THIS COPY WAS MADE
FOR: *IOGUN*
DATE: **09 OCT 2009**
Alcohol and other Drugs
Council of Australia

PUBLIC DRINKING AND VIOLENCE: NOT JUST AN ALCOHOL PROBLEM

Ross Homel
Steve Tomsen
Jennifer Thommeny

Three hundred hours of unstructured observation by pairs of observers in twenty-three licensed premises in Sydney allowed the identification through qualitative analysis of situational factors and management practices that increase the risk of physical violence. Four high-risk and two low-risk premises were particularly contrasted, as were violent and non-violent occasions in the same venues. Violence was concentrated in specific places at specific times. It was related to complex interactions between aspects of patron mix, levels of comfort, boredom, and intoxication, and the behaviour of bouncers. Violence is perpetuated by poor management, lax police surveillance, and inappropriate bureaucratic controls and legislation. The authors conclude that regularly violent venues should have their licenses cancelled, and police should enforce laws regulating bouncers. Promotions which cause mass intoxication should be banned, but responsible serving practices on their own may not greatly influence levels of violence.

Violence has become a matter of major public concern in Australia in recent years. Two separate massacres in Melbourne in 1987 and one in Sydney in 1991, each by a lone gunman, horrified the nation and reinforced the view of many that Australia is becoming a more violent and lawless country. Fear of random,

Ross Homel, Ph.D., is professor of justice administration at Griffith University in Brisbane, Australia. His main field of interest is criminology and the criminal justice system, particularly the deterrence of drinking and driving, alcohol-related violence and sentencing in Magistrates Courts. Steven Tomsen, Ph.D., is a lecturer in the Department of Sociology, University of Newcastle, New South Wales. He has wide interests in the sociological aspects of crime and justice. Jennifer Thommeny is a constable with the New South Wales Police Service, acting as research and policy officer in the area of alcohol and crime.

unprovoked violence from strangers now has a major effect on the lives of many ordinary Australians.

In response to the 1987 shootings, the federal government established the National Committee on Violence, which in 1990 published a report that assembled much of the available evidence on trends in violent crime, summarized current theories on what causes people to commit such offences, and set out policy initiatives which have the potential to reduce violent crime (National Committee on Violence 1990). The data in the report generally confirm what criminologists and police have always known: most acts of interpersonal violence are not the result of random attacks by madmen on complete strangers, but involve ordinary people as both attackers and victims who frequently know each other and who, for one reason or another, come into conflict in the home, street, work place, or place of recreation.

Indeed, even a quick perusal of the statistics on homicides and assaults leads one to a conclusion, which may be banal, but is of fundamental importance — the places in which most acts of interpersonal violence occur, and the times at which they occur, mirror, at least roughly, the rhythms and routines of daily life (e.g., Robb 1988). A majority of homicides involve intimates within the family home because those are the circumstances in which many people spend much of their lives. A higher proportion of non-fatal assaults than of homicides take place outside the home and involve strangers, but these events are also highly patterned, being more common late at night and on weekends, when social life and interaction is at its most intense. As Cohen and Felson (1979:605) put it:

Rather than assuming that predatory crime is simply an indicator of social breakdown, one might take it as a by-product of freedom and prosperity as they manifest themselves in the routine activities of everyday life.

There are few activities as routine in Australian culture as the imbibing of alcoholic beverages. According to a 1988 survey of four Australian states (Berger et al. 1990), three-quarters of all adults drink at least occasionally and one in ten can be classified as a "heavy drinker." Half the population drink at least once or twice a week, and especially for men under the age of twenty-five, this drinking is often done at hotels or licensed clubs. It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that assaults and homicides frequently involve the presence of alcohol in the offender, victim, or both.

Collins (1989) cites evidence that as many as 80% of those arrested in the United States for cutting, concealed weapons, other assaults, murder, and shooting had measurable levels of alcohol in their urine, while Robb (1988) in a study of serious assaults recorded by police in New South Wales found that 40% were nominated by police as involving alcohol. Moreover, assaults coming to police notice and recorded by them frequently occur after midnight around pub closing times, and at

least 20% take place in or around licensed premises (Ministry for Police and Emergency Services, Victoria Police 1989; Robb 1988).

However, police statistics greatly understate the extent of alcohol-related violent crime, because most assaults are not reported and because police often seem to be more reluctant to record reported alcohol-related assaults than reported non alcohol-related assaults.¹ Surveys of injured persons presenting at hospital for treatment permit a clearer picture of the true incidence of pub- and club-related violence, since assault victims are more likely to seek medical than police assistance. One recent hospital survey in Sydney suggests that each year in New South Wales many thousands of people, mostly young men, are injured (sometimes quite seriously) as a result of assaults occurring in or around licensed premises (Cuthbert 1990).

