

Assessing the relationships between late night drinks marketing and alcohol-related disorder in public space

Dr Alasdair J. M. Forsyth
Senior Research Fellow
The Glasgow Centre for the Study of Violence
Glasgow Caledonian University

October 2006

Acknowledgements

The author of this report would like to thank the following groups and individuals for their assistance and support during this research. Firstly thanks are due to the project's godparent, Professor Dick Hobbs (London School of Economics) and monitoring group, which comprised Linda Bowie and Mary Elmers (both Alcohol Focus Scotland), Dr Frances Finnegan (Glasgow Caledonian University) Inspector John Duffy, Inspector Gavin Smith and Sergeant Dean Barlas (all Strathclyde Police), Dr Martin Cloonan (University of Glasgow), Professor Patrick West (Medical Research Council), Alex Meikle (Chief Executive of the Glasgow Council on Alcohol), Nikki Boyle and Jo Murray (both NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde) and to the four field observers Andy Boyd, Jemma Lennox, Kathryn O'Neil and Thomas Woods (all Glasgow Caledonian University) without whose hard work and patience this report would not have been possible. Thanks also to David Bell and Catherine McGuinness (both Glasgow Caledonian University) for admin support, to Elaine Burton and Piers Williams for transcription, to Professor Vince Egan, Roger Houchin and Professor Jim McManus (all Glasgow Caledonian University), for their expert ratings, and to Dr Josie Galloway, Shaun Longmuir, Gerrad McAdam, Dr David Shewan and Gabby Vojt (all Glasgow Caledonian University) for their assistance with interviewee recruitment. 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 her research instruments. Finally, thanks are due to all those anonymous patrons of Glasgow's night-time economy who participated in the research.

Contents

	Page
Introduction	
<i>Background</i>	4
<i>Aims</i>	7
Methods	
<i>Research design</i>	10
<i>Procedure</i>	12
Results	
<i>Typology of nightclubs and their clientele</i>	19
<i>Patrons' behaviour and alcohol consumption</i>	25
<i>Disorder risk</i>	32
<i>Aggressive Incidents</i>	34
<i>Comparisons with previous research</i>	46
<i>Interviews with patrons</i>	50
<i>Glassware ban</i>	72
<i>Smoking ban</i>	81
<i>Street disorder</i>	91
Conclusions	
<i>Discussion</i>	98
<i>Key Implications and Recommendations</i>	113
Bibliography	
<i>References</i>	119
<i>Outputs to date</i>	125

Background

Introduction

In recent years there has been growing concern voiced about an apparent rise in alcohol-related public disorder or 'binge drinking' within the weekend night-time economy in the UK (e.g. Bright & Hinsliff, 2004; Iredale, 2004; Travis 2004; *The Times*, 2005). The problems associated with excessive alcohol consumption in public space have become unusually high profile in recent times. This is highlighted by the popularity of TV shows such as the BBC 'fly-on-the-wall' documentary series *Drunk and dangerous*, broadcast in early 2004 or the Bravo satellite TV channel series *Booze Britain*, broadcast twice daily later that year and *Booze Britain II: Binge Nation* the year after. Such behaviours have even been receiving publicity in an apparently perplexed foreign media (e.g. Altaner & Monaghan, 2004; Bamber, 2005; Jolly, 2004) and to the extent that Prime Minister Tony Blair has described this pattern of behaviour as "the new sort of British disease" (Morris, 2004).

Whether such concerns are fully justified, as opposed to say those concerning off-trade private consumption of alcohol or the on-trade drinking patterns of past decades, this perception has resulted in a number of high profile policy initiatives aimed at reducing problems associated with licensed premises (e.g. House of Commons, 2005; Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, 2003; Scottish Executive, 2002; Scottish Parliament, 2005) though it should also be stated that these measures have been drawn up somewhat incongruously against a background of continuous licensing 'liberalisation', in particular, a trend towards the 24-hour availability of alcohol (e.g. see Measham, 2006; Plant & Plant, 2005).

A number of factors have been proposed as being at the root cause of this contradictory legislative situation. These have included:

- New trends in alcohol marketing activities, such as cheaper on-trade alcohol, e.g. 'happy hours' or 'two 4 one' offers (Bowers, 2004; Brown, 2004; Hetherington, 2004; Purves, 2004), new product development, e.g. 'alcopops' or 'shots', or the re-branding / re-packaging of existing

products, e.g. 'premium lagers' or wine (BBC2 Television 2004; Measham & Brain, 2005; Rayner, 2004; Young, 2004) and orchestrated, often themed, drinks party entertainments at new purpose built or re-branded pub / nightclub 'hybrid' or 'chameleon' premises (Chatterton & Hollands, 2003; Forsyth et al, 2005; Hobbs et al, 2003).

- Changing social trends brought about by the impact of the rave ('dance drug' scene) of the late 1980s to mid-late 1990s. The advent of this era, dubbed the 'decade of dance' (Measham, 2004), may at the same time have artificially lowered a cohort of (then) young people's public drinking levels (Henley Centre, 1993; Jenkins, 2005), perhaps exaggerating the impression these are increasing today, whilst simultaneously creating the very conditions in which the present night-time economy could evolve (BBC2 Television, 2004; Collin, 1997; Hobbs et al, 2003). This resulted in large-scale overtly alcohol-orientated dance venues with extended licenses in redundant retail or commercial space in city centres created (and tolerated) as a foil to the alternative of out-of-town 'unlicensed' dance venues where ecstasy rather than alcohol would be consumed.
- A rise in the number of participants in the night-time economy, especially an increasing number of female bar drinkers, e.g. 'ladettes', (Ford, 2005; Hinsliff, 2004; McRobbie, 2004; Plant & Plant, 2001; *The Times* Health, 2004). The feminisation of the barroom environment is thought to be linked to both the new marketing activities and the impact of the now diminishing rave scene detailed above, combining to create a less male-orientated on-trade drinking environment, resulting in the demise of the traditional pub in British city centres (Chatterton & Hollands, 2003; Henderson, 1996; BBC2 Television, 2004). This has in turn been linked to increasing alcohol problems amongst women (BBC3 Television, 2006; Gray, 2006, Harrell & Howie, 2006; Plant et al, 2005; Patterson, 2006; Taylor-Whiffen, 2006).

At present these trends and the perceived problems which surround them show no sign of abating. Indeed, with the seemingly inevitable 'advance' towards '24-hour drinking' across the UK, these issues and their adverse consequences are likely to become increasingly salient in the near future, particularly in regard to late night drinking.

Despite the above concerns about 'binge' drinking and the continuing presence of much better understood and more established alcohol-related disorder problems (e.g. see Academy of Medical Sciences, 2004; Engineer et al, 2003; Finney, 2004) there has been surprisingly little research work conducted in the UK examining the issues surrounding disorder associated with licensed premises. The research that has been conducted to date has mainly focused on official statistics or data collected from offenders or victims of violence (e.g. Deehan et al, 2002; Maguire & Nettleton, 2003; Marsh & Kibby, 1993; Richardson & Budd, 2003; Shepherd & Brickley, 1996). The drawbacks of such research include that it relies on self-reports, either to the researcher or to the authorities, which, under-reporting aside, may be influenced by respondents' own alcohol consumption and that it takes place after the event in an 'unnatural' setting such as in custody, A & E wards, alcohol treatment or a university lab.

In contrast to the UK, elsewhere much work has been undertaken within or focusing upon the barroom environment to examine and help explain alcohol-related disorder. This includes research conducted in Australia (e.g. Homel & Clark, 1994), in New Zealand (e.g. Graves et al 1981), in the USA (e.g. Quigley et al 2003) and particularly in Canada by Kathryn Graham and various colleagues (e.g. Graham et al, 1980). Such authors have made assessments of barrooms' risk for disorder and supplemented their observations by interviewing staff or patrons from the premises concerned. This body of research has been useful in informing academics and the appropriate authorities on how to formulate policies designed to reduce alcohol problems in public space by identifying barroom features that predict or prevent disorder (see also Green & Plant, 2006)

The first study of this nature to be conducted in the UK was carried out by the author of this report for Greater Glasgow NHS Board (Forsyth et al, 2005). This previous research involved trained observers assessing the factors which may influence disorder risk, and witnessing actual violence, within the naturalistic setting of city centre licensed premises holding a Public House Licence (pubs). The study focused on bar server practices and to this end was supplemented by interviews with staff members from each of the eight pubs observed. The research made use of internationally validated instruments, drawn up by Kathryn Graham from her research of this nature conducted in Canada, that are designed to assess a barroom's disorder risk with the aim of creating safer bars (Graham, 1999). The current project aims to build upon this previous work and in doing so inform alcohol-related violence reduction policies in the UK.

Aims

This research takes the barroom participant observation method into the UK nightclub sector, that is late night (post-midnight) drinking venues. This is a sector of the night-time economy where alcohol-related disorder is already evident (e.g. Lister et al, 2000; Hadfield, 2006) and where such problems seem likely to become more salient with the current trend towards later licensing. In doing so it is intended to develop the observational method in order to advance its usefulness as part of a disorder risk tool kit for appropriate agencies such as the police, licensing boards, researchers and the drinks industry itself, indeed to all those with a vested interest in reducing alcohol-related harm.

The previous (pub) study found a relatively low level of disorder within Glasgow pubs (14 aggressive incidents from 100 hours observation, in a sample of eight pubs which included the two with the most recorded crime in the city centre) (Forsyth et al, 1995). The current study will compare this assessment with a similar sample located in the same geographical area but in the late night sector. Despite this lack of observed disorder occurring *within* pubs, very high levels of risky drinking behaviour were observed and it was hypothesised that the consequences of this behaviour might be felt elsewhere, such as in nightclubs where many pub patrons appeared to gravitate to, or on the surrounding streets

after closing time. Indeed these drinkers' behaviour was more disorderly and aggressive on the surrounding streets after the pubs had closed than it was inside the premises themselves (though not formally recorded, 20 aggressive incidents were witnessed as the observation teams made their way home).

In line with research conducted elsewhere (e.g. Briscoe & Donnelly, 2001; Lister et al, 2000) data obtained from the local (Strathclyde) police during pub study indicated that there were two peak times for city centre disorder, one at midnight (when the pubs come out) the other at 3.00 AM (when the nightclubs close). As well as detailing those seen within the licensed premises observed, this project aims to also observe and formally record any aggressive incidents witnessed on the surrounding streets, public transport, fast-food shops and other city centre locations, both while waiting to gain entry to the nightclubs and when exiting the city centre after closing time.

As with the previous (pub) study the findings of this research are compared with recorded crime and incidents of disorder statistics collated by the local Strathclyde Police. Unlike the previous study which was supplemented by interviews with serving staff, this research interviewed nightclub clientele. These interviews were undertaken to give the patrons a voice, asking why they go clubbing, its attractions, hazards and what could be done to improve city centres late at night. This phase of the research also aimed to uncover the overall drinking patterns of participants in the night-time economy, taking account of factors such as 'binge drinking', off-trade 'pre-loading' and 'after-parties'.

Finally, as well as a more general assessment of the levels of alcohol-related disorder and risk in the late night drinks market, this report will also attempt to answer some more specific questions raised by previous research conducted in the UK and elsewhere, including:

- The relationship between age and disorder (assuming that younger people are more likely to attend late night venues).
- Shed more light on the apparent 'gender equality' in aggressive behaviour found in the earlier Glasgow pub study.

- Investigate the role of stewarding (security staff, door supervisors or 'bouncers') in premises with distinct door polices and entry fees.
- Examine how music, dancing and other entertainments may impact on levels of disorder risk.
- Describe the promotional techniques used in this sector, in particular how alcohol is marketed late at night.

Additionally the research described in this report took place during a window of opportunity in Glasgow city centre. With the extension of licensing hours in England from November 2005 there is clearly a need for research into late night alcohol-related disorder research. At the same time, the impact of any proposed anti-smoking legislation within licensed premises needs to be assessed. In Scotland, licensing hours have traditionally been longer than elsewhere in the UK, and at 6.00 AM on Sunday 27th March 2006 smoking was banned from all public places throughout this country. This legislation was particularly problematic for nightclubs operators, as unlike say pubs, patrons would not always be free to 'nip outside for a smoke'. The impact of this legislation, and how it is enforced, in late night drinking venues is addressed by this report, with half of observations being conducted before 'the ban', half afterwards.

Finally, the timing of the research was also of interest because on the 2nd of February 2006 a Glasgow City Council bye-law was introduced banning glassware from all venues holding an Entertainment Licence within in the city centre, including nightclubs. This move was implemented as part of a range of measures aimed at reducing violence in the city's night-time economy, others include restrictions on alcohol promotions (a 'happy hours' ban), improved transport services (including a 'nite-zone'), the encouragement of safer premises schemes (e.g. 'Best Bar None' awards) and social marketing to encourage sensible drinking (GCCAAG, 2006). The glassware policy aimed at the phased elimination of glass, other than toughened or tempered glass (with an aim of achieving 80% plastic or aluminium during 2006), the sole exception being champagne / wine glasses, for which individual premises could apply for an exemption. The removal of glassware from licensed premises is seen as an important step to enhancing community safety by reducing the severity of both

alcohol-related accidents and assaults, particularly if all glass is removed since toughened glass can also be injurious (Warburton & Shepherd, 2000)

Methods

Sample selection

The main research methods used in this project were participant observation and in-depth interview. In the first instance this involved the recruitment of two teams, each of two field-workers, who were trained to conduct structured observations in nightclubs. These field observations were supplemented by face-to-face interviews with nightclub patrons conducted by the author of this report. However, before field observations could begin, care was taken to select a suitable sample of premises for the research.

There are approximately 70 venues holding an entertainment licence (up to 3.00 AM drinking time) in the City of Glasgow, the bulk of which are nightclubs located in the city centre. These nightclubs have a capacity of around 45,000 and the local police estimate that around 70,000 revellers are on the streets of the city centre shortly after 3.00 AM at the weekends (GCCAAG, 2006). These venues and their patrons are very heterogeneous and it would not be possible to cover all types of nightclub in a project of this scale (see Purcell & Graham, 2005, for a nightclub typology). The present project focused on eight premises, making it comparable with the previous (health board funded) pub study (Forsyth et al, 2005). The eight nightclubs to be observed were selected in consultation with the project's monitoring group as follows:

- From maps provided by Strathclyde Police, two geographical clusters of street disorder (from recorded crimes and call-outs to incidents) associated with concentrations nightclubs were identified. These were located one at either end of the city centre relative to the university and are hereafter referred to as clusters 1 and 2. It was decided to select four nightclubs from each cluster so that each observer team was operating in a different part of the city during every observational session.

- To ensure that each observer team witnessed the same nightclub environment, premises that held one off promotions (i.e. ticketed events) were excluded. It was also felt that such venues may be more likely to attract 'dance drug' users than dedicated alcohol drinkers.
- The monitoring group felt that to ensure a degree of comparability between nightclubs, premises serving niche markets should also be excluded. This meant no live music clubs, Goth / rock clubs, Gay clubs, salsa / Latin clubs, ceilidh clubs, private members' clubs, lap-dancing / strip clubs and other non-dancing clubs (e.g. comedy clubs) were eligible, leaving only mainstream 'high street' alcohol-orientated dancing nightclubs.
- To ensure observers' anonymity nightclubs which they frequented or where persons known to them were employed were excluded ($n = 3$).
- These exclusions reduced the total number of eligible premises to 16. At this point Strathclyde police provided data on recorded crimes of disorder and call-outs to incidents of disorder at these 16 nightclubs for the whole of the calendar year 2005 (see Table 1, below). However, it then became apparent that four of these premises had not been trading for that full calendar year. Although it might have been interesting to include one such 'newly opened' venue, after e-mail discussion with the monitoring group it was decided to exclude these nightclubs.
- In order to ensure that observers always walked an equal distance back to the university after exiting a nightclub, spending an equivalent time observing the street on each occasion, two premises relatively nearer to the university than the others were excluded.
- Finally, following a discussion with Level 1 Criminology students at the university, the author was informed that one nightclub in the city, which was still in the remaining ten, was 'dead' and few people 'went there

anymore'. After the 'pilot' experience (see below) of observing in a near empty nightclub, it was decided to eliminate this venue. (Which was fortunate as it actually ceased trading before the end of the project). As this nightclub had the second lowest number of police crimes and incidents of the 16 known ($n = 42$) - perhaps because so few patrons went there - it was decided to balance the selection process by also excluding the nightclub with the second highest police figures ($n = 184$).

The above procedure produced the sample of eight nightclubs to be observed, each of which was given an appropriate pseudonym for use in this report. As is shown in Table 1, these eight premises represent a broad range of levels of disorder known to the police and a variety of ownership. Further differences between these premises will be reported in the Results section.

Table 1: Selected Nightclubs

Venue	Nightclub associated disorder 'hotspot'	Crimes of Disorder recorded by Police	Incidents of Disorder reported to Police	Total No. of Crimes and Incidents of Disorder	Ownership
Xanadu	Cluster 2	102	93	195	Independent
Armageddon	Cluster 1	76	76	152	UK Chain
Rapture	Cluster 2	35	77	112	Independent
Tropicana	Cluster 2	72	35	107	UK Chain
Chocolate	Cluster 1	48	46	94	Local Chain
Idols	Cluster 1	42	39	81	Local Chain
Sinatra's	Cluster 2	25	51	76	UK Chain
Saturn	Cluster 1	0	6	6	Independent

Procedure

Two teams of two observers, (hereafter referred to as Teams A and B) each consisting of one male and one female, were recruited. Mixed gender teams are preferred as this is the combination most likely to ensure access and to 'blend in' to the nightclub environment, thus maximising both the team's level of personal safety and ability to observe by minimising their chances of receiving unwanted attentions by 'table-hoppers' or others who might compromise the research (e.g. people 'pulling'). 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 from the post-graduate MSc Forensic Psychology students at Glasgow Caledonian University. Unfortunately there were only two male students on that course, one of whom lived too far away from Glasgow. A second male observer was recruited from the university's marketing department as it was felt that some marketing knowledge would be beneficial to the research team. His 'partner' in Team B is an experienced bar server. The other female observer is an experienced nightclub worker and her partner in Team A is also a successful pub / nightclub performer. The four observers were trained in barroom observation techniques by the author using the *Safer Bars: Training Manual for Observers on the Safer Bars Study* (Graham, 2000). This was also provided for this purpose by Professor Graham for use in the previous 'pub study', (see Forsyth 2005) and which once again also to be proved an invaluable resource for familiarising observers with the research instruments, issues, ethics, other procedures and for the project's management.

The observers visited each of the selected nightclubs twice in the course of the research during which they made unobtrusive observations of alcohol marketing practices and patrons' behaviours. Each observation session took place at the weekend and effectively began within each nightclub at midnight (they were employed from 11.30PM to allow for queuing time before entering) and ended at 3.00 AM (allowing for 'drinking up time'). Unlike the previous health board funded pub study (Forsyth et al, 2005) formal observations began before entry and continued after exiting each nightclub until 3.30 AM (by which time the teams should have left the city centre) in order to detail any aggressive incidents witnessed outside (see below), thus making the length of each observational session a total of four hours in duration.

On concluding fieldwork, every observer completed detailed checklists of what they had seen. There were three such checklists, hereafter referred to as Forms 1, 2 and 3. The first of these, Form 1, recorded what they had seen during each observation session, including items relating to the nightclub environment (e.g. crowdedness, décor), drinks marketing (promotions, entertainments), staff practices (e.g. security, bar service) and patrons' behaviour (e.g. drunkenness,

sexual activity). Form 2 recorded details of any aggressive incidents witnessed, including who was involved (e.g. age, gender), was it related to any nightclub features and how staff handled the situation. Both of these instruments were adapted from those used in the previous health board funded study (Forsyth et al, 1995) and were provided by professor Kathryn Graham of University of Western Ontario, London (see Graham, 1999). Finally, Form 3 was essentially the same instrument as Form 2 but adapted to record aggressive incidents witnessed outside the nightclubs. This third form was introduced after observers in the previous (pub) study had witnessed more such incidents while walking home through the city centre than they had formally recorded within the pubs which they were observing.

As well as observers' scores, made on the night that they witnessed any aggressive incidents, their descriptions on every Form 2 and Form 3 were also rated for 'severity' by three independent experts. The three expert raters were Professor Jim McManus (chair of the Parole Board for Scotland and a board member of the Risk Management Authority), Professor Vince Egan (director of post-graduate clinical psychology at Glasgow Caledonian University and a former NHS clinical psychologist in a regional secure unit) and Roger Houchin (director of the Glasgow Centre for the Study of Violence and a former prison governor). Each aggressive incident was rated, exclusively, as either 'ambiguous intent' (i.e. may not have been an intentionally aggressive act, only interpreted as such), 'non-physical' (i.e. *only* involving verbal aggression) or 'physical' (i.e. an actual assault or fight). This latter category was divided into a fourth subcategory; 'severe' physical (potentially requiring medical treatment). This independently rated four-point classification of aggressive incident severity was also used in the 'pub study' (Forsyth et al, 2005) and is again derived from previous work by Kathryn Graham in Canada (Graham et al, 2000).

During fieldwork, although remaining in contact with each other throughout each observational session, individual observers and teams operated independently, they did not 'compare notes' or otherwise discuss or try to make sense of incidents until after they had formally recorded their observations on Forms 1, 2 and 3. The final stage of the observational process involved a meeting with the

author of this report at the university on the Monday morning following the observations, when the research team was able to discuss what they had seen and any difficulties encountered during the previous weekend's fieldwork.

Before embarking on the main observational phase of the project, a pilot observation session was undertaken in a Glasgow city centre nightclub. This nightclub was a mainstream venue, part of a national chain, similar to those selected for the final sample, but located away from the police hot-spots for disorder (see above) and, as such, ineligible for inclusion in the research. In the event the nightclub observed in the pilot night was very 'quiet' (at times there were less than 20 people around the dancefloor area), though this gave the observers time and space to effectively conduct a 'dry run' of the methodology (developing research-tools, communications, timing, observing, recording and other logistical practicalities) and their suitability for the job before collecting any 'real' data. Two aggressive incidents were observed, both on the surrounding streets, one before and one after entering the nightclub observed.

The pilot night involved all four observers and the author of this report. As such it also acted as reconnaissance exercise for the project as whole helping the research team to familiarise themselves with the drinking culture in the type of venues selected. This was useful in assisting the observers to be able to blend in to such drinking environments, for example ensuring that they were able to gain access to all the nightclubs without falling foul of any door policy or dress code. A small sum was provided so that observers could obtain the correct clothing and accessories to achieve this. This also helped observers to remain unobtrusive and, also to this end, observers were also permitted to purchase one alcoholic and one non-alcoholic drink, each, to 'nurse' throughout each session.

The pilot was conducted on Friday 10th February 2006 one week after the glassware ban was implemented (see *Background*). Formal observations then began on Friday 24th February. These were divided into two sweeps of data collection, during which observers visited each nightclub once before and once after the smoking ban. The first sweep of observations ceased on Saturday 25th March, the night of (i.e. immediately before) the smoking ban was implemented.

Observations resumed on Friday 21st of April before finishing on Saturday 27th May. These observations were all carried out and completed without any difficulty or disruptions to the schedule (despite observers being present on a night when several thousand clubbers were left stranded in the city overnight owing to a heavy snowfall).

Surprisingly the recruitment of nightclub patrons for interview proved more problematic. Initially it had been decided to recruit interviewees directly from the eight nightclubs in the sample by the observers handing out small cards (describing the project and providing a contact phone number) to patrons as they were leaving. It was envisaged that this would be done alongside nightclub PR reps (public relations representatives) who often hand out flyers at this time. However, during the observational period of the research, the local police had a policy of positioning two or four officers in the doorway of each nightclub at closing time. As well as potentially helping to reduce 'street' disorder (see *Street disorder*), this policy effectively dispersed both patrons and nightclub PR reps rendering the initial recruitment plan impossible.

A second plan (suggested by a Level 2 Criminology student) involved handing out cards in fast-food outlets near each nightclub. This however did not guarantee that interviewees would have attended any of the eight observed nightclubs as had originally been intended. Unfortunately it was decided to abandon this strategy after only one weekend's recruitment (and two interviews) when the first person to be interviewed turned out to be a journalist. Subsequent interviewees were recruited via an observer (Female Team A) who continued to hand out cards when appropriate after observations had ceased and from students, or former students, who knew persons who attend the nightclubs in Glasgow similar to those observed. This also allowed for some 'snowball' development (i.e. a process where one interviewee hands a card on to another who has no contact with the original recruiter). After a further delay owing to serious illness in the author's family, interviewee recruitment restarted, with the third interview on the 26th of July and was completed on the 15th of September.

The change in interview recruitment strategy meant that this data set was now limited in that it could not relate to occasions in specific nightclubs when the observers had visited. However, the new strategy had the advantage of accessing information on a much wider range of nightclubs than was originally anticipated including patrons of Gay clubs (and Gay nights in observed nightclubs), ticketed rave venues (where alcohol use was much less and ecstasy use much greater in any of the observed premises), student venues (which employed very different marketing techniques to those observed) and live music clubs attracting niche groups (e.g. Goths or other patron types rarely observed).

The final seven of the 32 interviewees were recruited by direct approach on the 'street'. This latter group was recruited in order to access demographics groups under-represented in the existing 25 in comparison to the observational data (e.g. young females) and to reduce any bias inherent in using university students as recruiters (though it should be stressed that Glasgow Caledonian is a 'new' university – i.e. a former polytechnic – with one of the most social inclusive 'non-traditional' student intakes in the UK).

All the interviews were conducted by the author of this report. Apart from the 'street' recruits, interviewees were given the option of being interviewed at the university or elsewhere. In practice, all bar one (the first interviewee / journalist) chose to come into the university. Before being interviewed, interviewees were provided with an information sheet which stressed the confidential nature of the interview, and a consent form. All participants were paid a small sum for their participation (a total of £20.00 per interview).

The final characteristics of the patrons interviewed are shown in Table 2, which gives details of how each interviewee was recruited (i.e. through a card handed out during observations, from observers handing out cards at other times, via student / ex-student finders and from the 'street'), and their demographics. This includes a measure of the level of deprivation in the area in which they stated that they currently resided. The deprivation measure used in the 'Area' column in Table 2 is DEPCAT, which is derived from the 2001 census (McLoone 2004) and in which all postcode sectors in Scotland are scored from 1 to 7 (DEPCAT 7

being the most deprived septile, 1 the most affluent). As can be seen from this measure, interviewees came from a broad range of backgrounds. In practice both this measure and the interviewees' stated occupations (also shown on Table 2), are likely to be strongly related to the (relatively young) age of (these) nightclub patrons rather than as an indicator of their life-time social class. Twelve gave addresses located outside Glasgow city, which ranged from nearby suburbs / satellite towns to places too far away for night-time travel to, or more especially from, the nightclubs described in this report.

Table 2: Interviewee Profiles

ID	Source	Age	Sex	Occupation	DEPCAT (Area)
#1	Card	23	M	'Sales Assistant (off licence)'	5 (Glasgow)
#2	Card	20	M	Exchange Student (Canada)	- (Winnipeg)
#3	Student A	20	M	Bar server (pub)	4 (N.Lanarkshire)
#4	Student B	19	F	University Student	3 (Fife)
#5	Student B	20	M	University Student	3 (Fife)
#6	Student B	19	F	University Student	2 (Fife)
#7	Observer	24	M	Trainee Manager (nightclub)	7 (Glasgow)
#8	Student C	30	M	Trainee Clinical Psychologist	3 (S.Lanarkshire)
#9	#7	23	M	Admin Assistant (call centre)	6 (Glasgow)
#10	Student D	21	M	Sales Assistant (stationery)	5 (Glasgow)
#11	Student D	19	F	Art Student	5 (Glasgow)
#12	Student D	20	M	Delivery Driver	6 (Glasgow)
#13	#7	26	M	College Student	6 (Glasgow)
#14	#3	19	F	Family Business (take-away)	7 (Glasgow)
#15	#16	21	F	University Student	5 (N.Ayrshire)
#16	Observer	20	M	University Student	5 (N.Ayrshire)
#17	Observer	20	F	College Student	5 (Glasgow)
#18	Student D	21	M	Sales Assistant (stationery)	5 (Glasgow)
#19	Student D	18	F	Sales Assistant (stationery)	5 (Glasgow)
#20	Student D	48	F	Retail Manager (fabrics)	6 (Glasgow)
#21	Student D	19	M	College Student / DJ	4 (Glasgow)
#22	Student D	18	F	School-leaver	7 (Glasgow)
#23	Student E	45	M	Removal Contractor	6 (Glasgow)
#24	#23	47	M	Computer Programmer	7 (Glasgow)
#25	#23	29	M	Assistant Manager (Leisure)	1 (E.Dunbarton)
#26	Street	16	F	School Student	2 (E.Dunbarton)
#27	Street	17	F	School-leaver	2 (Glasgow)
#28	Street	22	M	Call Centre Agent	5 (Glasgow)
#29	Street	20	F	University Student	4 (Inverclyde)
#30	Street	23	M	Art Student	6 (Glasgow)
#31	Street	20	M	College Student	7 (Glasgow)
#32	Street	18	M	Lifeguard	4 (S.Ayrshire)

These face-to-face interviews had two components. Firstly interviewees were asked about their previous week's drinking using a seven-day drinking-diary. This recorded what alcohol they had consumed (amount, type, brand, vessels etc.), where they were when they consumed it (e.g. in a nightclub) and when (allowing the temporal order of the 'binge' to be mapped from 'pre-loading' to 'after-party'). Secondly a semi-structured qualitative taped interview was conducted in which interviewees were asked about their views on nightclubs, alcohol, disorder, the city at night and licensing policy. The interview schedules were designed to corroborate the field observations and provide explanations for the processes and phenomena witnessed within the nightclubs during the observational phase of the research.

