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Abstract

The aim of this dissertation was to explore how the Internet has impacted ticketing for live music concerts from a consumer perspective and in doing so, identify how concert ticketing could be improved for consumers. This dissertation comprises five chapters which document the research process undertaken to achieve this aim, which are: Introduction; Literature Review; Methodology; Results, Analysis and Discussion; Conclusions and Recommendations.

By conducting a critical review of relevant literature, the researcher identified the following key themes to underpin this study and aid the questionnaire and focus group design: online pricing and distribution, recorded music and the secondary market. The questionnaire was distributed online, collecting quantitative and qualitative data from a non-probability sample chosen by self-selection, producing 100 complete responses. The 25-minute focus group collected qualitative data from six participants – also from a non-probability sample chosen by self-selection and convenience. Here, the quantitative data was analysed using Qualtrics and Microsoft Excel whilst a thematic method was used to analyse the qualitative data.

Stemming from analysis, the researcher was able to make conclusions about how the Internet had impacted concert ticketing from a consumer perspective. Most prominently, the majority of consumers prefer to purchase tickets online, expressing that overall, the Internet has improved concert ticketing due to the level of convenience it provides. Although interestingly, most consumers still prefer to use physical tickets received by post as opposed to e-tickets. However, a major issue identified was the technical issues experienced online – which prevent many fans from securing tickets. Furthermore, most consumers highlight negative views towards the secondary market. They suggest it makes it harder to obtain tickets on the primary market whilst exploiting customers to make unfair profits, and therefore, it should be regulated to protect consumers, artists and organisers.
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Chapter 1. Introduction
1.0 Introduction

1.1 Chapter Overview

This first chapter will introduce the topic of this research dissertation, explaining why the research is important, why the researcher chose it and the identified research problem. To solve the research problem, two research questions will be presented alongside an aim and set of objectives. This chapter also contains a breakdown of the structure of this dissertation.

1.2 Rationale

1.2.1 Live Music Industry

In 2016, 27 million fans attended live music concerts – contributing £1 billion to the United Kingdom (UK) economy and sustaining 30,000 jobs (UK Music, 2017a). From 2015-16, the sector demonstrated large levels of growth, increasing by 14%, with the Dugher (2017, cited in UK Music, 2017a, p.6) stating ‘live music did have another great year as millions of people poured into festivals, stadiums and venues... live music is a fantastic driver for growth’. 2016 also saw an 11% increase in music tourism, generating a further £4 billion in direct and indirect spending for the UK economy (UK Music, 2017b, p.6). These statistics demonstrate live music’s growing influence upon the UK’s national culture and economy, thus making it an increasingly important topic within academic research.

1.2.2 The Internet

Further growth experienced globally is the fast-paced development of the Internet. As Bagga and Bhatt (2013, p.77) suggest, ‘organisations need to have an online presence to keep with the fast paced growth of technology and changing consumer preferences’. Whilst Cloonan (2011, p.413) claims that ‘concert ticketing has been transformed by the Internet’ and many academics highlight theoretical advantages of online ticketing (Shugan and Xie, 2004; Bowdin et al., 2012; Jackson, 2013), little research has been conducted to ascertain its real-life impacts. This calls for research to explore whether these proposed advantages are actually perceived as
advantageous by consumers, or whether online ticketing currently presents more issues than those it has overcome.

1.2.3 Secondary Market

Within concert ticketing there are two markets: the primary market ‘where event organisers control the price, revenue splits and method of ticket sale’ and ‘the secondary market, where tickets purchased on the primary market are resold at any price by touts and would-be attendees’ (AVF, 2017). A major issue at the forefront of research and news headlines is the growth of the online secondary market, where commonly, scalpers purchase concert tickets in bulk and profit from re-selling them at inflated prices.

In response to the 2015 Waterson Report, reviewing the secondary market, the government placed a ban on the use of ‘bot’ software used to purchase tickets in bulk, effective April 2017, as they acknowledged this practice was ‘to the detriment of fans, artists and organisers’ (Conway, 2017, p.13). However, some within the industry believe that this is not enough. Whilst in England and Wales it is a criminal offence to tout tickets for designated football matches and likewise for the 2012 Olympic Games, many ask why the same cannot be done for concerts. Here, Cain (2016, cited in MacDonald, 2016) states:

‘The government should be promoting ways of working with the industry to address touting and cybercrime and helping the whole industry to do this. Funny that it set up task forces to manage touting for the Olympics when the eyes of the world were watching... but doesn’t seem to want to play when their reputation is not at risk’.

Whilst this issue continues to endure debate between academics, industry members and government, Cain (2016, cited in MacDonald, 2016) adds: ‘[the government] acknowledges that profiteering prevents consumers securing a ticket, yet calls for evidence of manipulation before recommending a price-cap’. This highlights the importance of research pertaining to the consumer perspective of online ticketing,
to potentially generate evidence for the necessity of regulation on secondary markets.

1.3 Research Problem
Given the three-fold rationale above, the researcher could clearly identify the need for further research into ticketing for live music concerts. Alongside the topic being current within news and government discussion, the researcher has a personal interest in live music concerts – attending several each year and subsequently, has a passion for improving concert ticketing for consumers, artists and organisers. As a student project, a consumer perspective was taken as gaining access to stakeholders such as artists would have been unrealistic. This led to the development of the research questions stated below:

1. How has the Internet impacted ticketing for live music concerts, from a consumer perspective?
2. How can online ticketing be improved for consumers in the future?

1.4 Research Aim and Objectives
In accordance with the above, the researcher created an aim and set of objectives which would enable the research questions to be answered.

1.4.1 Aim
The aim of this project is to explore how the Internet has impacted ticketing for live music concerts from a consumer perspective.

1.4.2 Objectives
The objectives are as follows:

1. To critically review the literature on event ticketing, live music concerts and Internet developments
2. To identify how the Internet has impacted upon ticketing for live music concerts and the issues associated with online ticketing, from a consumer perspective
3. To carry out primary research with consumers about their perceptions of how the Internet has impacted ticketing for live music concerts
4. To make conclusions from the research findings about how the Internet has impacted ticketing for live music concerts, from a consumer perspective and make recommendations for the future of online ticketing

To begin this process, the researcher conducted a literature review (objective one) where key themes and issues were identified to aid the primary research (objective two). The researcher conducted online questionnaires and a focus group to gather primary data from consumers (objective three), which were analysed and interpreted to formulate conclusions and make recommendations for industry, government and further research (objective four). This process and the information gathered have been documented in this dissertation as per the structure described below.

1.5 Structure of Dissertation

1.5.1 Literature Review
Firstly, the literature review examines current academic literature pertaining to event ticketing, live music concerts and Internet developments. The researcher used the key themes identified in this chapter to help design the questionnaire and focus group questions, and used them as a basis for the subsequent analysis.

1.5.2 Methodology
The following chapter details the methodology used to conduct the research, highlighting the research design, sampling and analysis techniques, as well as justifying the suitability of the questionnaire and focus group methods. Here, the researcher also considered the associated issues regarding reliability, validity and research ethics.
1.5.3 Results, Analysis and Discussion

Within this chapter, the primary data is presented and analysed to determine how the Internet has impacted concert ticketing from a consumer perspective. Here, the data has been compared and contrasted between each research method and with existing literature, lending discussion to the wider meaning of the results.

1.5.4 Conclusions and Recommendations

This chapter makes final conclusions from the findings identified in the previous chapter – with subsequent recommendations to the industry and to government. Limitations of the research are identified, providing recommendations for further research that aim to expand and improve upon this study. Finally, the aims and objectives of this dissertation are re-addressed, to examine the extent to which they were fulfilled throughout the research process.

1.6 Chapter Summary

This chapter has endeavoured to introduce the topic of this research dissertation, providing a summary of the key facts and issues that make this topic current and important within the field of research. Therefore, the researcher has justified the study, identifying gaps to be filled and subsequently, set an achievable aim and objectives for this project. The next chapter will continue to provide background on the research topic by discussing existing academic literature and research pertaining to event ticketing, live music concerts and Internet developments.
Chapter 2. Literature Review
2.0 Literature Review

2.1 Chapter Overview

When conducting a research project, Veal (2016, p.45) suggests that the researcher must first ‘scour the existing published – and unpublished – sources of information for related research’, as this ‘may provide interesting ideas and points of comparison with the proposed research’. Therefore, this chapter lends discussion to current literature and research surrounding event ticketing, live music concerts and Internet developments. The key themes identified will be used to formulate the primary research questions and subsequent analysis, thus laying the foundations for this entire dissertation.

2.2 Event Ticketing

All planned events have attendees – whether they be paying customers or invited guests it is important to manage and monitor their volume to ensure safety and control (Bladen et al., 2012; Shone and Parry, 2013). Beaven and Laws (2004, p.186) suggest that ‘by determining and enforcing a maximum ticket allocation, organizers can control capacity and promote safety of the audience, artists, and the conservation of a building or environment’, which academics Smith (2007), Bowdin et al. (2012) and Getz and Page (2016) agree with.

Beaven and Laws (2004, p.184) describe a ticket as ‘a token allowing access to a service or entry to an event’, usually purchased in advance and given in exchange for money. Bladen et al. (2012) suggests that a customer’s first impression of an event stems from the ticketing process. Therefore, ‘ticketing can be an integral part of their satisfaction with the event experience’ (Smith, 2007, p.185) and any problems encountered could impact the event’s image and ultimately, impact sales.

For events, there are various ticketing methods that can be adopted, which include:

- A central box office,
- By phone, or
- Online (Adapted from Shone and Parry, 2013, p.249).
Here, Shone and Parry (2013) emphasise that the ticketing method an event chooses to adopt must be relevant for the target market and event type.

2.2.1 Price
Tickets sold on the primary market are priced at face value – this is ‘the full price of that ticket prior to any service charges or facilities fees’ (Moe and Fader, 2009, p.75). When determining ticket price, Tum et al. (2006) suggests that consideration should be given to the influence price may have on a potential attendee’s decision to attend. Ticket price can also create expectations for the event – a high price could generate higher expectations for the standard of delivery (Tum et al., 2006; Getz and Page, 2016). For concerts, tickets are often sold within a tiered system where the price varies depending on seat location within a venue (Moe and Fader, 2009, p.75).

2.2.2 Distribution
In marketing terms, ‘place’ or ‘distribution’ is concerned with ‘the handling and movement of outbound goods from an organisation to its customers’ (Brassington and Pettitt, 1997, p.532). Whilst events are service goods, requiring no physical distribution, important ‘place’ decisions must still be made regarding factors such as the location of booking facilities (Brassington and Pettitt, 1997; Blythe, 2009; Bowdin et al., 2012).

Whilst Rogers (2013) suggests that these decisions are concerned with how customers gain access to tickets, Allen et al. (2011) expands, suggesting that distribution encompasses the entire ticketing process – not just deciding that tickets will be sold online but considering how simple the website is to use from the consumer’s perspective (Jackson, 2013). Supovitz (2005, p.303, cited in Smith, 2007, p.186) supports this, suggesting ‘it is essential to make it easy and convenient for potential buyers to purchase their tickets’.

A further distribution consideration is the delivery of tickets purchased over the phone or online. When physical tickets are used, these can be collected from a box
office, delivered by post or sent via e-mail to be printed by the customer (Shugan and Xie, 2004).

2.3 Live music concerts

Live music concerts are an event of performing arts which ‘traditionally involve musicians, singers, dancers or actors, in front of audiences’ (Getz and Page, 2016, p.76). Anderton et al. (2013, p.123) suggests ‘live music offers a rich and unique experience for audiences and performers’, whilst the demand for such experiences ‘appears to be enjoying an unprecedented boom’ (Brown and Knox, 2017, p.233).

In the twentieth century, live music concerts were primarily used as a promotional tool to boost record sales, however, this relationship has changed over time (Anderton et al., 2013). As recorded music sales continue to fall following the inception of music streaming, it is now thought that artists consider their recorded music as a promotional tool for their tours (Holt, 2010), with most popular musicians sustaining their careers through concerts (Brown and Knox, 2017).

2.4 The Internet

2.4.1 Internet Developments for Music

For the music industry, the Internet has led to the development of digital piracy whereby copyrighted material is illegally copied and/or downloaded (Cesareo and Pastore, 2014). As a result, ‘global sales of music have significantly diminished’ (Cesareo and Pastore, 2014, p.515) and the industry has had to adapt. Most prominently, ‘subscription-based music services… have become an important channel for the distribution of “liquid” music’ (Cesareo and Pastore, 2014, p.515). These services offer millions of songs to be streamed and/or downloaded for a low monthly cost – making them ‘a viable alternative to online music piracy’ (Cesareo and Pastore, 2014, p.515). Studies by Dewenter et al. (2012) and Mortimer et al. (2012) suggest this had an impact upon live music concerts – as access to recorded music has become relatively cheap via the Internet, the demand and willingness to pay for live music concerts has increased.
2.4.2 Internet Developments for Events

Since the 1980s, advances in technology have revolutionised ticketing within the events industry (Beaven and Laws, 2004). Beaven and Laws (2004, p.185) suggest that ‘the explosion in the use of the Internet has changed the way customers access information about events, and in some countries has become an accepted method of ticketing’. Jackson (2013) agrees on these two key functions of online ticketing, which parallel the main advantages of e-commerce:

- the ability to make transactions at a location which is close to the buyer, and
- the ability to present the buyer with a range of options and pricing structures (Adapted from Shugan and Xie, 2004).

Further advantages of online ticketing identified by Bowdin et al. (2012) are summarised in the Table 2.1.

Table 2.1: Key advantages of online ticket sales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speed</th>
<th>Consumers can purchase tickets without leaving their home, queueing or waiting for a phone operator to become available.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer ease</td>
<td>Consumers can view the different experiences offered by the event in their own time, selecting the events that best suit their pocket and time constraints.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue</td>
<td>Ticket revenue comes from the buyer’s credit card, which facilitates security and ease of collection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Up-to-date technology</td>
<td>Increasingly consumers expect leisure services to be available to purchase on the Internet. An on-line presence is critical in establishing an event brand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td>The tickets can be sent as an e-mail to the consumer at minimal cost, but very conveniently to the consumer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Adapted from Bowdin et al., 2012, p.411)
2.5 Online Ticketing for Live Music Concerts

2.5.1 Distribution

Online ticketing, a form of e-commerce, facilitates ‘round-the-clock availability of tickets’ (Cloonan, 2011, p.413) and the distribution of tickets without shipping (Hoyle, 2012). Live music concerts commonly outsource this function to a ticket agent such as Ticketmaster (Jackson, 2013) to widen their distribution network, however this comes at a cost which is usually passed onto the consumer (Bowdin et al., 2012). Furthermore, there is evidence that Internet servers struggle to cope during high levels of demand (Currie and Lu, 2011). For popular musicians, this results in site crashes, loss of tickets and ultimately, disappointment for fans (Fortunato, 2011; Chande, 2017).

Further developments for distribution can also be seen in electronic tickets. Firstly, tickets can be sent via e-mail and printed by the customer or presented on a smartphone (Bowdin et al., 2012). Alternatively, paperless ticketing can be used – where no ticket is distributed. Instead, customer information is stored on a database and proof of purchase and/or personal identification is required to gain entry (Shugan and Xie, 2004; Rascher and Schwarz, 2013).

2.5.2 Pricing

Although using a ticket agency can improve the booking process, charges are enforced in the form of transaction and/or shipping fees, which Lewis et al. (2006) suggest can impact the customer’s purchasing decision. However, Roggeveen et al. (2006, cited in Sethna and Blythe, 2016) indicates that incorporating these fees into the ticket price, called ‘bundling’, can effectively incentivise purchase and increase customer satisfaction.

