

April 2004

Drinks at Dons : an observational study of alcohol and violence in a campus setting.

Robyn Lincoln

Bond University, Robyn_Lincoln@bond.edu.au

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

Recommended Citation

Lincoln, Robyn, "Drinks at Dons : an observational study of alcohol and violence in a campus setting." (2004). *Humanities & Social Sciences papers*. Paper 83.

http://epublications.bond.edu.au/hss_pubs/83

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

DRINKS @ DON'S

**an observational study of
alcohol and violence in a
campus setting**

Centre for Applied Psychology & Criminology

Bond University

April 2004

**First published in 2004 by
Centre for Applied Psychology and Criminology
Bond University
Gold Coast 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 2004

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 please contact the Centre for Applied Psychology and Criminology on 5595 2659 or fax 5595 2672 or email rlincoln@staff.bond.edu.au.

Contents

Abstract	4
Acknowledgements	5
Background to the Study	8
Limitations of the Study	12
Initial Observations	14
Quantitative Observations	17
Conclusions	20
References	21

Appendices

1. Observation Timetable
2. Observation Schedule
3. Codebook
4. Layout of the Venue

Abstract

The aim of this study was to assess the influence alcohol consumption on violence within a public bar in a university setting. This replicates earlier studies by Homel and colleagues on pubs and nightclubs in cities and tourist precincts throughout Australia since the late 1980s. However, the specific focus of the present study was on a licensed venue within a university campus environment – an observational project that has not previously been undertaken in this country.

The observations were made by both undergraduate and postgraduate students enrolled in a criminology research methods subject. The same observation questionnaire used in the previous studies (1993, 1994, 1996 and 1999) was utilised in this data collection phase with some minor amendments. The data were collected from a single establishment over a period of five weeks between 17 February and 20 March 2004. The majority of the observations were made between 6.30pm to 8.30pm and 10.00pm to 12.30am on Thursday nights.

The overall findings revealed that violence was minimal during the observation period, with only one real incident of note, which occurred outside the facility and had no intervention of staff. Around one-third of all males displayed medium levels of drunkenness, while just under one-third of females displayed the same level of drunkenness. Males constituted up to three-quarters of the patrons, but tended to be observed in groups of mixed sex. This study suggests that practices in place in university settings may be 'more responsible' than at major commercial venues. However, the fact that Australia's 'wet drinking culture' prevails certainly requires attention.

Acknowledgements

The format and concept for this report were originally derived from a paper by Lincoln and Homel which was presented to the Australian Institute of Criminology Roundtable on 'Alcohol, Young People and Violence' on 13 December 1999; as well as a previous student project presented in a report by Lincoln and Mustchin (2000); and a related chapter by Lincoln and Homel (2001).

This research would not have been possible without the earlier groundwork done by Professor Ross Homel from the School of Criminology and Criminal Justice at Griffith University in initially developing the extensive observational questionnaire based on research in New South Wales licensed venues. He and his colleagues then established the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project and evaluated the program over three data collection periods. We are grateful for their generosity in making this research opportunity possible and in allowing us to model our study on theirs, which gave us a solid start and boundaries to work within.

The research would also not have been possible without the dedicated and enthusiastic scheduling, data collection, data entry and analyses by the students undertaking the Criminological Research Methods (CRIM 11-110/72-110) subject at Bond University in the January semester of 2004. It is essential to give credit to each of those students, as they all gave substantial amounts of hours and completed the survey forms in a rigorous and scientific manner (see Appendix 1).

Thank you to Gemma Halliday and Ryan Clarke for the preliminary study that was constructed after many visits to the tavern. The questionnaires would have been far too lengthy and repetitive without their keen observations.

Thank you to Nicholas Falle for reviewing the relevant literature. His task was to research any new literature published since the previous studies, as well as

summarise more specific literature on campus drinking venues and/or students and alcohol use.

The observation sessions were made easier because Simon King and Beth Orchard redrafted the original questionnaire. They adapted the questions to suit a single venue within a university campus and made the schedule as useful and user friendly as possible.

Emma Petherick had the task to schedule all the observation times as well as the schedule of other duties. She faced many obstacles including early closures of the tavern and the impending deadline for the project. Despite these difficulties, all was re-shuffled and distributed efficiently.

Thank you to Leah Styles who did the coding and data entry into SPSS. Her tasks included the initial cleaning of the data, coding and finally inputting. This required enormous speed and accuracy due to the tight timelines.

Many thanks to Dennis Johnsson and Åse Høyem Anderssen for embracing the statistical analysis duties so expeditiously. Their tasks also included the final cleaning of the frequencies and extraction for the codebook.

Thank you to Benjamin Squillari for entering these frequencies into the codebook. This task required swiftness and accuracy as the project neared its conclusion.

Thank you to Stuart Bates for assembling the qualitative material extracted from the observation schedules. This task involved full analysis of all the case studies as well as a keen and careful editing technique.

One of the most important tasks was handled by Lesley Brown, who extracted the required information from her colleagues for the compilation of the final report. In addition to the final editing, Lesley also handled the design of this document.

A very big thank you to Robyn Lincoln for all the support and guidance she has given us all through the duration of this project. Robyn also filled in for observers unable to make shifts when required.

Finally, once again thank you to everyone again for their dedication, support and effort applied in this study, including the many hours spent in Don's Tavern to accomplish this project.

Background to the Study

The present study replicates alcohol-related violence studies that were completed in various locations in New South Wales and Queensland (Homel et al 1994, 1997a, 1997b; Hauritz et al 1998). Unlike these previous studies, however, the location observed was a single venue – a public access tavern on a university campus. The previous studies originally focused on comparisons between drinking venues with the view that ecological factors would distinguish licensed premises that characterised high versus low violence (Homel & Clark 1994). While these studies found some credence to this approach – shabby and unkempt premises were more likely to attract violent behaviours – it was also noted that internal changes within a venue could exacerbate previously low levels of violence (Homel & Clark 1994). Thus the later studies focused particularly on patron and staff behaviours within the pubs and clubs that had the potential to impact on verbal and physical violence.

The most recent of those studies was completed in 1999 (Lincoln & Mustchin 2000; Lincoln & Homel 2001) in the Surfers Paradise precinct. This observational project found that, even three years after the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project had ended some possible residual impact was present. This is reflected in the fact that physical violence had remained lower than the 1993 pre-intervention level but verbal violence had increased beyond the 1993 pre-intervention levels. It is not clear whether the regulations and safe drinking practices were dampening physical violence or whether these were ‘displaced’ into more verbal interactions.

Since that group of studies was conducted, there has again been considerable public attention directed toward drinking and violence in licensed venues in Australia. For example, the former Australian cricketer David Hookey died following a scuffle with a bouncer outside a nightclub in Melbourne in January this year (Murphy & Hoare 2004). This incident (yet to be adjudicated in the courts) rekindled public debate about the training of bouncers and the role of nightclub security staff in violent incidents in entertainment precincts (*The Australian* 21 January 2004, p.12). More

recent actions by rugby league players have also garnered much public attention and discussion about alcohol-fuelled behaviours. Their actions have included lewd behaviours extending to alleged sexual assaults (Jeffrey 2004).