Statistical associations do not prove that alcohol consumption actually causes violence. After all, if drinking is common behaviour, and if violent incidents can be thought of as "routine activities which share many attributes of, and are interdependent with, other routine activities" (Cohen and Felson 1979:589), then it would be surprising *not* to find alcohol implicated in many instances of assault. The question is whether alcohol consumption itself contributes in some way to the likelihood of violence, or whether aspects of the drinkers or of the drinking settings are the critical factors. It is quite possible, for example, that male attitudes which legitimise the physical maltreatment of women, or environmental factors like crowding, discomfort, and aggressive bouncers in pubs and clubs, are the real causes of much alcohol-related violence (McGregor 1990; Victorian Community Council Against Violence 1990).²

The purpose of this article is to report briefly the method, results, and implications of some observational research into pubs and clubs which we conducted in Sydney in 1989.³ The study was the first systematic attempt in Australia to examine possible links between aspects of the environment of public drinking and the occurrence of violence. A key assumption was that there is a complex (but nevertheless real) relation between violence and public drinking (not the mere ingestion of ethanol), which is imbedded in Australian history and culture and reproduced in institutional arrangements and regulatory and police practices regarding drinking. In our research we aimed to transcend the narrow debate about the effects of ethanol *the substance* by focusing on the *total environment* of drinking and its regulation (or lack of regulation) by management, police, and other public officials. Thus, we considered features of the external regulation of licensed premises, as well as more directly observable characteristics such as physical layout, patron mix, and social atmosphere.

We argue that the regulatory system is undergirded by notions of the deserved misfortune of victims of pub violence. This belief is partly responsible for the historic failure in Australia to recognise violence in and around licensed premises as a major societal problem, and has led directly to inadequate legislation and police regulation. The failure of formal regulation has helped to entrench a range of

negative environmental factors that make some establishments bloodhouses year after year and many more establishments violent on a less predictable basis.

Observational Studies of Violence in Licensed Premises

Studies of drinking in public places have been conducted for many years (Fisher 1985). One of the earliest studies was an ethnographic analysis of the public house in the context of life in an English industrial town, based largely on direct observations (Mass Observation 1943). This tradition of ethnographic and observational research has continued to the present day. However, very few of these studies have been focused specifically on violence; indeed, all the problems associated with public drinking are often quite peripheral to the major concerns of the researchers (e.g., Fairweather and Campbell 1990). As the anthropologist Dyck (1980) has commented, the failure in the ethnographic literature to acknowledge commonplace instances of violence and the associated lack of first-hand accounts of violent behaviour is remarkable in and of itself.

Outside of anthropology, the situation is not much better. For example, quantitative observational studies have had more of a problem focus than the ethnographic studies, but often the major dependent variable is consumption rates, with violence being noted in an anecdotal rather than systematic fashion (e.g., Cutler and Storm 1975).

Two studies of violence that were based on systematic observation of drinking environments and patron characteristics influenced the design of our study. A New Zealand study by Graves, Graves, Semu and Sam (1981) used records kept by security officers employed in twelve pubs in Auckland to examine factors associated with the frequency and seriousness of pub violence. The research confirmed the common view that Polynesian patrons drink more and are involved in more violence than Europeans, and suggested that these ethnic differences can be explained by the preference of Polynesians for drinking for longer periods in larger groups and by their tendency to engage in group rather than individual activities. Thus, this research highlighted the importance of patron mix, group sizes, consumption, and time spent drinking.

A study by Graham and her colleagues (1980) in Vancouver was especially valuable as a guide for our research, since data were obtained for a large number of situational variables, as well as for instances of aggression and physical violence. Four observers (working in male-female pairs) noted 160 incidents of aggression (forty-seven involving physical violence) in 633 hours of observation in 185 drinking establishments. Many variables were positively correlated with aggression, including the percentage of drunk patrons, the percentage of American Indians, poor ventilation, the amount of sexual body contact, lack of cleanliness, and a hostile atmosphere. The authors stressed however that the barroom environment is best viewed as "an ecological system," and implied that the overall influence of this ecology on aggression may be greater than the sum of the effects of individual variables. Through factor analysis and qualitative analysis they

identified one distinct type of bar, "The Skid Row Aggressive Bar," which was characterized by high levels of aggression, extreme intoxication, down-and-out patrons not accepted anywhere else, and a "bizarre atmosphere" in which deviant and unusual behaviours were tolerated, even encouraged. The extent to which skid row bars constitute a major part of the problem of violence in other localities is a matter for further research.

The Sydney Study

Method

We used many of the variables and insights from the Vancouver research as a starting point for our own study. We were particularly influenced by these authors' suggestions that future research concentrate on places where alcohol-related aggression most often occurs, and that within this context more details be collected on the *processes* of aggression. This immediately raised two related questions: the method of sampling (how were "high risk" venues to be identified?) and the method of data collection (how best could "ecological processes" be studied?).

