



This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTION OF STUDENTS ATTENDING A FORCED-REFERRAL ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTS ON SUBSEQUENT BEHAVIOR

presented by

Paul Joseph Zelenski

has been accepted towards fulfillment of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in <u>Educational</u> Administration

Major professor

Date 12-12-95



PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record. TO AVOID FINES return on or before date due.

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE
SEP 1-9 2006	3	

MSU is An Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity Institution characteristics.pm3-p.1

A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTION OF STUDENTS ATTENDING A FORCED-REFERRAL ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTS ON SUBSEQUENT BEHAVIOR

Ву

Paul Joseph Zelenski

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

The Department of Educational Administration

1995

ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF THE PERCEPTION OF STUDENTS ATTENDING A FORCED-REFERRAL ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM AND ITS EFFECTS ON SUBSEQUENT BEHAVIOR

By

Paul Joseph Zelenski

Many colleges and universities have attempted to address the issue of alcohol misuse and abuse by developing comprehensive programs that typically contain the following components: policy enforcement, education and prevention, referral and treatment, and evaluation and research.

Programmatic efforts to address alcohol use have received mixed reviews in terms of success. Most professionals agree that not enough evaluation has been done to conclusively determine what works.

The purpose of this study was to determine if a particular aspect of the policy enforcement component - the forced-referral alcohol education program, contributed to changing the behavior of its participants. The following questions were developed to determine if a forced-referral program at a large public institution changed subsequent behavior: (1) Does a forced-referral alcohol education program effect drinking behavior as it relates to not getting caught again violating university regulations?

(2) Are there other factors that contributed to a student not entering the discipline system again after attending a forced-referral program? (3) Did alcohol use patterns change as a result of attending the forced-referral alcohol education program? (4) If the forced-referral program contributed to a student not reentering the judicial system, or changing their rate of alcohol consumption, what was it about the program that changed the student's behavior?

This perception study involved 52 participants who took part in telephone interviews. Participants attended a forced-referral program during the 1992-1993 academic year. Responses from the interviews where categorized to provide descriptive data to allow for conclusions to be made.

It was found that very few participants in the study (n=4) believed the experience contributed to a reduction in alcohol consumption, which in turn led to not reentering the discipline system. Twenty-two participants reported that the program was reason for not getting caught violating a university regulation. After a two-year period, 13 students believed the program had a lasting effect on their alcohol consumption. There were no overriding aspects of the forced-referral program that contributed to a positive behavior change.

This dissertation is dedicated to my wonderful wife and two daughters who have provided consistent and unconditional support and love during my graduate program. They are my inspiration.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am forever indebted to the members of my program committee, Dr. Will Baker, Dr. Marvin Grandstaff, and Dr. Samuel Moore who have provided support and guidance. A very special and sincere thank you to my major professor, Dr. Louis Hekhuis, who has been patient, supportive, and insightful throughout the duration of my graduate program and for more than twelve years. I would also like to acknowledge my professional colleagues who have endured this journey with me especially, Ms. Marie Hansen, Dr. Patricia Enos, Mr. K. Pete Marvin, and Dr. Phil Gardner.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST	OF	TABLESix
CHAP'	rer	
	ı.	INTRODUCTION1
		Statement of the Problem2
		Purpose of the Study5
		Research Questions9
		Definition of Terms10
		Delimitations11
		Order of Presentation11
	II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE
		Alcohol Use, Misuse, and Abuse
		On College Campuses14
		Frequency of Alcohol Use
		by College Students15
		Characteristics of College Students
		Who Drink Excessively18
		Influence of Peers on Student Alcohol Use20
		College and University Responses
		to Alcohol Use22
		Policy/Enforcement23
		Education/Prevention25
		Treatment/Referral27
		Research/Evaluation28

	The Effectiveness of Alcohol Education
	Programs29
	The Purpose of Student Discipline
	and Sanctions38
	The Effectiveness of Mandatory Alcohol
	Education Programs41
	Summary of the Review of the Literature44
III.	METHODS46
	Introduction46
	Research Design46
	Methodological Assumption49
	Materials
	Data Collection51
	Data Analysis52
	Limitations55
IV.	RESULTS57
	Introduction57
	Research Question 158
	Research Question 262
	Research Question 367
	Research Question 473
v.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR
	FURTHER RESEARCH77
	Introduction
	Summary of the Purpose
	Summary of the Methodology79
	Summary of the Results and Related Conclusions80

	Research Question 180
	Research Question 282
	Research Question 383
	Research Question 485
	Overall Conclusions of the Study88
	Implications for Further Study90
	Final Reflections91
APPENDICE	es es
A.	Letter to the Judicial Affairs Office at
	Michigan State University93
в.	Narrative and Code Number Sheet Used By
	Judicial Affairs Staff Member94
c.	Interview Instrument and Response Sheet95
D.	Letter to the Judicial Affairs Office
	Requesting Grad Point Average Data99
E.	Letter from the University Committee on
	Research Involving Human Subjects100
LIST OF R	EFERENCES

LIST OF TABLES

Table	
1.	Percentage of Students Reporting Number of
	Drinks Consumed Per Week17
2.	Frequency of Binge Drinking Episodes by
	College Students Over a Two-Week Period17
3.	Summary of Research of Voluntary Alcohol
	Education Programs34
4.	Frequency of Violations that Caused the
	Respondents to be Required to Attend
	the Program59
5.	Frequency of Responses Listing the Ways the
	AES Was a Reason for Not Getting Caught
	Violating Another University Regulation61
6.	Percentages for Reasons Given for Not Getting
	Caught Violating a Another University
	Regulation After Attending the AES63
7.	Contingency Table of Grade Point Averages and
	Effect of the AES65
8.	Percentage and Frequency of the Number of
	Drinks Per Week at the Time of the

9.	Percentage and Frequency of the Reasons Given as
	an Explanation of Why Alcohol Consumption Has
	Changed69
10.	Contingency Table of the Reasons Given for a
	Change In Alcohol Consumption Based Upon
	Whether Alcohol Consumption Went Up, Down,
	or Stayed the Same71
11.	Frequency Responses of Ways the AES Effected
	Rate of Consumption72
12.	Frequency Responses Identifying the Aspects of
	the AES that Contributes to a Change in
	Rate of Consumption74

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The majority of colleges and universities in the United States have alcohol and other drug education programs designed to reduce the incidence of misuse and abuse (Anderson and Gadeleto, 1985). Even with all of these programmatic efforts to reduce alcohol consumption, students still report consuming, on average, five drinks per week (Presley, Meilman, and Lyerla, 1993). Consequence to the individual and the campus environment from excessive use of alcohol and other drugs continues to plague institutions of higher education. For example, more than 50% of the 52,000 students participating in a national alcohol and other drug survey, reported experiencing nausea or vomiting, over the past year, as a result of excessive use. More than 28% reported a memory loss in the past year as a result alcohol or other drug use. Almost 40% of the respondents indicated that they did something they later regretted as a result of alcohol or other drug use. Alarmingly, more than 35%

stated that within the past year, they had driven a car while under the influence of alcohol (Presley et al., 1993). Are campus alcohol and other drug education efforts influencing the decrease of any of the behaviors associated with alcohol use?

The researcher's purpose of this perception study was to attempt to examine the effectiveness of a particular aspect of a comprehensive alcohol education program, the forced-referral alcohol education program. This type of program is being implemented by an increasing number of colleges and universities. The researcher sought to determine if the forced-referral program is perceived, by the participants, being effective at changing subsequent student behavior.

Statement of the Problem

Consumption of alcohol by college and university students is not a new phenomenon. Some historians have been able to trace alcohol use by college students back to Greco-Roman history when students would interact with teachers to discuss the great issues of the day (Goodale, 1986). While rates of consumption are not available from those ancient times, quantitative alcohol use data from the twentieth century, most notably the later part of the century, are well reported. Blane and Hewitt (1977) compiled alcohol use rates over three periods during the 1960's and 1970's. They

found from a review of the research literature that pre1966, 78% of male students reported alcohol use, while 71%
of female students reported alcohol use. From the 1966 to
1970 period 92% of the male students reported alcohol use,
while 90% of the female students reported use. Finally from
1971 to 1975, 89% of the males reported alcohol use, and 84%
of the females reported use of alcohol.

Most recent findings from a national survey of more than 52,000 current college students indicates that 85% percent of men report alcohol use one or more times in the past year, while 85.3% of women report alcohol use at least once in the past year (Presley, et al., 1993). It is important to note that the cited consumption rates all illustrate the number of students who have consumed at least one alcoholic drink within an established period of time (one year). An accurate understanding of the extent of the alcohol use problem of college students requires an investigation of the degree to which alcohol is currently misused or abused on college campuses.

Presley, Meilman, and Lyerla's (1993) data reveals an alarming number of college and university students are misusing and abusing alcohol. One in ten students from four-year institutions consume sixteen or more drinks per week. More than one third of the students reported having driven under the influence of alcohol in the past year. A large number of students (41.8 %) report incidents of binge drinking. Binge drinking is defined as consumption of five

or more drinks in one sitting within the past two weeks.

The by-products of the previously identified rates of consumption result in negative consequences that affect the individual student and the college or university environment. Behaviors ranging from missed classes and academic difficulties to destruction of property; physical and verbal assault to serious injury and sometimes even death (Goodale, 1986; Presley et al., 1993).

Wilsnak and Wilsnak (1982) state that people are all too familiar with the degree to which young people are drinking. They ask an important question: What can colleges and universities do about drinking, and what should they do? A review of the literature would suggest that higher education institutions should provide a comprehensive, systematic, effective program to deal with alcohol-related problems on campus (Wilsnak and Wilsnak, 1982; Gonzalez, 1986; Upcraft and Eck, 1986) Additionally, the literature indicates that during the 1980s alcohol education programs on college campuses were increasing at a rapid rate to respond to the growing concern of alcohol use and abuse (Ingalls, 1982; Anderson and Gadeleto, 1985).

While programs to respond to drinking problems on campus were on the rise, researchers began to ask whether these programs were making any difference in the behavior of college students as it related to consumption and negative consequences. Gonzalez (1986), suggests that questions remain about the ability of alcohol education programs to

reduce the incidence of alcohol-related problems. Some studies indicate that programs designed to respond to excessive alcohol use on campuses have proven effective in increasing awareness and, to a lesser extent, in improving attitudes about alcohol use. However, these same programs have yet to indicate any positive behavioral change.

(Berkowitz, and Perkins, 1987). The question remains: what components, if any, of a comprehensive alcohol education program, effect the behaviors exhibited by students as a result of drinking?

Purpose of the Study

The Temperance Movement of the 1800s, prohibition in the 1920s and the early 1930s, national organizations such as the National Council on Alcoholism, and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism have all made attempts to the address the behaviors associated with our society's abuse of alcohol. On college and university campuses across the country, not much was done to deal effectively with the consequences of excessive alcohol use by students prior to 1960. However, even then a common response to student misuse or abuse of alcohol resulted in meeting with the dean who would impose some kind of disciplinary action (Fischer, 1987).

During the 1974-75 academic year, Hewitt (1977)

conducted a study to identify college and university responses to student alcohol use. He found that only 15% of the institutions reviewed had implemented any type of organized alcohol education program as an attempt to change behavior. As stated earlier, alcohol education programs did not begin to appear in significant numbers on campuses across the country until the 1980s (Ingalls, 1982: Anderson and Gadeleto, 1985). Even before the 1980s, efforts to change behavior of students misusing and abusing alcohol through alcohol education were called into question. Engs (1977) indicated that during the past 100 years there have been a wide variety of philosophies and approaches to address excessive drinking, however, most of the programs have done little to change the drinking habits of our nation. Many of the programs are thrust upon students without being thoroughly evaluated as to their effects in changing knowledge, attitude and behavior (Engs, 1977). Engs (1977) has been quick to point out that an increase in knowledge, through attendance at an alcohol education program, does not necessarily change behavior.

A November 1988 article in the <u>Chronicle of Higher</u>

<u>Education</u> suggests that professionals in higher education

trying to eliminate excessive use of alcohol, reported a

"tremendous desire to learn what works." In that article

Gerardo Gonzalez a professor of counseling psychology at the

University of Florida, and a recognized national leader in

alcohol education on college and university campuses,

believes that institutions of higher education are throwing away millions of dollars on well intentioned efforts and programs without knowing what works.

The findings of a review of the literature show a contradiction of whether aspects of alcohol education efforts by colleges and universities changes subsequent student behavior. Consistent in the literature is that further investigation and evaluation needs to occur to determine the effectiveness of alcohol and other drug education efforts.

Fulton and Spooner (1987) suggest that alcohol awareness education and prevention activities may be "extremely" effective over the long term if viewed in a cultural context. Our society has witnessed cultural changes in the form of new norms such as requiring alternative drinks at parties, and an increase in popularity of non-alcoholic beer. Our values have also changed to include more strict laws governing alcohol use and harsher penalties for violation of alcohol related laws and policies (Fulton and Spooner, 1987). Voluntary alcohol education programs have indicated that behavior may be effected. Chen, Dosch and Cychosz (1982) found that negative behaviors such as driving under the influence of alcohol and heavy drinking (more than fifteen drinks per week), decreased after attending a voluntary alcohol education program. Sadler and Scott (1993) found that after students attended a first offenders program at Florida State University,

recidivism rate dropped from 4.5% to 0.2%. The researchers were quick to point out that there could have been many factors that could be responsible for the drop in recidivism rates, and only suggested that one of them could have been the first offender program.