Results

Typology of nightclubs and their clientele

Although the nightclubs selected were all chosen as mainstream high street dancing clubs, in practice the eight venues differed greatly from each other in terms of size, layout, clienteles, entertainments, music and door policy. The drinking environment in each nightclub was assessed using Form 1, which rated differing barroom features and recorded observers' field-notes. This section of the report will describe the observers' impressions of the eight nightclubs in the sample, the similarities and differences between them and their patron's behaviours. This was done by making use of the observers' qualitative (if rather subjective) field-notes and quantitative measures of various barroom and clientele features as recorded in Form 1 (see Methods).

Despite being chosen for their marketplace similarities (see *Sample Selection*) it was possible from the observers' field-notes to produce a typology of nightclubs, similar to that of Purcell and Graham (2005), based on music policy. This task was made complicated as five of the eight selected venues could be termed as 'super-clubs' (as defined in Purcell and Graham's Toronto, 2005, study) having more than one 'room' or dancefloor in operation on at least one occasion that the observers visited (only 'Tropicana', 'Sinatra's' and 'Saturn' did not fit this description). Despite this, in essence there were three types of music that

predominated in the nightclubs sampled. The first of these could be described as 'Urban' (with subgenres such as R & B, rap and hip-hop), the second as 'Cheesy pop' (including chart, student-rock and golden oldies) and the third, the most varied, as 'Dance' (including Happy-hardcore, various forms of House, Rave and Ambient). These three terms and their sub-genres were extensively used by both observers and interviewees.

Table 3 (below) summaries the music policy of each nightclub by listing the genres noted by observers in each during the majority of their visits, as well as the most often recognised artist played in each. As can be seen from this table, the range of artists played was limited and homogenous with the same songs (e.g. Kanye West, 'Gold-digger') being played in each, often several times per night. The exception to this pattern was the 'Dance' club 'Saturn', where no observer was able to recognise a single artist during the course of the research.

At this stage it is also worth noting that the sources of music varied between the nightclubs. All had at least one DJ (up to 5 on some occasions), all used pre-recorded or 'piped' music on at least one occasion, five made use of in-house video screens ('Armageddon', 'Sinatra's' and 'Saturn' being the exceptions) and two had live music ('Tropicana' – always, and 'Idols' - once). Two nightclubs ('Xanadu' and 'Tropicana') also had a variety of other entertainers including dancers (on the bar, a stage or podium), MCs (master of ceremonies or hosts), live crowd footage and celebrity PA (personal appearances).

The range of door prices paid by observers in order to enter each of the eight premises observed is also shown in Table 3 (data confirmed by observers' expenses receipts). Interestingly, despite having a greater variety of entertainments and entertainers, 'Tropicana' was the least expensive to gain entry to, at a maximum of £6.00 before discounts (and a minimum of £3.00). Five of the eight nightclubs charged a maximum of £8.00 entrance, though these could be reduced in most cases by a variety of discount schemes (e.g. flyers, early entry or memberships). Two nightclubs, 'Armageddon' and 'Saturn' were more expensive at £10.00 and £12.00 respectively, though in the latter case, observers visited during one night when the venue was being used for a

promotional event by a non-drinks company, at which entry was only £4.00. This event distorted the clientele of that nightclub overall and impacted upon its scores in all subsequent analyses (making it less of an outlier from the other seven than it otherwise would have been).

Table 3: Nightclub Styles

Venue & entry cost	Music Genre (<i>n</i> of citations)	Most Heard Artists (<i>n</i> of citations)	Main Dancing Styles (<i>n</i> of citations)
Xanadu £5-8.00	R & B (8) Happy-hardcore (7) Chart (6)	Pussycat Dolls (7) Kanye West (4) Snoop (3)	Raving (5) 'sexy' (3) Grinding (2) Skool disco (2)
Armageddon £6-10.00	Happy-hardcore (8)	DJ mixes (5) Pussycat Dolls (4) Will Smith (3)	Raving (6) Grinding (6) 'stomping' (3)
Rapture £3-8.00	R & B (8) Rock (7) Chart (6)	Pussycat Dolls (4) Proclaimers (3) Usher (3)	Grinding (6) Dirty-dancing (2)
Tropicana £3-6.00	Chart (8) Oldies (8)	Dolly Parton (6) Pussycat Dolls (5)	'wedding style' (4) 'messaging about' (2)
Chocolate £3-8.00	R & B (7)	Pussycat Dolls (5) Kanye West (4) Usher (4)	Grinding (6) 'sexy' (2) Hip-hop nodding (2) 'modest' (2)
Idols £4-8.00	R & B (8) House (8)	Kanye West (6) Nelly (4) Snoop (4)	Grinding (6) 'sexy' (3) Hip-hop nodding (3)
Sinatra's £8.00	Oldies (8) Chart (8) R & B (8)	Kanye West (8) Dolly Parton (5) Queen (5)	'big groups' (2) 'messaging about' (2) 'energetic' (2)
Saturn £4-12.00	Rave (5) Ambient (5)	all 'unknown' artists	'modest' (5) Raving (2) 'energetic' (2)

As can be seen from Table 3, the music genres exploited by each nightclub dictated the clientele's dancing style, which, as will be seen in later sections, influenced the potential for disorder in each. These dancing styles can be split accordingly into three types. Firstly, 'fun' dances, where patrons were described as 'messaging about' in (mixed gender) 'big groups' (e.g. 'office parties') or in a 'wedding style' (e.g. 'hen nights'). Secondly 'mating' dances, such as Grinding, 'sexy' and Dirty-dancing dancing styles, sexualised performances where dancers may be attempting to attract partners (i.e. 'pulling'). Thirdly, 'musical' dances,

where dancers are dancing in appreciation of the music or to be part of the 'scene' (i.e. 'scenesters'), such as Raving, Hip-hop nodding and numerous minority styles not shown in Table 3 (e.g. Air-guitar – 'Rapture'; Country & Western – 'Tropicana'; Salsa – 'Saturn'; or Break-dancing 'Idols' and 'Saturn').

In the observed nightclubs characterised by 'Cheesy pop' music (e.g. 'Tropicana' or 'Sinatra's') 'fun' dancing styles were more common than elsewhere. The 'Urban' style nightclubs ('Idols' or 'Rapture' and 'Chocolate'), tended to be associated more with 'mating' dances than the others perhaps indicating that such venues may be used as 'meat-markets' (locations where people go in search of a sexual partner) by patrons 'on the pull'. Indeed, as was also recorded in Form 1, this music genre alone was associated with sexual / sexist / offensive lyrics or imagery. The 'Dance' music clubs were more diverse, in that two played Happy-hardcore, one of which, 'Xanadu' had sexualised dancing similar to the 'Urban' nightclubs (the music here varied between R & B and 1988-90s 'dance classics' – which some observers coded as 'Cheesy pop'), while in the other, 'Armageddon', the dancing style was very aggressive Raving (stomping or mosh-pit like) along to hardcore mixes of 'Cheesy-pop' artists (e.g. Westlife). The following field-notes by the female observer in Team A illustrates the nature of the dancing style in 'Armageddon' and how it may actually have encouraged a high level of disorder in this nightclub (see *Aggressive Incidents*)

“People on the dancefloor drunk and on drugs bumping into each other and moshing in groups jumping up and down with their arms around each other's shoulders mostly big groups of young males with a couple of young girls.”...
“It's impossible to know what is an aggressive incident and what is dancing.”
(Female Observer, Team A)

In the third 'Dance' club, 'Saturn', the main dancing style was also Raving (e.g. waving hands in the air) though this varied in tempo (regardless of the tempo of the music). In subsequent interviews, patrons of 'Saturn' and similar nightclubs were at pains to differentiate such venues (from Happy-hardcore) by describing them as “adult dance” (though this may also have been a euphemism for 'dance drugs', i.e. ecstasy / MDMA, use).

From the observers' point-of-view, it seemed to be the case that the music being played dictated the type of clientele that each nightclub attracted and that this could have an influence on patrons' behaviours or disorder risk. (Almost identical views were expressed by interviewees who had attended these eight nightclubs, see *Interviews with patrons*)

“The type of Happy-hardcore stuff they play seems to attract the wrong type of customers which is a shame because if it wasn't for all the neds [hooligans] and the crap music it could actually be a decent enough club.” (Male Observer Team B, 'Xanadu')

“[in 'Saturn'] unlike the other clubs, patrons were older, drinking less and there for the music rather than to get fucked or pull, so atmosphere much more relaxed. I think the more ambient funky music helped the atmosphere too. All patrons very friendly, lots of eye contact and smiling. Loved-up atmosphere, everyone really enjoying the music and dancing with the people around them, strangers or not.” (Female Observer Team A, 'Saturn')

As with previous research (e.g. Forsyth & Cloonan in press 2008; Hadfield, 2006; Homel & Tomsen, 1993) it was apparent that patrons who were fans of the music played in licensed premises would be more tolerant of poor décor or any other negative features of the nightclubs concerned. This appeared to work in reverse with observers who usually did not appreciate the music on offer.

“This is the kind of club where people allegedly 'go for the music' so little attention was paid to the décor of the club or trying to create a certain atmosphere. The problem however, is that the music is crap and a Happy-hardcore version of Bros 'I owe you nothing' doesn't make up for the fact that the place is a hole!” (Female Observer Team B, 'Armageddon')

Therefore the clientele of the eight nightclubs varied depending upon the entertainments on offer when the observers made their visits. However it should be remembered that this is only representative of these premises on Friday and Saturday nights (subsequent patron interviews revealed that differing clientele switch between these and other venues on other nights of the week) and also that the clientele could vary greatly between the different rooms or dancefloors within the same 'superclub', a feature which was most evident at 'Rapture'.

“...the club is like two separate clubs. The ground floor has an Urban feel ... a stark contrast to the upstairs which is a lot shabbier and darker. This floor seems to attract students and may be catering for a student clientele (i.e. cheap and dirty!)”... “Even the level of drunkenness was varied. On the top floor people

were far more drunk than the bottom floor, but maybe the bottom floor it was more important to look cool and not mess about or dance in a stupid way as they were [up]stairs.” (Female Observer Team B, ‘Rapture’)

Interestingly most patrons were female (the ‘Dance’ club ‘Saturn’ was the exception to this rule and it was also the only nightclub in the sample where no under-18s were observed). Around half of male patrons observed were in groups of three or more (known as ‘wolfpacks’, an acknowledged risk factor for disorder). Two nightclubs, ‘Xanadu’ and ‘Armageddon’, had significantly more under-age patrons (i.e. under-18s), while two others, ‘Tropicana’ and ‘Sinatra’s’, had significantly more patrons aged over-30 years. Interestingly these latter two nightclubs also differed from the others in the sample in that observers noted that their eldest patrons (i.e. over-30s) tended to be females. In all the other nightclubs female patrons tended to be younger than male patrons. Under-18s always tended to be female. As might be expected from the demographics of Glasgow, only around one third of patrons were estimated to be ‘middle class’ (the ‘Dance’ club ‘Saturn’ being the only predominantly ‘middle class’ venue). Finally, two nightclubs, ‘Rapture’ and ‘Chocolate’, had significantly more patrons from ethnic minorities (mainly afro-Caribbean or South Asian). A summary of the patrons as described by the observers is shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Nightclub Patrons

Venue	N of patrons	% Female	% Male groups	% Aged U-18	% Aged over-30	Middle class %	Ethnic min. %
Xanadu	241	58.5	54.4	33.8 **	5.0	18.8	4.9
Armageddon	246	50.6	63.8	46.9 ***	4.4	17.7 **	1.9 *
Rapture	251	52.5	50.6	8.6	4.4 *	43.8	47.4 ***
Tropicana	252	60.6	39.0	4.6	34.8 ***	25.0	1.8 *
Chocolate	197	57.6	43.8	11.3	11.9	50.0	35.6 ***
Idols	258	60.6	45.0	12.5	7.5	50.0	22.1
Sinatra’s	248	58.8	48.1	1.9 *	35.6 ***	12.5 *	1.1 *
Saturn	154 ***	45.0 **	36.8	0 **	16.3	68.7 **	6.8
Mean	231	55.5	47.7	14.9	15.1	34.4	15.2

* $p > 0.05$, ** $p > 0.01$, *** $p > 0.001$ (by t -test comparing the mean for each nightclub with the mean for the other seven combined).

From Table 4, it can be seen that seven of the nightclubs observed held a similar number of patrons when the observers visited (around 250) the sole exception being ‘Saturn’ which was a slightly smaller venue than the others. Not indicated

on this table is how full to capacity these nightclubs were (mean 64.5%). This measure did not differ significantly between premises, except that one nightclub, 'Chocolate' displayed a marked decline in popularity of the course of the research (from 60.0 to 46.3% between the two data collection sweeps, see *Procedure*), something which is likely to have impacted on the disorder risk in this nightclub (see *Aggressive Incidents*).

“No one seemed to be really enjoying themselves. It felt more like a house party than a nightclub as no one was there. Saw many people leaving early and felt quite jealous!” (Female Observer Team B, 'Chocolate')

Patrons' behaviour and alcohol consumption

The type of clientele was also reflected in patrons' behaviours, for example, nightclubs with higher or lower numbers of under-age patrons (i.e. 'Xanadu' and 'Armageddon' or 'Saturn') also tended to have correspondingly higher or lower levels of observed drunkenness. Table 5 details patrons' behaviours as recorded in Form 1, broken down across the eight nightclubs in the sample.

Table 5: Patrons Behaviours

Venue	% drunk	% on drugs	% smoke	% not eating	% soft drinks	% NRG	% water	% tap
Xanadu	78.1 *	28.1	28.1	99.9	0	2.9	13.8	5.0 *
Armageddon	78.5 ***	41.3 *	28.3	97.5	0	2.8	10.0	0
Rapture	58.1	4.4	27.9	99.4	0	4.0	7.1	0
Tropicana	57.5	0.3 *	20.0	100 *	0	0.1 *	0.1	0
Chocolate	63.1	2.9	23.1	100 *	0	1.9	5.3	0
Idols	68.8	8.1 *	24.4	100 *	0.6 **	0 *	8.1	0
Sinatra's	69.4	5.6	23.7	97.1 *	0	7.5	4.5	0
Saturn	38.8 ***	50.0 ***	31.8	100 *	0	2.8	19.4 *	2.5
Mean	64.0	17.8	25.0	99.2	0.1	2.7	8.5	0.9

* $p > 0.05$, ** $p > 0.01$, *** $p > 0.001$ (by t -test comparing the mean for each nightclub with the mean for the other seven combined).

Table 5 also shows the percentage of patrons estimated to be eating food or consuming non-alcoholic drinks, both of which are believed to be protective against disorder. Indeed policies towards the improved provision of food within nightclubs have recently been proposed in Glasgow as a possible measure that might reduce city centre disorder (e.g. see Braiden, 2006). However, on the evidence of these observations, this might be difficult to achieve as very few

patrons were observed eating anything (despite two nightclubs in the sample, 'Tropicana' and 'Sinatra's', having hot food available throughout). Indeed, the most often observed food stuff represented in Table 5 was lollipops (presumably being used either as a sexual attractor or to counteract the 'gurning' effects of 'dance drugs' – though lollipops have been proposed elsewhere as a means of keeping nightclub patrons quiet after closing time, e.g. see Lashley, 2006).

Interestingly, from Table 5, the nightclubs where observers believed that more patrons were under the influence of illegal drugs tended to also be the ones where they observed more water (bottled or tap) being consumed. No patrons were observed consuming hot drinks, this despite the research taking place during a period of some extreme winter weather, including one occasion when several thousand clubbers were stranded overnight by heavy snowfall (Cramb, 2006). Soft drinks were observed being consumed, albeit rarely, in only one nightclub, cola in 'Idols', where there was a special *Coke* pump and ads for this beverage were shown on TV screens. Conversely, 'Idols' was the only nightclub where energy drinks were not observed being used. In six of the seven premises where energy drinks were observed the *Red Bull* brand was the only such beverage on sale (the sole exception being the 'Dance' club 'Saturn').

It should also be borne in mind that the figures in Table 5 represent only what the observers actually see and the true amount of, for example, energy drinks being consumed is likely to be much greater when one considers their use as 'mixers' with alcoholic beverages (e.g. as 'vodka and *Red Bull*'). Indeed, the task of drink / brand identification was particularly difficult in this project owing to the glassware ban which meant that all drinks were often served in the same anonymous vessels (see *Glassware ban*). This compares with, for example, the 'pub study' (Forsyth et al, 2005) where this task was made easy for observers by drinks often being sold in their own special branded containers, bottles, glasses, pitchers, test-tubes etc.

Observers' estimates of the alcoholic drinks being consumed in each of the eight nightclubs in the sample are shown in Table 6. The drinks listed in this table are only those that achieved a consumption level of more than one percent amongst

patrons overall. Therefore products such as cider (0.1%), non-lager beer (0.2%) and champagne (0.2%) are not shown in Table 6. It should also be noted that these figures do not sum to one hundred percent as patrons varied their drinks throughout the night and could be seen consuming more than one drink at the same time. Again such behaviours were confirmed by subsequent interviews with nightclub patrons (see *Interviews with patrons*).

Table 6: Alcohol consumed

Venue	% vodka	% other spirits	% lager	% wine	% cocktail	% alcopop	% shots
Xanadu	22.5 **	3.1	24.8 *	0 *	1.3	72.5 ***	1.3
Armageddon	33.1	6.3	23.1 **	0 *	0 *	64.1 ***	5.0
Rapture	45.0	10.0	39.4	0 *	0	27.6	1.3
Tropicana	41.2	15.6	53.1 *	5.6 ***	7.3 ***	6.9 **	1.9
Chocolate	43.8	10.0	40.6	0 *	1.3	15.0	1.3
Idols	52.5	18.8	47.5	0 *	1.3	28.8	0 *
Sinatra's	43.8	2.5	44.8	0.6	0 *	43.8	2.8
Saturn	37.5	6.9	60.0 **	1.6	0	0 ***	0.8
Mean	39.9	9.1	40.4	1.0	1.4	32.3	1.8

* $p > 0.05$, ** $p > 0.01$, *** $p > 0.001$ (by t -test comparing the mean for each nightclub with the mean for the other seven combined).

By comparing Table 6 with Table 4, once again the effect of clientele on the drinking environment can be seen. For example, alcopops were especially popular in premises catering for younger patrons (i.e. 'Xanadu' and 'Armageddon'). In contrast, such drinks were completely absent from the 'Dance' club 'Saturn'). In one of the 'Cheesy pop' venues, 'Tropicana', which caters for older patrons, there was a low level of alcopop consumption but it was the only nightclub in the sample where wine and cocktails were popular. Overall, however, vodka (39.9%), lager (40.4%) and alcopops (32.3%) constituted the vast bulk of alcohol products being consumed. Why these three drinks should be so popular was unclear from observations (potential reasons for this pattern will be explored later, see *Interviews with Patrons*); however they did not seem to be aggressively promoted. The mean prices for these three drinks were; vodka £2.39 (per single measure), lager £2.46 (pint or bottle) and alcopops £2.16 (per bottle) though these costs varied by brand.

None of the observed premises ran any kind of 'happy hour' (currently prohibited in Glasgow). Only one, 'Xanadu' appeared to be running a '2-4-1' offer (for alcopops). None ran cut price offers if a drink is bought in multiples. One, 'Saturn', advertised cheaper spirits if bought by the double (£3.90 for a double vodka as opposed to £2.70 for a single) though, compared to the prices in the other nightclubs, this was hardly a bargain as doubles were always cheaper in the others (range £2.80 to £3.80). There was no evidence of patrons being offered or sold a large or double measure without asking for one, no hand pouring of spirits and no unsolicited offers for an 'upgrade' to say a premium or deluxe brand of spirits.

Three premises ('Idols', 'Rapture' and 'Chocolate' – i.e. the 'Urban' venues) seemed to advertise competitive / low or flat-rate prices. In the extreme one observed nightclub, 'Idols', offered all drinks (except champagne) for £1.50 during the first sweep of observer visits (pre-smoking ban). Subsequent interviews with patrons revealed much lower drinks prices than these occurring in other venues, especially student-orientated nightclubs, and on other nights of the week at observed premises (see *Interviews with Patrons*). However, at the weekend, the nightclubs in the sample were as likely to promote themselves through their entertainments, such as up and coming DJs or themed-nights (e.g. beach, foam, UV-glow or Skool disco parties - observers attended such a party-night at 'Xanadu'), as they were through competitive drinks prices. Additionally, all the observed nightclubs engaged in some form of entrance discounts or competitions (though these could involve drinks brand-stretching, for example 'Rapture', gave out wristbands advertising an alcopop which allowed future discount price door admission and 'Xanadu' held a 'launch party' night for a new brand of alcopop).

“Apart from the one drink promotion [a blackboard behind the bar offered cheaper if spirits bought in double measures] no special offers or deals were advertised. There were flyers on most of the tables and posters on the walls on the way in for upcoming nights and guest DJs. 'Saturn' seems to promote its music rather than rely on drink promotions.” (Male observer Team B, 'Saturn')

Perhaps more concerning was orchestrated drinks party marketing which may encourage immoderate consumption (this was certainly the case in the 'pub

study', Forsyth et al, 2005). Five of the nightclubs had TVs / plasma screens. One of these, 'Xanadu' used this facility only to show music, including live shots from within the venue itself. Three ('Idols', 'Rapture' and 'Chocolate') interspersed music videos (all 'Urban' music – with themes which observers coded as violent, sexual / sexist or offensive) with advertising, including ads for other upcoming nights within the nightclub, for drinks, for other venues owned by the parent company (e.g. pubs) and even for items apparently unrelated to the night-time economy (e.g. record shops, newspapers and letting agents).

“Various TV screens around the club promoting different clubs and future promotional nights. TVs also advertising *Corona* [lager]. Wristbands advertising *WKD* [alcopop] were being handed out (you could get in half price with this).” (Female Observer Team B, 'Rapture')

One nightclub, 'Tropicana', engaged in much more aggressive drinks party marketing than the others, although despite this activity, its patrons scored second lowest for levels of drunkenness in the sample (see Table 5). This venue had its own in-house TV channel, used a variety of floor sellers, sales in novelty vessels (cheaper if alcohol bought this way) and free samples (a practice also observed at a clothing company promotion in 'Saturn'). 'Tropicana's' entertainers made regular references to specific drinks promos and alcohol / drunkenness per se, a behaviour also engaged in by the DJs at 'Xanadu'.

“Emphasis on party! Streamers shooting through the air. Cameras and dressing-up stuff like wings and bunny ears for sale. Screens with messages like “Bargain Drinks Prices”, “Welcome to the biggest party” and DJs constantly shouting “where are all you alcoholics”, “who’s here to get drunk?” and “everyone on the dancefloor” etc. etc.” ... “Blackboards behind bar advertising cocktails. Big screen TVs with slogans like “cheap drink prices”. DJ constantly making references to getting drunk and having fun. DJ pouring champagne from bottle into women’s mouths from the stage. At 2.50 AM noticed staff member walking around with glasses and backpack dispenser. I asked him what he was selling and he said glasses of fruit cocktail for £2.00 each. I asked him if it was alcoholic and he replied “oh yeah!””(Female Observer Team A, 'Tropicana')

“DJ constantly made references to alcohol “who is out to get pissed?”, “where are all the Glaswegian pissheads?”, “who had been drinking all day?” and “people in here who are fucked give me a shout”. (Female Observer Team A, 'Xanadu')

This combination of entertainment (drinks party marketing), type of clientele and alcohol appeared to give each premises a very different atmosphere in terms of

both how much patrons appeared to be enjoying themselves (or not) and potential for disorder, as is illustrated by the following field-note summaries made by observers which provide a flavour of each of the eight premises. These examples of observers' field-notes should also be treated as note of caution, illustrative of the potential for subjectivity in the observational method, especially as in this case where for the most part observers would have been unfamiliar with such drinking environments prior to their participation in this research.

Xanadai: "First impressions were not too bad as for the first 30 – 45 minutes it was light and the music was mainstream but then at 00:15 AM the lights went off (or dimmed a lot!) and the happy hardcore began. The atmosphere changed instantly and became more intimidating. The patrons were all young and regulars. Lots of skinny girls 'up for it' and lots of macho lads on the prowl. The design of the club and layout of the dancefloor felt like a cattle market: with all the girls gyrating on the dancefloor and all the males looking from the outskirts..." "The DJ was quite amusing and kept shouting "let's have a fuckin' party" in a Frank Gallagher style from *Shameless* [a TV show about a disadvantaged family / housing estate]. I felt too old [26 years of age] and straight to be anywhere near this establishment." (Female Observer Team B, 'Xanadu')

Armageddon: "I feel I had an advantage over [Male Observer Team A] as I was a teenager in the early 1990s and come from [a town in Ayrshire] (home of [a venue made infamous by the death of a clubber]) so I am used to rave music and pilled-up neds [hooligans]. [Male Observer Team A] was like a rabbit caught in the headlights. People were rough and would have kicked your head in if you looked at them the wrong way. Like being back at school disco. Lots of random snogging, rave dancing people passed out, gurning, chants of "here we here we here we fuckin' go". Lots of pushing, horseplay, spilled drinks. Very tense atmosphere. Lots of stewards, people constantly being asked to leave. Dancefloor dangerous with brawls, fights and moshing." (Female Observer Team A)

Rapture: "The club had two floors and three rooms. The top floor was student friendly: quite dark and very smoky with seating around the outside. It wasn't really decorated in any particular style, probably as most patrons were too drunk to notice. It looked fairly shabby compared to the bottom floor. This floor was the 'Urban' floor and was represented by mostly Black or Asian patrons (mostly male). There was an atmosphere of attitude but not in a hostile way. Most people just wanted to look the part. Dress code for this floor was definitely 'home boys'. Lots of 'bling' [a Hip-hop term for conspicuously expensive jewellery]." (Female Observer, Team B)

Tropicana: "Looks like the inside of a theme park haunted house but in the style of [a tropical island]. Very large age range in the place, at least one hen party happening. Dress for men ranged from suits to t-shirts and trainers. For women, your usual short skirts / dresses etc. Although as it was a hen night for some, group were wearing devil horns or bunny ears and tail. It looked like auditions were being held for *Brigit Jones's Diary* film. It's worth mentioning that a poster

behind the cloakroom desk advertised devil horns (£1.00), angel wings, roses and disposable cameras at £5.00.”... “‘Tropicana’ is the more chain-club entertainment end of the spectrum... like your typical Northern ‘club-land’ set in [Hawaii].” (Male Observer, Team A)

Chocolate: “Smoke [machine] was unbelievable (maybe to hide how empty the place was). £8.00 quite steep considering its not really ‘the’ place to be any more and I think this is maybe why it is so quiet. No atmosphere and everyone is bored. The staff, stewards and punters all looked a bit fed up and lots of people left early. Nothing to distinguish it from any other mainstream club in Glasgow and the interior almost identical to ‘Rapture’. We were literally counting the minutes till we would have to leave. In some clubs we’ve been to it’s been quite frustrating to watch everyone dancing and having fun and not being able to join in but not in this place.”... “At this rate I’ll be surprised if this club is open at this time next year.” (Female Observer Team A)

Idols: “Patrons young and definitely on the pull. Especially the girls who were definitely ‘cockteasers’ wearing hot-pants, tiny skirts and boob-tubes and dancing in a very erotic manner. Often dancing on raised area by themselves scanning the room to make sure men were watching them. Guys generally standing watching the girls dance or dancing in groups with other males. Despite all the apparent sexual tension with all these girls gyrating and showing a lot of skin there was no real sexual activity.”... “People were very drunk often staggering and falling over (although could also be due to the floor being wet due to numerous spilled drinks being mopped up), picking up random drinks, sitting in groups they did not know and pretty incoherent, especially the girls who were often groping the male stewards and chasing boys in to the boys toilets (including [Male Observer Team A]!). It was very hard to move about due to the amount of off-floor-dancing and no one was willing to move out the road to let you past. Lots of half empty drinks lying about. Don’t think the glass collectors knew if drinks were abandoned or unattended so just left anything that wasn’t empty. Toilets manky [filthy] with blockages and empty drinks lying about. Not checked at all. There was a guy in a cubicle with a girl while I was waiting to go in!” (Female Observer Team A)

Sinatra’s: “There was a main dancefloor with a bar at either end and seating all round the side. The décor was old and a bit scabby looking. All the seats were ripped and bits of the carpet were stuck down with gaffer tape. Wherever you went your feet stuck to the floor. ‘Sinatra’s’ had a much older clientele than the other clubs we’ve been to except maybe ‘Tropicana’ but where ‘Tropicana’ was quite mixed, the ‘Sinatra’s’ seemed mainly working class.”... “I found it quite hostile and uncomfortable to sit in ‘Sinatra’s’ and was quite surprised that nothing kicked off. It felt a bit like ‘Xanadu’ but with older punters. The décor made the place feel even more dingy and the toilets were stinking and flooded. The urinals were full of free passes to ‘Martino’s’ [a nearby similar nightclub].” (Male Observer Team B, ‘Sinatra’s’)

Saturn: “Club was quite dark and smoky. Pretty small. Dancefloor was in the middle with seating around the outside. It had only one bar. Décor was quite minimal and plain. Patrons were all 21 to 30-ish and danced in small groups of three or four. There was a lot of mingling and moving around. The dress code

seemed to be pretty relaxed. There was quite a wide range of people there, a few arty types, guys with hoodies, a lot of people wearing hats indoors and scarves. Didn't seem to be a lot of heavy drinking going on." (Male Observer Team B, 'Saturn')

In summary, observers' viewed 'Xanadu' and 'Armageddon' as being characterised by a younger rowdier clientele (especially the latter), while 'Tropicana' and 'Sinatra's' attracted older patrons (though while the former was seen as modern entertainment venue, the latter was seen as resembling a 'working-mans club'). Although all in the same market sector, the three 'Urban' venues; 'Idols', 'Rapture' and 'Chocolate', differed from each other (e.g. in terms of likely disorder risk) owing to the latter venue's apparent declining popularity and 'Raptures' mix of music styles and patrons between its two floors. The 'Dance' venue 'Saturn' appeared to be an outlier, with slightly older (late 20s), calmer patrons, and was where all the observers stated that they felt the safest.

