2009). Additionally, cardiovascular disease such as heart attacks and stroke and other diseases that affect human organ function - cirrhosis of the liver, epileptic seizures and brain damage have all shown to have some causal relationship with alcohol (WHO, 2008). Furthermore, alcohol contributes to deviant sexual behaviour, sexually transmitted diseases and HIV infection (Cook & Clark, 2005; Fisher, Bang & Kapiga, 2007).
In addition to the negative impact on health, alcohol consumption is associated with harmful social consequences. These affect the individual drinker, the drinker’s immediate environment and society as a whole (WHO, 2004). Social consequences can be deemed more pertinent because they reach further than the individual drinker. Consequences such as work performance and absenteeism, family relationships, interpersonal violence, suicide, homicide, crime and fatalities are often caused while under the influence of alcohol (Anderson, Chisholm & Fuhr, 2009).

New Zealand is not exempt from the global alcohol epidemic. According to the Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand (ALAC, 2004) alcohol is the most commonly used recreational drug in New Zealand. One thousand New Zealanders die every year from an alcohol related illness (Anderton, 2009; Hunt, 2010). This is in comparison to fewer than 20 deaths caused by methamphetamine and H1N1 (Swine Flu) (Anderton, 2009; Sellman, 2009). In 2010, Dr Geoff Robinson highlighted these dangers when he said if alcohol was introduced today it would be classified as a Class B drug alongside amphetamines and morphine (Hunt, 2010). According to a 2004 Ministry of Health alcohol use survey, approximately 81 percent of New Zealanders aged between 12 and 65 years reported consuming alcohol within a 12 month period (Ministry of Health, 2004). Internationally, New Zealand ranks 24th out of 50 countries in alcohol consumption per capita (ALAC website, 2011). One of the most alarming statistics comes from ALAC’s (1998) annual survey of attitudes towards alcohol. One quarter of all New Zealand adults identified themselves as binge drinkers. Although binge drinking carries no official definition, Stolle, Sack and

---

12 ALAC was restructured and was merged into the Health Promotion Agency (HPA). The Health Promotion Agency “leads and delivers innovative, high quality and cost-effective programmes that promote health, well-being and healthy lifestyles, disease prevention, illness and injury prevention and to enable healthy environments” (HPA Website, 2012).
Thomasius (2009) define it as episodic, excessive alcohol consumption of 4 standard drinks (for females) and 5 standard drinks (for males) with the aim of becoming drunk.

Confirming New Zealand’s problem with alcohol, Prime Minister John Key exclaimed on New Zealand television programme *Breakfast* that “We’ve got a binge drinking culture in New Zealand – I think we need to accept that. But the point is legislation to change that is difficult. We all have to want to buy into that as a community” (TVNZ, 2010). The evidence for further legislation is compelling. There have been a number of national incidents such as the attack on Navtej Singh which suggest the problem is deepening. The alcohol problem has reached various social arenas and sport is one of these locations.

The alcohol-sport sponsorship relationship has become the subject of increasing controversy and debate in recent times with renewed reminders from critics that alcohol is a drug with the potential to become very addictive. Moreover, there is a growing school of thought that sport is not an appropriate area for brewer sponsorship (Johnson, 1988). To many physicians, psychologists and social critics our incessant blending of alcohol with athletic excellence is hypocritical, irresponsible and hazardous to health (Johnson, 1988). As a drug alcohol depresses the nervous system, impairs both motor ability and judgement, reduces endurance and, as a diuretic, can disturb electrolyte balance and cause dehydration, all of which are detrimental to effective sports performance (Stainback, 1997; Reilly cited in Mottram, 2011). Nevertheless, beer companies have been very successful in naturalising the process of alcohol consumption in conjunction with participation and spectatorship of sport (Crompton, 1993).

Sport has been implicated in the alcohol and binge drinking problem in New Zealand because of firstly, the strong cultural links between sport, alcohol and masculinity or what has been described as the holy trinity (Wenner & Jackson, 2009). Second, the strong links,
sometimes to the point of dependency, between alcohol sponsorship and sport and lastly the on-going New Zealand media coverage of high profile athletes in trouble where alcohol has been involved. The 2010 NZ Law Commission report calling for a ban on alcohol sponsorship of sport, directly or indirectly, confronts each of these issues.

This research should be of interest to scholars across a diverse range of fields including: sports studies (sport sociology, sport history, sports marketing, sport management and policy), health studies and social and public policy studies. There are very few studies pertaining to the alcohol sponsorship of sport and this research provides some insights into a powerful, corporate-dominated, yet relatively unregulated and overlooked, relationship between two global industries: alcohol and sport. By highlighting how the relationship originated, the links with other sectors involved in the relationship, and how it can divide opinions across a nation, this study contributes to the debate whether alcohol should be used as a sponsor of sport in New Zealand.

Thesis Structure

This thesis intends to provide a concise investigation of the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship from both a socio-historical and contemporary perspective within a New Zealand context. Inclusive of Chapter 1 which serves as the Introduction, the thesis is divided into five chapters.

Chapter 2 provides the socio-historical contextualisation for the study. To begin, an outline of alcohol and its entry into the global sporting landscape is presented. Additionally the relationship between tobacco and sport is compared and contrasted with alcohol with respect to the debates regarding sport sponsorship. Further, the regulatory measures for alcohol sponsorship and advertising from a global standpoint afford international examples of highly contested, yet successful policy.
Chapter 3 details the qualitative methodology used for this study. Using a multi-method approach, located within a cultural studies framework, the contested terrain is highlighted and explained as the key tenet for this study. Beyond the socio-historical contextualisation offered, data was gathered through document analysis and interviews with selected stakeholders from around New Zealand.

Chapter 4 analyses the interview and document data in relation to the contested terrain of alcohol sponsorship of sport. Firstly, a discussion of the current New Zealand context from an alcohol regulation perspective draws attention to where the New Zealand Government has shifted priorities since the 2010 *NZ Law Commission* report. Discussion of those stakeholders with a public health interest in why alcohol sponsorship should be banned is presented and discussed. Following this analysis is undertaken of those vested interest groups who wish to maintain the current status quo in New Zealand. Two key themes emerged here; 1) the need for New Zealand to change its culture rather than removing alcohol sponsorship of sport and 2) the position that New Zealand sport cannot survive financially at any level without the help of alcohol sponsorship.

Finally, chapter 5 revisits the purpose and significance of the thesis, summarising the key conclusions, limitations and constraints, offers suggestions for future research. The chapter concludes by speculating about the future of the alcohol-sport relationship. For example, the implications of proposed changes to the liquor laws including the potential banning of alcohol sponsorship of sport and the implications for stakeholders.
CHAPTER 2: Review of Literature

This chapter contextualises the alcohol-sport sponsorship relationship historically, globally and locally within New Zealand. Alcohol is briefly traced from its uses in early civilizations to its modern day place in society in order to contextualize its widespread (mis)use and related consequences. Furthermore, analysis of the prominence of alcohol within a global context will emphasize that it has often been at the vanguard of many societal and sporting events. Thus, the historical prominence of alcohol within a sporting context is located to highlight the cultural significance of the relationship. Furthermore, the review will discuss the specific use of alcohol within a New Zealand context. This will shed a light on the historical position of alcohol and its social control and regulation within New Zealand.

I begin by offering a very brief history of alcohol tracing the problems it has caused and attempts by society to regulate and reform its use. Following this, I will locate the discussion within a New Zealand context. Here, alcohol is traced from its early arrival to New Zealand shores to the attempts to address a range of alcohol problems over time. I will then discuss sport sponsorship and the appeal of sport as a powerful promotional tool for both local and global corporations. In turn, two commodities: alcohol and tobacco are compared and contrasted with respect to their place in society and more specifically their relationship with sport. Both are legal drugs whose producers have successfully sponsored sport – but both have faced resistance from particular segments of society. The double edged sword of these products’ relationship with sport is evident given that on one hand they help finance sport but they both can be detrimental to both health and sporting performance (Crompton, 1993). The focus then shifts to tobacco and alcohol as separate entities tracing their respective historical relationships with sport. Finally, I touch on the regulations of alcohol
advertising to highlight the politics of legislation surrounding alcohol sponsorship within a New Zealand context.

**Early History of Alcohol in Society**

It is important to trace the history and uses of alcohol because this may help us understand its enduring place in society. While no one knows when alcohol was first used (Hanson, 1995), it has been an integral part of social life across societies for thousands of years. There is no official date set when humans first came into contact with alcoholic beverages; however, Roueche (cited in Lucia, 1967) claims the oldest records of alcohol being consumed date back as far as five thousand years ago, when cuneiform tablets from the third millennium were recovered from a temple at Erech near the head of the Persian Gulf. Patrick (1952) provides evidence to suggest alcoholic beverages have been around from as early as the Neolithic period (c.10,000 BCE). What is clear is that alcohol is one of the oldest known beverages in human history.

Prior to the scientific age, alcohol held a plethora of uses for society. Hanson (1995) explains that alcohol served as a source of needed nutrients. Moreover, it was widely used for medicinal, antiseptic and analgesic purposes. Socially, it was well recognized as a thirst quencher and social lubricant as well as increasing the enjoyment of eating (Hanson, 1995). While initially viewed as a positive natural beverage, alcohol was increasingly scrutinized as drunkenness became a problem in society particularly as more people took part in Dionysus revelries – where inebriation was believed to bring one closer to the deity (Sournia, 1990). In turn, practices that encouraged excessive drinking began to emerge. These included: drinking before meals on an empty stomach, inducing vomiting to permit the consumption of more food and wine and drinking games such as consuming the number of cups of wine as
indicated by the roll of a dice (Babor, 1986; Hanson, 1995). Thus, the contested terrain of alcohol has been around as long as the product itself.

Notably, although drunkenness was predominantly viewed as a sin (Austin, 1985) there were no regulatory measures in place to stop a person drinking as much as they liked. This kept alcohol consumption exceedingly high (Hanson, 1995). There is evidence however of early resistance to drunkenness and the alcohol problem. For example, Greek statesmen of the sixth century BCE introduced supervised festivities as an alternative to the drunkenness that was promoted by Dionysus revelries (Babor, Caetano, Casswell, Edwards, Giesbrecht et al, 2010). Furthermore the Athenian lawmaker Solon (c. 594 BC) prescribed the death penalty for drunken magistrates and required all wine be diluted with water before being permitted to be sold (Babor et al., 2010). In Elizabethan England (1558-1603), offenders were forced to parade through the streets wearing a ‘drunkard’s cloak’ – a bottomless beer barrel with holes cut out for arms (Heather & Robertson 1997). By the nineteenth century increasing industrialization and the need for a punctual workforce became more important than worship and celebrating festivals. Consequently, drunkenness came to be defined as a threat to industrial stability and growth (Hanson, 1995; Soumia, 1990). Thus, the contested terrain of alcohol consumption and regulation has a long history.

Akin to numerous products in today’s society, the growth of production and indeed marketing of alcohol sprung from the industrial revolution that occurred in the last quarter of the eighteenth century (Cavanagh & Clairmonte, 1985). Products like beer had become increasingly popular in both urban and rural areas and they were given a major boost with the revolution. Alcoholic beverages progressed from being products produced locally by specialized craftspeople in small markets to large scale industries distributed through a wide network (Cavanagh & Clairmonte, 1985; Room, 1997). Other technologies like refrigerated ships and tankers meant that not only was alcohol able to be mass produced, it could be mass
exported around the globe and within the country without the product going off (Gordon, 1993). This was particularly the case with beer, which would spoil if it went without refrigeration. These technologies would lead to increased global consumption of alcohol accompanied by disease, mortality and social problems.

The late nineteenth century saw the emergence of the mass temperance movements across the globe. Hanson (1995) notes that temperance was a response to a range of problems associated with increased alcohol consumption including: poverty, urban crime, violence, high infant mortality, along with personal, social and religious problems (Bancroft, 2009; Hanson, 1995). By 1930 the United States alone was consuming the equivalent of 1.7 bottles of hard liquor per person, per week – three times the amount consumed today (Von Drehle, 2010). American President Woodrow Wilson ratified a law in 1919 prohibiting the sale of alcohol – the 18th Amendment of the United States constitution (Clark, 1976). While the law only lasted until its repeal in 1933, it highlighted the extraordinary lengths the United States was prepared to go to in order to remove the alcohol problem from society. Ironically, prohibition had the opposite effect – it created a black market for alcohol and the rise of the mafia (Von Drehle, 2010).

While prohibition was passed in the United States, it did not have the same success in New Zealand. It is important to tell the story of alcohol and the temperance movement in New Zealand to address both the global nature of the problem, but additionally how it manifests in the local context that is the focus of this study.

A Brief History of Alcohol in New Zealand

“The white man and the whiskey bottle came to New Zealand together”
- Reverend W.J. Williams (1930, in ALAC, 2004).
Before Pākehā\(^{13}\) arrived, New Zealand remained one of the few parts of the world that had never developed alcoholic beverages (ALAC, 2004). As contact was made by Europeans, alcohol was introduced and consumption increased. Alcohol or ‘grog’ initially appeared on a large scale with early whale and seal hunters, convicts, beachcombers, traders and soldiers of fortune who came to New Zealand in the 1820s and 1830s (McKimmey, 1968). In the early pioneering period, there were no effective controls on liquor sales. Public houses (pubs) and bars sprang up in large numbers. Citizens could purchase liquor at general stores and bars making public drunkenness more common than during any other period of New Zealand’s history (ALAC, 2004). The *Licensing Ordinance* was passed in 1842 but it did not provide any restrictive measures for the number of licences granted or the conditions under which alcohol was sold or consumed (ALAC, 2002).

Concerned citizens facing growing social ills caused by alcohol spawned prohibitionists and temperance movements. In 1886 the *Alliance for the Suppression of the Liquor Traffic* became “one of the greatest populist movements in New Zealand history” (ALAC, 2002, p.13). Following this, the first comprehensive licensing act was passed in 1881 and banned Sunday trading and gave citizens the right to decide if any new licenses would be granted. The results were dramatic. The local poll became an issue of national significance (ALAC, 2002) and referendums on the prohibition issue were held in 1902, 1905, 1908 and 1911 (Hayler, 1913). Prohibitionists were convinced that without alcohol social problems would disappear and a communal bliss would prevail (McLauchlan, 2004). While prohibition achieved further support each referendum, including a 55% majority in 1911, it was not the three-fifths majority required under law (Hayler, 1913). However, more restrictive alcohol laws came into effect. These included the closing of bars brought forward from 11pm to 10pm, barmaids were banned, bottle licenses abolished and the minimum legal purchase age

\(^{13}\) Pākehā is a Maori (New Zealand indigenous) language term meaning New Zealand (white) Europeans.
raised from 18 to 21 years (ALAC, 2002). The following years saw the march for prohibition in New Zealand curtailed by the Great War (1913-1918). However, temperance fighters saw the Great War as an opportunity to press for change. They viewed sobriety as a patriotic duty of all New Zealanders (Ministry for Culture & Heritage, 2010).

In 1915 and 1916, close to 160,000 New Zealanders signed a petition calling for the early closing of bars (Ministry for Culture & Heritage, 2010). On the back of this petition spawned one of New Zealand’s most famous pieces of liquor legislation which, in turn, had a significant impact on drinking behaviour. The Sale of Liquor Restriction Act famously known as the ‘six o’clock swill’ was introduced in 1917 as a ‘temporary wartime measure’ (ALAC, 2004; McLauchlan, 2004). The law meant that all pubs and bars must be closed at 6pm. With a majority of New Zealand’s male workforce ‘punching their cards’ at 5pm, the legislation created a mad rush to the closest bar in order to consume as much beer as possible before the end of trading. According to ALAC (2004), the law, which lasted for 50 years, signalled the development of the all-male ritual of rapid beer drinking that one historian described as a most peculiar practice that promoted very unhealthy drinking patterns (Brooking, 2004).

A large portion of society opposed the six o’clock swill. The restaurant industry argued the law made it difficult to sell alcohol with meals (Ministry for Culture & Heritage, 2010). Additionally, the changing social attitude of New Zealanders was a driving factor. People socializing at a local sports club or the Returned Services Association (RSA) demanded the extension of closing hours (Ministry for Culture & Heritage, 2010). A referendum was held in September 1967 and produced a clear majority – 64.5% voted to extend opening hours beyond 6pm (Roberts, 2012).

Further sweeping law changes in the 1960’s increased the number and type of liquor licenses available, in turn increasing access to alcohol (ALAC, 2004). They would now
include restaurants, taverns, theatres, airports, cabarets, sport and other clubs. Drinking hours were extended and the legal drinking age was lowered from 21 to 20 years old in 1969 (ALAC, 2004), and subsequently from 20 to 18 years in 1999. This increased access to alcohol, particularly by younger generations meant a larger market with enormous potential. Not surprisingly a key strategy used by the alcohol industry to reach this expanding market was sport sponsorship.

**Sport Sponsorship**

Although various forms of sponsorship have existed for a long time, it was only in the 1980s that its utility as a marketing communications tool was recognised (Meenaghan, 1983). *The Economist* magazine’s business unit provided the first comprehensive definition in 1980:

1: A sponsor makes a contribution in cash or in kind – which may or may not include services and expertise – to an activity which is in some measure a leisure pursuit either sport or within the broad definition of the arts.

2: The sponsored activity does not form part of the main commercial function of the sponsoring body (otherwise it becomes straightforward promotion rather than sponsorship).

3: The sponsor expects a return in terms of publicity (Simkins, 1980).

Today, sponsorship is commonly defined as a business agreement between two parties. The sponsor provides money, goods, services or know-how. In exchange, the sponsored party (individual, team, event or organisation) offers rights and associations which the sponsor uses to their commercial benefit (Amis & Cornwell, 2005; Howard & Crompton, 2004; Lagae, 2003; McDaniel, Mason & Kinney, 1999; Ukman, 1995; Wilson, 1988). For example, professional golfer Tiger Woods is paid millions of dollars by the apparel giant Nike to wear their garments and use their golf clubs. In return, Nike receives hours of brand exposure through television coverage following Woods. His agent, Mark Steinberg, proclaimed: “Woods is a walking swoosh from the top of his hat to the heel of his shoe. He is
the most photographed athlete. Nike is the only brand you can see on this person” (Golf Today, 2001).

Meenaghan (1991) lists six ‘driving forces’ behind the growth and popularity of sponsorship (1) changing government policies on alcohol and tobacco (2) escalating costs of advertising in the media (3) the proven ability of sponsorship (4) new opportunities due to increased leisure activity (5) greater media coverage of sponsored events (6) inefficiencies of traditional media. All six provide some relevance to this study, in particular; the changing government policies on alcohol and tobacco. A number of scholars (Cornwell, 1997; Crompton, 1993; Daube, 2012; McDaniel & Mason, 2000) agree that sponsorship has become an alternative marketing tool for controversial products like alcohol and tobacco. Advertising costs were rising and becoming cluttered which made sponsoring events like sport increasingly attractive for marketers (Cunningham, Taylor & Reeder, 1992). The proven ability of sponsorship as an alternative marketing vehicle is highlighted by Easton and Mackie (1998) who note that the Euro 1996 Football Championship significantly boosted sales of Carlsberg-Tetley with sales rising by 70%.

Sponsorship growth was facilitated by a number of further factors (Howard & Crompton, 1995). In the 1960’s, most companies were selling goods by mass marketing. By the 1980’s, successful companies realised that a mass market did not exist, but rather consisted of segments or clusters of potential customers, each with his or her own propensity to purchase particular goods and services (Howard & Crompton, 2004). This enabled companies to strategically target specific areas of the market – sport being one of these key sites. Secondly, sponsors have been able to target specific audiences by their choice of sport. This occurs through narrowly focused outlets in the media. For example, many years ago, sporting magazines may have been limited to one or two publications. Today, a sponsor can
target consumers through between two and six publications for each individual sport alone (Howard & Crompton, 2004).

The proliferation of television channels, subscription services and pay-per-view special events has led to a substantial increase in the amount of televised sport produced (Cunningham, Taylor & Reeder, 1992). Television as a visual medium enhanced interest and knowledge of sport and therefore enlarged audiences (Cunningham et al. 1992). In addition, sport is inexpensive to produce and carries socially valued messages of patriotism, toughness, sexuality, masculinity among others. It is the amount of sport produced coupled with the messages it carries that attracts companies to align with sporting events (Howard & Crompton, 2004). As media mogul owner of News Corporation, and its subsidiary BskyB, Rupert Murdoch declared at a 1996 meeting that [sport] “absolutely overpowers film and all other forms of entertainment in drawing people to their television” (Robertson, 2004), and he further noted that the company would be using sport as a ‘battering ram’ and a lead offering in all our pay-television operations (Crane, 1998).

The increase in products and services along with the increased competition in the market through mergers and takeovers serves as an additional factor in the growth of sponsorship (Howard & Crompton, 2004). Put simply, fewer but larger companies exercise more control within distribution channels. This can be highlighted by global alcohol distribution company Anheuser-Busch InBev’s merger of Anheuser-Busch and InBev. InBev is additionally a merger of AmBev and Interbrew (Anheuser-Busch InBev, 2011). Because of the stronger competition in the market, it has become important to enhance relationships and sponsorship offers an avenue through sport, entertainment and hospitality to elevate relations (Cunningham, Taylor & Reeder, 1992).
Sport is an area of sponsorship that has grown exponentially over the past 50 years. Today, it is almost impossible to find any public event that is not sponsored in some way or another (Kover, 2001). Tripodi (2001) notes that since the 1984 Los Angeles Olympics, sponsorship has gained popularity amongst marketers as an effective brand equity-building strategy; and today corporate sponsorship has become a key element in the marketing mix.

According to early European figures, the global sponsorship market has grown from 3 billion Euros in 1984, to 20 billion in 2002 (Lagae, 2003). Similarly, Ukman (1995) states that 4,500 North American companies spent $4.2 billion to acquire sponsorship rights, of which 67% was spent on sporting events. More recently, this figure has climbed from $37.9 billion US dollars in 2007 to a projected $48.7 billion dollars by 2012 (IEG, 2011).