Empirical evidence suggests the drinking behaviours of young people merit particular attention which is the reason for undertaking the present study in a university location where the vast majority of patrons are under age 25. The consumption of alcohol, particularly in the form of binge drinking, is central to young people's culture. One Australian study (Taylor & Carroll 2001, p.19) found 51% of males and 36% of females aged 18 to 24 consumed five or more drinks on their last drinking occasion. Additionally, 30% of males and 15% of females consumed 10 or more drinks. These levels of consumption must be taken within the context of Australia's acknowledged 'wet' drinking culture (Room 1988). National household surveys endorse this point noting that the majority of adult Australians consume alcohol at least once a week with 21% being categorised as harmful, heavy or binge drinkers (Makkai 1998) and the problem is most acute for young people (Hollin & McMurrin 1993).

There is a growing body of evidence beyond the long term psychological and physiological risks of 'heavy' alcohol consumption amongst young adults illustrating the relationship between drinking and violent behaviour (Whelan 1999). In a review of the empirical research, Finney (2004) notes the peak location for violent offending is around outlets which serve alcohol and the chances of being involved in a violent incident increase sharply when drinking more than 8 or 10 units of alcohol on one occasion. In addition, Marsh and Fox-Kibby (1992) report that violent incidents outside licensed venues can be linked to large groups of intoxicated people queuing for transport facilities. Furthermore, males defined as 'young and single' are the most likely candidates for perpetuating, or being victimised during an alcohol-related incident, and overall males tend to drink more than females (Taylor & Carroll 2001). In particular university students are a vulnerable group in terms of becoming a victim of violence (British Home Office 2004).

Research suggests security staff have an important role in preventing or escalating violent behaviour of patrons in licensed venues. More than one-third of violent incidents on licensed premises featured security staff as participants, 'often as alleged perpetrators' (Maguire & Nettleton 2004, p.4). Similarly, Lincoln and Mustchin (2000) found that security staff contributed to levels of violence in Queensland nightclubs. As security staff play such a key role in managing behaviour, it is vital to review the regulation of such individuals.

It is the responsibility of the Queensland Government Office of Fair Trading and Consumer Affairs to regulate security staff. In the 1993 Security Providers Act, security personnel in charge of maintaining order in and around a public place are referred to as 'Crowd Controllers'. The Act notes that 'such individuals must be licensed by the State in which the licensed premises operate'. To qualify for a licence, an individual must be over 18 years of age and completed an approved training course. Furthermore, the Queensland Office of Fair Trading and Consumer Affairs (2004) states the individual must be an appropriate candidate for a security provider's licence (i.e. not be dishonest, lack integrity or use harassing tactics, not have criminal involvement in unlawful activities, and not have a recorded conviction of a disqualifying offence within the previous 10 years). There is no formal research, however, on the effectiveness of training programs or the problems of subjectively labelling someone as being of 'good character' (see Mason & Wilson 1992).

The behaviour of individuals is also affected by the design and physical environment of licensed venues. Macintyre and Homel (1997) found crowding in a venue was related to aggressive incidents, especially in the areas around the bar, bathrooms, dance floor, and entry/exit doors. Similarly, in many licensed venues geared towards young people, loud music has also been linked to aggressive behaviour (Donnerstein & Wilson, 1976). Macintyre and Homel (1997, p.94) note 'violent occasions are characterised by subtle interactions of several variables' and this should be reflected upon before exaggerating the importance of any one factor in influencing behaviour.

This view is further supported by research into crime prevention techniques, such as the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project (Homel et al 1994; Hauritz et al 1998). It briefly noted that licensed venues and law enforcement agencies must tackle violence from a number of perspectives to curb alcohol-related aggression, rather than impose the current early closing time of 3am now in effect at most Surfers Paradise nightclubs. The current debate around closing times merely underscores the importance of having well-constructed crime prevention programs along with well-designed evaluation research to yield robust data on which these decisions could be made based on such empirical evidence rather than on political or local views.

Limitations to the Study

Like most research projects, this study has a number of deficiencies that should be modified in any future studies. The deficiencies are both structural and practical; some are avoidable while others could not have been predicted. The limitations of this study included inconsistent closing times, as well as observers absent for their shifts. We sought to overcome these problems by altering the observation schedule to reflect possible closing times and distributing updated copies of these changes to the observers. Further, any shifts added were highlighted before being sent out at the end of the study.

Observers were questioned several times if they had any problems with the times they were scheduled. Many observers, however, still changed shift times with other observers. Yet, some observers still failed to turn up for shifts or cancelled too close to the shift's commencement for a replacement to be organised. Thus one major pragmatic issue is the allocation of observers to scheduled times. In the end this meant that we failed to achieve our target of 50 observation sessions. But given that this was of a single venue with no comparison and very few instances of violence observed, it is our view that more observation sessions would not have yielded different results from those achieved.

Another major problem was that despite our rigorous 'pilot study' conducted on the venue and our extensive reworking of the questionnaire, the final observation instrument still contains many variables or categories that did not apply to this particular venue or that were ambiguously worded which resulted in some confusion for the observers. For example, it was initially noted that many students on campus were from the USA where the drinking age is 21 and therefore their behaviour in a licensed venue where the drinking age is 18 may have differed from their local counterparts. Yet, we failed to take account of this in the observational instrument and left the 'ethnicity' categories as they had originally been devised.

These were therefore not relevant to the composition of the patrons we were observing.

A final problem is that there was insufficient training overall in completing the observational instrument, as had been previously recommended by Ross Homel. This meant that observational teams were not always certain of the specific meanings of some variables and categories. Therefore the data are perhaps not as rigorous as they might otherwise be. Clearly, this impacted on our abilities to code the data and the codebook displays some apparent inconsistencies. However, for all these limitations, this observational research has been a valuable tool us as students of criminological research methods in designing and implementing a study; in collecting data and then coding and cleaning it; and in producing results and attempting to interpret them.

Initial Observations

The venue is a privately owned licensed premises that contracts with Bond University, but is part of the university's operations. Opening hours are Monday to Wednesday from 11am until 10.30pm, Thursday and Friday 11am until midnight, Saturday from 4pm until midnight, and closed on Sunday. These hours are merely a guideline as the venue often closes earlier, depending on the patronage. It should be noted that the university is not representative of most universities as it is privately funded with approximately 2,500 students in attendance from all around the world. The January and September semesters are noticeably busier with many students on exchange or study abroad programs. A large proportion of these students are from the United States, and form an integral part of our observation since the legal drinking age in the United States is 21, versus 18 in Australia.

