

Factors associated with alcohol-related problems within licensed premises

Report to the Greater Glasgow NHS Board

(February 2005)

Dr Alasdair J M Forsyth,
Glasgow Centre for the Study of Violence
Room M436, George Moore Building,
Cowcaddens Road,
Glasgow G4 0BA
Glasgow Caledonian University

Dr Martin Cloonan & Professor Jean Barr
Centre for Research and Development in Adult and Lifelong Learning,
Department of Adult and Continuing Education,
St Andrew's Building, 11 Eldon Street,
Glasgow G3 6NH
University of Glasgow

Preface

The idea for a research project to examine the factors that influence levels of disorder associated with licensed premises in Glasgow city centre was first proposed by Jack Law and Mary Elmers of Alcohol Focus Scotland in early 2003. Alcohol Focus Scotland run an alcohol server training program, called *ServeWise*, this is a social responsibility intervention course for employees of the licensed trade industry. This idea, for a project to examine how factors such as staff training and other variables impact upon levels of disorder within licensed premises in Glasgow, arose following the refusal to grant the renewal of license for a nightclub in the city in October 2002. At the time, a senior police officer described the nightclub concerned as the “epicentre of violence” in Glasgow city centre. This case brought into focus the need for research to be conducted within Glasgow’s licensed premises, including both those with a high level of known disorder and those unknown to the police, this fuller picture being necessary in order to ascertain which factors, present in premises with low levels of disorder, may be preventative of such problems. An understanding of these preventative factors would allow policies to be drawn up with the intention of minimising the occurrence of such alcohol-related problems in future. In the months following this proposal, concerns regarding binge drinking and violence in the night-time economy, in Glasgow city centre and elsewhere, continued to grow and in March 2004 Greater Glasgow NHS Board commissioned this research project.

Acknowledgements

The authors of this report would like to thank the following groups and individuals for their assistance and support during the preparation of this research. Firstly thanks are due to the project steering group, which comprised Andrew Millard, Caroline Cherry and Nikki Boyle (all Greater Glasgow NHS Board), Stephen Birrell (Glasgow City Council), Linda Bowie (Alcohol Focus Scotland), John Duffy (Strathclyde Police) and Michael McHugh (Strathclyde Licensed Trade Association). Thanks also to Christopher Mooney (Senior Geographic Intelligence Analyst at Strathclyde Police) for data analysis, to Peter Doyle, Katie Hunter, Sarah Menzies, Tony McKee and Steve Parkin (all University of Glasgow) for conducting field observations on licensed premises, to Allie Neave (University of Glasgow) for secretarial support, to Joyce Lang (University of Glasgow) for project management during data collection and to David Shewan (Glasgow Caledonian University) for supporting the project during writing-up. Special thanks are due to Professor Kathryn Graham of the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada for her kind permission to use and adapt her research instruments for the purposes of this report and also to Alex Meikle of the Glasgow Council on Alcohol for his backing of the project tender. Finally thanks are due to all those members of staff working in Glasgow’s city centre public houses who participated in the research, in particular to the eight anonymous interviewees.

Contents	page
1. Introduction	
Aims	4
Background	6
2. Methods	
Research design and instruments	17
Identification of licensed premises	20
3. Levels of disorder and staff training	
Problems known to the police	31
Postal survey of licensed premises	34
Section of premises for observation	42
4. Observation of licensed premises	
Piloting and data recording	48
Characteristics of observed premises	50
Measuring risk factors for disorder	72
5. Observations of Disorderly Incidents	
Frequency of disorderly incidents	99
Characteristics of disorderly incidents	107
6. Staff views on disorder and server training	122
7. Discussion	
Conclusions	152
Policy Relevance	172
Recommendations	178
References	183
List of Tables	
Table 1: Characteristics of Observers	19
Table 2: City Centre Pubs' Clientele	38
Table 3: Selection Criteria for Observed Pubs	46
Table 4: Risk Factors in Observed Pubs	85
Table 5: Protective Factors in Observed Pubs	87
Table 6: Composite differences between Observed Pubs	91
Table 7: Incidents of Disorder Observed in Pubs	102
Table 8: Known Crime in Observed Pubs	105
Table 9: Observers' Ratings of Disorderly Incidents	108
Table 10: Characteristics of Serving Staff Interviewed	122
Appendices & Glossary	Supplement

1. Introduction

In this section the aims and objectives of this report and the background issues involved will be outlined. Specifically, firstly we will describe the nature of alcohol-related problems in Glasgow city centre's licensed premises. Secondly we will review the international literature on bar-room violence particularly that which provides pointers to how such disorder may be prevented or minimised.

In April 2003 it was estimated that there were 295 pubs and clubs within a half square mile of Glasgow city centre, in an area bounded by Queen Street, Argyle Street, Hope Street, and Buchanan Street. At this time, an estimated 70,000 revellers were attracted into this area (the former Exchange district of the city) per night during the weekend (Smith & Robertson, 2003). This study will examine weekend nightlife in this area, as well as other parts of the city centre with a concentration of licensed premises.

1(i) Aims

This project aims to identify the factors that can influence disorderly behaviour and other alcohol-related problems within licensed premises in Glasgow city centre with a view to developing recommendations that may assist licensing, policing and city centre management. Specifically, the factors to be investigated included 'risky' / 'safe' drinking environments and poor / good server practice.

The project also has the wider aim of exploring ways of by which the Glasgow's night-time economy can be perceived as a safer, more attractive, welcoming environment that may encourage others to visit, participate and wish to return. The findings of this research should help improve our understanding of the causes of alcohol-related disorder throughout Scotland and how to prevent these episodes from occurring. This research should be of direct benefit to the Scottish licensed trade industry, with these objectives also bringing further, and more widespread, indirect benefits to Scottish society as a whole.

To date, our research-based knowledge of why disorder occurs in and around licensed premises in Scotland is rather limited. Although, some research of this nature has been conducted elsewhere, principally in Canada and Australia, these studies' findings may not be applicable to the situation in Glasgow. Furthermore, our research-based knowledge of how best to prevent such disorder is even more limited, in particular the effectiveness of responsible server training programs in achieving this objective.

Audiences

The project intends to produce a range of recommendations designed to help reduce alcohol-related harms in Glasgow city centre. Audiences for the report should include city centre management, the emergency services, the licensed trade industry, licensed premises staff and their patrons / drinkers. The results of this research should be of great interest to all of those who deal with issues concerning alcohol, health and public order offences, ranging from policy makers and academics to members of agencies who have to deal with the consequences of such behaviour. Finally, the project's findings should be of real practical relevance to those engaged in employee training programs within the drinks and hospitality industry. A glossary of esoteric terms used in the current Glasgow drinking culture is provided at the end of the Appendices to this report to assist those who may be unfamiliar with the trappings of the licensed trade business and the vernacular of the night-time economy.

Key Questions

- 1. What are the licensed premises-related factors influencing a high risk of alcohol-related violence and disruption within the city centre?**
- 2. What promotes excessive alcohol consumption within these licensed premises?**
- 3. What promotes moderate alcohol consumption within these licensed premises?**
- 4. Does the way staff interact with clientele (including server trained staff) during both disruptive incidents and periods of normal service mediate against disruptive, anti-social or violent behaviour within the sample?**

- 5. What influence does overcrowding have, if any, on these issues?**
- 6. What demographic groups are more or less likely to contribute to anti-social, disruptive or violent behaviour?**
- 7. What other factors relating to the premises e.g. entertainment, frequency of glass collecting, monitoring of toilet areas, provision of food, premises layout etc. prevent or encourage the behaviours highlighted?**
- 8. How do trigger factors interact?**

In summary then, there are gaps in our knowledge concerning alcohol-related problems and their association with licensed premises in Scotland which this research intends to fill. The above key questions are particularly salient at the present time, as across the UK there has been a perceived increase in such problems. Whether or not this current ‘cause for concern’ is without foundation, in the next section we will describe recent changes to the licensed trade industry and how these may represent a new potential for increased alcohol-related problems, such as those that are investigated in subsequent chapters.

1(ii) Background

Alcohol, Disorder and the Night-Time Economy

Excessive consumption of alcohol and the problems associated with such behaviour have long been a cause for concern in Scotland, as the country has relatively high levels of these problems (e.g. see Brown et al 1999; MacLeod, 2004; Martin, 2004). These concerns have become particularly salient over the past decade with a sharp rise in alcohol-related problems being recorded across the UK (Alcohol Information Scotland, 2004; Academy of Medical Sciences, 2004; English, 2004; Engineer et al, 2003). This increase, in recorded alcohol-related harms, has been contemporaneous with a perceived change in drinking culture. These changes have included:

- The rise of the night-time economy (NTE), also known as the ‘24 hour city’, which has lengthened the time in which on-trade alcohol consumption can take place in city centres (Hobbs 2003). These changes are thought to have been

brought about by a combination of the ‘rave scene’ of the late 1980s / early 1990s creating a demand for licensed entertainment venues to be made available during the night (in preference to illegal – i.e. unlicensed - venues, where the illicit drug ‘ecstasy’ rather than alcohol was consumed, Jenkins, 2005; Measham, 2004) and the increased availability of vacant property providing space for such premises in city centres as a result of retail and financial businesses ‘drifting’ to out-of-town locations (Collin, 1997; Hobbs et al, 2002).

- The above vacuum has, in part, been filled by the rise of the so-called ‘super-pubs’, which may be up to twenty times the size of traditional bars (Hobbs, 2003). In less than a decade these pubs have become a prominent feature of city centres and high streets across the UK. These branded chain pubs have been viewed both as an important component of urban regeneration and also as the source of the current binge-drinking problem (Bowers 2004a; Carter 2004; Hobbs 2003; Purves, 2004; Rayner, 2004). This growth in the licensed trade sector has been most rapid in recent years (i.e. since the millennium), with the Home Office in 2000 estimating that this was “the ‘biggest area of employment growth’ creating ‘1 in 5’ of all new jobs” (cited in Hobbs et al 2002). The size of these pubs, their popularity with younger drinkers, their success, their promotions and economies of scale are clearly likely to have a far-reaching impact upon the future of the licensed trade industry and urban policy. The proliferation of such establishments over the past five years has resulted in much criticism, even from within the licensed trade / alcohol industry. This trend has been referred to as the “McDonalds-isation of pubs” (Muspratt, 2004).
- Increased alcohol consumption by some groups, especially by young women, also known as ‘ladettes’ (Ford, 2005; Hinsliff, 2004; McRobbie, 2004; *The Times Health*, 2004). This has had the knock on effect of pubs increasing the range of drinks available, especially wines, cocktails and shots (*BBC Television* 2004; Young, 2004). The ‘intrusion’ of large numbers of females, into what was formerly regarded as male social space, is also thought to have been related to

rave culture creating a more female friendly environment for intoxication to take place (Henderson, 1993). It may also be the case that the levels of alcohol consumption amongst the current crop of young revellers has been artificially exaggerated by the relatively low levels of the prior ('chemical') generation of young revellers (*The Economist*, 1993; The Henley Centre, 1993).

- The advent and conspicuous consumption of new drinks, or re-branded drinks. These have included stronger beverages, stratified pricing from premium to economy / budget ranges, alcopops, beverages containing legal stimulant drugs such as caffeine, taurine, guarana or combinations of these with or without alcohol and more recently drinks known as shots or shooters. The appearance and marketing of all these has again been related to the drinks industry's successful counter-attack on rave culture and, along with increasing wine marketing, to the luring of more women toward binge-drinking (*BBC Television* 2004; Collin, 1997; Forsyth 2002; Measham, 2004; Rayner 2004; Winterman, 2005).
- The advent of new drinking venues and new drinks has been associated with increasing concern about how these are promoted, in what is perhaps becoming a saturated market (Stevenson, 2004). A variety of alcohol promotions, including 'happy hours', two-for-one offers and potentially 'code' breaking imagery (e.g. Portman Group, 2002) have been dubbed as irresponsible (because they are cheap) by some commentators and as misleading (because they are not cheap really) by others (Bowers, 2004b; Brown, 2004; Carter 2004; Hetherington, 2004). This has resulted in both blanket bans by local council licensing boards (Glasgow city decided to ban such 'happy hours' on the 25th September 2003) and some pub operators cutting back on cheap offers (Bowers 2004c).

In short then, the past decade has seen an increase in availability of a greater variety of alcoholic drinks, being consumed by a greater number and variety of people in city centres over a longer period of time. The pace of these developments is thought to have outstripped the ability of city centres' to plan for the necessary infrastructure to be able to

cope with this new pattern of leisure consumption (e.g. lack of public toilets or adequate transport may exacerbate this situation) (Anthony, 2004; Marsh & Kibby, 1992). These new phenomena clearly have the potential for increasing the health and social problems associated with alcohol and there is a clear need to conduct research in this area.

Binge Drinking

Foremost amongst the problems attributed to the above changes is an alleged increase in binge drinking. This has been dubbed “the new sort of British disease” by Prime Minister Tony Blair (Morris, 2004). In 2004, this image of ‘binge drink Britain’ spread beyond our shores, with, for example, the New York Times running a story about “the mess that is now High Street Britain on a weekend around half past 11” (Jolly, 2004). It has further been asserted that this intensification of binge drinking culture has resulted in increased levels of city centre disorder, particularly during the night at weekends (Hobbs, 2003; Jolly, 2004). Whether or not the above changes were responsible for an upsurge in city centre alcohol-related disorder, as of early 2004, there was clearly a belief in some quarters that they were (Bright & Hinsliff, 2004; Iredale, 2004; Travis 2004; *The Times*, 2005). Indeed by mid 2004, some branded chain super pubs were beginning to reduce their measures and cut back on promotional activity in order to appear more socially responsible (Bowers 2004c).

It is certainly widely agreed that binge drinkers are more likely to experience alcohol-related problems and are also (though not necessarily in causal sense) more likely to be involved in crime. A study of youth lifestyles by Richardson and Budd (2003) found that 69% of male and 45% of female, among those termed binge-drinkers, were involved in crime compared with only 34% and 18% respectively of those termed ‘regular’ drinkers. This does not of course mean that their binge drinking was responsible for their involvement in crime (criminals may be more at risk for binge drinking), but it does not refute this hypothesis either. Further evidence of this problem was provided by a recent study of young prisoners by the Howard League for Penal Reform (2004) in which more than half (52%) stated that alcohol was one of the reasons that they had got into trouble compared with only 43% who stated that illegal drugs had played a part.

It is also agreed that the peak days and peak times for alcohol consumption and the peak days and peak times for violence are the same and in the same geographical location. Past research has noted that there are two peaks in the evenings for disorder one in the hour around midnight; the other a couple of hours later (Briscoe & Donnelly, 2001; Hope 1986; Lister et al 2000). This corresponds to the closing times of pubs and night clubs (depending on local licensing policy) and can result in Sunday officially appearing to be the most violent day of the week, as so many incidents take place after midnight following a Saturday evenings out on the town. In regard to the role of alcohol and licensed premises in these trends, it is worth noting from the outset that the peak times for recorded violent disorder seem to occur soon after closing time - not during drinking / serving time.

For the above reasons, it has been concluded that in order to maximise the likelihood of researchers observing alcohol-related disorder associated with licensed premises, observations should take place at the weekend, at night in city centres (Allen et al, 2003; Block & Block, 1995; Hutchinson et al 1998). This project investigated the above issues as they pertain to Glasgow city centre by conducting observations at these peak times.

Licensed Premises and Disorder

Disorderly or inappropriate behaviour in and around licensed premises, is an undesirable phenomenon that can not only bring negative consequences for those involved, but which can also have a damaging effect upon the licensed trade industry, the industry's employees, patrons, the emergency services and the public at large. There is little doubt that there is a great deal of disorder and violence taking place within the night-time economy and there are a number of issues here requiring research (see Finney, 2004, for review). A recent UK government estimate stated that alcohol harms cost £20bn per year, with drink- related crime being the largest segment of this expenditure, including an estimated one in five of all violent crimes being said to take place around pubs and clubs, 70% of which were at the weekend (Cabinet Office Strategy Unit Alcohol Project, 2003).

Research examples which illustrate the salience of this issue, include the 1996 Scottish Crime Survey, which estimated that 20% of all violent crimes took place in or around public houses, and research by the Scottish Executive which found that, during 1998, 36% of pubs / clubs had experienced violent crime (including threats), with 16% experiencing actual violence. This latter figure compares with only 3% for all other businesses, (excluding restaurants / take-away food outlets). Similarly, the 2001 / 2002 British crime Survey found that 21% of all violent incidents occurred in and around a pub or club, with this rising to 38% of violence between strangers.

In a survey of public attitudes to alcohol, conducted by MORI (2001) for the Portman Group, across the UK, a majority of respondents felt that alcohol-related violence in pubs / clubs / bars was increasing, with 14% claiming to have been victims of violence themselves within licensed premises. From these figures it would appear that this is an important issue, which commands a great deal of public interest. This is exemplified by the prime-time TV slot occupied by the current BBC 'fly-on-the-wall' documentary TV series *Drunk and dangerous* broadcast in early 2004 or the Bravo satellite TV channel series *Booze Britain* broadcast twice daily later that year.

The above figures, and 'amplified' media reports, omit mention of the likelihood of a much greater volume of lower level disorder or sub-aggressive behaviours related to licensed premises. These anti-social behaviours might include rowdiness, such as shouting; bumping and barging; rudeness, such as insults and gestures; arguments; inappropriate or predatory sexual behaviour; indecency; drinking games; disruptive groupings; 'table-hopping'; obstructive actions; 'macho' posturing and non-compliance with bar-staff. These create more widespread problems but seldom receive much media or policy attention (Hollands, 2000). The importance of these sub-aggressive behaviours is not limited to the nuisance and inconvenience that they cause others, but extends to these being known to be predictive of, and even precursors to, more serious disorder (see Graham & Homel, 1997). This project also investigated the impact of these behaviours, as they are paradoxically more common yet less well researched or understood.

Previous research has indicated that the bulk of known disorder associated with licensed premises occurs in a very few locations (see Block & Block, 1995 for review). For example, an 11PM to 4AM study of young males attending Accident & Emergency in Cardiff, by Shepherd and Brickley (1996) found that 15% of injuries had occurred within a single city centre pedestrianised street (29% had occurred within pubs or clubs). Hope (1986) found that over a quarter of all police incidents in Newcastle city centre took place within a 250 square meter area containing twelve pubs. Ramsay (1982) found that a majority of violent incidents in central Southampton took place in only a few pubs and nightclubs. Homel & Clark (1994) in their study in Sydney, Australia, found that three quarters of physical assaults took place in only one fifth of the pubs that they observed.

The converse of all this is that there is little or no disorderly behaviour known to occur in the majority of licensed premises. This clustering was also found with non-violent aggression. Homel & Clark's study observed no violent incidents in two thirds of their sample of pubs. By using the participant observation method, rather than relying on official statistics, it was possible for this research to look at factors associated with the presence or absence of disorder in Glasgow pubs. These factors are likely to be important when attempting to understand how disorder occurs in its natural setting and also how it might be prevented.

This observational method also has the extra advantage over reliance on official statistics, in that it allows the impact of 'unknown' violent incidents to be measured. That is there may also be a great deal of disorder within pubs that remains unrecorded. This is what Hobbs (2002) refers to as the "dark figure". Similarly much alcohol-related violent crime may be unknown, or only known to some authorities, say medical but not police, as intoxicated people may be embarrassed or feel that there is no point in reporting the incident if they are drunk, especially if their attacker was a stranger (Flood, 2004; Shepherd & Brickley, 1996). Additionally, and of importance to this study, some premises may be wary of calling the emergency services for fear of incurring extra police attention or endangering their license (Lister et al 2000).

Observing Alcohol and Aggression

Although, much research has been conducted looking at alcohol and aggression in laboratory settings, looking at alcohol and the behaviour of aggressive individuals (i.e. offenders) and looking at the relationship between alcohol and disorderly offences in a population over time (i.e. long-term trends), relatively few studies have looked at the relationship between anti-social and drinking behaviours, as they happen, in a natural setting such as licensed premises. In short, although the issue of disorder within bars is well known, it remains little researched or understood (see Homel et al, 1999 for review). This is particularly so with sub-aggressive disorders, which despite being more commonplace, are less likely to be recorded in the official statistics. Clearly, research into disturbances in and around licensed premises would improve our understanding of these undesirable events and most importantly how these incidents might be prevented.

Homel et al (1999) stated that in order to improve our understanding of this problem “direct observation, supplemented by surveys of staff or patrons, is the best way of studying violence in the natural setting of licensed premises”. These are the specific aims and methods of this research project.

To date, the small number of research studies of this nature, focusing on ways in which drinking venues can be made safer, have been conducted mainly in Canada, Australia and New Zealand (e.g. Graham et al 2000; Homel & Clark, 1994; Graves et al 1981). However, this is the first such research to have been conducted in Scotland (see Alcohol Focus Scotland, 2001). Indeed, despite Scotland’s and the Scots’ reputation for alcohol-related aggression – whether or not this reputation is justified (Plant, 1981; Robertson et al, 1995; Scottish Executive, 1999) – unlike elsewhere in the UK (e.g. Hope, 1986; Maguire & Nettleton, 2003; Marsh & Kibby, 1993; Ramsay, 1982; Robertson et al, 1995; Shepherd & Brickely, 1996) there has been a marked absence of research addressing the problem of alcohol and disorder in this country. Similarly, research into the impact that the advent of night-time economy has had upon the city centre has been undertaken mainly in England (e.g. Finney, 2004; Hobbs, 2003; Hollands, 1995).

Interventions aimed at Minimising Disorder

One obvious way to promote sensible drinking behaviour and keep good order within licensed premises is through interventions by bar-staff. It has been widely acknowledged that improving staff skills, by what is known as responsible server programmes, can be effective in reducing disorder and other anti-social behaviours associated with licensed premises (Graham et al, 1998 & 2005; Homel et al 1999; Scott, 2002; St.John-Brooks & Winstanley, 1998). This research project measured the extent of the uptake of responsible server programmes in Glasgow and observed their outcome in practice.

The types of training programmes open to employees of the licensed trade are quite diverse, both in terms of the course content on offer and who they are aimed at. Aside from informal in-house training, large pub chains often run their own staff training and evaluation schemes. These may be applied differently, where appropriate, to different staff members according to their duties and level of experience. Other or additional training is provided by a number of external bodies currently operating within the Glasgow area. One of these, Alcohol Focus Scotland's *ServeWise* programme, includes a large social responsibility component (i.e. people skills and dealing with disorder) and it has different options open to both licensees (*ServeWise Plus*) and other bar staff (*ServeWise Standard*) (Alcohol Focus Scotland, 2001). A similar programme called the *Professional Licensee On-Sales Course*, open to current license holders and the day-to-day manager of on-trade premises, is run by a Glasgow college. The college also have their own course for bar staff called *Serve Smart*. The English based British Institute of Innkeepers (BII) also run a programme, aimed at licensees called the Scottish Licensee Certificate (SLC), from a Glasgow college venue. There are also courses open to stewards, including both training conducted by private firms such as *Blueprint Training Solutions*, *Principal Training Services* and *Up Front Training*, all of which are recognised by the Security Industry Authority (SIA), as well as professional stewarding programmes run by a college, including those for the City of Glasgow Certificated Steward Badge. By their very nature these stewarding courses are concerned with issues such as dealing with disorder and people skills.

Previously in Glasgow the extent and nature of alcohol server training has been largely unknown but was thought to vary greatly, both between and within different licensed premises. Potentially, levels of server training may vary between those bar staff who have undergone an extensive training programme, including courses with a specific component designed towards disorder reduction to those who are untrained beyond how to pour drinks or collect glasses. This project also asked licensed trade staff about their views on such training, whether they have received any, if so what this entailed and their experiences of its effectiveness.

Server interventions are believed to reduce levels of disorder by improving the ‘people skills’ of licensed premises staff. People skills include how to deal with disorder and other inappropriate behaviour that staff may encounter while on duty and, just as importantly, how to prevent such things from occurring in the first place. This can be done in a number of ways ranging from improving direct communication techniques between servers and patrons to managerial techniques such as improving the drinking environment / pub design (see below). The potential benefits of such initiatives are obvious. However, there remains a need to conduct research that fully evaluates the efficacy of such schemes, say in comparison to licensed premises where no staff have undergone any disorder-related training. This project examined a number of licensed premises, through direct observation, each with differing levels of involvement with server-training programmes and, through face-to-face interviews, we elicited different types of pub staff’s views on such programmes (ranging from licensees to floor staff).

Pub drinking Environment Features

This research not only looks at variations in the levels of disorder across Glasgow pubs, but also at variations in pub features that might be termed as ‘mediating variables’. That is the factors that influence the likelihood of disorder occurring in the first place. These mediating factors can be quite diverse, but include type of licensed premises, type of drinking environment, and type of clientele (Graham et al, 1980; Marsh & Kibby, 1993; Scott, 2002). For these reasons a variety of types of pub, each with differing levels of known disorder were included in this research in order to assess the impact of specific

interventions. Failure to do so could have lead to efficient staff being unfairly associated with disorder, as it may be the case that the staff who are best at reducing disorder are so precisely because they have to work in circumstances where there is an increased likelihood of such events occurring. For example, pubs with a strict door policy, plastic glasses or many male staff have been found to have more incidents of disorder, but such features may be indicative of the management taking steps to sort out that disorder rather than that these features are a cause of disorder (Quigley et al 2003).

It must be stressed that the key to understanding the aim of this report is not that licensed premises will be judged as being ‘successful’ or ‘failing’ dependent *solely* upon the level of disorder associated with the premises. Instead, the licensed premises are assessed according to the observation of evidence that they have features or practices in place that are efficacious at reducing the level of disorder or preventing it from happening in the first place. In other words, there would be no point in conducting this research in ‘quiet bars’ with low levels of known disorder, whose clientele are extremely unlikely to ever become involved in alcohol-related anti-social behaviour. In this report, a positive drinking environment and good practice by staff will be measured by the *relative* absence of disorder within licensed premises, where such anti-social behaviour might have been anticipated from the presence of known risk factors, as indicated by the academic literature (e.g. large pubs, those serving a ‘less affluent’ clientele or those with many young male patrons).

Summary

In this section we have outlined the issues to be addressed in this report. At the present time there is a growing level of concern nationally about binge drinking in city centres at night during the weekend and about alcohol-related problems around licensed premises. The main objective of this report is to shed some light on this phenomenon, in Glasgow, and in doing so to provide some pointers towards the formulation of policies which may help to reduce these problems. The next chapter will describe the methods used by this research in order to achieve these aims.

2. Methods

In this chapter we will look at the research methods used in the compilation of this report. These included both validated techniques and instruments used in other countries to measure bar-room disorder and approaches unique to this project. As will now be described in detail, this research utilised a variety of methodologies including a postal survey, observational fieldwork and face-to-face interviews to provide a full picture of the issues raised in the previous chapter.

2(i) Research design and instruments

The main method used in this research project was participant observation in pubs. However, these observational findings were corroborated by the use of contemporaneous official (police) statistics. Interviews were also conducted with bar staff employed by each of the licensed premises observed. This was done following the completion of the observational research. Before observations began, however, a postal survey of pubs in Glasgow city centre was conducted in order to assist in the selection of a range of pubs appropriate for the study. Thus the overall research project and structure of this report can be divided into three clear components:

1. A postal questionnaire survey (yielding quantitative data)
2. An observational field study (yielding both quantitative and qualitative data)
3. Face-to face interviews (yielding mainly qualitative data)

Consultation with Research Partners

The method used to select pubs suitable for inclusion in this research project included a consultation process with the project advisory group partners. These comprised the police, the licensed trade association, an alcohol agency and local government representatives. Such multi-agency partnerships are known to be effective at pinpointing 'hot-spots' disorder, both directly (e.g. drunkenness) and indirectly (e.g. disturbances) related to alcohol (Tierney, & Hobbs, 2003). This allowed both individual licensed

premises and clusters of such venues, with either a history of association with disorderly behaviour (e.g. binge drinking, overcrowding) or no known history of such events, including those with the presence and / or absence of mediating / trigger factors, to be identified.

Given the time-scale and resources available for this project it was decided to conduct the observations and interviews in no more than eight licensed public houses. To begin the pub selection process, in April 2004, a list of the names and addresses of all licensed premises in Glasgow city centre was obtained from Strathclyde Police. The list included a variety of licensed premises each with different types of licenses, including Hotel, Restaurant and Entertainment. To standardise fieldwork (e.g. opening hours) it was decided to focus upon only one type of premises, those holding a Public House License (hereafter referred to as pubs).

There were three other reasons for choosing to conduct this research in pubs in preference to other types of licensed premises. Firstly, there are many more pubs in Glasgow, than say hotels or nightclubs. Their numbers made a good response rate to the postal survey segment of the research (see below) more likely and therefore also capable of producing meaningful statistics. Secondly, observations in these should be easier than in the nightclub environment (owing to size, number and movement of patrons, type of lighting etc.). Thirdly, as detailed in the previous chapter, it was pubs, especially branded chain pubs that were largely being held responsible for the current problems. It was decided that the final sub-sample of pubs, to be observed in the field (see below), would be located in Glasgow city centre and be divided evenly along lines of known disorder and staff training provision, including premises with high levels of known disorder and / or high levels of server responsibility training.

Glasgow Pub Observers

Observers were recruited in June 2004. They were divided into two teams, each with one male and one female observer. Initially all the observers were recruited from the post-graduate student population of DACE (Department of Adult & Continuing Education) at

the University of Glasgow. However, one male observer was replaced when he obtained full-time employment (see Chapter 7). All five observers visited each pub on an equal number of occasions (in the case of three observers this was two occasions each, with the remaining two, the observer who left and his replacement, visiting each pub only once). In subsequent chapters these observers will be termed as Team A and Team B. In subsequent chapters field-notes or quotes attributed to each observer will be described by using a notation system indicating their gender and team membership where appropriate. For example ‘AF’ will indicate Team A female observer and ‘BM1’ will indicate Team B original male observer (BM2 being his replacement). A summary of the observers and their characteristics is given shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Characteristics of observers

Team	Gender	Age	Occupation	Experience	Preferred Pub observed	Notation (Nights of observation)
A	Female	25	MSc Student	Bar Server	‘Swan’	AF (16)
A	Male	37	MSc Student	Pub DJ	‘Swan’	AM (16)
B	Female	26	MSc Student	Bar Server	‘Crown’	BF (16)
B	Male	28	MSc Student	Bar Server	‘Crown’	BM1 (8)
B	Male	37	Researcher	Observer	‘Red Lion’	BM2 (8)

The trained observers were all made familiar with the aims and methods of the research, but were not made aware of the reasons why specific pubs had been selected until the end of the project. Each of the two teams of two observers was of mixed gender to be in line with the design of previous work of this nature under-taken in Canada and elsewhere (e.g. Graham et al, 1980). This mixed gender format is preferred here as it is the most likely staffing combination to ensure the teams’ access to licensed premises, to help them to ‘blend in’ to the pub environment, to increase their personal safety and to lessen their chances of receiving unwanted attentions by ‘table-hoppers’ or others who might compromise the research, such as people ‘pulling’ (see Glossary). In other words ‘couples’ are the most likely to be able to observe what goes on in licensed premises without being observed themselves.

The observers were recruited on their experience, particularly of bar work and on their likely ability to ‘fit in’ to the licensed premises being studied. In reality this meant that the observers had to be aged under-forty years of age and that they had to have some knowledge of local night-life patterns. One unsuccessful applicant who had been a night-club manager for many years and who was very interested in the research was rejected, with his full agreement, on the grounds of age. Three of the observers had experience of bar work and were actually intending to do (more) bar work over the summer had they not been employed in this project. Another observer was a pub DJ, however this involved ‘Goth’ nights and this observer perhaps made the greatest sacrifices to ‘fit in’ (see Glossary). The pubs that observers had worked in and also those which they frequented were excluded in advance of the final premises selection procedure to ensure anonymity and objectivity (though to this end all the observers were asked to make field-notes on whether each of the pubs they had observed were to their taste, see Table 1, and the importance of this as potential bias will be detailed in later chapters).

2(ii) Identification of licensed premises

Geographical Area of Study

The selection process also took account of local geography, including external hazards or attractions adjacent to the licensed premises and their localities’ accessibility, for both clientele and the emergency services. This was done by ensuring that all selected licensed premises were in the same general locality or at least in very similar localities. In his book *Friday Night Saturday Night*, Robert Hollands (1995) makes use of the ‘divided city’ concept in central Newcastle, to identify areas frequented by different groups of young people. These concentrations of similar drinking venues can include clusters of similar pubs located in: a city’s ‘central business district’, in ‘student areas’, in ‘Bohemian west-ends’, in ‘red-light districts’, in ‘historic / heritage centres’ adjacent to a ‘theatre district’, to ‘holiday / tourist attractions’ or be in ‘club-land’.

In the Glasgow city centre context, this meant suitable licensed premises would be located in the city’s central business district. That is the area sometimes known as the

Exchange District, bounded by Queen Street Argyll Street, Hope Street and Cowcaddens Road. This area lies between the main bus and railway stations (including the starting points for late night buses), a fact that is both necessary for such pubs existence and a factor to be investigated in this research. This also meant that all pubs located in the city's 'red-light' district, Riverside, Merchant City and West End areas were excluded. However, for reasons detailed in the next chapter, premises holding a Public House license in those parts of the Blythswood and Charing Cross areas adjacent to Sauchiehall Street and Bath Street were included.

Pubs, and for that matter patterns of alcohol-related disorder, are not uniformly distributed across the city centre. For example, within this central area, as defined by this study (see above), on a street by street basis there were 15 pubs (i.e. licensed premises holding a public house license) located on Sauchiehall Street and only two on Argyle Street. Other streets with large concentrations of pubs (greater than 5 premises) were Hope Street (11 pubs), Bath Street (10), pubs and West George Street (6 pubs). Also the size of pubs in each location tended to vary according to local architecture. For example, the pubs on Bath Street were predominantly small basement bars (none of which were branded chains), while those on West George were vast conversions (a majority of which were branded chain pubs).

Type of Licensed Premises

The licensed premises to be studied in the proposed research were chosen along two dimensions: 1 – Frequency of alcohol-related disorder and 2 – Levels, types and coverage of server training. Suitable information regarding the former dimension was obtained from Strathclyde Police (see Consultation with Research Partners, see above) the latter via a prospective questionnaire survey (see Questionnaire Survey below).

To maximise the chances of disorder being observed, it was decided to focus upon premises serving a youthful interest group. This is because bar-rooms catering for younger clientele, especially young male patrons, have been thoroughly researched and consistently identified as high risk drinking environments in the international literature

reviewed in Chapter 1. Also as detailed in Chapter 1, in recent times, here in the UK, branded chain pubs have been the focus of particularly negative publicity in regard to their marketing techniques and how these may have encouraged binge-drinking and disorder amongst young people (e.g. Bowers, 2004c; Purves 2004; Stevenson, 2004). For this reason it was decided to focus upon such pubs in this research. These large so-called ‘super-pubs’ are usually themed or are run as branded chains, such as *All Bar One*, *Bar Med*, *Bar Zuka*, *Edwards*, *Flares*, *Goose*, *Ha ha*, *Hogshead*, *O’Neils*, *It’s a Scream*, *Slug & Lettuce*, *Waxy O’Connors*, *Wetherspoons* and *Yates*. These modern pubs are also thought to attract a particular cross-section of youthful employed patrons, including stag and hen parties at the weekends (Rayner, 2004).

In the remainder of this report such premises will be referred to as branded chain pubs or brands. It is important to distinguish between these branded chains and pubs which are owned by a pub company or ‘pubco’, such as *Enterprise Inns*, *Punch Taverns*, *Spirit*, *Unique*, *Pubmaster* and *Mitchells & Butler*, all of which have between two and six thousand premises (Neligan, 2003). Premises owned by or that are part of these ‘pubcos’ usually retain their individual character to the extent that drinkers will not be aware when their pub has changed hands between two of these ‘pubcos’. For example, one pub observed in the course of this research was over one hundred years old, it had retained much of its original décor / features and may be described as a traditional bar – yet it was part of a ‘pubco’ that also owned several branded chains. It was decided that the non-branded pubs in the final sub-sample for observational study should be split between those who are tied to a ‘pubco’ and those who are ‘independents’. To ensure the anonymity of all the observed pubs, in subsequent chapters these will be described with pseudonyms. How these pseudonyms were derived and a final pub typology (constructed on completion of the research) is given in Appendix 5.

It was anticipated that the selection process would be simplified by many of the features thought to influence patterns of drinking and disorder, co-existing in the same (cluster of) licensed premises, at the same time. For example, in a population survey in Australia, Stockwell et al (1993) noted that violent incidents tended to occur at venues with a late

license, which ran drinks discounts, attracted single males aged under-25 and had a permissive attitude towards drinking. Similar clusters have been found in research conducted in licensed premises elsewhere (e.g. Graham & Wells, 2003 in Canada; Quigley et al, 2003 in the USA). Interestingly, this also means that the types of licensed premises most likely to be selected in research projects such as this, are those least likely to be frequented (i.e. understood) by public health policy-makers and academics.

Questionnaire Survey

The primary purpose of this phase of the project was to identify eight pubs for inclusion in the observational and interview phases of the research, depending upon the extent to which they had server trained staff and what training programmes they had utilised. From this, it was possible to construct a hierarchy of server training across the licensed premises surveyed. This was vital in order to ensure that the relatively small number of observed pubs ($n = 8$) in the main survey's sub-sample encompassed the full range of server training statuses apparent in central Glasgow.

A questionnaire enquiring about the premises, staffing and clientele was drawn up and sent to the publican / licensee / manager of all licensed premises holding a public house license in central Glasgow (as geographically defined above). A copy of the 'Pub Style' questionnaire form used in the postal survey is provided in Appendix 1. This questionnaire was brief (two-sided) to encourage a good response rate. Respondents to this postal survey received no direct benefit from participation in the research and we had no way of knowing if each questionnaire had even been received by its intended target. For these reasons a low response rate was anticipated (although as we will see in the next chapter this was not to be the case).

In the event of a poor response rate to the postal survey, it had been envisaged that non-responding bars could be used for piloting the observational research (see below) and that, perhaps as many as two, non-responding pubs could be included in the main study. There were many reasons why it was felt that at least one non-responding pub should be included in the final eight selected for field observations, including that such bars may

have the poorest server practices or the highest levels of disorder, while responding bars (especially if these are few in number) may be those which are most public spirited, socially responsible and most concerned about alcohol-related disorder or involved in the highest levels of server training.

Initially a sample of 80 licensed premises was envisaged to ensure the desired number of questionnaire returns (assuming a 10% response rate from the publicans). However in practice, 90 suitable premises were identified within the targeted geographical area of Glasgow city centre. Two of the premises that were initially sent a questionnaire were subsequently found to have ceased trading. These were replaced by the inclusion of two additional pubs located in an adjacent part of the city centre (around St Enoch's) along with ten other premises in that locality, the addition of this 'booster sample' bringing the final total target number for the questionnaire survey to the convenient figure of one hundred (by this time it had become clear that the response rate would considerably exceed initial expectations).

Though not all of the licensed premises receiving the questionnaire were likely to fit the selection criteria for the observational study, the unexpectedly high response rate to this survey meant that the secondary aim of this phase of the project could be completed. This meant that the postal survey could, in itself, provide an indication of the level of server-training provision across a broad section of city centre establishments.

Observational Study

Before embarking on the main observational study, the instruments and techniques for this phase of the project were piloted. This involved both observer teams and the principal investigator spending a night of observation in licensed premises similar to those selected for the main research. This primarily acted as a pilot for the research methodology, including the development of research-tools, timing, observing, recording and other logistical practicalities. However, a secondary purpose of the pilot night was that it acted as a reconnaissance exercise, in order that observers were able to familiarise themselves with the drinking culture in such venues. This was necessary so that when the

main study's observations commenced, the observers felt able to blend in to the drinking environment of the pubs selected for the main study. For example, the pilot observations helped ensure that observers were able to gain access to all the selected pubs and not fall foul of any licensed premises door policies, such as dress codes (see Glossary). Fortunately this never happened during the observational study.

This technique has previously been used during research in the rave scene in Liverpool, England, by Russell Newcombe (1991 & 1992), who wore baggy clothes and a baseball cap in order to establish the correct 'street-cred' for unobtrusive observation. This has the twin benefits of improving both personal safety and ability to observe. In short, the aim here is to allow the observers to report what it is like being a patron in a pub by effectively becoming like a patron in that pub, interacting with others, staff and clientele, in as natural a way as possible.

In line with the research of Graham et al (2000), conducted in Canadian bar-rooms, and also to assist in making them inconspicuous, the observers were each allowed to purchase one alcoholic and one non-alcoholic drink to "nurse" through out the night. However, in practice this proved problematic when asking serving staff for receipts with in one instance the bar of the pub concerned (a police crime 'hot spot', see next chapter) being left unattended while staff members attempted to provide the team with proof of purchase.

The observations were undertaken in eight Glasgow city centre pubs over the summer of 2004 (roughly corresponding to the students' period of summer leave). All observations took place at the weekends (Friday and Saturday nights) between the hours of 9PM and 1AM, these being the days and times which previous research had indicated as being when most disorder occurs (e.g. Caswell et al, 1993; Hollands, 1995; Stockwell et al, 1992). Each four hour period of field observations comprised of three hours being spent inside the pub selected during normal service and approximately one hour's work afterwards. This final hour included time spent inside the pub 'during drinking up time' and outside the selected licensed premises (mostly immediately after closing time) so that

the researchers could monitor the impact of patrons upon exiting, with the observations formally ending when the observers had left the city centre.

Although remaining in contact with each other throughout the night's observations (e.g. extensive use was made of text-messaging), individual observers and teams operated independently. Observers were instructed not to 'compare notes' or otherwise discuss or try to make sense of incidents until after they had formally recorded their evening's observations. Recording was done by means of independent, retrospective note taking, as soon as possible after observations ceased (i.e. when they got home). However, it was anticipated that it might not always be possible to remember and write down everything that happened in the wee small hours of the morning. Therefore it was necessary to make additions to field-notes and incident forms (Forms 1 and 2, see below) on some occasions. To assist in this process, observers were encouraged to use a number of techniques known to improve recall. These included taking notes in the pub, by making use of beer-mats, fliers, tickets or packets / wrappers and by using audio equipment. This was provided for observers to vocally record their observations prior to their final write-up. The use of audio equipment in this way has proven useful in the past for recording observed bar-room behaviours, late at night, before these are forgotten, such as in a study of 'skinhead' drinking styles in Perth Australia by David Moore (1990).

Links to Existing Research

For consistency and to assure completeness, the observers filled in a structured checklist (i.e. a questionnaire) after each night's observation. These instruments were designed and developed by Professor Kathryn Graham, who has pioneered this bar-room observation method research, into alcohol and disorder, in Canada over the past 20 years (Graham, 1999). Professor Graham's methods have been extensively used or adapted in other countries (e.g. Australia). This meant that it was possible for our research to generate meaningful results comparable with that published elsewhere.

