

April 2000

Clubs and Violence : A Follow-up Evaluation of the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Plan

Robyn Lincoln

Bond University, Robyn_Lincoln@bond.edu.au

Michelle Mustchin

Bond University

Follow this and additional works at: http://epublications.bond.edu.au/hss_pubs

Recommended Citation

Lincoln, Robyn and Mustchin, Michelle, "Clubs and Violence : A Follow-up Evaluation of the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Plan" (2000). *Humanities & Social Sciences papers*. Paper 63.
http://epublications.bond.edu.au/hss_pubs/63

This Miscellaneous Material is brought to you by the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at [ePublications@bond](mailto:epublications@bond). It has been accepted for inclusion in Humanities & Social Sciences papers by an authorized administrator of [ePublications@bond](mailto:epublications@bond). For more information, please contact [Bond University's Repository Coordinator](#).

Clubs & Violence

**A Follow-up Evaluation of the Surfers Paradise
Safety Action Plan**

Robyn Lincoln & Michelle Mustchin

Centre for Applied Psychology & Criminology
Bond University
April 2000

**First published in 2000 by
Centre for Applied Psychology and Criminology
Bond University
Gold Coast QLD 4229**

The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Centre for Applied Psychology and Criminology nor of Bond University.

© Centre for Applied Psychology and Criminology 2000

Apart from any fair dealing for the purpose of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part of this publication may be reproduced by any process whatsoever without the permission of the publisher.

For further copies contact the Centre for Applied Psychology and Criminology on (07) 5595 2659 or fax to (07) 5595 2672 or email to rlincoln@bond.edu.au.

Contents

Abstract	4
Acknowledgements	5
Introduction	6
The Project	8
Key Findings	9
Conclusions	13
References	14
Appendix 1: Code of Practice	17
Appendix 2: Observation Timetable	19
Appendix 3: Observation Schedule	20
Appendix 4: Code Book	39

Abstract

The aim of this study is an assessment of the effectiveness of the safety action plan to reduce violence in nightclub precincts, which was implemented in Surfers Paradise in 1993. The focus of this report is the evaluation of the 1999 data collection, and whether there has been a decrease in the role alcohol plays in aggressive and violent behaviour in entertainment venues.

The data were collected from 17 different nightclubs around the Cavill Mall and Orchid Avenue areas in Surfers Paradise. The observations were made by Bond University student researchers between 23 February and 14 April 1999. The same 20-page observation questionnaire used in the previous studies (1993, 1994 and 1996) was employed in this data collection phase. The majority of the observations were between midnight and 2am on Thursdays to Saturdays.

The overall findings revealed that while verbal abuse and arguments have risen in the last three years, physical assaults are below the pre-1993 figures. This seems to suggest that changes to key environmental factors may be deflecting aggressive violent behaviour to a lesser form of aggression. Most of the clubs appeared renovated, and most of the premises seemed attractive and clean with up-market décor.

Over half of all males observed had medium to high levels of drunkenness, while the female drunkenness was slightly below this observed level. Males constituted up to three-quarters of the patrons, were generally less than 30 years of age, and tended to be observed in groups.

This follow-up study suggests that more needs to be done to target all forms of aggressive behaviour (including non-physical aggression). The interventions formulated by the safety action plan cannot work in isolation, nor can they work if commitment to their goals are not sustained. The underlying attitudes of Australia's 'wet drinking culture', and the social acceptance of young people's 'rites of passage' also need to be addressed.

Acknowledgements

The main body of this report is derived from a paper by Robyn Lincoln and Ross Homel which was presented to the Australian Institute of Criminology Roundtable on 'Alcohol, Young People and Violence' on 13 December 1999.

This research would not have been possible without the assistance of Professor Ross Homel from the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Griffith University. Ross kindly provided funds to cover the student researchers' costs in obtaining data in the Surfers Paradise nightclubs. More importantly, he and his colleagues had earlier done the groundwork in conducting baseline research, in establishing the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project, in evaluating the program for three previous data collection periods, and in initially developing the extensive observational questionnaire based on research in New South Wales licensed venues. We are grateful for the collegiate approach that Ross took by making this research opportunity available to our students.

The research would also not have been possible without the dedicated and enthusiastic scheduling, data collection, data entry and initial analyses by the students undertaking the Crime Prevention (CRIM 208) subject at Bond University in the January semester of 1999. It is essential to give credit to each of those students, some of whom were from the USA and studying in Australia for only one semester. They all gave substantial amounts of hours and most completed the survey forms in a rigorous and scientific manner (see Appendix 2).

Finally, it is critical to acknowledge the additional work done by Glenn Damaso who did most of the data entry; and the extraordinary contribution by a volunteer and later poorly-paid research assistant, Ms Mirieux (Mimi) Johnson. Mimi was keen to develop her research and analysis skills and so was thrown in at the deep-end on this project.

Robyn Lincoln
Adjunct Assistant Professor

Michelle Mustchin
Master of Criminology Student

Criminology, School of Humanities & Social Sciences
Bond University, Gold Coast Qld 4229

Introduction

This report evaluates the most recent empirical data from a series of observational studies of alcohol-related violence in nightclubs in Surfers Paradise. The major objective of the series of studies was to improve the safety of the environments in and around licensed venues in central city entertainment areas. The initial location was in Surfers Paradise (Homel et al 1997a), but safety action projects have also been conducted in Cairns, Townsville and Mackay (Fox 1996; Hauritz et al 1998a; Hauritz et al 1998b). Of course, perceived and actual violence problems in and around nightclubs are not restricted to Queensland locations nor to tourist destinations, and nor are the crime prevention strategies that deal with them (see Wilson 1997, on Melbourne's West End Precinct, among others).

It is important firstly, to acknowledge Australia's 'wet' drinking culture (Homel and Clark 1994; Makkai 1997; Room 1988). This is often contrasted with the 'mixed' drinking culture of the USA or the 'dry' drinking cultures of Scandinavian countries (Homel and Clark 1994). It implies that alcohol use in Australia is both 'socially integrated' and a part of 'popular culture' (Makkai 1997). Drinking in Australia is socially structured, culturally defined, environmentally influenced, as well as being the result of individual risk factors — such as family situations, socio-economic status, and psychological state for example (Whelan 1999). A majority of adult Australians consume alcohol and most are 'regular drinkers consuming alcohol at least once a week', with about 26% being non-drinkers, 53% being moderate drinkers and the remaining 21% being in the harmful, heavy or binge categories (Makkai 1998, 3). While alcohol use among adolescents has been reported as being in decline during the 1980s, about nine in ten young people report having engaged in drinking and it is this 'initiation into alcohol use' of adolescents that is of most concern (McAllister, Moore and Makkai 1991) when the environments of licensed nightclub venues are examined.

However, our concern about youthful drinking is not only focused on the physiological consequences (Whelan 1999) nor the implications for future adult drinking patterns. Our concern is with the relationship between drinking behaviours and the propensity for committing violence or being a victim of violence (Hollin and McMurran 1993; Stevenson 1996). The Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC) reports based on the National Drug Strategy National Household Surveys on victims and offenders in alcohol-related incidents (Makkai 1997; Makkai 1998) demonstrate that there is considerable concordance between the two groups with the key overlapping factors being: male, single and young. Over 40% of respondents reported experiencing victimisation from an alcohol-related incident which included physical abuse (over 10%), verbal abuse (over 30%) and being placed in a position of fear (over 20%) (Makkai 1997). With respect to self-reported offending it has been shown from those national surveys that between two and 12% of respondents claim to have committed an alcohol-related offence in the past 12 months (Makkai 1998).

The present study examines the consequences for alcohol-related incidents in licensed venues where some key environmental variables have been modified. While there are formal regulations that govern licensed premises, there are also informal standards required by the community (Homel et al 1997b). It was these informal requirements that led to the instigation of the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project in 1993. The project drew together criminologists, relevant local and state government agents, community representatives and local business operators to formulate an intervention strategy. A community forum was established, and from this community-based task groups were formed. Safety audits and risk assessments were conducted, from which a code of practice was developed (see Appendix 1). In addition to the community imperatives there were also more formal regulators — police and licensing inspectors — to enforce the preventive strategies. One of the major thrusts of the project was to overcome the freewheeling unregulated approach to the supply of alcohol which failed to discourage drinks promotions that have been cited as major risk factors for violence (Homel et al 1997b).

The major aims of the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project were (Homel 1994, 2-3):

- To reduce the violence in and around the Orchid Avenue, Cavill Avenue area, especially in the vicinity of licensed premises.
- To reduce public disorder in Orchid and Cavill Avenues as well as other problems associated with intoxication.
- To reduce the number of drink-driving incidents which result from drinking in the licensed premises in Orchid and Cavill Avenues.
- To reduce the fear of crime victimisation by tourists, residents, business people and shoppers in the Orchid and Cavill Avenue vicinity.
- To improve the public image of Surfers Paradise, making it more attractive to everyone in the community, in particular, overseas tourists.
- To maintain profitability of the licensed venues and nightclubs located in the Orchid and Cavill Avenue vicinity.
- To increase tourism revenue in Surfers Paradise.

The Project

To evaluate the effectiveness of the Safety Action Plan participant observation studies were conducted. Observational data were collected to record the levels of violence in nightclubs in the Cavill Mall and Orchid Avenue areas. Patron observations were initially collected in 1993, which provided a baseline for future comparisons. Follow-up observations were made in 1994 and 1996, and again in 1999, and the latter is the focus of this report.

The 20-page observation schedule was the same as that used in previous data collection phases (see Appendix 3). The schedule consists of items covering the physical and social environments, patron characteristics, bar staff and security staff, drinking patterns, serving practices, and aggression and violence. In addition, data were collected on closing times; number of bars on premises; physical environment (lighting, seating); bouncers or security and doorstaff (sex of bouncers, presence of security firm); social environment (crowding, sexual activities of patrons); patrons (age groups, type of dress); bar staff (ratio to patrons, staff acceptance of deviant behaviour); alcohol/drug consumption and costs (levels of male drunkenness, price of drinks); responsible serving practices (publicity to clientele concerning underage drinking, staff intervention with highly intoxicated patrons); and conflict/violence.

The section on conflict/violence was divided into verbal aggression, challenges/threats, friendly fights, rough ejections, accidents leading to injury and physical aggression or assaults such as bumping, grabbing, pushing, kicking and punching. For most types of aggression, data were recorded on the number of people involved (recipients and aggressors); whether there were weapons present; the severity of the incident; whether there was staff or patron intervention; whether staff were involved in the incident; the perpetrator (bouncer, patron or other staff); bouncer treatment of the situation (inflaming, diffusing, controlling or ignoring); the location of the incident (inside, outside or at the entrance); and the degree of drunkenness of the participants (high, medium or low).

