

CHAPTER 8

INVENTORY OF FOX HUNTING ACTIVITIES IN THE SCOTTISH BORDERS

CONTENTS

INVENTORY OF FOX HUNTING ACTIVITIES IN THE SCOTTISH BORDERS

	Page No.
Summary of Main Survey Findings	i
Introduction	8-1
Background	8-1
Objectives	8-2
Methodology	8-3
Overall Survey Methodology	8-3
Provider Survey Methodology	8-4
The Mounted & Non-Mounted Followers Survey Methodology	8-4
‘Grossing-Up’ Methodology	8-4
Caveats	8-5
Survey Response Rates	8-5
Survey Findings: Social & Recreational Activities	8-6
Stakeholders	8-6
The Providers/Organisers (The Hunts)	8-6
The Mounted Followers (Participants)	8-9
The Non-Mounted Followers (Participants)	8-10
Total Numbers of Participants & Activity Days	8-11
Spectators	8-12
Habitat Creation & Conservation Contributions	8-12
Survey Findings: Direct Expenditure	8-12
Overview	8-12

	Page No.
Expenditure by the Hunts	8-13
Expenditure by the Mounted Followers	8-14
Expenditure by the Non-Mounted Followers	8-17
Average Total Daily Costs Per Participant	8-17
Survey Findings: Direct Employment	8-18
The Surveys	8-18
The Survey Results & Estimates: the Hunts	8-19
The Survey Results & Estimates: the Mounted Followers	8-20
The Survey Results & Estimates: Direct Employment in Trade & Service Organisations	8-23
The Survey Results & Estimates: Voluntary Labour Inputs	8-26
Assessment of Indirect Impacts	8-27
The Multiplier Effect	8-27
Estimated Levels of Secondary Expenditure: the Mounted Subscribers	8-27
Estimated Levels of Secondary Expenditure: the Hunts	8-28
Estimated Levels of Secondary Employment	8-28
Economic Leakages	8-28
Verification and Concluding Comments	8-29
The Main Verification Sources	8-29
Comparisons with The Produce Studies Ltd Results	8-30
Comparisons with the MLURI Results	8-31
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	8-33
BIBLIOGRAPHY	8-34

8. INVENTORY OF FOX HUNTING ACTIVITIES IN THE SCOTTISH BORDERS

Summary of Main Survey Findings

This inventory of fox hunting in the Scottish Borders was based on **2 comprehensive postal questionnaire surveys**, covering the total populations of the Hunts (Providers) and Household Subscribers (Mounted Followers), **plus a telephone survey** of Non-Mounted (car, bike and foot) Followers. **The survey findings generally confirmed the results of a pilot survey conducted by Produce Studies in 1998.**

In 1999/2000 MLURI (the Macaulay Land Use Research Institute) was commissioned by the Rural Development Committee (RDC) of the Scottish Executive to assist its inquiry on the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill in December 2000. The MLURI's survey findings were also broadly similar to those undertaken by SWRC and presented by BFRS to the RDC, especially with respect to the levels of expenditure and employment respectively incurred and generated by Hunts and Mounted Subscribers. The results of both the BFRS and MLURI surveys were subsequently published on the RDC's web site: www.scottish.parliament.uk/official_report/cttee/rural-00/ra-ev-01.ht

The SWRC surveys achieved a **100% response rate** in the case of the Hunts and **53%** of the Mounted Subscribers.

The **key findings** presented below were based on the **1998/99** hunting season:

Physical Dimensions

- The total area over which foxhunting took place amounted to between **294,500 and 307,500 hectares**, representing **62-65% of the total** area of the Scottish Borders Region
- The Hunts (**5** located in the Region and **2** Northumberland Border Hunts partially active in the Region) provided **424 Meets/Hunting days**
- The **5** local Hunts kept **157 hound couples of working hounds, excluding puppies, i.e. 314 in total**. Collectively the **7** Hunts and the Mounted Subscribers used between **692 and 895 hunters** (used wholly or partly for hunting) and owned **between 98 and 122 brood mares**

Scale of Recreational Activities

- The Mounted Followers of the **7** Hunts totalled **406 subscribing members (391 Households)** plus 366 'other mounted followers'. Collectively the number of **Subscriber days amounted to between 9,100 and 11,750**
- The corresponding numbers of **Non-Mounted Follower days were between 9,650 and 14,400**

-
- ❑ In total **over 1,000 participants**, represented by Mounted Followers (Subscribers only) and Non-Mounted Followers, were estimated to have been involved in hunting during 1998/99 on **between 18,800 and 26,000 activity days**. The latter were concentrated in **the winter months**.
 - ❑ It was noted that in 1998/99 **the number of people participating in hunting** as Mounted and Non-Mounted Followers was **greater than the numbers of people over 16 years old**, who were involved in **playing rugby in the Scottish Borders** (ref sportscotland, (1999) Annual Report 1999).

Social Impacts

- ❑ The Hunts also had **Supporters Clubs** involving a total of **717 members**
- ❑ Nearly **2,000 tasks** were undertaken by a **‘core’ of 405 volunteers** in running efficient sporting and recreational operations, on behalf of the Hunts. These tasks related to **37** widely different types of social and recreational events, including Point-to-Points, Sponsored Rides and many evening-time social gatherings
- ❑ Directly as a result of hunting **over 470 hunting-related, social and recreational events** took place in the Region. These were open to and attended by a wide cross section of the community
- ❑ Many of the **61 Non-Mounted Followers** that were interviewed **spoke of the high quality recreational experience** that they enjoyed, referring to it as being **“my whole life during the winter months”**. The majority of these followers were OAPs and came from a wide diversity of socio-economic backgrounds, including farmers, shepherds, ambulance drivers, coalmen and forestry workers
- ❑ Followers in general were found to have been drawn from all socio-economic groups, rather than – as has often been claimed – from primarily the AB socio-economic groups. Participation in hunting should correctly be viewed as a socially diverse activity

The Expenditure Impacts

- ❑ The **direct expenditure** by the Hunts, Mounted Subscribers and Non-Mounted Followers totalled **between £3.5 million and £4.6 million**
- ❑ The **average cost per Meet** provided ranged **between £430** (Border Hunt) and **£1,175** (Berwickshire Hunt)
- ❑ The **average annual direct expenditures incurred by Mounted Subscribing Households** differed significantly according to the Hunts of which they were members. The figures per Mounted Subscriber ranged between **£14,500** (Bucleuch) and **£2,600** (Liddesdale). The **median value** was **over £9,000** for all 7 Hunts

-
- The estimated **annual travel expenditures** incurred by the total population of **non-mounted followers** totalled **between £100K and £110K**
 - The **average daily costs of participation for Mounted Subscribers were £333** (all recurrent and capital cost items) and for **Non-Mounted Followers were £14.50 (transport only)**
 - The **secondary expenditure** generated through purchases from locally based trade organisations made by the Hunts and Mounted Subscribers was estimated at between **£0.55 million and £0.85 million**

The Employment Impacts

- The direct employment jointly generated by the Hunts and Mounted Subscribers amounted to **between 211 and 267 jobs**. These represented between **81 and 98 FTEs**
- In addition **direct employment associated with the purchases from trade and service organisations**, made collectively by the Hunts and Mounted Subscribers, totalled **between 44 and 58 jobs**. These represented a further **30 to 39 FTEs**
- The **secondary employment** generated through purchases from **locally based trade organisations** made by the Hunts and Mounted Subscribers was estimated at **between 12 and 17 jobs**. These represented **8 to 11 FTEs**
- Collectively the **voluntary activities** involved inputs of **1,700 days**, representing **nearly 8 FTEs**
- In the case of the 55 to 68 full-time grooms employed by the total population of Mounted Subscriber Households, **between 39 and 48 were accommodated in tied houses**. This represented a **70% dependency**

The Economic Impacts

- **650 out of a total of 3,000 businesses (i.e. 22% of the total business population, ref: SEB Employment Census, 1995)**, located within the Scottish Borders Region, were involved in servicing hunting activities. The corresponding number of **externally located businesses was 400**
- **High economic leakages**, associated with trade and service purchases made from organisations located outside of the Borders Region were greatest in the case of **equine dentistry (76%), new trailers (64%), insurance (62%), new saddlery and tack (46%), and clothes and boots (48%)**. Overall, the value of total purchases made involved a relatively low level of leakage: 14%.

