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Background

- The implementation of this RBS-program started in Stockholm in mid-1990s
- Then number of on-licensed premises had increased
- The level of intoxication was high
- Serving to minors were common
- The level of violence around these premises was high

Conclusion: Something had to be done
The purpose of the RBS-Program

To reduce violence associated with alcohol consumption at on-licensed premises

Primarily targets:

• Reduce the serving of alcohol to persons who are noticeably under the influence of alcohol,
• or underaged
Background: The Alcohol Act

- The age limit for drinking at licensed premises is 18
- Alcohol may not be served to a person who is noticeably under the influence of alcohol
- The server shall ensure the recipient is 18
- If a person who is younger, or noticeably under the influence of alcohol, is served, the person who served the beverage can be fined or put in jail, maximum 6 month
- And the licensed premise can get a warning or lose the license to serve alcohol
The Alcohol Act

• The municipal licensing boards are responsible for the handling of licensing matters

• Both the municipality and the police department are responsible for the supervision of licensed premises
Three main components of the RBS-program

Three main components of the program:
1. Education of restaurant employees (RBS-training)
2. Co-operation:
   A steering group consisted of at least the licensing board at the municipality, the police-department and owners of licensed premises
3. Structured supervision of licensed premises
Other components

- Baseline data collection (service to minors and intoxicated patrons, statistics of violence)
- Follow ups
- Information to politicians and the general public
- Implement internal alcohol policies at the premises
The idea

- The idea is to influence many different groups of people who are involved in the serving of alcohol.
- The more groups that are influenced by the program, the larger effect.
Background

- In 2001 an evaluation was conducted in Stockholm and an effect of the program on violence was found
- The effect was 29 %
- The program became very popular and it was spread among other municipalities
Background

• In 2004, the Public Health Agency of Sweden was commissioned by the government to work on spreading the program in the 290 municipalities in the country.

• In 2006, the 21 County Administrative Boards were commissioned to work on spreading as well. One project coordinator was employed at each Board.
Background

- The program dissemination culminated in 2007
- In 2008, 90% of the municipalities stated that they were working according to the program, in full or partly
The evaluation

In 2009, the Stockholm County Council, was commissioned to study

• the effect on violence and
• the implementation process
THE EFFECT ON VIOLENCE
The hypothesis

The hypothesis of the study:

- The more components of the program the municipalities have used, the larger effect on violence
The effect on violence

To begin with:

- Mapping to what extent the municipalities were working according to the 3 main components of the Program each year
- A survey in all municipalities
Specification: RBS-training

• At least one two-day training, during the last two years in the municipality

• Training consisting of:
  - medical effects of alcohol
  - the Alcohol act
  - alcohol related violence
  - illegal drugs at licensed premises
  - conflict management

• Attendances from at least 30 % of the premises in the municipality

In 2008: 64 % of the municipalities fulfilled this requirement
Specification: Co-operation

• An active community coalition steering group, including representatives from at least:
  - The licensing board at the municipality
  - The police department and
  - Owners of licensed premises

In 2008: 34 % of the municipalities fulfilled this requirement
Specification: Supervision of on-licensed premises

Three types of supervision:
1. Late at night
2. In collaboration between the municipality and the police department
3. By the police department on its own

A certain amount of visits has to be carried out

In 2008: 48 % of the municipalities fulfilled these requirements

In 2008: 13 % fulfilled the requirements for all three program components
Outcome variable: Violence

- Number of police-reported assaults committed at night-time in each municipality each year
Results: Effect on violence

• The program had a significant effect on violence in the municipalities
• For each program component used, the effect was 3%
• If all three main components were used, the effect was 9%
Results: Different components

1. Co-operation, (municipality, police, restaurants)

2. RBS-training

3. Supervision
THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM
Research questions

(Which factors promote a successful implementation according to earlier research)

• To what extent were these factors present in the municipalities at the time of the implementation

• Were there any other factors that were important for the implementation
Method

1. A survey in all municipalities
2. 40 Interviews in 6 municipalities
Methods I (Survey)

A new survey about:

- which implementation promoting factors were present at the time of the implementation

The results were linked to the previous survey about the implementation of specific program components
Methods II (Interviews)

A series of semi-structured interviews were conducted in 6 municipalities about the implementation.

Representatives from:
- County administrative board
- The municipality
- Police department
- Restaurant owners
- Restaurant employees

were interviewed.
Examples of implementation promoting factors, according to earlier research

- Local needs, (is there a problem to be solved?)
- Awareness
- Decision, organisation, resources,
- Implementation plan
- The program: easy to use, cost efficient
- Support during the implementation, information, coaching, feedback
- The presence of an opinion leader, who can influence important persons during the implementation process
- Early involvement of the ones who are going to work with the program
Results: Promoting factors

- The project coordinator at the county administrative boards
- A political decision connected with resources, for the program
- Early involvement of the ones who are going to work according to the program
- Baseline data studies
- Give feedback, regarding the process, to politicians and to those who work with the program
- Clarify areas of responsibility among participants
Results: Negative factors

• Lack of information about what the program actually consisted of: Only 13% of the municipalities worked according to all three main components

• Lack of implementation plans, (long-sightedness). Who is doing what during the implementation process?
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