Lunch and dinner for resident students is provided by the Brassiere eight times a week, Monday to Thursday, served and located at the rear of the bar. Non-alcoholic beverages range from water to post mix, and a large selection of alcoholic beverages including beer, spirits and liqueurs are available during operating hours. The venue has a sign on the front door entrance reserving the right to eject unruly people, refusal to serve intoxicated patrons, and stating those under 18 years of age are not permitted by law. Smoking within the establishment is also strictly prohibited except outside in the beer garden/deck area.

The nearest licensed venue is the Robina Tavern, located roughly three to four kilometres to the west. Transport includes buses into Surfers Paradise on Thursday evenings, and taxis for which there is a phone to use within the venue. There is also a nearby car park. The bar staff are not all employed as bar tenders, some work shifts between the bar and Brassiere and others are 'glassies' (usually males) who go

around cleaning and collecting empty glasses. Overall, this licensed tavern has a comfortable, desirable appearance and is air-conditioned.

Inside the establishment there are 15 tables, roughly one and a half metres apart, with a total of 90 chairs. There are a further 16 round tables higher than the others, and capable of seating an extra 48 patrons. Additionally, there are five couches, each capable of seating three people comfortably and 13 individual cushions. The bar itself has five beer mats, one glass of tall straws, one glass of short straws, two cash registers, 15 spirit dispensers and three separate serving areas. At the time of observation, there were 17 high barstools located around the bar area but this is subject to variation (see Appendix 4 for map of the premises).

There are four pool tables that sit approximately three metres apart, seven arcade games virtually right next to one another while one other is isolated. A touch sensitive jukebox is across the room, approximately ten metres from the bar. There is one cigarette machine by the front entrance towards the right hand side, and one food vending machine around the corner from the cigarette machine. Four televisions, one data projector, and eight speakers are hung around the inside area from the ceiling. Nine doors, four exit doors equipped with plainly visible signs and five entry doors are the only way in and out of the venue. In the south-east corner there is a black entertainment stage, measuring four metres by two metres, which is laid out for performance purposes.

Outside the venue on a raised wooden platform, there are four tables with four chairs that are spaced two metres apart, two of the higher round tables are one metre apart, and three picnic tables are roughly five metres apart (capable of seating four). There is also one pool table outside in the middle of the patio. Both the picnic and pool tables are underneath a white tarp in addition to five other large white umbrellas. During our initial observations, the inside area was capable of comfortably seating 165 people, and outside a more modest 34. There are steps in the beer garden that lead up to the second floor of the residential south tower and are

accessible and steep. Thirteen black ashtrays, two silver floor ashtrays, one white ashtray bin, and three white 'bucket' sized bins lined with green bin liners are arranged on and around tables on the patio in the beer garden.

The tables inside are black, as are the upper round tables and stools by the bar. The couches are light brown in colour and the individual cushions are light grey. The carpet is an odd mix of brown and black speckles with long, brown curtains hanging on the windows. The tiles outside are red and the colour of the window frames are turquoise.

The women's restroom comprises six cubicles, six sinks 20 centimetres apart, two hand dryers, three soap dispensers and two rubbish bins. The men's restroom consists of four urinals, two of which are grouped together roughly 85 centimetres apart; the other pair is spaced one metre apart. Further, there are four sinks 70 centimetres apart. There are also two cubicles with doors that close and are connected to one another. The men's toilet has two hand dryers, three soap dispensers and two rubbish bins. Both these restrooms are clean with white tiles, but the sinks in the women's toilet are dark blue as opposed to the men's white ones.

Quantitative Observations

With respect to the observation sessions it was noted that the venue closes at a specified time, but on 46% of occasions it closed early which impacted on the number of sessions. Most observation sessions were on Thursdays (54%) as this was deemed from personal experience and the pilot study to be the most patronised night on the campus. The observation periods were relatively evenly divided across time slots from 6pm until close at midnight (with a range of six to nine and a mode of seven). There was also reasonable equivalence across the observational teams with an average of six each for the six groups but a range from four to eight.

The lighting in the venue was deemed 'dim' by 62% of observers. The seating capacity (approximately 150) was seen as adequate (73%) with divergent opinions as to whether it was mainly for standing (46%). The venue has a wide range of seating style from tables and benches in the outdoor 'beer garden/deck', along with comfortable lounges in one corner, plus high bar stools and tables. The décor was seen as ordinary or neutral by most observers (over 80%), relatively clean (73%), with comfortable ventilation (73%), and the upkeep was at an acceptable level (62% 'okay' and 27% 'well cared for').

Access to the bar was observed as convenient by most teams (89%) although later in the schedule observers rated it as 'medium crowding' (37%). Where both male and female toilets could be accessed by observers there were few occasions where they were described as 'dirty' (11% male and 13% female). Transport is available from the venue where taxis sit on the rank, buses are sometimes provided by university clubs or for special functions, and public transport is accessible at the bus stop under half a kilometre away.

In general crowding and movement was medium to low with overall comfort classified as medium (84%) by the observers. Both male and female patrons

interacted infrequently with strangers, sexual competition was not observed (62% 'none' for both males and females), and little overt sexual activity was evidenced (males 'none' 65% and females 'none' 68%).

Entertainment offered included music video, television, cable channels, bands, jukebox, dancing, pool tables and games machines which were available most of the time but it did depend on the night and whether there was a special campus function. Music when played tended to be popular Top 40. Meals were served for resident students on 16% of visits where special 'Mexican' nights or 'barbeques' are offered by campus caterings as an alternative to Brasserie meals.

Both males (59%) and females (54%) showed medium levels of cheerfulness and they tended to be reasonably friendly or social (51% 'medium' for males and females). Almost no roughness, bumping, rowdiness, swearing or hostility by male or female patrons was evidenced (ranging from 65% to over 90% rating 'none'). The patrons were mostly USA study abroad student with up to three-quarters being males on most observation occasions. They were 18 years and over (92%), in mixed sex groups (86%), known to each other (68%), of an Anglo origin (73%), in casual dress and with the not unexpected tendency for females to 'dress-up' more frequently (30% for females versus 8% for males).

The bar staff were mostly male of mixed age in casual uniforms (tee-shirts with venue logo), of Anglo origin and tended to be 'friendly' with patrons (73%). The security staff numbers ranged from one to over six of medium build (81%) and reserved (30%) to friendly (65%) toward patrons. ID requests at the door were deemed 'rigorous' (59%) by our observational teams but on quiet nights there were no checks (16%). Security staff both patrolled and remained stationary (68%) for most visits.

With respect to observations of violence there were three non-physical one-way verbal conflicts witnessed by males on both male and female victims with low to

medium levels of severity. Two of these were inside the venue. No non-physical arguments of a two-way kind were observed. One observational session included three incidents of threats/challenges by males on males outside the venue. According to observers there were 26 incidents of friendly 'lion-cub' fights mostly inside the venue with low to medium levels of drunkenness, mostly male aggressors and little staff involvement. Only one physical assault was witnessed, which was male on male and outside the venue. In addition there were three ejections and two refusals of admission. Overall however there was little violence observed and indeed in 59% of visits 'none' was the response.