More researchers found that alcohol education efforts may affect knowledge and to a lesser degree attitude, but have no effect on subsequent behavior (Dennison, 1977; Kinder, et al, 1980; Portnoy, 1980; Gonzalez, 1982; Hanson, 1982; Ingalls, 1984; Baines, 1984; Kraft, 1988; Magner, 1988). Dennison (1977) states that research on alcohol education has not received sufficient attention to determine behavioral impact.

One of the difficulties in effectively evaluating college and university alcohol education efforts is that typically they are multifaceted, or comprehensive, and it is hard to determine what parts of a campus program, if any, contribute to any kind of behavior change. A comprehensive program reaches the entire college or university community. Often a comprehensive program embodies: assessment and research, policy and law enforcement, education, treatment and referral, promotion of non-alcohol activities, and curriculum infusion to name a few (Rapaport and Bryan, 1991).

The researcher in this dissertation concentrated on the policy enforcement aspect of a comprehensive program and a corresponding sanction of sending a student to a forced

referral alcohol education program. The forced-referral program was examined to determine what effect, if any, it has on a perceived positive behavior change. There were two overriding reasons for concentrating on the forced referral program as an approach to attaining positive behavior change. First, in a 1979 survey of 165 colleges and universities, it was found that between 20% and 60% of judiciary problems on campus were alcohol related (Anderson and Gadeleto, 1979). Second, Flynn and Brown (1991) found more and more campuses use mandatory or forced-referral programs. This special condition is often used as a result of a student entering into the campus judicial system because of getting caught violating an alcohol regulation, or violating a regulation while under the influence of alcohol. Evaluation of college-based mandatory alcohol education programs has been found to be virtually nonexistent (Flynn and Brown, 1991). In an effort to contribute to the existing research on forced-referral programs, the following questions were addressed.

Research Ouestions

Does a forced-referral alcohol education program effect drinking behavior as it relates to not getting caught again violating university regulations?

- 2. Are there other factors that contributed to a student not entering the discipline system again after attending a forced-referral program?
- 3. Did alcohol use patterns change as a result of attending the forced-referral alcohol education program?
- 4. If the forced-referral program contributed to a student not reentering the judicial system, or changing their rate of alcohol consumption, what was it about the program that changed the student's behavior?

Definition of Terms

- Abuse of Alcohol patterns of drinking which indicate a growing problem of substance use and a consistent pattern of negative consequences
- Alcoholic Drinks a drink is equal to 12 ounces of beer,
 which is equal to 4-5 ounces of wine,
 which is equal to a wine cooler, which
 is equal to one and one half ounces of
 80 proof liquor

Forced Referral - a program which requires mandatory

Alcohol Education attendance as a result of getting caught

Program violating a university regulation

Misuse of Alcohol - an isolated drinking incident which
resulted is a negative consequence for
the individual or persons surrounding
the individual

Delimitations

The focus of this study pertained only to students attending Michigan State University. The reader should not conclude that Michigan State University students are representative of students who attend other large public institutions.

Order of Presentation

Chapter I includes the identification of the problem, and the purpose of the investigation and corresponding delimitations. Chapter II provides a review of the pertinent literature to assist in identifying the important

elements of the study. Chapter III explains the research design and the methodology used to analyze data. Chapter IV provides the results of the analysis. Finally, Chapter V provides the summary and conclusions drawn from the investigation, and possible future implications.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The review of the literature includes four related areas of review: First, the issue of alcohol use on college campuses will be addressed including efforts that are made to address alcohol misuse and abuse on college campuses. Second, the effectiveness of alcohol education programs as it relates to changing student behavior. Third, the purpose of student discipline, which includes sanctions resulting from violating university regulations. Finally, and most specifically, alcohol education programs aimed at changing student behavior after having violated college or university regulations will be examined.

Alcohol Use, Misuse, and Abuse On College Campuses

Alcohol use in American society can be associated with both negative and positive aspects of a person's life. While alcohol can be a part of celebrations and victories, it is also associated with car crashes and destroyed families. Thomas Goodale (1986) writes that alcohol has been a source of both enjoyment and harm since the beginning of recorded history. It has been associated with ritual and tradition, and used to ease tension and generate social interaction. He goes on to explain that alcohol has also contributed significantly to destruction as a result of irresponsible use. On college campuses this dichotomy of enjoyment and harm also exists. For many students, drinking is viewed as a positive social facilitator that is a part of growing up while at college. Yet administrators and others are concerned about the visible results of irresponsible use such as vandalism and accidents (Goodale, 1986). Upcraft and Welty (1990) write that colleges and universities are increasingly paying the price for excessive use of alcohol. Academic difficulties, property damage, discipline problems, hazing, assaults, rape, and campus arrests are all outcomes resulting from excessive use of alcohol.

In 1987, Sherry and Stolberg conducted a review of pertinent literature to attempt to identify the variables

that contribute to college student abuse of alcohol; they found that there were four.

- 1. Family and peer influence.
- 2. Knowledge of the effects of alcohol.
- 3. Attitudes toward alcohol.
- 4. Expectations about the reinforcing qualities of alcohol use.

The most consistent and potent predictor of frequency of alcohol consumption is peer pressure. Behavioral consequences of alcohol use were found to be related to responsible attitudes toward alcohol, peer pressure, and knowledge of the effects of alcohol on the body (Sherry and Stolberg, 1987). Sherry and Stolberg, (1987) hypothesize that the presence of responsible attitudes toward alcohol use may be a buffer against the occurrence of negative attitudes. A review of the extent of college student use of alcohol follows.

Frequency of Alcohol Use by College Students

Alcohol is clearly the most widely used drug on college campuses (Presley, Meilman and Lyerla, 1993; Johnston, O'Malley, and Bachman, 1990). College students typically consume more alcohol than their non-college counterparts (Johnston et al., 1990). Estimates of the number of students who drink range from 75 to 85 percent (Hughes and Dodder, 1983; Presley, et al. 1993; Johnston, et al., 1990). Engs and Hanson (1985) found that in a survey of college students

from every state in the nation, 81.9% reported drinking at least once in the past year. These percentages include those students who may only consume a drink once or twice a year. A national study conducted by Cheryl Presley and associates, involving more than 58,000 students completing the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey, found that students report consuming an average of five drinks per week. Table 1 indicates the percentage of students reporting number of drinks consumed per week.

Typically, consequences from drinking results when students consume excessive amounts of alcohol. Frequency of use is positively associated with drinking problems (Werch, Gorman, and Marty, 1987). Binge drinking, defined as the consumption of five or more drinks in one sitting, is of major concern on college campuses. More than 41 percent of students report binge drinking within a two week period (Presley, et al.,1993). Table 2 identifies the frequency of drinking episodes over a two week period.

Presley et. al. (1993) findings indicate that more than 20% of the respondents to the survey consume fifteen or more drinks in a two week period. A student who binge drinks six times in a two week period will have consumed at least 30 drinks. Considering that the results of the survey are self reported, one might assume that actual numbers of frequencies of drinking may be larger. The negative consequences for students who consume dangerous amounts of alcohol are clear. Typically students with lower grade

Table 1¹

Percent of Students Reporting Number of Drinks Consumed Per

Week

Number of Drinks Per Week	Total (N=53,644)
None or one	52.2
2 to 5	22.0
6 to 9	7.0
10 to 15	10.2
16 to 20	3.2
21 or more	5.3

Table 2²

Frequency of Binge Drinking Episodes by College Students

Over a Two Week Period

Number of Episodes	Total (N=53,299)
None	58.2
One	13.7
Two	9.6
3 to 5	12.1
6 to 9	4.1
10 or more	2.3

¹Presley, C.A., Meilman, P. W., and Lyerla, R. <u>Alcohol</u> and <u>Drugs on American College Campuses: Use, Consequences, and Perceptions of the Campus Environment, 1, Southern Illinois University for the U.S. Department of Education, 1993.</u>

²Presley, C.A., Meilman, P. W., and Lyerla, R. <u>Alcohol</u> and <u>Drugs on American College Campuses: Use, Consequences, and Perceptions of the Campus Environment, 1, Southern Illinois University for the U.S. Department of Education, 1993.</u>

point averages (GPAs) consume more alcohol(Engs and Hansen, 1985). College students with GPAs of D or F drink three times as much as those who earn an A grade (National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence, 1993, Presley et.al., 1993). Brown (1989) found that students on academic probation drink more than students who are not on probation. Almost half of the college students who said they had been victims of crime admitted that had used drugs or alcohol before the crime occurred (NCAAD, 1993).

Characteristics of College Students Who Drink Excessively

Students at four-year institutions tend to consume more alcohol than their two-year institution counterparts. Students attending institutions with less than 2500 students tend to consume more alcohol (Presley et. al., 1993). Among binge drinkers, there is little difference between the percentage of men (14.0%) and women(14.2%) who binge drink infrequently (once in the last two weeks). However, the more frequent the episodes of binge drinking the more likely it is to be a male (Presley et. al., 1993; Kuh, 1992). Hanson and Engs (1986), in a comparison study of students from seventy-two colleges from two separate academic years (1982-83 and 1984-85) found that males, particularly white males experienced more problems than their female counterparts. Consistently, men experience more negative consequences as a result of excessive drinking than women. Wechsler and McFadden (1979), reported that of the men they

studied from colleges an universities in New England, 25% of the men stated that they had been in trouble with authorities after drinking. In the same study, 20% of the men indicated that they had been in a fight after drinking, and 43% shared that they had said or done something that they normally would not have done while sober.

Male and female college students also report different reasons for experiencing problems from drinking (Wright, 1983). When college freshmen, who indicated that they had a drinking problem, were asked why they believed they had a problem, males indicated that problems resulted from perceived parental anger and over permissiveness. Men also reported conflicts with and between parents, delinquent behavior, and feelings of being unproductive and tired as reasons for their drinking problem (Wright, 1983). On the other hand, female freshmen students believed reasons for their problem drinking are related to parental rejection, parental depression, poor mother-daughter relationships, and maternal drinking or drug abuse problems (Wright, 1983).

The relationship between academic performance and substance use was reported earlier showing that the amount a student drinks negatively influences grade point average. Interestingly, many students are not aware of this negative relationship. Researchers at the University of Iowa showed that only 7 percent of the students surveyed believed they had lower grades as a result of drinking (Eigen, 1991). There also may be a relationship between academic majors and

substance use. In a study of 113 undergraduate students, LeMay (1968) reported that students who choose business, technology, humanities, and social sciences as majors tend to consume more alcohol.

Eigen (1991) also reports that heavy drinking is most prevalent among white men in the 18 to 29 age category. Black males of the same age category have a lower incidence of problem drinking. Black females are more likely to drink less than their white counterparts. Hispanic males tend to have more alcohol related problems than their white or black counterparts. Among Native Americans, there are different drinking patterns between tribes, however alcohol related problems affect Native Americans, in general, more seriously than others (Eigen, 1991).

Influence of Peers on Student Alcohol Use

When traditional age (18-25 year old) students enter college for the first time they are afforded a great amount of freedom and opportunity. Peer pressure on college and university campuses can be positive, yet often works negatively (Hitchcock and Oliver, 1986). Gaining acceptance from peers is often a problem for freshmen. When students leave home for the first time and are placed in an environment that is intellectually and socially pressured, alcohol becomes a way to ease anxieties and to feel "connected" to the world in which they now live. (Commission on Substance Abuse at Colleges and Universities, 1994).

The attitudes of college students are very heavily influenced by the behaviors and activities of their peers. College students accept levels of drinking by peers that markedly exceed what experts define as excessive drinking (Posavac, 1993). Because of the desire to be accepted by their friends, the amount and frequency a student drinks is often influenced by what the student believes their peers are doing in relation alcohol use (Commission on Substance Abuse at Colleges and Universities, 1994). In 1986, Perkins and Berkowitz conducted a study of undergraduates at a liberal arts college and found that students' perception of the amount and frequency of alcohol use was much more extreme than the actual rate of consumption. When students were asked about their own attitudes about drinking, about 14 percent put themselves in what Perkins and Berkowitz described as a "conservative camp," 66 percent of the respondents put themselves in a "moderate position," and 19 percent categorized themselves as "permissive" in relation to alcohol use. When the same students were asked to give their impression of the general student norm on drinking, using the same response categories, virtually no one perceived the norm to be conservative, only about one-third chose a moderate response and almost two-thirds (63%) saw their peers on campus as having a permissive attitude about drinking (Perkins and Berkowitz, 1986). Portnoy (1980) supports Perkins and Berkowitz assertion that the "perceived" world of the individual determines the actions

of the person, not the actual physical environment. It would appear then, that peer pressure is influenced by what students think their friends are doing in relation to alcohol use, rather than the actual behavior or attitude (Perkins, 1992).

College and University Responses to Alcohol Use

The report from the Commission on Substance Abuse (1994) states that over the past ten years campus-based efforts to eliminate the irresponsible use of alcohol has grown dramatically. Alcohol and other drug programs on college and university campuses are designed to:

- educate students about alcohol and the relationship between consumption and negative consequences;
- 2. combat the "nothing-to-do-but-drink" syndrome by providing attractive alternative activities;
- 3. counsel and treat students who have problems and
- 4. intervene with students who exhibit alcohol problems.
 (Ingalls, 1982)

Most professionals agree that a comprehensive alcohol and other drug programs include the following components: policy/enforcement; education/prevention; treatment/referral and research/evaluation (Bryan, 1982; Gonzalez, 1986, Rapaport and Bryan, 1988; Upcraft and Welty, 1990). A description of each of these components follows.