Disorder Risk

As well as recording patrons' demographics and drinking behaviours (both known variants of disorder risk), Form 1 included 22 scales, each measured from zero to nine, which quantitatively recorded the nature of the drinking environment in each of the observed premises. As was also the case with the Glasgow 'pub study' (Forsyth et al, 2005) responses across four groups of these scales were found to show a high level of consistency (Reliability) allowing them to be summed to single scales. As before, it was possible to produce a single scale measuring an 'Unhealthy Ambience' within the barroom environment from five individual scales measuring 'smokiness', 'ventilation', 'noise', 'movement' and 'crowdedness' (Cronbach's alpha = 0.696) (alpha scores of greater than 0.650 are accepted as indicating reliability, i.e. in creating a single variable). A single scale measuring 'Sexual tension' could be created from three scales measuring 'harassment of females', 'sexual activity' and 'pulling' (Cronbach's alpha = 0.709). A scale measuring 'Dirtiness' was created from four individual measures of 'bar wiping', 'table clearing', 'spillage' and 'toilet order' (Cronbach's alpha = 0.798) and a scale measuring 'Aggravation by patrons' was similarly created from 'barroom decorum' (i.e. amount of swearing etc.), 'male hostility', 'female hostility', 'level of intoxication' and 'rowdiness' (Cronbach's alpha = 0.868).

As was also the case in the previous ‘pub study’, no single unitary scale could be made from six individual scales measuring staff practices, however four of these six were found to correlate with each other, as were the remaining two. Thus two new compound scale variables, measuring staff practices, were created for the purposes of the nightclub study. These were ‘Staff Socialise’ combining a measure of bar servers and stewards levels of ‘professionalism’ (i.e. socialising with patrons) and a ‘Staff Alert’ scale which combined measures of ‘teamwork’, barroom ‘monitoring’, server ‘hostility’ and steward ‘hostility’.

Table 7 shows each of the above compound scales scores broken down across the eight observed nightclubs, that is ‘Unhealthy Ambience’ (scored 0 to 45), ‘Sexual tension’ (0 to 27), ‘Staff Socialise’ (0 to 18), ‘Dirtiness’, ‘Aggravation by patrons’ and ‘Staff Alert’ (all 0 to 36).

Table 7: Drinking Environments and Disorder Risk

Venue	Unhealthy Ambience	Dirtiness	Sexual tension	Aggravation by patrons	Staff Socialise	Staff Alert
Xanadu	27.0	20.3	15.8	27.4 **	6.6	23.5
Armageddon	29.8	24.3 **	16.0	29.7 ***	9.1	20.0
Rapture	28.8	14.5	17.0 **	20.9	6.6	23.3
Tropicana	19.9 ***	11.9 **	12.5	16.3 **	7.5	25.0 **
Chocolate	26.9	11.4 **	13.1	19.6	8.0	20.6
Idols	29.1	19.8	16.4	23.9	6.4	22.6
Sinatra’s	26.6	20.5 *	12.9	23.5	6.4	14.2 ***
Saturn	22.3 *	11.6 **	6.1 ***	9.8 ***	4.2 *	22.0
Mean	26.3	16.8	13.7	21.2	6.6	20.8

* $p > 0.05$, ** $p > 0.01$, *** $p > 0.001$ (by t -test comparing the mean for each nightclub with the mean for the other seven combined).

The patterns detailed in Table 7 show a degree of correspondence to the differing clientele and patron behaviours observed in each premises (see Tables 3, 4 and 5). For example, the two nightclubs which played Happy-hardcore (‘Xanadu’ and ‘Armageddon’), which had the youngest clientele and the most drunkenness, also had the highest levels of ‘Aggravation from patrons’. (This would also appear to concur with observers’ more subjective field-notes). In contrast, one of the ‘Cheesy pop’ clubs, ‘Tropicana’, which attracted an older clientele had less ‘Aggravation by patrons’, less ‘Unhealthy Ambience’, less

'Dirtiness' and more 'alert' staff. The 'Dance' club 'Saturn' did significantly better on most of these variables ('Staff Alert' being the exception), having particularly low levels of both 'Sexual tension' and 'Aggravation by patrons' relative to the other seven. (Note that these and subsequent analyses report relative differences between the eight premises observed and are not indicative of absolute levels of disorder risk within Glasgow nightclubs or elsewhere).

Thus it would appear that the eight premises observed varied greatly in factors known from the literature to be predictive (or preventative) of disorder. For example, based on this disorder risk assessment one might expect more frequent alcohol-related problems to occur in 'Xanadu' and 'Armageddon', and fewer such problems in 'Saturn', relative to the others in the sample.

In common with the previous Glasgow 'pub study', these factors for disorder tended to co-exist in the same premises and so, at this stage, their unique contributions to alcohol-related aggression still needs to be singled out. However a limitation of the 'pub study' was that relatively too few incidents of aggression ($n = 14$) were observed to permit much detailed analysis of how the observed risk factors related to actual violence witnessed by observers during the course of that study. This was not the case in the present study and the next section will detail the aggressive incidents witnessed by observers and recorded on Form 2.

Aggressive Incidents

During the course of their observations within the eight nightclubs sampled, observers noted a total of 34 aggressive incidents. This total includes one incident that occurred between patrons immediately outside the door of one nightclub ('Sinatra's') at closing time, but excludes one, also at closing time, where a nightclub's ('Tropicana's') door stewards intervened in a street fight which did not involve patrons. This latter incident is included elsewhere in this report (see *Street disorder*).

Eight off these 34 incidents were adjudged to be of 'ambiguous intent' (i.e. not intentionally aggressive) by the study's three expert raters (see *Procedure*). A

further five incidents were rated as being ‘non-physical’, that is involving ‘verbal aggression’ only. The remaining 21 incidents were rated as being ‘physical’ in nature (i.e. fights or assaults). In this report, these 21 are regarded as more serious incidents and they include a sub-group of five incidents rated as ‘severe’ physical (i.e. potentially requiring medical attention).

A breakdown of these aggressive incidents by nightclub is provided in Table 8. The first data column of this table gives the number of aggressive incidents witnessed by observers inside each of the eight premises. (Note that 22 of these incidents were witnessed by both observers in the team, A or B, present, while the remaining 12 were only witnessed or recorded by a single observer). The second and third data columns show those aggressive incidents rated as ‘physical’ and ‘severe’ physical by the study’s three independent raters. The final two columns show police figures for recorded crime / incidents of disorder associated with the nightclubs observed; firstly those available which correspond most closely to the time period of the field observations (January to June 2006) and then a total figure which combines these figures for the first half of 2006 with those for the whole of 2005, used for the sample selection (see Table 1).

Table 8: Incidents of disorder

Venue	Observed Incidents	‘Physical’ Incidents	‘Severe’ Incidents	Police data Jan-Jun 2006	Police data 2005-June 06
Xanadu	8	6	1	115	310
Armageddon	11	7	0	67	219
Rapture	0	-	-	35	147
Tropicana	4*	0*	-	71	178
Chocolate	2	1	0	23	117
Idols	5	4	2	50	131
Sinatra’s	4	3	2	65	141
Saturn	0	-	-	18	24
Total	34*	21	5	444	1267

* One ‘physical’ incident at the door of ‘Tropicana’ is not shown as, although this involved the nightclub’s door staff breaking up a fight, no patrons of the nightclub concerned were involved.

In Table 8 it is interesting to compare the numbers of observed incidents with those known to the local police. In terms of the overall pattern of incident frequency there would appear to be a high degree of correspondence between the two sets of figures. For example, in both data sets ‘Xanadu’ and

'Armageddon' have more incidents than the others, while 'Saturn' has the least. The exception to this pattern was 'Rapture', where (like 'Saturn') no aggressive incidents were witnessed, despite this nightclub having the highest score on the 'Sexual tension' disorder risk factor (see Table 7) and a relatively high level of police data. However, observers felt that this may have been due to chance and subsequent patron interviews supported this view (see *Interviews with patrons*).

The level of correspondence between observed and police data becomes less apparent when only incidents rated as 'physical' and especially 'severe' physical are considered, with these more serious incidents tending to occur in 'Idols' and 'Sinatra's' (neither of which had particularly high levels of disorder according to the police data). In contrast 'Armageddon', which had the most aggressive incidents overall ($n = 11$) and a relatively high level of disorder according to the police data, had no aggressive incidents rated as 'severe'.

As an additional measure of the correspondence between observed and police data, after they had completed all their observations, observers were informed that the venues they had been observing were selected according to their levels of disorder known to the police and were then asked to rank the eight premises according to what they thought these levels would be. How observers ranked the eight nightclubs is shown in Table 9. In interpreting this table it should be noted that observers were quite sophisticated in making these rankings, for example by taking into consideration how likely they felt certain venues were to call the police, rather than only taking into account how disorderly they appeared to be.

Table 9: Observers' rankings for disorder

Venue	Team A		Team B		Observers' Rankings (Mean)	Police 2005 (n)	Police Jan-Jun 2006 (n)
	Female	Male	Female	Male			
Xanadu	4	5	7	5	5 (5.3)	1 (195)	1 (115)
Armageddon	1	2	2	2	2 (1.8)	2 (152)	3 (67)
Rapture	5	6	4	3	4 (4.5)	3 (112)	6 (35)
Tropicana	7	3	5	7	6 (5.5)	4 (107)	2 (71)
Chocolate	6	7	6	6	7 (6.3)	5 (94)	7 (23)
Idols	3	4	3	4	3 (3.5)	6 (81)	5 (50)
Sinatra's	2	1	1	1	1 (1.3)	7 (76)	4 (65)
Saturn	8	8	8	8	8 (8.0)	8 (6)	8 (18)

The most striking feature of Table 9 is that observers believed ‘Sinatra’s’ to have been the nightclub which would be the most often ‘known’ to the police. Despite a relatively low level of police call-outs / crime (around half that for ‘Xanadu’), three of the four observers ranked this nightclub as being the one most likely to have a high crime rate (the remaining observer ranked it second ‘worst’). In contrast ‘Xanadu’, which had by far the highest level of disorder according to the police data sets (both 2005 data which was the basis for premises selection and the first six months of 2006), was not viewed as such by observers, though this was in part because they had noted that it had won awards (“I would have put ‘Xanadu’ higher but I saw that it had won awards so I was tricked into putting it lower than I would have” (Male Observer Team B) (‘Chocolate’ also had awards on display). ‘Armageddon’ was ranked as the second most likely to have a high number of police incidents as, despite this nightclub having the most troublesome clientele, observers felt it had some of the best staff for dealing with disorder (“Even though the security staff were dead good, it was a hotbed of incidents”, Male Observer Team B, “...it was only saved by having more and better staff”, Male Observer Team B). At the other extreme all four observers correctly identified ‘Saturn’ as the venue with the lowest recorded levels of disorder in the sample.

“Nice friendly atmosphere to a point, because you know that most of the patrons are all pilled-up [on ecstasy] and wouldn’t give you the time of day when clean. Although one guy gave me his two free cans of *Heineken* [lager], because he had a wristband, which was cool. The only way anyone from ANY of the other clubs would give you their booze would be if threw it at you in anger.” (Male Observer Team A, ‘Saturn’ – emphasis his)

It is interesting to note, from the risk assessment for disorder scores obtained by using Form 1 (e.g. on the scales on Table 7), from the number of aggressive incidents witnessed (see Table 8) and from the less formal rankings made by observers after fieldwork was completed (see Table 9), that in each case the observational data pertaining to these nightclubs is more similar to the police figures for the first six months of 2006 than it is for those for the whole of 2005. For example, the relatively lower police figures for ‘Chocolate’ and ‘Rapture’ or the relatively higher figures for ‘Sinatra’s’ and ‘Idols’ recorded in early 2006 (the time period during which observations took place), in comparison to 2005. This

suggests that the observers were picking up on real changes within these premises since the time of the police figures used in sample selection (2005) and strengthens the argument that unobtrusive observation can be used as a disorder potential monitoring tool in alcohol or violence harm reduction initiatives.

To statistically explore the relationships between observations (Form 1) and disorder levels (Form 2 and police figures) multiple linear-regression analyses (ordinary least squares) were conducted. The independent variables used in these regression equations were; estimated number of patrons inside each nightclub, percent full to capacity, percent female patrons, percent male patrons in groups of three or more ('wolfpacks'), percent patrons under-18, percent patrons aged 21-30, percent patrons aged over-30, percent patrons from ethnic minorities, proportion of patrons who were middle class, percent patrons who were drunk, percent patrons who under the influence of illegal drugs and the scales measuring 'Unhealthy Ambience', 'Dirtiness', 'Sexual tension', 'Aggravation by patrons', 'Staff Socialise' and 'Staff Alert'. Table 10, shows the results of these analyses.

Table 10: Predicting disorder

	Variables in Equation	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Adjusted R²	<i>p</i>
Model 1: Police Date * (Jan-June 2006)	'Aggravation by patrons'	4.502	0.000	0.635	0.000
	% Ethnic minorities	-4.063	0.000		
	'Unhealthy Ambience'	-3.137	0.003		
	'Staff Socialise'	-2.948	0.005		
	% Under-18	2.756	0.008		
	Number of patrons	2.425	0.019		
	% female	2.162	0.035		
Model 2: Observed Data (Aggressive Incidents)	% Ethnic minorities	-7.641	0.000	0.827	0.000
	% Aged under-18	6.010	0.000		
	% Drunk	3.904	0.000		
	'Dirtiness'	3.323	0.002		
	% on Drugs	-3.003	0.004		
	% Males in groups	2.443	0.018		
	% Aged over-30	-2.017	0.049		
Model 3: 'Severe' Incidents	'Aggravation by patrons'	4.160	0.000	0.355	0.000
	% Full to capacity	3.501	0.001		
	% Aged over-30	3.117	0.002		
	'Staff Alert'	-3.035	0.004		

* The police data for the first six months of 2006 is used for this purpose as these most closely correspond to the period of the field observations (see Tables 8 and 9)

When examining Table 10 a number of limitations have to be considered. The first relates to the nature of these data, for example each nightclub has eight measures of each independent variable (every occasion each observer visited) yet only one of each dependent variable (police figures, observed aggressive incidents and those rated as 'severe' incidents). Secondly, each of the three dependent variables has its own strengths and limitations. The police data is numerically more robust but does not (only) refer to nights, or even some months, when the observers were collecting data. The observed data takes account of any potential weaknesses in reporting to the police, but these contain much fewer cases. Also, it might be argued that cases known to the police are likely to be more serious than the non-'severe' incidents witnessed by observers.

In Table 10, Model 1 shows the relationship between Form 1 observations and the number police call-outs / recorded crime associated with the observed nightclubs. In this analysis nightclubs with a high number of police incidents / crimes of disorder were predicted most strongly by scoring highly on the 'Aggravation by patrons' scale, then in turn, by having proportionally *fewer* patrons from ethnic minorities, by *not* having an 'Unhealthy Ambience', by having staff who *do not* socialise with patrons, by having more under-age patrons, by having more patrons and by having more female patrons. The overall adjusted R-squared for this equation was 0.635, indicating that 63.5% of the variance in police data could be predicted by these six independent variables.

Model 2 conducts the same analysis to predict the number of aggressive incidents witnessed by observers and the resultant equation shows some similarities to that which best predicted the police figures (Model 1). In this more aggressive incidents were likely to be witnessed in premises with *fewer* ethnic minority patrons, more under-agers, more drunkenness, higher levels of 'Dirtiness', *lower* levels of illegal drug use, more males in groups and *fewer* patrons aged over-30 years. Finally, the same analysis was conducted for 'severe' incidents only. Given only three premises had any 'severe' incidents this equation, Model 3, should be treated with most caution, nevertheless such incidents could be predicted by 'Aggravation by patrons', being full to nearer

capacity, on this occasion *more* patrons aged over-30 and by staff *not* being 'alert' (teamwork, hostility, monitoring etc.).

Although there are limitations to these analyses, their value lies in that they support observers' (qualitative) field-notes and help to unravel some confounding factors. For example, in Table 7 the Happy-hardcore venues ('Xanadu' and 'Armageddon') have an elevated level of drug use relative to the sample mean. To the casual observer this may imply that illegal drugs are positively associated with disorder, however as indicated by Model 2, this association disappears when controlling for such premises even more elevated levels of 'Aggravation by patrons' and under-18s. Also, in Model 2 the age of patrons (whether under-18 or over-30) was negatively related to the frequency of aggressive incidents, yet in Model 3 the proportion of patrons aged over-30 years was positively related to 'severe' incidents. In other words under-age aggression is less serious than 'grown-up' violence. As will be seen in later in this section this would appear to concur with observers' descriptions of aggressive incidents.

Interestingly, in Table 10, a gender component was apparent in the regression equations predicting police data (nightclubs with a record of more trouble being observed as having a higher percentage of female patrons) and the total aggressive incidents witnessed (being predicted by the presence of 'wolfpacks'). This is interesting, and in the former case (Model 1, for police data) is unexpected, as previous research of this nature has tended to find that aggressive behaviour in bars is a predominantly, or even exclusively, a male behaviour. Indeed many studies of alcohol or barroom violence have focused solely on males (e.g. Burns, 1980; Graham & Wells, 2003; Murdoch & Pihl, 1988; Lang, 1975; Tomsen, 1997).

In this research an estimated 36.8% of patrons (63/171) involved in the 34 aggressive incidents witnessed were female, compared with only 8.3% of staff who intervened (11/133). Additionally, 28.1% of female patrons who were involved in aggressive incidents were involved in incidents rated as 'severe' (i.e. requiring medical attention) compared with 25.9% of males. This is very much at odds with findings elsewhere (though it chimes with the findings of the Glasgow

'pub study'). For example, a recent Canadian study of 1,334 observations conducted in 118 Toronto bars / nightclubs (Graham et al, in press) concluded: "*Women used different forms of aggression, inflicted less harm, and were more likely to have defensive intent compared with men*". (Though one current research project conducted in the UK would also confirm that, here at least, serious violence between females inside licensed premises is not uncommon, O'Brien & Westmarland, 2006).

In their research Graham and colleagues found that forms of aggression used by females differed from that of males in that it was restricted to passive aggression ("angry looks / body language") and defensive slaps directed against unwanted male advances. In the present research, the forms of aggression used by males and females also differed, however as the following observer's description of a single incident, involving both men and women, illustrates it was the choreography of violence rather than this active / passive or offensive / defensive dimension which was most apparent. (Note that observers' descriptions of aggressive incidents use the numbered notation 'P' to indicate nightclub patrons and 'S' to indicate nightclub staff, from Graham 2000, and that all patrons described are believed to have White Scottish ethnicity unless stated otherwise):

"Then P1 ([30-40 year-old] woman in pink top) and P2 ([25-40 year-old female] blonde in black knee high boots) had each other by the hair and were trying to force each others heads down. The other three women were hard to see but it looked like they initially were trying to break it up but then ended up getting involved themselves, resulting in a circle of five women all pulling each others hair. P3 [27-40 year-old female in black jacket] ended up getting punched in the face by one of the other women but I am unsure who did it. Her nose was burst open and she put her hands over face. At this point P6 (male [24-42 year-old in striped shirt]) started chasing P7 (other male [24-36 year old in checked shirt]) and punched him in the head and kicked him on the back of his leg. P7 turned round and tried to retaliate but stumbled. He managed to correct himself so he didn't fall and the fight between them didn't go any further than that." (Female Observer Team A, 'Sinatra's')

As illustrated in the above field-note, the choreography of aggressive incidents between males differed greatly from that of conflicts between females. Male conflicts tended to first involve two men 'squaring-up'. They may be 'assisted' by 'seconds', who would either encourage or hold back the two combatants. If a

fight did start then these two men would trade punches standing up, perhaps trying to get each other onto the floor by using headlocks. When a male combatant was floored the other male would then kick him when he was down. At this point 'seconds' may help the floored man to his feet. On other occasions the seconds too could 'square-up' and begin fighting in the same way, and this could lead to several men all engaging in a stand-up fight with a single opponent. Such conflicts were usually quickly spotted and dealt with by stewards.

“We saw P2 [25-30 year-old Hispanic male in white top] and P1 [21-23 year-old male in green t-shirt] ‘squaring up’ then they started to grapple with each other. P3 [22-25 year-old male in beige jumper] then tried to pull P1 away while shouting at P2. P4 [25-31 year-old Hispanic male with beard] was also trying to pull P2 away and as he did P2 threw a punch at P1 that hit him on the side of the head. This only took a few seconds to kick off and the bouncers, S1 and S2 [male stewards] were over straight away.” (Male Observer Team B, ‘Chocolate’)

“P1 [18-23 year-old male in red stripy top] was talking to P3 [17-22 year-old male in white t-shirt] and started to ‘square up’ to him. P1 started to push P3 in the chest. He did this a few times and then P3 pushed him back. P1 pushed him again and P2 [18-22 year-old male in beige jumper] intervened, but at the same time P1 went to head-butt P3 but just clipped him. P2 then threw a punch and hit the side of P1’s head. P4 [17-24 year-old male in white top with spiky hair] then joined in and shoved P2 out of the way... The whole incident was over very quickly and the bouncers arrived at the scene almost immediately.” (Female Observer Team B, ‘Armageddon’)

By contrast female fights were described by observers as being more difficult to spot when trouble was ‘brewing’ as, unlike the fixed ‘choreography’ of male disputes, these could suddenly ‘kick off’ from what had previously only appeared to be a (perhaps heated) conversation. This tended to involve hair-pulling, which usually resulted in the combatants falling to the floor and punching each other in the face or hitting each other on the head with an object at close range. Any other female who tried to break it up risked being pulled into the fight herself (i.e. by the hair) resulting in several women becoming entangled in a melee, leaving the stewards with a much more difficult situation to resolve.

“P4 [20-21 year-old female] went for someone, I don’t know who. This started at the top of the stairs near the toilets in the big room. It was a bit like the ‘Sinatra’s’ fight [above] where it starts off with two. Then others (P2 [20 year-old female in blue dress] and P3 [20 year-old female with ponytail]) join in, possibly in an attempt to break it up but it just snowballs into a bigger fight S1 and S5 [male stewards] were there first. S5 got between the two fighters and S3, S2 [female

stewards] and S6 [male steward] and some other security staff arrived about 20 seconds later. It was hard to see what was going on, it was just a mass of fighters and stewards. S5 definitely got punched in the face by one girl possibly an accident as punches were flailing everywhere.” (‘Idols’, Male Observer Team A)

That this research had a relatively high proportion of female fights is perhaps unsurprising, as the majority of patrons were female. However, only 19.7 % of stewards observed were female, and these were often tied up with door searches, a situation greatly worsened by the smoking ban (see *Smoking ban*). Additionally, owing to their low numbers ($n = 11$), strikingly 45.5% of female stewards who did intervene in aggressive incidents were involved in incidents rated as ‘severe’ compared with only 18.9% of males. Female stewards were also younger than their male colleagues (mean ages, 24.0 and 27.8 respectively, $t = 3.80$, $p = 0.002$) which may reflect a lack of available experienced female staff. Female toilets seemed to be checked much less frequently than male ones and in one aggressive incident a girl had locked herself in a cubicle while a group outside made menacing remarks about her.

“I was in the female toilets waiting for a cubicle. P1 [18 year-old female in glasses] was in front of me. She turned to me and said “aren’t men wanks?”... She told me that her boyfriend had “just got off with some wee slag on the dancefloor”. She seemed drunk, upset and angry. At this point another girl came into the toilets and barged passed us into a newly available cubicle. P1 got pissed off at this and started shouting “if some bitch skips me again I’m gonna boot fuck out them”. I saw another cubicle available and told her not too worry and pointed the cubicle to her. I continued to wait and noticed at the far end of the toilet P2 [18 year-old female in mini-skirt], P3 [18 year-old female in trousers] and P4 [18 year-old female in denim skirt] sitting on top of the sinks shouting at P5 in cubicle (who I never saw). P2 was the worst while P3 and P4 just seemed to agree. P2 was shouting “I know you’re in there ya wee bitch. Just wait till you come out” and just kept shouting “bitch” and “slag” at her. I didn’t wait to see what happened as there were no staff available in the toilets.” (Female Observer Team A, ‘Xanadu’)

There were many observations and several aggressive incidents where male stewards appeared either to fail to take female disorder seriously or provide empathy to victims of female-to-female assaults. For example, after breaking up a fight a male steward “looked like he could hardly suppress a smirk” (Female Observer Team A, ‘Xanadu’) at a woman who had her blonde hair-extensions ripped from her head, while the other male steward who was restraining the woman who attacked her “was looking out on to the dancefloor and dancing along to

the music stamping his foot and nodding his head to the beat”. When male stewards intervened successfully in a female dispute, they seemed unsure of what to do next, and tended to let female offenders remain in nightclubs where male offenders would be ejected. On one occasion female aggressors were later witnessed by observers talking to a male patron “boasting about the fight and acting out punching and stamping gestures” (Female Observer, Team A, ‘Idols’).

Male aggressors were not dealt with so leniently. On one occasion where a female patron attacked a male who had accidentally bumped her, she was not ejected by the male steward who intervened, yet on another occasion male stewards attempted to eject two male bystanders who had attempted to break up a female fight, allowing the women responsible to escape into the crowd while the men protested their innocence. In the extreme one male steward resorted to punching then biting a female patron several times on the arm and wrist when she refused let go of the hair of women she was assaulting. When he returned, after presumably ejecting her (the aggressor), he had blood on his shirt.

The issue of gender differences between aggressive incidents was further highlighted when comparisons were made using questions on Form 2 relating to the causes and nature of these events. There were three sections to this, the first of which asked about how observers viewed the causes of each aggressive incident, comprising whether any of the following factors were involved; ‘sexual jealousy’, ‘looking for a fight’, ‘recreational fighting’, ‘loyalty’, ‘defending’, ‘taking offence’, ‘insults’, ‘prejudice’, ‘over-reacting’, ‘disagreements’, ‘grudges’, ‘horseplay’ and various aspects of the nightclub environment or service. Each item was coded ‘yes’ (e.g. yes ‘horseplay’ was a factor), ‘no’, ‘maybe’ or don’t know (the latter response being excluded from subsequent analyses).

The second set of questions asked observers about any harm involved to each individual (patron or staff) personally involved in the incident. Specifically whether anyone was hurt, the type of injury and a rating from zero to ten on scales measuring, ‘severity’, ‘pain’, ‘intoxication’, ‘threats’ ‘verbal’ and ‘physical aggression’. Finally the third set of questions noted how each person involved in the incident had behaved. Items comprised whether the individual had ‘tunnel

vision', was 'unafraid', 'emotional', 'hyper', 'power-tripping', 'unaware' of other(s) perspective, 'impulsive', 'carried away', 'risk taking', 'unthinking', 'lacked comprehension' or 'stumbling / slurring'. These were also coded 'yes', 'no' and 'maybe' as above.

Using this method of variable coding, the most striking gender difference was that 29.8% of female combatants were coded as 'yes' by observers as being involved in incidents where 'sexual jealousy' was thought to have played a part, with a further 57.9% where this was 'maybe' a factor. The equivalent figures for males involved in aggressive incidents were only 2.4% 'yes', 'sexual jealousy' was a factor and 47.1% 'maybe' (chi-square = 34.24; $p = 0.000$). In contrast 26.7% of male fighters were involved in fights where someone 'looking for trouble' was thought to have been a factor, with a further 48.8% 'maybe looking for trouble', compared with zero female 'looking for trouble' and 33.3% 'maybe' doing so (chi-square = 24.63; $p = 0.000$).

Other significant gender differences concerning the likely causes of aggressive incidents comprised female combatants being more likely to be involved in incidents where observers noted that someone was 'over-reacting' (32.8% 'yes', 59.0% 'maybe') compared with males (15.9% and 40.2% respectively, chi-square = 22.45; $p = 0.000$). Females were also more likely to be involved in incidents where someone appeared ('maybe' only) to be holding a 'grudge' (females 42.0% 'maybe', males 23.5%, chi-square = 5.01; $p = 0.025$). Male combatants on the other hand were more often involved in incidents related to barroom features (mainly crowding, i.e. resulting in bumping) (7.8% 'yes' and 12.2% 'maybe' compared with 1.8% and 1.8% respectively for females, chi-square = 7.72; $p = 0.021$). Subsequent patron interviews indicated that 'bumping', or waiting to be bumped, was a tactic that may be employed by males who were 'looking for trouble' taking advantage of the congested layout of some busy nightclubs (see *Interviews with Patrons*).

“On his way out P2 [19 year-old male in red shirt] bumped into P1 [18 year-old male in white top] who turned around and pushed P2 backwards. P2 then squared up to P1. The bouncers then moved in and took P1 and P2 to the side of the dancefloor by the door.” (Male Observer Team B, 'Armageddon')

“I’m not surprised it kicked off like it did, it was very busy and everyone seemed crammed into the main [‘Urban’] room (the [side] room [playing ‘Dance’ music] was less busy), this added with the strobe lighting meant you couldn’t see properly and I was constantly banging into people so I presume others were too. (Female Observer Team B, ‘Idols’)

In terms of individual differences, interestingly males involved in aggressive incidents were more intoxicated than female combatants (scoring 6.4 on a scale of 0 to 10, compared to 5.7 for females, $t = 2.31$; $p = 0.022$). Individual male combatants were also more likely to be described as 'unafraid', (60.9% 'yes' and 26.1% 'maybe', compared to 36.2% and 34.5% respectively for females, chi-square = 9.93; $p = 0.007$). Finally, there was an unclear gender difference with incidents involving issues of 'loyalty' (chi-square = 13.06, $p = 0.001$) as more males in such incidents were coded 'yes' (16.9% as opposed to zero females), but also coded 'no' (34.8% versus 28.6%) compared females (71.4% coded 'maybe')

All other variables were non-significant. This includes many variables which from previous research (and lay beliefs) may have been expected to differ by gender, such as aggressive incidents involving females being less likely to have people getting 'hurt' (measured 'no', 'maybe' or 'yes'), with those hurt experiencing less 'pain', lower levels of injury 'severity', there being less 'threat' and less 'physical aggression', but more 'verbal aggression' (all scored zero to ten) from female combatants (e.g. see Graham et al, 2006). The observers' ratings did not support the findings of previous research any similar lay gender stereotype.