Whilst fans ‘complain about the cost of tickets’ (Corr, 2018, cited in Graham, 2018), ticket price increases could be the product of the Internet. As Nguyen et al. (2016, p.241) suggests, the Internet has facilitated ‘transparency of pricing strategies’ which Hutton (2018, cited in Graham, 2018) claims helps artists determine their ticket
prices: ‘everybody looks at everybody else’s prices and says, ‘If it’s £35 for them but we’re bigger... we can be £37.50’”. Whilst Graham (2018) indicates that as customer expectations increase, ‘tours... become more ambitious, and cost more to stage as a result’, Holt (2011) highlights continued indications from fans that they are being forced to attend fewer concerts due to high prices.

2.6 Secondary Ticketing

‘Secondary ticketing is the practice of purchasing concert...tickets before subsequently re-selling them... This may be because the original purchaser is no longer able to attend a concert. Alternatively, it may be carried out by scalpers or touts. Scalpers buy in bulk then re-sell at inflated prices... while touts... loiter outside venues in order to buy and sell tickets from and to people waiting in the queue’ (Anderton et al., 2013, p.141).

The Internet has transformed the secondary market (Leslie and Sorensen, 2009) through ‘the emergence of online re-sellers who match up sellers and buyers... in return for commission’ (Anderton et al., 2013, p.142).

2.6.1 Secondary Market Pricing

Black, Fox and Rochanowski (2007, cited in Brown and Knox, 2017, p.235) explain that ‘ticket scalping, which has been largely facilitated due to technological advancements’, has caused the “true cost of concert tickets to rise’. The secondary market mostly comprises organisations whose sole income is generated through re-selling tickets (Cloonan, 2011), causing ‘consumers to pay higher prices without creating higher profits for producers’ (Leslie and Sorensen, 2009, p.7). Brown and Knox (2017, p.235) echo this, stating:

‘An entire secondary industry thrives on music fans’ willingness to pay to see their favourite artists, with the industry referring to the profits made as... the so-called ‘value gap’ (IFPI, 2016), wherein much of the money now made from music does not make its way back to content creators’. 
In 2008, Ticketmaster bought the secondary ticket agency GetMeIn.com to bring ‘legitimacy and security to the... market’ (The Guardian, 2008, cited in Cloonan, 2011, p.415), however, they still allow tickets to be sold above face value. They state: ‘the buyer makes an informed choice... the face value of the ticket is always displayed... so that they know how much they are paying above the face value, or indeed below’ (Homann, 2014). However, many artists disagree with this mentality, believing that ‘concert attendees should not be selected on the basis of how much they are willing to pay’ (Courty and Pagliero, 2011, cited in Eckard and Smith, 2012, p.224).

2.6.2 Secondary Market Impacts upon the Primary Market
According to Leslie and Sorensen (2009, p.37), resale markets ‘stimulate competition’ on the primary market, making it harder for customers to obtain a ticket. In fact, ‘blocks of tickets may even be held back by primary market sellers... specifically for sale on the secondary market’ (Anderton et al., 2013, p.143). In 2009, it was revealed that concert promoter AEG had sold up to 1000 tickets for each night of Michael Jackson’s 45-show tour directly to a secondary ticket agent, collecting 80% of the profits made (Foster et al., 2009, cited in Cloonan, 2011).

2.6.3 Secondary Ticketing Regulation
Several academics agree that regulation of the secondary market would improve consumer welfare (Busch and Curry, 2011; Cloonan, 2011; Anderton et al., 2013). At one extreme, the Concert Promoter Association (CPA) launched campaigns to completely ban secondary ticketing (Cloonan, 2011). The CPA enlisted the help of Robertson (2008, cited in Cloonan, 2011, p.414), MP, who described scalping as ‘simply extortion at the expense of both fans and the entertainment industries’. However, there remain legitimate reasons for ticket re-sale, e.g. the purchaser is no longer able to attend (Cloonan, 2011; Anderton et al., 2013) and so a secondary market need exist. Instead, regulation could be implemented to control the secondary market.
By implementing a paperless ticketing system, identification is required to redeem the ticket purchase – preventing re-sale as the secondary market requires physical tickets to operate (Shugan and Xie, 2004; Anderton et al., 2013). Furthermore, the industry has seen the development of ‘ethical’ re-sale sites that enable tickets to be resold at face value (Anderton et al., 2013). Davies (2016, cited in BBC, 2017), the founder of ‘ethical’ re-sale site ‘Twickets’, explains ‘we strongly believe that genuine fans don’t wish to profiteer from ticket sale’. Ed Sheeran implemented this scheme for his 2018 tour, declaring tickets as valid only if they are purchased from the primary seller or ‘Twickets’ – enforced by requiring identification upon arrival (BBC, 2017). However, the re-sale site Viagogo facilitated the re-sale of tickets for this tour, despite knowing they would be invalid, rendering Sheeran’s attempt to tackle scalpers ineffective (Pintus and Thomas, 2017).

Finally, Davies (2016, cited in MacDonald, 2016) stated: ‘In our view the only way fans can be properly protected is through a blanket ban on resale for profit, as has been implemented in other markets around the world, and was successfully achieved for London 2012’. Whilst there is regulation in place to protect football fans, many within the live music industry ask why the same protection cannot be given to music fans (Conway, 2017).

2.7 Chapter Summary

Within this chapter, the key themes pertaining to this research project have been identified as: online pricing, online distribution, recorded music and the secondary market. The information gathered in this chapter will be used to formulate the primary research questions and underpin the data analysis. The next chapter will endeavour to describe the methodology used for this research project.
Chapter 3. Methodology
3.0 Methodology

3.1 Chapter Overview

Often, secondary data cannot provide a complete solution to a research problem (Adams et al., 2007). Therefore, in the previous chapter, the researcher identified ‘an information gap’ (Lomas, 2011, p.65) that could only be filled through primary research. Whilst current literature highlights some changes to concert ticketing that have resulted from the Internet, the researcher aimed to identify how these changes are perceived by the consumer. This chapter will detail and justify the methods used to conduct primary research, so that an experienced reader could replicate the study. It will also demonstrate considerations given to validity, reliability and ethical issues relating to the study.

3.2 Primary Research

As mentioned above, the researcher identified that secondary data was not sufficient to answer the research questions set out for this study and so primary research was required. Primary research is quantitative or qualitative data that is collected first hand.

3.2.1 Quantitative vs Qualitative Research

Veal (2016) describes quantitative research as involving numerical data which is analysed to draw conclusions and test hypotheses. Analysis can stem from sophisticated statistical methods or through counts or percentages (Walliman, 2014; Veal, 2016). Quantitative data collection is commonly associated with survey research; however, all quantitative data sources can be seen in Figure 3.1 (p.29) (Denscombe, 2014).
In contrast, qualitative research is rich data (Saunders et al., 2016) collected ‘in the form of words, conveyed orally or in writing’ (Veal, 2016, p.35). Qualitative data can be analysed deductively, using preconceived ideas or inductively, formulating new theory (Saunders et al., 2016). It is commonly associated with interviews however, can be extrapolated from questionnaires, documents or observations, as described in Figure 3.2 (Denscombe, 2014).
3.2.2 Mixed Methods

A mixed methods approach involves combining qualitative and quantitative data collection within a research study (Creswell, 2014). All methods have bias and weaknesses, therefore the collection of qualitative and quantitative data is thought to neutralise any weaknesses from either sets of data (Creswell, 2014).

The researcher chose a mixed methods approach for this research project as it fulfils its aim – by utilising questionnaire and focus group methods, consumer perceptions can be quantified, allowing for comparison, as well explored in more depth through the gathering of qualitative data. This is supported by Saunders et al. (2016) who suggests that questionnaires are more effective when linked with other methods. Similarly, Brotherton (2015) states that focus groups can aid the researcher’s understanding of data collected through other methods.

3.3 Questionnaires

Veal (2016, p.255) defines a questionnaire as ‘a written/printed or computer-based schedule of questions and a pro forma for recording answers to questions’. Questionnaires have the advantage of collecting large volumes of information within a short time period – making it suitable for a time-constrained student project (Saunders et al., 2016). Furthermore, ‘by using the same questions for the selected sample’ (Finn et al., 2000, p.4), questionnaires generate data that can be easily compared and analysed.

3.3.1 Design

As a self-completed questionnaire, the researcher acknowledged the importance of designing questions which were clear and simple to understand and answer (Adams et al., 2007). Unstructured, open questions allow respondents to ‘give answers in their own way’ (Saunders et al., 2016, p.452), providing ‘a rich source of varied material which might have been hidden by categories or a pre-coded list’ (Veal, 2016, p.284). Whereas structured, closed questions ‘provide a number of alternative
answers from which the respondent is instructed to choose’ (Saunders et al., 2016, p.452).

Often, questionnaires are created using a mixture of structured and unstructured questions (Brotherton, 2015) – and so a mixed design was used for the questionnaire in this study. Most questions were closed so that the data could be quantified and compared, with minimal pressure on respondents to interpret questions and provide lengthy answers (Adams et al., 2007). However, some open questions were used ‘as follow-ups or probes to the... closed questions in order to obtain... the reasons for people’s responses’ (Brotherton, 2015, p.167).

The questions asked collected data based on attitudes, opinions and experiences using techniques which included: list questions, category questions, Likert-scales and matrix questions (Saunders et al., 2016). Here, attitude questions had an even number of scales so that respondents were forced to choose a negative or positive response (Adams et al., 2007). The questionnaire contained 52 questions, which took approximately 10 minutes to complete.

3.3.2 Distribution

Self-completed questionnaires are commonly distributed by post or via the Internet (Saunders et al., 2016). Internet based surveys are considered to be simple to create, analyse and administer (Bernard, 2013) whilst offering the quickest and cheapest access to participants (Walliman, 2014). However, it is suggested that online questionnaires can produce low response rates (Adams et al., 2007; Bernard, 2013; Veal, 2016) and are ‘confined to those with access to the Internet’ (Veal, 2016, p.274). Although, this is advantageous to the topic of this research study, regarding Internet impacts. Given the above evaluation and the chosen sampling method (discussed below), the researcher decided the Internet would be an appropriate distribution method.

The online software package, Qualtrics, was used as it facilitated the design of the questionnaire, whilst automatically capturing the data (Saunders et al., 2016). The
researcher collected responses by posting a web-link for the questionnaire on the social media sites: Facebook and Twitter (Walliman, 2014).

### 3.3.3 Sampling

A sample is a smaller version of the population it is obtained from (Brotherton, 2015). To be considered representative, the sample should be identical to the population in its composition and characteristics, which for quantitative data can be achieved through probability sampling (Brotherton, 2015). However, given the hard to define population (encompassing anyone who has purchased tickets to a concert) and the resource, time and access constraints of a student project, a non-probability sampling technique was implemented (Brotherton, 2015).

Specifically, self-selection sampling was used, whereby the researcher posted the questionnaire on social media, inviting individuals to participate if they have purchased tickets to a live music concert. They would then decide if it was appropriate for them to participate and if willing, they completed the questionnaire (Saunders et al., 2016). Despite indications that online questionnaires produce low response rates (Adams et al., 2007), the questionnaire exceeded the researcher’s prediction of 50, gaining a total of 134 responses which the researcher deemed as successful.

### 3.3.4 Analysis

Prior to conducting analysis, the researcher sorted the raw data to account for missing responses (Brotherton, 2015) – where 34 incomplete questionnaires were identified. To ensure consistency in analysis, the researcher ignored data gathered from these responses (Brotherton, 2015), leaving 100 questionnaires to be analysed. Responses were anonymous and so for analysis purposes, data from qualitative questions were coded as ‘QR*respondent number*’.

The Qualtrics software facilitated analysis by producing tables and charts using the data collected (Saunders et al., 2016) – additionally, the researcher used Qualtrics to
filter the results to produce further findings. The data was also exported to Microsoft Excel where graphs were produced and percentages calculated (Saunders et al., 2016). This method of analysis was chosen due to the researcher’s knowledge of these programmes, likewise the researcher did not deem complicated statistical tests necessary for this study (Denscombe, 2014).

3.4 Focus Groups

Focus groups are an interview method whereby a small group are bought together ‘to explore attitudes... perceptions, feelings and ideas about a specific topic’ (Denscombe, 2014, p.217). Here, the interviewer acts as the discussion leader – creating an informal atmosphere (Veal, 2016). An advantage of this method over one-to-one interviews is that it allows participants to respond to questions whilst evaluating and challenging points made by the group, which according to Saunders et al. (2016), generates a more productive discussion. Focus groups are also efficient as several participants can be interviewed at once (Saunders et al., 2016), and Adams et al. (2007) highlights that they can validate findings from a questionnaire. Therefore, the researcher deemed the focus group method more appropriate than one-to-one interviews for fulfilling the research aim.

3.4.1 Design

Focus groups ‘can be structured, where there are pre-prepared questions and checklists, or completely unstructured, where the intervention of the researcher is minimal’ (Bell and Waters, 2014, p.148). The researcher structured the focus group using 10 questions, which were open to avoid bias, however follow up probes were used to explore certain topics in greater detail and generate more in-depth responses (Saunders et al., 2016).

3.4.2 Sampling

As focus groups are used to gather information about content and process, a representative sample is not required (Bernard, 2013), however, it is usual to balance the group by age, sex and/or economic status (Finn et al., 2000). Brotherton
(2015, p.190) highlights the need ‘to invite or select a range of different members who have some interest in the issues to be discussed’. Thus following recommendation from Saunders et al. (2016), the researcher used two non-probability sampling methods to recruit focus group participants. Firstly, questionnaire respondents were prompted to leave their contact details if they were willing to participate in the focus group (self-selection) – this generated eight female participants. Therefore, to achieve an even balance of sex, the researcher contacted known male individuals who were likely to have an interest in the research topic (convenience). As Bernard (2013) suggested that focus groups usually contain six-twelve members, the researcher selected six participants.

The focus group was held at Cardiff Metropolitan University – as this was most convenient to the participants and researcher. One 25-minute focus group was conducted, as the aim was to gather in-depth qualitative data to support the questionnaire, not to compare samples. The focus group’s characteristics are summarised in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1: Focus group characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus Group</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>3 Female</td>
<td>20-23</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.3 Analysis
Many academics recommend the use of audio-recording within interview research (Bernard, 2013; Walliman, 2014; Saunders et al., 2016; Veal, 2016). Veal (2016) suggests that transcripts produced from audio-recordings provide a complete basis for analysis that cannot be achieved through note-taking. Listed advantages and disadvantages of audio-recording can be seen in Figure 3.3 (p.35).
Having considered the above factors, the researcher audio-recorded the focus group using a mobile device, to alleviate the pressure of note-taking and facilitate effective analysis. The researcher transcribed the focus group using Microsoft Word immediately following the session – as Walliman (2014) suggests if this task is left too long, vital information may be lost. To protect anonymity, participants were coded as ‘FG1P*participant number*’. The full transcript can be found in Appendix A.

The researcher used a thematic approach to analyse the transcript – a method commonly affiliated with qualitative data (Saunders et al., 2016). This is a flexible technique that can be used deductively or inductively, however, its general purpose is to identify themes or patterns related to the research (Saunders et al., 2016). The researcher chose to use a combined approach, so as not to affect ‘the scope of analysis’ (Saunders et al., 2016, p.587). Here, the researcher commenced analysis with pre-determined themes derived from the literature review, however remained open to modifying or adding new themes that surfaced within the data (Saunders et al., 2016).