Permission was sought from and granted by Professor Graham to use her instruments (adapted for use in Scotland) and equally importantly her bar-room observers training

manual (Graham, 2000). This resource was invaluable in teaching the observers this research technique and also in guiding the researchers towards effective project management strategies. Replicating Professor Graham's procedure also meant that our Glasgow study used validated research instruments for observing and recording incidents of disorder that have been refined over the past two decades around the world. Two validated, standardised instruments were obtained from Professor Graham for this purpose. These will hereafter be referred to as 'Form 1' and 'Form 2'.

Form 1 covered a broad range of observational characteristics of bar-room environments. The first section of this form guided the observers through a checklist of what happened when they entered the bar. The second section dealt with the drinking environment inside the bar, including measures of smokiness, noise, crowdedness, cleanliness, entertainment, food and drink provision or promotion. The third section dealt with bar activities and behaviours, such as levels of intoxication and hostility. The fourth section concerned the bar staff and their skills, especially measures for dealing with disorder or tolerance of bad behaviour (poor decorum). The final section guided the observers through a checklist of characteristics describing closing time. Amongst the items on this Form 1 were many items and rating scales ($n = 22$) of bar-room features or behaviours known to be predictive of (higher or lower) levels of alcohol-related disorder (see Chapter 4). A full list of the main questions asked of the observers using this form (i.e. excluding subsidiary questions), broken down by type of data each yielded, is given in Appendix 3.

Form 2 dealt with any specific incidents of disorder witnessed by observers during the research. This form rates each incident, notes who was involved, how it was dealt with by staff (if at all) and allows a detailed 'blow by blow' description of what happened to be made. From the observer training manual, such incidents must involve any purposeful physical or verbal aggression (according to a list of structured criteria given at the end of Form 1, see Chapter 5). It was therefore possible for teams (or a member of a team) to observe more than one incident during a night's work, or alternatively to observe no such incidents. Care was taken to include all incidents of disorder, however minor (e.g. offensive or insulting swearing or deliberate bumping), as rather paradoxically, the more

major incidents proved to be the easiest to observe and recall. Indeed, violent incidents can be regarded as ‘spectator-sports’, allowing more direct observation of events to be made (e.g. see Tomson, 1997). This is because few people are likely to be looking at the observers when major disturbance ‘kicks off’. It was hardly surprising then that in practice more serious incidents were invariably spotted by both observers, while more minor non-physical aggressive incidents tended to be spotted by only one.

While inside the pubs observers made unobtrusive observations of the drinking environment, the patrons’ behaviours and the staff’s people skills (normal service, as well as ability to deal with any incidents). However, although not covered by the two structured forms, it was also intended to attempt to assess the impact of each selected bar on the surrounding environment. Specifically, what, if any, disorderly conduct takes place outside, including observations of the pubs’ patrons in the city centre after closing time? This involved observations being made in the street after exiting the pub and throughout the city centre area part of each team’s journey home, again just as if they themselves were ordinary consumers within the night-time economy. In short, although not formally recorded in a validated structured way, each night of observational fieldwork concluded when either contact was lost with all the observed pub’s patrons making their way home or the research team had left the city centre. These ‘after-hours’ observations are important to the overall aims of this project as they will help to provide a complete picture of a night’s drinking and its consequences on Glasgow city centre.

On the Monday following a weekend of observations, the observers all reported back to the principal researcher at the University of Glasgow. At these meetings, any problems encountered or incidents of disorder witnessed were discussed by the group. Each week the relevant research instruments were returned to the principal investigator who conducted all analyses, at Glasgow Caledonian University, when the observational phase of the study had been completed. The other named investigators on the research team, at the University of Glasgow, provided ‘blind’ severity ratings of each incident of disorder according to a four-point scale in line with the work of Graham and colleagues (Graham

et al 2000). On completion of the full data set from the observational phase of the study, the staff interview phase was begun.

Follow-up Interviews

Taped interviews were conducted with bar-staff at each of the observed premises. These interviews had two aims. Firstly, the interviews helped to corroborate and provide possible qualitative explanations for the observational data generated by the methods described above. Secondly, these interviews were also designed to give a voice to those working in the night-time economy. Initial contact with potential interviewees (subjects) from each of the eight pubs was made by sending a letter to the publican at each, informing them of the research and its progress. Next, a direct approach was made, within each pub during the afternoon, to the duty manager. At this point, the duty manager would either give permission for the interview to take place straight away or contact the pubs' owner / head office. Although the duty manager was given first refusal, in practice a wide variety of bar staff were represented, ranging from the licensee to floor staff. The interviews were conducted at a time and location of the interviewees choosing.

The interviews were in-depth, semi-structured in nature to yield qualitative data and were all tape-recorded. All interviews were anonymised and care was taken so that the comments of any individual could not be related to any licensed premises. Interviews lasted around half an hour each (range 25 – 45 minutes), an information sheet about the research was provided and informed signed consent was taken before the interview commenced. Subjects were paid a fee of £20 for their participation. The data obtained from these staff interviews were transcribed at the University of Glasgow, then analysed at Glasgow Caledonian University by the principal investigator, who conducted all the interviews at this time.

These follow-up interviews with staff from the licensed premises observed, asked a series of semi-structured open-ended questions or topic themes. A copy of the pub staff interview schedule used is provided in Appendix 2. As well as enquiring about alcohol, disorder and server practices in more general terms, the opportunity was also taken to

raise specific issues relating to the premises apparent from the observational phase of the project. Each of eight research questions asked by this research project (detailed in the Introduction chapter) was covered during the interview.

Summary

This project utilises a number of research methods to investigate the relationship between alcohol-related disorder and licensed premises in Glasgow. Firstly, through consultation with advisory group partners (e.g. Strathclyde Police or Alcohol Focus Scotland), it was possible to identify a range of pubs according to levels of known disorder and server training. This latter factor was further investigated by the use of a postal survey of the 100 most central pubs in Glasgow city centre. From this information eight pubs were selected for a participant observation research.

Participant observation of eight licensed premises was undertaken over the summer of 2004. This yielded both qualitative data from observers' field-notes and quantitative data from observers' ratings of pub environments using an internationally validated instrument. Individually, incidents of disorder, ranging from non-physical behaviour to actual violence, were similarly recorded on a separate research instrument whenever they occurred. These were augmented by data obtained from the face-to-face qualitative interviews conducted with a member of staff from each of the licensed premises observed by the principal investigator.

In short then, the research methods adopted by this project allowed comparisons to be made between official crime statistics and disorder observed in the field, as well as allowing the potential impact of alcohol server-training interventions to be directly observed. Additionally, this research details the amount and types of server training in place in Glasgow's pubs and bar staff's attitude to both these and other issues that may impact on alcohol-related disorder in the city.

3. Levels of disorder and staff training

This chapter will describe the process by which the final eight pubs involved in the observational and interview phases of the research were selected. In doing so levels of disorder and bar staff training in Glasgow city centre were investigated, revealing some interesting patterns. There were two components to this process. Firstly the identification from police data of pubs or streets in Glasgow city centre, known to have a weekend night-time disorder problem. Secondly the identification of the different staff training statuses in pubs across the city's centre. This latter information was obtained via a postal survey of eligible pubs. From the relevant information on disorder, obtained from Strathclyde Police, and server training information, obtained from the questionnaire survey, a final eight suitable pubs were selected for the remainder of the research process. However, both the police data and the postal survey revealed some interesting research findings in their own right. These findings are also reported in detail in this chapter.

3 (i) Problems known to the police

Data on recorded levels of disorder were obtained from Strathclyde Police via the force's Community Safety Inspector. At an initial consultation, maps of city centre disorder were presented to the project steering group. These were broken down into three, three hour, time slots over Friday night / Saturday morning and Saturday night / Sunday morning. The geographical pattern of disorder varied greatly over these three time slots. However, the time slot of the greatest interest to this project, given the nature of the types of premises identified for study (see previous chapter) was between 10PM and 1AM. During this time slot, the geographical area of the city centre affected by the most disorder was the greatest in extent. At this time, the main concentration of such incidents corresponded closely to the geographical area singled out for this research (i.e. the Exchange district of the city centre). However, it was noted that there was also a separate concentration of such incidents on or near part of Sauchiehall Street and that during the later time slot (i.e. outwith the scope of this project) this concentration intensified at a point in time when other parts of the city centre, previously affected by disorder (i.e. within the scope of this project) had become relatively peaceful. As will be described

later, some monitoring of this Sauchiehall concentration of disorder was accommodated during the research process.

To assist in the selection of licensed premises, two separate data analyses were conducted by Strathclyde Police. These were an initial analysis of disorderly incidents logged within pubs and on the streets in the city centre area (as geographically defined above) during the Spring of 2004 and a known crime 'hot spot' analysis to pinpoint premises with high levels of disorder. A more detailed long-term (23 months) analysis of incidents within the final eight pubs selected for the observational research was also conducted for the purposes of this research by the Strathclyde Police following the completion of fieldwork, though this latter analysis will be reported in detail in Chapter 5 of this report.

Initial City Centre Pub Disorder Analysis

A police incident analysis for information gathered between 10PM and 1AM from April to June 2004 was undertaken to identify levels of disorder both within the pubs and on the streets of the research relevant area of the city centre. This involved collating data on four types of incident, simple assault, serious assault, drunk & incapable and breach of the peace. Relatively few incidents of disorder were identified as having occurred either within or immediately outside licensed premises. This would seem to be at odds with much of the media reports detailed in Chapter 1.

The analysis by pub was restricted to the initial 88 premises, identified as the most central in the city (see previous chapter). From this only 29 disorderly incidents were logged by the police. These occurred in only 10 pubs (only three of which were in branded chain pubs). One pub constituted more than one third of these incidents ($n = 10$), four pubs had three such incidents, two pubs two incidents and three pubs one incident. This left the vast majority (87%) of pubs with no recorded disorderly incidents, as defined above, over all the weekend nights over the previous three months. This concentration of known incidents in a relatively small number of premises would appear to concur with the literature reviewed in Chapter 1.

At this point it should be stressed that these figures represent disorderly incidents known to the police and not all incidents of disorder occurring in Glasgow city centre's pubs. Some pubs may be very disorderly but may choose not to call the police (see Chapter 1). Conversely, other bars may set very high standards of behaviour and call the police over relatively trivial events. Finally, these three months may not have been typical for at least some of the premises involved. (Evidence for all of these possibilities was uncovered during fieldwork, see Chapters 4 and 6). Nevertheless, the number of recorded incidents seemed strikingly low, to both the authors of this report and the project's steering group, underlining the need to conduct field observations to assess whether or not these police figures accurately reflected the reality of Glasgow's pubs at the weekend.

The corresponding analysis of known disorder broken down by street, according to police data, revealed many more incidents than when such information was broken down by pub. In total this street analysis yielded 385 incidents across the 22 streets that most closely described the locations of 88 pubs originally identified (see Chapter 2). Three streets had no incidents, with levels of reported disorder varying greatly over the remainder from only one incident (in 2 of the streets) to 68 incidents (Sauchiehall Street). As with the data on known disorder levels within premises these data require a great deal of caution in their interpretation.

This information will not accurately reflect the level of violence in the city centre due to a number of factors including non-reporting, under-reporting, changes to crime management system and changes in the way crimes are recorded. Also, it should be remembered that each of these streets vary not only in size, but in terms of how busy they are in the evenings at the weekends. For example, precincts or streets with a relatively large provision of public transport are likely to be busier at this time and this is likely to impact upon both levels of known crime (this data) and actual crime. Finally, the number of pubs on each street varies greatly (as described in the previous chapter) as do the number of other premises, including other types of licenses which may act as 'hot spots' for disorder (e.g. a cluster of premises holding entertainment licenses, i.e. nightclubs, in the Sauchiehall area).

City Centre All Premises Disorder ‘Hot Spot’ Analysis

The second crime analysis conducted by Strathclyde Police identified crime ‘hot spots’ within the city centre during the night at the weekends. This involved data gathered over a 13 month period (June 2003 to June 2004) from police beats covering Glasgow city centre. As might be expected this involved a much larger number of incidents than the previous analysis, 2,970 in total. This analysis also included a broader range of crimes and offences including simple assault (604 incidents), serious assault (113) drunk & incapable (75) and breach of peace (823), as well as other disorderly incidents such as vandalism (201), public urination (112) and resisting arrest (184).

These data were first broken down by premises, which in this case could be any kind of premises, not just pubs or other licensed premises. This process identified 17 ‘hot spot’ premises (with nine or more recorded incidents). Only five of these were pubs (two were branded pubs), with two of these ‘hot spot’ pubs also featuring in the initial three month analysis conducted for this project (the two pubs with the most disorder each data set). The remainder was an odd mix of premises including nightclubs (4 ‘hot spots’), bus / railway stations ($n = 3$), food-outlets (2), a shop, a casino and a hostel. When broken down by street these new data revealed a similar pattern to that of the earlier three month analysis. Combining the premises and street data revealed that the area of the city most badly affected by crime between 10PM and 1AM at the weekends was, as expected, the Exchange district, confirming this as the part of the city where the bulk of the field observations of problems associated with licensed premises should take place.

3 (ii) Postal Survey of licensed premises

The aim of the postal survey was two fold:

- To obtain information on the suitability of each pub for the main study
- To obtain an overall picture of staff training in Glasgow city centre pubs.

The primary aim (above) of this phase of the research was to identify pubs' style, particularly whether they were frequented by young people and what other types of patrons. This would ensure that observers were not sent to inappropriate pubs, for example, premises catering for older people, a special interest group (where observers would be conspicuous) or where few women were patrons. The questionnaire also enquired about staff training in order that licensed premises with a variety of training statuses would be involved in subsequent phases of the study, that is, pubs that only train in-house, those that use external trainers and those that have involvement with social responsibility server training programmes such as Alcohol Focus Scotland's *ServeWise*. Basically, this meant that the postal survey had the objective of obtaining such information from a minimum of eight suitable pubs.

The questionnaire was first sent out at the beginning of June 2004. Subsequently it was sent out again to non-responding pubs, twice, so that by mid July 2004, a final total of 58 responses was achieved. However, three questionnaires were returned anonymously (all identifying marks on the questionnaire had either been obliterated or torn off), two of which were returned in the first sweep (including the very first one received). As there was a possibility of duplication (the anonymous pubs would all have received more than one questionnaire) these three cases were deleted from any subsequent analyses. Therefore, the final sample in the postal survey was representative of 55% of Glasgow city centre pubs. This was considerably in excess of expectations, as the survey had only aimed to obtain information on training and clientele from a minimum of eight licensed premises in order to assist in the selection of pubs for the subsequent observational and interview phases of the research. In other words, the project was provided with the bonus of having data on the majority of Glasgow's city centre pubs for analysis as research in its own right. That is a snapshot study of Glasgow's pubs' style, clientele and training provision, which will be described in the following section.

Responding Pubs

Two of the three key variables for pub selection (known crime and pub brand or 'pubco' chain) could be known in advance of the postal survey. Of the latter, there was no

significant difference in the likelihood of branded chain / non-branded chain pubs responding, with 13 of the 20 branded chain pubs (65%) in the study area responding compared with 42 (53%) of the remainder. There was also no difference in terms of response rate by known crime status, with six of the ten pubs with known disorderly crime responding to the survey. However, the four non-responding known crime pubs comprised the pub with the most incidents of all ($n = 10$) and three of the four with the second most known ($n = 3$). As will be detailed later, this was taken into account when selecting of the final eight premises.

This lack of a significant difference between pubs may only be a function of the very low number of crimes known to occur in Glasgow city centre's pubs. However, there was also no significant difference in the likelihood of responding to the questionnaire between pubs located on streets with higher levels of known disorder and those located on streets with lower levels. This was despite a relatively large number of such incidents ($n = 385$) being recorded over the analysed three month time slot and also despite levels of disorder varying greatly (between 0 and 68 incidents) across the 22 streets on which the initial 88 pubs were located (see selection procedure in Chapter 2). This uniformity in response rates by pubs' adjacent to street crime also implied a good geographical spread, with all of the main concentrations of pubs in Glasgow city centre (see Chapter 2) being represented by several premises in the sample of 55 premises.

Style of Pubs

The first side of the questionnaire enquired about the pubs' clientele (see Appendix). Respondents were given a list of potential patrons for a busy weekend evening, specifically 'tourists', 'students', 'women', 'young working people', 'after-work drinkers', 'clubbers', 'sports or music fans', 'diners', 'pre-arranged functions', 'hen or stag nights', 'families with children' and 'passing trade'. To each of these options the respondent was given the option to choose between "none", "few", "many" and "most". From this information it was hoped to be able to choose a range of pubs for the observational phase of the study whilst screening out any that may be unsuitable.

It is not known whether the (42 to 45) non-responding pubs differed by clientele in some systematic way from those that did, but it was clear that most of the pubs which responded had a clear potential for inclusion in the main study. Nevertheless, five bars were excluded on the basis that they stated that ‘few’ women drank in them and six on the basis that they mainly attracted a particular special interest group of music or sports fans where observers may have been conspicuous (e.g. Goths or Celtic fans).

From the point-of-view of the target population for this research, the options “many” or “most” constituted a majority of responses for ‘young working people’ (75.9%), ‘after-work drinkers’ (83.6%) and ‘clubbers’ (51.9%). Interestingly from the point-of-view of observer recruitment, less than half (40%) responded with ‘many’ or ‘most’ to the student option. On the other hand, it was interesting that only a small number of respondents indicated that their premises was frequented by another group of research interest, ‘stag or hen nights’ (16.4%). This finding seems unusual, as part of the stag / hen ritual is to visit several pubs in one evening. The only apparently less frequent clientele were families with children, which may reflect the question’s focus on weekend *nights* (see Appendix 1). A full breakdown of these findings is provided in Table 2.

Table 2: City Centre Pubs' Clientele

	None	Few	Many	Most	<i>n</i>
Tourists	4 (1)	37 (6)	14	0	55
Students	2	31 (5)	17 (1)	5 (1)	55
Women	0	5	49 (7)	1	55
Young Working	1	12 (2)	36 (4)	5 (1)	54
After-Work	0	9 (1)	49 (6)	6	55
Pre-club	4	22 (1)	24 (5)	4 (1)	54
Sport / Music	8	20 (5)	21 (2)	6	55
Diners	12 (1)	18 (2)	19 (4)	5	54
Functions	17 (1)	27 (5)	10 (1)	0	54
Stag & Hen	17 (1)	29 (4)	9 (2)	0	55
Families	41 (5)	12 (2)	2	0	55
Passing-trade	0	33 (3)	21 (4)	1	55

Note - Figures in brackets indicate the responses of the pubs observed in the main study that also returned a postal questionnaire (see next chapter).

In interpreting Table 2, it is worth remembering these frequencies are derived from publicans' self-report data. This means that these figures may not be strictly accurate, and are really only the respondents' impressions of who their clientele are or alternatively the impression of who their clientele are that they would wish to give. It was therefore of interest to see whether field observations would corroborate these responses and whether the face-to-face interviewees would support them, for example the high level of diners and low numbers of stag and hen nights reported here.

Staff Training Status

The second section of the postal questionnaire enquired about staff training at each pub. Firstly respondents were asked to indicate which of six types of training their staff had undergone. These were "Fire Safety Training" (which 82% of publicans said they were involved in), "Licensing Law" (89%), "Health & Safety" (93%), "Alcohol as a

Substance” (66%), “Social Responsibility” (60%) and “Food Hygiene” (91%). In short, nine out of ten of the publicans seemed to be saying that they were engaged in training their staff in terms of legal and safety aspects of their work, but around one third or more indicated that their staff training did not involve wider aspects of alcohol server responsibility. This may simply mean that the pubs were willing to meet their current legal obligations, but less willing, or able, to do other server training. Twenty five (46%) premises indicated that they engaged in all six types of training listed, twelve (22%) in five, with only one pub indicating only one type of training (food hygiene).

Secondly the publicans were asked to indicate who conducted their staff training. Again six options were provided. These were “In-house Training” (86% of pubs), “The Parent Company” (26%), “The British Institute of Inn Keeping” (27%), “*Welcome Host - Careers Scotland*” (6%), “*ServeWise - Alcohol Focus Scotland*” (16%) and “*Serve Smart - College of Food Technology*” (24%). There was a great deal of variance in responses to this question in terms of combinations of trainers used. Twenty two premises (40%) used only one source of training and in 17 cases this was ‘in-house only’. Eighteen (33%) used two sources of training and 13 pubs (24%) used three sources, one pub used four.

Thirdly respondents were asked to indicate how many of their staff had undergone the above training, with the options “few” (20% of pubs), “many” (18%), “most” (35%) and “all” (24%) being provided. When compared with number of types of training that staff underwent, there was a clear linear association ($X^2 = 8.2$, $df 1$, $p = 0.004$) indicating that pubs reporting more types of training also reported more staff being trained. For example, the pub reporting only one type of training stated that “few” were trained, while at the other extreme nine of 13 pubs who stated that “all” their staff were trained reported that had undergone all six types of training. There was no equivalent relationship in terms of number of sources of training being used, however it was noticeable that no pubs using either *ServeWise* or *Serve Smart* stated that “all” of their staff had been trained. At least some pubs using all other training sources indicated that “all” their staff had been trained by this method, though only in the case of those indicating that the parent company did their staff training did this figure reach 50%. In other words, it seemed that fewer staff

were likely to be involved in external training, such as programmes specifically designed help to reduce levels of drunkenness and disorder.

When types of training and who does the training were compared (a six by six cross-tabulation) it was apparent that, no matter who did the training, a majority of pubs using each type of trainer were involved in fire safety, licensing law, health & safety and food hygiene training. Although this is hardly surprising, given the large number of pubs who reported training their staff on these issues, this finding should be treated with caution because different training issues may have been met by different trainers or training bodies. It was interesting to note that it was only in pubs using the *ServeWise* programme that a majority of publicans replied that their staff were trained in social responsibility issues and only pubs using *ServeWise* and *Serve Smart* training had a majority responding positively to the alcohol as substance option. In other words, those pubs using external trainers appear to be more involved in types of training that are specifically designed to help reduce levels of drunkenness and disorder.

As might be anticipated, training varied by whether or not a pub was part of a branded chain. There are two reasons why this might be expected – ownership (i.e. company structure) and pub size (i.e. numbers of staff). Looking at proportion of staff who had undergone training, the brands appeared to train more staff ($X^2 = 9.8$, df 3, $p = 0.020$). None of the 13 branded pubs stated that “few” of their staff were trained, compared with 11 of the non-brands. At the other extreme seven (i.e. most) of the branded pubs stated “all” of their staff were trained, compared with only six of the non-brands.

There were no significant differences between branded pubs and non-brand pubs in terms of either the number of different types of training that staff underwent or the number of sources of training used. However, brands were significantly *more* likely to state that they engaged in social responsibility training, with 11 of the 13 indicating this, as compared to 22 of the 42 non-brands ($X^2 = 4.3$, df 1, $p = 0.038$). As might be expected, branded pubs were more likely to receive training from a parent company ($X^2 = 3.8$, df 1, $p = 0.050$). However, it was noticeable that no branded pub used the *ServeWise* programme and only

one used *Serve Smart* (the pub which used four sources of training). In total only 19 (35%) of the pubs in the sample used either of these two external server training programmes, with three pubs stating that they used both programmes.

There is clearly the possibility that some responding pubs may either misrepresent their responses to these questions or may not actually know accurately what training has taken place. For example, there is clearly a potential for confusion between *ServeWise* and *Serve Smart*. Through consultation with Alcohol Focus Scotland (see Chapter 2), it was possible to confirm whether pubs who stated that they had participated in *ServeWise* actually had. In practice one of the nine pubs claiming to have participated in the programme was unknown to Alcohol Focus Scotland's *ServeWise* personnel.

Other Mediating Features

Space was left at the end of the questionnaire for two open-ended questions. The first of these was designed to explore pub promotions, that is, what kind of marketing techniques each of the premises used to attract and retain custom (e.g. those marketing techniques which may encourage binge drinking). The second asked for the publicans' views on other relevant issues that they may wish to take the opportunity to raise (e.g. disorder).

In terms of promotional activity, twelve pubs volunteered information about drinks promotions, only two of which were in branded chains. Other promotional activities included advertising (23 pubs), flyering ($n = 12$), customer care (12), live entertainment (7), special themed party nights (5), internet (5), televised entertainment (4), food (4), cleanliness (2), ticket sales (2), sponsorship (2), mail-shots (2) outdoor tables (1), karaoke (1) and branding (1). One pub stated that it purposefully engaged in no marketing or promotional activity. Relatively few pubs ($n = 9$) volunteered information on any other issues not covered by the questionnaire. Of these, four pubs commented on the binge drinking and public disorder scare in the news media (a BBC *Panorama* documentary on this topic, entitled 'Cldnt Give a XXXX 4 Lst Ordrs' was broadcast Sunday, 6th June 2004 the weekend after the first batch of questionnaires was sent out). Two pubs commented on Glasgow's 'happy hours' ban, two stated that there were too many

licenses being given out in the city and, related to both these issues, one pub commented on the licensing board's policy on business plan evaluations.

3 (iii) Selection of premises for observation

The data sets obtained from both Strathclyde Police and the postal survey of publicans were combined to provide an objective basis for the selection of the final eight pubs (hereafter referred to as the sub-sample). In other words the final eight pubs would be selected upon two dimensions – level of known disorder and level of staff training. The police data is relatively straight forward in this respect, with all 88 pubs in the initial analysis being eligible for inclusion. However, 45 pubs either did not respond to the postal survey or chose to remain anonymous (and five of those that did return a questionnaire were in the 'booster sample' not covered by the original police data analysis). It was decided to include one pub in the observational study that did not return a questionnaire, especially any such premises with a particularly high level of known disorder. This was to ensure that some coverage was given to premises which may have, at least in theory, not responded because they had a disorder problem (see Chapter 2, Questionnaire Survey).

The non-responding pub was the easiest to select. This was the pub which had by far the highest level of disorder in the initial police analysis and which had the second highest level of crime of the five pubs appearing in the subsequent police 'hot spot' analysis (see above). This was a non-branded pub, though it was tied to a 'pubco'. The pub was located in the Exchange district and it will henceforth be referred to as the 'Plough' for the remainder of this report. It was also noteworthy that the 'Plough' was the only crime 'hot spot' pub *not* to respond to the postal survey.

The second pub to be chosen was the sub-sample's other 'hot spot' pub. This pub had the highest level of crime of all premises in Glasgow (i.e. not just pubs, or licensed premises) from the police 'hot-spot' analysis. This was a branded pub, henceforth referred to as the 'Red Lion', part of the 'Lion Bar's' chain. As with all but one of the branded pubs,

training at the 'Red Lion' was conducted "in-house" only, but the questionnaire returned from this pub indicated that "all" their staff were trained.

The next two pubs selected appeared in the initial police data set, as having some incidents of recent violent disorder occurring in the previous three months, but they did not appear in the 'hot-spot' analysis. The first of these was an independently owned non-chain bar (two recorded incidents of disorder). The postal questionnaire from this pub indicated the use of an external server training programme (*Serve Smart*), though "few" staff were so trained. This was the only pub of the 15 licensed premises claiming to use either *ServeWise* or *Serve Smart*, in the questionnaire survey, with any violent disorder logged by the police in the previous three months (2 assaults, one serious). For the remainder of this report this pub will be known as the 'Railway'. The other low known disorder pub selected was a branded pub, with only one recorded violent crime in the previous three months (and the only branded chain pub with any such disorderly incidents logged apart from the 'Red Lion'). This pub is hereafter referred to as the 'White Horse', part of the 'White's Pubs' branded chain.

It was decided to have two pubs from the same branded chain represented in this research, one with known disorder, the other without. This would allow a comparison to be made as to why, all other things being equal, one pub in the chain should be known for disorder while the other was not. (It should be noted that there were six possible branded chains from which similar pairings could have been made within Glasgow city centre, before consulting the police data, with some brands being represented by more than two pubs locally.) To this end, another 'White's Pubs' was selected, the 'White Hart'. Both of the 'White's pubs' in the sub-sample were "in-house" trained only, the 'White Horse' indicating "most", the 'White Hart' "all" staff, on their respective questionnaires. Finally, these two pubs were located in different parts of the city centre, with the 'White Hart' being located in the Sauchiehall Street area (which as stated previously was chosen to represent a separate time / space cluster of disorder).

Next, in order to complete the symmetry of the sampling frame, it was necessary to include one more branded chain pub without known disorder. The pub selected for this purpose was the only branded pub to use external training (both *Serve Smart* and the BII) and their questionnaire indicated that “most” staff were trained. This pub, hereafter referred to as the ‘Royal Oak’, part of the ‘Royal Taverns’ chain, had the added research advantage of being located very close to the ‘White Horse’ and several similar branded pubs with which it would be in direct competition.

The final two pubs selected were both unknown for disorder, externally server trained and non-branded pubs. The first of these was selected on the grounds that it was a second pub located in the Sauchiehall Street area, together with the ‘White Hart’. This pub, the ‘Swan’, was tied to a ‘pubco’, but had utilised the *ServeWise* programme as had the final pub, the independently owned ‘Crown’. Both pubs indicated that “many” of their staff were trained, and involvement with *ServeWise* was verified via Alcohol Focus Scotland (one person being *ServeWise* trained from the ‘Swan’ and three staff from the ‘Crown’ – making this latter pub potentially one of the highest trained for preventing disorder in the whole city centre sample).

Having decided upon the eight licensed premises for the subsequent phases of this research, on the basis of disorder and server training criteria, other features of each of the premises were then investigated. This was done both as a check for other factors that may influence levels of disorder at each and also as an intelligence gathering exercise to ensure the safety and anonymity of the observers. For example, to ensure that observers dressed appropriately in the style of each pub. The questionnaire survey data on each pub’s clientele was also particularly useful to this end. For example, one pub (the ‘Swan’) reported that “most” of its patrons were students (five of the other seven reported “few”), so it was expected that the observers would feel most at home on this premises. The only other pubs to report that “most” of their clientele were of one type were the ‘Crown’ (clubbers) and the ‘White Hart’ (young working people), indicating that these premises might present more challenging environments for the observers to work in.

Apart from the ‘Plough’, all of the pubs were comparatively new, being established from between three and twelve years ago (though the ‘Swan’ was formed on the site of two pre-existing pubs). Given that there are many old pubs in Glasgow, it was felt that this modern established age range of the pubs in sub-sample would be reflected by a youthful clientele attending each premises.

On the day before observations began, the principal investigator visited the exterior of each pub, noting any relevant physical features and characteristics of who was entering / leaving. For example, it was clear that the two independently owned pubs (the ‘Railway’ and ‘Crown’) were much smaller than the others, with the branded pubs all occupying particularly voluminous buildings. These visits were also conducted as a final check that each pub was still trading, and to the desired licensing hours, before the observers called.

It was also noted that the location of each of the bars varied from between busy road junctions, to narrow back streets and that each pub could either be adjacent to or distant from a wide variety of other night-time economy relevant premises, including other pubs, nightclubs, food-outlets, taxi ranks, bus stops, railway stations and residential property. For example, the ‘Crown’ was situated in a rather inaccessible (by vehicle) off-street location, while in comparison the ‘Red Lion’ and to a lesser extent the ‘Swan’ were located on busy trunk roads, near to large clusters of bus stops. The remaining five pubs were located in clusters of licensed premises (including pubs, clubs, restaurants, lap-dancing bars, casinos, live-entertainment venues and off-sales alcohol outlets) with the ‘White Hart’ in particular being close to several nightclubs. The presence or absence of these other cityscape features and the pubs street locations are likely to be reflected in the breakdown crimes known to the police occurring in each pubs street (see above), also shown in Table 3 (below), which summarises the selection criteria and characteristics of each of the final eight pubs.

Table 3: Section Criteria for Observed Pubs

Pub (approx age in years)	Number of Known disorderly incidents (if ‘hot spot’)	Who Conducts Server Training (number trained by <i>ServeWise</i>)	Ownership (Brand name)	Geographical Location (number of street crime incidents)
The Plough (100+)	10 (yes)	‘unknown’ (not <i>ServeWise</i>)	Tied to a ‘pubco’	Exchange (11)
Red Lion (6)	3 (yes)	In-house	Branded Chain (Lion Bars)	Exchange (39)
Railway (5)	2 (no)	In-house <i>Serve Smart</i>	Independent	Exchange (21)
White Horse (9)	1 (no)	In-house	Branded Chain (White’s Pubs)	Exchange (31)
White Hart (3)	0 (no)	In-house	Branded Chain (White’s Pubs)	Sauchiehall (68)
Royal Oak (3)	0 (no)	In-house Parent Company Brit. Inst. Innkeepers <i>Serve Smart</i>	Branded Chain (Royal Taverns)	Exchange (31)
The Swan (10)	0 (no)	In-house <i>ServeWise</i> (1)	Tied to a ‘pubco’	Sauchiehall (27)
The Crown (11)	0 (no)	In-house <i>ServeWise</i> (3)	Independent	Exchange (0)

Summary

The data provided from Strathclyde Police was extremely useful in identifying potential disorder ‘hot spot’ pubs and parts of the city that may be suitable for the observational phase of the research. The police data was also of interest in its own right for two main reasons. Firstly, that there were so few incidents of disorder logged as taking place within pubs and that this took place within (or outside) relatively few pubs. Secondly, that the premises associated with disorder tended to be located in the Exchange district of the city (especially pubs in the area between Queen Street and Central Stations) yet street crime appeared to be at least as high in the Sauchiehall Street area where few premises (of any kind) were identified as ‘hot spots’ - at least during this time of the night (around

midnight). These are all issues that the subsequent field observation research endeavoured to address.

The questionnaire survey highlighted that, during the weekend evenings, Glasgow city centre pubs tended to be frequented by after-work drinkers, young working people and clubbers. Most of these pubs reported training staff on legal / safety issues, though less appeared to train staff about alcohol responsibility issues. Finally, although the branded chain pubs appeared to train more of their staff, in particular in social responsibility training, they were unlikely to use external trainers.

The selection procedure was designed to produce a broad range of licensed premises (pubs in Glasgow city centre attracting youthful drinkers) in terms of their levels of known disorder and server training statuses, according to police data and the results of our questionnaire survey. As intended, the final sub-sample of eight pubs successfully comprised an equal number of pubs known or unknown for disorder according to the police data used in this phase of the research, an equal number that used or did not use external server training programmes and an equal number of branded or unbranded pubs.

The inclusion of crime ‘hot spot’ pubs, including the two with the most recorded crime in Glasgow city centre, was felt to maximise the chances of actual incidents or disorder being observed during fieldwork for analysis. The inclusion of pubs utilising external server training programmes, including two who had participated in Alcohol Focus Scotland’s *ServeWise* programme, was felt to maximise the chances of practices that maintain good order being observed. The eight premises chosen for field observation also varied according to ownership, style (i.e. clientele), size and location within the city centre, all of which are factors that are thought to influence the likelihood of alcohol-related problems occurring. Such issues will now be explored in the next chapter.

4. Observation of licensed premises

4 (i) Piloting and data recording

Pilot Observations

Before the main period of fieldwork commenced a pilot night of observation was conducted in a suitable city centre pub. The pub selected was located in a cluster of branded chain pubs, (see 2 (ii)). Although, this pilot pub was independently owned and was not 'known' to the police for disorderly crime during the previous three months (see 3 (i)), it was close enough to several such premises (branded chains and premises known for disorder including a crime 'hot spot' pub) to provide a good 'scoping' opportunity for the observers (two of the adjacent branded pubs were included in the main observational sub-sample). According to the postal questionnaire completed by this pilot pub, its patrons were likely to include "few" students (none of the observers knew much about this pub) and this pub had a relatively high level of staff training. Training had been conducted in-house, by the British Institute of Innkeepers and by *ServeWise* (confirmed by Alcohol Focus Scotland). It was indicated that five of the six types of training listed on the questionnaire had been undertaken ("social responsibility" being the sole omission) and that "most" staff were trained. This high level of training, combined with a claim that "many" patrons were passing trade, indicated that the pub should present a relatively safe environment to pilot the research methods, while the "few" students status indicated that the premises should fully test the observers' abilities.

The pilot night was conducted during the last Friday of June 2004 (the day the schools 'broke up' for the summer). The night was useful in that it allowed all members of the fieldwork team to familiarise themselves with the research methods and each other. The pub observed gave the impression of a very well-run establishment and it was felt that this premises would be more orderly than most of those likely to be observed in the main study. One aggressive incident was observed by one of the observers (BM1) at closing time though this was very minor and door staff were quick to intervene.

The pilot night ran smoothly and no substantial changes were deemed necessary to either the fieldwork procedures or the observational data forms. However, one potential difficulty was already apparent in regard of the near impossibility of observing patrons or incidents outside pubs at closing time, owing to the staggered departure of patrons and the large numbers of people on the streets at that time. Most importantly however, the pilot night allayed any fears or concerns that the observers had about the nature of the work and all felt ready for the experimental observations to begin.

Fieldwork and Recording Procedures

Although one of the main objectives of the fieldwork was to observe disorderly incidents, most of the observers' time was spent observing during normal service, with particular attention being paid to features of bars and server practices that may influence levels of disorder. Thus the vast majority of the output generated by these observations involved measuring the characteristics of the eight pubs that may be risk factors for disorder (rather than witnessing actual violence). Two types of data were recorded.

Firstly, the observers were encouraged to take field-notes. These notes focussed upon both the drinking environment (including the type of pub, sort of clientele and general atmosphere) and all staff activities (including ability to deal with disorder within each bar's environment). As much of these details may be rather subjective, the observers were also asked to comment on how they felt about each pub (including whether they would visit through choice). Nevertheless it must be stressed that, as observers recorded their notes independently at home alone, any common themes that arose can to an extent be considered as corroborated.

Secondly, the observers completed validated checklists and scales that have been used to identify characteristics associated with alcohol-related disorder. These were completed by referring to the *Safer Bars* observer training manual (Graham, 2000). These checklists and rating scales were later combined to form a total score of disorder risk at each of the eight pubs. Again there is a degree of subjectivity to each of these ratings, however as all observers visited each pub on an equal number of occasions, the mean scores across all

observations should be consistent as ordinal data (though in no way can it be regarded as providing absolute data of the risk factors in each pub). For consistency, the ratings made by the observers were also compared against official data (described in Chapter 3), questionnaire data (also in Chapter 3), observed incident data (see Chapter 5) and bar staff interview data (chapter 6) as well as the observers' own field-notes.

4 (ii) Characteristics of observed premises

The observers' field-notes were firstly useful in corroborating the criteria used in the pub selection process, particularly the information obtained from the questionnaire survey (see 3iii and refer also to Appendix 5), for example, that the 'Swan' was clearly a student orientated bar (in which the observers felt relatively at home). These notes were also useful in that they painted a picture of the clientele of each of the pubs in a qualitative way, not possible from the Canadian rating scales. These notes were also used to support specific differences between pubs in terms of disorder risk rating scales and factors that may have triggered actual violent incidents (Chapter 5). In this section we will use the observers' field-notes to provide a flavour of the drinking environment in each of the eight pubs in the sub-sample in turn.

The Plough

This pub was selected on the basis of having the highest level of known disorder during the three months prior to observations beginning and also as the only non-returner of pub-style / server-training postal questionnaire. Therefore, unlike the seven others in the sub-sample, at this stage, this pub's server training status, clientele and style were largely unknown. From initial observations it was clear that this could be described as a 'traditional bar' (reflected by it being more than one hundred years older than any of the others). This made attending this bar something of a novel experience for the student observers, with, for example, one (BF) describing her visit to this pub as being like in the TV show "*Phoenix Nights*" (stereotyping a traditional North of England social club).

"the bar's theme and layout is that of a traditional old Glasgow pub ... Certainly a different night" (AM)

“Some people looked a bit rough (missing teeth, big tattoos).” (AF)

Unlike the other seven premises, this pub had the clear (traditional) distinction between having a bar and lounge sections. The differences between the two segments of this pub were so great as to make global measures of the premises the most difficult of all in the sub-sample (like two totally different pubs). As one observer put it:

“[the bar] I would describe this as a working man’s pub (emphasis on gender and not class). The theme was one of ‘traditional simplicity’ – that may be otherwise referred to a ‘spit and sawdust’. The environment was tailored for men: lots of draught beers/lagers, posters for Guinness on wall, army recruitment in toilets, sport on TV and laddish ‘cock-rock’ music (AC/DC, Stones etc.)” ... “[the lounge] is dominated by women and their activities. They are most obvious as they tend to be leading the singing / doing the stage song / dancing” (BM2).

Interestingly this was the only bar with an internal door policy, restricting access between sections of the pub (the subsequent staff interview in this pub revealed a ‘no trainers’ door policy that applied only to the lounge). At one point observers became restricted to the bar, when they attempted to enter the lounge and were prevented - *“by doorman at 10PM “too full the noo”.” (BM2)*. However, this meant the door between the bar and the street was often not covered. This lack of door cover, in comparison to the other pubs in the sub-sample, may have been because many of the ‘Plough’s’ patrons appeared to be ‘regulars’. Also, unlike all the other pubs observed, the ‘Plough’ seemed to attract customers who stayed in the pub for the whole night.

“Patrons stayed put (other pubs’ patrons stay short time only) but here – people sat in same place all night. Saw families together (mother / father, older son / daughter / cousins etc.)” (AF)

The patrons of this pub appeared to reflect its traditional status with a wide range of types being present in the clientele. However, the observers felt that one common theme across the clientele was that they were seasoned (i.e. regular and heavy) drinkers and this was felt to be a possible risk factor for disorder, particularly in the lounge section where karaoke and suggestive dancing in a confined space (no purpose made dance floor area) seemed to combine a number of potential triggers.

“Hard characters / hard drinkers. Potential of a massive showdown never far away [in the lounge]”. (AF)

“underlying the party atmosphere [in the lounge] was a tension / atmosphere that could easily explode. I imagine if you said something wrong here it could escalate into trouble.” (BM2)

The observers had few complaints about the standard of service in the ‘Plough’, with field-notes indicating that bar staff were efficient, serving in line and acknowledging customers who were waiting (though one female observer – AF - noted that she was served a large glass of wine without asking). Although there was an absence of security on the front door of the bar (as opposed to the lounge) the stewards were also described as *“professional”*. Finally, the observers were asked whether they would visit this pub through choice. Unlike the other pubs, the division within between a bar frequented by men and a lounge frequented by women may have affected observer’s objectivity. Firstly, female observers felt slightly out of place in the bar section.

“many middle-aged men at the bar, so had to squash in to get a drink” (AF)

“big groups of males – one stood in way and wouldn’t let me past when looking for toilet (BF)

One of the male observers also appeared to be aware of this.

“Although women were present [in the bar] you got the impression that their presence was tolerated as they appeared to be with a male in the party” (BM2)

However, despite this, the female observers actually preferred the bar to the lounge section which, of all the pubs observed, the male observers felt most uncomfortable working in. The degree to which the male observers felt out of place, even threatened, by this environment was reflected in their field-notes.