The observations were conducted by students from a Bond University Crime Prevention class between 23 February and 14 April 1999 (see Appendix 2). The student observers received formal training sessions on the data collection process in order to most closely replicate the earlier procedures. They worked in teams of two or more for observation sessions of two hours' duration. A total of 57 such visits were made to 17 nightclubs in the Surfers Paradise area. Each club, on average, was visited three times with a range from one to six. The observation periods were divided into three phases: early (10pm to midnight) which comprised 39% of visits; middle (midnight to 2am) which comprised 47% of visits; and late (2am to 4am) which comprised 14% of visits. While the majority of clubs (77%) do have a closing time of 5am, some clubs closed early or were not open at all for their scheduled visit. Observation sessions were distributed across the days of the week as some clubs do have theme nights or staff nights for workers from entertainment venues on the quieter week nights. However, the majority of visits (63%) were on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights.

Key Findings

Overall the findings replicate those for earlier data collection phases and support the results reported in the literature (see Appendix 4). Namely that major factors related to violence include: 'drink promotions; groups of young males; crowding; lack of comfort; aggressive bar staff and security personnel; and inept methods for dealing with patrons' (Homel et al 1997b, 265). It is not the use of alcohol per se but the way it is managed, and it is not one single factor that causes violence around licensed venues but an interaction of various different factors (Homel and Clark 1994; Goldblatt and Lewis 1998; Hauritz et al 1998; Stockwell 1997).

The most important data however, relate to the observed levels of aggression compared with those reported for the earlier data collection phases (see Table 1). It is clear that the trends observed in 1996 have continued in the intervening three years, where overall aggression has increased and in some cases exceeded the pre-intervention levels for 1993. What is important is that physical assaults have declined.

Table 1: Observed rates of aggression and violence per 100 hours for 1993, 1994, 1996 and 1999

Type of Aggression	1993 (n=56)	1994 (n=43)	1996 (n=48)	1999 (n=57)
Verbal Abuse	12.50	2.33	8.34	13.2
Arguments	7.15	2.33	13.54	11.4
Challenges/Threats	1.79	0.00	9.38	14.0
Total Non-Physical	21.4	4.7	31.3	38.6
Physical Assaults	9.82	4.65	8.34	6.14

In general, the 17 venues observed were comfortable, although crowding and movement among patrons was prevalent, as most venues were designed for standing with small seating capacities. However, crowding at bar areas was not a major problem as most venues provided convenient bar access. Snack foods were offered either inside or outside the venue but these were very limited in scope. Approximately 68% of all premises had been renovated and the majority were deemed attractive, dimly lit with relatively up-market décor. Most of the venues were clean with low to medium smoke levels and adequate ventilation ensuring a comfortable and fresh atmosphere. Most of the entertainment offered was 'disco' with the majority of venues playing top 40 music at a relatively loud level. Public transport or transport provided by the venue was extremely limited, with the exception being the availability of taxis close to most venues.

The majority of venues provided security with more than half of all venues providing four or more bouncers. The majority of bouncers were of Anglo-Australian origin, under 30 years of age, mainly male and of medium to large build. When interacting with patrons, most bouncers were reserved. In addition to bouncers there were a small number of security guards present at select venues. No uniformed police officers were present inside any venue. The majority of bouncers patrolled the aisles and bars and were stationary at the venue entrances where ID checking was conducted.

Generally, the decorum expectations placed upon patrons by management were of a moderate standard and it was observed that over half (54%) of patrons were out for a 'big night'. The number of patrons at a venue mainly ranged from less than 50 people up to 200 people. Most of the patrons were of Anglo-Australian origin with Middle Eastern, Pacific Islanders, Aboriginal, Asian and Southern Europeans being represented in small numbers. Overall, there was a low number of tourists (both international and domestic).

At the majority of venues, males constituted most of the patron population, with 51-75% of the patrons being male. In addition, male groups represented approximately 50% of all groups. Most males were of a young age, ranging from less than 21 years old to 30 years old. The males were tidily dressed on the whole, opting for either a dressed-up or dress-up casual look. Approximately 58% of males had little interaction with strangers, preferring to stay in their own groups and approximately 28% mixed frequently with strangers. However, in regards to sexual activity, males regularly made contact with potential partners, mainly in the form of chatting up as well as necking and fondling which comprised 49% of all sexual activity, although sexual competition was non-existent or at a low-medium level. Overall, males were friendly and cheerful but male hostility, roughness, bumping and rowdiness were apparent at a low-medium level and approximately 61% of males were observed to be swearing.

Female groups represented approximately 50% of all groups. Most females, like males, were of a young age (less than 21 years to 30 years). The females were both well-groomed and tidily dressed, most in dress-up casual. As with the males, 58% of females had little interaction with strangers. In contrast to males, female sexual activity was mainly of the non-contact variety such as the checking out of potential partners. The level of female sexual competition was similar to that of males (no competition to low-medium level). Overall, females were very friendly and cheerful with very low levels (usually none) of female hostility, roughness, bumping and rowdiness. However, females were observed swearing at similar proportions to males (67%).

There was a total of fifteen verbal aggression incidents observed. The majority of these incidents were appraised as not very severe and the participants were of varying degrees of drunkenness. Ten of the aggressors were male and five were female, while nine of the victims were male and eight were female. In all cases, the perpetrator was a patron and the incident occurred 90% of the time inside the venue with the remaining 10% occurring at the entrance to the venue, at varying times in

the evening. In 60% of the incidents, either another patron or staff member became involved, while 40% of incidents received no intervention.

With respect to the thirteen arguments observed, over 40% of these incidents were described as having a high level of severity, and approximately 57% of participants had a high level of drunkenness. In total, ten males and seven females were involved. In 86% of cases, the perpetrator was a patron with the remaining 14% being represented by a bouncer as the perpetrator. The majority of arguments occurred inside the venue and earlier in the evening. In 86% of the incidents, either another patron or staff member became involved, while 14% of incidents received no intervention.

Observers reported a total of sixteen verbal aggression incidents. The majority of these incidents were not very severe and the participants mainly had a high level drunkenness. Seventeen of the aggressors were male and one was female, while thirteen of the victims were male and one was female. In 92% of cases, the perpetrator was a patron and the incident occurred 75% of the time inside the venue at varying times in the evening, although the majority of incidents were recorded earlier in the evening. In 67% of the incidents, either another patron or staff member became involved, while 33% of incidents were observed to receive no intervention.

The majority of the seven assault incidents observed were of average severity and the participants were deemed to be at average to high levels of drunkenness. Seven of the aggressors were male and one was female, while five of the victims were male and one was female. In all cases, the perpetrator was a patron and the incident occurred mostly inside the venue with the remaining at the entrance to the venue, mainly in the middle of the evening. In 67% of the incidents, either another patron or staff member became involved. In the cases where a bouncer intervened, treatment of the situation was varied with inflaming, mediating or controlling techniques being employed. Only one incident of property damage was reported and most student researchers (82% of visits) reported that there were no ejections during their two-hour observation periods at the venue.

The majority of venues provided plenty or adequate numbers of bar staff and these were generally fairly even mixes of males and females. Overall, bar staff were of a young age and of Anglo-Australian origin, although there were small numbers of Pacific Islander and Asian staff. The majority of bar staff were friendly when interacting with patrons and were only slightly or not permissive of deviant behaviour and were good at diffusing aggression. In the case of drunken patrons, staff intervened most of the time and treatment mainly involved the refusal of service or being asked to leave. In a small number of cases, management was called.

More than half the males were observed to have a medium to high level of drunkenness, as a result of drinking three or more drinks per hour. Normal beer was the most common drink consumed followed by mixed spirits, straight spirits and water. The majority of drinks were consumed from either bottles or middies. Only one incident of drug consumption was recorded for a male taking cocaine. Female drunkenness was slightly lower than that of males at approximately 46% reporting medium to high levels of drunkenness. Approximately 56% of females drank more

than three drinks per hour. Mixed spirits were the most common drink consumed, followed by cocktails and normal beer. The majority of drinks were consumed from middies and bottles. No drug consumption was observed among females.

Drink promotions were provided by over half of all venues, which included happy hour, gimmicks and various other promotions. In the qualitative component of the observation schedule a number of observers commented on the prevalence of drink promotions (see Atkin et al 1986; Carvolth 1991). This includes handing out 'two free drink' cards in the Cavill Mall and other drinks promotions sponsored by particular beverage producers. However, the majority of venues provided alcohol care signage such as underage drinking warnings, house policy notices and drink driving warnings. Self-testing breathalysers were available in 23% of venues.

Conclusions

As noted above, the current study repeats the general findings from previous data collections phases incorporated into the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project. In common with other similar interventions, it is generally found that the strategies are highly effective in the short-term but lack continuity of effect in the longer term (Homel et al 1997b; Homel et al 1997c). Labelling such interventions as 'failures' however is short-sighted (Felson and Clarke 1997; Gilling 1997; Clarke 1997). As Homel et al (1997b, 281) have noted: these projects do have a significant impact on aggression levels and alcohol consumption behaviours, even if for a limited period; other more traditional approaches have clearly not found enduring success either; and such community intervention strategies 'are dynamic and pass through many phases' but rarely will they leave the site unchanged. This is the case for Surfers Paradise, where, at least the levels of physical aggression have remained below the pre-intervention level, even if the non-physical aggression measures have climbed again. When combined with more recent work on developmental crime reduction approaches, our key recommendation is that there needs to be a range of crime prevention measures implemented (Graham and Homel 1997; Sherman et al 1998; Rosenbaum et al 1998; DCPC 1999; Sutton and Hazlehurst 1994).

While this present project takes a situational/community crime prevention focus, it also must be recognised that youthful alcohol use has an over-riding 'rites of passage' element (see Williams and Vejnaska 1986; Turanski 1986; Mason and Wilson 1992; Mazerolle and Roehl 1999). This is particularly evident in the Surfers Paradise precinct which is housed in a tourist location and which has a large number of alcohol venues that attract young people. The student observers were themselves regular club-goers and so were able to frame the research through their own participation in the 'club scene'. In the qualitative component they noted the essentialist and celebratory 'rites of passage' nature of this developmental phase for them. They also noted that the Schoolies Festival — where Surfers Paradise attracts up to 70,000 school-leavers for their graduation celebrations — is a prime example of this 'rites of passage' element and is where situational measures would be of benefit.

