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SUMMARY
Reducing intoxication on licensed premises is an important aim of the New Zealand host responsibility programme. A comprehensive programme of evaluation research is detailed, outlining the evaluation, development and ongoing monitoring of a campaign towards reduction of intoxication, based around television advertising. As part of stakeholder interviews, managers of licensed premises identified that they found reducing intoxication a difficult issue to deal with and they were hindered by the lack of drinker awareness of the legal responsibilities of bar staff. This lack of drinker awareness was confirmed by a subsequent survey. A campaign consisting of television advertising, posters and cards listing signs of intoxication was developed and pre-tested to ensure it had sufficient appeal and communicated the correct messages. Response to the campaign was assessed via surveys with the 18–55-year-old target age group and managers of licensed premises. Public awareness that bar staff could not serve intoxicated patrons increased markedly and managers were positive about the campaign. The role of this campaign in relation to other strategies to reduce intoxication is discussed.
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INTRODUCTION
Previous New Zealand research (Casswell et al., 1993) has shown that the quantities consumed at certain types of licensed premises (pubs/hotels, sports clubs and nightclubs) are predictors of the level of problems people report from their own drinking. This is in contrast to quantities consumed in restaurants and own homes, where no such relationship exists. The need to deal with excess drinking and intoxication in certain types of licensed premises has also been highlighted by research in other countries, such as that in New South Wales (Ireland and Thommeny, 1993), where they found that a high proportion of street offences were alcohol related and that a high proportion of these occurred in or near licensed premises. Likewise in the United Kingdom, Jeffs and Saunders (1983) found there was a reduction in alcohol-related crime when there was greater enforcement of the laws relating to drunkenness on licensed premises. Analysis of arrest data in another English project, the Brighton Licensing Project, showed that alcohol-related offences were more likely to be associated with licensed premises than private or public drinking places (Fienley, 1989; Sussex Police, n.d.). O'Donnell (1985) reported that in the United States approximately half of the intoxicated drivers were drinking at licensed premises and Lang et al. (1989) have reported similar levels in Western Australia.

Reduction of intoxication has been a key component of the New Zealand host responsibility programme, introduced in 1991. This programme has some parallels with server intervention programmes that had been developed in other countries (Saltz, 1986; Russ and Geller, 1987), but was
more comprehensive than most of these other programmes. It focused on both the private hosts and the hosts of licensed premises, the host being the server or supplier of the alcohol. The main components were as follows (Alcohol Advisory Council, 1991):

- providing and actively promoting low- and non-alcoholic alternatives;
- providing and actively promoting appropriate food;
- serving alcohol responsibly;
- being able to identify and responsibly deal with underaged and intoxicated people;
- arranging safe transport options.

The host responsibility programme was initially developed by an intersectoral group (including the hospitality and liquor industries) who formulated the national guidelines. However, much of the subsequent development of the programme, including the intoxication campaign, has been undertaken by the Alcohol Advisory Council (ALAC). This is an organisation established by the government in 1976, which is charged with promoting moderation in alcohol use. It appointed a full-time national host responsibility co-ordinator in late 1991.

The introduction of the host responsibility programme in New Zealand was a shift in emphasis for ALAC’s mass-media campaigns, where the traditional emphasis, as in most countries, had been on efforts to encourage individual drinkers to drink more moderately. The programme was supported by many of the key stakeholders in the hospitality industry, such as the Hotel Association of New Zealand. There was also some support from the alcohol producers and marketers.

ALAC’s host responsibility campaigns were intended to offer support and encouragement in the adoption of responsible hosting practices. At the same time, it was acknowledged that motivation to change would also come from the threat of fines or loss of licenses that could be imposed by other agencies.

The host responsibility programme initially focused on the components that were easier to achieve, such as the provision of food, and providing alternative transport and non-alcoholic drinks. In the second half of 1993, the focus was extended to place greater emphasis on dealing responsibly with intoxicated patrons.

This paper outlines the process, including the research, that led to the development of the strategy for the campaign; the research that assisted in the campaign development; and the subsequent monitoring of the campaign.