“[the bar] was a friendly everyday working man’s bar and was a pleasant environment for a drink and conversation. [The lounge] was a lot drunker, loud, cheesy and nightmarish. I felt like I was attending a Rab C Nesbit hen party.” (BM1)

“There is much more of a ‘party’ atmosphere here – as in a wedding reception party and you feel it is quite an unstable / volatile environment. Difficult to relax

here as overweight / underdressed ... women (25-40) attempt to dance suggestively in confined areas” (BM2)

Though the above (highly edited comments – to maintain political correctness) may seem rather opinionated, as will be seen from the incidents observed in this lounge section, the environment created by this intoxicated ‘sexy’ dancing in a cramped, predominantly female setting was to make this the only place where the research took place that the observers had any concern for their own safety (see incident #14).

“Patrons here [the lounge] were more drunk than ... [in the bar]; women were especially more drunk. Walking into this was similar to walking into a private wedding party – everybody seemed to know each other and we felt like the outsiders that we actually physically and spatially were! I would not contemplate returning to this section of the bar again” (BM2)

Nevertheless, the bar section this pub was regarded as somewhere the observers felt that they would visit again, but only under certain circumstances.

“might take a foreign friend to [the bar of this] pub to show ‘Glasgow pub’”(AF)

“It’s a bar you could imagine going to with your father and his mates ... I’d go again – but I wouldn’t go with a girlfriend” (BM2)

The Red Lion

Like the ‘Plough’, this pub was selected on the basis of being a known crime ‘hot spot’ according to police data. It was also selected as the first of four branded pubs. Unlike the other three branded bars, this pub was much more like a traditional pub (perhaps reflected in it being slightly older than the other brands – i.e. established in the 1990s). Unlike the other branded pubs, the ‘Red Lion’ did not have a designated dance floor, disco lights, plasma screens or loud music (see below), in fact this was the only pub in which observers had difficulty identifying *any* music, owing to the low volume and was the only pub in the sub-sample not to have a live DJ on any occasion that the observers visited.

All the observers made comments about the brightness of the lighting in the pub and the large number of promotional ads, which were this pub’s only décor. One observer (AF) commented that the combination of the very bright lighting and a “swirly” carpet pattern

gave a “*drunken effect without drinking*”. However, the pub also seemed to put a much greater emphasis on the provision of seating than any of the others.

“Looks like a bar designed by McDonalds. Lots of ads around the walls.” (BM1 - echoing Musprat, 2004, see Chapter 1)

“Lighting is very bright and music very low resulting in an atmosphere similar to a train station waiting room. This may be intentional given the proximity of [a large variety of major transport nodes]” (BM2)

The proximity of a large number of bus stops, railway stations and a taxi rank may have contributed to the pub appearing to have a very varied clientele and a rapid turnover. This was the most obvious difference in patrons’ behaviour between this pub and the ‘Plough’ (where similar types of drinkers stayed for the duration).

“Very drunken, slightly threatening. The customers were as random as if you were in a bar with everyone from a Glasgow bus. Young and old, the only people missing were the rich.” (BM1)

“Random mix of clientele. Upstairs many groups of young neds – thought might kick off – actively felt a wee bit uncomfy next to such a large group of them. Downstairs was older and more alcoholic.” (AF)

To the observers, the pub appeared to be attracting this “random mix of clientele” by advertising very low prices for food and drink (e.g. bottled drinks at £1.25, and two pints of vodka and Red Bull® for £7.00).

“In my view this is a very cheap... In fact I overhead one patron say to his mate “let’s just stay here cos’ it’s so fuckin’ cheap”.” (BM2)

“The main attraction to the pub would seem to be the cheaper alcohol.” (AM)

It was felt that these prices were also attracting in a certain type of customer, specifically the much ‘less affluent’, who may view price as a more important factor when considering where to purchase on-trade alcohol on a Friday or Saturday night.

“I regard this bar as a WORKING CLASS (emphasis on class and not gender here) bar with patrons being male and female – although predominantly male” (BM2)

“The patrons were ‘working class’, heavy drinkers. A few women patrons were very drunk (staggering).” (AF)

Perhaps for the above reasons (price and clientele) the observers felt that there appeared to be a large amount of drunken behaviour here, even in comparison to the other seven pubs in the sub-sample.

“Very drunk. Many single alcoholics (one man emptied leftover drinks into his glass). People straight from work - had tool belt, helmet. Rowdier than other bars, some people obviously just in to get a one-night stand openly snogging.” (AF)

“Atmosphere upstairs fairly tense due to group of ‘neds’ in bar – but they were fairly good natured. Intense atmosphere partly due to lots of people being fairly drunk and not sure how patrons would react if aggravated” (BF)

Although it was a common feature in most of the eight premises (see Appendix 3) the observers commented on the sheer amount of obviously intoxicated people who were still being served in this bar and also on the extent of their intoxication.

“Served already very drunk patrons and let intoxicated ones in (and remain) - even one old man who had wet himself. Lots of ‘horseplay’ went on without staff commenting or even looking.” (AF)

“Some older males incapable of walking unaided were still being served. General appearance of patrons was a look of “ill and unhealthy”.” (BF)

Despite the apparent tolerance of drunkenness in this pub, all the observers commented that this pub not only had a designated no smoking area, but had one which the floor staff did attempt to enforce.

“One male bar person handled a situation where patrons were smoking in a designated non-smoking area very well and in good humour. The bar staff seemed to know how to deal with drunk individuals quite well.” (AM)

In general, the observers felt that the serving staff in this bar were struggling to cope with serving but succeeding to an extent (one observer – AF - complained about people being allowed to “push in” at the bar, another – BM2 - about having dirty glasses on their table for 40 minutes before being cleared). It did however seem that the staff in this pub were

used to dealing with intoxicated people and the problems they may cause. The female bar staff appeared to be particularly good at being pleasant to older drunken males.

“Personally felt that not enough bar staff – female and didn’t have enough back up from male staff – unpleasant environment to work. Female bar staff worked hard – male bouncers talked at lot with male member of staff. Didn’t really monitor bar very much.” (BF)

In contrast to the serving staff, the observers commented frequently on a lack of professionalism by the security staff. They did not seem to have control of the door, failed to monitor the floor, socialised with patrons (including a female observer - BF) and did not help out the serving staff or even each other during potential flashpoints.

“Bar staff very busy and some looked harassed. Security staff very unprofessional (compared to ‘Hole-in-the-Wall’ security). At one point, one member requested back up through head set when some members of the public got aggravated about being denied entry to bar – but had seen other member of security staff chatting upstairs. No monitoring of upstairs bar.” (BF)

What was interesting, especially as the observers would have been unaware of this for most of the observational phase of the research, was that this bar employed a different security company from the other seven pubs, all of whom hired ‘Hole in the Wall’ stewards. As will be seen later this difference was also very apparent from the validated rating scales used by the observers.

Thus from the trained observers’ point-of-view, the ‘Red Lion’ appeared to have a similar range of patrons (varied, but mainly “working class”, “seasoned drinkers”) to the ‘Plough’. However, this pub differed in that it appeared to trade to a transient clientele, attracting them in by competitive pricing rather than entertainment.

Interestingly the only observer to say he would visit the ‘Red Lion’ through choice was the non-student (BM2 – who actually favoured this pub most of all). The other observers all disliked this pub largely because they felt it had an ‘economy’ / ‘budget’ or ‘downmarket’ appeal, describing it as “a cheap drinking hole” (BF), “a dock yard saloon” (BM1), “back to basics drinking” (AM) or “skanky” (AF).

The Railway

Although some disorder was recorded in the months prior to the start of observations, the ‘Railway’, unlike the ‘Plough’ or the ‘Red Lion’ was not a known crime ‘hot spot’. According to the questionnaire the pub returned, the management did use an external server training programme (*Serve Smart*). Unlike any of the other seven pubs, the ‘Railway’ had a designated dining area, where patrons who were only drinking were *not* permitted. The pub was also unusual, in the sub-sample, in that offered table service, particularly cocktails. The ‘Railway’ was candlelit (these were gradually snuffed out at closing time), perhaps an indication of a low frequency of serious disorder on this premises. This pub played music set at a level that did not interfere with conversation. This music tended to have no lyrics (e.g. chill-out, see 4 (iii)) and, unlike the other six bars with audible music and DJs, it was noted that nobody was here was seen foot-tapping or head-nodding. One male patron observed dancing was described as looking “*out of place*” (AM).

The most apparent feature of this pub was that it appeared to be ‘higher class’ than say the ‘Plough’ or ‘Red Lion’. The décor was variously described by the observers as “*über-trendy*”, “*sophisticated*”, “*chic*”, “*civilised*” or “*upmarket*” and one described the marble tiled gents toilets as - “*the best I have seen in Glasgow ... really clean*” (BM2). The drinks were described as pricey. This was reflected in the relative ‘affluence’ of the clientele. For example, those who appeared to have come straight from work, rather than wearing construction tabards, were described as being either attired in (designer) business suits or had arrived with going out clothes in bags to change from their (presumably less glamorous) work clothes (i.e. planned visits).

“A lot of older, trendy people wearing reassuringly expensive clothes. Drunken Kelvinside [i.e. ‘posh’ Glasgow] accents. Bronzed bodies. Quite old and camp people. Some work types (wearing suits)” (AF)

“The ‘Railway’ appear to be aiming for professionals aged 25 plus as a client group.” (BM2)

Perhaps in keeping with this clientele, the serving staff were variously described by observers as “*smart*”, “*cool*” or “*trendy*”. Although it cannot be inferred that this was down to their external training, it was noted that the servers performed their duties particularly efficiently.

“Staff were professional and friendly acknowledging customers with a look as they waited to be served. All wore ‘Railway’ branded t-shirts. Girl broke a glass as she passed table, informed barman and it was cleared within 2 minutes. Most efficient bar staff I have encountered so far.” (BM1)

The one negative feature to this pub’s professionalism appeared to be a tendency to serve after hours, including serving the observers after midnight (a Team A expense claim receipt verified this allegation). This was the only pub where this practice was observed, as were similar events also not observed elsewhere, including two young females being served a £15 pitcher at five minutes to midnight and a male having a whole new drink poured for him after midnight when it had accidentally been emptied by floor staff. One observer commented on some tolerance of queue jumping or favouritism (e.g. barman serving a girl first - AF). (This tolerance of ‘me first’ was confirmed in the subsequent interview with a ‘Railway’ staff member). Also the pub seemed to have a particularly strict door policy, in comparison to all the others pubs, especially in regard to age, which the observers felt was being enforced to bolster the pubs ‘exclusive’ image.

“Bouncers seemed to stop lots of people coming in so bar quite empty – perhaps to give an ‘exclusive’ feel to bar.” (BF)

“My attention was focussed on the doorman most of the night as I sat in a position near the door. During the night he must have made approximately 15 requests for ID. Many people were turned away – despite appearing well over 18. In one instance a group of six were turned away, all looked 20 to 25 years! I suspect the policy may have been over 25s only – or the bar is attempting to keep the atmosphere safe for the over 25s who want to relax.” (BM2)

This door policy may have influenced the pub’s patrons. One female observer (AF) described the males in this pub as “*calmer than other bars*”. Rather than patrons being ‘on the pull’ (as in some of the brands), here patrons were described as “*flirting*” or “*like*

one big office party". On the whole the observers did not believe this to be a pub where any serious disorder was ever likely to take place.

"Overall a very quiet night that verged on boredom. People in bar were more interested in relaxed posing with flashy drinks and jewels, than drinking" (BM2)

Despite the lack of any threat felt by the observers in the 'Railway' they held surprisingly negative attitudes towards this pub. This seemed to stem from its 'exclusive' image and strict door policy. For example, one male observer (AM) commented that he had walked past it many times but never envisaged entering it, while one female stated that she felt lucky to get in as she was 26 years old, but looked younger (BF). The observers were also very critical of the pub's patrons, describing them variously as "*posers*", "*pseudo-sophisticated*" and "*Jordan wanabes*", with only one observer saying he would ever visit through choice, to impress a new girlfriend, but not with his friends. No other pub in the sub-sample brought out such opinions in the (student) observers, and to what, if any, extent this may have influenced their subsequent ratings is unknown.

The White Horse

This is one of two pubs of the eight selected which is part of the 'White's Pubs' branded chain. Unlike its sister, the White Hart', this pub was located in the Exchange district of Glasgow city centre, near the 'Plough', 'Red Lion', 'Railway' and 'Crown', and was directly across the street from rival branded pub the 'Royal Oak'. Unlike the budget priced 'Lion Bars' chain (see above), both 'White's Pubs' and 'Royal Taverns' are relatively recent brands (re-branded in the case of 'White's') that resemble nightclubs, with purpose built dance floors, DJ booths, disco lights etc. Part of the rationale for selecting this pub was to see how it contrasted with both the rival brand (across the street) and with another pub in the same branded chain. Of the two in the same branded chain, this was the only one with any disorderly incidents recorded by the police in the three months prior to the start of observations (though this was only one incident, i.e. the lowest of the four premises with known disorder during that time period).

This pub was in an attractive old building (an office block conversion) up stone stairs from the street. However, one observer (BF) noted that the design of the building created congestion due to the large number of pillars (see incident #2). Other than expensive lighting the only décor was advertising (including Christmas offers in September). Ads focused on particular themed nights or seasons, including drinks promotions such as themed drinks festivals (each involved staff dressed accordingly, e.g. beachwear). Also a female staff member circulated selling test-tubes from the floor. These features were common to both of the ‘White’s Pubs’s’ observed.

“White’s Pub’s theme is ‘manufactured party’ instant party atmosphere from the moment you walk in. Flashing lights very loud music, TVs displaying raunchy videos, females in bar dancing together, obvious power drinking (very fast) all contribute towards this atmosphere upon arrival. You feel obliged to participate and by not participating in getting drunk you feel ‘out of place’. Everyone there is intending to get drunk as quickly as possible – the variety of designer alcohol available contributes towards this, as well as the way in which it can be drunk (via glass, pitcher, bottle, test tube, shooter, flavours etc). It is a marketing fantasy come true, and the punters love it!! Overall, a manufactured party for the end of the working week – you come here to unwind and get hammered!” (BM2)

This party theme seemed to be attracting a certain type of clientele, described by one observer (AM) as the “Club 18-30 types” (a package holiday notorious for binge drinking). Although there appeared to be no dress code, the style of this pub was reflected by the patrons’ attire and intended activities (e.g. ‘pulling’ and ‘binge drinking’).

“Patrons dress: male trousers or jeans and t-shirt / shirt. Female – tiny skirts and revealing tops or tight jeans and top. Hen nights welcome.” (BF)

“Loud music prevented any kind of conversation, people obviously speed drinking, lots of shouting, flashing lights with semi-disco / club atmosphere. It was a non-threatening atmosphere for those drinking, but perhaps more so [i.e. more threatening] to those sober. It could be regarded as intimidating to someone unfamiliar with this type of atmosphere (e.g. over 50’s / straight-edgers etc.). The in-house video perpetuates the theme of the bar. It seems to promote the message - “this is what it is like to be pissed in our pub, come on join the party”. The same video shows punter after punter downing test tubes in one gulp – presumably to promote the concept of style / drink etc.” (BM2)

The observers also noted that the controlled environment in this pub seemed to keep the lid on any potential trouble (this utility of this technique was explored further in the

subsequent interview with a staff member of this pub). However the observers also felt that this system could be manipulated to encourage binge drinking. For example, playing ‘oldies’ music, which unlike modern music has no accompanying video, meant that the parent company were able to play their promotional videos over the soundtrack.

“DJ responded with more cheesy classics – e.g. Dirty Dancing – in with many patrons engaged in faux dirty dancing – people seem to believe that they’re as glamorous as people portrayed on music videos and adopt similar characteristics – Bubble bursts come 12.00AM. Because no video for cheesy classics, much more ‘White’s Pubs’ promotional material on video.” (BF)

As indicated in the above quote, the one problem with this crowd control technique is that the patrons’ mood changes at midnight, when the music stops and lights go on. This creates the possibility for large numbers of intoxicated and recently made less happy groups and individuals to take out their frustrations on the streets.

“Noticed lighting flashes a lot, which doesn’t show people staggering, lighting extremely flattering (very apparent when lights came on).” (BF)

“Another point: once the music stopped / lights came on - it suddenly became a less friendly place to be!! No violence but an air of expectancy” (BM2)

Perhaps because of the need for crowd control (this was the pub with the greatest number of patrons, see Appendix 3) there was a heavy steward presence here. One observer (BF) stated she felt that the stewards were in control of the pub with the bar staff being relegated to the role of “*servicing monkeys*”. This was also the only pub where steward instigated violence was observed (incidents #1 and #2, see next chapter). However, despite the behaviour of this one rogue individual (who was not seen in the pub again on three subsequent nights of observation), the observers felt that both the security staff and servers were very professional and had adopted a style in keeping with the pub.

“Young looking bar staff. A couple of them looked a bit alternative – lip piercing / alternative hair, but majority looked like patrons – 2 tone hair, lots of blondes etc. Efficient and gave me a larger drink for no extra price and charged only for lime cordial not soda water (another bar was £2 for this). Pleasant, however served patrons in no order.” (AF)

“Bar staff throughout both floors were constantly busy – serving, clearing and / or cleaning. They had no time to stand still and did a good job keeping things ticking over. Those serving did so in a very efficient manner – quick, pleasantly and seemed to be manning certain sections of the downstairs bar. Security staff were very well organised with a very high visibility factor – constantly patrolling and observing busy bar from certain vantage points. Obvious but unobtrusive with it.”
(BM2)

Although the observers seemed positive about the way this pub was run, all stated that they would not visit again as it was not their type of pub (owing to the types of music, patrons, their activities etc.).

The White Hart

The other of the two pubs in the ‘White’s Pubs’ brand was located in the Sauchiehall area. This is the first of the pubs examined in this section with no disorderly crime or offences recorded during the three months prior to observations. Unlike all the other pubs in the sub-sample, the ‘White Hart’ is located near to a cluster of (alcohol-orientated) nightclubs, including one adjacent to the pub. It was noted by the observers that this closest nightclub, ‘Janus’, heavily flyered the pub and at closing time the security staff of both premises seemed indistinguishable (see Appendix 4, Incident #12). On one occasion a PA was made by a ‘boy band’ who would be appearing in ‘Janus’ later that night.

This was the only pub that observers ever had to queue to get into. It had all the same features and décor as the ‘White Horse’, although a smoke machine added to the ‘atmosphere’. The pub was also unique in the sub-sample in that it had a worker in the female toilets, who sold make-up, deodorant etc. (a female observer – AF - commented that despite this the toilets were still not very clean). If anything, the highly controlled entertainment system here seemed to be being used even more aggressively for drinks party promotion than at the ‘White Horse’

“Loud, hot, busy with video screens everywhere showing footage of people in ‘White’s Pubs’ downing shooters and dancing in a very sexual manner, girls flashing their breasts, guys being loud alpha males. Repetition of “,WHITE HART”” “FUN” flashing on the screen every five minutes. Very high tech lights all over the bar. An environment controlled to deliver the message that drinking in

‘White’s Pubs’ is fun, sex, happiness and success that felt like an Orwellian nightmare!’ (BM1)

As with the ‘White Horse’, though again to a much greater intensity, this manufactured party theme was reflected in the behaviour and attire of the clientele. This pub, more than any other in the sub-sample seemed to fit the sexual ‘meat-market’ stereotype of ‘super-pubs’ portrayed in recent media reports (see Chapter 1). Adding to this, the message “on the pull” was flashed over and over again by the pubs plasma screens alongside images of ‘sexy’ dancing and people drinking shots.

“Everyone out on pull – noted about one couple not interacting with larger group. Overall – people enjoying themselves. Lots of large groups of males, generally older than groups of women. Music popular choice with patrons. People drinking to get drunk... Everyone dressed similar – men: trousers and smart shirt / t-shirt. Female: tight jeans and halterneck top or very, very, very short skirt and skimpy top. Women dancing suggestively like women on videos.” (BF)

“For punters, women want to look sexy and there is a lot of cleavage and thigh on display. Men want to look flash – in a Robbie Williams type of way. These attempts at desirable style gradually erode with alcohol consumption and people become less caring of their physical state as time goes by. Women dance (standing and sitting) provocatively (often emulating videos) whereas males stand in groups watching (often leering) the women.” (BM2)

In comparison to the ‘White Horse’ and indeed most of the other pubs in the sub-sample, the clientele of this pub was younger and more mixed. At first glance this latter feature may be regarded positively (e.g. as a ‘socially inclusive’ venue) however an alternative view may be that this was a bad mix, one which presented a potential for conflicts of interest to arise. This mix was constantly changing and seemed to make the pub’s atmosphere more intense. This was the only pub where observers noted that, as the night wore on, the atmosphere changed in an ever more hostile direction.

“Between 9 and 10.30PM there was a party atmosphere. Females were dancing suggestively and ‘getting in to the groove’, males content to watch and joke amongst themselves. During this time – a ‘happy’ atmosphere with little danger. By 10.30, and up to midnight, the atmosphere seemed to change negatively. There was an electricity in the air, everyone was charged and there was an undercurrent of threat / danger. This was never manifest, but you could sense a shift from ‘party-party’ to ‘party-party-but don’t fuck wi’ me OK’. Overall, quite a hostile environment to be in unless intoxicated with the rest of them.” (BM2)

“Club 18 to 30 holiday. People out on pull ... People a bit more hostile – in five years time patrons will graduate to ‘White Horse’. This bar definitely attracts a certain type – bouncer initially looked pubwatch partner [BM2] up and down and let us in without a smile. Most female patrons wore bunny ears suggesting hen nights. Earlier in evening patrons seemed a bit friendlier – student types – later a bit hostile.” (BF)

The very varied and ever-changing patrons of this pub seemed to put the floor staff under a great deal of pressure. Observers noted that they seemed to struggle with the sheer amount of empties and cleaning needs that this type of custom generated.

“Bar staff – only noted 2 glass / bottle collecting, not enough for amount of people and big queues at bar. Bottle collector took bin bag round and tables had 20 bottles of empties. Ashtrays rarely cleared” (BF)

“Staff here are very, very busy at all times. Bar staff never seem to stop, constantly serving or washing glasses. Glass collectors are always evident, but never seem to completely clear all surfaces. Door staff are constantly monitoring the bar inside and out. Overall it is a well co-ordinated effort – but the sheer volume of people and vessels give the impression that it is untidy and unorganised. If it was to kick off big style in here I doubt it could be completely controlled and there would be a lot of damage to people and property (due to clutter of glasses and bottles).” (BM2)

Observers also made a number of specific complaints about the service they received in this pub including being “*short changed*”, staff being unpleasant to them, drinks’ being expensive, particularly soft drinks. One male observer (AM) commented that the policy seemed to be to deter patrons from consuming soft drinks by charging £2.50 for a half pint of orange juice, while his female team partner (AF) described the alcohol drinks on sale that night as “*watered-down*”.

“Bar staff poor – had to wait a long time to be served and other patrons queue jumped. Couldn’t hear staff – they couldn’t hear us – had to lean right across a sticky bar. Most bar staff look harassed and like they didn’t enjoy their job – not chatting at all. Bouncers better, friendlier, all huge. Also bar staff did not clear up bar and drinking areas sufficiently... Also drinks smaller than last time.” (AF)

Thus the differences between this pub and its sister, the ‘White Horse’, were superficially very small (e.g. both played exactly the same music) however despite these similarities the observers had much more negative opinions about the ‘White Hart’ which was

without doubt their least favourite pub in the sub-sample. Although (as we will see in later sections) this pub did not always score highest on overall number risk factors for disorder present within in it, in a purely subjective sense the observers certainly felt that this was the most dangerous pub in the sub-sample. Although, as described above, the observers had a number of complaints about the serving staff, it was the patrons of this pub who they felt particularly threatened by. To this end female observers made comments about the ‘meat market’ nature of the pub, while male observers felt that there was an expectancy of violence.

“Pretty drunken. Lots of ‘crazy’ and ‘sexy’ dancing and bump n’ grind by men and women. Mixed crowd, Asian groups, lesbians, wheelchair, older ‘business’, Kelvin Hall sports competitors and so on. Don’t like pub at all – cheesy, sleazy crowd” (AF)

“I could sense more aggression in the young males. Boiling pot for trouble” (AM).

The Royal Oak

This pub is part of a rival branded chain to ‘White’s Pubs’ and was located directly across the street from the ‘White Horse’. This pub was selected for observation because it was not known for crime in the months prior to observations and, uniquely among all the branded pubs in the whole sample, it claimed to have used external server trainers (*Serve Smart* and the British Institute of Innkeepers, as well as conducting both in-house training and training undertaken through the parent company).

At face value, this pub seemed similar to the ‘White’s Pubs’ in the sub-sample. However, despite having all the familiar trappings, including a high tech entertainment system (perhaps even more so than in ‘White’s Pubs’), DJs, plasma screens, its own promotional TV channel, themed party nights etc., and also being similarly described as “*generic, soulless*” (AF) or “*like a cheesy nightclub*” (BM1) by the observers, this pub did seem to have a different atmosphere to that of the rival brand. Rather than being described as aggressive, “*electric*” or sexually charged, the atmosphere in the ‘Royal Oak’ was seen as “*friendlier*”, “*Cooler than ‘White’s Pubs’, less lecherous than ‘White’s Pubs’*” (AF) and “*Not as much of a meat market as ‘White’s Pubs’*” (BM1). However, it was also dubbed

by the observers as or having “no atmosphere”, being “cold and lifeless” and, that without the lighting and loud music, resembling a “social/rugby club” (BF).

“Despite attempting to create a party atmosphere, the bar simply had NO atmosphere. People looked bored more than happy. Couples (male and female) had little to say to each other and several males were dancing alone. There is a lot of emphasis placed on advertising FUN + DRINK, but it seems to have been bought by only half the people here.” (BM1)

“Atmosphere incoherent. People who looked to enjoy themselves were in big groups – others in couples or same sex small groups looked on at people enjoying themselves. Lots of people looked tired and bored” (BF)

These differences between the ‘Royal Oak’ and ‘White’s Pubs’ were perhaps reflected in their respective clientele. Although similar in their intentions, those choosing to drink in the ‘Royal Oak’ seemed more understated, in terms of dress and behaviour than was apparent at the ‘White Horse’ across the road.

“Patrons were largely “call centre” type people and also group of older men – possibly taxi driver work night out. Private function – hen night. Patrons in mixed groups – not as many on pull as ‘White’s Pubs’. Ned techno music was dreadful. Some patrons looked bored. Everyone generally good humoured. Mixed groups – overall not much interaction between groups” (BF)

This was also the only pub in sub-sample whose clientele was predominantly female. This of course may also have influenced the patrons’ behaviour, particularly that of the males, and this feature of the clientele would seem likely to have had an impact upon both the extent and nature of disorderly incidents associated with this pub.

“Unfortunately 50% of the patrons looked bored all of the time – staring at each other / their drinks in silence (possibly wishing that they were amongst the other 50% of happy people). Women seem to enjoy this bar more than men – who seem to spend most of the time gazing out the window watching the traffic or what is going on in ‘White Horse’!!” (BM2)

The main service related criticism that observers had of this pub was that it seemed to be understaffed, resulting in delays to service and allowing an accumulation of litter, empties etc., and what’s more, this seemed to get more obvious with each visit.

“Not very quick at serving customers. Possibly students. They failed to make enough eye contact and failed to clear glasses or ashtrays enough. Could have done with a few more bodies to cover the bar” (BM1)

“Some areas of bar particularly cluttered ... One very sulky looking girl clearing glasses (she was the only one doing this all night)”. (AF)

“One young male member of staff cleared glasses and bottles but much more needed because place was spilling over with empties.” (BF – first visit)

“Bar staff busy, two or three left to clean ashtrays and clear surfaces – more needed. Carpet of glass near door and in foyer when leaving. Bar much filthier in terms of spillage than last time.” (BF – second visit)

The ‘Royal Oak’ occupied an odd position with observers in terms of their objectivity, as it clearly did not have the potential for alcohol-related disorder that was evident in the ‘White’s Pubs’. This had an ambiguous effect on the observers, in that it was a safe environment, but a boring one, with little for them to observe other than the (lack of) cleanliness. All the observers disliked this pub (because of both its branded style and lack of interesting things to observe) and some confessed that, like the customers, what was going on outside the ‘Royal Oak’s’ large windows could be distracting (e.g. activities across the road at the ‘White Horse’).

The Swan

The ‘Swan’ was one of the pubs in the sample that both stated that it appealed “mostly” to a particular type of patron and that utilised Alcohol Focus Scotland’s *ServeWise* server training programme (the other on both counts being the ‘Crown’). This was very much a student bar and to an extent this was reflected in the pub’s style (e.g. posters of bands on the wall). This was the only pub in the sub-sample to put on any live musical entertainment and unlike the other pubs the musical style here was more slanted towards guitar groups (e.g. metal and indie). It was noted that the pub put on a great variety of live, DJ, televised and other entertainments, depending upon the night of the week.

The one problem with the inclusion of a pub like this in the sub-sample was that three out of four of the observation sessions were conducted outwith university / college term-time (i.e. in the Summer). This meant that during the first three occasions that the observers visited the pub it was very quiet, while on the final occasion (the very last of night of the

research) the pub was over-crowded ('fresher's week'). Interestingly, as will be detailed later, the busier night in this pub was relatively the more incident free. The type of patrons in the pub was also almost certainly influenced by this 'time of year effect'.

The 'Swan' was very male-orientated, in comparison to all other pubs in the sub-sample, yet paradoxically it was not a place where females felt harassed (see Appendix 3), with one male observer describing the "*Focus on drinking not posing*" (BM1) and one female observer stating that she "*Felt more comfortable drinking a pint in here*" (BF). During the summer this pub seemed to attract groups of young men wishing to play pool. This is a known high risk factor for disorder and (as will be detailed later, by incidents #4 and #8) aggressive behaviour by pool-playing groups was to become a feature of observers' experiences in this pub.

"Pool playing was a central focus. One group of student types sat in a corner. Couple of groups with two men only chatting - amiably. Didn't seem like regulars apart from one of two at the bar and seemed to have randomly arrived there. Music was good, but pub was lacking something." (AF)

"Patrons sinking pints – few people drinking alone. Pub had more of an atmosphere dictated by people in there. Patrons played pool or sat and chatted on sofas. One group of guys quite rowdy – space for 'horseplay'." (BF)

During the first three visits to this bar, observations of server practices were dominated by the lack of customers in the pub. For example, patrons could be served immediately. Nevertheless the observers felt that the staff of the 'Swan' were less professional than they might have been, especially given that their tasks did not seem to be nearly as arduous as those faced by the staff in some of the branded pubs.

"The bar was manned efficiently as it was never seriously busy. One person was able to efficiently supply the demand from patrons. Those wanting a drink were served immediately. Doorman was dressed in regulation black - smart but very short, occasionally stepped into bar and helped with clearing up empties etc." (BM2)

"Serving quick enough at bar, but not very good at clearing glasses and ash trays. [Bar staff] Appeared to be drinking some alcohol and a lot of socialising. May have been because it was a quiet night" (BM1)

“Bar staff talked a lot with patrons – didn’t really collect up much glasses / bottles in rest of bar. Bouncer didn’t really look professional – let woman in with pint and intoxicated – bar staff refused service. Few people in pub – not a lot for bar staff to do” (BF)

Some of the behaviour (e.g. drinking, socialising or leaving their post) of the Swan’s staff may have been acceptable, to an extent, as they had little to do on three of the nights that observations took place in this pub, however, the final observational visit to this pub was to provide one observation team with a different perspective. On this occasion, not only was the bar overflowing, but also much space was taken up by, and distraction caused by, of the presence of a live (soul music) band. The serving staff also seemed to have changed. Previously one observer (BM1) noted that they comprised *“Three females all over 30”* (i.e. unusually old for this sub-sample and in one of the most youthful pubs – see age of staff interviewed Chapter 6). On this final visit to the ‘Swan’ the servers were much younger. This change may have been in keeping with the season, with one observer (AM) describing the new clientele as a *“Lot of student-types”*.

[Staff were] *“Very busy but still managed to be polite. Could have done with more staff though. Less alternative looking than last time. All aged 21 to 30 – possibly students themselves. One complaint is that when the server cleared the tables he cleared it onto the bar, so there was a lot of mess on the bar.” (AF)*

“The staff were dressed casual. They had a fairly casual attitude. Coordination behind the bar did not seem to be very structured. People getting served not in turn. Some people waiting for ages (example me). Busy bar this time different takes on serving practices.” (AM)

Despite their concerns about the staff, none of the observers particularly disliked this pub, indeed it was the favoured venue for Team A (why they chose it for their last session). This bias was not entirely unexpected and this was the one pub where the observers felt they might meet someone they knew. One observer (BF) commented that she knew the DJ and was a little concerned that he had observed her, out in a pub at the weekend, twice with males neither of whom were her boyfriend (i.e. BM1 and BM2).

The Crown

Like the ‘Swan’, the ‘Crown’ served a particular clientele (at night, during the weekends) in this case clubbers. It was hypothesised that, of the four pubs with no known disorder, the ‘Crown’ should have the least risk of violence. This was because it was known to have had more staff externally trained than any of the others (three *ServeWise* staff) and it was located in a quiet side street (no crime in the months before observations began). The ‘Crown’ also resembled the ‘Railway’ in that it was a relatively small (by the standards of this sub-sample) ‘style bar’ or ‘café-bar’. This could be described as the type of pub that sprang up across city centres in the UK during the late 1980s to mid 1990s (during what Measham, 2004, calls the “Decade of Dance (1988-1998)”) before the branded theme pubs eventually usurped this trend. In a sense, this pub might therefore be seen as being a throwback to a previous generation of premises and a slightly passé, less youth-orientated, night-time culture.

Despite such café bars being seen as relatively unfashionable, the ‘Crown’ was variously described by the observers as either “*Arty*”, “*Stylish but not pretentious*”, “*trendy*”, “*cool*”, “*hip*” and as a “*Funky bar*”. In contrast to the ‘Railway’, it appeared to be promoting itself on a “*laid back*” image, rather than ‘exclusiveness’, with the ‘Crown’s’ features being described by observers as “*basic*” as opposed to “*designer*”. Also like the ‘Railway’, food was available at night, although only female servers were observed eating meals or snacks in the ‘Crown’.

More so than any other pub in the sub-sample, the ‘Crown’ seemed to attract different patrons at different times, for example, Fridays seemed to have a larger number of after-work drinkers and less pre-club patrons. On Saturday’s the pub seemed to be quite quiet until large numbers of clubbers arrived before embarking on a night’s dancing. It was noteworthy that these were a very different type of clubber to those who drink in some of the branded chains and gravitate to premises such as ‘Janus’ on Sauchiehall Street. Again in this respect the ‘Crown’ had some similarities to the ‘Railway’.

“Patrons mostly on way to clubs. ‘The Crown’ sold tickets for [several nightclubs, all located in opposite direction from Sauchiehall Street]. Noticeable that especially males had taken ecstasy. Crowd good natured.” (BF – Saturday)

“Night different from last time – not such a pre-club warm up. More people after work – smart ‘architect types’. People out for drinks with friends. Atmosphere pleasant – some male patrons ‘posers’.” (BF – Friday)

“Was relatively quiet at first and around 35 people and got much busier around 10.30 (70 people). Definitely a pre-club atmosphere. Everyone very friendly stepping out of each others way and apologising if they bumped against one another. Everyone seemed to be in a good mood possibly because it was a sunny day, possibly because of altered brain chemistry. Not a hint of trouble. Easily the most pleasant bar I have researched.” (BM1 - Saturday)

The staff in the ‘Crown’ seemed able to cope with this variety of patrons and levels of turnover without much difficulty – maintaining a “laid back” style, without being unprofessional.

“Staff casually dressed all monitoring the bar constantly and acknowledging customers with eye contact when they were waiting to be served. All staff were very friendly and socialised with customers and each other. I think this added to the party atmosphere of the bar without effecting speed or efficiency of service. They regularly emptied ash trays and collected glasses from tables around the bar.” (BM1)

“Doorman very smart. All staff friendly and chatty. Trendy young bar staff (none over 25). Efficient bar was cleared and half swept by 12. Took time making drinks (e.g. cocktails, Guinness etc.) – but not slow. Made DJ stop playing (he was intent on keeping going after 12) – but in a friendly manner.” (AF)

More so than at any of the other pubs in the sub-sample, the ‘Crown’s’ door-staff in particular were praised by all the observers as being efficient and friendly (see also rating scales in Appendix 3 and the analysis in next section), though they were never troubled by aggressive drunks.

“[staff were] Efficient – certainly. Young, ‘cool’ bar staff. Bouncer was very good asked men to leave fairly sternly (looked like drug dealers) and they complied. Prevented under-agers from getting in – but perhaps let too many in. Staff perhaps overwhelmed due to large number of people at peak but served me fairly quickly.” (AF)

The lack of drunken aggression or service problems at the ‘Crown’ had a strange effect on observers’ attitudes towards this pub. Several observers complained about being sent here because to them (being unaware of the pub selection procedure) it seemed like

something of a waste of their time observing it, as serious disorder was so unlikely to take place. For example, two observers commented that the height of the barstools was the most “*most dangerous thing in pub*” (AF), adding that there was a danger of them falling asleep and dropping off their seat, injuring themselves.

“There was a very relaxed atmosphere. Nothing happened or nothing could be anticipated to happen. Very uneventful night. Chill-out pub.” (AM)

“The atmosphere was non-threatening, amiable at times and no air of menace was ever observed.” (BM2)

This aside, the observers were split evenly on how they personally felt about this pub, with two favouring it, one who would attend under certain circumstances and two who did not like it because of its niche (style bar) market – “*Bit on an in-crowd*” (AM) and “*too cliquy and there is an air of elitism*” (BM2).

Again it must be stressed that these observers’ field-notes may be prone to an unknown degree of subjectivity (e.g. the students may have had a negative opinion towards the young working people who made up “most” of the ‘White Hart’s’ clientele, see previous Chapter). However, this may have been more of a problem if pubs with an older clientele had been selected, or if older observers, unfamiliar with the trappings of the modern night-time economy, had been employed in this research. In the next section we will go on to detail the characteristics of each pub observed, according to standardised checklists and validated rating scales known to be predictive of disorder (Form 1, see Chapter 2). It was expected that these would be more objective and it was of interest to how much these quantitative measures corroborated the observers’ written assessments.

4 (iii) Measuring risk factors for disorder

The previous section made use of the observers’ field-notes to highlight some of the more qualitative differences between the eight pubs (e.g. types of patrons, entertainments, serving or door policies), however at this stage we have taken no account of the pub sizes, numbers of patrons, numbers of staff, products on sale, layout and other physical features (e.g. geographical location) all of which may impact upon levels of disorder. In

this section we will look at some more specific aspects of the eight pubs in the sub-sample as recorded by the observers using Form 1. This form comprises a checklist of items and validated rating scales used to measure features and behaviours in each pub, including those known to be related to both increased and lessened disorder risk. These items are all indicated in Appendix 3.

From the information recorded in each Form 1, an assessment was made of the potential risk for violence or aggressive disorder apparent in each pub in the sub-sample. However, firstly we will look at other aspects of these pubs, such as their physical characteristics (e.g. pub size) and drinking behaviours (i.e. alcohol consumption) that are likely to mediate potential levels of disorder within licensed premises.

Drinking Environments

The eight pubs varied greatly by size (something that will need to be taken into account when examining actual incidents of disorder (next Chapter). For example, when the observers were asked to estimate the number of patrons at peak time, mean scores for each pub varied from between 65 to 80 (the ‘Railway’, ‘Swan’ and ‘Crown’) to between 225 and 280 (the ‘Royal Oak’, ‘Plough’, ‘White Hart’ and ‘White Horse’). This also takes no account of turn-around, with the ‘White Hart’, for example, sometimes requiring a queue simply to gain access and being described as having “constant” movement to and from the pub throughout the night. In contrast, the relatively congested ‘Plough’ and relatively vacant ‘Swan’ were both places where people tended to stay for the evening. Despite these difficulties, it did appear to be the case that the branded pubs tended to be larger pubs and busier than the non-brands (i.e. more patrons, which by itself, at least in a statistical sense, increased the likelihood that disorderly persons would be present). Staffing levels reflected this pub size differential, ranging between from around four employees estimated as being on duty in the ‘Crown’ to around fourteen in the ‘White Horse’, on a given weekend night.

Several features known to be predictive of disorder, and asked about in Form 1, did not vary across the eight pubs in this sub-sample. For example, all the observed pubs

employed stewards, who displayed equal levels of hostility (always low and little more so than the serving staff, with mean scores, on scales from 0 to 9, of 3.3 and 2.7 respectively). Similarly the staff at each of the pubs were equally good (or equally poor) at monitoring numbers of patrons inside and at working as team (see Appendix 3).

Of particular interest were the low numbers of under-age drinkers in all of the pubs (mean % never above 3.5). For this reason the number of 18 to 21 year olds was taken as the younger age group risk factor in subsequent analyses. Interestingly, one pub, the 'Red Lion' had a particularly flat age range, having both the most under-18s and the second most over 30s (50% of the clientele), making this pub different from the others in terms of having relatively low numbers in the median 21 to 30 age range, which was the commonest age range (between 40 and 60%) in six of the seven others. This may be in keeping with the observers' comments about the 'Red Lion' having a "random mix of clientele" (see observers' field-notes, above). The other pub with a different age profile, from the predominant 21 to 30 range, was the 'Plough', which was the only pub with more than half of its patrons estimated at ages 30 plus and it also had fewer in the 18 to 21 range than the rest. (As this was the only pub in the sub-sample not to return a postal questionnaire its clientele were unknown in advance of observations beginning). In contrast, one pub, the 'White Hart', had significantly fewer patrons aged 30 plus than the others, (i.e. the pub that was located near Sauchiehall Street's nightclubs). Finally, only one pub, the 'Royal Oak' was estimated to have a majority female clientele.

Some of the other features that Form 1 enquired about were only applicable to some of the pubs in the sub-sample, for example only half were built on two or more levels. The types of entertainment provided by each pub varied greatly. Only one (always) had karaoke and only one (once) had live musical entertainment. The three 'club-like' branded pubs ('White's Pubs' and the 'Royal Oak') made a heavy use of music videos and both chains had their own promotional TV channel shown on large plasma screens. The non-brand 'Swan' used TV music programs for this purpose. All except the two 'style bar' pubs (the 'Railway' and 'Crown') used pre-recorded music to some extent, and this was potentially the only form of musical entertainment at the 'Red Lion', though

it was seldom audible. The ‘Red Lion’ was the only pub not to employ DJs. This lack of use of entertainment as an attraction by the ‘Red Lion’ may reflect its reliance on competitive drinks pricing (this was also confirmed during subsequent staff interviews, see Chapter 6).