Comparisons with previous research

Although at odds with the research conducted elsewhere, the relatively high number of aggressive incidents involving female patrons in this nightclub study would appear to support the findings recent similar research conducted in Glasgow city centre, that is the 'pub study' funded by the local health authority (Forsyth et al, 2005, see Introduction). Despite this apparent 'gender equality' in involvement in aggressive incidents between men and women, that study observed a much lower rate of aggressive incidents than has been found in similar studies conducted elsewhere, only 14 from around 100 hours of

observation. For example, in Australia, Homel and Clark (1994) noted 102 incidents from 296 hours of barroom observation (involving 147 two hour visits). More recently, in Canada, Graham and colleagues (2006) noted 1,052 incidents from around 3,335 hours observing 118 Toronto nightclubs (1,334 two and half hour visits). These studies both translate to rates of around one aggressive incident for every three hours of observation (or 35 and 32 incidents per 100 hours observation respectively), the same as found in the present Glasgow nightclub study (34-35 in 100 hours). Thus this finding of the present nightclub research project (i.e. the frequency of aggressive incidents) *would* appear to be in line with that of previous international studies using the observational method, this despite it differing greatly from that found in an otherwise similar study conducted in another sector of the licensed trade industry, recently, in the same geographical area (Glasgow city centre).

Not only did the number of aggressive incidents witnessed (and recorded on Form 2) in the present nightclub study differ greatly from that observed in the previous 'pub study', so also did many of the other variables recorded in an identical fashion (i.e. on Form 1) during their observational phases. Some key differences between the two studies are shown by Table 11 (below, from Forsyth & Millard, 2006). When examining this table, it should be remembered that, although these studies involved identical methodologies, were of the same magnitude (each involving approximately 100 hours of observation) and were conducted in the same geographical area, both used different teams of observers and were conducted approximately 18 months apart.

As already indicated, the most striking difference between the two studies is that there were more than double the number of aggressive incidents witnessed during the nightclub research than in the 'pub study', 34 or 35 (depending on whether an incident involving door staff but not patrons is counted) as opposed to only 14 in the pubs. This was despite the 'pub study' selection process purposively including the two premises, holding a Public House Licence, which had the highest rate of crimes and incidents of disorder within Glasgow city centre. Clues as to why there should be such a difference in observed

aggressive incidents are evident from the respective Form 1 data recorded from each project, shown on Table 11.

Table 11: Comparisons with pub sector study

Variable	Nightclubs	'Pub study'	<i>p</i> (t-test)
<i>Form 1</i>			
Number of Patrons (on premises)	231	172	0.000
% Female	55.5	44.6	0.000
% Under-18 years of age	14.9	1.4	0.000
% Over-30 years of age	15.1	40.2	0.000
% Drunk	64.0	56.8	0.114
'Unhealthy Ambience' 0-45	26.3	22.5	0.002
'Dirtiness' 0-36	16.8	16.2	0.623
'Sexual tension' 0-27	13.7	9.4	0.000
'Aggravation' by patrons' 0-36	17.4	15.0	0.018
<i>Form 2</i>			
Aggressive Incidents	34-35*	14	-
• 'Ambiguous Intent'	8	3	-
• Verbal Aggression	5	2	-
• 'Physical' Incidents	21	9	-
○ 'Severe' Physical	5	3	-
Street Incidents**	5-7***	20	-

* One 'physical' incident at the door of a nightclub would have been included in the staff-focused 'pub study', though here it is counted as an outside incident.

** Street incidents were not formally recorded on a Form 3 in the 'pub study'.

*** As well as the incident recorded differently at the observed premises (* above) another outside incident was witnessed before observers had entered a nightclub, which was not a feature of the pub study as observers did not have to wait outside before gaining entry (interestingly this incident occurred at one of the premises, the 'White Hart', observed in the previous study and assessed then as 'high risk' for disorder)

One explanation as to why there should be more aggressive incidents in the nightclub sample may simply be that these premises were larger (231 to 172 patrons). However although that could well be used as an explanation for any differences in reported incidents (e.g. to the police, see Table 10) it is not as likely to be a factor in observational data, such as that collected for these two research projects. The reason for this is that observers tend to only notice incidents in the vicinity of their observation point. In other words, in large venues, or 'superclubs' with several rooms or floors such as those observed in the nightclub study, it is inevitable that some incidents will be missed. In comparison, aggressive incidents in small, quiet, well-lit pubs are unlikely to be missed (many of the nightclubs were darkened or using strobe lighting and would be too noisy to hear verbal aggression). In any case, the difference in patron numbers, shown

in Table 11, would appear to be too small to explain away all the variance in observed incidents witnessed inside these two groups of premises. (Curiously, as is also shown on Table 11, despite there being more aggressive incidents within the nightclubs, as compared to the pubs, there were actually many more outside incidents witnessed in the 'pub study'. This finding will be examined in greater detail in a later section (see *Street disorder*).

Perhaps a better explanation for the differences in the rates of aggressive incidents between the nightclub and pub sectors may lie in patron demographics and behaviours. Nightclub patrons were more likely to be female and aged under-18, but less likely to be aged over-30. This corroborates with 'pub study' observations which noted that younger patrons tended to gravitate towards nightclubs (including some of those observed in the present study) after closing time (midnight) while other patrons (e.g. 'old men' and 'couples') tended to gravitate towards transport nodes (i.e. they were going home).

Comparing the scales used to predict disorder risk between the pub and nightclub sectors (see also Table 7) reveals significantly higher levels of 'Unhealthy Ambience' in the nightclubs (despite the smoking ban), marginally higher levels of 'Aggravation by patrons' (mainly due to the presence of more younger patrons in some nightclubs) and much higher levels of 'Sexual tension' than was observed in the pubs (this despite observers in that study thinking that there was a high level of inappropriate sexual behaviours within these pubs).

There was no difference in levels of 'Dirtiness' between the two studies. However, the most interesting non-significant difference was in levels of drunkenness. This implies that the differences in disorder between these two sectors may not be down to any differences in alcohol consumption (e.g. prolonged drinking) or drinks marketing, but instead may be simply down to youthfulness and sex, in other words activities associated with dancing behaviour. Subsequent patron interviews supported this view.

Interviews with patrons

The 32 interviewees had mean age of 23 years (range 16 – 48) and 12 (37.5%) were female. At the start of the interview, they were asked to complete a one-week drinking-diary. This asked what alcohol products, if any, they had consumed during each of the previous seven days. The brand and size of each beverage was noted in order to calculate standard units, as was the time and place of consumption in order to gain the temporal progression of each drinking occasion / session between off-trade, pub and nightclub consumption, as well as noting any alcohol consumption in other venues (e.g. restaurants – though this was rarely mentioned). Table 12 details each interviewee's drinking pattern over the previous week in relation to how many nights they had been clubbing.

When examining Table 12 it should be noted that, some interviewees ($n = 12$) had not been clubbing in the previous week, however others ($n = 6$) had been out on more than one occasion (e.g. #32 had been out on three separate nights during the week before he was interviewed). In such cases the units for each clubbing occasion are summed (e.g. #32's alcohol consumption in the 'Units in nightclub' column on Table 12 are 14+1+16, which indicates the number of standard units of alcohol that he had consumed, respectively, on each of his three nights out clubbing - while actually inside a nightclub).

Table 12: Interviewees' previous week's drinking patterns

ID	Age and Sex	Alcohol and Clubbing activity in past week							Club Night Cost (£)
		Days Drink	Total Units	Max Day	Club Nights	Units before	Units in nightclub	Units after	
#1	23M	6	66	13	2	5+4	6+5	2+0	?
#2	20M	3	41	16	2	2+0	1+16	0	?
#3	20M	1	6	6	1	6	0	0	20-60
#4	19F	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	?
#5	20M	3	15	10	0	-	-	-	?
#6	19F	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	15
#7	24M	4	63	33	1	0	8	0	>150
#8	30M	1	28	28	1	12	16	0	20-40
#9	23M	2	19	13	1	10	3	0	30-40
#10	21M	4	34	16	0	-	-	-	50
#11	19F	3	12	7	1	4	3	0	30
#12	20M	2	26	24	1	6	18	0	60-80+
#13	26M	6	84	34	2	0+8	10+12	0+14	25
#14	19F	5	48	25	1	4	15	10	35
#15	21F	1	11	11	1	6	5	0	20-50
#16	20M	2	52	30	2	9+21	13+9	0	45-100
#17	20F	3	54	21	1	6	5	2	20
#18	21M	1	15	15	0	-	-	-	30-50
#19	18F	1	13	13	1	6	7	0	30
#20	48F	4	9	3	0	-	-	-	40-50
#21	19M	2	15	13	1	10	3	-	20
#22	18F	3	38	14	2	10+7	4+4	0	30-40
#23	45M	7	50	11	0	-	-	-	30
#24	47M	2	5	3	0	-	-	-	10
#25	29M	5	53	21	1	12	9	-	80-100
#26	16F	0	-	-	0	-	-	-	30-40
#27	17F	3	27	17	0	-	-	-	40
#28	22M	1	27	27	1	19	4	4	60
#29	20F	1	4	4	0	-	-	-	40
#30	23M	3	78	56	1	10	4	0	40
#31	20M	4	41	14	0	-	-	-	50-66
#32	18M	4	52	22	3	3+10+6	14+1+16	0	20-30

The most striking feature of Table 12 is that interviewees' drinking patterns were very heterogeneous. Three interviewees, #4, #6 and #26 (all female) had not consumed any alcohol at all during the past week. At the other extreme, nine interviewees had consumed 50 or more units that week, with 14/20 males and 4/12 females exceeding the supposed limits for 'sensible drinking' of 21 and 14 units respectively (eight males and three females reached the comparative 'risky

drinking' levels of 50 and 35 units respectively). Perhaps more alarmingly, some interviewees tended to concentrate all their weekly drinking into a single occasion, with nine male and (all) four of the female interviewees who had exceeded their recommended weekly maximum having reached these respective limits (of 21 or 14 units) in a single day / drinking session. For example, interviewee #8 drank his entire weekly total of 28 units in around six hours of clubbing and pre-loading on the previous Friday night. He stated his alcohol consumption and dancing in nightclubs were indissoluble.

“...for me alcohol goes hand in hand with dancing em and when I drink I drink to excess as probably I do when I go out it becomes more a night out for dancing not for chatting. I would rather have a carry-out in the house than go to a pub.”
(Male Patron, #8)

Table 12 also allows inspection of the pattern of drinking over a night's clubbing, including pre-loading (drinking before entering the nightclub), consumption within the nightclub environment and after-parties (drinking after leaving the nightclub). Again this was very heterogeneous, with for example one respondent, #3, drinking before but not inside the nightclub he attended that week. Indeed several interviewees drank more alcohol before entering a nightclub than they then did while inside, while others extended their late night drinking session to after-parties. The subsequent taped section of the interview revealed that the patterns indicated in Table 12 were not fixed to particular individuals and, for example, that many of those who did not go clubbing during the previous seven days also had experience of pre-loading and after-parties.

At this point it should be stressed that these figures only refer to their drinking in the previous seven days and these data may not be typical. For example, #22 had her 18th birthday during the week concerned and the individual who drank the most on any one day, #30, stated that this involved a 22 hour session, entirely at home, for his flat-mate's birthday. On the other hand interviewee #24 had intended going out during the previous weekend but had been unable to do so owing to a work-related back injury. However, the last column of Table 12, detailing how much each interviewee expected to spend on a single night out clubbing does relate to their perceptions of a typical occasion. Again this varied greatly between individuals, though typically these totals were derived from

summing together the cost of all alcohol purchases, entry to nightclubs, fast-food at closing time and transport, with the latter cost often being around half of total spend for those who lived far from the city centre (see *Street disorder*).

After completing their one-drinking week-diary, taped semi-structured interviews helped to explain some of the reasons behind the patterns shown in Table 12. In these, respondents gave three main reasons for participating in the nightclub scene, as opposed to say drinking alcohol in other locations. Interestingly these three reasons were very similar to the nightclub typology indicated by the observational phase of the research (i.e. groups of friends / workmates dancing to 'Cheesy pop', sexualised dancing in 'meat-market' type environments of the 'Urban' style nightclubs and individuals who were into various aspects the dancing or music scene, see *Typology of nightclubs and their clientele*).

In the first of these, interviewees stated that they mainly went out clubbing to celebrate a special occasion with friends (e.g. 'hen nights' birthdays, works nights out). These 'social-clubbers' tended to view themselves as infrequent nightclub attendees (though in large groups, special occasions may become relatively common). Those interviewed in this category were often students, who had not been out clubbing in the past seven days owing to interviews being conducted outside term-time (perhaps making the figures in Table 12 a slight underestimate of overall typical nightclub-related alcohol consumption).

“Well, it’s a good laugh like with all your friends, but I’m, I don’t know, it’s not really something I do. I really only go for special occasions.” (Female Patron, #6)

“It’s mainly like you would go out to a club to celebrate someone’s birthday or something because it’s like a sort of big event, I don’t do it that often so it’s kinda more special than just going in a pub.” (Male Patron, #5)

The second reason was to “meet new people” (i.e. 'pulling' sexual partners). These 'pulling-clubbers' tended to be frequent attendees, particularly of the (type of) nightclubs observed in this research.

“I just like, I like eh meeting people. Mainly eh go out to meet girls, have a good time with friends as well.” (Male Patron, #3)

“Want to go somewhere where I can, where I feel comfortable and er somewhere where I’ve got a chance of pulling.” (Male Patron #10)

‘Pulling-clubbers’ appeared to be the most likely to be influenced my marketing (perhaps explaining the more overt, TV etc. advertising observed in ‘Urban’ style premises such as ‘Rapture’, ‘Chocolate’ and ‘Idols’) as keeping their costs down was more important than it was to the other types of clubbers. ‘Pulling-clubbers’ also tended to vary the premises which they attended, in some cases even visiting several venues on one night.

“Socialise with friends, meet nice girls. Basically if they’ve got a drink offer on that’s always a bonus. If it’s a cheap night.” (Male Patron, #28)

“‘Xanadu’ is for 16 year olds. ‘Sinatra’s’ is full of old people, even though I’m 29 [laughs]. It depends on how drunk you are and what you’re looking for, you might go to ‘Sinatra’s’ if you want an older woman but that just depends. ‘Chocolate’ is alright. I would go back there, it’s a good mix, good music.” (Male Patron, #25)

Interestingly, interviewees in this group often saw little point in going to nightclubs when they were in a relationship.

“I don’t really do it as much as I used to, like I used to go out clubbing a lot like, but I think, kind of once I’ve got a boyfriend I’ve calmed down a bit so [laughs].”... “Yeah well, it’s kind of better to just stay in, like spend time with them rather than shout at each other really.” (Female Patron, #17)

“I go to a club with my friends but to be honest it’s, if I can think of anything else, it’s just a woman, I think ha ha.”... “Recently I’ve just started seeing someone, so I mean I’ve not, I’ve not actually felt the need to actually kind of picking up women or anything like that.” (Male Patron, #9)

The third type of clubber was either music fans (part of a similar youth / subculture e.g. Goths) or part of some other niche group / scene not covered by the observational research. These included persons who attended rock / live music venues, Gay clubs (four interviewees were Gay / lesbian), student-orientated venues (including mid-week student-only nights at some of the observed nightclubs) and ticketed rave venues, where illegal drugs and expensive door prices were more prominent features of the night out than they were to those who attended the eight nightclubs observed. These ‘music / scene-orientated’ clubbers appeared to be the most regular attendees, though they tended to stick to only one or very few regular premises where they could

'hang-out' with like-minded individuals in the same scene (regardless of class, ethnicity, age etc.).

"I choose a club for the music and, I suppose it's a bit of a cliché for the atmosphere as well. The kind of people who are going to be going there." (Male Patron, #1)

"...initially I went to them first probably cos' of word of mouth and also a Gay club you know, you're more likely to meet similar people. And usually go to places just by word of mouth, people have said that they're good or the music you hear about on the internet and flyers and stuff, er specific nights out and what types of music they play and stuff. So I tend to go to places that I'll enjoy music." (Male Patron, #16)

However, it should also be stressed that the three types of clubber described above were not mutually exclusive as, for example, 'music / scene-orientated' clubbers could go on 'works nights out' and Gay clubbers often went out to 'straight' venues with friends or vice-versa. This 'pick and mix' pattern of clubbing meant that despite their diversity and in spite of the changes to recruitment strategy (away from the observed nightclubs, see Methods) only two interviewees had not (yet) attended any of the eight observed premises.

"I like 'Saturn' for the music, 'Alumni' [a student-orientated nightclub] is a pulling ground more than anything and the same with 'Shangri-La' [a nightclub similar to 'Xanadu']. 'Shangri-La I felt like I was back in [home town in the Highlands] a couple of times." (Male Patron, #7)

"...the music, probably to still feel attractive em to still feel that you know that you're attractive to people, that you can still pull, em to spend time with friends, to get drunk, to have fun, all these things" (Male Patron, #8)

Additionally clubbing choices could change over time, perhaps away from the original reasons for attendance (i.e. socialising, 'pulling' or music / scene orientated clubbers) and towards continued and dedicated alcohol use.

"It's slowed down now. If you're younger, I'm 29 but when you're younger 20, 25, I don't know, guys always think with what's between their legs so to me it's the only real reason for being out, and it's the same with the lassies, they're just as bad and nowadays it's as easy to get a woman as you can pick an apple off a tree or something. They're just falling for it. So at the day it's, the older you get and if you got a girlfriend at home, it's just an aspect of the drink. Nowadays for me as I get older it's to drink longer. It's not to get a woman, but younger sense its women, nowadays it's to drink longer." (Male Patron, #25)

As was indicated in the field observations, certain types of premises seemed to attract certain age groups. For example, the ‘Cheesy pop’ nightclubs, ‘Tropicana’ and ‘Sinatra’s’, had many more over-30s according to the observers (see Table 4). This pattern was confirmed in the interviews with both these premises being described as “grab a granny” (e.g. by male patrons, #12, #28) and most interviewees felt too young to attend such venues.

“Yeah it’s [‘Tropicana’] more like older women, younger guys’ type thing and they’re all looking for pretty much the same thing. That’s not really what I’m going for a club for.” (Male Patron, #13)

‘Tropicana’, was just full of old people. I just found, I feel conscious that I’m really young in there. Don’t like the music.” (Female Patron, #11 – aged 19)

However, other interviewees felt that this age division was brought about as much by age-ism amongst nightclub operators (i.e. via door policy) as by their clienteles’ entertainment preferences (i.e. music policy). For example, the oldest interviewee complained that she felt pushed towards such ‘Cheesy’ venues.

“I think probably 20 years ago this age group that I’m in [48 years old], that sort of age group didn’t go out and socialise 20 years ago, and they do and it’s always going to be the case now. And the ones that think they’ve got the monopoly cos’ they are 20, 25 and everything is catered for them. There’s much more of this age group [48] and they’ve got much more money but they don’t really have the places to go so there’s market there if somebody was to get into it, and do it properly. I think for the likes of my age group as well, I think nightclubs appear to be kind of, it’s like people who go to nightclubs at this kind of age are like soddos. They’re either not in a happy relationship at home watching the TV so they’re going out and doing things like that. So it’s almost like, oh that ‘Engelbert’s’ [a nightclub similar to ‘Sinatra’s’] or whatever like, the way that it was kind of portrayed because it was for maybe a different age group and it’s like it’s only young people that should want to go and do nightclubs. When I was younger parents listened to completely different music from what I listened to, whereas now parents and children listen to the same sort of music so they’ve got the same tastes. So I think we need to broaden the whole social scene to a bigger age group really. Cos’ I don’t think it’s gonna go back the way really.” (Female Patron, #20)

At the other end of the spectrum were nightclubs such as ‘Xanadu’ and ‘Armageddon’, which observers felt were attracting large numbers of much younger patrons. In these venues observers had often felt too old (they were aged 22 to 26) and described many of the patrons as ‘neds’ (hooligans). The marketing student observer (Male Observer Team B) had stated that he was “not

sure what the USP” (unique selling point) of such nightclubs was “because it’s not cheap, it’s not well decorated or looked after and the music is terrible”. Interviewees confirmed these views (e.g. by #31 calling them “ned-inn’s”) and those who had attended these venues and others like them implied that being able to get in was the USP (i.e. they had less exclusive door polices).

“I used to always go to ‘Obliteration’ [a similar venue to ‘Armageddon’] but that was because I was underage and that was the only place we could get in”... “And like ‘Xanadu’, ‘Armageddon’, places like that where it’s easy to get in, cos’ and ‘Faculty’ [a student-orientated nightclub], it’s harder to get in there, though” ... “I don’t really like them, ha, ha. It’s just the fact that I can get in. But most of it is about the music and stuff like that, and where everybody else wants to go. Where my pals want to go, stuff like that.” [When asked if would go back to any of these premises] “No, not now I’m 18, no way.” (Female Patron, #22)

“Well, I used to go to like ‘Armageddon’ and places like that, ‘Xanadu’ and places like that when I was a lot younger and just because they’re very easy to get into because not a lot of people that are older go to them, but now that I’ve got ID and like I can get into places I prefer to go to places such as ‘Graduates’ [a student-orientated nightclub] and I can get into them all. You feel safer, put it that way, you feel safer in places like that, and places like ‘Armageddon’ and ‘Xanadu’ like that, it’s more erm, it’s like its kinda neddy. The guys are neddy to be honest with you. The last time I was there I just wanted to leave cos’ er there was sick everywhere, there was people you could tell were like not old enough to be in the places, staggering about, so I just didnae enjoy myself basically so I don’t enjoy myself in those kind of atmospheres so, whereas ‘Graduates’ and that you can tell that they’re professionals that are running the place really.” (Male Patron, #12 – aged 20)

In other words, patrons were prepared to put up with poor facilities and even dangerous clientele (e.g. ‘neds’) in order to gain access to nightclubs. In this situation the potential is obvious for younger (perhaps more vulnerable patrons) to gravitate to the same places where there are also likely to be the most troublemakers, who may also be unable to gain access to other nightclubs (albeit for different reasons). This implies that it may not simply be the case that premises with younger patrons are more disorderly solely because they have younger patrons, which would chime with the aggressive incidents witnessed in such venues during observations. For example, although close to half the patrons at ‘Armageddon’ was felt to be under-18 (mainly females) almost everyone involved in aggressive incidents in that nightclub (mainly males) was felt to be aged over-18 years.

Other patrons, who were able to get into and choose from a wide variety of premises purposively, avoided certain nightclubs. Indeed, when interviewees were shown a list of ten nightclubs, which included the eight observed nightclubs and two 'red herrings' ('Flamingo' and 'Legends', Glasgow city centre nightclubs which were not observed) interviewees actually found it easier to state where they would avoid rather than where they would choose to go to. The potential for violence (along with various age and music-related reasons) was often a deterrent which could over-ride any potential attractors on offer by nightclubs.

“A lot of the clubs are quite rough so I like to go to a club that’s a nice clientele where I’m assured I’m not going to get into any trouble and I’ll have a good night.” (Male Patron, #28)

“Another reason I like going to ‘Saturn’. I prefer the people that are in ‘Saturn’ and I prefer the music.”... “Well, most of them are taking drugs and what not but I don’t know. I never have any trouble, I never fight with anybody. There’s never any violence, I don’t see any.” (Male Patron, #7)

One interviewee (#23) stated he purposively avoided *all* eight of the nightclubs observed because he was “mair interested in drugs” and he “wouldn’t go if there was any bother”, for him effectively ruling out the type of premises in the sample. The only establishment in the city which he frequented was a ticketed rave venue where he believed there would be no trouble “Because most people are on drugs”.

“Well, there’s nae trouble. I never really see trouble. The only time I’ve seen trouble in ‘Galaxy’ [a large ‘Dance’ music / Rave venue] was Chinese Triads. Two of them set about each other but that was no matter where they had met in the world that would be them setting about each other. But I’ve known no ever seen much trouble in ‘Galaxy’ and I’ve been going for about ten year.” (Male Patron, #23)

Interestingly the field observation that nightclubs where there was more drug use than drunkenness might be less violent premises was borne out by interviewees who attended such venues regardless of whether they admitted to using illegal drugs themselves or not.

“‘Saturn’, if you go in there Sunday night. I’ve hardly seen any trouble in there to be honest with you. If there is, it’s usually a drunk guy. It’s never a guy taking drugs. I mean that’s in general I would say so.” (Male Patron, #25)

“In... most, the club that I’ve seen the most drugs taken at in Glasgow is ‘Devotion’ [a Gay ‘Dance’ club] and I’ve never seen one fight in there in my life.” (Male Patron, #16)

Interviewees who believed this gave two broad reasons why illegal drugs, especially ecstasy, should be associated with safer (i.e. less violent) nightlife. The first concerned the pharmacological effects ecstasy (i.e. inducing empathy or loved-up feelings), along with aspects of the supposed peaceful norms within ‘dance drug’ culture which could even influence the behaviour of those present who had not used the drug (e.g. attracting those patrons whose aim was to attend violence-free nightclubs as well as like-minded drug users).

“I think there’s a not a trouble there [‘Saturn’] if you go there erm and it’s a very kind of, it’s, it’s obviously because people’s take drugs very loved-up attitude so you, you’re in a happy mood and you’re in love with everyone I think. That’s what it is though, cos’ you think you’re not going to get anyone starting a fight with you. There’s less trouble.” (Male Patron, #9)

“I think it causes a lot less violence cos’ people are more erm, cos’ if someone’s on ecstasy they can’t fight worth a shit and they don’t want to fight. If someone’s stoned they don’t want to fight, you know?” (Male Patron, #31)

However, it should be stressed that the above beliefs mainly applied to ecstasy (MDMA) and that views were more mixed about other substances.

“Depends on the drug. Pills [ecstasy] can be more euphoric for people so they are certainly not inclined to fight I don’t think. I suppose it depends on the personality as well but certainly the people I know tend to get more affectionate rather than, I find I get the same at the height of the night, quite dramatically.”...
“Alcohol mixed with charley [cocaine] could possibly be a bad idea for some people, but again I think it depends a lot on the personality. I think if you get a quite chilled out person then it doesn’t matter how much charley they have they still won’t want to fight.” (Male Patron, #13)

The second reason why was not so much to do with any positive effect of illegal drugs, but more to do with these substances moderating the negative effects of alcohol use. Put simply, illegal drug use, especially ecstasy, was seen as helping to reduce alcohol consumption and therefore moderating alcohol-related disorder, even in those who had used both substances at the same time. This may perhaps, at least in part, help to explain why none of the fights witnessed in ‘Armageddon’ escalated to the point where they were rated as ‘severe’ physical (see Table 8), despite this nightclub having the greatest number of aggressive

incidents, the highest level of drunkenness and most troublesome clientele ('neds') out of the eight observed.

“Because, because, because generally speaking they [ecstasy pills] have a better effect on people than alcohol does. I know that with, like with me, because before I used to just drink a lot, then I could, I never knew how I was gonna, like sometimes I could just get really aggressive and that, but when I started taking pills then it was, I would just like hug people!” (Female Patron, #17)

“I could quite often go for a night without drinking anything in a club if I was going to be taking pills [ecstasy tablets].” (Male Patron, #1)

When asked what the main reasons were for violence occurring within nightclubs it was hardly surprising that interviewees usually first offered alcohol as *the* explanation.

“Put it this way if you wasnae allowed to drink in pubs there'd be no fighting. Simple as that like!” (Male Patron, #25)

However when asked to give examples of violent nightclub-related disorder which they had seen (or had been involved in) themselves, a similar set of reasons and triggers to those involved in the aggressive incidents witnessed by the observers were mentioned. These included people 'looking for trouble', 'bumping' (often related physical congestion within premises) and 'sexual jealousy'. As with the field observations the reasons why males and females became involved in violence differed. For example some males in particular were thought to go out specifically to look for trouble, and to use any number of reasons to start a fight, where as female fights were thought to be mainly restricted to sexual jealousy.

“Erm, I think like, I think sometimes, well you get these guys, that I think kind of go out looking for fights and then like, or like, who are pretty aggressive and then when they drink it makes it worse. I think most people like, obviously don't want trouble, but I think it's kind of in the attitude.” (Female Patron, #17)

“Well with lassies it's usually over men. I would say, but with guys, guys it can be anything, it can be football er birds, it can be oh you bumped into me about two hours ago but now I've got enough drink in me I want to say something about it.” (Male Patron, #12)

The following account of a violent incident involving an interviewee, #7, illustrates how individuals deemed troublemakers were felt to be able operate by

using certain aspects of the drinking environment within nightclubs in order to try and provoke a reaction in others, in this case by harassing (or attempting to 'pull') a female in the company of the male interviewee.

“There was a guy trying it on with one of my mates and she was saying to me can you get this guy away from me. He was freaking her out. So I turned round and said “Mate, do you want to leave her alone?” And he picked me up and threw me across the dancefloor. Like, pretty much picked me up and threw me!”... “That was in ‘Shangri-La’ [a nightclub similar to ‘Xanadu’]. You know, I got up and I was like, “What the fuck is your problem?” And the guy was a lot bigger than me and he went, “Look, get the fuck out of here. I’m going to kill you.” And I’m like, “Well, what have I done? I’ve told you to leave my mate alone who doesn’t want you to dance with her, you know?” Whether that’s just his attitude and he thinks that women should all dance with him cos’ he’s God’s gift or whether that’s just him being drunk, I’m not sure. But I know a lot of people can get, that also know bouncers and when you get a drink in you and you know the bouncer you think, “I’m untouchable. I can fight with somebody and not be chucked out”, you know. “If they get the better of me I know the bouncers are there just to take them away.”” (Male Patron, #7)

In other conflicts the physical conditions within nightclubs (e.g. door congestion or lengthy bar queues) could lead to bumping / friction between males. This was another pattern / trigger for violence witnessed in the field observations, as is illustrated in the following accounts of incidents involving male interviewees.