Context for the campaign

It is important to note the context in which this campaign took place. In April 1990, a new Sale of Liquor Act came into effect in New Zealand, which resulted in wide-ranging changes, including much easier access to liquor licenses. Associated with this was the intention that license holders who did not serve alcohol responsibly would more readily lose their licenses: ‘easy to get, easy to lose’ (Liquor Licensing Authority, 1990). In February 1990, a liquor licensing project was initiated by the Alcohol and Public Health Research Unit, which provided formative evaluation input to assist 18 alcohol health promotion workers from throughout the country to utilise the provisions in the new Act. An example of one of the developments within this project was collection of data from people caught drinking and driving, to identify their last drinking location (Stewart et al., 1993). This development, known as the Last Drink Survey, has continued beyond the 2 years of the liquor licensing project. The locations that come up more regularly are visited and offered assistance with the introduction of host responsibility practices. If there is resistance, objections are made to the renewal of the licenses.

On 1 April 1993, compulsory breath testing was introduced into New Zealand, which operates in a similar manner to random breath testing in Australia (Homel, 1988). Prior to this there had been a long history of efforts to reduce drink-driving in New Zealand, including occasional blitzes and a range of advertising campaigns.

Another relevant development was the release in 1993 of the police 5-year strategic plan which for the first time showed that the police were publicly identifying alcohol issues as one of their priority areas. This strategy included: enhancing and maintaining host responsibility practices; policing of licensed premises; intersectoral collaboration; and targeting premises displaying bad practices (New Zealand Police, 1993).

A change in the rules controlling broadcast alcohol advertising in February 1992 greatly increased expenditure on alcohol advertising: the 1993 advertising expenditure was 42% higher than in 1991 and in the same period television advertising increased more than fourfold (Casswell et al., 1994).

This campaign also took place in the context of declining consumption, an economy that had
been in recession and was beginning to show signs of recovery, and a pricing policy that kept the real price of alcohol tagged to inflation.

**Role of mass-media advertising**

Mass-media advertising was a key component of the whole host responsibility programme, including the campaign to reduce intoxication on licensed premises. The difference between this campaign and many of the others that have been reported was that the focus was not on attempting to get the individual drinkers to reduce their alcohol consumption. It was rather on providing support for managers of licensed premises in their efforts to decline further drinks to intoxicated patrons.

In using mass media it is important to be aware of what it can realistically achieve. Mass-media campaigns have been utilised in a large number of health promotion campaigns, both in alcohol and other areas (for reviews see Partanen and Montonen, 1988; Egger et al., 1993; Wallack and de Jong, 1995; Montonen, 1996). The experience from using mass media in alcohol health promotion is that it is good for increasing knowledge or building awareness, it can sometimes contribute to attitude change, but it is difficult to show that it contributes directly to behaviour change (Hewitt and Blane 1984; Partanen and Montonen 1988; Montonen, 1996). However, one of its main functions is often seen to be in creating a climate of opinion that is supportive of healthy public policies (Casswell et al., 1989; Wylie and Casswell, 1992; Edwards et al., 1994).

**DEVELOPMENT OF THE STRATEGY**

The development of the strategy and the subsequent campaign development involved a number of research studies, which are outlined below and summarised in Table 1.

**Stakeholder study**

Approximately a year after the host responsibility programme was launched, a study was undertaken by the Alcohol and Public Health Research Unit (APHRU) to assess stakeholder responses to the programme and associated campaign material to date, and to assist in developing strategies for the next phase of the programme (Abel et al., 1993). This involved interviews with: ten national level stakeholders, most of whom had been on the national working party on host responsibility; six Maori community workers; 22 community health promotion workers; ten liquor licensing inspectors; and 27 managers of licensed premises (22 pub/hotel and five nightclub) who had shown sufficient interest in host responsibility to order ALAC resources. Respondents were interviewed by telephone by researchers who used a questionnaire that consisted primarily of open-ended questions on which they probed for detail and clarification of issues. The interviews were audio-taped and transcribed prior to analysis.

A dominant perception of most stakeholders was that dealing with intoxication on licensed premises was a major problem. It was frequently mentioned, by both managers and other stakeholders, that the lack of public awareness of the legal obligations of the serving staff was contributing to this problem. Although it is illegal in New Zealand for bar staff to serve a person to the point of intoxication, or once they are intoxicated, it was felt that very few drinkers were aware of this.