Male drinking was low to medium with similar resulting levels of drunkenness and both of these measures were somewhat lower for females. Most patrons drank beer with some observable water and soft drink consumption and low levels of spirit consumption. Plastic cups are used on the heavily patronised Thursday night sessions but not at other times. Patrons tended not to get involved in shouting rounds (assessed as 'none' at 30% and 'low' at 46%) which fits with a student population. No cover charge is the norm (89%) and water is available free of charge. Very low levels of illicit drug use were seen but one or two patrons were deemed to be using heroin and some observer teams thought there was drug dealing in evidence (16%).

There were signs about underage drinking, house policy and patron care clearly displayed in the venue. However, there were some drinks promotions observed (35%). Overall there were few sessions where intoxicated persons were seen (76% of occasions) and therefore very little inappropriate service (49%). Often it was these categories that elicited confusion from the observation teams where it was not always clear whether there were no intoxicated persons (a not applicable category) or whether there was no inappropriate service (a 'no' response).

Conclusions

The data collected over the five week observation period were analysed with the statistical software SPSS. The findings indicated Thursday nights between 8pm and midnight were the busiest times. The music played most of the time was of the Top 40 variety. Roughly 87% of the patrons were in mixed female/male groups. About 67% of the patrons knew each other. Further, 73% of the patrons were of Anglo-origin. In 54% of the observation sessions, 51-75% of the patrons were males.

Overall, there was very little violence at this licensed premise. The observations indicate that there were no ejections due to violence (91%), however a few 'lion cub' (friendly fights) were noted in 17% of the observational sessions. Alcohol consumption was observed to be medium at three to four drinks an hour in 35% of the observational sessions. Very low alcohol consumption was observed in one-quarter of the sessions.

Bouncers' interactions with patrons were perceived to be friendly in 65% of the periods, and they seemed pleasant and relaxed most of the time. The control and patrol style they used most was patrolling and stationary at 67%. There were both male and female bouncers and predominately Anglo origin and of medium size.

Our research shows that violence within this university setting is minimal, with most patrons behaving appropriately. While there were some minor altercations, the majority were not notable enough to cause concern. The staff responses were generally appropriate and there was adequate security, ID checking and patron care signage. Of significance, is that the single major observed incident of violence took place outside the venue. This finding underscores the need for responsible serving practices to operate beyond the boundaries of licensed premises and for a more 'whole-of-community' crime prevention approach to be adopted.

References

- British Home Office (2004). *Crimes Against Students: Emerging Lessons for Reducing Student Victimisation*, Research, Development and Statistics Directorate, Home Office Development and Practice Report, London.
- Donnerstein, E. & Wilson, D.W. (1976). Effects of Noise and Perceived Control on Ongoing and Subsequent Behaviour in Homel, R. (ed) *Policing for Prevention: Reducing Crime, Public Intoxication and Injury*, Crime Prevention Studies Volume 7, Willow Tree Press, New York.
- Finney, A. (2004). *Violence in the Night-Time Economy: Key Findings from the Research*, Home Office Research Findings 214, Home Office, London.
- Hauritz, M., Homel, R., McIlwain, G., Burrows, T. & Townsley, M. (1998). Reducing Violence in Licensed Venues through Community Safety Action Projects: The Queensland Experience, *Contemporary Drug Problems* 25, 511-551.
- Hollin, C.R. & McMurrin, M. (1993). *Young Offenders and Alcohol-Related Crime*, John Wiley & Sons, London.
- Homel, R. & Clark J. (1994). The Prediction and Prevention of Violence in Pubs and Clubs in Clarke R.V. (ed) *Crime Prevention Studies*, Willow Tree Press, New York.
- Homel, R., Hauritz, M., Wortley, R., Clarke, J. & Carvolth, R. (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, Brisbane.
- Homel, R., Hauritz, M., McIlwain, G., Wortley, R. & Carvolth, R. (1997a). Preventing Drunkenness and Violence Around Nightclubs in a Tourist Resort in Clarke R.V. (ed) *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, Harrow & Heston, New York.
- Homel, R., Hauritz, M., Wortley, R., McIlwain, G. & Carvolth, R. (1997b). Preventing Alcohol-Related Crime Through Community Action: The Surfers Paradise Safety Action Project in Homel R. (ed) *Policing for Prevention: Reducing Crime, Public Intoxication and Injury*, Crime Prevention Studies Volume 7, Willow Tree Press, New York.
- Jeffrey, N. (2004). Scandal Can't Tarnish Game's Jewel, *The Australian* 27 May, 1.
- Lincoln, R. & Homel, R. (2001). Alcohol and Youthful Rites of Passage in Williams, P. (ed) *Alcohol, Young Persons and Violence*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Lincoln, R. & Mustchin, M. (2000). *Clubs and Violence: A Follow-Up Evaluation of the Surfers Paradise Safety Action Plan*, Centre for Applied Psychology and Criminology, Bond University.

- Macintyre, S. & Homel, R. (1997). Danger on the Dance Floor: A Study of Interior Design, Crowding and Aggression in Nightclubs in Homel, R. (ed) *Policing for Prevention: Reducing Crime, Public Intoxication and Injury*, Crime Prevention Studies Volume 7, Willow Tree Press, New York.
- Maguire, M. & Nettleton, H. (2004). *Evaluation of Targeted Police Initiatives*, Home Office Research Report, London.
- Makkai, T. (1998). *Alcohol and Disorder in the Australian Community: Part II Perpetrators*, Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice No 77, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Marsh, P. & Fox-Kibby, K. (1992). *Drinking and Public Disorder*, The Portman Group, London.
- Mason, G. & Wilson, P. (1992). Alcohol and Crime in Wilson, P. (ed) *Issues in Crime, Morality and Justice*, Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra.
- Murphy, P. & Hoare, D. (2004). Hookes Landed the First Punch, *The Australian*, 22 January, 1.
- Queensland Office of Fair Trading and Consumer Affairs (2004). *Security Providers* accessed from <http://www.fairtrading.qld.gov.au/oft/>
- Room, R. (1988). The Dialectic of Drinking in Australian Life, *Australian Drug and Alcohol Review*, 7, 413-437.
- Taylor, J. & Carroll, T. (2001). Youth Alcohol Consumption: Experiences and Expectations in Williams, P. (ed) *Alcohol, Young Persons and Violence*, Australian Institute of Criminology Research and Public Policy Series No 35, Canberra.
- Whelan, G. (1999). Alcohol Dependence, *Australian Doctor* 19 March, 1-7.