Environmental Impacts

- The Hunts spent **£2,900 on habitat creation and landscape conservation/maintenance tasks**
- The Hunts provided an important service, involving **the collection of ‘fallen’ (dead livestock)** from farms and transport to the Hunt Kennels. This service was available to **some 1,000 farm holdings**
- The total **numbers of farm animals** and Borders Region **farms** covered by this service in 1998/1999 were respectively **3,260 and 329**

Verification

- The **independent verification exercise conducted by the Scottish Parliament Information Centre** (January 2001) did not identify any bias in the estimates presented by BFRS to the Rural Development Committee during its consultation procedures on the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill. The review drew attention to **fundamental differences in the research objectives and methodologies** adopted by the researchers in preparing the MLURI and BFRS reports
- It was nonetheless gratifying that **broadly similar expenditure estimates and employment were obtained from the two independent studies.**

INVENTORY OF FOX HUNTING ACTIVITIES IN THE SCOTTISH BORDERS

Introduction

Background

- 8.1** This Chapter covers the results of fox hunting surveys undertaken as part of the overall Study commissioned by BFRS into the nature, size and structure of the ‘Countryside Management Industry’ in the Borders Region.
- 8.2** Within the Chapter the **main** or generic estimates derived from the surveys are presented in **Boxes**. They are used to support the text. Where necessary, the Chapter is supported by **Appendices**, the function of which is to present the details behind the main estimates
- 8.3** In 1998/99 the hunting of live quarry in Borders Region was confined to fox hunting. There were no harrier or foot packs. However, some packs of beagles and bassets visited the Region, in the autumn, as part of training exercises.
- 8.4** The results of the fox hunting surveys reported in this Chapter covered the activities of three stakeholder groups, namely:
- the ‘providers’/‘organisers’ (i.e. The Hunts);
 - the mounted followers. These consisted of ‘household subscribers’ and ‘other mounted followers’. Household subscribers represented households known to have paid an annual subscription to one of the Borders’ Region Hunts. Such households contained one or more resident mounted followers’. ‘Other mounted followers’ were people known to have attended Meets of Borders’ Region Hunts, but were not subscribing members of any of the said Hunts. Instead they paid a ‘cap fee’ or field money on the day(s) that they attended as a mounted followers;
 - the non-mounted followers.

The second and third groups listed above were generically referred to the ‘participants’.

- 8.5** At the outset it was considered appropriate to describe the activities of these stakeholder groups within a broad definition of ‘fox hunting’:

The hunting of foxes in the wild is organised by Hunts, most of which are members of the Masters of Foxhounds Association. Each day’s hunting is managed overall by a Master. The Huntsman, who may or may not be a Master, manages the hounds. It is the hounds, which hunt the live quarry under the control of the Huntsman and the direction of the Master. The hounds are followed by the mounted ‘field’ of regular and other subscribers. This ‘field’ of mounted followers is managed by the Field Master for that day. There are also unmounted followers, who travel by car/quad bike and/or on

foot, in order to watch the day's hunting and in particular the performance of the hounds. Some Hunts have a 'Master of Car Followers', who manages the car and foot followers. These unmounted followers are to be distinguished from the numbers of people (spectators), who are merely present to observe the Hunt and its mounted followers as they assemble (meet) at the start. Many of the hunting activities are supported by fund-raising volunteers, most of whom are members of a Hunt Supporters' Club.

The hunting activities of both the 'providers' and 'participants' relate both to the 8 month hunting season and to the 4 months' off-season, when all horses and hounds used for hunting need to be kept fit, through regular exercising, and young horses and hounds need to be trained.

- 8.6** All of the 7 Hunts operating within the Borders were members of the MFHA. However, none has a Master of Car Followers.
- 8.7** The Hunts were bound by Codes of Good Hunting Practice, notably for the Masters of Foxhounds Association (1992) and for the National Working Terrier Federation (1996).

Objectives

- 8.8** In 1997 BFRS commissioned the Produce Studies Group to prepare a pilot assessment of 'The Economic Contribution of Hunting Within the Scottish and Northumberland Borders'. Whilst the 'pilot' was helpful in providing broad estimates of the total expenditure, employment and fallen-stock contributions of the seven Hunts and their Participants, it was clear that a more comprehensive and in-depth assessment was required. Thus, in subsequently commissioning Scott Wilson and SAC, the prime objectives were verification/modification, refinement and extension of the pilot study results.
- 8.9** The surveys were designed to provide answers to questions concerning not only the economic, but also the social, contributions made by fox hunting in the Borders Region. Some information was also sought, concerning the habitat conservation and establishment practices of both the Hunts and their subscribers.
- 8.10** Specifically in relation to the 1998/99 hunting season, answers were sought to the following questions:
- ❑ what did fox hunting contribute in terms of countryside recreational, and related, social activities?
 - ❑ what did it contribute by way of economic activity, as reflected by estimates of:
 - the direct expenditure incurred by each of the 3 stakeholder groups?
 - the direct employment generated by the organisers and the mounted follower members of Hunt subscriber households?

-
- the impacts of the 3 stakeholder groups on the local Trades and Service organisations? (The responses to this question are reported separately in this document as part of Chapter 10);
 - the associated (multiplier) effects upon indirect levels of expenditure and employment?

Methodology

Overall Survey Methodology

8.11 The hunting surveys, like those for the entire project, were impartially designed, undertaken and analysed by the consultants. They were based upon a combination of postal questionnaires and telephone interviews. Their prime functions as commissioned by the Borders Foundation for Rural Sustainability, were to:

- provide both the rural community and decision-makers with reliable information; and
- inform public debate relating to countryside issues.

8.12 The information sought for the hunting component of the project, related to the 1998/99 hunting season. It covered the nature and extent of hunting expenditure and employment, as well as recreational and conservation activities.

8.13 Surveys of both the organisers (the Hunts) and the household subscribers known to contain one or more mounted followers were conducted, using postal questionnaires. They were designed, so as to facilitate rigorous statistical analysis. In the case of both the Hunts and the mounted followers (subscribers), the total populations were surveyed. The names and addresses of the household subscribers were supplied by the Hunt Secretaries.

8.14 In the interests of objectivity, the two questionnaire surveys, involving the organisers and the mounted followers, purposely excluded any reference to the impact of a possible ban upon fox hunting in the future. They sought to gather factual information about the socio-economic and environmental contributions of fox hunting undertaken in accordance with established codes of conduct.

8.15 In addition a telephone survey was conducted, in order to obtain information about those people, who were known to follow one or more of the Hunts regularly by either using a vehicle (car, motor-bike and quad-bike) or/and on foot. The main purpose of this particular survey was to determine the extent of the dependence of this ‘allied’ interest group upon fox hunting. Through this particular survey, some insights were sought into the impacts of a possible ban, specifically upon the interest group. The researchers considered that it would be helpful to provide decision-takers with information about the vulnerability of the stakeholders to potential changes to their recreational environments.

8.16 The surveys sought only to obtain information from those people actively involved with fox hunting. Thus they excluded directly posing questions to

hunt saboteurs; likewise to casual or occasional spectators, such as the people who attend meets on Boxing Day.

The Provider Survey Methodology

- 8.17** All of the Hunts, which operated in the Borders Region, were included in the postal survey. Five of these actually had their headquarters (i.e. kennels and stables), in the Borders, namely: the Buccleuch, the Berwickshire, the Jedforest, the Lauderdale and the Liddesdale Hunts. These five Hunts operated exclusively within the Region. In addition the survey covered the activities of two adjacent Hunts in North Northumberland: the Border and College Valley Hunts. The survey in these two cases sought only to identify their activities, direct expenditure and employment as they specifically related to the Borders Region. In the case of these two Hunts, both of the Hunt Secretaries and all of the mounted followers, to whom questionnaires were sent, were specifically asked to confine their answers to those days spent hunting on the northern side of the Border.
- 8.18** The comprehensive postal survey was undertaken in December 1999, involving the Secretaries of each of the 7 Hunts and the use of a questionnaire (ref: **Appendix 8.1**).

The Mounted & Non-Mounted Followers Survey Methodologies

- 8.19** The postal survey of the total population of **391 subscriber households, containing one of more mounted hunt followers**, was conducted in December 1999. It was based upon the use of a comprehensive questionnaire (ref: **Appendix 8.2**).
- 8.20** A Survey of non-mounted followers was undertaken for each of the 7 Hunts. The Secretaries of each of the Hunts and/or the Hunt Supporters' Clubs were asked to provide a list of the names, addresses and telephone numbers of their regular non-mounted followers. The latter comprised those who followed by car, on foot or on quad/motor-bikes. 4 of the 5 Local Hunts and both of the North Northumberland Hunts responded.
- 8.21** In the case of the 2 North Northumberland Hunts only information relating to those days and the expenditures spent to hunting in Borders Region was sought and recorded.
- 8.22** For the 6 Hunts, 10 names were drawn at random from these lists. These individuals were then interviewed by telephone. For this purpose a check-list of questions/discussion topics was used (ref: **Appendix 8.3**).

'Grossing-Up' Methodology

- 8.23** It is usual statistical practice to assume that the respondents to a survey are representative of the population. Whilst it is valid to adopt this as a basis upon which to aggregate ('gross-up') the survey results, it was recognised that the estimates of expenditure might have been biased upwards, because of greater interest on the part of those deeply involved in fox hunting to reply to the questionnaires. Thus, to obtain estimates for the total population, which

reflected these two possibilities, the following approach was adopted based upon two assumptions, namely:

- the responses received should be regarded as representative and should thus be ‘grossed-up’ to obtain estimates for the total population of mounted subscribers, i.e. the non-respondents were assumed, on average, to have been identical to the respondents.. The resulting estimates have been designated as ‘**Maximum**’ in the Boxes presented later in the report;
- the non-respondents were assumed to spend only half as much as the respondents. The ‘grossed-up’ estimates calculated on this basis have been designated as ‘**Minimum**’ in the Boxes.

8.24 It was considered that the adoption of these two assumptions would generate credible ‘grossed-up’ estimates. Because of the uncertainties involved in undertaking surveys of this type, it was considered that decision-takers would find it more helpful to be provided with guideline estimates rather than finite numbers.