Policy/Enforcement

The development of alcohol policies is an important part of a comprehensive campus alcohol education program (Gonzalez, 1987). When developing policies to address alcohol use on college campuses, institutions usually must choose to enforce either complete abstinence or elimination, support responsible moderation, or attempt to reduce consequences (Commission on Substance Abuse at Colleges and Universities, 1994). Policy enforcement approaches vary from institution to institution.

Rapaport and Bryan (1991) suggest that campus policies and the enforcement of policies must:

- maintain consistency with Federal, State and local laws;
- 2. promote an educational environment free from substance abuse;
- 3. define geographic jurisdictions and demographic characteristic of populations to be governed;
- 4. define individual behavior and group activity that are prohibited both on campus and at off-campus events controlled by institutions;
- 5. specify the potential consequences for using or possessing different amounts and/or categories of alcohol and other drugs;
- 6. establish protocols and procedures for the involvement of campus law enforcement and other campus entities;
- 7. establish protocols and procedures for referring

individuals with alcohol and other drug problems to appropriate sources of assistance;

- 8. define campus guidelines on marketing alcoholic beverages; and
- 9. define appropriate guidelines for any sanctioned use of alcohol.

Upcraft and Welty (1990) are consistent with Rapaport and Bryan, yet more concise. They (Upcraft and Welty) suggest those campus policies addressing alcohol and other drug use must be consistent with State and local laws. The policies must address both individual and group behavior, and address both on-campus and off-campus behavior.

Consequences for inappropriate behavior must be made clear and the policies must apply to all campus property and to events controlled by the institution.

While it is important for colleges and universities to have alcohol policies that are consistent and follow laws, a policy is only as effective as the extent to which it is enforced. Colleges and universities have a responsibility to enforce policies. Failure to do so reduces such policies and regulations to "window dressing" and counters any real commitment to eliminating problems associated with alcohol use (Upcraft and Welty, 1990). When institutional policies prohibit alcohol use, it is incumbent upon the institution to explain and discuss with students the rationale for such policies. Moreover, when students are involved in the

formulation of policies, greater support is given to the enforcement of the rules and regulations (Bryan, 1982). However, in a study of undergraduate students, Britain and Roberge (1988) found that 80 percent of the respondents said that the alcohol policy did not change their drinking behavior, and that 39% indicated that alcohol policies had no effect on the perception of alcohol use on campus. Finally, regardless of the effectiveness of policy enforcement, Upcraft and Welty (1990) point out that enforcement of alcohol and other drug regulations is no longer a matter of choice for colleges and universities, rather it is a matter of law.

Education/Prevention

While the enforcement of alcohol policies is important, policies are only one part of a thorough approach to address problems associated with alcohol use (Nelson, 1987).

Prevention and education efforts within a comprehensive alcohol and other drug program are intended to prevent a problem from occurring and provide accurate alcohol and other drug information so that it can be used for individual decision making (Rapaport and Bryan, 1991). Alcohol education and prevention programs often try to persuade a target group that the physical and social consequences of alcohol use are extensive, that every drinker is vulnerable, that no one is immune, and that moderation or abstinence is an effective way to avoid these unwanted consequences

(Gonzalez, 1986).

Prevention and education efforts are often categorized into three levels: Primary efforts, which target an entire population; Secondary efforts, which focus on individuals at risk for developing alcohol problems; and the Tertiary efforts, which focus prevention efforts on problem drinkers (Berkowitz and Perkins, 1987; Upcraft and Welty, 1990; CAS Standards, 1990; Linney and Wandersman, 1991). Additionally, Berkowitz and Perkins (1987) suggest two approaches to prevention on college campuses. The first or "traditional approach" focuses on changing individual awareness or attitudes and on developing policies and regulations to regulate alcohol consumption. Alcohol education program coordinators and college and university administrators have increasingly recognized the lack of effectiveness of such programs and consequently have looked to a new approach that focuses on peer-oriented strategies that focus on the "social ecology" of the campus dynamics as it relates to alcohol use (Berkowitz and Perkins, 1987).

Examples of primary prevention efforts of this second approach would include an alcohol education component in orientation programs, and a consistent alcohol education program throughout the academic year. These consistent programs usually include the extensive use of peers.

Secondary prevention efforts would include training faculty, staff, and students for early warning signs of an alcohol problem. Tertiary efforts would include counseling and

treatment for addicted students or problem drinkers (Upcraft and Welty, 1990).

Treatment/Referral

Colleges and universities should have a system for referral and treatment for students who are in trouble as a result of their use of alcohol (Upcraft and Welty, 1990). The first step is to provide intervention strategies that are designed to correct what is seen as group deviance and to encourage students to avoid behavior that is selfdestructive (Miller, Pfaffenberger, and McCarty, 1981). Typically, institutions of higher education address assistance for students with alcohol problems in ways which will include provisions for treatment, referral, aftercare and support groups (Rapaport and Bryan, 1988). It is widely believed that colleges should not be in a position of providing long-term treatment, but should have resources available for alcohol counseling (Upcraft and Welty, 1990: CAS Standards, 1990). Peer counseling, under professional supervision, of students with alcohol and other drug problems is becoming a valuable resource for many campuses. It is believed that 46% of colleges are utilizing peer counseling (Eigen, 1991). Student assistance programs should identify and maintain contacts with campus and community agencies which offer treatment services to students (CAS Standards, 1990). Many institutions also have many support groups in place (Eigen, 1991). Support groups

can include twelve step groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous, programs for co-dependents and adult children of alcoholics (Rapaport and Bryan, 1988).

Research/Evaluation

The CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs) Standards (1990) clearly state that there must be systematic and consistent research and evaluation of alcohol programs on college campuses. Research and evaluation is important in determining whether the educational goals and needs of the student population are being met. The conclusions that are drawn from effectively evaluating programs should be used to revise and continuously improve the initiatives of a comprehensive alcohol and other drug program (CAS Standards, 1990). Further, gathering information for assessment, evaluation, and research purposes allows a program to be developed and improved based upon a clear understanding of the circumstances or issues that are present at that particular college or university (Rapaport and Bryan, 1988).

In addition to the importance of evaluating alcohol and other drug program initiatives, institutions of higher education are in a position to conduct research to yield greater insight into issues related to alcohol and other drug use that would be valuable to the larger society (Upcraft and Welty, 1990).

There are three reasons for evaluating alcohol

education efforts. The first is that there is a growing demand for accountability. If an alcohol education program shows effectiveness, support, in the form of resources is more likely to occur (Dean and Dean, 1982). Secondly, evaluation allows practitioners to have a better understanding of the impact of their efforts. Third, the implementors of a comprehensive alcohol and other drug program must know what works (Dean and Dean, 1982).

The Effectiveness of Alcohol Education Programs

"What works" continues to be a dilemma for many colleges and universities as they examine the effectiveness of their efforts to curb alcohol abuse and misuse. At a societal level, Fulton and Spooner (1987) suggest that perhaps from a cultural context, alcohol awareness and education programs, prevention activities may be effective over the long term. As evidence they point to cultural changes in the form of new norms (i.e., requiring alternative drinks at parties, non-alcoholic beer, designated driver programs) and values reflected in institutional policies. Yet, Fulton and Spooner ask a very fundamental question: Can colleges and universities teach, and students learn, responsible drinking? In 1977 Ruth Engs states, "... during the past 100 years there have been a wide variety of alcohol education philosophies. However,

most of these programs have done little to change the drinking habits of our nation (Engs, 1977)."

At many institutions of higher education, alcohol education programs are thrust upon students without being thoroughly evaluated as to their effects in changing knowledge, attitudes, and most importantly behavior (Engs, 1977). In a study of college administrators, it was found that only 24% report that alcohol education programs have improved their campus environment. In fact, 35% of those surveyed indicated an increase in alcohol use despite significant programmatic efforts to decrease misuse and abuse. Forty one percent reported no change in the campus environment (Magner, 1988).

Research supporting the effectiveness of alcohol programs is limited (Dennison, 1977). Even with limited success, Goodstadt and Caleekal (1984) suggest that campusbased alcohol education programs as opposed to other alcohol programs appear to be better designed, and more concerned with determining effectiveness in relation to behavior change. The following is a summary of the studies conducted to examine the effectiveness of voluntary alcohol education programs on college and university campuses. A review of studies that are mandatory or forced-referral programs, which are most closely related to this current study, will take place at the conclusion of this chapter. As the effectiveness of programs is measured, it is important to acknowledge that an increase in knowledge about alcohol use

does not necessarily change behavior (Engs, 1977).

Generally, alcohol programs that are voluntary show some impact on a student's knowledge and attitude about alcohol. The studies which report any behavior change are minimal.

There is some evidence that experiential voluntary alcohol education programs have shown positive behavior change. Goodstadt and Caleekal (1984), conducted a review of alcohol education programs. They found that programs are more likely to be effective if they include field or laboratory experiences, as well as factual and experiential strategies. They suggest that more effective programs occur over an extended period of time. Behavior change is more likely to be evident if the experiences of the students are intense, require a significant amount of input on the part of the participant who has spent a large amount of hours with the program over an extended period of time (Goodstadt and Caleekal, 1984). Experiential programs are more likely to fail if there is inadequate conceptualization, poor content or process development, unsatisfactory implementation, and inappropriate program evaluation (Goodstadt and Caleekal, 1984).

Rozelle (1980) studied the effectiveness of a ten-week alcohol education two credit course. Rozelle attempted to measure effectiveness based upon two approaches. One was a cognitive approach which involved teaching accurate factual information. The second approach involved experiential

learning such as field experiments and observations. Both approaches increased awareness about alcohol use issues, and lessened the negative consequences when compared to a control group. The experiential approach consistently scored higher in responsible attitudes and lower, which is positive, in negative consequences (Rozelle, 1980).

Chen, Dosch, and Cychosz (1982) studied the impact of a voluntary alcohol education program which was part of a campus's alcohol education week. They attempted to measure behavior change over a short period of time. They found that of those who participated in the program, there was a significant improvement in drinking attitudes and impact on two specific behaviors - driving under the influence of alcohol, and a reduction of heavy drinking, which was defined as more than fifteen drinks a week.

Kivlahan (1990) conducted a study of students who volunteered to participate in an eight-week education program for social drinkers who wanted to learn more about or to change their drinking behavior. The participants were divided into three groups based on instruction approaches. The first group was an alcohol skill class which emphasized moderation. The second group was an alcohol information class emphasizing the negative consequences of drinking. The third group was used as a control group. The drinking levels of the three groups were assessed, four, eight, and twelve months after having completed the class. Kivlahan (1990) found that the alcohol skill's class reduced their

drinks per week by 39%. The alcohol information group reduced their drinking 22%. The control group reduced their drinking by 16%. However, while drinking behavior appears to have changed, 40% of the alcohol skills group, 58% of the alcohol information group, and 64% of the control group reported exceeding the legal level of intoxication at least once during each of the three weeks they were monitored.

A final study where researchers reported any success in changing student alcohol drinking behavior was conducted by Robinson (1981). This researcher did a comparison study of three alcohol instruction programs. Three instructional methodologies were studied. Implicit instruction - class lectures and factual information only. Explicit instruction - lectures followed by conclusions that were drawn from the lecture, followed by recommendations for behavior. Values clarification instruction - values clarification exercises were used during class lectures. All instructional methods reported an increase in knowledge about alcohol. Only explicit instructional methods were able to produce any changes in attitudes or behaviors. The values clarification approach showed no influence on changing attitudes and behaviors (Robinson, 1981).

Of the few studies examining alcohol program effectiveness, the majority show no effect on behavior. A summary table (Table 3) of the research highlighted in this chapter, and their findings can be found on the next page.

Researchers have demonstrated that while it is

Table 3
Summary of Research of Voluntary Alcohol Education Programs

AUTHOR(S)	CHANGE IN KNOWLEDGE		CHANGE IN BEHAVIOR
Barnes (1984)	х	x	
Blum, Rivers, Howat, and Bellows (1980)	х		
Chen, and Bosch (1987)	х	x	
Chen, Dosch, and Cychosz (1982)	х	x	x
Dennison (1977)	х		
Engs, and Hanson	х		
Gonzalez (1982)	х	х	
Goodstadt, and Caleekal (1984)	х	x	x
Hanson (1982)	x		
Kinder, Pope, and Walfish (1980)	х		
Kivlahan (1990)	х	х	х
Kraft (1988)	х	х	
Portnoy (1980)	х		
Robinson (1981)	x	х	x
Rozelle (1980)	x	х	x

relatively easy to increase alcohol knowledge, it is more difficult to modify attitudes and even harder to change behavior (Hanson, 1982). For the most part, alcohol education programs have been ineffective on obtaining the goals of reducing or preventing substance abuse (Kinder, Pope, and Walfish, 1980). In fact, Kinder and associates suggest that there is evidence that alcohol education programs may exacerbate use of alcohol. The presentation of factual information alone does not seem to be a valid method of producing attitudinal or positive behavioral changes (Kinder et. al., 1980).