The types of music played also varied greatly. The ‘Swan’ played more metal or indie rock and less dance music. All three ‘club-like’ branded pubs played more rap / hip-hop and the two ‘White’s Pubs’ played more R & B. This seemed to be because of their greater use of ‘sexy’ dancing videos. The three ‘club-like’ branded pubs also played more chart / pop music, while the two ‘style bar’ pubs played less. These two pubs were the only two to play chill-out music, especially the ‘Railway’. The ‘Railway’ and the ‘Swan’ were also interesting in that they seldom played oldies. The importance of oldies in encouraging certain drinking behaviours has already been highlighted in the observers’ field-notes (see above) and the role of music in promoting alcohol consumption was explored further during subsequent staff interviews (detailed in the Chapter 6).

The two ‘style bars’ also differed from the other six pubs in that they had no TV. Of those that did have TVs, other than music, normal programming (e.g. *Big Brother* or the news) was usually shown, with only the bar in the ‘Plough’ showing sport. This by itself is considered to be a predictor of disorder (Graham et al, 2000), but especially so with the type of sports shown here, which included boxing, rugby, football and *WWE Smackdown*. The ‘Plough’ also differed from all the others in that it was the only pub where evidence of illegal drug use was never observed during fieldwork. The ‘Railway’ differed from the other pubs in that it was the only pub where any significant proportion of patrons was observed eating anything at all. Although, this was only around one in ten, this seems likely to be a function of this pub being attached to a restaurant (all the other pubs offered food at different times of the day).

Drinking Activity

The types of alcohol being consumed varied greatly across the eight pubs. Estimated percentages of patrons in each pub consuming all types of beverages are shown in

Appendix 3. (Note - totals for beverages do not equal 100% as patrons tended to consume many different drinks throughout the night, often more than one at the same time).

The most commonly observed beverage being consumed was lager, with an estimated mean of 45.3% of all patrons observed consuming. The only significant differences between the eight pubs in terms of lager's popularity were that proportionally more patrons were observed consuming this beverage in the 'Swan' (60.6%, i.e. the pub which had proportionally the most male patrons) and proportionally fewer were doing so in the 'Royal Oak' (33.1%, i.e. the pub which had proportionally the most female patrons).

The most popular lager brands cited by observers were premium brands (e.g. Bud® 23.1% and Stella® 19.2% of citations). Indeed it would appear from the observers' records that over three-quarters of lager being consumed in Glasgow city centre is premium (i.e. relatively expensive, usually strong) beer. This also meant that a great deal of lager was being sold in bottles (arguably also quicker and easier to serve). On only three occasions did an observer state that all lager was being sold in glasses (twice in the 'Plough' and once in the 'Swan'), with the ratio of glasses to bottles varying between ten glasses to one bottle (the 'Plough') and from one glass to four bottles (observed on three occasions in the 'White Hart') to the extreme of one glass to five bottles (one observation in the 'White Horse'). In other words, branded bottles were more likely to be the vessels from which lager was consumed in branded pubs.

As well as being sold in bottles, a number of other lager marketing techniques were observed, including two drinks for a cut price, cheaper by the bottle and ads / video promos. Lager tended to be consumed by males, particularly younger men, and was most often bought in rounds, sometimes being bought two-at-a-time. The speed of lager consumption was most often described as 'moderate' (47.2% of observations) but was more often described as 'fast' (38.9%) than as 'slow' (13.9%). (Lager's ubiquitous nature perhaps meant that it provided a yardstick against which the observers measured the pace of consumption of other drinks).

In contrast to lager, consumption of ale (non-lager beers) was very rare in this study, with a mean estimate of 3.6% of patrons seen consuming (ranging between 1.4% in the ‘White Horse’ and 6.1% in the ‘Plough’). Ales differed from lager in that most (estimated 88.2%) consumption took place from the glass rather than the bottle. By far the most commonly observed non-lager beer brand observed was Guinness® (88.2% of non-lagers - perhaps testimony to the success of this brand’s youthful marketing strategy), followed by imported wheat beers (9.1% of non-lagers) with traditional ales such as ‘heavy’ being consumed by only a very few patrons (6.1% of non-lagers, i.e. 0.3% of all patrons). Like lager, most ale consumers were described as male, though in contrast to lager this was particularly likely to be older men, and they also tended to buy in rounds (though one “trendy” young female in “dreads” was the lone stout drinker in one of the ‘style bars’). Unlike lager, the pace of ale consumption was evenly split between moderate and slow (34.8% each) with fewer (17.4%) drinking fast and some (13.0%) drinkers being described as ‘sipping’.

Cider was even less popular (mean consumption level of 0.8%). Despite this, levels of cider consumption did vary significantly, with more being consumed in ‘Swan’ (3.1%) and less in the ‘White Horse’ (0.1%). All but one observation of cider drinking involved the Magner’s® brand (like Guinness® an Irish marketing concept) and, like beers, cider drinkers were predominantly male. Cider was also interesting in that it tended to be served, and gradually consumed, ‘bottle to glass’ (half of all observations) making speed of consumption variable and difficult to estimate.

Vodka was estimated to be the second most commonly consumed drink in the study, with 28.8% of patrons observed consuming it (ranging from between 22.5% in the ‘Railway’ to 33.1% in the ‘Royal Oak’). This was very much a female drink, which was commonly consumed via a straw or alongside other drinks. A great many vodka promotions were observed, including cheap doubles, ads, being poured ‘straight’ or by optic, the opportunity to upgrade from the ‘house vodka’ to a premium brand (Smirnoff®) and being available in a variety of glasses, pitchers etc. A majority (56.1%) of vodka consumption was described as (at least) fast.

Other spirits were comparatively less popular than vodka, with a 9.5% mean consumption level (ranging from between 6.4% in the 'Plough' to 14.3% in the 'Railway'). Scotch whisky (48.3%) was the most often cited type of spirit other than vodka, followed by gin (20.7%). There was no clear pattern of who consumed these beverages, though as with vodka, the pace of consumption was most commonly described as (at least) fast (77.3%) and this often took place alongside other drinks.

Despite the media concerns about rising wine consumption, especially by women, (see Chapter 1) there was little evidence of this in this study with only an estimated 5.1% patrons observed consuming it. Oddly, despite the 'White Horse' being involved in a much greater level of promotional endorsement of this beverage in comparison to any of the other premises in the sub-sample, this pub had a significantly lower level of wine consumption (1.9%). Wine was however, almost exclusively consumed by women, especially older women, the exception to this rule being 'couples' (this was also the case with champagne). Wine consumption was noticeably more moderate than other drinks, mainly being described either as slow (34.8%) or as sipping (26.1%).

Like wine, alcopops is another beverage that has received a great deal of media attention, and blame, in recent accounts of the alleged changing pattern of alcohol consumption in Britain (see Chapter 1). Unlike wine, a relatively high level of alcopop consumption was noted by the observers (mean 15.9%), however this was very much restricted to only certain (types) of premises. Significantly, more alcopop consumption appeared to be taking place in all three of the 'club-like' brands, the 'White Hart' (27.5%), 'White Horse' (28.8%) and the 'Royal Oak' (28.4%). Meanwhile, significantly less consumption was taking place in the 'Swan' (6.3%), the 'Railway' (4.0%) and in particular the 'Crown' (2.0%) (i.e. the student pub and the two 'style bars').

At this point it should be remembered that these mean scores are the average estimates across pubs and take no account of the numbers in each pub. Therefore, for this reason, given the size of the three 'club-like' branded pubs, it is safer to assume, than figures for

other beverages, that any attempt to generalise the 15.9% consumption figure across the city centre's night-time economy would be a gross underestimation of the numbers of patrons choosing to drink alcopops.

The most popular alcopop brands cited by observers were Smirnoff Ice® (40.0%), Bacardi Breezer (27.5%) and WKD (15.0%). These were particularly heavily promoted by cut-price offers, and commonly consumed via straws, often two-at-a-time. Like wine, alcopops were very much a female drink, though in this occasion it tended to be preferred by younger women (though one "old man" was observed smoking a pipe whilst consuming a pineapple alcopop through a straw). Consumption of alcopops was most commonly described as fast (60.7%).

Consumption of soft drinks, including water was rare (mean 0.6%), although it was observed in all eight pubs. Interestingly, there was significantly less soft-drink consumption in the 'Crown' (0.1%) that had consistently some of the lowest levels of the measures of drunkenness recorded (see Appendix 3). This anomaly seems to stem from soft drinks being mainly consumed by people who were already extremely intoxicated in an effort to sober up (36.4% of observations), or where soft drinks were consumed alongside other drinks as a partial mixer, 'can to glass' (also 36.4% of observations).

Consumption of non-alcoholic hot drinks was even rarer (mean 0.1%) and was only ever observed in the 'Railway' (0.9% of patrons). This was restricted to coffee (including espresso) and seemed to be a function of this pub having a designated restaurant section (though a subsequent interview with a member of the serving staff of the 'Railway' indicated that hot drink consumption was far from encouraged at these times).

The consumption of non-alcoholic energy drinks was difficult to quantify, as there was extensive use of these as mixers, particularly Red Bull® with vodka. The overall mean for these drinks being consumed on their own was only 1.1% (which in no way reflects their popularity) and this varied significantly between more consumption being observed in the 'Red Lion' (4.4%) and significantly less in the 'Plough' (0.1%). There was no

consumption of these drinks at all observed in either of the two 'style bars', the 'Railway' and the 'Crown'.

This latter finding is rather interesting as, along with alcopops (see above) these are the very drinks (legal stimulants) that were thought to have been introduced to combat, and were targeted at, the 'rave scene' during the mid 1990s. The lack of popularity of these 'new drinks of the 1990s' in Glasgow's 'style bars', particularly the sub-sample's 'pre-club' pub, the 'Crown', would seem to indicate that, rather making converts from the so-called 'chemical generation' this marketing ploy seems to have created a new generation of consumer, especially in the case of alcopops, this being women who attend branded 'club-like' chain pubs (and, as will be detailed later, then gravitate to alcohol-orientated nightclubs after pub closing time, such as those located on or near Sauchiehall Street).

On Form 1 space was left for other drinks not included in the above list. Three categories of beverage were noted. The first additional drink observed was champagne, which was only observed in the 'Royal Oak' (0.1%) and the 'Plough' (0.3%). The second additional drink was cocktails which were not observed in the 'Plough', 'Swan' or 'Red Lion' (arguably the three more masculine bars) and were rare in four of the others (range 1.0 to 2.5%), but were a significant feature of the 'Railway' (15.6%). Cocktails were mainly observed being consumed by women and it was common for this to involve communal consumption from a pitcher with each drinker having her own straw.

The third additional drink observed was shooters or shots. These are a comparatively new phenomenon, the advent of which has recently been criticised as encouraging binge-drinking (see Chapter 1). These highly promoted new drinks were absent from the (traditional) 'Plough', (cut-price) 'Red Lion' and (pre-club) 'Crown', but observed elsewhere, and were a significant feature of the 'White Hart' (8.1%, with 40% being recorded during one night observation – consumption in other pubs ranging between means of 1.1. and 1.3%). Interestingly, there was no clear type of person who chose to consume these, however, the observed mode of consumption of these drinks was most

often described as ‘in-a-oner’ (84.6%) the remainder *only* as fast (15.4%). Clearly the consumption of these drinks could have implications for levels of drunken behaviour.

In short then, the observations confirmed that there was no shortage of alcohol being consumed in Glasgow city centre, in the evenings, at the weekend and that this was being consumed in a great variety of forms. Having identified the characteristics of the eight bars and the patterns of drinking that takes place in each, all of which might mediate alcohol-related problems, the next section will examine the specific features of each pub which were recorded by the observers and that are known from the literature (see Chapter 1) to be predictive of or protective against disorder (i.e. risk factors). That is, an attempt will be made to predict which pubs in the sub-sample are the most likely venues in which violence may take place (before describing the actual incidents of aggression witnessed within each pub by the observers, in the chapter which follows).

Risk Factors for Disorder

Form 1 checks for a large number of features ($n = 111$) which are known from the academic literature (see Chapter 1) to be either risk factors for or protective factors against violent disorder (see Appendix 3 - where these are marked by asterisk). These risky or protective features were recorded by every observer whenever she/he visited each pub (i.e. each feature was recorded twice in each pub by each observer, totalling a maximum of eight observations per variable per pub). Recordings were coded either as categorical data (e.g. were door staff observed, did they ask patrons for ID), or as continuous data (e.g. amount of drinking up time) including percentages (e.g. proportion of patrons standing) and of several ($n = 24$) internationally validated rating scales of bar-room characteristics, scored from zero to nine (e.g. how noisy the pub was, with a score of 0 indicating “very quiet, easy to talk” and a score of 9 indicating “ears hurt, cannot talk”). Each type of variable was recoded before analysis to eliminate missing or inappropriate values, for example, the categorical data was recoded into dummy variables (e.g. were door staff observed was recoded as a binary and if they asked for ID as ordinal data, i.e. no, yes observed once, yes observed more than once).

Differences between these risky or protective pub features, as recorded by the observers in the field, were used to construct a measure of relative risk between the eight licensed premises in the sub-sample. That is, Form 1 was used to make a risk assessment of each pub, indicating which of the eight premises were the most at risk of disorder and which were the safer. (Note - this can only be interpreted as relative risk between the eight premises observed, not as a measure of absolute risk). By using this method, if some pubs were found to have more risk factors than protective factors, then such premises were assessed as being at a higher risk for violent disorder, than say pubs found to have more protective factors than risk factors, which were in turn assessed as being at lower risk.

There were three stages to this process. Firstly, the distributions for each of the relevant categorical variables and mean scores for each of the continuous variables known to be either risky or protective pub features were calculated. When these distributions and mean scores were broken down across the eight pubs, a great many differences between these premises were apparent, with around half (53 of 111) of these differences reaching statistical significance (by X^2 , chi-square for categorical and by one-way ANOVA, analysis of variance for continuous variables, see Appendix 3).

Secondly, how each pub's scores were distributed across each categorical variable was compared against the distribution of the other seven pubs in the sub-sample (by X^2) and each pub's mean score on each relevant continuous variable was compared with the mean of the mean scores of the other seven pubs (by independent t -test). In this way, whenever either a risky or a protective feature present in any of the pubs was significantly different from the others, then that feature was attached to (associated with) that pub, as either a risk or protective factor, as appropriate. Finally, the total number of risk and protective factors (statistically significantly) associated each pub (by X^2 or t -test) was summed to give an overall risk assessment for violent disorder within each premises.

For example, one of the rating scales on Form 1 measured pub 'exit management' (see the final table in Appendix 3), with higher scores indicating poorer management (scored from 0 "gradual, friendly goodnight" through to 9 "uncontrolled confrontation"). The

mean score on this variable (scale) was 2.1 (range 0 to 5, $SD = 1.3$) with mean scores for individual pubs ranging between 0.9 and 3.3. From this, a significant difference between scores for 'exit management' across the eight premises was found (by one-way ANOVA, $F = 3.5$, $df 7$, $p = 0.003$).

When each individual pub's 'exit management' mean score was compared against the means of the others combined (by independent *t-test*), significant differences were found involving three of the pubs. Of these, the 'Red Lion' scored significantly higher than the mean of the rest of the sub-sample (mean = 3.3, $t = 3.4$, $p = 0.003$), indicating that this pub had poorer 'exit management' practices. Meanwhile, the 'Swan' (mean = 1.1, $t = 2.2$, $p = 0.032$) and the 'Crown' (mean = 0.9, $t = 4.0$, $p = 0.002$) scored significantly lower, indicating that these two pubs had better 'exit management' practices. As the difference between the 'Crown' and the other seven pubs (including the 'Swan') was greater than the difference between the 'Swan' and the other seven pubs (i.e. $p > 0.01$, as opposed $p > 0.05$) it might be considered that the 'Crown' had the best 'exit management' practices of any pub in the sub-sample (i.e. the most significantly better than the rest of the pubs). In this example, 'exit management' was added to the total risk for disorder score of the 'Red Lion'. However, this same pub feature was included as a protective factor in the overall risk assessment for both the 'Swan' and 'Crown'.

Owing to the large number of tests being run here and the fact that we had no prior reason to assume that the 'Crown' had the best exit management practices (i.e. no alternative hypothesis to the null), the interpretation of these individual test results require some caution. For example, under the rules of Bonferroni's correction the more statistical tests conducted the greater the likelihood that a significant result will be found by chance alone (especially at $p = 0.05$). (Ultimately if 20 tests are run, using 0.05 as the critical significance level, then the odds are that one false result will be found.) This is also known as Type I error (i.e. finding an effect when none existed). In the present analysis more than 100 tests were run between each pub's scores and the mean of the seven others, therefore according to this rule at least five 'significant' results (at the $p > 0.05$ rejection level), for each pub, are likely to have been found by chance alone. For

instance, in the above example concerning pub ‘exit management’ practices, the finding for the ‘Swan’ would be discounted. Therefore, in accordance with this rule, and to eliminate the possibility of false rejection of the null hypothesis (i.e. accepting a chance difference between the pubs), these tests were repeated with the critical significance level set at $p = 0.01$ and at 0.001 .

However, as the purpose of these analyses was to look at (produce a sum total of) the overall difference in risk of disorder between pubs, rather than their differences on individual features such as ‘exit management’ practices, it was decided to retain the lower ($p = 0.05$) critical significance level in order to eliminate the possibility of Type II error (i.e. not including an effect where there was one) when calculating the overall risk measure. As a safeguard to this approach, it should be noted that, if the results obtained at the lowest critical significance level ($p = 0.5$) were occurring by chance alone, false acceptance would be apparent if roughly equal numbers of risk factors were associated with each pub. (If this was the case, then such results would have been discounted.) However, this was not the case, and certain pubs were clearly associated with more or less risk or protective factors than were others, at every level of critical significance. This shown in Tables 4 and 5, which indicate that the general pattern of these results held, particularly for the protective factors, although at the strictest level of rejection ($p = 0.001$), one pub, the ‘Red Lion’ now had more risk factors than any of the other premises.

In Tables 4 and 5, each potential risk or protective factor, statistically significantly associated with each of the eight pubs in the sub-sample (by X^2 or t -test, see above), is listed beneath the relevant pub’s name. The initial inclusion criterion for each factor was that it achieved significance at the 0.05 rejection level. Risk or protective factors displaying a greater level of significance (at the 0.01 rejection level) are indicated by that factor being listed in italics, with the most highly significant results ($p = 0.001$) being listed in bold beneath the name of the appropriate pub concerned. The sum total of risk factors and protective factors associated with each pub, according to each level of critical significance, is given on the bottom row of Tables 4 and 5 respectively.

Table 4: Risk Factors in Observed Pubs

The Plough	The Red Lion	The Railway	The Royal Oak
			Sexual music
<i>Sport on TV</i>			
Full to capacity			
Door congested			
Exit congested			
No door staff			
Male Staff			
Staff humiliate			
Staff invade space			
Staff use force			
<i>Staff harass patrons</i>			
<i>Staff allow aggro</i>			
Staff lack control			
Not ask for ID			
Drinks taken out			
<i>Patrons D & I</i>			
Smokiness	Smokiness		
Lack ventilation			
<i>Lack wiping</i>			
Spillage			
Rowdiness			
Male hostility			
Poor decorum	Poor decorum		
Drunkenness level	Drunkenness		
	Drunks allowed in		
	<i>U18s allowed in</i>		
	U18s served		
	Males > 30 years		
	Vomit		
	Sectarianism		
	Pool table(s)		
	Staff square up		
	Wolfpacks		
	Police enter		
	<i>Not manage exit</i>		
	Stewards socialise		
	Stewards drinking		
	Not monitor bar		
	Not monitor exit	<i>Not monitor exit</i>	
		<i>Time called near 12</i>	Time called near 12
		Served after 12	
Totals = 23 / 7 / 2	Totals = 18 / 10 / 8	Totals = 3 / 3 / 1	Totals = 2 / 0 / 0

Table 4: Risk Factors in Observed Pubs (continued)

The White Horse	The White Hart	The Swan	The Crown
Sexual music	Sexual music		
<i>Sexual on TV</i>	<i>Sexual on TV</i>		
Pool table(s)		Pool table(s)	
Smokiness			
	Lack of wiping		
	<i>Spillage</i>		
Noise	<i>Noise</i>		
Movement	Movement		
Crowdedness	<i>Crowdedness</i>		
Dance congestion	Dance congestion		
	Queue to get in		
	Wait to be served		
Vomit			
Drug dealing			
Drug use			Drug use
		Sectarianism	
<i>Security strength</i>	Security strength		
	Rowdiness		
	Male hostility		
% Patrons standing	% Patrons standing		
	<i>Few older patrons</i>		
		% Male patrons	
Wolfpacks	Wolfpacks		
Sexual activity	Sexual activity		
Pulling activity	<i>Pulling activity</i>		
Female harassment	<i>Female harassment</i>		
Staff humiliate			
<i>Staff verbal aggro</i>			
<i>Staff bully patrons</i>			
Staff allow aggro		Staff watch aggro	
Staff hostility	Staff hostility		
		<i>Staff send out fight</i>	
		Not ask for ID	
		Staff socialising	
			Staff drinking
			Taxi provision
Totals = 22 / 6 / 2	Totals = 20 / 9 / 2	Totals = 7 / 3 / 2	Totals = 3 / 0 / 0

Table 5: Protective Factors in Observed Pubs

The Plough	The Red Lion	The Railway	The Royal Oak
	No sexual/sport TV	<i>Food promoted</i> <i>Eating fast food</i> Eating meals	
	Not full to capacity <i>Few standing</i> Not crowded <i>No dance congested</i>	Few standing	
		Not noisy <i>Not smoky</i> <i>Ventilation</i> Wiping Table clearing Low spillage Clean toilets Few drunks enter <i>No drunks served</i>	Not smoky Ventilation
Refuse service Few young patrons <i>Many older patrons</i>			Few drunks enter
			% Female patrons
		<i>No wolfpacks</i> Low sexual activity Few pulling Low sex harassment <i>Few hostile males</i> <i>Few hostile females</i> Low rowdiness Good decorum <i>Low drunkenness</i> Low security strength Staff not socialising	
Totals = 3 / 1 / 0	Totals = 5 / 2 / 0	Totals = 24 / 15 / 6	Totals = 4 / 0 / 0

Table 5: Protective Factors in Observed Pubs (continued)

The White Horse	The White Hart	The Swan	The Crown
		No sexual music No sexual/sport TV Not noisy	No sexual music
		<i>Not full to capacity</i> No bar congested <i>Not crowded</i> Quick service No wait till served	Low spillage
<i>Ask for ID</i>		Low movement <i>No wolfpacks</i> <i>Few pulling</i> <i>Low sex harassment</i>	Quick service <i>No wait for service</i> No drinking games Drunks not served <i>No doubles at 12</i> No door refusals
			No wolfpacks Low sexual activity Few pulling
			Few hostile males <i>Few hostile females</i> Low rowdiness <i>Good decorum</i> Low Drunkenness Staff not hostile
Staff not socialising		Staff not hostile	
		Stewards not socialising Low security strength	Stewards not socialising <i>Low security strength</i>
Time called early	Time called early <i>Monitor outside pub</i>		
		Exit management	<i>Exit management</i> No loitering outside
Totals = 3 / 2 / 1	Totals = 2 / 2 / 1	Totals = 14 / 7 / 2	Totals = 21 / 10 / 4

In the above tables a consistent pattern can be seen. Specifically, four pubs (the ‘Plough’, ‘White Horse’, ‘White Hart’ and ‘Red Lion’) had statistically significant associations with a larger number of risk factors for disorder than the others in the sub-sample (though less so at the strictest, 0.001, level of critical significance). At the other extreme, two pubs were consistently statistically significantly associated with more factors thought to

be protective against disorder (the ‘Railway’ and ‘Crown’). For example, at the least strict level of critical significance ($p = 0.05$), the ‘Plough’ was associated with 23 risk factors and only three protective factors while the ‘Crown’ was associated with only three risk factors and 21 protective factors. At the strictest level of critical significance ($p = 0.001$), the ‘Plough’ was associated with two risk and zero protective factors, while the ‘Crown’ was associated with zero risk factors and four protective factors (corresponding scores for the intermediary, 0.01 level, of critical significance being seven risk to one protective factor in the ‘Plough’ and zero risk to ten protective factors in the ‘Crown’).

The overall pattern shown in Tables 4 and 5 would seem to be roughly in line with the observers more subjective field-notes (although the ‘White Hart’ did not stand out as being the ‘worst’ pub in these tables). The remaining two pubs, the ‘Royal Oak’ and ‘Swan’ had similar numbers of both protective and risk factors, with the former not deviating much from the sample norm on any variable (and given the number of tests run these would appear to fall within the expected range of chance results at the 0.05 rejection level). This would appear to concur with the observers’ comments about this pub being “boring” (see Characteristics of observed premises above).

The above analysis provides a crude but clear differentiation between the eight pubs in terms of the likely level of risk of disorder on each of the premises observed. What is also clear is that the types of risk factors involved seemed to be similar both within and between some of the pubs. For example, two of the risk factors in the ‘Red Lion’ pertain to the presence of under-agers, while three of the protective factors in the ‘Railway’ relate to food provision and all of this pub’s risk factors relate to closing time features. On closer inspection, it was also apparent that some other factors seem to co-exist across premises. For example, pubs where there was more (or less) ‘pulling’ activity also tended to have more (or less) sexual activity and female harassment. In particular, there appeared to be a high degree of consistency across some of the scores obtained using the rating scales on Form 1 ($n = 24$) that measured related features, such as in this ‘pulling’ example.

To confirm the apparent consistency in responses to these internationally validated rating scales (all key factors in the prediction of violent bar-room disorder) Cronbach's alpha was performed across all of the rating scales used in Form 1 (scoring in the range 0 to 9, see Appendix 3). This is a data reliability test that verifies whether if one question is true, then another one is also likely to be true. For example, if a pub is rated high on 'pulling' is it also rated high on sexual activity and female harassment? The alpha score for this example was 0.864 (acceptable alpha scores of high reliability are those greater than 0.650). Therefore it is valid to consider these three scales ('pulling', sexual activity and female harassment) as a single item. That is they can legitimately be combined to produce a new composite variable measuring a combination of the three scales.

Similar high Cronbach's alpha scores were found for the five scales measuring pub atmosphere (smokiness, ventilation, noise, movement and crowdedness; alpha = 0.830), the four scales measuring standards of cleanliness (wiping, table clearing, spillage, toilet cleanliness; alpha = 0.800) and the five scales measuring patrons behaviour (rowdiness, drunkenness, pub decorum, male and female hostility; alpha = 0.882). Despite the high degree of agreement between the above items, interestingly no such reliability was found across any combination of the remaining seven rating scales, which measured staff activities (i.e. staff teamwork, monitoring inside bar, servers socialising, stewards socialising, sever hostility, steward hostility and exit management).

These Cronbach's alpha scores indicate both a high degree of consistency across observers' ratings and also validate the summing of these four groups of rating scales into distinct variables. Hereafter these four new composite variables will be termed as pub 'ambiance', 'dirtiness', 'sexual tension' and 'aggravation' respectively (see above). The internal consistency of each of these composite variables was checked by Pearson's *r* correlation analyses. In these, all five bar-room features measuring 'aggravation' and all three measuring 'sexual tension' correlated with each other (all $p = 0.001$ or better). All four scales measuring 'dirtiness' also correlating with each other (all $p = 0.005$ or better), as was also the case with the five variables measuring 'ambiance', except for the scale measuring ventilation which did not correlate significantly with those measuring

movement or crowding. As might be expected, given Tables 4 and 5, these composite variables were strongly associated with certain pubs. This is shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Composite differences between Observed Pubs

Pub	Unhealthy 'Ambiance' (0 to 45)	'Dirtiness' (0 to 36)	'Sexual tension' (0 to 27)	'Aggravation' (0 to 45)
The Plough	26.1*	22.0	8.4	18.4
Red Lion	22.0	19.0	9.8	19.0*
Railway	14.6	8.3	5.3*	7.4
White Horse	27.0	15.3	14.5	18.5
White Hart	31.0	20.4*	16.9	20.4
Royal Oak	21.6	17.3	11.3	16.0
The Swan	15.4	14.7	4.7*	11.8
The Crown	21.5	16.6	4.0	8.8

Table 6 provides the mean score for each of the pubs in the sub-sample on the composite scales (i.e. compound variables) measuring 'ambiance', 'dirtiness', 'sexual tension' and 'aggravation'. All these composite scales differed across the eight pubs by one-way ANOVA (all $p = 0.000$). As before, when individual pub's mean scores were compared against the mean of the others (by t -test) a clear pattern emerged. Specifically, the 'Railway' and 'Crown' tended to score 'better' than the other pubs, with the 'White Hart' scoring the poorest. This is indicated on Table 6 where significant differences (at the 0.01 rejection level) between individual pubs and the remainder, on each composite scale, are shaded either darker for (poorer scores) or lighter (for better scores). (Differences significant only at the 0.05 rejection level are indicated with an asterisk, though considering the number of tests being run here these must be treated more cautiously.)

The findings presented in Table 6, provide a narrower, but statistically more robust confirmation of those indicated in Tables 4 and 5. Table 6 confirms that two pubs (the 'Railway' and 'Crown') are likely to be more orderly premises in comparison to the others. This analysis also seems to confirm that the 'Plough', 'White Horse' and (in line

with observers' more subjective field-notes) particularly the 'White Hart' are more likely to be disorderly. However, the picture with the 'Red Lion' was less clear. On inspection of Table 4, this would seem to be the case because many of the 'Red Lion's' risk factors were related to staffing (stewarding) practices for which a reliable composite variable could not be constructed. This absence of a composite variable for staff practices also seems likely to have underplayed the apparent risk level in Table 6 of the 'White Horse' and particularly the 'Plough', both of which also had many risk factors which were associated with poor staffing practices (though in each of their cases these risks mainly related to the bar servers rather than stewards, see Table 4). Similarly the failure to construct a composite staffing rating scale for Table 6 is also likely to underplay the protective factors in the 'Crown' (see Table 5). Finally, as was found in earlier analyses, and also by other methods used in this research (e.g. observers' field-notes), on Table 6 the remaining two pubs, the 'Swan' and 'Royal Oak', seemed to fall between the extremes of the others.

Three Point Hierarchy of Disorder

From all of the above analyses, it was clear that risk factors for disorder do vary across the eight pubs studied. No pub was completely free of risk and no pub lacked any protective factors. However, it was obvious that four of the pubs in the sub-sample observed had a more risk factors present, but much fewer protective factors (see Tables 4 to 6 and refer also to the observers' field-notes). Henceforth these four pubs, the 'Plough', 'Red Lion', 'White Horse' and 'White Hart', will be termed as the 'high risk' for disorder pubs in this research. Similarly, two pubs, the 'Railway' and 'Crown', had many more protective factors and fewer risk factors. Henceforth these will be termed as being of 'low risk' for disorder in this report. The remaining two pubs either had similar numbers of both types of factor (i.e. a range of both risk and protective factors were observed), as in the 'Swan', or had very few of either type of factor, as was the case in the 'Royal Oak. These two pubs are henceforth termed as being at 'medium risk' for disorder.

This three point hierarchy in disorder risk, at least in part, fits what might be expected from the literature (see chapter 1). However there are also some minor qualifications to this finding and also as to how these risk assessments fit with what might have been expected from the pub selection procedure (described in Chapter 3). It did seem to be the case that the branded chain or ‘super pubs’ were at a relatively ‘high risk’ for disorder, although these were not the only ones, and one branded pub (the ‘Royal Oak’) was only assessed as ‘medium risk’. In terms of the police data used in the selection process, one pub assessed by this research as being at ‘high risk’ for disorder (the ‘White Hart’) had not been selected on the grounds of known crime, whereas one pub which was selected as being known for violent crime (the ‘Railway’) was assessed by this research as being at ‘low risk’. At this stage, this latter finding may raise some questions about the predictive power of this three point hierarchy, however as will be detailed later (e.g. in Chapter 5 (i)), these assessments did appear to be very effective at predicting a more detailed level of recorded crime associated with each of eight pubs in the sub-sample.

Limitations to risk assessment

Some care is required in interpreting these findings. Firstly, many of the risk / protective factors in each pub were related (or measuring much the same thing). This may have exaggerated the degree of differences between pubs. Secondly, some risk factors are ambiguous. For example, features such as ‘security strength’ (i.e. number and hierarchy of stewards) may be highly correlated with trouble, but it may also mean that staff are taking steps to reduce that trouble. Thirdly, it would be wrong to assume that each pub with a high or low total risk score is categorised as ‘high’ or ‘low risk’ for the same reasons, as the relevant factors at play in each of the premises were sometimes different and sometimes the same as those that were apparent in other pubs in the sub-sample.

Looking firstly at the two pubs assessed as being at ‘low risk’ for disorder, the ‘Railway’ and ‘Crown’ exemplifies these complexities. These are the two relatively small (in this sub-sample), independent, ‘style bars’. Both seem to score highly on having non-aggressive patrons and not being ‘meat markets’ pubs. However, the other protective features in these two ‘low risk’ pubs do seem to vary, with the ‘Railway’ scoring very

well on standards of cleanliness (both the ‘dirtiness’ factor above and in the observers’ field-notes) and in having its own restaurant, which seems to have helped its risk prevention score in terms of food provision. Meantime, the ‘Crown’ scored well on a number of staff orientated features, including bar service and door management, particularly those relating to closing time (see Table 5).

In contrast to the ‘Crown’, the ‘Railway’s’ closing practices appeared to be the poorest in the whole sub-sample (see Table 3), something also recorded in observers field-notes. Like the ‘Railway’, the ‘Crown’ also had only three risk factors, though these were more diverse and statistically weak. One, taxi provision, was related to this pubs awkward location. The second, staff drinking, appeared to reflect the ‘laid back’ party atmosphere described in some observers field-notes, though this seems at odds with the pub’s high scores on other staff activity measures. The third risk factor identified in this pub was drug use by patrons, although it should be noted that, unlike as observed in the other pubs, the drug use concerned here was prior ecstasy use (on one occasion involving a large proportion of patrons, especially males, see field-notes above). The effects of this drug in terms of reducing violence and in particular sexual predation are well known (e.g. Buffum & Moser, 1986; Henderson 1996), therefore this risk factor may actually be ambiguous in the Scottish context.

In many ways the features that were protective in the two ‘low risk’ pubs were the same as those that were risky in the ‘high risk’ pubs. However, once again different features seemed to cluster in different premises. Firstly the two ‘White’s Pubs’ were similar in that both scored highly on ‘sexual tension’. This was augmented by other common features such as the presence of ‘wolfpacks’, sexual music and sexual behaviour being shown on TVs. Other risky features common to both these pubs included large numbers of patrons standing, high ‘security strength’ and staff hostility. The ‘White Hart’ was the only premises to score badly on all four compound variables, scoring particularly so on ‘dirtiness’, ‘aggravation’ and especially as having an unhealthy ‘ambiance’. Additional risk features in ‘White Horse’ were more diverse including drug use (a variety of

substances) and drug dealing. This pub also differed from its branded sister in having pool tables and in vomit being observed (both also features of the 'Red Lion').

The risk factors in the other two 'high risk' pubs were quite distinct from those in the 'White's Pubs'. In the 'Red Lion' these seemed to centre on an acceptance of 'aggravation', drunkenness and patrons' demographics. Other features included, sectarianism, a police presence and strong indications of a lack of professionalism amongst the security staff (see also observers' field notes). (Note - this was the only pub not to employ stewards from the 'Hole-in-the-Wall' security company.) The 'Plough' had some similarities to the 'Red Lion' with drunkenness, demographics, aspects of staff / security's control of the door and an acceptance of potentially disorderly behaviour also being featured. (Note - that although these risk factors were broadly, concerning patron demographics and staffing practices, these were not necessarily exactly the same features as those that were observed in the 'Plough'). The 'Plough' also scored badly on unhealthy 'ambiance' and especially 'dirtiness', as well as maleness (staff, sport on TV etc.). All these features would seem likely to be a reflection of the bar's traditional "spit and sawdust" style (see observers field-notes).

There was little in the way of protective features observed in the 'Plough', other than that it did refuse service to potentially problematic customers and that it had an older age profile. However, as we will see in the next two chapters, this may be ambiguous in the Scottish context as older people (aged well over 30) were not only observed being involved in disorder but could often be the instigators of trouble. Similarly, the 'Red Lion' had few protective factors other than that it was seldom congested (though, as it had a transient clientele, this does not mean that it was not busy in terms of numbers of patrons over time, see observers' field-notes above) and that it showed normal BBC / ITV programming on its televisions rather than sport, music or 'sexy' promotional videos.

There were also very few protective features recorded by the observers in either of the 'White's Pubs'. The one common feature was that both called 'time' long before

midnight. The 'White Hart' also monitored patrons on the street outside, although as will be detailed later (Chapter 6), this may have been to encourage them to attend a nearby nightclub ('Janus') rather than to monitor their behaviour. The 'White Horse' did perform well in terms of staff professionalism, in not socialising and asking for ID (perhaps a reason why this pub had an older age profile than its sister on Sauchiehall Street).

The above differences and similarities, in types of risk factor for disorder found in the four 'high risk' pubs, allowed these to be further subdivided according to the type of risk present. The first of these types of 'high risk' concerned pubs, such as the 'Plough' and 'Red Lion', where risk factors for disorder centred upon their type of clientele and staff practices, including their tolerance of disruptive patrons (poor decorum). Henceforth, these two premises will be termed as 'Type-A high risk' pubs. The other two 'high risk' pubs, the 'White Hart' and 'White Horse', are similarly termed henceforth as 'Type-B'. In these 'Type-B high risk' pubs the observed risk factors tended to be more centred upon high levels of sexual activities and orchestrated drinks party marketing.

The two 'medium risk' pubs, the 'Swan' and 'Royal' Oak' are more difficult to quantify, particularly in the latter case where there were even fewer risk factors ($n = 2$) than in the 'low risk' pubs. These were sexual music and calling time close to midnight (as opposed to the 'Railway' where it could be called after 12). In contrast, the 'Swan' was the most male pub in the sample and some other risk factors present here may relate to this (e.g. a pool table and sectarianism). However, this pub also scored poorly on a number of serving staff activities particularly in relation to not dealing quickly with potential disorder (see also incidents #4 and #8, next chapter) and a lack of professionalism (socialising), though this may have been due to the bar being less than busy on three of the four occasions that observers called (when it was outside student term-time).

The 'Swan's' protective factors did seem to relate to an absence of busyness. Given that this was a student pub in the holidays and that it was extremely busy on the last occasion it was observed (110% capacity according to one observer) this might be misleading. In contrast to the serving staff, the observers' rating of the security / door staff was more

positive (though perhaps the numbers were not adequate, see incidents #4 and #8). What was striking was that despite this being a very male pub the ‘Swan’ had a very low level of ‘sexual tension’ (see also observers’ field-notes). The converse of the presence of a large number of males being a risk factor for disorder is that a pub having a larger number of female patrons is a protective factor. In this study, one pub, the ‘Royal Oak’, was estimated to have a majority of female patrons. Although this should be regarded as a protective factor, as we will see this may also be ambiguous in today’s Scottish context, as females in this study seemed to be no less likely to become involved in disorder as their male peers (see next chapter).

Summary

From the observers’ field-notes it did appear that there was a great deal of variance across the eight pubs in the sub-sample. In general the pub selection rationale (as described in the previous chapter) was borne out by the observers’ comments, however there did appear to be two inconsistencies. Firstly, the ‘Railway’ did not appear to be a very disorderly pub (indicating the two assaults incidents logged by the police in the three months prior to this research may have been highly unusual). Secondly, the ‘White Hart’ was clearly felt to be the most dangerous pub in the sub-sample, yet this pub was not known for disorderly crime (though the lounge section of the ‘Plough’ was also felt to be a potential flashpoint and was considered to be particularly intimidating by the male observers). Importantly, even at this early stage of the analysis there appeared to be a divide forming between four pubs (the ‘Plough’, ‘Red Lion’, ‘White Horse’ and ‘White Hart’) which, although very different, appeared much more disorderly than the other four, with two of these other premises (the ‘Crown’ and ‘Railway’) appearing to be the least disorderly.

This was confirmed by the succeeding section which detailed specific risk factors for disorder, present in each pub, obtained using internationally validated research instruments. Although these may have some cultural ambiguities in relation to Scottish context (e.g. a question on racism had the word ‘sectarianism’ added in advance of fieldwork – no racism was observed), the results obtained were impressive (especially

given the relatively small number of observations conducted). Among the risk factors found to vary between these eight pubs were measures of ‘dirtiness’, unhealthy ‘ambiance’, ‘sexual tension’ and ‘aggravation’, as well as measures of staff practices and the presence or absence of specific pub features known to relate to disorder risk (e.g. pool tables or food provision).

From these findings it seemed that there were two pubs in the sub-sample of eight that could be termed as ‘low risk’ for disorder (the ‘Crown’ and ‘Railway’), two as ‘medium risk’ (the ‘Swan’ and ‘Royal Oak’) and four as ‘high risk’ (the ‘Plough’, ‘Red Lion’, ‘White Horse’ and ‘White Hart’). These four ‘high risk’ pubs appeared to be split between two premises where risk factors centred on clientele demographics and staff tolerance of disruptive drunks (‘Type-A high risk’) and two pubs where sexual behaviours and an orchestrated drinks party environment seemed to be more important (‘Type-B high risk’). How this division into three levels of risk (and two types of high risk) relates to the actual incidence of observed aggression witnessed during this research will be explained in the next chapter.

5. Observations of Disorderly Incidents

The previous chapter identified risk factors for alcohol-related disorder as observed in eight Glasgow city centre pubs. This was done by using trained observers' field-notes and by analysing the scores that they recorded on an internationally validated research instrument, Form 1, designed for this purpose (see Appendix 3). This chapter will detail actual aggressive incidents of disorder witnessed by the observers in these eight pubs and recorded on another internationally validated research instrument, Form 2, designed to help explain alcohol-related aggression (see Chapter 2). These incidents will be compared known crime occurring within the eight pubs, as logged by Strathclyde police over the time course of this research project. Finally, an explanation of each these aggressive incidents and how they fit with known patterns of triggers (see Chapter 1) will be provided, that is what Hobbs (2002) calls "the choreography of violence".

The last chapter concluded with two of the eight observed pubs (the 'Crown' and 'Railway') being assessed as 'low risk' for violent disorder, according to the above methods. Similarly, two pubs (the 'Swan' and 'Royal Oak') were assessed as being 'medium risk' by this process. The remaining four pubs were assessed as being 'high risk', with these being sub-divided between two pubs (the 'Red Lion' and 'Plough' – termed here as 'Type-A') that scored poorly on staffing and clientele factors (e.g. tolerance of poor decorum) and two pubs (the 'White Hart' and 'White Horse' – 'Type B') where risks were centred on sexual activity and orchestrated drinks party marketing (e.g. 'sexy' dancing). It was therefore of interest in this chapter to see whether these risk assessments were useful in the prediction of actual violent incidents, occurring in each of the eight pubs, both those witnessed by the observers and those logged by the police.