Caveats

8.25 Whilst the surveys and analyses outlined above were conducted with the essential statistical rigour, the consultants were well aware of the limitations of information obtained by the use of such survey methods. As is well recognised within the market research profession, errors may exist, for several reasons, including the fact that:

- the respondents replied to questions about activities, which had taken place twelve months previously;
- the majority of the mounted follower respondents relied upon memory rather than carefully-kept records and accounts;
- only expenditures, involving cash transactions, were reported on the questionnaires; to the extent that inputs-in-kind, involving personal grazing, stocks of hay, straw etc consumed and personal labour, were excluded from the responses. Thus the latter represented under-estimates.

Survey Response Rates

8.26 In comparison with many other market research studies, the response levels were very high:

- **100% for the Hunts;**
- **53% for the mounted subscribers/participants:** responses were received from **207 of the 391 households, known to contain one or more mounted subscribers**, to whom the questionnaire was sent. For a postal survey, that was considered to be a very good rate. The rate varied significantly between the Hunts (ref: **Appendix 8.4**);
- **100% for the non-mounted followers.**

- 8.27** There was general consistency between the responses received from respondents within Hunts. Thus the basis for ‘grossing-up’ the survey data to obtain Regional estimates was considered to be robust. Furthermore it was noted that in general, the respondents had taken care in completing the questionnaires. In some cases the respondents indicated that cheque stubs and other financial records had been consulted.
- 8.28** In short, not only was the response rate higher than usually achieved for surveys of this nature, but there were indications that quality of information might be more reliable.

Survey Findings: Social/Recreational Activities

Stakeholders

- 8.29** It was recognised that fox hunting served the recreational interests of 2 generic as distinct from 3 specific types of stakeholders, namely:
- those seeking **active participation**, principally the organisers (the Hunts), the mounted followers (household subscribers) and the non-mounted participants who followed on foot and/or by vehicle (car, motor-bike or quad-bike);
 - those whose interests were essentially **‘passive’** as occasional and/or seasonal spectators.
- 8.30** The surveys focused primarily upon the former. The remainder of this Chapter highlights the main findings with respect to the extent of countryside recreation associated with the three main forms of active participation.

The Providers/Organisers (The Hunts)

- 8.31** The total area over which foxhunting took place was estimated to have been between 294,500 and 307,500 hectares.
- 8.32** The 5 ‘local’ Hunts, whose centres of operations (kennels) were situated within the Borders Region, differed with respect both to the types of landscape (as classified by ASH Consulting Group in ‘the Borders Landscape Assessment’ report to SNH and Borders Regional Council, 1998) in which they operated and the frequency of operation, as summarised below:
- the Duke of Buccleuch, which hunted **3 days per week** (Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays); **occasionally there is a fourth day** (Friday). The hunting took place predominantly in the Upland and Upland Fringe landscapes, but also extends into River Valley landscape and marginally into the Lowland landscape type;
 - the Berwickshire, which hunted **2 days per week** (Tuesdays and Saturdays). Its country was located predominantly in Lowland and Upland Fringe landscapes. However, its activities also took place in the Upland, River Valley and Coastal landscape types;

- ❑ the Jedforest, which hunted **2 days per week** (Wednesdays and Saturdays). The hunting was provided predominantly in the Upland Fringe areas, but also included Upland and River Valley landscape types;
- ❑ the Lauderdale, which hunted **2 days per week** (Tuesdays and Saturdays). The hunting was provided in the same range of landscape types as the Berwickshire, excluding the Coastal landscape type, but extended over more of the Upland and Upland Fringe landscape areas;
- ❑ the Liddesdale, which hunted **1 day per week** (Saturdays). The hunting country was predominantly located in the Upland landscape types but extended into Upland Fringe areas.

8.33 In addition, two North Northumberland Hunts provided some of their hunting in Borders Region, by mutual agreement with the 'local' Hunts. They were:

- ❑ the Border Hunt, which hunted **3 days per week** (Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays) – approximately **23%** of its hunting took place predominantly within the Upland and Upland Fringe landscapes of Borders Region;
- ❑ the College Valley, which also hunted **3 days per week** (Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays). Its operations within the Borders Region accounted for **just under two-thirds** of the total number of annual meets provided. The predominant landscape type, in which it provided hunting within the Borders, was Upland. However, its country also included areas of Upland Fringe and some River Valley landscape types.

8.34 **The total area over which fox hunting took place** covered all of the five main landscape types and **represented** between 62 and 65% of the total area of Borders Region.

8.35 The extent of countryside sport and recreation provided by these **7 Hunts** within the Borders Region during the Hunting season (August to end of March) was as shown in **Box 8.1**.

BOX 8.1: SPORT & RECREATION PROVISION BY HUNTS – 1998/99 SEASON	
<u>'Local' Hunts</u>	Number of Meets held per season (days)
Bucleuch	104
Berwickshire	63
Jedforest	84
Lauderdale	66
Liddesdale	48
Sub-total	365
<u>Northumberland Border Hunts (operating in the Borders)</u>	
Border	21
College Valley	38
Sub-total	59
Total	424
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999	

- 8.36** The provision of sport and recreation involved a wide array of social activities, which were organised by the Hunt Supporters' Clubs. In 1998/99 a total of **717 people** were formally members of the Hunt Supporters' Clubs. Also significantly involved in the Hunts activities were large numbers of volunteers. The numbers of core volunteers (**405**) were found to be similar to the numbers of subscribers. In 1998/99, the 7 Hunts collectively were responsible for **53 different types of main social and recreational events**, in addition to providing the hunting days. These included: annual Point-to-Points, Team Chases, Hunter/Horse Trials, Sponsored/Pleasure Rides, Dressage Events, Hunt Team Events, Hill Rides, Hunt Dances/Balls, Hunt Breakfasts, Whist Drives, Wine and Cheese Parties, Treasure Hunts, Sponsored Walks, Coffee Mornings, Fayres, Auctions and Sales, Puppy Shows and Open Days. Directly as a result of hunting, over 470 social and recreational events took place in the Region in 1998/99. These were open to and attended by a wide cross section of the community
- 8.37** In total, nearly **2,000 volunteer tasks** were undertaken in association with these and related events (ref **Appendix 8.2**). These involved inputs of over **1,700 volunteer days**.
- 8.38** In order to provide the **365 days** of hunting listed in **Box 8.1**, the 5 'Local' Hunts were involved in keeping the numbers of livestock summarised in **Box 8.2**.

BOX 8.2: LIVESTOCK INVENTORY OF THE 'LOCAL' HUNTS						
Locals Hunts	Horses / Hunters		Breeding	Young	Ponies	Hounds
	Full	Part	Stock	Stock		(Couples)
	Time					
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Buccleuch	13	0	1	3	2	40
Berwickshire	6	0	2	0	0	37.5
Jedforest	6	1	0	6	0	31.5
Lauderdale	2	0	0	0	0	32.5
Liddesdale	3	0	0	0	0	15.5
Total	30	1	3	9	2	157
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999						

- 8.39** Another important service provided by the Hunts featured in the survey, namely the service of collecting 'fallen' (dead) livestock from farms and transporting them to the Kennels. In 1998/99 the numbers of farm animals and farms covered by this service were respectively over **3,260 and 329**. The service was open to all farmers, over whose land hunting takes place, i.e. approximately **1,000 holdings**. The numbers of animals and farms involved were found to vary from year to year. For example, the primary research undertaken by Produce Studies Ltd in Borders Region revealed that in 1997/98 the service catered for some **4,500 animals**.

- 8.40** The numbers of foxes killed during the season by the 7 Hunts within the Borders Region was reported total **390**, of which **99** were contributed by the 2 North Northumberland Hunts.

The Mounted Followers

- 8.41** The survey revealed that the subscriber households, for which the questionnaire was completed, were involved in hunting during the 1998/99 season for the numbers of days shown in **Box 8.3**.

BOX 8.3: SPORT & RECREATION PARTICIPATION BY SUBSCRIBER HOUSEHOLDS (MOUNTED FOLLOWERS) OF 7 HUNTS IN THE BORDERS – 1998/99 SEASON

The Main Hunt Of the Respondent	Response Rate	No. of Days Spent Hunting	Grossed-Up Estimates 'Max'm' 'Min'm' <i>Subscriber Days</i> (Rounded)	
Buccleuch	56.8%	2,618	4,610	3,615
Berwickshire	72%	1,117	1,550	1,335
Jedforest	58.3%	840	1,440	1,140
Lauderdale	58.2%	963	1,655	1,310
Liddesdale	27%	27	260	142
Border	20%	113	565	339
College Valley	51.1%	851	1,665	1,258
Total		6,529	11,743	9,136
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999				

- 8.42** The Hunts reported that collectively they had **406** subscribing members. For the 7 Hunts, 'other mounted followers' totalled **366**. Because the majority of subscribers followed more than one Hunt (indeed, often several), these seemingly 'additional' followers were not for the most part 'additional'. Such multiple hunt, mounted followers were covered by the survey of mounted subscribers and were thus included in the grossed-up estimates presented above. The grossing-up was undertaken using the method described earlier in **paragraph 8.23**.
- 8.43** Overseas hunting visitors accounted for a small addition, in the case of each Hunt. The total addition to the above totals from this source was estimated to amount to **160 days** in 1998/99.
- 8.44** The survey revealed that **324 horses** (hunters) were used for hunting by the Mounted Subscribers of the 7 Hunts, who responded to the questionnaire. The related grossed-up totals were between **459 and 591 hunters**, used only for hunting. In addition some **233 to 304** horses were used partly for hunting. Thus the number of horses, used either partly or wholly for hunting, totalled

between **692 and 895**. The corresponding survey results and grossed-up estimates for the numbers of breeding stock, specifically relating to hunting by Mounted Subscribers, were respectively **68** (survey total) and between **95 and 119 brood mares** (grossed-up totals).