**Public awareness survey**

This lack of public awareness was confirmed by questions placed in a market research company omnibus survey, to measure public and drinker awareness of managers’ legal liabilities (Wylie, 1994). The random telephone survey was undertaken in the 11 largest urban areas in New Zealand in June 1993.

The three items asked about and the responses to each are detailed in Table 2. The 1993 data are based on 657 persons aged 18–49 years. Twenty-seven per cent said they knew for sure that a manager of a pub, club or restaurant could be fined for selling alcohol to someone who is drunk. Few knew for sure that managers could be fined for allowing someone to get drunk on their premises (9%), or for allowing someone who is drunk to be on their premises (6%). The majority of the sample (78%) went to pubs or clubs, although the frequency varied. Awareness was greater among those who visited at least once a week; 41% said they knew for sure about the fines for selling alcohol to someone who is drunk, but on the other two items they still had quite low awareness (12 and 8% respectively).

**CAMPAIGN DEVELOPMENT**

Following the research findings from the stakeholder study and public awareness survey, a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Research project</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Research method</th>
<th>Findings/implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Late 1992/early 1993</td>
<td>stakeholder study</td>
<td>to assess stakeholder responses to first year of host responsibility programme</td>
<td>stakeholders, $n = 75$</td>
<td>qualitative research using telephone interviews</td>
<td>identified difficulty of dealing with intoxication on licensed premises and lack of public awareness of legal obligations of serving staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1993</td>
<td>public awareness survey</td>
<td>to measure public awareness of managers’ legal obligations; n = 15 managers of licensed premises</td>
<td>18–49-year-olds, $n = 657$</td>
<td>omnibus telephone survey</td>
<td>found low public awareness of managers’ legal obligations identified ‘Bars’ advertisement as suitable, but none of poster options as suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1993</td>
<td>pre-testing campaign ads and posters</td>
<td>to ensure campaign material had sufficient appeal and communicated desired messages</td>
<td>n = 40 drinkers at pubs/clubs, stakeholders and drinkers $n = 47$</td>
<td>qualitative research, face to face interviews</td>
<td>one poster option identified; managers of licensed premises positive about intoxication leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February/March 1994</td>
<td>pretesting of posters and signs of intoxication leaflet</td>
<td>to ensure material had sufficient appeal and communicated desired messages</td>
<td>managers of pubs/clubs, $n = 90$</td>
<td>qualitative research using telephone interviews</td>
<td>recall and liking of campaign quite good; marked increase in awareness of managers not being allowed to serve drunks positive response to advertisement; many had not received posters and intoxication leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1994</td>
<td>public response to campaign</td>
<td>to identify public recall and appeal of campaign and impact on awareness of managers’ legal obligations</td>
<td>18–55-year-olds, $n = 1000$</td>
<td>telephone survey</td>
<td>recall and liking of campaign quite good; marked increase in awareness of managers not being allowed to serve drunks positive response to advertisement; many had not received posters and intoxication leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1994</td>
<td>licensed premise managers’ response to campaign</td>
<td>to identify licensed premise managers’ responses to campaign</td>
<td>managers of pubs/clubs, $n = 90$</td>
<td>qualitative research using telephone interviews</td>
<td>recall and liking of campaign quite good; marked increase in awareness of managers not being allowed to serve drunks positive response to advertisement; many had not received posters and intoxication leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late 1994</td>
<td>public response to follow-up advertising</td>
<td>to update public awareness of managers’ legal obligations following a further period of advertising</td>
<td>18–55-year-olds, $n = 1000$</td>
<td>telephone survey</td>
<td>recall and liking of campaign quite good; marked increase in awareness of managers not being allowed to serve drunks positive response to advertisement; many had not received posters and intoxication leaflet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-1995</td>
<td>stakeholder study</td>
<td>to review profile of host responsibility and provide directions for its future development</td>
<td>stakeholders, $n = 106$, including $n = 53$ from licensed premises</td>
<td>qualitative research using mostly telephone interviews</td>
<td>‘Bars’ campaign acknowledged as assisting in dealing with intoxicated patrons, although many stakeholders saw threat of loss of license as main motivation for adopting responsible hosting decrease in awareness that managers not allowed to serve drunks, but still well above pre-campaign levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1996</td>
<td>public response after period of no advertising</td>
<td>to update public awareness of managers’ legal obligations after 17 months with no advertising</td>
<td>18–45-year-olds, $n = 1000$</td>
<td>telephone survey</td>
<td>recall and liking of campaign quite good; marked increase in awareness of managers not being allowed to serve drunks positive response to advertisement; many had not received posters and intoxication leaflet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
decision was made by ALAC to develop a campaign to increase public awareness of bar managers' legal responsibilities regarding the serving of intoxicated patrons. The campaign was intended to target both the public, and in particular drinkers at pubs and clubs, and those serving alcohol at these premises. For the public, the intention was to increase their awareness, in the belief that they would then be more understanding if they or their mates were refused service. For the managers and bar staff, the campaign was intended to show them that efforts were being made to help them deal with the intoxication issue. It also gave the issue a national profile that made it harder for the managers to ignore it. There was to be an emphasis on encouraging co-operation and support between bar staff and patrons.