The paradoxical message is sent to young people about alcohol as a 'rite of passage' yet there is still little responsibility on the providers of alcohol venues to provide safe environments and not enough emphasis on the role of the broader community with respect to alcohol consumption attitudes. This paradox is replete within the crime prevention literature (Tonry and Farrington 1995). Crime prevention strategies are aimed at providing well regulated and cohesive communities and yet it is these very communities that are unregulated and lack cohesion that have higher crime rates. This is a clear indicator that a more holistic approach — incorporating developmental, community and situational crime prevention techniques and interventions — is required.

References

- Atkin, C., J. Hocking and M. Block (1986) Teenage Drinking: Does Advertising Make a Difference? in C.M. Felsted (ed), *Youth and Alcohol Abuse: Readings and Resources*, Oryx Press, Montreal, 63-74.
- Carvolth, R. (1991) Does Responsible Hospitality Work: A Synopsis of Research Findings in T. Stockwell, E. Lang and P. Rydon (eds), *The Licensed Drinking Environment: Current Research in Australia and New Zealand*, National Centre for Research into the Prevention of Drug Abuse, Perth, 134-141.
- Clarke, R.V. (1997) Introduction in R.V. Clarke (ed), *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, Harrow and Heston, New York, 1-45.
- Developmental Crime Prevention Consortium (1999) *Pathways to Prevention: Developmental and Early Intervention Approaches to Crime in Australia*, National Crime Prevention, Canberra.
- Felson, M. and R.V. Clarke (1997) The Ethics of Situational Crime Prevention in G. Newman, R.V. Clarke and S.G. Shoham (eds), *Rational Choice and Situational Crime Prevention: Theoretical Foundations*, Ashgate, Aldershot.
- Fox, J.C. (1996) *Cairns Safety Action Project: Implementation Report*, Cairns City Council, Cairns.
- Gilling, D. (1997) *Crime Prevention: Theory, Policy and Politics*, UCL Press, London.
- Goldblatt, P. and C. Lewis (1998) *Reducing Offending: An Assessment of Research Evidence on Ways of Dealing with Offending Behaviour*, Home Office Research Study 187, Home Office, London.
- Graham, K. and R. Homel (1997) Creating Safer Bars in M. Plant, E. Single and T. Stockwell (eds), *Alcohol: Minimising the Harm*, Free Association Press, London, 171-192.
- Hauritz, M., R. Homel, G. McIlwain, T. Burrows and M. Townsley (1998a) Reducing Violence in Licensed Venues Through Community Safety Action Projects: The Queensland Experience, *Contemporary Drug Problems* 25(Fall), 511-551.
- Hauritz, M., R. Homel, G. McIlwain, T. Burrows and M. Townsley (1998b) *Reducing Violence in Licensed Venues: Community Safety Action Projects*, Trends and Issues, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Hauritz, M., R. Homel, M. Townsley, T. Burrows and G. McIlwain (1998) *An Evaluation of the Local Government Safety Action Projects in Cairns, Townsville and Mackay*, Centre for Crime Policy and Public Safety, School of Justice Administration, Griffith University.

- Hollin, C.R. and M. McMurrin (1993) *Young Offenders and Alcohol-Related Crime*, John Wiley & Sons, London.
- Homel, R. and J. Clark (1994) The Prediction and Prevention of Violence in Pubs and Clubs in R.V. Clarke (ed), *Crime Prevention Studies*, Criminal Justice Press, New York, 1-46.
- Homel, R., M. Hauritz, R. Wortley, J. Clarke and R. Carvolth (1994) *The Impact of the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project: Key Findings of the Evaluation*, Centre for Crime Policy and Public Safety, School of Justice Administration, Griffith University.
- Homel, R., M. Hauritz, G. McIlwain, R. Wortley and R. Carvolth (1997a) Preventing Drunkenness and Violence Around Nightclubs in a Tourist Resort in R.V. Clarke (ed), *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, Harrow and Heston, New York, 263-282.
- Homel, R., M. Hauritz, R. Wortley, G. McIlwain and R. Carvolth (1997b) Preventing Alcohol-Related Crime Through Community Action: The Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project in R. Homel (ed), *Policing for Prevention: Reducing Crime, Public Intoxication and Injury*, Crime Prevention Studies Volume 7, Willow Tree Press, New York, 35-90.
- Makkai, T. (1997) *Alcohol and Disorder in the Australian Community: Part 1 Victims*, Trends and Issues, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Makkai, T. (1998) *Alcohol and Disorder in the Australian Community: Part II Perpetrators*, Trends and Issues Series, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Mason, G. and P. Wilson (1992) Alcohol and Crime in P. Wilson (ed), *Issues in Crime, Morality and Justice*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra, 145-158.
- Mazerolle, L.G. and J. Roehl (1999) *Controlling Drug and Disorder Problems: Oakland's Beat Health Program*, National Institute of Justice Research in Brief, US Department of Justice, Washington DC.
- McAllister, I., R. Moore and T. Makkai (1991) *Drugs in Australian Society: Patterns, Attitudes and Policies*, Longman Cheshire, Melbourne.
- Room, R. (1988) The Dialectic of Drinking in Australian Life, *Australian Drug and Alcohol Review* 7, 413-437.
- Rosenbaum, D.P., A.J. Lurigio and R.C. Davis (1998) *The Prevention of Crime*, Wadsworth, Montreal.
- Sherman, L.W., D.C. Gottfredson, D.L. MacKenzie, J. Eck, P. Reuter and S.D. Bushway (1998) *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*,

National Institute of Justice Research in Brief, US Department of Justice, Washington DC.

Stevenson, R.J. (1996) *The Impact of Alcohol Sales on Violent Crime: Property Destruction and Public Disorder*, New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research, Sydney.

Stockwell, T. (1997) Regulation of the Licensed Drinking Environment: A Major Opportunity for Crime Prevention in R. Homel (ed), *Policing for Prevention: Reducing Crime, Public Intoxication and Injury* Crime Prevention Studies Volume 7, Willow Tree Press, New York, 7-33.

Sutton, A. and K.M. Hazlehurst (1994) Crime Prevention in K. Hazlehurst (ed), *Crime and Justice*, LBC Information Services, Sydney, 421-461.

Tonry, M. and D.P. Farrington (1995) Introduction in M. Tonry and D.P. Farrington (eds), *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*, Crime and Justice Volume 19, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Turanski, J.J. (1986) Reaching and Treating Youth with Alcohol Related Problems: A Comprehensive Approach in C.M. Felsted (ed), *Youth and Alcohol Abuse: Readings and Resources*, Oryx Press, Montreal, 82-92.

Whelan, G. (1999) Alcohol Dependence, *Australian Doctor* 19 March, 1-7.

Williams, M. and J. Vejnaska (1986) Alcohol and Youth: State Prevention Approaches in C.M. Felsted (ed), *Youth and Alcohol Abuse: Readings and Resources*, Oryx Press, Montreal, 101-118.

Wilson, P. (1997) Reducing Violence Associated with the Use of Alcohol: With Special Attention to the West End Precinct, unpublished paper, School of Humanities and Social Sciences, Bond University.

Appendix 1: Code of Practice

1. Security

This establishment is strongly committed to providing quality entertainment in an atmosphere where patrons and staff are secure from threat and harassment.

To achieve this the following strategies are in place:

- All security staff are trained, registered and identifiable, and give priority to the well being of our patrons.
- Physical violence, harassment or threat will not be tolerated. Any patrons behaving in this manner will be asked to leave.
- The police will be called immediately if any act of serious violence occurs.
- Any patron who feels threatened or harassed should immediately inform security staff.

2. Safety Inside the Venue

This venue has policies in place to ensure it is safe and to contribute to the safety and enjoyment of the neighbourhood for residents, staff and patrons.

To achieve this the following strategies are in place:

- Any acts of vandalism and nuisance should be reported to the manager who will notify the police. Patrons who notice general features of the neighbourhood which they feel are unsafe should report their concerns to the manager. These will be reported to the police or the Code of Practice Monitoring Committee depending on the urgency of the situation.
- Staff are trained in emergency procedures, and first aid is available at the main management area.
- Public telephones are readily available and emergency phone numbers are displayed nearby. The venue is safe and comfortable and conforms to all health, fire, licensing and council regulations.

3. Staff Responsibility

Our staff work as professionals in the entertainment industry and are trained to be welcoming, responsive and efficient.

To achieve this the following strategies are in place:

- Staff are easily recognised by their name tags. They are trained to be hospitable, courteous, responsive and attentive and are aware of their legal responsibilities.
- Door staff are welcoming and will inform patrons of the likely length of any wait for admission.
- Complaints about staff should be made to the manager.

4. Responsible Use of Alcohol

We are committed to the principles contained in the National Guidelines for the Responsible Serving of Alcohol.

To achieve this the following strategies are in place:

- The law does not allow us to sell alcohol to anyone who is intoxicated or under the age of eighteen. It is an offence to allow intoxicated or disorderly persons to remain on the premises.
- Staff will strictly enforce these laws and patrons will be asked to leave if they do not comply with these requirements or the reasonable requests of staff.
- A good range of interesting non-alcoholic drinks are served and food and hot drinks are available. Advertising practices which invite the excessive consumption of alcohol such as 'Laybacks' and 'Flips' are not to be used.
- Staff are happy to call a relative, a friend or a taxi when it is not safe for a person to drive.
- Information about the responsible use of alcohol is available on the premises.

5. Quality Service and Entertainment

The type of service and quality of entertainment are important components of the atmosphere of enjoyment we want to create for our customers.

To achieve this the following strategies are in place:

- All bar and food areas are adequately staffed. Where available quiet areas for conversation are provided.
- Local music and videos are promoted.
- Entertainment provided does not promote violence, aggression or harassment.

6. Honest and Accurate Advertising

Our advertising is honest and accurate and emphasises our commitment to entertainment in a safe and enjoyable environment.

To achieve this the following strategies are in place:

- At all times our advertising will reflect the values and philosophies of this Code of Practice.
- It will not degrade or exploit any group in the community and will not promote our nightspot with gimmicks that encourage alcohol abuse or emphasise violence.
- Conditions of entry will be clearly posted. This includes dress standards and the prior arrangements which must be made for large groups such as bus loads of people.

7. How to Use Our Code of Practice

We provide easy access to information on our Code of Practice and clear procedures to get help or make complaints.

All staff are aware of the conditions in the Code and are happy to explain and implement its provisions.

Where it is thought we have not complied with our obligations under this Code of Practice, the matter should be reported to the Chairperson of the Monitoring Committee.

