# Choosing Alcohol Locations through primarily Non-Alcoholic Considerations:

An investigation into the importance of Physical, Economic, Social and Legal Availability to Adolescents Choosing Commercial Sources to Obtain Alcohol

J.M. van der Ziel

30 October, 2015

# **Choosing Alcohol Locations through primarily Non-Alcoholic Considerations:**

An investigation into the importance of Physical, Economic, Social and Legal Availability to Adolescents Choosing Commercial Sources to Obtain Alcohol

J.M. van der Ziel s1250604

COMMUNICATION STUDIES Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences University of Twente

GRADUATION COMMITTEE First supervisor: Dr. J.J. Van Hoof Second supervisor: Dr. J.F. Gosselt

#### ABSTRACT

Background The widely used reasoning of the availability of alcohol products to be an important predictor of adolescents' alcohol consumption serves as the starting point of the present explorative study. Four availability domains, i.e. physical, economic, social and legal availability, guide the investigation into adolescents' train of thought when choosing a commercial source to obtain alcohol. Little is known about the importance of items representing these domains from the perspective of adolescents and how these relate to each other. This study contributes by integrating the four availability domains and the associated items into one study thus providing an all-embracing overview. Method A survey mainly addressing an off- and on-premise scenario in which Dutch adolescents supposedly chose a store and a nightspot to obtain alcohol was used to obtain data. One-sample t-tests were performed to assess the extent to which the allocated scores of the availability items deviated from the median value and the corresponding mean domain score, and thereafter Spearman's rank-order correlation analyses were run to explore the interrelationships between both items and domains. Results The developed availability scale, appearing to be reliable in measuring the domains as constructs, shows physical and economic availability to be the most important domains. Within these domains however, non-alcohol related items such as a quick checkout, a pleasant atmosphere and keeping enough money for other things were allocated the highest importance. Additionally, high positive correlations were found, amongst others, between legal and social availability. **Discussion** By successfully composing a complete set of availability items, the study was first in providing a scale to comprehensively measure the four availability constructs. The main study findings are generally in line with existing literature, however, due to the lack of similar studies further research is essential to support the explanations for the demonstrated correlations.

**Keywords** Alcohol, availability, adolescents, physical, economic, social, legal, domains, off-premise, on-premise, obtainment, consumption, store, nightspot

#### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Despite strenuous efforts of governments, schools, parents and many others to discourage underage drinking, alcohol use amongst adolescents still is a widespread phenomenon that is of public health concern. Binge and sustained alcohol drinking show different effects for adolescents as compared to adults (Guerri & Pascual, 2010) as early alcohol use can lead to alcohol injury, long-term problem drinking and alcohol dependence (Kelly et al., 2012), thus showing alcohol use to be extra harmful during youth.

As longitudinal research shows, alcohol use among adolescents is known to be influenced by numerous aspects, such as exposure to alcohol advertising (Chen, Grube, Bersamin, Waiters & Keefe, 2005), family members' attitudes (Valentine, Holloway & Jayne, 2010; Turrusi, Jaccard, Dunnam & Grimes, 2001) and television and music video viewing (Robinson, Chen & Killen, 1998). For the sake of the present study however, these predominantly attitudinal predictors of alcohol use are taken for granted while this research focuses on the advanced phase by which time the intention to use alcohol has already been formed and one solely wants to obtain it. Consequently, an insight into adolescents' train of thought during the process of obtaining alcohol products can contribute to a more effective approach towards dealing with adolescents' alcohol consumption.

A widely used reasoning, thus the theoretical starting point of this study, is that the availability of alcohol products is an important predictor of alcohol consumption by adolescents, as both are related (Paschall, Grube & Kypri, 2009; Popova et al., 2009; Kuntsche, Kuendig & Gmel, 2007). Briefly: the easier it is to obtain alcohol, the more alcohol is consumed (Edwards, as cited in Jones-Webb et al., 1997).

Studies on the availability of alcohol are extensive, however, the existing literature mainly focuses on a few determinants of alcohol availability individually rather than including a more complete set of determinants collectively. Doing so, previous studies have often used a fragmented approach whereby the likelihood of the domains jointly interacting, and exercising influence on behavior such as alcohol consumption, has been ignored. Van Hoof (2010), however, takes a more

complete approach by distinguishing between four domains of availability: *physical, economic, social* and *legal* availability. This distinction served as a main guidance in establishing the theoretical framework of this explorative study. Furthermore, as a result of the lack of comprehensive studies into these availability domains, no common understanding exists of an all-embracing set of factors able to represent these domains. To address this limitation, a broad overview of items corresponding to the domains was derived from the existing literature and is elaborated on in the theoretical framework in line with the before mentioned distinction provided by Van Hoof (2010).

When it comes to the actual access to alcohol, researchers generally distinguish between social and commercial sources. Studies show that adolescents significantly prefer social sources above commercial sources. Friends and family appear to be key providers of alcoholic drinks, more so than commercial institutions (Dent, Grube & Biglan, 2005; Harrison, Fulkerson & Park, 2000).

Further, a distinction between so called off- and on-premises is of relevance because of price differences, amongst others, and because not all alcohol outlets serve the same purpose. Where some alcohol establishments are designed for on-premise alcohol consumption, others are intended to be more convenient where one can walk in and purchase alcohol to consume it elsewhere (Snowden & Predemore, 2013). In their study focusing on the role of low prices and special promotions of beer, Kuo, Wechsler, Greenberg and Hang Lee (2003) describe off-premise establishments as retail outlets selling beer for off-premise consumption, such as liquor stores, convenience stores and grocers. Following this description, Labhart, Graham, Wells and Kuntsche (2013) define off-premise outlets as locations where no consumption takes place, also including most grocery and convenience stores, as well as gas stations. On-premise establishments are subsequently described as drinking establishments serving beer for on-premise consumption, such as bars and clubs (Kuo, Wechsler, Greenberg & Hang Lee, 2003). In line with this description, Labhart, Graham, Wells and Kuntsche (2013) label on-premises as commercial establishments where alcohol is served, including pubs, bars, hotels and restaurants, and demonstrate that the alcohol price tends to influence the location one chooses to buy and/or consume alcohol: often due to limited financial

resources, youth prefers to obtain its alcoholic beverages off-premise and consume them elsewhere before going out to the intended on-premise location(s), which also appears to lead to an eventual higher consumption of alcohol.

Summing up: taking into consideration the limitations of the current studies on alcohol availability, the present study contributed to the existing literature by investigating the *physical*, *economic*, *social* and *legal* availability domains through a combined approach. The aim of this study was to gain insight into the importance of these so called availability domains and their interrelationships, together with behavioral variables such as *alcohol consumption* and *alcohol obtainment*. In contrast to previous, fragmented studies, this study took a first step in jointly examining what factors are able to represent each availability domain, which moreover lead to providing a first realization of an availability measurement scale. To meet the before mentioned research purposes, a complete set of availability items was assessed by Dutch adolescents below the legal drinking age who supposedly chose an off-premise and on-premise location to obtain alcohol. In the following theoretical background the availability domains are elaborated on and an extensive set of relevant availability items is depicted.

#### 2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The basic principle of alcohol availability influencing alcohol consumption was introduced by Bruun et al. (as cited in Heather & Stockwell, 2004) who were first to articulate the "Availability Theory" and argued that restrictions on alcohol availability were legitimate for the sake of public health. Van Hoof later defines availability as "the degree to which something is at hand when needed" (p. 24, 2010). As is argued by Gosselt, (2011) the consumption of risky products is mostly influenced by their availability and a distinction again is made between four availability domains (Van Hoof, 2010): *physical, economic, social* and *legal* availability. Gosselt, Strump and Van Hoof (2015) further elaborate on alcohol availability in their qualitative study towards the premise purchase preferences of adolescents and conclude that adolescents do not consider all availability domains to be equally important. Hereafter, the four availability domains are elaborated on to gain a better understanding of the concept of alcohol availability and to gain insight into the factors able to represent the domains in the context of this study.

#### 2.1 Physical availability

With respect to the physical availability of alcohol, Van Hoof (2010) uses the following criteria: the outlet density and opening hours of alcohol outlets related to alcohol use. Stanley, Henry and Swaim (2010) measure physical availability as the number of alcohol outlets in the community and whether beer and wine were sold in non-liquor stores, whereas Heather and Stockwell (2004) use a broader approach and refer to physical availability as the availability of alcohol in one's environment and define the probability that he or she will come into contact with alcohol as an important mediator. Opening hours together with the amount of alcohol outlets have been found to positively relate to the alcohol consumption of adolescents: in general, higher outlet density and longer opening hours relate to a higher availability and lead to an increase in alcohol consumption (Halonen et al, 2013; Schneider & Gruber, 2013; Chen, Gruenewald & Remer, 2009; Kuntsche, Kuendig & Gmel, 2008).

Next to off- and on-premise locations, the online environment too should be taken into

consideration since this platform might be a meaningful purchase location for youngsters. According to Mutschler, Diehl & Kiefer (2007), adolescents are likely to participate in online shopping when it comes to risk products such as tobacco. Gosselt, Strump and Van Hoof (2015) however conclude that adolescents do not consider buying alcohol products online to be attractive enough to make use of this modality on a regular basis.

#### 2.2 Economic availability

Van Hoof (2010) refers to the economic availability of alcohol as "the relationship between alcohol use and the prices of alcohol, which involves structural and incidental increases and decreases in the price of alcoholic beverages and/or government taxes". More concisely, Heather and Stockwell (2004) outline economic availability as the price of alcoholic drinks as part of the disposable income of potential consumers.

Van Hoof et al. (2010) consider the price of alcohol products to be a determining factor in alcohol consumption which is also shown to have a negative relationship with alcohol use (Van Hoof, 2010). As later illustrated by Cook et al. (2011) a lower price elasticity exists since participants considered lower alcohol prices to increase their alcohol consumption, although higher alcohol prices did not appear to influence drinking behavior. More studies have documented the effect of alcohol prices however, and in general it is concluded that alcohol consumption decreases when the price of alcohol increases, and conversely the consumption of alcohol increases when the alcohol price decreases (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996; Farrell, Manning, & Finch, 2003; Yamada, Kendix & Yamada, 1996). Further, Wechsler, Kuo, Lee, and Dowdall (2000) link alcohol on discount and reduced alcohol prices to a higher consumption of alcohol by American adolescent college students. The authors also mention the skill of these students in obtaining alcoholic drinks at reduced prices to be an important factor in binge drinking. Additional research on American college campuses by Kuo, Wechsler, Greenberg and Lee (2003) showed that, amongst other factors, the availability of low alcohol prices and frequent alcohol promotions at both off- and on-premise locations was also associated with

higher binge drinking rates. In line with these findings, Van Hoof, Noordenburg and de Jong (2008) also found that Dutch youth consumed more alcohol in the case of discount offerings. In the same study, however, it was concluded that these discounts were no primary reason for adolescents to visit particular cafés and/or to spend more money whilst going out.

#### 2.3 Social availability

Kuntsche, Kuendig and Gmel (2007) found that, together with the physical environment, social environment characteristics also shape adolescents' perceived availability. The authors include having peers and siblings who drink, going out without parental knowledge and drinking in public settings in determining social characteristics that influence perceived availability and adolescents' alcohol use.

As cited by Gosselt, social availability refers to "the prevailing norms and values regarding the use of risky products in a given social environment" (p. 20, 2011), whereas Moore, Ames and Cunradi (2007) involve the level of normative support for or against drinking within a social environment and make a distinction between objective social availability (i.e. the actual drinking of friends, family and others) and subjective social availability (i.e. one's perceptions of drinking norms in a certain social network). Grunewald, Ponicki and Holder (1993) associate social availability with the physical presence of alcohol in one's network and the attitudes of people therein regarding alcohol.

Hearst, Fulkerson, Maldonado-Molina, Perry and Komro (2007) found that the predominant source of alcohol for youngsters is parents, though Harrison, Fulkerson and Park (2000) show the most common source to be friends. Similar studies (Dent, Grube & Biglan, 2005; Harrison, Fulkerson & Park, 2000) subsequently determine social sources to be the most important in obtaining alcohol, either family or friends. Therefore, consensus seems to exist on the notion that social sources are most prevalent when youngsters want to obtain alcohol.

When it comes to social factors within commercial sources, youngsters appear to use different strategies in their approach. A debriefing session with underage mystery shoppers as part

of the study into underage alcohol sales of Van Hoof and Gosselt (2013) reveals that the crowdedness of a store is taken into consideration. While some adolescents avoid busy outlets because of the risk of other customers getting involved when attempting to purchase alcohol, another purposely selects crowded outlets to subsequently act as if she is not able to find her ID when asked for. As result of the same study, the potential presence of family and friends appears to be taken into account also when choosing an outlet.

#### 2.4 Legal availability

Regarding the legal availability domain, Van Hoof (2010) refers to legislation and laws related to alcohol use, including the compliance of age limits. Research on the effectiveness of age limits shows that when minors are restricted by a legal drinking age, it leads to a decrease in their alcohol consumption (Jackson et al., 2014). Gosselt (2011) discusses a possible adverse effect which can be explained by two opposing theories that are at play: the tainted fruit theory and the forbidden fruit theory (Bushman & Stack, 1996). The tainted fruit theory supposes restricted goods to appear less attractive, while the forbidden fruit theory expects restricted goods to appear more attractive. Empirical evidence for the occurrence of the latter effect in this context is not evident, although it should be taken into consideration.

The legislation designed to prevent underage use of alcohol entirely depends on the compliance of sales personnel (Gosselt, Van Hoof & De Jong, 2012). Studies on compliance ratings however show that Dutch vendors inadequately obey the rules, since a decoy study with so called MysteryKids (children aged just below the legal age) showed a compliance level of 46.5% in the Netherlands (Roodbeen, Lie, Schelleman-Offermans, 2013). Although this rating might seem fairly inadequate, an improvement is observable since a compliance level of only 15% was determined by a similar decoy study the year before (Gosselt, Van Hoof & De Jong, 2012 ) while on average more than 97% of alcohol vendors claimed to comply with the age limit the year before (Bieleman, Kruize & Zimmerman, 2011). However, a more recent mystery shopping study by Van Hoof, Gosselt and De

Jong (2015) shows the largest Dutch supermarket chain to maintain a worrying compliance rate of only 11.2%.

Clearly, adolescents are creative in circumventing legislation: some of them falsify identification cards and use fake ID's (Fabian, Toomey, Lenk & Erickson, 2008), carry a motorbike helmet to appear older or ask vendors to wrap up the purchase as a gift (Gosselt, Strump & Van Hoof (2015) or simply act as if the ID cannot be found (Van Hoof & Gosselt, 2013). Also the self-service checkout machines appear to be a weak spot in the legislative system (Van Hoof, Gosselt & De Jong, 2015).

Strangers too can play a role in adolescents' efforts to obtain alcohol: youngsters asking strangers or other customers to buy alcohol for them is referred to as shoulder tapping, which however will only be used by underage college students as a last resort (Fabian, Toomey, Lenk & Erickson, 2008).

## 2.5 Conclusion

Summing up, research implies that youngsters do not appear to experience the limiting of the legal availability of alcohol as a major obstacle in the obtainment of alcohol products. Perhaps not only because of the craftiness of youngsters to circumvent legislation, but also for the reason that other domains, e.g. social availability, turn out to score relatively highly. Limiting adolescents' alcohol use by restricting commercial sources through legal measures is a commonly used strategy, but when social factors are overlooked, such as friends and family serving as important actors in enabling youngsters' alcohol obtainment, these measures are likely to fall short. Also, whether or not mutual, the influence of the economic and physical availability domains on the complete availability concept should be far from ruled out. Despite most of the literature on alcohol outlet density focusing on adult populations, it is clear that youngsters are confronted with alcoholic products both in commercial settings and in their social environment, and when one e.g. has the skills to circumvent

legislation and has the financial resources to buy alcoholic drinks, the overall availability of alcohol might just be worryingly high.