Companies work hard to communicate how vital their support is in sustaining sports and sport events. Nike, the sporting goods giant has reaped the benefits of aligning themselves with prominent sport stars such as Michael Jordan, Roger Federer and the aforementioned Tiger Woods. In the case of Tiger Woods, the game of golf saw increased numbers and Nike saw a large increase in profits (Farrell, Karels, Montfort & McClatchey, 2000). However, investing in sport has not always led to automatic or guaranteed success for companies. Growing concerns have been raised at the type of companies entering the sport sponsorship mix with tobacco and alcohol firms constantly coming under the microscope. For example, Heineken, a prime sponsor of the 2011 Rugby World Cup and the UEFA Champions League, continues to reinstate the idea that consumer support for their brand helps sustain particular teams and events.

According to scholars, one factor, the banning of tobacco advertising, was the major catalyst for sponsorship growth in the early 1980s and 1990s (Howard & Crompton, 2004;)

---

14 The Union of European Football Association (UEFA) Champions League is the annual competition between the top 32 club teams throughout Europe.
Meenaghan, 1991). In 1971, United States Congress passed legislation banning tobacco advertisements on television (this will be discussed in more depth later on) thus companies were forced to seek alternative avenues for marketing. Aligning with sport was appealing for three main reasons (1) the association afforded these harmful products a degree of public respectability (Meenaghan, 1983) (2) location within media sport coverage provided an avenue from which they were technically banned and (3) it gave them access to the youth market (Howard & Crompton, 2004). Both alcohol and tobacco sponsorship have emerged as controversial social commodities and it is towards these two products that my attention now shifts.

**Alcohol and Tobacco: Reviewing the Issues**

The sponsorship of sporting events by alcohol and tobacco companies continues to serve as a contested terrain. This section reviews the issues associated with alcohol and tobacco before concentrating on their sponsorship of sport and associated regulatory histories. This section is divided into three short categories. (1) Consumption. Here the impact on health is debated in terms of the innate difference between two ‘sin products’ (McDaniel, Mason & Kinney, 1999). Tobacco causes harm no matter the intake and induces disease from individuals exposed to second hand smoke. Alternatively alcohol is generally viewed as a product that does not necessarily cause harm when consumed in moderation (McDaniel & Mason, 1999).

(2) Marketing. Alcohol has drawn on a number of marketing ploys adopted by the tobacco industry (Bond, Daube & Chikritzhs, 2010; Daube, 2012). Their stated intention is to encourage brand loyalty as opposed to increasing consumption. Additionally, the marketing of these products increasingly highlights the correlation between marketing and exposure to youth. (3) Regulations. The alcohol industry has employed similar tactics to tobacco as they faced broadcast and print advertising bans and a wide range of state regulatory measures. For example, despite public service campaigns aimed at educating consumers about responsible
drinking, the alcohol industry’s public relations strategies have long been discredited (Daube, 2012).

**Consumption**

Public health parallels have been drawn between the tobacco and alcohol industry (Bond et al., 2010; Daube 2012; Ziegler, 2006). Historically, tobacco companies have continually defended their position, discounting all evidence that linked their product to health concerns and even going as far as to highlight the benefits (Daube, 2012; Howard & Crompton, 2004). However, in 1998 the Master Settlement Agreement opened tobacco’s books to the public and revealed that there is no safe level of smoking (Crompton, 1993). Today tobacco is largely recognized as a pariah industry (Daube, 2012). Alcohol companies are now similarly undermining evidence which points to potential harm while promoting positive links to health outcomes (Daube, 2012). Comparatively, the advertising, marketing and sponsorship of alcohol has faced lighter regulations than tobacco due to the serious health effects of tobacco (Howard & Crompton, 2004; McDaniel & Mason, 1999; McDaniel, Mason & Kinney, 1999). Unlike tobacco where any use of the product is bad for health, the problem with alcohol is not its moderate consumption but rather excessive abuse of it. As a consequence alcohol companies often argue that they are marketing a legal product to adults that, when used responsibly, does not present a problem (McDaniel, Mason & Kinney, 1999). In fact, some studies have linked alcohol to potentially positive health effects such as a decrease in cardiovascular problems (cf. Wallerath, Poleo, Lee & Förstermann, 2003).

However, more recent, abundant evidence is emerging which suggests that there is no level of alcohol use for which there is zero risk (Bond et al. 2010). The WHO (2011) states that alcohol consumption is the third largest risk factor for disease and disability. The World Cancer Research Fund (2007) in their report on the global prevention of cancer notes that, on
the basis of a number of cohort and meta-analysis studies, there is increasing evidence that alcoholic drinks of any kind are a cause of various cancers. Further, based on their previous report from 2001 they conclude: “The previous report identified a threshold of modest consumption of alcoholic drinks, below which no effect on cancer risk was observed, with the exception of breast cancer. Current evidence does not identify a generally ‘safe’ threshold” (World Cancer Research Fund, 2007, p.171). The Australian guidelines to reduce health risks from drinking alcohol (NHMRC, 2009) presents further evidence to suggest that rather than high levels of alcohol consumption providing onset for alcohol related disease, the harm is increased as consumption increases. While the report suggests a ‘safe’ level of drinking, it suggests that there is ultimately no level of consumption that leads to positive health outcomes.

**Marketing Alcohol & Tobacco**

A wide range of legislative constraints on tobacco (bans on broadcast and print media) provided a trigger for innovative forms of marketing, including sport sponsorship (Daube, 2012; Howard & Crompton, 2004). Consequently, tobacco companies continue to spend millions of dollars on marketing. Sponsorships allow tobacco and alcohol brands to evade advertising restrictions and promote their products “indiscriminately to the entire population” (Munro & de Wever, 2008, p.209). Gaining naming rights to televised sporting events enables an alcohol brand to be promoted to a mass audience throughout the day, even though alcohol advertisements per se are banned from broadcast media until 8:30pm in Australia and New Zealand (Munro & de Wever, 2008). Daube (2012) questions how such actions by alcohol companies differ from that of the tobacco industry? He asserts that tobacco companies have known about the danger of tobacco for 60 years, whereas the alcohol industry has known about the damage alcohol can cause for centuries.
Tobacco companies maintained within their arguments against advertising restrictions that studies linking tobacco advertising to harm were inconclusive and found such advertising affects brand loyalty, as opposed to product misuse or abuse (Bond et al. 2010). Wichmann and Martin (1991) quote a former tobacco institute spokesman who stated their “intent is to reinforce brand loyalty or try to switch brand loyalty. The latter is extremely difficult, which is why a relatively large amount of money is spent every year on advertising and promotion” (p.126). The alcohol industry has done the same. According to internal alcohol industry documents, Miller Brewing Company claims to advertise its beer to encourage those of a legal drinking age who choose to enjoy beer, to select their brands of beer and that advertising is used to remind drinkers about responsible consumption and advertising bans will not stop alcohol abuse (Bond et al. 2010; Bring, 1996).

The promotion of alcohol, as was the case with tobacco, critics suggest is problematic because of the messages conveyed to underage consumers (Howard & Crompton, 1999; McDaniel & Mason, 1999; McDaniel et al. 2001). There are a number of studies that suggest, like there is for tobacco sponsorship of sport (Hoek, Gendall & Stockdale, 1993), there is a relationship between alcohol sponsorship of sport and under-age consumption of alcohol.

Gordon, Brookes and Hastings (2009) used a cohort of 1000 13 year olds, followed up at 15 years to investigate the cumulative effect of alcohol marketing. Their initial findings established children were aware of alcohol marketing, with sponsorship providing a prominent part of this awareness. Of the 920 13 year olds 61% recalled sport sponsorship by alcohol on television with a further 66% recalling sports clothing with alcohol logos. Additionally, this increased to 76% and 73% respectively 3 years later. The authors concluded that this awareness increased the odds of having an alcoholic drink by 35%. The most recent systematic review of alcohol advertising’s impact on youth identified 13 studies
and 38,000 young people (Anderson, De Bruijn, Angus, Gordon & Hastings, 2009) and concluded that

Exposure to media and commercial communications about alcohol is associated with a greater likelihood that adolescents will initiate alcohol consumption, or drink more if they are already drinking at baseline (Jernigan, 2010, pp.70-71).

**Regulations**

Tobacco companies have continually sought to avert the advertising curbs with voluntary self-regulation (Daube, 2012). However, realising the precarious nature of health regulation both tobacco and alcohol companies are now devoting greater attention to corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities. Over the last 20 years alcohol companies have set up and funded CSR activities to manage issues that may be detrimental to business (Anderson, 2004). Alcohol companies voluntarily implement codes around their products (Daube, 2012) and point to their funding of public service messages emphasizing the need to drink responsibly and be of a legal age to do so (McDaniel, Mason & Kinney in Slack, 1999). Their view is that responsible drinking can be learned and this should be the cornerstone of alcohol policy (Anderson, 2004). Alcohol companies apply messages of safe drinking to their products such as: listing the amount of standard drinks within each alcoholic beverage and by including ‘enjoy responsibly’ messages on the beverage container itself (Daube, 2012). Beer company Heineken, major sponsor of Rugby World Cup and the UEFA Champions League, includes a link on their website stating ‘enjoy Heineken responsibly’ (Heineken website, 2011). Within the *Lion code for responsible marketplace activity*, New Zealand company Lion Breweries states that these self-regulatory measures “set out our commitment to marketplace practices that do not in any way contribute to the problems of alcohol misuse, obesity or excessive consumption in general” (Lion, nd, p.4).
However these messages have been critiqued as being ‘weak, limited, low impact messages’ (Daube 2012) while Turner (2007) suggests it is debatable whether such disclaimers are providing a message or just lip service. Jernigan (2008) notes that production of social responsibility messages and programs are often a subset of marketing and do not operate from a public health evidence base. That is, they seek to promote the positive values of the brand, its parent company or the industry itself as opposed to a general interest in the health of consumers (Jernigan, 2008). Therefore, the messages act as another form of marketing that attracts consumers to their products. According to Jones and Gregory (2009, p.234), these messages are “likely to further increase excessive drinking among young people.” For example, they found that young people used these messages (particularly the standard drinks number) to identify the best value for money when purchasing alcohol and reducing the amount of liquid consumed in order to get drunk faster. In terms of producing enjoy responsibly messages at sporting events, it remains to be seen how effective these messages really are.

It is now generally recognised that tobacco use of any measure causes serious health risks whereas it is the abuse of alcohol products that creates concern. Consequently, it is tobacco that has been the most regulated product when it comes to promotions, advertising and sponsorship; “Nobody could now argue credibly that tobacco companies should be part of policy-making processes, can be trusted with voluntary agreements on advertising, or should run public education programs. The alcohol industry is different – or is it?” (Daube, 2012, p.108). It is the socio-historical relationships between tobacco and sport and between alcohol and sport that I now turn to. These relationships will highlight their independent issues and histories with sport as well as their regulations within the sporting sector and the calls for change to New Zealand’s alcohol laws surrounding sponsorship of sport.
The Tobacco, Sport Sponsorship Relationship

It is important to briefly outline the value of discussing the tobacco, sport, sponsorship relationship. Like alcohol, tobacco has a long standing relationship with sport, including heavy investment through sponsorship. Moreover, like alcohol, tobacco has enjoyed varying levels of social acceptability within sport which has changed over time (McDaniel, Mason & Kinney in Slack, 1999). That is, the tobacco industry has faced legislative restrictions such as advertising constraints, tax increases and disapproval from the health community (Bond et al. 2010). The tobacco industry is also important because it eventually lost its fight against its ability to sponsor sport in a majority of countries. Alcohol is currently facing similar public opposition. Thus this tobacco discussion informs current discussions around alcohol, particularly sponsorship of sport.

The tobacco epidemic is one of the biggest public health threats the world has ever faced (WHO, 2012). According to the WHO, tobacco use is the single greatest cause of preventable death (including accidents and all other chronic diseases) in developed nations (Sparks, Dewhirst, Jette & Schweinbenz, 2005). Tobacco is responsible for nearly six million deaths per year. Five million are users and former users, and more than 600,000 are non-smokers exposed to second-hand smoke (WHO, 2012). There are more than 4000 chemicals in tobacco smoke, of which at least 250 are known to be harmful and more than 50 are known to cause one of many different types of cancer (WHO, 2012).

In 1954 the first signs linking tobacco to cancer were produced when a scientist at Memorial Sloan/Kettering Cancer Centre painted tobacco fats on the back of mice and produced tumours (Crompton, 1993). On the back of further evidence of this relationship, including a report released by the United States Surgeon General linking smoking with lung cancer (White, 1988), cigarette advertising was banned from the broadcast media by

The legal prohibition of cigarette advertisements from the airways was viewed as a triumph for anti-tobacco forces (Mullin, Hardy & Sutton, 2007). However, the ban encouraged companies to look for new ways to promote their products. According to Blum (2005) tobacco companies shifted their television advertising expenditures into the creation and sponsorship of televised sporting events. Tobacco companies progressed onto sponsorship as a new medium through which they could promote their products and circumvent the television advertising ban (Connolly, Orleans & Blum, 1992; Dewhirst & Hunter, 2002; Howard & Crompton, 2004; Wilson, 1988). The net result for tobacco companies was a more cost effective and less hard sell way to retain cigarette brand imagery (Blum, 2005). McQuistan and Squier (2001) add that “the effort to inculcate positive images of the relationship between smoking and athletics has become a major strategy as the adverse health effects of tobacco become more widely known” (p.101). Non-advertising promotional activities such as event sponsorship and product give-aways increased at a much faster rate than advertising because of the television ban (Tye, Warner & Glantz, 1987).

The sponsorship of sport by the tobacco industry is as old as the professional athletic competition itself (Blum, 2005). After the establishment of the National Baseball League in 1876 trading cards with pictures of the players made their debut in cigarette packets (Blum, 2005). In 1900 a number of Bull Durham chewing tobacco signs were placed on the outfields of many southern American baseball stadiums (Crompton, 1993; Howard & Crompton, 1995) and because reserve pitchers warmed up close to these advertising hoardings, the area became known as ‘the bullpen’ (Howard & Crompton, 1995). The potential association between tobacco and sport grew as the early twentieth century progressed – particularly as
advancements in communication facilitated the increasing popularity of sports and their place in popular culture (McDaniel, Mason & Kinney in Slack, 1999). For this reason, many baseball players, including Lou Gehrig and Babe Ruth supplemented their earnings with tobacco endorsements (McDaniel, Mason & Kinney in Slack, 1999).

For a majority of the time between 1970 and 1999, the relationship between tobacco and sport could be viewed as natural – like any other type of product that entered the sport sponsorship mix. This is evident in the sheer number of sports sponsored by tobacco companies during the 1970s, 80s and 90s. The six major cigarette companies (Philip Morris, RJR Nabisco Holdings Corp., American Brands Inc., (British, American Tobacco) B.A.T. Industries PLC, Loews Corp., and Brook Group Ltd.) had advertisements in 22 of the 24 Major League Baseball (MLB) ballparks in the late 1980s (Howard & Crompton, 1995). Skoal cigarettes had its ‘pinch hitter of the year’ in MLB. Camel cigarettes were an official sponsor of the 1986 FIFA World Cup in Mexico. Lucky Strike was heavily involved in both darts and ten-pin bowling (Howard & Crompton, 1995). These examples represent cases from the United States alone. On a global scale, tobacco companies sponsored Formula One racing teams (Dewhirst & Hunter, 2002), Snooker world championship events, Cricket (Bates, 1999), Rugby League, MotoGP and Skiing (Blum, 2005). In sum, globally, tobacco and sport were very effective partners.

For a period sport was ‘easy street’ for tobacco companies. It developed into an avenue for tobacco companies to display cigarette brand names shown or mentioned on television or radio without being accompanied by the Surgeon General’s health warnings that were required on print advertisements (Howard & Crompton, 2004). United States tobacco company Philip Morris International (named after America’s first tobacconist) latched itself onto three major sporting events in this instance; The Virginia Slims ladies’ tennis circuit, Winston Cup motor racing (NASCAR) and later the sponsorship of the Marlboro Cup horse
race in 1973 (Crompton, 1993; Howard & Crompton, 2004). The impact of these sponsorships was immediately evident with the injection of a US$17 million dollar prize pool for the ladies tennis circuit (DeParle, 1989).

The Virginia Slims case in particular launched women’s tennis from a fledging tour to a fortuitous opportunity and a historic breakthrough for women. Their tennis tour would become entirely professional for the first time but in conjunction with the promotion of a brand of cigarettes ‘Virginia Slims’ – made especially for women (Howard & Crompton, 2004). This new relationship found favour on the female tennis circuit and the players became particularly loyal towards the Philip Morris Corporation even when other corporations such as Procter & Gamble offered more lucrative sponsorships (Howard & Crompton, 2004). Tennis authority Pam Shriver stated that “Virginia Slims doesn’t mean cigarettes to me. To me it is people, it’s a relationship, its tennis...I don’t feel bad looking somebody in the eye and saying ‘Virginia Slims is our sponsor,’ because they’re a great sponsor. Too bad they’re a cigarette” (Howard & Crompton, 2004, p.525). This type of response to tobacco sponsorship was what tobacco companies so desired. Sport was one opportunity where bodies of thankful and financially dependent recipients who could be relied upon to support the tobacco industry (Howard & Crompton, 2004). The success of the Virginia Slims tennis tournament lasted 15 years and ultimately gave tobacco companies leverage to sponsor a range of other sports.

Sport remained a powerful and reliable avenue for tobacco companies to promote their products through the 1900s (White, 1988). As more research was made available however, people in the sporting industry began to seriously question the effect of the tobacco-sport relationship, especially with regards to the messages being sent to the youth of society (Crompton, 1993). In 1977 the physicians health promotion group Doctors Ought to Care (DOC) began purchasing counter advertising space in cities, bus benches, newspapers, TV and
radio (Blum, 2005). DOC also used satire to inspire major health organisations and the business community to put significant funds into breaking the tobacco sport connection (Blum, 2005). Creations included ‘the Emphysema Slims Tennis Tournament’ (Blum, 2005).

The Move to Ban Tobacco Sponsorship

According to Crompton (1993), the linkage between sport and tobacco obscures the connection between cigarettes, chewing tobacco and disease. As previously mentioned, smoking cigarettes and chewing tobacco are physiologically harmful. There have been thousands of studies relating the use of tobacco products with diseases such as cancer and emphysema (Ames, Gold & Willett, 1995; Doll & Hill, 1956; Shopland, Eyre & Peachacek, 1991; Trichopoulos, Li & Hunte, 1996). The Surgeon General declared smoking to be “the single largest preventable cause of disease and disability,” citing “overwhelming evidence from no less than 50,000 studies” (Freedman & Cohen, 1993, p.1). As the evidence mounted against tobacco companies, including the aforementioned Sloan/Kettering study the Comprehensive Smoking Education Act 1984 mandated specific warnings relating to tobacco products such as the “SURGEON GENERAL’S WARNING: Smoking causes lung cancer, heart disease, emphysema, and may complicate pregnancy” (Crompton, 1993, p.152). A similar act in 1986 produced even more health warnings.

Locally, the movement to ban tobacco sponsorship spawned from a data review from the New Zealand Toxic Substances Board (1989) (Crompton, 1993; Bettina-Cornwell, 1997). They reviewed data from 37 countries and found those with the greatest number of restrictions on tobacco advertising reported the largest annual average fall in tobacco consumption (Crompton, 1993; New Zealand Toxic Substances Board, 1989). A subsequent New Zealand study by Hoek, Gendall and Stockdale (1993) assessed whether male adolescents’ attitudes towards cigarette brands changed after viewing an advertisement
promoting a cigarette sponsorship. They found the advertising raises awareness to non-smokers rather than changing the awareness of smokers to alternative brands. Moreover, Bettina-Cornwell (1997) mentions a number of studies that agree sponsorship can function like advertising (Cuneen & Hannan, 1993; Ledwith, 1984; Pope & Voges, 1994; Rajaretnam, 1994; Sandler & Shani, 1992; Turco, 1995). Further studies can be found that conclude young people are aware of and influenced by cigarette advertising, particularly in relation to brand association with specific sporting events.

In response to this research and a series of United States Congressional hearings in the 1990’s, tobacco companies were forced to open their files to the public (Howard & Crompton, 2004). For almost half a century tobacco companies denied their products were detrimental to health or that they ever targeted children, despite the plethora of scientific evidence pointing directly to these facts. Their files showed they knew about these issues all along but had embarked on a course of public denial (Howard & Crompton, 2004). The series of events led to the Master Settlement Agreement (MSA) in the USA in 1998 (Bond et al. 2010). The MSA served to

Prohibit brands from acquiring naming rights agreements for a stadium or arena; sponsoring a football, basketball, baseball, soccer or hockey league (or any team involved in such a league); or selling/licensing/marketing any apparel or merchandise that bears a tobacco brand name (Howard & Crompton, 2004, p.526).

This was a partial ban on tobacco advertising in US sport. The main exception being events held in adult only establishments such as bars. Tobacco companies were limited to one sport sponsorship per brand (Blum, 2005). These restrictions are typical of the regulation made by other nations (Sparks, 1999). Furthermore, in 2003 the WHO signed 28 countries to its new Framework Convention for Tobacco Control (FCTC) (Sparks et al, 2005). The FCTC identified comprehensive measures for the regulation of tobacco products. This framework highlighted the balance of power swinging back in favour of a legislative balance that was
created by the ban of tobacco advertising (Howard & Crompton, 2004). Today almost all countries have a partial or total ban on tobacco advertising and sponsorship. Among the countries with an absolute ban are France, Belgium, Finland, Norway, Denmark, New Zealand and Ireland (Howard & Crompton, 2004).

As of 21 June 2011, 174 countries have ratified the FCTC while 120 nations have adopted or changed their tobacco control legislation after the ratification (WHO, 2011b). Only 19 countries, representing 6% of the world’s population, have comprehensive national bans on tobacco advertising, promotion and sponsorship (WHO, 2012). It is estimated that a comprehensive tobacco ban on advertising, promotion and sponsorship could decrease tobacco consumption by up to 16% (WHO, 2012). These figures suggest such bans are beneficial to public health. Within the sport sector, the majority of cigarette/tobacco sponsorships are heavily regulated or at least carry some form of regulation. For example, Philip Morris agreed to limit event signage to sports where 75% of the audience are adults – mostly motor sports (McDaniel & Mason, 1999). My attention now shifts to a subsequent, and more pertinent controversial product that has aligned with sport, alcohol.