Another objective of the campaign was to put the issue of enforcement of the law pertaining to serving intoxicated patrons on the agenda of enforcement agencies, particularly the police.

The main component of the programme was a television advertisement, although it was also intended that there be accompanying point-of-sale material, such as posters in pubs and clubs.

Pre-testing of advertisements and posters
As has been standard practice with most of the alcohol health promotion campaigns in New Zealand, an important formative evaluation role was pre-testing of material being considered for the campaign to ensure that it had sufficient appeal and communicated the desired messages adequately. The material that was evaluated by APHRU in late 1993 (Trotman et al., 1994) comprised two advertisements, described on audio-tape and accompanied by photographs (on a single sheet for each advertisement) of some of what they might see. Filmed material was not used at this stage, as the intention was to identify which if any of the possibilities was suitable and what changes were needed, before large amounts of money were spent making the advertisement. Describing on audio-tape what people would see on television is a low-cost approach that the author has found to be effective for pre-testing purposes.

The pre-testing included both managers of licensed premises (15) and persons who drank at pubs and clubs at least once a month (20 Maori and 20 non-Maori). Respondents were aged 18–59 years, which ALAC had identified as the target group. Interviews were carried out in different parts of New Zealand, although about half were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Awareness of fines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can be fined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know for sure (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selling alcohol to someone who is drunk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing someone to get drunk on their premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowing someone who is drunk to be on their premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 1994</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a The June 1993 figures are based on persons aged 18–49-years-old and the June and December 1994 figures are based on persons aged 18–55 years.
conducted in Auckland, the main urban area. There was an equitable gender mix among drinkers. Respondents were contacted via networking procedures and interviews were undertaken face-to-face by trained interviewers. The questionnaire consisted mainly of open-ended, probe-type questions. The answers were written on the questionnaires and coded into categories prior to analysis.

The advertisement that elicited the most favourable responses was known as the `Bars' advertisement. It began with a person behind what appeared to be prison-type bars talking about `doing time' behind bars. Then the camera panned back to reveal that the person was actually behind a metal grille in a pub or club bar. He tells the viewers about the consequences for him if he serves drunks (`we can be fined $1000 . . . we can lose our job . . . and the bar's license can be cancelled . . . then we all lose out!). There was mention of the problems when people get drunk and the advertisement concluded with an outdoors cricket scene, with the barman playing with the patrons.

This advertisement was particularly well received by the managers, who liked the fact that their point of view was being communicated, that their legal responsibilities in terms of intoxication were made clear, and that co-operation between staff and patrons was encouraged. The messages were also clearly communicated to the drinkers who, along with the managers, liked the `bars' theme and its multiple meanings. Some of the drinkers, particularly Maori, had difficulty relating to the bar scene as shown in the accompanying pictures and the researchers recommended that the final execution of the advertisement make efforts to include aspects that would increase its appeal, particularly to Maori. These included: showing groups drinking together (the pictures in the pre-test, to keep production costs down, showed only a few individual drinkers); having Maori, and possibly Pacific Islands persons in the groups; portraying the pub as more lively and more likely to appeal to younger drinkers; including women; and ensuring the patrons are clearly not potentially underage (this was a concern identified about the main patron in the pre-test pictures).

