



This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

SELF-REPORTED IMPACT OF JUDICIALLY MANDATED
ALCOHOL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES
ON COLLEGE STUDENTS

presented by

KATHERINE R. PAYTON-SULLIVAN

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Education

Dr. Gloria S. Smith
Major professor

Date 3-26-97



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 30 2003 080105		

SELF-REPORTED IMPACT OF JUDICIALLY MANDATED
ALCOHOL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES ON COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Katherine R. Payton-Sullivan

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Teacher Education

March 26, 1997

ABSTRACT

SELF-REPORTED IMPACT OF JUDICIALLY MANDATED ALCOHOL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES ON COLLEGE STUDENTS

by

Katherine R. Payton-Sullivan

The purpose of the study was to provide information about the impact of selected features of mandated learning activities on alcohol-related knowledge, attitude and behavior of first time violators of university alcohol regulations. Information was also collected about the impact of the meeting with the administrative officer (AO) who decided the disciplinary action.

Impact was assessed through self-reports from a telephone survey in which questions were asked about the violator's knowledge, attitude and behavior relative to alcohol. This survey was conducted in Spring of 1996, with violators from the 1994-95 school year. Chi square (X^2) was the statistic used to analyze the data.

Violators who were not required to participate in mandated learning activities had a greater frequency of yes responses to questions about the impact due to the meeting with the AO than violators who were required to complete a mandated learning activity. However, this was statistically significant only for the question which asked if they learned something as a result of the meeting.

Violators who were required to participate in two mandated learning activities had a greater frequency of yes responses (though not statistically significant) to questions about impact due to the meeting with the AO than

violators required to participate in only one activity. When these same two groups were asked about the impact of the activities, there was a statistically significantly greater frequency of yes responses to the question about the impact of the activity on their own use of alcohol than violators required to do only one activity.

Violators required to participate in an activity involving peer conversation about alcohol had a statistically significantly greater frequency of yes responses to four of the six questions about the impact of the activity.

Violators required to participate in a specific mandated learning activity (the Alcohol Education Seminar) had a statistically significantly greater frequency of yes responses to questions about the impact of the seminar than violators who participated in all other activities.

Implications and limitations of the findings are discussed and suggestions for future research are presented.

Copyright by
Katherine R. Payton-Sullivan
1997

DEDICATION

To my mother and now Noreen, who are always at the throne of grace praying for me; my husband, Othello, for all his love, prayers, encouragement, patience, help and support, and to Jesus, my high priest, I truly give the glory.

"No weapon fashioned against you shall prosper;" Isaiah 54:17 (NAB)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My appreciation is expressed to my committee members, Dr. Gloria Smith, the chair of my committee, and Dr. George Rowan, for their constancy, insight and encouragement toward higher learning and completion of this study; my dissertation director, Dr. Lee June, for fostering my writing and insights, and thanks to Dr. Eugene Pernell for his shared insights as part of the committee.

Special thanks to a colleague and friend, Marie Hansen, for all her support and encouragement through the years of study, and completion of the project, and thanks also to Dr. Ira Washington for assistance in statistical design.

I must also thank Mike Shelton for the outstanding job of typing over the years, and formatting of the final copy.

Thanks to Dr. Bill Alli, who shared insights and encouraged me over the years; Sister Pat, Rita and Jan for their loving support through listening and prayer. To those who took part in the survey as respondents and interviewers, thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I - STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Rationale	2
Significance of the Study	3
General Response to the Problem	3
MSU's Response in the Area of Policy and Enforcement	6
CHAPTER II - LITERATURE REVIEW	14
Alcohol as a Problem on College and University Campuses	14
Defining Impact	16
Summary of Research on Mandated Activities' Effectiveness	17
Factors Impacting Knowledge, Attitudes and Behavior	20
CHAPTER III - RESEARCH DESIGN	26
CHAPTER IV - DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND RESULTS	34
Description of Sample and Usable Responses	34
Research Question #1: Mandated Learning Activity vs. Administrative Officer Meeting	37
Research Question #2: One Mandated Learning Activity vs. Two Mandated Learning Activities	39
Research Question #3: Input into Choice of Mandated Learning Activity vs. No Input into Choice of Mandated Learning Activity	42
Research Question #4: Impact of Mandated Learning Activities With Shame vs. Mandated Learning Activities With No Shame	43
Research Question #5: Mandated Learning Activities involving Peer Conversation vs. Mandated Learning Activities With No Peer Conversation	45
Alcohol Education Seminar (AES) - A Specific Mandated Learning Activity vs. Other Mandated Learning Activities	48
Research Question #6: Impact of Mandated Learning Activities on Heavy Drinkers	51