“‘Flamingo’ [a ‘Cheesy pop’ nightclub similar to ‘Tropicana’] on Saturday night! A guy had came up behind and I was standing at the bar and he tried to gently push me out the way and I didn’t move cos’ there was nowhere to go. So basically he tried to put his hands under my armpits and lift me out the way! And then he started trying to have a go at me but I just ignored him and he went away so.” (Male Patron, #28)

“I went to ‘Rapture’, just a big load of guys, think they were on a stag party, all pissed up.”... “I was walking up past, I was actually going out, I had a half drunk drink in my hand and I kind of pushed passed a guy and em he wasn’t much bigger than me but he kind of grabbed my t-shirt from behind over my head and then just started laying into me.” [Was there a reason?] “No, no, not at all apart from banging past him in the queue, it was a busy club. So that was the one time I’ve been attacked in a nightclub and the bar stewards threw us both out.” (Male Patron, #1)

Interestingly, the above account of an experience of personal violence by interviewee #1 took place within the ‘Urban’ nightclub ‘Rapture’, one of the two premises in the sample where observers witnessed no aggressive incidents during fieldwork (the other being the ‘Dance’ club ‘Saturn’). His and other

interviewees' accounts of incidents or behaviours within this nightclub support observers' belief that it was by chance alone that no aggressive incidents were witnessed here during observations and this would also seem to place it more in line with police data (see Table 8). Interviewees' accounts also supported the disorder risk variables recorded for 'Rapture' (see Table 7). For example, the following account by interviewee #12 of personal involvement in violence also happened in 'Rapture', and is of interest as this was the nightclub which observers rated highest on the 'Sexual tension' disorder risk scale. This potential trigger for violence was mentioned as being particularly prominent within this nightclub by several interviewees who had attended it.

“I was with my girlfriend and a guy was there and he was, I don't know he come up and danced behind her and I just said to him, I says this is my girlfriend it's no actually er em you know it's no somebody I'm trying to fire into or anything like that, and he basically said “so what?” and called me something. I was like, whatever, and then he kept doing it and doing it and obviously I've got a wee bit of drink in me and I was a wee bit wound up and angry so I said do that again and I'm gonnae hit you and he basically done that in my face. I just snapped basically and I hit him and then that was it. All his pals dragged him away and my pals dragged me away but it was nothing, it was nothing major, it was just like, like I say it was just one guy being idiot.” (Male Patron, #12)

The above account also supports the field observations which saw male fights occurring along an identifiable choreography, involving two men squaring-up, challenges being made, a punch being thrown and 'seconds' being present to provide support or to intervene. Female fights on the other hand were seen as being at the same time less common yet more “vicious” (i.e. worse), involving no real choreography or pattern other than hair-pulling and attempts to disfigure. In common with the field observers, interviewees also believed sexual jealousy to be the prime motivator in these conflicts.

“There's always trouble, there's always lassies trying to fight with my [female] friends that are out because they think my friends are with me...”... “they fight with each other. They seem to, they come up to you and try and pull you and then they think because you're like “Get lost”, they think you're with one of my friends and they're like jealous of my friend so they have a go at them and it just seems to be trouble in 'Graduates' [student-orientated nightclub]. (Male Patron, #7)

“Every time I go into the toilets in nightclubs there's a load of girls crying over a guy or some other girl that's got off with some guy that she wanted to. I think it's

to be honest, every time I've seen women fighting, it's over a man. There was girls fighting in the street on Saturday night out there. It's vicious!"... [outside 'Sorority', a student-orientated nightclub]... "Someone's dress got all ripped and there was bouncers getting all scratched and everything. It was vicious and they kept going for each other!" (Female Patron, #11)

The above account by interviewee #11 supports field observations that female toilets could be particularly hostile places, often being unmonitored, perhaps owing to a lack of female stewards. Although some interviewees, both male and female, felt that women were not physically strong enough for stewarding work or may become targets for abuse, there was also some support for more female stewards being employed to deter disorder among nightclub patrons.

"Well, more of a deterrent for girls to fight. Something, cos' girls, guys, there's a limit to what guys [male stewards] can do to girls as well because you cannae grab a girl the same as you would grab a guy if you're a guy, but if you're a woman [female steward] then it's a wee bit more acceptable." (Female Patron, #15)

"Well, I've started noticing that 'Graduates' [a student-orientated nightclub] are getting a lot more [female stewards] in which I think is quite good because I'd sadly went to 'Armageddon' a couple of times and they didn't search any girls because there weren't any [female] bouncers and I thought that was quite dodgy. I really, I did, I was quite aware of that at the time. I thought anyone could be smuggling anything in here and no-one would know cos' no-one's searching them." (Female Patron, #11)

Another argument for greater employment of female stewards is simple patron demographics, in that, from field observations, it appeared that the majority of nightclub patrons were female, that under-age patrons in particular tended to be female, and in all except the two 'Cheesy pop' nightclubs ('Sinatra's' and 'Tropicana') which had a much older clientele, female patrons tended to be younger than male ones. Some (mainly male) interviewees felt that this situation was down to discriminatory door policies that had, at least in part, arisen because the majority of door stewards were male (and perhaps also a no 'wolfpacks' policy). (All observers noted that "Girls get in free" at Sinatra's on Sundays).

"Doormen are mostly men therefore they are kinda sexist in a way. They let a lot of girls in with short skirts and low cut tops." (Male Patron, #28)

"I don't care what anybody says if you're with lassie you'll get in anywhere but if, and it's a really annoying spot with me like, it's like if I go to, even if it's like two or three guys. For instance that Saturday I was out there, was four guys there

and we must have been knocked back from maybe six or seven clubs and it's, to be frank, a lot of arseholes on the door going, oh that's Saturday nights, "You canny get in you're too drunk". Fair enough, there was a couple of nights when I have had too much but that particular night, I wouldn't say, well, I'm not a guy for causing trouble but then other nights you can come up and its like "Sorry boys not the night" but yet six lassies walk in behind you. Obviously, they're trying to give the club a good name by packing it with birds you know?" (Male Patron, #25)

Although age(-ism) (see earlier section) and sex(-ism) were more often or more forcefully provided by interviewees' as reasons why they felt they had been refused entry by door stewards, as is also indicated in #25's complaint above, some did show awareness that they could be turned away if they appeared to have had too much drink before arriving at a nightclub.

"Like a few times I've been told [by door stewards] "no you're too drunk" and I've been like, I've actually just finished my work at 11.00 and I've went straight and I was like I've just actually finished work driving. "Ah you're drunk or you're on something." (Male Patron, #12)

"You expect maybe that it would be a bit cheaper to have a few drinks before you go in than it would if you were actually in the place but I'm always wary about getting too drunk then they won't let you in." (Female Patron, #11)

The issue of pre-loading (drinking prior to entering a nightclub) was one of the prime reasons for conducting these patron interviews (see *Aims*). As can be seen from Table 12, there was much evidence that this practice is commonplace, with only one of the interviewees, #7, who had attended a nightclub in the week before their interview not having pre-loaded (range 4 to 21 units) on at least one occasion. (This was a very atypical week for #7, he had been on a camping holiday, and he claimed to spend the most money of all interviewees on a night out clubbing.) Those who did not pre-load on any particular occasion usually did not do so because of some prior commitment, such as going out straight from work. Ironically this tended to affect those who worked in the licensed trade themselves (such as #7 and #13 – two of the three interviewees who had a non-pre-loaded nightclubbing session in the previous week, the other being #2 a Canadian exchange student) and who were otherwise amongst the biggest consumers of alcohol interviewed. Therefore if nightclub operators have concerns about potential patrons turning up drunk and

attempting to gain entry while intoxicated, then it would appear that, on the evidence of this research, these would not appear to be without foundation.

Similarly, Table 12 also highlights the issue of after-parties (drinking after leaving a nightclub). From interviewed patrons drinking diaries, post-nightclub drinking would appear to be less commonplace than pre-loading, with only four of the 20 previous week clubbers having consumed any alcohol in this fashion (range 2 to 14 units). Again it should be stressed these figures only refer to the previous week's alcohol consumption or nightclub attendance and other interviewees were also able to discuss at length their motivations and experiences of both after-parties and pre-loading, regardless of whether they had engaged in such drinking behaviours during the previous seven days (i.e. on Table 12).

From the taped interviews three reasons for pre-loading emerged. The first reason for pre-loading was socialising. This was because the nightclub drinking environment was not seen as conducive to 'catching up' with your clubbing friends at the weekend (owing to the volume of the music, lack of seating and time spent dancing or mingling around inside the venue). 'Social pre-loading' could take place either at friends' houses or in pubs, often at premises near the destination nightclub where they could keep an eye on the destination venue's door queue and perhaps obtain discount tickets (e.g. where the pub and nightclub had the same parent company or other business arrangement, as was also highlighted in the previous pub study, Forsyth et al, 2005).

"I like music but usually before I go out to a club I like to be able to go out and you have your first couple of rounds with your mates and you catch up. Cos' usually you don't get to see them through the week cos' of work. I like to catch up with them cos' instead of being in a club and somebody sitting next to you and sitting shouting in your ear and you can't hear the other guy sitting at the next table from you." (Male Patron, #31)

"My mate came up to mine and we had a couple of bottles of beer there and then we went to [friend's flat] and we had a bottle of beer there. Then we went to a pub and we had a few pints and then go on to a nightclub..." "I think it's to save money and you have a better time in a nightclub when you're drink, drunk." (Male Patron, #10)

The second reason for pre-loading was to get in party mood (e.g. 'Dutch courage' for dancing). This could overlap with social-preloading, but could also take place at home alone or while in transit towards the destination nightclub. The logic of this being that it took time to get in the party mood (i.e. become intoxicated) and so arriving at a nightclub sober would involve some time spent trying to catch up (speed drinking) or feeling uncomfortably sober.

"I mean I'd rather go there and be drunk already and be ready to have a great time. Be less self-conscious about dancing like an arsehole basically." (Male Patron, #30)

"Well, I think you probably couldn't really go out and go straight into a nightclub because you'd probably just be standing there like that, no confidence to actually move about. So I think that's why you go to the bar [i.e. pub] first. That kind of settles you and if you're going out with friends you've got a chance to catch up first." (Female, Patron, #20)

The third reason was to save money. Although the pub could be seen as a cheaper option than a nightclub (at least at the weekends), this kind of preloading was more pitched towards off-trade purchase.

"I think it's cheaper actually if you buy a big bottle of something you keep it in the house and you drink at your own pace. You just feel more in the mood for going out I think." (Male Patron, #16)

"We usually go to a pub or else we'll drink in a pal's house or something but I always seem to be drunk before I go out to the dancing. Always!"... "Probably sometimes cos' it's cheaper as well, cos' if you bought something with your pals first and then drink it first and then go in, cos' it will save you money when you get in there." (Female Patron, #22)

In most cases however, pre-loading was seen as having more than one purpose, combining each of the above three reasons depending on the circumstances

"I mean I've went in sober plenty of times obviously when I was PR-ing and things for clubs, you go in sober. But I think you can just get into it a lot quicker when you've went in with a couple of drinks in you and it does make your night cheaper as well." (Female Patron, #14)

"Cheap! Buzz, gets you in the mood before you go out sort of thing. If you go into a club sort of flat and you're not in the mood for it, it can take away from the night. But if you've had a couple of drinks and talked to your mates and had a laugh before you go out you kinda more in the spirit of things by the time you get in there." (Male Patron, #13)

Finally, although strictly speaking *not* (planned) pre-loading it should be noted that some interviewees only decided to attend a nightclub after having already become intoxicated elsewhere.

“Usually we just plan to get drunk and then once we’re drunk in the flat we say lets go out and that’s it.” (Male Patron, #30)

“It’s just certain nights we’ll meet up with people in town and then it’s the decision do we stay out longer.” (Male Patron, #24)

At the other extreme, others saw the pre-loading session as an integral part of the nightclub session / experience which itself could be pre-planned earlier in the week (as was also the case with deciding where to go or buying / choosing what to wear), even developing into something of a regular pre-club ritual.

“Generally erm, well it would take me a couple of hours to get ready. I’ll maybe have a wee drink when I’m getting ready. Then I’ll go tae a friend’s house, have a drink there. And then, mebbe, well if I’m going out local [North Ayrshire] then we’ll just get a taxi into town. If we’re coming up here [Glasgow] then it’s the train [where we will continue drinking] “...and then we’ll probably go tae a couple of pubs and then we’ll go tae a nightclub.” (Female Patron, #15)

“Normally I’ll just basically go, get a shower. Come down. Chill. Stick some music on. Have my friends round. We’ll normally sit and chill. Get a couple of beers, have a laugh. Listen to some music while getting ready then basically go out.” (Male Patron, #28)

Similar reasons were given for attendance at after-parties (i.e. socialising, lower cost and music) except that ‘getting in the party mood’ had now developed into ‘keeping the party mood going’ for as long as possible.

“Well, a lot of people you don’t see until you get into the club and a lot of people or maybe you won’t go the club, or you go to the club straight away so its hard to sort of speak to all your friends to any great degree, so after-party gives you a chance to go and speak to them after and have a proper conversation, albeit probably a drunken one. Usually a lot of fun, you don’t want the night end.” (Male Patron, #13)

“All the rules, all the rules go out of the windae when you’re at an after-party. You’ll just drink whatever’s there because you think “Oh well, I don’t have a choice here, it’s not my drink”. But I think that, as I was saying about going to the chip shop, that you just want the night to keep going so, the after-party just kinda keeps the atmosphere going and you think you’re still out.” (Male Patron, #16)

Interestingly there was a view that longer (e.g. 24 hour) opening hours in the on-trade sector (i.e. more time spent in nightclubs) would jeopardise the existence of after-party scene, while the greater availability of off-trade alcohol was seen as potentially fuelling this after-hours phenomenon.

“I get big discounts on booze from work [has part-time job in off-licence] so I drink before I go out and erm I just have a few drinks in the club to top myself up. Tend not to go to excess. Maybe party afterwards” ... “The only thing I have seen emerging over the last five years has been all-night partying. Things like there’s 24 hour booze services you can phone up when you’re at a party and get them to come and deliver a set amount of alcohol. Been to parties that have lasted days.”... “I mean the parties I’ve been to and the police have had to turn up about six in the morning to say turn it down. You know like eight in the morning and they’re allowed to turn the music back up, past that point in the night.” (Male Patron, #13)

An alternative view was that 24 hour licensing could actually shorten the length of time that some patrons would spend drinking in nightclubs.

“It may in fact lead me to go home earlier, to be fair because you wouldn’t be there till the bitter end so there might be an argument for less binge drinking that way and for not trying to drink as much before 3.00.” (Male Patron, #8)

The types of beverages consumed by interviewees tended to vary throughout the session, typically including pints of beer in pubs (usually males), wine at home (usually females) or even large volume, high ABV, economy beverages such as cider while travelling / walking (e.g. #15, #16 and #32), then switching to either spirits or premium bottled lagers or alcopops while inside the nightclub (i.e. the three types of beverage most often observed being consumed in the nightclub drinking environment, see Table 6), with any remaining drinks being soaked up by the after-party. What was particularly apparent was that many interviewees preferred smaller volume (often more potent) alcoholic beverages within nightclubs than they would choose to drink elsewhere.

“Beer makes you feel bloated and sluggish and when you switch over to stuff like *Jack Daniels* and *Jim Beam*, the bourbons and things they make you feel more mellow instead of, instead of slow” (Male Patron, #31)

“Probably like *Red Square* [a caffeinated alcopop available in larger volumes than most] or *Smirnoff Ice’s* [an alcopop], like no vodka when I’m getting ready. That’s for later.” (Female Patron, #22)

The reasoning behind this preference for smaller volume higher strength alcoholic beverages *inside* nightclubs was the belief that these would not 'bag' or 'gas you up'. This view was also offered as the main reason why almost no one (interviewed or observed) ate any food inside nightclubs. Having a full stomach, whether full of less potent alcoholic beverages or food, was seen as having the twin disadvantages of interfering with dancing ability and limiting levels of intoxication to somewhere below that desired within the nightclub environment.

"I don't drink many pints, so if I was out on a, cos' at the end of the day I don't like the taste of drink. I go out to get drunk which some people find very strange but it must just be my generation. Erm. So if I'm out to get drunk I'd rather have one pint at the start and then go on to vodkas because I just get tanked up. Be the same aspect if I was drinking and I'd eaten a lot of food, I couldn't get drunk quick. It would cost me an absolute fortune to get drunk!" (Male Patron, #25)

In this situation, rather than food, other drinks were chosen specifically to provide energy or stimulation in the belief that these would assist late night exertions such as dancing, 'chatting-up' or merely staying awake. This could even extend to pre-loading with caffeinated alcoholic beverages such as tonic wine.

"I start off with the first one, it'll be a pint. And then after that I'll probably have another pint or two and then I'll move onto the *Jack Daniels* or *Jim Beams*, [spirits] whatever one they have. And I'll stick to that unless I'm feeling tired or something in which case I'd switch to something like *Southern Comfort* [a liqueur] and Lemonade to sort of a sugar rush." (Male Patron, #31)

"I've been drinking *Buckfast* [a 15% ABV tonic wine not sold on-trade in Glasgow's nightclubs] for about ten years now since I was fourteen and, but I drink *Buckfast* because its got so much caffeine in it that it'll keep me awake all night and it makes me talk a lot. Drinking *Buckfast* makes me kinda feel drunk but in control of myself as well, I've never felt violent but I think it's got a really bad name for violence but I've never felt that way." ... "I'd say drinking a bottle of *Buckfast* is like being on cocaine all night." (Male Patron, #30)

Another reason for choosing small, stronger drinks in nightclubs was the types of vessels that they were sold in, in particular that these were small, portable and less likely to be spilled (this vessel functionality issue will be expanded upon in the next section, see *Glassware ban*). Additionally, some respondents felt that being able to consume a whole alcoholic drink quickly, at a single sitting, rather than leaving it till between dances, was a safeguard against the possibility of drinks spiking (someone tampering with another patron's drink by adding extra

alcohol or other drugs, without that patron's knowledge, perhaps with the intent of harming the patron, e.g. date-rape). Regardless of the prevalence of such behaviour (no interviewees had been a victim of drinks spiking, nor did they know anyone who had been), as will be expanded upon in later sections (see *Glassware ban* and *Smoking ban*), the fear of such crime appears to be quite prevalent amongst clubbers. This is in itself an alarming situation, as fear of drinks spiking may actually be encouraging rapid consumption of potent drinks, leading to very problems that spiking is often blamed for.

“I like beer but I like vodka as well. Small drinks. I don't really like to have a drink that you need to carry for a long time”... “...if I'm sitting about with my mates sort of thing, I'll have a pint or whatever but if I'm dancing about I want a drink I can drink quite quickly.”... “...its more a case of you want to dance about and you want something you can drink fast and kinda get rid of and you put your glass on the bar or a table or anything. It's like all your mates and you want to get up and dance and then you can't cos' you've got a drink and nobody to look after it, cos' there is a big chance that it could get spiked.” (Female Patron, #14)

Another marketing factor that appeared to influence patrons' choice of drinks in nightclubs was promotion. Even some of the very basic promotional techniques recorded by field observers were reported as being influential by interviewees. For example, observers noted that the 'Dance' club 'Saturn' did not rely on drinks promotions save for a blackboard behind the bar indicating that double measures of spirits were cheaper. Although observers did not rate this offer as a bargain (as it was still more expensive to purchase doubles here than in any other observed premises) even this paltry offer influenced interviewees who attended this nightclub.

“Yeah, at 'Saturn' I always drink double vodkas and *Coke* cos' they are the cheapest things.” (Male Patron, #7)

The observers did not record any overtly irresponsible drinks marketing (indeed they more often commented on how expensive the drinks prices were). Perhaps the cheapest offer observed was at 'Idols', where all drinks except champagne were £1.50 during their first two visits. However, this apparent lack of cheap prices or marketing promos may simply have been because of the types of nightclubs they attended ('high street', mainstream venues, catering for working people) and the nights of the week which they attended. Interviewees repeatedly

mentioned that drinks prices were much cheaper during the week, especially in student-orientated venues. This was true even of the observed nightclubs, for example 'Tropicana' held a mid-week 'student night' when all drinks were £1.00. Many other premises had similar mid-week student rates yet even this was not the cheapest alcohol available to these young people mid-week

"Yeah, 'Legends' [an 'Urban' nightclub similar to 'Rapture'] and especially like 'Faculty' [a student-orientated nightclub] I think it's a bit dangerous though, what they're doing at the moment is, it's 'a pound drink' but the other night it was 75p a pint."... "...it was 75p a pint, right but I just thought to myself that is a bit dangerous, cos' I mean you could get ten pints for seven fifty you know and a bit dodgy, but it's 'a pound a drink' otherwise [confirmed by observation of venue's poster] and that's still, in my eyes, that's a wee bit dodgy. So I think someone should step in and tell them, look, you can't do that." (Male Patron, #21)

Additionally one interviewee remarked that she had recently been offered a double measure without asking, though she did not see this as a problem.

"Yeah, cos' when the lassie [bar server] says to me in 'Sunset' [a 'Cheesy pop' nightclub similar to 'Tropicana'], she says its only 30 pence extra to get a double I was like yes, just give me that then! Cos' it's 30 pence extra."... [Did this have an influence] ... "Uh-huh. I asked for a, I just said can I get a vodka and *Coke* and she's like "oh, it's only 30 pence extra if you want a double" and I went "yeah just give me that then." (Female Patron, ##22)

This attitude was more typical of interviewees, than #21's (above), and for many price was a major factor in where and when they went clubbing. Here in lies a danger, in that if prices in nightclubs were increased (e.g. as an act of policy) then it would only encourage increased off-trade consumption and pre-loading. Indeed this may even explain why patrons at certain nightclubs appeared more intoxicated to observers in than other nightclubs where the drinks were cheaper or the clientele was more affluent. For example, the following reason for pre-loading was suggested by a patron of 'Armageddon', the nightclub whose clientele were rated as the most drunken by observers (see Table 5).

"It's weird. It's about £8.00 to get into I think. And then it's about, I'm sure it's about £3.50 or something for a drink! [confirmed during observations] That's why people drink before they go there though. If you're going to 'Armageddon' you're going to drink before you go in and then you're already steaming when you get there." (Female Patron, #22)

One final, more recent, issue that had impacted upon patrons' drinking behaviour was the Glasgow city centre's entertainment licence venues' glassware ban. However, as will be explained in the next section this measure had more far reaching consequences than merely influencing patrons' beverage choice.

“I wouldn't drink it [beer] in a club, but in a pub I would probably drink pints. I wouldn't drink them in a club.” [Why?] “I just don't like drinking out of plastic glasses.” (Male Patron, #18)

Glassware ban

One of the aims of this project was to evaluate the impact of the ban on glass from Glasgow's nightclubs, which had been implemented less than one month before the start of observations. To this end observers noted what kind of vessel each type of beverage was being sold in, in each of the eight nightclubs in the sample. A number of factors complicated this task. Firstly, some drinks, champagne and wine, were exempt, however these were very rarely observed (see Table 6). Secondly, nightclub operators were allowed to use vessels made from special or 'safety' glassware (i.e. toughened or tempered, see *Background*). In practice then, it was impossible for observers to be one hundred percent accurate when determining what type of glass they were drinking out of never mind what else they were observing. Thirdly some drinks were served in materials other than glass, 'special glass' or glass substitutes (i.e. plastic), such as cans of beer or ceramic pitchers of cocktails.

Table 13 shows the estimated proportions of glass to plastic observed for the three most commonly observed beverages in the eight nightclubs sampled (i.e. vodka, lager and alcopops, see Table 6). This table notes the type of vessel which observers believed that each of these three beverages was being sold in, in each nightclub during each visit. In Table 13 where 'special glass' (i.e. toughened or tempered) was observed this is recorded in the columns headed 'SG'. Plastic is recorded in the columns headed 'P' and ordinary glass in the columns headed 'OG' (the latter being estimated initially from any chips or breakages witnessed during observations).

In practice each vessel for each drink in each nightclub was observed eight times (i.e. during both visits by each of the four observers), however as can be seen from Table 13, (i.e. where cells do not sum to eight observations), it was not possible on some occasions for individual observers to decide what the vessels that some products were being sold in were made of (not just between types of glass, but also between hard polycarbonate plastic and ‘special glass’).

Table 13: Observed vessels used post-glassware ban

Venue	Vodka			Lager			Alcopops			ANY		
	OG	SG	P	OG	SG	P	OG	SG	P	OG	SG	P
Xanadu	0	0	7	0	0	7	0	0	8	0	0	22
Armageddon	0	0	8	0	0	7	0	0	8	0	0	22
Rapture	0	0	8	0	0	7	0	0	6	0	0	21
Tropicana	2	6	0	2	6	0	0	1	2	4	13	2
Chocolate	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	0	4	0	0	20
Idols	0	0	8	0	0	8	0	0	6	0	0	22
Sinatra’s	2	5	1	6	2	0	0	0	7	0	7	7
Saturn*	3	5	0	2	2	0	-	-	-	8	7	0
ANY	7	16	40	10	10	37	0	1	41	5	27	116

* ‘Saturn’ did not sell alcopops and by the second round of visits (i.e. post-smoking ban sweep) was selling lager in aluminium cans which appeared to be being recycling as these empties were left longer than other vessels by the busers who would later gather them up into a plastic bag.

The most apparent feature of Table 13 was that most (five of the eight premises) were 100 percent plastic (as far as these commonly consumed beverages are concerned). Interestingly, both the Happy-hardcore nightclubs, ‘Xanadu’ and ‘Armageddon’, serving a young clientele and which had relatively high crime rates (from police statistics) were glass-free. This was also the case in the three ‘Urban’ nightclubs, ‘Rapture’, ‘Chocolate’ and ‘Idols’. On the other hand, the three premises with relatively older clientele, ‘Tropicana’, ‘Sinatra’s’ and ‘Saturn’ were not 100 percent plastic, indeed they all still appeared to be using ordinary glass for some beverages (e.g. pint tumblers in ‘Sinatra’s’). However, it should be noted that by the second session of observations, ‘Saturn’ appeared to be no longer using ordinary glass and had switched to serving lager in cans.

When examining Table 13 by beverage rather than premises another interesting pattern appears, in that in only one instance did an observer note that alcopops were not being served in plastic. Again this may relate to age, as younger

consumers tended to go for this drink (where as pints were preferred by older patrons), something which patron interviews also bore out. The one occasion where an observer felt that even alcopops were not being sold in plastic took place in 'Tropicana'. Observers' experiences in this nightclub illustrate the complexities involved in the task of identifying the medium in which drinking vessels have been manufactured. Here the practice was to open glass bottles (e.g. of beer or alcopops) and pour them into small 'glasses', giving the impression that the beverage concerned was being transferred from ordinary glass to 'special glass' in order to comply with the bye-law. (This mode of serving was also observed during the pilot night, see Methods.)

“Think it was toughened glass as they were all pouring lager from bottles into glasses. There was still big glass ashtrays out though.” (Female Observer, Team A, 'Tropicana' – first data collection sweep)

However, on observers' very last visit it transpired that this was not the case. A ruse like the one described in the following field-note implies that the level of ordinary glass shown in Table 13 may in fact be an underestimate.

“When we came in we went to the bar. I ordered a vodka and [Male Observer Team A] got a bottle of *Budweiser*. My glass didn't look like toughened glass and the barman poured [Male Observer Team A]'s bottle of *Bud* into the same type of glass. I asked the barman why he poured the bottle into the glass. He said it was due to Glasgow bye-laws. I asked if the glasses were a special type of glass and he said no. I wanted to be sure so I said “I know you can get special toughened glass, is this not it?”. He said no and it was pointless and stupid putting the contents of the bottles into glasses and was a pain in the arse for bar staff.” (Female Observer Team A, 'Tropicana' – second sweep)

Even when drinking vessels were smashed it was difficult for observers to be certain what medium had been used in its' manufacture, as the following description of an aggressive incident in 'Sinatra's' illustrates.

“DJ said something over the microphone to the effect “fight in front of the DJ box”... [We] Went round to the back of the DJ box and found S1, S2 and S3 [stewards] tending to P1 [male] who was bleeding badly from his neck / shoulder area... When [Male Observer Team A] and I walked back to O1 [observation point] we saw lots of broken glass on the floor. It might have been toughened glass as it seemed to be broken into little squares but might just been smashed down by people walking on it. I've never seen toughened glass before so I couldn't say for sure.” (Female Observer Team A, 'Sinatra's' – 02.30 AM)

A few minutes after the above incident a second fight broke out which convinced the observers that ordinary glass was involved (extracts from the field-notes of both of the observers who witnessed this aggressive incident are given).

“Then two males (P1 and P2) started fighting at table next to us. P1 [tattooed 28-30 year-old in white shirt] lunged over at P2 [27-30 year-old in white shirt] and the two began brawling on to the floor in front of us. Both were tumbling about trying to get each other in headlocks and swinging punches. Both were red in the face and their faces were contorted in anger. They were like this for a good couple of minutes with no intervention from stewards despite patrons chanting “fight fight fight”. Then P2 threw a glass at P1 which missed P1 and hit the wall showering the people sitting there with glass...” (Female Observer Team A, ‘Sinatra’s’ – 03.05 AM)

“...I didn’t see any scarrings on P1 [tattooed 28-30 year-old male in white shirt] as he was taken past me and [Female Observer Team A] to the fire exit. However a guy who had been sitting near the incident had blood on his shirt. Don’t know how badly P1 was injured or if anyone had been hurt by the shattered glass from the glass hitting the wall.” (Male Observer Team A, ‘Sinatra’s’)

These two aggressive incidents, within minutes of each other in the same nightclub, clearly illustrate the potential for glass to cause injury. In contrast, the following incident, which took place at ‘Xanadu’ (a 100 percent glass-free nightclub) shows how the use of plastic vessels can clearly minimise injury risk.