3.5 Reliability, Validity and Triangulation

Veal (2016, p.46) defines reliability as ‘the extent to which research findings would be the same if the research were to be repeated at a later date or with a different sample’. Social research, such as this study, usually lack reliability as patterns of
behaviour, attitudes and opinions change over time and differ within varying social environments (Veal, 2016).

Validity ‘is the extent to which information presented in the research truly reflects the phenomena which the researcher claims it reflects’ (Veal, 2016, p.46). Veal (2016) argues that qualitative data is more internally valid than quantitative data as more time is spent collecting it, however, as qualitative data is open to interpretation, this could hinder its internal validity (Adams et al., 2007). Furthermore, whilst qualitative research does not claim generalisability (external validity), claims can be made that the findings are true for some people among the population (Veal, 2016).

Whilst a representative sample can increase validity, this sampling method was not suitable for this study. Instead, the researcher increased validity through triangulation – when a study utilises ‘two or more independent sources of data and methods’ (Saunders et al., 2016, p.207) (mixed methods), to ensure the accurate interpretation of the data. This approach was useful within this research project – as consumer perceptions can be difficult to interpret correctly, the data from the questionnaire and focus group could be cross referenced and validated.

3.6 Ethics

When conducting research with human participants, the researcher acknowledged the importance of ethical considerations. Here, Walliman (2014, p.123) suggests ‘you must be sensitive to issues of privacy, fairness, consent, safety [and] confidentiality’.

In compliance with Cardiff Metropolitan University regulations, the researcher completed an ethics form for approval by the Ethics Committee, prior to conducting primary research. Here, the researcher detailed the project’s rationale, the proposed research methods, any associated potential risks and how these risks would be managed and/or reduced (Veal, 2016). The main risk identified was confidentiality (Walliman, 2014) – to protect participants in this study, the questionnaire only requested personal details of those willing to partake in the focus group, which was
stored separately from their responses to ensure anonymity. Within the focus group, personal information was requested for consensual purposes, however, this information was coded during transcription and thus, responses were anonymised.

Draft documents containing the questionnaire and focus group questions were also submitted for approval, alongside participant information sheets and consent forms. These documents, including the approved ethics application, can be found in the corresponding appendix:

- Appendix B: Approved ethics application
- Appendix C: Blank questionnaire
- Appendix D: Participant information sheet
- Appendix E: Blank participant consent form
- Appendix F: Focus group questions and prompts

By gaining ethical approval, the researcher demonstrated an effective consideration of the ethical issues associated with this research project and alleviated risks to an extent deemed satisfactory by the committee (Denscombe, 2014).

### 3.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has justified the use of questionnaire and focus group methods, describing their design, plus the sampling and analysis techniques used. It has demonstrated the steps taken to ensure ethical standards were adhered to, as well as giving consideration to reliability and validity. Using the techniques just described, the next chapter will present an analysis of the data collected from the questionnaire and focus group.
Chapter 4. Results, Analysis and Discussion
4.0 Results, Analysis and Discussion

4.1 Chapter Overview

The previous chapter outlined the methods used to conduct primary research for this dissertation. This chapter will present the primary data collected from the questionnaire and focus group methods, where the data from each method will be compared and contrasted with each other and with the literature identified in Chapter Two. Alongside this analysis, the findings will be discussed in relation to their impacts upon current and future research and practice.

4.2 Pricing

4.2.1 Price Increases

Figure 4.1: Primary market prices

As seen in Figure 4.1, the prices paid for concert tickets on the primary market vary considerably, the most common range being £21-40 (61%). However, by filtering the data, the researcher found that a higher percentage of respondents have purchased a ticket for more than £40 (81%), than those who have purchased a ticket for less (65%) (Figure 4.1).

When asked about concert ticket prices, all focus group participants agreed that they were becoming too expensive. Specifically, FG1P5 remarked:
'They’ve increased quite a lot. When I first started going to gigs... it was... £18-20 to see someone like Ed Sheeran or Bastille, obviously people get bigger... as time goes by but now it costs like £40-50... which in the space of 10 years is a massive price increase’ (FG1P5).

FG1P2 then proposed the view that apart from when a concert moves to a bigger venue, the price increases seen within live music concerts cannot be justified:

‘I can remember seeing Thirty Seconds to Mars in the CIA [Cardiff International Arena] and paid £20 for the ticket and then they went on tour again but it was... £45, but it was in the same venue, same band, how can they justify that price increase?’ (FG1P2).

All participants agreed with this. FG1P2 continued to remark on popular artists that charge in excess of £100 for concert tickets:

‘Yeah it’s a big act but... what puts me off is it’s £100 out of my pocket to go and see someone for an hour and a half and it’s not worth it’ (FG1P2).

This highlights that which Graham (2018) suggested – that popular acts are creating more ambitious tours which come at a cost to the consumer.

4.2.2 Expectations

Focus group participants were asked for their thoughts on the idea suggested by Getz and Page (2016), that a high ticket price will generate high expectations of the event’s delivery. FG1P5’s initial response was:

‘I don’t think so because... most gigs nowadays have a lot that goes into them, like a lot of lighting and rigs and you kind of expect that anyway no matter what price you’re paying’ (FG1P5).

Three other participants agreed with this, suggesting high expectations of concerts have become the norm regardless of price. However, this norm may have been established as a result of previous rises in concerts prices – FG1P2 considered this:

‘I just think... I wouldn’t pay £100 to stand in the middle of a concert because in my mind I’d be thinking, I paid £100 for this, I want to
see my £100. Like that goes back to what you asked earlier [do higher prices increase your expectations?], you... want to see your money, you don’t want to walk out a concert and think, I just paid £100 for that, that’s not worth it’ (FG1P2).

Two participants agreed, with FG1P6 remarking: ‘You do... expect them to put on a show’ (FG1P6). This shows further support for Graham’s (2018) idea discussed in Section 4.2.1 that customer expectations are forcing artists to create bigger shows, which come at a higher cost. When this results in higher ticket prices, customer expectations continue to increase creating a vicious cycle.

### 4.2.3 Online Price Transparency

It is suggested that the price increases seen within live music concerts could be a product of price transparency facilitated by the Internet (Nguyen et al., 2016). In line with Beaven and Laws (2004), FG1P2 indicates that this allows for price comparisons: ‘because you can see all the prices out there, now on the Internet, you can value it up in your head’ (FG1P2). Interestingly, FG1P4 supports Hutton’s (2018, cited in Graham, 2018) view that transparency helps artists determine their prices, indicating the influence of the secondary market:

‘I think... the higher prices they [re-sale sites] charge are probably why concerts are getting pricier. Like the artists can see the potential profit they can make because some fans are willing to pay those crazy prices to see them’ (FG1P4).

Whilst the secondary market will be discussed further in Section 4.5, this view indicates that online transparency has likely had an influence upon concert ticket prices.

### 4.2.4 Booking Fees

Concert price increases are also a result of transaction and/or shipping fees (booking fees), which 93% of respondents have paid when purchasing tickets online (Figure 4.2, p.42). Of these respondents 86% believe these fees are high, with 53%
suggesting they are too expensive (Figure 4.3). However, 33% understand their necessity and 14% believe they are priced fairly (Figure 4.3).

Figure 4.2: Booking fees

![Pie chart showing the percentage of respondents who have paid transaction and/or shipping fees when purchasing tickets online.](chart1.png)

Figure 4.3: Booking fee opinions

![Bar chart showing the distribution of respondents' opinions on transaction and/or shipping fees.](chart2.png)

Despite this, 73% feel frustrated by fees (Figure 4.4, p.43) – a feeling conveyed by FG1P2 when describing their experience: ‘It’s the added prices as well, like the booking fees that you have on top of it, which is sometimes a pain’ (FG1P2). As Smith (2007) and Bladen et al. (2012) suggest, ticketing is the first point of contact for a customer and begins to shape their satisfaction with the event. If 73% of customers
are left feeling frustrated by booking fees (Figure 4.4), this could negatively impact upon their overall concert experience. Furthermore, by filtering the data in Figure 4.4 the researcher found support for Lewis et al. (2006), as booking fees have influenced the purchasing decision of 43% of respondents – indicating that they considered and/or decided not to purchase as a result.

Figure 4.4: Booking fee impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have transactions costs and shipping fees ever made you...</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...feel frustrated.</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...decide not to purchase a ticket.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...consider not purchasing a ticket.</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...none of the above.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.5: Fee bundling

Which of the following tickets would you be most likely to purchase? Where booking fee = transaction + shipping costs. A ticket priced at...
However, whilst booking fees are usually add-ons to the ticket price, Roggeveen et al. (2006, cited in Sethna and Blythe, 2016) suggested that customers are more satisfied when fees are bundled. This idea is supported by the findings in Figure 4.5 (p.43), where respondents were presented with three ticket options – each equating to a total price of £40 but containing different breakdowns of ticket cost and booking fee. The majority showed preference for a £40 ticket with no booking fee (Figure 4.5, p.43), demonstrating preference for the ticket cost and fees to be combined.

### 4.3 Recorded Music

#### 4.3.1 Access to Music

Figure 4.6: Recorded music access

![Figure 4.6: Recorded music access](image)

Cesareo and Pastore (2014) suggest recorded music sales are declining – which is supported by the data in Figure 4.6 that shows less than one third of respondents purchase music albums. However, by filtering the data in Figure 4.6, the researcher found that 97% of those who purchase physical albums also access music via the Internet. Most prominently, 88% of respondents use a music subscription service to access record music – a significant Internet development described by Cesareo and Pastore (2014).
By filtering the data in Figure 4.7 the researcher found that 77% of respondents use services that incur a small monthly charge whilst the remainder use free-to-use services. Similarly, over half of respondents listen to music for free online via YouTube (50%) and/or Soundcloud (2%) (Figure 4.6, p.44). Furthermore, of those who purchase albums, 49% only make an album purchase every three to twelve months (Figure 4.8). Overall, demonstrating that due to the Internet, the majority of respondents spend very little on recorded music.
4.3.2 Music Access Impact on Concert Ticketing

Figure 4.9: Recorded music and concerts

As shown in Figure 4.9, the majority of respondents indicate that by paying less for recorded music, they feel more inclined to purchase a concert ticket (89%) and are able to attend more concerts (84%). This challenges Holt (2010) who suggests that music fans are attending fewer concerts, however is in line with studies by Dewenter et al. (2012) and Mortimer et al. (2012) that found a link between the development of online music streaming and the demand for live music concerts. A further idea supporting this link surfaced within the focus group:

‘it’s helped because you don’t have to buy an album to listen to a new band, it might come up on your suggested and you think they’re really good and then they’re doing a gig down the road and then you can go see them’ (FG1P3).

This suggests that online music streaming has facilitated greater exposure for artists and their concerts, which supports Holt’s (2010) idea that artists now use recorded music as promotion for their tours.

Dewenter et al. (2012) and Mortimer et al. (2012) also suggested that cheap access to music makes customers more willing to pay for concerts, however, 52% indicate that as a result of paying less for music they would not be more willing to pay a
premium price for a concert (Figure 4.9, p.46). Following earlier findings in Section 4.2.1 that concert prices are increasing, fans may be forced to pay premium prices and thus in reality, attend fewer concerts in line with Holt (2010).

4.4 Distribution

4.4.1 Access to Tickets

Figure 4.10: Ticketing methods

As shown in Figure 4.10, 99% of respondents have purchased tickets online, making it the most commonly used method in comparison to 33% who have used a box office and 19% who have purchased tickets over the phone. This supports Beaven and Laws (2004) who say that the Internet is now a widely accepted ticketing method – which 93% of respondents show preference for (Figure 4.10).

When asked why these respondents preferred to purchase tickets online, the most popular reason was convenience (94%) (Figure 4.11, p.48). This supports Bagga and Bhatt (2013) who suggest that convenience is a major factor that influences buying behaviour. In line with this, Supovitz (2005, cited in Smith, 2007) highlights the importance of making it convenient for customers to purchase tickets – thus 94% suggest online ticketing has achieved this (Figure 4.11, p.48).
When focus group participants were asked why they choose to purchase tickets online, FG1P1 also indicated convenience: ‘...so much easier. Instead of having to queue up somewhere you can just do it from the comfort of your own home’ (FG1P1). This supports Shugan and Xie (2004) who suggest that e-commerce allows transactions to take place at a location close to the buyer. FG1P5 also added that the convenience of purchasing tickets online allowed them to increase their chances of success:

‘...you can have your laptop, your iPad, your phone all at the same time so you’ve got more chance’ (FG1P5).

In connection with convenience, 77% noted the speed of online transaction (Figure 4.11), a reason which also surfaced within the focus group:

‘...it’s just like click and done. Whereas if you’ve got to wait on the phone to get someone to answer you, you could be on hold for hours’ (FG1P6).

Further reasons given in Figure 4.11 included access to pricing information (59%) and the ability to compare ticket options (52%), with QR45 indicating: ‘It’s easier to look at pricing of different concerts before you decide to purchase’ (QR45). QR38 also
shared: ‘It’s easier as you can see all the prices and a seating plan so you can choose where to sit’ (QR38). Many academics including Beaven and Laws (2004), Shugan and Xie (2004), Bowdin et al. (2012) and Jackson (2013) agree that the availability of pricing and ticket information is one of the biggest Internet developments for concert ticketing. The final reason given by 50% of respondents was the ability to receive tickets via e-mail (Figure 4.11, p.48), which Bowdin et al. (2012) suggests adds to the convenience of online ticketing.

Figure 4.12: Reasons for not purchasing online

Despite these advantages, 7% of respondents prefer other methods (Figure 4.10, p.47). Of these respondents, 29% indicated that this was due to worries with inputting bank details online (Figure 4.12). This challenges that suggested by Bowdin et al. (2012) that online ticketing facilities greater security – however as this is the view of two out of 100 respondents, the data does not sufficiently disprove it. Furthermore, 29% of respondents prefer other methods due to technical issues that can occur online (Figure 4.12) – this will be discussed in Section 4.4.3. As highlighted in Section 4.2.4, 43% of respondents’ purchasing decisions have been influenced by transaction fees (Figure 4.4, p.43) – this is further supported by the findings in Figure 4.12 that show 14% choose not to purchase online due to these fees. Finally, Figure 4.12 indicates that 14% of respondents prefer to process their transaction with an actual person.
### 4.4.2 Ticket Types

Figure 4.13: Ticket types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ticket Types for Live Music Concerts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical ticket, collected from box office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical ticket, received by post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-ticket, printed by you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-ticket, presented on a smart phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paperless ticket</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticket types used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred ticket type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shugan and Xie (2004) suggest that there are a variety of ticket types used for concerts however, most commonly used are physical tickets received by post (82%) and e-tickets, printed by the customer (82%) (Figure 4.13). By filtering the data in Figure 4.12 (p.48), the researcher found that 89% of respondents have used some form of electronic ticket, which Shugan and Xie (2004), Bowdin *et al.* (2012) and Hoyle (2012) suggest are one of the major Internet developments for event ticketing. FG1P2 described their advantage:

‘*Paperless ticketing is quite good...Because you’re not carrying anything...some people forget their tickets and then they’re like, you can’t come in. But with that you’re just taking your ID that you’d have with you anyway*’ (FG1P2).

Despite this, only 37% of respondents preferred using these tickets types (Figure 4.13), with FG1P6 expressing that using paperless tickets would make them nervous about inputting their details correctly during the purchase. FG1P4 also noted issues with paperless ticketing: ‘*If you book several tickets on one card for other people,*
then you have to wait for the other people to turn up and go in all together’ (FG1P4), which FG1P5 agreed with.