Sport, Sponsorship and Alcohol: Historical Mix

This section will investigate alcohol from its primitive associations with sport to the present day alliance at the forefront of modern day sport sponsorship. I begin by outlining the socio-historical relationship. This is pertinent since the early links between sport, alcohol and the pub exemplify the current day association whereby alcohol sponsorship has become a reliable, natural commodity within the world of sport. The associations are long and deep – covering the pubs early role as a facilitator of sport to the decline of the pub as a social centre and the rise of the pub as a retail outlet (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). Additionally, I trace the movement away from the pub, as brewing companies took more of a commercial interest in
sport. Associated within this shift are emerging public health concerns. In turn, I briefly discuss some of the problems that alcohol’s association began to cause for sport, beginning with Australian Cricketer Tom Wills, who in the early 1800s experienced the throes of a growing commercial sporting era (de Moore, 2005). Next, I focus on contemporary alcohol issues, based on the ever growing commercial arrangement where alcohol brands are associated with sport. Debates related to such problems lead to the final section which approaches the calls for regulation of alcohol sponsorship of sport.

Sport’s relationship with the alcohol industry dates back significantly earlier than the tobacco industry. According to Collins and Vamplew, (2002) by the sixteenth century or perhaps even earlier, the ale (Public) house was the main area for hosting sporting events. The public house (pub) provided the formation of many football clubs in England (Collins & Vamplew, 2002; Dixon & Garnham, 2005). One example is the Liverpool club being formed out of an argument between a sponsoring brewer and the already established Everton club (Dixon & Garnham 2005). Collins and Vamplew (2002) report that a number of sports (eg. cricket, darts, billiards, snooker, hunting, cock fighting, football (soccer), rugby and a host of others) used the public house to grow their sport – or simply relied on the pub in order to survive and run events. In sum, the public house laid the seeds for the early commercial development of these sports.

Evidently, the pub played a significant role in the very early years of primitive sporting events. Landlords discovered the space adjoining their property could be used for the promotion of sporting events which would attract crowds (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). The yards, greens and grounds owned by the publican would be used for sports as diverse as skittles, quoits, bowls, boxing, wrestling, tennis, foot racing, cricket and any number of activities featuring animals could be housed (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). Foot racing would
begin and end at the establishment. The early relationship between the pub and sport was effectively nurtured and sustained by the tavern keeper or landlord (Brailsford, 1999). Over time the tavern owner often developed into an ‘established specialist’ – a sports promoter par excellence (Brailsford, 1999). According to Collins and Vamplew (2002, p.5),

In order to organise events which would bring in a bigger clientele, the publican became the promoter of sports, arranging matches and providing prize money, as well as being the bookmaker. If there was money to be made from the ale and food consumed by the sporting crowd, the same was true of the opportunities for gambling.

In 1722 the landlord of the Red Lion in Gloucester advertised a number of events including: jumping, dancing, bowling and wrestling to be staged on his premises (Brailsford, 1999). Other sports such as prize fighting began to emerge in pubs in the 1840’s. Dozens of British pubs were known as ‘boxing pubs’ and were owned by ex-pugilists (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). In effect, the pub became the unofficial headquarters of the sport. When gentlemen participated in county events (such as a cricket match) the landlord was not only a supplier of facilities – his premises, but had a major financial interest in the event, from entrance charges and from his provision of food and drink (Brailsford, 1999). Indeed, the advertising of forthcoming matches originates from pub landlords providing them with a steady stream of income (Brailsford, 1999). The pub’s role was also the common administrative centre. Arrangements for boxing matches were made in the tavern. Horses had to be entered for races in one of the town’s prominent inns, and the pub was the most frequent meeting place for cricket clubs (Collins & Vamplew, 2002).

In addition, other sports have long links with the pub. Sugar (1978) traces the lineage of the relationship between alcohol and baseball to its formative years where he attests that the first major league – the National Association of Professional Baseball Players was founded in a saloon. Underdown (2000), traces the relationship between alcohol and cricket all the way back to the 1700’s where a successful wine merchant, Thomas Lord founded the
Marylebone Cricket Club (MCC) and its home ground – Lords. However, the stranglehold of pubs would not last. Although the pub was the major social setting for sport in the early 1800s, “The advent of an urban industrial society...the exigencies of industrial work and time discipline saw the erosion of many traditional practices based on the pub” (Collins & Vamplew, 2002, p.10). Additionally the rise of urban areas such as public parks and the role of the church in daily life made people reassess their leisure pursuits and moral obligations (Hanson, 1995).

As the pub declined in its role as the social meeting house for teams and the promoter of fixtures and organisation, brewers and brewing companies began to see the opportunity to invest in sport. Collins and Vamplew (2002) assert that the relationship sprung out of the brewers reliance on the agricultural industry for its basic ingredients to make beer and the close link this had with rural life and its recreations. While brewers support was initially directed towards such rural sports as hunting and horse racing, by the mid nineteenth century the brewers’ sporting interests extended beyond these rural pastimes (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). For example, in the 1920’s brewer Josh Tetley & Son played a prominent role in the building and establishment of Headingley as a major cricket and rugby stadium. Further confirming the close relationship between alcohol and sport, C.F. Tetley subsequently became the chairman of the Leeds Cricket, Football and Athletic Company as well as holding the presidency of the Headingley Rugby Union club (Collins & Vamplew, 2002).

Post World War One saw multi-sport clubs become commonplace (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). These clubs were purchased by brewers and maintained by membership subscriptions offering a continual source of financial support including that from the brewer themselves (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). Brewer Mitchells and Butlers would boast one of the largest sport clubs in England by the 1960s. It housed three cricket pitches, two football
pitches, nine tennis courts, five bowling greens and one netball pitch. The constant operating costs saw many of these sport clubs disintegrate as brewers had few ideas of how to maintain such costs. However, this proved to be far from the end of the brewery involvement in sport (Collins & Vamplew, 2002).

This relationship between sport, alcohol and society advanced with the advent of national advertising. While not directly sponsorship, this technique brought together the traits associated with sport and leveraged an alcohol brand in order to draw sportspeople towards drinking alcohol. This type of advertising could be viewed as the onset of sponsorship by alcohol. In 1929 the Irish beer brand Guinness used sport in its ‘Guinness is good for you’ campaign (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). They claimed Guinness was the product to bring you back to health post influenza and other illnesses (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). Moreover, Guinness claimed the drink built strong muscles, fed exhausted nerves and enriched the blood, and in 1932, used the slogan ‘Guinness for strength’ which Collins and Vamplew (2002, p.49) assert “made a more direct appeal to sporting instincts by featuring athletic motifs”. The campaign broadened to feature specific sports and enjoyed a close relationship with cricket where the advertisements became rather poetic as indicated in the example below:

You’re out of luck, your score was a duck.
From fielding your feet are quite sore.
Now by missing a catch, you’ve just lost the match.
What is it a lovely day for?
Lovely day for a Guinness (Collins & Vamplew, 2002, p.49).

Early marketing practices that aligned beer and sport were often health related. A 1909 advertisement for Budweiser used the headline ‘ball players use beer in training’ and quoted the president of the Brooklyn Trolley Dodgers (now known as the Los Angeles Dodgers) baseball team, describing his team’s ideal meal: “We would request a simple dinner
with light beer as that is our idea of a proper drink for athletes in training” (Quoted in Johnson, 1988, p.70). Johnson (1988) remarks of St. Louis Cardinals nutritionist Whitey Herzog pondered a potential solution to his injury concerns of the time “If they’d eat a blasted steak or drink a blasted beer every once in a while, maybe their muscles wouldn’t keep ripping off their rib cages...Babe (Ruth) lived on hot dogs and beer. Sometimes that might be good for you” (p.70).

According to Vamplew in Dimeo (2006) the use of alcohol by athletes should be viewed within the context of wider society. Much of the population utilized alcoholic drinks as a thirst quencher or for physical stamina. Harrison and Howard (1971) agreed by stating that alcohol was at times, much safer to drink than water. Water was scarce and unsafe in rural areas and highly contaminated in urban townships. Further, it was generally believed that intoxicants such as alcohol aided stamina; whenever more energy was required, the individual turned to alcohol (Harrison & Howard, 1971; Vamplew in Dimeo, 2006). It took a long time for things to change – even at the conclusion of the nineteenth century cricketers still turned to alcohol during a day’s play. By 1888 however, there was a shift toward a new school of thought. Alcohol excited the nerves and impinged on a quiet sleep, therefore many athletes adapted a training system on water alone (Vamplew in Dimeo, 2006).

While the alcohol industry consists of three major sectors/products – beer, wine and distilled spirits, it is beer that has retained the closest ties with sport (Johnson, 1988). Professor Robert S. Weinberg, a former Anheuser-Busch president stated that in the 1950s and 1960s beer commercials consisted of either funny cartoons or serious images that sought to sell excellence, fineness and quality (Johnson, 1988). Much like the Guinness advertising referred to previously, beer was viewed as a drink of substance that not only provided a social blanket for many, it was additionally thought of as a nutritional drink for athletes and even as
a replacement for meals – for example its use as a replacement for bread in early Victorian times (Underdown, 2000).

By 1982, the common view was that alcohol was detrimental to physical performance. The American College of Sports Medicine conducted an analysis of physical performance and alcohol. They concluded that there were four main adverse effects of alcohol:

1) Acute ingestion of alcohol negatively influenced many psychomotor skills in a dose response. This is detrimental to reaction time, hand-eye coordination, accuracy and balance while in tracking tasks, such as driving. Additionally, control movements lost their precision.
2) Alcohol consumption negatively influenced physiological functions crucial to performance such as respiratory dynamics and cardiac activity.
3) Alcohol did not improve muscular work, thus decreasing performance levels.

However, health research has not deterred the alcohol industry or the sport industry from developing a strong, long standing relationship. Nor has such research, as we will see later, prevented athletes from continuing to imbibe a liquid that is only now proven to be detrimental to athletic performance. At this juncture, the focus shifts to the rise of modern alcohol sponsorship, as the relationship between alcohol and sport grows ever stronger.

Modern Alcohol Sponsorship

The model for modern sponsorship methods, whereby a competition is paid by a sponsor to adopt a brand name, was established during the darts boom of the 1930s (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). The popularity of darts was seized upon by breweries that recognised that it could increase the number of patrons in bars. Collins and Vamplew (2002) state that not only did sponsorship give the sport financial stability, it provided an order and structure, including brewery appointed stewards. Despite the early association of the pub, alcohol and breweries with sport, the largely integrated relationship between alcohol and sport did not develop until the late twentieth century (Sparks et al, 2005).
A significant development in the consolidation of the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship was the arrival of twentieth century technological advancements including railroads, refrigeration and pasteurization. Then came black and white television and then full colour television with the ability to showcase glitzy sporting events such as the Super Bowl – reaching audiences of millions (Johnson, 1988). The emergence of commercial television was perhaps the most significant factor because it offered a powerful vehicle for beer companies to reach large, audiences particularly male consumers.

It is with some irony that the sophisticated marketing by alcohol companies in sport was born out of a purchase of a brewing company by a tobacco firm. In 1970 the “lacklustre Milwaukee brewery” (Johnson, 1988, p.72), Miller Brewing, was purchased by tobacco giant Philip Morris International (Crompton, 1993). With their experience in the tobacco sport sponsorship industry, Philip Morris International introduced a new level of marketing sophistication to the beer industry (Howard & Crompton, 2004). A vice president for Miller at the time stated: “We introduced them (Miller) to segmented markets, target marketing, and image-oriented selling” (Crompton, 1993, p. 160). In 1970, Miller was the seventh largest American brewery but by 1977 it had vaulted to second place with much of this success attributed to sport sponsorship (Crompton, 1993).

By the late 1970s, Miller had purchased over half the allocated advertising space allowed for beer commercials on network sports programming (Johnson, 1988). Additionally, they introduced ‘Miller Lite’, a low strength beer that was increasingly popular with the ‘fitness freaks’ (Johnson, 1988). Given the network sport success of Miller, Anheuser-Busch followed suit to great effect. Anheuser-Busch subsequently dominated the market in late 1970. They were the number one brewery in the world and used their corporate power to negotiate exclusive deals at the time; such as being the only brewery allowed to advertise on
the Entertainment Sports Programming Network (ESPN) (Johnson, 1988). In 1988, Johnson states that Anheuser-Busch invested two thirds of its $344 million advertising budget in sport related areas. With their influence in many sports ranging from bowling to the Olympics, alcohol companies provided sports a means to become an entertainment business.

Anheuser-Busch was at this time the largest brewery in the United States. However it was viewed as a $700 million company that was run like a corner grocery store (Johnson, 1988). The success of Miller caused Anheuser-Busch to reconsider its marketing strategies and eventually it became the largest investor of sport sponsorship in the world. By 1989, Anheuser-Busch “sponsored 23 of the 24 domestic Major League Baseball (MLB) teams, 18 of the 28 National Football League (NFL) teams, 22 of the 27 National Basketball Association (NBA) franchises, 13 of the 14 domestic National Hockey League (NHL) teams and nine teams in the Major Indoor Soccer League” (Crompton, 1993, p.161).

Today it is nearly impossible to find a sport that does not involve sponsorship by an alcohol (beer) company somewhere around the world. Anheuser-Busch lists 22 different categories of sport sponsorship on its website. Perhaps the most significant of these sponsorships is that between Budweiser and the FIFA World Cup. Budweiser has been the official beer of the tournament since Mexico 1986 – a total of nine tournaments – and it has the exclusive rights for a tenth time when the FIFA World Cup heads to Brazil in 2014 (Donohue, 2006). However, Anheuser-Busch has other key sport sponsorships including particular competitions. Its Budweiser brand is the official beer of the National Basketball Association (NBA) and was the official sponsor of the USA Olympic Team in 2008. Furthermore, the company sponsors events where they have naming rights (Budweiser Shootout NASCAR event). They sponsor individual athletes (their brand Michelob Ultra
sponsors top PGA golfer Sergio Garcia). The company also holds the official beer sponsorship of the Flora London Marathon (Budweiser).

Much of this success and growth of alcohol sponsorship of sport is attributed to the substantial growth of the global alcohol industry. According to Jernigan (2008) in his somewhat outdated review of the industry the ten largest global beer companies by volume accounted for 28.0% of the total market share. By 2006, when the figures were produced, this had risen substantially to 66.0%. Anheuser-Busch ranked 57th in Advertising Age’s 2006 list of the top 100 global advertisers, with a 2005 spending budget of $633 million (Jernigan, 2006). By 2011, the brewer moved up the ranks to 44th with a 2010 global spend of $967.3 million; including a big spend on its National Football League (NFL) sponsorship (Schultz, 2012). Jernigan (2008) places emphasis on globalization, which he attests makes products more standardized globally. This leads to global alcohol marketing, particularly through sporting events in order to reach the global audience.

It is important to ask the obvious, yet often overlooked question concerning why there are such strong links forged between alcohol and sport. As Johnson, (1988, p.70) pondered, “What kind of cultural hypocrisy is going on when Americans insist on immersing sport in a sea of intoxicating drink?” Reflecting on this question in the early 1990s sport media scholar Lawrence Wenner asked: “How is it that alcohol consumption in the face of athleticism is not perceived as cultural irony? How has this come about? How is it that the sports fan feels at ease in judging athletic prowess with beer can in hand?” (Wenner, 1991, pp. 391-392). Perhaps an answer to Wenner’s question lies in the success of sponsorship. Marketers accomplish an ‘extension of the self’ by embedding brands into the lives and lifestyles of

---

15 Such articles are quickly outdated because of the ever changing nature of the industry. For example, within Jernigan’s article he lists ‘In-Bev’ as the largest global beer marketer by volume (figures are from 2006). In-Bev was purchased by Anheuser-Busch in 2008 to become now known as ‘Anheuser-Busch In-Bev.’ It is now the world’s largest brewing industry, holding 25% of the entire alcohol market (A-B In-Bev, 2011).
target consumers, making them an integral part of cultural and sporting events (Jernigan, 2010). Marketers have had overwhelming success with the IEG network (2001) announcing sponsorship as the fastest growing form of marketing and this is confirmed with $24.6 billion being spent on sponsorship worldwide in 2001 (Dolphin, 2003). This figure has risen dramatically with spending on sports, causes, festivals, the arts and entertainment expected to grow from $46.3 billion in 2010 to $48.7 billion in 2012 (Klayman, 2011).

Alcohol brands align with sport for a number of reasons including the fact that alcohol is sold at live sporting events as part of the entertainment package and the characteristics of specific sports play an important role in reproducing valued aspects of both nationalism and masculinity. For example, New Zealand Rugby Union (NZRU) corporate manager Paul Dalton even went as far as suggesting that “when you think of the All Blacks, you think of Steinlager and when you think of Steinlager you think of the All Blacks” (Boock, 2010).

Part of the answer’s to Johnson (1988) and Wenner’s (1991) questions may also lay in the strong links between the consumption of both sport and alcohol as cultural commodities and furthermore the implications this has for the articulation of the sports consumer and brand identity (Jackson & Andrews, 2005; Wenner & Jackson, 2009). Newman (2007), in his ethnography of the NASCAR nation, observed that it became evident that corporate capitalism was a prevailing fixture within sporting spaces. Newman (2007, p.292) asserts that “In NASCAR Nation, drivers and teams are most commonly identified not by colour schemes, mascots, or team logos, but rather by the vast universe of corporate intellectual properties that dominate the sport’s bodies, automobiles and stadia”.

One spectator interviewed by Newman suggested that it is the corporate sponsors and their marketing budgets that make the events happen. Highlighting the strong relationship that can be forged between brands, sports/athletes and citizens one fan ‘lauded’ her
commitment to her favourite driver’s sponsor, Anheuser-Busch’s (Budweiser) proclaiming that; “Hell yeah I buy Bud [Budweiser Beer] ... I love Junior [NASCAR driver Dale Earnhardt Jr] and I wouldn’t drink anything else!” (Personal communication, 14 October 2006, quoted in Newman, 2007, p.292).

The very premise that this spectator has aligned themselves with a particular NASCAR driver and a particular brand of alcohol lends itself to the notion that alcohol sponsorship is simply a ‘good fit’ for sport. This idea of a ‘good fit’ can be seen in many parts of the globe, amongst many different sports and teams. For example, the Milwaukee Brewers MLB team is known affectionately as the ‘Brewers, Beermakers and Beermen’ and play their matches at Miller Park – named after Miller Brewing Co. (Milwaukee Brewers Website, 2012). From a New Zealand context, the Otago Rugby Union team has shared a long association with the Speights brewery. In 1989, the brewery became the official sponsors of the Otago team. Speights contributed $250,000 to the upgrade of Carisbrook stadium – Otago’s former home ground (Gordon, 1993). The money was used to cover the costs of new seats in the main grandstand – which were arranged to spell ‘Speights’ (Gordon, 1993). Today the Speights logo is as equally visible as the Otago logo on the team jersey. The south stand of the newly constructed Forsyth Barr stadium in Dunedin is now known as the ‘Speights Stand’. According to the sign writers responsible for creating the Speights signs for the stadium blog, “We printed over 140m of Speight’s blue panels to line the full length of the stand. Add in 1800mm high 3d lettering, and we have a new place to drink the Pride of the South” (Williams Signs + Graphix, 2012).

In order to analyse the extent of alcohol involvement in sport in the present day, it is important to take a look at some of the historical involvement of early professional sportsmen with alcohol. It is striking that alcohol has been viewed as a problem product within sport for
such a lengthy gestation. Sportspeople know that drinking can be both bad for health and detrimental to sporting performance. Yet teetotallers are, according to Vamplew in Dimeo, (2007), “probably a minority in British sport.” Many of the sports people who drink are aware of the negative effects alcohol has on their functions but often are not interested in achieving best performance – rather they play for the physical fitness or for fun (Vamplew in Dimeo, 2007).

de Moore (2005) tells the tale of ‘Australia’s finest colonial cricketer Tom Wills. Wills, who was also the founding father of Australian Rules football, committed suicide while in the throes of alcohol withdrawal at age 45. His drinking was viewed as severe, but typical of the players of that era (c. 1830-1890). de Moore brings to life a period where numerous players recalled drunkenness on the field. Organised colonial sport was a

seductive and welcoming place for those who wished to drink, and like-minded males from late adolescence, with little constraint, were likely to drink and drink heavily. It was a narrow world of players, administrators and admirers; time was plentiful and players sufficiently idle for recreational drinking (di Moore in Dimeo, 2007, pp. 4-5). Hence, there was a sense of drinking culture already emerging within sport. This development was well illustrated in the late 1800s and into the early 1900s in English Football. Dixon and Garnham in Dimeo (2007), state that drink played a crucial role in the lives of professional footballers at the end of the nineteenth century. The drink industry itself was involved in many ways with football during this period. Football clubs were often founded by local public houses and thus the teams used the tavern for changing rooms and other facilities.

While these authors note the direct relationship between alcohol and the individual player was less obvious, there were many pieces of evidence that pointed to a strong relationship. Many thought the footballer was a person beneath contempt – a vagabond who spends the whole of his time in a public house except for an hour and a half, when he is
called upon to earn his wages. “For players, victories needed to be celebrated, the tensions of defeat eased and injuries salved. The natural way to do this was to visit a public house and consume alcohol” (Dixon & Garnham in Dimeo, 2007, p.32).

In modern times, the appeal of drinking away a victory, defeat or injury remains true. However the relationship between alcohol and sporting performance has changed drastically. Traditionally, alcohol was viewed as an aid to strength, stamina and courage (Vamplew in Dimeo, 2007). Today, aside from sports such as darts or archery – those sports that require a steady hand for aiming, alcohol is no longer viewed as a performance enhancing drug (Vamplew in Dimeo, 2007). “Players know that drinking alcohol might adversely affect their performance yet they find that their employers are tolerant of a drinking culture, a continuation into professional ranks of a long standing amateur tradition” (Vamplew in Dimeo, p.53). The advent of alcohol sponsorship of sport has paved the way for a natural relationship between the athlete and alcohol. This has led to a number of incidents whereby athletes have harmed themselves with alcohol.