CHAPTER V - DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	54
Discussion	54
Limitations of the Study	65
Recommendations	67
REFERENCES	69
APPENDIX A - Student Questionnaires	78
APPENDIX B - Public Law 101-226	89
APPENDIX C - UCRIHS Approval Letter	90

LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 - Comparison of Impact of AO Meeting on Violators Completing No Activity vs. Violators Completing Activity	39
Table 4.2 - Comparison of Impact of AO Meeting on Violators Completing One Activity vs. Two Activities	41
Table 4.3 - Impact of Activity(ies) on Violators Completing One Activity vs. Two Activities	41
Table 4.4 - Impact of Activity when Violator had Input into Choice of Activity vs. No Input	43
Table 4.5 - Impact of Activity(ies) with Shame vs. Impact of Activity(ies) with Non-Shame	44
Table 4.6 - Impact of Peer Conversation Activity vs. Impact of Non-Peer Conversation Activity	46
Table 4.7 - Impact of AES vs. Non-AES Activity	50
Table 4.8 - Impact of Activities on Heavy Drinkers vs. Light/Moderate Drinkers	53

CHAPTER I

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Alcohol and other drugs have a significant impact on America's children and youth, from elementary through college age (Haworth-Hoeppner, Globetti, Stem & Morasco, 1989; Robinson, Gloria, Roth & Schuetter, 1993). Parents, communities, churches, students and schools are very concerned about this issue. Illegal drugs and alcohol are being used by children at progressively earlier ages (Friend & Kowalski, 1984; Robins & Przybeck, 1985; Yu & Williford, 1990).

Chemical substance use generally begins prior to college entrance, although it often increases after the student is in college (Pascale, Trucksis & Sylvester, 1985; Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Moeykens & Castillo, 1994). Research has shown that the mean age for initial drug use is 13 and the most often used is alcohol (Fournet, Estes, Martin & Robertson, 1990). Even more frightening, the Fournet longitudinal study showed that at least one percent of those surveyed reported their initial experimentation occurred under the age of nine and that substantial drug and alcohol use occurred as early as the fifth grade.

Further studies have shown that early initial drug use has been linked to later use of these substances and that the heaviest college drinkers tend to begin

in elementary school (Haworth-Hoeppner et al., 1989). A survey conducted by Gallup in 1994 and 1995 showed that when 13 to 18 year old youth were asked to name the biggest problems facing young people today, drugs led their lists.

College officials believe that alcohol is a factor in over 40% of all academic problems and in over 28% of college dropouts (Anderson & Gadaletto, 1991; Hill & Bugen, 1979). Anderson and Gadaletto (1991) conducted a series of longitudinal surveys and found that their 1991 percentages represented statistically significant increases in alcohol abuse over their 1985 and 1988 figures. Werch, Gorman and Marty (1987) found a positive relationship between increased alcohol use and the various social and academic problems students experienced.

Alcohol abuse is a problem at a large midwestern university, Michigan State University (MSU), where the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (Presley, Meilman & Lyerla, 1993) was used in 1992 to survey MSU students. Results from the survey showed that 77% of Michigan State University students report underage drinking in the residence halls, 27% of students under age 21 reported use at campus events where it is prohibited by law and regulation, and 8% reported no use.

Rationale

The data gathered in this study provides colleges and universities with important information about which features of mandated learning activities possibly impact change in alcohol use and abuse, along with assisting these institutions

in designing mandated learning activities and assigning disciplinary actions to judicial violators.