Appendix 2: Observation Timetable

Student Observers

Amy Heller
 Emma Woodley
 Erin McKittrick
 Glenn Damaso
 Guy Christiansen
 Heidi Zeller
 Joanna Johnson
 Kylie White & Daniel
 Leah Rechen
 Meta Ransome
 Scott Hardman
 Stacey O’Gorman
 Tonje Askim
 Justin & Cynthia

Clubs Observed

The Party
 Melba’s
 Avenue
 Rose & Crown
 Benson’s
 Penthouse
 Cocktails & Dreams
 Surfers Beer Garden
 Fever
 Shooter’s Saloon Bar
 Crazy Horse
 Billy’s Beach House
 Santa Fe Gold
 O’Malley’s

Pulse
 DS1
 Berlin Club

	Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday	
WEEK 1	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB
EARLY 10 – 12 PM	Amy Erin	1			Emma Tonje	3	Kylie Daniel	2	Meta Robyn	4
MIDDLE 12 – 2 AM	Amy Erin	2			Emma Tonje	5	Kylie Daniel	8	Meta Robyn	8
	Scott Heidi	3			Justin Stacey	1	Leah Joanna	5	Glenn Guy	3
LATE 2 – 4 AM	Scott Heidi	5			Justin Stacey	3	Leah Joanna	10	Glenn Guy	1

	Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday	
WEEK 2	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB
EARLY 10 – 12 PM	Kylie Daniel	10	Amy Erin	1	Emma Erin	6	Leah Joanna	6	Emma Erin	7
MIDDLE 12 – 2 AM	Kylie Daniel	12	Amy Erin	4	Emma Erin	11	Leah Joanna	7	Emma Erin	9
	Scott Heidi	1	Emma Tonje	6			Justin Stacey	4	Glenn Guy	11
LATE 2 – 4 AM	Scott Heidi	9	Emma Tonje	13			Justin Stacey	12	Glenn Guy	10

	Tuesday		Wednesday		Thursday		Friday		Saturday	
WEEK 3	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB	NAME	CLUB
EARLY 10 – 12 PM			Meta Robyn	13			Kylie Daniel	11	Scott Heidi	7
MIDDLE 12 – 2 AM			Meta Robyn	4	Leah Joanna	8	Kylie Daniel	13	Scott Heidi	2
			Emma Tonje	10	Justin Stacey	12	Glenn Guy	9	Amy Kylie	7
LATE 2 – 4 AM			Emma Tonje	2	Justin Stacey	8	Glenn Guy	13	Amy Kylie	11
					Leah Joanna	9				

Appendix 3: Observation Schedule

Name of the venue:

Suburb:

Distance to the nearest licensed venue:

Particular site observed (ie which bar?):

Type of place:

Skid Row Hotel	1
Hotel (other)	2
Club	3
Nightclub	4

No. of drinking areas:

No. of restaurants:

No. of discos:

Closing time of premises:

Date:

Day of week:

School holiday: Yes No

Other holiday: Yes No

Observation start time:

Observation finish time:

Observation team:

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

Lighting:

Dark	1
Dim	2
Medium bright	3
Bright	4

Seating capacity:

<50	1
50-99	2
100-149	3
150-199	4

Seating comfort:

Adequate	1
Too few	2

Designed mainly for standing: Yes No

Seating style:

Rows of tables	Yes	No
Rows, partitions (café)	Yes	No
Spaced comfortable tables and chairs	Yes	No
Highbacked chairs	Yes	No
Chairs with arm rests	Yes	No
Bar stools	Yes	No
Standing room only	Yes	No

Bar access (not crowding):

Convenient	1
Inconvenient	2

Appearance 1:

Renovated	1
Not renovated	2

Appearance 2:

Attractive	1
Neutral	2
Not attractive	3

Décor:

Shabby	1
Ordinary	2
Nice	3
Posh	4

Theme: Yes No

Predominant colour scheme (eg blue, black one colour):

Ventilation:

Stuffy	1
Warm	2
Comfortable	3
Fresh	4

Smoke level:

High	1
Medium	2
Low	3

Cleanliness:

Spotless	1
Clean	2
Dirty	3
Filthy	4

Upkeep:

Well cared for	1
Okay	2
Slightly run down	3
Run down	4

Toilets:

	Male	Female
Clean	1	1
Dirty	2	2

Transport:

	Available	Limited	None
Taxi	1	2	3
Public	1	2	3
Provided by venue	1	2	3

BOUNCER/SECURITY/DOORMEN

Bouncers are employed by the establishment. Security firms are sometimes used as well, usually on the door. 'Bouncer' below does not refer to security firm personnel. Quite often, security firm personnel wear a uniform designating which security firm they are from, while bouncers may well wear a uniform, though it is more likely to be that of a waiter in a restaurant. Note that these are general guidelines only.

Total no. of security personnel (eg Wormald):

No. of bouncers (employed by the establishment):

Did you see a police officer in uniform inside the venue: Yes No

Size of bouncers (predominantly):

	Male	Female
Small	1	1
Medium	2	2
Large/Heavy	3	3

Ethnicity of bouncers (predominantly):

Anglo-Australian	1
Middle Eastern	2
Pacific Islands	3
Aboriginal	4
Asian	5
Southern European	6
Other (specify)	7

Bouncer interaction (one option per time):

Hostile and rude	1
No interaction with patrons	2
Reserved	3
Friendly	4
Sitting with patrons	5

Friendliness of bouncers:

Friendly:	Cheerful (can include sitting with patrons)	1
	Pleasant/Relaxed	2
	Non-committal	3
	Distant	4
Unfriendly:	Rude	5
	Edgy	6
	Hostile/Violent	7

Security firm (more than one option allowed):

On door	Yes	No
In car park	Yes	No
Other (specify)	Yes	No
None	Yes	No

ID requested at door:

Rigorous	1
Haphazard	2
Selective	3
No check	4

Control 1 of entrances (Bouncers/Security):

Of entrances	1	
Of aisles and bar crowding	2	
Specific places:	Bar	3
	Aisles	4
	Toilets	5

Control 2 patrol style (Bouncers/Security):

General patrolling	1
Stationery	2
Patrolling and stationery	3

SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Overall comfort:

High (very comfortable)	1
Medium (moderately comfortable)	2
Low (little comfort)	3
None (uncomfortable)	4

Crowding:

Overfull	1
High (full capacity)	2
Medium (2/3 full)	3
Low (1/3 full)	4
None	5

Bar crowding:

High	1
Medium	2
Low	3
None	4

Movement (may be more than one option for each period):

Very little movement	1
Wandering about	2
Table-hopping	3
Bumping, shoving	4

Noise level music:

Very quiet	1
Medium quiet	2
Medium loud	3
Loud	4
Painful	5

Entertainment/Recreation (circle all that apply):

None	1
Music video	2
TV	3
SKY Channel	4
Single entertainer	5
Band	6
Jukebox or disco	7
Stripper	8
Dancing	9
Pool	10
Poker machines	11
Card machines	12
Table-top dancing	13
Other games	14
Other (specific)	15

Noise level voice:

Very quiet	1
Medium quiet	2
Medium loud	3
Loud	4
Painful	5

Type of music:

Thrash	1
Heavy metal	2
House/acid	3
Top 40	4
Jazz/blues	5
Classics (eg Piano Man, American Pie)	6
50s (eg Little Richard, Elvis Presley)	7
60s (eg Beatles, The Rolling Stones)	8
70s (eg Abba, Village People)	9
Other (specify)	10

Food:

Full meals	1
Free nibbles (eg peanuts)	2
Small snacks (to buy chips, peanuts)	3
Hot snacks (eg pies, hot chips)	4
Hot dogs inside	5
Hot dogs outside	6
Other food brought in from outside	7
Salty foods	8
None	9

Patron interaction:

	Male	Female
Frequently with strangers (sociable)	1	1
Little interaction with strangers (clique)	2	2
Frequently with other regulars	3	3

Decorum expectations of management:

High	1
Moderate	2
Permissive	3
Very permissive	4

Sexual activity:

	Male	Female
None or very casual	1	1
Checking out	2	2
Chatting up	3	3
Discreet necking	4	4
Heavy necking, touching	5	5
Flagrant fondling	6	6

Sexual competition:	Male	Female
High	1	1
Medium	2	2
Low	3	3
None	4	4

Patron purpose of visit:	% of patrons
Regular/local	_____
After work	_____
Social club gathering	_____
One or two drinks	_____
Out for a big night	_____

Cheerfulness (individual):	Male	Female
High	1	1
Medium	2	2
Low	3	3
None	4	4

Friendliness (social):	Male	Female
High	1	1
Medium	2	2
Low	3	3
None	4	4

Roughness and bumping:	Male	Female
High	1	1
Medium	2	2
Low	3	3
None	4	4

Hostility:	Male	Female
High	1	1
Medium	2	2
Low	3	3
None	4	4

Group territoriality (to what extent, as an observer, do you feel that you were 'treading on someone else's turf?'):	
High	1
Medium	2
Low	3
None	4

Rowdiness:	Male	Female
High	1	1
Medium	2	2
Low	3	3
None	4	4

Swearing:	Male	Female
High	1	1
Medium	2	2
Low	3	3
None	4	4

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE

'Personal violation (verbal insult/unwanted physical contact)'
'Behaviour offensive according to norms of place'
'Dispute in which the participants had personal investment'

**NON-PHYSICAL
 VERBAL AGGRESSION (ABUSE ONE-WAY)**

Total no. of incidents:

Incident #: one two three four five six seven eight

Aggressors:

No. male

No. female

Victims:

No. male

No. female

Time observed:

Early	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Middle	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Late	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Severity:

High	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medium	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Low	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Intervention:

By patron	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
By staff	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Both	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Staff involved:

Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Perpetrator:

Bouncer	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Patron	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Other staff	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Location:

In	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Out	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Entrance	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Degree of drunkenness of participants:

High	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medium	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Low	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Comments:

NON-PHYSICAL ARGUMENTS

Total no. of incidents:

Argument #: one two three four five six seven eight

Aggressors:

No. male

No. female

Victims:

No. male

No. female

Time observed:

Early	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Middle	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Late	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Severity:

High	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medium	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Low	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Intervention:

By patron	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
By staff	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Both	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Staff involved:

Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Perpetrator:

Bouncer	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Patron	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Other staff	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Location:

In	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Out	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Entrance	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Degree of drunkenness of participants:

High	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medium	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Low	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Comments:

**NON-PHYSICAL
CHALLENGES/THREATS**

Total no. of incidents:

Threat #: one two three four five six seven eight

Aggressors:

No. male

No. female

Victims:

No. male

No. female

Time observed:

Early	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Middle	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Late	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Severity:

High	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medium	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Low	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Intervention:

By patron	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
By staff	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Both	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Staff involved:

Yes	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
No	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2

Perpetrator:

Bouncer	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Patron	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Other staff	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Location:

In	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Out	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Entrance	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Degree of drunkenness of participants:

High	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medium	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Low	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Comments:

Overall level of non-physical violence:

High	1
Medium	2
Low	3
None	4

Comments:

.....