Table’s 1 and 2 outline some international and New Zealand specific sporting incidents involving high profile athletes and alcohol. These tables highlight just a portion of the severity of the issue, with a majority of the national incidents in particular occurring within the past five years. While many argue that incidents involving alcohol and athletes have been around for decades, the elevation of the media means they become much more of a social issue within popular society.
Table 1
*New Zealand Sport Stars’ Alcohol Related Incidents.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATHLETE</th>
<th>SPORT</th>
<th>INCIDENT</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zac Guildford</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Guildford has been involved in a number of alcohol related incidents. These include drinking outside of All Black’s team curfew in a 2011 loss to Australia, a day out drinking at a wedding in Rarotonga where he was involved in a fight and abused a member of the public on the streets (Knowler, 2011). In 2013 he has stood down from all rugby to sort his drinking problem following another incident where he was so drunk he punched the wrong person (Wall, 2013).</td>
<td>2011-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cory Jane and Israel Dagg</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Jane and Dagg were disciplined after being caught drinking 72 hours before Jane was to take the field in the Rugby World Cup quarter-final (Hill, 2011).</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Ryder</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>New Zealand cricketer Jesse Ryder was involved in celebration drinks with teammates after a series win over England in Christchurch when he smashed a toilet window in a bar. When he arrived at hospital, he abused some of the hospital staff (The Press, 2008).</td>
<td>2009-2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dane Coles</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Arrested for disorderly behaviour, ‘heavily intoxicated and aggressive’ according to police (Robson, 2009).</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Bell</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>New Zealand swimming teammates Dean Kent, Corney Swanepoel and Daniel Bell were expelled from the New Zealand Olympic village in Beijing 2008 after taking a photo of an intoxicated Bell sitting on a toilet at a social function. Bell got into trouble again at the World Championships in Rome in 2009 after being submitted to hospital suffering from excessive alcohol intake (Gilhooly, 2009).</td>
<td>2008-2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome Kaino</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Received a ‘stern dressing down’ from All Black management after committing a drink driving offense (Gilhooly, 2008).</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taniela Moa</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Suspended for one match after throwing a bottle that hit a woman in the face while drinking at a rugby clubrooms in Auckland (Cleaver, 2009).</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fetu Vainokolo</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Breached team protocols by throwing a drink over a woman in a Dunedin nightclub (Burdon, 2009).</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Walsh</td>
<td>Rugby Referee</td>
<td>Turned up to the International Rugby Board (IRB) referees conference intoxicated and was fired by the NZRU (Johnstone, 2010).</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sione Tuita</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Punched a man in a bar after discussing a rugby match held the previous day (Maret, 2009).</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Howlett</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>After the New Zealand All Blacks were knocked out of the 2007 Rugby World Cup in France at the quarter final stage, All Black Doug Howlett was arrested for jumping on cars parked outside the teams hotel room after clocking up a $31,000 bar and food tab after the loss (The Press, 2007).</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy Cowan</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Jumped onto a parked car in Dunedin after drinking at a nightclub after a rugby match. In a separate incident had an altercation with door-staff at an Invercargill nightclub after being refused entry for being too intoxicated (The Southland Times, 2008).</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucky Mulipola</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Provided the police with a false name, assaulted an individual and drove under the influence of alcohol (ODT, 2008).</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2  
International Sport Stars’ Alcohol Related Incidents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAYER + COUNTRY</th>
<th>SPORT</th>
<th>INCIDENT</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke Pomersbach -</td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>In 2009 Pomersbach was charged with assaulting a police officer, driving</td>
<td>2009-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td></td>
<td>under the influence and other traffic offences after a string of events</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in Perth (AAP, 2012). Pomersbach allegedly molesting a woman from the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>USA and beating up her boyfriend while in India playing in the Indian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Premier League (IPL) cricket tournament (AAP, 2012). While dismissed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>without conviction, he lost his lucrative IPL contract.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavin Henson -</td>
<td>Rugby Union</td>
<td>Henson, a former Wales representative spent the night out drinking after</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td>a club rugby match. He then proceeded to continue drinking on board a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flight the next morning where he began throwing ice cubes at fellow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>passengers. He lost his Cardiff Blues contract (Daily Mail Reporter,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2012).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Oden - United</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Oden was cut from the Portland Trailblazers roster in 2012 after posting</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td></td>
<td>nude pictures of himself on the internet. He admitted to many years of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alcohol abuse during his 5 year NBA career (Cosentino, 2012).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Wanjiru -</td>
<td>Running</td>
<td>Wanjiru, the 2008 Olympic marathon champion jumped from his balcony</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td>after his wife found him in bed with another woman. This woman says that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>he was drunk and did not mean to kill himself (Clarke, 2011).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Bird</td>
<td>Rugby League</td>
<td>These are just a few of the players who have been involved in drunken</td>
<td>2007–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Carney</td>
<td>(NRL) -</td>
<td>incidents that have seen them sacked from their clubs or incur fines</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Seymour</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>and counselling for alcohol abuse (See: Ballym, 2009; Benuik, 2011;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stevenson, 2006; Walter, 2010).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brett Stewart</td>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Symonds - Australia Cricket</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jake Friend</td>
<td></td>
<td>Symonds turned up to a match between Australia and Bangladesh drunk and</td>
<td>2007–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Monaghan</td>
<td></td>
<td>went on a local radio station intoxicated and called New Zealand player</td>
<td>2009.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brendon McCullum a lump of Sh!@$ (Briggs, 2009).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vin Baker - United</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Ruined his NBA career with alcoholism. Turned up to his Boston Celtics</td>
<td>1993–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td>(NBA)</td>
<td>practice intoxicated and was fired (Associated Press, 2007).</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Daly - United</td>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>The Professional Golfers Association (PGA) tours ordered Daly to</td>
<td>1990–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States</td>
<td></td>
<td>undergo counselling or enter alcohol rehab seven times, once</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>disciplined him for hitting golf shots off the top of a beer can</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>during a pro-am and cited him 21 times for ‘failure to give best efforts’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>during tour events (Smits, 2010).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Gascoigne -</td>
<td>Football (Soccer)</td>
<td>Gascoigne was touted as one of England’s great football talents in the</td>
<td>1985–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td></td>
<td>late 1980’s until he found alcohol and would live a life plagued by</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>alcoholism in which his career would be littered with incidents including</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assaulting his wife (Jones, 2009).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelle Lindbergh -</td>
<td>Ice Hockey</td>
<td>Died in a car accident after driving a car off the road well over the</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td>blood alcohol limit after heavy drinking at a bar with his Philosophy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flyers teammates (Seravalli, 2010).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Within contemporary New Zealand society, the sport-alcohol relationship has been scrutinised with respect to links to particular social problems, specifically fighting and domestic violence. In recent years there have been a plethora of cases where prominent athletes have made the headlines for the wrong reasons (Table 1). These reasons are almost always related to alcohol. As Table 2 highlights, the National Rugby League (NRL) competition in Australia has been somewhat of a breeding ground for misdemeanours in recent times. Its poor reputation has been another piece of evidence to suggest that sport and alcohol should not be married together. These cases have received large media attention in New Zealand because New Zealand has a franchise in the competition – The New Zealand Warriors. In 2008, the NRL season was sponsored by Australian beer brand Fosters. By September that year, there were 22 alcohol related scandals (Boock, 2008). Boock, a sport journalist highlights the obvious problem between NRL players and alcohol when he states:

Never mind that the most recent controversy involved three players from the Brisbane Broncos club, which just happens to carry as two of its major sponsors, XXXX beer and Bundaberg Rum. Or that one of the most publicised cases this year concerned the drunken antics of Todd Carney, eventually axed from the Local Liquor-backed Canberra Raiders. Then there was Tim Smith, released from the Tooheys-sponsored Parramatta Eels; Ben Roberts in trouble with his Fosters-aligned Bulldogs, and Greg Bird, of the VB-backed Sharks, put in the back of the Paddy Wagon after State of Origin II.

Having outlined the development, nature and extent of the sport-alcohol sponsorship relationship along with increasing societal concerns it is worth examining the various forms of social regulation that have attempted, but rarely succeeded in containing and controlling problems.

---

16 The Vodafone New Zealand Warriors themselves have an alcohol sponsor – beer brand Lion Red. Additionally, the NRL alcohol sponsors Bundaberg Distilling Company and Victoria Bitter (VB) often have advertisements painted onto the Warriors home ground during each season.
Regulation of Alcohol Sponsorship

In developed countries, alcohol is widely and readily available, and the real prices (minutes of work needed to buy one drink of alcohol) have decreased (Room, Schmidt, Rehm & Mäkelä, 2008). Increasing availability of the product causes more health and social harm (Babor, Caetano & Casswell et al, 2010). Coincidentally, the spread of free market ideology and global trade agreements have undermined the nation state’s ability to control marketing, monopolies and tax policies (Zeigler, 2006). Therefore, to “counterbalance the globalisation of alcohol trade; we need international agreements that protect public health” (Room et al. 2008, p.1248). Calls for global regulation are echoed by Zeigler (2006) who states that alcohol and tobacco should be excluded from trade agreements and dealt with as separate entities. In light of these recommendations, a global Framework Convention on Alcohol Control (FCAC) is suggested to counterpart the already established Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009; Room, et al. 2008; Zeigler, 2006;).

These fresh international calls to address alcohol harm via global regulatory means are explicated by the numerous voices to address global sport sponsorship (and advertising) of alcohol products (Anderton, 2009; Casswell & Maxwell, 2005; O’Brien & Kypri, 2008; Zeigler, 2006). Alcohol is a heavily regulated product in today's society (Casswell & Maxwell, 2005) and in all countries where alcohol is sold, its use is promoted through advertising and marketing practices (Hill & Casswell in Heather & Stockwell, 2004). The World Health Organisation (2011a) in their survey of 106 counties notes a significant shift towards more restrictive measures. For example, they note that Estonia shifted from partial to a full ban on advertising for beer, wine and spirits.
However, restrictions specifically targeting sponsorship of sporting events were less common than other marketing restrictions (WHO, 2011a). The regulation of alcohol sponsorship of sport, as a percentage of all member states in 2008 equated to 31.8% - which included total ban (14.4%), partial ban (12.8%) and self regulation (5%). Overall, as it currently stands, 44% of countries had no regulations on alcohol sponsorship of sport.

According to Hill and Casswell (2004, p.350),

“Alcohol advertising at major sporting events frequently circumvents the alcohol advertising bans or codes of practice in different countries. In countries that permit broadcast alcohol advertisements and those that do not, the association between alcohol and sports is pursued through the mass media in ways that most codes do little to restrain.”

Regulation, by which alcohol advertising is policed, has three components (Anderson, 2007), legislation (defining appropriate rules); enforcement (initiating actions against violators); and adjudication (deciding whether a violation has taken place and imposing an appropriate sanction).

In addition to these components, there are a number of regulatory practices. Statutory regulation is the regulation by law (Anderson, 2007; Babor et al, 2010). An example of this is France’s Loi Evin, which will be explained ahead. Non statutory regulation regards voluntary standards of practice, statutes or guidelines (Anderson, 2007). For example, in response to the concern and advocacy over youth drinking in the USA, the trade association responsible for beer, wine and spirits adopted codes to prevent alcohol advertising where children comprise 30% of the television audience (Babor et al, 2010). The term ‘self-regulation’ indicates that the primary responsibility for regulating alcohol marketing lies with the alcohol beverage industry itself (WHO, 2011a). For example, in Australia, New Zealand, Ireland and some other countries where alcohol advertising is permitted on broadcast media, self -regulation through voluntary codes is implemented and involves the media, advertising and alcohol industries (Hill & Casswell in Heather & Stockwell, 2004). Furthermore, the term co-
regulation is used where the rules are developed, administered and enforced by a combination
of government agencies and industry bodies (Casswell & Maxwell, 2005).

The countries with complete bans of both alcohol sponsorship of events and alcohol
advertising are: Algeria, Costa Rica, Eritrea, Guatemala, Indonesia, India (Southern States),
the Islamic Republic of Iran, Mauritius, Nepal, Norway and the Russian Federation (WHO,
2004). Additionally, countries that have banned alcohol sponsorship of sporting events are:
Jordan, Croatia and Turkey for the wine and spirits industries, and Bosnia and Herzegovina,
Finland, Gambia, Poland and Switzerland for spirits (WHO, 2004). Aside from countries that
have implemented these full bans, there are a number of countries with partial bans on
alcohol sponsorship. A number of these countries’ partial bans include sport sponsorship. It is
these counties that will be discussed here as to highlight that such regulatory policy does exist
and can be proven successful.

The French Loi Evin, implemented on the 10th of January 1991 is one of the most
comprehensive attempts to restrict the advertising of alcohol and particularly alcohol
sponsorship of sporting and cultural events (Casswell & Maxwell, 2005). This policy places
advertising bans on all alcoholic beverages containing over 1.2% alcohol by volume (WHO,
2011a). Rigaud and Craplet (2004) provide a description of the law summarising the key
aspects of the regulation in relation to sport and alcohol as follows:

1) No advertising should be targeted at young people.
2) No advertising on television or in cinemas.
3) No sponsorship of cultural or sporting events is permitted.

The effects of this law were immediate. From a sporting perspective, the television
retransmission of several international football matches was cancelled (Rigaud & Craplet,
2004). The sporting aspect of the law quickly became a major point of contention. This
provision forbid French broadcasters from showing alcohol brands on athletes’ clothing and
sport stadium hoardings, effectively banning the broadcast of many major foreign sporting events, where such marketing techniques are common (Casswell & Maxwell, 2005).

The law made it impossible for American brewer Anheuser-Busch to sponsor the 1998 FIFA Football World Cup in France despite heavy lobbying towards the French government (Riguad & Craplet, 2005). As proof that sport does not die without alcohol sponsorship, Casio worldwide took over as the major sponsor of the tournament. The Loi Evin has placed restrictions on other global events. For example, a Paris court ordered Dutch brewer Heineken to remove all print advertising linked to the 2007 Rugby World Cup tournament that was staged in France (Kevany 2008; Leveque & Antonovics, 2007). Indeed, the court ordered Heineken to remove adverts with its brand name – with a spokeswoman saying the ruling affected 250 banners displayed in Paris alone. Furthermore the European Rugby Union championship known as the ‘Heineken Cup’ is referred to as the ‘H Cup’ in France.

Other countries, particularly in the European Union, have regulated alcohol sponsorship of sport. Denmark’s latest agreement (in 2000) stipulates that among other regulations, advertising and sponsorship may not be combined with sports, sports grounds and sports magazines (Ősterberg & Karlsson, 2006). In Denmark’s case an independent enforcement committee has been set up to ensure that the agreement is followed by all alcohol advertisers and sponsors. In Norway there is a total ban on the advertising of all alcoholic beverages containing more than 2.5% alcohol by volume (Ősterberg & Karlsson, 2006). The Alcohol Act 1997 also states that any kind of advertising of alcoholic beverages aimed at consumers is forbidden (Ősterberg & Karlsson, 2006). During the late 1990’s this law was challenged substantially by several Norwegian breweries who decided to sponsor sports teams and sports events. Lengthy court proceedings resulted in a win for the brewing industry. However, this was overturned by the Supreme Court, maintaining the ban on all
alcohol advertising (Karlsson, 2001). These alcohol marketing restrictions include a ban on alcohol logos on the uniforms of visiting sports teams, a policy designed to protect children from alcohol marketing (Casswell & Maxwell, 2005).

Portugal and Spain both have restrictions on alcohol sponsorship of sport. Portugal uses a self-regulation code which outlines that advertising will only be allowed when it does not associate the consumption of alcoholic drinks with sports activities. Portugal’s law on advertising tries to separate alcohol from sports and cultural activities (Ősterberg & Karlsson, 2006). Spain’s 1976 *Code for Advertising* stipulates that advertisements must not occur in association with sporting activities or be associated with sport programmes (European Alcohol Policy Alliance, 2012). Additionally, alcohol consumption is forbidden in areas where sports events take place, such as sporting arenas (Ősterberg & Karlsson, 2006). The United Kingdom (UK) regulations stipulate that alcohol advertisements cannot suggest that any alcoholic drink can enhance mood, confidence, popularity, personal qualities, performance or sporting achievements (Gordon et al. 2009). The UK regulations are similar to current New Zealand laws.

Where countries have or have not made regulations against alcohol sponsorship of sport, international sporting bodies have made regulations of their own within particular sports. The Fédération Internationale des Sociétés d'Aviron (FISA), the world governing body of rowing does allow alcohol sponsors as long as their products contain less than 14% alcohol (Day & Juncar, 2010). However, FISA does prohibit any alcohol sponsors for exclusively youth events (participants under 18 years). The Fédération Internationale de Basketball (FIBA), the world body for basketball has similar views to FISA in that they accept alcohol sponsorship but not for a hard liquor brand. FIBA also would not allow any beer sponsor of youth events (Day & Juncar, 2010).
Fédération Internationale de Natation (FINA), the international governing body of swimming under its ‘general rules’ section states in rule 6.3 that advertising for tobacco and alcohol is not allowed (FINA website, 2011). Where alcohol sponsorship of sporting events or teams has been allowed, some organisations have placed some regulations against the sale of alcohol within live sporting fixtures. For example, the Football Association (FA), England’s governing football body, does not prohibit alcohol companies from sponsoring teams but has regulated it somewhat in that alcohol cannot be sold, served or consumed within sight of the pitch in the 15 minutes leading up to the match, during the match and the 15 minutes after the match is over unless in a corporate hospitality box (Fuller, 2011).

With regulatory policy implemented on a different scale throughout the world, it is important to highlight where New Zealand fits into the mix. I will begin discussing the regulatory framework used in New Zealand. I will then look at the evidence both for and against regulating alcohol policy. I will draw on one particular key study from O’Brien and Kypri (2008) of the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship. I will then briefly discuss two recent reports produced by different organisations in New Zealand. These reports provide evidence to suggest that change has happened over time, and that further regulation is unlikely to have any effect on binge drinking.

Alcohol Regulation in New Zealand

In New Zealand, all advertising is self-regulated. This means that a separate governing body, known as the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) is employed to regulate advertisements. The regulations are based on the laws regarding advertising that are set down by the New Zealand Government. While government has set down the laws they are officially adjudicated by the ASA and a separate entity known as the Advertising Standards Complaints Board. In relation to the ASA codes for advertising liquor (ASA, 2010, p.42), principle 5
states: “Sponsorship advertisements and sponsorship credits shall clearly and primarily promote the sponsored activity, team or individual. The sponsor, the sponsorship and the items incidental to them, may be featured only in a subordinate manner.” Additionally, principle 5(f) states: “sponsorship advertisements and sponsorship credits may be broadcast at any time except during programmes intended particularly for minors”. In their issues document, the NZ Law Commission said that it favours leaving the bulk of advertising regulation to the ASA. However, Kypri, Langley and Connor (2010) state that this content provides insufficient controls as many children are still watching television at 8:30pm, when alcohol advertising is allowed to commence.

There is evidence from New Zealand suggesting that receiving alcohol industry sponsorship increases hazardous drinking (Kypri et al. 2010). This evidence is provided in the results of a study conducted by O’Brien and Kypri (2008) that addressed the relationship between alcohol industry sponsorship and hazardous drinking among sportspeople. They advise that “a potentially effective method currently used by alcohol industries to encourage drinking in sportspeople is the provision of free or discounted alcohol products and/or monetary support directly to sportspeople at an individual, team or club level” (O’Brien & Kypri, 2008, p.1962). In conducting a questionnaire of 1279 athletes across various sporting codes and levels, they concluded that 47.8% of the sample reported alcohol industry sponsorship. Of this number, a further 47% reported receiving free or discounted alcohol products. Additionally, the authors used the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT). AUDIT consists of 10 questions about recent alcohol use, alcohol dependence symptoms, and alcohol-related problems (Babor, Higgins-Biddle, Saunders & Monteiro, 2001). They concluded that AUDIT scores were 2.4 points higher for participants receiving alcohol industry sponsorship than not. They suggest that sport administration bodies should
consider the health and ethical risks of accepting alcohol industry sponsorship (O’Brien & Kypri, 2008).

O’Brien and Kypri’s (2008) study provides “some much needed evidence in an ideological discussion” (Rehm & Kanteres, 2008, p.1967). What effect alcohol sponsorship has on New Zealand’s binge drinking culture remains unanswered. Two pieces of research (not including the 2010 NZ Law Commission report) have reported on alcohol sponsorship of sport. The first in October 2006 was compiled by the Foundation for Advertising Research (FAR). They sought a consortium of academics that produced a literature review of alcohol sponsorship and its impact (NZ and international). They analysed levels of alcohol sponsorship and the impact of this sponsorship on recipients and the community (Day & Juncar, 2010). Additionally 56 papers were reviewed and individual interviews undertaken. They found little evidence that alcohol promotion contributed to alcohol consumption. However, they state that the take up of alcohol by adolescents and its abuse by some drinkers is a multi-dimensional problem and requires a closer look.

The second study was compiled by PS...Services (2010) on behalf of Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC, now SportNZ). SportNZ is the New Zealand Government sport delivery and funding agency. They conducted interviews, desktop research and an online survey of 211 sport clubs. They found similar results to FAR. Feedback suggested that an alcohol ban would hit sports clubs and such sponsorship would erode the social, economic, environmental and cultural capital of New Zealand communities (Day & Juncar, 2010). To be clear, both of these studies or reports must be understood with respect to their terms of reference and whose interests they served. Arguably, in both cases (FAR and SportNZ) the focus was less on the issue of the potential social harm emerging from the sport-alcohol
relationship, and more on the implications of increased regulation and/or decreased funding for sports.

What these studies argue is that alcohol is the glue holding New Zealand sport together. Another example to highlight this somewhat extraordinary train of thought from many New Zealanders comes from the highest level when Lion Breweries corporate affairs director Neil Hinton said of the All Blacks during the build up to the 2011 Rugby World Cup: “we believe we own the strongest property in the market, we will spend our time channelling our association with the All Blacks” (Harvey, 2011). These studies, including such comments above and from various individuals (see Cheng, 2010), suggesting a change in attitude is required rather than banning sponsorship by alcohol companies’ further attests to the need for the current study.