Appendix 1: Observation Timetable

Student Observers Groups		Allocation			
		Early	Middle	Late	Total
Ase	1. Ase & Beth	3	3	3	9
Benjamin	2. Benjamin & Dennis	4	4	1	9
Beth	3. Emma & Leah	3	3	3	9
Dennis	4. Gemma & Lesley	4	3	2	9
Emma	5. Nick & Simon	3	5	1	10
Gemma	6. Ryan & Stewart	3	5	1	9
Leah					
Lesley					
Nick					
Ryan					
Simon					
Stuart					

Observation Roster

Week 1	Tuesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Early 6pm-8pm	Ase & Beth	Gemma & Lesley	Ryan & Stewart	Benjamin & Dennis
Middle 8pm-10pm	Benjamin & Dennis	Nick & Simon	Gemma & Lesley	Nick & Simon
Late 10pm-12am	Emma & Leah	Benjamin & Dennis	Ase & Beth	Ryan & Stewart

Week 2	Tuesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Early 6:30pm-8:30pm	Ryan & Stewart	Emma & Leah	Nick & Simon	Emma & Leah
Middle 8:30pm-10:30pm	Gemma & Lesley	Ryan & Stewart Nick & Simon	Emma & Leah	Ase & Beth
Late 10pm-12am		Ase & Beth Gemma & Lesley		Nick & Simon

Week 3	Tuesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Early 6:30pm- 8:30pm	Ase & Beth	Gemma & Lesley	Ase & Beth	Gemma & Lesley
Middle 8:30pm- 10:30pm	Ryan & Stewart	Ase & Beth Benjamin & Dennis	Emma & Leah	Ase & Beth
Late 10pm-12am		Nick & Simon Emma & Leah		

Week 4	Tuesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Early 6:30pm- 8:30pm	Nick & Simon	Ryan & Stewart	Benjamin & Dennis	Benjamin & Dennis
Middle 8:30pm- 10:30pm	Benjamin & Dennis	Benjamin & Dennis / Ryan & Stewart	Nick & Simon	Emma & Leah
Late 10pm-12am		Emma & Leah / Ase & Beth		

Week 5	Tuesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
Early 6:30pm- 8:30pm	Nick & Simon	Emma & Leah	Benjamin & Dennis	Gemma & Lesley
Middle 8:30pm- 10:30pm	Gemma & Lesley	Ryan & Stewart	Ryan & Stewart	Nick & Simon
Late 10pm-12am		Gemma & Lesley		

Amendments were made to this roster as the weeks progressed to cater for extra functions and early close times. Weekly rosters are presented here as the schedules evolved each week.

Appendix 2: Observation Schedule

Date:

Day:

Start time:

Finish time:

Team:

Close time if early: Reason:

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
High-backed chairs	Yes	No
Chairs with arm rests	Yes	No
Bar stools	Yes	No
Standing room only	Yes	No
Lounges	Yes	No

Bar access (not crowding):

Convenient	1
Inconvenient	2

Appearance:

Attractive	1
Neutral	2
Not attractive	3

Décor:

Shabby	1
Ordinary	2
Nice	3
Posh	4

Ventilation:

Stuffy	1
Warm	2
Comfortable	3
Fresh	4

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

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:

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

Noise level voice:

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

Patron purpose of visit:

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

Entertainment/Recreation (circle all that apply):

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

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
- Table service 2
- Bistro style 3
- Free nibbles (eg peanuts) 4
- Small snacks (to buy chips, peanuts) 5
- Hot snacks (to buy pies, hot chips) 6
- None 7
- Times of food service:

Patron interaction:

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

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 |
| Close dancing | 7 | 7 |

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

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

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

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

PATRONS

Classification:	% in each category
Local residents/non-Bond	_____
Staff	_____
Students (local)	_____
Students (international)	_____

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%

Patron familiarity:	%
Patrons as strangers	_____
Patrons known to each other	_____

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

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:
 Percentage/proportion of patrons within
 full view of observers during observation period:

Patrons within hearing distance:
 Percentage/proportion 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
Older	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

BOUNCERS/SECURITY

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 with patrons (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

ID requested at door:

Rigorous	1
Haphazard	2
Selective	3
No check	4

Control/patrol style (Bouncers/Security):

General patrolling	1
Stationery	2
Patrolling and stationery	3

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE NON-PHYSICAL VERBAL (ONE-WAY)

Total no. of incidents:

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:

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE NON-PHYSICAL ARGUMENTS

Total no. of incidents:

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:

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE NON-PHYSICAL CHALLENGES/THREATS

Total no. of incidents:

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:

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE PHYSICAL FRIENDLY (LION CUB) FIGHTS

Total no. of incidents:

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:

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE PHYSICAL ASSAULT

Total no. of incidents:

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

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

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

Property damaged:

Yes	1
No	2

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

Comments:

CONFLICT SUMMARY

Total ejections:

No. rough ejections:

No. refused admission:

No. accidents with injury:

Overall level of physical violence:

High	1
Medium	2
Low	3
None	4

Comments:

ALCOHOL/DRUG CONSUMPTION

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

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

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

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

Shouting rounds:	
High	1
Medium	2
Low	3
None	4

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

RESPONSIBLE 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 NARRATIVE

Appendix 3: Codebook

	n	%
Closing time of premises		
On time	20	54.1
Early	17	45.9
Day of visit		
Tuesday	8	21.6
Thursday	20	54.1
Friday	6	16.2
Saturday	3	8.1
Observation period		
6.00 pm to 8.00 pm	6	16.2
6.30 pm to 8.30 pm	9	24.4
8.00 pm to 10.00 pm	7	18.9
8.30 pm to 10.30 pm	7	18.9
10.00 pm to 12.30 pm	8	21.6
Observation team		
Ase & Beth	8	21.6
Dennis & Benjamin	8	21.6
Emma & Leah	5	13.5
Gemma & Lesley	5	13.5
Nick & Simon	7	18.9
Ryan & Stuart	4	10.9
Lighting		
Dim	23	62.2
Medium bright	13	35.1
Bright	1	2.7
Seating capacity		
<50	10	27.1
50-99	7	18.9
100-149	17	45.9
150-199	3	8.1
Seating comfort		
Adequate	27	73.0
Too few	10	27.0
Designed mainly for standing		
Yes	17	45.9
No	20	54.1

Seating style		
<u>Rows of tables</u>		
Yes	23	62.2
No	14	37.8
<u>Rows, partitions (café)</u>		
Yes	8	21.6
No	29	78.4
<u>Spaced comfortable tables and chairs</u>		
Yes	29	78.4
No	8	21.6
<u>High-backed chairs</u>		
Yes	14	37.8
No	23	62.2
<u>Chairs with arm rests</u>		
Yes	10	27.0
No	27	73.0
<u>Bar stools</u>		
Yes	31	83.8
No	6	16.2
<u>Standing room only</u>		
Yes	10	27.0
No	27	73.0
<u>Lounges</u>		
Yes	29	78.4
No	8	21.6
Bar access (not crowding)		
Convenient	33	89.2
Inconvenient	4	10.8
Appearance		
Attractive	2	5.4
Neutral	31	83.8
Not attractive	4	10.8
Décor		
Shabby	5	13.5
Ordinary	30	81.1
Nice	2	5.4
Ventilation		
Stuffy	5	13.5
Warm	2	5.4
Comfortable	27	73.0
Fresh	3	8.1
Cleanliness		
Clean	27	73.0
Dirty	10	27.0