**PHYSICAL
FRIENDLY FIGHTS ('LION CUB FIGHTS')**

Total no. of incidents:

Comments:

Physical aggression/assaults (deliberate unfriendly bumping, grabbing, pushing, actual physical violence – punching, kicking etc):

Total no. of incidents:

Comments:

Weapons (circle all that apply):

- None 1
- Broken glass 2
- Fists 3
- Knife 4
- Pool cue 5
- Bar stool 6
- Person's head 7
- Pool ball 8
- Other (specify) 9

**PHYSICAL
ASSAULT**

Total no. of incidents:

Incident #: one two three four five six seven eight

Aggressors:

No. male

No. female

Victims:

No. male

No. female

Time observed:

Early 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

Middle 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

Late 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3

Severity:

High 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

Medium 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

Low 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3

Intervention:

By patron 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

By staff 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

Both 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3

Staff involved:

Yes 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

No 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

Perpetrator:

Bouncer 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

Patron 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

Other staff 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3

Victim precipitated:

Yes 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

No 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

To what extent did the victim precipitate the attack:

Physical provocation 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1

Verbal taunting 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2

Bouncer treatment of situation:

Inflaming (provoking)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mediating/defusing	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Controlling	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
Ignoring	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4

Location:

In	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Out	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Entrance	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Degree of drunkenness of participants:

High	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Medium	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Low	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

Comments:

Property damaged:

Yes	1
No	2

Total ejections:

No. rough ejections:

No. refused admission:

No. accidents leading to injury:

Overall level of physical violence:

High	1
Medium	2
Low	3
None	4

Comments:

PATRONS

Social class:	% in each category
Students (high school)	_____
Students (college)	_____
Military	_____

Percentage of males:

No. of patrons:

<50	1
50-99	2
100-199	3
200-499	4
500-999	5
>1000	6

Minimum no. of patrons at any one time:

Maximum no. of patrons at any one time:

Ages (% in each category):

	Male	Female
<18	_____	_____
18-21	_____	_____
22-25	_____	_____
26-35	_____	_____
>35	_____	_____

Groups:

% estimated average for the night

Single males	_____
Single females	_____
Couples	_____
Medium 3-4	_____
Large >5	_____
TOTAL	100%

Types of groups:

% estimated average for the night

Mixed	_____
All females	_____
All males	_____
TOTAL	100%

Patrons familiarity:

%

Patrons as strangers	_____
Patrons known to each other	_____

Ethnicity:

%

Anglo-Australian	_____
Middle Eastern	_____
Pacific Islands	_____
Aboriginal	_____
Asian	_____
Southern European	_____
Other (specify)

Tourists (local and international):

High	1
Medium	2
Low	3
None	4

Dress overall:	Male	Female
Unkempt	1	1
Tidy	2	2
Well-groomed	3	3

Dress by percentage:	Male	Female
Working gear (manual)	_____	_____
Business suit	_____	_____
Dress-up casual	_____	_____
Dress-up	_____	_____
Grunge	_____	_____
Cult-dressing	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____

View of patrons:
 No. of patrons within full view of observers during observation period:

Patrons within hearing distance:
 No. of patrons whose conversations were able to be overheard during the observation period:

BAR STAFF

Percentage male/female:

100% male	1
75% male/25% female	2
50% male/50% female	3
25% male/75% female	4
100% female	5

Age of staff:

Young	1
Mixed age	2
Old	3

Approximate age range:

Presentation of staff:

All uniformed	1
Some uniformed/some not	2
Formal	3
Informal	4
Unkempt	5

Ethnicity of staff:

	%
Anglo-Australian	_____
Middle Eastern	_____
Pacific Islands	_____
Aboriginal	_____
Asian	_____
Southern European	_____
Other (specify)	_____

Staff ethnicity compared to patrons:

Matched	1
Unmatched	2

Staff gender compared to patrons:

Matched	1
Unmatched	2

Availability of staff:

Plenty	1
Adequate	2
Few	3

Staff acceptance of deviant behaviour:

Not permissive	1
Slightly permissive	2
Not applicable	3
Permissive	4
Very permissive	5

Coverage of bar staff:

	Male	Female
Bare chest	1	1
Skimpy top	2	2
Skimpy bottom	3	3

Staff ability to defuse aggression:

Very good	1
Good	2
Poor	3
Very poor	4
No aggression to defuse	5

Ratio of bar staff to patrons:

1 to 10	1
1 to 20	2
1 to 40	3
1 to 50	4
Less than 1 to 50	5

Staff interaction with patrons:

Hostile and rude	1
No interaction with patrons	2
Reserved	3
Friendly	4
Sitting with patrons	5

ALCOHOL/DRUG CONSUMPTION AND COSTS

A standard drink is defined as a POT (285ml) of normal strength beer, a nip (1 ounce) of spirits, 2 ounces of port or sherry, a glass (4 ounces) of wine. A light beer equals a standard drink.

Drinking rates:	Male	Female
High (>4/hr standard drinks)	1	1
Medium (3-4/hr)	2	2
Low (1-2/hr)	3	3
Very low (<1/hr)	4	4

Drunkenness:	Male	Female
High	1	1
Medium	2	2
Low	3	3
None	4	4

Shouting rounds:	
High	1
Medium	2
Low	3
None	4

Drinks consumed (average over the evening):	Male%	Female%
Normal beer	_____	_____
Light beer	_____	_____
Straight spirits	_____	_____
Mixed spirits	_____	_____
Cocktails	_____	_____
Wine	_____	_____
Soft drinks	_____	_____
Water	_____	_____
TOTAL	100%	100%

Drinking containers (average over the evening):	Male%	Female%
Bottles	_____	_____
Cans	_____	_____
Middies	_____	_____
Schooners	_____	_____
Plastic cups	_____	_____
Other (specify)	_____	_____
TOTAL	100%	100%

Cover charge:	
High (>\$5.00)	1
Low (<\$5.00)	2
None/free	3

Ice water:	
Free	1
Cost	2

Cost of drinks (use pots of beer as a reference):

- Cheap (<\$2.00) 1
- Average (\$2.00-\$2.50) 2
- Expensive (>\$2.50) 3

Drug consumption (circle all that apply):	Male	Female
None apparent	1	1
Marijuana	2	2
Heroin	3	3
Speed	4	4
Cocaine	5	5
MDA/ecstasy	6	6
Amil	7	7
Others (specify)	8	8

- Drug dealing on premises:**
- A great deal 1
 - Some 2
 - None apparent 3

HOST RESPONSIBILITY SERVING PRACTICES

- Publicity to clientele:**
- Under age drinking warning 1
 - House policy 2
 - Request to leave premises quietly 3
 - Patron care sign 4
 - Other (specify) 5
 - None 6

- Self-testing breathalysers:**
- Obvious 1
 - Not obvious 2
 - None available 3

- Promotion of consumption (where possible collect samples):**
- Top up/replace or fill empty glasses 1
 - Happy hour 2
 - Drink promotions 3
 - Gimmicks (specify) 4
 - Sports related 5
 - Nothing 6

- Staff intervention with highly intoxicated patrons:**
- In every case 1
 - Sometimes 2
 - No intervention 3
 - No highly intoxicated patrons 4

Nature of intervention with highly intoxicated patrons:

- Refusal of service 1
- Offer non-alcoholic drink 2
- Offer food 3
- Suggest alternative transport 4
- Ask for ID 5
- Other (specify) 6
- No intoxicated patrons 7

Transport organised by establishment for patrons:

- Yes 1
- No 2

In what form:

- Offered privately 1
- Public bus 2
- Other (specify) 3

Intoxicated and ordering:

	Yes	No	Sometimes
Unsolicited service	1	2	3
Pressure to drink	1	2	3
Appropriate service	1	2	3
Patron ignored	1	2	3
Service delayed	1	2	3
Offer of an alternative	1	2	3
Service denied	1	2	3
Management called	1	2	3

How effectively overall does the establishment discourage intoxication?

Comments:

OBSERVATIONAL STUDY NARRATIVE

Appendix 4: Code Book

VENUES AND OBSERVATIONS

Name of venue	N	%
The Party	1	1.8
Melbas	3	5.3
Avenue	4	7.0
Rose & Crown	4	7.0
Cocktails & Dreams	6	10.5
Penthouse	3	5.3
Bensons	4	7.0
Surfers Beer Garden	3	5.3
Fever	2	3.5
Shooters	6	10.5
Crazy Horse	4	7.0
Billy's Beach House	3	5.3
Santa Fe	5	8.8
Pulse	3	5.3
DS1	1	1.8
Berlin Club	3	5.3
O'Malleys	2	3.5

Number of bars	N	%
One	32	56.1
Two	16	28.1
Three	7	12.3
Four	2	3.5

Number of restaurants	N	%
Zero	51	89.5
One	6	10.5

Number of discos	N	%
Zero	9	15.8
One	42	73.7
Two	5	8.8
Four	1	1.8

Closing time of premises	N	%
2.00 am	3	5.3
4.00 am	5	8.8
5.00 am	44	77.2
Not known	5	8.8

Month of visit		
February	14	24.6
March	37	64.9
April	6	10.5
Day of visit		
Monday	1	1.8
Tuesday	6	10.5
Wednesday	8	14.0
Thursday	10	17.5
Friday	14	24.6
Saturday	12	21.1
Sunday	6	10.5
Observation period		
10.00 to midnight	22	38.6
Midnight to 2.00 am	27	47.4
2.00 am to 4.00 am	8	14.0
Observation team		
Scott & Emma	4	7.0
Justin & Stacey	6	10.5
Meta & Robyn	4	7.0
Amy & Erin	4	7.0
Glenn & Guy	6	10.5
Scott & Heidi	3	5.3
Kylie & Daniel	12	21.1
Leah & Joanna	5	8.8
Emma & Tonje	5	8.8
Erin & Heidi	2	3.5
Cynthia	3	5.3
Amy & Emma	3	5.3
Lighting		
Dark	7	12.3
Dim	32	56.1
Medium bright	17	29.8
Bright	1	1.8
Seating capacity		
<50	32	56.1
50-99	20	35.1
100-149	4	7.0
150-199	1	1.8
Seating (comfort)		
Adequate	37	64.9
Too few	20	35.1
Designed mainly for standing		
Clubs & Violence	40	