However, dealing with a public health policy issue where there are many interest groups involved and corporate lobbying is rife with challenge. Consider the fact that the 2010 NZ Law Commission report, although highly critical of the alcohol industry, noted that any additional regulation should not duly inhibit the ability of the liquor industry to contribute to further economic growth or impose costs not in proportion to the harm being mitigated. The paucity of research pertaining to the success of regulation of alcohol sponsorship of sport is constantly used in defence of alcohol. However, the regulation of alcohol advertising and sponsorship is one of the WHO’s (2008) strategies to reduce the harmful effects of alcohol. What we can disseminate is that countries are and have implemented successful policies to regulate alcohol sponsorship of sport. The Loi Évin is one example of a successful national regulatory policy. The WHO (2008, p.5) states that “joint appropriate and coordinated actions of different agencies and stakeholders are needed in raising awareness and political

17 The All Blacks are sponsored by Lion Breweries’ product Steinlager. Lion’s rival Dominion Breweries (DB) is responsible for brewing and distributing Heineken in New Zealand – the official beer of Rugby World Cup.
commitment to reduce public health problems caused by harmful use of alcohol.” The exploration of alcohol sponsorship of sport and the place of its role within public policy measures within a New Zealand context follows Chapter 3 within this agenda.
CHAPTER 3: Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodological approach that will be used to analyse the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship. Included is a brief overview of the links between the alcohol industry, promotional culture and sport sponsorship. Following a call from scholars to implement a multi-method approach to research and located within the cultural studies paradigm (Agger, 2006; Andrews, 2002; Andrews & Loy, 1993; Howell, Andrews & Jackson, 2002; Wright, 2001), this analysis examines the contested terrain of discourses that constitute the ‘sport- alcohol nexus’ (Palmer, 2011) in New Zealand. This will facilitate an examination of the relationship between alcohol sponsorship and sport with respect to its past, present and potential future. Overall the multi-methodological approach draws upon socio-historical contextualisation, social policy and document analysis, and interviews with key stakeholders.

In light of this procedure, the chapter is divided into five sections. Firstly, I will locate the research within the cultural studies paradigm to highlight the multi-method approach. Multiple methods of analysis are required in order to contextualise specific practices of representation within particular historical and cultural ‘circuits of power’ (du Gay et al., 1997); that is, where has power come from? Specifically, links are drawn to associate sport within the cultural studies framework – acknowledging that everyone ‘reads’ sport in some way (Denzin, cited in King, 2006) and therefore from different positions of power. In turn, I will refer to the socio-historical grounding of my research, much of it already outlined in Chapter 2, in order to present an understanding of the growth of alcohol sponsorship of sport. This is important to lay the groundwork for the emergence of this particular study. I will draw on discursive elements that play an important role in emphasising the competing discourses of various stakeholders positioned within the alcohol sponsorship of sport nexus. This will help to identify how the various stakeholders explain, justify, and/or challenge and resist the
relationship between alcohol and sport sponsorship. Following this, I will outline the various modes of data collection.

**Cultural Studies**

Cultural practices are as much a part of the real world as political and economic processes that have come to dominate the attention of sociologically focused researchers (Howell et al. 2002). Cultural studies draws from whatever fields are necessary to produce the knowledge required for a particular project (Nelson, Treichler & Grossberg, 1992). To this extent it is a discipline that is eclectic, evolving and deliberately political.

Stuart Hall was one of the first to criticize the singular theoretical approach to the study of complex social problems. He said that as scholars, we are used to being in the comfortable position whereby we construct research using a single theoretical position over and over again (for example, a feminist approach). Hall declares we do this “without any effort to measure the theory against the demands of the messy world of people’s lives, social institutions and relations of power” (quoted in Wright, 2001, p.135). Concurring with Hall, Larry Grossberg proclaims that “we need to recognize the fact that the world is complex and cannot be divided up and distributed neatly in simple categories” (cited in Wright, 2001, p.143).

Jhally (1989) expands on these points by stating that cultural studies “is part of an attempt to shift the focus of debate from a concentration of ideology to one of culture and to focus on power from the viewpoint of contestation” (p.72). This notion is based on the work by Richard Johnson (1986-87) who argued that three premises form the minimum basis of cultural studies: (1) Cultural studies are intimately concerned with social relations. (2) Culture involves power and helps produce inequalities in the abilities of individuals and
social groups to define and realise their needs. (3) “Culture is neither autonomous or externally determined but a site of social differences and struggles” (p. 39).

Therefore, cultural studies, by and large advocates a multi-method approach to research. There is no real definition of cultural studies and the field has even been viewed as ‘non theoretical’. Hall dismisses the non-theoretical critique by asserting that cultural studies is:

not about theory but about a resource, something that will help you gain better knowledge about a particular context, help you give a better answer to a particular (politically defined) question. The point is to not to have a theory but to constantly grapple with the fact that the theoretical resources you have been using are not adequate to address the next question you ask, to the next historical context within which you are located, or the next political struggle that occupies your research (cited in Wright, 2001, p.134).

The methodologies of cultural studies are unique in that “it has no distinct methodology, no unique, statistical, ethno-methodological or textual analysis to call its own” (Nelson et al. 1992, p.2). Its ambiguous methodology has been referred to by some as a bricolage (Alasuutari, 1995; Nelson et al. 1992). That is, the choice of method is pragmatic, strategic and self-reflective. The choice of research practices depends upon the questions that are asked, and the questions depend on the context (Nelson et al. 1992). Furthermore, cultural studies has no guarantees about what questions are important to ask within a particular context or how best to answer them; thus no methodology can be completely agreed upon with total confidence. Yet at the same time, no method can be eliminated out of hand. As a consequence, “textual analysis, semiotics, deconstruction, ethnography, interviews, phonetic analysis, psychoanalysis, rhizomatics, content analysis, survey research – all can provide important insights and knowledge” (Nelson et al. 1992, p.2).

In light of this, my methodological approach stems from the work of Johnson, Chambers, Raghuram & Tincknell (2004). These authors contend that culture has come to
matter in different ways and different methods correspond to the different modes by means of which culture impresses itself on us as an object. That is, a multiplicity of methods is necessary because “no one method is intrinsically superior to the rest and each provides a more or less appropriate way of exploring some different aspect of the cultural process” (Johnson et al, 2004, p.42).

This apparent lack of homogeneity within cultural studies suggests an ongoing and even agonizing struggle over definition and meaning (Andrews & Loy, 1993). However, the epistemological foundations of cultural studies negate any commitment towards affirming and upholding the legality of a single all-inclusive cultural studies position. Rather, as Stuart Hall notes, cultural studies is a continually contested terrain – “a sort of constant battlefield between the constraining influence of social structure and the creative impulses of human agents” (1981, p.233). Larry Grossberg agrees that cultural studies is unequivocally “Always a contested terrain – and that contestation is internal – among its own – as well as external. Cultural Studies is an open ended and ongoing theoretical struggle to understand and intervene into the existing organisations of active domination and subordination, within the formations of culture” (1989, pp.114-115).

Grossberg’s notion to understand organisations of domination and subordination lends itself to alcohol sponsorship as a societal force existing as a constant battlefield. By studying alcohol sponsorship within sporting culture, one might understand what the intentions of alcohol sponsorship of sport are to wider social society.

Cultural Studies & Sport

Recognising that sport touches the lives of millions of people worldwide (Hargreaves & McDonald, 2002), and the concern of cultural studies with the everyday and the ordinary it should come as no surprise that in addition to cultural forms such as clothing, music and popular media, sport emerged early on as a key site of analysis within the field of cultural studies (King, 2005). Sport studies scholars, including those in sociology, history,
anthropology, geography and gender studies have acknowledged that the cultural studies perspective provides an important method to understand the social importance of sport.

While suggesting that sport emerged as a key site of analysis, King (2005) misses the key argument. It is that rather than sport emerging, it is better explained by the notion that sport was always a part of cultural studies – in fact, as Critcher (1974) attests, alluding to sport and culture,

“I want to insist that sport is not an accidental part of society, but an integral element in it... there is no sport without society. It has to be sport in society. Sport is not accidental: it is not peripheral; it’s not a simple leisure activity which some people do in their spare time; it is essentially part of our culture” (p.3).

Therefore, sport is an arena where ‘it all comes together’ (King, 2006). That is, sport is an element in society where race, class, gender, the nation, globalization, and capitalism meet and are analysed by cultural critics dealing with sport. It is about viewing sport as a major site of articulation with other issues such as public health, sponsorship, ethics, morals alongside agency and capital. With respect to this thesis, sport is a key site where we can confront alcohol sponsorship and its articulation to overarching issues related to public health, ethics, morals and capital. That is, the politics of everyday life are found within the sporting space (King, 2006) and become part of society’s dominant narratives that make certain ways of seeing the world seem normal and conventional. The alcohol-sport relationship in New Zealand, as I have outlined in earlier chapters, has become one of societies taken for granted dominant narratives. Chapter 4 will illustrate how alcohol sponsorship is a contested terrain by questioning the role alcohol has on sport and in turn, the role sport plays within wider New Zealand culture.

The Socio-Historical Approach

The socio-historical approach casts an eye over the social history of society. According to Cross (2008) social history is a way of looking at how a society organises itself and how this
organization changes over time. It is an integrative study concerned with creating a global picture of society. Collins and Vamplew (2002) contend that in the case of the social history of sport, there has been a tendency to isolate research into discrete areas which rarely impinge on other fields. As such they wrote their book *Mud, Sweat and Beers: A cultural history of sport and alcohol* in order to promote a “shift in the focus of studies of sport and leisure away from such compartmentalised investigations of individual aspects of leisure towards broader, holistic explorations of leisure and recreational histories” (p.3). For example, they note the importance of brewers to commercial sport – financing sports clubs and more recently the providing of extensive funds through alcohol sponsorship (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). They propose that the full nature and extent of the sponsorship relationship has not been explored. My research will attempt to fill this gap, particularly within a New Zealand context by analysing the extent and contestable nature of the relationship between sport, alcohol and sponsorship.

As in the past, modern sport culture shapes cultural attitudes, norms and power arrangements and sport serves as a key site for understanding these how norms and power structures have been negotiated, resisted and struggled with and against. In reference to earlier chapters, it is clear that the history of sport culture – the idea of a leisure activity that requires physical exertion, coupled with the “deep and long connections between drinking and sporting enjoyment” (Collins & Vamplew, 2002, p.3), alcohol and sport “cross-pollinate with each other in so many ways” (Collins & Vamplew, 2002, p.3). Indeed, alcohol companies have, over time, held increasing amounts of power within sport, particularly with the advent of sponsorship. However, history also shows that alcohol is detrimental to sport performance as well as general health and has cost a number of athletes their careers. As such, where power lies within the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship requires investigation.
The current research involves a contextualisation of the sport, alcohol, sponsorship triumvirate within New Zealand. I have already provided insight into how and why New Zealand as a nation is an important site for studying this relationship. Likewise, my socio-historical account of the global relationship of alcohol sponsorship of sport as well as the tobacco industry sponsorship of sport provides a detailed picture of the corporate environment surrounding sport and the dangers caused by alcohol within the sporting landscape. In doing so, I have provided a broad understanding of the context in which alcohol sponsorship of sport has caused such a divide between different sports and at different levels – and that this ‘contested terrain’ needs to be located and understood. For this study, the sites of analysis include a variety of policy documents, media other associated texts and interviews.

Discourse and Sport

Discourse or discourse analysis is the study of the process of communication and the construction of meanings (Wagg, Brick, Wheaton & Caudwell, 2009). That is, it refers to a formalized way of thinking through language in use – created through text, imagery and everyday interactions (Piggin, 2008). The study of discourse focuses primarily upon the role of, and the relationships between language, social structures and forms of social action and agency (Wagg et al, 2009).

Because of the broadness of the term (Piggin, 2008) and the divergent interests of different researchers, it is necessary to define the different specifications of discourse. Similar to Piggin (2008), I see it as important to distinguish different methods of analysing discourse. A number of scholars differentiate between the opposing ends of the discourse spectrum (Fairclough, 2003; Taylor, 2004; Van Dijk, 1997). These scholars, in particular Fairclough (2003); differentiate between those practices which pay close attention to the linguistic
features of texts – which he refers to as textually oriented discourse analyses – and those which do not. The latter approach is often influenced by Foucault (Taylor, 2004) and generally focuses on the historical and social contexts of text and gives little attention to the linguistic features of text (Taylor, 2004). Moreover, Taylor comments that by investigating language as a process there is not an explicit analysis of the power relations between people who are using discourse. Rather, an analyst can examine how discourse is used to construct a particular social setting, acknowledging that language contributes to how we see and understand the world (Piggin, 2008). One may also examine discourse to “draw attention to the all-enveloping nature of discourse as a fluid, shifting medium in which meaning is created and contested” (Taylor, 2004, p.8).

For the purposes of this thesis, it is important to note that “in its most literal sense discourse is a form of communication that runs back and forth” (Wagg et al, 2009, p.38). Rather than drawing upon the plethora of theoretical notions relating to discourse, I will use discourse analysis simply as a tool, much in the way that Tonkis (1998, p.245) defines as “the study of language and texts as forms which help to create and reproduce systems of social meaning.” Power relations occur from these texts but are also analysed independently (for example, the New Zealand government over alcohol companies as to whom they can sell their product) to understand how such discursive practices are produced (Piggin, 2008).

This thesis undertakes the textual analysis of a number of documents, ranging from historical books and journals, to the more recent and somewhat pertinent documents that specifically draw attention to an association between alcohol sponsorship and sport. The use of discourse will additionally aid in the analysis of interviews in order to address and illustrate the contested terrain via the competing discourses that are articulated by various stakeholders. Overall the use of discourse analysis facilitates the examination of the contested nature of the alcohol sponsorship of sport debate across a range of documents, regulatory
policies and positions of key stakeholders as located within a particular socio-historical context.

Research Strategy

The theoretical and methodological roots of this study prohibit any supposition that it is value-free or uninfluenced by the background and assumptions of those involved. By implementing what Plymire (2005) and Newman (2009) refer to as reflexivity, a researcher can identify how their personal perspectives and background influence the descriptions of the scene and interpretations of the data. While this is indeed the case I also draw upon historical evidence, government documents and the insights of key stakeholders some of whom have enormous power and influence to shape public policy.

My research journey began by contacting selected stakeholders via letter, email and telephone (see appendix A), that were directly or indirectly associated with alcohol’s sponsorship of sport. Given my timeframe, financial resources and the busy schedule of a number of important interviewees, I organised interviews with 10 individuals across a range of sectors at a variety of locations around New Zealand. My semi-structured interviews lasted between 40 and 100 minutes.

The interviewees, except for Member of Parliament Jim Anderton (who provided information in reply to questions submitted due to his workload) signed consent forms (see appendix B), and all requested anonymity. Consequently, these individuals are only identified by pseudonyms and the agency they are associated with – see Table 3. Anonymity is treated

18 The 2011 Heineken sponsored Rugby World Cup was held in New Zealand between September 9 and October 23. This meant government officials, tournament officials, ground staff and other executives were unavailable during this time. Additionally, the Heineken Tennis Open, New Zealand’s premier men’s international event is held in January. The September to November period is the busiest time for the tournament in signing international players to attend the tournament and organising the draw.

19 Jim Anderton represented the Wigram electorate in Christchurch and was the leader of the Progressive Party. Anderton however did not run in the election himself as he retired from politics at the election. He pledged his support for the Labour Party MP in his electorate to take over his seat, which he held from, 1984-2011 and was the longest current serving MP at the time of his retirement.
seriously but in cases where information was available publicly real names of both officials and organisations are used.

Table 3
Organisations, Job Positions and Pseudonyms of Interviewees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>PSEUDONYMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Advisory Council of New Zealand</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Chris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion Breweries New Zealand</td>
<td>Relations</td>
<td>Nathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Anderton</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>Jim Anderton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auckland Rugby</td>
<td>Sponsorship</td>
<td>Matt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport and Recreation New Zealand (SPARC – Now SportNZ)</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Sam &amp; Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otago University Basketball Club</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Paul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Cricket Club</td>
<td>Club Official</td>
<td>Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand Rugby League</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td>Simon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invercargill Licensing Trust (ILT)</td>
<td>Official</td>
<td>Nick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of mediums will be used for this study. Firstly, scholarly text provides narrative and impetus for the topic by highlighting the key areas for research (cf. Collins & Vamplew, 2002; Palmer, 2011). National and international policy documents such as the NZ Law Commission report, ALAC documents and a variety of policy documents from stakeholders provide detailed descriptions of the history of drinking in New Zealand as well as the social and cultural implications surrounding alcohol (such as sport sponsorship). Additionally, the NZ Law Commission as well as individual submitters to the report have the ability to put across their ideas exactly as they wish – planned and uninterrupted, something that is not always possible within other mediums. Policy documents are the foundation for contest and it is within the public sphere that these challenges are played out. Thus, my focus is on the public arena.

Other documents such as press releases, media presentations, interviews, and other propaganda mediums are used to highlight the contestation around alcohol sponsorship of sport. Increasingly, electronic media are being used for the articulation and dissemination of opinions regarding policy within the sporting landscape. The internet and sport
documentaries are key sources of information in this regard. Websites such as www.stuff.co.nz provide accessibility to a host of national news and information which would have been, in the past, restricted to daily newspapers.

Beyond these resource sites semi-structured interviews were conducted with a selection of the ‘key stakeholders’ within the alcohol sponsorship of sport landscape. Interviews form part of the qualitative data collection, that is, the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of a phenomenon rather than the ‘how many’ and ‘when’ of quantitative methodology (Gratton & Jones, 2010). This procedure offers the researcher some degree of flexibility in the interview structure (Smith, 2010). Importantly, the pre-determined questions come with the option of developing additional questions during the interview depending on the responses given by the interviewee (Gratton & Jones, 2010).

In sum, this thesis draws on a multi-method approach, located within the cultural studies paradigm. It applies the contested terrain metaphor which focuses on sport as a space where ideologies are debated, negotiated and challenged/resisted. The socio-historical analysis helps to understand the origins, nature and impact of alcohol sponsorship of sport at different points in time; that is, drawing on the past to help inform the current debate. Discourse analysis aids by highlight the key issues and positions within the current debate, particularly through research interviews which, in turn, helped develop dominant themes within the thesis. Overall, the use of a multi-method approach facilitates a more rounded research strategy that helps address the complexity of the issue.
CHAPTER 4: Alcohol Sponsorship of Sport

The aim of this study is to explore the contested terrain of the alcohol sponsorship of sport debate in New Zealand. That is, why alcohol sponsorship is so important to New Zealand sport despite ongoing social and health concerns within a nation recognised for having a binge drinking culture. The following sections are structured around a number of central themes. (1) The tobacco and alcohol sponsorship issue. (2) Why alcohol sponsorship of sport should be maintained. (3) Why alcohol sponsorship of sport should be regulated and (4) what steps have or will be taken to address policy associated with alcohol sponsorship of sport?

The primary motive for locating the tobacco and alcohol relationship as a starting point is that here, we have the two most common licit drug industries serving as two of the major sponsors of global sport since the early 1900s. Tobacco sponsorship of sport was removed because tobacco could no longer hide itself as a health deterrent (Crompton, 1993). Yet alcohol, whose ill effects are measured in Disability Adjusted Life Years (DALYs), as is tobacco (Bacchi, 2009), remains a key figure in sport sponsorship. In fact, as noted earlier, sport sponsorship was to a large degree launched by tobacco executives seeking ways to overcome the constraints on traditional advertisements (Bettina-Cornwell, 1997; Johnson, 1988). The question therefore becomes: should alcohol sponsorship of sport be viewed in the same instance as a fellow licit drug? Such a question opens the debate surrounding vested interest groups and whether the pendulum is weighted toward these groups as opposed to confronting the issue with greater authority than is currently being done.

I will then cast an eye to the alcohol-sport sponsorship debate itself. The focus will be on three issues. First, what are the primary factors that stakeholders have drawn upon in relation to the NZ Law Commission report – in maintaining alcohol sponsorship? That is, why and how do these organisations argue against changes to the current status quo? Second,
which organisations and individuals are seeking to ban alcohol sponsorship of sport and why?

And third, what actions are currently being undertaken and/or planned by various stakeholders and their organisations to address: (a) the alcohol sponsorship of sport issue and (b) the place of alcohol in the sporting environment. The aim of this final section is to encourage more questions surrounding the debate, which is a major premise of cultural studies – to constantly grapple with new political questions that arrive from the initial questions that are posed.

Charting the contested terrain through alcohol sponsorship of sport, it is important to locate where individual opinions originate. Sally Casswell (1997) provides a good starting point. She notes there are a range of perspectives and interests at play in the public discourse on alcohol. The task one faces is “to attempt to reconcile the conflicting views of those who, coming from different sectors, have different primary goals to achieve” (p.251). Thus, the discourse surrounding alcohol sponsorship of sport is complex in itself. This chapter explores this complexity aiming to provide some coherence to the ‘many and varied voices’ that Casswell (1997) alludes to. Within this study (and outside of it) there are those with a concern for public health. Those within the public health sector are medical professionals, health sector employees (mental health for example), academics or epidemiologists in the public health field and public in general. That is, anyone interested in prolonging life, preventing disease and promoting good health in society. This of course, includes sporting organisations who are inadvertently promoting good health. The public health field’s concerns focus on making New Zealand healthier by reducing the harm from alcohol through effective policies (see Casswell, 1997).

---

20 As I discovered in my interviews, it was impossible to discuss alcohol sponsorship of sport without reference to New Zealand’s drinking culture and the role of sport in this culture (McEwan et al. 2010).
Contrasting and sometimes contradictory positions on alcohol sponsorship of sport is evident in the views of vested interest groups. These groups have their own goals to achieve which often outweigh the general societal view. As Casswell (1997) points out, while vested interest groups do have some mutual unease about the adverse consequences of heavy alcohol use, their primary interest is to “protect the return on the investment of their shareholders” (p.251). These groups are alcohol producers and distributors, sporting organisations, teams, pub owners and government among others where financial stability is crucial for organisational survival. Vested interest groups are often contradictory in nature. For example, Vamplew (cited in Dimeo 2007, p.53) also notes that “sponsors want to see their products consumed at post-match ceremonies, but coaches want their athletes to restrict alcohol intake.” These groups are faced with trade-offs – making decisions for financial benefit or for the good of society. Thus there is evidence that sport sponsorship is crucial for vested interest groups in trying to achieve cultural credibility and financial capital ahead of public health concerns. So as is largely evident, the contested terrain is well and truly at play within the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship.

The Cultural Significance of Tobacco in Sport;

To address the tobacco issue within current discussions surrounding alcohol sponsorship of sport, it is critical to locate the debate within the context of New Zealand. MP Jim Anderton’s (2010) speech in Parliament on the tobacco excise bill provides a good starting point. New Zealand Parliament was, at this time, looking to increase the price of tobacco through an excise tax. Simultaneously, Alcohol in our lives: Curbing the harm was published and released to Parliament. There was a significant amount of support for the tobacco excise bill and it was quickly accepted. However, National Party MP Simon Power, who was Justice

---

21 An excise tax is an indirect tax introduced by governments in order to control specific goods and services production and consumption. The producer is hit with the tax and in order to recover the money lost, has to raise the price of their products. They are often imposed as an additional tax to already taxed goods.
Minister at the time, stated that the price of alcohol would not be increased (Anderton, 2010). Challenging this decision Mr. Anderton argued that increasing taxes on any product results in decreases in consumption. Therefore government should address alcohol in the same manner as tobacco to reduce harm:

If we increase the price of tobacco, we reduce the volume of tobacco that is smoked. There is a linear relationship and many studies around the world will show exactly the same thing for product after product (Anderton, 2010, May 5).