“As I saw it P1 [male in leather jacket] was punching P2 [male with ponytail] really hard. P2 was punching back and about three of his friends were attempting to fight back with punches. P1 even picked up a plastic bottle (by chance it was the new *Vodka Ctrl* bottle [a plastic alcopop, see below]) and was hitting out with it. After two calls from the DJ that a fight was occurring S1 [male steward] ran behind P2 and his friends...” (Male Observer Team A, ‘Xanadu’)

In the above incident it seems reasonable to assume that the male in the leather jacket would not have had time in the heat of the moment to decide that the weapon he had picked up was plastic and not glass (‘special glass’ or otherwise). Were it not for the glassware ban, and the compliance of ‘Xanadu’s’ management with this bye-law, then it is all too easy to see how this incident could have become much more serious. Indeed in such all-plastic venues the advantages of removing glassware extended across a broad range of safety improvements to both patrons and staff, not just in terms of violence reduction (views shared by interviewees).

“One guy knocked his drink over on the table and just threw the cup across the room. People chucking glow-sticks about and lots of horseplay. There was a sign saying no drinks or smoking on the dancefloor but this was ignored by both patrons and staff, and girls were dancing in their bare feet.” (Female Observer Team A, ‘Xanadu’)

As a result of witnessing such behaviour, observers began to feel safer themselves working in glass-free environments, regardless of other factors such as number of aggressive incidents witnessed, clientele or staff practices.

“Even though there was more trouble in ‘Armageddon’, I felt safer there in comparison because; A: it was minor scuffles not glassings, B: you couldn’t look around ‘Armageddon’ without seeing a security staff member monitoring various parts of the club, C: the security staff looked a lot more organised and not fannying about collecting glasses, which ironically was the very thing causing extreme violence in ‘Sinatra’s’.” (Male Observer Team A, ‘Sinatra’s’)

Interviewees were also very positive about the potential of the glassware ban to reduce the severity of violence in nightclubs.

“I don’t think it reduces the risk of violence but it reduces the risk of serious injury from violent attack.” (Male Patron, #8)

“I think it’s quite a good thing to be truthful with you. Well from working in pubs I did actually see one of my glass collectors getting glassed by a guy.”... “...the guy was only a 17 year old boy collecting glasses you know... They were arguing over the Rolling Stones these two guys. And the guy just picked up a glass to hit the other guy and hit the glass collector. Just for the fact that for all the difference, yeah, you’ve got a plastic cup and you feel like, “why have I got a plastic cup?” That’s just, that’s saying glass is better. That’s somebody somewhere once saying glass is better and you’re all believing that. There’s no benefit or negativeness if you know what I mean, except you won’t get glassed. You know? It’s not a weapon any more.” (Male Patron, #7)

The above quote from interviewee #7 is of particular interest as he was working as a trainee-manager of licensed premises in the outskirts of Glasgow (where the glassware ban had not yet come into effect). He and other interviewees who had worked in the licensed trade industry were amongst the most enthusiastic supporters of this policy. Interestingly, their reasoning came not only from observing the floor (patrons fighting or accidents) but also from the point-of-view of their own convenience as plastic was seen as making their job easy (though the financial aspects that switching from glass to plastic faced by nightclub operators were not mentioned).

“It [glass] smashes and it’s so much harder to clean up. At least with plastics you just go along with a bin bag and plonk them all in, you know?” (Male Patron, #7)

“I used to work in ‘Devotion’ [a Gay ‘Dance’ club] for two months and we used to do glasses but they didn’t, they don’t, they’ve not started doing the plastic glasses yet but I think definitely it’s a brilliant thing to add these plastic glasses in. Because I mean I’ve got, I had cuts and everything just for going like ahhh smashing glasses. So I like the glass ban.” (Male Patron, #21)

There were however some complaints about the types of plastic being used in some premises. Soft plastic “cups” such as polypropylene (relatively inexpensive) and polystyrene were much less popular than harder “plastic glasses” made from (relatively more expensive) polycarbonate. This was partly for aesthetic reasons and partly because the former were seen as prone to spillage or splitting, both of which could actually lead to accelerated alcohol consumption by some patrons.

“Well, like last night [in ‘Chocolate’] for instance I was holding a vodka and *Coke* and my mate hit me and glass, the plastic split all the way down the middle. I had to down it and it was a whole new thing so. That can be infuriating but.” (Male Patron, #32)

“I think it’s quite good [banning glassware]. I think it’s good because it makes it safer but the only thing is you get, I think it should be stronger plastic cos’ you get that squidgy, you pick up the pints and it overflows cos’ your pressing it too hard or something.”... “... it’s just plastic and they just throw it or just throw it off the balcony or something.” (Male Patron, #3)

Additionally, as implied in latter quote from interviewee #3 above, some patrons seemed to view certain plastic containers as ‘disposable’ and tended to treat them as such creating a litter problem. This, coupled with increased spillage, probably accounted for some of the observers’ field-notes describing litter, mess, spills, abandoned drinks, sticky carpets and ice cubes on dancefloors.

“I think it’s alright if you’ve got the sort of thick plastic cups because you tend to like treat them like a glass and you put it down somewhere sensibly you don’t just chuck them on the floor.” (Male Patron, #5)

“Aye, you do get a bit more spillage from the glassware ban. It’s a lot more, you can’t get a hold of it as well and it’s just going everywhere. The plastic cups you get in ‘Graduates’ [a student orientated nightclub] they’re terrible for it.” (Male Patron, #28)

One solution to these problems proposed by interviewees was increased use of plastic bottles, especially those with stoppers through which liquid could be drawn (i.e. containers resembling those used for sports drinks). During field observations two of the sampled premises, 'Xanadu' and 'Rapture', introduced an alcopop called *Vodka Ctrl*, launched as an anti-spiking measure (though the cap could easily be unscrewed) which was sold in such spill-proof plastic containers. In 'Xanadu' this product quickly became the most popular on sale (see Table 6 and earlier Male Observer Team A's description of a fight in this nightclub where the introduction of this beverage seemed to be helping to reduce the severity of violence). However, some interviewees who had seen this beverage, and the many design advantages it held within the nightclub drinking environment, felt that the concept could be taken further and all drinks could be served in or poured into such vessels (i.e. in a practice similar to that engaged in at 'Tropicana', but with spill-proof plastic containers not glass).

"I think its alright, they're doing a lot of the plastic bottles now but 'Graduates' [a student-orientated nightclub] are putting it into plastic cups and I don't like that cos' they fill them up to the – well, if they're using smaller glasses, it fills them right up to the top and they are easier to spill. They sometimes use a bigger cup and it only fills it like half full. I'd prefer if they just, instead of them putting it from the glass bottle into the cup, they get plastic bottles. I'm not too sure I can't remember where it was where they were doing the plastic bottles but I think that's fine, yeah..." "Yeah, cos' you see people dropping their glasses. There was a time when in 'Sunset' [a 'Cheesy pop' nightclub similar to 'Tropicana'] ... and a guy fell upstairs and dropped his glass and it smashed everywhere. It was just like, somebody has to clean that up and they might not get everything, part of it. But if you drop a plastic bottle all you're going to do is spill it, you're not going to make a mess or anything like that." (Female Patron, #19)

"I kinda used to like them [alcopops] but they're just expensive. I tried. There's one that I noticed that was out that I got that's got one of those caps that..." [*Vodka Ctrl*?] "...yeah, that you're not allowed, that you can't put anything in it [i.e. spike it], but it tastes disgusting so that kinda, I think it would be quite good if they actually gave you your drink in a bottle like that? They should do that instead of those horrible expensive alcopops, they could just give you a bottle!" (Female Patron, #11)

When pressed about why they preferred glass, interviewees were often stuck for an answer, however the main themes appeared to be its' childish, downmarket or cheap image, temperature (i.e. cold drinks were thought to warm up quicker in plastic vessels), taste (i.e. the beverage did not taste the same) and it giving out

a negative image of city's nightclubs (though this view was only expressed by interviewee #2 who was a Canadian exchange-student).

“In know when you're drinking it's always like there's the cheap comment about, the clubs are so cheap they don't buy glass, but I guess it's a good safety thing. Em, kind of think as a foreigner you sometimes think “oh well what kind of city am I in?” I mean the thought has crossed my mind, I don't know how serious it was, but it's just like why is it plastic and not glass does it have that much potential for [violence?].” (Male Patron, #2)

“I think its just cos' its plastic you just realise it you know, you're used to drinking out a glass. I just don't like drinking out of plastic. It doesn't taste the same either.” (Male Patron, #18)

Interestingly, older patrons tended to be more pro-glass or anti-plastic than younger interviewees, as is illustrated form the following statements made by the oldest male interviewee [47 years-old] and the interviewee who's 18th birthday was during the previous week (i.e. she was only over-age post-ban). Indeed some younger patrons were either unaware of the glassware ban before the interview or failed to see why this issue should be controversial.

[Why do you prefer glass?] “I don't know! Subjective. Well, its more special isn't it. Something that's like you're out for a picnic with your daft plastic cups or whatever but in saying that I'd rather drink out of that knowing nobody's going to get a glass in their face.” (Male Patron, #24)

“I think it's a good thing if it stops like people getting obviously, getting angry and glassing people and stuff. But it doesnae really bother me and my friends.” ... “I don't get it [why people object to plastic]. It doesnae bother me myself. Just as long as it's got a drink in there, ha, ha ,ha.” (Female Patron, #22)

Although all interviewees were positive about the glassware ban being implemented in nightclubs (if in some cases reluctantly so) and could see why it was necessary, their views were more divided about whether it should be extended to pubs and in particular to restaurants. This was largely for reasons relating to movement (in nightclubs) and the view that in other types of premises glassware was an integral part of the service / experience that attracted patrons to drink in such venues in the first place.

“Cos' in clubs people are up and they're dancing about and they're jumping around and all that kind of stuff. A plastic cup, I mean if it's going to hit somebody when you're drinking it they might get some beer over them or something like that which can be dried and washed out and the plastic cup

finishes on the floor and that's it. Whereas if it was a glass one and somebody ends up dropping it or it goes flung at somebody. Smash. It cuts everything” (Male Patron, #32)

“Well people pay for like, the service and whatever, whereas in a club you're not really paying for the service as such, so in a restaurant I think it would be a bit stupid to see like all these posh people with their wine in little paper cups.” (Female Patron, #6)

On the other hand, interviewees were in favour of the ban being extended to nightclubs outside Glasgow. The views of patrons who lived or studied outside the city were particularly interesting in this regard and they were able to recount stories of glass-related incidents while clubbing away from Glasgow. These contradict the view expressed by the Canadian interviewee #2 above and imply that Scottish clubbers see Glasgow as a safer city because of the ban.

“Glassware ban? Actually, I'm quite happy with that cos' I've seen a couple of incidents, I was in a club [in Edinburgh] and someone threw a glass and it smashed all over someone that I knew and I think it's a really good idea.”... “I was on holiday [in Spain] and one of the guys I was with got a glass smashed in his face cos' there was a guy giving one of the girls we were with a hard time and he kinda stepped in the way and the guy smashed a glass in his face. He had to go to hospital.”... “...it was in Edinburgh that there was that [first] incident and I wouldn't see what the problem is [in banning glass there]. I know a couple of my mates don't like their alcopops to be poured into a glass cos' it's just not the same. They just like holding the bottle but I've seen a couple of places that do plastic bottles [there] which I think is good. I like them.” (Female Patron, #11)

“I was recently in a club in Dundee actually, and like there was glass bottles all over the floor and smashing everywhere and I couldn't understand it. I was like why is there glass everywhere people. Do they not have plastic cups and everyone's like, what are you talking about, but yeah, there was glass everywhere and it was horrible because I felt I couldn't dance because I was gonna stand on it and cut myself and everyone else around me was gonna do it as well. They weren't, they weren't noticing it either.” (Female Patron, #6)

The final comment by interviewee #6 above is of particular interest as it indicates just how rapidly Glasgow's clubbers had become used to the glassware ban. The next section will explore the other 'ban' which Glasgow's nightclub patrons have had to quickly become used to, Scotland's national prohibition of smoking in enclosed public places (including *all* licensed premises).

Smoking ban

The observational fieldwork of this research was timed so that half of observations were conducted before the smoking ban was implemented and half afterwards. In the weeks before the ban, and in particular on the night of the ban (Saturday 26th March 2006), observers took note of how the nightclubs in the sample were preparing for it, or informing patrons of the likely impacts that this would bring and how these would be managed. In the event, how this was handled varied greatly, with some nightclubs providing information a week or more in advance while others seemed to ignore it completely, even on the night of ban. Interestingly, the actual night of the ban was unusually calm and no aggressive incidents were observed (in 'Chocolate', 'Sinatra's' or outside).

“No one really mentioned the smoking ban, there weren't any signs up or announcements made. The tables all still had ashtrays on them and a lot of people were smoking.” (Male Observer Team B, 'Sinatra's' – on the night of the ban)

“There were posters about the club informing patrons about the smoking ban and warning that patrons who smoked risked a fine as did the club. It stated that they intended to issue all patrons with a wristband so that they could leave to smoke outside the club entrance. It also stated due to the ban on drinking in public patrons should remember not to take their drinks outside with them. This was a notice made by 'Saturn' themselves rather than being provided by a company or the Scottish Executive. There was also a similar sign in the female toilets warning patrons about drink spiking and to avoid leaving drinks unattended or accepting drinks from strangers.” (Female Observer Team A, 'Saturn' – one week before ban)

The above field-note concerning 'Saturn' is of particular interest as this nightclub's operators had taken it upon themselves to produce posters and print leaflets (one of which was retained by observers as evidence) informing patrons about the likely impact of the ban ('Chocolate' gave out flyers with information about the smoking ban on the night it came into force, the only other time that this attentive practice was observed). This does however beg the question why, given the peculiar management difficulties that the ban presented to the nightclub sector, this task was left to individual operators, rather than being dealt with by some responsible public body (e.g. the Scottish Executive, local health board, city council etc.) especially those authorities who supported the ban.

As is also indicated in the above field-note, 'Saturn' intended to use a wristband pass-out system to allow patrons to go outside to smoke and then re-enter without having to pay again. This approach, or something similar (e.g. a hand stamp), was also adopted by 'Xanadu', 'Rapture' and 'Sinatra's' to allow patrons to smoke on the street. At 'Tropicana' (which had the lowest door price) patrons appeared to be allowed to come and go on to the street simply by asking the door stewards if they could go out and then "to hope that they recognise you on your way back in" (Female Observer Team A). However it was managed, there was no doubt that nightclub patrons leaving to smoke on busy city streets could lead to a number of problems, as is illustrated by the following field-note.

"The pass out system here is a bit of a farce. You collect a wristband from the pay-in counter which allows you in and out the club. In theory this should work. Patrons enter club, pay, get wristband at same time and then come and go as they please. In reality, people pay and enter the club. After about an hour decide they want a cigarette so go back out to cash desk to collect a band and either barge into everyone still waiting to pay to get into the club in first place or have to queue up with people still to come in and then have to convince cash desk staff that they have already paid. Chaos ensues. Once you finally get your band and make it outside you are sent right across the road to mingle with beggars and parked cars. I guess this is so the club doesn't have to take responsibility for all the dropped fag ends. While outside I saw people from the club smoking who still had their drinks with them. On re-entering the club you have to undergo another search. When I was going back in a male went to go up the stairs, female steward shouted on him to come back but he ignored her. She looked around for male stewards for support but he was too busy searching someone else to even notice. Male patron therefore got back in without being searched which I don't think the female steward was very happy about." (Female Observer Team A, 'Xanadu')

The remaining three observed premises, 'Armageddon', 'Chocolate' and 'Idols' were lucky in this respect in that they had back courts (yards to the rear of these premises), which could be converted into smoking areas. At these three nightclubs patrons could come and go for a smoke as they pleased.

"About 40% were going out. Went to a wee decking style area with tables and ashtrays fenced off at back of club." "...saw male smoking a joint in smoking area." (Female Observer Team A, 'Armageddon')

The above field-note also illustrates how the smoking ban has provided an opportunity for patrons to smoke cannabis during a night's clubbing. As will be seen from subsequent patron interviews, this was just one of many unintended consequences of the ban, not all of them positive, which allowed patrons to

leave and re-enter nightclubs throughout the night had brought about. But first the impact of the ban upon the drinking environments within the eight nightclubs observed is examined by Table 14

Table 14: Environmental impact of the smoking ban

	Pre-ban score	Post-ban score	<i>p</i> (t-test)
‘Unhealthy Ambience’	27.7	24.8	0.040
Smokiness (0-9)	5.1	4.3	0.062
Ventilation (0-9)	4.2	4.1	0.951
Noise (0-9)	6.0	6.0	1.000
Movement (0-9)	6.3	5.6	0.079
Crowdedness (0-9)	6.1	4.9	0.003
‘Dirtiness’	17.0	16.5	0.752
Bar wiping (0-9)	3.9	4.1	0.693
Table clearing (0-9)	4.7	4.4	0.477
Spillage (0-9)	5.3	5.0	0.575
Toilet order (0-9)	3.2	3.1	0.886
Numbers attending	252	210	0.013
Aggressive Incidents	22 (2 ‘severe’)	12-13 (3 severe)	-

Table 14 shows two of the risk factors for disorder scales, ‘Unhealthy Ambience’ and ‘Dirtiness’, and all of their subscales’ scores for all eight observed nightclubs combined, before and after the smoking ban (see Table 7). These two risk factors for disorder are examined here because scores on both of these might have been expected to have changed after of the smoking ban came into effect (e.g. better ventilation, no smoke, less litter etc.).

At first glance there does seem to have been a positive effect, with scores for ‘Unhealthy Ambience’ improving significantly (albeit marginally so) from 27.7 to 24.8 (out of 45). However, when the subscales which were summed to make the ‘Unhealthy Ambience’ scale are each examined individually it is apparent that this improvement was not down to there being less smoke, but due to less crowding (the only subscale which varied significantly between observers’ estimates recorded before and after the smoking ban). Levels of smokiness had *not* declined significantly since the smoking ban. This lack of difference in smokiness appeared to be because of the presence of smoke machines which observers felt had been ‘turned up’ post-ban (the question on Form 1 did not

specify tobacco 'smokiness') and perhaps this was also due to other substances being emitted into the air of some nightclubs to cover up 'new' smells (e.g. body odours) which had become more apparent in the absence of cigarettes fumes.

“The club (ground floor especially) was definitely not as smoky but upstairs the smoke machine was on full and you could hardly see anything or anyone, so you couldn't differentiate from before the smoking ban was implemented (couldn't tell if there was a smoking ban or not).” (Female Observer Team B)

“Less smoky than last time but they seemed to be pumping artificial perfume through the smoke so the whole place seemed like sweet plastic.” (Female Observer Team A, 'Chocolate')

Surprisingly, there was also no significant difference levels of 'Dirtiness' or in any of the subscales which made up this compound variable, before or after the smoking ban. However, as is also shown in Table 14, the estimated numbers of patrons attending these eight nightclubs, before and after the smoking ban, did show a significant difference, dropping from an average of 252 to 210 individuals. This effect was not as strong as that for the decline in levels of crowdedness, before and after the ban, perhaps suggesting that the crowding situation in nightclubs had been helped both because fewer patrons were attending and because some patrons were outside smoking at any given point.

Table 14 also shows the number of aggressive incidents witnessed before and after the smoking ban. Interestingly, these declined sharply from 22 to 12 (or 13 if the incident outside the door of 'Tropicana' is counted, see Table 8). It is not possible to relate this decline to the smoking ban, it could have been due to the better weather, exam-time or chance, but it may have been assisted by there being less patrons (especially if deterred smokers were more likely to be troublemakers), less crowding and the ability for patrons to move outside these nightclubs (to cool down or to avoid trouble). On the other hand three of the five incidents rated 'severe' took place after the ban (or alternatively one in eleven incidents were rated 'severe' after the ban, compared with one in four before).

Although it is impossible to relate the effect of smoking ban to the five 'severe' incidents, observers did feel that the extra door management duties which it had imposed on stewards could lead to more serious violence. In this scenario,

security resources are more stretched because stewards now had to monitor smokers leaving and entering nightclubs for the duration of the night. This meant that if a fight did break out it would take longer for these stewards to respond or even notice. This situation was felt to be particularly acute with female stewards whose numbers were limited to begin with and who were now required to search female smokers throughout the night.

“Security staff looked smart, shirts and suits. However hardly saw much of the stewards in terms of monitoring the club. I saw two bouncers walking about the entire night. The only time I saw more than one in the same vicinity was when a fight was kicking off. This is more or less the same situation as last time, but I think it may be made worse by the smoking ban, as at all times you need at least four stewards working the door: two for outside and two inside for re-searching all the patrons who are coming back inside. In addition at least one of the four has to be female for the searching of female patrons. So in effect, all night you’re going to have four stewards short of a full set, which is serious in ‘Xanadu’ because they weren’t doing a brilliant job of monitoring the club last time we were here, before the ban.”... “Whenever I accidentally bumped into some guy I would automatically turn round and profusely apologise as it seemed like something could kick off at anytime, and if it did it would take a good few minutes for the stewards to realise I was getting battered, and as this research has shown me: you can do a lot of damage in two minutes.” (Male Observer Team A, ‘Xanadu’)

Another potential way in which the smoking ban was felt to increase the likelihood of serious crime was that it may have inadvertently created opportunities for drink-spikers, something which, as explained in earlier sections, both patrons and nightclub operators already had some concerns about. This was because smokers often left their drinks unattended when they went outside for a smoke on the streets owing to a bye-law in Glasgow which prohibits the consumption of alcohol in public places.

“I’ve found a lot of people leave their drinks, right? Girls especially, say for instance in ‘Astro’ [a student-orientated ‘Dance’ venue]? Everyone, you’ve probably been in ‘Astro’ I’m sure. You know the wee, as you go in on the left there’s that window with the window sill? Everyone leaves their pints stacked up there and goes outside. It’s *begging* for someone to *Rohypnol* that or you know as far as I can see. Everyone is worried about date rape and stuff and yet the smoking ban seems to be a perfect opportunity for people.” (Male Patron, #13)

Additionally, some interviewees complained about ‘loosing’ their seats or drinks when they went outside for a smoke, again perhaps encouraging more rapid consumption. Non-smokers on the other hand complained about being left to

watch smokers' drinks or being left sitting on their own, sometimes feeling conspicuous or vulnerable while their friends or partner went outside to smoke. Interestingly for these reasons non-smokers were happier being left inside nightclubs offering visual entertainment to watch while their friends smoked.

“[In ‘Flamingo’ and ‘Tropicana’] ...they [friends] go out for a smoke and you're sitting on your own there's always something to watch where if you go to some of these, other one's you're not going to watch people dancing because they might get the wrong idea or whatever, so.” (Male Patron, #9)

“...if you both go then you lose your seats so it can be quite annoying there but that's the only time. Now it gives me an opportunity to speak to people outside a club. Go cool down if it's too hot inside the club or, even if you ran out of money go the bank machine. Or you can go to the pub, it's cheaper!” (Male Patron, #13)

In the above quote, interviewee #13 also hints that not everyone allowed outside by the smoking pass-out system was (only) leaving the nightclub for a quick cigarette. Interviewees stated that it was now possible to arrive at a nightclub early (before midnight, when some door prices were cheaper and the pubs are still open), obtain a smokers wristband or hand stamp and then leave to visit a pub for cheaper alcohol, before returning to the nightclub.

“Well, that's the other thing [laughs] its like £2.50 for a shot of Sambucca [in ‘Saturn’] and you can jump into next door [to a pub] and get it for £2.00.” (Male Patron, #13)

This was one of several reasons which emerged as to why even non-smokers were taking advantage of the pass-out systems set up to allow smoking patrons to leave and re-enter nightclubs. Others included to visit shops or the bank (cash machine), to cool down (several interviewees complained about the high temperatures in some nightclubs, especially at ‘Dance’ venues), to escape the music / noise (some interviewees complained about hearing problems after visiting nightclubs, especially at rock-oriented venues), to socialise and to ‘pull’.

“Em, I found myself, I'm not a smoker but I'll go out to the little bit where they smoke. I just say to my friends I'm out for some fresh air but I just go out there anyway and I just, cos' the smokers, the non-smokers don't go there so I better go and see what it's like and I went up there and they were all standing there and eh for five minutes to see what it's all about really or else maybe start chatting to some people or”... [asked if wants to ‘chat up’ smokers] “Aye that's the problem when you're in the club you don't know who smokes and who doesn't smoke sometimes.” (Male Patron, #3)

“See a lot of non-smokers like my ex-girlfriend doesn’t smoke but she ended up coming out and smoking, er not smoking, coming out just for the conversation” (Male Patron, #13)

Interviewees, smokers and non-smokers spoke at length about the growth of the outdoor smoking scene or ‘smirting’ (from the words smoke and flirting). ‘Smirters’ often spent a great deal of time outside nightclubs, time spent away from the bar which would seem likely to impact upon levels of crowdedness inside and perhaps even on bar takings or intoxication (assuming not all ‘smirting’ patrons simply drink faster while inside).

“Because I think it’s [‘smirting’] a, it’s a good way to actually meet women I think and er the new smoking ban.” (Male Patron, #9)

“It was weird last night when I was out last night at ‘Chocolate’ and I went out for a fag for about, took me about 45 minutes. I just meet a few guys and we just stood outside and we just smoked and chatted for ages and then went back in” (Male Patron, #32)

Indeed, in a very short space of time, smoking outside had become an integral part of the nightclub experience, which, at the very least, would seem to increase group cohesion and identity amongst smokers, perhaps reinforcing the benefits of such behaviour. The following quote from the first person to be interviewed took place only five weeks after the ban had come into effect and illustrates how rapidly this phenomenon had arisen.

“I think it’s really sociable, but what I’ve found when I’ve gone out for a cigarette, which is much less than I would normally have one, is that everyone seems, has this affinity that they are all stuck out in the cold and everyone’s like having a good laugh, especially at ‘Saturn’ where a lot of people are quite high and just talking away. You can actually speak to someone without music, it’s quite nice.” (Male Patron, #1)

In his statement above, interviewee #1 also implies that he smokes less frequently when he is out clubbing now in comparison to what he did before the ban. This impact of the ban was mentioned by several smoking interviewees.

“I’ll smoke less, like you need to go outside so I’ll only make a couple of journeys whereas before I’d be smoking ten in a nightclub or something.” (Male Patron, #10)

“I don’t smoke as much when I’m out. I do not smoke anywhere near as much. There’s a downside as well though cos’ I have smoked indoors after like getting drunk and you get thrown out which is a bit.”... “I was turfed out of [a pub]. It was just one of those silly things that I just completely forgot. Sparked it, and it was just the bouncer happened to be there cos’ I think my friend would have noticed before he did but.” (Male Patron, #7)

Rather than bothering to stop dancing and go outside one interviewee had resorted to using a ‘bridging product’ while in nightclubs.

“I just use nicotine chewing gum if I’m really, well, I keep wanting to give up so I’ve always got nicotine chewing gum with me, so.” (Male Patron, #24)

Interestingly, although no interviewee claimed to have stopped smoking because of the ban, one did state that she had started again because of the publicity surrounding it coupled with the draw of the ‘smirting’ scene.

“I had actually stopped smoking in January and I started smoking around about the smoking ban cos’ mainly I was fed up hearing people talking about cigarettes all the time and it just actually kept it going in my head so I then started smoking and I actually thought it was quite novel this going outside to have a cigarette cos’ you would chat to people outside so it became quite sociable thing to do. So since then I’ve been kind of one and off, on and off, smoking.” (Female Patron, #20)

Some smokers stated that, although they supported the ban, it nevertheless put them off going to nightclubs, perhaps helping to explain some of the drop in attendance at the sampled venues noted by observers (see Table14).

“Ultimately I think it’s a good thing. It’s, I would say it’s the biggest off point of going to a pub or a club is the fact I can’t smoke in it.” (Male Patron, #7)

This was seen as another factor potentially fuelling attendance at after-parties, the fact that you could smoke, drink alcohol and socialise at them.

“I like the socialising bit [of the after-party scene] and it’s a different atmosphere at a party, even if people are playing decks [DJ-ing] and things and you’ve still got the loud music. It’s still a different atmosphere. You can sit down and you can smoke without having to think, “Oh, am I breaking the law?”” (Male Patron, #7)

However, other smokers, such as those who were more ‘music / scene-orientated’ clubbers stated that things such as whether there was a smoking ban or not would be unlikely to influence how frequently they attended nightclubs.

“I think that maybe the kind of places like I said I go to for the music, people will go for the music regardless of whether they can smoke yeah.” (Male Patron, #1)

Non-smokers were always very positive about the ban and some indicated that they were likely to go out to nightclubs (or to go out drinking in other types of licensed premises) more often now that the ban was in place.

“The only thing is I can say about it is the main thing for me is the smoking it encourages me to go out a lot more as well cos’ I find myself going out a lot more now there’s no smoking, it’s good, it’s good for me.” (Male Patron, #3)

Overall, interviewees were very positive about the ban regardless of whether they smoked or not. As well as obvious reasons such as health (passive smoking) and the smell of smoke in their hair or clothes the next morning, banning lit cigarettes from the nightclub environment was also felt to increase levels of safety (though candles replacing ashtrays may counter this).

“But the smoking ban is quite good, see when you’re out and you’ve got like, people are walking, like when I’m out any way if I’m passing someone with a fag, watch it in case they come near me. It’s accidental I know but at the end of the day it burns your, if it burns a £50.00 top, then they’re no gonnae be happy with that. See when you’re going out with during the week, when you come out of places with strobes and dry ice, there’s burns, burns, burns.” (Male Patron, #12)

However, although interviewees (and observers) were happy about the removal of smoky smells from nightclubs, it was noted that these had been replaced by other aromas, including the toilets, damp, food (where available), flatulence and in particular body odour, which would seem to be a particular problem in nightclubs owing to the amount of sweat from dancing and other exertions.