Educational activities which have significant impact on student alcohol use and abuse behaviors are too important for educators to ignore. Disciplinary actions can no longer be administered to students in the hope the mandated learning activities performed will produce results. These interventions must be scientifically evaluated to determine if they are effective.

Significance of the Study

Presently, colleges and universities across the country use mandated learning activities without knowledge of their impact. This study provides data to institutions of higher education about which features of mandated learning activities may be related to self-reported change relative to alcohol use and abuse. This information can be used in the assignment of disciplinary actions and the design of mandated learning activities.

General Response to the Problem

Many college and university alcohol education programs were initiated in response to the well-documented high level of alcohol use by college students (Millner, 1991). The government encouraged college campuses across our nation to give more attention to the problem of substance abuse among college and university students. Important efforts have been developed to address this problem on campus through the enforcement of new policies, increased

enforcement of rules, and implementation of peer education programs (Steinberg, 1996).

Federal funding and new federal regulations have encouraged college campuses across the nation to give more attention to the problem of student substance abuse. Many important campus efforts have been developed to address this problem through the enforcement of new policies, increased enforcement of rules, and peer education programs.

The Drug Free Schools and Communities Act, Public Law 101-226 (Federal Register, 1990), was an important initiative from the federal level requiring schools receiving any federal dollars to establish a policy that prohibits illegal drug use by faculty, staff and students and the abuse and illegal use of alcohol. Colleges and universities are required to annually inform all students, faculty and staff members of the existence of this policy; the consequences for being arrested for the use of illegal drugs or alcohol, health risks of drug and alcohol abuse, and treatment resources available on campus. Failure to comply with these provisions may result in loss of federal funding.

A number of colleges and universities have required participation in alcohol education sessions and activities by those students who violate school alcohol regulations. These sessions and activities will be referred to herein as "learning activities." Examples of the activities utilized by some schools are contained in a manual published by Phelps and Burchell (1991) at Colorado State University. The manual lists a number of educational learning activities that have been developed and used by institutions of higher education. This manual was

compiled by surveying colleges and universities across the country. One section of the manual is devoted to alcohol learning activities for students who violate alcohol regulations. Some examples of these activities include (a) showing a film or video on or about alcoholism and then leading a discussion; (b) volunteering at a detoxification center; (c) collecting cans for a local Students Against Driving Drunk (SADD) chapter; and (d) attending or organizing an alcohol education program in the residence hall(s).

Preventive Responses

Federal legislation has provided money through the Fund to Improve Post Secondary Education (FIPSE) which has allocated 100 institution-wide program grants each year since 1989. Many of these grants fund the establishment of a campus alcohol education coordinator position. The FIPSE grant criteria are clear that funding is for alcohol and other drug education prevention activities and not for treatment and rehabilitation. These prevention efforts include peer education programs, theater troupe presentations, and the establishment of student groups to provide organized activities for non-drinkers. One recipient of such federal funding was Michigan State University.

MSU received its grant in 1991 to set up groups in each residence hall to sponsor alternative activities to drinking. The University has now institutionalized the alcohol education program developed and implemented with federal dollars -- it is called "Project Impact." There is a student organization in every residence hall committed to organizing alcohol free activities and peer

education programs. The University has hired a full time alcohol education coordinator in the Student Life Department to work with the Residence Life Department advisors to these groups. The coordinator also advises the Michigan State University (SADD) Chapter and the Project Impact coordinating student organization (the Student Action Team Roundtable).

MSU's Response in the Area of Policy and Enforcement

MSU has adopted a Public Health Model as part of its response to the alcohol problem on its campus.

MSU's PUBLIC HEALTH MODEL

- I. Policy
 - A. limits accessibility and decreases use through enforcement
 - B. policies parallel state law
 - C. mandated learning activities for violators of alcohol regulations
 - 1. alcohol education seminar
 - 2. other learning activities
- II. Education
 - A. Project Impact groups in residence halls
 - B. University-wide educational campaigns
 - C. peer education programs in residence halls
- III. Treatment
 - A. assessments by counselors
 - B. recovery groups
- IV. Research
 - A. Core Alcohol and Drug Survey
 - B. Healthy U. survey

The focus of this study was on policy and enforcement. The purpose of policy and enforcement is to limit accessibility and decrease use (Janosik &

Anderson, 1989). A good example of the successful use of these strategies was the effort to reduce cigarette smoking by public health officials. This policy of educating the public, limiting access by empowering non-smokers, and decreasing use also increased the public's knowledge and changed attitudes and behaviors toward smoking.