Also pre-tested at the same time as the two advertisement options were three different options for a poster incorporating the slogan `Take It Easy'. However, the research showed that the term did not have enough inherent positive attributes to be used as a slogan for poster material and it was recommended that consideration be given to alternative strategies for reinforcing the television campaign.

Pre-testing of posters and signs of intoxication leaflets

The advertising agency developed four new posters, which each included the phrase `Let's All Take It Easy', which featured a full beer glass replacing the `I' in `It'. These were pre-tested with a sample of 47 people consisting of: health/community workers; district licensing agency personnel; police; licensed premise managers; and members of the public. Maori were included in most of these groups. The only poster option that was recommended (Trotman and Wyllie, 1994) was one which began with the phrase `Let's All Take Notice' and listed the fines and other consequences of serving an intoxicated patron.

Also pre-tested at the same time was an ALAC leaflet listing 20 behavioural signs of intoxication, for possible use by managers and staff of licensed premises. This was produced in response to feedback from managers included in the stakeholder survey (Abel et al., 1993), that they had difficulty identifying who was intoxicated. The managers generally responded positively to the leaflet, stating that it was informative and useful for training bar staff. It had been proposed that these leaflets, along with the posters, could be distributed by police, licensing personnel or health sector people working with licensed premises and opinion was sought from these groups and the managers as to the preferred means of distribution. The managers tended not to mind who distributed the material, while among the others it was generally felt that it would depend upon the area and type of premises concerned.

The police in the sample were also asked their opinion about a small card issued by national police headquarters, that listed the 20 behavioural signs of intoxication, intended for use by police when enforcing the liquor laws regarding intoxication in licensed premises. Response to the card was muted, with over half the police feeling it did not tell them anything new.

Campaign materials

The materials that were developed and used in the campaign were: the `Bars' advertisement, with some small changes made; a revised poster listing the fines and other consequences for serving intoxicated patrons; plus another poster that was not pre-tested, which featured the barman
from the ‘Bars’ advertisement. Both posters had the heading ‘We’re Here To Serve Drinks. We Can’t Serve Drunks.’ In smaller lettering, at the bottom of the posters, were ‘Let’s all take it easy’ and the slogan that was used in the previous host responsibility campaigns, ‘Host Responsibility: That’s What Friends Are For.’ The ALAC leaflet listing signs of intoxication was also produced and had the same front page as the poster, featuring the barman in the ‘Bars’ advertisement. It was intended that the posters and leaflet be distributed primarily by police visiting licensed premises in their area.

CAMPAIGN MONITORING

Response to the campaign was monitored among both the general public aged 18–55 years and managers of pubs and clubs. At the time the response was measured, the advertising had been on air for ~2 months, from mid-April to mid-June 1994. During this time the advertisement had received $NZ435,000 worth of airtime, much of this being gratis time provided by the television channels and bonus/discount time. This was a reasonably sized budget for a health promotion campaign in New Zealand, but small compared with many of the alcohol industry advertising spends on individual campaigns.

Public response to campaign

An ad-hoc telephone survey was undertaken using a market research company fieldforce. One thousand interviews were undertaken with persons aged 18–55 years, randomly selected from throughout New Zealand (Wyllie, 1994). The results showed a large increase in awareness of managers’ legal liabilities regarding the serving of intoxicated patrons. The proportion who knew that managers could be fined for selling alcohol to someone who was drunk had increased from the pre-campaign level of 27% to 65% (see Table 2). There were also significant increases \( (p \leq 0.001) \) for the other two items specified in Table 2, but awareness remained low. Among people who visited pubs/clubs at least once a week, awareness of the fines were 77% (up from 41%), 30% (was 12%) and 27% (was 8%) respectively for the three items listed in Table 2 [these increases were all statistically significant \( (p \leq 0.001) \)].