A national study of 72 universities which involved surveying students that attended a similar class was conducted during the 1982-83 academic year and again in the 1984-1985 academic year. Within the two-year period, the participating institutions reported that they had a comprehensive alcohol and other drug program in place. From 1982-83 to 1984-85 there was only a slight increase in students' knowledge about alcohol issues. Interestingly, the populations which represented the heaviest drinkers reported the highest increase in knowledge (Engs and Hanson, 1989). The researchers suggested that perhaps the reason that the heaviest drinkers had the highest increase in knowledge could be that they are most familiar with the effects; physically, emotionally, and socially, of the drug (Engs and Hanson, 1989).

Kraft (1998) also conducted a study to determine the

effects of an alcohol education program on a college campus. The results of the study indicated a change in knowledge and attitude about alcohol use. However, no positive behavior change was found. Blum, Rivers, Howat, and Bellows (1980) set out to determine whether another approach, a contracted abstinence agreement, would effect alcohol drinking behavior. In essence, the University entered into a contractual agreement with students to not drink. They found that this approach had little systematic effect in attitude or behavior change regarding alcohol use of college students

Further research, this conducted by Gonzalez (1982), attempted to determine if an alcohol education module experienced by college students would have any impact on its participants. The purpose for doing the study was to show that alcohol education efforts, based on the knowledge-attitude-behavior model can be effective in reducing alcohol problems. He found that as a result of successfully completing the alcohol module, knowledge and attitude where significantly effected, however, no significant difference in drinking behavior was found (Gonzalez, 1982).

Barnes's (1984) approach to determine if alcohol education efforts have any impact, was to assess the success of existing programs based upon socialization theory. The researcher's findings indicate that generally alcohol education programs can produce an increase in factual knowledge, are minimally effective in changing attitudes,

and have no effect on alcohol use. Barnes believes that the absence of a clear philosophy of alcohol education is reflected in the lack of goals or stated outcomes; which in turn leads to the inability for colleges and universities to effectively evaluate efforts to determine what works. Barnes further states that the goals for an alcohol education program must begin with a relevant social theory (Barnes, 1984).

A study consisting of one thousand undergraduates set out to compare drinking attitudes and behaviors between students participating in a voluntary alcohol education program and students who did not participate in the program (Chen, and Bosch, 1987). Both attending and non-attending groups had similar viewpoints for most issues concerning motivation for drinking and drinking opinions. The results of the study indicated that students attending an alcohol education program only exhibited healthier attitudes than students who did not, thus having no effect on behavior (Chen, and Bosch, 1987).

Dennison (1977), similar to Goodstadt and Caleekal (1984) and Rozelle (1980), studied the impact of field experiences on changing alcohol behavior. Unlike the other two studies, Dennison (1977) found that field experiences had no effect on drinking behavior.

Finally, when reviewing research conducted to examine the effects of voluntary participation in alcohol education programs, Portney (1980) used the Responsible Alcohol Use

Inventory which attempted to assess how responsible individuals' drinking patterns were through a series of seven Likert-style type statements. None of the comparisons conducted from the results of Responsible Alcohol Use Inventory were significantly different, indicating that the alcohol education program had no effect on individual drinking patterns (Portnoy, 1980).

When a student is required to go to an alcohol education program (mandatory or forced-referral), typically it is a result of getting caught violating a college or university regulation and being held accountable through the institution's discipline system. Before reviewing the results of the research conducted for mandatory programs, an overview of the purpose of student discipline and corresponding sanctions is provided.

The Purpose of Student Discipline and Sanctions

Judicial systems employed by colleges and universities should contribute to the teaching of appropriate individual and group behavior as well as maintaining a safe and secure campus environment (CAS Standards, 1986). One of the main purposes or goals of a judicial system is to maintain and create a safe and orderly environment. The campus climate that judicial programs help create should build awareness of the justification for rules and regulations, promote an

understanding of the rights and freedoms of students, and instill a sense of accountability and responsibility for individual and group behavior (Caruso, 1987). Disciplinary sanctions handed down after judicial proceedings are a common mechanism for holding students and groups accountable for behavior.

Characteristics of student offenders tend to be consistent. Male college students are caught violating college or university regulations more frequently that their female counterparts (Williamson, 1952; Tracey, Foster, Perkins, and Hillman, 1979; Janosik, Davis, and Spencer, 1985). Students residing in residence halls with an occupancy larger that 600 people, violate university regulations more frequently (Tracey, Foster, Perkins, and Hillman, 1979; Janosik, Davis, and Spencer, 1985). Offcampus students are less likely to be caught violating regulations. In terms of year in school, sophomore and freshmen, respectively, are more prone to getting caught violating regulations (Janosik, Davis, and Spencer, 1985). Generally, student offenders are not significantly different from the general student population in terms of major (Tracey, Foster, Perkins, and Hillman, 1979).

In 1965, Brady and Snoxell suggested that "penalties" used in disciplinary procedures must be chosen primarily with the aim that the penalty itself will assist in the rehabilitation of the student. Sanctions must have a purpose in order to uphold the educational mission of a code

of conduct (Ardaiolo and Walker, 1987). The purpose of judicial sanctions is to protect the campus community from behaviors that are detrimental to the educational mission of the institution, and to assist students in identifying appropriate parameters to quide behavior (Ardaiolo and Walker, 1987). The discipline process should constructively confront students with their inappropriate behavior and offer motivation to change that behavior to avoid further difficulty. Sanctions should encourage students to exercise self control and equip them with information on how to succeed in the future (Boots, 1987). Perhaps E. G. Williamson put it best when stating that discipline as punishment will not correct behavior, rather, discipline should be a part of a relationship that is based on assisting the student to grow. Alone, punishment is repressive (Williamson, 1955).

When considering discipline sanctions for alcohol violations, some would argue that penalties are so "light" that the penalties often invite students to take the policies themselves lightly (Hoekema, 1994). Ranges in sanctions will vary depending on the seriousness of the alcohol offense. Low level violations of alcohol regulations such as open alcohol containers in public areas will result in a warning or probation, often with special conditions attached. Special conditions (i.e., an alcohol education program) augment discipline sanctions to emphasize student growth through encouragement and information to

assist in changing behavior (Ardaiolo and Walker, 1987).

Persons found guilty of more serious behaviors such as assault while under the influence of alcohol may be suspended or expelled. Often criminal prosecution accompanies the most serious offenses (Upcraft and Welty, 1990, Hoekema, 1994). At some colleges and universities, mandatory alcohol education programs have been developed to serve as a sanction, for violators of alcohol regulations, or students who were under the influence of alcohol while violating another campus regulation. Typically, attendance at a mandatory program is combined with some kind of warning or probation (Flynn, and Brown, 1991).

The Effectiveness of Mandatory Alcohol Education Programs

Very few institutions have evaluated the effectiveness of mandatory alcohol education programs (Flynn, and Brown, 1991). Gonzalez (1981) conducted a study to determine the degree to which alcohol played a role in discipline cases. He found that 34% of the judicial cases filed within one academic year were alcohol related. In more than 50% of the cases reported, the violations that fit into categories such as breaking and entering, liquor-law violations, and sex offenses, were alcohol related. Forty six percent of malicious mischief cases were alcohol related. Gonzalez (1981) points out that typically violators are sent to an

alcohol awareness workshop where participants usually gain some knowledge, but many have been referred for a second offense, indicating a failure to change behavior.

Requiring an individual to sit through an alcohol intervention program has received mixed reviews. Amanda (1986), speaking from a psychotherapist's perspective, suggests that mandatory counseling and education, as a condition of disciplinary action distorts and undermines the basis for corrective intervention. On the other hand, O'Connell (1984) studied the effects of an involuntary therapeutic, rather than preventive, group for alcohol abusers. After attending an eight-session structured program, the students participating in the program did not violate any of the drinking policies. Forty one percent reported a reduction in alcohol use. Two-thirds reported a greater willingness to seek help for alcohol problems. Fifty-two percent reported a positive change in attitude toward alcohol use (O'Connell, 1984).

Sadler and Scott (1993) studied first offenders of alcohol regulations. They set out to determine if an alcohol education program at their particular university reduced the number of repeat offenders. Their findings showed that the recidivism rate dropped from 4.5% to 0.2%. The researchers were quick to point out that there could have been many factors which influenced the decrease in repeat behaviors, and simply suggest that the program may have been a factor in reducing the recidivism rate.

Brown, Tucker, and Brandon (1991) did a perception study of freshman residence hall students who attended a forced-referral alcohol education after having violated an alcohol policy. The program was described as interactive and required participants to be heavily involved. Sixty percent of the participants surveyed believed the program should be a part of the discipline system, and helped them understand the psychological and physiological impact of alcohol. The majority of the participants would recommend the program to a friend, and believe the program encouraged them to use common sense in using alcohol. Yet, with such positive reviews of the program, Brown et. al. (1991) could only report that 15% of the students reported that the program had caused them to change their drinking habits.

In 1980, Ramsey (1982) conducted a study to see if a required alcohol education program would have an effect on college students who were arrested for behavior associated with alcohol or other drugs. This program was four weeks, which included discussions on chemical abuse, medical aspects of chemical use, psychological aspects of substance use, and what to do if you have a substance abuse problem. Forty-five students went through the program and none of the participants was a repeat offender when surveyed after a "short period of time." Ramsey (1982) did not indicate the specific length of time that the follow-up occurred with the participants.

Finally, Flynn and Brown (1991) conducted a study of a

mandatory alcohol education program intended for violators of campus regulations. They surveyed 30 participants of the seven-hour program. The respondents reported an increase in alcohol knowledge and conservation in attitude. Flynn and Brown (1991) did a three-month follow-up and found a continued increase in knowledge was maintained, and the quantity and frequency of drinking, as well as behavior problems were reduced. However, the researchers did not report any suitable controls to suggest that a change in behavior resulted because of attending the program.

Summary of the Review of the Literature

The review of the literature showed that a significant number of college students drink excessively (binge drink). College and universities have attempted to address student alcohol misuse and abuse by developing comprehensive alcohol and other drug programs. These programs typically included components that address alcohol policies and enforcement, education and prevention, treatment and referral, and research and evaluation. The findings of some studies of alcohol education programs show that there may be some effect on positive behavior change. However, most professionals agree that there has been limited research to conclude what works when considering the effectiveness of alcohol education programs.

Mandatory alcohol education programs for students who entered the discipline process due to issues related to alcohol use have not been extensively evaluated. The present study was conducted in an attempt to contribute to the current research in this area and perhaps provide greater insight into the effectiveness of forced-referral alcohol education programs as a mechanism for changing student behavior.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

Introduction

Chapter III contains a description of the research design, subjects, materials, and procedures for data collection and analysis. Included are methodological assumptions and limitations.

Research Design

This research is a perception study, with a random selection of subjects who attended a forced-referral alcohol education program after having been caught violating a university regulation. As stated earlier, this study was designed to answer the following questions: (1) Does a forced-referral alcohol education program effect drinking

behavior as it relates to not getting caught violating university regulations after attending the program? (2) Are there other factors that contribute to a student not entering the discipline system again after attending a forced-referral program? (3) Did alcohol use patterns change as a result of attending the forced-referral alcohol education program? (4) If the forced-referral program contributed to a student not reentering the judicial system, or changing their rate of consumption, what was it about the program that changed the student's behavior?

Students from Michigan State University, a large
Midwestern, public university, who attended the Alcohol
Education Seminar (AES) during the 1992-1993 academic year
were identified. The AES is a forced-referral or mandatory
alcohol education program.

The AES is a three-hour program that emphasizes group interaction and information sharing. Participants discuss topics which include: understanding the levels of intoxication, the physiological and psychological effects of alcohol use, addiction, adult children of alcoholics, and co-dependency. Students attending the Seminar also discuss social and environmental issues such as the relationship between sexual activity and alcohol, sexual assault, as well as the effects of the media on alcohol use. The format includes short lectures by a facilitator, group exercises and discussion, and a video. Students who attend the AES are typically first time violators of alcohol regulations,

or were under the influence of alcohol while having been caught violating another university regulation (i.e., noise).

From those students who attended during the 1992-1993 academic year, the population of AES participants who were believed to not have been caught violating another university regulation after a two year period was identified. A random sample of students from this group was chosen to conduct anonymous telephone interviews. Pilot interviews were conducted, using students from another academic year, to test the instrument to ensure that information from the interview would enable the researcher to answer the research questions. At the conclusion of each pilot interview, the interviewer asked the students how they interpreted each question and if they had difficulty understanding any question, or part of the interview.

The design of the study allowed for the participants to maintain anonymity. The Judicial Affairs Office at Michigan State University was contacted, in writing, (see Appendix A) and asked to provide a list of first names and current telephone numbers of those students who attended the Alcohol Education Seminar during the 1992-93 academic year, and who did not get caught violating another university regulation within a two year period. Once the Judicial Affairs Office

³Six students from the population were later identified to having violated another University regulation after attending the AES. These subjects remained in the sample.

was able to identify the subjects in the population, they contacted the Registrar's Office to obtain current telephone This list was provided to a different staff person in the Judicial Affairs Office who placed an initial telephone call in an effort to reach each subject; an established narrative was used (see Appendix B). hundred eighteen (n=118) students were verified to be presently enrolled and having provided the University with an accurate telephone number. A code number was assigned to each potential subject. If the student was willing to be interviewed, the telephone call, identified only by the code number, was immediately forwarded to the researcher, in another location, to conduct the interview. A total of fifty-two (52) students were willing to be interviewed. Twenty (20) subjects refused to be interviewed. Attempts to contact the remaining students were made without success. Each subject, or potential subject, received at least three telephone calls to participate in the study. The calls were made on different days at different times in hopes of being successful. The length of each interview ranged from ten to twenty minutes.