#### 3. METHOD

To be able to examine the importance of the availability domains together with the corresponding availability items to adolescents when choosing a commercial source to obtain alcohol, a survey was designed which mainly encompassed three scenarios of alcohol obtainment. Hereafter the method of the data gathering and the treatment of the obtained data are elaborated on by addressing the processes of the acquisition of respondents, the sample description, the design of the survey and ultimately, in anticipation of the results, the approach of the analysis.

#### 3.1 Procedure

Because of the delicate target group, it was decided to address the under aged indirectly, through school teachers, youth workers, soccer trainers and a gym owner to ensure a prudent and confidential approach. The before mentioned parties were approached face to face, through email (see appendix A) and/or by phone and were requested to contribute to the study by enabling the target group to fill in the questionnaire. The approached parties were encouraged to recruit respondents by raffling off a voucher.

A link to the online survey was distributed by email to teachers, youth workers and soccer coaches who administered the digital survey using standardized protocols. Also the social networking site Facebook was deployed to grasp a larger amount of response by repeatedly placing and sharing a request message. Further, for several youth centers and the fitness center without the disposal of computers, a physical survey was created identical to the web version which was sent and returned through postal service.

Soon after launching the survey via the online survey platform Qualtrics, feedback showed, in contrast to earlier trials, that respondents spent about 30 minutes to complete all the questions with outliers to 45 minutes. After serious consideration it was decided to delete the entire home scenario to reduce the completion time and limit the amount of potential dropouts. The home scenario was considered to be least important and in this way an interesting distinction between off- and on-

premises could still be made. For this reason the deleted scenario will not be explained any further.

Despite an eventual relatively small sample, much effort was put into recruiting enough parties to provide respondents. A total of 62 youth centers, 14 schools, 5 soccer trainers and a gym owner were approached, either face to face, through email and/or by telephone. Because of the ethical guidelines of the University of Twente (see appendix C), schools were requested to inform the students' parents when participating in the study (see appendix B), which might have been too much of an obstacle to cooperate. Also request messages were repeatedly placed and shared by contacts on Facebook. Ultimately 8 youth centers, 4 schools, 2 soccer trainers and a gym owner agreed to participate by recruiting respondents face to face. Another 12 youth centers offered to place a request message on Facebook which was thankfully accepted, but did not seem to pay off. Also relying on the snowball tactic did not prove to be effective in gathering respondents.

#### 3.2 Respondents

As the survey progressed, the sample size severely decreased because of dropouts. For the first scenario, an analysis could be performed over 203 respondents, while for the second scenario only 167 respondents remained because of 36 dropouts. Ultimately, 165 respondents continued to address the rest of the survey. The sample completing the survey had a gender distribution of 70% male and included ages ranging from 14 to 17 years old with a mean age of 15.8. Education ranged from practical education to academic and when classified into educational level, a distribution of 27% low, 47% middle and 26% high education existed. As concerns experience in consuming alcohol, 90% of the sample indicated to have had an alcoholic drink before.

## 3.3 Focus groups

Prior to creating the definitive survey, the theoretical foundation was supplemented with practical insights from two focus group meetings, with a total of nine adolescents aged either 16 or 17 years old and following a vocational education. By way of a pretest the survey scenarios and questions

were discussed and enhanced on the basis of the youngsters' feedback, who all had experience in obtaining and consuming alcohol, to ensure the scenarios reflected realistic circumstances and the questions addressed relevant matters. First, the off-premise and on-premise section were discussed by starting off with presenting the scenarios wherein one supposedly has to choose a store (offpremise section) and a nightspot (off-premise section) to obtain alcohol. Minor adjustments were advised to reflect a more realistic situation, e.g. instead of referring to a birthday party as the drinking occasion for the off-premise scenario, the youngsters advised to rather call it a get together with a couple of friends; it was not seen as realistic that one had to bring alcohol themselves to a birthday party. Secondly, participants were asked to spontaneously come up with a top 5 of items that could play a role in their choice making for both premise situations and thereafter these were openly discussed and compared together with the preexisting list of items from the literature. This resulted in a global confirmation of the relevance of the formerly gathered items, together with some valuable additions such as the role of easy to falsify, alternative proofs of age used at certain nightspots, such as bracelets. Also nightspot's door policy, the overall presence of other customers and personnel in stores, and the fact that as long as one can drink enough alcohol elsewhere before going out can make up for not being able to drink at a nightspot were mentioned as influencing factors and thereby taken into consideration for the final item generation.

#### 3.4 Instruments

The finalized survey (see appendix J) started off with a short introduction wherein it was explained that one's anonymity was guaranteed, no wrong answers existed and it was best not to ponder too long. The survey mainly addressed both an off- and on-premise scenario in which one was asked to indicate the importance of numerous randomized items in the realm of physical, economic, social and legal availability when one supposedly would want to obtain alcohol.

#### Survey scenarios

The first scenario addressed a situation wherein one had planned a get together for the coming Saturday evening at a friend's home with a couple of other friends. The participant was asked to bring alcohol for which he or she decides to go to a store. Next, the participant is requested to assess multiple items through the following instruction: 'Of the following items that have to do with alcohol and stores, indicate their importance in choosing a store to obtain alcohol for the upcoming get together' with a Likert scale ranging from 1: very unimportant to 5: very important.

Subsequently, in the second scenario the situation is described wherein at midnight the get together at the friend's place has ended and it is decided to go out to a night spot for some alcohol. Then, the participant is requested to assess multiple items through the instruction: 'Of the following items that have to do with alcohol and night spots, indicate their importance in choosing a night spot to go to for alcohol.', again with a Likert scale ranging from 1: very unimportant to 5: very important.

# Off-premise availability domains

After being presented the off-premise scenario, subjects responded to thirteen items that assessed the off-premise physical availability of alcohol. A construct was created by subjects rating the importance of non-alcohol related items such as: 'That the store is nearby' and the importance of alcohol related items such as 'That the alcohol is of a high quality' (Cronbach's alpha: 0.80).

Economic availability was assessed by five items and a construct was created by the importance rating of the non-alcohol related item 'That I have enough money left for other items' and alcohol related items such as 'That alcohol price fits my budget' (Cronbach's alpha: 0.85).

Social availability was assessed by fourteen items and a construct was created by subjects rating the importance of non-alcohol related items such as: 'That there are few other customers' and alcohol related items such as 'That my parents/guardians allow me to drink' (Cronbach's alpha: 0.85).

Finally, legal availability was assessed by subjects responding to eleven legal availability items. A construct was created by the rating of the importance of non-alcohol related items such as:

'That I can secretly use a false ID' and alcohol related items such as 'Easy to steal alcohol' (Cronbach's alpha: 0.88). All of these previously discussed items were assessed through a Likert scale ranging from 1: very unimportant, to 5: very important.

#### On-premise availability domains

On-premise availability domains were assessed identical to the off-premise domains. After being presented the second scenario concerning the choice of a nightspot to obtain alcohol, subjects responded to thirteen on-premise physical availability items. A construct was created by subjects rating the importance of non-alcohol related items such as 'That the nightspot looks nice' together with alcohol related items such as 'That there are also spirits available' (Cronbach's alpha: 0.93).

Economic availability was assessed by five items and a construct was created by the importance rating of the non-alcohol related item 'That I have enough money left for other items' and alcohol related items such as 'That the alcohol is cheap' (Cronbach's alpha: 0.86).

Social availability was assessed by fourteen items. A construct was created by subjects rating the importance of non-alcohol related items such as: 'That friends and I go to same nightspot' and alcohol related items such as 'That parents/guardians allow me to drink' (Cronbach's Alpha: 0.90).

Ultimately, legal availability was assessed by sixteen items. A construct was created by subjects rating the importance of non-alcohol related items such as: 'That age control is not too strict at entrance' together with alcohol related items such as 'That I do not get into trouble drinking as a minor' (Cronbach's Alpha: 0.93).

#### Alcohol consumption

Alcohol consumption was assessed by 5 items, starting with: 'Have you ever had an alcoholic drink (not just a sip to taste but for example a whole glass of wine or beer, a mixed alcoholic beverage or a shot)?'. For the respondents answering 'yes', a quantity-frequency method (Allen & Wilson, 2003) was applied to further assess alcohol consumption. To determine quantity, one was asked the

number of drinking days, with response options ranging from 0 to 4 for weekdays and 0 to 3 for weekend days. Frequency was assessed by the total number of alcoholic drinks one usually consumed during weekdays and subsequently during weekend days, where both response options ranged from 0 to 10 or more. By multiplying the number of weekdays one usually consumed alcohol (q1) by the frequency of alcoholic drinks one usually consumed on a weekday (f1), added to the number of weekend days one usually consumed alcohol (q2) that was multiplied by the frequency of alcoholic drinks one usually consumed on a weekend day (f2) alcohol consumption was measured. This comes down to the equation: Alcohol consumption = (q1 . f1) + (q2 . f2).

#### Self-reported frequency of alcohol obtainment

Off-premise alcohol obtainment was assessed with 4 items. 'Have you ever obtained alcohol from a store?' with response options including yes and no. Respondents answering yes were presented 3 follow-up questions: 'During the last 7 days, how many times have you obtained alcohol from a store?'; 'During the last 30 days, how many times have you obtained alcohol from a store?'; and 'During the last year, how many times have you obtained alcohol from a store?', with response options ranging from '0 times' to '41 times or more'. On-premise alcohol obtainment was measured in an identical fashion, by replacing the word store for nightspot in the 4 questions. For both off-premise alcohol obtainment and on-premise alcohol obtainment the belonging items were employed as individual items in further analyses.

#### Perceived difficulty of alcohol obtainment

Subjects responded to 4 items that assessed the perceived difficulty of alcohol obtainment. One item measured the ease with which adolescents could obtain alcohol in general: 'Imagine: you want to obtain alcohol, anyhow. How easy or difficult is that for you?'. The three additional items measured the ease with which adolescents could obtain alcohol at a store, a nightspot and at home, e.g. 'Imagine: you go to the store and want to obtain alcohol. How easy or difficult is that for you?' For all

4 questions the response options ranged from very easy to very difficult. The 4 items were not recoded into one variable, but were employed individually during further analysis.

#### Friends and family drinking alcohol

Friends drinking alcohol was assessed by 1 item: 'How many of your friends drink alcohol?', with response options ranging from very few to very many. To measure family drinking alcohol, subjects responded to 1 item: 'How many of your family members (parents/guardians + brothers and/or sisters) drink alcohol?', with response options again ranging from very few to very many. Both items were employed individually during further analysis and not recoded into one variable.

# 3.5 Analysis procedures

Prior to performing any analyses, numerous respondents were excluded from further analysis; i.e. people of the age of 18 or higher were not taken into further account because of the Dutch legal drinking age, and respondents who dropped out before even completing the questions relating to the first scenario were excluded.

Also, the missing responses caused by the automatic skipping past the additional follow-up questions were dealt with. E.g. when having replied no to the introductory question of Alcohol consumption ('Have you ever had an alcoholic drink?'), the remaining questions concerning Alcohol Consumption were not presented to the respondent. After all, it would make no sense to ask someone when and how much alcoholic drinks he or she usually consumes when it was just indicated that one has never tried alcohol before. This resulted in empty cells in the data file, for which it was considered to be legitimate to fill these with zero's to indicate no alcohol consumption during weekdays or weekends so these respondents could still be included into further analyses. The same procedure was applied to the questions concerning Off-premise Alcohol Obtainment.

Further, several variables were recoded into new variables, such as the QF of Alcohol Consumption as explained before and Educational Level was reclassified into low, middle and high education, following the standard education classification of the Dutch Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS.nl). Also by calculating the mean scores of the availability domains for both off- and on-premise, existing out of all the corresponding availability items, new variables were computed to be able to demonstrate the domains' overall importance.

Ultimately, statistical analyses were performed using IBM SPSS Statistics. First, a One-Sample T Test was used to compare the mean scores of the availability items with the median value of 3 and with the mean score of the corresponding domain. To determine the relationships between the availability domains, a Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed since this test concerns the determination of associations between two variables for an ordinal type of data.

#### 4. RESULTS

This chapter addresses the yielded results in the following order: first, the mean scores of the availability constructs for the off-premise scenario are elaborated on to give a first impression of the allocated importance. Subsequently, the corresponding off-premise availability items are elaborated on, based on their significant deviation from the median score of 3 and the corresponding mean construct score to allow for a relative interpretation of the items' importance. Likewise, the on-premise mean construct scores and their corresponding availability items are discussed identically.

Then, to prevent the overlooking of meaningful items because of not showing significant deviation within an availability construct, an additional overview is given. The availability items are therein collectively considered, both for the off-premise and the on-premise items.

Thereafter, the interrelationships of the off-premise availability constructs along with the behavioral variables are explored with reference to a correlation matrix. To, subsequently, determine which items are responsible for the relatively high correlation between several availability constructs, the corresponding availability items of these constructs are zoomed in on. Likewise, the on-premise availability constructs along with the behavioral variables and the corresponding availability items are approached and discussed identically.

#### 4.1 Mean scores availability domains off-premise scenario

The mean score of each of the four availability domains was calculated for the *off-premise* scenario to be able to place the belonging availability item scores in perspective when comparing the mean item scores. As can be seen in Table 1, *Economic availability* (M = 3.33) comprises the highest mean score, followed by *Physical availability* (M = 3.17), *Legal availability* (M = 2.66) and lastly by *Social availability* (M = 2.63).

#### 4.1.1 Mean scores availability items off-premise scenario

When exclusively taking into consideration the availability items that significantly deviate from both

the median score of 3 and the mean score of the corresponding domain, numerous items are to be disregarded. For *Physical availability*, however, multiple items remain. Significantly deviating (P < 0.05) in a higher sense are (in descending order) the items 'Quick checkout' (M = 3.66), 'Besides alcohol other products available' (M = 3.62), 'Store is nearby' (M = 3.56), 'Pleasant to shop' (M = 3.35) and 'Also spirits available' (M = 3.34) as is shown in Table 1. Scoring significantly lower than the median value of 3 and lower than the mean domain are the items (in ascending order) 'Store is large' (M = 2.49), 'Alcohol of well-known brand' (M = 2.79) and 'Store looks nice' (M = 2.81).

With regard to the items belonging to *Economic availability*, only the item '*Have enough money left for other items*' (M = 3.54) was awarded an importance that significantly deviated from the median score of 3 and the overall mean score of *Economic availability*.

As concerns the items belonging to Social availability, merely 'Parents/guardians allow me to drink' (M = 3.47) was assigned a significantly high sense of importance. Evaluated significantly low in importance are the items 'Friends and I go to the same store' (M = 2.26), 'Many staff' (M = 2.27), 'Few staff' (2.33), 'Many other customers' (M = 2.33), 'Few other customers' (2.35) and 'Friend works on the cash desk' (2.42).

None of the items corresponding to *Legal availability* scored significantly high in importance, whereas the lower significantly evaluated legal items were '*Easy to steal alcohol*' (M = 1.95) and '*Not getting into trouble stealing alcohol*' (M = 2.05).

#### 4.2 Mean scores availability domains on-premise scenario

For the *on-premise* scenario too, the mean score of each of the four availability domains was calculated, to be able to place the corresponding availability item scores in perspective. As can be seen in Table 2, *Physical availability* (M = 3.38) is assigned the highest mean score, followed by *Economic availability* (M = 3.21), *Legal availability* (M = 2.93) and lastly *Social availability* (M = 2.90).