Upkeep		
Well cared for	10	27.0
Okay	23	62.2
Slightly run down	4	10.8
<hr/>		
Male toilets		
Clean	21	56.8
Dirty	4	10.8
Not known	12	32.4
<hr/>		
Female toilets		
Clean	15	40.6
Dirty	5	13.5
Not known	17	45.9
<hr/>		
Transport		
<u>Taxi</u>		
Available	15	40.6
Limited	11	29.7
None	11	29.7
<u>Public</u>		
Available	12	32.4
Limited	13	35.2
None	12	32.4
<u>Provided by venue</u>		
Available	14	37.8
Limited	1	2.7
None	22	59.5

SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT

Overall comfort		
High	1	2.7
Medium	31	83.8
Low	5	13.5
<hr/>		
Crowding		
Medium	19	51.4
Low	15	40.5
None	3	8.1
<hr/>		
Bar crowding		
Medium	14	37.8
Low	14	37.8
None	9	24.4
<hr/>		
Movement		
Very little movement	18	48.6
Wandering about	16	43.2
Table-hopping	3	8.2

Noise level music		
Very quiet	2	5.4
Medium quiet	12	32.4
Medium loud	19	51.4
Loud	4	10.8
Noise level voice		
Very quiet	5	13.5
Medium quiet	11	29.7
Medium loud	17	45.9
Loud	4	10.9
Patron purpose of visit		
Regular/local	13	35.1
After work	1	2.7
Social club gathering	8	21.7
One or two drinks	13	35.1
Out for a big night	2	5.4
Entertainment/Recreation		
<u>Music video</u>		
Yes	17	45.9
No	20	54.1
<u>TV</u>		
Yes	20	54.1
No	17	45.9
<u>SKY/cable channel</u>		
Yes	13	35.1
No	24	64.9
<u>Single entertainer</u>		
Yes	2	5.4
No	35	94.6
<u>Band</u>		
Yes	11	29.7
No	26	70.3
<u>Jukebox or disco</u>		
Yes	29	78.4
No	8	21.6
<u>Dancing</u>		
Yes	9	24.3
No	28	75.7
<u>Pool</u>		
Yes	34	91.9
No	3	8.1
<u>Other games</u>		
Yes	25	67.6
No	12	32.4
<u>Other</u>		
Yes	4	10.8
No	33	89.2

Type of music		
Top 40	27	73.0
Classics	6	16.2
70s	1	2.7
Other	3	8.1
Food		
Full meals	6	16.2
Small snacks	5	13.
Hot snacks inside	13	35.1
Hot snacks outside	4	10.8
Food brought from outside	9	24.3
Male interaction		
Frequently with strangers	5	13.5
Little interaction with strangers	25	67.6
Frequently with other regulars	7	18.9
Female interaction		
Frequently with strangers	4	10.8
Little interaction with strangers	25	67.6
Frequently with other regulars	8	21.6
Male sexual activity		
None	24	64.9
Checking out	3	8.1
Chatting up	4	10.8
Discreet necking	1	2.7
Heavy necking, touching	2	5.4
Flagrant fondling	2	5.4
Close dancing	1	2.7
Female sexual activity		
None	25	67.6
Checking out	2	5.4
Chatting up	3	8.1
Discreet necking	2	5.4
Heavy necking, touching	2	5.4
Flagrant fondling	1	2.7
Close dancing	2	5.4
Male sexual competition		
Medium	3	8.1
Low	11	29.7
None	23	62.2
Female sexual competition		
Medium	3	8.1
Low	11	29.7
None	23	62.2

Male cheerfulness (individual)		
High	9	24.3
Medium	22	59.5
Low	6	16.2
Female cheerfulness (individual)		
High	9	24.3
Medium	20	54.1
Low	8	21.6
Male friendliness (social)		
High	15	40.5
Medium	19	51.4
Low	3	8.1
Female friendliness (social)		
High	14	37.8
Medium	19	51.4
Low	3	8.1
None	1	2.7
Male roughness and bumping		
Medium	2	5.4
Low	9	24.3
None	26	70.3
Female roughness and bumping		
Medium	1	2.7
Low	7	18.9
None	29	78.4
Male hostility		
Low	3	8.1
None	34	91.9
Female hostility		
Low	3	8.1
None	34	91.9
Male rowdiness		
High	1	2.7
Medium	1	2.7
Low	11	29.7
None	24	64.9
Female rowdiness		
Low	11	29.7
None	26	70.3

Male swearing		
High	3	8.1
Medium	2	5.4
Low	19	51.4
None	12	32.4
N/A	1	2.7
Female swearing		
Medium	4	3.9
Low	18	48.6
None	14	37.8
N/A	1	2.7
Group territoriality		
Medium	1	2.7
Low	7	8.9
None	29	78.4

PATRONS

Classification		
Local residents/non-Bond	2	5.4
Staff	3	8.1
Students (local)	6	16.2
Students (international)	26	70.3
Percentage of males		
0-25%	1	2.7
26-50%	8	21.6
51-75%	20	54.1
76-100%	4	10.8
N/A	4	10.8
Minimum no. of patrons at any one time		
0-50	23	62.2
51-100	4	10.8
101-200	3	8.1
201-250	3	8.1
N/A	4	10.8
Maximum no. of patrons		
0-50	7	18.9
51-100	7	18.9
101-150	8	21.6
151-200	1	2.7
201-250	2	5.4
251-300	3	8.1
301-350	1	2.7
351+	4	10.8
N/A	4	10.8

Under 18 year old patrons		
Yes	2	5.4
No	34	91.9
Age not known	1	2.7
Groups (estimated average)		
Single males	12	32.4
Single females	4	10.8
Couples	1	2.7
Medium 3-4	12	32.4
Large 5+	7	18.9
N/A	1	2.7
Types of groups		
Mixed	32	86.5
All females	3	8.1
All males	2	5.4
Patron familiarity		
Patrons as strangers	9	24.3
Patrons known to each other	25	67.6
N/A	3	8.1
Ethnicity		
Anglo	27	73.0
Other (specify)	10	27.0
Male dress		
Working gear (manual)	1	2.7
Dress-up casual	30	81.1
Dress-up	3	8.1
Grunge	2	5.4
Other	1	2.7
Female dress		
Working gear (manual)	1	2.7
Dress-up casual	22	59.5
Dress-up	11	29.7
Grunge	2	5.4
Other	1	2.7
Percentage of patrons within full view		
0-20	1	2.7
21-40	2	5.4
41-60	6	16.3
61-80	8	21.6
81-100	18	48.6
N/A	2	5.4