5 (i) Frequency of disorderly incidents

Defining disorder

A disorderly incident, as defined in this research, is basically something that happens during a night of pub observation, which requires the completion of Form 2 by an

observer. At the end of Form 1 the observers had to complete a checklist of 23 aggressive behaviours, the observation of any one of which would route them towards Form 2. What these aggressive behaviours have in common is that they all involve an intentional action designed to injure another person either physically or psychologically. Again this is in line with the work of Kathryn Graham (2000) in Canada. In practice, most observed incidents of disorder, tended to involve several of these behaviours, especially the more violent incidents. Thus the range of potentially aggressive behaviours included both violent and non-physical disorder.

Specifically these were; “Someone was obnoxious, i.e. annoyed at least one person” (witnessed on nine occasions by observers), “Someone was argumentative” ($n = 12$), “Someone behaved rudely or inappropriately” (4), “Someone bullied someone of the same sex” (2), “Someone touched someone else against their will” (5), “Someone challenged someone, looking for a fight” (5), “Someone did something illegal” (2), “Someone angry with, threatening, the world in general” (2) “Someone threatened a particular person” (8), “Two or more people in a heated or serious argument” (12), “Someone pushed or grabbed someone aggressively” (7), “Someone slapped someone else” (2), “Someone punched someone else” (2), “Someone kicked someone else” (1), “Someone threatened with a weapon” (1), “Someone used a weapon” (1), “Two people involved in a physical fight” (5), “Three or more people involved in a physical fight” (2), “One or more person engaged in dangerous horseplay” (2), “Someone threw something in anger at someone” (3), “Someone hit an inanimate object in anger” (0), “Someone did something intended to cause trouble” (5), and “Other kind of aggression” (witnessed three times by observers).

Over the course of the observations a total of only 14 incidents fitting any of the above descriptions were observed inside, or immediately outside, any of the licensed premises in the sub-sample (most fitted several criteria). As there were a formal 96 hours of observations within these pubs, plus a few minutes drinking up and exiting time on each of the 32 nights of observation, this can be said to approximate to 14 incidents in 100

hours (though some incidents, especially relatively minor non-physical aggressive acts will undoubtedly have gone unobserved).

At first glance this would appear to concur with the police figures, reported in Chapter 3, indicating that a very low level of violent disorder is occurring within Glasgow city centre pubs at the present time. This seems like a very low rate of disorder in comparison to similar research, using this method, conducted elsewhere. For example, Graham et al (1993) in Canada, recorded 133 incidents in around 300 hours (97 three hour visits) of observation, while Homel and Clark (1994) in Australia recorded 102 incidents in around the same amount of observation time (147 two hour visits) – that is, rates of disorder being observed more than double what we found in Glasgow. However, previous studies of this nature have tended to focus only on known problem premises (including nightclubs and hotels) in order to maximise the chances of disorder being observed. By contrast, the present study observed a cross-section of pubs, half of which were unknown for disorder and only two of which were crime ‘hot spots’.

Perhaps a better comparison with this research was Hollands (2000) study of the night-time economy in central Newcastle, England, even although he employed a very different research method. In his sample, 80% of respondents had never been in an “altercation”, with an average 1.6 incidents of aggression being experienced, ever, by those who had. This equates to a figure of patrons being involved in a fight, on average, once every 970 nights out on the town – alternatively once every nine and a half years. Hollands also suggests that a small number of individuals were involved in a disproportionate number of fights. Interestingly, Hollands also found that those who drank in the notorious (binge-drinking) Bigg Market area of Newcastle were less likely to have experienced a fight than those who drank elsewhere. The frequency of violent disorder observed in this study would appear to lie between these two extremes, of the other observational studies and Holland’s research. This not entirely unexpected given the way that the sub-sample of pubs was selected, making the next point of interest how these incidents broke down across each of the eight licensed premises observed. This is summarised in Table 7, which gives details of each of the 14 incidents.

Table 7: Incidents of Disorder Observed in Pubs

Pub (number of incidents)	Incident ID (number of observations)	Number & Gender of Patrons Involved (approx age range)	Staff Involved (approx age)	Severity Rating (pub total score)
The Plough (2)	#5 (2)	2-3 M + 2-3 F (38-50)	3-4 M (35-39)	Physical -
	#14 (2)	8-15 F (18-60)	5 M (26-30)	Physical (6)
Red Lion (1)	#6 (2)	1 M + 3 F (19-22)	0	Physical (3)
Railway (1)	#13 (1)	1 M + 1 F (35)	0	Non-Physical (2)
White Horse (2)	#1 (1)	1 M (25)	1 M (30)	Physical -
	#2 (2)	1 M + 2 F (24-26)	1-3 M (23-30)	Severe (7)
White Hart (3)	#3 (1)	3 M + 1 F (30)	0	Physical -
	#7 (1)	3 M (23)	2 M (28-30)	Non-Physical -
	#12 (2)	1-6 M (19-22)	3-4 M (25)	Severe (9)
Royal Oak (3)	#9 (1)	2 M + 2 F (22-26)	1 M (25)	Ambiguous -
	#10 (1)	1 M + 1 F (20)	0	Physical -
	#11 (1)	1 M + 1 F (20-21)	0	Ambiguous (5)
The Swan (2)	#4 (2)	2 M (21-38)	1 M (30-32)	Ambiguous -
	#8 (2)	5 M + 1 F (18-25)	3 M + 1 F (26-35)	Severe (5)
The Crown (0)	-	-	-	- (0)

The first thing that is apparent from Table 7 is that incidents of disorder were not uniformly distributed across the pubs in the sub-sample, ranging between three incidents (the 'Royal Oak' and 'White Hart') to no incidents at all (the 'Crown'). Although the low number of incidents makes such comparisons unreliable, it is striking that the 'hot spot' pubs (the 'Red Lion' and 'Plough') or for that matter any of the four pubs known for crime according to the selection procedure (see Chapter 3) were not particularly high in terms of the number of incidents that occurred. This underlines the view that caution is required when using police callouts as an indicator of disorder levels in pubs. This of course takes no account of severity or numbers of combatants involved in each incident.

The second thing that is apparent from Table 7 is the large and diverse number of people involved in these 14 incidents. Over 80 individuals were identified including both patrons and staff (one observer stated that 15 patrons were involved in one fight, incident #14, though Form B only provided space for eight individuals to be fully described). In interpreting Table 7 it should be remembered that these figures, like all observational data, are reliant only upon what observers see. Therefore there can be a great deal of variance in both the numbers of combatants observed and how they are described. A full description of combatants and their roles in each incident is provided in Appendix 4.

Despite the above limitations, it was clear that the people involved in these incidents did not fit the model for those most likely to be involved in bar-room disorder according to the literature reviewed in Chapter 1. For example an equal number of females were involved in these aggressive incidents (using the upper estimate of total numbers identified). Only four incidents involved only male patrons and one only female (two 'physical' incidents, #6 and #14, involved heavily pregnant women). Also, despite the (intended) youthful age profile of these pubs (see Appendix 3), there was a substantial age range involved in these 14 incidents. In the extreme, one incident, #14, involved 8 to 15 women, the initial aggressor being 50-60 year old, abetted by her pregnant daughter.

In Table 7, each incident was rated for severity, independently by the two authors of this report who had not been involved in the fieldwork process (Martin Cloonan and Jean

Bar) according to their assessment of observers' accounts as recorded in each Form 2 (21 of which were completed, see Appendix 4). A four point rating scale was used categorising each incident as either 'ambiguous intent', 'non-physical', 'physical' and 'severe physical'. Like the instruments used to record these incidents (Form 1 and Form 2) this categorisation is the same as that previously used and developed by Kathryn Graham and colleagues in Canada (e.g. Graham et al, 2000). From the accounts of the incidents given by observers, this rating procedure produced three incidents classified as 'ambiguous intent' (may not have been deliberately aggressive, only interpreted as such). Two incidents were classified as 'non physical' (e.g. involving verbal aggression) and nine as 'physical' (i.e. actual violence). Three of these 'physical' incidents were rated as 'severe' (i.e. requiring medical treatment).

When the distribution of severity scores across the eight pubs is examined, this pattern did begin to appear closer to what might be expected (at least from the observations in the previous chapter) with the 'Crown' and 'Railway' being lowest and the 'White Hart' the highest, although this does not account for the low severity rating total of the 'Red Lion' (the highest crime police 'hot spot' in the city centre).

Incidents Known to the Police in Observed Pubs

Data were made available for the purposes of this research by Strathclyde Police that measured known crime and call out incidents in each of the eight pubs in the sub-sample. This third police data set (see also 3(i)) covered the whole of the previous year and the duration of the data collection for this project, a total period of 23 months, that is from January 2003 to November 2004 inclusive. This was done so that it was possible to compare observational data, both risk factors and actual incidents, with disorder known to the police, including that which was logged during fieldwork. A relatively long time span was required to be analysed for this purpose as it was anticipated that some of the pubs in the sub-sample would have very few known incidents of violence.

These long-term crime figures, broken down by each pub in the sub-sample, are shown in Table 8. The first column of this table highlights this long-term police data sub-divided

by recorded crimes and incidents, alongside each of the other quantitative measures of disorder taken in this research (i.e. observed incidents, risk factors and the initial police disorder data analysis conducted at the beginning of the study, see Chapter 3).

Table 8: Known Crimes in Observed Pubs

Pub	Final 23 month analysis of known crimes by pub (police incidents)	Initial disorder analysis (if 'hot spot')	Number of observer risk factors (No. of protective)	Number of Observed Incidents (severity score)
The Plough	60 (38)	10 (yes)	23 / 7 / 2 (3 / 1 / 0)	2 (6)
Red Lion	131 (115)	3 (yes)	18 / 10 / 8 (5 / 2 / 0)	1 (3)
Railway	10 (2)	2 (no)	3 / 3 / 1 (24 / 15 / 6)	1 (2)
White Horse	33 (not known)	1 (no)	22 / 6 / 2 (3 / 2 / 1)	2 (7)
White Hart	24 (not known)	0 (no)	20 / 9 / 2 (2 / 2 / 1)	3 (9)
Royal Oak	17 (21)	0 (no)	2 / 0 / 0 (4 / 0 / 0)	3 (5)
The Swan	8 (18)	0 (no)	7 / 3 / 2 (14 / 7 / 2)	2 (5)
The Crown	0 (2)	0 (no)	3 / 0 / 0 (21 / 10 / 4)	0 (-)

As indicated by Table 8, when this final batch of police data was analysed, as might be expected, it was found to be largely in line with the previous two batches of police data (i.e. the three month all city centre pubs disorder analysis and the thirteen month city centre 'hot spot' analysis) in that the 'Plough' and the 'Red Lion' had the highest levels of recorded crime and police incidents. However, the 'Railway' had, relatively, much fewer crimes or incidents than might have been expected from the initial police data set. This indicated that, as suspected from the observers' field-notes, the two crimes (assaults) logged by the three month analysis may have been highly atypical of this pub and that it had initially been miscast (selected for inclusion in this research) as a relatively

‘disorderly’ pub. On the other hand, this information indicated that the ‘White Horse’ had been correctly selected as a relatively disorderly pub and also that the ‘White Hart’ had higher levels of known crime than the ‘Swan’ and ‘Royal Oak’. Notably the ‘Crown’ had no recorded crimes (and only two police call out incidents).

The long-term analysis of police figures, detailed in Table 8, would appear to support the conclusions of the field observations (see Chapter 4) in that the four pubs assessed as ‘high risk’ the ‘Plough’, ‘Red Lion’, ‘White Horse’ and ‘White Hart’ were, as predicted, more disorderly than the others. (The majority of the 283 “crimes” logged in the long-term analysis conducted by Strathclyde Police comprised either breach of the peace, $n = 79$, or assaults, $n = 121$, including 23 serious assaults). However, interpreting Table 8 in support this assertion requires a number of potential caveats must be considered. Firstly, it must be stressed that these figures only refer to crimes known to the police. For example, based on field observations alone, the ‘White Hart’ might have been expected to have had a higher level of known problems, perhaps indicating that this pub may be less likely to report incidents to the police (reasons for such a possibility will be explored in the next chapter).

Secondly, these figures take no account of features such as pub size or clientele. The three smaller pubs in the sub-sample, the ‘Railway’, ‘Swan’ and ‘Crown’ all had lower levels of crime, though it would seem unlikely from (the extent of variance in) these police data that it was only because they attracted fewer patrons. The ‘Royal Oak’ was striking in this respect, in that this large pub had a relatively low crime / police incident rate in comparison to the other three branded chain pubs (e.g. half the crimes of the rival ‘White Horse’ across the street). It could be that this pub’s atmosphere and clientele (described as “boring” by observers, see Chapter 4) were responsible for this anomaly.

Thirdly, in busier or larger pubs, incidents may have taken place that were not witnessed by the observers. This seems quite likely to have been the case in pubs with two floors or two bar-rooms (i.e. the ‘Plough’, ‘Red Lion’, ‘White Horse’, ‘Royal Oak; and ‘Swan’). As will be detailed in the next section, this could also impact upon the quality of

observations (i.e. it was harder to see the whole of what went on, or make sense of events inside the larger, busier pubs). By contrast, inside the two smaller, single roomed pubs (the 'Crown' and the 'Railway') it would have been difficult to miss a disorderly incident. This feature of the observational method is likely to have offset any bias towards more aggressive incidents being witnessed and recorded in pubs with more patrons (see above), though the extent to which this had an influence in each pub is hard to quantify. This weakness in the observation method is unlikely to be a factor that had much of an impact upon the recording of police data.

Finally, it is not known whether any of the incidents known to the police were the same as any of those observed during fieldwork. The police were only observed in attendance at one incident, #12 in the 'White Hart' (see below). This and each of the other 14 observed incidents of disorder witnessed by the field observers in this research will now be described in detail in the next section.

5 (ii) Characteristics of disorderly incidents

This section will make use of the observers' descriptions of the incidents of disorder that they witnessed, to try to make sense of why each event occurred and what might be done to prevent such occurrences in the future. In doing so, edited extracts from each observer's field-notes concerning these incidents will be presented, verbatim, as they were written on each Form 2. The observers' accounts of these aggressive incidents made use of a validated notation system (Graham, 1999) to identify each of the individual combatants involved in each incident. In this patrons are assigned the letter 'P' (e.g. P1, P2, P3 etc.), while any staff involved are assigned the letter 'S'. A full description of these combatants can be found in Appendix 4, which includes details of what the observers felt their role in the conflict was and also some unique identifying information (necessary so that the accounts of both observers in each team could be compared). As with all of the data collected by the observers, it must again be stressed that they were only able to record what they saw and were under strict instructions not to let their minds 'fill in the blank spaces'. In practice, this meant that this section of the project generated

more missing data than those detailed in other chapters. This is illustrated by Table 9, which describes a checklist, from Form 2, of known reasons (or triggers) for disorder on licensed premises.

Table 9: Observers' Ratings of Disorderly Incidents

Contribution	No	Maybe	Yes	Unknown
Sport/Music	#1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10,11,13	#8,14	#8	#12
Territorialism	#1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14	#8,14		#12
Sex jealousy	#1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10	#5,6,11,14	#9,13	#4,12
Look for fight	#3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13	#4,8,14	#1,2	#12,14
Fight for fun	#3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14	#14	#2,8	#1,12
Out of loyalty	#1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,13	#6,9,14		#4,12
Defend other	#1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,10,11,13	#5,9,14		#12
Offended	#3,5,6,7,9,10,11	#4,6,8,14	#1,2,4,8,13	#12
Insulted	#1,2,3,4,5,7,9,10,11,14	#4,6,8,14	#8,13	#12
Sectarianism	#1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10,11,13,14		#8	#8,12
Emotional	#3,5,7,8,9,10	#4,6,8,11,14	#1,2,13,14	#12
Pool/Karaoke	#1,2,3,4,6,7,8,9,10,11,13	#4,14	#5,14	#12
Bar crowding	#2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13	#14	#1	#12
Discussion	#1,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,13,14	#5,6,8,11,14	#2,4	#12
Grudge	#1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13	#14		#4,12,14
Horseplay	#1,2,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14	#14	#3,4	#12
Staff refusals	#1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14			#12
Poor service	#1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14			#12
House rules	#1,2,3,4,6,8,9,10,11,13,14	#5	#5,7	#12

Table 9 places each incident (#1 to #14) on a grid to indicate the likelihood that each of these reasons, listed in the right hand column, was a contributory factor to the disorder, as interpreted by the observers of each incident. Where more than one observer rated an incident the same in this respect, this is indicated by the incident number being in bold (e.g. both observers who witnessed incident #14 felt that 'Sport/Music' was "Maybe" a

contributory reason for this conflict, whereas only one observer felt that ‘Sport/Music’ was “Maybe” a reason for #8, while the other observer stated ‘yes’ it was a reason).

As can be seen from Table 9, the incident in which the unseen portion of events was the most pronounced was incident #12, which despite being seen by both observers (BF and BM2) over a period of time, may actually have been two or even three separate events. This incident (independently rated as ‘severe physical’) happened during a very busy night in the ‘White Hart’ and involved a “*SWAT style*” (BM2) ejection of patrons by stewards, perhaps related to the subsequent appearances on the scene of paramedics (who led away an injured patron) and the police (who spoke to the duty manager). For a full description of this incident and all the others described in this section see Appendix 4.

“...Two doormen held an arm each with the third walking behind. It had a policing “snatch squad” feel to the incident as the door-staff dealt quickly and efficiently with a threat in the bar. P2 was excited and continued to argue with the door-staff once outside, eventually he removed his belt in a threatening manner and was clearly angered by something...” (BM2)

As well as illustrating the problems of observing such events in busy pubs, this incident raises some other interesting points. Firstly, it involved the apparent use of a belt as a weapon, something that was to be witnessed more than once in the course of this research (indeed belts were the only weapon use witnessed, excluding thrown drinks). However, of greater importance, this incident illustrated the power of ‘security strength’ and co-ordination (i.e. number and organisation of stewards) in removing troublemakers. The observers of this incident described this as a “*Very professional eviction*” (BM2) and as “*Security staff behaved professionally*” (BF). One observer (BF) noted that one of the stewards involved in this was not a ‘White Hart’ steward (i.e. from the ‘Hole-in-the Wall’ security firm) steward, but was ‘Janus’ personnel (i.e. from a nightclub in the vicinity).

As detailed in Chapter 1, the role of stewards can be seen as somewhat ambiguous when attempting to identify risk factors for disorder associated with licensed premises. Their presence does correlate with violence, though at the same time it can be regarded as a step which has been taken to prevent violence. However, some studies have indicated that

stewards can at times be the source of much violence (see Chapter 1). During the course of the present study, such behaviour was only witnessed from one steward, at the ‘White Horse’, though this involved two separate incidents on the same evening, incidents #1 and #2. The first of these was relatively minor (the steward concerned pushed a patron).

“...Bouncer (S1) looked edgy all night. Couldn’t stop moving – being mouthy (bragging body gestures) with other bouncers (my opinion: looked like a steroid user)...” (AF)

At this point the observer who witnessed this stated *“S1 should not have been so aggressive”* (AF), however, this incident (independently rated as ‘physical’) was only a foretaste of what was to follow. This next incident, #2 (rated ‘severe physical’), involved the same steward and began around one and a half hours later, at closing time. This time the steward assaulted a patron, apparently because the patron asked if *“he knew him and that he was in the year above him at school”* (AM).

“...Very suddenly the male steward (S1) grabbed the male patron (P1) by the shoulders and aggressively pulled him from his chair, with some force. The steward (S1) then, with some force, bashed patron (P1) into the right hand door standard / pillar. During this steward (S1) was hitting and thumping (punching) patron (P1), the final blow to the back of the patron’s head bashing his face into the pillar...” (AM)

The assault was only terminated when *“...steward (S2) intervened, shouting, “that’s enough”...”* (AM). Understandably, both observers felt that steward (S1 in #1 and #2) had been the initial aggressor here, consistently rating him as ‘looking for a fight’ for the ‘fun’ of it (see Table 9), showing *“pure aggression for apparently no reason”* (AM). It was also felt that the other stewards present *“could have got involved sooner”* (AF) and stopped this beating. It was also noted by one observer (AM) that the rogue steward returned to the window of the pub after the ejection and gave the *“thumbs up”* sign to his victim. On revisiting this pub one month later, the same observer also noted that the whole incident must have been caught by the pub door’s CCTV security camera.

These incidents occurred on the observers’ first visit to the ‘White Horse’ and this rogue steward was not seen on duty during any subsequent visits. He was however seen on duty

while observers were making their way home from elsewhere. On another occasion when the observers were making their way home from another premises, the following incident was observed as they were passing his pub at closing time.

“Police van pulled up to the ‘White Horse’ and 8 police went into ‘White Horse’. Waited across the road to see man walk out and put in ambulance. No blood, don't know what happened. People outside unconcerned - people snogging and wandering around.” (BF)

This was the only time that an aggressive incident was witnessed from the street (see Street incidents, below) that concerned any of the pubs in the sub-sample, made while observers were making their way home from a formal observation session in one of the others. Whether or not this rogue steward was involved in this other, un-rated, incident was not known. It must be stressed that this individual steward's rogue behaviour was atypical of 'Hole-in-the-Wall' security staff and particularly so of the door staff at the 'White Horse' who were otherwise amongst the least hostile in the sub-sample. Were it not for the actions of this steward, the 'White Horse' would have had no disorderly incidents recorded whatsoever, on any occasion that this pub was formally observed during the study, making it comparable in this respect with the ('low risk') 'Crown'.

The 'Crown' was the only pub in the sub-sample where no disorderly incidents were observed. This was not entirely unexpected, as no such crimes were known to the police at this location, it was assessed as being 'low risk' for disorder in this research, according to observers' ratings (see Chapter 4) and it was known to have a high degree of staff training (see Chapter 3). The other pub assessed as being 'low risk' for disorder assessment was the 'Railway' and indeed only one, relatively mild, aggressive incident was recorded in this pub. Only one observer witnessed this incident, #13, on the last occasion that the 'Railway' was visited during fieldwork.

“...P1 and P2 were in the middle of an argument. P1 looked drunk and had ‘a face on’. P2 was making futile attempts to calm her...P1 was shouting and finger wagging...” (AM)

This incident can be regarded as comparatively minor (rated 'non-physical'), but within the context of the 'Railway' it can certainly be considered as disorderly. The incident

seemed to be some sort of a ‘domestic’ dispute between a ‘couple’. Another two such ‘domestic’, incidents #9 and #11, were observed, again both were fairly minor (both independently rated as ‘ambiguous intent’) witnessed by only one observer each and both occurred in the ‘Royal Oak’. Of these #11 is described first.

“...It became a tit for tat argument between the two of them – until it eventually ended with the two of them snogging and making up. It would seem to have been fuelled by the changing mood states as a result of alcohol effects.” (AM)

It is difficult to see how such ‘domestic’ incidents could be prevented altogether, other than by serving staff somehow limiting the alcohol consumption of such warring partners. However, there is clearly some scope to prevent these from escalating or affecting other patrons. For example, in the second of the ‘domestic’ disputes witnessed at the ‘Royal Oak’, incident #9.

“...P2 stormed off and left the pub, but returned within a few seconds and grabbed P1’s arm. They left together (he by force) and stood arguing in the street. He had left his jacket and P3 and P4 opened the fire door in order to return this and intervene in the argument (verbal only, although looked tense) and the couple came back into the pub. They then went back out the fire doors and only this time did S1 intervene. He was not concerned about the argument – only the use of the fire doors...” (AF)

The observer concerned felt that staff could have done more to intervene and “*Could have appeased the argument and should have stopped P1 from spilling his pint all over the dance floor*” (AF). The only other incident witnessed in the ‘Royal Oak’, #10, was observed on the same evening as incidents #9 and #11. Although independently rated as ‘physical’ (see Table 7), this incident also seemed fairly minor.

“...P1 noticed P2 and danced across to her. He attempted to catch P2’s attention with no reaction. P1 reached out and grabbed P2’s arm and attempted to pull her on to the dance floor. P2 pulled away aggressively – clearly upset that P1 had reached out and touched her...” (AM)

It is interesting to speculate whether the environment of this pub, which was regularly described as “boring” by the observers’, was a factor in these three singularly observed incidents being recorded, all over the course of the same night of fieldwork. It might be the case that these three incidents would have gone unnoticed in say the ‘Plough’ or

‘White Hart’, but at the same time this may be as much a factor of the tolerance for such activities in these pubs, as compared to the ‘Royal Oak’ and that the observers were correct to record these on this occasion.

What incidents #9 and #10 have in common is that they also both involve dance floor activity. As described in Chapter 4, the observers felt that the extent and nature of ‘sexy’ dancing by female patrons and ‘leering’ by their male counterparts (who were often older or in ‘wolfpacks’) created a charged atmosphere that could trigger disorder. One such event took place in the ‘White Hart’, though it was only witnessed by the female observer as her partner was queuing at the bar (the incident was not witnessed by staff either). The outcome of this incident, #3, should act as an illustration of how failure to prevent such harassment can result in a loss of business from the publican’s point-of-view.

“...a hen night of nurses came into bar – nurses all wearing scrubs except hen who was wearing ‘carry on’ nurses outfit...Big group of 25 – 35 year-old males standing drinking ‘in pack’. Some nurses (1 or 2) interact with males. One or two males lift up hen’s skirt 2 or 3 times. Hen looks pissed off and moves away from them. Guys all laughing. Hen party decides to leave.” (BF)

‘Sexy’ dancing related aggression was not restricted to incidents directly involving males. The largest disturbance witnessed during the whole study (involving up 15 female patrons and six male staff) took place in the lounge section of the ‘Plough’. This incident, #14, seemed to stem from one group of female patrons objection to the provocative or insulting nature of another group of females’ dancing, combined with the cramped environment (see Table 9) of this section of the pub (see Chapter 4).

“There is no dance floor yet many people were dancing (some on the speakers). The DJ was egging people on and it seemed to be more of a disco than a karaoke at times. I am uncertain of what happened and saw no obvious incident but suddenly P1 ‘waded in’ to the dance floor and started having a go at P5. Perhaps P5 had in some way insulted P2 (pregnant and drunk)...” (AF)

What is also interesting about this incident is that the two observers had different opinions of the role of the DJ in resolving the conflict. The female observer seemed to feel that he was antagonising things, “...the DJ was clearly taking pleasure in this and

was stood in the middle of the women making comments like “this is better than the X Channel” (a porn channel)...” (AF) while the male observer (who was a pub DJ himself) felt that he had helped calm the situation, “S1 [the DJ] seemed to know P2 and tried taking to her to the side to talk to her. S1 seemed to try to calm the situation with the others too...”. Whatever was the case, this was not the only time that a DJ was to become involved in an incident of disorder witnessed by the observations teams, nor was it the only occasion where a drunken pregnant female was at the centre of the aggression.

One other incident was witnessed in the lounge area of the ‘Plough’. Like incident #14 this, #5, was centred on activities relating to the karaoke (see Table 9). In this incident a group involved was ejected from the pub by stewards, perhaps because one of them had sat on the karaoke ‘stage’. As this was the only pub in the sub-sample where this form of entertainment was observed, it does appear to suggest that this bar-room activity (like pool tables) may be a catalyst for disorder that requires extra vigilance from staff. Incident #5 had some other similarities to #14, in that the cramped and crowded nature of this venue could easily allow trouble to escalate or spread to other patrons.

“...As S1, S2 and S3 began to move the party downstairs, S3 was given a bottle by one of P1 to P4 and he didn’t look happy with this. He snatched the bottle and slammed it on a shelf / counter outside the toilet. Suddenly an arm was seen to fly out and struck P3 across the bare chest (By P? and P3 was unhurt - oblivious to the slap!)... Following P1 to P4 and S1 to S3 were approximately four to five other females all of which were carrying bottles or glasses of alcohol that they continued to drink as they went downstairs...” (BM2)

In this incident, the observers felt that although the security staff had successfully removed the aggressive patrons, without rising to a great deal of provocation, things could perhaps have been handled better. For example, the male observer (BM2) felt that the stewards were only focused on those patrons directly involved in the incident, and *“could have dispersed the crowd that gathered to observe and prevented people from following the incident to the ground floor, the latter involved people carrying glasses and bottles that could have been used as weapons if it had escalated”* (BM2). The observers were uncertain as to what had precipitated this incident but it seemed to revolve around the karaoke and some kind of house rule-breaking.

Although no incidents seem to have been triggered by staff giving poor service or refusing service, one other incident, #7, involved staff having to enforce rules (see Table 9). This ‘non-physical’ incident (see Table 7) occurred at the ‘White Hart’ and was the simple ejection of a drunken patron again carried out professionally and efficiently, without using any physical force, despite protestations from the drunk and his friends.

“...Bouncer signals that they are all to leave. One man (P2) (with girl) looks hesitant. P1 mouthing off, looks angry, bouncers tower over him. He gets up. I then follow them to exit, bouncers leading all three out. P1 still being mouthy. P2 and P3 shake bouncers hands at exit and leave. All three stand on pavement outside debating what to do. Bouncers restrained and professional.” (AF)

The advantages for pubs of employing efficient and professional security staff to deal with incidents such as #7 were apparent throughout the observations made in this study. As indicated in Chapter 4, only one pub in the sub-sample, the ‘Red Lion’ did not use the ‘Hole-in-the-Wall’ security firm. The stewards employed by this pub seemed less professional, and although they were not hostile, they seemed lackadaisical by comparison. It was interesting therefore that the only incident to be witnessed in this pub was not noticed by any staff. This incident, #6, was the other event to involve a drunken pregnant woman and clearly had the potential to become more serious than it eventually was (independently rated as ‘physical’, but not ‘severe’).

“P2, P3 and P4 sitting drinking bottle of wine round table. P1 had been sitting on end of table with group of males but didn’t look like he was with them. P1 goes over to next table and talks to P2 to P4. P1 pours / throws beer from bottle at P2, P3 and P4 and walks away to leave. P2 stands up and lobs empty wine bottle after him. P2 asks group of males on next table (who P1 had originally been sitting with) if P1 was their friend. Onlookers didn’t seem to know him.” (BF)

This incident is interesting in a number of ways. For example, the academic literature rates proportion of patrons standing as a risk factor for disorder, yet the ‘Red Lion’ placed a greater emphasis on seating than any of the other pubs in the sub-sample (see observers’ field-notes above). As exemplified by this incident, more seating creates more opportunity for potential ‘tablehoppers’. By contrast, pubs where most patrons are standing, or those with relatively few well spaced seating areas, are more likely to

discourage such behaviour and allow other patrons the opportunity to avoid such undesirable 'guests'. Also, with regard to the Scottish Executives proposed ban on smoking in public places, including public houses (the pub staff's views on the potential impact which will be described in the next chapter), it was interesting to note that this incident seemed to have been triggered by the 'tablehopper' being refused a cigarette by the smoking drunken pregnant woman.

The final two incidents to be described in this section both took place at the 'Swan'. Like some of the incidents described above (e.g. #6), these also illustrate the advantages of having efficient stewards. However, unlike what was thought to be the case at the 'Red Lion' (see previous incident), the stewarding at the 'Swan' was viewed by the observers as professional (see Appendix 3), the problem here being that the 'security strength' was simply not adequate to deal with any serious incidents when they occurred. The three smaller pubs, the 'Crown', 'Railway' and 'Swan' all employed stewards, however on occasions this was only one man for each of these premises. This clearly provides the larger pubs (i.e. those in branded chains with an extra advantage for dealing with disorder). At the 'Swan' there was only one (different) man present on both occasions that an incident was observed.

On the first of these occasions, incident # 4, the situation did not escalate (and was independently rated as 'ambiguous intent'). However, this incident provided some pointers towards the much more serious incident #8 observed a month later. Both of these incidents had several similarities. To begin with, they both involved a group of young men playing pool (a known high risk factor for bar-room violence) and they both involved one young man being singled out by others. Team B (i.e. female observer BF) witnessed both of these incidents, the first of which, #4, is now described.

"...The aggressor (P1) was heatedly discussing something with doorman (S1) who was blocking him from re-entering bar. After some discussion with doorman (S1) and friends the two people involved embraced and the aggressor left the bar. May have been disagreement relating to pool between friends." (BM1)

The observers who witnessed this incident clearly felt that the internal security arrangements of the 'Swan' were not sufficient to deal with such a situation, should things have gone the wrong way - *"Bouncer just held door open – IF situation had escalated – not sure bouncer alone could have broken pair up"* (BF) and *"Although the incident sorted itself out with P1 and P2 'making friends' it could have gone the other way and S1 failed to completely cut out the dialogue that continued after the incident between P1 and P2. It was too risky to allow them to be close enough to embrace as it could equally have been a chance for violence"* (BM1). These comments were to prove prophetic in regard of what happened in incident #8, which was by far the most serious (rated 'severe physical') of those witnessed during the study. Like #4, incident #8 began with pool players arguing with other patrons and involved the doorman attempting to allow one group to leave whilst the other group remained in the pub.

"P1 was standing at the bar - facing the pool table - and I could lip read "fuck..." and gestures / body language were hostile. P4, P5 and P6 stayed where they were (back to window) and were clearly shouting back...Shortly after this S1 (bouncer) ushered P4, P5 and P6 out the door and allowed P1, P2 and P3 to stay inside. S2 (barman) and S3 (DJ) tried to calm P1 down. P4, P5 and P6 left with a few more insults and began wandering [towards Sauchiehall Street]." (BF)

However, despite being very similar to incident #4 whilst inside the pub, ultimately this incident reignited and escalated directly outside.

"...P1 was being pacified by staff and was seen monitoring the whereabouts / actions of P4, P5 and P6... he eventually left the bar with P2 and P3 with him – walking behind him. As he crossed the road he removed his leather belt and curled it around his right fist. Once on the pavement he turned to face P4, P5 and P6 and stood arms akimbo with the belt dangling in a very threatening manner. As he began shouting at P4, P5 and P6 (general insults and threats) P2 and P3 attempted to move him on and leave the scene. He refused and eventually they stood in silence (in single file) behind P1. Meanwhile P4, P5 and P6 were clearly aware of the threats / abuse being thrown at them but seemed to be leaving the scene – although reluctantly ... we heard P1 cry "ya Fenian bastards" and this had the instant effect of breaking P5's resolve to leave the scene... What followed was a fury of fists, P1 fell to the floor and P4, P5 and P6 surrounded him and all laid into P1. This lasted less than a minute and eventually P4, P5 and P6 stopped the assault as P3 screamed hysterically for them to "stop and go". They did, with P5 carrying the belt of P1 and wrapping it up, placed it in his back pocket" ... "As we approached P1 was still on the floor, but as we got nearer was being

helped to his feet by a person who had been travelling in a car. P3 was screaming, P2 calling an ambulance. No bar staff were seen – despite outside the door of ‘Swan’. P1’s head was bleeding badly, he had a cut to his right temple and blood covered all of his head, ear, neck and was running down his eyes over his cheeks. He looked dazed and for some reason had no shoes on!” (BM2)

Before attempting to explain this violence, it should be noted that both the observers concerned (BF and BM2) were ‘shaken’ by having to witness this incident and its severity (after the incident it was noted, by BF, that all three assailants were noted wearing sturdy Timberland® boots). The atmosphere of the research project seemed to change afterwards (prior to this incident observers had been becoming somewhat blasé about the absence of serious violence that they were witnessing in the pubs selected) and this may have influenced their recording of further incidents.

Both the observers of the above incident felt that with adequate security staff more could have done to keep P1, P2 and P3 inside the pub until P4, P5 and P6 were well away, thus preventing it from continuing and escalating outside. They felt that it might even have been possible for staff to intervene after P1 had exited the pub, to calm him down, and when they could have attempted to remove his belt. The observers also felt that this beating had been prolonged by the fact that it occurred on a relatively quiet section of the street (at that time of night) with few people around who could have intervened and prevented things from going so far. It was felt that this would not have happened if this pub had been located in a busy cluster of pubs, such as in the vicinity of the ‘White Horse’ and ‘Royal Oak’, where a greater concentration of CCTV cameras may also have been a deterrent. In other words this most severe incident was in part as a consequence of the absence of factors often thought in the academic literature (see Chapter 1) to increase levels of disorder (e.g. clusters of pubs, large pubs, security / steward strength etc.).

Other aspects of this incident did fit the existing academic literature. The incident involved young males, drunkenness, pool players, sectarianism (i.e. read ‘racism’ in the literature) and above all it seemed to involve someone who was determined to become involved in violence, despite poor odds of ‘victory’ and no matter what was done by bar staff or others to prevent this / calm him, “...*The incident was not representative of the*

night in the bar. This flared up at closing time and appears to have centred on the actions of P1... he got what he asked for and was clearly out of his depth attempting to take on three people whilst being very drunk.” (BM2). In such cases there would seem little chance of preventing disorder, only of minimising it by forceful intervention. To this end the lone steward at the ‘Swan’ had tried valiantly to avert this incident from escalating, with help from both serving staff and the DJ, all to no avail.

One final interesting aspect of this incident was that it escalated rapidly once it had moved outside of the pub concerned. This was to be a major feature of this observational research phase of the project. That is, there appeared, at least subjectively, to be a lot more disorder on the streets of Glasgow city centre after the pubs closed than there was within the premises themselves, perhaps, at least in part, because of the informal ‘policing’ role of security staff.

Street Incidents

After the observers completed their observational sessions in each the eight pubs they remained cognisant of any disorder while making their way home. The observers all described the streets of Glasgow city centre as much more disorderly, than that which they had just formally observed within the pubs. However, it also should be stressed that this was not the case on every night. In particular, it should be noted that the observations took place predominantly during a prolonged spell of very wet weather and that on some occasions the streets were described as “deserted”.

A page was appended to Form 1 to try to gauge this street disorder in relation to the patrons of the pubs observed during each night’s work. However it soon became apparent that this was a near impossible task (see Chapters 2 and 4). Nevertheless, observers were able to note no less than twenty disorderly street incidents on their way home during the study (i.e. more than were observed during a much longer time period spent inside the pubs – this total excludes incident #8). Although observers were not required to do so, some field-notes were made about these events. The following example describes Team B’s journey home along a small section of Sauchiehall Street:

“12.30AM - In the space of 10 minutes we observed two street fights taking place in Sauchiehall Street near Charing Cross. Incident one ... saw a very drunk male (23 years) get seriously assaulted by two males (both aged 25 plus) after he had been pushed to the ground. His head was cut and bleeding but [he] wanted to fight. A friend wanted to stop him – but the two aggressors moved on him, pushed him into a doorway, on to the ground, and laid into him, repeatedly with systematic punches. Two cops intervened – ran across the street and cuffed one whilst the other fought with the second cop!...” (BM2)

“Sauchiehall Street outside ‘Wheatsheaf’ [pub] ... noticed male on floor, perhaps fallen, later apparent might have been pushed. Cuts to back of head. Two guys and two or three girls walking away. One helped male up off floor (friend). Two guys start trying to fight with male again. Male a lot smaller than two guys, they start punching him Not clear if girls trying to stop fight or not. Two guys get a shoe off male and throw it into street. Half a minute later two policemen run over from car (stopped outside ‘King’s Arms’ [branded pub in King’s Inns chain]) pounce on two guys (one each) split them up and handcuff them...” (BF)

“12.40AM - Sauchiehall Street opposite ‘Ganymede’ [nightclub]. Scuffles between two younger neddy looking guys and one older male 30 plus in suit and tie. Fighting between one young guy and older guy. Not really much contact except grabbing at each other. But move into oncoming traffic on Sauchiehall Street. Breaks up as two parties move off in different directions. Police car drives up Sauchiehall Street seconds later, so fight would not have continued. Don’t think parties saw police or vice versa.” (BM2)

“Minutes later a running battle was taking place between ‘Greyhound’ [pub] and ‘Prince of Wales’ [another branded chain’s pub] between two guys. One aged 25 to 30, the other 40 to 45. The younger guy was the more aggressive, running at, throwing blows and attempting to kick a retreating man (twice the size and weight of the aggressor). A few blows were exchanged in the centre of the traffic lanes, but both parties left as quickly as it had started (my guess: this was a continuation of an argument in a nearby bar – possibly the ‘Anchor’ [pub]).” (BF)

There are several points of research interest in the above accounts. Firstly, the sheer intensity and concentration of the violence in this small area of the city centre after the pubs have closed (this would concur with the police street crime data described in Chapter 3). Secondly, the sheer number of premises surrounding the area where these conflicts were taking place (only some of which at this locus are even mentioned in the observers’ accounts), which underscores the near impossibility of attributing incidents of disorder to a specific pub’s patrons by this observational method (see Chapter 2). Thirdly,

the great variety of individuals (age, gender, social class, attire etc.) involved, adding some weight to the view that it is the ‘toxic mix’ of different types of people competing for ‘liminal space’ in the city centre night-time economy that can become the trigger for violence (see Chapter 1). Such a toxic mix of types of drinker would be unlikely in many of the pubs observed, except perhaps to some extent those in branded chains.

Summary

In this section we have confirmed that the level of disorder taking place inside Glasgow city centre pubs is relatively low, with only 14 such incidents being observed, some of which were very mild or ambiguous. Nevertheless, the pubs rated as ‘low risk’ for disorder in Chapter 4 were those in which the fewest disorderly incidents were recorded. This pattern was confirmed by police data specific to the eight pubs observed. The 14 incidents witnessed, varied greatly in their nature, causes and outcomes, however some trends were emerging. These included disputes arising from bar activities (e.g. karaoke), inadequate or rogue security, ‘domestic’ disputes, sexual predation (‘pulling’), provocative (‘sexy’) dancing and people simply out looking for trouble. One surprising feature of those involved, especially given the pubs selected, was that most of those at the centre of these incidents were not, as might be expected from the literature, young males (i.e. men under 30 years old).

Although not part of the focus of this research it was noteworthy that there seemed to be more disorder occurring on the streets after the pubs had closed. These street observations gave rise to a further set of questions. For example, if the pubs are relatively orderly in comparison to the streets outside afterwards, what is the cause of this difference? Is it the patrons of the pubs who are causing all this trouble and, if they are responsible for at least some it, why then should they be better behaved whilst they are inside the premises than when they emerge on to the streets? This was one of the issues explored in the next chapter, which involved face-to-face interviews with members of the serving staff employed by each of the eight pubs in the sub-sample.

6. Staff views on disorder and server training

The Interviewees

In October 2004 face-to-face interviews were conducted with a member of staff in each of the eight pubs in the sub-sample (refer to Appendix 5). As detailed in Chapter 2, interviewee recruitment first involved writing to the licensee to inform him / her about the research and our intention to interview a member of their staff. Secondly a direct approach was made to the duty manager in each pub during a quiet time in the afternoon mid-week. At this point access to a suitable interviewee from each pub was successfully negotiated. It is to the credit of the publicans that all agreed to participate in this part of the research, all almost immediately, including the ‘Plough’, the only pub in the sub-sample that had not participated in the postal survey (see Chapter 3). Although who was interviewed and where / when the interview took place were at the discretion of the pubs’ management, as shown in Table 10, a broad range of bar serving staff was recruited.