Furthermore, FG1P2 indicated issues they have previously faced with e-tickets:

‘When they’re trying to scan it on your phone, it might not work properly... and then if you have a print out, but the print out is creased and they’re like “we can’t scan that”’ (FG1P2).

FG1P3 also added that e-tickets can easily be deleted when clearing out your e-mails. FG1P2 went on to say: ‘If it was up to me I’d just have a ticket and that would be it, because you get to keep that ticket then’ (FG1P2). All focus group participants agreed that they preferred a physical ticket received by post – interestingly, this was also preferred by the majority of questionnaire respondents (61%) (Figure 4.13, p.50). Within the focus group, the researcher asked participants why they preferred a physical ticket. Alongside the issues with electronic tickets previously described, the researcher found the main reason to be that they can be kept ‘forever’ (FG1P2) as a ‘memory’ (FG1P6) of the concert. However, FG1P2 noted a drawback to physical tickets:

‘The only difference with that... is they charge you for it, it’s like 3 quid but it’s free for an e-ticket, so I’ll get an e-ticket’ (FG1P2).

This highlights the issue discussed in Section 4.2.4 that when purchasing tickets online, booking fees are impacting customer purchasing decisions.

4.4.3 Technical Issues

The data in Figure 4.14 (p.52) supports Currie and Lu’s (2011) suggestion that many Internet servers cannot cope with high levels of demand, as 71% of respondents have experienced technical issues when purchasing tickets online. Here, QR33 stated: ‘It’s a nightmare to access tickets if the show is popular’ (QR33).

As can be seen in Figure 4.15 (p.53), 87% of respondents indicated that as a result of facing technical issues when attempting to purchase tickets online, they were unable
to secure tickets to the concert. FG1P3 spoke of their experience: ‘...I’ve had it where you go to buy the tickets and... then the website crashes and... it reloads and they’re sold out’ (FG1P3). This data from the questionnaire and focus group supports Chande’s (2017) suggestion that technical issues can create disappointment for fans.

Figure 4.14: Technical issues

When FG1P4 spoke of their experience of purchasing tickets online, they explained:

‘A lot of the time it’s stressful...I remember one time, tickets went on sale at 9:00am...I refreshed the page at one minute to nine and they were sold out. I had no chance’ (FG1P4).

All focus group participants agreed this can be stressful, whilst QR10 expressed: ‘System crashing during high-demand ticket sales can cause frustration’ (QR10). If technical issues make the ticketing process stressful and frustrating, according to Smith (2007), this could damage the concert’s image and impact on sales. Furthermore, as a result of facing technical issues, 20% of respondents were deterred from using the same site again whilst 11% were deterred from purchasing tickets online altogether (Figure 4.15, p.53), thus demonstrating the potential impact upon sales if tickets are only available online.

Whilst QR53 suggests the ‘queuing’ system implemented by ticketing sites helps to prevent site crashes, QR34 suggests further issues regarding queues: ‘Sites still crash regularly and the queue system seems unfair. Someone joining the queue after you
seems to be put ahead’ (QR34). This highlights the view that virtual queuing can be randomised and unfair for customers in comparison to a ‘real-life’ queue. FG1P6 also highlights the frustration of waiting in a virtual queue: ‘You do seem like you’re just sitting there forever in this massive long queue and you’re just like “I might as well give up”’ (FG1P6).

Figure 4.15: Technical issues impacts

Despite the technical issues experienced by 71% of respondents (Figure 4.14, p.52), some still experience a high success rate. QR37 said: ‘[recently I’ve had] less crashes when trying to buy tickets, higher success rate for me personally’ (QR37) – whilst five out of six focus group participants agreed they are usually successful when purchasing tickets online. However, FG1P6 expressed: ‘I’m usually successful with stuff that’s not that popular’ (FG1P6), which highlights that customers can be less successful when demand is high – supporting the findings in Figure 4.15 that 87% of respondents have been unable to secure concert tickets when purchasing online.
4.5 Secondary Ticketing

4.5.1 Buying Second-hand Tickets

Figure 4.16: Secondary market platform consideration

When asked which platforms they would consider purchasing second-hand tickets from, 97% of respondents indicated they would purchase from a friend or family member, however, only 6% would purchase from a ticket tout outside a venue (Figure 4.16). The difference in these statistics could be attributed to a lesser amount of trust between someone unfamiliar compared with someone the respondent knows personally. Interestingly, 42% would purchase a ticket from a re-sale site, where the seller is unfamiliar to the respondent like a tout, although this transaction takes place online (Figure 4.16). However, this data indicates that 58% would not purchase from a ticket re-sale site (Figure 4.16) – all focus group participants shared this view, with FG1P5 revealing:

‘I personally, no matter how much I wanted to see someone, would never buy off a site like that because I just think that morally, it’s so wrong and it just takes advantage’ (FG1P5).

FG1P1 also remarked: ‘I just wouldn’t use it... because I can’t trust it’ (FG1P1). These statements both suggest a lack of belief and trust in re-sale sites.
However, only 36% of respondents have actually purchased concert tickets on the secondary market (Figure 4.17). Here, the majority of respondents purchased tickets from a friend or family member, whilst half used a ticket re-sale site (Figure 4.18). By filtering the data in Figure 4.18, the researcher found that 78% of respondents have purchased a second-hand ticket online – this included 25% on Ebay, 8% via social media and 3% via the ethical re-sale sites Twickets and Vibe Tickets that sell tickets at face value and charge no fees.

Figure 4.18: Secondary market platforms
4.5.2 Selling Second-hand Tickets

Figure 4.19: Consumers as sellers

![Pie chart showing 30% of respondents have sold a ticket and 70% have not.]

Figure 4.20: Reasons for re-sale

![Bar chart showing reasons for re-selling tickets: 93% because the person could no longer attend, 7% purchased too many by accident, and 10% purchased to sell for profit.]

Whilst 36% of respondents have purchased second-hand tickets (Figure 4.17, p.55), 30% have acted as re-sellers (Figure 4.19). Of these respondents, 96% resold their ticket(s) because they or the person the ticket was intended for could no longer attend (Figure 4.20). Anderton et al. (2013) suggests that when tickets are re-sold by individuals, as opposed to scalpers, it is usually for this reason. Furthermore, 7% purchased too many tickets by accident (Figure 4.20) which would also be considered a genuine reason for reselling a ticket (Cloonan, 2011). As tickets are usually re-sold at inflated prices by scalpers, surprisingly, 10% of respondents purchased tickets specifically to re-sell them for profit (Figure 4.20). However, it is the normality of selling tickets above face value that may have led respondents to do
so, as stated by QR17: ‘Most people sell them for more and it’s an easy way of making profit’ (QR17).

Figure 4.21: Re-sale platforms

The majority of respondents sold their tickets to a friend or family member (63%), whilst 23% used a ticket re-sale site (Figure 4.21). Interestingly, the same number of respondents sold their tickets via social media (23%), more so than via Ebay (13%) or a ticket tout outside a venue (3%) (Figure 4.21). By filtering the data seen in Figure 4.21, the researcher found that 57% have resold tickets using an online platform however, a higher percentage have sold them face-to-face (63%), supporting Cloonan’s (2011) suggestion that the online secondary market is mostly comprised of organisations, not individuals.

Of respondents who chose not to sell their tickets online, 68% indicated that this was because it would be too much hassle whilst 37% said it is too complicated (Figure 4.22, p.58). 47% chose not to sell online as they believe ticket re-sale sites are unethical and 16% were discouraged by the associated commissions and/or fees (Figure 4.22, p.58). Thus it can be inferred that these respondents view selling tickets online as time consuming, inconvenient and complicated, meaning a simple method need be developed for consumers. Further discussion will be given on the ethical nature of re-sale sites in Section 4.5.5.
4.5.3 Secondary Market Pricing

Shown in Figure 4.23 are the prices paid for tickets on the secondary market – whilst there is no large majority, the most common price range is £41-60 (28%). This is higher than the most commonly paid face value range of £21-40, as indicated by 61% of respondents in Figure 4.1 (p.39), thus demonstrating that prices on the secondary market are usually higher than that of the primary market.
As shown in Figure 4.24, the majority of those who purchased tickets from a friend or family member (68%), via social media (66%), via Twickets (100%) or via Vibe Tickets (100%) paid face value. Interestingly, respondents only paid more than face value when purchasing tickets online: via a ticket re-sale site (72%), an online marketplace (56%) or social media (33%) (Figure 4.24).

When discussing whether re-sale sites are fair and justified (Section 4.5.5), 42% commented on inflated prices (Figure 4.27, p.63). FG1P4 also highlighted: ‘I’ve [purchased from a re-sale site] ... but never again. I paid nearly triple the face value for one gig’ (FG1P4). Furthermore, FG1P1 shared the view that re-sale prices are
‘ridiculous’ (FG1P1), whilst, as discussed in Section 4.2.3, FG1P4 suggests that these inflated prices could be the reason for price increases on the primary market. This supports the view of Black, Fox and Kochanowski (2007, cited in Brown and Knox, 2017) who indicated that the cost of concert tickets has risen due to the emergence of online ticket scalping.

Similarly, Brown and Knox (2017) highlight a value gap wherein much of the profits made on ticket sales do not go to the organisers or artist. Some respondents expressed views in line with this such as ‘the wrong organisations are profiting’ (QR41) and ‘It’s not fair that people should be gaining money from re-sale of tickets when none of that money is even going to the artist’ (QR54). When considering the findings in Section 4.2.2 surrounding price and expectations, it could be said that the higher prices paid by customers on the secondary market generate higher expectations of the artist’s performance. Thus forcing artists to create larger productions, despite receiving no extra ticket revenue to fund expenditure – if expectations aren’t met, this could lead to disappointment for fans at the fault of the re-sale site, however at the expense of the artist.

In contrast to the 56% of respondents who purchased second-hand tickets at face value (Figure 4.24, p.59), when respondents acted as sellers 73% sold their tickets at

![Figure 4.25: Re-sold ticket prices](image-url)
this price (Figure 4.25, p.60). Of the reasons given, it appeared respondents did not wish to profit and believed this was fair, as stated by QR22: ‘because I couldn’t attend it felt wrong for me to make profit from someone who could attend’ (QR22). This is consistent with Davies (2016, cited in BBC, 2017) who suggests that genuine fans do not wish to profit from ticket sales.

However, in challenge of Davies (2016, cited in BBC, 2017), 23% of respondents who re-sold tickets did so for more than face value (Figure 4.25, p.60). QR3 explicitly states their reasoning for this as: ‘Bought the tickets to make a profit’ (QR3). In fact, all but one of these respondents charged more than face value as they saw a profit opportunity. In line with Homann (2014), this data suggests that some believe it is acceptable to charge higher prices on the secondary market, as QR53 expresses: ‘customers know what they’re doing’ (QR53). This suggests customers can make informed choices about the tickets they purchase, with QR57 stating: ‘Totally their choice and if you are willing to pay more to see the artists you like you will pay regardless’ (QR57). However, the remaining respondent said: ‘The website auto priced the tickets’ (QR14), which suggests that re-sale sites encourage customers to sell tickets above face value, which acts only to earn themselves higher profits.

4.5.4 Secondary Market Impacts upon Primary Market

A common complaint from customers, according to Leslie and Sorensen (2009), is that the secondary market makes it harder to obtain tickets in the primary market. All focus group participants agreed – specifically, FG1P2 remarked:

‘[scalpers] go on there and buy like six tickets and they’re going to sell those six tickets but that’s stopping six other people that actually want to go to that concert to buy tickets’ (FG1P2).

This view was echoed by several questionnaire respondents, expressing similar to QR23:

‘People deliberately buying tickets at face value to resell for profit makes it harder for people to get tickets at the true cost as they sell out too fast’ (QR23).
These quotes support Leslie and Sorensen (2009), suggesting that bulk-buying scalpers generate more competition on the primary market, reducing the likelihood of customers securing tickets at face value. As QR61 indicates:

‘Websites using automated buying methods to get tickets in bulk make it unfair for the general public who genuinely want to see a band or artist’ (QR61).

4.5.5 Ticket Re-Sale Sites

Figure 4.26: Opinion of re-sale sites

Within the questionnaire, 11% of respondents indicated beliefs that re-sale sites are fair and justified (Figure 4.26). Three of these respondents agreed that customers who genuinely cannot attend need a re-sale platform: ‘It is perfectly reasonable for someone to have bought a ticket but who is no longer able to attend’ (QR64). However, the remaining respondents believe these sites are justified as they meet the demand for customers willing to pay higher prices, with QR40 stating: ‘If people really want a ticket they will pay more for it’ (QR40).

Despite this, the majority of respondents believe re-sale sites to be unfair and unjust (89%) (Figure, 4.26). By categorising the reasons given (Figure 4.27, p.63), the
researcher found that 42% believe the prices are too high, whilst similarly, 32% believe it is unfair for profits to be made by selling tickets at high prices. Here, QR42 highlights: ‘It is too easy for people to buy multiple tickets to sell on at a price above face value just to make a profit’ (QR42). Whilst QR72 asks: ‘If you bought them for a set price and can no longer attend, why should people have to pay more just to go in your place?’ (QR72).

Figure 4.27: Reasons why re-sale sites are unfair and unjust

Further reasoning given by 17% of respondents was regarding unfair practice – when re-sale sites use ‘bots’ to buy tickets in bulk from the primary seller (Figure 4.27). As highlighted by Foster et al. (2009, cited in Cloonan, 2011), some primary sellers sell directly to re-sale sites, taking a portion of the extra profits made. QR41 notes this practice: ‘It is shown that sites have held back tickets and then resold them at extortionate prices’ (QR41). With this, 15% suggest that when re-sale sites buy tickets in bulk, it makes it harder for individuals to purchase tickets on the primary market (Figure 4.27). As highlighted by QR2: ‘Usually bots... prevent people from buying first hand’ (QR2), whilst QR49 adds that: ‘Re-sell sites stop people who genuinely love an act from attending’ (QR49).
Further to this, 14% of respondents expressed the view that re-sale sites exploit their customers, as stated by QR10: ‘People take advantage of those who wish to see a concert’ (QR10). Many respondents agree that by charging above face value, re-sale sites take advantage of fans’ willingness to pay, with none of the surplus profits going to the artists. This was highlighted by Leslie and Sorensen (2009) and the reason given by 5% of respondents for believing re-sale sites are unfair and unjust (Figure 4.27, p.63).

Interestingly, only 2% of respondents said re-sale sites were unfair and unjust because of fraudulent tickets (Figure 4.27, p.63). However, this issue surfaced more prominently within the focus group, with FG1P6 sharing: ‘...you don’t know if it’s legit[imate], you might not even get in’ (FG1P6). All participants agreed with this notion that re-sale sites are untrustworthy. FG1P6 then spoke of their friend’s experience with re-sale fraud:

‘He had to go through to his bank to get all the money back and they worked out that the person that put them on was selling multiple copies of the same ticket’ (FG1P6).

4.5.6 Secondary Market Regulation

Figure 4.28: Re-sale regulation

Following the overriding negative view towards re-sale sites (Figure 4.27, p.63), 96% of questionnaire respondents and all focus group participants agreed they should be
regulated to protect consumers (Figure 4.28, p.64). By categorising the reasons given, the researcher found that 51% of respondents believe regulating the secondary market would prevent the high prices being charged and the subsequent unfair profits (Figure 4.29). Respondents also indicated that regulation would help to protect consumers (25%) and create a fairer system (22%) where tickets can be sold for legitimate reasons at face value (Figure 4.29). In line with Robertson (2008, cited in Cloonan, 2011), QR28 explains: ‘Buying tickets to re-sell in bulk means that both the customers and organisers lose out’ (QR28) – therefore, a fairer system would also benefit organisers and artists.