An early decision was taken to use qualitative rather than quantitative methods, relying heavily on unstructured observations in licensed premises and, to a lesser extent, on semi-structured interviews with licensing and general duties police, chamber magistrates, and security industry personnel. There were several reasons for the decision to use a qualitative approach. While the Vancouver research identified many potentially relevant situational factors, it was obvious reading the results that there were a large number of differences between drinking settings in Sydney in the late 1980s and in Vancouver in the late 1970s, and that many more variables would have to be generated. More importantly, we judged that the reduction of the problem to "variable analysis," even after extensive piloting, would hinder attempts to explore the complex interactions and subtle processes which, we hypothesized, led to violence. In addition, the absence of any objective data base in New South Wales identifying licensed premises as more or less violent necessitated a "theoretical sampling" strategy based on the best available qualitative judgements concerning premises' standings in terms of violence and/or poor management (Glaser and Strauss 1967). Being unable to stratify the population of premises, unweighted probability sampling would have yielded too few high-risk premises to allow detailed analysis of the relevant environmental factors.

Our aim was to contrast situational variables and management practices in a small number of premises known to have been regularly violent over a long period of time with the same factors in a sample of establishments noted for their lack of violence or for their ability to defuse violent incidents when they occurred. Using this design, even if little violence was actually observed in the study, it would be possible to explore aspects of drinking settings that were associated with violence.⁴ Eventually four high-risk and two low-risk premises were identified, on the basis

of first-hand knowledge, police information, and exploratory visits. Each of these premises was visited by pairs of observers at least five times, each observation period being between two and six hours in duration. A further sixteen sites were visited at least once, making a total of fifty-five visits to twenty-three sites in seventeen establishments. Total observation time was nearly three hundred hours.⁵

All the premises studied intensively were in suburban locations. This was not because it was thought that there is more drinking-related violence in the suburbs — police statistics and research suggest the contrary — but because the problems in city locations such as Kings Cross in Sydney or West End in Melbourne are often dispersed across a number of violent venues. It is easier to plausibly link public violence and the characteristics of particular premises in suburban locations. One consequence of this sampling strategy was that "skid row" premises did not figure as prominently as in the Vancouver study, although some were visited, particularly during the exploratory phases.

One type of problem location studied intensively was licensed clubs. Licensed clubs have often been credited with being more orderly than hotels and having good control over their patrons, but it appears that financial pressures have led many to develop forms of entertainment, principally late night discos or live music for young people, which create problems not anticipated by management. In fact, all the violent mainstream premises chosen for full study, whether in pubs or clubs, traded after midnight and were popular with young people because they provided live music or a disco.

The control sites were studied for the features that distinguish them from the violent. However, during field research it soon became apparent that the violent premises are for most of the time not violent. Violent occasions in these places seemed to have characteristics that clearly marked them out from non-violent times. In effect, these locations were acting as controls for themselves. This unexpectedly helped us refine our ideas about the relevant situational variables, and to some extent reduced the importance of comparisons with the premises selected as controls. We could eventually note which variables regularly prevailed and linked up with each other during violent or peaceful periods.

This method was actually an extension of the theoretical sampling approach, from the choice of physical sites to the choice of times and days for observation. For example, one site was very violent on a night that had discount drinks and a punk band. The observers returned on a similar night with full-priced drinks and a similar band, so as to discern any differences and hoping that other aspects of the drinking environment were essentially unchanged. By this comparative means hypotheses about key variables and their relations were being tested out during observation and to some extent were directing its pattern.

In broad terms, the method of data collection and analysis was based on Miles and Huberman (1984). After leaving a site, notes were made and information written onto an observation sheet listing a large number of variables. The visits were then written up as separate narrative accounts by each observer. These

narratives were cross-checked and later coded at group meetings. Early and often clumsy efforts to code narratives signalled whether or not various codes were meaningful and linked to the data. Indeed, the real thinking about the research questions took the form of regularly revising the codes, a process that was more productive than premature speculation about the "real" causes of violence. After at least a dozen revisions, almost two hundred coded items were settled upon, grouped under a small number of broad headings: physical and social atmosphere, drinking, patrons, staff, and violence. To simplify analysis, summary sheets for each narrative were also prepared, classified according to the degree of violence observed.

Results

In total, thirty-two assaults involving some degree of physical violence were observed during the course of the study. Excluding nine rough ejections, which were borderline assaults, the thirty-two incidents represent a rate of about eleven per one hundred hours observation, 50% higher than the rate of 7.4 in the Vancouver study. The higher rate is not surprising, since we over-sampled violent premises and also sampled late at night when violence is more likely. Graham and associates (1980) report that they witnessed no brawls and no incidents involving serious physical injury. By contrast, four of the thirty-two incidents in our study were "brawls," and a number of assaults were rated as "serious" by observers. For example, in one case an ejected patron was held by three bouncers who repeatedly bashed his head against a steel garbage crate, while on another occasion a floor manager apparently confused a young man with another patron who had been in a fight, lost his temper, and began to throttle this very small and young drinker who choked for several minutes.⁶

In contrast to findings from the limited amount of anthropological research, such as Dyck's (1980) analysis of "scrapping" in barrooms in the small western Canadian city of Parklund, most of the incidents in our study could not be characterised as "fights," in the sense of being equal conflicts freely entered into by the participants. In at most a quarter of cases could the victim be said to have actually or possibly invited the attack. Assaultants — whether patrons or staff — who deliberately seek out a violent encounter, appear to pick their mark. These are most often fewer in number, younger, and smaller. Assaultants also appear to focus on victims who they see are quite drunk, or at least far more intoxicated than they are. When more than two parties are involved, pub assaults are often further trivialised as "brawls," with the equal responsibility of all parties — assaultants and victims — implied by this. By our reckoning, equal responsibility is usually not the case.