Percentage of patrons whose conversations were able to be heard		
0-20	21	56.8
21-40	7	18.9
41-60	2	5.4
61-80	1	2.7
81-100	1	2.7
N/A	5	13.5

BAR STAFF

Percentage male/female		
100% male	7	18.9
75% male/25% female	25	67.6
50% male/50% female	3	8.1
25% male/75% female	2	5.4

Age of staff		
Young	6	16.2
Mixed age	31	83.8

Presentation of staff		
All uniformed	32	86.5
Some uniformed some not	4	10.8
N/A	1	2.7

Ethnicity of staff		
Anglo	37	100

Staff ethnicity compared to patrons		
Matched	22	59.5
Unmatched	15	40.5

Staff gender compared to patrons		
Matched	16	43.2
Unmatched	21	56.8

Availability of staff		
Plenty	19	51.4
Adequate	15	40.5
Few	3	8.1

Staff acceptance of deviant behaviour		
Not permissive	10	27.0
Slightly permissive	4	10.8
Permissive	2	5.4
N/A	21	56.8

Staff ability to defuse aggression		
Very good	1	2.7
Good	3	8.1
No aggression to defuse	33	89.2
Ratio of bar staff to patrons		
1 to 10	16	43.2
1 to 11-20	14	37.8
1 to 21-40	6	16.2
1 to 41-50	1	2.7
Staff interaction with patrons		
No interaction with patrons	3	8.1
Reserved	6	16.2
Friendly	27	73.0
Sitting with patrons	1	2.7

BOUNCERS/SECURITY

No. of bouncers		
1	1	2.7
2	9	24.3
3	5	13.5
4	3	8.1
5	7	18.9
6+	9	24.4
N/A	3	8.1
Police officer in uniform inside the venue		
No	37	100.0
Size of male bouncers (predominantly)		
Small	1	2.7
Medium	30	81.1
Large/Heavy	6	16.2
Size of female bouncer		
Small	6	16.2
Medium	6	16.2
N/A	25	67.6
Ethnicity of bouncers (predominantly)		
Anglo-Australian	36	97.3
Pacific Islands	1	2.7
Bouncer interaction with patrons		
No interaction with patrons	2	5.4
Reserved	11	29.7
Friendly	24	64.9

Friendliness of bouncers		
<u>Friendly</u>		
Cheerful	2	5.4
Pleasant/Relaxed	20	54.1
Non-committal	14	37.8
<u>Unfriendly</u>		
Edgy	1	2.7
ID requested at door		
Rigorous	22	59.5
Haphazard	3	8.1
Selective	6	16.2
No check	6	16.2
Control/patrol style (Bouncers/Security)		
General patrolling	9	24.3
Stationery	3	8.1
Patrolling and stationery	25	67.6

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE NON-PHYSICAL VERBAL (ONE-WAY)

Total no. of incidents:		
0	34	91.9
1	3	8.1
Male aggressors		
1	3	8.1
N/A	34	91.9
Male victims		
1	3	8.1
N/A	34	91.9
Female victims		
1	1	2.7
None	2	5.4
N/A	34	91.9
Time observed		
Late	2	5.4
N/K	1	2.7
N/A	34	91.9
Severity		
Medium	1	2.7
Low	2	5.4
N/A	34	91.9

Intervention		
Both staff and patrons	1	2.7
N/K	2	5.4
N/A	34	91.9
Staff involved		
Yes	1	2.7
No	2	5.4
N/A	34	91.9
Perpetrator		
Patron	2	5.4
N/K	1	2.7
N/A	34	91.9
Location		
Inside	2	5.4
Outside	1	2.7
N/A	34	91.9
Degree of drunkenness of participants		
Medium	2	5.4
Low	1	2.7
N/A	34	91.9

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE NON-PHYSICAL ARGUMENTS

Total no. of incidents		
0	37	100.0

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE NON-PHYSICAL CHALLENGES/THREATS

Total no. of incidents		
0	36	97.3
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	2.7
Male aggressors		
1	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Male victims		
1	0	0
2	0	0
3	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
Time observed		
Late	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
Severity		
Low	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
Intervention		
By staff	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
Staff involved		
No	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
Location		
Outside	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
Degree of drunkenness of participants		
Medium	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE PHYSICAL FRIENDLY (LION CUB) FIGHTS

Total no. of incidents		
1	2	5.4
2	3	8.1
3	3	8.1
4	1	2.7
5	1	2.7
N/A	27	73.0
Male aggressors		
1	2	5.4
2	3	8.1
3	3	8.1
4	0	0
5	1	2.7
N/K	1	2.7
N/A	27	73.0

Female aggressors		
None	5	13.5
1	4	10.8
2	1	2.7
N/A	27	73.0
Male victims		
None	3	8.1
1	4	10.8
2	1	2.7
3	1	2.7
4	1	2.7
N/A	27	73.0
Female victims		
None	6	16.2
1	4	10.8
N/A	27	73.0
Time observed		
Early	1	2.7
Middle	4	10.8
Late	4	10.8
N/K	1	2.7
N/A	27	73.0
Severity		
Low	9	24.3
N/K	1	2.7
N/A	27	73.0
Staff involved		
Yes	1	2.7
No	8	21.6
N/K	1	2.7
N/A	27	73.0
Perpetrator		
Bouncer	2	5.4
Patron	6	16.2
Other staff	2	5.4
N/A	27	73.0
Location		
In	6	16.2
Out	3	8.1
Entrance	1	2.7
N/A	27	73.0

Degree of drunkenness of participants		
High	1	2.7
Medium	4	10.8
Low	3	8.1
N/K	2	5.4
N/A	27	73.0

CONFLICT/VIOLENCE PHYSICAL ASSAULT

Total no. of incidents		
1	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Male aggressors		
1	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Male victims		
1	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Time observed		
Late	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Severity		
Medium	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Intervention		
By patron	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Staff involved		
No	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Perpetrator		
Patron	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Victim precipitated		
No	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Location		
Out	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

Degree of drunkenness of participants		
High	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
Bouncer treatment of situation		
Ignoring	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
Property damaged		
No	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
Weapons (circle all that apply)		
Fists	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3

CONFLICT SUMMARY

Total ejections		
1	3	8.1
N/A	34	91.1
No. refused admission		
1	2	5.4
N/A	35	94.6
No. accidents with injury		
N/A	37	100.0
Overall level of physical violence		
Medium	1	2.7
Low	6	16.2
None	22	59.5
N/A	8	21.6

ALCOHOL/DRUG CONSUMPTION

Male drinking rates		
High (>4/hr)	7	18.9
Medium (3-4/hr)	13	35.2
Low (1-2/hr)	8	21.6
Very low (<1/hr)	8	21.6
N/A	1	2.7