Figure 4.29: Reasons why re-sale should be regulated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevent customer exploitation</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent high prices and unfair profits</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a fairer system of re-sale</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent the sale of fraudulent tickets</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent bots/bulk buying</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore, 15% of respondents believe regulation can prevent the sale of fraudulent tickets and thus ensure better safety for customers (Figure 4.29). QR12 also highlights how second-hand sellers are at risk of fraud by re-sale sites: ‘There is always a risk that the site isn’t genuine and/or you won’t receive your payment’ (QR12), therefore regulation could protect sellers too. Finally, 14% made reference to the prevention of bulk-buying practices (Figure 4.29), as mentioned by QR58: ‘Normal people are limited to e.g. 4 tickets yet bots buy and sell 100s of tickets at a time for 4x the original price’ (QR58).
The regulatory measures identified in the literature review were presented to questionnaire respondents, where the majority (78%) indicated that a face-value price cap on re-sale sites could be effective (Figure 4.30). However, as re-sale sites earn their profits from selling tickets above face value, such regulation could result in the closure of these sites. Whilst this may be a positive outcome, this would leave genuine customers without a platform to re-sell tickets, as FG1P1 suggests: ‘there will always be someone who legitimately can’t go anymore’ (FG1P1). Therefore, whilst Cloonan (2011) and some questionnaire respondents support a ban on secondary ticketing, there is indication that a secondary market need still exist.

Figure 4.30: Proposed regulation

Instead, 64% of respondents suggest that being able to return your ticket to the primary seller for a refund, where it will be put back on sale, could be an effective way of facilitating a secondary market (Figure 4.30). Here, QR29 suggests:

‘If a ticket is no longer needed, I believe there should be a system in place where the ticket can be resold through the primary seller if someone wants it, leading to a refund’ (QR29).
This would be convenient to customers, as suggested by FG1P2: ‘if you can’t go to an event, you just want your money back’ (FG1P2) and would help to-reassure buyers that tickets are legitimate as they can only be purchased from the primary seller.

Anderton et al. (2013) discusses the creation of ‘official’ or ‘ethical’ re-sale sites as a method of regulation, where tickets can be re-sold at face value. 59% believe these sites could be effective (Figure 4.30, p.66), alongside two thirds of focus group participants. Here, FG1P2 stated:

“That’s a good idea. If you’re putting tickets up at face value, then those people then who put the tickets up obviously can’t go to the event, they’re not making a profit’ (FG1P2).

Whilst FG1P3 spoke of their experience as a re-seller:

‘Yeah I like that idea because before I’ve not been able to go anymore and...I had to end up charging more for it because of all the fees and commissions...that those re-sale sites take. Else I would have a loss on my ticket. Would have been happy to just get my money back so using that ethical site...would have been good’ (FG1P3).

However, when Ed Sheeran implemented this scheme for his 2018 tour, tickets continued to be unfairly resold on other re-sale sites (Pintus and Thomas, 2017). Therefore, whilst ethical re-sale sites could improve the secondary market, in order to fully protect consumers and make this regulation effective other re-sale sites would need to be shut down or appropriately controlled.

Lastly, only 21% of respondents indicated that paperless ticketing could be effective (Figure 4.30, p.66), however, this is unsurprising following earlier findings in Section 4.4.2 that only 3% of respondents prefer to use paperless tickets (Figure 4.13, p.50). Whilst this could be an effective method of preventing scalpers, as re-sale sites require physical tickets to operate (Anderton et al., 2013), issues arise when genuine customers are no longer able to attend and are left unable to sell their ticket.
Within the focus group, when the researcher asked who should be responsible for regulating ticket re-sale, FG1P3 initially indicated: ‘the ticket sellers, or the venue that you go to should regulate how they sell the tickets’ (FG1P3). However, the remaining participants appeared unsure. Following this, the researcher prompted as to whether it should be the responsibility of government to regulate ticket re-sale. Here, all participants agreed, with FG1P5 suggesting:

‘Yeah I guess some attempts artists have made to control the resale of their tickets have worked to an extent, but to make it universal you need some government intervention’ (FG1P5).

This further supports the discussion with regards to Ed Sheeran’s 2018 Tour, that whilst attempts are being made by individual artists, the support of government regulation is required to ensure it is effective in protecting consumers.

4.6 Online Ticketing

4.6.1 Summary

Figure 4.31: Has the Internet improved concert ticketing?

Overall, do you believe that the Internet has improved the concert ticketing process for consumers?

- Yes: 91%
- No: 9%

To conclude, respondents were asked to indicate the top three benefits of online ticketing and overall, considering the benefits and drawbacks, whether the Internet has improved concert ticketing from a consumer perspective. Here, 9% said that the Internet had not led to an overall improvement for concert ticketing (Figure 4.31). Of these respondents, most indicated that this was due to technical issues, as QR34
expressed: ‘Sites still crash regularly and the queue system seems unfair’ (QR34). Other reasons were with regards to the unfair re-sale of tickets above face value and booking fees, as discussed in Sections 4.5.3 and 4.2.4 respectively.

However, the majority of respondents (91%) indicated that the Internet has improved concert ticketing (Figure 4.31, p.68). As shown in Figure 4.32, the largest benefit of online ticketing for consumers is the convenience it provides, where QR9 portrays: ‘Convenience wise it allows you to access events that are not necessarily nearby but you still wish to go’ (QR9). QR6 also comically notes the advantage of being able to purchase tickets at home: ‘More people are likely to buy tickets if they can do it in their pyjamas’ (QR6).

Figure 4.32: Top benefits of online ticketing

The second most popular advantage was the quick transaction time (70%) (Figure 4.32), as described by QR46, buying tickets online is: ‘quick, easy and simple, [you] can purchase on your mobile in seconds and have confirmation on email the same day’ (QR46). Furthermore, despite only 37% of respondents stating that they prefer to use electronic tickets (Figure 4.13, p.50), 46% stated that these tickets are one of the top benefits of online ticketing (Figure 4.32). The next two advantages selected
by 44% and 37% of respondents respectively are access to pricing information and the ability to compare ticket options (Figure 4.32, p.69). As QR50 highlights: ‘[The Internet] gives you access to many ticket options very quickly and the ability to compare prices’ (QR50). Whilst QR42 insists: ‘availability and knowledge of events going on has improved’ (QR42) – this builds upon QR9’s earlier suggestion that the Internet allows customers to access information and purchase tickets for events, even if they do not live close geographically.

Finally, the two features of online ticketing selected by only 4% of respondents and thus deemed to be least advantageous are with regards to buying and selling second-hand tickets (Figure 4.32, p.69). This is likely due to the drawbacks of the secondary market highlighted by respondents in Section 4.5, where 89% indicted negative views towards re-sale sites (Figure 4.26, p.62) and 91% believe they should be regulated to better protect customers (Figure 4.28, p.64).

4.7 Chapter Summary

This chapter has endeavoured to present and analyse the primary data collected from the online questionnaire and focus group carried out by the researcher. The analysis has been compared and contrasted with existing research, allowing for discussion of the relevance and significance of the data. In the next chapter, the researcher will summarise the key findings identified in this chapter and give recommendations based on these findings for the industry, government and future research. Limitations of the research will also be discussed and conclusions will be made.
Chapter 5. Conclusion and Recommendations
5.0 Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Chapter Overview

This final chapter will seek to reflect upon the research process and its outcomes. It will make note of the key findings of the research, review the aim and objectives and make recommendations for the industry and government. This chapter will also highlight the limitations of the research undertaken and make subsequent recommendations for future research.

5.2 Aim and Objectives Revisited

In Chapter One, the researcher set an aim for this research project: to explore how the Internet has impacted ticketing for live music concerts, from a consumer perspective. Objectives were also set, stating the steps that would facilitate the fulfilment of the aim – these are detailed below with accompanying explanations of how they were completed:

1. To critically review the literature on event ticketing, live music concerts and Internet developments: Chapter Two adheres to this objective by presenting a critical consideration of current literature pertaining to the research topic.

2. To identify how the Internet has impacted upon ticketing for live music concerts and the issues associated with online ticketing, from a consumer perspective: Stemming from the literature review, the researcher identified existing ideas surrounding online ticketing, creating a basis for this study, shaping a gap in research and beginning the completion of this objective.

3. To carry out primary research with consumers about their perceptions of how the Internet has impacted ticketing for live music concerts: The researcher conducted 100 online questionnaires and a focus group containing six participants to gain insight into the consumer perspective of the impacts the Internet has had upon concert ticketing, as detailed in Chapter Three.

4. To make conclusions from the research findings about how the Internet has impacted ticketing for live music concerts from a consumer perspective and make recommendations for the future of online ticketing: Finally, the researcher used the analysis demonstrated in Chapter Four to inform
conclusions about how the Internet has positively and negatively impacted concert ticketing. Subsequently, the researcher identified necessary improvements to online ticketing, presented in recommendations for the industry, government and future research.

5.3 Limitations

Although the researcher believes the aim and objectives were fulfilled, as a student project, the process and its outcomes hold the following limitations:

1. Sampling Technique: Utilising a self-selected sample and distributing the questionnaire through the researcher’s social media likely resulted in respondents being of a similar demographic. Similarly, all focus group participants were students aged 20-23, therefore, the data collected from both methods may not be representative of other age groups or demographics.

2. Sample Size: Whilst the sample sizes were reasonable for a student project (100 questionnaires and one six-participant focus group), a larger sample would be required to increase the validity of the findings and enable generalisation.

3. Research Experience: The researcher had never led a focus group before and therefore struggled to control strong characters. This meant that at times, certain participants led the conversation whilst others barely contributed – this may have prevented some from contributing an opinion that could have altered the findings.

4. Questionnaire Length: With 34 incomplete responses, upon reflection, the questionnaire could have been shorter in length – when it came to analysis, some questions proved irrelevant to the aim.

5. Other Stakeholders: Whilst conclusions have been made from this research regarding a consumer perspective, there are multiple stakeholders of live music concerts, such as artists and event organisers, whose perspectives should be considered when attempting to properly evaluate online ticketing.
Despite these limitations, the researcher believes that valuable data was collected during this research process. The key findings of which are detailed below.

5.4 Summary of Key Findings

5.4.1 Positive Impacts
By analysing the data collected, the researcher found a variety of positive impacts that the Internet has had upon concert ticketing, from a consumer perspective:

- **Access to Recorded Music**: The Internet has facilitated cheap access to record music through music subscription services and streaming sites, which has led to an increase in concert attendance and ticket sales.
- **Electronic Tickets**: Some find the development of electronic tickets advantageous, however, many still prefer a physical ticket received by post as it can be kept as memorabilia.
- **Social Media**: Increasingly, consumers are using social media to buy and sell concert tickets.
- **Convenience**: Consumers prefer to purchase concert tickets online. Overall, consumers believe the Internet has improved concert ticketing, mostly due to its convenience but also because of the quick transaction time, ability to receive tickets by e-mail and access to pricing and ticket information.

5.4.1 Negative Impacts
Despite this, the researcher also found several negative impacts that the Internet has had upon concert ticketing from a consumer perspective:

- **Price Increases**: The Internet may be responsible for concert price increases through booking fees and transparency created within the primary and secondary market.
- **Expectations**: These higher prices generate higher expectations of the performance – consumers view this as detrimental when expectations are generated by secondary market prices, as the artists do not receive this extra ticket revenue to fund the upscaling of production.
• **Technical Issues:** Technical issues experienced by consumers are a major issue with online ticketing that prevent many fans from securing tickets.

• **Secondary Market:** Consumers believe the development of an online secondary market has made it harder to obtain tickets on the primary market. Overall, consumers view re-sale sites as unfair and unjust, agreeing that they should be regulated to prevent high prices and unfair profits, prevent fraud and create a fairer system. Consumers suggest such regulation could protect consumers, artists and event organisers, who they believe all lose out from online secondary ticket sales.

### 5.5 Recommendations for Industry and Government

Following these findings, the researcher makes the following recommendations to the industry and to government:

1. **Technical Issues:** Concert organisers and ticketing agents should endeavour to improve server capacity and the overall online ticketing experience for consumers.

2. **Booking Fees:** They should also evaluate the booking fees they charge and consider incorporating them into the ticket price.

3. **Ticket Returns:** Consumers expressed that selling tickets online can be complicated – the researcher recommends introducing a system whereby tickets can be returned to the primary seller for a refund.

4. **Government Regulation:** The researcher agrees with government that enforcing a secondary market price cap would be ineffective. Instead, further to recent amendments to the Digital Economy Bill criminalising the use of bots to purchase tickets in bulk, the researcher recommends the creation of one ‘ethical’ site for face value re-sale and the subsequent closure of for-profit re-sale sites. Whilst attempts have been made to utilise ‘ethical’ sites, they require government backing to be effective.
5.6 Recommendations for Future Research

Following this study’s findings and limitations, the researcher recommends the following areas for future research:

1. **Price and Expectations:** Further research should be undertaken to explore the impact of secondary market prices upon consumer expectations and the subsequent affect this has upon artists and event organisers.

2. **Social Media:** As social media becomes more prevalent in society, further research should be undertaken to explore its impact upon ticketing and the live music industry as a whole.

3. **Stakeholders:** Whilst this research project has gained a consumer perspective of online ticketing, alternative stakeholder perspectives, such as that of artists and ticket agents, should also be explored.

5.7 Chapter Summary

Within this chapter, the aim and objectives created for this study were re-addressed, providing evidence of their completion. The researcher highlighted the key research findings, making final conclusions that hope to contribute to existing research regarding the consumer perspective of online ticketing. Although limitations have been identified, the findings have created a basis for further research pertaining to how the Internet has impacted concert ticketing and the developments needed to improve it further. Thus, recommendations were made for the industry, government and future research.

Finally, through analysis of the primary data, the researcher has successfully identified how the Internet has impacted concert ticketing from a consumer perspective, and subsequently established how online ticketing can be improved for consumers in the future. By answering both research questions, the researcher hopes that the information presented in this dissertation can inform the industry and spark discussion over the main issue identified here: the future of secondary market regulation.
Chapter 6. Appendices
6.0 Appendices

Appendix A: Focus Group Transcript

Focus Group Transcript

Researcher: My first question is; why do you choose to go to concerts? P2, you start.

FG1P2: For the atmosphere and seeing the bands that you enjoy live. It’s much different than sitting at home and listening to them. You get to experience the band. It’s just the experience really.

FG1P6: It’s just something fun. It’s something different to do as well, rather than just going to a club and listening to music that gets played. Like (P2) said it’s just the atmosphere.

FG1P3: It’s good as well as you get to see supporting acts, so you might find someone else that you know you really like, so it’s good to get an open view of the genre that you like to listen to.

FG1P4: Yeah it’s good for finding new music as well, I think.

FG1P5: Yeah sometimes bands do covers as well which is quite good, it’s enjoyable to listen to them do something different than what you can listen to on a CD.

FG1P1: I guess it’s just the memory then if you go with friends, it’s the sort of thing you can experience together.

Researcher: Next question. In recent years’ music subscription services like Spotify and Apple Music have increased in popularity and this has had an impact on album sales, as they have gone down. How do you think that this has impacted concerts?

FG1P6: I don’t feel like it has had a negative impact on it. I have Spotify and I will still go and buy a ticket for a concert. I feel like you still want to experience it in the moment. Just listening to it on Spotify is if you can’t get a ticket or while you’re waiting.

FG1P3: If anything it’s helped because you don’t have to buy an album to listen to a new band, it might come up on your suggested and you think they’re really good and then they’re doing a gig down the road and then you can go see them. So if anything it’s helped.