The data analysis suggests that much of the violence we observed is not due to anything inherent in public drinking or in the typical patrons of these venues. The key variables suggested by our "constant comparative" and empirically grounded

form of analysis were aspects of the patron type, the social atmosphere, drinking patterns, and the behaviour of doormen.

Patron type

The typical patrons in violent premises are young, working class men. However, the social class of patrons cannot explain the differences between these violent sites and more peaceful venues with patrons from a similar social background, nor can it explain why the violent venues are at other times peaceful, although the patrons present are much the same. Moreover, there is no clear causal connection between the young age of regular patrons and levels of violence. The single venue with the greatest number of young drinkers was in fact one of the non-violent locations selected as a control.

The gender ratio in venues, together with the social links between the males present, seem more critical than age or class. The proportion of males, and presence of male groups, in any venue seem to exacerbate feelings of rivalry and group loyalty, and can result in arguments and fights. Males in groups, especially as strangers to each other, were seen to come into conflict more readily. The venues we studied drew a larger number of these groups of strangers than others, attracting people from a fairly wide area.

Solo males and males with female partners or in mixed groups appear to be less inclined to enter into conflicts. However, it should not be assumed that the presence of women always has a pacifying effect on social atmosphere, or that it is rare for women to become involved in conflict and violence. Women were victims of male violence in two incidents, and arguments, challenges, mock fights and fights between females were observed regularly at most of the violent locations — the worst of these involving women bouncers. A surprisingly high number of women patrons spoken to also followed the male path in being apparently indifferent to acts of violence, and several took pleasure in watching fights and brawls.

Social Atmosphere

Although we could find no direct connection between physical attractiveness and violence, attractive, renovated, and well-designed surroundings commonly mean that a venue also has a responsible management and positive staff who relate well to patrons. Not surprisingly, unattractive, neglected, and dirty venues also tended to be among the least comfortable and to have poorly supervised, aggressive, and abrasive staff. However, despite all the myths, rough pubs with plenty of rowdy behaviour (which would include the local workingmen's pubs celebrated in Australian folklore) are not necessarily violent.

The two most relevant aspects of atmosphere seem to be *comfort* and *boredom*. Comfortable premises are not necessarily the most attractive, renovated places. The most important aspects seem to be roominess, ventilation, and, especially if it is from music of poor quality, only moderate noise. Big crowds in most sites usually mean discomfort for many patrons, a problem exacerbated by a lack of

seating and by crowded corridors, stairs, and doorways. Patrons in these situations tend to alleviate their discomfort by more rapid drinking, which causes higher levels of drunkenness, and eventually aggressive reactions to discomfort directed at individuals or property. Overcrowding on dance floors appeared to be linked to several arguments and at least one of the severe assaults observed.

Levels of comfort interact with levels of boredom. Entertained crowds are less hostile, drink more slowly, and seem to be less bothered by uncomfortable surroundings. In some venues, levels of boredom and aggression directed at other patrons were reduced by entertainment in such forms as television, videos, and game and card machines. Stage entertainment, including dancing and quizzes, were also noted to reduce levels of boredom and aggression, sometimes at a critical point during the night when the form of patron interaction suggested that conflict was likely.

Of the many aspects of entertainment and boredom, bands and music are perhaps of greatest importance. While violent and non-violent occasions do not follow a simple bands/no bands dichotomy, quality bands that entertain an audience generate a positive social atmosphere that has been observed to counteract other negative variables. A smaller crowd with a bad band seems more likely to present trouble than a large crowd entertained by quality musicians.

Drinking Patterns

High levels of intoxication are an obvious feature of many violent occasions. This is worsened by discount drinks, with prices in some venues being as low as 10c or 11c. More commonly they are set at around \$1 on specific discount nights. On these occasions many patrons who have paid a high cover charge (e.g., \$10) in order to see an inferior band or just to enter a disco, seem to decide that they should become quite drunk in order to get their "moneys worth." In fact, the most violent visit of all, with very high levels of intoxication and seven assaults observed in a few hours, was an 11c discount night with an \$11 cover charge. In some clubs, cheaper drink prices (e.g., \$1.30 for a strong mixed drink) can also serve to bring on very high levels of drunkenness, and resulting violence. This was obviously the case in the licensed club we included among our group of four most violent premises. As already noted, it is important that these rates of drinking can also be artificially raised by high discomfort and boredom.

Many patrons appear to pass through stages of drunkenness — with aggression coming later. Substantial amounts of food that can lower levels of drunkenness were generally not available in the violent premises we studied, especially later at night when patrons are more intoxicated. Some locations had a small range of hot food available, but more often snacks were limited to hotdogs. Hotdog stands often appear to have the adverse effect of encouraging patrons to mill around outside venues. Both of the non-violent control locations we studied operated substantial restaurants.