Not known	1	1.8
Yes	35	61.4
No	21	36.8

Seating style

Rows of tables

Yes	15	26.3
No	42	73.7

Rows, partitions (café)

Yes	6	10.5
No	51	89.5

Spaced comfortable tables and chairs

Yes	24	42.1
No	33	57.9

Highbacked chairs

Yes	10	17.5
No	47	82.5

Chairs with arm rests

Yes	9	15.8
No	48	84.2

Bar stools

Yes	46	80.7
No	11	19.3

Standing room only

Yes	10	17.5
No	47	82.5

Bar access

Convenient	49	86.0
Inconvenient	8	14.0

Appearance 1

Renovated	39	68.4
Not renovated	18	31.6

Appearance 2

Attractive	32	56.1
Neutral	20	35.1
Not attractive	5	8.8

Décor

Shabby	2	3.5
Ordinary	23	40.4
Nice	26	45.6
Posh	6	10.5

Theme		
Yes	18	31.6
No	39	68.4
Ventilation		
Stuffy	3	5.3
Warm	16	28.1
Comfortable	33	57.9
Fresh	5	8.8
Smoke level		
High	8	14.0
Medium	15	26.3
Low	34	59.6
Cleanliness		
Spotless	9	15.8
Clean	43	75.4
Dirty	5	8.8
Upkeep		
Well cared for	24	42.1
Okay	30	52.6
Slightly run down	3	5.3
Male toilets		
Clean	29	50.9
Dirty	19	33.3
Not known	9	15.8
Female toilets		
Clean	32	56.1
Dirty	20	35.1
Not known	5	8.8
Transport		
<u>Taxi</u>		
Available	37	64.9
Limited	13	22.8
None	7	12.3
<u>Public</u>		
Available	2	3.5
Limited	13	22.8
None	42	73.7
<u>Provided by venue</u>		
Available	1	1.8
None	56	98.2

SECURITY

Total number of security personnel		
Zero	48	84.2
Two	1	1.8
Three	2	3.5
Four	3	5.3
Five plus	3	5.3
<hr/>		
Number of bouncers		
Zero	3	5.3
One	3	5.3
Two	12	21.1
Three	5	8.8
Four	12	21.1
Five	7	12.3
Six plus	12	21.1
Not known	3	5.3
<hr/>		
Uniformed police officer inside venue		
No	57	100
<hr/>		
Size of male bouncers		
Medium	34	59.6
Large/heavy	20	35.1
Not known/applicable	3	5.3
<hr/>		
Size of female bouncers		
Small	5	8.8
Medium	3	5.3
Large/heavy	1	1.8
Not known/applicable	48	84.2
<hr/>		
Age of bouncers		
Young (<30)	35	61.4
Older (>30)	20	35.1
Not known/applicable	2	3.5
<hr/>		
Ethnicity of bouncers		
Anglo-Australian	43	75.4
Middle Eastern	1	1.8
Pacific Islands	11	19.3
Not known/applicable	2	3.5
<hr/>		
Bouncer interaction		
Hostile and rude	5	8.8
No interaction with patrons	8	14.0
Reserved	21	36.8
Friendly	17	29.8
Sitting with patrons	4	7.0
Not known/applicable	2	3.5

Friendliness of bouncers		
Cheerful (eg sitting with patrons)	3	5.3
Pleasant/relaxed	25	43.9
Non-committal	16	28.1
Distant	7	12.3
Rude	1	1.8
Edgy	3	5.3
Not known/applicable	2	3.5
Security personnel		
<u>On door</u>		
Yes	25	43.9
No	30	52.6
Not applicable	2	3.5
<u>In car park</u>		
No	55	96.5
Not applicable	2	3.5
<u>Other (specify)</u>		
Yes	12	21.1
No	43	75.4
Not applicable	2	3.5
<u>None</u>		
Yes	15	26.3
No	18	31.6
Not applicable	24	42.1
ID requested at door		
Rigorous	21	36.8
Haphazard	4	7.0
Selective	18	31.6
No check	14	24.6
Control of entrances		
Yes	53	93.0
No	3	5.3
Not applicable	1	1.8
Control of aisles and bar		
Yes	32	56.1
No	24	42.1
Not applicable	1	1.8
Control of toilets		
Yes	8	14.0
No	47	82.5
Not applicable	2	3.5
Control of patrol style		
General patrolling	5	8.8
Stationary	13	22.8
Patrolling and stationary	37	64.9
Clubs & Violence	44	

Not applicable	2	3.5
----------------	---	-----

VENUE (CONT)

Overall comfort

High (very comfortable)	15	26.3
Medium (moderately comfortable)	34	59.6
Low (little comfort)	8	14.0

Crowding

High (full capacity)	9	15.8
Medium (2/3 full)	23	40.4
Low (1/3 full)	17	29.8
None	8	14.0

Bar crowding

High	7	12.3
Medium	20	35.1
Low	17	29.8
None	13	22.8

Movement

Very little movement	23	40.4
Wandering about	31	54.4
Bumping, shoving	3	5.3

Noise level music

Very quiet	2	3.5
Medium quiet	4	7.0
Medium loud	24	42.1
Loud	23	40.4
Painful	4	7.0

Entertainment/Recreation**None**

No	57	100.0
----	----	-------

Music video

Yes	40	70.2
-----	----	------

No	17	29.8
----	----	------

TV

Yes	22	38.6
-----	----	------

No	35	61.4
----	----	------

SKY Channel

Yes	9	15.8
-----	---	------

No	48	84.2
----	----	------

Single entertainer

Yes	2	3.5
-----	---	-----

No	55	96.5
----	----	------

Band

Yes	8	14.0
-----	---	------

No	49	86.0
----	----	------

Clubs & Violence	45	
------------------	----	--

<u>Jukebox or disco</u>		
Yes	21	36.8
No	36	63.2
<u>Stripper</u>		
Yes	8	14.0
No	49	86.0
<u>Dancing</u>		
Yes	26	45.6
No	31	54.4
<u>Pool</u>		
Yes	32	56.1
No	25	43.9
<u>Poker machines</u>		
Yes	3	5.3
No	54	94.7
<u>Card machines</u>		
Yes	3	5.3
No	54	94.7
<u>Table-top dancing</u>		
Yes	6	10.5
No	51	89.5
<u>Other games</u>		
Yes	6	10.5
No	51	89.5
<u>Other (keno, lap dancing, DJ, Fox sports, video games, laser show)</u>		
Yes	11	19.3
No	46	80.7

Noise level voice

Very quiet	6	10.5
Medium quiet	18	31.6
Medium loud	20	35.1
Loud	13	22.8

Type of music

Heavy metal	2	3.5
House/acid	3	5.3
Top 40	39	68.4
Jazz/blues	2	3.5
Classics (eg Piano Man, American Pie)	1	1.8
70s (eg Abba, Village People)	2	3.5
Other	8	14.0

Food

Full meals	6	10.5
Free nibbles (eg peanuts)	3	5.3
Small snacks (to buy chips, peanuts)	16	28.1
Hot snacks (eg pies, hot chips)	5	8.8
Hot dogs outside	8	14.0
Other food brought in from outside	1	1.8
None	18	31.6

PATRONS

Male patron interaction

Frequently with strangers (sociable)	16	28.1
Little interaction with strangers (clique)	33	57.9
Frequently with other regulars	8	14.0

Female patron interaction

Frequently with strangers (sociable)	12	21.1
Little interaction with strangers (clique)	33	57.9
Frequently with other regulars	9	15.8
Not applicable	3	5.3

Decorum expectations of management

High	11	19.3
Moderate	36	63.2
Permissive	9	15.8
Not known	1	1.8

Male sexual activity

None or very casual	15	26.3
Checking out	14	24.6
Chatting up	13	22.8
Discreet necking	7	12.3
Heavy necking, touching	6	10.5
Flagrant fondling	2	3.5

Female sexual activity

None or very casual	20	35.1
Checking out	13	22.8
Chatting up	8	14.0
Discreet necking	10	17.5
Heavy necking, touching	6	10.5

Male sexual competition

High	4	7.0
Medium	17	29.8
Low	16	28.1
None	20	35.1

Female sexual competition

High	2	3.5
Medium	13	22.8
Low	17	29.8
None	25	43.9

Patron purpose of visit

Regular/local	10	17.5
After work	1	1.8
Social club gathering	2	3.5
Clubs & Violence	47	

One or two drinks	13	22.8
Out for a big night	31	54.4

Male cheerfulness

High	18	31.6
Medium	35	61.4
Low	4	7.0

Female cheerfulness

High	24	42.1
Medium	23	40.4
Low	5	8.8
None	5	8.8

Male friendliness

High	10	17.5
Medium	30	52.6
Low	14	24.6
None	3	5.3

Female friendliness

High	8	14.0
Medium	27	47.4
Low	14	24.6
None	8	14.0

Male roughness and bumping

High	3	5.3
Medium	11	19.3
Low	17	29.8
None	26	45.6

Female roughness and bumping

High	2	3.5
Medium	8	14.0
Low	11	19.3
None	36	63.2

Male hostility

Medium	7	12.3
Low	18	31.6
None	32	56.1

Female hostility

Medium	5	8.8
Low	12	21.1
None	40	70.2

Group territoriality

Medium	5	8.8
Low	14	24.6
Clubs & Violence	48	

None	38	66.7
------	----	------

Male rowdiness

High	2	3.5
Medium	14	24.6
Low	18	31.6
None	23	40.4

Female rowdiness

High	1	1.8
Medium	3	5.3
Low	19	33.3
None	34	59.6

Male swearing

High	2	3.5
Medium	8	14.0
Low	25	43.9
None	22	38.6

Female swearing

Medium	2	3.5
Low	17	29.8
None	38	66.7

VERBAL AGGRESSION

Total number of verbal aggression incidents

Zero	47	82.5
One	6	10.5
Two	3	5.3
Three	1	1.8

Male aggressors

Zero	3	5.3
One	4	7.0
Two	3	5.3
Not applicable	47	82.5

Female aggressors

Zero	5	8.8
One	5	8.8
Not applicable	47	82.5

Male victims

Zero	4	7.0
One	4	7.0
Two	1	1.8
Three	1	1.8
Not applicable	47	82.5

Female victims		
None	5	8.8
One	3	5.3
Two	1	1.8
Three	1	1.8
Not applicable	47	82.5
Time of incident		
Early	4	7.0
Middle	3	5.3
Late	3	5.3
Not applicable	47	82.5
Severity of verbal aggression		
High	1	1.8
Medium	1	1.8
Low	8	14.0
Not applicable	47	82.5
Intervention		
By patron	1	1.8
By staff	3	5.3
Both	2	3.5
No intervention	4	7.0
Not applicable	47	82.5
Staff involved		
Yes	3	5.3
No	7	12.3
Not applicable	47	82.5
Perpetrator		
Patron	10	17.5
Not applicable	47	82.5
Location		
In	9	15.8
Entrance	1	1.8
Not applicable	47	82.5
Degree of drunkenness of participants		
High	4	7.0
Medium	3	5.3
Low	3	5.3
Not applicable	47	82.5