Tobacco prices were to be increased by 30%. However, Justice Minister Power stated that to increase the price of alcohol correspondingly would be unreasonable towards people who drink alcohol safely. To which Anderton (2010) replied:

5000 people die every year from tobacco smoking, and that makes this kind of measure significant and important. What is there about the social, economic and health problems of alcohol that make it different from tobacco? The cost of tobacco-related harm is between 1 and 2 billion dollars. The cost of alcohol related harm to New Zealand is indicated by reputable economists and analysts to be in the order of 2 to 3 billion dollars a year.

Anderton’s comments, which indicate similarities linking alcohol and tobacco, are supported by a number of sectors such as national government organisations, academics and health professionals (Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009). Recommendations from the WHO and others have called for the adoption of a Framework Convention on Alcohol Control (FCAC) concurrently alongside the already established Framework Convention on Tobacco Control (FCTC) which was formed in 2005 (Room et al. 2008). Recognizing the similarities between alcohol and tobacco, particularly regarding the transferability of policy from the FCTC to the FCAC, Casswell and Thamarangsi (2009) suggested that since such policy measures are effective for tobacco control, they would also be for alcohol. Significant for this study are:

- Price measures
- Advertising, promotion, sponsorship (national and international)
- Communication, scientific information
- Regulating product content (See Casswell & Thamarangsi, 2009, p.2253).
To date, the government has yet to act on a significant part of the *NZ Law Commission’s* recommendations – that is adopting policy measures similar to those adopted for tobacco (cf. Anderton, 2009; Casswell, 1997; Kypri, MacLennan, Langley & Connor, 2011; WHO, 2008). This includes recommendations related to the marketing of alcohol.

From the responses of government, there is a reluctance to draw parallels between alcohol and tobacco and to consider further regulatory reforms, including price increases, despite the plethora of evidence of social harm. Current New Zealand Prime Minister John Key made this clear as recently as August 2011 when he stated on Television New Zealand’s (TVNZ) *Breakfast* programme that when Jim Anderton passed a law that put the price of sherry up:

> It did a couple of things. It put the fortified wine manufacturers in my electorate out of business, and it stopped grandma from having a sherry, so she moved off to low price vodka. It didn’t actually change her consumption of alcohol. So yes, I mean if you could get a price that was a high selling point for all alcohol, maybe, but all you’re likely to do is raise excise across the board (Key quoted in Anderton, 2011a, August 29).

The question to be asked then is why has alcohol not been subject to the same level of regulation as tobacco? Jim Anderton (2010, pp.2-3) again provides one possible answer:

> The tobacco industry is on the ropes, and the people are brave now (*sic*)...Why? Because everything has been done, practically, and the tobacco industry has given up. It knows that it is a done deal. The liquor industry has not given up...The brave Government will take on the ‘on the ropes’ tobacco industry, but it will not have a bar of taking on the liquor industry, which is actually a much more significant and important problem facing New Zealand than ever before.

Anderton’s argument stems from and is based on alcohol companies lobbying for government officials in what he terms the “pervasive political influence of alcohol” (Anderton, 2011b). He says that alcohol companies send every Member of Parliament a box of beer at Christmas – and this included a box for himself. Anderton suggests alcohol companies are generous to those who will help them. Because of this ‘dishonesty’ as Anderton puts it, he believes that any changes to alcohol laws, particularly regarding those surrounding advertising and
sponsorship to match tobacco will not happen in the near future. In his view, there is no political will to do so (Anderton, 2011a).

Additionally, a further critique is that despite the harms caused by the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship, government and vested interest groups are united on the issue. Alcohol sponsorship of sport does not carry the same stigma as tobacco sponsorship once did. Alcohol can be consumed in moderation as opposed to tobacco, where one inhalation of cigarette smoke can cause disease to that person as well as those nearby through second hand smoke. Therefore, there is no precedent to address the way alcohol is advertised – notably through alcohol sponsorship of sport.

However, Jim Anderton continually draws comparisons between the sponsorship of sport by alcohol companies and tobacco companies. Anderton says he would like to see the alcohol sponsorship of sport banned. He argues alcohol producers are using the same marketing ploys as tobacco once did, in that both industries say that the individual should take responsibility for their own actions (Anderton, 2011c). While Anderton is firm in his conviction, he acknowledges that the banning of alcohol sponsorship of sport would require efforts from the government to cover the costs during a transition period:

We did it with smoking. Remember Rothmans cricket series? It is now sponsored by the National Bank. This example shows that changes can be made. Twenty years ago sport was saturated with tobacco promotion. My research uncovered 32 significant sport sponsorships in 1991 – they included pretty much all the major sporting codes, including cricket, racing, rugby, tennis, motor racing, soccer, cycling and more. Now I might be wrong about this – but I think cricket, rugby, tennis, soccer and cycling are still going in New Zealand without the support of Rothmans or Benson & Hedges (Anderton, 2009; 2011c).

There are parallels between the alcohol and tobacco sponsorship of sport. If there is a precedent to remove a harmful product from sponsoring sport based on evidence, then removing alcohol from sport should be almost as straightforward as removing tobacco. However, such is the contested terrain of the topic that many do not view the tobacco and
alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship in the same stratum. The debate relates to two key issues. One issue is the ability to recover the funds that would be lost if alcohol sponsorship was removed. In fact, a number of stakeholders argued that New Zealand and indeed, international sport struggled immensely when tobacco was initially prohibited from sponsoring sport. A second issue is the ability for society to use alcohol safely. That is, tobacco will kill you but alcohol provides a grey area because one or two drinks do not conclusively have the same consequence.

The (in)ability to recover funds from a ban of alcohol sponsorship of sport provided stakeholders with justification to exclude tobacco and alcohol from the same vacuum. Contextually, in 1990, the Health Sponsorship Council (HSC) was established in New Zealand on the back of the Smoke-free Environments Act 1991. The HSC took over all events and activities that had previously been sponsored by tobacco companies (HPA Website, 2012). By 1998/1999 this task was completed and the HSC now focuses on using social marketing to improve health outcomes. It could be argued that sport was able to easily recover from tobacco sponsorship and given the position that alcohol has in current society, there are those, including Jim Anderton who believes that the same could be the case for alcohol: “I would like to see alcohol sponsorship of sports games banned. That would require a commitment from government to cover transition in sponsorship...We did it with smoking” (Anderton, 2009, p.4). Conversely, as the contested terrain surrounding the debate attests, it is not straightforward. In fact, the ability to recover from banning alcohol from sponsoring sport would be a much greater challenge.

The challenge commences with stakeholders declaring that contrary to Jim Anderton’s belief, the transition from alcohol sponsorship would be ineffective for sport particularly in the short term. Matt, who is involved in the sponsorship relationship with one of New Zealand’s major rugby unions, was immediate in refuting sports’ ability to easily
recover from the tobacco ban. Matt states that not only would it be difficult for sport to recover from a ban of alcohol sponsorship, but the transition period would hurt sport financially as it did with tobacco. The following quote is representative of the overall views of the interviewees who feel an alcohol sponsorship ban would hurt sport:

I would challenge you to what you mean by easily recover? I wasn’t around with any rights holder or sponsor where tobacco was involved. But I can only presume that a lot of revenue would have been lost by tobacco no longer being able to sponsor sports...There are only certain industries in New Zealand that are able to come up with the sorts of money required, there are not many big players in the country who can do that...I don’t necessarily think that the revenue gained from tobacco would have been easily recovered from elsewhere and I think that would be the case with breweries (Personal Communication, November 16, 2011).

Sam, an executive member of an organisation responsible for the delivery of sport in New Zealand spoke in similar tones to Matt. Sam specifically noted the HSC to substantiate Matt’s statement and observed that not only would alcohol sponsorship be acutely complex to replace, but if alternative funding was not found, sport at all levels would be presented with a perilous situation. As Sam claims,

We are uneasy about the term easy. When tobacco sponsorship was banned in the sports sector there was an agency set up to replace tobacco sponsorship. So the funding was not lost to the sector...But I wouldn’t say it was necessarily easy or would be easy if alcohol sponsorship was removed especially not if that funding stream wasn’t replaced. Without that stream there would be a number of consequences for sport at all levels (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

Financially, the loss of tobacco and alcohol sponsorship offer similar dilemmas – that is, alcohol, like tobacco, would be exceedingly difficult to replace in terms of locating new money. However, from a public health perspective, tobacco and alcohol present dissimilar challenges based on medical evidence and the level of harm each drug causes. When questioned about the similarities between alcohol and tobacco sponsorship of sport, Simon, from a major New Zealand sporting organisation agreed that tobacco and alcohol are inherently different:
I think they’re completely separate. If you’re sitting at a football match for example and the person sitting next to you is smoking, well that can damage your health. Whereas if a person is sitting next to you having a beer it can have no impact on your health unless they have way too much and start fighting with you. But directly there can be no harm to you or anyone in your area if one person is drinking. If one person was smoking obviously you have got that passive smoke (Personal Communication, November 15, 2011).

Additionally, Mark, also from SPARC, highlighted the differences in the public health impact of tobacco and alcohol. In line with tobacco harm from consumption, with alcohol the problem is not consumption but the abuse (Crompton, 1993). Alcohol still can cause harm from a public health and cultural perspective but usually gets the benefit of the doubt.

According to Mark,

There’s no health benefit from smoking tobacco, that’s not to say alcohol is healthy either. Tobacco cannot be used safely whereas alcohol can be used safely, so they’re inherently different. They also have varying levels of addictiveness making them quite different substances (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

One aim of this study was to understand how the interviewees representing different sectors of society differentiate between tobacco and alcohol sponsorship of sport. The results of this study suggest that interviewees make a clear distinction between alcohol and tobacco, in part, because consumption of alcohol is culturally acceptable and observed as causing less harm. While it is believed that the tobacco and alcohol industries share similar values, the contested terrain lends support to alcohol in the first instance. Consider these statements, illustrative of the contested terrain. When interviewees were asked to compare alcohol and tobacco sponsorships of sport the following type of responses emerged:

**Chris:** Alcohol holds a different place within our country socially. It is linked to social celebration and this kind of thing. The public will have far less support for removing or doing anything substantial around alcohol sponsorship of sport. Of course tobacco is banned in many situations. They are comparable obviously as there are some similar issues policy wise but they are different products (Personal Communication, November 2, 2011).

**Sam:** In terms of the New Zealand psyche, I mean over 85% of New Zealanders drink and that’s where it is different to a tobacco type issue because less New Zealanders smoke tobacco and it very clearly establishes itself as a harmful product.
that has no benefit and because of the smaller percentage of New Zealanders that smoked. The tides turned against smokers but that will never happen against drinkers (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

**Mark:** Most New Zealanders identify as drinkers and are happy to carry on drinking. The psyche of our country is that we are a country that likes to be able to have a drink and I think that is tied up with when decision makers are considering decisions around restricting the availability of alcohol. They are very sensitive to what voters and others want which I think is very different to tobacco. They are getting congratulated for what they do around tobacco whereas if they were doing the same things around alcohol they would be getting beaten up by people around them. So I think there is sensitivity in terms of what the meaning of alcohol for New Zealand is and where it fits in within what we want as a society (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

**Nathan:** People get into bother when they drink too much and they lose their marbles and ability to rationalize. So if you keep drinking under that you’ve got less chance of messing up. And that’s where the harm comes from so you know this is not a cessation like tobacco; you know there is a safe level of consumption of alcohol. There is a perfectly normal level of consumption that that can and is part of a healthy lifestyle. This simply is not the case with tobacco (Personal Communication, November 17, 2011).

The debate over whether alcohol is as harmful to health and to the cultural fabric of society as tobacco will no doubt continue. Evidence from a health standpoint certainly points to alcohol being harmful no matter the intake (WHO, 2004) – which is the same for tobacco. To this extent the tobacco sponsorship case helps inform current discussions around alcohol sponsorship. This can be seen in the various themes and positions surrounding the debate. Critics argue that both products are harmful, addictive, lethal drugs (Babor et al, 2010; Bates, 1999; Crompton, 1993; Sellman, 2010). Moreover critics argue that alcohol sponsorship of sport both conveys negative messages to underage consumers and consumption is inconsistent with the demands of sport participation (Howard & Crompton, 1995; McDaniel, Kinney & Chalip, 2000). However, while some 50,000 research studies suggest that any tobacco smoking is harmful, the same level of evidence simply does not exist for alcohol. Here we see one particular aspect of the contested terrain at play. Diverse groups; representing different sectors of society, assert their position whether on moral, ideological or public health grounds or based on vested interests. At this point attention shifts to the alcohol sponsorship of sport
debate proper. This necessitates locating the 2010 *NZ Law Commission* report and its implications for sport sponsorship.

### The Current Context of Alcohol and Sponsorship Regulation in New Zealand

Following the submission of the 2010 *NZ Law Commission* report to Parliament the Government employed a Select Committee\(^\text{22}\) to make recommendations on which areas of legislation needed reform. The Select Committee presented their findings to parliament in August of 2011 (Hartevelt, 2011) and based on these findings, the Government introduced the *Alcohol Reform Bill*. The Government received over 9,000 submissions eventually leading to the introduction and passing of the bill (Hartevelt, 2011) which proposed 130 changes to the New Zealand liquor laws across various categories with Government accepting all of them.

The *Alcohol Reform Bill* attracted controversy, particularly surrounding the availability and promotion of alcohol. This is due to the government overlooking the *NZ Law Commission* recommendations surrounding advertising and sponsorship. Commentating in the *Drug and Alcohol Review*, Kypri, MacLennan, Langley and Connor (2011) state New Zealand needs ‘reform not tinkering’ – a phrase they use in relation to the government response. They assert in their submission to the *Alcohol Reform Bill*, that the government take a more serious look at the way alcohol is advertised and used as a sponsorship tool. They agreed with the *NZ Law Commission* that advertising and sponsorship should be restricted. They suggest that for effective alcohol controls, the *Alcohol Reform Bill* needs a number of

---

\(^{22}\) A Select Committee is a small group of Parliamentary members enlisted to deal with particular areas or issues within contemporary Government debate. The committees are investigative and they draw on evidence both within and outside of the current governmental legislature, including public submissions. Their objective is to discern whether a law change is appropriate. The committee will disestablish upon the conclusion of each investigation (New Zealand Parliament, 2011).
further changes including, centrally for this study: “Advertising being restricted to product information, with sporting teams, music events and other activities being free of alcohol brand promotion; and advertising being subject to government regulation rather than ‘self-regulation’”(Kypri, MacLennan, Langley & Connor, 2011, pp.432-433).

For the stakeholders interviewed, the Commission’s recommendations are not straightforward. In fact, there are a number of issues at play which I will now examine. The principal goal is to highlight the contested terrain of interests revealed in the arguments put forth by key stakeholders. The major themes or ‘driving forces’ for maintaining or removing alcohol sponsorship will be discussed and this will be followed by the ‘solutions’ offered by particular groups, including the alcohol industry.

Sub categories were developed from the interview data with respect to alcohol sponsorship of sport and its relationship to the NZ Law Commission report. The first category is the ‘culture of drinking’ – a term often referred to by the interviewees. Specifically, they refer to New Zealand’s drinking culture in terms of a history of binge drinking which occurs predominantly outside sport. But this of course raises the question about the difference between explaining and justifying particular patterns of behaviour and where sport might fit into the culture, if it fits at all.

I previously noted the importance of discourse in the representation of key debates and the power relations that emerge. In this instance, power must be viewed from a socio-historical perspective given the long historical ties between alcohol and sport (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). This is because alcohol sponsorship of sport, compared to sponsorship by any other industry or organisation, dominates the New Zealand sport landscape. However, this is not just a New Zealand issue – global alcohol conglomerates have formed alliances with sport that cut across national boundaries (Jernigan, 2009).
Changing the Drinking Culture

Drinking alcohol in New Zealand society is viewed as a taken for granted cultural practice that serves as a signifier of national and, in particular, masculine identity (Gee & Jackson, 2012; Jackson, Gee and Scherer, 2009). Furthermore, sport and leisure have long been a part of all aspects of New Zealand culture – particularly colonial sports such as rugby union (Phillips, 1987; Scherer & Jackson, 2007), cricket and netball, which have long historical ties with national identity and global success. With respect to this study, each interviewee had views on how drinking alcohol in the sport setting as a cultural practice is produced and operates within the context of New Zealand society, but more importantly within New Zealand sport as a sponsorship tool.

The interviews revealed that history and tradition are used to both explain and justify New Zealand’s dominant drinking culture. Chapter 2 of the *NZ Law Commission* report, titled *The Context for Reform*, the commission outlines various social and demographic variables that play a role in the amount of alcohol consumption. The Commission states that; “cultural attitudes around drinking are a further factor that can influence per capita alcohol consumption” (NZ Law Commission, 2010, p.65). The dominant cultural attitude, supported by a plethora of evidence gathered from the interviews, suggests that culturally New Zealand has a general tolerance for drunkenness, a lack of concern about wellbeing in relation to drinking and a reluctance to limit alcohol intake to avoid negative consequences (ALAC, 2010). This drinking culture is carried over into sport and the historically close association forges a naturalised link between New Zealand society, sport and drinking alcohol. This enduring culture of drinking in New Zealand has become what McEwan et al. (2010) call a ‘culture of intoxication’. A number of interviewees confirmed the drinking culture of New Zealand:
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Sam: Well there would probably be two key ‘driving forces’ behind alcohol issues in New Zealand. The first is the accepted *culture* of drinking to excess in New Zealand. That is a societal, *cultural thing* which is common in a lot of Anglo-Saxon nations [Emphasis Added] (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

Matt: New Zealand is a very social *culture* and generally that involves having a chat or a yarn with a mate over a beer [Emphasis Added] (Personal Communication, November 16, 2011)

Nathan: Alcohol is inherently associated with sociability, and has been for a long time. I think a lot of people drink alcohol because there is certainly a lot of social mores around the fact that it is a part of our *culture*, our social way of life, part of our attitude and behaviour towards celebration and sociability generally [Emphasis Added] (Personal Communication, November 17, 2011).

As the interviewees confirm a particular culture of drinking, often described as a binge drinking culture, has become naturalised and normalised in New Zealand. This normalization is reinforced by a number of factors. Morgan (1988, p.194), for example, states that alcohol companies have placed an “increasing emphasis on ‘lifestyle’ factors which is aimed to increase the occasion when one drinks.” The culture of lifestyle drinking has filtered down into the sporting arena – which arguably is one of the more prevalent lifestyle practices in New Zealand. ALACs (2010) *Guidelines for managing alcohol at large events* is testament to the value sport holds as a lifestyle factor for alcohol. According to ALAC (2010) alcohol in sport in New Zealand is pervasive with Jones, Phillipson and Lynch (2006) adding that alcohol abuse has been identified as a major public health concern at large events. Additionally, McEwan et al. (2010) suggest that this culture of lifestyle drinking can be put down to, among other things, the international/national marketing of alcohol products, particularly within the context of advertising and sponsorship of sport.

There is, therefore, an opportunity for the sport stakeholders to call for a change in New Zealand drinking culture through sport by calling for further alcohol sponsorship restrictions. Jim Anderton believes that if you want to reduce the harm caused by alcohol then you need to change the culture and indeed he acknowledges the historical place of alcohol in New Zealand’s cultural history when he stated: “We already HAD a drinking culture”
(Anderton, 2009 [Emphasis Added]). Further, acknowledging the importance of sport and the media Anderton advocates for change through initiatives such as the regulation of alcohol sponsorship of sport:

Most young Kiwi boys watch those games; they grow up dreaming of being just like the stars they see on TV. So what do they do when they see those games dripping in beer sponsorship? They learn that saturation in beer is part of the game. Beer marketers like Steinlager know that. That is why they sponsor the All Blacks...Administrators, media and talkback callers act surprised when athletes like Jimmy Cowan or Jesse Ryder get into trouble for drinking too much. But I don’t blame those players for making mistakes. I blame the culture that associates alcohol with their sporting brilliance as a way of making money out of selling more beer [Emphasis Added] (Anderton, 2011c, February 10).

Furthermore, Anderton notes that as long as brewers spend millions of dollars associating alcohol with sport, we will have little chance of changing New Zealand’s heavy drinking culture. Anderton believes the culture needs to change because the goal of beer companies is to “normalise the association between sports and alcohol, so that as those little boys will grow up they will understand beer and rugby go together like bread and butter” (Anderton, 2011c, February 10).

This normalization process has been orchestrated by the alcohol industry which has a long history including, “the underlying support of a political and economic system that places a higher value on profit than on the overall health and well-being of its citizens” (Morgan, 1988, pp.195-196). However, a number of interviewees argued that this normalization through sport in particular is not a driving factor in New Zealand’s binge drinking culture. Rather than viewing sport sponsorship by alcohol as a driving factor of New Zealand’s normalised culture of drinking to excess, a number of interviewees believe alcohol sponsorship of sport is not a cause for alcohol harm, but rather sport is a setting. Sport only has an extended role to play, rather than alcohol sponsorship of sport being a driving factor of New Zealand’s binge drinking culture:

**Chris:** New Zealand uses sport as a social setting and our whole history of sport is around people connecting with people as well as the sport. Sport is also an area that is
subject to laws specific to alcohol. So it is a regulated environment, sports clubs are licensed premises...because of the prominence of sport within our culture, it is a vehicle for selling and promoting alcohol [Emphasis Added] (Personal Communication, November 2, 2011).

Chris: I think that because sport is a social setting, the behaviour of our social norms gets played out in them. What you would actually say is that there is something deeper going on here. The people of New Zealand are actually playing out a culture around alcohol in the setting that they often happen to be in. I don’t think the drinking behaviour in and around sport is unique to sport [Emphasis Added] (Personal Communication, November 2, 2011).