Female drinking rates		
High (>4/hr)	3	8.1
Medium (3-4/hr)	13	35.2
Low (1-2/hr)	10	27.0
Very low (<1/hr)	10	27.0
N/A	1	2.7
Male drunkenness		
High	5	13.6
Medium	12	32.4
Low	11	29.7
None	8	21.6
N/A	1	2.7
Female drunkenness		
High	2	5.4
Medium	11	29.7
Low	9	24.3
None	14	37.9
N/A	1	2.7
Average male type of drink consumption (%)		
<u>Normal beer</u>		
0-20	1	2.7
21-40	2	5.4
41-60	6	16.2
61-80	4	10.8
81-100	23	62.2
N/A	1	2.7
<u>Light beer</u>		
0-20	4	10.8
N/A	33	89.2
<u>Straight spirits</u>		
0-20	3	8.1
N/A	34	91.9
<u>Mixed spirits</u>		
0-20	10	27.0
21-40	1	2.7
N/A	26	70.3
<u>Cocktails</u>		
0-20	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
<u>Wine</u>		
0-20	4	10.8
21-40	1	2.7
N/A	32	86.5
<u>Soft drinks</u>		
0-20	10	27.0
21-40	3	8.1
41-60	1	2.7
61-80	1	2.7

81-100	1	2.7
N/A	21	56.8
<u>Water</u>		
0-20	11	29.7
21-40	2	5.4
N/A	24	64.9
<hr/>		
Average female type of drink consumption		
<u>Normal beer</u>		
0-20	12	32.4
21-40	2	5.4
41-60	2	5.4
61-80	1	2.7
81-100	15	40.6
N/A	5	13.5
<u>Light beer</u>		
0-20	5	13.5
N/A	32	86.5
<u>Straight spirits</u>		
0-20	2	5.4
21-40	1	2.7
N/A	34	91.9
<u>Mixed spirits</u>		
0-20	7	18.9
21-40	1	2.7
41-60	3	8.1
61-80	2	5.4
81-100	2	5.4
N/A	22	59.5
<u>Cocktails</u>		
0-20	7	18.9
N/A	30	81.1
<u>Wine</u>		
0-20	6	16.2
21-40	1	2.7
N/A	30	81.1
<u>Soft drinks</u>		
0-20	16	43.2
61-80	5	13.5
81-100	1	2.7
N/A	15	40.5
<u>Water</u>		
0-20	12	32.4
81-100	1	2.7
N/A	24	64.9

Average male drinking containers

Bottles

0-20	5	13.5
21-40	1	2.7

N/A	31	100
<u>Cans</u>		
0-20	3	8.1
N/A	34	91.9
<u>Middies</u>		
0-20	3	8.1
21-40	1	2.7
41-60	1	2.7
61-80	1	2.7
81-100	2	5.4
N/A	29	78.4
<u>Schooners</u>		
0-20	4	10.8
41-60	2	5.4
61-80	3	8.1
81-100	5	13.5
N/A	23	62.2
<u>Plastic cups</u>		
0-20	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
<u>Other</u>		
0-20	3	8.1
61-80	1	2.7
81-100	17	45.9
N/A	16	43.2

Average female drinking containers

<u>Bottles</u>		
0-20	3	8.1
41-60	2	5.4
N/A	32	84.5
<u>Cans</u>		
0-20	2	5.4
N/A	35	94.6
<u>Middies</u>		
21-40	2	5.4
41-60	1	2.7
61-80	1	2.7
81-100	3	8.1
N/A	30	81.1
<u>Schooners</u>		
0-20	3	8.1
21-40	3	8.1
41-60	5	13.5
81-100	2	5.4
N/A	24	64.9
<u>Plastic cups</u>		
0-20	1	2.7
21-40	1	2.7
41-60	5	13.6
81-100	17	45.9

N/A	13	35.1
<u>Other</u>		
0-20	2	5.4
61-80	1	2.7
81-100	3	8.1
N/A	31	83.8
<hr/>		
Shouting rounds		
High	2	5.4
Medium	5	13.5
Low	17	45.9
None	11	29.8
N/A	2	5.4
<hr/>		
Cover charge		
High (>\$5)	1	2.7
None	33	89.2
N/A	3	8.1
<hr/>		
Water		
Free	31	83.8
N/A	6	16.2
<hr/>		
Cost of drinks		
Cheap (<\$2.00)	5	13.5
Average (\$2.00-\$2.50)	18	48.6
Expensive (>\$2.50)	11	29.7
N/A	3	8.1
<hr/>		
Male drug consumption		
Heroin	1	2.7
N/A	36	97.3
<hr/>		
Female drug consumption		
Heroin	2	5.4
N/A	35	94.6
<hr/>		
Drug dealing on premises		
A great deal	6	16.2
None apparent	29	78.4
N/A	2	5.4

RESPONSIBLE SERVING PRACTICES

Publicity to clientele

Under age drinking warning

Yes	19	51.4
No	14	37.8
N/A	4	10.8

<u>House policy</u>		
Yes	12	32.4
No	18	48.7
N/A	7	18.9
<u>Request to leave premises</u>		
Yes	5	13.5
No	26	70.3
N/A	6	16.2
<u>Patron care sign</u>		
Yes	15	40.6
No	17	45.9
N/A	5	13.5
<u>Other</u>		
Yes	2	5.4
No	25	67.6
N/A	10	27.0
<hr/>		
Self-testing breathalysers		
Obvious	2	5.4
Not obvious	3	8.1
None available	22	59.5
N/A	10	27.0
<hr/>		
Promotion of consumption		
Happy hour	4	10.9
Drink promotions	13	35.1
Gimmicks	2	5.4
Nothing	13	35.1
N/A	5	13.5
<hr/>		
Staff intervention with highly intoxicated patrons		
Sometimes	4	10.9
No intervention	6	16.2
No highly intoxicated patrons	23	62.2
N/A	4	10.9
<hr/>		
Nature of intervention with highly intoxicated patrons		
Refusal of service	1	2.7
Offer non-alcoholic drink	2	5.4
Other	3	8.1
No intoxicated patrons	28	75.7
N/A	3	8.1
<hr/>		
Transport organised by establishment for patrons		
Yes	11	29.7
No	24	64.9
N/A	2	5.4

What form of transport		
Public bus	15	40.5
Other	2	5.4
N/A	20	54.1
<hr/>		
Intoxicated and ordering		
<u>Unsolicited service</u>		
No	23	62.2
N/A	14	37.8
<u>Pressure to drink</u>		
Yes	1	2.7
No	22	59.5
N/A	14	37.8
<u>Appropriate service</u>		
Yes	4	10.9
Sometimes	1	2.7
No	18	48.6
N/A	14	37.8
<u>Patron ignored</u>		
No	23	62.2
N/A	14	37.8
<u>Service delayed</u>		
No	23	62.2
N/A	14	37.8
<u>Offer of an alternative</u>		
No	23	62.2
N/A	14	37.8
<u>Service denied</u>		
No	22	49.5
N/A	15	40.5
<u>Management called</u>		
No	22	49.5
N/A	15	40.5