Table 1:

Mean Scores	Availability	Itoms	Off_Promise	Scenario
WEUN SLUES	AVUIIUDIIILV	ILEIIIS	UII-FIEIIIS	SUEIIUIIU

Items	t1	Μ	SD	t2	Divergence of mean domain
Physical availability		3.17	0.63		
Quick checkout	8.199*	3.66	1.14	6.071*	0.49
Besides alcohol other products available	7.399*	3.62	1.18	5.356*	0.45
Store is nearby	7.464*	3.56	1.06	5.184*	0.39
Pleasant to shop	4.231*	3.35	1.18	2.175*	0.18
Also spirits available	4.266*	3.34	1.15	2.163*	0.18
Long opening hours	3.498*	3.30	1.22	1.519	0.13
Alcohol of high quality	2.498*	3.21	1.18	0.445	0.04
Many kinds of alcohol to choose from	2.195*	3.18	1.15	0.091	0.07
Pleasant atmosphere	-0.619	2.95	1.25	-2.560*	-0.22
Lots of stores in area	-0.752	2.94	1.12	-2.915*	-0.23
Store looks nice	-2.344*	2.81	1.17	-4.418*	-0.36
Alcohol of well-known brand	-2.502*	2.79	1.21	-4.510*	-0.38
Store is large	-6.678*	2.49	1.08	-8.915*	-0.68
Economic availability		3.33	0.97		
Have enough money left for other items	6.380*	3.54	1.20	2.459*	0.21
Alcohol price fits budget	4.715*	3.42	1.27	0.999	0.09
Alcohol price reduced	4.399*	3.37	1.20	0.470	0.04
Alcohol cheap	4.035*	3.35	1.24	0.228	0.02
Alcohol on special offer	-0.453	2.96	1.24	-4.251*	-0.37
Social availability		2.63	0.69		
Parents/guardians allow me to drink	5.228*	3.47	1.28	9.362*	0.84
Older friend accompanies to buy	-0.856	2.93	1.23	3.428*	0.30
Ask acquaintance to buy	-1.156	2.90	1.22	3.184*	0.27
Family member accompanies to buy	-2.430*	2.79	1.21	1.915	0.16
No parents/guardians working at store	-2.069*	2.80	1.39	1.721	0.17
No acquaintances of parents/guardians working at store	-2.255*	2.79	1.34	1.684	0.16
Under aged friends have obtained alcohol there	3.760*	2.67	1.23	0.519	0.05
Ask stranger to buy	-5.485*	2.53	1.22	-1.148	-0.10
Friend works on the cash desk	-7.216*	2.42	1.14	-2.584*	-0.21
Few other customers	-8.534*	2.35	1.08	-3.641*	-0.28
Many other customers	-9.493*	2.33	1.00	-4.212*	-0.30
Few staff	-9.095*	2.33	1.04	-4.035*	-0.30
Many staff	-10.169*	2.27	1.03	-5.043*	-0.36
Friends and I go to same store	-9.961*	2.26	1.06	-5.006*	-0.37
Legal availability		2.66	0.86		
Not getting into trouble buying as minor	1.702	3.15	1.28	5.490*	0.49
Cashier does not always ask for ID	0.389	3.03	1.26	4.221*	0.37
High chance of succeeding in obtaining alcohol	-0.482	2.96	1.31	3.216*	0.30
Not getting caught by police in possession of alcohol	-1.699	2.83	1.40	1.750	0.17
According to law not allowed alcohol	-2.535*	2.77	1.27	1.269	0.11
Able to use ID from another	-3.096*	2.73	1.25	0.789	0.07
Not getting into trouble if discovered using false ID	-3.119*	2.70	1.35	0.469	0.04
Previously succeeded in obtaining alcohol	-4.062*	2.63	1.30	-0.324	-0.03
Able to secretly use false ID	-5.480*	2.50	1.31	-1.772	-0.16
, Not getting into trouble stealing alcohol	-10.908*	2.05	1.24	-7.007*	-0.61
Fasy to steal alcohol	-12 895*	1 05	1 16	-8 716*	-0.71

*Note.* Initially a One-Sample T Test was performed to assess the extent to which the mean value deviated from median score 3, which resulted in the t1 scores. The t2 score refers to the subsequently performed One-Sample T Test to assess the extent to which the mean value deviated from the corresponding domain mean score. n=203.

\*P < 0.05.

Table 2:

Mean Scores Availability Items On-Premise

Items	t1	М	SD	t2	Divergence of mean domain
Physical availability		2 20	0.95		
	0.255*	<b>3.30</b>	1.10	F 11/*	0.46
Pleasant atmosphere	9.355*	3.84	1.10	5.114*	0.46
Pleasant to be at	7.280 <sup>**</sup>	3.03	1.13	2.922*	0.25
Besides alconol other products available	6.234* c.270*	3.58	1.20	2.156*	0.20
Long opening nours	6.370*	3.55	1.12	1.976	0.17
Quick ordering and checkout	5.35/*	3.48	1.16	1.108	0.10
Nightspot looks nice	5.193*	3.45	1.12	0.799	0.07
Nightspot is large	4.170*	3.37	1.13	-0.168	-0.02
Nightspot is hearby	3.992*	3.35	1.12	-0.376	-0.03
Also spirits available	3.069*	3.28	1.16	-1.165	-0.10
Many kinds of alconol to choose from	2./18*	3.25	1.20	-1.389	-0.13
Alashal of high sublity	1.488	3.14	1.25	-2.447*	-0.24
Alcohol of high quality	0.931	3.08	1.16	-3.289*	-0.30
Alconol of Well-known brand	-1.213	2.90	1.09	-5.741*	-0.48
Economic availability	4 2 2 2 *	3.21	0.95	0 40 <del>7</del> *	0.00
Have enough money left for other items	4.392*	3.41	1.20	2.12/*	0.20
Alcohol price fits budget	3.001*	3.28	1.21	0.762	0.07
Alcohol cheap	2.264*	3.21	1.20	-0.005	0.00
Alcohol price reduced	1.866	3.17	1.20	-0.391	-0.04
Alcohol on special offer	-0.140	2.99	1.11	-2.588*	-0.22
Social availability		2.90	0.78		
Friends and I go to same nightspot	2.827*	3.25	1.15	3.951*	0.35
No parents/guardians working at nightspot	0.756	3.08	1.33	1./2/	0.18
Ask acquaintance to order and pay alcohol	0.708	3.07	1.20	1.782	0.17
Parents/guardians allow me to drink	0.639	3.06	1.21	1.706	0.16
Many other customers	0.065	3.01	1.19	1.151	0.11
Under aged friends have obtained alcohol there	-0.261	2.98	1.19	0.828	0.08
Friend works behind the bar	-0.957	2.92	1.13	0.185	0.02
No acquaintances of parents/guardians working at nightspot	-1.037	2.90	1.27	-0.018	0.00
Older friend accompanies in ordering/paying	-1.333	2.88	1.16	-0.220	-0.02
Lots of staff	-2.235*	2.81	1.07	-1.031	-0.09
Able to ask stranger to order for me	-3.201*	2.72	1.11	-2.039*	-0.18
Few staff	-3.384*	2.70	1.14	-2.254*	-0.20
Family member accompanies to order and pay	-4.430*	2.62	1.12	-3.274*	-0.28
Few other customers	-4.786*	2.58	1.13	-3.644*	-0.32
Legal availability	*	2.93	0.85		
Staff not always asking for age proof when ordering/paying	2.708*	3.26	1.26	3.428*	0.33
Not getting into trouble drinking as minor	2.335*	3.23	1.26	3.053*	0.30
Not having to show age proof often	2.313*	3.21	1.1/	3.085*	0.28
High chance of being allowed into nightspot although too young	1.457	3.14	1.22	2.197*	0.21
Age control at entrance not too strict	0.560	3.05	1.24	1.288	0.12
Not getting into trouble ordering/paying as minor	0.324	3.03	1.19	1.081	0.10
Not getting caught by police in possession of alcohol	0.193	3.02	1.21	0.944	0.09
Previously succeeded in drinking alconol	0.190	3.02	1.23	0.928	0.09
Previously succeeded in ordering/paying alcohol	-0.317	2.97	1.22	0.425	0.04
High chance of succeeding in obtaining alcohol	-1.082	2.90	1.22	-0.338	-0.03
Able to use age proof from another	-1.065	2.90	1.16	-0.287	-0.03
Not getting into trouble it discovered using faise age proof	-1.041	2.90	1.26	-0.325	-0.03
Able to secretly use raise age proof	-2.220*	2.80	1.19	-1.45/	-0.13
According to law not allowed alcohol	-3.448*	2.70	1.12	-2.642*	-0.23
Not getting into trouble stealing alcohol	-4.//U*	2.51	1.33	-4.090*	-0.42
Easy to stear alconol	-8.843*	2.22	1.14	-8.048*	-0./1

Note. Initially a One-Sample T Test was performed to assess the extent to which the mean value deviated from median score 3,

which resulted in the t1 scores. The t2 score refers to the subsequently performed One-Sample T Test to assess the extent to which the mean value deviated from the corresponding domain mean score. n=167.

\*P < 0.05.

4.2.1 Mean scores availability items on-premise scenario

When it comes to the availability items for the *on-premise* scenario that significantly deviate from both the median score of 3 and the corresponding mean domain score, again numerous items are left aside. Adolescents still awarded numerous items corresponding to *Physical availability* a significantly high importance, such as '*Pleasant atmosphere*' (M = 3.84), '*Pleasant to be at*' (M = 3.63) and '*Besides alcohol other products available*' (M = 3.58) as is shown in Table 2.

In the realm of *Economic availability*, only '*Having enough money left for other items*' (*M* = *3.41*) was allocated a significant importance.

Considering the construct Social availability, merely 'Friends and I go to same nightspot' (M = 3.25) was significantly evaluated as important. Numerous items were significantly evaluated as unimportant, such as 'Few other customers' (M = 2.58), 'Family member accompanies to order and pay' (M = 2.62), 'Few staff' (M = 2.70) and 'Able to ask stranger to order for me' (M = 2.72).

As concerns Legal availability, the items 'Staff not always asking for age proof when ordering/paying' (M = 3.26), 'Not getting into trouble drinking as minor' (M = 3.23) and 'Not having to show age proof often' (M = 3.21) were rated significantly higher than the mean domain score and the median value. Significantly under evaluated *legal* items were 'Easy to steal alcohol' (M = 2.22), 'Not getting into trouble stealing alcohol' (M = 2.51) and 'According to law not allowed alcohol' (M = 2.70).

4.3 Highest rated availability items for both premises

By only discussing the items that significantly deviated from the median score of 3 and the items that significantly deviated from the domain mean score, which applies for the previous paragraphs 4.1.1. and 4.2.1., the risk arises of overlooking multiple items that might not seem relevant at first sight because of scoring relatively low within a certain domain, but do take in a high position when considering all availability items together. Therefore, an additional overview is given in Table 11 (see appendix I), where for both premises a rating is shown of the availability items with the highest mean

scores. This overview e.g. shows the off-premise item '*Alcohol price fits budget*' taking in the fifth place and the on-premise item '*Long opening hours*' taking in fourth place in an overall rating while being previously left out of consideration because of the applied significance criterion.

#### 4.4 Off-premise availability domains correlations

The results of the Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis, performed in order to determine the relationships between the availability constructs, the behavioral variables and their interrelationships for the off-premise scenario, can be seen in Table 4.

The highest correlation existed between *Legal availability* and *Social availability* which was statistically significant, r = .740, p < .001. The second highest correlation between the availability constructs existed between *Legal availability* and *Economic availability* which was statistically significant, r = .526, p < .001.

In terms of the dependent variables, especially *Alcohol consumption* showed to correlate strongly with several other variables, such as *Alcohol obtainment store last year*, which was statistically significant,  $r = .687^{**}$ , p < .001 and *Friends drinking alcohol*, which also was statistically significant,  $r = .575^{**}$ , p < .001. No dependent behavioral variable notably correlated significantly with an availability construct.

#### 4.5 On-premise availability domains correlations

The relationships between all four availability domains showed a relatively high positive correlation in the *on-premise* scenario, as is shown in Table 5 where the results of the Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis for the *on-premise* scenario are depicted. As was also the case in the *off-premise* scenario, *Legal availability* and *Social availability* demonstrated the highest positive correlation between the availability constructs, and was statistically significant, r = .743, p < .001. The lowest correlation to be found between the availability constructs was between *Legal availability* and *Physical availability* that was statistically significant, r = .563, p < .001.

When considering the dependent behavioral variables, again *Alcohol consumption* showed to correlate strongly, this time with *Alcohol obtainment nightspot last year*, which was statistically significant,  $r = .738^{**}$ , p < .001. At the same time the variable *Perceived difficulty of obtaining alcohol at nightspot* strongly correlated with *Perceived difficulty of obtaining alcohol in general*, which was statistically significant,  $r = .690^{**}$ , p < .001. Again, no dependent behavioral variable notably correlated significantly with an availability construct.

#### 4.6 Correlations between availability items off-premise scenario

The results of the Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis, performed to attain a more in depth look into the mutual relations of the availability constructs for the *off-premise* scenario, are discussed next. The correlation matrix of the individual items of the domains *Legal availability* and *Social availability* for the *off-premise* scenario is to be found in Table 5 (see appendix D). The highest interitem correlation was found between 'Not getting caught by police in possession of alcohol' and 'No parents/guardians working at store', which was statistically significant,  $r = .574^{**}$ , p < .001.

As concerns the domains *Legal Availability* and *Economic Availability*, the correlation scores are shown in Table 6 (see appendix E). The highest correlation to be found between items of these domains was between '*High chance of succeeding in obtaining alcohol*' and '*Alcohol on special offer*' which was statistically significant,  $r = .444^{**}$ , p < .001.

#### 4.7 Correlations between availability items on-premise scenario

To attain a more in depth look into the mutual relations of the availability constructs for the *on-premise* scenario, again a Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed which is discussed next. The correlation matrix of the individual items of the domains *Legal Availability* and *Social Availability* for the *on-premise* scenario is displayed in Table 7 (see appendix F). As is shown, the item '*Previously succeeded in ordering and paying alcohol*' highly correlated both with '*Under aged friends have obtained alcohol there*', which was statistically significant, r = .660\*\*, p < .001, and

'Older friend accompanies in ordering and paying', which was statistically significant, r = .646\*\*, p < .001.

Inter-item correlations between the domains *Economic Availability* and *Physical Availability* are displayed in Table 8 (see appendix G). Here, the items *Lots of nightspots in area* and *Alcohol cheap* showed the highest correlation which was statistically significant,  $r = .606^{**}$ , p < .001, followed by *Night spot is nearby* and *Alcohol price reduced* which was statistically significant,  $r = .602^{**}$ , p < .001.

The correlations between the constructs *Economic Availability* and *Legal Availability* are depicted in Table 9 (see appendix H), where the highest correlation existed between *Alcohol price fits budget* and *High chance of being allowed into nightspot although too young* which was statistically significant,  $r = .578^{**}$ , p < .001.

#### 4.8 Correlations between premises

In the last stage of the analysis, a distinction was made between the off-premise and on-premise setting. A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed to display correlations between the availability constructs. As can be seen in Table 10, relatively high correlations existed between the similar constructs, ranging from *Physical Availability*, which was statistically significant,  $r = .562^{**}$ , p < .001, to *Social Availability*, which was statistically significant,  $r = .737^{**}$ , p < .001.

# 4.9 Conclusion

Summing up, the availability domain scoring the highest mean thus being allocated the highest importance was *Physical availability* followed by *Economic availability*, which applied to both premise scenarios. The availability items mostly causing these high means however differed from each other per premise type.