Non-Mounted Followers (Participants)

8.45 Information on the numbers of foot and car-borne followers was provided by the survey of the 7 Hunts. This covered the average numbers of both non-mounted followers and cars, attending Meets during the season. The estimates are summarised in **Box 8.4**.

BOX 8.4: ESTIMATED ATTENDANCE OF NON-MOUNTED FOLLOWERS WITH THEIR CARS AT MEETS – 1998/99 SEASON					
Hunt	Average Non-Mounted Followers Cars		Total Meets Per Season	Total Follower Car Days Per Season	
	No.s per Meet		No.	No.	No.
Buccleuch	55	40	104	5,720	4,160
Berwickshire	30	20	63	1,890	1,260
Jedforest	30	18	84	2,520	1,512
Lauderdale	35	20	66	2,310	1,320
Liddesdale	15	12	48	720	576
College Valley	10	6	38	380	228
Border	40	30	21	840	630
Total			424	14,380	9,686
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999					

8.46 Further insights into participation levels and attitudes were provided by the telephone survey of nominated foot/vehicle-borne followers, which generated a 100% response. 61 people agreed to be interviewed in relation to the frequency and duration of their participation; the average mileages travelled to and from the Meets, the expenditures incurred; and the significance or otherwise of this form of countryside recreation.

8.47 The main findings were as summarised below (ref: also **Appendix 8.2**):

- ❑ the extent of annual participation by the 61 people interviewed was 1,059 days (i.e. over approximately 7% of the total 14,380 days reported above);
- ❑ the total expenditure incurred (primarily on travel) by these non-mounted followers was estimated at £31,400;

-
- the significance of the activity as a recreational pursuit was summed up by the following most frequent statements:
 - “hunting is my life and the main form of winter-time recreation”;
 - “it is my main social activity. I should be lost without it.”
 - 25 of the 61 interviewees (41%) stated that they had no winter-time recreational activity other than following the hunt.

8.48 The nature and level of the participation by non-mounted followers was recognised to have been socially important, since such followers were found to have been drawn from all socio-economic groups, rather than – as had often been claimed – from primarily the AB socio-economic groups. Participation in hunting should correctly be viewed as a socially diverse activity.

8.49 Comparison of the numbers of participation days estimated for the 1998/99 season makes interesting reading, in that the total numbers of non-mounted follower days were larger than those for subscriber household, mounted followers: in round terms, 14,400 compared with between 9,100 and 11,700 days. It seems important that this comparison should be viewed in the context of the high quality of the recreational experiences perceived by virtually all of the 61 respondents. In summary, hunting provided several benefits to non-mounted followers: ‘it provides a great day out in the countryside, where I can watch hounds working, meet my friends and see a great deal of beauty’. Indeed, many of these followers described hunting as being ‘my life’.

8.50 The contribution, that following the hunt on foot, quad/motor-bike or by car made to the social lives of those involved, was amplified by the replies of telephone survey respondents (ref: **Appendix 8.2**). These summarise the views of the interviewees, concerning both the benefits which they derived and the impacts which they perceived that a ban would have on their lives. It will be seen that the responses were in many cases repetitive, signifying consensus amongst the regular followers.

Total Numbers of Participants & Activity Days

8.51 In total over 1,000 participants, represented by Mounted Followers (Subscribers only) and Non-Mounted Followers, were estimated to have been involved in hunting during 1998/99 on between 18,800 and 26,000 activity days. These were concentrated in the winter months. These estimates excluded the days attended by other/occasional Mounted Followers, who were not subscribers but paid a cap/daily fee, and the allied recreational activities of hound and puppy walkers.

8.52 It was noted that in 1998/99 the number of people participating in hunting as Mounted and Non-Mounted Followers was greater than the numbers of people over 16 years old, who were involved in playing rugby (ref: sportscotland, (1999) Annual Report 1999).

Spectators

- 8.53** No spectators were specifically surveyed. However, some information on estimated numbers attending meets on ‘high days’ during the season were provided by the 5 ‘Local’ Hunts. The estimated numbers reported for New Year’s Day was **1,025**.

Habitat Creation and Conservation Contributions

- 8.54** It has been generally recognised that both Hunts and some Mounted Subscribers have been amongst those members of rural communities who have made a contribution to the upkeep of the countryside. Both landowners and farmers have been particularly involved in both the provision and management of several important wildlife habitats associated with hunting, notably: woods, coverts, copses and spinneys, fences, hedges and headlands, woodland rides, green lanes and stone dykes. The 7 Scottish Border Hunts and their Subscriber Household, Mounted Followers proved to be no exception.
- 8.55** The surveys revealed that collectively the Hunts spent approximately £2,900 on these tasks in 1998/99. The wider project surveys showed that, whilst the conservation inputs made by individual landowners and farmers, specifically relating to hunting, were less than those associated with lowland game shooting, they were nonetheless important.

Survey Findings: Direct Expenditure

Overview

- 8.56** The survey identified that all of the three principal stakeholders incurred recurrent and capital expenditure, directly in association with hunting activities. By far the largest share of the total expenditure was borne by the Participants, as indicated by the estimates displayed in **Box 8.5**:

BOX 8.5: TOTAL DIRECT EXPENDITURE ESTIMATES			
Stakeholder Group	Survey Results	<i>Grossed-Up Estimates</i>	
		<i>Maximum</i>	<i>Minimum</i>
	£M	rounded	
	£M	£M	£M
The 7 Hunts [*1]	0.32	0.32	0.32
Subscriber Household, Mounted Followers [*2]	2.17	4.18	3.08
Non-Mounted Followers	0.03	0.11	0.10
TOTAL	2.52	4.61	3.50
[*1] Details provided in Appendix 8.3			
[*2] Details provided in Appendix 8.3			
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999			

8.57 The two postal surveys, covering the ‘providers’ and subscriber household, mounted followers, together with the telephone survey of non-mounted followers, identified annual expenditure totalling **£2.52M**. Based on the ‘grossing-up’ method described earlier, the estimated total expenditure for all of the three stakeholder groups was between **£3.5M and £4.61M**. Specifically, the direct expenditure of mounted followers in the Borders was estimated to range between **£3.1M and £4.2M**. The possible need for small adjustments to be made to the above estimates was recognised in the interests of:

- avoiding double-counting, associated with the donations and fund-raising activities of participants (estimated at between £0.06M and £0.09M per year);
- including the estimated expenditure of overseas visitors, amounting to 160 days of hunting in the Borders during 1998/99.

However, because they were of similar magnitudes, the expenditure estimates for a) and b) tended to cancel each other out, thereby obviating the need for any adjustment to the above totals.

8.58 In this context, it should be noted that special care was taken to avoid double-counting. The annual subscriptions and cap fees paid by followers to the Hunts were excluded from the total expenditure estimates, since in essence they represented transfer payments.

8.59 Some of the more detailed components of the expenditure totals are presented in the sections which follow.

Expenditure By The Hunts

8.60 In terms of total costs and the cost per hunting day provided, the Hunts compared as shown below in **Box 8.6**.

BOX 8.6: COMPARATIVE ANNUAL DIRECT EXPENDITURES BY HUNTS			
Hunt	Total Annual Cost	No. of Meets	Average Cost
	£ '000 (rounded)	per season	per Meet
			£ (rounded)
Buccleuch	107	104	1,030
Berwickshire	74	63	1,175
Jedforest	46	84	550
Lauderdale	50	66	760
Liddesdale	9	48	190
College Valley	20*	38*	526
Border	9*	21*	430
* denotes that both the annual expenditures and numbers of Meets relate solely to the Borders Region.			
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999			

8.61 The above estimates contain no real surprises, reflecting as they do the range of different hunting terrains and frequencies involved. In terms of individual components, the major recurrent and capital cost items were accounted for by:

Main Recurrent Cost Items

Wages & Perks (33-48%)
Horse & Hound Feed (5-8%)

Main Capital Cost Items

Horses (60-100%)

Recurrent costs accounted for 95% or more of the total annual expenditures.

8.62 A detailed expenditure profile for each of the Hunts, covering both recurrent and capital items, is provided in **Appendix 8.3**.

Expenditure By The Mounted Followers

8.63 The actual expenditures recorded by the Subscriber Household respondents totalled £2.1M, comprising in round terms:

Recurrent Expenditure Items	£1.2M (55%)
Associated Recurrent Expenditure Items	£0.1M (4%)
Capital Expenditure Items	£0.9M (41%)

8.64 The average expenditures per Subscriber Household, Mounted Follower differed markedly between the Hunts as the following summary of the survey results, shown in **Box 8.7**, indicates.