Table 10: Characteristics of serving staff interviewed

Pub Name	Locus (<i>n</i> of visits)	Current Job Title	Gender (Age)	Service (in post)
Plough	Pub in use (3)	Bar & Kitchen Hand	M (21)	5 years (5 years)
Red Lion	Pub office (2)	Deputy Manager	M (26)	3 years (1 year)
Railway	Pub closed (2)	Cocktail Waiter	M (20)	3 years (1 year)
White Horse	Pub empty (1)	Trainee Manager / Staff Trainer (ex Door Steward)	M (22)	2 years (10 months)
White Hart	Pub in use (2)	Floor Staff (completed bar & hospitality college course)	F (18)	7 months (7 months)
Royal Oak	Pub empty (3)	Bar Supervisor	M (27)	2 years (2 years)
Swan	Pub in use (3)	Licensee & General Manager (family member is owner)	M (26)	8 years (2 years)
Crown	University (2)	Licensee & Manager	F (24)	6 years (1 year)

As is shown in Table 10, the interviewees included two licensees (from the ‘Crown’ and ‘Swan’ – i.e. both the *ServeWise* trained pubs, see Chapter 3), a deputy manager (the ‘Red Lion’), a trainee manager (who was also a staff trainer in the ‘White Horse’), a bar supervisor (the ‘Royal Oak’), a cocktail waiter (the ‘Railway’), a bar & kitchen hand (the ‘Plough’) and a member of floor-staff (the ‘White Hart’). As will be described in detail throughout this chapter, all eight interviewees had first hand experience of dealing with patrons at night during the weekend. They also represented a broad range of past licensed trade experience and other employment / training backgrounds, including work as a door steward (the trainee manager) and a relevant college qualification (the floor worker).

From Table 10, it can also be seen that all the interviewed staff were relatively young, aged 18 to 27 years, with a total experience in the licensed trade of between only seven months and eight years (seven months to five years in their current position). This youthful profile of the interviewees is likely to be a reflection of both the modernity of the selected premises and the age of the clientele that they serve (this concurs with the observers’ field-notes concerning staff’s age, see Chapter 4). Therefore, when interpreting these interviews, it must be assumed that the young age of these interviewees would be likely to have had some influence over their views and responses.

Target Markets

The interview began with some questions about their pub’s style and the type of patrons it attracted, as recorded on the postal questionnaires (see Chapter 3) and as witnessed by the observers (see Chapter 4). In terms of pub style the staff interviewees confirmed much of what had already been noted by the observers, including the “traditional” image of the ‘Plough’, the student clientele of the ‘Swan’, the transient clientele of the ‘Red Lion’ and the ‘style bar’ nature of the ‘Railway’ and the ‘Crown’. However of particular interest here were the responses of the staff from the three ‘club-like’ branded pubs (the ‘White Horse’, ‘White Hart’ and ‘Royal Oak’) which all seemed to be focused much more upon attracting ‘young working people’, especially at night during the weekends.

“Our target is sort of late teens to 30 but we do get a lot of people outwith that age range as well in here, that is our specified target from head office, but we do get a lot of obviously older people as well, a lot of groups of older guys out on Saturday nights we do get a fair mix in here I must admit.” (Royal Oak)

“...the end of the month the typical thing is that everyone goes out and gets drunk and comes in to spend their money but whereas the weekend after that is generally quiet because the trend is that they’ve spent their money before” (White Horse)

“It is a wide, wide range, like during the week it is probably kind of older, kind of clientele, but at the weekends it is a lot younger, em between 18 and 25, pretty much...”... “[Music] *During the day it’s kind of mellow, kind of chill-out stuff. At night it’s pretty much dancy, R & B kinda thing... Yeah, cos the age group we’re trying to attract is kinda, it’s the thing they would listen to”* (White Hart)

These statements by the staff members of the ‘club-like’ branded pubs would imply that such pubs were specifically targeting the kind of clientele who have been associated with binge drinking and its consequences in recent times (see Chapter 1). It was also apparent that both these three large ‘club-like’ branded pubs and the two ‘style pubs’ in the sample tended to focus upon younger people later in the evenings at the weekend in comparison to other times of the day or week (i.e. during the peak times when all the observations conducted for this research took place).

“...as soon as it hits 5 o’clock all the office crowds come in and they all stay until about 8 o’clock. In between 8 and 9 there is a bit more of a changeover. All the office workers leave and the pre-clubbers come in. So there is a certain divide and you can tell just by the way they act.” (Railway)

“...then because of our bus stops, we’re actually located because of the bus stops, so fae about 3 o’clock, maybe say 4 o’clock to about 7 o’clock you get people coming in, everybody that comes in, the guys will come in drink 6 pints in a hour and half and then walk oot, so at 7 o’clock you start dying doon again. At the weekends again at 9 o’clock you’re getting everybody going home from work but then you’re getting all the night timers coming again so fae 9 tae 10 o’clock is your busy stages.” (Red Lion)

These changes in types of patrons described by the interviewees would appear to concur with the field observations described in Chapter 4. The staff interviewed from both all four branded pubs and the two ‘style bars’ also indicated that, for many of their night-time economy patrons, the pub was not the intended last port of call in a session, but that these people tended to gravitate towards nightclubs after closing time.

“It’s a pre-club pub, you get people come in, you tend to get a lot of stag and hen weekend and groups, will come in and you will get people that come in regularly every weekend for like the hour or two hours they come in and then they go off somewhere else. It tends to be older folk heading up to the ‘Setebos’ and ‘Janus’ [nightclubs in the Sauchiehall cluster] and stuff, places like that.” (White Horse)

“We do get a lot of hen nights and stag nights, yet again its because we’re a big pub and we’re cheap they can come here and they can [get] tanked up and then they move on to somewhere that’s maybe a wee bit decent, a club or something” (Red Lion)

As will be explained in greater detail in later sections, the forging of links with specific nightclubs or other licensed premises could be seen as an important strategy for attracting a particular night-time economy clientele.

“Well it used to be with Bonkers [the nightclub the closure of which precipitated this project], around the corner, it used to be what we call a feeder club you need a feeder club for a big dancing, they’re [the pub management] trying to set up a rapport with ‘Rosalind’ [night-club] I think its called over the road, so we do, we let them come in and flyer and that, but obviously the bigger nightclubs are up Sauchiehall Street so it killed our night time a wee bit has suffered but that ‘Rosalind’ has shot wur takings back up again.” (Red Lion)

“...we differ [from the] ‘White Horse’ [because] Sauchiehall Street is student heaven with all student places, I think that’s what it is, that’s why this is [a] younger [pub] as well...” (White Hart)

Serving Staff Training Programmes

Next, as lead in to questions on staff training, the interviewees were asked about their career motivations and why they worked in their pub. With the exception of the ‘Swan’s’ interviewee (whose family owned the pub) it was striking that all the interviewees had previously been patrons of their workplace before they joined the staff (including the 18 year-old interviewee at the ‘White Hart’).

“I have always wanted to work in a pub. I actually did a college course last year at the [college] on License House Operations, so it was basically theory and stuff for running a bar.” ... “Well in all honesty, when I turned 18 I basically handed my CV into every pub, I literally walked up Bath Street, down Sauchiehall Street and this was the first one that phoned me back, so I am here.” (White Hart)

“I kind of just fell into it, I was working in a restaurant and then I ended up coming in here on a staff night out, liked it, I had just turned 18 and wanted a new job, so I started here... Well, I was just in here and it was like the first time I had ever been in, so I thought it is a nice wee place actually, I’ll see if they were looking for any staff.” (Railway)

When the interviewees were asked about what training they had received, either when they had first joined the industry or subsequently during the time that they have been in post, a wide variety of answers was given. It was noticeable, that with the exception of the two licensees interviewed, this training was largely restricted to customer service. This was even the case when external training programmes were used.

“Well, they’ll do certain things like, companies like Diageo the drinks brand, sent me and two other guys away to a whisky training for two days up North, we stayed in a castle, it was great. Either that or we will go through to their head office in Edinburgh and get cocktail training from like the world’s best, either that or we enter into competitions which also comes with training as well.” (Railway)

When interviewees were asked what areas they would like to have received more training in, issues relating to health & safety and licensing law were most often mentioned, regardless of the interviewees current job status.

“Just also with all the stuff about legislation and stuff in place these days. Manual handling, I am not particularly well versed, you know, if somebody lifts something and does their back in and they are going to sue or off work whatever, I’d rather you know, I train them as much as I can in terms of lifting and what not, but also I do not have certification to say that I can do that.” (Swan)

“Like obviously the big thing is the licensing law because, being honest, we’ve had a case where someone went outside and fell and then she twisted her ankle or something, but she was drunk and then the police came in and had a word with us because they said “you shouldn’t have served her in that state” but she was fine when leaving, I mean you could stand there tonight and you will see at least ten people fall, sober or not...” (White Horse)

This part of the interview was particularly useful with the ‘Plough’s’ interviewee as his pub had not participated in the postal survey and so we had previously been unaware that this pub’s bar staff training was ‘in-house’ only (see Chapter 3), as follows:

“When you start you get an induction which is basically talking through your contract, shown the different products that we sell, a tour of the building, shown the

fire exits, shown around the beer bars, shown the cellars and then a few maybe training on the tills, because it's a computerised till, its all touch screen, so you get an hour's training on that and then after that it's really you are just up here and maybe you get loaded up with somebody to show you around the bar and how to pour pints if you have never worked in a pub before...In terms of more training it would be to maybe with more sort of product info, to learn more about whiskies and wines, cos maybe that has just come through experience... The food side of it, yeah trained for that as well, the training for that was quite good, you get a lot of Health and Safety training and certificates for that, so it is quite good.” (Plough)

In contrast to this ad-hoc approach, all the branded chain pubs had standardised training packages sent down from head office to in-house trainers.

“we've got our own training officer up, we've got a training plan called [straight-up] and gradually, it's a 12 week package, start off after you've been here eight weeks you fill in a certain amount of it, it basically covers everything...They get trained to smile they get trained on how to ice fruit and serve a person drink every time and they get trained in customer excellence.” (Red Lion)

“Trained on everything, trained on the tills, on what stock we have, trained about what wines we have ... the training is a sort of an ongoing thing in here, we do have a lot of staff training nights and if something new comes in we will... The head office will send out an information pack and pamphlets and you know problem cards all the wee bits and pieces we need and either myself or one of the other supervisors will take a workshop for the rest of staff.” (Royal Oak)

“...training I just got here was, it was quite extensive like, pretty much mostly on the bar and obviously to me I kinda knew all the theory things behind it and that [having studied Licensed House Operations at college] ... but mostly the training I got here was to do with this bar etc... It was like, you do all your theory stuff behind like yer marketing, yer finance, yer wines and spirits, yer measures, yer cellar management, stuff like that, em how to do, you do like food production as well and all that. It's really, really good actually... we have a 30 day appraisal then we have a 13 week appraisal em, but we don't have enthin after that...” (White Hart)

All the branded pubs' interviewees referred at length to the role of undercover inspectors (called 'mystery shoppers' / 'customers') who would be sent from head office to check up on how each pub in the chain was performing. Trainers in these pubs therefore put a great deal of emphasis on staff being prepared for this inspection, as head-office evaluations (i.e. league tables) appeared to put pressure on the branch's management.

“We do a lot of, we have a mystery customer who comes in, so we do a lot, a lot, of mystery customer training. The questionnaire is very, very thorough, so we train the

staff quite regularly on the mystery customer, the points to look for and all these bits and pieces, we do, do quite a bit with the staff I must say... We try to keep it as informal as possible, a lot of the time the training is like maybe having a pint and we usually do it up here and it is nice and quiet and it is just the staff, and it is very informal, but at the same point in time we enforce it, if people ar'nae learning things then we do make sure that they do do it... Yeah, we have to, as I say because of this mystery customer then it does reflect badly on the pub if we get a bad score... Oh yeah, there is a league table, there is sort of pressure on us to make sure that the standards are kept to.” (Royal Oak)

“Well we all do monitoring, we’ve got monthly checklists we’ve got assessments to go through in the training, so every week I’ll do a kind of assessments of the staff, though they don’t even know of, I’ll stand at the stairs and watch them serve and I’ll say you’ve, got to do say with the mystery customer, you’ve got acknowledge that you go to the bar within a minute, you’ve got to smile, you’ve got your courtesy, if it’s more than a minute you’ve got to update them....” (Red Lion)

Social Responsibility Training

In comparing the branded pubs training programmes, it appeared that the ‘White’s Pubs’ package seemed to put more emphasis on both social responsibility and dealing with disorder, than was the case with the other two brands represented in the sub-sample (‘Royal Taverns’ and ‘Lion Bars’). However, it should be noted that the interviewee in the ‘White Horse’ was this branch’s ‘in-house’ trainer and that the interviewee from the ‘White Hart’ did not mention these aspects of her training (see above), although this could also be a genuine difference between practices in the two branches concerned.

“...work books, there’s eight sections in it, ehm it ranges from induction, right up to how to look out for troublesome customers, licensing law, things to do with that, everything with regards to safety in the pub, health and safety of customers, things like that, it is all covered in the books.” ... “the performance of the branch as a whole is always monitored and then we get people coming and doing mystery shoppers ... They come in and check, do the door staff have badges, are the door staff pleasant, are they well organised, stuff like that, so they will come in on a Friday and Saturday night and they’ll make sure that the building is being controlled and the toilets has been checked and stuff like that so” (White Horse)

Two pubs had indicated using the *Serve Smart* training programme in their postal questionnaires, the ‘Railway’ and the ‘Royal Oak’ (who also stated that they used the British Institute of Innkeepers). Neither of the interviewees from these two pubs were aware of these programmes nor had they heard of server responsibility training. However,

both of the interviewees from the two pubs that had used Alcohol Focus Scotland's *ServeWise* programme were very much so, although this is hardly surprising given that both were the licensees. Both of these interviewees had undergone the *ServeWise* programme as part of their licensee training (the assistant managers at the 'Crown' also did the course) and they were generally positive about the experience.

"Yes, to do our licensee training, it was good fun. It highlights things that you maybe knew but could forget about after a while" ... "Mainly, who to serve and to take control of situations where like somebody comes in and they have obviously had too much, not to just give them a drink because it is the easier option, making sure everyone IDs people, what else – generally just like housekeeping rules, just to make sure the place is kept clean." (Crown)

"The one that I did was just a refresher course, I had already done a licensee's course a few years' ago, but I think it had run out and it had to be renewed before I got a license for this place." ... "Just licensing laws, just things that you perhaps do and that are actually illegal, you know, or vice versa you know." ... "I think again that is just basic common sense. I suppose for somebody that is young and just come in to the industry and they didn't know much about it, it might [be useful]. I mean we deal with these kind of things day in and day out. I actually went along with one of my new directors and he says "Do you ever get trouble in your pub?" I'm like that "it happens daily" you know and he was kind of a bit taken aback as to how he would perhaps deal with it." (Swan)

The other interviewees, who had not heard of such server responsibility programmes, were generally positive about the aims of such initiatives and when asked if there was any other type of training that he would like to have received one interviewee spontaneously mentioned the issues of responsible service and techniques for dealing with disorder.

"If anything, it should, Health & Safety, I should have done and I would kind of like to get the whole, get trained up on how to safe serve, eh end up saying "no". There is an abrupt way of doing it, but it's not the most, not the best way. See that's the kind of thing I'd like." (Railway)

Preventing Disorder

Interviewees described a number of strategies that they used look out for disorder, though these were more often thought to have come about from a combination of common sense, instinct and experience, rather than as a result of any formal server training.

“I have not had any specific training you know, but I was in the army for a good few years and I was in Northern Ireland for a few years so I suppose I’ve got a fair eye for it... It is very difficult when the bar is busy to tell what is going on around, I mean sometimes you get people in and you just know straight away they are worth keeping an eye on.” (Royal Oak)

“Well what I say to staff when training them [is] if people come into a bar and all you’re there to do is serve drink, [but] when I’m serving a drink I make sure I’m always looking about me, but I don’t know whether that’s being from an ex-door steward, raised voices, smashed glasses, you can tell what’s happening and what’s about to kick off and they know when something does kick off...” (White Horse)

“I usually kinda try tae stand back in the bar and just have a wee look round just to make sure there’s nothing and again having a wee wander round the floor, obviously you can see what’s... Just look for, if there’s big groups of guys being really noisy and all that... Clearing up to go an all that.” (White Hart)

There was a view that nipping disorder ‘in the bud’ was very much a case of ‘horses for courses’ that varied according to the individual server concerned, the situation that he / she was confronted with and the type of patrons involved.

“...its just talking to them on their level... “right prick, enough’s a fucking enough, you’re acting like fanny”, and rather than if it was a nicer person, going “look mate come on”, there’s different ways. A lot of people say you should deal with everybody the same, but that’s shit, the guy’s sitting there where marks on his face [scars], then you come a wee bit harder on them” ... “Obviously at £1.59 a pint we don’t attract city people, do know what I mean, what we just try and dae is keep an eye on it. I’m fae [a ‘scheme’] so I know how to speak to these kind...” (Red Lion)

“...just depends on the clientele because being honest you can have nights the clientele is absolutely fantastic and then sometimes I can walk in and say “no I don’t like it” you just get a vibe for it and its “nah I don’t like this clientele” and if that’s the case then there is things you can do. Saturday afternoon I’ve seen us have three or four groups of twenty guys in here on stag weekends... if they get out of hand, if they are getting a bit rowdy, because obviously families come in at weekends... like our music system is computer controlled and then we can change the tempo of songs, so instead of having dancy upbeat stuff on, you change it to really mind numbing boring songs and they’ll no stay, and I can guarantee, I can guarantee nine times out of ten this technique works.” (White Horse)

The pub entrance (‘the door’) tended to be seen as the first line of defence against troublemakers, as preventing undesirables from entering in the first place was always seen to from the servers’ point-of-view as a preferable option as having to remove them

at a later time, such as in the situation described in the previous quote, where large groups of males or ‘wolfpacks’ had managed ensconce themselves in the pub.

“We do have a problem with that [wolfpacks] in here I must admit, we do not have any door staff during the week and that is a slight problem, because once they are in the pub, it is very, very difficult to get rid of them and if they haven’t done anything wrong and if they are sober, then it is very difficult to turn around and say, “no, you are not getting a drink” because you have to try and give some kind of a reason. (Royal Oak)

“We try and avoid that [wolfpacks]. It depends, if they have not had too much to drink, then we will let them in, if they have had a few pints before here then we wouldn’t.” (Plough)

Interestingly, unlike all the other pubs, who saw presence of large groups of males as undesirable, one pub in the sub-sample, the ‘Red Lion’, had a quite different policy towards ‘wolfpacks’ and also their own views on how to keep them in order.

“We go for they sort of groups [wolfpacks] that’s what we want in here. Basically there’s always a leader, see if you go for that leader then you’ve won every time. You’ve got to take a wee bit commonsense and go up and speak to them know what I mean, usually speak to them as they come and explain to them that you don’t usually let big groups of people in, you’ll soon find first bit of hassle and I’m going to put you out and after you’ve broke that wee bit of communication barrier it should be a wee bit easier.” (Red Lion)

Enforcing House Rules

All eight of the pubs in the sub-sample employed stewards (security staff or ‘bouncers’) during the weekends at night. The main function of these staff members was the control of ‘the door’. In other words, it was left to the security staff’s discretion who enters the pub at these times. Interviewees felt that this was an important component in their disorder risk reduction strategy, as well as keeping out others who may not fit in with the pubs style / image or may represent a threat to their license (e.g. under-18s or drunks).

“...I prefer to have really strong door stewards and then, we’ll stop them from getting in, then causing us a problem later. Take the stand, couldn’t really mind if they complain or anything like that because it would be normal to complain but if you’re not going to get in somewhere and if they want to speak to me then I’ll speak to them and stuff but I still trust my door stewards and that’s why you’ve got to,

that's what's important is the fact that we've got a trust with our two head stewards that we know they're going to look after the door, we know that.” (White Horse)

On occasions when no door staff were present these informal ‘policing’ duties passed to the bar servers. This allowed the opportunity for the pubs door policy / tolerance of poor decorum to be discussed and also to assess how the interviewees themselves would decide whether or not a person should or should not be served on their premises, in the absence of the door stewards having already made that decision for the serving staff. Again, common sense and experience, or even guesswork, were the resources that interviewees tended to draw upon, rather than formal server training.

“...because the bar is situated with the door right in front of it, so straight away I always check the first person that walks in so you can always kind of tell what somebody is like in the way that they are dressed first of all and the way that they speak to you at the bar.” (Swan)

“...we are supposed to have guidelines, but it is just generally kind of agreed with each other, when people come in, you know if somebody thinks they have had too much, we maybe ask somebody else you know, so we sort of discuss really quickly and decide and try not to serve anyone that is drunk and looks like they can't look after themselves... Yeah, aye, without being mean because you can't just, it is quite hard to judge people because of what they look better whatever... Nothing specific, just kind of use your common sense.” (Crown)

“Yeah, we don't have any football colours. Obviously at the weekends there are door staff on, so we don't have to make that choice, but pretty much it is left up to the individual that is on the bar at the time. Obviously people who look, or smell as if they have had a lot to drink, then they do not get served, but it is very difficult to tell sometimes.” (Royal Oak)

Although a number of specific door policies were mentioned, it was noticeable that these were not particularly dress-code orientated and there seemed little evidence of house policies that discriminated against potential patrons on the way that they looked, as opposed to how they looked likely to behave. The exceptions to this were football colours (a particularly salient issue in Glasgow, where these may have sectarian overtones) and the various parts of the ‘ned uniform’ (e.g. tracksuits and skip-caps, see Glossary).

“...it is very rare to actually get neds in here, mainly because there is a slight dress code, we won't serve people in trackies, stuff like that [i.e. tracksuits].” (Railway)

“We don’t let football colours in, on a Friday and Saturday after 5 o’clock we don’t like trainers and work gear in, that’s just, try and up the clientele a wee bit because we’re busy enough at they times.” (Red Lion)

“the only one we have is no football colours...” ... “We have pretty strict rules on that [age], you know, we do not even allow children in to eat, you know, we just do not allow that, there is no point in jeopardising the license in that respect you know...Just at the weekend, no caps and tracksuits.” (Swan)

The group identified as being the main target for door staff to prevent from entering the pubs in the sub-sample were under-agers. This policy would seem to be, at least in part, responsible for the very low numbers of under-18s observed during the fieldwork of this research. The staff interviews from the ‘Railway’ and ‘White Horse’ confirmed what the observers had already noted, that these two pubs had particularly strict age ID policies. Indeed, it did seem as though most of the pubs in the Exchange district of the city centre were pitching their door policy at ages well above 18 years.

“Strict on ID as well because its just there’s, there’s too many and I mean from being a door steward I’ll have seen every type of fake ID and I’m not bothered what people say to me because I know a fake ID when I see one and some of them you do need to laugh at, but its like me saying to the staff make sure if they don’t want to serve them if they’ve even got the slightest of doubt, if its someone who is over 18 and they do look young then they will be used to getting asked for ID... Yeah you can tell the way someone comes up to a bar as well, I mean, doing the door as well you can tell, you can always tell by people’s reaction, if someone comes up to your bar and looks young and walks with their head down then they’re trying to hide something. If they make contact with you, eye contact with you and look calm then you say to yourself “yes this person is over 18” because they are no trying to hide anything that way.” (White Horse)

“We get a lot of people from ‘Titania’ [under-18’s nightclub] trying to come in, but its, the worst nights would be a Friday and Saturday night when we have got a doorman on, so they won’t get in, so it is not a problem...Well on Friday and Saturdays, because of ‘Titania’ and sort of under-age places, it is a strict over 21s only. I mean, obviously if it is like friends of staff, there is a bit more sway, but it is not too strict a dress code or anything, any football colours, no.” (Railway)

“...because we have got this 21 policy now where we ID everybody that looks between 18 and 21, it does make it a bit easier. I must admit. But then you get a lot of aggro from people between 19 and 20 saying “well why are you asking for ID, I don’t look under 18?” But it is certainly easier since that has come out. I think that is a pretty good idea.” (Royal Oak)

The larger pubs were also able to use floor staff to patrol and check for undesirable patrons, such as under-agers, and to carry out ID checks inside the premises. (Note - some of the branded pubs were sufficiently large for inappropriate patrons to make themselves distant from the nearest bar or server).

“I think every pub going to get their underage problem you know what I mean and we are such big pub again and somebody comes in and there’s about four or five of them maybe two of them are underage and you say right why are they two no coming to the bar and then you go up and do ID at the table, we don’t just do ID at the bar we’ve got floor staff” (Red Lion)

Dealing with Disorder

Unexpectedly, especially given their views towards under-agers (see above), when asked to recall how a specific disorderly incident was dealt with, that they had encountered in the course of their duties, the interviewees tended describe incidents that had been instigated by older patrons than what was the norm for their clientele.

“I don’t know if we are as bad as a lot of places as we don’t get trouble all the time, but there has been quite a few occasions where people come in and they are either older old people who have had too much to drink, you can’t tell them really and then they refuse to leave... Seventy, Eighty, grandfathers, and we’ve had one time I can remember two guys coming in, quite sort of neddy guys and they obviously did not feel comfortable, because its, everyone is a bit more, I don’t know, well-to-do I suppose, and they just were up for causing a fight, causing trouble.” (Crown)

“There was actually one women in a couple of weeks’ ago, I wasn’t working, but I had come in for a drink anyway, and I didn’t see this, but I had just arrived just after she had been chucking salad at people and was being really insulting... She was about 60 odds! Really drunk, but I mean she had not been served...” (Railway)

Older patrons, including (‘domestic’) couples were also seen as more troublesome in that they tended to be ruder or make more apparently unjustified complaints about servers. Nevertheless, this also seemed unusual given the youthful focus of pubs in the sub-sample, perhaps re-enforcing the view that certain inappropriate mixes of clientele (i.e. ‘toxic mix’ or ‘fish out of water’ scenarios) are likely to lead to problems.

“It tends to be a lot of older people, maybe over 40, slightly older people and women ... I will give you an example, I had a couple up on Sunday, they had asked for a pint of cider and I did not have any cider, it was a man and wife and the wife

had gone down to the toilet, when she came back up the stairs, she had obviously said something to the husband and he just went absolutely off on one and he was complaining and saying that the ladies toilets were filthy, there was no toilet roll and he was complaining about the cider, and after she walked away, he turned around and said "I am really sorry about that mate". And I was like, well why are you bothering to complain? And he said well, "my wife wanted me to complain". I went down to the toilets and it was perfect there was no mess at all, they just like to complain for the sake of complaining. They are a nuisance." (Royal Oak)

"You get the occasional one, maybe people who complain about the price sometimes, of drinks, just the usual things, but not very often... Usually people who are middle-aged... forty to fifty... Maybe complain about, if the place has been really busy and it has been hard to get the place cleaned, they will complain about that, em, maybe if a glass is dirty, they will just say that glass is dirty." (Plough)

Although, as will be discussed in the next chapter, these views may simply be a function of the young age of the staff interviewed, this would seem to concur with the observational data which suggested that not all alcohol-related disorder in Glasgow city centre was as result of youthful exuberance, as some recent media reports have implied (see Chapter 1). Interestingly, patrons of higher social class were also highlighted as being more likely to be rude to servers and make complaints about service.

"It's usually posher people [who complain] there are people who are just quite happy to be out from the scheme or whatever." (Red Lion)

"We get a lot of office people who can be quite difficult sometimes, because they are not the most polite in the world" ... "Rudeness would just be, I know it sounds stupid but they don't say "please" or "thank you" to a bar tender.... If you say "hi, how are you doing, what can we get for you" and they talk amongst themselves and completely ignore you. It does put you in a bad mood." (Railway)

It was striking that all the interviewees did not primarily rely upon the police for dealing with incidents of disorder within their premises but instead relied upon stewards. In short, private security firms were operating as the first line of public order enforcement within Glasgow city centre's night-time economy. In this scenario, the role of the state's emergency services seems to have been relegated to a 'last resort' status, their involvement only to be considered, by pub staff, when all else has failed.

"If it looked like it was going to endanger anyone and it was and we weren't able, what we can do is with 'Hole-in-the-Wall' [security firm] if we don't have a

doorman and if it is not like a real emergency, we can phone someone from the office, they are in the office 24 hours and they will be here in a couple of minutes they will come out and help...Well the office is central and so we can do that. We have also got panic buttons, but that is for a real emergency.” (Crown)

“If a fight broke out and it was out of control and the door stewards could not handle it then maybe [I’d call the police]. But Sunday to Thursday two are on the door, Friday and Saturday there is three.” (Plough)

“[calling the police] is usually at [the licensee] or the Duty Manager’s discretion. There is a few big guys working here so we tend to nip any trouble in the bud straight away and just ask people to leave before it gets to the stage where we need to phone the police.” (Royal Oak)

An exception to this rule, of using staff to sort out violent patrons first, and only calling the police when staff could not cope anymore, was provided by the interviewee from the ‘White Horse’, himself an ex-door steward.

“Well obviously you need to look out for the staff. Anyone who is ever cheeky to any staff doesn’t get back in...Asking someone to leave, that’s the only way you remove them, ushering them out by standing behind them and walking behind them, always make sure that there’s two people, that’s what we do and no hesitation if they don’t want to leave then phone the police, because obviously then they are breaking the law.” (White Horse)

Unlike the ‘White Horse’, see previous quote, three of the pub staff interviewed gave details of informal security arrangements that they had made with neighbouring premises. In these arrangements security resources would be pooled, such that if the pub’s stewards were unable to cope with a disorderly incident then the serving staff would call on the other premises for help, and then deal with it themselves, when sufficient back up was available, rather than or before considering calling the police.

‘Janus’ [nightclub] is quite good, like if they’ve stewards on at night, if we’ve got a problem they’ll come right in, d’you know what I mean, kind of that kinda thing and help us out.” [Janus staff were observed in this pub, see Appendix 4, incident #12] ... “I think if it was quite bad we would probably call ‘Janus’ first... If it was worse than that we’ve got like panic buttons just under the, under the front till there, so just get the police in at that point...” (White Hart)

“Well I would never, if I had a problem my last resort would be ‘Poosy Nancies’ [a nearby lap-dancing bar] if I was actually physically being threatened then I’d have somebody in minutes and then I would phone ‘Poosy Nancies’. Personally myself

I'm miar of a goer, I would deal with it, I'm no gonnae back doon fae ye, I'm no gonnae raise my hand tae ye, but... if you tell me your gonnae punch my cunt oot then I'm gonnae say "look mate that's my job it'll no be the first time and it won't be the last time"..." (Red Lion)

Where informal security alliances had been made, these could be with premises that were owned by different parent companies and could also involve cooperation between stewards from rival security firms. Such arrangements were reciprocal and could also involve forging commercial or personal relationships between various licensed premises.

"...we have got quite a decent relationship between here and 'Callisto' [a nightclub], we give them cheap coffees and they let us in for free. If there are any problems here the door staff are more than willing to come across and give us a hand. So it is almost like a wee community. I mean if they see there is a problem they will run across the road. I mean if we see that they are standing outside and it is getting close to the point of saying to someone, "look we are going to have to call the police", we will speak to them first and say "look can you give us a hand getting someone out", because most of them are big, massive guys." (Railway)

"Only, it's an unwritten rule that only 'Janus' [nightclub] get to come in and do it [flyering]. Yeah, we've got a thing, yeah..." (White Hart)

It was interesting that these arrangements were not being made with other pubs in the vicinity. In the case of the 'White Horse' and 'Royal Oak', which were in a cluster of rival branded pubs – but no other types of licensed premises (nightclubs, lap dancing bars etc.) there seemed to be a distinct absence of such a community spirit, perhaps even a reversal situation where they blamed each other for trouble in the vicinity.

"Well they've [the 'King's Head', a brand / police 'hot spot'] got 15 door staff on, they've got 8 on in a midweek night. So like if something happened across the road there, certainly wouldn't have any problems with door staff, because I would expect it if it was here and obviously we're licensed to the bottom of the stairs, you can take that a bit further to the road and someone's fell outside you go and help them, its that comes more down to common decency than doing a job." (White Horse)

"Obviously they [troublesome patrons] do the circuit, if they get knocked back from a couple, they [the nearby pubs' stewards – including the 'White Horse' and 'King's Head'] do send them down our way, I must admit." (Royal Oak)

One pub, the 'Swan' was located away from any clusters of licensed premises. Here there was simply no opportunity for a local alliance to be arranged. As such, this pub allowed

any nightclubs that wanted to flyer inside. In such pubs it would seem that the police are more likely to be the first people turned to for assistance when violence threatens.

“There have been a couple of instances when I have had to phone [the police], but its just been its, you know, random times of the day where you can’t really foresee anything like that happening, you know, its just somebody perhaps coming in with a gripe who has had too much to drink... There was a guy came in, came in drunk and when he was asked to leave, the boy [server] that asked him to leave, he [the patron] took offence, the guy that was serving him asked him to leave and he took offence to it and he was getting quite threatening so he just had to push the panic button, you know the police were in pretty sharpish, you know” (Swan)

There would seem to be little doubt that the forging informal business / security arrangements between licensed premises has the potential to artificially reduce the number of violent incidents within pubs that become known to the police (i.e. the figures cited in previous chapters, e.g. Table 8, are likely to be a gross underestimate of what really goes on in premises with such arrangements). However, on the other hand it might equally be argued that such arrangements are likely to free up a great deal of police time, to deal with, perhaps more serious, incidents elsewhere, such as on the streets.

Disorder in the Night-time Economy

There was agreement amongst all those interviewed that the police were doing a great job, but were struggling to do so because of lack of personnel in comparison to the sheer amount of trouble on the streets of Glasgow city centre at night during the weekend. This in itself would seem likely to make the pubs become more reliant upon private security.

“Police taking a far bigger stance on it, I know they’re struggling to do a fantastic job and stuff ...They need to take more of a crack down, they need to do more stop and searches of groups of young people... I mean they’re just looking for someone to either mug, harass, annoy, cause a fight with” ... “just probably more of a police presence and I mean not vans knocking about, I mean actual physical bobbies on the beat, to just more to make the fact it is safe to go out in Glasgow, that does shake off this image of being a hard nuts city and a hard drinking city which it’s not, cause people aren’t drinking as much what they used to...” (White Horse)

“...more police out on foot I think would be very handy, its very rarely do you see the police out on foot, but I understand that obviously their manpower is very small... But certainly more police on foot, it is all very well them driving by in a van

but certainly more of them out and about, actually on the ground I think would be helpful” (Royal Oak)

Combined with more police on foot, another measure that the staff interviewees felt could reduce disorder was more public transport, especially buses, as both the lack of sufficient mass transit after mid-night and the price of fares, especially taxis fares, were felt to increase levels of aggravation, for example at taxi ranks or bus stops.

“I think what they were trying to do was bring in officers to actually walk the street, but that’s all they did, maybe give them some sort of powers, taxi ranks, main bus stops, main trouble spots, the police know where the trouble spots are... people have no got the money to get a taxi home” (Red Lion)

“I’d put more [transport], cos you get like buses but they’re only every like 40 minutes. I’d put them every 20 minutes, because the more you’re hanging about, you get aggravated and you just, fights start and I think you’d put more police cos, see like two policewomen walking about in here, it’s like, there’s like two clubs in this vicinity, d’you know what I mean...” (White Hart)

The staff interviewees proposed a variety of explanations for the apparent high level of disorder on the streets of Glasgow city centre after midnight, when the pubs had just closed. One view put forward by some of interviewees employed by the branded chain pubs seemed almost like something of an admission of guilt that their aggressive marketing techniques were to blame (although perhaps they may have felt that making such statements would help to portray the industry in a positive, responsible light).

“I agree with the binge drinking, down here I think the prices should be a lot higher I don’t think you should be able to come out and make yourselves, for £10 you shouldn’t be able to make yourselves that drunk so you want to fight with everybody, do you know what I mean.” (Red Lion)

“...it is a culture, that’s quite a bad culture really being honest, but I’m actually glad, although I am sort of encouraging it, I’m glad that the company is taking a step now to try and stop it a bit, because some of the states I’ve seen people in, from both experiences [stewarding and serving], are shocking and there’s nothing I feel more sickified than seeing like a girl maybe 18, 19, lying sprawled all over the pavement its just they’ve no respect for themselves no respect for anyone else and then they ask themselves why they end up in situations like that....” (White Horse)

Some of the interviewees suggested that it was not always the pub-goers / drinkers who were responsible for much of the street disorder apparent in Glasgow city centre.

“A lot of it is, see if you actually walk about Glasgow at night you see a lot of the junkies maybe all falling, hanging about, you see a lot of guys walking up they’ve usually got a white skip-cap and tap on they’ve got a dug on the leash they’re definitely not getting into a pub, know what I mean, they’re walking about, they look hard as fuck” (Red Lion)

“...a lot of these people you see on the streets at that time of night are not dressed for going to a pub, they have obviously been out and wandering around the streets getting drunk outside in the streets rather than actually in pubs.” (Royal Oak)

In this scenario, it was believed that a combination of the two groups was partly responsible for the street disorder, especially when intoxicated pub patrons came into contact with those who Hobbs (2002) calls the “legion of the banned”.

“I think it is a mixture of both, I think maybe people get too drunk and then you get the sort of ned characters hanging about. So that is a bad mix and then they just start fighting and causing trouble.” (Plough)

“I would say they [‘neds’] get dressed for the weekends. They put on their white shirt and the black trousers. I could walk into a busy pub and say “this person does this, he doesnae always dress like this, this is his weekend image... and you get antagonists in the city centre, I think, like your ned, your junkies, your beggars that all hang about and they can be the cheekiest lot of people if you don’t gie them ten pence or whatever and then people react to things and then things like that someone who is begging you for money, they end up insulting you, you can see how people would get annoyed with that and start.” (White Horse)

One interviewee felt that under-agers, the group he and his pub went to such great lengths to keep out (see Enforcing house rules, above) caused much of this street disorder. This was an interesting view, given that, from data collected by the observers, under-18s were not being allowed admission to Glasgow city centre pubs in significant numbers.

“...honest its under-age people, they are nine times out of ten the problem. They’ll drink before they come in and they’ll hide it. I seen it, when was I off, three weeks ago, huge fight outside ‘Percy Hobbs’, the restaurant across the road and that was groups of ten, twenty, no more than 16 years old and passers-by were getting caught up in this and I walked back because I was out on my break getting something to eat and I came back and said to door stewards look at that, that’s going to kick off over there.” (White Horse)

One interviewee felt that it was too easy to blame these street characters, though he did not know where the pub-going troublemakers were drinking or going on to next.

“By that time of night [closing time] there are very few as far as I would say street drinkers and beggars...I walk past there [Exchange] every Friday and Saturday night and it is the spill out from, I don’t know where they come from, but there is always a taxi queue and that can cause, and there is a bus stop and they are very close to each other and I suppose that can cause some kind antagonisation because everybody that is there seems to be a wee bit lary...” (Swan)

Other interviewees were more forthright about naming premises which they felt were operating in a way that led to trouble (e.g. irresponsible promotions or patrons).

“I wouldn’t say that in our place people are coming in just to knock back loads, but yeah definitely I definitely would, students and stuff like that and young folk, like the ‘Ganymede’ [Sauchiehall nightclub] and it is just 60 pence a drink...” (Crown)

“I mean it would have been good if you had observed that one [the ‘King’s Head’, branded pub] because I can stand here on a Saturday night and see the police turn up three at a time.” (White Horse)

The role of security staff in maintaining order within pubs was felt to exaggerate the level of disorder after closing by one interviewee (this would appear to concur with the field observations described in previous chapters).

“I think it’s a bit a both...obviously, when you’re in the pub and you’re in the pub and you drink more and more and more and things happen, things are said and you just come out and it all just comes to a head and other people from other places and drunk people banging into each other and it just starts... I think it possibly is to do with security because once you’re outside, it’s like, “I don’t care”...” (White Hart)

In the Sauchiehall street area the sheer mix of premises and types of people were thought to contribute to the elevated level of disorder at this locus (see Chapter 5).

“Yeah, especially Sauchiehall Street, a lot more police presence would help because there is a lot of trouble up Sauchiehall Street, the streets around about as well, a greater police presence in the city... I think just because of the number of pubs on it and the number of dance pubs as well and just the sheer great mixture of people that are on it as well, older ones, younger ones, just a bad mix really” (Plough)

This latter explanation would appear to fit with Hobbs's (2002) view of the night-time economy as a liminal contested space, one where regardless of the role of alcohol, people who would normally be hostile towards one another would be most likely to come in into contact or conflict with each other.

“There too many different, see in Glasgow there's a lot of different schemes, the different schemes grow up fighting each other see as soon as they hit 18, 21, they start going out with their friends, see as soon as they see another scheme that they've battled with, maybe in the town, when they growing up, it just goes, straight away its just a fight.” (Red Lion)

The disorder on the street was a cause for concern for the interviewees not just because of their role as alcohol servers and the harm that the publicity surrounding these disturbances was doing to the industry (see Chapter 1), but also because they themselves had to get home safely at night when public transport was limited.

“I was staying in [the East End], I've moved into the town because of the bus service at night, you know what I mean I cannae afford to get taxis home every night, as I says I don't like standing at a bus stop, I don't mind standing there for five minutes if I know my bus is gonnae come, but see if you stand there for five minutes and nothing comes and there two wee guys arguing round the corner and you think I just cannae” ... “I think if its OK if yer walking, I don't like standing stationary at a bus stop ... I do not mind walking home, I walk constantly so I don't feel like much of a target but standing at a bus stop yes definitely.” (Red Lion)

“I got the crap beaten out of me a couple of months' ago... it was just on a night out. I don't have change - apparently that is a beatable offence. ...a lot of the time I will actually bring my car to work, just because it is easier and if I am working a twelve, four, five close, I don't want to walk after that.” (Railway)

The 'Crown', had a policy of hiring taxis for all staff (note - lack of taxi access was one of this pub's few risk factors, see Table 4, owing to its location). Other pubs in the sub-sample took some similar steps to safeguard vulnerable staff members after closing time.

“Everyone gets a paid taxi and everyone should get a taxi home, but trying to order taxis from private firms or from black hacks is impossible, it is absolutely impossible, but we try and make sure that if there is two people working they both go to the same taxi, get the same taxi home.” (Crown)

“We don't have specific policies, but...make sure the girls are in the taxis first when we are phoning taxis and it is always a male manager that locks up at night, usually

two, at the weekends, Friday, Saturdays, there maybe be two or three guys at the same time locking up and we'll be or they'll be in the last taxi but we always make sure that the girls are in the first taxi so we don't leave any of the girls standing outside or anything like that, we do tend to look out for each other.” (Royal Oak)

Policy Initiatives

The interviewees felt that the situation on the streets after midnight could be improved by cutting the licensing hours or revoking completely the licenses of premises with a reputation for trouble. This seemed to be indicating that the interviewees felt that the patrons of some premises (not just pubs) were more likely to cause trouble after pub closing time than those from others, either when emerging from the pub they had been drinking in or when gravitating towards certain nightclubs afterwards.