Fable 4:
Correlations between Availability Domains and Dependent Variables for Off-Premise Scenario

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Physical availability	-											
2. Economic availability	.418**	-										
3. Social availability	.402**	.451**	-									
4. Legal availability	.285**	.526**	.740**	-								
5. Alcohol consumption	.256**	.353**	.076	.112	-							
6. Perceived difficulty of obtaining alcohol in general	239**	041	022	.019	413**	-						
7. Perceived difficulty of obtaining alcohol in store	190*	042	.034	.078	348**	.523**	-					
8. Friends drinking alcohol	.296**	.391**	.212**	.215**	.575**	488**	184*	-				
9. Family members drinking alcohol	.196*	.281**	.084	.183*	.196*	214**	101	.457**	-			
10.Alcohol obtainment store last 7 days	.205**	.222**	.099	.151	.386**	245**	358**	.332**	.198*	-		
11.Alcohol obtainment store last 30 days	.268**	.253**	.167*	.195*	.592**	327**	426**	.378**	.152	700**	-	
12.Alcohol obtainment store last year	.235**	.259**	.079	.080	.687**	374**	491**	.433**	.142	584**	821**	-

*Note.* A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed to acquire correlation scores (n=203). \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05

Table 5: Correlations between Availability Domains and Dependent Variables for On-Premise Scenario

 Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
 1. Physical availability	-											
2. Economic availability	.703**	-										
3. Social availability	.585**	.661**	-									
4. Legal availability	.563**	.673**	.743**	-								
 5. Alcohol consumption	.307**	.288**	.128	.218**	-							
6. Perceived difficulty of obtaining alcohol in general	147	100	.005	020	413**	-						
7. Perceived difficulty of obtaining alcohol at nightspot	267**	187*	092	182*	538**	.690**	-					
8. Friends drinking alcohol	.447**	.392**	.242**	.277**	.575**	488**	538**	-				
9. Family members drinking alcohol	.201**	.203**	.179*	.171*	.196*	214**	205**	.457**	-			
10. Alcohol obtainment nightspot last 7 days	.324**	.317**	.173*	.207**	.646**	373**	499**	.524**	.218**	-		
11. Alcohol obtainment nightspot last 30 days	.371**	.329**	.187*	.217**	.696**	475**	630**	.624**	.327**	.837**	-	
12. Alcohol obtainment nightspot last year	.426**	.391**	.181*	.289**	.738**	510**	672**	.661**	.297**	.750**	.902**	-

*Note*. A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed to acquire correlation scores (n=167). \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05

Statistics showed for the *Off-premise scenario* that the items per domain significantly rated as most important were *Quick checkout* for *Physical availability*, *Have enough money left for other items* for *Economic availability*, *Parents/guardians allow me to drink* for *Social availability* and lastly *Not getting into trouble buying as minor* for *Legal availability*, whereas for the *On-premise scenario*, the most important items per domain were *Pleasant atmosphere* for *Physical availability*, *Have enough money left for other items* for *Economic availability*, *Friends and I go to same nightspot* for *Social availability* and ultimately *Staff not always asking for age proof when ordering/paying* was awarded the highest importance for *Legal availability*.

Because of the possibility of overlooking meaningful items that were left out of consideration because of the significance criterion, an additional overview was presented. This indeed showed the offpremise item '*Alcohol price fits budget*' to take in the fifth place and the on-premise item '*Long opening hours*' to take in fourth place in an overall rating, while being left out of consideration before.

Also of interest are the mutual relationships of the availability domains. In this respect, after performing a Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis, the highest correlation was found between the domains *Legal availability* and *Social availability*, both at the *off-premise* and the *on-premise* scenario. However, when taking a closer look, by zooming in on the availability item level of these domains, it shows that the items responsible for the high correlation at the *off-premise* scenario differ from the items responsible for the high correlation at the *on-premise* scenario. Where e.g. the *off-premise* combination of '*Not getting caught by police in possession of alcohol*' and '*No parents/guardians working at store*' shows the highest correlation, the similar *on-premise* combination merges into the whole with merely a moderate correlation. Another notable difference herein is that only a select amount of *off-premise* items showed relatively high correlations.

Finally, a Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed to compare the availability domains between the off- and on-premise scenario to control for possible similarities or differences between the premises. Results show that a fairly high correlation exists between the four identical domains, with *Social availability* showing the highest correlation and *Physical availability* coming in as last.

The above mentioned findings formed the basis for the elaboration of the research results in the next chapter, in which the data will be interpreted and key points will be discussed prior to identifying any action arising from the conclusions and discussing what this involves in practice.

#### 5. DISCUSSION

In the previous chapter, the most relevant findings were reported by means of referring to the performed tests and their resulting tables. Next, these findings are touched upon once more while they are described in the sense of what they might mean and why they matter. Also, the link is made to comparable research whereupon any possible limitations of the present study are discussed and recommendations for future research are given, prior to drawing a main conclusion of the present study.

Prior to touching upon the main results, it can be concluded that the scale, which was designed to measure the four availability constructs, has functioned properly. Reliability analyses resulted in relatively high Cronbach's Alpha's and there was no need to delete any items to achieve an even higher Alpha score. Therefore, the applied sets of items per construct appear to be closely related as a group in which this study has shown these items to make up for reliable constructs. Herewith, the present study has provided its first contribution to the literature in taking the first step towards the development of an availability measurement instrument.

Secondly, as concerns the study's main findings it is clear that both the *economic* and *physical* availability domains are awarded the most importance when adolescents have to choose a commercial source to obtain alcohol. Linking this result to comparable research is challenging however, because of the lack of studies comprising a similar comprehensive approach into alcohol availability. What can be noted, however, is that these two domains appear to be predominate in the existing literature relating to alcohol availability; i.e. these domains have often been documented as general representations of alcohol availability in a large body of literature (albeit in a separate setting). E.g. Halonen et al. (2013), Schneider and Gruber (2013) as well as Scribner, Cohen and Fisher (2000) focused on *physical* factors such as the density and/or proximity of alcohol outlets as measures of alcohol availability, to illustrate examples of studies relating *physical availability* to alcohol availability. Also literature addressing the influence of *economic* availability is in abundance: e.g. studies into the influence of discounts on alcohol

(Van Hoof, Noordenburg & De Jong, 2008; Wechsler, Kuo, Lee & Dowdall, 2000) and studies into price elasticity (Farrel, Manning & Finch; 2003) are widespread, although these studies often relate the *economic availability* factors to alcohol consumption rather than to alcohol availability. Still, however, the relatively large focus on both the *physical* and *economic availability* in the existing literature, implies a prioritization of these domains which is in line with the present study's results. Moreover, the items representing these domains in the literature were generally evaluated as important in the present study. E.g. the items '*Store is nearby*' and '*Long opening hours*' relate to commonly used *physical* items and the item '*Alcohol cheap*' relates to a commonly used *economic* item and were rated moderately important i.e. a significant higher importance score than the median score.

Thirdly, zooming in at the item-level of the availability domains, it showed that the vast majority of the *physical* and *economic* items were identified as significantly important. When reviewing the most important items of these domains, it is notable that their nature is not directly alcohol related. As concerns the *physical* items, 'Quick checkout' for off-premise and 'Pleasant atmosphere' for on-premise do not particularly have anything to do with alcohol. For the *on-premise* scenario this might not be too surprising considering the fact that e.g. nightspots are not exclusively designed for alcohol consumption. Other main attractions are also at stake to draw customers, such as the social setting of a nightspot (Snowden & Pridemore, 2013). Therefore it can be expected that one does not choose a certain *nightspot* primarily for alcohol related reasons and one gives a higher priority to the presence of a pleasant atmosphere. As concerns the *off-premise* scenario it is notable that a non-alcohol item as 'Quick checkout' prevails, although this item is in line with the portrayal of Snowden and Pridemore (2013) of off-premise alcohol outlets being designed with convenience in mind. The same observation concerning the non-alcohol relationship goes for the *economic* items, where 'Keeping enough money for other *things*' is leading in both premise scenarios. The item 'Alcohol on special offer' showed not to be of any significant importance, which for the on-premise scenario is in line with findings of Van Hoof,

Noordenburg and De Jong (2008) who concluded discounts on alcohol not to be a primary reason for adolescents to visit particular cafés. The present study's findings imply that the same applies for the offpremise location, i.e. special offers are not experienced as significantly important to adolescents in choosing a particular store. In the social context of obtaining alcohol, adolescents awarded 'Parents/quardians allow me to drink' the highest importance. This might sound hopeful for parenting reasons, but it is not directly clear how this finding should be interpreted in the context of choosing a store. Perhaps one without parental approval prefers a store more distant from the social environment in order to minimize the chance of being spotted and/or caught. This is consistent with mystery shoppers' reasoning of avoiding to select a particular outlet because of the chance of running into family and friends (Van Hoof & Gosselt, 2013). Likewise, reasoning that one values the permission of parents/guardians to drink so he or she can go to a store nearby when allowed to drink also makes sense, and is reinforced by the physical item 'Store is nearby' also being awarded a significantly high importance. However, this is rather conjectural and further research is necessary on this topic. Further, although Dent, Grube and Biglan (2005) and Harrison, Fulkerson and Park (2000) determine social sources as most important in obtaining alcohol, these proclamations do not hold in the context of choosing a store to obtain alcohol since the social items were generally allocated a low importance. In line with Fabian et al. (2008) shoulder tapping does not appear to be of high importance since 'Able to ask stranger to buy for me' did not score high on any of the premises. Also the item 'Can ask acquaintance to buy alcohol' was rated below the median score, which implies that letting other people get the necessary alcohol is not considered to be relevant in the off-premise scenario. For the onpremise, the non-alcohol related item 'Friends and I going to same nightspot' is awarded the highest importance, again showing alcohol not to be a primary motivator for choosing a particular nightspot thus confirming the findings of Snowden & Pridemore (2013) of the social setting to be one of the main attractors of a nightspot. Judging from the legal item scores, legal measures are not taken into serious

consideration by adolescents when choosing a store, as is evidenced by the lower assigned importance of this domain and the corresponding items. ID related items such as '*Cashier does not always ask for ID*', '*Able to use ID from another*' and '*Able to secretly use false ID*' show to be barely taken into consideration which at first sight is in contrast to previous research findings showing adolescents to be creative in circumventing legislation by falsifying ID cards and using fake ID cards (Fabian et al., 2008; Schwartz et al., 1998). It could, however, be that ID related measures are of no relevance in choosing a store because of other flaws in the legislation system such as a weak spot in the self-service checkout machines as was demonstrated by Van Hoof, Gosselt and De Jong (2015). In contrast to the off-premise findings, for the on-premise scenario multiple legal items were awarded significant importance, i.e. the items '*Staff not always asking for age proof when ordering/paying', 'Not getting into trouble drinking as minor'* and '*Not having to show age proof often'*. This shows that, although the overall importance of the *legal off-premise* domain is futile, these *legal* items do appear to play a role in choosing a nightspot to drink alcohol.

Finally, by determining the interactions between the four availability domains, together with the dependent behavioral variables, relatively new ground is broken. A first step towards exploring the reciprocity leads primarily to the notion of *legal availability* positively correlating highly with *social availability*. At first sight, this interaction could be explained by reasoning that when *legal* items are experienced as important, this might result in adolescents calling upon *social* factors. E.g. when a youngster finds it important whether one is asked for ID by the cashier because he or she is apprehensive about being asked, he/she therefore chooses to be accompanied by a friend who can provide support or perhaps buy the alcohol. Conversely, the same applies when *social* items are not considered to be important in choosing places to obtain alcohol which could be caused by *legal* factors falling short and therefore inadvertently facilitating in the obtainment of alcohol: when it is of no importance whether a friend comes along because perhaps at certain stores the cashiers do not ask for
ID anyway. On the basis of the current findings however, prudence is at its place because similar research is lacking to support this line of reasoning. Thus, merely the conclusion should be drawn that a relation exists between the concerning domains and between several of the corresponding items. Furthermore, the relatively high correlation between the domains *physical* and *economic* deserves mentioning, though this being the case only in the *on-premise* scenario. This relationship can be put into perspective, by realizing that these two domains are both rated as most important, which could partially explain the interaction. However, at the off-premise scenario the physical and economic availability domains do not show a similar high correlation. Zooming in on the *physical* and *economic* on-premises items shows that the relationship is mainly attributable to the economic item 'Reduction on alcohol' showing a positive, high correlation with the *physical* item '*Nightspot nearby*'. A sensible explanation for this relationship could be that a third variable is at play here, e.g. financial resources. Perhaps when one does not have a lot of money to spend, he/she wants to minimize the traveling costs by choosing a nightspot nearby and in line with saving money a reduction on alcohol then also is relevant. Conversely, when one has more money to spend the distance becomes irrelevant together with whether or not alcohol is on reduction at a certain nightspot. Another positive high correlation exists between 'Alcohol cheap' and 'Lots of nightspots in area' which again could guite possible relate to one's financial resources: someone who values a nightspot to offer cheap alcohol prefers to go to a place with lots of nightspots in one area to be able to choose the one nightspot that offers cheap alcohol. Again, however, further research is necessary to further explore these, and previous lines of reasoning.

It should be addressed also, that the additional, dependent behavioral variables, such as *alcohol consumption* and *alcohol obtainment* did not appear to show notable correlations with the availability domains and therefore have been left out of further consideration.

# 5.1 Limitations

The study had several limitations which ought to be mentioned here. First of all, the rather small sample size of this study did not particularly enhance the reliability of the results. The aim to reach a sample size of approximately 400 respondents seemed to be too ambitious. In the first place the willingness of schools and youth centers to participate turned out to be disappointing and, secondly, lots of youngsters themselves appeared not to be willing to participate in the study. One must be aware of the fact that a large group of adolescents not willing to participate, together with a high dropout of respondents, could also affect the interpretation of the results. The high dropout rate could be due to the length of the survey, which the respondents might have regarded as (too) long. Therefore, it should also be taken into consideration that this occurrence might have exercised influence on the results, as could also be the case for the completed surveys that might have been rushed through when experienced as too long.

Another aspect to take into account, is the fact that the yielded data is a result of a self-reported survey. Although in a marketing context this is a common and often inevitable method to inventory data, it could result in a certain bias. Although the quantity-frequency method has proven its use for measuring alcohol consumption (Allen & Wilson, 2003), the method used to measure *store alcohol obtainment* and *nightspot alcohol obtainment* however could have its flaws because of recall issues: when asked how often in the last year one has obtained alcohol from a store or nightspot, the respondent cannot be expected to precisely recollect the amount of alcoholic drinks over such a period.

It should also be taken into consideration that the Dutch alcohol legislation was changed only a few years ago from the minimum legal drinking age (for soft liquor) of 16 years old to 18 years old. This entails that the dataset likely included several respondents who previously were allowed to drink because they were 16 years old, but in the new legislative situation they were in violation. It should be kept in mind that this could have skewed particular results, such as the answers to questions relating to 'Alcohol obtainment'.

## 5.2 Future research

The present study has provided valuable insights and useful results which can serve as a basis for future research. Now that it has been determined which availability items appear to play the largest role for adolescents when choosing a commercial source to obtain alcohol, these items can perhaps be focused on allowing for a more in-depth investigation into their exact role and mutual relationships.

Furthermore, the present study has in its own way made a first step towards a comprehensive investigation into the relationships between the four availability domains. It has been demonstrated that interaction exists between the numerous items, and therefore between the domains, which previous studies seem to have neglected. Instead of investigating the availability concepts in a separate way it would be advisable to integrate the different domains into a more complete approach to gain more insight into the reciprocity. Further research could contribute in getting a more precise understanding of exactly how these relationships are established and how to interpret these correctly. In any event, a replication or similar study is highly recommended to cover a larger sample for a higher reliability and to use a shorter survey for a more efficient and effective data gathering.

It could be of interest also, to examine to what extent the findings will hold in comparable circumstances with other risky products such as tobacco or gambling products such as scratch cards. Following Gosselt (2011) who argues the concept of availability to be more widespread than to only alcohol and to be applicable also to tobacco products, it is quite possible that somewhat similar results are to be found in the context of adolescents obtaining tobacco or scratch cards. Otherwise, one could consider to apply this research method to different alcohol obtaining contexts, such as (secretly) taking alcohol from home or going to a drinking shack.

Finally, the findings can also be put to practical use by making a real life assessment. By selecting only the important availability items and altering the phrasing of the scenario question to cover a certain (group of) store(s) and/or nightspot(s), a practical instrument can easily be created. This could be set up

to measure the actual *alcohol availability* of a certain area or region in a comprehensive way to provide valuable insights for policy makers, or for that matter alcohol establishment managers, to deliberately influence the commercial *availability of alcohol* to adolescents.

## 5.3 Main conclusions

Concluding once more, and relating back to the research's main objectives, this study comprehensively explored the importance of physical, economic, social and legal availability domains to adolescents when choosing a commercial source to obtain alcohol. First, the applied sets of items representing the availability domains appear to be closely related as a group. This means that the present study provides a valuable contribution by laying a valid basis for the further development of a scale that can measure the four constructs of availability.