Methodological Assumptions

1. All students who attended the Alcohol Education

Seminar during the 1992-93 academic year and did not get

caught violating another University regulation within a two

year period, had an equal and independent opportunity to be identified; thus, were representative of the described population.

2. Students who attended the Alcohol Education
Seminar during the 1992-93 academic year were not unlike
students who attended AES during any other year.

Materials

From the researcher's review of the literature, the limited number of previous studies of mandatory alcohol education programs, did not allow the respondent or study participant to openly comment on the effectiveness of their respective programs. The interview instrument and response sheet (see Appendix C) identify a series of closed, and open-ended questions. Open-ended questions allowed the respondent to express some depth and meaning to their answer (Scheaffer, Mendenhall, and Ott, 1990). The subjects were not limited to a prescribed categorical answer. After the pilot study was conducted, some questions were reworded so that they were more clear, and understandable. The response sheet was developed in order for the researcher to easily record the responses from the subjects.

Data Collection

The data collected from the telephone interviews were primarily descriptive in nature. Interviews were used to obtain participants' perspectives and perceptions.

Interviews were chosen to allow the researcher to interpret what the respondent was saying and to probe for more information (Merriam, 1998). The researcher had experience in conducting interviews, including telephone interviews, and had a clear understanding of the purpose and intent of each of the questions.

The interviews were conducted during the last two weeks of April, 1995, and the first week of May, 1995. Telephone calls were placed at different times on different days. At least three attempts were made to contact each of the potential respondents.

Once the interviews were completed, grade point averages (GPAs) were collected for each subject to determine if there was a grade effect based upon the responses given by the subjects. To obtain the GPAs, the Judicial Affairs Office provided the student ID number to the Registrars Office in order to obtain the respondents' GPA. The researcher was provided the GPAs using the same code number system utilized to obtain the participants in the telephone interviews (see Appendix D).

Data Analysis

At the conclusion of the interviews, given the nature of the responses from the subjects, the researcher was able to categorize the responses given by the study participants. Analysis of categorical data allowed the researcher to assign frequencies to subjects in each category (Clayton, 1984). From the categorical data, contingency tables were developed to provide insight into attempting to answer the research questions.

The data were analyzed using a standard Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) program. A frequency analysis was performed on each question of the interview based upon placing responses in categories. The following identifies the established categories for each interview question.

Question 1. Did you attend the Alcohol Education
Seminar? Categories: Yes; No

Question 2. What did you think of the experience?

Categories: Positive response; Negative response; Both negative and positive response; Indifferent response

Question 3. How many years have you attended Michigan State University? Categories: 1; 2; 3; 4

Question 4. When you were caught violating a
University regulation, do you remember what the reason was?
Categories: Noise; Open alcohol; Possession of Alcohol;
Party/keg; In a room where alcohol was present; Other

Question 5. Have you been caught for violating any other regulations since attending the AES? Categories:

Yes; No

Question 6. Why do you think you have not violated a University regulation again? Categories: Did not want to get kicked out; Moved off campus; I got caught again (violating University regulations); I don't know; changed behavior; Just did not get caught; I don't usually break rules; Other

Question 7a. Do you think your alcohol consumption has changed over the past two years or so? Categories:

Yes; No

Question 7b. If yes, in what ways has your consumption changed? Categories: Consumption went up; Consumption went down; Consumption stayed the same

Question 7c. On average how many drinks do you consume a week now? Categories: 0; 1; 2-3; 4-6; 7-10; 10-15; more than 15

Question 7d. Is the number of drinks you consume now different from the number you consumed about two years ago? Categories: Yes, went down; Yes, went up; No

Question 7e. Why do you think your consumption of alcohol has changed the way you have identified?

Categories: No change; Tired of negative consequences;

More mature/responsible; I have other things to do; I drink more now since turning twenty-one; Moved off campus; I don't

know

Question 7f. Has any significant, or not so significant event occurred in your life that caused you to change your rate of consumption? Categories: No event; Getting caught was significant; Need to improve grades/do better in school; Other

Question 8a. Do you think the AES, in any way,
effected your rate of consumption of alcohol? Categories:
Yes; No

Question 8b. If yes, in what ways? Categories: No effect; For a short time, consumption went down; I thought I might have a problem as a result of going to the program; I didn't want to use anymore; I don't drink as much; I am just more careful

Question 8c. Was there any specific aspect of the AES which played a significant role in changing your alcohol consumption? Categories: There was no specific aspect of the program; Levels of intoxication exercise; The length of the program; Group discussion; Personal stories; The facilitator; Video

Question 9a. Do you think that the AES, in any way, is a reason for you not getting caught again violating a University regulation? Categories: Yes; No

Question 9b. If yes, in what ways? Categories: AES was not a reason; Did not want to get caught again; More careful not to get caught; I changed my drinking behavior;

More aware of policies

Question 9c. Was there any specific aspect of the AES which played a significant role in contributing to you not getting caught violating another University regulation?

Categories: No specific aspect; Video; Group discussion

Question 10. Is there anything else you would like to add since reflecting on you experience of attending the AES? Categories: No additional comment; Positive comment; Negative comment

When assigning categories, the rule was followed that even if only one subject answered the question in a particular way, a category was assigned. Where appropriate, an "other" category was created to accommodate some singular responses. This was done because the primary purpose of this study was to determine if the AES had any impact in changing perceived subsequent behavior, versus investigating how many students responded similarly to any given question. Descriptive statistics were used to draw conclusions from the data. To supplement the responses to each of the categories, anecdotal information will be highlighted in response to the research questions.

Limitations

There are limitations to this study in that conclusions can only be made based upon responses given by the students

who chose to participate in the study. These students volunteered to participate, thus the finding should be viewed with caution (Rosenthal and Rosnow, 1975). Another limitation to consider is that when conducting structured interviews. There will remain differences in the way questions are put to each respondent and what is recorded and noted from the respondent's answer. The influence of bias under these conditions is inherent and difficult to measure (Oppenheim, 1966).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Introduction

The researcher's purpose in this study was to investigate whether the participant believed their attendance at a forced-referral alcohol education program effected their subsequent behavior. In this chapter, the results of the telephone interviews are reviewed in light of responding to the identified research questions. The findings of this study are divided into four categories addressing each research question. The discussion and summary comments of the finding are presented in Chapter V.

Over half (63.5 %) of the participants in the study were in their third year of school when the interview took place, indicating that they were in their first year when they attended the Alcohol Education Seminar. Students in their fourth year of school represented 34.6% of the

population. When respondents were asked, what was the reason for getting caught, 44.2 % indicated that they were participating in a party where alcohol was being served or were in possession of a keg. The violations of being in possession alcohol or carrying an open container represented 38.4% of the sample. Forty-six of the 52 participants said that they had not been caught for violating another University regulation after having attended the Alcohol Education Seminar. Six respondents indicated that they, in fact, had been caught violating another University regulation.

Research Question 1

Does a forced-referral alcohol education program effect drinking behavior as it relates to not getting caught again violating university regulations?

When subjects were asked for the behavior that originally caused them to be caught violating a University regulation, the most frequent response for students who did not violate again and those who did was having a party or keg. Table 4 identifies the nature of the violation for students who were not caught again, and those who were.

As stated earlier 46 of the participants indicated that they did not violate another University regulation after having attended the Alcohol Education Seminar. Twenty-four

Table 4

Frequency of Violations that Caused the Respondents to be
Required to Attend the Program

	Not caught again violating a regulation	Caught again violating a regulation
Noise violation where alcohol was present	4	1
Open alcohol container	10	-
In possession of alcohol*	10	-
Party/Keg	18	5
Present where alcohol was being consumed	3	-
other	1	-

^{*} The container was not open

(66.7%) of the 46 respondents indicated that the AES was not a reason for them failing to be caught violating a University regulation again. Twenty-two students believed that the Seminar did contribute to not getting caught again for violating a University regulation. Table 5 is a contingency table that illustrates the ways in which the AES contributed to the 22 students not getting caught again. The most common answer given was that they were more careful not to get caught a second time. Several students said during the interview that they did not want the hassle of having to go to the program again even though the University policy states that students only attend the program once. Four students (7.7% of all participants in the study) believed the program contributed to changing their drinking behavior, which resulted in not getting caught again violating a University regulation. All four subjects indicated that their drinking decreased. One student stated, "I was not aware of what it [alcohol] does to the body over time." Each student revealed that they already began evaluating the role alcohol plays in their life, but the program gave them valid information to change their behavior. The remaining eighteen did change their behavior so as not to get caught again violating a regulation, but did not change their rate of consumption. The six students who were caught again for violating a University regulation after attending the AES stated that the program did not make any difference in their subsequent drinking behavior.

Table 5

Frequency of Responses Listing the Ways the AES Was a Reason for Not Getting Caught Violating Another University

Regulation

	AES is a reason for not getting caught again
I did not want to get caught again	4
I am more careful to not get caught again	11
I changed my drinking behavior	4
Now I am more aware of the policies	3

of those respondents stated that, "... perhaps it [the program] made me more aware of the policies."

Research Ouestion 2

Are there other factors that contributed to a student not entering the discipline system again after attending a forced-referral program?

Interview participants gave several explanations for not entering the discipline system after attending the Alcohol Education Seminar. Table 6 indicates that over half (51.9%) of the participants stated that they moved off campus, and that was the reason why they did not get caught again violating a University regulation. Eight (15.4%) subjects indicated that they changed their behavior as a reason for not getting caught again violating a regulation. Of the eight students who indicated they changed their behavior, four indicated that they reduced the amount and frequency of alcohol consumption. The remaining four subjects did not give very specific ways in which they changed their behavior. One said, "I am just a different person now, in every way." Another subject indicated that they were tired of "the scene" they were involved in. in mind, the identified behavior change cannot be attributed, necessarily, to the AES.

For those students (n=27) who stated they moved off campus as the reason for not getting caught again, fifteen

Table 6

Percentages for the Reasons Given for Not Getting Caught

Violating Another University Regulation After Attending the

AES

Reason	Frequency	Percentage
I did not want to get kicked out of the residence halls	2	3.8
I moved off campus	27	51.9
I did get caught again	6	11.5
I changed my behavior	8	15.4
I just did not get caught again	2	3.8
I do not usually break rules	4	7.7
Other	3	5.8

(55.5%) indicated that the Alcohol Education Seminar did not contribute, in any way, to their not entering the discipline system again. Eleven volunteered that they were just more careful not to get caught. Two students of the eleven believed all the Seminar did was teach people how not to get caught again. Only two students volunteered that they violated regulations again, but did not get caught. They both attributed this phenomenon as simply being lucky. One subject said, "honestly, based on what I do, I can't believe I have not been caught again."

Grade point averages were collected for three separate semesters: Fall 1992 (prior to attending the AES); Fall 1993 (the first semester of the academic year after attending the AES); and Spring 1995 (the semester the telephone interviews took place). Controlling for course loads, there was not a significant difference between the grade point averages (GPAs) of the participants, for each semester. Generally, the grade point average for the students who said the AES did contribute to not getting caught again, were lower, than their counterparts who said the Seminar did not have an effect. For example, for Fall of 1992, the students who indicated that the Seminar did not effect their behavior had a mean grade point average of 2.6161. For the same semester, students who indicated that the seminar did have an effect on behavior have a grade point average of 2.4912. Table 7 summarizes the grade point average for each of the two groups for each semester.

Table 7
Contingency Table of Grade Point Averages (GPAs) and Effect of AES

	Number of Subjects	Mean Grade Point Average
Cumulative GPAs - Fall '92		
Group 1*	30	2.6161
Group 2**	22	2.4912
Cumulative GPAs - Fall '93		
Group 1	27***	2.7418
Group 2	22	2.5583
Cumulative GPAs - Sprg '95		
Group 1	30	2.8018
Group 2	22	2.6955

- * Students who indicated that the Alcohol Education Seminar had no effect on entering the discipline system after attending the program
- ** Students who indicated that the Alcohol Education Seminar had an effect on entering the discipline system after attending the program
- *** Three subjects were not enrolled Fall Semester 1993

Perhaps another factor that may have played a role in whether the AES had an effect on getting caught again was the feeling about the overall experience of attending the program. Over half of the subjects (53.8%, n=28) chose not to make any concluding comments about the program. Of those students who did not enter the discipline system again, after attending the program, thirteen chose to make a positive concluding comment about the Alcohol Education Seminar; seven made a negative comment. Examples of positive comments were:

"The program was helpful...keep doing it"

- ...people said it was pointless but they [the University] need to have a consequence"
- "...pretty good group discussion"

"It was pretty good punishment for the first time" Examples of negative comments were:

"...didn't help because I was forced to go...maybe helped some people...shorten it"

"It is pointless...listening to some lady telling me things I already know"

[&]quot;It was too long"

Of the six students who violated again after attending the program, three made positive comments about the program, two did not comment, and one made a negative comment.

Research Ouestion 3

Did alcohol use patterns change as a result of attending the forced referral alcohol education program?

Thirty-four (65.4%) of the fifty-two respondents indicated that their alcohol consumption has changed over the past two years. Twenty-nine of the 34 stated that their consumption went down. Five indicated that their consumption went up. Table 8 identifies the current level, by number of drinks per week, of alcohol use at the time of the interview. More than 35% of the respondents indicate that they currently consume less than three drinks per week, while more than 38% indicated they consume more than seven drinks per week.