Doormen

The behaviour of barstaff does not figure as highly as expected in the creation of an aggressive or violent atmosphere. Edgy and aggressive bouncers are another matter. They have been observed to initiate fights or further encourage them on several occasions. Some were even observed to leave premises while they were on duty in order to continue a fight with departing patrons. More often, they have been seen to show a good measure of indifference to violence. They regularly asked conflicting patrons to leave premises, and then virtually arranged a fight that they and departing patrons could watch immediately outside the location. The unprofessional view that assaults occurring just outside the premises where they are employed are not their business, appears to be commonplace.

Many bouncers seem poorly trained, obsessed with their own machismo (relating badly to groups of male strangers), and some of them appear to regard their employment as giving them a licence to assault people. This may be encouraged by management adherence to a repressive model of supervision of patrons ("if they play up, thump em"), which despite their belief does not reduce trouble and adds further to a hostile and aggressive atmosphere. But in practice many bouncers are not well managed in their work, and appear to be given a job autonomy and discretion that they cannot handle well.

The bad relations of many male bouncers with male patrons led some of our informants to suggest that women should be employed on pub and club doors. Although in one club the use of a well-spoken female on the door seemed to appease groups of males who were refused entry for non-membership, it is simplistic to suggest that these sorts of conciliatory skills are held by all females and no males. Some male doorstaff were observed to have these qualities, and took the role of restraining other bouncers from excessive violence. The most relevant factors seem to be training and experience, rather than gender. Unfortunately, bouncing is still an occupation with a high rate of turnover. Younger bouncers may be leaving this sort of work just as they are beginning to acquire the sort of experience and work maturity that their job requires.

Summary

These findings can be summarised as follows. Violent incidents in public drinking locations do not occur simply because of the presence of young or rough patrons or because of rock bands, or any other single variable. Violent occasions are characterised by subtle interactions of several variables. Chief among these are groups of male strangers, low comfort, high boredom, high drunkenness, as well as aggressive and unreasonable bouncers and floorstaff.

Discussion

Our research confirms the work of Graham and associates (1979) and others that a great deal of violence occurs in and around licensed premises. While some of the violence we observed did not result in serious injury, many of the incidents

would be classified as serious assaults by any reasonable criterion. In this respect, the research findings reflect everyday experience that violence is a routine aspect of interactions in many pubs and clubs.

However, it is important to recall that our sample of Sydney drinking places was biased toward times and places where prior knowledge indicated that violence was likely to occur, and that even in the worst places many visits were "uneventful" in the sense that no violence was observed. This is consistent with the finding of Graham and her colleagues (1979) that a small number of premises, chiefly of the "skid row" variety, accounted for a high proportion of all observed instances of aggression. It is also consistent with the results of a recent observational study of a representative sample of thirty-four Sydney clubs and pubs which found that 16% of all premises accounted for three-quarters of all observed incidents of physical violence.⁸

Routine Activities Theory and the Role of Intoxication

The existence of "hot spots" of predatory crime has been the subject of some recent criminological research. Sherman, Gartin, and Buerger (1989) analysed calls to police in Minneapolis over one year, and showed that all recorded domestic disturbances occurred at 9% of all possible addresses, while all recorded assaults occurred in only 7% of all possible locations in the city. These authors build on a popular sociological theory of crime, "routine activities theory," which attempts to account for the nonrandom distribution of crime by proposing that the rate at which such events occur in collectivities is affected by "the convergence in space and time of the three minimal elements of direct-contact predatory violations: 1) motivated offenders, 2) suitable targets, and 3) the absence of capable guardians against a violation" (Cohen and Felson 1979:589). Sherman and his colleagues extend the ideas of routine activities theory from collectivity to "place," arguing that places, like persons, can be seen to have routine activities subject to both formal and informal regulation.

One advantage of applying the routine activities perspective is that it becomes immediately apparent that single variable theories of violence (e.g., "He did it because he was drunk") are unlikely to have much explanatory power. This is because the critical factors are not those to do with offenders, victims, or guardians alone, but those affecting their *convergence* in time and space. Thus, high rates of intoxication do not on their own guarantee that violence will break out, since it is not clear that intoxication will inevitably increase the supply of motivated offenders and suitable victims, or that it will have any effect on the presence of capable guardians. However, in interaction with other factors, intoxication may be a potent explanatory factor — as our analysis suggests.

Laboratory research has generally failed to find any direct connection between the ingestion of alcohol and the incidence of aggression (e.g., Gustafson 1986a; Taylor and Gammon 1976), but has highlighted the importance of interactions of alcohol consumption with factors like frustration (Gustafson 1986b). Violence

may therefore occur (as it did in our study) when some patrons are vulnerable to attack due to their extreme intoxication, when formal or informal controls are not sufficient to deter violence, and when potential offenders are drunk *and* frustrated, frustration perhaps being promoted by poor quality entertainment or by crowding. In a well-managed club or pub employing skilled doormen and floorstaff who can detect problem situations before they get out of hand, or who have good communication skills and can defuse aggression before it leads to violence, there may rarely be any connection between levels of intoxication and violence. Alternatively, aspects of patron mix may amplify or reduce the risk of violence when rates of intoxication are high, by affecting the processes of informal guardianship or by influencing the motivations of offenders and the supply of victims. Drunk males on their own often make good victims; informal controls on aggression may work far better in groups consisting of both men and women, even if everyone is drunk, than in all-male groups.