Secondly, the findings show both the *physical* and the *economic* domain to be of importance, which generally is in line with the large body of literature that often documents these domains as general representations of alcohol availability. The legal domain does not appear to function as a barrier in obtaining alcohol and although social sources have often been determined as highly important in previous studies, this does not hold in the context of choosing a commercial source to obtain alcohol. A closer look into the *physical* and *economic* domains reveals the most important items, however, not to be alcohol related.

Thirdly, reviewing the relationships between the domains demonstrates a high positive correlation between both the *social* and *legal* domains and the *legal* and *economic* domains in the *off-premise* scenario. Also in the *on-premise* scenario high positive correlations exist, particularly between the domains *social* and *legal, economic* and *physical,* and ultimately between *legal* and *economic.* Possible explanations are given for these domain relationships, as well as for the corresponding items that correlate highly, but reflecting on these lines of reasoning is challenging since the existing literature

lacks comparable research. Anyhow, this study has provided new insights by its comprehensive approach whereupon follow-up studies can build.

# LITERATURE

Allen, J.P., & Wilson, V.B. (2003). *Assessing Alcohol Problems*. A guide for Clinicians and Researchers. Bethesda, United States of America: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

Bieleman, B., Kruize, A., & Zimmerman, C. (2010). Monitor Alcoholverstrekking Jongeren 2011. Naleving leeftijdsgrenzen 16 en 18 Jaar Drank- en Horecawet: tweejaarlijkse metingen 1999-2011. [Monitor Alcohol Supply Adolescents. Compliance with age restrictions 16 and 18 Years: two-year measurements 1999-2011.] Groningen, The Netherlands: Intraval.

Bushman, B.J., & Stack, A.D. (1996). Forbidden fruit versus tainted fruit: Effects of warning labels on attraction to television violence. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *2*,207-226.

Cook, P.A., Phillips-Howard, P.A., Morleo, M., Harkins, C., Briant, L., & Bellis, M.A. (2011). The big drink debate: perceptions of the impact of price on alcohol consumption from a large scale cross-sectional convenience survey in north west England. *BMC Public Health*, *11*(1), pp. 664.

Chaloupka, F.J., & Wechsler, H. (1996). Binge drinking in college: The impact of price, availability, and alcohol control policies. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, *14*, 112-124.

Chen, M.J., Grube, J.W., Bersamin, M., Waiters, E., & Keefe, D.B. (2005). Alcohol Advertising: What Makes It Attractive to Youth? *Journal of Health Communication*, *10*, 553-565.

Chen, M.J., Gruenewald, P.J., & Remer, L.G. (2009). Does Alcohol Outlet Density Affect Youth Access to Alcohol? *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *44*, 582-589.

Dent, C.W., Grube, J.W., & Biglan, A.B. (2005). Community level alcohol availability and enforcement of possession laws as predictors of youth drinking. *Preventive Medicine*, *40*, 355-362.

Fabian, L.E.A., Toomey, T.L., Lenk, K.M., & Erickson, D.J. (2008). Where do underage college students get alcohol? *Journal of Drug Education*, *38*, 15-26.

Farrell, S., Manning, W.G., & Finch, M.D. (2003). Alcohol dependence and the price of alcoholic beverages. *Journal of Health Economics, 22*, 117-147.

Gosselt, J.F. (2011). Off limits. The effectiveness of age limits in reducing underage sales. Enschede, Univeristy of Twente.

Gosselt, J.F., Hoof, J.J., van & Jong, M.D.T. de (2012). Why should I comply? Sellers' accounts for (non-)compliance with legal age limits for alcohol sale. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention and Policy*, 7.

Gosselt, J.F., Hoof, J.J., van, Baas, N. & Jong, M.D.T. de (2011). Effects of a National Information Campaign on compliance with age restrictions for alcohol sales. *Journal of Adolescents Health, 49*, pp. 97-98.

Gosselt, J.F., Strump, T., & Van Hoof, J.J. (2015). Adolescents' experiences and perceived (dis)advantages of the three main outlet types for alcohol purchases. *Journal of Health Psychology, ..*(.), pp. 1-10.

Grunewald, P.J., Ponicki, W.R. & Holder, H.D. (1993). The relationship of outlet densities to alcohol consumption: A time series crossectional analysis. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.*, *17*(1), 38-47.

Guerri, C., & Pascual, M. (2010). Mechanisms involved in the neurotoxic, cognitive, and neurobehavioral effects of alcohol consumption during adolescence. *Alcohol, 44*(1), 15-26.

Halonen, J.I., Kivimäki, M., Virtanen, M., Pentti, J., Subramanian, S.V., Kawachi, I., & Vahtera, J. (2013). Proximity of off-premise alcohol outlets and heavy alcohol consumption. A cohort study. *Drug and alcohol dependence, 132*, pp. 295-300. Harrison, P.A., Fulkerson, J.A., & Park, E. (2000). The relative importance of social versus commercial sources in youth access to tobacco, alcohol, and other drugs. *Preventive Medicine*, *31*(1), 39-40.

Hearst M.O., Fulkerson, J.A., Maldonado-Molina, M.M., Perry, C.L. & Komro, K.A. (2007). Who needs liquor stores when parents will do? The importance of social sources of alcohol among young urban teens. *Preventive Medicine*, *44*, pp. 471-476.

Heather, N., & Stockwell, T. (2004). *The essential handbook of treatment and prevention of alcohol problems*. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Jackson, N., Denny, S., Sheridan, J., Fleming, T., Clark, T., Teevale, T., Ameratunga, S. (2014). Predictors of Drinking Patterns in Adolescence: A Latent Class Analysis. *Drug and Alcohol Dependance, 135* (1), pp. 133-139.

Jones-Webb, R., Toomey, T.L., Short, B., Murray, D.M., Wagenaar, A., & Wolfson, M. (1997). Relationships among Alcohol Availability, Drinking Location, Alcohol Consumption, and Drinking Problems in Adolescents. *Substance Use & Misuse, 32*(10), pp. 1261-1285.

Kelly, A.B., Chan, G.C.K., Toumbourou, J.W., O'Flaherty, M., Homel, R., Patton, G.C. & Williams, J. (2012). Very young adolescents and alcohol: evidence of a unique susceptibility to peer alcohol use. *Addictive behaviors*, *37*(4), pp. 414-419.

Kuntsche, E., Kuendig, H., & Gmel, G. (2008). Alcohol outlet density, perceived availability and adolescent alcohol use: A multilevel structural equation model. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 62*, 811-816.

Kuo, M., Wechsler, H., Greenberg, P., & Lee, Hang. (2003). The Marketing of Alcohol to College Students. The Role of Low Prices and Special Promotions. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *25*(3), pp. 1-8.

Labhart, F., Graham, K., Wells, S., & Kuntsche, E. (2013). Drinking Before Going to Licensed Premises: An Event-Level Analysis of Predrinking, Alcohol Consumption, and Adverse Outcomes. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, *37*(2), pp. 284-291.

Moore, R.S., Ames, G.M., & Cunradi, C.B. (2007). Physical and social availability of alcohol for young enlisted naval personnel in and around home port. Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy, 2 <a href="http://www.substanceabusepolicy.com/content/2/1/17">http://www.substanceabusepolicy.com/content/2/1/17</a>, Retrieved last May 5, 2010.

Mutschler, J., Diehl, A., & Kiefer, F. (2007). Beschaffung psychotroper Substanzen über das Internet. *Der Nervenarzt, 78*(7), pp. 818-820.

Paschall, M.J., Grube, J.W. & Kypri, K. (2009). Alcohol control policies and alcohol consumption by youth: A multi-national study. *Addiction, 104*, 1849-1855.

Popova, S., Giesbrecht, N., Bekmuradov, D. & Patra, J. (2009). Hours and days of sale and density of alcohol outlets: Impacts on alcohol consumption and damage: A systematic review. *Alcohol Alcoholism*, *44*, 500-516.

Robinson, T.N., Chen, H.L., & Killen, J.D. (1998). Television and music video exposure and the risk of adolescent alcohol use. *Pediatrics, 102,* e54

Roodbeen, R., Lie, K.J., & Schelleman-Offermans, K. (2013). Alcoholverkoop aan jongeren 2013. Nuchter, Kenniscentrum Leeftijdsgrenzen.

Schwartz, R.H., Farrow, J.A., Banks, B., & Giesel, A.E. (1998). Use of false ID cards and other deceptive methods to purchase alcoholic beverages during high school. *Journal of Addictive Deseases, 17,* 25-33. Schneider, S., & Gruber, J. (2013). Neighbourhood deprivation and outlet density for tobacco, alcohol and fast food: First hints of obesogenic and addictive environments in Germany. *Public Health Nutrition, 16*(7), pp. 1168-1177.

Scribner, R.A., Cohen, D.A., & Fisher, W. (2000). Evidence of a structural effect for alcohol outlet density: A multilevel analysis. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 24*, 188-195.

Stanley, L.R., Henry, K.L., & Swaim, R.C. (2010). Physical, Social, and Perceived Availabilities of Alcohol and Last Month Alcohol Use in Rural and Small Urban Communities. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 40*, pp. 1203-1214.

Snowden, A.J. & Pridemore, W.A. (2013). Alcohol and violence in a nonmetropolitan college town: alcohol outlet density, outlet type, and assault. *Journal of Drug Issue, 43*(3), pp. 357-373.

Turrisi, R., Jaccard, J., Taki, R., Dunnam, H. & Grimes, J. (2001). Examination of the shortterm efficacy of a parent intervention to reduce college student drinking tendencies. *Addictive Behaviors, 15*(4), pp. 366-372.

Valentine, G., Holloway, S.L. & Jayne, M. (2010). General patterns of alcohol consumption: continuity and change. *Health & Place, 16*, pp. 916-925.

Van Hoof, J.J. (2010). *Sweet sixteen and never been drunk*. Adolescent Alcohol Use, Predictors and Consequences. Enschede: University of Twente.

Van Hoof, J. J., Gosselt, J. F., & De Jong, M. D. T. (2015). *Alcohol nog steeds volop beschikbaar voor minderjarigen in de supermarkt* [Fact Sheet]. Retrieved from http://leeftijdsgrens.com/wpcontent/uploads/2015/06/Factsheet\_ID-scanners.pdf

Van Hoof, J.J., & Gosselt, J.F. (2013) Underage Alcohol Sales–It Only Takes a Minute: A New Approach to Underage Alcohol Availability. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol And Drugs, 74*(3). 423-427.

Van Hoof, J. J., Van Noordenburg, M., & De Jong, M. D. T. (2008). Happy Hours and Other Alcohol Discounts in Cafés: Prevalance and Effects on Underage Adolescents. *Journal of Public Health Policy, 29,* pp. 340-352.

Wechsler, H., Kuo, M., Lee, H., & Dowdall, G. (2000). Underage college drinkers have easy access to alcohol, pay less, and consume more per occasion than older students. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *19*, 24-29.

Yamada, T., Kendix, M., & Yamada, T. (1996). The impact of alcohol consumption and marijuana use on high school graduation. *Health Economics, 5*, 77-92

# APPENDIX A: LETTER USED TO INVITE YOUTH CENTERS AND SCHOOLS TO PARTICIPATE

# Beste <NAAM JONGERENWERKER/NAAM DOCENT van <NAAM JONGERENCENTRUM/SCHOOL>,

Zoals op scholen en jongerencentra vaak het geval is, zal ook uw <JONGERENCENTRUM OF SCHOOL> waarschijnlijk een plek zijn waar een streng anti-alcoholbeleid gevoerd wordt. Toch blijkt uit onderzoek dat jongeren doorgaans eenvoudig aan alcohol kunnen komen, ondanks de nieuwe leeftijdsgrens van 18 jaar, meestal via vrienden. Om meer duidelijkheid te krijgen over dit belangrijke vraagstuk, voer ik in het kader van mijn studie Communicatiewetenschap onderzoek uit naar jongeren en het verkrijgen van alcohol. Met medewerking van scholen en jongerencentra vullen jongeren mijn enquête in, zodat ik aanbevelingen kan doen over een effectiever beleid wat betreft jongeren en alcohol voor onder meer scholen, jongerencentra en ouders. Ook u kunt deelnemen aan dit onderzoek en in ruil inzicht krijgen in de (anonieme) resultaten.

Om precies te zijn onderzoek ik *de invloed van de beschikbaarheid van alcohol* (bijvoorbeeld in de supermarkt, thuis of bij vrienden) *op het verkrijgen ervan door jongeren*. Ik ben daarvoor op zoek naar jongeren van 14, 15, 16 of 17 jaar oud die mijn enquête kunnen invullen. De enquête is binnen 15 minuten in te vullen en gaat over hoe belangrijk bepaalde factoren (zouden kunnen) zijn bij het (eventuele) verkrijgen van alcohol. Het is voor het invullen onbelangrijk of de jongere al wel of niet alcohol gedronken heeft. Al zijn het er maar een paar, alle kleine beetjes helpen! Onder de deelnemende scholen en jongerencentra mag ik bovendien namens de universiteit een VVV-bon verloten ter waarde van 50,- euro.

Ik wil graag noemen dat de enquête niet aanzet tot het drinken of kopen van alcohol en juist zou kunnen dienen om dit onderwerp na de enquête nog eens kritisch te bespreken. Bovendien is mijn onderzoek goedgekeurd door de ethische commissie van de universiteit. De enquête wordt afgesloten met de melding dat alcohol verboden is voor minderjarigen en dat voorzichtigheid geboden is bij het eventuele drinken van alcohol vanwege de grote kans op schade. De gegevens worden vertrouwelijk behandeld en in eventuele publicaties worden geen enkele uitspraken gedaan specifiek over personen, scholen of jongerencentra.

Ik hoop dat ik uw interesse gewekt heb in dit onderzoek en u mij hiermee wil helpen. Verdere details licht ik natuurlijk graag toe, maar het heeft verder niet heel veel om handen. De enquête is online te benaderen via de volgende link: <u>https://utwentebs.eu.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV\_6u2aZ7O6VeFgVQV</u>. Het is ook mogelijk om een papieren versie te laten invullen, die ik kan toesturen met een retourenveloppe.

Ik hoor graag van u. Bellen mag altijd!

Met vriendelijke groeten,

Jamie van der Ziel Masterstudent Communicatiewetenschap Universiteit Twente jamievanderziel@live.nl 0630240932

# APPENDIX B: APPROVAL FORM OF ETHICS COMMITTEE (1/7)

# UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

Gedragswetenschappen

## COMMISSIE ETHIEK (CE) FACULTEIT GEDRAGSWETENSCHAPPEN

## AANVRAAGFORMULIER BEOORDELING VOORGENOMEN ONDERZOEK DOOR CE

## 1. Titel

1b. Datum van de aanvraag 16-10-2014

1a. Wat is de titel van het onderzoek (max. 50 tekens)?

LET OP: Als u van het SONA systeem gebruik gaat maken, moet hier dezelde titel worden vermeid als de titel die in SONA zai worden gebruikt. Deze titel zai ook zichtbaar zijn voor de proefpersonen (bij gebruik SONA). Jongeren en het verkrijgen van alcohol

## 2. Contactgegevens onderzoekers/uitvoerders

2a. Voorletters J.M.

2b. Achternaam van der Ziel

2c. Vakgroep (indien van toepassing)

## 2d. Studentnummer

1250604

2e. E-mailadres

j.m.vanderziel@student.utwente.nl

2f. Telefoonnummer (tijdens het onderzoek):

0630240932

2g. Indien er meer dan één uitvoerder is, dan graag in het onderstaande invulblok de gegevens (voorletters/achternaam/vakgroep/studentnummer/emailadres/telefoonnummers) van alle uitvoerders van het onderzoek invullen.

#### 3. Contactgegevens hoofdonderzoeker/begeleidend docent

LET OP: De eerst verantwoordelijke onderzoeker/begeleidend docent is verantwoordelijk voor de bij deze aanvraag verstrekte gegevens en het onderzoek als geheel en verleent (Indien van toepassing) met de aanvraag in dit formulier toestemming aan ANDERE PERSO(O)N(EN) (zie vraag 2) om voornoemde onderzoek met proefpersonen uit te voeren.

Deze eerst verantwoordelijke onderzoeker is een gepromoveerde onderzoeker.