“...I actually live down at the bottom down at the Riverside and I, since Bonkers [the nightclub the closure of which precipitated this project] and Privilege [a similar nightclub] closed, its no problem walking down that way now.” (Swan)

“I think they [the licensing board] are pretty good, I mean when they cut ‘King’s Head’s’ [‘hot spot’] licensing hours and there was a specific reason, i.e. there was a lot of trouble in there, things like shutting down Bonkers, I think they were spot on with that, I mean these places just breed trouble...” (White Horse)

However interviewees’ views were more mixed about another aspect of local licensing policy, aimed at reducing alcohol-related problems, Glasgow’s ‘happy hour’ ban. Since January 2004 this had included the banning of two-for-one offers and free drinks.

“Initially it did [reduce our business], what happened was when we took them off, we just stopped doing them completely, because at the time there was a bit of a grey area from the licensing, and so we did not want to put our foot over the line, so we completely eliminated it and I think we lost a good bit of business in terms.” (Swan)

“a lot of things [offers] we had, the old menu had, like you got a free drink with it [food], we couldn’t do that [anymore]” (White Hart)

The large branded chain pubs had however managed to find loopholes in order to get round this ban, which were risks that the smaller pubs simply were not prepared to take for fear of losing their license (see previous comment).

“Obviously with the new laws that come out in Glasgow...we do cheap drink, we do special offers we’re no allowed, we used to four for a fiver now we’ve got to sell each bottle individually, well we still do it but we just sell the bottles at £1.25 we don’t advertise it 4 for £5... We just cheated, we just brought it all doon to the same price everyday, this is what the ‘Lion Bars’ has been all about anyway, that’s what’s we’re all about, cheap prices everyday day in and day out.” (Red Lion)

The situation at the ‘Royal Oak’ was particularly telling in that this pub had attempted to stick to the ‘spirit’ of the ‘happy hour’ ban, rather than ‘to the letter’ (like its neighbours, presumably including the ‘White Horse’), but this had a negative effect on business, resulting in an ‘if you can’t beat them join them’ move.

“...because of the new licensing laws our hands have very much been tied lately, over the past to what offers we can do, they are starting to come back in now, but it’s a case of we have not really had any drinks offers of late” ... “A lot of pubs around here continued to do that even although by law they are not allowed to do so, whereas because we were, for whatever reason, we weren’t doing it, so we stopped a lot of our drinks offers and certainly yeah, it was a lot quieter and the pubs around here were a lot busier because they were still doing them. But eh, we’ve brought the prices down permanently now so that’s kind of cancelled that out a wee bit, but yeah it certainly had an effect on us.” (Royal Oak)

Another policy initiative that the interviewees were less than positive about concerned the Scottish Executive’s proposed 2006 ban on smoking in public places (Note - at the time of the interviews this plan had not yet been formally ratified). Like the ‘happy hour ban’ it was felt that this measure would harm the business of the non-branded pubs most.

“it is quite smoky yeah, but that cannot really be helped because it is a traditional pub and most people smoke at the bar... I think it [the smoking ban] is good for people who don’t smoke, then they can maybe enjoy themselves a bit better, but I think it will kill a lot of the business in terms of the pub” ... “Definitely, definitely. I think it will kill this place.” (Plough)

“I think yes, [it will harm our business] because we have people who come in just to have a cigarette and maybe they come in like three times a day and just buy a coffee, but three times a day, every day.” (Crown)

Other interviewees saw potential problems ahead in trying to enforce the smoking ban, especially in the larger pubs. However, it should be stressed that, all interviewees agreed that, banning smoking was unlikely to lead to more actual disorder or violence in itself once it was as accepted as the law of the land.

“...I can’t see many people giving up smoking just so they can come to a pub, I see a lot more people staying at home and having a drink before going out or finding ways around it. I think it would be very difficult to enforce as well ... Well, I mean if people want to have a cigarette, pretty much they are going to have a cigarette, I mean how do you clamp down on someone in the corner on a Saturday night in the bar when somebody’s in the corner having a sly cigarette.” (Royal Oak)

“I think people will just do it anyway. Do you know what I mean, for a while people would... But people will still find some way to start smoking in it anyway. We don’t have enough staff to stop them, do you know what I mean” (White Hart – in which both this interviewee and the observers commented that the effects of a smoke machine were much more noticeable, see chapter 4)

Promotional activity

As detailed in Chapter 1, the aggressive promotion of alcoholic drinks (‘happy hours’, cut-price deals, two-for-one offers etc.) has been criticised as encouraging binge-drinking and other alcohol-related problems. Despite efforts to crack down on these, such as the Glasgow ‘happy hours’ ban (see above), it was clear from the field observations that a great many drinks promotions were still ongoing in Glasgow city centre pubs. These were confirmed during the interviews, as was their popularity, accounting for some of the two-at-a-time drinking witnessed by the observers (see Chapter 4).

“We try and keep a hold of people we’ve got a lot of hooks out there we do cheap offers like we broadcast our cheap offers to try and bring them in, we try and hold a big group you know what I mean, gie them a good service, we say to the floor staff, you go over there and cheer them up a bit, we offer them table service or whatever” ... “you get quite a lot of bottled beers for £1.25 quite a lot of yer bottles of wine at £4.89, there’s always offers though basically there’s doubles there on offer on the shelf at £2 for a double and mixer that’s a long running one for 5 year offer keep the price capped and all that.” (Red Lion)

“Yeah, we do, we do promotions on most of the spirits, on doubles, a lot of people come here for that because it works out cheaper because you are getting your draft mixers for free.” (Plough)

There was little doubt that the large branded pubs had the ability to undercut smaller pubs, especially the independents (who did not benefit economically from being part of a chain or attached to a ‘pubco’). For this reason, those interviewees working for the brands saw these companies as being the future of industry.

“I think ‘King’s Inns’ [another brand, including the ‘King’s Head’] and pubs like myself are the only way forward I don’t think independent pubs are going to make it because we’re buying in, in bulk and we’re running it to a wage budget, we’re making money, the smaller pubs are no gonnae survive this budget...” (Red Lion)

“Aye, I think the bigger pubs in Glasgow will go from strength to strength from what I can see, the big organised, you know, the big chains of pubs I think. I think the independent ones will struggle more and more...” (Royal Oak)

Needless to say, some of the non-branded pubs felt that they appealed to a more discerning clientele and that this would ensure that they would survive the current fad for large branded chain pubs, as their market was not so dependent upon competitive pricing or the ability to ‘cheat’ on policies aimed at discouraging cheap alcohol.

“...the main one we always go for is like some of the business people with a bit more money obviously, they are more willing to spend money on cocktails, because cocktails aren’t cheap. Just people that, who are willing to spend money on something good, as opposed to the cheapest option.” (Railway)

“I think because it is a traditional bar I think, and I think it is also because all of our ales are hand pulled and because of the cask conditions and I think that is appealing to a lot of customers.” (Plough)

As mentioned in Chapter 1, because of the negative publicity that they have been receiving, and perhaps to avert further policy initiatives being made against them, some of the brands were introducing their own social responsibility policies.

“...promo wise we do promos all week, do you want to know, we do two for £3 on bottles at the weekends, but I don’t know if you’ve seen, over the last, two days ago we, announced that we’re doing, reducing the amount of alcohol in cocktails, yeah this is the big new drive from us... It’s to try and stop binge drinking as a service of the company we’re increasing the price of alcohol... Its we’ve been reduced from six shots to four shots, eh Friday and Saturday nights the designated driver of a group gets free soft drinks, doing cheaper soft drinks as well, coffee is available all night whereas it used to only be available till food stopped, its now available all night and we are increasing the price of alcohol like shots and stuff are going to be increased from a £1.” (White Horse)

It was interesting, that despite comments such as those made in the previous quote, soft drinks and coffee drinking were rarely observed during fieldwork. Indeed, the interview

conducted with the server in the only pub where coffee drinking was observed implied that it was not the policy of his pub to promote the consumption of hot drinks at night.

“It is not that I would promote it, I think it is just some of the customers that we get, they tend to drink coffee and they like it an awful lot and come in at annoying times.” (Railway)

Other alcohol ‘harm reduction’ policy initiatives also tended to be frowned upon by interviewees. One reason for this is that, as exemplified by the previous quote from the employee of the ‘White Horse’, taking a stand could be regarded in some quarters as an admission of guilt or implying that something was wrong with company or premises concerned. This view is underscored by the same interviewee’s opinion on plastic glasses (currently being introduced in Glasgow nightclubs).

“you know the type people that go in there [the ‘King’s Head’] and we don’t want that in here and we’ve always stuck by the fact that we are a really safe pub to come in to. People come in to have a good time and as far as I’m concerned any pub that has to switch to plastic glasses and the likes I wouldn’t want to go into it, A; I don’t like drinking out of plastic and B; if you take a step back and think “why is this place having to switch to plastic” its not voluntary, its sends that its getting the wrong type of people in it, I mean I’ve been in it...” (White Horse)

Other Factors Influencing Alcohol-related Problems

Apart from drinks promotions, the other main way of attracting and retaining patrons was the provision of entertainment. This was especially so with the non-branded pubs who were both unable to rely on competitive pricing and who, unlike the brands, tended to be located on sites away from agglomeration economy locations enjoyed by the larger ‘high street enterprises’ (3 of the 4 brands were located in a cluster of licensed premises, while 3 of the 4 non-brands were not, the exceptions being the ‘Red Lion’ and ‘Railway’).

“...we have got entertainment on seven nights a week, at the moment we are actually having to revise it just because we are having problems with sound levels here and upstairs they [residents] are complaining, but anything that we put on, no matter what it is, he moans about it...” ... “Monday night is kind of an open night, acoustic night, Tuesday is a DJ, Wednesday is a karaoke, Thursday we have a kind of blues jam... I think it is just purely because we are slightly out of the way here, we have to put on something to bring people to the area, you know.” (Swan, Note - this pub had significantly lower noise levels, see Appendix 3)

Providing musical entertainment was also important to the larger pubs, though in their case this was seen as a method of increasing the volume of sales (i.e. alcohol consumption) rather than as a way of attracting custom.

“It [DJ] creates an atmosphere, if people are going out then they like to be, hear their favourite songs before they go out, it puts them in a better mood and then obviously the better mood people are in then the more they’ll spend on drink and it all works back as a business point of view, its all logical” (White Horse)

“I don’t know, it is really strange, I think people drink more when they are [in the lounge], because the music is on and they are having a good time.” (Plough)

As indicated by the observations recorded during fieldwork (Forms 1 and 2, see Chapters 4 and 5), the interaction between alcohol consumption and music (especially ‘sexy’ dancing to this music or music videos) was seen as a major contributory factor to the overall risk for disorder within licensed premises and was also the trigger for some of the actual aggressive incidents witnessed. This possibility was spontaneously offered as an explanation for some alcohol-related disorder by one of the interviewees employed by one of the pubs where the observations had suggested that these risk factors were present.

“I know it’s a bit unfair, but with dressing the way they dress, by acting they way act in pubs and stuff, girls, sometimes, they don’t deserve anything to happen to them, but groping and stuff is going to happen when you’re teasing people and stuff like because you’ve had a couple of drinks. Its the one thing that you do find from working in pubs does cause a lot of trouble, is this situation with girls and then they react to guys when a guy puts a foot wrong and then it can end up in a big hoohah...” (White Horse)

Another interviewee also felt that increased alcohol consumption played a role of escalating certain charged situations by causing people to over-react emotionally or take offence to situations where only horseplay or minor insults had been intended. Again, this would also seem to be in line with some of the ratings of incidents of actual disorder witnessed by the observations teams (see Table 9).

“...there’s people that you have a wee slagging match with, it seems, comes a wee bit nasty, somebody doesn’t like it if somebody’s mum gets a called a cow, sits in the corner has another three beers and walks up whacks the guy over the head with a bottle when it was only a carry on know what I mean” (Red Lion)

On the whole interviewees felt that there was little that could be done to prevent alcohol-related problems and that ultimately it was all down to the individual, rather than drinking per se. Actions such as increasing the price of alcohol or otherwise making it less available may have some impact on the pub trade (e.g. more off-sales purchase and ‘pre-loading’, i.e. getting drunk before going to the pub) but at the end of the day binge drinking and alcohol-related disorder will always be features of Scottish society.

“but at the end of the day it is the people who choose to drink, alright the pubs are serving the drink, but it is the people’s choice to go in there and get in that state.” (Royal Oak)

“No, well I mean, we have never really encouraged binge drinking, I mean the only time you will get binge drinking is when it is the office people and they can afford to do it, and at that point we will still say no, and they will argue with us and we will stand by our word and then they won’t come in for about a month, because they are too embarrassed.” (Railway)

“I think it is a moral thing... if somebody wants to go out and get steaming, they will go out and get steaming, if they want to drink, if somebody wants to drink 10 pints of lager within ten minutes then they’ll still, they will do it, you know, it doesn’t matter whether or no it is between a happy hour or not” (Swan)

As indicated by the previous quote, the interviewees were not convinced that things were nearly as bad as was being made out by the politicians and media (see Chapter 1). In contrast this was seen as something of a ‘moral panic’ (after Cohen, 1972) in which they were becoming unfairly scapegoated to fit in with someone else’s agenda, no matter what measures the licensed trade industry took to the contrary.

“...when there is something in the press or the television whatever, they do a lot of their interviews in here, cos’ the news [media centre] is just across there, and what tends to happen is that they are doing a piece and then they open a wee bit up when they speak to the customers and maybe they think they have identified a problem from the reports, but when they speak to the customers it seems as if they are completely contradicting them, you know, smoking and binge drinking, you know people don’t actually seem to think it is an issue.” (Swan)

“No but like this thing that we’re doing now, this big [social responsibility] drive that we’re doing ...this was on the news for literally two seconds but yet I can sit on tonight on TV and watch numerous programs about ‘Booze Britain’ there’s one that I watch all the time and this is a company trying to put a stop to it, knows that there

is a problem with binge drinking, its trying to take, make a stop of that is not seen any coverage in the newspapers...I think it's a huge step for a pub to take because it's a risky step as well, but it's a sensible step and its not been given the fair cop of, I mean, we'll advertise it on TVs, free drinks for designated drivers and stuff, all that will be advertised so people are aware of it...." (White Horse)

As far as the observed differences between the levels of disorder associated with individual licensed premises were concerned, the interviewees felt that much of this was down to the clientele of a pub. Once a bad mix of patrons had become associated with a particular pub then it acquired a reputation. Once a pub's reputation had become established then this could prove to be extremely difficult to shake off, no matter what serving staff of the pub did, no matter what other wider policy initiatives were taken to reduce disorder, either within the premises concerned or more generally.

"The problems are, its [the 'King's Head's'] got the reputation and to me from experience, I was a door steward in Glasgow for two years, so I know what like it is, and they have got the reputation and then when you have got a reputation its hard to shake it off the reputation, whereas the good thing is we don't have a reputation so we have never been labelled as a trouble spot...." (White Horse)

"We've got quite a reputation, we used to be a bad pub for trouble, we just don't accept trouble, if there's trouble in our pub then you're barred for life." (Red Lion)

Interestingly, this process was thought to work in both directions. For example, the interviewee from the 'Crown' (the pub with no aggressive incidents and no recorded crime, see Chapter 5) attributed her pub's orderly reputation its "*friendly old style*" or café-bar theme which meant that, at the same time, it was "*not really fashionable any more*" (i.e. in today's branded binge drinking culture) but "*good for the image so it does not get too rowdy*". However, despite their individual pubs having a good reputation, one fear put forward by both the licensees interviewed was that the whole city centre night-time economy was in danger of being labelled, unjustly, with a disorderly reputation and that there was little that could be done to stop this process of stigmatisation.

"That's about it, just the issue about the smoking thing, I don't really see there is much of an issue or the binge drinking thing, to be honest with you, I think its more mountains out of mole hills, but you cannot really say that because everyone seems to be completely smitten by the idea of banning smoking and banning happy hours and what can you do?" (Swan)

“I don’t know if it is even the licensing board’s responsibility, maybe it is like someone else’s to provide an alternative.” (Crown)

Summary

In this chapter we have explored the issues concerning alcohol-related problems associated with licensed premises from the servers’ point-of-view, by interviewing staff employed in each of the eight pubs observed. Several interesting themes emerged from these interviews. Firstly, it was clear that the licensed trade staff were eager to participate in disorder reduction initiatives. After all, during working hours they were in the ‘front-line’ for dealing with pub disorder and after closing time they had to negotiate the alcohol-related problems on the street themselves whilst making their way home. Secondly, all the staff interviewed were, like much their pub’s clientele, relatively young (i.e. under 30 years of age). This coupled with the fact that they tended to have been patrons in their pub prior to becoming employees raises some issues as to whether they always viewed their premises and clientele as staff rather than as customers (some still frequented their pub as such). These concerns would seem particularly salient in regard to training, in that even those who conduct staff training may be relatively inexperienced.

In regard to maintaining good order within their pubs, all the interviewees stressed the importance of security staff (stewarding) and it was interesting that in some instances different licensed premises, located in the same area, could pool their resources (i.e. stewards) to this end. This reliance on stewards, rather than the police, for dealing with disorder seems likely to have influenced the known crime figures for each pub, perhaps also helping to create or avoid reputations. The interviews also confirmed the marketing advantages of the large branded pubs and their staff appeared to acknowledge that this could play a role in binge drinking. However, all the interviewees felt there was little that could be done to prevent drunkenness and disorder entirely, as such behaviours were deeply ingrained in Scottish culture and the final decision to drink rested with the individual. In the next chapter all the findings of the previous chapters will be drawn together and what it might actually be possible to do to help reduce alcohol-related problems, associated with licensed premises in Glasgow city centre, will be explored.

7. Discussion

The previous four chapters have described data collected by various means to explore the nature of alcohol-related problems within licensed premises in Glasgow city centre. This has included the use of official crime statistics, a postal survey of city centre pubs, field observations being carried out in a sub-sample of these pubs and interviews being conducted with members of serving staff from each of the pubs in this sub-sample. The findings of each section of this project will now be brought together and used to address the key research questions posed in Chapter 1.

7(i) Conclusions

This study was designed to address eight key research issues (see Chapter 1). Each of these will now be dealt with in turn, according to what we have learned from this study.

1. What are the licensed premises-related factors influencing a high risk of alcohol-related violence and disruption within the city centre?

The field observations conducted by this research in eight Glasgow city centre pubs uncovered a large number of risk factors which are known from the academic literature to be predictive of alcohol-related violence. Conversely some of the pubs observed also had many positive features that are known to encourage the maintenance of good order in licensed premises. Between the observed pubs, these features included differing levels of ‘aggravation’ by patrons, ‘sexual tension’, ‘dirtiness’ and having an unhealthy ‘ambiance’ (e.g. noise, heat, etc.). These are all factors previously thought to be either predictive of disorder and this appeared to be borne out by the present study. Server practices also varied between pubs, as did levels and efficiency of security staff. In short, the more orderly pubs observed, as maintained by their staff, also tended to be those where less disorderly behaviour by patrons took place.

By contrasting pubs that scored highly on risk factors for violence with those which scored highly on protective factors, it was possible to construct a three point hierarchy of the likelihood of disorder occurring in the pubs observed. In this hierarchy, two pubs

were described as ‘low risk’, two as ‘medium risk’ and four as ‘high risk’. However, the four ‘high risk’ pubs could be further divided according to the types of risk factors present. Specifically, two of these pubs seemed to have risk factors relating to their clientele, heavy consumption of (perhaps cheap) alcohol, staff behaviours or house policies (such as door control or tolerance of disruptive behaviour). These were termed as ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs in this research. The other two ‘high risk’ for disorder pubs, termed as ‘Type-B high risk’ in this research, seemed to fit the media stereotype of weekend binge drinkers better. In these a sexually charged, highly orchestrated ‘club-like’ environment, fostered by the use of many aggressive marketing techniques, such as ‘in-house’ TV promos and themed drinks parties (festivals), were observed.

Such a differentiation between the ‘high risk’ pubs raises some interesting research questions. If these differences are real and applicable elsewhere, then it would mean that those risk factors associated with ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs are all well-known aspects of problem drinking in the West of Scotland. For example, some patrons of these pubs were described as “alcoholics” or “hard characters” by the observers. The two ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs were both known to the police as ‘hot spots’ for crime and staff interviews confirmed the observers’ views that these pubs were “traditional”, “working man’s” or having had a “reputation” for trouble, attracting large groups from low income backgrounds. There is a wealth of research evidence that ‘disadvantaged’ or ‘socially excluded’ groups, such as those who make up much of the clientele in these pubs, are more likely to experience alcohol-related problems or be both the perpetrators and victims of crime (including violent crime). This evidence includes studies that have been conducted here in Scotland which have strongly confirmed these relationships (e.g. Alcohol Information Scotland, 2004; Houchin, 2005; MacCallum et al 2000; Wright & Kariya, 1997).

In short, the clientele of ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs are likely to include, at least in a statistical sense, some individuals who are ‘problem drinkers’, who may be no stranger to violence, whether they are drunk or sober, whether they are in a pub or elsewhere. One staff interviewee even commented that his pub (supposedly the worst ‘hot spot’ for crime

in Glasgow city centre during the times at which our observations took place) was a more pleasant environment for his patrons than might be found in the ‘schemes’ they are having a night out away from. For these reasons, the problems presented by these two pubs and others like them in Glasgow city centre can be regarded as deep-rooted and, as such, server practices are unlikely to be the direct ‘cause’ of an elevated level of disorder here (though they may act to increase these levels of disorder). Nevertheless, as we have seen, in previous chapters, it is possible for measures to be taken to help to minimise the risk of disorder in such pubs, or quell such problems more easily when they occur. Indeed it may be the case that positive steps are already being taken to minimise disorder in these premises, for example the observers felt that the serving staff were particularly good at dealing with drunken people in the pub with the highest known level of crime.

The problems presented by ‘Type-B high risk’ pubs are quite different. In these pubs, patrons were described as being out for the weekend, and therefore, by inference, are less likely to be hardened drinkers of the type described in the ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs (e.g. employed and relatively much more ‘affluent’ than many of the patrons who drink in ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs). Nevertheless, these patrons also became very intoxicated and this seemed to be related to the carefully crafted promotion of a ‘manufactured party’. Thus, the problems here seemed more likely to be centred on ‘binge drinking’ and also the sexual ‘meat market’ activities that were the norm in these premises. Those involved in disorderly behaviour within ‘Type-B high risk’ pubs were relatively younger and more mixed in terms of social class. The question has to be raised here, as to whether these people would be as likely to be involved in violence here as they would in other environments, in comparison say to those who become involved in violence within ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs. Finally, a much greater use of efficient security staff by these pubs would seem to artificially lower levels of violence known by the police to take place within them, as opposed to both the ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs and many other types of night-time economy premises (licensed or otherwise).

In summary then, the pubs observed in this project could be subdivided by their relative risk for disorder occurring, according to assessments made using an internationally

validated research instrument. This was possible because the features of bar-room environments known to be protective against or predictive of violence were found to co-exist, often in the same licensed premises. These features, or risk factors, included levels of ‘dirtiness’ (e.g. spillage), an unhealthy ‘ambiance’ (e.g. smokiness) ‘sexual tension’ (e.g. ‘pulling’) and ‘aggravation’ (tolerance of rowdiness), as well as staff practices (e.g. hostility towards patrons) and the presence or absence of specific pub features known to relate to disorder risk (e.g. pool tables or food provision).

2. What promotes excessive alcohol consumption within these licensed premises?

The availability of cut-price drinks during specified periods of time known as ‘happy hours’ has previously been thought to lead to excessive alcohol consumption on licensed premises (Graham & Homel, 1997; St.John-Brooks & Winstanley, 1998). Although ‘happy hours’ have been banned in Glasgow, we found that the branded chain pubs had found loopholes to get round this policy. In particular, rather than selling drinks cheap for a short space of time, these were now sold at a cheap price all of the time. Such practices, including drinks ‘festivals’ and ongoing offers (some already lasting for several years) have also been associated with excessive alcohol consumption (Scott, 2002; Stockwell et al, 1993). Alarming, during an interview with a staff member from a branded chain pub, the interviewee commented that his pub had originally complied with ‘the spirit’ of the ‘happy hours’ ban and only adopted this “cheat” after they had lost out on business to neighbouring branded pubs that had only followed this ban and other anti-irresponsible drinks promotions initiatives to ‘the letter’ (e.g. advertising drinks a £1.25 each rather than four for a fiver). In contrast to the branded pubs, those non-branded premises that had ‘happy hours’ prior to the ban felt that they could not take the risk of losing their license by running such promotions any more, so they cut these out completely and may have lost out on business to the large branded pubs as a result of their compliance.

It is believed that alcohol promotions, such as those described above, attract drinkers whose planned intention is to get drunk (rather than to participate in other pub activities), while particularly low prices also encourage some other drinkers to become more intoxicated and remain in the pub for longer than was their initial intention. One branded

pub (termed as ‘budget’ rather than ‘club-like’ in the present study) seemed to take pride in its low prices. While this pub (categorised here as ‘Type-A high risk’) undoubtedly attracted a ‘less affluent’ clientele than most of the others in the study, many of whom may have been unable to afford to go out for a drink elsewhere, some problems with this approach were apparent. For example, one observer overheard patrons deciding to stay longer in this pub than they had intended because of these low prices. Also, the interviewee from this pub stated that the brand had chosen its location because of its proximity to many transport nodes (this was the only branded pub not be in a cluster of licensed premises). The low prices here encouraged people from these transport nodes (bus, railway and taxi) to come in and many “hooks” (i.e. offers) were in place to get them to stay put. To this end, the field observers commented that this pub was attracting a transient clientele and that it resembled a transport “waiting room”.

A related issue concerned the actual types of beverage being sold - their volume, price and alcohol strength (all factors which may also influence speed of consumption). These features varied considerably across the pubs observed. For example, new drinks such as alcopops were much more commonly seen being consumed in the three ‘club-like’ branded pubs in the sample, usually by younger women (two of these pubs were categorised as ‘Type-B high risk’ in this research). These new drinks were rare in the two ‘style bars’ observed (both of which were categorised as ‘low risk’ for disorder in this research). Another new drink, shooters or shots, was also observed, particularly in one of the branded chain pubs (the pub that the observers felt was the most threatening). Shooters or shots tended to be consumed “in-a-oner” and it was noticeable that spirits and alcopops (which shooters or shots combine the properties of) were the other drinks being consumed the most rapidly, particularly in the pubs categorised as ‘Type-B high risk’ for disorder by this research.

The great bulk of beer being consumed was lager (the most common drink observed). Most of this lager took the form of premium brands that could be consumed either from the glass or from the bottle. Consumption of premium lager brands from the bottle, as opposed to the pint tumbler, was much more likely to be observed in the ‘club-like’

branded pubs. It might be contended that beer sold in bottles is both h served consumed more quickly than is beer served in pint glasses. However, this may actually be a feature of pubs, such as the ‘club-like’ brands observed, because the lack of seating means that drinking while standing up is the norm. This makes drinking from bottles a more sensible choice (less spillage). Consumption from the bottle may actually be a preferable option in the ‘club-like’ pubs, with purpose-built dance-floors, as it is not possible to dance whilst drinking from a pint tumbler (the kind of problems that attempting to do this can lead to was observed during one incident, #11, of disorder recorded in this study). Also, bottle service may reduce the time spent queuing at the bar, frustration and spillage from bumping. Nevertheless, the conspicuous consumption (even brandishing) of desirable premium labels on bottles can be viewed as a form of drinks promotion in itself (forming powerful consumer-brand relationships).

Other more aggressive promotional activities were also observed. For example, the ‘club-like’ branded pubs had their own promotional TV channels. These transmitted direct advertising messages, as well as more subtle imagery designed to foster a drinks party atmosphere. This included scenes of partial nudity, ‘sexy’ dancing (which drunken patrons emulated) and footage of patrons in the pub, drinking, especially drinking premium brands or expensive cocktails and newer drinks such as shots. This footage was interspersed with music videos (more ‘sexy’ dancing) and messages that flashed almost subliminally over footage of happy attractive drinkers, including “[pub name] fun” and “on the pull”. Again this seems to be a promotional loophole that the brands have found to circumvent alcohol harm reduction initiatives, as these messages would seem to contravene the alcohol industry’s own code of practice (e.g. Portman Group, 2002).

In summary then, despite efforts to eliminate such practices, many of the types of alcoholic drinks promotions thought to encourage binge drinking were observed during the course of this research (e.g. cheap price offers). However, rapid consumption of alcohol seemed also to be promoted by a carefully crafted combination of premium pricing (i.e. conspicuous consumption), branding (e.g. in bottled beverages), product innovation (i.e. new drinks, e.g. shots) and using either direct advertising or drinks party

images transmitted on large screens showing internal branded TV channels. This was particularly the case in some of the branded club-like pubs.

3. What promotes moderate alcohol consumption within these licensed premises?

There was little evidence of moderate drinking during field observations. The types of alcoholic beverage which observers felt were being consumed slowly (i.e. ales and wines) were unpopular with patrons in all the pubs in the sub-sample. Non-alcoholic drinks were mainly purchased as mixer for spirits (especially Red Bull® with vodka) and were only consumed on their own as a side drink or by extremely intoxicated people in a vain attempt to sober up. Furthermore, hot drinks were only observed in one pub and this was not encouraged by the staff in that pub at night-time.

Food consumption was almost non-existent in all but one of the observed pubs. This pub had an attached restaurant, but even here only around one-in-ten patrons were observed eating anything. Only this and one other pub were promoting food at night. These were the two 'style bars' in the sample. However, only staff were observed eating anything more than crisps in the other pub offering this service, perhaps because many patrons here were intent on going 'clubbing' after closing time (clubbing, especially if in combination with ecstasy use, would make the consumption of food at this time disagreeable). The intention to go on to nightclubs of the type where all the trappings of the 'rave scene' were a feature (e.g. ecstasy use, house / techno music and prolonged dancing etc.), may also have helped to moderate alcohol consumption in these 'style bars'. It should be noted that these behaviours are not a feature of the type of nightclubs located around Sauchiehall Street where patrons from the branded chain pubs were more likely to gravitate to (perhaps to continue their observed risky behaviours, e.g. drinking alcohol heavily, 'pulling' and 'sexy' dancing).

The above lack of food consumption being observed was rather disappointing, as eating is an activity that both provides distraction, slowing down the rate of alcohol consumption and slows the rate of alcohol absorption through the stomach (see Finnigan

et al, 1999). Indeed previous research has indicated that the availability of food, in particular full meals, reduces the incidence of violence (Homel et al, 1999; Scott, 2002). However, it should be borne in mind that the observers had no way of knowing what food the patrons they observed had consumed prior to 9PM, whether on or off the premises. Nevertheless, given the numbers of obvious after-work drinkers observed it would seem likely that, for many, prior food consumption was nil.

In a statistical sense, it was actually easier to quantify the absence of factors that promote immoderate alcohol consumption, than those that actually promote moderate consumption. To this end it was certainly the case that both the 'style bars' observed did not make extensive use of drinks promotions and in one of these the high price of their drinks was suggested, during their staff interview, as being a counter to binge drinking. However, as this bar attracted an 'affluent' clientele, this premium pricing approach is likely to have a relatively minimal impact on consumption here (but not in vetting the types of patrons on who could afford to drink there). In the club-like pubs the aggressive promotion of premium priced (i.e. expensive) drinks may actually worsen matters, by encouraging intoxicated customers to spend beyond their immediate means, leaving them with no money for a taxi home. Furthermore, any initiative on uniform on-trade price controls, imposed across all city centre pubs, would need to be accompanied by similar controls elsewhere and be extended to off-licenses, in order to prevent the problem being displaced (e.g. to street drinking) and to discourage an increase in 'pre-loading'.

Finally, some features identified in literature as moderating alcohol consumption appeared, at the very least, to be somewhat ambiguous in the Scottish context. Specifically, diversionary entertainments provided by pubs have been thought to reduce drinking speed whilst retaining customers longer. These diversions can include activities, such as pool-tables, dance-floors or karaoke, and more passive entertainments, such as video or live shows. In regard to their association with violence, the normal exception to this rule is pool-tables, which have been estimated to be related to as many as twenty percent of pub conflicts (Marsh & Kibby, 1993). Indeed, in this research, although only three pubs had any pool tables, two of the fourteen incidents involved pool players. Both

happened in the same pub (which had only one table, on only three of the four occasions it was visited by the observation teams) and it was interesting that these incidents did not appear to be focused on the game itself (i.e. implying it was the type of player rather than something intrinsic to this game that was responsible).

In contrast to the conclusions of previous research, all the diversionary activities observed seemed to be encouraging heavy drinking. Activities such as 'sexy' dancing, karaoke, video screens and music (especially 'oldies') were all thought to increase alcohol consumption by both the pub observers and staff interviewees. This was felt to work because these activities made the consumer feel happy and up for a party. Added to this it would seem inevitable that the provision of a purpose built dance floor, bottled drinks (i.e. portable alcohol consumption) and very loud music are not designed to encourage conversation.

In summary, in this study it was only possible to quantify the factors thought to promote sensible drinking by variations in their almost total absence rather than their presence (e.g. soft or drinks and food provision). Furthermore, it was felt that some supposedly protective features (e.g. entertainment provision) actually had the opposite effect and encouraged rapid alcohol consumption.

4. Does the way staff interact with clientele (including server trained staff) during both disruptive incidents and periods of normal service mediate against disruptive, anti-social or violent behaviour within the sample?

The people skills (or lack of them) of licensees, serving and security staff have been shown to be a major predictor of disorder in bars (Graham & Homel, 1997). That is, factors relating to normal service practices are understood to be as important in the prevention of disorder, as factors relating to how staff quell disorder once it has started.

The observers in this study were generally positive about the serving staff they observed. One pub did seem to have less professional serving staff, though this was a student bar mostly observed outside term-time when the bar was very quiet. Although not

commented on directly in their field-notes, according to the forms completed by the observers, staff in another pub seemed more aggressive towards patrons. This was a ‘traditional’ pub that was rated as having a ‘high risk’ for disorder, ‘Type-A’ (see above) and was a police crime ‘hot spot’.

The other ‘Type-A high risk pub’, the low priced non-‘club-like’ brand, differed in this respect, as the observers felt that the serving staff here were particularly good at dealing with the type of ‘socially excluded’, hard drinking, transient clientele that their bar attracted. However in this pub, fault was found with the stewards who seemed very unprofessional (though not hostile) to the observers and who often left their post to socialise, leaving the door unattended or the floor staff to deal with problems. Interestingly, the observers both noted this and rated these stewards as by far the poorest security staff in the study without knowing that this pub used a different security firm from that used by the seven other pubs observed.

Only one openly hostile steward was observed, though this individual was responsible for two of the fourteen violent incidents witnessed over the course of this research. Although this involves the actions of only one man, it does seem that such people are still being inappropriately employed to impose order in Glasgow’s city centre night-time economy. On other occasions when violent incidents did occur these were invariably dealt with professionally by the security staff (though the stewards at the pub who employed from a different firm from the rest of the pubs were never observed being put to the test).

Interestingly, staff interviews revealed a heavy reliance on stewards to sort out problems with patrons. The staff interviewed were not happy to call the police when disorder threatened, perhaps for fear of it reflecting badly upon their pub, bringing it a reputation or even jeopardising the license. Of particular interest was the finding that several pubs had formed security alliances with other licensed premises, (though not with others holding public house licenses) which could be reciprocated in other ways, such as business arrangements (e.g. referring on clientele, flyering access etc.). In these informal, “unwritten” arrangements, if the pub was having problems that their own stewards could

not deal with, they would phone another licensed premises for assistance, and reinforcing security staff would be 'borrowed' to deal with the trouble. It was also possible for the seven observed pubs that used the same security firm to phone the head office for more steward reinforcements to be sent out.

From the staff interviews, it was clear that all servers had experience of being watchful for and dealing with disorder. All of those interviewed mentioned methods that they used to spot trouble when it was brewing and some of the techniques that they used to deal with it when things 'kicked off'. However, these techniques for dealing with problems invariably stemmed from a combination of experience (not all gained from working in pubs) and instinct / common sense.

It was noticeable that only the two licensees interviewed, who were both trained through Alcohol Focus Scotland's *ServeWise* programme, had even heard of server responsibility programmes (though a staff trainer for one of the branded pubs stated that his company's package placed a great deal of emphasis on such issues). On the other hand, all those who were unaware of such initiatives were positive about them in principle and one interviewee spontaneously stated that he would like to be trained up on responsible service and disorder minimisation issues. These views would appear to confirm the findings of research conducted in Canada that evaluated server trained bar staff's views of an aggression reduction programme (Graham et al, 2005).

In summary, the standard of serving and stewarding observed in this research was generally good and professional. However, there were exceptions to this and large numbers of intoxicated people were observed being served. The serving staff in one relatively rowdy pub seemed best at dealing with such people, while the others tended to rely on stewards to deal with disorder when it did occur (which could include calling in stewards from other premises rather than the police). The young age of the staff in these (mainly young people's pubs) was thought to be a mixed blessing. It was noticeable that pubs using external server training providers (perhaps those with programmes that focus upon social responsibility and dealing with trouble) were less disorderly.

5. What influence does overcrowding have, if any, on these issues?

There are some uncertainties concerning how the size and crowdedness of licensed premises influence levels of disorder. On the one hand, larger venues may encourage large groups to enter, thus increasing the level of risk (Caswell et al, 1993; Graves et al, 1981; International Center for Alcohol Polices, 2002). On the other hand, small venues may create a crowded, frustrated atmosphere (e.g. in terms of delays in being served) and increased bumping. In short, both extremes of licensed premises size have been implicated as potential causes of disorder (Scott, 2002; St.John-Brooks & Winstanley, 1998). In the present study, three of the pubs observed were much smaller than the others. These had a capacity of around one-hundred, while the others had capacities of around two-hundred or more. Unusually, in this study, it was the larger premises that tended to get the more crowded or congested (not the smaller pubs as might be expected).

It was certainly the case that congested areas, especially where ‘sexy’ dancing was taking place (e.g. off-floor dancing), could lead to both disorder being triggered and it being missed completely by staff. However, the observations made by this research were unclear as to whether or not crowdedness necessarily leads on to more serious disorder. For example, less crowded pubs were thought to create space for dangerous horseplay by single groups who may dominate (i.e. take-over) the pub. Similarly, although the proportion of patrons standing is rated in literature as a risk factor, in the present day Scottish context this may be ambiguous. For example, a greater provision of seating may lead to increased unwelcome ‘tablehopping’.

In this project it was also felt that the most serious violent incident observed could have been prevented, or at least minimised, had the pub concerned been busier and, there been more persons present, it could also have been stopped outside the pub concerned, averting subsequent injury. Although alcohol-outlet concentration has been viewed as undesirable in some quarters, for example in New York, USA, a new bar cannot open within 500 yards of an existing one (cited in Cracknell, 2004), in this study concentrations of pubs in certain small areas was felt to add to levels of safety by

observers and pub staff alike. These could form small communities, which with cooperation between premises (e.g. pooling of security resources) could add to the level of safety both within the pubs concerned and perhaps also on the streets outside.

In summary, the effect of overcrowding was difficult to assess in this research, as the busier pubs also tended to be the largest and also where the most movement among patrons took place, consequently making these the most difficult premises to observe. Additionally, the relative absence of people in one of the smaller or quieter premises observed was felt to have contributed to the disorder witnessed, by allowing space for horseplay and meaning that fewer people (pub staff or otherwise) were on hand to prevent violent incidents from escalating.

6. What demographic groups are more or less likely to contribute to anti-social, disruptive or violent behaviour?

According to previous research, several demographic groups have been found to be more prone to become involved in alcohol-related violence within licensed premises (the 'usual suspects' might be described as a young, lower 'class' males). However, although not discounting this typology completely, the present study has indicated that the situation in Glasgow today seems to deviate from this norm.

Past research has indicated that younger drinkers are more likely to be involved in disorderly incidents, particularly under-age drinkers. It has been found that even the mere presence of under-agers can be related to increased aggression by older patrons, especially the presence of under-age females (Graham et al, 1980). Happily, the present study found very little evidence for large-scale under-age drinking in Glasgow's city centre pubs, with such people often being completely absent from a night's field observations. This seems to be, at least in part, a consequence of strict ID or door policies by the pubs concerned. It was noteworthy however that drunken teenagers were observed on the streets (one even threatened an observer as she left a pub).

As there was insufficient data recorded on the under-18 age group, in this research the term ‘younger patrons’ referred to the 18 to 21 age group. As the pubs in this study mostly had a youthful focus, this meant that most patrons observed were in their twenties (only two pubs, both of the ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs had different age profiles). For this reason older patrons in this report are defined as those aged over 30 years. Therefore, to be in line with previous international research, a high proportion of patrons aged 18 to 21 was considered as a risk factor for disorder in a pub (this age group has also been the focus of research into binge drinking in the UK, e.g. Engineer et al, 2003) while a high proportion of patrons aged 30 plus was coded as a protective factor. However, this assumption was not borne out by the incidents observed

Unlike similar research conducted elsewhere, many of those involved in disorderly incidents were aged over 30, and were sometimes much older. This pattern seemed to be corroborated by staff interviews in which staff regularly referred to older patrons when asked to provide a recent example of when they had to deal with trouble. It is of course possible that this reflects the youthful nature of the pubs selected. Older people in these pubs may seem like ‘misfits’ and may be atypical of, or deviant from, most drinkers aged over 30. Also, such older patrons may be seen as undesirable by pub management who are trying to encourage younger customers. It may even be the case that just as older people tend to be more fearful of the young (e.g. Cohen, 1972), the young may be more fearful of the old who invade, contest or threaten ‘their’ space in the ‘liminal’ night-time economy. This phenomenon may have influenced the responses of the pub staff interviewed, as they were all aged under 30 years.

Another deviation from the accepted wisdom was the relatively large number of females witnessed getting involved in incidents of disorder. This included older women (i.e. over 50, from both observations and interviews), women in couples, women in large groups (the female equivalent of ‘wolfpacks’) and even two cases of drunken pregnant women being at the centre of the aggression. Whether this is a phenomenon peculiar to Glasgow, one that has always existed or is evidence for the ‘ladettes’ hypothesis cannot be gauged from this study, but it does raise some interesting research possibilities. Despite this,

when assessing a pub's risk level for violence, a high proportion of male patrons was coded as increasing the risk of disorder, while a higher proportion of females was regarded as being protective in the quantitative analyses undertaken in this research.