Our focus on the role of intoxication to illustrate the limitations of single variable theories is deliberate, given the tendency in some of the alcohol studies literature to assume that controls on consumption should be the first priority in dealing with alcohol-related problems (Moskowitz 1989). While acknowledging that there is an important place for such approaches, the results of our research suggest that if violence around licensed premises is to be reduced in the short to medium term, policies need to be developed which confront the problem directly by addressing the manifest inadequacies of management and external regulation. Although in theory responsible serving practices involving policies like server intervention should help to reduce levels of violence by lowering consumption and eliminating gross intoxication, there does not appear to be any scientifically persuasive evidence that any program implemented to date has actually achieved this goal. Of course, this might simply be because most programs have not been implemented very effectively (Carvolth 1991), but it might also be because server programs focus too much on consumption and not enough on the broad control of problem situations.⁹ In other words, they are based on the assumption that problems in licensed premises are due primarily to the ingestion of a drug — alcohol — when in fact situational factors and poor management are, from our analysis, of more fundamental importance, at least with respect to violence.

This is not to say that we reject the need for some controls on intoxication. One striking aspect of poor management is the way in which some licensees promote high levels of drunkenness by various kinds of drinks promotions, such as cheap drinks combined with high cover charges. For this reason, we advocate an immediate and direct legislative assault on all practices involving discount drinks, "two-for-one" promotions, happy hours, and any other serving practices that have the effect of producing high levels of drunkenness in a short period. While one might debate the rights of individual patrons to choose to drink to intoxication, our findings concerning the destructive effects of mass binge drinking resulting from

deliberate and irresponsible price discounting and drinks promotions leaves us in no doubt that such practices should be banned.

The Regulation of Licensed Premises

Although there are moves in some parts of the world, including Australia, to deregulate the operations of licensed premises, extensive controls still operate at the levels of legislation, government bureaucracy, and police surveillance. In New South Wales, the *Liquor Act 1982 (Amended 1989)* and the *Registered Clubs Act 1976* are the major legislative instruments, supported by other acts, such as the *Gaming and Betting (Poker Machines) Taxation Act 1956*, and the *N.S.W. Security Industry (Amendment) Act 1985*. These acts are administered by the Liquor Administration Board, an organisation which has its counterparts in the other states, and by the police (Liquor Administration Board 1988). The problem is that while an enormous amount of effort goes into such issues as the regulation of amusement devices and poker machines, fire and safety standards, training of staff and standards of service, and the collection of license fees, relatively little effort is put into administering licensed premises so that social problems like violence (or drinking and driving) are prevented. It is clear from our research that violence could be much reduced by changes to the management and regulation of licensed premises, but for historical reasons the regulatory paths pursued have tended to ignore or worsen the problem (Homel and Tomsen 1991).

The typical patrons in high violence establishments are young working class males. The low social status and power of this group has effects at all levels in the criminal justice system, which deploys enormous resources towards the surveillance and control of young men. Very often the misfortunes incurred by these young victims are seen as deserved, and criminal assaults on them are thought of as essentially victimless incidents. The real victim in such cases is regarded as being a more abstract and subjective notion termed the "public order."

It is paradoxical that although rowdy drinking is regulated with consideration to the "public order," instances of violence are conceived by politicians, bureaucrats, and police as individualised disputes between different patrons. Assaults on individual victims are the responsibility of those victims, and are not thought of as contravening the public interest in that citizens should be free from unreasonable violence. This indicates a major flaw in the current form of the *N.S.W. Liquor Act*, which directly mentions violence in only two places: in S.103(1)(a), where a licensee or his employee is permitted to turn out any person "who is then intoxicated, violent, quarrelsome or disorderly"; and S.125(1)(b), where it is stated that a licensee shall not "permit intoxication, or any indecent, violent or quarrelsome conduct, on his licensed premises."

There is an urgent need for amendments to S.125, so that the continuous operation of a violent venue is an offence under the act that will lead to the cancellation of a license. Action to close down at least five regularly violent discos in the West End area of Melbourne has been taken in the past two years, on the

initiative of the Liquor Licensing Commission and the Victorian Community Council Against Violence, but appears never to have been contemplated in New South Wales and other states.¹⁰

A further policy priority to emerge from our research was the need for better regulation and training of bouncers. Bouncers are required under the *Security Act* to both hold a valid and current security license and to carry related identification on the job, such as a photo identification card. One aim of this legislative provision is to discourage aggressive and violent individuals from becoming bouncers. However, it is obvious from our research that despite the intentions of the legislators, a significant number of working (and licensed) doormen are still prone to violence. This suggests that there is a need to mandate training for security staff in human interaction skills, crowd control, and non-violent conflict resolution. In addition, it is essential that the existing legislation be enforced in line with the intentions of Parliament. Without a greater overall police effort to implement the *Security Act*, it has little more than symbolic value and will do nothing to reduce actual levels of violence.