It should be noted that the methodology did differ in some respects between the two surveys: the nearest age grouping from the first survey that could match the subsequently defined 18–55 target group was 18–49; the benchmark data were only from urban areas, whereas the latter sample covered all areas; and the benchmark was part of an omnibus survey, while the other was an ad-hoc survey. If anything, these differences would probably have been more likely to lead to higher levels in the benchmark survey, as it contained more younger people and awareness tended to be higher among younger age groups.

Other questions in the survey ascertained that two-thirds recalled having seen the advertisement when it was described to them, with 18–29-year-old males having highest recall (84%). Recall of the advertisement also increased with increasing frequency of visiting pubs and clubs; of those who visited at least weekly, 76% recalled it. The liking for the advertisement was quite high, although this and the amount of notice they thought friends would take of it were both a little lower than other recent ALAC campaigns. This may have reflected the targeting of the campaign to only those who drank at pubs and clubs, whereas previous campaigns tended to have a wider target group.

Licensed premise manager response to campaign

At a similar time to the public survey (second half of June 1994), a study was also undertaken with 90 managers of licensed premises, these being: pubs/hotels (32), sports clubs (26), chartered clubs (17) and nightclubs (15) (Wyllie and Hollis, 1994). Interviews were undertaken in regions around New Zealand to ensure a mix of town/rural plus smaller and larger urban areas. The premises were randomly selected from telephone directories. In some smaller areas, where there was some difficulty in locating specific types of premises (such as sports clubs), interviewers followed up suggestions from locals as to where to make contact. Because one of the objectives was to assess response to the posters and leaflet, it was important to have an adequately sized sub-sample who had seen the material. Therefore an effort was made to include regions where the police believed that their local staff were more likely to have been active in visiting licensed premises to discuss host responsibility and deliver the material. Almost half the sample (44) were drawn from such regions. The telephone interviewing was undertaken by trained APHRU interviewers from the Unit. Rather than write down responses, they audio-taped each interview to save time, as managers tend to be very busy and not keen to
have too much of their time taken up. The interviews lasted ~10–15 min. Most of the questions were open-ended, allowing respondents to answer in their own words. The taped interviews were listened to and translated into codes for different categories of response, which were then used for analysis. This level of analysis, which removed the expense of transcribing, was considered appropriate given that the responses did not need to be understood in any great depth.

Most of the managers had seen the television advertisement and most of these responded positively to it. They felt it helped educate their patrons and also felt it supported them in dealing with their patrons. Many managers had not received either of the posters, but those who had received them were generally positive in their comments about them. Once again, many had not received the leaflet listing signs of intoxication. Those that had generally felt it was of some usefulness for staff. A number had left them on the bar and a few mentioned that patrons had read them.

As mentioned previously, this campaign was the positive part of a strategy to reduce intoxication; it was complemented by the threat of prosecution or loss of license. The survey therefore asked managers the following question: `If someone in a ...... (INSERT TYPE OF PREMISE THEY MANAGE) over a 12-month period regularly served people who were intoxicated, how likely do you think it is that they would get charged and prosecuted?’ The majority of managers felt that a prosecution was unlikely. However, the reasons given suggested that many managers may have responded from the stance that they thought they did not have an intoxication problem on their own premises and therefore a prosecution was unlikely, rather than commenting on all premises of the type they managed. Other reasons given for a low risk of prosecution included a perceived low level of police monitoring of licensed premises and not having heard of people being prosecuted. Some did feel that people would eventually get caught because they would be reported or problems would be traced back to their bar. This perception may have related to the presence of Last Drink Surveys in some regions.

Some of the managers mentioned a perceived increase in the risk of prosecution in the previous 12 months. Greater awareness of host responsibility and the fines was often mentioned and some also mentioned increased police emphasis on monitoring of licensed premises. Many of the managers felt there had been some sort of positive change in the attitudes of their patrons to host responsibility and intoxication issues over the previous 12 months.

Questions were also asked to ascertain the level of contact that managers were having with district licensing agency personnel, health/community workers, or the police. Most had, in the previous 3 months, had contact with at least one agency and many of these had contact on matters to do with host responsibility or licensing issues. A minority said they had been visited by the police in the previous 3 months for monitoring purposes, and this was restricted almost solely to nightclubs and pubs, with no sports club managers and few chartered club managers monitoring the police. Most managers had not noticed any increase in the level of contact with these three agencies over the previous 12 months. Most managers said they enjoyed a good or reasonable relationship with the police.