### 2a. Voorletters

J.J.

3b. Achternaam van Hoof

3c. Vakgroep

CW - CMC

3d. E-mailadres

j.j.vanhoof@utwente.nl

Telefoonnummer tijdens het onderzoek

6131

## 4. Beoogde begin- en einddatum onderzoek

4a. Wat is de beoogde begindatum van het onderzoek

27-10-2014

4b. Wat is de beoogde einddatum van het onderzoek

24-11-2014

#### 5. Doel en vraagstelling onderzoek

Geef een duidelijke en voldoende uitgebreide omschrijving van het onderzoek, waarmee een voldoende ethische beoordeling mogelijk is. Bij onvoldoende informatie wordt het voorstel in eerste instantie afgekeurd en zal het opnieuw ter beoordeling moeten worden voorgelegd.

#### 5a. Wat is het doel van het onderzoek?

```
Het doel van het onderzoek is inzicht te krijgen in de
wisselwerking tussen de verschillende elementen van de
beschikbaarheid van alcohol wanneer het gaat om het verkrijgen
van alcoholische drank door jongeren en in hoeverre deze
elementen een beinvloedende factor zijn op jongeren wat betreft
het verkrijgen van alcohol.
```

## 5b. Wat is de vraagstelling van het onderzoek?

Er wordt aan jongeren gevraagd in hoeverre bepaalde (omgevings)factoren een rol voor hen spelen bij het verkrijgen van alcohol.

## 6. Binnen welk kader wordt het onderzoek uitgevoerd

6a. Het onderzoek wordt uitgevoerd in het kader van een studie. Het gaat specifiek om een:

Masterthese

#### 7. Aard van het onderzoek

7a. Wat is de aard van het onderzoek?

Anders, te weten:

Online survey onderzoek met focusgroep als pretest

## 8. Gebruik Proefpersonen uit SONA

8a. Wilt u voor uw onderzoek met proefpersonen gebruik maken van SONA?

Nee

#### 9. Omvang aantal sessies

Probeer een zo goed mogelijke schatting te geven van de benodigde duur van het onderzoek. Eventueel aan de hand van een pilot.

LET OP: Het onderzoek moet worden aangevraagd in eenheden van 15 minuten. Dit om de beschikbare tijd meer optimaal te benutten. Proefpersooncredits worden toegekend per standaard eenheden.

9a. Zal een proefpersoon zijn/haar deelname afronden in één of meerdere sessie(s)?

# APPENDIX B: APPROVAL FORM OF ETHICS COMMITTEE (3/7)

In één sessie (vragen 9b en 9c zijn niet van toepassing) 9d. Wat is de totale duur van de sessie(s) in minuten?

20

9e. Sessies kunnen vaak in duur verschillen. Wanneer dit bij dit onderzoek het geval is, kunt u in het onderstaande tekstvak hiervan een nadere omschrijving geven?

N.v.t.

#### 10. Achtergrond proefpersonen

10a. Worden proefpersonen geworven omdat zij patiënt zijn?

LET OP: India Ja: De Commissie Ethiek GW (CE-GW) beoordeelt geen aanvragen voor onderzoeken waarin de proefpersonen patiënten zijn, terzij een erkende lokale medisch-ethische commissie een verklaring heeft afgegeven dat het onderzoek buiten hun reikwijdte valt. Het aanvragen van een beoordeling vindt in dat geval plaats via mw. C.D Lammertink-Spenkelink (C.D.Lamertink-Spenkelink@utwente.nl en tel. 5350). Een afschrift van de aanvraag van die beoordeling met daarbij de uitslag dient evenwel aan het CE-lid van de GW-vakgroep gezonden worden.

Nee

#### 11. Beoogde aantal proefpersonen, verdeling, inclusie en exclusie criteria

11a. Wat is het beoogde aantal proefpersonen?

500

- 11b. Wat is de beoogde verdeling man/vrouw onder de proefpersonen? 50/50 (%)
- 11c. Wat zijn de beoogde inclusiecriteria?

De respondent moet jonger dan 18 jaar oud zijn, aangezien deze onder de Drank- en Horecawet dient te vallen.

## 11d. Wat zijn de beoogde exclusiecriteria?

Respondenten jonger dan 14 jaar oud.

## 12. Procedure van het onderzoek

12a. Wat moet een proefpersoon die aan dit onderzoek deelneemt doen? Een duidelijke beschrijving van de proedure van het onderzoek (instructies aan de proefpersonen, te meten variabelen, condities, manipulaties, aantal/iengte vragenlijsten) is vereist.

# APPENDIX B: APPROVAL FORM OF ETHICS COMMITTEE (4/7)

#### Focusgroep

Bij wijze van pre-test wordt de, in een later stadium af te nemen, enquête besproken met een aantal jongeren (om en nabij de 8 personen). De jongeren vullen de enquête in en vervolgens wordt gevraagd naar feedback, zodat er aanvullingen dan wel aanpassingen gedaan kunnen worden door de onderzoeker.

#### Enquête

Voornamelijk middelbare scholen worden benaderd en gevraagd hun leerlingen op school de enquête digitaal te laten invullen. Docenten ontvangen een heldere beschrijving van het proces met daarin o.a. de te volgen voorschriften. Alvorens de daadwerkelijke enquête van start gaat, krijgt de respondent een inleidende tekst op het scherm te zien waarin o.a. beknopt het doel van het onderzoek, de geschatte tijdsduur, de anonieme verwerking en de voortdurende mogelijkheid tot stoppen staat beschreven. De respondent wordt gevraagd op haar eerste gevoel af te gaan tijdens de vragen en niet te lang na te denken. De survey bestaat voornamelijk uit mc-vragen die op uniforme wijze zijn opgesteld. Na het schetsen van een kort scenario wordt de respondent gevraagd aan te geven hoe belangrijk hij/zij bepaalde factoren vindt bij het verkrijgen van alcohol.

#### Bijvoorbeeld:

Stel je voor: je hebt volgende week een feestje bij een vriend thuis. Er zal alcohol gedronken worden. Jou wordt gevraagd ook wat alcohol mee te brengen. Je besluit om naar de winkel te gaan voor zes blikjes bier. Hieronder zie je verschillende punten die vooral over de eigenschappen van een winkel gaan. Geef aan hoe belangrijk deze punten voor jou zijn als je naar de winkel zou gaan voor alcohol. 1. Dat de winkel waar alcohol te koop is dichtbij is Belangrijk o o o o Onbelangrijk

De te meten variabelen zijn: \*Perceived alcohol availability \*Social availability \*Legal availability \*Economic availability \*Physical availability De vragenlijst is binnen 20 minuten in te vullen.

## 13. Is een van de onderstaande situaties van toepassing?

 Kruis aan of één van onderstaande situaties van toepassing is op de onderzoeksopzet:

- Het onderzoek is Standaard Onderzoek: Onderzoek dat gepland is op een bepaalde fysieke lokatie (dat wil zeggen: niet online), waarbij de deelnemers alleen aan dat deel deelnemen.
- Het onderzoek is Tweedelig Standaard Onderzoek: gepland is op een fysieke lokatie (d.w.z. niet online) dat in 2 delen uiteenvalt. Deze delen kunnen een aantal dagen na elkaar gepland zijn. Een deelnemer moet zich voor beide delen tegelijkertijd opgeven.
- O Het onderzoek is online vragenlijst onderzoek dat in SONA is opgesteld en wat door SONA wordt geadministreerd.
- Het onderzoek is online onderzoek met een externe (niet in SONA opgestelde) vragenlijst.

## 14. Mogelijke gevolgen van het onderzoek voor de proefpersonen.

14a. Kan het onderzoek voor de deelnemende proefpersonen negatieve gevolgen hebben en/of gaat het onderzoek gepaard met ongemak voor de proefpersonen?

Nee

14b. Toelichting

# APPENDIX B: APPROVAL FORM OF ETHICS COMMITTEE (5/7)

Indien Nee: Geef toelichting. Indien Ja: daarbij ook aangeven welke maatregelen worden getroffen om het mogelijk ongemak en/of de negatieve gevolgen te ondervangen.

Jongeren wordt slechts naar hun mening en ervaring gevraagd.

#### 15. Wilsbekwaamheid proefpersonen

Wilsbekwaamheid houdt in dat de proefpersonen beschikken over het individuele vermogen om zelfstandig beslissingen te nemen.

#### 15a. Zijn de proefpersonen wilsbekwaam?

Ja

#### 16. Leeftijdscategorie

16a. In welke leeftijdscategorie vallen de proefpersonen?

```
Minderjarig kind: 0 t/m 11 jaar
```

Minderjarig adolescent: 12 t/m 17 jaar

Meerderjarig: 18 jaar en ouder

#### 17. Schriftelijke toestemming bij minderjarige kinderen.

17a. Indien er minderjarige kinderen (0 t/m 11 jaar) worden onderzocht: wordt er schriftelijk toestemming gevraagd van de ouders /verzorgers?

17b. Toelichting Indien Ja: op welke wijze? Indien Nee: waarom niet?

18. Schriftelijke toestemming bij minderjarige adolescenten

18a. Indien er minderjarige adolescenten (12 t/m 17 jaar) worden onderzocht: wordt er (schriftelijk: alleen ouders) toestemming gevraagd aan zowel de adolescent als de ouders /verzorgers?

Ja

18b. Toelichting Indien Ja: op welke wijze? Indien Nee: waarom niet?

> Ja, via passive consent. Vanuit de school wordt een brief gestuurd naar de ouders ter kennisgeving met daarbij ook de mogelijkheid bezwaar te maken

#### 19. Volledige voorlichting vooraf

19a. Worden proefpersonen (en/of ouders/verzorgers) alvorens zij meedoen aan het onderzoek volledig over de aard van het onderzoek voorgelicht, bijvoorbeeld door middel van een brochure?

# 19b. Toelichting

Ja

Indien Ja: op welke wijze

Indien Nee: waarom niet?

De jongeren die deelnemen aan de focusgroep worden eerst door hun leraren voorgelicht over de aard van het onderzoek. Ter plekke worden zij nogmaals volledig door de onderzoeker zelf over de aard van het onderzoek ingelicht.

De respondenten voor de enquête worden volledig over de aard en het doel van het onderzoek voorgelicht door de leerkracht, die op zijn/haar beurt geïnformeerd is middels een door de onderzoeker gestandaardiseerde brief met informatie en instructies.

# APPENDIX B: APPROVAL FORM OF ETHICS COMMITTEE (6/7)

## 20. Volledige voorlichting achteraf

20a. Worden de proefpersonen (en/of ouders/verzorgers) achteraf volledig in kennis gesteld van het doel van het onderzoek, door middel van een adequate debriefing?

Nee

## 20b. Toelichting

Indien Ja: op welke wijze? Indien Nee: waarom niet?

> Wat betreft de focusgroep zal er geen debriefing gedaan worden, vanwege praktische overwegingen en de te respecteren anonimiteit.

> Wat betreft de enquêtes worden de proefpersonen en ouders/verzorgers vooraf al voldoende ingelicht. Indien de wens vanuit school bestaat om ingelicht te worden over de uiteindelijke resultaten en conclusies van het onderzoek, dan geeft de onderzoeker hieraan gehoor en voorziet hij hen later van deze informatie in de vorm van een verslag en evt. presentatie.

## 21. Informed Consent formulier

21a. Verlenen proefpersonen (en in geval van niet-wilsbekwame proefpersonen: de voogd of ouders/verzorgers) vooraf schriftelijk toestemming voor het onderzoek door middel van een 'Informed Consent' formulier met daarin informatie over doel, aard en duur, risico's en bezwaren?

Een standaard Informed Consent formulier is te vinden op de website van de Commissie Ethiek.

Ja

#### 22. Afhankelijkheid proefpersonen

22a. Beschrijf de relatie tussen de hoofdonderzoeker/onderzoekers enerzijds en de proefpersonen anderzijds.

De relatie tussen de onderzoekers en de proefpersonen is geheel onafhankelijk

22b. Zijn de proefpersonen, buiten de context van het onderzoek, in een afhankelijke of ondergeschikte positie t.o.v. de onderzoeker?

Nee

#### 23. Duidelijkheid t.a.v. terugtrekken

23a. Wordt proefpersonen duidelijk gemaakt dat zij zich te allen tijde kunnen terugtrekken?

Ja

## 24. Beloning proefpersonen

LET OP: Alleen voor onderzoek waarbij alleen proefpersoon credits worden gegeven, kan gebruik gemaakt worden maken van het SONA systeem.

# 24a. Welke beloning(en) kunnen proefpersonen ontvangen voor hun deelname aan het onderzoek.

Geen

Proefpersoon credits

Anders, te weten:

VVV bon

# APPENDIX B: APPROVAL FORM OF ETHICS COMMITTEE (7/7)

# 25. Opslag en verwerking gegevens

25a. Worden gegevens van het onderzoek vertrouwelijk behandeld en anoniem opgeslagen en verwerkt?

Ja

# 26. Inzage gegevens

26a. Hebben proefpersonen achteraf inzage in hun eigen gegevens?

# 26b. Indien Nee: Waarom niet?

Omdat er met een online survey gewerkt wordt, welke niet terug te leiden is naar individuen.

# APPENDIX C: INFORMED CONSENT LETTER FOR PARENTS OF SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

Betreft: enquête jongeren en alcohol

Beste ouder/verzorger,

Mijn naam is Jamie van der Ziel en ik studeer Communicatiewetenschap aan de Universiteit Twente. Voor de afronding van mijn Masterstudie voer ik onderzoek uit naar jongeren en alcohol. Met mijn afstudeeronderzoek hoop ik een bijdrage te leveren aan de gedragswetenschap, wat vervolgens kan leiden tot een meer effectieve benadering door overheden, scholen en families bij het omgaan met jongeren en alcohol.

Het doel van mijn onderzoek is inzicht te krijgen in hoeverre bepaalde factoren een rol spelen wanneer een minderjarige aan alcohol zou willen komen. Enkele voorbeelden van deze factoren zijn de huidige wetgeving, de hoeveelheid winkels in de buurt waar alcohol te koop is en de naleving van de alcoholwet door verkoopmedewerkers. Voor mijn onderzoek vullen scholieren en studenten van 14 jaar en ouder tot jonger dan 18 mijn digitale enquête in, waarin voornamelijk de vraag gesteld wordt hoe belangrijk bepaalde factoren zouden kunnen zijn bij het verkrijgen van alcohol. Het speelt hierbij geen rol of iemand wel of niet ooit alcohol gedronken of gekocht heeft. Ook als uw kind niet drinkt, is het belangrijk dat hij of zij meedoet. De deelnemers blijven anoniem en hun deelneming is vrijwillig. Daarnaast heeft het kind het recht om op ieder moment te stoppen met de enquête als hij of zij dat wil, om welke reden dan ook.

De school heeft ingestemd met dit onderzoek. Als wetenschappelijk onderzoeker breng ik u echter via deze weg graag persoonlijk op de hoogte, zodat u de mogelijkheid heeft om zonder opgaaf van reden uw kind niet te laten deelnemen. Desondanks hoop ik dat uw interesse in dit onderzoek is gewekt en u open staat voor deelname. Mocht u vragen hebben of uw kind willen uitsluiten van deelname, dan kunt u contact opnemen met mij via mijn emailadres j.m.vanderziel@student.utwente.nl of met docent <NAAM> via <EMAIL>. Doe dit uiterlijk op <DATUM> aanstaande, want het afnemen van de enquêtes vindt plaats <OP/VANAF DATUM>.

Ik hoop u hiermee voldoende geïnformeerd te hebben.