When the subjects were asked why they think their consumption changed, eighteen (34.6%) believed that they were more mature and responsible. Several of these students said that drinking just was not as important anymore. Table 9 provides the reason the respondents gave when asked why their consumption changed the way they identified. One respondent said, "drinking just got old, I didn't care to do it any more." Three of the 18 who said they were more mature stated that their consumption went up. One of those

Table 8

Percentage and Frequency of the Number of Drinks Per Week at the Time of the Interview*

Number of Drinks Per Week	Frequency	Percentage
0 drinks	2	5.9
1 drink	4	11.8
2 - 3 drinks	6	17.6
4 - 6 drinks	9	17.3
7 - 10 drinks	7	13.5
10-15 drinks	5	14.7
more than 15 drinks	1	2.9

* A drink is equal to: 12 ounces of beer = 4 to 5 ounces of wine = 1½ ounces of 80 proof liquor

Table 9

Percentage and Frequency of the Reasons Given as an

Explanation of Why Alcohol Consumption Has Changed

Reason for Alcohol Consumption Change	Frequency	Percentage
There was no change in my consumption	18	34.6
I am tired of negative consequences as a result of drinking	5	9.6
I am more mature and/or responsible	18	34.6
I have other things to do besides drink	5	9.6
I drink more now since turning 21	3	5.8
I moved off campus	1	1.9
I really do not know	2	3.8

three students said,

"...I probably drink a little more, but now I am twenty-one and I think I do it [drink] responsibly." The interview with this student revealed that he or she did not consume very much when he or she was sent to the AES. The other two simply said that when they became of legal age, their consumption went up. Table 10 is a contingency table explaining the reason for the change in consumption based upon whether consumption went up, down, or stayed the same.

When respondents were specifically asked if they believe the Alcohol Education Seminar effected their rate of alcohol consumption, 33 (63.5%) responded negatively.

Nineteen (36.5%) students believed that the Seminar did change their drinking behavior. Table 11 lists the ways in which the subjects thought the AES effected their rate of consumption. Of the nineteen respondents who indicated that the Seminar did effect their rate of consumption, they did not identify any particular way in which the Seminar changed the consumption. The most frequently represented response was that consumption went down for a short period of time (1-2 months), and then went back up. The six students whose consumption changed for a short time all stated that the program, "forced" them to take a look at their use.

Table 10

Contingency Table of the Reasons Given for a Change in
Alcohol Consumption Based Upon Whether Alcohol Consumption
Went Up, Down, or Stayed the Same

	Consumption went down	Consumption went up	No change in consumption
No change in consumption	-	-	18
Tired of negative consequences as a result of drinking	5	_	-
More mature/ responsible	15	3	-
Have other more things to do	5	-	-
Drink more now since turning 21	1	2	-
Moved off campus	1	-	-
Does not know why consumption has changed	2	-	-

Table 11

Frequency Responses of Ways the AES Effected Rate of

Consumption

	AES did have an effect on rate of consumption	an effect on rate of consumption
AES had no effect	-	33
For a short time, alcohol consumption went down	6	AL-ADEAC
Student thought they may have a drinking problem	3	
Student just did not want to use anymore	1	- spilan - incolen
Student does not drink as much	4	
Student is more careful when drinking	5	

Research Ouestion 4

If the forced-referral program contributed to a student not reentering the judicial system, or changing their rate of alcohol consumption, what was it about the program that changed the student's behavior?

Twenty-two (42.3%) students indicated that the Alcohol Education Seminar contributed to their not reentering the discipline system after attending the program. Nineteen (36.5) of the students thought the Seminar contributed to changing their rate of alcohol consumption.

The respondents indicated that their was no particular aspect of the Seminar that contributed to the consumption change. Three students believed the levels of intoxication exercise and the general group discussion contributed to a change in behavior. Table 12 is a distribution of responses given by the subjects regarding what aspects of the program, if any, contributed to a change in their rate of consumption. Ten of the nineteen students, who indicated the Seminar contributed to a drinking behavior change, were able to identify a specific aspect of the program that led to that change. The other nine students generally felt the overall experience is what contributed a rate of alcohol consumption change. One student stated, "... I really can't think of anything specific about the program...it was more of not wanting to go again and feeling kinda silly for having to be there." When questioned further, the student indicated that at times the program was "a joke." Another

Table 12

Frequency and Percentages Identifying the Aspects of the AES

that Contributed to a Change in Rate of Consumption*

	Frequency	Percent**
Levels of intoxication exercise	3	5.8
Length of program	1	1.9
Group discussion	3	5.8
Personal stories	1	1.9
Facilitator	1	1.9
Video	1	1.9

- * 42 of the respondents indicated no specific aspect
- ** Percentage of the entire sample (n=52)

student stated that while there was no specific aspect of the program that contributed to any kind of alcohol behavior change, the program caused him or her to evaluate their presence at the program. The student said, "I couldn't believe I was sitting there [in the program]...while I deserved to be there, personally I do not think I should be there...if you know what I mean...I changed because I did not want to be one of those people, that feels comfortable in a setting like that."

There was also no specific aspect of the Alcohol

Education Seminar that contributed to students not getting
caught again violating University regulations. Only two of
the 22 subjects indicating the Seminar played a role in
their not reentering the discipline system, gave a specific
aspect of the program. One student said the video, and the
other believed the general group discussion contributed to
not getting caught again violating a regulation. One
student said that the group discussion illustrated for him
or her how absurd some of the behaviors are that cause a
person to get caught, and he or she did not want to fall
into that trap. The person who thought the video was
effective, stated that the content was, "too close to home."

As stated earlier, four students (see Table 5) believed they did not enter the judicial system again because they changed their drinking behavior. One student believed the information about the physiological aspects of alcohol use was significant. The other three commented that it was the

experience in its totality that contributed to the change.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Introduction

Chapter V contains a summary, and conclusions of this study. Finally, the investigator proposes recommendations for further research related to this study.

Summary of the Purpose

A review of the literature identified that there is a desire to "know what works" when considering approaches to reduce the incidence of excessive use of alcohol on college campuses. It is recommended that institutions of higher education develop comprehensive alcohol and other drug education programs that include policy/enforcement, education/prevention, treatment/referral, and evaluation/research components. Most researchers found that

alcohol education efforts may effect knowledge and to a lesser degree attitude about alcohol use, but most found that programmatic efforts have very little effect on future behavior. One of the difficulties in determining if alcohol education programs on college and university campuses are effective is that they are usually multidimensional and, taken in their entirety, are hard to evaluate.

The researcher attempted to focus on a specific component of a comprehensive alcohol education program to investigate if there was any perceived change in subsequent behavior of its participants. In an effort to determine "what works," the study concentrated on the policy/ enforcement aspect of a comprehensive alcohol education program and a discipline sanction - the forced-referral program instituted on a number of campuses. Anderson and Gadeleto (1979) found that between 20% and 60% of the discipline problems on campus were alcohol related. forced-referral program is used as a sanction for students who violate university regulations related to alcohol consumption. As stated earlier, Flynn and Brown (1991) found that an increasing number of campuses are using mandatory or forced-referral programs as a result of a student entering into the campus judicial process. Yet, very little research has been done on forced-referral programs to test their effectiveness. The purpose of this study was to contribute to the body of knowledge of identifying "what works," when considering a particular

component of a comprehensive alcohol and other drug education program.

Summary of the Methodology

Unlike other studies of forced-referral programs, the researcher in this study attempted to do two things. First, it was to interview students who attended a forced-referral program two years after the experience. This was done to determine if they believed the program contributed to any behavior change after an extended period of time. Other studies surveyed students up to three months after attending a program. Second, it was to examine if behavior did in fact change, what was it about the program that contributed to the change according to the participants. Previous studies attempted to document any behavior changes without trying to ascertain what was it about the experience that perhaps accounts for the behavior change.

In this study, behavior change was analyzed against two measures. First, did the forced-referral program change behavior in relation too not entering the discipline system again after attending the program? Second, did the forced referral program change behavior in relation to the amount of alcohol consumption?

Fifty-two students participated in the telephone interviews which lasted on average between ten and twenty

minutes. Participants of this perception study were from a large Midwestern public university.

The subjects in the study assisted in attempting to respond to four research questions evolving from the identified purpose of the study.

- 1. Does a forced referral-alcohol education program effect drinking behavior as it relates to not getting caught again violating university regulations?
- 2. Are there other factors that contributed to a student not entering the discipline system again after attending a forced-referral program?
- 3. Did alcohol use patterns change as a result of attending the forced-referral alcohol education program?
- 4. If the forced-referral program contributed to a student not reentering the judicial system, or changing their rate of alcohol consumption, what was it about the program that changed the student's behavior?

Summary of the Results and Related Conclusions

This summary and conclusions section is organized to allow each research question to be addressed.

Research Ouestion 1. Does a forced-referral alcohol

education program effect drinking behavior as it relates to not getting caught again violating university regulations?

Twenty-two (42.3%) of the 52 participants in the study believed that the Alcohol Education Seminar (AES) did contribute to not getting caught again for violating a University regulation. Of those 22, only four (7.7% of the total sample) reported a change in their drinking behavior. It is important to note that each of those four students indicated to the interviewer that prior to going to the Seminar, they had been evaluating the role alcohol use was playing their life. The four participants stated that the program gave them the additional impetus to make the positive changes in their drinking behavior which enabled them to not enter the discipline system again.

One might conclude that in order for the Seminar to effectively change student drinking behaviors, the participant would have to be evaluating the role alcohol plays in his or her life prior to attending the program. Perhaps Seminar participants could be given information to begin evaluating their alcohol use prior to attending the Seminar. The eighteen students who believed the Seminar contributed to not reentering the discipline system but did not change drinking behavior, could simply not want to get caught again to avoid having to complete another special condition (i.e., Seminar) of their disciplinary action.

The results of the study indicate that an overwhelming majority (92.3%) of the participants attending the AES did

not decrease their alcohol consumption as a result of attending the program. This finding calls into question the effectiveness of the Alcohol Education Seminar if its purpose is to change student drinking behavior. If the goal of the Seminar is to change behavior, new ways to achieve behavior change will need to be explored. Perhaps the nature of the content or the way it is delivered should be adjusted for the Seminar to be more effective. Is the Seminar format best suited to influence a perceived change in consumption? Would a field experience be more effective, or a change in length of the program, or the number of times a student attends the Seminar achieve greater success?

Research Question 2. Are there other factors that contributed to a student not entering the discipline system again after attending a forced referral program?

Only four students participating in the study said that they changed their drinking behavior, as a reason for not entering into the University discipline system again. What, then, were the reasons given by the remaining participants for not getting caught again violating University regulations? Over half (51.9%, n=27) reported that they moved off campus. Since Michigan State University does not hold off campus students accountable for inappropriate behavior, the likelihood that a student residing off campus will violate a University regulation is minimal. Fifteen of the 27 students indicated that the Seminar did not play a

role in their not getting caught violating a University regulation.

It appears that a change to an off campus residence is a most effective means to keep students out of the discipline process. However, drinking behavior does not necessarily change. The problem behavior is removed from the University, but their is not a drinking behavior change, thus the problem moves to the off campus community. Given that the most frequently given response to a change in alcohol consumption over a two year period was that the student believed that they were more mature, one might conclude that the Seminar had little or no effect on changing drinking behavior. Did the Seminar contribute to the maturation process? Further studies should investigate the maturation process concerning alcohol consumption of Seminar participants and similar non-attending students to determine if their is a difference.

It would appear that the participants in the study found other ways to stay out of the discipline system rather than change there drinking behavior. Some admittedly stated that they were lucky not to get caught.

Research Question 3. Did alcohol use patterns change as a result of attending the forced referral alcohol education program?

Fifty out of the 52 participants indicated that they consumed at least one drink per week. The general student

population drinks on average, five drinks per week (Presley, Meilman, and Lyerla, 1993). Presley et. al. (1993) found that 25.7% percent of the general college student population consumes six or more drinks. Nearly one-third (31.1%) of the students attending the Alcohol Education Seminar reported consuming seven or more drinks per week. Nearly half (48.7%) reported consuming four or more drinks per week. Students attending the Seminar drink more per week than their non-attending counterparts, however, among the most heavy drinkers, fewer students attending the Seminar report consuming large quantities (more than 15 drinks) of alcohol per week. An explanation for the heaviest drinkers not attending the Seminar could be that the program is geared toward social drinkers. If a University judicial staff member deems the student to be a heavy drinker, often they are sent for an assessment with a substance abuse counselor. Students who attend the Seminar are viewed to be more social drinkers which may account for their rate of consumption being greater that their non-attending counterparts.

Thirty-five students believed their alcohol consumption changed over the past two years. Nineteen of the 34 students indicated that the Alcohol Education Seminar did effect their rate of consumption. There was no overriding reason for the consumption change. However, the most frequently represented (n=6) response was that their rate only went down for a short period of time (1 to 2 months)

and then went back up to where it was previous. One could conclude that the content of the Seminar, while it is fresh in someone's mind, can have an effect on consumption. Perhaps repeated contact with a Seminar participant over a longer period of time may produce a more substantial After a two year period only thirteen behavior change. students indicated that the Seminar had any lasting effect on their rate of alcohol consumption. Thirteen of the 52 participants, constitutes a small portion (25%) of the sample. There may be several explanations for the ineffectiveness of the Seminar influencing a behavior change over an extended period of time. The content may not be meaningful for the participants; students who attend the program may be angry at being forced to attend and close themselves off from evaluating their alcohol use; and participants may feel their rate of alcohol consumption is responsible.