This model has four components, with the first requiring the University to establish and enforce policy in order to decrease availability. The second component is education and prevention. Under this component students are made aware of the Michigan Highway Safety Department's standard for alcohol consumption, the risks associated with abuse, and the nature of "problem drinking." The standard set by the Michigan Highway Safety Department is called 0-1-3. The 0-1-3 standard says:

Zero = zero alcohol, especially if you're under 21, driving, chemically dependent or pregnant. One = one drink per hour sets the pace for moderate drinking. Three = no more than three drinks per day, and never daily.

Another important part of this component is providing alcohol free activities and living spaces. Alternative social activities and peer education programs are created in each residence hall. This effort is coordinated through "Project Impact." Treatment and intervention are the third component of the model. This involves intervening with problem drinkers and providing assessment and referral for treatment through the MSU Counseling Center. The fourth component is research and uses the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey data.

Policy, Enforcement and Characteristics of Students Assigned to Attend Learning Activities

Policy was established in regard to alcohol use to limit student access to alcohol on campus and to be in compliance with state and federal law. Michigan State University's student regulations have been operationalized in the residence halls as prohibiting the following kinds of behaviors:

1. underage drinking of alcohol
2. alcohol in the hallways
3. parties with five times the intended occupancy of the room
4. the existence of a common source of alcohol

A student caught violating a policy in a residence hall, usually by a student staff member called an RA (Resident Assistant), is reported to the director of the building called an RD/CD (Resident Director/Complex Director). The student staff member files a disciplinary report with the RD/CD. If the student is a first time violator, the RD/CD acts as an administrative officer (AO). An AO is a university staff member with delegated authority by the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services to notify students when they have been accused of violating a university regulation and to determine what disciplinary action will be taken if the student admits to the violation and requests the administrator to take disciplinary action as opposed to having a judicial hearing. The RD/CD then requests a meeting with the violator and the student is asked if s/he admits or denies the offense. If the student violator admits committing the offense, s/he

can then have the administrator take disciplinary action. This is what occurs in 80% of the cases.

However, if the student violator denies committing the offense, s/he has a right to a hearing. If the violator is found not guilty (based on preponderance of evidence), the case is dismissed; but if the violator is found guilty, whoever conducted the hearing decides upon disciplinary action. If the student violator is a second time offender then s/he is referred to the Judicial Affairs Office where staff acting as administrative officers go through the same process as the director of a residence hall.

A disciplinary action is taken by an AO in response to violation of university regulations by a student. These actions may be a warning, a warning probation for a set period of time, or a disciplinary probation for a set period of time. These actions may also be coupled with other requirements or special conditions as deemed appropriate including mandated learning activities to be studied. The 1989 amendment to the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act requires colleges and universities to list the consequences for violations and to apply and enforce disciplinary actions consistently. "Procedures and penalties for the violation of regulations are designed for guidance or correction of behavior only. Repeated violations justify increasingly severe penalties" (Michigan State University Administrative Officer Manual, 1995).

Mandated Activities and Their Characteristics

The mandated learning activities are the part of the disciplinary action which are intended to help the violator learn from his/her mistake and correct his/her behavior. The learning activities used by Michigan State for violation of alcohol regulations include an Alcohol Education Seminar. The seminar is three hours in length with a fifteen-minute midway break and involves the following:

- (1) an Agree/Disagree exercise wherein a facilitator reads one of seven statements and the students discuss how they feel about the statement.
- (2) a video called "Finding Out" is viewed and the theme of the discussion is making healthy sound decisions in regards to alcohol and related issues (levels of intoxication, impaired brain functions, behaviors exhibited or not, blood alcohol levels, 0-1-3, alcohol and families), and giving a handout titled "The Alcoholic Family."
- (3) a "Healthy Choice" continuum wherein each student reads off one of 26 statements with the group trying to agree where a behavior should be placed on the continuum.