Met vriendelijke groeten,

Jamie van der Ziel Masterstudent Communicatiewetenschappen

# APPENDIX D: CORRELATION MATRIX SOCIAL AVAILABILITY AND LEGAL AVAILABILITY OFF-PREMISE

## Table 5:

Correlations between Social Availability Items and Legal Availability Items Off-Premise

Variables	Easy to steal alcohol	Not getting into trouble buying as minor	Not getting into trouble stealing alcohol	Not getting caught by police in possession of alcohol	Previously succeeded in obtaining alcohol	Able to secretly use false ID	High chance of succeeding in obtaining alcohol	Not getting into trouble if discovered using false ID	Able to use ID from another	According to law not allowed alcohol	Cashier does not always ask for ID
Few other customers Few staff	.265** .300**	.190** .158*	.168* .176*	.255* .308**	.257** .228**	.161* .269**	.193** .169*	.260** .274**	.134 .169*	.110 .209**	.102 .155*
Under aged friends have obtained	.296**	.342**	.140*	.336**	.439**	.394**	.366**	.474**	.354**	.124	.402**
Friend works on the cash desk	.335**	.319**	.261**	.428**	.251**	.475**	.346**	.399**	.405**	.308**	.443**
No parents/guardians working at	.238**	.437**	.281**	.574**	.357**	.498**	.389**	.470**	.377**	.243**	.402**
No acquaintances of	.309**	.371**	.257**	.500**	.361**	.469**	.361**	.483**	.311**	.330**	.342**
Friends and I go to same store	.335**	.202**	.127	.289**	.165*	.302**	.113	.164*	.221**	.146*	.223**
Many other customers	.332**	.175*	.260**	.293**	.185**	.240**	.099	.297**	.192**	.326**	.142*
Ask acquaintance to buy	.302**	.442**	.170*	.481**	.443**	.448**	.458**	.455**	.527**	.155*	.500**
Older friend accompanies to buy	.120	.440**	.268**	.459**	.448**	.369**	.538**	.511**	.442**	.010	.530**
Family member accompanies to buy	.139*	.275**	.157*	.300**	.336**	.294**	.423**	.333**	.368**	.124	.377**
Many staff	.340**	.161*	.168*	.192**	.196**	.159*	.185**	.279**	.287**	.253**	.226**
Ask stranger to buy	.330**	.282**	.272**	.310**	.303**	.430**	.385**	.364**	.359**	004	.352**
Parents/guardians allow me to drink	.015	.306**	.026	.186**	.164*	.125	.225**	.129	.334**	.148*	.214**

Note. A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed (n=203)

# APPENDIX E: CORRELATION MATRIX LEGAL AVAILABILITY AND ECONOMIC AVAILABILITY OFF-PREMISE

## Table 6

Correlations between Legal Availability Items and Economic Availability Items Off-Premise

Variables	Alcohol cheap	Alcohol price reduced	Have enough money left for other items	Alcohol on special offer	Alcohol price fits budget
Easy to steal alcohol	.128	.141*	.091	.076	.009
Not getting into trouble buying as minor	.391**	.330**	.335**	.394**	.381**
Not getting into trouble stealing alcohol	.118	.172*	.144*	.245**	.183**
Not getting caught by police in possession of alcohol	.256**	.325**	.261**	.367**	.320**
Previously succeeded in obtaining alcohol	.308**	.306**	.217**	.434**	.361**
Able to secretly use false ID	.282**	.327**	.238**	.363**	.162*
High chance of succeeding in obtaining alcohol	.401**	.348**	.292**	.444**	.399**
Not getting into trouble if discovered using false ID	.315**	.291**	.293**	.372**	.363**
Able to use ID from another	.383**	.405**	.386**	.414**	.291**
According to law not allowed alcohol	124	.035	.074	.054	031
Cashier does not always ask for ID	.358**	.356**	.322**	.382**	.280**

Note. A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed (n=203).

# APPENDIX F: CORRELATION MATRIX LEGAL AVAILABILITY AND SOCIAL AVAIALBILTY ON-PREMISE

## Table 7:

Correlations between Legal Availability Items and Social Availability Items On-Premise

Variables	Many other customers	Few other customers	Few staff	Lots of staff	Under aged friends have obtained alcohol there	Friend works behind the bar	No parents /guardians working at nightspot	Friends and I go to same nightspot	Older friend accompanies in ordering/paying	Able to ask stranger for me	Parents/guardians allow me to drink	No acquaintances of parents/guardians working at nightspot	Ask acquaintance to order and pay	Family member accompanies to order and pay
Able to secretly use false age proof	.215**	.278**	.345**	.324**	.460**	.339**	.382**	.312**	.527**	.486**	.411*	.421**	.386**	.430**
Age control at entrance not too strict	.147	.210**	.136*	.184*	.458**	.270**	.383**	.447**	.500**	.385**	.404**	.392**	.473**	.303**
Easy to steal alcohol	.122	.338**	.345**	.378**	.336**	.328**	.300**	008	.243**	.424**	.073	.304**	.150	.300**
Not getting into trouble drinking as minor	.359**	.328**	.364**	.380**	.443**	.552**	.466**	.285**	.478**	.459**	.395**	.460**	.484**	.425**
Not getting into trouble ordering / paying as minor	.227**	.235**	.220**	.326**	.558**	.359**	.423**	.482**	.557**	.430**	.421**	.435**	.446**	.428**
Not getting caught by police in possession of alcohol	.277**	.177*	.122	.220**	.462**	.392**	.430**	.453**	.513**	.419**	.403**	.468**	.518**	.307**
Not getting into trouble if discovered using false age proof	.240**	.242**	.272**	.254**	.466**	.378**	.426**	.264**	.471**	.510**	.251**	.448**	.446**	.507**
Not having to show age proof often	.335**	.208**	.187*	.299**	.466**	.400**	.369**	.369**	.573**	.402**	.433**	.417**	.507**	.470**
Previously succeeded in drinking	.382**	.345**	.420**	.544**	.593**	.560**	.473**	.329**	.562**	.560**	.291**	.448**	.495**	.389**
High chance of succeeding in obtaining alcohol	.092	.170*	.139	.262**	.500**	.188*	.240**	.420**	.440**	.307**	.460**	.234**	.464**	.207**
Staff not always asking for age proof when ordering/paying	.289**	.237**	.222**	.335**	.491**	.440**	.365**	.415**	.513**	.516**	.376**	.377**	.474**	.383**
Not getting into trouble stealing alcohol	.378**	.375**	.496**	.414**	.222**	.474**	.514**	029	.301**	.534**	.144	.489**	.181*	.351**
Previously succeeded in ordering/paying alcohol	.311**	.357**	.309**	.532**	.660**	.514**	.413**	.387**	.646**	.566**	.351**	.467**	.482**	.455**
Able to use age proof from another	.266**	.279**	.315**	.464**	.498**	.461**	.453**	.302**	.566**	.497**	.244**	.438**	.424**	.426**
High chance of being allowed into nightspot although too young	.257**	.180*	.171*	.151	.416**	.339**	.336**	.444**	.349**	.318**	.546**	.341**	.477**	.332**
According to law not allowed alcohol	.376**	.428**	.407**	.418**	.310**	.396**	.368**	.087	.245**	.333**	.274**	.329**	.146	.342**

Note. A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed (n=167).

# APPENDIX G: CORRELATION MATRIX ECONOMIC AVAILABILITY AND PHYSICAL AVAILABILITY ON-PREMISE

## Table 8

Correlations between Economic Availability Items and Physical Availability Items On-Premise

Variables	Alcohol price reduced	Alcohol cheap	Have enough money left for other items	Alcohol on special offer	Alcohol price fits budget
Lots of nightspots in area	.521**	.606**	.467**	.441**	.359**
Nightspot is nearby	.602**	.521**	.462**	.466**	.412**
Long opening hours	.473**	.526**	.404**	.370**	.359**
Many kinds of alcohol to choose from	.493**	.550**	.342**	.518**	.390**
Besides alcohol other products available	.433**	.436**	.443**	.291**	.247**
Also spirits available	.544**	.496**	.325**	.401**	.332**
Alcohol of high quality	.479**	.512**	.309**	.337**	.276**
Pleasant atmosphere	.200**	.446**	.488**	.281**	.457**
Nightspot is large	.489**	.362**	.233**	.387**	.266**
Nightspot looks nice	.390**	.477**	.429**	.359**	.439**
Pleasant to be at	.303**	.425**	.474**	.197*	.390**
Quick ordering and checkout	.434**	.474**	.470**	.396**	.461**
Alcohol of well-known brand	.373**	.354**	.326**	.349**	.364**

Note. A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed (n=167).

# APPENDIX H: CORRELATION MATRIX LEGAL AVAILABILITY AND ECONOMIC AVAILABILITY ON-PREMISE

## Table 9

Correlations between Legal Availability Items and Economic Availability Items On-Premise

Variables	Alcohol price reduced	Alcohol cheap	Have enough money left for other items	Alcohol on special offer	Alcohol price fits budget
Able to use false ID Age control at entrance not too strict	.311** .341**	.359** .463**	.277** .427**	.366** .386**	.341** .510**
Easy to steal alcohol	.259**	.133	.018	.313**	.180*
Not getting into trouble drinking as minor	.546**	.529**	.441**	.501**	.434**
Not getting into trouble ordering/paying as minor	.386**	.443**	.523**	.422**	.549**
Not getting caught by police in possession of alcohol	.395**	.395**	.481**	.441**	.419**
Not getting into trouble using false ID	.435**	.395**	.310**	.398**	.384**
Not having to show age proof often	.418**	.502**	.465**	.378**	.439**
Previously succeeded in drinking alcohol	.575**	.542**	.402**	.546**	.413**
High chance of succeeding in obtaining alcohol	.261**	.352**	.360**	.333**	.490**
Staff not always asking for age proof when ordering/paying	.477**	.473**	.445**	.469**	.455**
Not getting into trouble stealing alcohol	.347**	.307**	.109	.343**	.150
Previously succeeded in ordering/paying alcohol	.485**	.548**	.482**	.523**	.500**
Able to use age proof from another	.446**	.415**	.369**	.507**	.312**
High chance of being allowed into nightspot although too young	.349**	.453**	.422**	.303**	.578**
According to law not allowed alcohol	.186*	.250**	.224**	.167*	.201**

Note. A Spearman's rank-order correlation analysis was performed (n=167).

Table 11:

Highest rated Availability Items for both Premises

Items		Availability domain	Μ
Off-pren	nise		
	Quick checkout	Physical	3.66
	Besides alcohol other products available	Physical	3.62
	Store is nearby	Physical	3.56
	Have enough money left for other items	Economic	3.54
	Parents/guardians allow me to drink	Social	3.47
	Alcohol price fits budget	Economic	3.42
	Alcohol price reduced	Economic	3.37
	Pleasant to shop	Physical	3.35
	Alcohol cheap	Economic	3.35
	Also spirits available	Physical	3.34
On-pren	nise		
	Pleasant atmosphere	Physical	3.84
	Pleasant to be at	Physical	3.63
	Besides alcohol other products available	Physical	3.58
	Long opening hours	Physical	3.55
	Quick ordering and checkout	Physical	3.48
	Nightspot looks nice	Physical	3.45
	Have enough money left for other items	Economic	3.41
	Nightspot is large	Physical	3.37
	Nightspot is nearby	Physical	3.35
	Also spirits available	Physical	3.28
	Alcohol price fits budget	Economic	3.28

Note. Top rated availability items sorted by mean score (M). Off-premise n=203. On-Premise n=167.

**APPENDIX J: SURVEY** 



# ENQUÊTE JONGEREN & ALCOHOL

Jamie van der Ziel Afstudeeronderzoek Communicatiewetenschap

ONDER BEGELEIDING VAN: DR. J. VAN HOOF & DR. J.F. GOSSELT

UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

Beste tiener,

Bedankt voor je deelname aan dit onderzoek over jongeren en alcohol. Je krijgt 2 situaties te lezen waarover je een aantal vragen krijgt. Het maakt hierbij niet uit of je zelf ooit wel of geen alcohol gedronken hebt. Probeer je in te leven in de situaties en beantwoord de vragen op je gevoel. Er zijn geen goede of foute antwoorden. Op het eind volgt een aantal vragen over jouw ervaring met alcohol en die van anderen in je omgeving.

Om je antwoorden voor het onderzoek te kunnen gebruiken, is het belangrijk dat je de vragenlijst volledig invult en afrondt. De enquête is in 15 minuten af te ronden.

De gegevens en de resultaten van het onderzoek worden anoniem en vertrouwelijk verwerkt. Mocht je je niet prettig voelen bij welke vraag dan ook, dan heb je altijd het recht om je deelname te beëindigen. Als je wilt, kun je op het eind je e-mailadres achterlaten om op de hoogte te worden gehouden van de resultaten van het onderzoek. De enquête is bedoeld voor jongeren van 14,15,16 en 17 jaar oud.

Bedankt voor je hulp en succes!

Jamie van der Ziel student Communicatiewetenschap aan de Universiteit Twente (jamievanderziel@live.nl) Wat is je geslacht?

🔿 Man

○ Vrouw

# Wat is je leeftijd?

- 0 14
- 0 15
- 0 16
- 0 17
- Anders, namelijk:

# Welk soort onderwijs volg je op dit moment?

- Kopklas
- O Praktijkonderwijs
- VMBO Basisberoepsgerichte Leerweg (BL)
- VMBO Kaderberoepsgerichte Leerweg (KB)
- VMBO Gemengde Leerweg (GL)
- VMBO Theoretische Leerweg (TL)
- Havo
- Atheneum
- Gymnasium
- O MBO niveau 1
- MBO niveau 2
- MBO niveau 3
- MBO niveau 4
- HBO
- ⊖ wo
- Anders, namelijk:

Stel je voor: je hebt aankomende zaterdag afgesproken bij een vriend(in) thuis, voor een gezellige avond samen met nog wat andere vrienden. Jullie hebben afgesproken dat iedereen wat alcohol meeneemt, dus jij ook. Je besluit om hiervoor naar de winkel te gaan. Hieronder zie je verschillende punten, die allemaal te maken hebben met alcohol en winkels. Geef aan hoe belangrijk deze punten voor jou zijn, wanneer je de winkel kiest om aan alcohol te komen voor de gezellige avond.

	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat er veel winkels in mijn omgeving zijn waar alcohol verkrijgbaar is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de alcohol in de winkel goedkoop is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er veel soorten alcohol zijn om uit te kiezen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de winkel een prettige sfeer heeft:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat de winkel dichtbij is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er behalve alcohol ook andere producten te krijgen zijn:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er alcohol te krijgen is van een hoge kwaliteit:	0	0	0	0	$^{\circ}$
Dat de winkel groot is:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat de winkel prettig is om in te winkelen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik er snel kan afrekenen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er naast bier en wijn ook sterke drank te krijgen is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er korting is op de alcohol:	0	0	0	0	$^{\circ}$
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat ik er een onbekende kan vragen om de alcohol voor mij te kopen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik na het kopen van de alcohol nog genoeg geld over heb voor andere dingen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de prijs van alcohol in mijn budget past:	0	0	0	0	$\odot$
Dat er weinig andere klanten zijn:	0	0	0	0	$\circ$
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat mijn vrienden en ik naar dezelfde winkel gaan om alcohol te krijgen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er weinig personeel is:	0	0	0	$\circ$	$\odot$
Dat de winkel er mooi uitziet:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat er een vriend of vriendin van me achter de kassa zit:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er geen ouders/verzorgers van me werken:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de winkel ruime openingstijden heeft:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er geen bekende(n) van mijn ouders/verzorgers werken:	0	0	0	0	0

	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat ik er stiekem een vervalste id kaart kan gebruiken:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er alcohol in de aanbieding is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er veel andere klanten zijn:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik volgens de wet geen alcohol mag drinken, kopen of bij me hebben:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat ik er een bekende kan vragen om de alcohol voor mij te kopen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er een oudere vriend of vriendin met me meegaat om de alcohol voor mij te kopen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de kassamedewerker niet altijd naar een id bewijs vraagt als ik alcohol probeer af te rekenen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat in de winkel makkelijk alcohol te stelen is:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ik er alcohol probeer te kopen, omdat ik minderjarig ben:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ik er alcohol probeer te stelen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat bij de winkel de politie me niet betrapt op het bij me hebben van alcohol:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat het me er al eerder gelukt is alcohol mee te krijgen:	0	0	0	0	$\odot$
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik een vervalst id bewijs gebruik:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er een familielid van me meegaat om de alcohol voor mij te kopen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat ik er stiekem het id bewijs van een ander kan gebruiken:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik van mijn ouders/verzorgers alcohol mag drinken:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er veel personeel is:	0	0	0	0	0

Stel je voor: het is zaterdagavond en je zit bij de vriend(in) thuis met nog wat andere vrienden. Het is erg gezellig, maar het is bijna middernacht en jullie vinden het tijd om ergens anders naartoe te gaan. Jullie besluiten met zijn allen op stap te gaan om nog wat alcohol te drinken in een uitgaansgelegenheid (kroeg, café of discotheek). Hieronder zie je verschillende punten die gaan over alcohol en uitgaansgelegenheden. Geef aan hoe belangrijk deze punten voor jou zijn, bij het kiezen van de uitgaansgelegenheid waar jullie heen gaan en gaan drinken.