Sam: Well we see sport as a setting rather than a cause. We are not aware of any strong arguments that sport drives alcohol consumption or patterns of consumption and the evidence from our research seems to back that up”...You could point to equal amounts of harm from the Big Day Out or any other cultural event...If you get 15 or 11 young men in a social setting, especially if they have been running around a paddock or heading off into town there is always going to be a culture of breaking the rules and pushing things a little bit too far [Emphasis Added] (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

Simon: I don’t think we have created a culture of alcohol and sport in New Zealand. I don’t think that people drink more at a sporting event than they would do at any other event. Sport is an entertainment business the same as anything else [Emphasis Added] (Personal Communication, November 15, 2011).

Matt: Alcohol has been involved in sport for a long period of time and you know there is sort of this element also of removing just the fact that there is a commercial arrangement in place but it’s also supporting society from that social aspect. You know that’s why in club rugby there is that clubrooms aspect. They belong to a club and there is a social aspect that goes with that – having a drink with their club members and their teammates after a game is a really social thing to do in New Zealand. It is a part of our culture and that just transfers into higher level rugby. It is one of those fundamental philosophies of sport I suppose in that it brings people together [Emphasis Added] (Personal Communication, November 16, 2011).

Sport as a social setting could be an extension of attitudes from a dominant society that normalizes binge drinking. As the statements above highlight, alcohol in New Zealand is a major part of the social fabric. Sport is one of the major social arenas where the social fabric is sewn together. Extrapolated from the interviewees is that without alcohol in sport, the social fabric is not complete. Having a beer at a sporting event as a player or spectator has been imbedded in society. Indeed, sport is home to the dominant social attitude surrounding New Zealand’s ‘culture of intoxication’. Thus, sport has a role to play in changing the
dominant culture around binge drinking. As a justification for maintaining alcohol sponsorship of sport, these interviewees have used this socio-historical and cultural discourse not only to satisfy their own vested interests but also to argue that the “desire to relax with alcohol and amuse oneself with games is almost as old as human culture itself – and, as many would argue, long may it continue” (Collins & Vamplew, 2002, p.124). Essentially, emphasis is placed not on binge drinking itself, but on a socially and historically created discourse of alcohol in sport.

From a cultural perspective, it was important to draw upon the interviews to dig deeper into the relationship between sponsorship, sport and binge drinking. As previously noted binge drinking in New Zealand is an accepted culture within a (sporting) culture. This is where the problem in society emerges. When questioning the interviewees about this relationship, the messages were mixed. However a majority held the view that accusations of alcohol sponsorship of sport driving a binge drinking culture were an exaggeration. Defenders argued that sport is a social setting, and like many other settings, there will always be a select few who will drink to absolute excess. However, they assert that there are no strong links between alcohol sponsorship and binge drinking. My interview with Nathan from national alcohol distributor Lion Breweries highlighted this justification:

I think (alcohol sponsorship of sport) certainly draws an association. The Speights Coast to Coast is known as the ‘Speights Coast to Coast’. What I would say though is that it would be very difficult for anyone to extrapolate from that association that that is somehow encouraging problem or binge drinking and that’s the question. So the difficulty I have with the statement that alcohol sponsorship draws a link between brands and sport – my response would be ‘and what’s wrong with that?’ (Personal Communication, November 17, 2011).

I think the association with youth binge drinking and alcohol sponsorship is a very long bow to draw. That you could blame sponsorship of sport by alcohol brands for young people’s propensity to drink, I think that is rather over-simplifying the origins of youth binge drinking and I think it is worth pointing out young people have been binge drinking for decades, well before sport sponsorship by alcohol was actually allowed to be advertised or be allowed on the scale that it is now (Personal Communication, November 17, 2011).
Again, the socio-historical relationship has been drawn. The contested terrain here is that alcohol sponsorship of sport has some propensity to increase drinking (O’Brien & Kypri, 2008) and this is what makes the alliance dangerous to changing the culture. However, as Nathan opined, the purpose of alcohol sponsorship, much like any other sponsorship is not about encouraging excessive use of the product, but rather to associate an activity with a particular brand. Nathan and others spoke of using sport to help consumers select their brands over others in a loyalty situation.

Part of the NZ Law Commission’s report and submissions were based on New Zealand sportspeople as role models, getting themselves into trouble because of alcohol. The concern is that their daily lives and work environment are all attached to alcohol. Being employed by a sporting organisation that has aligned itself with an alcohol brand means greater access to alcohol for the athletes but additionally comes with a great deal of consequences if alcohol is mismanaged. The athlete is subjected to public scrutiny in the media and assumed to have some sort of alcohol problem. This situation fuels the drinking culture debate because New Zealand athletes attract a lot of public attention for their performances both on and off the field. With this being the case, one might conclude that these athletes reinforce the culture of drinking in New Zealand. This is because the athletes are sponsored by alcohol companies (for example, the New Zealand Rugby Union is partnered with Lion Breweries and their product Steinlager) and therefore drink alcohol (a higher percentage would drink than not in the case of professional rugby). The athlete is perceived as a billboard for sport and alcohol. If it is okay for the athlete to drink then it is okay for the public to replicate it. As athletes playing a role in the culture of New Zealand binge drinking, the interviewees outlined how they could be part of the solution and not just a part of the problem.

For example, during my post Rugby World Cup 2011 interviews, a story broke about a New Zealand athlete finding himself on the wrong side of alcohol. All Black wing Zac
Guildford was attending a wedding in Rarotonga and indulged in a drinking session with some friends where he reportedly “stumbled into a bar drunk, naked and bleeding and assaulted at least one person” (Hunt, 2011). He also had verbally abused a female athlete who was out training that day. Guildford had been in the news two months prior after getting into a heavy drinking session after a test match loss to Australia. It was post this incident that Guildford admitted he was struggling to deal with alcohol.

One informant (Nathan) expressed concern over such sporting persons being held to account for the removal of alcohol sponsorship. This individual felt that not only does New Zealand have a culture of drinking to excess but as a nation, we are quick to locate something or someone that is prevalent in society to pass the blame onto – and too often in recent times it is athletes for the alcohol sponsorship of sport. This interviewee noted how far away from sport sponsorship, New Zealanders’ drinking culture really is:

To suggest that Zac Guildford’s problem originated in Steinlager’s sponsorship of the All Blacks is pretty far-fetched. He is only in the media because he is an All Black...In some cultures, particularly New Zealand and Australia young men unfortunately have a sensation seeking propensity that probably does not get squeezed out of them until they are 25 and so it is very easy to exploit those sorts of situations you know and to say the situation proves there is a problem with sponsorship by alcohol companies, it does nothing of the sort (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

Furthermore, some interviewees argued that these athletes are misrepresented in the media. According to another interviewee (Sam), sponsorship holds little responsibility for the alcohol issue, particularly concerning athletes and incidents which are often singled out in a wider context. Subsequently, and consistently these athlete incidents are viewed as having little if no relationship with alcohol sponsorship of sport. Indeed, such issues are disproportionate and do not provide ‘hard evidence.’ Additional interviews drew more reaction to the Zac Guildford news story in this instance:

Issues such as the Zac Guildford one - there is certainly evidence of young people who play sport being involved in alcohol issues but the way these are represented in the media tends to lump the blame on the sport and sponsorship setting. You know the
Mike Tindall incident in Queenstown is another example. Does that mean the English Rugby team has a disproportionate problem with alcohol because they’re at a tournament with an alcohol sponsor or that they may be sponsored by an alcohol company? Is that hard evidence? No (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

Culturally and historically, alcohol has been linked with sport from a sponsorship standpoint. Those interviewed however, argue that this has little or no role to play or there is no ‘hard evidence’ that alcohol sponsorship of sport plays a role in societal drinking habits. However, one interviewee’s comments do acknowledge that in some situations, alcohol sponsorship may have a role to play in the excessive patterns of drinking that surrounds New Zealand culture. Paul from the Otago University Basketball club drew on youth and student identity as a key component:

Well we are obviously students and we like to drink. I think most of the students were proud to have a (alcohol) sponsor. Students here, particularly at this university enjoy drinking excessively probably more so than any other university I have experienced and so it matched up naturally with their identity around drinking, university and sports (Personal Communication, September 21, 2011).

In this context the ‘culture of intoxication’ is based on reasonably recent socio-historical factors around the university. However, alcohol sponsorship has its part to play in maintaining the identity and thus helping to maintain the culture of drinking. When queried about the ability to gain alternative sponsors, Paul stated that they did have a local sporting manufacturer who helped source some gear but at the end of the day, as university students, you simply cannot turn down free financial help. The next section examines the influence of economics on stakeholders’ views on the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship in New Zealand.

---

23 Mike Tindall, the Rugby Union player representing England at the 2011 Rugby World Cup in New Zealand was filmed (via CCTV) in a Queenstown bar with a number of teammates intoxicated. His behaviour in particular drew exceptional media circumstance in that he is married to the granddaughter of the Queen of England. It is noteworthy to state that England was involved in a number of drunken incidents during the tournament (Spink, 2011). Additionally, the England Rugby Union and England Rugby team was sponsored by Greene King Beer ‘the official beer of England rugby’ (New Zealand Rugby News, 2011, p.33).
Alcohol Based Sporting Economy?

Despite ongoing global financial crises it seems that one thing remains constant – the consumption of both alcohol and sport. Thus, we should not be surprised that alcohol companies invest a lot of money into various aspects of sport. Here, the analysis is divided into two sections. The first section examines the financial state of sport organisations in New Zealand. That is, alcohol sponsorship of sport has become a necessity for the survival of some sports leading to an ‘alcohol based sporting economy.’ The second section explores what strategies, if any, stakeholders are implementing or planning to implement to reduce harm and whether or not sport in New Zealand could be financially able to survive without alcohol sponsorship.

Economically, an array of factors contribute to alcohol sponsorship of sport: the industrialisation of alcohol production and growth of multi-national alcohol producers, the increasing number of products becoming available, the multi-national marketing of alcohol products, the growth of social media (Facebook, Twitter) and the rise of consumerism have all, equally according to McEwan et al. (2010) contributed to what Hayward and Hobbs (2007) have coined the ‘alcohol based leisure economy’. This provides the starting point for the next critique of the alcohol sponsorship of sport debate that emerged from my interviews; that is, the economic debate.

The contested terrain is explained by the sale of alcohol through sponsorship providing an important revenue source for many sport clubs and their activities. Turning to the study produced for SPARC (PS…Services, 2010), the sponsorship of sport by alcohol companies is viewed as being very important as a source of funding. The offers comments from most National Sporting Organisations (NSOs) identify that the sale of alcohol in clubs is an important source of revenue for their survival. Additionally the NZRU stated in the report
that rugby in New Zealand constantly operates at a deficit so any fall in revenue – and they note particularly in sponsorship support, will result in spending and activity cuts (PS...Services, 2010). Further, the support alcohol companies provide clubs through sponsorship and the sale and supply of alcohol in their clubrooms helps clubs survive and at the higher level, gives NSOs the ability to fund the game at all levels – that is, to be able to provide a sufficient amount of funding required to filter from national to local level sports.

The interviewees offered a range of perspectives. Socio-historically alcohol sponsorship of sport in New Zealand has financially supported the sector at all levels. Over time, just as western society has allowed for greater freedoms, especially for women, society has become consumers of an alcohol based leisure economy (Hayward & Hobbs, 2007; McEwan et al. 2010). The increasing importance placed on leisure, has attributed to the significance of sport to New Zealand society. Television companies have seized the opportunity to secure increased broadcasting rights and in response alcohol companies are seeking out sponsorships of sporting events, teams and athletes (McEwan et al. 2010). Therefore, New Zealand is becoming home to an ‘alcohol based sporting economy’.

Testament to this for example, is the 25 year association between Steinlager and the All Blacks. The reason for alcohol’s entry into the landscape was not only viewed as a cultural decision in linking sport and leisure with alcohol, but additionally it was alcohol companies, who had drawn this association with leisure that gave them the financial ability to support sporting pursuits. As these interviewees highlight:

**Chris from New Zealand Rugby League:** Money I think initially. The people that were here at the time didn’t target many other sponsors. Even the ones that they might have targeted, they didn’t see much value in I suppose. I mean, it was alcohol companies who were the most willing and most able to help fund sport at the time (Personal Communication, November 15, 2011).

**Simon from ALAC:** I mean it would be fair to say rugby is a bit of an outlier in that history of alcohol in rugby has been so intricately interwoven particularly around the financial aspects (Personal Communication, November 2, 2011).
Peter from Metropolitan Cricket club: They’re (alcohol sponsors) probably the ones who have been there before and appear to be more readily available or keen to give money to you (Personal Communication, September 15, 2011).

Historically there is a strong cultural and economic association between alcohol sponsorship and sport in New Zealand. Culture plays a significant role in the financial aspect of sponsorship of sport by alcohol companies. Matt details a particular sponsorship rugby has with an alcohol brand and what makes it financially and culturally important in the maintenance of that particular sport;

Speights sponsors the under-85 year age group club rugby grade here and preseason Speights hosts an open day for all the teams, for all the players. And it is literally just chilly-bins, a couple of beers and a barbeque. It is very limited consumption. If we didn’t have a sponsor that could come and fill the shoes as well then potentially that event couldn’t happen, which is us adding more value to the guys who are playing in that competition. So there are these extra benefits that we are able to provide our members and our players through the relationships. (Personal Communication, November 16, 2011).

This type of relationship is consistent historically with breweries responsible for the early onset of sport sponsorship. As Collins and Vamplew, (2002, p.58) note, “as well as money...sponsorship also brought with it an order and structure to the sport.” Order and structure enables sporting organisations to survive in the professional world. Alcohol sponsorship of sport financially offers substantial opportunities. For example, alcohol sponsorship can provide money and contra, where the contra can be sold in the stadium as extra profit whereas another sponsor (such as a power company for example) could only deliver cash benefits:

Matt: I suppose to answer your question of how significant is the sponsorship, it’s very significant in line with our other sponsors as well...It’s (our alcohol sponsor) probably actually a greater value because we can deliver greater things to Lion. You know like the pourage rights at our matches for example. Whereas other sponsors – it’s purely the brand association and the hospitality they get. So, naturally, there is more commercial alignment with us and Lion than perhaps other sponsors (Personal Communication, November 16, 2011).

Matt proposed that sport was dependent on the financing provided by all sponsors but naturally, alcohol sponsorship would provide the bulk of the sponsorship to the organisation.
This is one reason why the relationship between alcohol and sport has been viewed as ‘natural’ (Crompton, 1993). In the New Zealand context, as Matt explains if alcohol sponsorship was to be banned from sport, this would have serious financial consequences. Sporting entities are reliant more than ever on the funding that alcohol companies afford to sport.

Alcohol sponsorship of sport appears to be of greater value than alternative or co-operative sponsors. According to Dominion Breweries (DB) manager of corporate affairs Mark Campbell, DB believes there is a place for alcohol sponsorship of sport. He explained to the New Zealand Drug Foundation that to ban alcohol sponsorship of sport would have grave consequences for club sports and teams around New Zealand from minor events to the ability to host major events such as Rugby World Cup 2011 (Welham, 2011). It is, as the introduction to this thesis eluded, ‘the lifeblood’ of sport in New Zealand, particularly at the lower levels as Peter comments,

It’s (alcohol sponsorship) the lifeblood of the club actually in terms of the funding we get to be perfectly honest if we didn’t have such an easy or readily available source of funding we would struggle to get other sources of sponsorship (Personal Communication, September 15, 2011).

Alcohol as a source of funding for sport is crucial to clubs for their ability to survive and for organisations at a higher level, where this funding is able to be distributed from the top down to the grassroots level in a trickledown effect. Financially, if the NZ Law Commission recommendations were passed, there would be repercussions for national, provincial and regional sport. As Matt notes in this instance,

Look, if it (the Law Commission recommendations) went through naturally first and foremost it would have a fundamental impact on us financially. It would also have an impact on grassroots rugby. From a club point of view they rely heavily on takings over the bar. So it would have a heavy impact on them. They would become more reliant on us as a host union which applies more pressure as well. So it’s not just the fact that we are losing money but our constituents are losing money as well which then puts more pressure on the upper end (Personal Communication, November 16, 2011).
Regulating Recommendations

One of the major tenets of this thesis is to highlight the *NZ Law Commission* recommendations to government and what could be done to meet these recommendations. The basis of the recommendations was to instigate change to New Zealand society. However, as this thesis has instructed, in light of the power balance within the vested interest groups within the contested terrain that surrounds alcohol sponsorship of sport – it is likely that sport will aim to continue to operate the way they always have. Creating the preeminent conditions for an organisation to achieve their goals without having to sacrifice in order for the whole sector to run smoothly is the intention. *The NZ Law Commission* (2009) stated that if research necessitates that regulations are warranted, then it is necessary to weigh up both sides of the argument. The Commission declared that

> It is important that additional regulation does not unduly inhibit the ability of the liquor industry to contribute to further economic growth, or impose costs that are not in proportion to the harm being mitigated (NZ Law Commission, 2009, p.219).

Indeed, the reliance on alcohol sponsorship by a number of sports means that regulations in this manner would potentially cause consequences to economic growth. However, a number of people, as mentioned in earlier chapters, would argue that the harm mitigated warrants more stringent regulations. Each stakeholder was interviewed to address what they (or their organisation) are currently doing, and/or plan to do in the future to address alcohol sponsorship of sport. Initially, I endeavoured to discover what each stakeholder’s views were in terms of tackling alcohol sponsorship. I wanted to ascertain stakeholders’ plans to implement any changes to the way sport was sponsored by alcohol companies because such initiatives reveal how cultural processes serve as contested cultural spaces when the world of sport and society intersect.
Issues related to alcohol in New Zealand society are often played out in the sport sections of most media outlets, therefore alcohol sponsorship of sport and the minimisation of harm cannot be understood without locating one within the other and how sport in this instance can help society. This could not be achieved, as I found, without inclusive discussions surrounding alcohol in general society – alcohol consumption in sport has become a social issue rather than a sporting one (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). For example, the recommendations from the NZ Law Commission state that alcohol sponsorship should be banned as part of a staged process. This is because sport is identified in the Commission’s initial 2009 report under the regulatory category ‘demand reduction’ alongside ‘supply controls’ and ‘problem limitation’ as one of the three strategies for dealing with the minimisation of harm from alcohol (NZ Law Commission, 2009, pp.220-225).

The NZ Law Commission’s report, like this thesis, involved dealing with stakeholders. A majority of those interviewed for this thesis provided submissions to the report. Within these submissions, particular organisations outlined their stance on the various themes surrounding alcohol in New Zealand (for example advertising and sponsorship, purchase age, liquor licenses). However, a majority of these organisations did not go into too much detail as to what measures are being taken in regards to alcohol sponsorship of sport in terms of minimising the harm or acting on the recommendations from the Commission.

To begin, I want to group this section of the chapter into two distinct categories. The first being regulations. Here, the focus is centred upon what stakeholders are implementing based on alcohol regulation. These are things such as alcohol management at events and within organisations. The second is cultural – what is being achieved by sport alcohol stakeholders for the betterment of society. For example, I will draw on the NZRL model of ‘More than just a game’. This example highlights the contested terrain. As Jackson and Scherer (2013, in press) state, a contested terrain is a site of struggle over policy. The NZRL,
as we will see, has resisted against law which has not banned alcohol sponsorship of sport.

The NZRL fights within the constant battlefield as NZRL informant Simon stated:

    We have garnered plenty of interest from alcohol companies, wanting to associate themselves with the Kiwi’s24, and it is tough because there are large sums of money at play. But we have said no for now…it is about being more professional than before (Personal Communication, November 15, 2011).

While alcohol sponsorship of sport is the ‘lifeblood’ of New Zealand sport, some sporting organisations are beginning to attempt to look at other avenues of sponsorship.

    Within the alcohol sector and those that work alongside, the promotion of an alcohol brand is essential in order to draw an association between the particular beer and its distribution company (for example, Heineken and DB). This similar to a brand of biscuits trying to get a consumer to purchase their products over another brand. The difference, as this thesis has already alluded, is that alcohol is heavily regulated. The sport governing body in New Zealand, on behalf of the government, controls the regulations around a large proportion of sporting organisations’ activities. However, Sam and Mark explained that in terms of alcohol regulation in sporting organisations, they have no specific policy:

    **Mark:** We support anything that leads or shows good alcohol management. But sporting organisations are independent, so we expect them to maintain a similar stance in that they recognize that alcohol is a potentially harmful product that needs to be responsibly managed (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

    **Sam:** We don’t prescribe sports to alter their behaviour when it comes to alcohol sponsorship. We do take an interest in sporting organisations that are sustainable and we have a strong interest in increasing community participation. If removing alcohol sponsorship is a way for organisations to clean up their sport then we certainly support them around that decision (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

In response to regulatory measures, organisations have undertaken a number of steps to align themselves within the right side of laws while maximising the sponsorships from alcohol companies. The alcohol companies themselves are committed to maintaining the current regulatory measures while implementing a number of strategies around sponsorship

---

24 The Kiwi’s is the name given to the New Zealand (men’s) national rugby league team.
to ensure both the brand and the sport work within the boundaries of the law. An interviewee from Lion Breweries stated that the company is doing a number of things to minimise the harm associated with alcohol:

**Nathan:** So there are lots of things. Probably most importantly the marketing and promotion of alcohol is the most heavily regulated promotion of any product in New Zealand. So we absolutely adhere to all the codes that are required of liquor advertisers. We also have what we call our own code of marketplace responsibility. It sets out for everyone to see what our position is and what we will do to ensure that we don’t produce, promote and sell products in a way that will encourage harmful consumption or will target particularly vulnerable groups in our community (Personal Communication, November 17, 2011).

This code for marketplace responsibility sets out the guidelines surrounding sponsorship. Within it, the code states that Lion does not seek to promote their products at events or in association with events that are designed to target underage or at risk groups (Lion, nd).

Stakeholders are working closely within the regulations of alcohol sponsorship. Matt traced a number of initiatives undertaken in order to meet New Zealand regulations as well as cooperating with the alcohol industry. Nathan outlined the importance of this stakeholder relationship:

In terms of our association with any groups that we provide support to in the way of sponsorship, there are certain expectations we have of them and that we would expect them to display in terms of the service of alcohol in our brands. We work with liquor retailers to ensure they are meeting their legal requirements in the service of alcohol and also that they are not irresponsibly promoting our brands (Personal Communication, November 17, 2011).