Students also receive a handout entitled "The Highs and Lows of Drinking" and are asked to evaluate their options against the standards presented. The community and university resource list is distributed and students are encouraged to take a copy along with other drug and alcohol handouts.

Examples of other mandated learning activities include:

- (1) creating and putting up an alcohol education bulletin board in a residence hall;
- (2) presentation of an alcohol education floor or hall program;
- (3) attending another person's alcohol education floor or hall program;
- (4) writing an alcohol education paper;
- (5) visiting a university resource;
- (6) organizing a floor activity that does not focus on alcohol education.
- (7) community service
- (8) study table attendance

Research Questions for the Study

The main research questions were: Does requiring mandated learning activities of violators of university alcohol regulations make a difference in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse? Secondly, if it does make a difference, what are the factors associated with the mandated learning activity(ies) that are most effective in making the difference(s)? Specific questions addressed were:

1. Do judicial violators who are required to complete mandated learning activities report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse when compared to violators who are not required to complete mandated learning activities?

2. Do judicial violators who are required to complete two mandated learning activities report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitudes and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse than violators who are required to complete only one mandated learning activity?
3. Do judicial violators who perceive they have input into the choice and/or the development of the mandated learning activity report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse than judicial violators who perceive they were not given input into the choice and/or the development of the learning activity?
4. Do judicial violators report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse if mandated learning activity involve the elements of shame and embarrassment than when the activity does not involve these elements?
5. Do judicial violators report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse if the mandated learning activity involves some peer conversation about alcohol than if the activity does not?
6. Are judicial violators, who are defined as heavy drinkers, less likely to report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude

or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse than judicial violators
who are moderate or light users?

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The overall purpose of this study was to examine the impact of various learning activities on college offenders in judicially mandated alcohol education activities.

This review of literature will examine the following areas: (a) alcohol as a problem on college and university campuses, (b) defining impact and current research on impact, (c) mandated activities, and (d) factors which may be associated with successfully impacting knowledge, attitude and/or behavior.

Alcohol as a Problem on College and University Campuses

Alcohol and illegal drugs are being used by young people at progressively earlier ages (Friend & Koushki, 1984; Yu & Williford, 1990). Heavy alcohol use by our college population has been documented by numerous studies which found greater alcohol consumption by college students in comparison to the general population (Burrell, 1990; Blane & Hewitt, 1977; Celis, 1994; Engs & Hanson, 1985; Glassco, 1975; Gonzalez & Broughton, 1986; Schall, Kemeny & Maltzman, 1992; Toohey, 1971; Vischi, Jones, Shrank & Lima, 1980; Weschler, 1995). Research has shown that 13 is the mean age for initial drug use and the most common and significant drug used is alcohol (Fournet, Estes, Martin & Robertson, 1990; Maney,

1990). The Fournet study also showed that at least one percent of those surveyed reported their initial experimentation with alcohol occurred under the age of nine; and Haworth-Hoeppner, Globetti, Stem and Morasco (1989) showed that early initial drug use has been linked to later use of these substances with the heaviest college drinkers tending to begin drinking in elementary school.

Five or more drinks in a sitting is defined as alcohol abuse, and underage drinking on college campuses is also a sign of abuse of alcohol (Johnston, O'Malley & Bachman, 1991). These same researchers tell us that 41% of U.S. college students report they consumed five or more drinks in a sitting during the previous two weeks when the survey was conducted.

Students report the negative consequences for their alcohol abuse in the form of missing classes, performing poorly on tests or projects, hangovers, blackouts, being sick or nauseated, getting physically injured, destroying property, shoplifting, driving under the influence, speeding, getting sexually assaulted, getting into fights, getting in trouble with the law and/or school officials, and getting arrested for drunk driving (Barnes, 1975; Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse [CASA] Commission, 1994; Presley, Meilman & Lyster, 1993; Wechsler, 1995; Wechsler, Dowdall, Davenport & Castillo, 1995; Engs & Hanson, 1990; Meacci, 1990; Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, 1993; Wechsler, Dowdall, Davenport, Moeykens & Castillo, 1994; Wechsler & Issac, 1992).