“There’s good things and bad things about it [the smoking ban], erm, because I think the smoke before used to cover up smells but, like you never noticed before like people and... er now it’s away you smell a lot more different things, but like ‘Graduates’ [a student-orientated nightclub] have covered that up because they’ve got candles and stuff now, so, but it’s definitely good because the next day your clothes don’t smell and your hair doesn’t smell and stuff, and passive smoking.” (Male Patron, #16)

“Err. Actually prefer it [the smoking ban] to be honest with you. But a lot of clubs I notice have a big change in the smell. As in a worse smell, a BO [body odor] smell kinda thing. It’s like a just no a pleasant smell but a lot of clubs have

got like I think 'Graduates' [a student-oriented venue] put strawberry into the, the, what do you call it, the smoke machines." (Male Patron, #12)

As is apparent from the above interviewee's quotes, like the field observers, patrons had become aware that some nightclubs were using aromatic substances (including scented candles, incense, air-fresheners and perfumes) to cover up the unpleasant smells uncovered by the smoking ban. One patron was unhappy about this as she felt it ruined the taste of her drink.

"Oh, well the only thing is 'Graduates' [a student-oriented venue] have air fresheners cos' people are so used to having the smoke around they're putting this air freshner in. I know it's like the smoke gets rid of all the kind of like smells from the nightclub so they're putting in air fresheners that are like strawberry and things. I remember being in and it was quite a quiet night, I think it was during the exams and stuff like that and erm, it was really, really strong and it was quite off putting cos' you've bought your drink and there's this strawberry smoke going into it and it kind of affects the taste of the drink but generally it's [the smoking ban] fine." (Female Patron, #19)

Overall then, nightclub patrons appear to have been very complaint with the smoking ban. Observers only noted a very few isolated instances where patrons attempted to smoke and interviewees, even those who smoked, were generally in favour of the policy (even if in some cases they felt it would limit their future attendance at nightclubs). In many respects, this mirrored the situation with the glassware ban and, the impact of the two polices coming so close together temporally, seems to have transformed the Glasgow nightclub environment in a short space of time, both physically and in the minds of the city's clubbers.

There was even some scope for the two bans to be seen to interact, for example, the question was raised that if you are allowed to go outside to smoke and all drinks are being served in plastic vessels, should patrons be allowed to take their drinks outside with them (ensuring they were not left unattended, eliminating all the problems that this was felt to cause, e.g. fear of drinks spiking, see above). Observers and interviewees had both seen some patrons taking their drinks outside with them, illegally (in Glasgow there is a bye-law banning drinking alcohol in public places), with some feeling that this practice and indeed outdoor smoking itself had the potential to create new street disorder.

“And I think also as well, in a way because of the smoking [ban], right? And more people are drinking outside then they really shouldn’t be taking glass outside with them either.” (Female Patron, #20)

Street disorder

The final aim of this research project was to monitor levels of disorder on the streets surrounding nightclubs after closing time (3.00 AM). To this end observers continued to take field-notes and record any aggressive incidents that they witnessed in a similar fashion to what they had been doing while inside the nightclubs themselves.

In practice, what was observed varied greatly depending on the weather. For example, when it was raining the streets were often very quiet. On one extreme occasion the heaviest snowfall recorded in Glasgow for over 50 years had brought the city to a halt during the three hours that observers were inside the premises which they visited that night, and many clubbers were observed in difficulty at this time (e.g. owing to lack of transport, unsuitable clothing etc.). On other occasions the streets were described as being either ‘busy’ (36/64 observations) or ‘very busy’ (20/64 observations). The two field-notes below illustrate the kind of scenes observers witnessed while making their way home from the same nightclub on two different occasions (again this should also be taken as an illustration of observers’ potential for subjectivity).

“Lots of police about, two outside club, more on ‘Station Street’, ‘City Square’ and a car at the bottom of ‘Precinct Street’. No one really hanging about due to rain. Saw taxi marshals but they were all in a minibus going up ‘Centre Street’. CCTV van at taxi rank at [Railway] Station. Lots of neds from ‘Armageddon’ hanging about but no trouble.” (Female Observer Team A, ‘Chocolate’ - conditions ‘cold, damp, breezy’)

“There were lots of people outside chip shops nearby and queuing for taxis along ‘Station Street’. A lot of people were walking towards ‘Central Square’ and ‘Precinct Street’. ‘Central Square’ in particular had lots of people hanging around outside the clubs there in groups and there was a lot of singing and shouting. There were police nearby when we left the ‘Chocolate’ and also on ‘Precinct Street’ where we saw one guy in the back of the police van being questioned but we couldn’t see what this was for. We also saw a girl with no shoes on being sick in a doorway, a man being sick at the side of the road and a ‘large’ woman passed out outside [a shop]”. (Male Observer Team B - conditions ‘freezing, dry, still’)

A short checklist was added to Form 1 to try and quantify the number of public officials or night workers (e.g. police) on duty seen by observers after closing time and also any 'public incivilities' (acts of anti-social behaviour) which they witnessed during their journey from the nightclub they had been observing to the perimeter of the city centre at the university (which usually lasted around 20 minutes). How often these features of the city centre at night were observed is shown in Table 15 (maximum 64, 16 nights out, 4 observers).

Table 15: Observed Night Workers and 'Public Incivilities'

	Not observed	Observed once	More than Once
Night Worker			
Cleansing workers	45	18	1
Taxi Marshals	32	8	24
Ambulance emergency (lights on)	51	13	0
Medics treating patient	64	0	0
Police on the beat	4	10	50
Police in vehicles	14	29	21
Police making arrest	56	7	1
Public Incivility			
Persons chanting or singing	19	15	30
Persons drinking alcohol	56	8	0
Persons using drugs	64	0	0
Persons being sick (vomit)	49	13	2
Persons urinating	37	22	5
Persons drunk & incapable (passed out)	39	18	7
Persons taking risks or dares	41	15	8

From Table 15, it is clear that on the city centre streets between 3.00 and 4.00 AM, night workers do make their presence felt, in particular the police on the beat. This contrast with the findings of previous 'pub study' (Forsyth et al, 2005), research conducted earlier in the night (midnight to 1.00 AM) 18 months previously, in which both the observers and the interviewees (pub staff) in that study expressed concerns about what they felt was a lack of police on the beat.

Despite the high police presence and the apparent visibility of night workers (which could in theory deter anti-social behaviour), from Table 15, 'public incivilities' were regularly witnessed, especially persons chanting or singing.

However the most striking difference between this 'nightclub study' and the previous 'pub study' was that only a maximum of 7 (minimum 5) aggressive incidents were witnessed on the streets, compared with 20 (not formally recorded) in the 'pub study' (see Table 8 for details). (It should be noted that both studies were conducted in the same geographical area, e.g. in one case an observed nightclub was next door to an observed pub, so the routes taken out of the city centre by the observers on these two studies is unlikely to be a major factor in any differences their findings).

That fewer aggressive incidents were witnessed on the streets after nightclub closing time (compared with pub closing time) may reflect a difference in city centre policing at this time. For example, the high visibility policing observed directly outside nightclub doors at closing time (which also influenced interviewee recruitment strategies, see Methods) seemed to be preventing trouble, as the following description of an aggressive incident and field-note both illustrate.

“[While trapped in a confined space behind jammed doors at nightclub’s exit] ...I heard P2 [female] saying to P3 [female] “that’s my brother and appreciate it if you didn’t point your finger at him... He (P1) then turned to P3 and said “alright calm it curly”. He then became quite aggressive and was pointing his finger at P4 [male] and shouting something about a fight. At this point someone started to prise the open the [jammed front] doors with their hands... The amount of police on ‘Main Street’ seemed to put a stop to all talk of fighting and P1, P2, P3 and P4 all left.” (Female Observer Team A, ‘Sinatra’s’)

“When we left the club there were two policemen at the door where two guys had been arguing with the bouncers but they calmed down pretty quickly.” (Female Observer Team, B, ‘Xanadu’)

Some interviewees also felt there was a greater police presence on the streets of Glasgow at night than there had been in the recent past. However, predictably, many stated they would feel safer if there were more still.

“I’ve noticed that there’s been an awful lot more police on the streets, it’s been really noticeable. There’s been times when it’s been crying out for it. There’s been rioting and god knows what and that would make you feel unsafe but you can’t really walk a hundred yards without seeing a couple of policemen. Definitely makes you feel safer.” (Female Patron, #11)

Alternatively it may be that the difference in numbers of street incidents witnessed between the two observational studies was because the streets of Glasgow are genuinely safer at 3.00 AM, when the nightclubs come out, than they are after midnight, when the pubs come out. Interviewees' supporting this view offered a variety of explanations, including that pub people are more drunken or violent than nightclub type people, that there are more (and a greater mix of) people outside at midnight, that by 3.00 AM the most intoxicated patrons have already gone home (been ejected), that most people remaining are too tired to fight, or that they have danced all the aggression out their system.

“Because when the pubs come out there’s a whole bunch of drunk people suddenly there. By three they are either, they’ve been dancing so they’ve got most of the aggression out them or there is just less of them.” (Female Patron, #27)

“I feel safer the later. See at 3.00, 4.00 in the morning. I feel safer than at 12 o’ clock.”... “12 o’ clock seems to be the danger hour. 12.00 till 1.00, that’s when people who are too drunk to get in new places don’t get in and that’s usually when the worst part of the night can be I would say.” (Male Patron, #7)

The above comment by #7 indicates that nightclub door polices may play a role in influencing street disorder, in that stewards may prevent some of the worst troublemakers and drunks from being able to enter any nightclubs. This hypothesis would also be in line with the view that pre-loaders are a problem for nightclub operators and door staff.

“I find it more dangerous to leave a club about 1.00 than about 3.00, em and that’s in every city that I’ve lived in.”... “Because pubs I think are coming out at that time em and maybe a lot of people have had a lot to drink and maybe have been ejected from clubs. There just seems to be a lot more people around and I think by three’ish it’s either, you’re either so more drunk or the real troublemakers have gone home.” (Male Patron, #8)

Interestingly, despite the consensus being that there was more disorder when the pubs came out than when the nightclubs do, female interviewees stated that they actually felt less safe at 3.00 AM, while male interviewees felt more at risk on the streets at midnight when the pubs came out. In this scenario, female clubbers tended to stick to the busy main streets while making their journey home, while males (i.e. those not in large groups) tended to prefer the back-

streets. Some males also stated they felt safer at when out at night in female company.

“The girls it’s like they’re less safe cos’ there isn’t anyone around to help them out, so that’s what they’re worried about, but the guys are worried about just crazy bastards that might stab somebody!”... “Keep your eyes open and keep your ears open and you’re always fine. You’ve got a couple of lassies with you, you’re even safer”. (Male Patron, #31)

“Yeah, the end of ‘Main Street’ [one of the nightclub clusters (see Methods)] I know it admittedly but I’ve got a friend at [address near ‘Main Street’], all I do is just walk up and then go up the back at [side-streets] cos’ I know that bit is just mental! If I’m out there at 3.00 in the morning and I suddenly realise, shit I’ll go up the back way.” (Male Patron, #24)

In contrast to males, who felt the danger zone was in the city centre around concentrations of nightclubs, females stated that they felt less safe after leaving the city centre, particularly when walking home in their own areas.

“I think I’ve got the bus home and walked up to the shopping centre once in [deprived housing scheme] myself and my mum was mad with me.”... “Probably, because [the scheme] is like totally quiet at that time. Anything could happen to you but in the town it’s still mobbed at that time. It’s probably safer that way. You normally see police about as well.” (Female Patron, #22)

However, both male and female interviewees who felt vulnerable late at night stated that improved transport provision would lessen this fear of crime.

“I’ve heard a number of my friends saying that the Gay community are particularly vulnerable coming out of clubs, say ‘Divine’ [a Gay ‘Cheesy pop’ nightclub] I know there’s a taxi cab rank outside ‘Divine’ but a number of my friends say there’s not enough taxi’s serving the Gay establishments, given their alleged vulnerability to abuse or homophobia.” (Male Patron, #8)

“The one thing I wish they would do though, like generally I’m one of the last ones out of the taxi, I wish the taxi driver would wait until I get into my close [stairwell]. Cos’ I live at [inner-city address] although it’s on the street, sometimes I wish the taxi driver would wait until I get into my close cos’ its 3 o’clock in the morning and erm.” (Female Patron, #19)

Interviewees felt that the amount of people on the streets or in fast-food take-aways after the nightclubs came out was down to the absence of trains (especially the tube), length of queues for taxis and lack of buses. For example, this interviewee lived outside Glasgow and had one hour to find something to do between the nightclubs coming out and her bus home leaving.

“You just get the munchies when you’ve been drinking and plus my bus, the [nightclubs] close at 3.00 and my bus doesn’t come till 4.00 so it’s like something to do.” (Female Patron, #29)

Interviewees, especially males, were actually deterred from using night-buses as these were felt to be disorderly and several told stories of violent incidents they had encountered while travelling on these.

“In fact when I was coming back from ‘Armageddon’ years ago we were going through [an inner-city area] and the bus got smashed. Sort of like people from [that area] just smashed the whole bus up and we had to get off and walk! And then it was quite scary cos’ you thought they might start fighting people and stuff but they never actually started fighting anybody but I think., but that was because they knew that that bus was coming back from ‘Armageddon’”. (Female Patron, #22)

“...they [my friends] all went for their bus at one side of the city so they all walk me round to the bus-stop and left me with this massive crowd of wierdos and er, you’re standing there and it’s like right I’m not waiting with these guys coz a lot of people are starting to get aggressive now they’ve no drink left and all that. So you just wander down to the front of Central station and just wait in the line for the taxi [i.e. to a rank with taxi marshals].” (Male Patron, #31)

Although seen as safer, several interviewees complained about the lack of taxis and how expensive they were (some allocated half their clubbing budget for the taxi ride home – up to £25.00). Interviewees felt that they might be more likely to use night-buses more often if these had a security or stewarding system, either on-board or at city centre terminuses. However, others felt that although this would be an ideal, it would be unlikely to happen owing to the costs involved.

“I think they would have to be more policing or maybe even stewards on these trains, tubes and buses em to police that em that would be something. I think more taxis, better public transport, more police on the ground em, but of course these things all cost money and where’s the money going to come from?” (Male Patron, #8)

“I think if there was stewards and I think if the buses were regular and they came when they said they were gonna come. I don’t fancy waiting, it would be quite nice if they had people at bus stops even cos’ it’s waiting around in the dark at a bus stop that I don’t like. I wouldn’t fancy doing that.”... [As with taxi marshals?] Well, exactly. I quite like that. So there’s no fighting and that in the queue. And people don’t jump the queues. But like buses, I don’t like standing at bus stops cos’ everyone that’s there is completely out of their face and it’s not very nice.” (Female Patron, #11)

In the above quote by #11, a comparison is made with the taxi marshals who work in the Glasgow's transport Night Zones (see *Background*). At these taxi ranks, the marshals help to keep order in the queues and their presence is thought to have greatly speeded up the rate at which clubbers are able to get home. Some interviewees felt this was indeed the case.

“The queues for the taxis are getting a lot better as they've got these stewards now. I think that's a big help to be honest. That's a really good move.” (Male Patron, #28)

As stated in the *Background* to this research, the establishment of taxi marshals (see also Table 15) was just one of several recent initiatives which the city of Glasgow has implemented with the aim of making the night-time economy safer (others include the glassware ban). Therefore it is important to note that, although all this research was conducted within Glasgow, the findings of this report should not reflect upon levels of disorder within that city relative to elsewhere. As should already be apparent, there was little doubt amongst interviewees that much had been done in recent times to improve community safety in Glasgow city centre at night. Moreover, all interviewees who had experience of the night-time economy elsewhere, ranging from other large cities in Scotland, England or overseas to the numerous small towns which surround Glasgow, stated that the city centre was one of the safest places to go clubbing that they knew of. Additionally, interviewees were also very positive about the high standard of nightclub entertainment on offer and would recommend the city to others as one of, if not the best for nightlife in the UK.

“I think it's worse if you go drinking outside of Glasgow. Glasgow is the safest place to drink. I've been to other places and... [gives example of a nightclub in a nearby town]” (Male Patron, #28)

“I'd say it's a positive experience and everyone should go out [in Glasgow]. It's the best night out in Scotland anyway, but not touching Amsterdam.” (Male Patron, #30)

Finally, interviewees were asked to comment on alcohol-related disorder in the night-time economy. Although all felt there was some justification for current concerns about binge drinking and violence, most felt that these were exaggerated and that the media or politicians tended to focus in on the

behaviours of a minority of troublemakers, using this worst case scenario to stereotype all clubbers or all young adult drinkers.

“I think it’s over-exaggerated slightly the binge drinking industry. I think it is the same today as it probably was 50 years ago. Everybody just probably wants to go out and have a good time and stuff like that but, I think they do, they take it a bit far. They [politicians] over-exaggerate it to make a story for the press.” (Male Patron, #28)

“I think this binge drinking thing is heavily out of proportion because I mean it’s not like that. Because they [politicians and the press] don’t go out themselves they don’t know, they can’t see what’s going on. So they have a cheek to talk really and you know.” (Male Patron, #21)

Conclusions

Discussion

This research has examined levels of alcohol-related disorder in the night-time economy of a UK city centre. The research was conducted against a background characterised by increasing concerns about ‘binge drinking’, alcohol-related health problems, crime and anti-social behaviour, juxtaposed with one characterised by the increasing availability of alcohol brought about by increased liberalisation of licensing controls (e.g. towards 24 hour drinking) and the increased affordability of an expanding variety of alcoholic beverages.

The research undertaken for in this report investigated the issues above by way of participant observation in eight city centre nightclubs (venues holding an entertainment licence) in Glasgow, Scotland, between February and May 2006. These observations used internationally validated instruments designed to measure disorder risk within the barroom environment and built upon a similar study conducted by the author in licensed premises in Glasgow city centre’s early night-time (late PM) drinks market (premises holding a Public House Licence). On this occasion, field observations were supplemented by in-depth interviews conducted with patrons of the city centre’s nightclubs between May and September 2006.

Glasgow was also chosen as a suitable arena for this research to be conducted in, at this time, because it allowed the investigation of the impacts of both the national Scottish smoking ban, which prohibited smoking from all enclosed public spaces, including *all* licensed premises and the introduction of a local city centre bye-law banning glassware from all venues holding an Entertainment Licence, including nightclubs. The research also aimed to examine patterns of disorder within the city centre after the nightclubs had closed (at 3.00 AM). Therefore, the eight nightclubs in the observational sample were located in the city centre, were all venues which held regular nights at the weekends (allowing them to be visited more than once, on Friday and Saturday nights) and were chosen individually to represent a broad range of known crime or call-outs to disorder, as recorded by the local police (Strathclyde Police).

In Scotland, and particularly in the city of Glasgow, as a response to this burgeoning night-time economy and the perceived problem of 'binge drinking' (issues equally salient throughout the UK), many initiatives have been introduced in recent times with the aim of creating safer nightlife. These have included policies encouraging the training of bar staff (see Forsyth et al, 2005), security staff, the creation of night zones (with taxi marshals) to improve transport links, CCTV, the banning of 'happy hours' (and other 'irresponsible' drinks marketing), social marketing to discourage immoderate consumption, the establishment of a night-radio network, the smoking and glassware bans.

Despite these measures, the first thing apparent to the author in conducting this research was how radically the nightclub scene had changed, being much more disorderly, from what he observed during fieldwork for his PhD thesis conducted during 1993-94 (Forsyth, 1997). This thesis looked at the 'dance drug' (rave) scene in Glasgow at that time, which was characterised by 'lured-up' dancing behaviours, the absence of 'pulling', moderate alcohol consumption and a non-violent ethos. Twelve years later this culture appeared to have been largely replaced by one characterised by drunkenness, overtly sexualised dancing and aggressive behaviours. This observed difference would appear to be in line with national indicators suggesting a long-term decline in 'dance drug' use and corresponding rise in 'binge drinking'. This change in club culture clearly

presents new challenges for both nightlife management and substance use harm reduction. (Although some of the observed venues were common to both the 1993-94 and 2006 research, only one had retained a non-violent 'rave' ethos, this was the nightclub with the lowest levels of disorder in the current research. This echoes a similar finding in the previous 'pub study' and suggests that observing premises where 'dance drug' use is more common than drunkenness, may not be an economical use of human resources in future violence research).

The observational research confirmed that there was great variance in disorder risk between individual nightclubs. Differences in disorder risk between such premises appeared to be related to their differing clientele and patrons' behaviours, which were, in turn, related to the types of entertainment on offer (i.e. because of music policy rather than drinks prices). The nightclubs in the sample with more frequent violence, whether as recorded by the police or as witnessed during fieldwork, tended to be those where a younger more intoxicated clientele was observed. However as more serious violent incidents tended to occur at premises with a (slightly) older clientele, it would be misleading to view late night alcohol-related disorder in public space as merely a problem caused by younger drinkers (e.g. teenagers).

These findings tend to suggest that disorder levels within nightclubs are a function of their clientele and these levels should not necessarily reflect badly on the operators or staff of individual premises (e.g. those employed in venues with high crime rates). To draw an analogy from education statistics, 'failing schools' tend to be those with a disadvantaged intake and, far from this being the fault of the teachers, staff at such schools may be amongst the most dedicated and able workers in the most challenging teaching environments. Closing such schools only passes their disadvantaged pupils along with the 'failing school' tag elsewhere without solving any underlying problems. In this scenario, action taken against the 'worst' offending nightclubs (e.g. on 'league tables' based on unadjusted police figures) would only seem likely to displace the clientele of such premises elsewhere, either to the off-trade (i.e. the streets) or to other nightclubs where the staff may not be so 'au fait' with all the best techniques for dealing with troublesome patrons. As with 'failing schools' measures of 'added value'

(i.e. how many problems a premises presents when taking into consideration the clientele) would seem to be a better approach in evaluating individual licensed premises.

It is of course also likely to be the case that certain types of clientele make decisions about which nightclubs to attend based on the likelihood of there being trouble or not. For example, some groups or individuals may purposively seek out venues where they believe there will be like-minded disruptive individuals. On the other hand, in this research, some patrons stated that they attended 'adult dance', nightclubs (which were less 'binge drinking'-orientated) in the belief that there would be no violence at such venues. Similarly, fewer incidents of aggression were witnessed in nightclubs with high proportions of patrons from ethnic minorities. These findings may be a function of minority groups (e.g. ethnic minorities, Gay / lesbian or older clubbers) purposively avoiding some premises where they anticipate trouble. However, these findings are limited as no venues catering for niche groups (e.g. ticketed raves, live rock venues or Gay / lesbian nightclubs) were observed, and, for example, the gender dynamics of aggressive disputes within Gay nightclubs may be quite different to those witnessed in the eight 'straight' premises observed in this research.

By using internationally validated tools, the research was able to make a risk assessment for disorder in each observed nightclub and describe in detail a number of violent incidents witnessed within these premises. There was a high degree of correspondence between the observed data and police figures relating to the eight nightclubs in the sample. However there were also some differences. For example, levels of minor disorder and the frequency of less serious aggressive incidents witnessed appeared to be more in line with police figures than was the case with more serious disorder risk or 'severe' violence witnessed. Nevertheless, it was noteworthy that observations were more in line with police figures collated over the period of the field research (the first 6 months of 2006), which were obtained only after the analysis had been completed, than they were for corresponding figures relating to the period immediately prior to the research commencing (the whole of 2005), which were used in the sample selection process.

These findings illustrate the usefulness of the observational method and the potential it has for violence or alcohol harm reduction tool-kits. For example, field observers could be employed to predict the likelihood of disorder at newly opened licensed premises or to provide an early warning service for likely changes in the levels of disorder at existing venues or city centres over time, by picking up on new trends or policy impacts before any official statistics have been collated and published. Most importantly, this technique could be used to understand the reasons why certain premises may be associated with relatively high, low or fluctuating levels of alcohol-related crime and disorder, something which may not always be apparent from raw police statistics.

The frequency and severity of aggressive incidents (mainly fights) witnessed in this late night premises research was much greater (more than double) that witnessed in the previous Glasgow (pub sector) research. Although within the nightclub sample a higher frequency of aggressive incidents appeared to take place within premises characterised by younger, more intoxicated patrons, in comparison to the previous pub-sector research overall levels of drunkenness did not vary significantly. This finding suggests that it is features inherent to nightclubs (e.g. dancing behaviour, i.e. movement, youth and sexual conduct) rather than alcohol sales that are responsible for the greater levels of violence occurring within late night premises.

Although there was little evidence of any overtly irresponsible alcohol promotion techniques being used during observations, drunkenness was the norm in the observed premises, with consumption patterns varying according to clientele. In fact, the one nightclub which did engage in aggressive drinks promotion (drinks party marketing) was otherwise assessed as being relatively orderly (and none of the four aggressive incidents witnessed there were rated as 'physical', see Table 8). However, interviews with nightclub patrons, who were not restricted to the weekends or the mainstream 'high street' premises visited by observers, revealed differing evidence, specifically that some niche venues, particularly student-orientated nightclubs, ran drinks promotions that some might argue may encourage immoderate consumption (e.g. £0.75 per pint of lager). This sort of

marketing was more likely to take place during weeknights, including at some of nightclubs observed. In contrast, at the weekends (when observations were conducted) both the field observers and the interviewed patrons were more likely to complain about how expensive drinks prices were.

The logic behind this price structure would appear to be that weeknight clientele comprise less affluent drinkers (e.g. students) and such low prices may attract new customers (presumably in the hope that these would be retained as weekend patrons once they had gained regular employment). At weekends patrons are more likely to be working people, therefore more affluent and perhaps expecting to be entertained beyond cheap alcohol. Although this weekly price structure would seem to be a potentially risky strategy, it is worth considering that imposing price increases on such nightclub operators may only encourage increased off-trade consumption, such as greater levels of pre-loading (drinking before entering nightclubs) as already seemed to be the case, particularly at the weekends when drinks prices within nightclubs were higher.

A particular focus of the interviews with patrons was to look for evidence of the practice of 'pre-loading'. That is drinking alcohol before going out to nightclubs, perhaps involving cheap drinks purchased from supermarkets, supposedly because of the relatively high price of alcohol in pubs and nightclubs. This view is controversial. For example, the Scottish Grocers' Federation stated in a submission to the Scottish Parliament (2005) "*It is not the case as suggested in previous evidence that consumers are intoxicating themselves with liquor purchased from the off-license prior to entering public houses and nightclubs*". Other submissions to the same Parliamentary committee disagreed, with for example the Scottish Beer and Pub Association (SBPA) arguing that "*anecdotal evidence from our members suggests that there is an increasing trend, particularly amongst younger drinkers, of consuming alcohol from the off sales sector at home, and then coming out for an evening to frequent on sales premises, passing the consequent problems of 'binge drinking' on to the on trade. In the past, there has been a presupposition that on and off trade are different and separate entities. This is no longer the case*".

This research found that pre-loading before entering nightclubs was the norm, with many patrons drinking more before entry than they did inside the nightclub. Therefore the evidence of this research would refute the view above expressed by The Scottish Grocers Federation but support that of the SBPA. However, it should be stressed that price was only one factor influencing pre-loading behaviour by nightclub patrons, other factors included socialising opportunities and to get in the appropriate mood for clubbing (i.e. for dancing). Nevertheless this does indicate that policies which increase the price of alcohol on-trade, in this case within nightclubs, without a corresponding increase to prices in the off-trade, would be likely to increase the extent of pre-loading.

Also, and again in contrast to the view expressed by The Scottish Grocers Federation but in line with that of SBPA above, patterns of alcohol consumption between the on-trade and off-trade sectors appear to over-lap greatly, as was further evidence by the existence of after-parties or continued drinking taking place at 'private' locations, often with organised musical entertainments (e.g. DJs), beyond 3.00 AM when the nightclubs have closed. This existence of this phenomenon may be an argument in favour of longer licensing hours, on-trade, by those who see off-trade consumption as a greater problem. The converse also being true, that is shortening nightclub hours would seem likely to encourage the growth of after-parties. There was also a suggestion that the opportunity to socialise while drinking alcohol and smoking, which the 'privacy' of after-parties present, *may* have made these drinking events more popular in Scotland since the introduction of the smoking ban in public places.

Rather than simply to drink alcohol, which could be done elsewhere (e.g. at private parties, at home or in the pub), three sets of reasons for nightclub attendance were identified from both observations and patron interviews. These were; for 'fun' / socialising on special occasions with friends, to 'pull' / meet new sexual partners, and for reasons relating to participation in music or other scenes. These three reasons impacted upon both patterns of alcohol consumption and disorder levels, with, for example, premises characterised by 'pulling' being at increased risk of violent conflicts arising from 'sexual jealousy'.

In common with the findings of the previous pub sector study, a large proportion of aggressive incidents witnessed involved female aggressors. Both field observations and interviewed patrons indicated that these female-to-female conflicts were mainly related to 'sexual jealousy', and while male-to-male conflicts could also be down to this reason, these were more likely to be due to persons 'looking for trouble', coupled with alcohol (more so than with females) and the physical conditions within crowded nightclubs. Although, as might be expected, most aggressive incidents involved males, when female conflicts did occur they seemed to be at least as likely to become serious (e.g. resulting in injuries requiring medical attention - as rated by this project's independent violence risk assessment experts). This is not what might be expected from the international literature.

One possible explanation as to why relatively more conflicts involving females than might be expected from the literature, were witnessed maybe simply because the majority of nightclub patrons observed were female (previous research having focused on predominantly male drinking environments). In short, if more women are going out and more women are drinking alcohol more heavily when they go out, then it can hardly be surprising that there are more alcohol-related female-to-female conflicts. This does *not* mean that women are more violent than was the case previously. Although this finding is in line with similar recent research (the Glasgow pub-sector observational research), there has been no longitudinal studies of this nature conducted in the UK, therefore it is impossible to say whether women (or for that matter men) are more or less disorderly than they were at any given point in the past. Interestingly, observers in both the present study and the previous Glasgow 'pub study' (who were not the same people) independently described licensed premises where the female patrons were more aggressive than the males as having a "wedding reception" type atmosphere. This would indicate that they (or for that matter we all) are familiar with environments characterised by alcohol-related female hostility, except that in the past these tended to be associated with more private drinking environments. Additionally, a unique retrospective study which examined female alcohol-related violence, describes types of female-to-female aggression

resembling that witnessed in this research occurring between women some decades ago (Day et al, 2003).