BOX 8.7: COMPARATIVE ANNUAL DIRECT EXPENDITURES BY HOUSEHOLD SUBSCRIBER MOUNTED FOLLOWERS				
Hunt	Average Recurrent Cost	Average Associated Recurrent Cost	Average Capital Cost	Average Total Cost (rounded)
£ per respondent (207 respondents)				
Buccleuch	6,944	665	6,899	14,500
Berwickshire	5,491	493	4,206	10,200
Jedforest	4,868	463	4,104	9,450
Lauderdale	5,448	557	3,832	9,850
Liddesdale	2,139	283	165	2,600
College Valley	4,872	534	4,168	9,600
Border	2,849	302	3,545	6,700
Total	5,763	561	4,170	10,500
Source:SWRC Survey, 1999				

8.65 In comparative terms the above figures contained no surprises, since in general they reflected the different characteristics of the Hunts and their mounted followers. At first sight the figures looked high. However, examination of the 27 individual items of expenditure which most Subscriber Household Mounted Followers incurred in hunting, indicated otherwise. Reference to the detailed expenditure analyses presented in **Appendix 8.3** provided the evidence, which was cross-checked for accuracy with the Hunt Secretaries. Most importantly, it was evident that there was a substantial degree of consistency about the expenditure levels between Hunts of similar character. For instance the mounted followers of the Berwickshire, Jedforest and the Lauderdale Hunts had broadly similar **Average Total Annual Direct Costs per Mounted Subscriber**. Whilst consistency was apparent in relation to the estimates of the Average Total Cost per respondent, it masked differences which existed within the three broad categories of cost (annual average recurrent costs; annual average associated recurrent costs; and annual average capital costs). This is apparent from the component estimates presented in **Boxes 8.7 and 8.8**.

8.66 The highlights which emerged from analysis of the individual Recurrent Expenditure profiles, are displayed in **Box 8.8** (ref: also in **Appendix 8.3**).

8.67 For almost all of the Hunts, mounted follower expenditure on horse care (feed, veterinary care, farriery, bedding and dentistry) accounted for the highest share. Staff and labour costs represented similar proportions in the case of 4 of the 7 hunts. The wide differences in the reliance upon livery services was a noticeable feature. Not surprisingly, the transport costs, incurred by the mounted followers of the two North Northumberland Hunts, accounted for higher shares of total expenditure than in the case of participants of the 'local' Hunts. Perhaps the most notable feature of the comparisons was the very different expenditure profile of the Liddesdale Hunt's mounted followers, reflecting the inherently different type of hunting terrain involved.

BOX 8.8: COMPARATIVE ANNUAL DIRECT EXPENDITURES BY HOUSEHOLD SUBSCRIBER MOUNTED FOLLOWERS				
Percentages of Total Annual Recurrent Costs Incurred On:				
Hunt	Horse Care *1	Staff/ Labour	Livery	Transport
Buccleuch	36%	29%	11%	5%
Berwickshire	48%	29%	4.5%	6.5%
Jedforest	42%	26%	13%	8.3%
Lauderdale	43%	16%	22.5%	7%
Liddesdale	78%	0%	0%	7%
College Valley	24.5%	28.5%	17.5%	8.3%
Border	50.5%	10.3%	3.5%	12.4%
Footnote: *1 This covered expenditure on Feed, Bedding, Veterinary Care and Medications, plus Farriery & Equine Dentistry				
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999				

Looking at the Hunts overall, the single largest expenditure item incurred by Household Subscriber Mounted Followers was staff (full and part-time) costs. It accounted for over 21%. The other notable single items were feed (14.6%), livery (12.4%), farriery (10%) and veterinary services (9.3%).

8.68 Equivalent analysis of the Capital Expenditure profiles revealed the estimates presented in **Box 8.9**.

BOX 8.9: COMPARISON OF CAPITAL EXPENDITURE PROFILES		
Percentages of Total Capital Costs Incurred On:		
Hunt	Transport	Horse Purchase
Buccleuch	33%	31.5%
Berwickshire	33%	28%
Jedforest	46%	38%
Lauderdale	37%	38%
Liddesdale	0%	0%
College Valley	37%	26%
Border	35%	32%
All Hunts	35%	32%
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999		

8.69 The principal components of the 5 Associated Recurrent Costs were donations and fund raising activities. Overall these accounted for 42% of the Total, the individual Hunts varying between 57% (College Valley) and 0% (Liddesdale).

- 8.70** Appendix 8.3 presents the results of ‘grossing-up’ the survey responses to provide expenditure estimates for the total populations of mounted followers, subscribing to each of the Hunts.

Expenditure By The Non-Mounted Followers

- 8.71** The main expenditures, entailed in following by car and quad/motor-bike, related to the overhead and running costs of the vehicles used. Based on the average travel distances involved and guideline estimates of costs per mile, provided by the UK Automobile Association, the total annual travel costs were estimated for the **61** interviewees surveyed. For the 1999/2000 season they amounted to **£31.4K**.
- 8.72** In relation to other expenditure items, such as food, drink and clothing, the respondents did not think that these were significant. With a few exceptions, no estimates were provided. In contrast, annual subscriptions or cap fees were explicitly mentioned, though the estimated sums involved were not considered to be high. The estimates varied dependent upon whether they took the form of an annual subscription, a donation, a non-mounted follower’s annual subscription or a cap.
- 8.73** Estimation of the annual travel expenditures incurred by the total population of non-mounted followers totalled between **£100K and £110K**.

Average Total Daily Costs Per Participant

- 8.74** Analysis of the actual expenditures respectively recorded and reported by the survey respondents revealed the average daily costs of participation were as follows:

<u>Type of Follower</u>	<u>Average Daily Cost Per Follower</u>
Household Subscriber (Mounted)	£333 (all recurrent and capital items)
Non-Mounted	£14.50 (transport costs only)

Supporting Data

- 8.75** **Appendix 8.3** provides detailed data in support of the expenditure estimates presented earlier.

Survey Findings: Direct Employment

The Surveys

- 8.76** Both of the postal surveys, respectively covering the Hunts and Subscriber Household Mounted Followers, included comprehensive questions about the extent and nature of employment directly related to hunting.
- 8.77** In the case of the Hunts, information was collected about the numbers of:
- permanent staff employed, full-time throughout the year;
 - permanent staff employed, part-time throughout the year;
 - seasonal part-time employees and the particular months involved;
 - casual workers and the particular months involved;
 - voluntary inputs made and the nature of them;
 - self-employed workers;
 - people involved in fund-raising;
- 8.78** Previous studies and reports on fox hunting suffered from failure to adopt a standard basis for translating part-time and casual employment into full-time equivalents (FTEs). Frequently, but not always, the following conversion factors were used:
- a part-time (all-year) employee was regarded as being equivalent either to two thirds, or half, of a full-time job;
 - a seasonal part-time worker was taken as being equal to between one third and one quarter of a full-time person.
- The estimation of the inputs of casual workers was often even less precise.
- 8.79** In pursuit of greater accuracy, the surveys of both the Hunts and Mounted Subscribers obtained the information about all of the non-full-time inputs, in terms of the **numbers of hours worked**. The totals were then divided by the numbers of days and hours worked in a year by full-time workers (1,680 hours). The resultant estimates, expressed as FTEs, are considered to be more reliable than those derived using the conventions described in paragraph 8.78. They were then added to the survey information obtained for the numbers of full-time workers employed respectively by the Hunts and the Mounted Subscribers.
- 8.80** In the case of the two North Northumberland Hunts, respondents were asked to provide information solely about the numbers of hours specifically relating to hunting in the Borders Region.
- 8.81** The postal surveys also provided information about expenditures on the products and services purchased by the Hunts and Mounted Subscribers from a wide array of business organisations. This information enabled estimates to be made, concerning **the employment in Trade and Service organisations, directly associated with hunting**. (Estimates of the levels of indirect and induced employment are presented later in the Chapter).

The Survey Results & Estimates: the Hunts

8.82 Collectively, ‘the Hunting Organisers’ (7 Hunts) were found to employ **13 FTEs**. These represented 12 full-time jobs and a further 6 part-time (seasonal), casual and self-employed people. Thus, it was found that the provision of hunting in the Region involved **18 jobs**. The detailed employment profiles are presented in **Boxes 8.10 and 8.11**.

BOX 8.10: DIRECT EMPLOYMENT BY HUNTS: SURVEY RESULTS – JOBS						
	<u>Number of Jobs as</u>					TOTAL Numbers of JOBS
	Full Time	Part Time All Year Seasonal	Casual -	Self Employed		
Number of People/Jobs						
Buccleuch	3	0	1	0	2	6
Berwickshire	2	0	1	1	0	4
Jedforest	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lauderdale	2	0	0	0	0	2
Liddesdale	2	0	0	0	0	1
Sub-Total	10	0	2	1	2	15
Border	0	0	1	0	0	1
CV	2	0	0	0	0	2
Sub-Total	2	0	1	0	0	3
TOTAL	12	0	3	1	2	18
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999						

BOX 8.11: DIRECT EMPLOYMENT BY HUNTS: SURVEY RESULTS – FTEs						
HUNT	FTEs	Part-Time All Year	Part-Time Seasonal	Casual	Self Employed	TOTAL Number of FTEs
Number of FTEs						
Buccleuch	3	0	0.2	0	1.1	4.3
Berwickshire	2	0	0.5	0.2	0	2.7
Jedforest	2	0	0	0	0	2
Lauderdale	2	0	0	0	0	2
Liddesdale	1	0	0	0	0	1
Sub-Total	10	0	0.7	0.2	1.1	12
Border	0	0	0.3	0	0	0.3
CV	0.8	0	0	0	0	0.8
Sub-Total	0.8	0	0.3	0	0	1.1
TOTAL	10.8	0	1	0.2	1.1	13.1
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999						

The Survey Results & Estimates: the Mounted Followers

8.83 Equivalent survey data were obtained from ‘**the Participants**’ (**Mounted Subscribers**). These, together with the ‘grossed-up’ estimates, are shown in **Boxes 8.12 and 8.13**.