ARGUMENTS

Total number of argument incidents		
Zero	50	87.7
Clubs & Violence	50	

One	4	7.0
Two	2	3.5
Five	1	1.8

Males involved

Zero	2	3.5
One	1	1.8
Two	3	5.3
Three	1	1.8
Not applicable	50	87.7

Females involved

Zero	4	7.0
One	1	1.8
Three	2	3.5
Not applicable	50	87.7

Time of incident

Early	4	7.0
Middle	2	3.5
Late	1	1.8
Not applicable	50	87.7

Severity

High	3	5.3
Medium	2	3.5
Low	2	3.5
Not applicable	50	87.7

Intervention

By patron	2	3.5
By staff	2	3.5
Both	2	3.5
No intervention	1	1.8
Not applicable	50	87.7

Staff involved

Yes	4	7.0
No	3	5.3
Not applicable	50	87.7

Perpetrator

Bouncer	1	1.8
Patron	6	10.5
Not applicable	50	87.7

Location

Inside	4	7.0
Outside	2	3.5
Entrance	1	1.8
Not applicable	50	87.7

Degree of drunkenness of participants		
High	4	7.0
Low	3	5.3
Not applicable	50	87.7

CHALLENGES/THREATS

Total number of challenges/threats		
Zero	45	78.9
One	9	15.8
Two	2	3.5
Three	1	1.8

Male aggressors		
Zero	1	1.8
One	5	8.8
Two	6	10.5
Not applicable	45	78.9

Female aggressors		
Zero	11	19.3
One	1	1.8
Not applicable	45	78.9

Male victims		
Zero	4	7.0
One	4	7.0
Two	3	5.3
Three	1	1.8
Not applicable	45	78.9

Female victims		
Zero	11	19.3
One	1	1.8
Not applicable	45	78.9

Time of incident		
Early	6	10.5
Middle	3	5.3
Late	3	5.3
Not applicable	45	78.9

Severity		
High	2	3.5
Medium	4	7.0
Low	6	10.5
Not applicable	45	78.9

Intervention		
By patron	1	1.8
Clubs & Violence	52	

By staff	6	10.5
Both	1	1.8
No intervention	4	7.0
Not applicable	45	78.9

Staff involved

Yes	6	10.5
No	6	10.5
Not applicable	45	78.9

Perpetrator

Bouncer	1	1.8
Patron	11	19.3
Not applicable	45	78.9

Location

Inside	9	15.8
Outside	2	3.5
Entrance	1	1.8
Not applicable	45	78.9

Degree of drunkenness of participants

High	7	12.3
Medium	5	8.8
Not applicable	45	78.9

OVERALL AGGRESSION

Overall level of non-physical violence

Medium	2	3.5
Low	15	26.3
None	40	70.2

Total number of friendly fights

Zero	47	82.5
One	5	8.8
Two	4	7.0
Three	1	1.8

Physical assault incidents

Zero	50	87.7
One	6	10.5
Two	1	1.8

Weapons

None	54	94.7
Fists	2	3.5
Other	1	1.8

ASSAULTS

Total number of incidents

Zero	51	89.5
One	5	8.8
Two	1	1.8

Male aggressors

One	5	8.8
Two	1	1.8
Not applicable	51	89.5

Female aggressors

Zero	5	8.8
One	1	1.8
Not applicable	51	89.5

Male victims

Zero	1	1.8
One	5	8.8
Not applicable	51	89.5

Female victims

Zero	5	8.8
One	1	1.8
Not applicable	51	89.5

Time of incident

Clubs & Violence	54
------------------	----

Early	1	1.8
Middle	5	8.8
Not applicable	51	89.5

Severity

High	1	1.8
Medium	4	7.0
Low	1	1.8
Not applicable	51	89.5

Intervention

By staff	3	5.3
Both	1	1.8
No intervention	2	3.5
Not applicable	51	89.5

Staff involved

Yes	4	7.0
No	2	3.5
Not applicable	51	89.5

Perpetrator

Patron	6	10.5
Not applicable	51	89.5

Victim precipitation

Yes	3	5.3
No	3	5.3
Not applicable	51	89.5

Extent victim precipitated the attack

Physical provocation	2	3.5
Verbal taunting	1	1.8
Not known/applicable	54	94.7

Bouncer treatment of situation

Inflaming (provoking)	1	1.8
Mediating/defusing	1	1.8
Controlling	1	1.8
Not known/applicable	54	94.7

Location

Inside	5	8.8
Entrance	1	1.8
Not known/applicable	51	89.5

Degree of drunkenness of participants		
High	2	3.5
Medium	3	5.3
Not known/applicable	52	91.2

Property damaged		
Yes	1	1.8
No	56	98.2

REFUSALS

Total ejections		
Zero	47	82.5
One	3	5.3
Two	3	5.3
Three to five	4	7.1

Number of rough ejections		
Zero	50	87.7
One	1	1.8
Two	4	7.0
Three	2	3.5

Number refused admission		
Zero	44	77.2
One	3	5.3
Two	2	3.5
Four	1	1.8
Five	1	1.8
Six	1	1.8
Ten plus	5	8.8

Number of accidents leading to injury		
Zero	54	94.7
One	3	5.3

Overall level of physical violence		
Medium	1	1.8
Low	11	19.3
None	45	78.9

PATRONS (CONT)

Percentage of males		
26-50%	15	26.3
51-75%	30	52.6
76-100%	12	21.1

Number of patrons		
<50	20	35.1
Clubs & Violence	56	

50-99	14	24.6
100-199	14	24.6
200-499	8	14.0
500-999	1	1.8

Minimum number of patrons at any one time

<50	29	50.9
50-99	8	14.0
100-199	13	22.8
200-499	7	12.3

Maximum number of patrons at any one time

<50	19	33.3
50-99	9	15.8
100-199	14	24.6
200-499	12	21.1
500-999	3	5.3

Patrons under 18 years

Yes	12	21.1
No	45	78.9

Age of male patrons

Very young (<21)	12	21.1
Young (22-30)	30	52.6
Middle age (31-45)	13	22.8
Mixed	2	3.5

Age of female patrons

Very young (<21)	20	35.1
Young (22-30)	26	45.6
Middle age (31-45)	8	14.0
Mixed	2	3.5
Not applicable	1	1.8

Groups — male

Zero/not applicable	7	12.3
1-25%	26	45.6
26-50%	19	33.3
51-75%	3	5.3
76-100%	2	3.5

Groups — female

Zero/not applicable	22	38.6
1-25%	23	40.4
26-50%	12	21.1

Groups — couples		
Zero/not applicable	13	22.8
1-25%	34	59.6
26-50%	9	15.8
51-75%	1	1.8
Groups — medium (3-4)		
Zero/not applicable	8	14.0
1-25%	12	21.1
26-50%	18	31.6
51-75%	13	22.8
76-100%	6	10.5
Groups — large		
Zero/not applicable	22	38.6
1-25%	26	45.6
26-50%	9	15.8
Type of group — mixed		
Zero/not applicable	3	5.3
1-25%	17	29.8
26-50%	15	26.3
51-75%	11	19.3
76-100%	11	19.3
Type of group — all female		
Zero/not applicable	15	26.3
1-25%	24	42.1
26-50%	18	31.6
Type of group — all male		
Zero/not applicable	7	12.3
1-25%	17	29.8
26-50%	21	36.8
51-75%	2	3.5
76-100%	10	17.5
Patron familiarity — strangers		
1-25%	8	14.0
26-50%	16	28.1
51-75%	19	33.3
76-100%	14	24.6
Patron familiarity — known to each other		
Zero/not applicable	2	3.5
1-25%	14	24.6
26-50%	25	43.9
51-75%	8	14.0
76-100%	8	14.0

Ethnicity — Anglo Australian		
1-25%	2	3.5
26-50%	2	3.5
51-75%	11	19.3
76-100%	42	73.7
Ethnicity — Middle Eastern		
Zero/not applicable	47	82.5
1-25%	9	15.8
76-100%	1	1.8
Ethnicity — Pacific Islands		
Zero/not applicable	45	78.9
1-25%	8	14.0
26-50%	2	3.5
76-100%	2	3.5
Ethnicity — Aboriginal		
Zero/not applicable	56	98.2
76-100%	1	1.8
Ethnicity — Asian		
Zero/not applicable	32	56.1
1-25%	21	36.8
26-50%	1	1.8
51-75%	2	3.5
76-100%	1	1.8
Ethnicity — Southern European		
Zero/not applicable	36	63.2
1-25%	20	35.1
76-100%	1	1.8
Ethnicity — Other		
Zero/not applicable	47	82.5
1-25%	6	10.5
26-50%	3	5.3
76-100%	1	1.8
Tourists (local and international)		
High	1	1.8
Medium	11	19.3
Low	32	56.1
None	13	22.8
Dress overall — male		
Unkempt	2	3.5
Tidy	48	84.2
Well groomed	7	12.3

Dress overall — female		
Tidy	33	57.9
Well groomed	22	38.6
Not applicable	2	3.5
<hr/>		
Dress by males — business suit		
Zero/not applicable	49	86.0
1-25%	8	14.0
<hr/>		
Dress by males — casual		
Zero/not applicable	49	86.0
1-25%	1	1.8
26-50%	1	1.8
51-75%	3	5.3
76-100%	3	5.3
<hr/>		
Dress by males — dress-up casual		
Zero/not applicable	4	7.0
1-25%	8	14.0
26-50%	7	12.3
51-75%	9	15.8
76-100%	29	50.9
<hr/>		
Dress by males — dress-up		
Zero/not applicable	26	45.6
1-25%	18	31.6
26-50%	5	8.8
51-75%	6	10.5
76-100%	2	3.5
<hr/>		
Dress by males — grunge		
Zero/not applicable	46	80.7
1-25%	10	17.5
76-100%	1	1.8
<hr/>		
Dress by males — other		
Zero/not applicable	54	94.7
1-25%	2	3.5
76-100%	1	1.8
(eg biker clothing, surf clothing, khakis)		
<hr/>		
Dress by females — business suits		
Zero/not applicable	54	94.7
1-26%	2	3.5
51-75%	1	1.8