Why female-to-female conflicts in these nightclubs should be so likely to escalate is more difficult to explain (research conducted outside the UK has suggested that female barroom aggression is limited to defensive slaps and angry looks). In this research, female-to-female conflicts typically involved hair-pulling, including cases where several women become involved by being pulled in by the hair to form in a 'mass of fighters'. Such conflicts would appear to be more difficult for stewards (nightclub security staff) to break-up and perhaps even to spot or pre-empt. These contrast sharply with male-to-male conflicts which tended to involve a consistent choreography, typically starting with a pair of patrons squaring-up and issuing challenges to each other, a pattern which could easily be spotted and quickly broken-up by stewards before things had time to escalate.

It was also felt that male stewards, who made up the majority of nightclub security staff, could be slower to intervene in female-to-female conflicts. This may not only be because male stewards could be less aware when female conflicts were brewing (or because they are absent from potential flash points such as the female toilets) but because of fears of that they may be accused of acting inappropriately (i.e. sexual assault). A lack of speedy intervention would seem likely make female fights more prone to escalate. Even when male staff did intervene in female-to-female conflicts they often did not seem to know what to do next (e.g. some very aggressive female fighters were observed not being ejected) or failed to act empathetically (i.e. they did not always take female fights seriously). The obvious solution to these problems would be to increase the number of female stewards on duty in nightclubs.

In common with the findings of recent research conducted in the UK into the roles played by female nightclub security staff (an *ESRC* funded project by Hobbs & Westmarland entitled 'Women on the Door: Female Bouncers in the New Night-time Economy', see Taylor-Whiffen, 2006), female stewards were observed being at least as likely as their male colleagues to become involved in quelling incidents of serious violence. This may in part be due to their much

lower numbers on duty and dispels any beliefs that female security staff are only there to provide a 'softly softly touch' or as conflict negotiators and diffusers.

Alarmingly, this situation became worse during the course of the research when the Scottish ban on smoking in enclosed public spaces was introduced. This meant that stewards now spent much more of their time at the nightclub door monitoring the patrons who were allowed outside on a temporary basis to smoke and also searching these patrons as they exited and re-entered. These duties inevitably meant that stewards who were at the door would be less likely to spot and slower to respond to trouble inside the nightclub. Given that at least one female steward was required to search female smokers, this new development seemed to have a particularly adverse affect on the numbers of female security staff patrolling inside the nightclubs observed.

Patrons also felt that a limited number of female stewards on the doors of nightclubs had created the situation where it was easier for females to gain entry to nightclubs, regardless of their age, state of intoxication or likelihood of causing trouble. Indeed, field observations noted substantial numbers of under-age patrons, predominantly female, in some venues. These venues tended to have the most, though not the most serious, aggressive incidents which typically only involved the (over-age) male patrons. This finding would chime with previous international research which has found that the presence of under-age females to be related to increased aggression in other patrons (Graham et al, 1980). The findings of the present study indicated that this relationship may be down to the same less rigorous door polices at a limited number of venues allowing both under-age females and troublesome, if over-age, males entry (both being unable to gain entry elsewhere, albeit for different reasons). This situation would appear to carry some obvious dangers. Although imposing more rigorous age-checking at certain venues may seem to offer a simple solution to this problem, such a policy risks displacing younger female drinkers on to the streets, again carrying obvious, and perhaps more serious, dangers.

Door polices appeared to impact upon levels of disorder on the city centre streets. This is because of the cumulative effect of door stewards at numerous

nightclubs refusing entry to certain types people (mainly groups of males or intoxicated persons) at around pub closing time (i.e. the time when most would-be nightclub patrons arrive at the door). Such people, who Hobbs (2003) dubbed “the legion of the banned”, would then wander from premises to premises attempting to gain entry, their disgruntled numbers being swelled by troublesome ex-patrons who had already been ejected from nightclubs. This was one of the reasons why interviewed patrons felt the city centre streets were less disorderly after 3.00 AM when the nightclubs closed than they were in the hour post-midnight after the pubs had closed. Others reasons for this view included that dancing could work off peoples’ aggression and the belief that nightclub type people were more peaceable than those who only drank in pubs.

Field observations also implied that the city centre streets were less disorderly after nightclub closing time in comparison to what was noted at closing time during the previous Glasgow pub sector study. This contrasts sharply with the observed differences in levels of disorder inside both types of premises. However unlike the previous study a visible high police presence was noted on the street at this later time, as well as the presence of other public night workers (e.g. taxi marshals). Therefore it may also be the case that this more visible policing at nightclub closing time had made the streets less disorderly. For example officers were observed stationed at the doors of nightclub premises so that they are the first people who patrons see when exiting the venue. Indeed, potentially troublesome patrons were observed being visibly calmed or deterred by this police presence as soon as they emerged on to the city streets. Further, as well as deterring those who may be out ‘looking for trouble’, this policy also seems to have had positive influence on those who were fearful of crime in the city centre late at night.

Despite the view that the city centre streets were safer later in the night, and the high police presence noted (by both observers and interviewees) many of the patrons interviewed still experienced fear of crime at this time. Fear of crime amongst patrons in the night-time economy differed by gender, with males feeling more vulnerable on the busy city centre streets and females feeling less safe on the quieter streets nearer their home.

Interviewees felt that more and safer public transport would help to reduce fear of crime and alcohol-related problems in night-time economy. The absence of trains combined with a perceived shortage of buses and taxis (as well as the latter's high cost) was felt to fuel city centre disorder by allowing groups to congregate and creating frustration. Interviewees spoke positively about Glasgow's taxi marshals and wished to see a similar scheme being put into place at night-bus terminuses. The buses themselves were also seen as potential flashpoints which some patrons were afraid to use. It was felt that increased policing or some kind of marshalling system at the main night-bus terminuses, or even onboard stewarding, would be needed to make these a more attractive way home for some nightclub patrons.

Another fear of crime issue, whether real or imagined, which emerged during interviews with nightclub patrons was drinks spiking. It was felt that leaving drinks unattended in nightclubs while dancing created an extra opportunity for drinks spikers as compared to other drinking environments (e.g. pubs). For this reason some patrons were choosing to drink small, potent, quick to consume, beverages. An increased fear of drinks spiking was another unexpected consequence of the smoking ban as some interviewees felt that this had increased the amount of time that some drinks were left unattended. One suggested solution to this problem was to improve the availability of plastic bottles with caps (much like sports drinks containers). Some premises were already selling an alcopop in such containers, the design of which was seen as being very advantageous when dancing or moving around nightclubs.

Despite the above concerns about tying up stewarding resources and increased opportunities for drinks spikers, the nightclub patrons interviewed were on the whole very positive about the Scottish Executive's ban on smoking in enclosed public spaces. Despite the extra management problems that this initiative has presented for nightclub operators and the added inconvenience imposed on smokers, both interviews and field observations indicated a very high level of compliance with this new law. This finding is particularly noteworthy in the late

night sector as, unlike say pubs or restaurants, patrons who have paid to enter a nightclub cannot simply leave for a few minutes to smoke and then re-enter.

Both smokers and non-smokers spoke positively about being able to leave nightclubs supposedly 'to smoke' for a short time before being able to re-enter (without having to pay the entrance fee again). Reasons for this included the smoking pass-out system allowing nightclub patrons the opportunity to cool down, get fresh air, take a break from the music and to socialise. However, the emergent 'smirting' scene (smoking outside nightclubs) seems to have the potential to strengthen bonds between smokers and perhaps further reinforce their behaviour. There would even seem to be a possibility that both non-smokers and ex-smokers could become involved in smoking (albeit perhaps only on a part-time or 'recreational' basis) owing to the attractions of the 'smirting' scene, as was the case with one interviewee. Although no interviewees had stopped smoking because of the ban, several stated that they now smoked less on a night out clubbing than they had done previously. On the evidence of this research, the policy of banning smoking from all enclosed public places, as introduced in Scotland, would seem likely to be successful if applied to nightclubs and all other licensed premises elsewhere (e.g. in England).

Another controversial piece of legislation which came into force within Glasgow's night-time economy in early 2006 was the city's ban on glassware from all venues holding an Entertainment Licence. This too was popular with interviewees, and also with field observers who (perhaps because they were sober and more aware of the danger) felt safer working in glass-free nightclubs regardless of how disorderly or violent they were.

Glasgow's no glassware policy aimed at the phased elimination of glass, other than toughened or tempered glass, with an objective of achieving eighty percent plastic or aluminium during 2006. The sole exception to this policy was made for champagne / wine glasses, for which individual premises could apply for an exemption. Such exemptions are unfortunate, as they allow opportunities for potentially harmful glassware to remain in circulation. For example, field observations indicated that some nightclubs' compliance with the ban may be

less than one hundred per cent, with one venue in the sample apparently pretending to serve in toughened or tempered glass by pouring drinks from branded bottles into ordinary glass vessels. Therefore any future policies designed to remove dangerous glassware would benefit from a rigorous monitoring system to ensure compliance, especially if exemptions are allowed.

Other concerns about the appropriateness of the exemptions to the glassware ban include that toughened glass (or other 'special glass') can also be dangerous and that a one hundred percent plastic policy would have been more effective. Such concerns were borne out during this observational research. Not only did field observers witness some serious acts of violence involving apparently toughened glassware, but they also witnessed aggressive incidents involving plastic vessels which would have had much more serious consequences had glass, of any kind, still been present. In other words, if not for this policy and the compliance with it of most of the nightclubs sampled (five of the eight were all plastic) the number of aggressive incidents witnessed in this research rated as 'severe' (requiring medical attention) would have been greater.

Interestingly, some younger patrons, who may be less accustomed to glass, seemed oblivious to the controversy surrounding this policy. Those patrons interviewed who had themselves worked in nightclubs were also positive about the glassware ban from a staff point-of-view, in that they felt plastic was safer to wash and easier to clean up in terms of accidental breakages etc. The main caveat, to unanimous support for the removal of glass, was that some types of plastic were deemed to be unsuitable for use in nightclub environment. Vessels made from soft materials, such as polystyrene or polypropylene, were unpopular in this respect as it was felt they could easily split or overflow, leading to spillage and increased littering. Harder polycarbonates, which could be difficult to distinguish from glassware, were deemed as being more suitable for this purpose.

Despite the above complexities (exemptions, compliance, type of plastic), from the findings of this research there can be no doubt that this policy could be successfully extended to nightclubs elsewhere, which interestingly interviewees

now viewed as being more dangerous than those in Glasgow for this reason alone. Although some interviewees were less positive about extending the glassware ban to pubs, and in particular to restaurants, like the smoking ban, on this evidence, patrons will be quick to accept the removal of glassware from nightclubs elsewhere.

Recent research funded by the glass industry has concluded “*After recent attempts to ban glasses and bottles from pubs in Glasgow we felt it was important to demonstrate that such a ban would not have an effect in reducing alcohol-related violence*” (David Workman, director general of British Glass, quoted in *The Publican*, 31/10/06). This is of course rather misleading, as it is doubtful whether the medium in which drinking vessels are manufactured (e.g. glass or plastic) can make any difference to the frequency of alcohol related violence within licensed premises. What is not in doubt from this observational study of nightclubs is that when violence does occur within licensed premises, and it does frequently, the severity of injuries can be greatly reduced by a one hundred percent glass-free drinking environment.

Although this study has focused on interventions aimed at informing polices dedicated to reducing alcohol-related disorder, including the impact of interventions such as the elimination of irresponsible drinks promos, removing glassware, banning smoking, stewarding, policing and various polices designed to improve the management of city centres after closing time, one final note of caution is worth considering. It should not be forgotten that nightclubs are places of public entertainment. In this research one nightclub appeared to losing popularity, its’ patrons were described by field observers as being relatively orderly but bored, with few people dancing or enjoying themselves and many patrons leaving early. In other words, observers felt that the reasons why this nightclub was relatively safe were the same as those why it might soon cease trading. This illustrates the need to include measures of positive features on any future checklist designed to assess disorder risk within licensed premises and the danger that too many restrictions imposed on nightclubs or their patrons may harm the very industry that such measures are designed to protect.

This study has examined the late night drinks market in Glasgow, Scotland. However, the findings presented here should not be taken as an indicator of any problems peculiar to that one city, let alone to any of the eight individual premises observed. Any focus on individual premises or cities is likely to prove unproductive. As was illustrated in the *Background* to this report, the problems and processes highlighted in these findings are widespread and likely to be typical of those faced by cities across the UK. Their solution needs a wider change in drinking culture beyond the scope of this research. Nevertheless it was clear during the course of this research that the city in which fieldwork was conducted has made great steps towards minimising alcohol-related harm within its' night-time economy which could be applied equally well elsewhere.

In summary, recent policy changes affecting Glasgow's late night drinks market would appear to demonstrate the future of safer clubbing, towards the creation of smoke-free and glass-free environments, along with safer streets and improved transport systems. However, this research did confirm that a high level of alcohol-related disorder is taking place in public space in the hours after midnight. At present this seems likely to continue to be the case regardless of the amount of steps taken by individual cities or nightclubs to limit this harm. Therefore the challenge lies at a higher level of policy making, to encourage more responsible drinking behaviour, without focusing on individual premises or even sectors of the licensed trade, which may simply push irresponsible or troublesome drinkers or drinking behaviours elsewhere.

Key Implications and Recommendations

- The research confirmed the usefulness of the observational method for measuring disorder risk. It is recommended that this technique is used in future research, as part of licensed premises assessments and in city centre violence reduction tool-kits designed to reduce levels of alcohol-related disorder in the late night drinks market.
- Even though all the observed premises were mainstream, high street nightclubs holding regular nights, a great deal of variance in levels of

disorder, disorder risk and aggressive incidents was observed between each of the eight venues in the sample. This raises the question of what might be found in other types of late night (niche) premises (e.g. live music nightclubs, ticketed rave promotions, Gay / lesbian clubs, Latin / salsa clubs, ceilidh clubs, lap-dancing clubs, private members clubs, non-dance nightclubs, casinos and student orientated venues). Patron interviews implied that the drinking environments in these differ greatly from those observed in this study. Future research should also aim to investigate patterns of drinking, disorder and alcohol-marketing techniques in these types of premises.

- The variance in levels of disorder risk and aggressive incidents witnessed between observed premises seemed to be a function of their clientele rather than because of their operators' drinks policy / prices. Clientele type appeared to be a function the entertainments on offer (i.e. music policy). The relationship between music and alcohol-related disorder in public space requires further investigation. This should include the physical aspects of music provision (e.g. sound-systems) as well as genre effects, the tempo, familiarity to patrons and the role of song lyrics.
- At the weekend nightclubs appeared to promote themselves according to the entertainments they had on offer rather than drinks promotions. However through the week some operators seemed to be able to sell alcohol at much lower prices, especially venues catering for students. Future observational research investigating alcohol prices and other drinks promotions should not be restricted to the weekends
- The nightclub patrons who participated in this research displayed a great variety of drinking styles, patterns and behaviours over the seven days prior to being interviewed. Over the course a week, or even in a single day, some individuals could vary their drinking locations, purchase outlets, types of beverages, drinks brands, preferred drinking vessels and types of nightclub premises. Therefore it would be wrong for policy

makers to assume that nightclub type drinkers represent a homogenous population, or drinking culture, who would all be equally responsive to a single intervention.

- Although high levels of drunkenness were observed, nightclub operators may be being unfairly singled out for blame attributed to any resultant problems as there was much evidence of 'pre-loading', that is buying (usually cheaper) alcohol from off-trade or pub outlets, prior to attempting to gain entry to nightclubs or even prior to entering the city centre night-time economy.
- Although there may be a place for increasing drinks prices within the late night drinks market, these would need to be concurrent with price increases of at least the same order of magnitude in the off-trade. Otherwise the extent of pre-loading is likely to increase. At present preloading may actually be being encouraged by the relatively high drinks prices in some nightclubs at the weekend.
- The use of caffeinated beverages, whether as spirits mixers (i.e. energy drinks) or in pre-loading (e.g. tonic wine) was a prominent feature of the late night drinks market which warrants further investigation.
- Patrons varied their choice of alcoholic drinks greatly throughout the nightclubbing session. Smaller more potent beverages (e.g. vodka) were preferred inside nightclubs because of their portability (less spillage) and speed of consumption. This may increase intoxication levels in some, though conversely breaks from drinking to engage in dancing (or smoking outdoors) may reduce intoxication levels.
- Some patrons were concerned about the greater opportunities for drink-spiking within nightclubs as compared to other on-trade premises, where drinks are more often left unattended (e.g. while dancing) and chose to drink smaller more potent alcoholic beverages, quickly, for this reason

alone. This situation was felt to have been worsened by the introduction of a smoking ban, as owing to a local bye-law prohibiting the consumption of alcohol in public places, patrons were not allowed to take their drinks outside with them while smoking. This policy could be reviewed (e.g. it may become possible to serve drinks in sealable containers which may even be taken, if not consumed, outdoors).

- The design of drinks vessels (regardless of the materials which they are made from) was seen as an important feature of the late night on-trade marketplace. Increased availability of drinks containers with plastic caps, like sports drinks, was aired as a potential way of lessening both fear of spiking and the problems associated with drinks spillage in the nightclub drinking environment (e.g. while dancing).
- This research has highlighted some of the extra problems faced in managing smoking bans by nightclubs (i.e. premises where people have paid to enter). Despite these problems there was an almost one hundred percent compliance by patrons who were overwhelming positive about the effect that this ban had on the nightclub drinking environment. On this evidence there is no reason from to assume that such a non-smoking policy would be less favourably received elsewhere in the UK.
- The smoking ban appeared to use up a great deal of valuable stewarding (security and door supervision) resources. In premises without an exclusive outdoor designated smoking area, where patrons had to smoke on the street, stewards were required to monitor and search patrons who left the venue temporarily to smoke on the street. Thus, smoking bans would appear to increase the demand for and demands upon nightclub security staff, something which those likely to be effected by such legislation in the future (e.g. in England) should be mindful of.
- Owing to the severity of some of the fights between females witnessed, it is felt that polices to introduce more security staff would be

advantageous, especially, as was the case in this research, in premises where the majority of patrons are female or where female security staff numbers inside nightclubs are limited by the extra door searches brought about by the management of a smoking ban. Additionally, as the choreography of female-to-female violence appeared to differ greatly from that of male-to-male fights, licensed premises disorder reduction training programs should be mindful not to focus only upon techniques for spotting, preventing or dealing with male conflicts. Accordingly, more research needs to be conducted into alcohol-related female aggression, in order to inform the appropriate authorities of how best to deal with this issue, for example so that staff training programs are made aware of the warning signs to such conflicts and how best to resolve them.

- The removal of glassware, all types of glassware, from nightclubs is one measure which can bring clear public safety rewards. Removing glassware may have little impact on the incidence of violence inside licensed premises but it will greatly reduce their severity, as well as reducing accidental injuries. When aiming to create safer bars, the removal of glassware from all licensed premises should be encouraged. However, although those interviewed in this research, especially younger clubbers, were very positive about the removal of glass from nightclubs, their interviews also indicated that patrons of other types of premises (e.g. older pub-goers) may be more resistant to such a move.
- The level of disorder found to be occurring within licensed premises trading late at night was found to be greater than that occurring in premises observed in a similar research project investigating the early night (pub sector) drinks market. The reason for this higher level of disorder was felt to be because of the presence and nature of dancing behaviours, not because of any greater levels of intoxication.
- In contrast to what was witnessed inside, after nightclub closing time (3.00 AM) the surrounding streets seemed less disorderly in comparison

to when the pubs close (midnight). This may be because there are less people around, but it may also reflect a difference between patron types (e.g. in terms of levels of hostility or drunkenness).

- There was a high visibility of police on the beat observed at nightclub closing time. Not only did this seem to be preventing some disorder, but it also made some vulnerable patrons feel safer by reducing their fear of crime when making their way home through the city late at night.
- It was felt that better late night public transport provision could help to reduce city centre disorder and fear of crime, and that one way in which this could be achieved was to expand city centre taxi rank marshalling schemes to night-bus terminuses. Additionally night-bus timetables could be structured to better coincide with nightclub closing times, perhaps by stopping directly outside the main (clusters of) nightclubs. Introducing on-board stewarding to late night public transport systems was felt to have the potential to reduce the level of disorder and fear of crime associated with these, thereby encouraging more clubbers to leave the city centre, perhaps earlier, by choosing this route home.
- Future research should not be limited to the on-trade during opening hours as, from this evidence, it does not necessarily follow that higher (or lower) levels of disorder within premises will always translate to higher (or lower) levels of disorder on the streets outside at closing time.
- Future disorder risk assessment tools should include items that measure the positive aspects of licensed premises, for example how popular these are and how much patrons are enjoying themselves or not.
- When assessing individual premises, care needs to be taken to ensure that these are not unfairly labelled as problematic or as failing. To simply judge licensed premises on raw police statistics (e.g. on a league table) would miss any 'added value' where the operators of such premises may

have taken steps to make their venue safer. Otherwise there is a danger that premises will be judged solely on their clientele (e.g. the age, gender or social class of patrons), a clientele which will only be displaced elsewhere (onto the streets or to another formerly 'safer' premises) if action is taken against individual premises on these grounds alone.

- Despite the success of a number of policies observed in action and helping to reduce disorder risk, there is no doubt from this research that currently a great deal of harmful alcohol consumption takes place in the late night drinks market. However, the solution to this problem cannot be found by concentrating on individual premises or even a specific sector of the drinks market (or night-time economy). Such unconsidered actions would only succeed in displacing the problem elsewhere, for example more restrictive policies targeting nightclubs would seem to encourage potentially more problematic increases in off-trade consumption. However until some wider change in drinking culture (e.g. among young adults) has been achieved, the need to formulate new policies designed to reduce alcohol-related problems late at night seems likely to grow.

Bibliography

References

Academy of Medical Sciences (2004) *Calling Time: the nation's drinking as a major health issue*. London: The Academy of Medical Sciences.

Altaner D & Monaghan G (2004) Großbritannien will Brauereien und Pub-Ketten zur Kasse bitten. *Die Welt*, August 24th.

Bamber D (2005) Britain calls in army to control drunken yobs. *Sydney Morning Herald*, June 20th.

BBC2 Television (2004) *Booze Business*. The Money Programme, October 27th and November 3rd.

BBC3 Television (2006) *Binge Drinker*. Mischief, January 12th.

Bowers S (2004) Blair to call time on cut price drinks promotions. *The Guardian*, May 20th.

Braiden G (2006) It's the way to stop drunken violence... serve junk food in clubs. (Glasgow) *Evening Times*, May 26th.

Bright M & Hinsliff G (2004) Britain a nation in 'grip of drink crisis'. *The Observer*, November 21st.

Briscoe S & Donnelly N (2001) *Assaults on licensed premises in inner-urban areas*. Sydney: New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.

Brown C (2004) Call for last orders on happy hour drinks. *The Scotsman*, September 18th.

Burns T (1980) Getting rowdy with the boys. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 10: 273-287.

Collin M with Godfrey J (1997) *Altered state: The Story of Ecstasy Culture and Acid House*. London: Serpent's Tail.

Chatterton P & Hollands R (2003) *Urban Nightscapes Youth Cultures, Pleasure Spaces and Corporate Power*. London: Routledge.

Cramb A (2006) 3,000 clubbers stranded as snow bring chaos. *Telegraph*, March 13th.

Day K, Gough B & McFadden M (2003) Women who drink and fight: A discourse analysis of working-class women's talk. *Feminism and Psychology* 13: 2, 141-158.

Deehan A, Marshall E & Saville E (2002) *Drunks and disorder: processing intoxicated arrestees in two city-centre custody suites*. Police research series paper 150. London: Home Office.

Engineer R, Phillips A, Thompson J & 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.

Finney A (2004) *Violence in the Night-time Economy: Key findings from the research*. Home Office Findings 214. London: Home Office.

Ford R (2005) Women pay new price for binge drinks. *The Times*, January 14th.

Forsyth AJM (1997) *A Quantitative Exploration of Dance Drug Use: The new pattern of drug use in the 1990s*. PhD thesis. Glasgow University of Glasgow

Forsyth AJM & Cloonan M (in press, February 2008) Alco-pop?: The Use of Popular Music in Glasgow Pubs. *Pop Music Studies*.

Forsyth AJM, Cloonan M & Barr J (2005) *Factors Associated with Alcohol-related Problems within Licensed Premises*. Glasgow: Greater Glasgow NHS Board.

GCCAAG (2006) *Play Safe in Glasgow: Annual Report 2005 – 2006*. Glasgow: Glasgow City Centre Alcohol Action Group.

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, LaRoque L, Yetman R, Ross TJ & Guistra E (1980) Aggression and barroom environments. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 41, 277-292.

Graham K, Tremblay PF, Wells S, Pernanen K, Purcell K & Jelley J (2006) Harm, Intent and the nature of Aggressive Behavior of males and females: Measuring naturally occurring aggression in barroom settings. *Assessment*, 13: 280-296

Graham K & 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 & Wells S (2000). Evaluating theories of alcohol-related aggression in bars. *Addiction*, 95: 6, 847-864.

Graves TD, Graves NB, Semu VN & Sam IA (1981) The social context of drinking and violence in New Zealand's multi-ethnic pub settings. In Harford TC & Gaines LS (Eds.), Research Monograph No. 7, *Social Drinking Contexts*. Rockville, MD: NIAAA.

Gray L (2006) Alcohol kills record number of women. *Scotsman*, July 29th.

Green J & Plant M (2006) *Bad Bars: A review of risk factors*. Final Report to Alcohol Education Research Council. London: AERC.
<http://www.aerc.org.uk/documents/pdf/finalReports/Bad%20Bars.pdf>

Hadfield P (2006) *Bar Wars: Contesting the night in contemporary British cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harrell E & Howie M (2006) Violent crime by women up 50 per cent in past 4 years. *The Scotsman*, September 1st.

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 & Winlow S (2003) *Bouncers: Violence and Governance in the Night-time Economy*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hommel R & Clark J (1994) The prediction and prevention of violence in pubs and clubs. *Crime Prevention Studies*, 3, 1-46.

Hommel R & Tomsen S (1993) Hot Spots for Violence: The Environment of Pubs and Clubs. In Strang J, Heather N & Gerull S-A (Eds) *Homicide: Patterns, Prevention and Control Canberra*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.

House of Commons (2005) *Anti-Social Behaviour Report*, Home Affairs Select Committee, 5th Report of session 2004-05. London: House of Commons.

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.

Lang AR, Gaeskner DJ, Adesso VJ & Marlatt GA. (1975) Effects of alcohol on aggression in male social drinkers. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 84: 5, 508-518.

Lashley B (2006) Lollipop idea to shush yobs. *Manchester Evening News*, September 16th.

Lister S, Hobbs D, Hall S & Winlow S (2000) Violence in the night-time economy; Bouncers: the reporting, recording and prosecution of assaults. *Policing and Society*, 10: 4, 383-402.

McLoone P (2004) *Carstairs Scores for Scottish Postcode Sectors from the 2001 census*. Glasgow: MRC Social and Public Health Sciences Unit.

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 & 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 & Kibby KF (1993) *Drinking and Public Disorder*, A report of research conducted by MCM Research for the Portman Group. London: Portman Group.

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.

Measham F (2006) The new policy mix: Alcohol, harm minimisation, and determined drunkenness in contemporary society. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 17: 4, 258-268.

Measham F & Brain K (2005) 'Binge' drinking, British alcohol policy and the new culture of intoxication. *Crime Media Culture*, 1: 3, 262-283.

Morris N (2004) Blitz planned on drunken violence in town centres. *The Independent*, Home Affairs Correspondent, June 29th.

Murdoch D & Pihl R (1988) The influence of beverage type on aggression in males in the natural setting. *Aggressive Behaviour*. 14, 3325-3335.

O'Brien K & Westmarland L (2006) Violence Techniques as Gendered Performance: Controlling licensed venues by female bouncers. Presentation at the *British Society of Criminology* annual conference held at Glasgow Caledonian University, symposium on 'Alcohol and Disorder', July 5th.

Paterson S (2006) 65% rise in female drunk drivers. *The Herald*, August 16th.

Plant ML, Miller P & Plant MA (2005) The relationship between alcohol consumption and problem behaviours: Gender differences among British adults. *Journal of Substance Use*, 10, 22-30.

Plant EJ & Plant M (2005) A "leap in the dark?" Lessons for the United Kingdom from past extensions of bar opening hours. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 16: 6, 363-368.

Plant ML & Plant MA (2001) Heavy drinking by young British women gives cause for concern. *British Medical Journal*, 323, 1183

Prime Minister's Strategy Unit (2003) *Alcohol Misuse: Interim Analytical Report*. London: The Cabinet Office.

Purcell J & Graham K (2005) A typology of Toronto nightclubs at the turn of the millennium. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, 32, 131-167.

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.

Quigley BM, Leonard K & Collins L (2003) Characteristics of Violent Bars and Bar Patrons. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 64: 6, 765-772.

- Rayner J (2004) On the streets of binge Britain. *The Observer*, September 5th.
- Richardson A & Budd T (2003) *Alcohol, Crime and Disorder: A study of young adults*. Home Office Research Study 263. London: Home Office.
- Scottish Executive (2002) *Review of Liquor Licensing Law in Scotland*. Nicholson Committee. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Parliament (2005) *Report on the Licensing (Scotland) Bill*, Local Government and Transport Committee Report, 7th Report 2005. Edinburgh: Scottish Parliament.
- Shepherd JP & Brickley, MR (1996) The Relationship between Alcohol Intoxication, Stressors and Injury in Urban Violence, *British Journal of Criminology*, 36, 546-565.
- Taylor-Whiffen P (2006) Why women want to join the club: The boom in the night-time economy has prompted a sharp rise in the number of female bouncers. *The Independent*, October 3rd.
- 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.
- Warburton AL & Shepherd JP (2000) Effectiveness of Toughened Glassware in Terms of Reducing Injury in Bars: a randomised controlled trial. *Injury Prevention*, 6, 36-40.
- Young R (2004) Wine and women drinkers may spell the end of the British pub habit. *The Times*, October 6th.