BOX 8.12: DIRECT EMPLOYMENT BY MOUNTED SUBSCRIBERS: SURVEY RESULTS & ESTIMATES – JOBS

HUNT	Survey Response Rate %	Item	TOTAL NUMBER OF JOBS GENERATED BY MOUNTED FOLLOWERS (PARTICIPANTS)						TOTAL	TOTAL <i>Rounded</i>
			FTEs	Part-Time	Part-Time	Casual	TOTAL			
			All Year	Seasonal				<i>Rounded</i>		
Number of People/Jobs										
Buccleuch	56.80%	Survey	13	9	20	22	64			
		GU est	Max'm	22.9	15.8	35.2	38.7	112.6	113	
		GU est	Min'm	18	12.4	27.6	30.4	88.4	88	
		Survey	7	1	7	9	24			
Berwickshire	72%	GU est	Max'm	9.7	1.4	9.7	12.9	34.3	34	
		GU est	Min'm	8.4	1.2	8.4	10.9	29.1	29	
Jedforest	58.30%	Survey	2	6	4	4	16			
		GU est	Max'm	3.4	10.3	6.9	6.9	27.4	27	
		GU est	Min'm	2.7	8.2	5.4	5.4	21.7	22	
		Survey	2	7	3	6	18			
Lauderdale	58.20%	GU est	Max'm	3.4	12	5.2	10.3	31	31	
		GU est	Min'm	2.7	9.5	4.1	8.2	24.5	25	
Liddesdale	50% (equiv)	Survey	0	0	0	0	0			
		GU est	Max'm	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		GU est	Min'm	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sub-Total		Survey	24	23	34	41	122			
		GU est	Max'm	39.4	39.5	57	68.8	205.3	205	
		GU est	Min'm	31.8	31.3	45.5	54.9	163.5	164	
Border	20%	Survey	0	1	2	2	5			
		GU est	Max'm	0	5	10	10	25	25	
		GU est	Min'm	0	3	6	6	15	15	
		Survey	4.1	2.4	2	1	9.5			
College Valley	51.1%	GU est	Max'm	8	4.7	3.9	2	18.6	19	
		GU est	Min'm	6	3.6	3	1.5	14.1	14	
Sub-Total		Survey	4.1	3.4	4	3	14.5			
		GU est	Max'm	8	9.7	13.9	12	43.6	44	
		GU est	Min'm	6	6.6	9	7.5	29.1	29	
TOTAL		Survey	28.1	26.4	38	44	136.5		137	
		GU est	47.4	49.2	70.9	80.8	248.9	249		
		GU est	37.8	37.9	54.5	62.4	192.6	193		

GU est = Grossed-Up Estimate

Source: Postal Questionnaire Survey of Mounted Followers conducted by SWRC in December 1999 on behalf of BFRS

BOX 8.13: DIRECT EMPLOYMENT BY MOUNTED SUBSCRIBERS: SURVEY RESULTS & ESTIMATES – FTEs

HUNT	Survey Response Rate %	Item	TOTAL NUMBERS OF FTEs GENERATED BY MOUNTED SUBSCRIBERS					TOTAL	
			Full-Time Jobs FTEs	Part-Time All Year [Hours] FTEs	Part-Time Seasonal [Hours] FTEs	Casual [Hours] FTEs	FTEs	Rounded FTEs	
Buccleuch	56.8%	Survey	13	[7,711]	[7,171]	[1,215]			
		Survey	13	4.6	4.3	0.7	22.6		
		GU est Max'm	22.9	8.1	7.6	1.2	39.8	40	
		GU est Min'm	18	6.3	6.2	1	31.5	32	
Berwickshire	72%	Survey	7	[1,988]	[1,964]	[354]			
		Survey	7	1.2	1.2	0.2	9.6		
		GU est Max'm	9.7	1.7	1.7	0.3	13.4	13	
		GU est Min'm	8.4	1.4	1.4	0.2	11.4	11	
Jedforest	58.3%	Survey	2	[2,895]	[570]	[315]			
		Survey	2	1.7	0.3	0.2	4.2		
		GU est Max'm	3.4	2.9	0.5	0.3	7.1	7	
		GU est Min'm	2.7	2.3	0.4	0.25	5.65	6	
Lauderdale	58.2%	Survey	2	[3,240]	[842]	[456]			
		Survey	2	1.9	0.5	0.27	4.67		
		GU est Max'm	3.4	3.3	0.9	0.5	8.1	8	
		GU est Min'm	2.7	2.6	0.7	0.4	6.4	6	
Liddesdale	50% (equivalent)	Survey	0	[0]	[0]	[0]		0	
		Survey	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		GU est Max'm	0	0	0	0	0	0	
		GU est Min'm	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Sub-Total		Survey	24	[15,834]	[10,547]	[2,340]			
		Survey	24	9.4	6.3	1.37	41.07		
		GU est Max'm	39.4	16	10.7	2.3	68.4	68	
		GU est Min'm	31.8	12.6	8.7	1.85	54.95	55	
Border	20%	Survey	0	[520]	[845]	[160]			
		Survey	0	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.9		
		GU est Max'm	0	1.5	2.5	0.5	4.5	5	
		GU est Min'm	0	0.9	1.5	0.3	2.7	3	
College Valley	51.1%	Survey	4.1	[1,098]	[2,255]	[495]			
		Survey	4.1	0.65	1.34	0.3	6.39		
		GU est Max'm	8	1.3	2.6	0.6	12.5	13	
		GU est Min'm	6	1	2	0.4	9.4	9	
Sub-Total		Survey	4.1	[1,618]	[3,100]	[655]			
		Survey	4.1	0.95	1.84	0.4	7.29	7	
		GU est Max'm	8	2.8	5.1	1.1	17	17	
		GU est Min'm	6	1.9	3.5	1.4	12.8	13	
TOTAL		Survey	28.1	[17,452]	[13,647]	[2,995]			
		Survey	28.1	10.35	8.14	1.77	48.36	48	
		GU est Max'm	47.4	18.8	15.8	3.4	85.4	85	
		GU est Min'm	37.8	14.5	12.2	3.25	67.75	68	

1 FTE = 1680 hours GU est: Grossed-Up Estimate

Source: Postal Questionnaire Survey of Mounted Followers conducted by SWRC in December 1999 on behalf of BFRS

- 8.84** Collectively the survey respondents reported that in 1998/99 they employed **28 people full-time plus another 20 FTEs as part-time (seasonal) and casual workers, i.e. a total of 48 FTEs**. When these responses were grossed-up to cover the total population of Mounted Subscribers (rather than 52.9% that completed questionnaires), the estimate for employment generated by mounted followers totalled between **68 and 85 FTEs**. The range of estimates was based upon the extrapolation/ 'grossing-up' method described earlier. The **total numbers of jobs** associated with these FTEs were estimated, as shown in **Box 8.12**, to be between **193 and 249**.
- 8.85** Assuming that none of the non-respondents employed any staff (a highly unlikely event), then the total estimated employment generated by mounted followers would be **48 FTEs**. This could be regarded as the absolute minimum total direct employment estimate. Based on market intelligence, it was reasonable to assume that those Subscriber Households, that did not complete a questionnaire, also employed people to support their hunting activities. Using the 'grossing-up' method described earlier, the amount of that additional employment was been estimated at between **20 and 37 FTEs**. Further survey work would be required to determine a more precise estimate. However, that would present difficulties, since the identities of the non-respondents were not known, either to the consultants or the Hunt Secretaries. Such difficulties are common to the analyses following most surveys.
- 8.86** In the case of the 5 locally based Hunts, it was estimated that the equivalent of between 55 and 68 full-time grooms had been employed. Subsequently, it was estimated that 70% of these grooms were provided with tied accommodation i.e. between 39 and 48 tied accommodation facilities.

The Survey Results & Estimates: Direct Employment in Trade & Service Organisations

- 8.87** Information on the direct expenditure by participants on goods and services, connected with their hunting activities, was obtained from the postal survey. The estimates derived from the survey were used to calculate the direct employment in Trade and Service Organisations, associated with hunting. They are presented in **Box 8.14** below, as they provided the basis for the employment estimates subsequently shown in **Box 8.15**.
- 8.88** The data is presented using the expenditure categories adopted for the survey of Mounted Subscribers. To avoid the problem of double-counting, these estimates excluded:
- expenditure on labour directly employed by Mounted Subscribers;
 - items, which accrued as revenue to the Hunts, namely expenditure on subscriptions, cap fees and field money; and
 - the net contributions made to the Hunts resulting from fund-raising activities. From both the surveys conducted in the Borders and previous research work conducted in England and Wales, it was estimated that about half of the Participants expenditure on fund-raising activities accrued

as revenue to the Hunts, whilst the remainder represented revenue to hunting-related suppliers.