Dress by females — casual		
Zero/not applicable	53	93.0
1-25%	2	3.5
76-100%	2	3.5
Dress by females — dress-up casual		
Zero/not applicable	7	12.3
1-25%	9	15.8
26-75%	5	8.8
51-75%	12	21.1
76-100%	24	42.1
Dress by females — dress-up		
Zero/not applicable	22	38.6
1-25%	14	24.6
26-50%	10	17.5
51-75%	3	5.3
76-100%	8	14.0
Dress by females — grunge		
Zero/not applicable	50	87.7
1-25%	5	8.8
26-50%	1	1.8
51-75%	1	1.8
Dress by females — other		
Zero/not applicable	56	98.2
76-100%	1	1.8
(eg biker clothing)		
Number of patrons within full view during observation		
<50	28	49.1
50-99	13	22.8
100-199	10	17.5
200-499	3	5.3
No answer	3	5.3
Number of patrons whose conversations were overheard during the observation		
Zero	22	38.6
Two	8	14.0
Three	4	7.0
Four	2	3.5
Five	8	14.0
Six	1	1.8
Ten	3	5.3
Fifteen	3	5.3
Twenty	2	3.5
Thirty	1	1.8
No answer	3	5.3
Clubs & Violence	61	

BAR STAFF

Bar staff — percentage male/female

100% male	11	19.3
75% male/25% female	9	15.8
50% male/50% female	18	31.6
25% male/75% female	12	21.1
100% female	7	12.3

Age of bar staff

Young	42	73.7
Mixed ages	12	21.1
Old	2	3.5
No answer	1	1.8

Presentation of bar staff

All uniformed	37	64.9
Some uniformed/some not	7	12.3
Formal	3	5.3
Informal	8	14.0
No answer	2	3.5

Ethnicity of staff — Anglo Australian

51-75%	3	5.3
76-100%	54	94.7

Ethnicity of staff — Pacific Islands

Zero/not applicable	49	86.0
1-25%	6	10.5
26-50%	2	3.5

Ethnicity of staff — Asian

Zero/not applicable	54	94.7
1-25%	3	5.3

Staff ethnicity compared to patrons

Matched	46	80.7
Unmatched	11	19.3

Staff gender compared to patrons

Matched	30	52.6
Unmatched	27	47.4

Availability of staff

Plenty	19	33.3
Adequate	30	52.6
Few	8	14.0

Staff acceptance of deviant behaviour		
Not permissive	11	19.3
Slightly permissive	13	22.8
Permissive	4	7.0
Very permissive	2	3.5
Not applicable	27	47.4

Staff ability to diffuse aggression		
Very good	3	5.3
Good	16	28.1
Poor	4	7.0
Very poor	1	1.8
No aggression to diffuse	33	57.9

Ratio of bar staff to patrons		
1 to 10	15	26.3
1 to 20	23	40.4
1 to 40	13	22.8
1 to 50	5	8.8
Less than 1 to 50	1	1.8

Staff interaction with patrons		
Hostile and rude	1	1.8
No interaction with patrons	11	19.3
Reserved	14	24.6
Friendly	29	50.9
Sitting with patrons	1	1.8
No answer	1	1.8

ALCOHOL/DRUG CONSUMPTION AND COSTS

Drinking rates — male		
High (>4/hr)	16	28.1
Medium (3-4/hr)	29	50.9
Low (1-2/hr)	12	21.1

Drinking rates — female		
High (>4/hr)	7	12.3
Medium (3-4/hr)	25	43.9
Low (1-2/hr)	20	35.1
Very low (<1/hr)	3	5.3
Not applicable	2	3.5

Drunkenness — male		
High	6	10.5
Medium	26	45.6
Low	20	35.1
None	5	8.8

Drunkenness — female		
High	2	3.5
Medium	24	42.1
Low	19	33.3
None	12	21.1
Shouting rounds		
High	3	5.3
Medium	10	17.5
Low	28	49.1
None	16	28.1
Male drinks consumed — normal beer		
1-25%	5	8.8
26-50%	31	54.4
51-75%	17	29.9
76-100%	4	7.0
Male drinks consumed — light beer		
Zero/not applicable	41	71.9
1-25%	14	24.6
26-50%	2	3.5
Male drinks consumed — straight spirits		
Zero/not applicable	36	63.2
1-25%	18	31.6
26-50%	3	5.3
Male drinks consumed — mixed spirits		
Zero/not applicable	6	10.5
1-25%	19	33.3
26-50%	27	47.4
51-75%	3	5.3
76-100%	2	3.5
Male drinks consumed — cocktails		
Zero/not applicable	52	91.2
1-25%	2	3.5
26-50%	3	5.3
Male drinks consumed — wine		
Zero/not applicable	56	98.2
1-25%	1	1.8
Male drinks consumed — soft drinks		
Zero/not applicable	45	78.9
1-25%	12	21.1
Male drinks consumed — water		
Zero/not applicable	45	78.9
Clubs & Violence	64	

1-25%	11	19.3
26-50%	1	1.8

Female drinks consumed — normal beer

Zero/not applicable	27	47.4
1-25%	20	35.1
26-50%	8	14.0
51-76%	2	3.5

Female drinks consumed— light beer

Zero/not applicable	37	64.9
1-25%	11	19.3
26-50%	9	15.8

Female drinks consumed — straight spirits

Zero/not applicable	54	94.7
1-25%	3	5.3

Female drinks consumed — mixed spirits

Zero/not applicable	10	17.5
1-25%	4	7.0
26-50%	22	38.6
51-75%	10	17.5
76-100%	11	19.3

Female drinks consumed — cocktails

Zero/not applicable	23	40.4
1-25%	24	42.1
26-50%	6	10.5
51-75%	4	7.0

Female drinks consumed — wine

Zero/not applicable	31	54.4
1-25%	20	35.1
26-50%	4	7.0
51-75%	2	3.5

Female drinks consumed — soft drinks

Zero/not applicable	41	71.9
1-25%	16	28.1

Female drinks consumed — water

Zero/not applicable	41	71.9
1-25%	15	26.3
26-50%	1	1.8

Male drinking containers — bottles		
Zero/not applicable	3	5.3
1-25%	15	26.3
26-50%	26	45.6
51-75%	4	7.0
76-100%	9	15.8
Male drinking containers — cans		
Zero/not applicable	52	91.2
1-25%	5	8.8
Male drinking containers — middies		
Zero/not applicable	10	17.5
1-25%	12	21.1
26-50%	23	40.4
51-75%	10	17.5
76-100%	2	3.5
Male drinking containers — schooners		
Zero/not applicable	39	68.4
1-25%	6	10.5
26-50%	11	19.3
76-100%	1	1.8
Male drinking containers — plastic cups		
Zero/not applicable	47	82.5
1-25%	2	3.5
26-50%	3	5.3
51-75%	1	1.8
76-100%	4	7.0
Female drinking containers — bottles		
Zero/not applicable	15	26.3
1-25%	19	33.3
26-50%	19	33.3
76-100%	4	7.0
Female drinking containers — cans		
Zero/not applicable	54	94.7
1-25%	3	5.3
Female drinking containers — middies		
Zero/not applicable	13	22.8
1-25%	5	8.8
26-50%	15	26.3
51-75%	12	21.1
76-100%	12	21.1
Female drinking containers — schooners		
Zero/not applicable	45	78.9
Clubs & Violence	66	

1-25%	4	7.0
26-50%	7	1.8
51-75%	1	1.8

Female drinking containers — plastic cups

Zero/not applicable	48	84.2
51-75%	3	5.3
76-100%	6	10.5

Cover charge

High (>\$5)	17	29.8
Low (<\$5)	13	22.8
None	27	47.4

Cost of drinks

Inexpensive (<\$3)	2	3.5
Average (\$3-\$3.50)	21	36.8
Expensive (>\$3.50)	34	59.6

Water

Free	44	77.2
Cost	10	17.5
Not applicable	3	5.3

Drug consumption — male

Not applicable	56	98.2
Cocaine	1	1.8

Drug consumption — female

Not applicable	57	100.0
----------------	----	-------

Drug dealing on premises

Some	3	5.3
None apparent	54	94.7

HOST RESPONSIBILITY SERVING PRACTICES

Publicity to clientele

Underage drinking warning	9	15.8
House policy notice	7	12.3
Request to leave premises quietly	1	1.8
Patron care sign	4	7.0
Other	3	5.3
None	12	21.1
More than one above	21	36.8

Self-testing breathalysers

Obvious	1	1.8
Not obvious	12	21.1
Clubs & Violence	67	

None available	44	77.2
Promotion of consumption		
Happy hour	9	15.8
Drink promotions	14	24.6
Gimmicks	3	5.3
Nothing	27	47.4
More than one	4	7.0
Staff intervention with highly intoxicated patrons		
In every case	2	3.5
Sometimes	14	24.6
No intervention	2	3.5
No highly intoxicated patrons	39	68.4
Nature of intervention with highly intoxicated patrons		
Refusal of service	6	10.5
Offer food	1	1.8
Other	9	15.8
No intoxicated patrons	39	68.4
Not applicable	2	3.5
Transport organised by establishment for patrons		
Yes	1	1.8
No	56	98.2
Form of transport		
Offered privately	1	1.8
Not applicable	56	98.2
Unsolicited service		
Yes	3	5.3
No	48	84.2
Sometimes	4	7.0
No answer	2	3.5
Pressure to drink		
Yes	2	3.5
No	52	91.2
Sometimes	1	1.8
No answer	2	3.5
Appropriate service		
Yes	18	31.6
No	34	59.6
Sometimes	3	5.3
No answer	2	3.5
Patron ignored		
Yes	2	3.5
No	48	84.2
Clubs & Violence	68	

Sometimes	5	8.8
No answer	2	3.5

Service delay

Yes	3	5.3
No	43	75.4
Sometimes	9	15.8
No answer	2	3.5

Offer of alternatives

No	55	96.5
No answer	2	3.5

Service denied

Yes	3	5.3
No	49	86.0
Sometimes	3	5.3
No answer	2	3.5

Management called

Yes	2	3.5
No	50	87.7
Sometimes	3	5.3
No answer	2	3.5