Public response to follow-up advertising
Following the initial launch of the ‘Bars’ advertisement and associated material, there was another period of advertising beginning 4 months later running from late October to mid-November 1994, with the equivalent of $190,000 worth of airtime. Other ALAC campaigns were also running at the same time—promoting host responsibility practices in private homes and a campaign featuring reasons why people may choose not to drink.

A telephone survey of 1000 persons aged 18–55 years was undertaken in late November/early December 1994 (Wyllie, 1995). The method was similar to that used to monitor the campaign earlier in the year. The proportion who said that they knew for sure that managers could be fined for selling alcohol to someone who was drunk decreased a little from 65% in the previous survey to 59%, which was a statistically significant change ($p \leq 0.01$). There were also corresponding slight decreases on the other two items, although the second of these did not reach significance ($p > 0.05$; Table 2). A similar proportion to the previous survey recalled having seen the advertisement (69%). This decrease was consistent with a decrease in airtime compared with the initial launch of the campaign.

1995 stakeholder study
The intoxication campaign was also addressed as part of a stakeholder study which was undertaken...
in mid-1995. This study sought to review the profile of host responsibility and provide direction for its future development. Included in the 106 interviews were 53 licensed premise stakeholders, of whom two were from national bodies and the rest were managers of premises: 16 from pubs/hotels, 15 from sports clubs, 10 from nightclubs, and 10 from chartered clubs. These premises were selected with the aim of providing a mix in terms of their implementation of host responsibility, although those who were known to be anti-host responsibility were not included, as most of the questions would have been irrelevant to them. Respondents were selected from around New Zealand, the interviews were undertaken by trained APHRU interviewers, most were interviewed by phone and the questionnaire consisted predominantly of open-ended questions.

Managers were asked the same questions as the general public to ascertain their knowledge of their legal liabilities. Almost all knew they could be fined for serving intoxicated patrons or serving patrons to the point of intoxication. Some were not sure as to whether they could allow a drunk person to be on their premises. Awareness among management/staff and the provision of food were the two changes most often perceived to have occurred in the last 2 years that have impacted on patron intoxication. Awareness had come partly via liaison with police and liquor licensing personnel and associated with this was the fear of sanctions. Public awareness of host responsibility, particularly awareness of the restrictions on bar staff, was also felt to be assisting. The impact of the drink-driving campaigns and compulsory breath testing was also often acknowledged. Other things mentioned, particularly by the non-licensed premises stakeholders, included increased provision of non-alcoholic drinks and displaying of host responsibility material on the premises.

There were some managers of licensed premises who felt there had been no changes in the last 2 years that had impacted on patron intoxication. For some this related to a perception that they had already been performing adequately, while for others the priority was with making money.

The aspect of the host responsibility campaign that managers felt had most assisted licensed premises in dealing with intoxicated patrons was the television advertising, especially the ‘Bars’ advertisement, but also the drink-driving campaigns. Posters and written material, an increase in public awareness coupled with a change in public acceptance of intoxication, and training were also mentioned by a number of managers.

Most managers felt that there had been a positive change in patron attitudes towards host responsibility and efforts to reduce intoxication. The largest change noted was an increase in awareness of drink-driving issues. There was also perceived to be a general change in the public attitudes about drinking, a more widespread positive attitude towards responsible hosting, and a greater awareness of the possible ramifications for any legal infringements on the part of management or staff.

Suggestions as to what could be done to ensure that fewer people became intoxicated on licensed premises focused primarily on continuing to educate the public and make them more aware; continuing training and the provision of information to management/staff; and providing alternatives such as entertainment, non-alcoholic drinks and food. Stakeholders from the non-licensed premises sectors also sometimes mentioned the need for tighter, more stringent licensing criteria and stronger police support—the need for more presence on premises and more prosecutions. A number of managers were unable to make any suggestions. They either felt that intoxication will always occur among a sector of patrons, that it is not a problem at their premises, or that all that can be done is already being done.