Other studies show a positive correlation between poor college performance and increased alcohol consumption. These researchers show that students who are performing poorly academically drink more in all contexts than

do their peers who have higher academic standing (Brown, 1989; Eagle & Schmitt, 1990; Hartford, Wechler & Rohman, 1983; Hughes & Dodder, 1983; Waddell, 1993).

Because alcohol is the most widely used mind-altering drug not only on college campuses but in our society in general, faculty and students generally accept student intoxication as a prevalent part of the campus environment. Daugherty and O'Brian (1989) noted:

Social dependence is present when high risk drinking choices are typical for the whole group, and may even be required for a full sense of membership to that group. The danger in social dependence is that it makes a person's high risk drinking choices seem normal, because for that group they are (p. 8).

Defining Impact

Educators define success in these programs in reference to their impact on the student's knowledge, attitude and/or behavior (Andrews, 1987; Jessor, 1982; Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986; Sherry & Stalberg, 1987). There is a widely accepted belief in alcohol education programs that by educating students about the harmful effects of alcohol, students will be compelled to exercise responsible alcohol use or abstinence (Keeley & Solomon, 1982). These educators say the degree of impact on the learner's knowledge, attitude and/or behavior is affected by characteristics of the learner, learning activity or learning environment. Andrews (1987) reports that the Gonzalez (1992) Knowledge, Attitude, Behavior Model is widely used to promote alcohol education. However, research has not been able to demonstrate the effectiveness of his model or others (Magner, 1988).

Research in non-college settings does show that it is relatively easy to increase knowledge about alcohol and drugs, but less easy to change attitudes, and very difficult to bring about changes in behavior (Goodstadt, 1980; Gonzalez, 1990; Hanson, 1982; Hewitt, 1981; Pickens, 1984). There are others who report having successfully impacted knowledge and behavior, such as Caleekal-John and Pletsch (1984) who report having a positive impact on alcohol use through an intensive knowledge-based program about alcohol and its effects. There are also those who argue that reliable knowledge about alcohol abuse precedes behavior change (Robinson, Roth, Gloria, Keim & Satter, 1993). Reviews of alcohol education programs show a general focus on impacting attitudes toward alcohol use and increasing knowledge (Schaps, Churgin, Palley, Takata & Cohen, 1980; Kinder, Pape & Walfish, 1980).

Summary of Research on Mandated Activities' Effectiveness

An exhaustive literature review resulted in the same conclusion as that of Flynn and Brown (1991) who stated that "Evaluation of college based mandatory programs is virtually non-existent" (p. 18). The evaluations they did find were done in "impressionistic terms." When research is done on college alcohol education programs in general, the focus is on the general student population and not those mandated to perform judicial activities.

The Director of the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Gordis (1995) found that:

Unfortunately, comparatively little evidence exists about which interventions would be successful if applied widely and at an acceptable cost (p. 5).

Flynn and Brown (1991) did research on college judicial offenders and found that "Gains in alcohol knowledge and attitudes and reduction in abusive alcohol behavior can occur in mandated referral situations." Violators of campus alcohol policies who were required to be part of an involuntary therapy group were studied by O'Connell and Beck (1984). They found that 41% reported a reduction in alcohol use. Greene (1987) reported on students who were disciplined by the university in cases where they acted under the influence of alcohol and were required to attend a two-session program on responsible drinking. However, she gave no indication of the mandated activity's impact on knowledge, attitude or behavior. Mandated programs involving non-college subjects show positive impact (Dunham & Mauss, 1982; Grey, 1981; Rosenberg & Liftik, 1976; Scoles & Fine, 1977). Dunham and Mauss (1982) concluded that forced referrals were "...more effective where the penalties for non-compliance were the more certain, not necessarily the more severe" (p. 5).