	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijik	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat er veel uitgaansgelegenheden in mijn omgeving zijn waar alcohol verkrijgbaar is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de uitgaansgelegenheid ruime openingstijden heeft:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er behalve alcohol ook andere producten te krijgen zijn:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er alcohol te krijgen is van een hoge kwaliteit:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de uitgaansgelegenheid een prettige sfeer heeft:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de uitgaansgelegenheid groot is:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijik	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat ik er snel kan bestellen en afrekenen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er korting is op alcohol:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik na het kopen van de alcohol nog genoeg geld over heb voor andere dingen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat mijn vrienden en ik naar dezelfde uitgaansgelegenheid gaan om alcohol te krijgen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de uitgaansgelegenheid dichtbij is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er geen bekende(n) van mijn ouders/verzorgers werken:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijik	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat de uitgaansgelegenheid er mooi uitziet:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er naast bier en wijn ook sterke drank te krijgen is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik er een bekende kan vragen om de alcohol voor mij te bestellen en af te rekenen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er alcohol in de aanbieding is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er weinig personeel is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de prijs van alcohol er in mijn budget past:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijik	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat er veel andere klanten zijn:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de alcohol in de uitgaansgelegenheid goedkoop is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat mijn minderjarige vrienden er al eens eerder alcohol hebben kunnen krijgen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er geen ouders/verzorgers van me werken:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de uitgaansgelegenheid prettig is om in te zijn:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er veel soorten alcohol zijn om uit te kiezen:	0	0	0	0	0

	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijik	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat er weinig andere klanten zijn:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er een oudere vriend of vriendin met me meegaat om de alcohol voor mij te bestellen en af te rekenen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ik er alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen, omdat ik minderjarig ben:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er veel personeel is:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik er een onbekende kan vragen om de alcohol voor mij te bestellen en af te rekenen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er een familielid met me meegaat om de alcohol voor mij te bestellen en af te rekenen:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijik	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ik er alcohol probeer te stelen:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik van mijn ouders/verzorgers alcohol mag drinken:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik er stiekem een vervalst id bewijs (id kaart, polsbandje, stempel, etc.) kan gebruiken:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat er een vriend of vriendin van me achter de bar staat:	0	0	0	0	0
Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik een vervalst id bewijs gebruik (id kaart, polsbandje, stempel, etc.):	0	0	0	0	0
Dat de controle op leeftijd bij de ingang niet te streng is:	0	0	0	0	0
	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijik	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk:	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijik	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk: Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is:	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijik	belangrijk	erg belangrijk
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk: Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is: Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen:	erg onbelangrijk O	onbelangrijk O O	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk O	belangrijk O O	erg belangrijk O
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk: Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is: Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen: Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik als minderjarige alcohol drink:	erg onbelangrijk O	onbelangrijk O O O	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk O	belangrijk O O O	erg belangrijk O O O
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk: Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is: Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen: Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik als minderjarige alcohol drink: Dat bij de uitgaansgelegenheid de politie me niet betrapt op het bij me hebben van alcohol:	erg onbelangrijk O O O	onbelangrijk O O O O	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk O O O O O	belangrijk O O O O	erg belangrijk O O O O
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk:         Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is:         Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen:         Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik als minderjarige alcohol drink:         Dat bij de uitgaansgelegenheid de politie me niet betrapt op het bij me hebben van alcohol:         Dat ik niet telkens opnieuw moet laten zien hoe oud ik ben als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:	erg onbelangrijk O O O O O	onbelangrijk O O O O O O	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	belangrijk O O O O O O O	erg belangrijk O O O O O
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk: Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is: Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen: Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik als minderjarige alcohol drink: Dat bij de uitgaansgelegenheid de politie me niet betrapt op het bij me hebben van alcohol: Dat ik niet telkens opnieuw moet laten zien hoe oud ik ben als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:	erg onbelangrijk O O O O erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O O	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk	belangrijk	erg belangrijk O O O O O O O O O
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk: Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is: Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen: Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik als minderjarige alcohol drink: Dat bij de uitgaansgelegenheid de politie me niet betrapt op het bij me hebben van alcohol: Dat ik niet telkens opnieuw moet laten zien hoe oud ik ben als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:	erg onbelangrijk O O O O erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O O	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk / 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	belangrijk O O O O D belangrijk O	erg belangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O O
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk:         Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is:         Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen:         Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik als minderjarige alcohol drink:         Dat bij de uitgaansgelegenheid de politie me niet betrapt op het bij me hebben van alcohol:         Dat ik niet telkens opnieuw moet laten zien hoe oud ik ben als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat het barpersoneel er niet altijd naar een id bewijs (id kaart, polsbandje, stempel etc.) vraagt als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat het me al eens eerder gelukt is er alcohol te drinken:	erg onbelangrijk O O O O O erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk O O O O O onbelangrijk O	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk / 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	belangrijk O O O O D belangrijk	erg belangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk:         Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is:         Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen:         Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik als minderjarige alcohol drink:         Dat bij de uitgaansgelegenheid de politie me niet betrapt op het bij me hebben van alcohol:         Dat ik niet telkens opnieuw moet laten zien hoe oud ik ben als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat het barpersoneel er niet altijd naar een id bewijs (id kaart, polsbandje, stempel etc.) vraagt als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat het me al eens eerder gelukt is er alcohol te drinken:         Dat het me er al eens eerder gelukt is alcohol te bestellen en af te rekenen:	erg onbelangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O	onbelangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O O	onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk / 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	belangrijk	erg belangrijk 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk:         Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is:         Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen:         Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik als minderjarige alcohol drink:         Dat bij de uitgaansgelegenheid de politie me niet betrapt op het bij me hebben van alcohol:         Dat ik niet telkens opnieuw moet laten zien hoe oud ik ben als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat het barpersoneel er niet altijd naar een id bewijs (id kaart, polsbandje, stempel etc.) vraagt als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat het me al eens eerder gelukt is er alcohol te drinken:         Dat het me er al eens eerder gelukt is alcohol te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat ke volgens de wet geen alcohol mag kopen, drinken of bij me hebben:	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk / 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	belangrijk O O O O O D belangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O O	erg belangrijk O O O O O O D D D D D D D D D D D D D
Dat er alcohol is van een bekend merk:         Dat in de uitgaansgelegenheid makkelijk alcohol te stelen is:         Dat de kans groot is dat het me lukt om er aan alcohol te komen:         Dat ik er geen problemen krijg als ze ontdekken dat ik als minderjarige alcohol drink:         Dat bij de uitgaansgelegenheid de politie me niet betrapt op het bij me hebben van alcohol:         Dat ik niet telkens opnieuw moet laten zien hoe oud ik ben als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat het barpersoneel er niet altijd naar een id bewijs (id kaart, polsbandje, stempel etc.) vraagt als ik alcohol probeer te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat het me al eens eerder gelukt is er alcohol te drinken:         Dat het me er al eens eerder gelukt is alcohol te bestellen en af te rekenen:         Dat ik volgens de wet geen alcohol mag kopen, drinken of bij me hebben:         Dat ik er stiekem het id bewijs (id kaart, polsbandje, stempel, etc.) van een ander kan gebruiken:	erg onbelangrijk	onbelangrijk () () () () () () () () () ()	niet onbelangrijk / niet belangrijk / 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	belangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O O	erg belangrijk O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O

6. Heb je weleens alcohol gedronken (niet zomaar een slokje om te proeven, maar bijvoorbeeld een heel glas wijn of bier, een mixdrankje of shotje)?

OJa (ga gewoon verder bij vraag 7)

ONee (sla vraag 7 t/m 10 over en ga verder bij vraag 11)

7. Op hoeveel doordeweekse dagen (maandag t/m donderdag) drink je meestal alcohol?

- 00
- **O**1
- **O**2
- **O**3
- **O**4

8. Hoeveel glazen alcohol drink je meestal op een doordeweekse dag (maandag t/m donderdag)?

00	<b>Q</b> 5
<b>O</b> 1	<b>O</b> 6
<b>Q</b> 2	<b>O</b> 7
<b>O</b> 3	08
<b>Q</b> 4	<b>Q</b> 9
	<b>Q</b> 10 of meer

9. Op hoeveel weekenddagen (vrijdag t/m zondag) drink je meestal alcohol?

- **O**1
- **O**2
- **O**3

10. Hoeveel glazen alcohol drink je meestal op een weekenddag (vrijdag t/m zondag)?

00	<b>O</b> 5
<b>O</b> 1	<b>O</b> 6
<b>O</b> 2	<b>O</b> 7
<b>O</b> 3	08

- O4 O9
  - $\mathbf{O}$ 10 of meer

- 11. Heb je weleens alcohol verkregen vanuit een winkel?
- O Ja (ga gewoon verder bij vraag 12)
- Nee (sla vraag 12 /m 14 over en ga verder bij vraag 15)
- 12. Hoe vaak heb je de laatste 7 dagen alcohol verkregen vanuit een winkel?
- O 0 keer
- **O** 1-2 keer
- **O** 3-4 keer
- **O** 5-6 keer
- **O** 7-8 keer
- 9-10 keer
- 11-20 keer
- 21-30 keer
- 31-40 keer
- O 41 keer of vaker

# 13. Hoe vaak heb je de laatste 30 dagen alcohol verkregen vanuit een winkel?

- 0 keer
- 1-2 keer
- **O** 3-4 keer
- **O** 5-6 keer
- **O** 7-8 keer
- 9-10 keer
- 11-20 keer
- 21-30 keer
- 31-40 keer
- O 41 keer of vaker

14. Hoe vaak heb je het afgelopen jaar alcohol verkregen vanuit een winkel?

- 0 keer
- **O** 1-2 keer
- **O** 3-4 keer
- **O** 5-6 keer
- **O** 7-8 keer
- 9-10 keer
- 11-20 keer
- 21-30 keer
- O 31-40 keer
- O 41 keer of vaker

- 15. Heb je weleens alcohol verkregen in een uitgaansgelegenheid? (kroeg, café, discotheek, etc.)?
- O Ja (ga gewoon verder bij vraag 16)
- Nee (sla vraag 16 t/m 18 en ga door bij vraag 19)

16. Hoe vaak heb je de laatste 7 dagen alcohol verkregen in een uitgaansgelegenheid?

- 0 keer
- O 1-2 keer
- **O** 3-4 keer
- **O** 5-6 keer
- 7-8 keer
- 9-10 keer
- **O** 11-20 keer
- 21-30 keer
- 31-40 keer
- O 41 keer of vaker

17. Hoe vaak heb je de laatste 30 dagen alcohol verkregen in een uitgaansgelegenheid?

- 0 keer
- O 1-2 keer
- 3-4 keer
- **O** 5-6 keer
- 7-8 keer
- 9-10 keer
- 11-20 keer
- O 21-30 keer
- 31-40 keer
- **O** 41 keer of vaker

18. Hoe vaak heb je het afgelopen jaar alcohol verkregen in een uitgaansgelegenheid?

- 0 keer
- **O** 1-2 keer
- 3-4 keer
- **O** 5-6 keer
- 7-8 keer
- **O** 9-10 keer
- 11-20 keer
- 21-30 keer
- O 31-40 keer
- O 41 keer of vaker
| 19. | Stel | e voor: | je wilt aan | alcohol kome | n. Op welke | manier dan | ook. | Hoe makkelij | k of moeilij | k is | dat vooi | r jou? |
|-----|------|---------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|------|--------------|--------------|------|----------|--------|
|-----|------|---------|-------------|--------------|-------------|------------|------|--------------|--------------|------|----------|--------|

		niet makkelijk /		
erg makkelijk	makkelijk	niet moeilijk	moeilijk	erg moeilijk
0	0	0	0	0

20. Stel je voor: je gaat naar de winkel en je wilt aan alcohol komen. Hoe makkelijk of moeilijk is dat voor jou?

		niet makkelijk /		
 erg makkelijk	makkelijk	niet moeilijk	moeilijk	erg moeilijk
0	0	0	0	0

21. Stel je voor: je wilt thuis aan alcohol komen. Hoe makkelijk of moeilijk is dat voor jou?

		niet makkelijk /		
erg makkelijk	makkelijk	niet moeilijk	moeilijk	erg moeilijk
0	0	0	0	0

22. Stel je voor: je gaat naar een uitgaansgelegenheid en je wilt aan alcohol komen. Hoe makkelijk of moeilijk is dat voor jou?

		niet makkelijk /		
erg makkelijk	makkelijk	niet moeilijk	moeilijk	erg moeilijk
0	0	0	0	0

## 23. Hoeveel van je vrienden drinken alcohol?

		niet weinig /		
erg weinig	weinig	niet veel	veel	erg veel
0	0	0	0	0

24. Hoeveel van je familieleden (ouders/verzorgers + broers en/of zussen) drinken alcohol?

erg weinig	weinig	niet weinig / niet veel	veel	erg veel
0	0	0	0	0

25. Mag je van je ouders/verzorgers alcohol drinken?

() Ja

O Nee

26. Mag je van je ouders/verzorgers alcohol kopen?

O Ja

O Nee

27. Mag je van je ouders/verzorgers thuis alcohol pakken?

- O Ja
- O Nee

Vul de vragen 28 en 29 alleen in als je weleens alcohol gedronken hebt. Ga anders direct door naar vraag 30 onderaan deze pagina.

28. Waar kom jij meestal aan alcohol? (slechts 1 antwoord mogelijk)

0	cafe
0	discotheek
0	festival
0	internet
0	keet/hok/schuur/caravan
0	kroeg
0	nachtwinkel
0	restaurant
0	school
0	slijterij
0	snackbar
0	(sport)kantine
0	straat
0	supermarkt
0	thuis
0	vrienden thuis
0	familie thuis
0	anders, namelijk:

29. Via wie kom jij meestal aan alcohol? (slechts 1 antwoord mogelijk)

- ) broer/zus
- 🔿 mijzelf
- O neef/nicht
- O onbekenden
- O ouders/verzorgers
- O oom/tante
- () vrienden
- O anders, namelijk:
- 30. Wat is je maandelijkse inkomen ongeveer (denk bijvoorbeeld aan bijbaan, vakantiewerk, kleedgeld en zakgeld)?

31. Ongeveer hoeveel euro geef je maandelijks uit aan alcohol?

32. Noem de 4 cijfers van je postcode:

(Met deze vraag wordt gekeken waar iedereen ongeveer vandaan komt. Je blijft anoniem.)

Je bent bijna klaar met de enquête. Wil je nog iets kwijt wat misschien belangrijk zou kunnen zijn? Dat kan hieronder.

Wil je op de hoogte blijven van de resultaten van mijn onderzoek? Vul dan hieronder je e-mailadres in.

Je bent nu klaar met de enquête.

Let op: als je jonger bent dan 18 jaar, dan is alcohol voor jou verboden. Alcohol is extra schadelijk voor je gezondheid op jonge leeftijd. Het kan sneller leiden tot alcoholverslaving, alcoholvergiftiging en schade aan de hersenen en organen. Wees je dan ook bewust van de nadelige gevolgen.

Nogmaals, bedankt voor je deelname!

Met vriendelijke groeten,

Jamie van der Ziel Masterstudent Communicatiewetenschap Universiteit Twente j.m.vanderziel@student.utwente.nl

> Onder begeleiding van: Dr. J. van Hoof & Dr. J.F. Gosselt Onderzoekers Universiteit Twente