It should be noted that both the licensed premises stakeholders and those from the other sectors felt that the threat of loss of license or other penalties were the main motivation for licensed premises to adopt host responsibility practices, although this was mentioned more often by the other sector stakeholders. There was also a lot of mention of the importance of providing an environment that people are attracted to drink in. For some there was the associated perception that society is changing and less accepting of ‘drunks’ and problems associated with excess alcohol consumption.

Public response after period of no advertising
Given the decrease in public awareness of managers’ legal liabilities when advertising spend was reduced, the same questions were repeated in a survey following 17 months of no advertising. Other host responsibility advertising had been on air prior to this survey, including a 15-second segment from the ‘Bars’ advertisement, but it was a segment that showed the consequences of drunkenness and made no mention
of the manager’s legal liabilities. A similar methodology was used as for the previous measures of public response to the campaign, but the upper age limit of the sample was reduced from 55 to 45 years, to reflect a tighter target group for this next phase of the host responsibility programme. The proportion of 18–45-year-olds who knew for sure that managers could be fined for serving drunks was 50%, which compared with 60% in December 1994, and 66% in June 1994 after the main campaign. It was still well above the 27% recorded by 18–49-year-olds in the pre-campaign measure in June 1993 (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

This paper has outlined the evolution, development and on-going monitoring of a campaign that sought to contribute to a reduction in intoxication in pubs and clubs. The campaign was a component of a broader host responsibility programme that focuses on servers of alcohol in both licensed and private settings.

The evolution and development of this initiative highlights the value of an on-going programme of evaluation to complement health promotion activities. The potential for the campaign strategy arose from a stakeholder survey, where bar managers identified lack of public awareness as to the legal requirements regarding the serving of intoxicated patrons as a barrier to intervening with such people. This lack of awareness was confirmed by a public survey and a campaign was developed to address the issue. Pre-testing helped to ensure that an advertisement and posters were developed that would have sufficient appeal and communicate the correct messages. Surveys following the campaign showed a large increase in public and drinker awareness that bar staff can be fined for serving someone who is drunk. Research with licensed premise managers confirmed that the campaign was being well received by them and making a useful contribution.

This study provides a good example of the effective use of mass-media advertising. One of the things that mass-media campaigns can do well is build awareness. The increase in awareness following the launch of this campaign was certainly very impressive. The awareness did decrease when the advertising was not being broadcast, but the level of awareness was still approximately twice its pre-campaign level.

As with all mass-media campaigns, it is important to be realistic about what can be achieved. While this campaign may make it easier for bar staff to refuse service, the campaign by itself is unlikely to be sufficient to greatly alter bar staff behaviour. Both licensed premise managers and other stakeholders generally acknowledged that the threat of negative repercussions—loss of license and other penalties—were the dominant motivation for licensed premises to adopt host responsibility practices.

Obviously, for the loss of licenses to be a real threat, there needs to be monitoring of premises and enforcement of the legislation relating to intoxication (Jeffs and Saunders, 1983; McKnight and Streff, 1994). As shown with random breath testing in Australia, people have to believe that there is a risk of getting caught before they modify their behaviour (Homel, 1988). It could well be assumed that similar dynamics apply when it comes to serving alcohol to persons who are intoxicated or approaching that state.

There are also obviously other things that have the potential to impact on behaviours related to intoxication. It was apparent from the comments of the licensed premise managers in the 1995 stakeholder survey that, while acknowledging the value of this campaign, they also saw compulsory breath testing and the focus on drink-driving as having an important influence on patron attitudes towards host responsibility and efforts to reduce intoxication.

Reducing intoxication in licensed premises is obviously not an easy task. As with most health promotion initiatives, it is likely to require an ongoing concerted effort over many years. This will require all sectors to work together and ensure that they are doing everything they can, both in terms of their own roles and as collaborative teams.

The threat of loss of license can be complemented by host responsibility practices which provide licensed premises staff with mechanisms, tools and support to assist and encourage them in the adoption of practices to reduce intoxication. The campaign described in this paper should be seen as just one small component of what needs to be a long-term strategy over many years. However, on the basis of the information available, the campaign would seem to have made a useful contribution.
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