Conclusion

Regular violence in public drinking locations cannot simply be blamed on rowdy patrons or excused as something natural and unstoppable. Nor can it simply be blamed on the irresponsible ingestion of a legal drug. The drinking environment is an evolving historical and cultural product, which can be left unchanged or altered for the better. It is clear from our research that continuous patterns of violence in these locations are strongly related to local situational variables, which in turn reflect management practices and government legislation and regulation.

While it is difficult, and perhaps not even desirable, to attempt to modify the routine activities of pub and club goers, it is far easier, and surely consistent with broad considerations of the public good, to regulate the routine activities of the premises they frequent (Sherman et al. 1989). The most extreme way of doing this is to incapacitate the activities of the worst "hot spots" by license cancellation. Short of this, the other reforms in regulatory practices that we have outlined briefly in this article have the potential to improve greatly the safety of licensed premises for the tens of thousands of young people who rely on these places to provide most of their entertainment.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The study of licensed premises in Sydney was funded by the Criminology Research Council and the N.S.W Directorate of the Drug Offensive, and was also actively supported by the N.S.W. Police Department, who seconded one of the authors, Constable J. Thommeny, to the project to assist in data collection and analysis. The opinions expressed in this article are those of the authors and do not

PUBLIC DRINKING AND VIOLENCE

necessarily reflect the views or policies of the funding agencies or of the N.S.W. Police Service.

NOTES

1. One reason why police may be reluctant to process assaults involving drunk offenders is the fear that in court the defendant may invoke the common law plea of "diminished responsibility" (Howard 1970).
2. Evidence on the alcohol-violence link comes from six streams of enquiry: trend studies in populations; studies using drinking locations as the unit of analysis; natural experiments; individual coincidence estimates; experimental studies; and observational studies of drinking in natural settings. Observational, drinking location, and population trend studies are the least common, while those based on individual coincidence estimates are the most common, including as they do studies of injured persons treated at hospital (e.g., Cuthbert 1990); surveys of self-reported drinking and violent acts in the general population (e.g., Kantor and Strauss 1987); analysis of police crime incidence reports (e.g., Robb 1988); and studies of convicted criminals or of problem drinkers (e.g., Indermaur and Upton 1988). Despite the different approaches and widely differing quality of the data, the literature as a whole does support the thesis that under some circumstances there is a causal link between alcohol consumption and violence, but specifying the exact nature of "the circumstances" has proven to be a problem of extreme difficulty (Collins 1989).
3. Restrictions on length prevent us from presenting more than a summary of our methods and results. Readers interested in further details of the study are referred to Tomsen, Homel and Thommeny (1990) and to Homel and Thommeny (1991).
4. In contrast to Graham and associates (1980) we took physical violence as our major dependent variable, using an aggressive atmosphere as one of the predictors.
5. Most hotels and licensed clubs in Sydney contain more than one "site" for drinking. These include public bars, lounge bars, restaurants, nightclubs, and discos. Depending on reputation and on the results of exploratory visits, one or more sites within a pub or club were selected for further study. For purposes of analysis, two sites on the same premises were treated as separate drinking settings. Most visits were conducted by the same two observers (Tomsen and Thommeny), sometimes operating as a pair and sometimes accompanied by a friend, work colleague, or spouse.
6. Observational research of this kind entails obvious ethical problems. In our defense, we did not look for assaults for their own sake. We sought rather to understand the dynamics of violent premises. In addition, on two occasions observers called staff who broke up incidents before they could become serious,

and on another occasion an observer ended up in a local police station during the early hours of one morning as a witness.

7. Dyck (1980) notes that although the notion of a "fair fight" was accepted both in the barrooms and in the courtroom, some incidents in Parklund bars did not fall into this category. These included fights in which weapons were used, fights initiated by bullies known as "chicken-shit bastards," and vicious assaults by men known as "rangatang." However, the majority of incidents he describes were "scraps" in which co-participants were more or less jointly agreed upon settling their differences with their fists.

8. Supervised by Homel, this study involved 147 visits and three hundred hours of observation. It was carried out by twenty-two senior year students of Macquarie University in July and August 1991.

9. An overview of early Australian developments in responsible serving may be found in Homel and Wilson (1987). The philosophy of the main Australian program (*Patron Care*) is set out in Carvolth (1988). The results of a recent industry-federal government initiative are set out in the *National Guidelines for the Responsible Serving of Alcohol* (National Alcohol Beverage Council and National Campaign Against Drug Abuse 1990).

10. Establishments closed down in Melbourne specifically because of violence include Bojangles, the Hippodrome, the Richmond Football Club disco, the Gasmeter Hotel, and the Underground (information supplied by Mr. Arch Sutton, Liquor Licensing Commission). Sherman and associates (1989) refer to two violent bars in Minneapolis that had their licenses revoked, so this practice may also be common in cities in other countries.