Research Question 4. If the forced-referral program contributed to a student not reentering the judicial system, or changing their rate of alcohol consumption, what was it about the program that changed the student's behavior?

Each of the interview subjects, who said the program was reason for changing their behavior was asked to identify a specific aspect of the program which contributed to a behavior change. Very few students identified specific aspects of the program. Nineteen participants believed the

Alcohol Education Seminar contributed to a change in their alcohol consumption. Of those nineteen, ten did not offer a specific aspect of the program that changed their behavior; even after having been given suggestions of different components of the program. A reason for the lack of response could have been that the student could not recall the specific aspects of the program after two years. Also, the student may not have been willing to think about the specifics of the program at the time of the interview. Three identified the levels of intoxication exercise which discusses the behavioral and physiological aspects of becoming intoxicated. Three also stated that they thought the group discussion that took place contributed to their behavior change. Participants in the AES are encouraged to talk openly and honestly about their feelings, behaviors, and perspectives related to the variety of topics discussed during the three-hour session. The remaining four respondents each offered different explanations about why they believed the program changed their rate of consumption (see Table 12). It is difficult to make conclusions regarding the effectiveness of a specific aspect of the program. However, it appears that for those who believed that the Seminar contributes to a change in alcohol consumption, it was not so much the content which instigated a change but perhaps the fact that they had to attend the It may have been the overall experience that contributed to a behavior change rather than any specific

aspect of the program.

As mentioned earlier, twenty-two students said that the program contributed to their not reentering the University discipline system. Keep in mind, only four students believed that the program effected their drinking behavior, which in turn led to not getting caught violating another University regulation. Two of the four were able to identify specific aspects of the program which contributed to their not reentering the discipline system. One student identified the video shown during the program as having an effect on their behavior. The video presents several vignettes that address, alcohol use and date rape, an accident (student falls off a balcony after a night of drinking), children of alcoholics, and drinking games among The student stated that the video was very other issues. realistic, and hit him or her close to home. When asked to explain more, the student opted not to discuss the effect of the video further. The other student added that the group discussion contributed to not getting caught violating a University regulation after attending the program. one of the students who stated that group discussion also effected their alcohol consumption.

Very few students were able to identify specific aspects of the program that contributed to a behavior change. Further investigation should be done concerning the content and format of AES to determine if changes in the program could achieve a greater frequency of positive

behavior change.

Overall Conclusions of the Study

It is important to remember that the results of this study can only be generalized to those who participated in this research, yet it may offer some insight into the effectiveness of forced-referral alcohol education programs. Most of the students were willing to comment openly about their experience of attending the Alcohol Education Seminar at Michigan State University. Some students, when asked more probing questions, declined to respond. The interview participants revealed that the Seminar had little effect on changing the drinking behavior. As forced-referral programs continue to be evaluated, institutions of higher education will need to determine the degree to which a program will be judged effective. In this study 13 students believed the program had any lasting impact on their rate of alcohol consumption. The institution will have to determine if this number is significant enough to continue the program in its current form.

While only four students believed that the Seminar contributed to a change in drinking behavior, which enabled them to not get caught violating another University regulation, overall 22 students said the program was a reason for their not getting caught. From an alcohol

education point of view, this finding may be quite discouraging, yet more than one third of the sample said the program effected their behavior when measured against not reentering the discipline system. Again, program administrators will need to determine if these numbers are sufficient enough to continue such a program. As mentioned previously, there could be several explanations for the degree to which the program was successful in changing behavior: program content may not be relevant to the participant; students may be angry about having to attend the program; there may be a willingness to avoid other negative consequences from getting caught again; and the student may simply have matured, with or without the help of the program, to the point that alcohol consumption and the behaviors associated with it may not be as important.

Although not linked to a specific research question, while completing the literature review, the investigator uncovered information regarding the negative relationship between academic performance and substance use (Eigen, 1991). The review of the literature revealed that students who receive lower grades tend to have more problems with alcohol. For this reason, the investigator of this study wanted to determine if the students participating in the telephone interviews had grade point averages that changed over the two-year period, based upon not reentering the discipline system. Unlike what was found in other studies of alcohol use and grade point average, there was no

significant difference between students who reported that the AES contributed to not getting caught again and those who said the AES did not play a role in reentering the discipline system. One might conclude that this may be another indication of the Seminar having little impact on subsequent behavior.

Implications for Further Study

It is imperative that research be continued to clarify "what works" when considering the many facets of a comprehensive alcohol education program. The question arises of whether forced-referral or mandatory alcohol education programs are an effective means of changing behavior. This study generates more questions than perhaps it has attempted to answer. Can forced alcohol education, truly be educational in the way it was intended? Is the punitive aspect of requiring a student to attend an alcohol education program really what contributes to a positive behavior change, rather the content of the program? Will researchers ever be able to attribute any behavior change to a specific alcohol education programmatic thrust?

It is recommended that additional studies be conducted to determine if forced-referral programs really do contribute to a positive behavior change. Specifically, a study should be conducted to further explore the punitive

aspects of the mandatory program to examine what aspects of the program can increase the likelihood of a positive behavior change. A follow-up study which involves interviewing students who enter society and become contributing members of communities to see if they have used any information attained from a forced-referral program. And lastly, perhaps further investigation should be put into looking at different pedagogy methods to determine if certain content or experiences are likely to achieve a positive behavior change.

Final Reflection

Upon reflecting on past professional experiences and the findings of this study, the investigator has cause to wonder, what role, if any, a forced-referral program should play within a comprehensive alcohol education program. If the purpose of a comprehensive program is to eliminate the misuse and abuse of alcohol and other drugs, perhaps the research findings, to date, would call into question the efficacy of the forced-referral program. Yet, if students are changing their behavior in other ways, so as not to get caught violating a regulation and report the forced-referral program contributed to that change, then perhaps the program is effective in reducing, or removing behaviors that lead to property damage on campus, and incidences of violence, for

example. The answer to the question "what works," when considering alcohol education efforts, should be addressed based upon what the objective of the program is with clear measures of evaluation in place to judge its effectiveness.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO JUDICIAL AFFAIRS OFFICE

March 14, 1995

TO:

Marie Hansen

Judicial Affairs

FROM:

Paul Zelenski

RE:

Completion of Ph.D.

Thank you for agreeing to assist me with my research examining the effectiveness of the Alcohol Education Seminar. At this time I would like to request that a list of students, who attended the Seminar during the 1992-93 academic year, be compiled. To maintain anonymity, we have agreed that a member of your staff will assist me in placing the telephone calls for each interview. Your staff member will provide me a code number as a means of differentiating between subjects.

I would like to conduct the telephone interviews during the month of April. Your assistance is appreciated. I hope that this study will provide your office with valuable information about the effectiveness of the Alcohol Education Seminar.

APPENDIX B

NARRATIVE AND CODE NUMBER SHEET USED BY JUDICIAL AFFAIRS STAFF MEMBER

AES EVALUATION QUESTION	NAIRE COVER SHEET
SUBJECT NO:	
Date/Time of Effort to Contact: 1)	Contacted? YES NO
2)	Contacted? YES NO
3)	Contacted? YES NO
1. Hi! My name is, and I We are collecting information on the impact and as part of the research for a graduate student willing to spend some time answering questions a	working on a dissertation. Would you be
YES (if YES, go to number 3)	NO (if NO, go to number 2)
DID NOT ATTEND (go to number 2)	
2. (NO) Thanks anyway, and have a good day/	night (or have a good test, etc.).
3. (YES) There is no risk in your participating in to be completely voluntary, so if you don't want will skip it. To protect your confidentiality, we withe graduate student. Do you understand? No doctoral student.	to answer a question, just say so and well not give your name or phone number to
[FORWARD THE CALL]	
NOTES:	

APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT AND RESPONSE SHEET

AES RESPONSE SHEET						
SUB	JECT NO:				Recorded?	Yes□ No□
Date	:	Tir	ne:			
the c thing com have mine all th	Iudicial Affa g I ask is the fortable giving e an accura d if I recorde he informati	cipating in the interiors Office in evalurate you be honesting. Remember I hat te interpretation conditions from the interv	ating to t, and ave no of you on? T	the effective provide as way of known r response The recordir	eness of the promotion	ogram. The one ntion as you feel are. To help me ing if you would
Que	stions:		· · · · · ·			
1.		attend the Ald Seminar (AES)?	ohol			
	Do you attended?	remember when	you			
2.	What did y experienc	you think of the e?				
3.	How ma	any years have MSU?	you			
4.	University remember (prompt possession)	u got caught violaty regulation, do er what the reason if necessary: minon, alcohol in the halile under the influer	you was or in lway,			

5. Have you been caught for violating any other regulations since you attended the AES? [The response to this question should be no if the student has been properly identified.]	
6. Why do you think that you have not violated a University regulation again? [prompt: Have you just not gotten caught? Did you move off campus? Did you change your behavior?]	
7. Do you think your alcohol consumption has changed over the past two years or so?	
If yes: In what ways has your consumption changed?	
On average, how many drinks do you consume a week now? [A drink is a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink.]	
Is the number of drinks you consume now different from the number you consumed about two years ago?	
Why do you think your consumption of alcohol has changed the way do you have identified?	

	Has any significant, or not so significant event(s) occurred in your life that caused you to change you rate of consumption?	
If no:		
	On average, how many drinks do you consume a week? [A drink is a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink.]	·
8.	Do you think the AES, in any way, effected your rate of consumption of alcohol?	
	If yes:	
	In what ways?	
	Was there any specific aspect of the AES which played a significant role in changing your alcohol consumption?	
9.	Do you think that the AES, in any way, in a reason for you not getting caught again violating a University regulation?	

If yes: In what ways?	
Was there any specific aspect of the AES which played a significant role in contributing to you not getting caught violating another university regulation.	
Is there anything else you would like to add since reflecting on your experience of attending the AES?	

Thank you for participating in the phone interview. I can assure you that your responses will be an asset to evaluating the AES. Thanks again.

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO THE JUDICIAL AFFAIRS OFFICE REQUESTING GRADE POINT AVERAGE DATA

September 1, 1995

TO:

Marie Hansen

Judicial Affairs

FROM:

Paul Zelenski

RE:

GPA Data Request

In an effort to complete my research examining the effectiveness of the Alcohol Education Seminar as it relates to behavior change. I would like to request the Grade Point Averages (GPAs) of those students who participated in the telephone interview. Attached is the list of code numbers of those participants I was able to interview. Please match the code to the corresponding student number you have in your possession to provide the list of GPAs.

Specifically I would like to request the cumulative GPAs for the following semesters.

- 1. Fall 1992
- 2. Fall 1993
- 3. Spring 1995

Thanks you for your assistance.

APPENDIX E

LETTER FROM THE UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH INVOLVING HUMAN SUBJECTS

MICHIGAN STATE

April 10, 1995

TO: Paul Zelenski

101 Student Services

RE: IRB#:

TITLE:

95-164 THE PARTICIPANTS PERCEPTION OF ANY BEHAVIOR CHANGE AS A RESULT OF ATTENDING A FORCED REFERRAL ALCOHOL EDUCATION PROGRAM

REVISION REQUESTED:

CATEGORY:

APPROVAL DATE:

N/A 2-H,I 04/10/95

The University Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects' (UCRIHS) review of this project is complete. I am pleased to advise that the rights and welfare of the human subjects appear to be adequately protected and methods to obtain informed consent are appropriate. Therefore, the UCRIHS approved this project including any revision listed above.

If we can be of any future help, please do not hesitate to contact us at (517)355-2180 or FAX (517)336-1171.

RENEWAL:

UCRIHS approval is valid for one calendar year, beginning with the approval date shown above. Investigators planning to continue a project beyond one year must use the green renewal form (enclosed with the original approval letter or when a project is renewed) to seek updated certification. There is a maximum of four such expedited renewals possible. Investigators wishing to continue a project beyond that time need to submit it again for complete review. again for complete review.

REVISIONS: UCRIHS must review any changes in procedures involving human subjects, prior to initiation of the change. If this is done at the time of renewal, please use the green renewal form. To revise an approved protocol at any other time during the year, send your written request to the UCRIHS Chair, requesting revised approval and referencing the project's IRB # and title. Include in your request a description of the change and any revised instruments, consent forms or advertisements that are applicable.