In the literature on alcohol-related violence, women are more often portrayed as the victims of male aggression (e.g. Parks, 1999) and there was some evidence of this from the present study. This is particularly related to 'wolfpacks' or large groups of men who can effectively dominate the clientele of a pub. In line with past research, in the present study these males were usually slightly older, and spent their time "leering" at younger women. The 'club-like' branded pubs were felt to be the most prone to this kind of activity, with one pub in particular being described as a 'meat market' (a 'Type-A high risk' pub). All the observers and at least one interviewee felt that many of the women involved in these activities were not entirely blameless for any resultant disorder, in that a great deal of teasing and other harassment could exacerbate the situation. Much of this 'high risk' behaviour revolved around 'sexy' dancing, often encouraged by the controlled 'party' environments of the 'club-like' branded pubs, which seemed to encourage people 'pulling'. All of these features are well known in the academic literature as factors that contribute to anti-social, disruptive or violent behaviour. It should also be noted that, several male / female conflicts observed appeared to be 'domestic disputes', between partners or 'couples', rather than because of 'pulling' activity.

The other aspect of the demographics of aggressive patrons that concurred with the existing literature was social class and income (not necessarily the same thing). Having a 'low social class' clientele has been estimated to account for as much as a quarter of the variance in violence between pubs in Scotland (Scottish Office 1992, cited in Alcohol Focus Scotland, 1999). Although the observers, or for that matter the staff members interviewed, would have had no way of finding out the precise nature of the socio-economic backgrounds of patrons, it was clear that two of the pubs, the two police crime 'hot spot' pubs, had a 'working class' clientele (the two pubs termed here as 'Type-A high risk'). Of these, the pub which had the most crime known to the police of any premises in Glasgow city centre (licensed or otherwise) at the weekend during the three

hours around midnight, was believed to attract a particularly ‘disadvantaged’ and ‘less affluent’ clientele, at least in part because of its budget prices. This was confirmed by the staff member interviewed from this pub, who said that his low prices did not attract “city types”, but instead mainly people from Glasgow’s housing ‘schemes’. Interestingly, despite these risk factors, and its high level of crime known to the police, only one incident of disorder was witnessed in this pub by observers during this study.

At the other extreme to these ‘working men’s bars’, was one of the ‘low risk’ for disorder pubs the clientele of which were described as being ‘up-market’ and coming from wealthy parts of the city. Despite this, several of the interviewees, including the staff member from this pub, felt that these wealthy patrons were often the most troublesome customers, particularly in relation to making complaints.

The two club-like branded pubs, termed as ‘Type-B high risk’, seemed to have a very mixed clientele in terms of social background. This was felt to provide a potential for conflict between different groups, who might not otherwise even come into contact with one another. This situation was even more pronounced on the streets after closing time when all kinds of people; the young, the old, the rich, the poor, people from different areas, religions, gender-orientations, youth styles and other backgrounds all ‘rubbed shoulders’ with one another in a competition for space or transport.

One final feature of a pub’s patrons, which is particularly difficult to measure, concerns the type of clientele who might be attracted to disorder. For instance, some people consider participation in a fight as an integral part of a good night out (Moore, 1990; Tomsen, 1997). In a study by Graham and Wells (2003) young Canadian males who had been involved in bar-room aggression were interviewed. Some were described as ‘recreational fighters’, who may provoke a fight or make an exaggerated response to a minor incident just to escalate things. Graham and Wells describe this behaviour as a ‘right of passage’ amongst young males. This was also found by Tomsen (1997), in Australia, who described their actions as ‘social protest’. Although such ‘recreational fighting’ did appear to be a feature of some of the incidents observed in the present study,

it cannot be said from this research why some Glaswegian drinkers are drawn to such behaviours.

Related to the above, such violent individuals may seek out like-minded others, inevitably gravitating to premises seen as having a greater level tolerance for their behaviour (Raistrick et al 1999). In the present study, this seemed to be a distinct possibility at the two police crime ‘hot spot’ pubs observed, both categorised as ‘Type-A high risk’ pubs by this research. On the other hand, there is some recent research evidence which suggests that many of those involved in the ‘new’, night-time economy, city centre, alcohol-related violence are first offenders (Maguire & Nettleton, 2003) and it would be interesting to speculate whether or not these are the type of person who would comprise part of the clientele in the ‘club-like’ branded pubs which this research has categorised as ‘Type-B high risk’ pubs.

In summary, although the demographic groups observed, during the course of this research, becoming involved in violent disorder, had some commonality to what might have been anticipated (e.g. young, ‘less affluent’, males), the findings of this research were of interest chiefly because of the number of females (i.e. the same number as males) and also the number of older patrons involved (i.e. over 30s, despite most of the pubs observed having a younger clientele). It was felt that a ‘toxic’ mix of patrons may be more of a precursor for disorder than the presence of any particular demographic group.

7. What other factors relating to the premises e.g. entertainment, frequency of glass collecting, monitoring of toilet areas, provision of food, premises layout etc. prevent or encourage the behaviours highlighted?

There are a surprisingly large number of non-alcohol-related factors that have been proposed as influencing levels of disorder within licensed premises. For example, the prevailing atmosphere of a pub is likely to be influenced by both the physical environment and less tangible influences such as an ‘anything goes’ ethos. Such things may easily be defined by the theme or style of the pub. For example, ‘sports bars’, which

may have TVs showing aggressive activities (e.g. boxing) or pre-club bars, which may have very loud music and dancing, have both been demonstrated by previous research as having elevated levels of disorderly behaviour (Graham et al 2000). In the present study, it was noticeable that the two pubs defined as 'style bars' were both rated as 'low risk' for disorder and that these had the fewest observed incidents or known crimes. These two pubs differed from the others in many subtle ways (e.g. they had no TV, did not play popular music styles and did not promote new drinks).

The atmosphere of a pub is often set by the standard of fixtures and fittings. It was noted by the observers that the two 'style bars' were also particularly clean and both had highly individual décor. At the other extreme the two 'Type-A high risk' pubs were particularly unclean, with very basic décor and bright lighting or a poor layout. All of these are factors that are known to be predictive of disorder in the academic literature. This is because, on the one hand, keeping pub décor in good order can give the impression that disorder will not be tolerated, whereas on the other hand, a lack of general maintenance, poor comfort and bad design can add to frustration, congestion, bumping and slow service, all of which are factors that increase the likelihood of disorder (Scott, 2002; St.John-Brooks & Winstanley, 1998).

The three 'club-like' branded pubs observed were interesting in that, while they were quite stylish in their design, they were often very unclean and cluttered. Again this is in part related to their entertainment provision (i.e. their manufactured drinks party environment, with loud music, 'sexy dancing' and flashing or 'flattering' lights). This was seen as controlling the mood of patrons while they were in the pub, but perhaps adding to their levels of frustration when the party stopped at closing time. One particular problem in these pubs was the accumulation of empty vessels, litter and spillage. For example the branded 'club-like' pubs were both the type of premises where lager was more likely to be consumed from the bottle, (as opposed to the pint tumbler) and also the type where by far the most consumption of alcopops took place (drinks that were nearly always consumed from the bottle). In such conditions, the volume and accumulation of glassware could easily overwhelm the floor staff, a situation exacerbated by these pubs

also experiencing constant movement and ever changing patrons throughout a Friday or Saturday night. This was because these pubs tended to attract a clientele who moved from pub to pub throughout the night, especially stag and hen parties. Not only do all these features relate to a greater likelihood of disorder breaking out in the first place, but they also make it much more difficult to quell any trouble once it has started.

Taking the problem of accumulated, un-cleared, empty vessels and other glassware as an example of increased risk potential, these could easily injure people accidentally or could even be used as weapons. There is little doubt that safer 'glassware' is an effective harm reduction measure in bar environments where disorder or accidental breakages are commonplace (St.John-Brooks & Winstanley, 1998, Luke et al. 2002). However, no plastic vessels were observed in the present study and these seemed to be unpopular with staff, as their introduction was thought to imply an association with violence.

Other visible precautions that licensed premises may take to prevent disorder are equally ambiguous. For example, floor staff patrolling the premises (e.g. the toilets), the use of CCTV or mirrors, a high staff to patron ratio, numbers of male staff, security strength, calling time early and imposing firm house rules can all help prevent disorder. However, all of these features may actually encourage confrontations with patrons, and some research has indicated that these increase violence (Graves et al, 1981; Lister et al 2000; Scott, 2002; Maguire & Nettleton, 2003). This contradiction is, in part, thought to come about through such measures being viewed by certain patrons as indicative of an expectation of trouble or even as a challenge. This relates back to the fears expressed during the staff interviews, that some premises can easily acquire a reputation for trouble which, whether justified or not, can be hard to shake off. These findings imply that unobtrusive security measures would be best at preventing problems.

In summary then, the style of a pub seemed to impact upon its relative disorder risk. The two 'style bars' in the sub-sample had the lowest risk assessment, the fewest incidents of aggression witnessed and the smallest number of crimes known to the police. These pubs either had a café appearance or were attached to a restaurant (both offered food). They

also had the most individual décor, giving an appearance that disorder would not be tolerated. In contrast, some other pubs had a relatively disorganised appearance (e.g. through the clutter of drinking vessels) and their entertainments seemed to exacerbate things. Finally specific anti-disorder measures (e.g. staff patrolling or plastic glasses) were seen as ambiguous as they may create an expectancy of disorder.

8. How do trigger factors interact?

Although, many of the risk factors for alcohol-related disorder tended to co-exist in the same places, how these ‘trigger’ factors interact is less well understood. Graham et al (1980) described the bar-room environment as an “ecological system”, implying that the effects of various combinations of risk factors for disorder may be greater than the sum of the individual parts observed in isolation. In short, disorderly behaviour does not simply take place because a pool table is present or because no food is available, any more than it takes place just because alcohol has been consumed. It is more likely to be the case that disorder takes place because of an adverse interaction between some or all of these risk factors. This theory is in accordance with the biopsychosocial framework for controlled intoxicant use, proposed by Norman Zinberg (1984), of drug (in this case alcohol), set (the individual patron or staff member’s state of mind) and setting (licensing policy, the drinking environment and server practices).

Such interactions between risk factors were clearly observed during the course of this research. Firstly, the risk and protective factors for disorder tended to be found co-existing in the same pubs. For example, the pubs with the smartest décor tended to be the bars with the better server practices and also those with the least aggressive patrons, while drunker more aggravated patrons appeared to frequent pubs that were dirtier or had less professional security practices.

Secondly when incidents did occur they seemed to result from a combination of these risk factors. The patrons at the centre of these violent incidents were invariably drunk (apart from cases of violence instigated by security staff) and often bar features such as cramped

dance floors or inefficient security were observed exacerbating things, with ‘entertainments’ such as karaoke or pool-playing providing a potential catalyst. On other occasions it was patrons’ behaviours such as ‘sexy’ dancing or horseplay that appeared to trigger incidents, which could rapidly escalate owing to the role of alcohol.

In summary, these observations are in line with the existing academic literature, which suggests that alcohol is not the cause of bar-room violence but that its consumption, especially heavy consumption, allows incidents to escalate and become more serious (Graham & Wells, 2003). Staff interviewed in the present study also held this view. However, once alcohol has been consumed certain bar-room features and server practices have been demonstrated, both by this research and elsewhere, to either trigger violence or allow it to escalate. For these reasons it would seem clear that measures aimed at improving drinking environments and licensed trade staff’s people skills do present an opportunity to reduce alcohol-related problems on licensed premises in Glasgow. The implications of this will be discussed in the next section.

7(ii) Policy Relevance

In this section we will assess what implications the findings of this research have for future work in the area of alcohol-related problems within licensed premises in Scotland. There are several areas of policy interest here, including bar staff practice, policing and future research, each of which will now be discussed.

Server Training Implications

The lack of awareness of server responsibility training programmes was a striking feature of the staff interviews conducted during this project. This does not seem to reflect demand, as the interviewees all expressed an interest in such training. As well as an interest in responsible service and techniques for dealing with disorder, it was also interesting that when asked what type of training they would like to have received; legal issues were often voiced (e.g. keeping abreast of changes in licensing legislation).

It was noteworthy that the licensees interviewed in this research felt that such training was not only useful as an exercise in its own right but also that it provided them with some kind of certification. There would seem to be several advantages to this: firstly, certification makes courses more attractive; secondly, it allows staff to be able to say that they can do, what they already know how to do; thirdly, it provides some kind of status or endorsement of their job as a profession. This echoes Hobbs' (2002) study of 'bouncers' (stewards), in which interviewees felt that training was useful only in that it provided them with some sort of qualification and recognition from the authorities that they were doing a very difficult job. However, Hobbs' interviewees were critical of training that is concentrated too much on health & safety, to the neglect of customer care and communication skills that his research indicated were more useful to those who had to diffuse aggression as part of their job.

Although it cannot be stated from this research that pubs where staff had undergone external serving training programmes were experiencing less alcohol-related problems or dealing with aggression better, it was certainly the case that no evidence to the contrary was found. In particular, it was noticeable that the four pubs who stated in the questionnaire survey that they had not utilised an external server training programme were the same four pubs who were rated as 'high risk' for disorder by the observational phase of this research and that these were also the four pubs with the highest recorded crime rates. However, caveats to this inference include that all the relatively high disorder pubs (according to police data) in the research were relatively large and that three of these were in branded chains who may now be building responsible service and techniques for dealing with disorder into their training packages.

It was interesting that the one large branded chain pub not rated as 'high risk' by this research, was the only brand (according to the postal survey) to use external trainers. However, once again we cannot say for certain that this pub's relatively low level of crime is a reflection of its use of external training or even that the pub's parent company's policy is the reason for this. That is, a greater sense of social responsibility by this brand's parent company in general maybe the underlying reason behind its lower

level of disorder (in comparison to other brands) *and* also what makes it take training more seriously. In this respect it was interesting to note this brand's original compliance with the Glasgow 'happy hours' promotions ban.

Finally, it was of interest that the only pub where the police logged no crimes over the past year was the premises with the most staff trained by Alcohol Focus Scotland's *ServeWise* programme. This pub was rated as 'low risk' for disorder by this research and was also the only pub where no actual disorder was observed (making it also the only premises in the study where disorder was completely unknown by any means of measuring such problems).

Policing Implications

The situation in Glasgow seems to be the same as that recorded in the night-time economy elsewhere in the UK. Hobbs (2002), for example, it is estimated that Manchester city centre attracts 75,000 people on Friday and Saturday evenings who are policed formally by approximately 30 officers (i.e. on the street) and 'policed' informally by almost 1,000 'bouncers' (i.e. stewards, in licensed premises). Given that all eight pubs in the present sub-sample employed stewards, with 'security strength' ranging between one and eight stewards, at night at the weekend, we estimate that there would have been around 400 stewards on duty in the 100 most central pubs we originally looked at in Glasgow city centre. To this total number of stewards might be added perhaps as many again working in pubs outside the geographical areas of the city centre covered by this research (e.g. the 'West End' and 'Merchant City'), plus all the security staff working at other types of licensed premises in throughout each of these areas (nightclubs, hotels, entertainment venues etc.). In short, it does appear that, as Hobbs contends (2002), at these times we as a society surrender the 'policing' (i.e. control of order) of our city centre to private enterprise, leaving 'bouncers' (i.e. stewards) as the "primary custodians of order". This is not to say that Glasgow's pub security staff do not do a good job. Aside from one rogue individual, the stewards working for the main company carrying out pub security in this study appeared to do their extremely difficult job very professionally,

even if the face of extreme provocation. Nevertheless, this situation is far from ideal and it would be preferable if these tasks were at least being overseen by the police.

There can be no doubt that the presence of this ‘private army’ of stewards means that the amount of violence known to the police associated with licensed premises is likely to be a gross underestimate. This discrepancy is likely to be intensified further by the practice, uncovered in this research, of pubs choosing to phone for steward reinforcements from other premises before they would contemplate calling the emergency services. Although it could be argued that these practices help free up police time to deal with disorder elsewhere, the controlling presence of stewards within pubs would also appear to force up the amount of disorder occurring outside on the streets for the police to deal with. This occurs because pub stewards are very effective at maintaining order within pubs and at removing disorderly people from pubs, but there is no private army of security staff on hand in the streets to maintain order in the melting pot that is the city centre’s streets after all the pubs have spilled out their patrons, often simultaneously, at closing time.

Although the observers reported witnessing disorderly, even violent incidents, on the streets of Glasgow during their journey home, unfortunately it was not possible to connect these to specific licensed premises. This was anticipated, as research in Sydney, Australia, had previously noted the near impossibility of this in areas with a high density of licensed premises (Briscoe & Donnelly, 2001). What remains unclear is who was causing all this street disorder in Glasgow city centre when the pubs close. Three possibilities were proposed as to who the troublemakers might be:

- People who had been drinking in pubs
- People who had not been drinking in pubs
- Both the above groups and interaction between them

Taking the pub drinkers hypothesis first, there was a clear possibility that there were two groups here who may be responsible for street disorder. The first are the types of individual described by the observers as ‘hard’ drinkers or characters who tended to frequent the pubs termed ‘Type-A high risk’ in this report. These people are likely to

comprise individuals who would get into trouble anyway, either as an assailant or victim, regardless of whether they were involved in binge-drinking in the night-time economy. Indeed, it may even be possible that they would get into more trouble if they did not come into the controlled environment of these city centre pubs, but instead remained in their home areas or wandered the streets. (At this point it should be stressed that the majority of patrons of these two pubs *do not* fit this troublemaker typology). In other words the rise of the night-time economy has merely displaced the location where such offend (and if so resources need to respond to this displacement). The second type of troublesome pub-goer would appear to fit the weekend ‘binge-drinker’, ‘on the pull’ stereotype and in this study these people tended to frequent the pubs described as ‘Type-B high risk’ in this report. (The majority of drinkers in some of these premises *did* appear to fit the ‘binge-drinking’ or ‘on the pull’ typologies.) The question as to whether or not these people would get into trouble anyway remains unanswered by this research (i.e. if they are known offenders, such as the suggested ‘dressed-up neds’ at the weekend scenario proposed by one pub staff interviewee). What was clear though, was that the observers felt that these patrons’ levels of hostility increased at closing time when the ‘manufactured’ party promoted by this type of premises was over.

This research also produced some evidence in support of the second hypothesis that street disorder in Glasgow is mainly down to people who do not drink in pubs, in that many people who did not appear to have come from licensed premises were observed roaming around at this time of the night. This motley crew of non-pub-goers included, ‘junkies’, ‘neds’, street drinkers, beggars and even children (though at this point it should be noted that, during the other peak time for street disorder, when the nightclubs come out, the number of such people on the streets was thought likely to be much smaller). Large groups of males who fail to gain access to licensed premises are thought to swell the numbers of such people roaming around the streets. In this scenario, pub door stewards refuse entry to these undesirables; perhaps because they are well-known troublemakers or perhaps because they are already drunk (this prior drinking to the point of intoxication, as opposed to ‘pre-loading’, may in itself only have happened in anticipation of rejection by the pub ‘door’). This is the excluded group who Hobbs (2002) calls “the legion of the

banned”. How and where these individuals become intoxicated was another important question raised by this research.

The third hypothesis, that it is a combination of and interaction between these two populations, would seem to be the most likely to be true (indeed the only time an observer was threatened was, as she exited a pub, by a teenage girl running in Sauchiehall Street). This complicated situation is obviously the most difficult to control. On the one hand this means that not all of the disorder in Glasgow city centre at closing time can be directly attributed to pubs. However, the existence of these pubs, the presence of their patrons and the other business they generate (e.g. fast food, transport, etc.) is likely to be the main attractor for the non-pub-going disorderly population, again effectively displacing such behaviours from other parts of the city over time.

Research Implications

This research was successful beyond what had been originally been anticipated. In particular the compliance and willingness of the licensed trade to participate in this type of project was highly commendable. The response rate to the pub postal survey greatly exceeded expectations, allowing it to function as a piece research in its own right, rather than merely acting a scoping exercise to identify premises suitable for the main observational phase. During the field observations, the fieldworkers experienced no difficulty in accessing, or any problems while working within, a broad cross-section of city centre pubs. Finally, staff members from every one of the observed pubs were happy to take part in face-to-face interviews with the principal researcher. All these features bode well for continued or future research projects in this area.

There are two ways in which this research could be developed. Firstly, the participant observation (or ‘mystery customer’) method could be retained but used to explore disorder in other night-time economy environments. Examples of some of these research possibilities are now summarised:

- **Observations made in pubs outwith the city centre** (e.g. on licensed premises that may not be so heavily controlled by stewards)

- **Observations extended to nightclubs** (and their closing time, thus completing the temporal picture of the drinking pattern in the city centre's night-time economy)
- **Observations made outside licensed premises** (i.e. around closing time, for example, on the street, at fast-food outlets, in hospital casualty wards, with paramedics, with the police and either at transport nodes, e.g. taxi ranks and buss tops, or on transport modes, e.g. night-buses).

Secondly, other methodologies could be employed to explore other aspects of alcohol-related problems associated with licensed premises in Glasgow city centre's night-time economy, such as within the eight pubs that were observed during this project. These are now summarised as follows:

- **Participant observation work could be conducted from the pub servers point-of-view** (this would mirror Hobb's work with 'bouncers', i.e. door stewards)
- **Interviews conducted with the patrons of pubs that have high or low levels of either known disorder or disorder risk** (this would mirror Holland's research of night-time economy participants)
- **Interviews conducted with arrestees or casualty patients** (this would clarify who was involved in disorder and why / where they had consumed alcohol, e.g. in which / what types of pubs or other licensed premises, and would also allow the missing component from the observational methods described above to be assessed – i.e. patron's drinking patterns prior to entering the city centre night-time economy and its pubs, including 'pre-loading')

As with the present project, each of the above proposals for future research in this area should involve a consultation process with a range of appropriate research partners (e.g. alcohol agencies and city centre management) to help identify the areas of greatest need. All of the above potential project proposals' methods could be supplemented by conducting interviews with the relevant key expert personnel (e.g. police and health services). Finally, such projects could also have their findings corroborated by the appropriate use of official statistics concerning their relevant issues and populations.

7(iii) Recommendations

This research project has assessed the level of alcohol-related problems within Glasgow city centre licensed premises. Whereas the findings of this project do not support some of the recent media reports indicating a high level of violence in central Glasgow's pubs, some problems were found, as were many positive features, such as staff interventions. In order that good practices should continue and the level of disorder associated with licensed premises be reduced, the following recommendations are now made:

- **More server responsibility training.** This report has indicated that responsible service is related to a reduced level of disorder in licensed premises. Although it cannot be said from this research that this is a causal effect it was clear that in the pubs where greater levels of server responsibility were observed there was substantially less known crime and fewer risk factors for disorder were witnessed. Pubs where a high level of responsible service was observed tended to be the same pubs that indicated that they included social responsibility in their staff training, for example by utilising an external server training programme.

Further to this, interviews with Glasgow city centre pub staff revealed positive attitudes towards such training, especially in regard to techniques for dealing with disorder and keeping up to date with changes in licensing law. Furthermore such courses were seen as providing recognition of the difficult job bar staff do.

Additionally, it is felt that such courses should also be made open to entertainers who work in pubs and other licensed premises (e.g. DJs) as not only is it the case that such people are likely to become involved in dealing with disorder, but it was also clear that their activities could influence the mood of patrons, drinking behaviours and the risk of disorderly behaviour happening in the first place (e.g. by controlling the tempo of the music).

The effects of entertainment provision, especially music, provided by licensed premises were seen to both influence levels of disorder and rates of alcohol consumption. Clearly this feature of pubs has the potential to both improve and exacerbate levels of alcohol-related problems. It is recommended that more research be conducted in this area and that these issues be incorporated into pub staff or server training programmes.

- **More experienced pub staff.** The staff of the pubs observed in this project tended to be rather young and inexperienced (i.e. under 30 years of age). Interviews with pub staff revealed a tendency for them to have been patrons of their premises prior to them choosing to work there and therefore some may have had a tendency to view their workplace as a customer, rather than as an employee.

We feel that it would be advantageous for such premises to employ some more experienced (i.e. older) staff, who are likely to be more mindful of potential troublemakers and more familiar with a broad range of techniques for dealing with actual violent disorder should it occur.

Furthermore, the interviews revealed that training in some pubs was also being conducted by these relatively young staff. Although there are clear advantages to this situation (e.g. young staff may understand the culture of the night-time economy better and may have more empathy with the clientele), we would also identify a need for more experienced (i.e. senior) staff to be used as trainers.

- **Better communication between police and the licensed trade industry.** During staff interviews a reticence towards calling the police to deal with disorderly incidents was noted. This was because of a belief that calling the police to their premises would leave them with ‘black marks’ against their name or lead to a reputation (ultimately placing their license in jeopardy). These views were augmented by the field observations which indicated that stewards were being used to deal with disorder in pubs rather than the police. This has the ‘knock on’ effect of ‘bouncing’ troublemakers on to the street from licensed premises, presumably to cause trouble (for the police) elsewhere. We recommend that pub staff be encouraged to call the police and that licensees are assured that this will not count against them in any way (though failure to report crimes may).

Additionally, we urge improved communications from door stewards and bar managers to the police, as this could provide valuable intelligence on the movements of potential troublemakers within the city centre. This could involve the extending of current video and radio link systems between pubs and the police or CCTV operators from daytime to night-time use (‘footsteps across the city’). Such linkages could also be made between different licensed premises to provide a city-centre wide early warning system.

- **More police on the beat.** Although somewhat reticent about calling the police on to their premises, the pub staff interviewed were unanimous in their desire to see a more visible police presence on the streets of Glasgow (i.e. in greater numbers, on foot and wearing high-visibility clothing), especially after closing time. The field observers also noted that the police seemed to be overstretched in dealing with incidents on the street and in other types of (non-licensed) premises at this time, when and where there appeared to be a great deal more serious disorder taking place than in the pubs themselves.

Increasing the visible numbers of police on the beat would also seem likely relieve some of the crowd control burden presently being placed upon pub staff, reduce the fear of crime amongst the more law-abiding potential participants of the night-time economy (who may currently be deterred from entering the city centre at

night) and may also act as a deterrent to alcohol-related disorder on the streets (or on public transport), which, unlike the pubs observed, currently have no army of private security firms (stewards) to prevent violence.

- **Maintenance of a high standard of stewarding.** At present access, crowd control, prevention and elimination of disorder in the night-time economy is controlled within licensed premises by stewards. Although this apparent surrender of the maintenance of public order from the state's emergency services (e.g. the police) to private enterprise seems a less than ideal situation, it was noteworthy that on the whole both the field observers and serving staff interviewed had very positive views towards the role played by Glasgow's pub stewards, their effectiveness and their professionalism.

However, one pub's security firm seemed less professional than the others and elsewhere one rogue steward was responsible for two of the fourteen incidents of violence observed during fieldwork. These observations indicate a strong need to keep up the prevailing high standard of stewarding and we would highlight the usefulness of training and monitoring procedures to these ends, for example the work of the Security Industry Authority (SIA).

- **Introduction of systems for monitoring disorder potential.** The field observations conducted by this research were effective at identifying risks for violent disorder within the eight pubs selected. We do not believe that there was anything intrinsically different between these eight pubs and similar premises throughout Glasgow city centre and elsewhere. Therefore this technique could be utilised by the industry or licensing boards to monitor disorder risk within the night-time economy. For example, such internal checks could easily be made a part of the monitoring and assessment procedures already in use by chain pubs. From the staff interviews conducted in this project, it would appear that, at present these 'mystery customers' or 'mystery shoppers' focus upon customer service and staff efficiency rather than social responsibility or disorder minimisation techniques. We would advise that more components with an emphasis on these issues be included in such programmes.

Similarly checks for disorder risk could also be performed by external agencies. For example, the proposed Liquor Licensing Standard Officers (LLSOs, see Nicholson Committee, 2002) or others, with suitable experience and appropriate powers to act as the 'eyes and ears' of the licensing board or other authority. Such agencies could use the techniques of this research to help to enforce responsible alcohol marketing and service in licensed premises. Such initiatives are recommended as being particularly desirable as they are in effect both preventative against disorder and will help to improve standards of service more generally.

- **Changes in the way that licensed premises are marketed.** Many of the pubs in this research, particularly those in newer branded chains, appeared to promote irresponsible consumption of alcohol, either by competitive pricing or more often by sophisticated drinks party marketing. Measures aimed to increase the price of alcohol may have some impact upon the consumption levels of some drinkers (e.g. the 'less affluent'), but the larger pubs would appear to be more able to withstand (i.e. find loopholes to circumvent) such legislation (many promotions actually encouraged the conspicuous consumption of relatively expensive branded drinks). Also price increases would have to extend to off-sales, so as to prevent displacement of the problem and 'pre-loading'. A better approach to this problem may be a return to marketing the pub as a social venue, as opposed to a drinking venue, rather than ineffectual (and discriminatory) pricing measures.
- **Change in public attitudes towards alcohol-related disorder.** At present participants in the night time economy are too tolerant of disorder. Why should it be the case that, as Hobbs, 2002 states, "The acceptance amongst denizens of the night-time economy of levels of violence unparalleled outside of military and penal institutions is astounding". This is the most difficult, yet the most fundamental, of all possible strategies with the objective of reducing alcohol-related problems associated with licensed premises. It may be the case that some of these problems are so culturally ingrained in the West of Scotland that they will be difficult to remove completely through 'knee-jerk' legislation or even long term education. However, there can be little doubt that creating safer drinking environments within licensed premises, in which *any* disorderly behaviour is not tolerated, would be a positive step towards this achieving this goal.

References

Academy of Medical Sciences (2004). *Calling Time: the nation's drinking as a major health issue*. London: The Academy of Medical Sciences.

Alcohol Focus Scotland (2001). *The ServeWise Handbook: On-license handbook 4th edition*. Glasgow: ServeWise, Alcohol Focus Scotland.

Alcohol Information Scotland (2004). <http://www.alcoholinformation.isdscotland.org>.

Allen J, Nicholas S, Salisbury H and Wood M (2003). Nature of burglary, vehicle and violent crime. In Flood-Page C and Taylor J (Eds.) *Crime in England and Wales 2001/2002: Supplementary Volume*. Home Office Statistical Bulletin 01 / 03. London: Home Office.

BBC Television (2004). *Booze Business*. The Money Programme, October 27th and November 3rd.

Block RL and Block CR (1995). Space, place, and crime: Hot spot areas and hot places of liquor-related crime. In: Eck JE and Weisburd D (Eds.) *Crime and Place*, 145-184. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press; and Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Bowers S (2004a). Blair to call time on cut price drinks promotions. *The Guardian*, May 20th.

Bowers S (2004b). Drink deals 'not as cheap as they seem'. *The Guardian*, May 21st.

Bowers S (2004c). Anti-binge campaign will hurt profits, say Wetherspoons. *The Guardian*, June 14th.

Bright M and Hinsliff G (2004). Britain a nation in 'grip of drink crisis'. *The Observer*, November 21st.

Briscoe S and Donnelly N (2001). *Assaults on licensed premises in inner-urban areas*. Sydney: New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.

Brown A, Young D and Duncan G (2001). *The economic costs of alcohol misuse in the Lanarkshire Health Board area 1999*. Glasgow: Greater Glasgow NHS Board.

Brown C (2004). Call for last orders on happy hour drinks. *The Scotsman*, September 18th.

Buffum J & Moser C (1986). MDMA and Human Sexual Function. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*, 18:355-359.

Cabinet Office Strategy Unit Alcohol Project (2003) Interim Analytical Report
http://www.pm.gov.uk/files/pdf/interim_report.pdf

Carter H (2004). The city that parties too hard for some. *The Guardian*, September 11th.

Caswell S, Zhang JF and Wyllie A (1993). The importance of amount and location of drinking for the experience of alcohol related harms. *Addiction*, 88(11):1519-1526.

Cohen S (1972). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics: The creation of the mods and rockers*. London: McGibbon & Kee.

Collin M with Godfrey J (1997). *Altered state: The Story of Ecstasy Culture and Acid House*. London: Serpent's Tail.

Cracknell D (2004). Police fail to use powers to tackle binge drinking. *The Times*, Political Editor, October 17th.

Economist, the. (1993) Ecstasy: Market update, 38, November 13th.

Engineer R, Phillips A, Thompson J and Nicholls J (2003) *Drunk and disorderly: A qualitative study of binge drinking among 18 to 24 years olds*. Home Office Research Study No. 262. London: Home Office.

English S (2004). Alcohol deaths double in a decade doctor says. *The Times*, June 23rd.

Finney A (2004) *Violence in the night-time economy: key findings from the research*. Home Office Findings 214. London: Home Office.

Finnigan F, Hammersley R and Millar K (1999). The effects of meal composition on blood alcohol, psychomotor performance and subjective state. *Appetite*, 31:361-375.

Flood S (2004). Hospital calls time on drink-related injuries. *The Guardian*, December 1st.

Ford R (2005). Women pay new price for binge drinks. *The Times*, January 14th.

Forsyth AJM (2001). A Design for Strife: Alcopops - Licit drug, familiar scare story. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 12:59-80.

Graham K (1999). *Safer Bars: Assessing and Reducing Risks of Violence*. Toronto: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health

Graham K (2000). *Safer Bars: Training Manual for Observers on the Safer Bars Study*. Toronto: Centre for Addiction and Mental Health

Graham K and Homel R (1997). Creating safer bars. In Plant M, Single E, and Stockwell T. *Alcohol: Minimising the harm – what works?* London: Free Association Books.

Graham K, LaRoque L, Yetman R, Ross TJ and Guistra E (1980). Aggression and barroom environments. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 41:277-292.

Graham K, Leonard KE, Room R, Wild TC, Pihl RO, Bois C and Single E (1998). Current directions in research on understanding and preventing intoxicated aggression. *Addiction*, 93(5):659-676.

Graham K, and Wells S (2003). ‘Somebody’s gonna get their head kicked in tonight’: Aggression among young males in bars – a question of values. *British Journal of Criminology*, 43:546-566.

Graham K, West P and Wells S (2000). Evaluating theories of alcohol-related aggression in bars. *Addiction*, 95(6):847-864.

Graham K, Jelley J and Purcell J (2005) Training bar staff in prevention and managing aggression in licensed premises. *Journal of Substance Use*, 10(1):48-61.

Graves TD, Graves NB, Semu VN and Sam IA (1981). The social context of drinking and violence in New Zealand's multi-ethnic pub settings. In Harford TC and Gaines L.S (Eds.), Research Monograph No. 7, *Social Drinking Contexts*. Rockville, MD: NIAAA.

Henderson S (1993). Fun, Fashion and Frisson. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 4:14-16.

Henderson S (1996). ‘E’ types and dance divas: Gender research and community prevention. In Rhodes T & Hartnoll R (Eds.) *AIDS Drugs and Prevention: Perspectives on individual and community action*, 66-85, London: Routledge.

Henley Centre, the (1993). *Leisure Futures*. (London, The Henley Centre).

Hetherington P (2004). Time to be called on happy hours. *The Guardian*, Regional Affairs Editor, July 10th.

Hinsliff G (2004). Bingeing women fuel crime: Blunkett warns of soaring violence as alcohol culture spirals out of control. *The Observer*, Chief Political Correspondent, July 18th.

Hobbs D (2003). *The Night-Time Economy*. Alcohol Concern Research Forum Papers, September.

Hobbs D, Hadfield P, Lister S and Winlow S (2002). ‘Door Lore’: The Art and Economics of Intimidation. *British Journal of Criminology*, 42:352–370.

Hollands RG (1995). *Friday Night, Saturday Night: Youth cultural identification in the post-industrial city*, Department of Social Policy Working Paper No.2. Newcastle: University of Newcastle.

Hollands RG (2000). 'Lager louts, tarts, hooligans': The criminalization of young adults in Newcastle nightlife. In Jupp V, Davies P & Francis, P. (Eds.) *Doing Criminological Research*, 193-214 London: Sage.

Hommel R, Burrows T, Gross J, Herd B, Ramsden T and Teague R (1999). *Preventing Violence - A review of the literature on violence and violence prevention*. A report prepared for the Crime Prevention Division of the New South Wales Attorney General's Department. Queensland: Griffiths University.

Hommel R and Clark J (1994). The prediction and prevention of violence in pubs and clubs. *Crime Prevention Studies*, 3:1-46.

Hope T (1986). Liquor licensing and crime prevention. Home Office Research Bulletin Number 20. London: Home Office.

Houchin R (2005) *Social Exclusion and Imprisonment in Scotland: A Report*. Report to Scottish Prison Service. Glasgow Centre for the Study of Violence. Glasgow: Glasgow Caledonian University

Hutchinson IL, Magennis P Shepherd JP and Brown AE (1998). The BAOMS United Kingdom survey of facial injuries part 1: aetiology and the association with alcohol consumption. *British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery*, 36:3-13.

Howard League for Penal Reform (2004). *A Sobering Thought*. (London, Howard League).

International Center for Alcohol Policies (2002). *Violence and Licensed Premises*, ICAP Reports 12. Washington: International Center for Alcohol Policies.

Iredale W (2004). Binge drinking increase crime. *The Times*, July 18th.

Jenkins S (2005). Get plastered not stoned: The Government hopes that longer pub opening hours will help it to regain lost taxes. *The Times*, January 14th.

Jolly M (2004) Pubs Gone Wild. *New York Times*, September 5th.

Leonard KE, Collins RL and Quigley BM (2003). Alcohol consumption and the occurrence and severity of aggression: An event-based analysis of male to male barroom violence. *Aggressive Behavior*, 29:346-365.

Lister S, Hobbs D, Hall S and Winlow S (2000). Violence in the night-time economy; Bouncers: the reporting, recording and prosecution of assaults. *Policing and Society*, 10(4):383-402.

Luke LC, Dewar C, Bailey M, McGreevy D, Morris H & Burdett-Smith P (2002). A little nightclub medicine: The healthcare implications of clubbing. *Emergency medicine Journal*, 19(6):542–545.

MacCallum H, Morrison A, Stone DH and Murray KJ (2000) Non-fatal head injury among Scottish young people: the importance of assault. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, January;54:77-78

MacLeod M (2004). Scots scrape barrel with binge drinking. *Scotland on Sunday*, Political Correspondent, July 4th.

McRobbie A (2004). Free to vomit in the gutter: The forces that are shaping young women's attitudes to sex and drink mark a corrosion of feminist values. *The Guardian*, June 7th.

Maguire M and Nettleton H (2003). *Reducing alcohol-related violence and disorder: An evaluation of the 'TASC' project*. Home Office Research Study 265. London: Home Office.

Marsh P and Kibby KF (1993). *Drinking and Public Disorder*, A report of research conducted by MCM Research for the Portman Group. London: Portman Group.

Martin L (2004). Binge-drink culture 'costs the country £1bn a year'. *The Observer*, Scotland Editor. June 20th.

Measham F (2004). The decline of ecstasy, the rise of 'binge' drinking and the persistence of pleasure. *Probation Journal: The Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 51(4):309 - 326.

MORI (2001). *Alcohol and Society*. London: Portman Group.

Morris N (2004). Blitz planned on drunken violence in town centres. *The Independent*, Home Affairs Correspondent, June 29th.

Moore D (1990). Drinking, the construction of ethnic identity and social process in a Western Australia youth subculture. *British Journal of Addiction*, 85(10):1265-1279.

Muspratt C (2004). Small brewers say pub choice is being swallowed. *Telegraph*, September 9th.

Neligan, M (2003). Brewers bow out of the pub. *BBC News Online*, October 6th.

Newcombe R (1991). *Monitoring and Surveillance of Quadrant Park Night-club, Derby Rd. Bootle, Merseyside*. Report to Spencer Leisure, Liverpool. Liverpool: 3D Research Bureau.

Newcombe R (1992). A Researcher Reports from the Rave. *Druglink*, 7(1):14-6.

Nicholson Committee (2002) *Review of Liquor Licensing Law in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Quigley BM, Leonard K and Collins L (2003). Characteristics of Violent Bars and Bar Patrons. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 64(6):765-772.

Parks KA (1999). Women's bar-related victimization: refining and testing a conceptual model. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 25(5):349-364.

Plant M (1981). *Drugs in perspective*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Portman Group (2002). *Code of Practice: on the naming, packing and promotion of alcoholic drinks*, 3rd Edition. London: Portman Group.

Purves L (2004). It's unhappy hour in our cities' hangover factories: No one would take their granny out to dinner these days, not with the clientele of the Lout & Lapdancer likely to lurch in. *The Times*, June 8th.

Raistrick D, Hodgson R and Ritson B (Eds.) (1999). Intoxication in Social and Environmental Contexts. In *Tackling Alcohol Together*, 65-77. London: Free Association Books.

Ramsay M (1982). *City Centre Crime: the scope for situational prevention*. Research and Planning Unit, Paper 10. London: Home Office.

Rayner J (2004). On the streets of binge Britain. *The Observer*, September 5th.

Richardson A and Budd T (2003). *Alcohol, Crime and Disorder: A study of young adults*. Home Office Research Study 263. London: Home Office.

Robertson G, Gibb R and Pearson R (1995). Drunkenness among police detainees. *Addiction*, 90(6):793-803.

St.John-Brooks K and Winstanley K (1998). *Keeping the Peace: A guide to the prevention of alcohol related disorder*, produced by Working Solutions for the Portman Group. London: Portman Group.

Scott MS (2002). *Assaults in and around bars*, COPS Problem-orientated Guides for Police Series No.1. Washington: US Department of Justice.

Scottish Executive (1999). *Plan for Action on Alcohol Problems*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.

Shepherd J and Brickley M (1996). The relationship between alcohol intoxication, stressors and injury in urban violence. *British Journal of Criminology*, 36:546–566.

Smith, K and Robertson A (2003). 295 pubs and clubs in a square half-mile: No wonder police find it hard to keep control. *Evening Times*, April 23rd.

Stevenson R (2004). Wetherspoons woes point to hangovers for other pub operators: Chronic over-capacity and price cuts bring more problems than just binge drinking. *The Independent*, July 14th.

Stockwell T, Somerford P and Lang E (1992). The relationship between license type and alcohol-related problems attributed to licensed premises in Perth, Western Australia. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 53:495-498.

Stockwell T, Lang E and Rydon P (1993). High risk drinking settings: The association of serving and promotional practices with harmful drinking. *Addiction*, 88(11):1519-1526.

Tierney J and Hobbs D (2003). *Alcohol-related crime and disorder data: Guidance for local partnerships*, Online Report 08/03. London: Home Office.

Times, the (2004). G & Ts and A & Es shouldn't mix. *Health*. August 31st.

Times, the (2005). Relaxed pub laws have bred, savages judge says. January 11th.

Tomsen S (1997). A Top Night Out: Social protest, masculinity and the culture of drinking violence. *British Journal of Criminology*, 37:90–102.

Travis A (2004). Police blame 11% rise in violent crime on drink and low level thuggery. *The Guardian*, Home Affairs Editor, December 1st.

Winterman D (2005) Whetting the appetite: Licensing laws will soon be relaxed prompting fears about increased binge drinking, but is alcohol to blame or is it a matter of taste? *BBC New Magazine*, Lead Story, January 19th.

Wright J and Kariya A (1997). Aetiology of assault with respect to alcohol, unemployment and social deprivation: a Scottish accident and emergency department case-control study. *Injury*, June-July;28(5-6):369-72.

Young R (2004). Wine and women drinkers may spell the end of the British pub habit. *The Times*, October 6th.

Zinberg NE (1984). *Drug Set and Setting: The Basis for Controlled Intoxicant Use*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.