BOX 8.14: PARTICIPANTS' DIRECT EXPENDITURE WITH HUNTING-RELATED SUPPLIERS LOCATED IN THE SCOTTISH BORDERS

Expenditure category	Grossed-Up Values Minimum £	Grossed-Up Values Maximum £
Livery	142,400	208,838
Feed, hay & bedding	247,430	314,251
Veterinary activities	113,595	147,329
Farrier	101,683	135,912
Saddlery & Tack Repairers	93,870	124,037
Clothing & cleaning materials	57,862	77,847
Insurance	23,002	29,376
Transport	82,722	113,150
Stable Maintenance & Repairs	43,125	57,330
Horse purchase	303,324	398,135
Building purchase	125,521	183,936
Horse Transport equipment	178,371	241,165
Attendance/Transport Events	20,268	26,038
Fund Raising Contributions*	19,855	28,764
Food & Drink	16,286	23,249
Training the Young	12,281	17,689
Overnight accommodation	8,875	11,302
Other expenditure	91,318	133,962
Total	1,681,788	2,272,311

8.89 To provide an estimate of the levels of employment by hunting-related suppliers, supported by Mounted Subscribers' spend on directly purchased goods and services, output per FTE employment ratios were applied to the expenditure categories shown in **Box 8.14**. The resulting estimates are presented in **Box 8.15** below.

8.90 It should be noted that the output per FTE employment ratios are merely yardsticks. They have been used by other people and were considered to be the best available at the time. However, the estimates need to be used circumspectly on account of the normal caveats associated with multipliers derived from aggregated economic data.

BOX 8.15: DIRECT EMPLOYMENT AT HUNTING-RELATED SUPPLIERS RESULTING FROM MOUNTED SUBSCRIBERS' EXPENDITURE

Expenditure Category	Output per	Grossed-Up Estimates	Grossed-Up Estimates
	FTE*	Minimum FTE	Maximum FTE
Livery	118,800	1.2	1.8
Feed, hay & bedding	118,800	2.1	2.6
Veterinary activities	28,200	4.0	5.2
Farrier	118,800	0.9	1.1
Saddlery & Tack Repairers	58,200	1.6	2.1
Clothing & cleaning materials	58,200	1.0	1.3
Insurance	123,300	0.2	0.2
Transport	46,200	1.8	2.4
Stable Maintenance & Repairs	58,200	0.7	1.0
Horse purchase	118,800	2.6	3.4
Building purchase	40,800	3.1	4.5
Horse Transport equipment	58,200	3.1	4.1
Attendance/Transport – Events	69,200	0.3	0.4
Fund Raising Contributions	69,200	0.3	0.4
Food & Drink	41,300	0.4	0.6
Training the Young	118,800	0.1	0.1
Overnight accommodation	41,300	0.2	0.3
Other expenditure	71,700	1.3	1.9
Total		24.8	33.6

Notes: * Based Scottish Input Output Tables 1996 (adjusted for inflation)

- 8.91** Using this approach, it was estimated that the amounts that Mounted Subscribers spent on hunting-related goods and services in 1998/99 supported between **25 and 34 FTEs** (equivalent to **between 37 and 51 jobs**). These were in addition to the estimates of between **68 and 85 FTEs** directly employed by the Mounted Subscribers themselves.
- 8.92** Equivalent calculations for the Hunts were undertaken, based on the survey results. As reported above, it was estimated that direct expenditure by the 7 Hunts totalled **£314,940** in the 1998/99 season (excluding depreciation). Excluding labour costs, it was estimated that the purchases of goods and services directly associated with hunting, totalled approximately **£186,500**. From the survey results, it was estimated that **85%** of this expenditure was made at hunting-related suppliers, based in the Borders. This indicated that around **£158,500** was spent in the Borders by the Hunts.
- 8.93** By applying gross output per FTE ratios, based on the Scottish Input-Output Tables 1996, to the different expenditure categories, it was estimated that the employment at hunting-related suppliers, supported through the direct expenditure incurred by the Hunts, amounted to **4.9 FTEs**. They represented approximately **7 jobs**.

The Survey Results & Estimates: Voluntary Labour Inputs

- 8.94** As indicated earlier, a considerable number of tasks were undertaken in 1998/99 – as in other years – both by the members of Hunt Supporters' Clubs

and by non-subscribers. Information on these inputs was obtained from the 7 Hunt Secretaries. In summary, the inputs involved:

- ❑ the execution of **1,995 volunteer ‘tasks’** by a total of **405 ‘core’ volunteers** (i.e. the main, but not the only, volunteers that were involved in undertaking the tasks);
- ❑ the provision of 37 major recreational and social fund-raising events;
- ❑ the contribution of **1,710 days of labour** (based on a 7.5 hour working day).

8.95 Based upon a working year of 1,680 hours, these inputs represented **7.6 FTEs**.

Assessment Of Indirect Impacts

The Multiplier Effect

8.96 Direct expenditure by Hunt Providers and Mounted Subscribers included purchases of ‘round one’ goods and services from companies, located within the Scottish Borders, as well as from companies outwith the area. In turn these companies made purchases of goods and services from their suppliers, located in the Scottish Borders (representing ‘round two’ transactions/economic impacts). The latter led to increased demand further down the supply chain. These impacts are referred to as the ‘indirect’ effects of the ‘round one’ expenditure. In addition, this increased demand generated increased incomes in the local economy. A proportion of this additional income was also re-spent on goods and services purchased in the Scottish Borders. These expenditures are known as the ‘induced’ effects.

8.97. In this study the ‘indirect’ and ‘induced’ economic impacts were estimated by applying multiplier values to:

- ❑ the estimates of the Hunts’ expenditures on direct trade purchases of goods and services; and also
- ❑ the Participants’ spend on goods and services directly purchased from hunting-related suppliers.

Estimated Levels of Secondary Expenditure – Mounted Subscribers

8.98 There is very little published information on the multiplier effect at a regional level in Scotland, as the main published source (the Scottish Input-Output Tables) relates to Scotland as a whole, where the linkages in the economy lead to higher multipliers than those at a regional level. However, research conducted into angling in 1996 by Deloitte Touche produced an output multiplier of **1.34** for angling in the Borders. An in-depth study into tourism multipliers in 1992 (Scottish Tourism Multiplier Study, 1992) estimated that output multipliers for rural areas in Scotland ranged from **1.31 to 1.34**.

8.99 Based upon this earlier research, it was been estimated that Mounted Subscribers’ direct spend, with hunting-related suppliers, amounting to

between approximately **£1.7 million and £2.3 million (ref Box 8.14)**, generated between **£0.5 million and £0.8 million** additional indirect and induced expenditure within the Borders in the 1998/99 season.

Estimated Levels of Secondary Expenditure – the Hunts

- 8.100** As reported earlier, it was estimated that direct expenditure by the 7 Hunts totalled **£314,940** in the 1998/99 season (excluding depreciation). Excluding labour costs, it was estimated that the direct expenditure on trade goods and services totalled approximately **£186,500**. The survey results indicated that **85%** of the purchases were made at hunting-related suppliers based in the Borders. Thus the expenditure by the Hunts through Borders'-based trades and services was estimated to be **£158,500**. By applying a multiplier, in the range of 1.31 - 1.34, to this figure indicated that expenditure on trade goods and services by the Hunts generated additional indirect and induced expenditure in the local economy of between **£49,000 and £54,000**.
- 8.101** It should be noted that the above analysis excludes the induced effects resulting from spend by direct employees in the local economy. It was not possible to estimate these impacts due to the lack of multipliers for induced expenditures at a regional level. However, these effects were thought to have been minimal.

Estimated Levels of Secondary Employment

- 8.102** Calculations of the indirect and induced employment were undertaken by applying an estimate of the average output per FTE employment ratio for the local economy to the indirect and induced expenditure estimates. The average gross output per FTE in the 1996 Input Output Tables was £72,000 (adjusted to 1999 prices, and rounded to nearest 100). Applying this ratio suggested that indirect and induced expenditure by Mounted Subscribers and Hunts supported between 8 - 12 FTEs in the local economy, as shown in **Box 8.16**.

BOX 8.16: ESTIMATES OF INDIRECT AND INDUCED EMPLOYMENT ASSOCIATED WITH HUNTING WITHIN THE SCOTTISH BORDERS	
Expenditure Category	Indirect and Induced Employment (FTEs)
Expenditure by Mounted Subscribers on hunting related items	7.2 - 10.7
Expenditure by Hunt Providers	0.7
Total	7.9 - 11.4
Source: SWRC Survey, 1999	

Economic Leakages

- 8.103** Analysis of the survey results highlighted the level of direct expenditure leakages from the local economy in terms of Mounted Subscribers' and Hunts' expenditures on items purchased from hunting-related suppliers, located outside the Scottish Borders. Of particular note were the high levels of purchases from non-local suppliers made by Mounted Subscribers in the case of the following items:

-
- **Insurance:** Almost two-thirds (62%) of Participants' expenditure on insurance accrued to companies located outwith the region, and this proportion was particularly high amongst the Buccleuch, Berwickshire and Liddesdale Hunts;
 - **Equine Dentistry:** Over three-quarters (76%) of expenditure on equine dentistry was made outside the Borders;
 - **New Trailers:** Almost two-thirds (64%) of expenditure on new trailers accrued to companies located outside the Borders, a leakage of between £0.3M and £0.4 million from the local economy. With the exception of the Berwickshire followers, the spend per head was also much higher where these articles were purchased from external organisations.
 - **Clothes & Boots:** Almost half (48%) of Participants' expenditure on clothes and boots was made with companies located outwith the Borders. This proportion was even higher amongst followers of the Buccleuch & Jedforest Hunts.
 - **New Saddlery & Tack:** Almost half (46%) of expenditure on new saddlery and tack was made with companies located outwith the Borders. It was also noticeable that the Buccleuch, Lauderdale and Liddesdale Hunt Subscribers, who purchased from external companies, spent more per head than those loyal to local companies;

Overall the leakages on the total purchases made by subscriber households amounted to 14%.