FG1P4: As a band it exposes you to more people I suppose, as a lot of people won’t go and buy an album from a shop, it’s just convenient.
Researcher: So, do you think that paying less for music has increased the popularity of concerts? So would you go to more concerts now, because you pay less, do you all use those sort of services?

FG1P1, 2, 3, 4 & 6: Yeah.

FG1P5: No, I don’t

Researcher: So you still pay for albums?

FG1P5: Yeah, I prefer to have a physical copy of something and I’m a cheapskate so I don’t want to have to pay out every month for Spotify. So I’d rather buy second hand CDs if I can or buy on Amazon. But no matter how much I would spend on CDs or even if I did have Spotify or something, I would still go to the same amount of gigs. So for me it wouldn’t make a difference.

Researcher: Okay, next question. Do you all purchase tickets online mostly for concerts?

All participants: Yeah.

Researcher: Why do you choose to purchase tickets online?

FG1P1: Easier, so much easier. Instead of having to queue up somewhere you can just do it from the comfort of your own home.

FG1P5: Yeah.

FG1P6: Yeah, it’s just like click and done. Whereas if you’ve got to wait on the phone to get someone to answer you, you could be on hold for hours, so it’s just so much easier to just click it, add your bank details, done.

FG1P5: And also, if you’re trying to get tickets to something that’s really popular you can have your laptop, your iPad, your phone all at the same time so you’ve got more chance.

Researcher: FG1P2, anything to say on this question?

FG1P2: Yeah, it’s like a guarantee. You know you’re definitely going once you purchase those tickets online, whereas if you wait, like sometimes I’ll do on the door tickets, so I’ll just go to a gig and pay for it on the door, but then you can’t have a guarantee that there will be tickets left on the door, you’ll never know. So it’s just the safety and security really.

Researcher: Okay, next question. How would you describe the process of purchasing tickets online from your previous experiences? In terms of, is it difficult or stressful? Do you face any issues?
**FG1P4:** A lot of the time it’s stressful.

**FG1P5:** Very stressful.

**FG1P1, 2, 3 & 6 agree**

**FG1P4:** I remember one time, tickets went on sale at 9:00am, I was trying to get two tickets, I refreshed the page at one minute to nine and they were sold out. I had no chance.

**Researcher:** Has anyone else had experiences like that?

**FG1P3:** Yeah I’ve had it where you go to buy the tickets and you’re waiting and then the website crashes and it goes down and you’re just there like, ‘oh great, I really wanted those tickets’, but the website crashes and it reloads and they’re all sold out.

**FG1P5:** It’s especially stressful when you’re trying to stay on the computer at work and buy tickets and you’re in a half an hour queue and you’re trying to do your job but you’re trying to buy tickets as well.

**Researcher:** So has everyone else had similar to that?

**FG1P2:** It’s the added prices as well, like the booking fees that you have on top of it, which is sometimes a pain.

**Researcher:** Have you all been successful at some point in getting tickets online or do you always tend to face issues?

**FG1P5:** Quite successful.

**FG1P2:** Very successful

**FG1P1, 3 & 4 agree.**

**FG1P6:** I’m usually successful with stuff that’s not that popular. Stuff that no one wants to go to. But I’m not sure whether music concerts classes as Glastonbury, or whether anyone has tried to get tickets for Glastonbury but it’s actually impossible. You do seem like you’re just sitting there forever in this massive long queue and you’re just like, I might as well just give up.

**Researcher:** Okay, so there’s been recent developments within how tickets are distributed. So you can now get e-tickets which are sent by e-mail or you can have paperless ticketing. Do you all know what paperless ticketing is?

**FG1P5:** Is that like an app on your phone?
Researcher: It can be. So when you purchase a ticket you don’t ever receive any physical ticket by e-mail or in the post you just turn up with your card that you purchased the ticket on and then they will give you entry based on that. So what are you views on things like that: e-tickets that get sent to you and the form of paperless ticketing.

FG1P2: Paperless ticketing is quite good. I’ve had that before. You literally just buy the ticket and you have nothing, you just have your name and address and they just check your ID, they’ve done that before which is quite easy. Because you’re not carrying anything, like if you forget your tickets, some people forget their tickets and then they’re like, you can’t come in. But with that you’re just taking your ID that you’d have with you anyway. And that’s it you just walk in then and give them your name and they’re like yeah that’s fine.

FG1P6: That makes me so nervous, I would literally just be like oh my god what if they don’t let me in. What if I’ve typed my name wrong? Did I pay with this card? I would be going mental.

FG1P4: I think the only issue with paperless is that if you book several tickets on one card for other people, then you have to wait for the other people to turn up and go in all together.

FG1P5: And if you’re ill or something.

FG1P4: Yeah, whereas if you each have a ticket you don’t have to wait around for people.

FG1P2: I’ve done that before and they were alright about it. They might just say what’s their names and if there’s any problems that guy will be there and be like, what’s his name? and that’s it then, but that is for small gigs, that’s not for major gigs. But then with e-tickets and stuff like that as well, I’ve found to be quite a few problems like when they’re trying to scan it on your phone, it might not work properly and they start getting weird with it and they’re saying that it’s your fault when it’s not. And then if you have a print out, but the print out is creased they’re like we can’t scan that. If it was up to me I’d just have a ticket and that would be it, because you get to keep that ticket then.

FG1P6: Yeah I like that

FG1P4: Yeah I’d rather that

FG1P2: Then you have that forever then

FG1P3: Yeah, especially when you get the e-tickets and you’re clearing your e-mails and you delete the e-mail and then you’re like ‘oh great’.

Researcher: So what sort of tickets do you prefer to use then? The actual...
FG1P3: actual paper ticket

Researcher: ...the physical ticket?

FG1P2: The card ticket, yeah.

FG1P6: Like the one that they rip off?

FG1P1, 2, 3, 4 & 5: Yeah

FG1P6: And you keep the other bit as like a memory.

FG1P2: The only difference with that now is they charge you for it, it’s like £3 quid, but it’s free for an e-ticket, so I’ll get an e-ticket.

FG1P4, 5 & 6 agree

Researcher: Okay, next question. What are your opinions of online ticket resale sites such as Viagago and GetMeIn?

FG1P2: Dodgy

FG1P1, 3, 4, 5 & 6 agree

FG1P2: Proper dodgy

FG1P3: Horrendous

FG1P2: There was that thing the other day, where someone bought tickets for gig at Wembley on there and then found out they were in someone else’s seat and there’s a lot of arguments with resale sites because you could pay £600 for a gig that cost £90 and you might not get in. It’s risky I think, a lot of these new resale sites going around.

FG1P5: I think they should be illegal, I think they’re really bad, they take the mic out of people. I personally, no matter how much I wanted to see someone, would never buy off a site like that because I just think that morally, it’s so wrong and it just takes advantage.

FG1P4: I’ve done it once, but never again. I paid nearly triple the face value for one gig.

FG1P6: I feel like I would buy off there if it was the same price, I would think that’s fine. But then you don’t know if it’s legit, you might not even get in and then you’ve got ready, you get all the way there and then you’re like oh no, I can’t get in. So it’s a bit dodgy.
**FG1P4 & FG1P5 agree**

**Researcher:** What about you, P1?

**FG1P1:** Just what everyone else said, I just wouldn’t use it though, because I can’t trust it.

**Researcher:** Has anyone else used them before?

**FG1P1, 2, 3 & 5:** No

**FG1P6:** My boyfriend used one, and he had to go through to his bank as the money had come out but he realised that the ticket was fake. And he had to go through to his bank to get all the money back and they worked out that the person that put them on was selling multiple copies of the same ticket, so it’s just a bit of a pain really.

**Researcher:** And do you think that these secondary sites make it harder to get a ticket first hand?

**All participants agree**

**FG1P2:** Yeah because they go on there and buy like six tickets and they’re going to sell those six tickets but that’s stopping six other people that actually want to go that concert to buy tickets.

**FG1P6:** A lot of places do that thing now though where it’s a name on the ticket so if you can’t make it then you can sell it back to original people and other people can buy it then but you can’t sell it yourself, so I think that’s quite good.

**FG1P1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 agree.**

**FG1P1:** Yeah, Clwb Ifor (Cardiff music venue) has got that, they’re using Dice, where you can’t get the ticket until the day of, or a few hours before but if you can’t go you can either pass it along to a friend, and they have to have the app as well or you can sell it back. So that’s good, I like that.

**FG1P4 agrees**

**Researcher:** That actually brings me onto my next question. Do you think that ticket resale should be regulated?

**All participants:** yeah

**Researcher:** and who do you think should be responsible for regulating it? Do you think the original ticket sellers, the artists, the venues?
FG1P3: I would say the ticket sellers, or the venue that you go into should regulate how they sell the tickets. Because you shouldn’t be paying like six times the face value, maybe like 10% or above, because if you didn’t get it the first time and someone’s re-selling it that’s fair enough, but nothing more than that really.

FG1P6: Although I kind of feel like, if you buy a ticket to a normal event at the student union, like an event I’m going to tonight, they do different releases. So I kind of feel like yeah, if you didn’t get it the first time, it’s alright for the price to go up a little bit and then that’s okay because someone’s had to process that but then if it’s going up too much then it’s a bit ridiculous.

Researcher: Do you think it should be the responsibility of the government? In order to protect consumers.

FG1P4: Yeah I think they could do to be fair. As if they bought in a regulation everyone would have to follow it.

FG1P5: Yeah I guess some attempts artists have made to control the resale of their tickets have worked to an extent, but to make it universal you need some government intervention.

FG1P2: Actually thinking about it it’s just like any other good isn’t it. Like the trade descriptions act or whatever it’s called, that stops people miss-selling things to protect people. It’s just like that.

All participants agree.

Researcher: So there’s a few different types of regulation that have been trialled and suggested. Some people think that resale sites like Viagogo and GetMeln should just be banned completely, others think that there should be price caps so that they can’t sell above certain prices. What do you think of these ideas?

FG1P2: I just think at the end of the day, if you’re selling a ticket, you should be selling it because you can’t go, you shouldn’t be selling it because you’re trying to make profit off of different things.

FG1P5 & 6 agree.

FG1P2: A lot of people can make a lot of money off it but then it’s not the sort of thing you want to make a profit off. People are going because they want to enjoy it and it’s something that they want to do, but then you can’t charge extortionate amounts, just for their enjoyment, just for the privilege of you having more money in your back pocket from it.

FG1P1: Yeah I think that there needs to be somewhere for you to be able to re-sell tickets because there will always be someone who legitimately can’t go anymore or
like if you bought extra tickets thinking your friends would have them but then they don’t.

**Researcher:** So an alternative idea was used on Ed Sheeran’s latest tour, he set up a partnership with an ‘ethical re-sale site’ where tickets can only be put on at face value, so it’s almost like they are being ‘officially’ resold at face value. What do you think of this idea?

**FG1P2:** That’s a good idea. If you’re putting tickets up at face value, then those people then who put the tickets up obviously can’t go to the event, they’re not making a profit. Because if you can’t go to an event, you just want your money back. You’d rather that, if I can’t go, I want my money back, but you can’t make a profit off something like that.

**FG1P3:** Yeah I like that idea because before I’ve not been able to go anymore and it was like I had to end up charging a bit more for it because of all the fees and commissions and stuff that those re-sale sites take. Else I would have a loss on my ticket. Would have been happy to just get my money back so using that ethical site thing would have been good.

**FG1P5 & 6 agree.**

**Researcher:** In general, what are your views of concert ticket prices, both first hand and second hand? We can start with first hand prices if you want.

**FG1P5:** They’ve increased quite a lot. When I first started going to gigs when I was in my early teens, at Plymouth Pavilions, it was like £18-20 to see someone like Ed Sheeran or Bastille, obviously people get bigger and bigger as time goes by but now it costs like £40-50 to go there, which in the space of 10 years is a massive price increase. It puts me off wanting to go there because I know how cheap it used to be.

**FG1P2:** The only reason I think they’re should be a price increase ever should be because of the venue. So if you’re playing somewhere like Clwb (Cardiff music venue) and it’s like £7 a ticket, then you move somewhere to like the Student Union (Cardiff) and it goes up to like £15 you can understand it. But I can remember seeing Thirty Seconds to Mars in the CIA and paid £20 for the ticket and then they went on tour again but it was like £45, but it was in the same venue, same band, how can they justify that price increase? The only price increase you could see is if the venue is different, then that’s fair enough.

**FG1P1, 3, 4, 5 & 6 agree**

**FG1P2:** Because then you’re paying for a bigger capacity, they’ve got to pay that venue, they’ve got to make sure they can run that venue.

**Researcher:** And what about second hand prices?
FG1P1: Like we said before the prices on there are just ridiculous.

FG1P4: and to be honest I think that like the higher prices they charge are probably why concerts are getting pricier. Like the artists can see the potential profit they can make because some fans are willing to pay those crazy prices to see them.

FG1P2: Yeah I guess like because you can see all the prices out there, now on the internet, you can value it up in your head. If someone’s selling tickets for I don’t know like £200 but you find one for £150 then you might think that’s alright and buy it. But also to be fair like I know they’re aren’t many now but if I ever went to a gig and there were touts outside selling tickets I swear they’d only be like £50 max or whatever like they are so much pricier now on these online re-sale sites. I mean I wouldn’t have paid that £50 because it was only £20 to start with but yeah that’s still cheaper than nowadays.

Researcher: What do you think about the use of a tiered pricing system, so where tickets are priced differently depending on where you’re sat or stood within the venue?

FG1P3: Yeah that seems fair

FG1P2: Yeah that’s fair

FG1P1, 4, 5, 6 agree

FG1P1: Yeah I’ve never had an issue with that like it’s understandable because you don’t see the same concert from the back of the venue to the front row.

Researcher: Do you think that the higher prices of concerts now increase your expectations of the concert? So do you expect more from it in terms of production and that kind of thing.

FG1P5: I don’t think so because I think most gigs nowadays have a lot that goes into them like a lot of lighting and rigs and you kind of expect that anyway no matter what price you’re paying. Like if you go to an arena or a stadium, maybe not if you go to the Student Union (Cardiff) or something but if you’re going to a bigger venue then you just expect it.

FG1P6: Especially from big names as well.

FG1P5: Yeah

FG1P6: You do kind of expect them to put on a show

FG1P4 agrees

Researcher: And do prices affect your decision to attend or if there’s someone that you really want to see will you attend no matter what?
FG1P2: No it does have an affect I think, definitely. I remember when Drake announced his tour, and I love Drake but it was £100 a ticket so there was no chance. It was just ridiculous amounts of money. And Eminem has announced his tour and they’re £110 a ticket. How they can justify that amount of money. Yeah it’s a big act but then at the same time, what puts me off is it’s £100 out of my pocket to go and see someone for an hour and a half and it’s not worth it, I might like that person but I don’t like them that much.

FG1P6: And when you think about how many people actually turn up as well, it’s just ridiculous amounts of money. They don’t need to be paid that much an hour just to stand on stage and sing. It’s just stupid.

FG1P2: I just think it’s like I wouldn’t pay £100 to stand in the middle of a concert because in my mind I’d be thinking, I paid £100 for this, I want to see my £100. Like that goes back to what you asked earlier, you do kind of want to see your money, you don’t want to walk out of a concert and think, I just paid £100 for that, that’s not worth it.