REFERENCES

- Berger, D.E., J.R. Snortum, R.J. Homel, R. Hauge and W. Loxley
1990 Deterrence and prevention of alcohol-impaired driving in Australia, the United States and Norway. *Justice Quarterly* 7:453-465.
- Carvolth, R.
1988 Patron Care - The health/alcohol industry Glasnost: Criticisms and opportunities. Keynote Address at the First International Conference on Responsible Hospitality Practices, Brisbane, June.
- Carvolth, R.
1991 Latest Developments in Server Training Research. Paper delivered to the National Workshop for Research into the Licensed Drinking Environment, Melbourne, May.

PUBLIC DRINKING AND VIOLENCE

- Cohen, L.E. and M. Felson
1979 Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review* 44:588-608.
- Collins, J.J.
1989 Alcohol and interpersonal violence: Less than meets the eye. In *Pathways to Criminal Violence*, N.A. Weiner and M.E. Wolfgang (eds.), 49-67. Newbury Park: SAGE.
- Cuthbert, M.
1990 Investigation of the incidence and analysis of cases of alleged violence reporting to St Vincent's Hospital. In *Australian Violence: Contemporary Perspectives*, D. Chappell, P. Grabosky and H. Strang (eds.), 135-146. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Cutler, R.E. and T. Storm
1975 Observational study of alcohol consumption in natural settings: The Vancouver beer parlor. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 36:1173-1183.
- Dyck, N.
1980 Booze, barrooms and scrapping: Masculinity and violence in a Western Canadian town. *Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 1:191-198.
- Fairweather, J.R. and H. Campbell
1990 *Public Drinking and Social Organisation in Methven and Mt. Somers*. Canterbury, New Zealand: Agribusiness & Economics Research Unit, Lincoln University.
- Fisher, H.R.
1985 *Studies of Drinking in Public Places: An Annotated Bibliography*. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation.
- Glaser, B.G. and A.L. Strauss
1967 *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine.
- Graham, K., L. La Rocque, R. Yetman, T.J. Ross and E. Guistra
1980 Aggression and barroom environments. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 41:277-292.
- Graves, T.D., N.B. Graves, V.N. Semu and I.A. Sam
1982 The social context of drinking and violence in New Zealand's multi-ethnic pub settings. In *Social Drinking Contexts*, T.C. Harford and L. Gaines (eds.), 103-120. Washington, D.C.: NIAAA.
- Gustafson, R.
1986a Threat as a determinant of alcohol-related aggression. *Psychological Reports* 56:287-297.
- Gustafson, R.
1986b Alcohol, frustration and aggression: An experiment using the balanced placebo design. *Psychological Reports* 59:207-218.

- Homel, R. and S. Tomsen
1991 Pubs and violence: Violence, public drinking and public policy. *Current Affairs Bulletin* 68(7):20-27.
- Homel, R. and P. Wilson
1987 *Death and Injuries on the road: Critical Issues for Legislative Action and Law Enforcement*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Howard, C.
1970 *Australian Criminal Law*. Melbourne: Law Book Co.
- Indermaur, D. and K. Upton
1988 Alcohol and drug use patterns of prisoners in Perth. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 21:144-167.
- Kantor, G.K. and M.A. Strauss
1987 The "drunken bum" theory of wife beating. *Social Problems* 34:213-230.
- Liquor Administration Board
1988 *Annual Report 1987/88*. Sydney: Liquor Administration Board.
- McGregor, H.
1990 Domestic violence : Alcohol and other distractions — A grassroots perspective. In *Alcohol and Crime*, J. Vernon (ed.), 59-66. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Mass Observation
1943 *The Pub and the People: A Worktown Study*. London: Gollancz.
- Miles, M. and A. Huberman
1984 *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Beverly Hills, California: SAGE.
- Ministry for Police and Emergency Services, Victoria Police
1989 *Study of Serious Assaults on Civilians Reported to the Victoria Police*. Melbourne: Ministry for Police and Emergency Services.
- Moskowitz, J.M.
1989 The primary prevention of alcohol problems: A critical review of the research literature. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 50:54-88.
- National Alcohol Beverage Council and National Campaign Against Drug Abuse
1990 *National Guidelines for the Responsible Serving of Alcohol*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- National Committee on Violence
1990 *Violence: Directions for Australia*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Robb, T.
1988 *Police Reports of Serious Assault in N.S.W.* Sydney: NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.
- Sherman, L.W., P.R. Gartin and M.E. Buerger
1989 Hot spots of predatory crime: Routine activities and the criminology of place. *Criminology* 27:27-55.

- Taylor, S.P. and C.B. Gammon
1976 Aggressive behavior of intoxicated subjects: The effect of third party intervention. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol* 37:917-930.
- Tomsen, S., R. Homel and J. Thommeny
1990 The causes of public violence: Situational and other factors. In *Australian Violence: Contemporary Perspectives*, D. Chappell, P. Grabosky and H. Strang (eds.), 177-194. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Victorian Community Council Against Violence
1990 *Violence in and around Licensed Premises*. Melbourne: Victorian Community Council Against Violence.