8.104 The levels of indirect and induced employment within the Borders, supported by expenditure by the Hunts and Mounted Subscribers, would be improved if purchases of the above items were to be made through hunting-related suppliers located in the region. This was recognised to be an issue that might merit further study in seeking to identify potential opportunities for both sustainable economic development and diversification within the local economy.

Verification and Concluding Comments

The Main Verification Sources

8.105 The results of this survey were submitted by BFRS to Rural Affairs Committee (RAC) of the Scottish Parliament as part of the evidence considered by the Committee during its deliberations on the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill. Prior to the analysis of the survey results SWRC/SAC were aware of the criticisms by a number of academic authors (Ward, N. 1998 and Macmillan, D. 1999) levelled against earlier research undertaken into the socio-economic contributions of Hunting with Hounds in Great Britain. It was noted that these criticisms relied solely on secondary sources and did not stem from comparisons based on primary research conducted by the critics. A similar absence of primary research findings was noted in the case of the evidence presented to the RAC by the Scottish Campaign Against Hunting with Dogs (Rickard, S. 2000). It was also noted

that the primary research results, which these authors sought to criticise, did not relate specifically to the speculative impacts of a potential ban. Instead, as in the case of this particular report, the research focussed primarily upon identifying the nature/extent of Hunting activities and their contributions to rural communities in a specific/typical year. For these reasons, all of these secondary sources were discarded as not providing a reliable basis for verifying/amending the survey results presented in this Chapter.

8.106 Instead two primary research sources were used for verification purposes, namely:

- the results of the pilot survey conducted in the Borders by Produce Studies Limited in 1998
- the report prepared by the Macaulay Land Use Research Institute (MLURI) into the activities of the 10 packs of Fox-hounds in Scotland, which was commissioned by the RAC established to take evidence on behalf of the Scottish Executive.

Cross-referencing to these two documents provided some helpful insights as summarised below.

Comparisons with The Produce Studies Ltd Results

8.107 The comparisons summarised in **Box 8.17** indicate that, despite some methodological differences, the results of the two surveys were, with respect to gross expenditures and the levels of employment generated, broadly similar and, in the case of the lower grossed-up estimates of total expenditure, to be almost identical.

BOX 8.17: COMPARISON OF SURVEY RESULTS			
Item	Units	Produce Studies Group Pilot Survey Results	SWRC/SAC Survey Results
Hunts Surveyed	No.	7	7
Mounted Followers Surveyed	No.	368	391 **
Direct Expenditure			
Hunts	£ M	0.34	0.32
Mounted Followers	£ M	3.14	3.08 to 4.18
Total	£ M	3.48	3.40 to 4.50
Direct Employment			
Hunts	Jobs	16	18
Mounted Followers	Jobs	230	193 to 249
Sub-Total	Jobs	246	211 to 267
Trade & Service Businesses	Jobs	97	37 to 51
Total	Jobs	343	248-318
Footnote ** = subscriber households			

8.108 This suggests that the confidence of the BFRS in presenting the survey results to the RAC was well founded.

Comparisons with the MLURI Results

- 8.109** This source of verification proved to be much more problematic. Regrettably all attempts by the BFRS to ensure that the two pieces of research were founded upon similar, if not identical, methodologies, failed. The Scottish Executive insisted that the MLURI survey would be conducted independently and without reference to the activities of any other research organisation, irrespective of its impartial approach.
- 8.110** Not surprisingly, the methodologies adopted were subsequently found to be different. This made comparisons very difficult, even though MLURI had devoted a Chapter of its report specifically to the hunting activities of the 5 locally based Borders Hunts.
- 8.111** Nevertheless some interesting insights did emerge from comparisons between the two reports. The respective estimates are presented in **Box 8.18**.

BOX 8.18: COMPARISON OF SURVEY RESULTS				
Item	Units	MLURI Survey Results (All Scotland – 10 Hunts)		SWRC/SAC Survey Results (Borders Regions – 7 Hunts)
Average Total Annual Expenditure per Subscriber Household **	£/Head	17,393		10,500
Mean Number of Subscriber Mounted Followers Per Household	No.	1.44		1.04
Average Total Annual Expenditure Per Subscribing Mounted Follower	£/Head	12,078		10,096
Average Recurrent Annual Expenditure per Subscriber Household	£/Head	9,216		6,324
Average Recurrent Annual Expenditure Per Subscribing Mounted Follower	£/Head	6,400		6,080
Direct Employment		(All Scotland – 10 Hunts)		5 Locally Based Scottish Borders Hunts
		Initial Estimate	Revised Estimate	
Hunt staff	FTEs	20 [+]	19-20	12
Employment by Mounted Followers	FTEs	83 [+]	85-103	55-68
Supply Industry (Trade & Service Organisations)	FTEs	56 [+]	66-69	20-28
Total Employment	FTEs	159 [+]	170-192	87-108
Average Per Hunt	FTEs	16	17-19	17.5-21.5
Footnote: ** This covers all Capital and Recurrent Cost items				

- 8.112** From **Box 8.18** it is clear that the average levels of expenditure incurred respectively per subscriber household and per subscribing mounted follower identified by the MLURI survey were broadly similar to, but higher than, the SWRC/SAC survey findings. This provided further grounds for confidence, especially since the BFRS figures presented to the RAC were lower than those determined by the researchers appointed by the Scottish Executive.
- 8.113** However, in relation to the employment findings, the reverse situation applied, such that BFRS did not feel confident that the aggregated estimates initially published by MLURI reflected the full picture.
- 8.114** More importantly, though, the comparisons revealed some initially inexplicable anomalies between the results of the two surveys. On further extensive investigation and cross-checking by MLURI with their data sources, it became apparent that, whereas the SWRC/SAC survey covered the total population of subscriber households, the aggregated results of the MLURI survey were too low. It was also recognised that the sampling technique used by MLURI had excluded certain parts of the Scottish Borders and that the anomalies had arisen substantially through misunderstandings between the researchers and the Hunt Secretaries. Consequently as a result of further consultations, upward adjustments were made by the MLURI researchers (ref: Box 8.18 –revised estimates). As a result, it will be observed from **Box 8.18** that, in terms of the average numbers of FTEs employed by Hunts and Mounted Subscribers, the two studies were broadly in agreement..
- 8.115** The initial rather than the revised estimates presented by MLURI served as the basis of the comparative assessment of results made by The Scottish Parliament Information Centre (SPICe). More importantly, this assessment drew attention to the fundamental differences between the objectives of the two surveys: ‘the MLURI study was based on the premise of a ban on hunting, the BFRS study was not, and sought instead to assess the contribution of hunting to the Borders economy.’ Indeed, the particular focus of the overall study conducted on behalf of BFRS meant that attention concentrated upon identifying the positive contributions of hunting and the potential for generating further employment.
- 8.116** In the final analysis it is the fundamental differences in perspective of the two research teams that need to be borne in mind when reviewing the objective verification process, undertaken by SPICe and published in the first quarter of 2001.
- 8.117** Above all this verification exercise has shown that no evidence of bias was found in the case of any of the estimates resulting from the SWRC/SAC surveys, which were subsequently presented by to the RAC by BBFRS.

Footnote

The numbers of events and tasks undertaken by voluntary labour, which are referred to in this Chapter, related to all 7 Hunts. In the case of the two Northumberland Border Hunts the voluntary labour covered the total events, tasks and inputs on both sides of the Border, i.e. the estimates were not adjusted to provide Borders specific data.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Scott Wilson is very grateful to all of the Hunts and Participants who completed the postal survey questionnaires and took part in the subsequent telephone surveys. Their inputs to the compilation of this inventory have been invaluable.

Consultees

Mr B. Cowe MBE, Chairman of the Borders Foundation for Rural Sustainability
The Masters and Secretaries of:

- ❑ The Berwickshire Hunt
- ❑ The Border Foxhounds
- ❑ The College Valley/North Northumberland Hunt
- ❑ The Duke of Buccleuch Hunt
- ❑ The Jedforest Hunt
- ❑ The Lauderdale Hunt
- ❑ The Liddesdale Hunt

Denise Walton, Co-ordinator, Borders Foundation for Rural Sustainability

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Borders Foundation for Rural Sustainability (2000) Consultation on the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill – Submission to the Rural Affairs Committee of the Scottish Parliament

Macmillan, D. (1999) The economic impact of a ban on fox-hunting with dogs in Scotland. Environmental and Resource Economics Group, University of Aberdeen. Research Paper: Ref 99/3

Macaulay Land Use Research Institute (2000) Economic Impacts of a Ban on Hunting with Dogs in Scotland. A Report for the Scottish Executive Rural Affairs Department

Produce Studies Ltd (1998) The economic contribution of Hunting within the Scottish and Northumberland Borders. The Produce Studies Group

Rickard, S. (2000) Economic Impact of a Ban on Hunting with Dogs in Scotland. Scottish Campaign Against Hunting with Dogs

Rural Affairs Committee (2000) Official Report Friday 8 December (Afternoon). The Scottish Parliament

SEB (1995) Employment Census

sportscotland (1999) Sports Participants in Scotland, Annual Report

The Information Centre (2000) Additional briefing for Rural Affairs Committee members on matters raised by the Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill, The Scottish Parliament

Ward, N. (1998) Foxing The Nation – competing claims about the economic impact of a hunting ban