FG1P4 & 6 agree

FG1P2: Whereas if you paid £40, like when I saw Coldplay in Cardiff it was about £83 or something like that and I was a bit weary but I thought I would do it, and the show was awesome. We had these wristbands that lit up, and it sound stupid but that does make it, there was a lot of free stuff like free badges and free posters going around and then you could kind of see where your money was orientating. And there was canons going off and you saw your money, it didn’t interact with you personally but you saw where it went and it was a good show. That’s what you want, when you sit at home and listen to music, it’s not a show, you’re listening to music and you like that song, but when you go and see them you want them to put on a show. At the end of the day, in hindsight, you want a theatre production, you kind of want something like that, you want them to do stuff on stage and entertaining you. Yeah you like their music, but you need entertainment alongside it as well at the same time.

FG1P5 & 6 agree

FG1P4: I mean the price of bigger artists’ shows now has made me stick to smaller gigs, like I’ll just go to Clwb (Cardiff music venue).

FG1P2 agrees

FG1P4: Like I know they’ve been bringing in loads of people lately, it’s like £6, last time I went it was £6 and I’d rather do that. I tend to enjoy it more.
**FG1P6:** It makes me rather pay for a festival. Because even though you’re paying a bit more, you’re getting to see so many more people, and it just seems so much more worth your money than just paying like £100 just to see one person.

**FG1P1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 agree**

**FG1P2:** Going off what you said then, the way I do it is that I count who I’d see to see if it’s worth my time, like £300? Okay, I’d see him, but I won’t see that lot, and work it out like that. But yeah I do think money comes into it a lot. Like you said about Clwb (Cardiff music venue), there’s like little gigs. I used to go to Clwb all the time and little bands, little metal bands and hardcore bands. But then the other day, tickets went on sale for While She Sleeps who have been in there aswell but then they were like £18 a ticket, but I remember paying £7 a ticket for going to Clwb so where’s that £18 going. I know it’s a bit of a bigger band maybe than what I saw, but I know what the venue’s like, so I think the venue comes into it a lot at the same time. Like if I go to Clwb and pay £8 to see Astroid Boys, I know what the venues like and I’ll pay it. But then if a band comes in and they’re charging £25, well I paid £25 to go and see Thirty Seconds to Mars in CIA yet you’re in a little club that’s gunna hold 100-200 people. Do you know what I mean?

**FG1P1, 3, 4, 5 & 6 agree**

**FG1P2:** I do think money factors it a lot, like you might like the band but...

**Researcher:** Has anyone else got anything else to say on price at all?

**Researcher:** Okay thank-you all, that is the end of the focus group.
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- Cross-sectional study – due to time constraint placed upon university research project.
- Participation in the questionnaire will take around 10 minutes.
- The majority of questions will be closed whereby answers will be provided for the participant to choose from. Some questions will have the option of ‘other’ with a text box for participants to add their own responses. One open question will also be used which asks the participants to expand upon their response to a question.
- Questions types include: list questions, where a list of responses are offered and they may select one or multiple responses, category questions whereby participants must select one answer to identify their behaviour and/or attributes and rating questions, using a likert-style rating (presented using a drop-down box or list of options for better mobile device optimisation rather than traditional horizontal layout). When using a likert scale, an even number of response options will be used to ensure a useful response, i.e. there will be no ‘not-sure’ options.

Sampling:
- Self-selection (convenience) sampling technique – questionnaire will be publicised on Facebook and Twitter as something individuals can participate in if they have ever purchased tickets to a concert, participants will decide if it is appropriate for

¹ An Approved Protocol is one which has been approved by Cardiff Met to be used under supervision of designated members of staff; a list of approved protocols can be found on the Cardiff Met website here
them to take part, emails will also be sent to colleagues and friends inviting them to participate. This technique will be used as it allows the researcher to utilise networks that they have access to and will ensure participants are those who have feelings or opinions about the research which should provide rich data.

- It would be reasonable for the researcher to expect 50 responses to my questionnaire.

Confidentiality:

- No personal information will be requested to ensure confidentiality and anonymity, except in the case that the participant is willing to participate in my further focus group, in which case a name and email address will be requested. This will be stored separately to the questionnaire responses to ensure anonymity and confidentiality remains.
- Participants must give consent before proceeding to complete the questionnaire

Analysis:

- The researcher will use the report section of Qualtrics to analyse the data. Here it is possible to isolate factors to compare them, and the software can produce graphs and infographics.
- The researcher will also use excel to help present the data in tables.

Focus Group

Method:

- Quantitative research to expand upon initial quantitative research, to gather more in-depth information on consumer behaviours, experiences and opinions in relation to ticketing for live music concerts.
- Cross-sectional study – due to time constraint placed upon university research project.
- The researcher estimates that the focus group will last for approximately 40-55 minutes. This should be sufficient time for 6 people to have an in-depth discussion surrounding 8 questions.
- The focus group is to be held within a seminar or meeting room at Cardiff Metropolitan University (Llandaff campus). The seating of participants will be in a circular fashion if possible so that everyone is facing inwards to encourage equal discussion.

Sampling:

- Self-selection (convenience) sampling technique – participants of the questionnaire will be asked to leave their contact details if they are interested and willing to participate in the focus group. Additionally, emails will be sent to colleagues and friends inviting them to participate. As a result, participants are likely to be students, or at least from the Cardiff area.
- The researcher hopes to recruit 6 participants for the focus group. This number is appropriate to generate good discussion around the topic and to allow each participant to contribute effectively. Keeping the focus group small should limit to possibility of certain participants holding back from contributing and similarly prevent dominating characters persisting.
Confidentiality:
- Participants will be asked for their signature, age and occupation when consenting to participate. Their names will not be used within the research to protect confidentiality and anonymity – participants will be given a participant number instead. Personal information about their age and occupation will be used purely as a way to explain the reliability and generalisability of the sample used. However, the provision of this information will be optional, in case participants do not wish to give these personal details.

Analysis:
- The focus group will be audio-recorded using a recording device built into the researcher’s mobile device. The transcript of the focus group will then be word processed, using numbers to represent the participants.
- To analyse the transcript, a content analysis method will be used. The researcher will begin by splitting the data into categories pre-determined by the literature and the quantitative data collected from the questionnaire. However, the researcher will flag any other themes or categories that arise within the focus group discussion outside of the pre-determined categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A4 Will the project involve deceptive or covert research?</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A5 If yes, give a rationale for the use of deceptive or covert research</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 Will the project have security sensitive implications?</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7 If yes, please explain what they are and the measures that are proposed to address them</td>
<td>Click here to enter text.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE**

**B1 What previous experience of research involving human participants relevant to this project do you have?**

The student has previously conducted a face-to-face ‘street’ survey within a Zoological Park on a GCSE project. The student has also previously created a questionnaire which was distributed online both during an A-Level Extended Project and Event Project Management module at Level 5.

**B2 Student project only**

- What previous experience of research involving human participants relevant to this project does your supervisor have?

The project supervisor has extensive experience of supervising undergraduate and postgraduate research projects. The project supervisor has carried out extensive research for his PhD.
### C Potential Risks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1 What potential risks do you foresee?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Questionnaire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questions may cause offense to participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Confidentiality issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants may not have time to complete the entire survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If participants are rushed for time in responding to the survey, their answers may not be accurate and reliable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Responses may not produce rich and useful data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Questions may confuse participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Risk of low response rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Technology failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants may struggle to navigate the questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing the researcher’s email address publicly could mean they receive unwanted e-mails</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Focus Group**

- Questions/discussion topics may cause offence to participants
- Disorderly or aggressive behaviour towards the interviewer or other participants
- Confidentiality issues concerned with personal information and recording of the discussion
- Participant anxiety over their responses
- Safety and security issues over non-student participants entering University building
- Inability to find sufficient participants
- Inability to generalise results from the convenience sample
- Dominating figures within the group and/or less confident participants who contribute less
- There is the risk that the interviewer may lead participants towards certain opinions
- Inconvenient time of the focus group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2 How will you deal with the potential risks?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Questionnaire</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A consent form and overview of the project will be placed at the start of the questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The researcher will ensure all questions are suitable and appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants will be informed at the start of the questionnaire as to how long it should take them approximately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants will be notified of their right to withdraw their data at any time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants will be reassured of confidentiality, that all data will be anonymised, the participants will be coded and that the researcher will have sole access to the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Personal information will not be requested by participants – unless they are volunteering to participate in my focus group where a name and email address will be requested, in this case, participants will be reassured that their responses will still remain anonymous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Questions have been carefully designed to ensure rich data will be produced
• Further qualitative research will be conducted via a focus group to ensure rich data is collected
• The researcher will ensure that all questions use simple or pre-explained terminology to ensure clarity and understanding for all participants
• The researcher will post the questionnaire link regularly to encourage responses and to ensure the post appears on individual’s timelines/news feeds
• The researcher will use Qualtrics software which is recommended by the university and therefore it should be reliable – if any technical issues arise help can be received from the IT team at university
• The researcher will ensure all questions are optimised for use of a mobile device as it is likely that many participants will complete it use their mobile phones
• The researcher will provide their university email address, not personal e-mail address and therefore any unwanted e-mails can be reported to the university

Focus Group
• The focus group will be held in a safe environment – utilising a seminar or meeting room within the university
• The researcher will ensure all questions and topics are suitable and appropriate
• As the interviewer, the researcher will also act as the facilitator, holding control over the group in the case that a heated discussion may escalate
• A consent form and overview of the project will be given to each participant prior to the focus group and a consent form must be signed by each participant.
• Participants will be informed prior to the focus group that the discussion will be recorded
• Participants will be notified of their right to withdraw at any time
• Participants will be reassured of confidentiality, that all data will be anonymised, the participants will be coded and the researcher will have sole access to the data
• Due to the researcher’s limited access, the sample will be noted as a limitation of the research
• The researcher will ensure all participants have fair contributions to the discussion, they will prompt less confident participants to contribute and deviate away from those who attempt to lead the group – however pressure will not be put upon participants to contribute to the discussion
• The small size of the sample should prevent participants from feeling intimidated and should therefore encourage decent contributions from all participants.
• To the largest extent possible the questions will be impartial and worded so that they are not leading
• The focus group time and location will be arranged in advance at a convenient time for all participants to the largest extent possible
Appendix C: Blank Questionnaire

Start of Block: Default Question Block

Q51 School of Management, Cardiff Metropolitan University  The aim of this research project is: to explore how the Internet has impacted ticketing for live music concerts, from a consumer perspective. This project has received the approval of Cardiff School of Managements’ Ethics Committee, at Cardiff Metropolitan University (Ethics Number: 2016D5368).

Statement of participation:
I understand that my participation in this project will involve completing a questionnaire about my experiences with and opinions of ticketing for live music concerts, which will take approximately 10 minutes of my time.
I understand that participation in this study is entirely voluntary and that I can withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason or I can discuss my concerns with the researcher, Jade Clark, via e-mail (st20078935@outlook.cardiffmet.ac.uk).
I understand that any identifying information provided by me will be held confidentially, such that only the researcher, Jade Clark, can trace this information back to me individually.
I understand that my data will be stored on password protected computers, anonymised after completion of the survey and that no one will be able to trace my information back to me. The raw data will be retained for five years when it will be deleted/destroyed.
If you are 18 years of age or over, understand the statement above and freely consent to participate in this study please tick the consent box to proceed.

☐ I consent

Page Break

Q60 Have you ever purchased tickets to an event?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Skip To: End of Survey If Have you ever purchased tickets to an event? = No
Q2 Who have you purchased tickets for?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ Yourself

☐ Somebody else

Q3 What types of events have your purchased tickets for?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ Music festivals

☐ Live music concerts

☐ Sporting events

☐ Non-music festivals

☐ Conferences, exhibitions or trade shows

☐ Entertainment events e.g. comedy shows

☐ Other ______________________________

Carry Forward Selected Choices from "What types of events have your purchased tickets for? You may select all answers which are applicable."
Q4 When do you usually purchase tickets to the following events?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Type</th>
<th>Purchase Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music festivals</td>
<td>▼ On the day ... more than 3 months in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live music concerts</td>
<td>▼ On the day ... more than 3 months in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting events</td>
<td>▼ On the day ... more than 3 months in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-music festivals</td>
<td>▼ On the day ... more than 3 months in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences, exhibitions or trade shows</td>
<td>▼ On the day ... more than 3 months in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment events e.g. comedy shows</td>
<td>▼ On the day ... more than 3 months in advance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>▼ On the day ... more than 3 months in advance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Skip To: End of Survey If When do you usually purchase tickets to the following events?() Is Not Displayed

Q21 Which of the following methods have you previously used to purchase tickets? You may select all answers which are applicable.

- [ ] Via a box office
- [ ] Over the phone
- [ ] Online
- [ ] Other ___________________________
Q5 How do you prefer to purchase tickets?

- Via a box office
- Over the phone
- Online
- Other ________________________________

Display This Question:
If How do you prefer to purchase tickets? != Online

Q54 Why do you prefer not to purchase tickets online?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

- Prefer to process transaction with an actual person
- Not comfortable using technology
- Worries over security issues with inputing bank details online
- Lower or zero transaction and/or shipping costs
- Avoid technical issues that can occur online
- Other ________________________________

End of Block: Default Question Block

Start of Block: Block 1
Q16 How do you access and listen to music? You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ Purchase physical album

☐ Purchase digital album

☐ Music subscription service e.g. Spotify

☐ Online via Youtube

☐ Other ____________________________

---

Display This Question:
If How do you access and listen to music? You may select all answers which are applicable. = Purchase physical album
Or How do you access and listen to music? You may select all answers which are applicable. = Purchase digital album

Q14 How often do you purchase a music album?

☐ Very frequently (a few times a month)

☐ Frequently (once a month)

☐ Often (once every 1-3 months)

☐ Not very often (every 3-12 months)

---

Display This Question:
If How do you access and listen to music? You may select all answers which are applicable. = Music subscription service e.g. Spotify
Q15 Which of the following music subscription services do you use?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ Spotify
☐ Spotify Premium
☐ Apple Music
☐ Tidal
☐ Other ______________________________

Page Break

Q9 The following questions will now be specific to live music concerts.

In these questions, when referring to the primary market, this means purchasing directly from the original seller e.g. Ticketmaster, the venue itself, or the artist's own website. The price that tickets are sold for on the primary market is referred to as 'face value'.

When referring to the secondary market, this means purchasing tickets second hand e.g. from individuals or ticket re-sell sites such as Viagogo and GetMeln.

Q19 Do you usually plan to purchase concert tickets or make an impulsive decision?

☐ Always plan
☐ Usually plan
☐ Usually make an impulsive decision
☐ Always make an impulsive decision

Display This Question:
If When do you usually purchase tickets to the following events? Live music concerts - more than 3 months in advance Is Selected
Or When do you usually purchase tickets to the following events? Live music concerts - 1-3 months in advance Is Selected
Or When do you usually purchase tickets to the following events? Live music concerts - up to 1 month in advance Is Selected

Q20 What factors influence you to purchase your tickets in advance? You may select all answers which are applicable.

- [ ] Limited availability of tickets
- [ ] Wanting to secure the best seats
- [ ] Wanting to secure a top-priced ticket
- [ ] Wanting to secure a cheap ticket
- [ ] Other ________________________________

Display This Question:
If How do you prefer to purchase tickets? = Online

Q23 Why do you prefer to purchase tickets online? You may select all answers which are applicable.

- [ ] Convenience
- [ ] Access to information about pricing
- [ ] Ability to compare ticket options
- [ ] Speed of transaction
- [ ] Ability to receive tickets via e-mail
- [ ] Other ________________________________
Q39 What types of tickets have you used for live music concerts? You may select all answers which are applicable.