PROBLEMS/ CHANGES:

Sincerely,

UCRIHS Chair

Should either of the following arise during the course of the work, investigators must notify UCRIHS promptly: (1) problems (unexpected side effects, complaints, etc.) involving human subjects or (2) changes in the research environment or new information indicating greater risk to the human subjects than existed when the protocol was previously reviewed and approved.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH

AND **GRADUATE STUDIES**

University Committee on Research Involving **Human Subjects** (UCRIHS)

Michigan State University

232 Administration Building East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1046

DEW:pjm

cc: Louis Hekhuis

David E. Wright, PA

ַ ח

517/355-2180 FAX: 517/432-1171

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Anderson, D. S., and Gadeleto, A. F. Progress or Illusion: The 1979 and 1982 College Alcohol Surveys. <u>Journal of</u> <u>College Student Personnel</u>, 1984 25 (4).
- Amanda, G. Dealing With the Disruptive College Student: Some Theoretical and Practical Considerations. <u>College Health</u>, April 1983 34.
- Ardaiolo, F. P. and Walker, S. J. Models of Practice. In New Directions for Student Services: Enhancing Campus Judicial Systems, ed. R. Caruso and W. Travelstead. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Baines, G. M. Evaluation of Alcohol Education A
 Reassessment Using Socialization Theory. <u>Journal of Drug Education</u>, 14 (2).
- Berkowitz, A. D., and Perkins, H. W. Current Issues in Effective Alcohol Education Programming. In <u>Alcohol Policies and Practices on College and University Campuses</u>, ed. J. S. Sherwood. NASPA Monograph Series, 1987.
- Blane, H.T., and Hewitt, L. E. Alcohol and Youth: An Analysis of the Literature, 1960-1975. Rockville, Maryland: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, March 1977.
- Blum, S., Rivers, C., Howat, J., and Bellows, D. The Effect of Contracted Abstinence On College Students Behavior Toward Alcohol Use. <u>Journal of Alcohol and Drug</u> Education, 1980 25 (3).
- Brady, T. A. and Snoxell, L. F., <u>Student Discipline in Higher Education</u>. American College Personnel Association, Washington D. C., 1965.
- Britain, S., and Roberge, L. Student's Perception of the Effects of a University's Alcohol Policy. <u>College Student Journal</u>, Fall 1988 22
- Brown, J. L., Alcohol Consumption Among Kansas State
 University Freshmen by Probation and No-Probation
 Status. <u>Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education</u>, 1989 34
 (3).

- Brown, C. L., Tucker, E., and Brandon, C. Freshman Residents' Perception of an Alcohol Education Class. College Student Journal, December 1991 25
- Bryan, W. A., Administering A Campus Alcohol Program. In Alcohol Programs for Higher Education, ed. J. C. Dean and W. A. Bryan. ACPA Media, Southern Illinois Press, 1982.
- Boots, C. C., Human Development Theory Applied to Judicial Affairs Work. In <u>New Directions for Student Services:</u>

 <u>Enhancing Campus Judicial Systems</u>, ed. R. Caruso and W. Travelstead. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- Caruso, R., Organizing for Judicial Affairs Work. In New <u>Directions for Student Services: Enhancing Campus</u>
 <u>Judicial Systems</u>, ed. R. Caruso and W. Travelstead.
 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs) Standards: Standards and Guidelines Judicial Programs and Services. 1986.
- CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards for Student Services/Development Programs) Standards: Standards and Guidelines for Alcohol and Other Drug Programs. 1990.
- Chen, W. W., Dosch, M. Comparison of Drinking Attitudes and Behaviors Between Participating and Non-Participating Students in an Voluntary Alcohol Education Program. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, Spring 1987 32.
- Chen, W. W., Dosch, M. and Cychosz, C. M. The Impact of a Voluntary Educational Program - Tip It Lightly, Alcohol Awareness Week. <u>Journal of Drug Education</u>, 1982 12 (2).
- Clayton, K. N. An Introduction To Statistics for Psychology and Education, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1984.
- Commission on Substance Abuse at College and Universities Rethinking Rites of Passage: Substance ABUSE on America's Campuses. Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, Columbia University, 1994.
- Dean, H. E., and Dean, J. C. The Evaluation of Campus Alcohol Programming. In <u>Alcohol Programs for Higher</u> <u>Education</u>, ed. J. C. Dean and W. A. Bryan. ACPA Media, Southern Illinois Press, 1982.

- Dennison, D. The Effects of Selected Field Experiences Upon the Drinking Behavior of University Students. <u>Journal of School Health</u>, 1977 49.
- Eigen, L. D. Alcohol Practices, Policies, and Potentials of American Colleges and University. An Office of Substance Abuse Services White Paper, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Rockville, Maryland, 1991.
- Engs, R. C. Let's Look Before We Leap: The Cognitive and Behavioral Evaluation of a University Alcohol Education Program. <u>Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education</u>, 1977 22 (2).
- Engs, R. C. Drinking Patterns and Drinking Problems of College Students. <u>Journal of Studies on Alcohol</u>, 1977 38 (11).
- Engs, R. C., and Hanson, D. J. The Drinking Patterns and Problems of College Students: 1983. <u>Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education</u>, 1985 31 (1).
- Engs, R. C., and Hanson, D. J. The Alcohol Knowledge and Drinking Myths of a National Sample of University Students. <u>Journal of College Student Development</u>, 1989 30 (2).
- Fischer, J. M. A Historical Perspective: Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism in America and on Our Campuses. In Alcohol Policies and Practices on College and University Campuses, ed. J. S. Sherwood. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, Monograph Series, 1987.
- Flynn, C. A. and Brown, W. E. The Effects of a Mandatory Alcohol Education Program on College Student Drinkers.

 <u>Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education</u>, 1991 37 (1).
- Fulton, D. R. and Spooner, S. E. Alcohol on Campus: The Current Issues. NASPA Journal, 1987 25 (2).
- Gonzalez, G. M. Alcohol Education Can Prevent Alcohol Problems: A Summary of Some Unique Research Findings.

 Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 1982 27 (3).
- Gonzalez, G. M. Proactive Efforts and Selected Alcohol Education Program. In <u>New Directions for Student</u> <u>Services: Alcohol and the College Student</u>, ed. T. G. Goodale. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.

- Gonzalez, G. M. Alcohol Policy Development: A Necessary Component for a Comprehensive Alcohol Education Program on Campus. In <u>Alcohol Policies and Practices on College and University Campuses</u>, ed. J. S. Sherwood. NASPA Monograph Series, 1987
- Gonzalez, G. M., and Wiles, W. The Incidence of Alcohol Usage as a Factor in Student Disciplinary Cases. NASPA Journal, 1981 12 (2).
- Goodale, T. G. What History Has Taught Us. In <u>New Directions</u> for Student Services: Alcohol and the College Student, ed. T. G. Goodale. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.
- Goodstadt, M. S., and Caleekal, J. Alcohol Education Programs for University Students: A Review of Their Effectiveness. <u>International Journal of the</u> Addictions, 1984 19 (7).
- Hanson, D. J. The Effectiveness of Alcohol and Drug Education. <u>Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education</u>, 1982 27 (2)
- Hanson, D. J. and Engs, R., Correlates of Drinking Problems Among Collegians. <u>College Student Journal</u>, 1986 20 (2)
- Hewitt, K. The Whole College Catalogue About Drinking A
 Guide to Alcohol Abuse Prevention. U. S. Department of
 Health, Education, and Welfare. Rockville, MD, 1977.
- Hoekema, D. A. <u>Campus Rules and Moral Community</u>, Roman and Littlefield Publishers Inc.: Lanham, Maryland, 1994.
- Hughes, S. P. and Dodder, R. A., Alcohol Consumption
 Patterns Among College Populations. <u>Journal of College</u>
 <u>Student Personnel</u>, 1983 24.
- Ingalls, Z. Higher Educations's Drinking Problem. Chronicle of Higher Education, July 21, 1982.
- Ingalls, Z. Campus Programs Called Ineffective in Ending Student Alcohol Abuse. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1984, May 2.
- Janosik, S. M., Davis, M. B., and Spencer, E. F. D. Characteristics of Repeat Student Offenders: A 6-year Study. <u>Journal of College Student Personnel</u>, 1985 26 (5).
- Kinder, W. N., Pope, N. and Walfish, S. Drug and Alcohol Education Programs: A Review of Outcome Studies. <u>The</u> <u>International Journal of the Addictions</u>, 1980 15 (7).

- Kivlahan, D. R. Secondary Prevention with College Drinkers: Evaluation of an Alcohol Skills Training Program. <u>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</u>, December 1990 58.
- Kraft, D. D. The Prevention and treatment of Alcohol Problems On a College Campus. <u>Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education</u>, 1988 34 (1).
- Kuh, G. D. The Influence of College Environments on Student Drinking. Paper read at Association for the Study of Higher Education. Boston, Massachusetts. October 1991.
- LeMay, M., College Disciplinary Referrals for Drinking.

 <u>Journal of Student Alcohol</u>. 1968 29.
- Linney, J. A. and Wandersman, A. <u>Prevention Plus III:</u>
 <u>Assessing Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Programs at the School and Community Level</u>. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Rockville, Maryland, 1991.
- Magner, D. K. Alcohol Related Problems Have Not Decreased on Most College Campuses, Survey Indicates. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1988, November 9.
- Merriam, S. B. <u>Case Study Research in Education: A</u>
 <u>Oualitative Approach</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass,
 1988.
- Mills, K. C., Pfaffenberger, B., and McCarty, D. Guidelines for Alcohol Abuse Prevention on the College Campus:

 Overcoming the Barriers to Program Success. <u>Journal of Higher Education</u>, 1981 52.
- National Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence (NCAAD).

 NCAAD Fact Sheet: Youth and Alcohol. Washington, D.C.,
 1993.
- Nelson, S. J. Alcohol Policies and Educational Mission.

 NASPA Journal, 1987 25 (2).
- O'Connell, D. F., and Beck, T. An Involuntary Therapeutic Group for Alcohol Abusers. <u>Journal of College Student</u> <u>Personnel</u>, 1984 25 (1).
- "Officials Involved in Cutting Substance Abuse by Students Search for What Works." Chronicle of Higher Education, 1988, November 9.
- Oppenheim, A. N. <u>Ouestionnaire Design and Attitude</u>
 <u>Measurement</u>, New York: Basic Books, 1966.

- Perkins, W. H. Confronting Misperceptions of Peer Drug Use Norms Among College Students: An Alternative Approach for Alcohol and Other Drug Education Programs. <u>Peer</u> <u>Prevention Implementation Manual: Help Network</u>. 1992.
- Perkins, W. H. and Berkowitz, A. D. Perceiving the Community Norms of ALCOHOL Use Among Students: Some research Implications for Campus Alcohol Education Programming. <u>International Journal of the Addictions</u>, 1986 21.
- Portnoy, B. Effects of a Controlled Usage Alcohol Education Program Based on the Health Belief Model. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Drug Education</u>, 1980 10 (3).
- Posavac, E. College Students' Views of Excessive Drinking and the University's Role. <u>Journal of Drug Education</u>, 1993 23 (3).
- Presley, C.A., Meilman, P. S., and Lyerla, R. Alcohol and Drugs on American College Campuses: Use, Consequences, and Perceptions of the Campus Environment, 1, Southern Illinois University for the U.S. Department of Education, 1993.
- Ramsey, E. An Intervention Model for Alcohol and Drug Problems on the College Campus. <u>Journal of College</u> <u>Student Personnel</u>, 1982 23.
- Rapaport, R. S. and Bryan, W. A. Conceptual Framework for Developing a Comprehensive Campus Program to Reduce Alcohol, Other Drug and Substance Problems. <u>U.S.</u>

 <u>Department of Education Network of Colleges and Universities Committed to the Elimination of Drug and Alcohol Abuse</u>, 1991.
- Robinson, J. III A Comparison of Three Alcohol Instruction Programs on the Knowledge, Attitudes, and Drinking Behaviors of College Students. <u>Journal of Drug</u> Education, 1981 11.
- Rosenthal, R. and Rosnow, R. L. <u>The Volunteer Subject</u>, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1975.
- Rozelle, G. R., Experiential and Cognitive Small group Approaches to Alcohol Education for College Students. <u>Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education</u>, 1980 26 (1).
- Sadler, O. and Scott, A. First Offenders: A Systematic Response to Underage Drinking on the College Campus.

 <u>Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education</u>, 1993 38 (2).

- Scheaffer, R. L., Mendenhall, W., and Ott, L. <u>Elementary</u>
 <u>Survey Sampling</u>, fourth ed., Boston; PWS Kent
 Publishing Company, 1990.
- Sherry, P. and Stolberg, V. Factors Affecting Alcohol Use of College Students. <u>Journal of College Student</u>
 <u>Personnel</u>, 1987 24 (4).
- Tracey, T. J., Foster, M. E., Perkins, D. C., and Hillman, L. P. Characteristics of Student Offenders: Some New Findings and Suggested Improvements in Research Method. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1979 20.
- Upcraft, M. L., and Eck, S. C. TAAP: A Model Alcohol Education Program That Works. In <u>New Directions for</u> <u>Student Services: Alcohol and the College Student</u>, ed. T. G. Goodale. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1986.
- Upcraft, M. L., and Welty, J. D. A Guide for College
 Presidents and Governing Boards: Strategies for
 Eliminating Alcohol and Other Drug Use on Campuses,
 U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational
 Research and Improvement, September, 1990.
- Wechsler, H. and McFadden, M., Drinking Among College Students in New England: Extent, Social Correlates, and Consequences of Alcohol Use. <u>Journal of Studies on</u> Alcohol, 1979 40.
- Werch, C. E., Gorman, D. R., and Marty, P. J., Relationship Between Alcohol Consumption and Alcohol Problems in Young Adults. <u>Journal of Drug Education</u>. 1987 17 (3).
- Williamson, E. G., Jowe, W. W., and Lagerstadt-Knudson, B. What Kinds of College Students Become Disciplinary Cases? <u>Educational and Psychological Measurement</u>, 1952 12.
- Williamson, E. G., The Fusion of Discipline and Counseling in the Educative Process. <u>Personnel and Guidance</u>
 <u>Journal</u>, 1955 34 (1).
- Wilsnak, R. W., and Wilsnak, S. C. Introduction and Overview. In <u>Alcohol Programs for Higher Education</u>, ed. J. C. Dean, and W. A. Bryan. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1982.
- Wright, L. S., Correlates of Reported Drinking Problems Among Male and Female College Students. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Alcohol and Drug Education</u>, 1983 28 (3).