Matt stated a number of measures Auckland Rugby Union is currently employing to ensure that such an association is managed closely:

Certainly with regards to replica apparel on any children’s clothing the Speights logo is removed. With regards to any offers we might push out – it might be a ticket offer that the first 500 receives a free Speights at the park. That certainly goes to the over 18 age group. If we push an alcohol message out to our members we will avoid sending that message to family members... In our hospitality lounges there is always a bar manager present and we have a supervisor from our own side and then also the bar manager is there.
The two club members interviewed had comparable ideas about meeting regulatory measures. Both noted that their sponsorships were from local bars. Within these sponsorships, both had reasons to attend the particular establishment after the matches. They both acknowledged the need to keep the pub visits relatively low key but noted clubs had a role to play within teaching responsible drinking habits within these situations. For example as Peter stated:

We make sure that when we attend the bar that we say ‘okay, let’s have one driver, drop your cars at home and we will pick everyone up’. We always make sure no one drinking is driving. The bar sponsor has a courtesy coach as well that can take us home or to another bar at any stage, so they’re showing responsibility (Personal Communication, September 15, 2011).

Paul drew on the socio-historical context in his analysis of the regulations. He stated that while the club does have a bar sponsor, the bar provided a meeting space because they did not have clubrooms – a common feature of the rise of modern sport (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). In terms of regulation, Paul stated that while it was important to support the sponsor and arrive up to the bar after each match:

In no way were people obligated to turn up. If people did not want to go to the bar they didn’t have to. We made sure that it was more about the social gathering to chat about the game rather than drinking. As students a majority of us do not have a lot of money to spend on beer anyway (Personal Communication, September 21, 2011).

Regulations surrounding alcohol sponsorship – that is, maintaining safe alcohol practices within sporting organisations to justify having alcohol sponsors in the first instance are taken very seriously. Chris emphasised the seriousness that sporting organisations were taking towards alcohol when he explained that his organisation ALAC had a number of approaches from sporting organisations:

We had the CEO of New Zealand Cricket, the New Zealand Sport Federation of Athletes, Softball, Netball and Rugby League call us. We didn’t initiate any of them; they all approached us and said ‘look can we meet with you? We want to see what we can do about the issue of alcohol’ (Personal Communication, November 2, 2011).
Specifically they did not get approached upfront about the issue of sport sponsorship and the direct relationship surrounding that area. Chris maintained that cash to sport from alcohol companies had decreased significantly over the past few years. This point was echoed by the NZRU who stated that a far higher percentage of revenue is attained from gaming societies; therefore there is ‘concern’ about the impact of regulation on the brewery sponsorship as a source of sponsorship funding (PS...Services, 2010). However, National Sporting Organisations are beginning to look closely at alcohol sponsorship and where it fits within their core values. The New Zealand Rugby League has introduced a model that challenges the need for alcohol sponsorship.

**More Than Just a Game: An Alternative to the Alcohol Based Sporting Economy?**

The New Zealand Rugby League (NZRL) has taken the approach of removing alcohol sponsors from their organisation. The NZRL took the approach that the whole culture of rugby league needed changing. The NZRL was sponsored by the beer brand Lion Red for a number of decades. However the NZRL decided that the sport needed cleaning up. On the back of incidents occurring in club games such as referee abuse and drinking on the sidelines, Simon, a senior executive within the NZRL and their board decided that a change needed to happen from the top. So the NZRL implemented a strategy called ‘More than just a game’.

The approach to begin with was described by Simon as:

> Our whole emphasis is more than just a game and how we can create, particularly for our demographic, which is that lower socio-economic side of things. When we talk about more than just a game, we talk about more professional than ever before, more integrity than ever before, more respect for ourselves and others, more community

---

25 In New Zealand, a percentage of the takings from gaming machines are put into the community. Organisations such as the Pub Charity are required by law to distribute a minimum of 37.12% into back into the community for various projects (Pub Charity, 2012). This includes sponsorship of a number of sporting and cultural events of all sizes. Most notably is the sponsorship of the national provincial rugby sevens tournament, officially known as the ‘Pub Charity Rugby Sevens’.
focused and socially responsible for creating better people (Personal Communication, November 15, 2011).

In order to manage this new direction, the NZRL removed alcohol sponsors from the organisation. Simon stated that as a rugby league culture, the NZRL believes that the individual should not abstain from drinking but they do not believe they should promote drinking either. Removing alcohol from the sidelines of club matches around New Zealand was crucial to changing the culture and perception of the Rugby League community:

We are trying to take alcohol off the sidelines because it has a negative ripple effect on the game and a perception of the game. People on the sidelines have a few drinks and start to get aggressive and shout at the players and the referee and it’s got a huge negative ripple. So it would be hard to change that culture if our premier team (the New Zealand national team) ran out onto the field with alcohol logos blazoned all over them (Personal Communication, November 15, 2011).

The NZRL has linked with ALAC (now part of the Health Promotion Agency HPA) as part of the More than just a game campaign. When a club comes on board, the NZRL gives that club goal post posters that replace the old Lion Red posters. These posters display phrases such as ‘ease up on the drink, not on the tackle’. They have sandwich boards that are placed around the sidelines and car parks of club grounds that declare ‘no alcohol or smoking on the sidelines or in the car parks’. Additionally, the NZRL distributes flyers and other paraphernalia that provides the crowds with information on the NZRL strategy (Personal Communication, November 15, 2011).

In measuring the success of removing alcohol sponsorship from their sport, Simon stated that the NZRL had been very proactive over the past five years or so to align themselves with sponsors who were going to bring more than just a financial benefit to the organisation. Simon stated that the NZRL has turned down large offers from alcohol companies over recent times. Simon stated that the NZRL has benefitted both financially and culturally from removing alcohol sponsorship:

It has been very positive for us. You could take the direct approach and say we have got less income because we have turned away that major sponsor that could provide
large amounts of income but I think it has given us more credibility on what we are trying to achieve. I think that indirectly this approach has attracted other sponsors. It has provided us money because of this social aspect – sponsors that may not have come on board if we had an alcohol sponsor (Personal Communication, November 15, 2011).

The NZRL’s stance has made rugby league more than just a game. The organisation has recorded a surplus each year since 2010, including a $505,000 surplus in the 2012 financial year (Greenwood, 2012). The credibility off the field, transformed to on the field, with the Kiwi’s winning the 2010 World Cup.
CHAPTER 5: Conclusion & Future Research

Alcohol is responsible for 2.5 million deaths worldwide (WHO, 2011) and kills 1000 New Zealanders every year (Anderton, 2011a). The World Health Organisation (2008) stated that one of its strategies for reducing the harmful use of alcohol is addressing the marketing of alcoholic beverages. New Zealand has an acknowledged binge drinking culture (Anderton, 2011a) and one of the factors that helps to maintain this ‘culture of intoxication’ (McEwan, et al. 2010) is the sponsorship of sport by alcohol companies. This is confirmed by the fact that the 2010 NZ Law Commission report into alcohol in New Zealand society devoted an entire chapter to alcohol advertising and sponsorship. Within the chapter, they recommended that alcohol sponsorship be removed from sport and cultural events in a three stage process.

Based on the report, the New Zealand Government introduced the Alcohol Reform Bill. This bill does not include any measures to meet the recommendations of the NZ Law Commission on advertising and sponsorship.

One of the stated reasons government has chosen not to reform the alcohol advertising and sponsorship laws is because alcohol sponsorship of sport is the ‘lifeblood’ of many club sports in New Zealand and helps fund high priority sport in New Zealand such as Rugby Union (PS...Services, 2010). Therefore, this thesis examined the contested terrain of the alcohol sponsorship of sport relationship in New Zealand. The contested terrain metaphor seeks to understand how and why a cultural product, practice or in this case relationship serves as a site of political, social and cultural power relations (Hartmann, 2000).

Drawing upon a cultural studies framework the study adopted a multi-method approach including research articles, reports (including submissions) and semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with a number of key stakeholders within alcohol sponsorship and sport in New Zealand. These included a politician, sport
governing bodies personnel, members of club sports and representatives from the alcohol industry.

Based on this primary question, it was important to break down the topic into a number of sub-questions in order to view the contested terrain from a number of positions. These include the socio-historical relationship between alcohol and sport both globally and in New Zealand. This highlights the ever increasing role played by alcohol in society and how alcohol has become more prevalent in leisure activities including filtering into sport. Secondly, how the tobacco-sport sponsorship debate is able to inform our understanding of alcohol sponsorship. That is, whether or not there are any differences between the two products and whether sport could survive if alcohol sponsorship was banned. I then questioned the way stakeholders critique or justify and defend alcohol sponsorship of sport to serve individual interests. The final sub-question asks what can or is being done to meet the recommendations by the 2010 NZ Law Commission.

Given the paucity of research both globally and within a New Zealand context that has examined alcohol sponsorship of sport from a social policy perspective, addressing vested interest groups, this thesis sought to understand the complexities and challenges surrounding alcohol sponsorship of sport. A true lack of understanding as to how alcohol sponsorship of sport is viewed in New Zealand society is a barrier to being able to effectively form any regulatory measures within New Zealand sport. This is supported by O’Brien and Kypri (2008), who argue “There may be value in examining contextual variables” (p.1961). Indeed, focusing on those involved in both public health and vested interest groups as ‘stakeholders’ in the contested terrain of alcohol sponsorship of sport in New Zealand has provided new insights into how a product that is a drug, provides a plethora of associated challenges, issues and consequences at multiple levels.
The Locus of Alcohol Sponsorship

Analysing the data, gathered from a multitude of sources including document analysis, media texts and interviews, a multiple method was developed and located within the cultural studies paradigm in order to situate cultural forces that make up our daily lives. To contextualise the alcohol sponsorship of sport, a socio-historical analysis built largely around Collins and Vamplew’s (2002) cultural history of sport and alcohol was used. Collins and Vamplew (2002) suggest that alcohol’s relationship with sport is built on the key cultural practices and institutions in our lives, the pub, church, sport and leisure. They describe how alcohol sponsorship of sport eventually transformed into a social issue rather than a sporting one. In turn, the thesis examined the perspectives of key stakeholders in the alcohol-sport sponsorship relationship to help illustrate the complexity and contradictions within the contested terrain of the issue. To summarise, three key debates emerged for stakeholders as a consequence of the NZ Law Commission report, emanating from their vested priorities: (1) Change the culture, not the sponsorship; (2) Alcohol is the (financial) lifeblood of New Zealand sport; and, (3) Alcohol and sport – more than just a game.

**Change the culture, not the sponsorship**

Key stakeholders in the alcohol sponsorship of sport debate indicate that a strategy for systematically moving forward to change New Zealand’s ‘culture of intoxication’ (McEwan, et al. 2010), must begin by acknowledging the problem of New Zealand’s binge drinking culture – a culture that “normalises the abuse of alcohol” (Anderton, 2011a). As the 2010 NZ Law Commission report notes, “cultural attitudes around drinking are a further factor that can influence per capita alcohol consumption” (p.65). Additionally, heavy drinking and drinking to intoxication are “persistent features of New Zealand’s drinking culture” (p.66).
Jim Anderton states that there are many contributing factors to New Zealand’s drinking culture. Included are some factors that cannot be changed, such as our history. But there are some aspects that can be changed – like the contribution that is made by alcohol’s association with sport (Anderton, 2011a). He goes on to state that rather than placing responsibility on individual players for alcohol fuelled indiscretions, he blames the culture that associates alcohol with sporting excellence claiming “as long as brewers spend one hundred thousand dollars a day associating alcohol with sport, we will have no chance of changing the drinking culture” (Anderton, 2011a).

However, with respect to a culture of alcohol and its role in processes of socialisation, various stakeholders do not hold alcohol sponsorship of sport to any account. Thus to ban alcohol sponsorship of sport will do nothing to address New Zealand’s drinking culture. Within their submission to the NZ Law Commission, alcohol distributor Lion Nathan stated that while implementing restrictions on advertising and marketing was populist and easy to implement, there is no evidence that such measures will contribute to removing New Zealand’s drinking culture (NZ Law Commission, 2010, p.324). Additionally, changing the culture rather than regulating alcohol sponsorship of sport in New Zealand’s was supported by a number of interviewees,

**Chris:** Binge drinking culture is the major issue needing addressing in New Zealand. We are growing up in a country that has a high level of acceptance towards getting drunk. I don’t think drinking in this manner is unique to sport, it happens in workplaces and a whole range of settings. This is where we need to address drinking (Personal Communication, November 2, 2011).

**Mark:** In general (the driving forces behind alcohol issues in New Zealand) our liberal licensing laws and our cultural factors – reflected in the NZ Law Commission report (Personal Communication, November 3, 2011).

**Matt:** I don’t think it (binge drinking) is specific to sport or sponsorship. It is a far bigger issue. (Personal Communication, November 16, 2011).
The lifeblood of New Zealand sport

A second key finding from this research was key stakeholders’ rejection of the NZ Law Commission’s recommendations. The NZ Law Commission notes that it is clear alcohol related sponsorship is important, but the amounts are difficult to quantify. Within the thesis interviews, Nathan mentioned that between one quarter and one third of Lion Breweries’ marketing budget is spent on sport sponsorship. Therefore one aspect of the contested terrain is evident in the vested interests that challenge the ban of alcohol sponsorship – key stakeholders are clearly resistant to change because of its financial implications. However, it is not just the alcohol industry that is resisting change. The SportNZ report remarks that any reduction in revenue or additional compliance costs may put many clubs’ viability at risk or result in reduced activities (PS...Services, 2010).

The NZ Law Commission (2010) concludes that sponsorship is increasingly important to the alcohol promotion mix. However, their view is that alcohol-related sponsorship should be restricted and eventually banned. They do suggest that if such funding is to come to an end, it is critical that such a contribution is replaced. At the club level, those interviewed both stated that club sport survival is not absolutely dependent on alcohol funding. The overall findings here can be summarised by these statements,

**Peter:** If they banned it (alcohol sponsorship of sport) it would create a bit more work but it wouldn’t be a case of ‘oh let’s not play anymore’. I think most clubs would just work harder to find sponsorship (Personal Communication, September 15, 2011).

**Paul:** If there was another organisation willing to jump on board with sponsorship, I am pretty sure we would take them up on the offer. As most clubs would as minnows in the sport sponsorship pool (Personal Communication, September 21, 2011).

The challenge of ensuring sport remains a financially viable business model in New Zealand relies on the funding that a national governing body can provide in a trickledown effect. Again, the NZ Law Commission (2010) stated that substantial sums of money are
involved and this is where the debate becomes difficult. This is because alcohol shares a close relationship with sport – a product that is sold and consumed at live sporting events. Consumers are able to support the sponsor on the ground where that sponsorship takes place, like the brewery itself has shifted to the match venue. Other sponsorship commodities such as a brand of motor vehicle for example, can only provide brand association. At the highest levels of sport in New Zealand, the feelings of sport stakeholders who rely substantially on all sponsorship but increasingly alcohol sponsorship can be summed up as follows, 

**Matt:** We can deliver greater things to Lion (alcohol sponsor) such as pourage rights at matches. So naturally, there is more of a commercial alignment (Personal Communication, November 16, 2011).

### Alcohol and sport: ‘More than just a game’

In light of the overwhelming evidence indicating the level of social and health harm being done, New Zealand’s binge drinking culture needs to be addressed. Certain forms of legislation have been implemented, such as a blood alcohol limit for drink drivers and the age one can purchase alcohol. The *NZ Law Commission* (2010) recommended a three stage process by which alcohol advertising and sponsorship could be severely regulated and banned. Alcohol is a drug, yet, society allows alcohol to sponsor sport – that is taking a harmful product and associating it with a healthy activity, which according to some of those interviewed, is the wrong message (Anderton, 2010).

A third and final key finding is that alcohol sponsorship of sport, under the current financial structure of many organisations, is more than just a sponsorship. Many defenders against regulation argue that alcohol sponsorship is the lifeblood of sport in New Zealand and a key ingredient in the maintenance of the social nature and culture of sport. However, others argue that the ability to change this culture within a culture is possible. To transform New Zealand’s binge drinking culture requires a commitment from society to reduce sources of harm. The NZRL example demonstrates a commitment from one sport organisation to
strongly regulate what was formerly considered their binge drinking culture. By banning alcohol sponsorships, the NZRL has set a precedent for potentially breaking new ground within social policy. However, a more comprehensive and sustainable level of social change will likely require a commitment from government to address the reality of the problem regardless of the power of alcohol lobbyists. Perhaps then, alcohol sponsorship of sport, like its predecessor tobacco, would be seen in a new light within New Zealand.

Constraints, Limitations and Future Research

Time and resource constraints limited this research to select 10 interviews from a significant pool of potential stakeholders. Given that each stakeholder interprets alcohol sponsorship of sport differently, conducting more interviews may have added to the depth and wealth of data. However, this research did take steps to ensure that both the public health sector and vested interest groups were equally represented.

A further constraint was the discretion shown by some stakeholders who politely declined to participate in the study citing sponsorship and contractual confidentiality. Although this may have led to some informative data being omitted from this research, it also highlights the power dynamics that exist between and within stakeholder organisations, sponsorship relationships and government, in short, it highlights one aspect of the contested terrain.

Additionally, tracing alcohol sponsorship of sport to the government level and in turn a multitude of clubs who receive alcohol sponsorship could have been explored. However, given that the Alcohol Reform Bill came before parliament as this thesis was being produced, it was clear that government had made its decision to reject the recommendations from the NZ Law Commission. Locating clubs that no longer accepted alcohol sponsorship through their own self regulation was difficult to find. However in-depth research locating the clubs
involved in the NZRL model ‘more than just a game’ and clubs who no longer accept alcohol sponsorship of sport through their own self-regulation and the success of these clubs pre and post alcohol sponsorship would provide valuable research.

In the long term, literature would benefit from a complete study of the scope of alcohol sponsorship of sport, from clubs to national sporting organisations. Does alcohol sponsorship of sport assume a sizeable role within the confines of New Zealand sport? Such a study would require extensive research into every club in every sport that includes alcohol as a sponsorship of any kind. A project of this magnitude would be required to present comprehensive research to government in order to answer how much of our sporting culture is supported by alcohol sponsorship?

Further research in the global context could assess the regulatory measures and subsequent success rate of European countries that have placed a ban on alcohol sponsoring sport. Additionally an analysis of the nature, extent and effects of alcohol sponsorship at major sporting events, including those televised, would highlight the nature and extent of alcohol sponsorship, promotion and advertising during a sporting fixture. Finally, analysis of how successful other nations who have banned or restricted alcohol sponsorship of sport have been at sustaining sport in light of sponsor funding loss might provide useful information those involved in the debate. This might include, for example, a focus on the current state of sports who were previously sponsored by alcohol companies prior to the introduction of Loi Evin in France.

Final Thoughts

The evolution of alcohol sponsorship of sport in New Zealand has occurred over a long period of time and is related to a range of political, economic and social factors. What originally began as a form of support by pubs for sport equipment, grounds and clubrooms,
turned slowly into alcohol sponsorship of sport. Today the relationship has been further transformed to the extent that multi-national, global alcohol conglomerates use their power to invest in sport as a way to successfully ground themselves in the culture of a society without the strict regulations attached with other advertising mediums. While the public health and social harms of alcohol are legislated against, alcohol sponsorship of sport has been largely ignored. The recent decade of alcohol harm in New Zealand society saw the pendulum swing towards addressing these harms within the core of New Zealand culture. As result sport became one target for implementing a change to this culture.

Sport stakeholders have operated with alcohol sponsors throughout the entirety of New Zealand’s recent sporting history, particularly as sport turned professional in the 1990’s. Stakeholders are now faced with a number of different challenges to the ones faced upon the initial injection of alcohol sponsorship. Not only is the financial stability of sport at the core of each organisation, but now sport is a much more important vehicle to national success in a global arena. One only needs to gauge reaction to the All Blacks success at the 2011 Rugby World Cup to appreciate this. Stakeholders now have to contend with tighter regulations surrounding alcohol advertising so sponsorship is a vehicle to market products without such tight laws.

The contested terrain that is alcohol sponsorship of sport will no doubt endure for the foreseeable future but needs to be resolved. In order for this to be accomplished, New Zealand’s binge drinking culture must be addressed. Government policy relating to sponsorship is currently in the hands of the Alcohol Reform Bill which is due for its final reading in parliament as this thesis goes to print. In the interim, there are calls for local level authorities to address the issue regionally. Rebecca Williams of Alcohol Health Watch New Zealand states that in Auckland, a committee has formed to ban alcohol sponsorship of sporting events in the region until the government is confident enough to take responsibility
and address the issue from a national level (Maas, 2012). Time will tell whether government
is willing to prioritise state investment in sport sponsorship to fill the gap of any loss of
alcohol funding in order to address New Zealand’s drinking culture. Ultimately, it would be
short-sighted not to include sport in any discussions of the alcohol reform, including the
regulation of sponsorship, as part of a solution to the nation’s binge drinking culture.
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Appendix A: Sample Interview Letter

DD/MM/YYYY

Kieran Cody  
C/o School of Physical Education  
University of Otago  
PO Box 56  
Dunedin,  
New Zealand

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Kieran Cody and I am a Masters candidate in Physical Education at the University of Otago. My thesis research is an investigation of the relationship between sport and the alcohol industry in New Zealand. In brief, the study explores the contested nature of the relationship from the perspectives of key stakeholders in light of the 2010 New Zealand Law Commission Report.

I would like to invite you to participate in an interview. This would take approximately one hour of your time and with your permission I will audio-record the interview. The interview can take place at your convenience.

I have attached an abstract of my research topic for your benefit as well as the participant information sheet, which confirms your privacy rights. Additionally, I can provide a general list of questions in advance of the interview. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me or my supervisor.

Thank you very much and I look forward to hearing from you.

Kieran Cody (PG-Dip PhEd, BA)
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form

Masters Research – Kieran Cody
University of Otago
Informed Consent Form

I have read the Information Sheet concerning this project and understand basic information about the nature and process of the research. All my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I understand that I am free to request further information at any stage.

I ............................................................................ (Please print name) agree to participate in the study being conducted by Kieran Cody at the University of Otago. It is further understood that I have received the following information concerning the study;

1. The study has been explained to me. I understand the explanation that has been given and what my participation will involve.

2. I understand that my participation is entirely voluntary.

3. I understand that I am free to discontinue my participation in the study at any time without penalty.

4. I understand that the results of the study will be treated in strict confidence and that I will remain anonymous. Within these restrictions, the results of the study will be made available at my request.

5. I understand that at my request, I can receive additional explanation of the study at any time.

.........................................................................................................
Signed                                                  Date