- Physical ticket collected from a box office
- Physical ticket received by post
- E-ticket, received via e-mail and printed by you
- E-ticket, received via e-mail and presented at the venue on a smart phone device
- Paperless ticket, where you do not receive any form of ticket, but present confirmation of the purchase at the venue e.g. the card used to make the purchase
- Other ________________________________

Carry Forward Selected Choices from "What types of tickets have you used for live music concerts? You may select all answers which are applicable."

Q40 What type of ticket do you prefer to use for live music concerts?

- Physical ticket collected from a box office
- Physical ticket received by post
- E-ticket, received via e-mail and printed by you
- E-ticket, received via e-mail and presented at the venue on a smart phone device
- Paperless ticket, where you do not receive any form of ticket, but present confirmation of the purchase at the venue e.g. the card used to make the purchase
- Other ________________________________

Display This Question:
If Which of the following methods have you previously used to purchase tickets? You may select all a... = Online
Q47 Have you ever experienced technical issues when purchasing concert tickets online? e.g. site crashing

☐ Yes

☐ No

Display This Question:
If Have you ever experienced technical issues when purchasing concert tickets online? e.g. site cras... = Yes

Q48 As a result of facing technical issues were you...
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ ...unable to secure tickets for the concert.

☐ ...deterred from using the ticket site in future.

☐ ...deterred from purchasing tickets online in future.

☐ Other ________________________________

Q10 What prices have you paid per ticket to a live music concert on the primary market?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ £0-£20

☐ £21-£40

☐ £41-£60

☐ £61-£80

☐ £81-£100

☐ £101+ (please state estimate)
Display This Question:
If How do you access and listen to music? You may select all answers which are applicable. = Music subscription service e.g. Spotify
Or How do you access and listen to music? You may select all answers which are applicable. = Online via Youtube

Q18 Do you believe that by paying less for access to music you are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>▼Strongly agree ... Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...more inclined to purchase a concert ticket.</td>
<td>▼Strongly agree ... Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...willing to pay a premium price for a concert ticket.</td>
<td>▼Strongly agree ... Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...able to attend more concerts.</td>
<td>▼Strongly agree ... Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display This Question:
If How often do you purchase a music album? = Not very often (every 3-12 months)

Q58 Do you believe that by only purchasing an album every 3-12 months, you are...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>▼Strongly agree ... Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>...more inclined to purchase a concert ticket.</td>
<td>▼Strongly agree ... Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...willing to pay a premium price for a concert ticket.</td>
<td>▼Strongly agree ... Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...able to attend more concerts.</td>
<td>▼Strongly agree ... Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q11 What is the top price you would be willing to pay for a ticket to the following concerts?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert Type</th>
<th>£20 ... None of the above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A concert by your favourite artist/band</td>
<td>£20 ... None of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A concert by an artist/band that you like</td>
<td>£20 ... None of the above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A concert by an artist/band that you do not know well</td>
<td>£20 ... None of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Carry Forward Selected Choices from "What is the top price you would be willing to pay for a ticket to the following concerts?"

Q61 For the following concerts, if the price of a ticket exceeds the top price that you are willing to pay, would you...
(See drop down options)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concert Type</th>
<th>Decision Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A concert by your favourite artist/band</td>
<td>▼...decide not to attend. ... ...decide to still attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A concert by an artist/band that you like</td>
<td>▼...decide not to attend. ... ...decide to still attend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A concert by an artist/band that you do not know well</td>
<td>▼...decide not to attend. ... ...decide to still attend.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display This Question:
If Which of the following methods have you previously used to purchase tickets? You may select all a... = Online

Q33 Have you ever paid transaction and/or shipping fees when purchasing tickets online?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

Display This Question:
If Have you ever paid transaction and/or shipping fees when purchasing tickets online? = Yes

Q34 Do you believe these transaction and/or shipping fees are priced...

- [ ] ...too highly.
- [ ] ...highly, but I understand why they must be charged.
- [ ] ...fairly.
- [ ] Other ________________________________
Q52 Which of the following tickets would you be **most likely** to purchase? Where booking fee = transaction + shipping costs.

- a ticket priced at £40 with no booking fee
- a ticket priced at £36 + £4 booking fee
- a ticket priced at £29 + £11 booking fee

Display This Question:
If Have you ever paid transaction and/or shipping fees when purchasing tickets online? = Yes

Q43 Have transaction costs and shipping fees ever made you...
You may select all answers which are applicable.

- ...decide to not purchase a ticket.
- ...consider not purchasing a ticket.
- ...feel frustrated.
- Other __________________________

Q12 Have you ever purchased tickets within a **tiered system**, where ticket prices vary depending on seat location or the time that you purchased them?

- Yes
- No

Skip To: Q28 If Have you ever purchased tickets within a tiered system, where ticket prices vary depending on sea... = No

Display This Question:
If Have you ever purchased tickets within a tiered system, where ticket prices vary depending on sea... = Yes
Q13 Do you think the use of a tiered ticketing system is fair and justified? Whereby different consumers are charged different prices for the same concert.

- Totally unfair and unjust
- Moderately unfair and unjust
- Moderately fair and justified
- Totally fair and justified

Q63 In a short sentence, please explain your reasoning for the previous answer.

____________________________________________________________________

Page Break

Q28 Which of the following would you consider purchasing second-hand tickets from?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

- A ticket re-sale site e.g. Viagogo
- A ticket tout outside a venue
- An online marketplace e.g. Ebay
- A friend or family member
- None of the above

Q38 Have you ever purchased a second-hand ticket for a live music concert?

- Yes
- No
Skip To: Q27 If Have you ever purchased a second-hand ticket for a live music concert? = No

Display This Question:
If Have you ever purchased a second-hand ticket for a live music concert? = Yes

Q24
Where have you purchased a second-hand ticket from?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ A ticket re-sale website e.g. Viagogo
☐ A ticket tout outside the venue
☐ An online marketplace e.g. Ebay
☐ A friend or family member
☐ Other __________________________

Carry Forward Selected Choices from "Where have you purchased a second-hand ticket from? You may select all answers which are applicable."

Q37 When you purchased tickets in the following ways, did you pay..

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A ticket re-sale website e.g. Viagogo</th>
<th>▼Less than face value ... More than face value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ticket tout outside the venue</td>
<td>▼Less than face value ... More than face value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An online marketplace e.g. Ebay</td>
<td>▼Less than face value ... More than face value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A friend or family member</td>
<td>▼Less than face value ... More than face value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>▼Less than face value ... More than face value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display This Question:
If Where have you purchased a second-hand ticket from? You may select all answers which are applicable. = A ticket re-sale website e.g. Viagogo
Or Where have you purchased a second-hand ticket from? You may select all answers which are applicable. = A ticket tout outside the venue
Or Where have you purchased a second-hand ticket from? You may select all answers which are applicable. = An online marketplace e.g. Ebay
Or Where have you purchased a second-hand ticket from? You may select all answers which are applicable. = A friend or family member

Q25 What prices have you paid per ticket to a live music concert on the secondary market?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ £0-20
☐ £21-40
☐ £41-60
☐ £61-80
☐ £81-100
☐ £101-£150
☐ £151-£200
☐ £201+ (please state estimate)

Q27 Do you believe that ticket re-sell sites are fair and justified? Where tickets are usually sold above face value.

☐ Totally unfair and unjust
☐ Slightly unfair and unjust
☐ Slightly fair and justified
☐ Totally fair and justified
Q64 In a short sentence, please explain your reasoning for the previous answer.

__________________________________________________________________________

Q29 Have you ever re-sold a ticket which you purchased for a live music concert?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Skip To: Q41 If Have you ever re-sold a ticket which you purchased for a live music concert? = No

Display This Question:
If Have you ever re-sold a ticket which you purchased for a live music concert? = Yes

Q32 Why did you re-sell the ticket(s)?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ You/the person the ticket was intended for could no longer attend

☐ You purchased more tickets than you needed by accident

☐ You purchased more tickets than you needed in order to re-sell them for a profit

☐ Other ________________________________________________

Display This Question:
If Have you ever re-sold a ticket which you purchased for a live music concert? = Yes
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Q30 How did you sell the ticket(s)?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ Via a ticket re-sell site
☐ Via a ticket tout outside a venue
☐ Via an online marketplace e.g. Ebay
☐ To a friend or family member
☐ Other ________________________________

Display This Question:
If How did you sell the ticket(s)? You may select all answers which are applicable. ! Via a ticket re-sell site
And How did you sell the ticket(s)? You may select all answers which are applicable. ! Via an online marketplace e.g. Ebay

Q53 Why did you decide not to re-sell the ticket(s) online?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ Large commissions taken and/or fees charged by re-sell sites
☐ Too complicated
☐ Too much hassle
☐ You believe ticket re-sell sites are unethical
☐ Other ________________________________

Display This Question:
If Have you ever re-sold a ticket which you purchased for a live music concert? = Yes
Q31 How much did you re-sell the ticket(s) for? You may select all answers which are applicable.

- [ ] Less than face value
- [ ] Face value
- [ ] More than face value

Display This Question:
If How much did you re-sell the ticket(s) for? You may select all answers which are applicable. = Less than face value
Or How much did you re-sell the ticket(s) for? You may select all answers which are applicable. = Face value
Or How much did you re-sell the ticket(s) for? You may select all answers which are applicable. = More than face value
Carry Forward Selected Choices from "How much did you re-sell the ticket(s) for? You may select all answers which are applicable."

Q36 Can you briefly explain why you re-sold the ticket(s) at this price?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than face value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Face value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than face value</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q41 Do you believe that the re-sale of concert tickets should be regulated to protect consumers?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q65 In a short sentence, please explain your reasoning for the previous answer.

____________________________________________________________________________________

Display This Question:
If Do you believe that the re-sale of concert tickets should be regulated to protect consumers? = Yes

Q42 Which of the following methods do you believe could be effective in regulating ticket re-sale?
You may select all answers which are applicable.

☐ A price cap on re-sale sites - to prevent tickets being sold above face value

☐ A system whereby tickets can be returned to the original seller for a refund - where they will be put back on sale by the original seller

☐ One 'official' ticket re-sale site - where tickets can only be re-sold between consumers at face value

☐ Paperless ticketing - where proof of purchase and identification is required at the venue

☐ Other ________________________________
Q45 In your opinion, what are the top three benefits of online ticket sales? Please select three answers only.

☐ Convenience

☐ Access to pricing information

☐ Ability to compare different ticket options

☐ Quick transaction time

☐ Ability to receive tickets via e-mail or use paperless ticketing

☐ Access to second hand tickets

☐ Ability to re-sell excess tickets

Q44 As well as benefits, there are considered to be many drawbacks to online ticket sales, including high transaction costs, technical issues and the high price of tickets on the re-sale market.

Overall, do you believe that the Internet has **improved** the concert ticketing process for consumers?

☐ Yes

☐ No

Q66 In a short sentence, please explain your reasoning for the previous answer.

__________________________________________________________________________
Q49
Thank-you for completing my questionnaire. Your response will make a great contribution to the research for my dissertation.

If you wish to help me further, I will be holding a focus group in January 2018 at Cardiff Metropolitan University (Llandaff campus) to further discuss this topic.

Are you willing and able to participate in this focus group?

- Yes
- No

Display This Question:
If Thank-you for completing my questionnaire. Your response will make a great contribution to the re... = Yes

Q50 Thank-you for showing interest in participating in my focus group. Please leave your details below and I will contact you in due course.

(Please note that your questionnaire responses will still remain anonymous)

- Full Name ________________________________________________________________
- Email address ____________________________________________________________

End of Block: Block 1
PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Online Ticketing for Live Music Concerts

Project summary
The purpose of this research project is to identify the impacts the Internet has had upon ticketing for live music concerts. Your participation will enable the collection of data which will form part of a study being undertaken at Cardiff Metropolitan University.

Why have you been asked to participate?
You have been asked to participate as you have indicated to the researcher that you have previously purchased tickets to a live music concert and would be willing to take part. During the focus group, you will be asked about your behaviours, experiences and opinions in relation to ticketing for live music concerts and how the Internet has impacted this. Your participation is entirely voluntary and you may withdraw at any time.

Project risks
The research you are participating in involves a focus group, which will be recorded for later analysis. The researcher is not seeking to collect any sensitive data about you; this study is only concerned with your behaviours, experiences and opinions in relation to ticketing for live music concerts. The researcher does not think there are any significant risks associated with this study. However, if you do feel that any of the questions are inappropriate then you can stop at any time. Furthermore, you can change your mind and withdraw from the study at any time – the researcher will completely respect your decision.

Protecting your privacy
All the information you provide will be held in confidence. The researcher has taken careful steps to ensure that you cannot be directly identified from the information you provide. Your personal details (i.e. your signature on the consent form and age and occupation – if you are willing to provide these details) will be kept in a secure location by the researcher. When the study is complete and analysed, all the information and documentation used to gather raw data will be destroyed except your signed consent form which will be held securely for 5 years. The recordings of the focus group will also be held in a secure and confidential environment during the study and destroyed after 5 years.

YOU WILL BE OFFERED A COPY OF THIS INFORMATION SHEET TO KEEP

If you require any further information about this project, then please contact:
Jade Clark, Cardiff Metropolitan University
Email: st20078935@outlook.cardiffmet.ac.uk
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Participant name or Study ID Number:
Title of Project: **A study to explore how the Internet has impacted ticketing for live music concerts, from a consumer perspective**
Cardiff Metropolitan University Ethics Reference Number: **2016D5368**
Name of researcher: **Jade Clark**

---

**Participant to complete this section:**  
**Please initial each box.**

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study.  
   I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.  
   [ ]

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving any reason.  
   [ ]

3. I agree to take part in the above study.  
   [ ]

4. I agree to the focus group being recorded.  
   [ ]

5. I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications.  
   Yes [ ]  No [ ]

The completion of the following two questions is voluntary:

6. How old are you?  
   [ ]

7. What is your current employment status?  
   [ ] Student  
   [ ] Part-time employed  
   [ ] Full-time employed  
   [ ] Unemployed

---

________________________  
Signature of Participant  
________________________  
Date

________________________  
Name of person taking consent  
________________________  
Date

________________________  
Signature of person taking consent
## Appendix F: Focus Group Questions and Prompts

### FOCUS GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order of the focus group</th>
<th>Discussed</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welcome all the participants and introduce myself and the project title.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Make sure everyone has signed consent form and copies to the attendees. Remind them about recording systems.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Why do you choose to go to concerts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) In recent years, music subscription services such as Spotify and Apple Music have increased in popularity, resulting in decreased album sales. How do you think this has impacted concerts?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prompt: do you think paying less for music has increased the popularity of concerts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prompt: what affect do you think this has upon the artists?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Why do you choose to purchase concert tickets online as opposed to other methods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) How would you describe the process of purchasing concert tickets online?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prompt: is the process simple or is it difficult and stressful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prompt: what issues have you faced when purchasing tickets online?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) What are your views on the developments in ticket distribution? Such as e-tickets that you print yourself and paperless ticketing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prompt: if paperless ticketing is an unknown concept within the group the researcher will explain it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prompt: do you prefer these types of tickets?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) What are your opinions of online ticket resale sites such as Viagogo and GetMeIn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prompt: what experiences have you had with re-sale sites either buying or selling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prompt: who do you think these re-sale sites affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Prompt: do they make it harder to obtain tickets on primary market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) In your opinion, do you think ticket re-sale should be regulated?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prompt: who should be responsible for regulating</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prompt: give examples of regulation that could be used/are trying to be used e.g. Ed Sheeran’s Divide tour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) What are your views on the price of concert tickets both within the primary and secondary market?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prompt: what are your views on tiered pricing systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prompt: are concerts becoming less affordable?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prompt: do higher prices create higher expectations of the concert?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Prompt: does the price affect your decision to attend?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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