Policymakers at institutions of higher education requiring participation in mandated alcohol education activities do not know what impact, if any, these mandated learning activities have on student behavior.

Scoles & Fine (1977) have also shown that simply requiring participation in an activity may make a difference regardless of the actual activity performed. In most cases, judicial administrators have not consulted educational experts in order to find out which activities will have the most impact on student behavior.

Furthermore, none of the learning activities in the Colorado State University (Phelps & Burchell, 1992) resource manual include any evidence that the mandated activities used have been evaluated to determine if they are effective in positively modifying student knowledge, attitude and/or behavior.

The research on whether or not mandated learning activities are effective at all is mixed. Therefore, there is a need for further research in this area. Thus two broad questions are to be investigated. First, **Do the judicial violators who are required to complete mandated learning activities report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse when compared to violators who are not required to complete mandated learning activities?**

Approximately 22% of students violating alcohol regulations who were required to complete mandated learning activities were required to do more than one activity. This raises the second broad question:

Do judicial violators who are required to complete more than one mandated learning activity report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitudes and/or behaviors relative to alcohol use and abuse than violators who are required to complete only one activity?

There are educators who define success as impacting knowledge, attitude and/or behavior. The degree of impact on the learner's knowledge, attitude and/or behavior is believed to be affected by particular characteristic(s) of the learner, learning activity or learning environment.

Factors Impacting Knowledge, Attitudes and Behavior

The degree of impact a learning activity has on a learner's knowledge, attitude and/or behavior is said to be affected by particular factors such as the learner's background, the learning activity, or the learning environment. An example of this is the learner's input into choice of task performed.

Pintrich and DeGroot (1990) have shown there are three behavioral indicators affecting learner motivation, and choice of task is an important factor. Choice of task also facilitates learning and personal growth (Ames, 1992; Howe & Howe, 1975; Knowles, 1975; Rogers, 1969; Rogers & Freiberg, 1994; Ryan, Cornell & Deci, 1985; Ryan & Grolnick, 1986; Serdahely, 1984). A number of educators report the learning activity is significantly impacted by the student's perception of control (Ames, 1992; Boyce & Wayda, 1994; Short & Greer, 1994).

Ames (1992) told us that:

Giving students choices is viewed as supporting student decision making...

The perception of control appears to be a significant factor affecting students' quality of learning. Students' perceptions of control have important consequences... (p. 266).

Educators believe that the more input a learner has in the learning activity the more motivated; hence the following question was raised:

Do judicial violators who perceive they have input into the choice and/or the development of the mandated learning activity report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitudes and/or behaviors relative to alcohol use and abuse than judicial violators who perceive that they were not given input into the choice and/or the development of the learning activity?

The young adult's need to identify with peers or gain acceptance by the peer group is very important during this transitional stage of life. To be shamed and embarrassed in front of one's peers may have an impact in changing behavior. J. Lindsay-Hartz, J. De Rivera and M.F. Mascolo (1995) stated:

Sometimes, facing something about which a person feels ashamed can motivate that person to commit to change... (p. 298).

F.K. Gibbons (1990) noted that:

...fear of embarrassment helps bring behavior in line with certain accepted social rules...Without its impact, there would be social anarchy, and social discourse, as it exists, would be virtually impossible (p. 138).

R.S. Miller (1995) indicated that:

As an aversive state of mortification, abashment, and chagrin that follows public social predicaments, embarrassment can have a substantial impact on social behavior (p. 322).

Shame and embarrassment may be elements of the following mandated learning activities offered at Michigan State University: creating and putting up an alcohol education bulletin board in the residence hall, presenting an alcohol education program in the residence hall, attending an alcohol education program in the residence hall, study table attendance in a residence hall, and organizing a residence hall activity that does not focus on alcohol.

Mandated learning activities which probably do not have shame and embarrassment as elements are attending the Alcohol Education Seminar (AES), writing an alcohol education paper, community service and visiting a university resource.

Literature seems to suggest that shame and embarrassment play an important part in behavioral change, thus, the following question was asked:

Do judicial violators report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitudes and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse if mandated learning activity involve the elements of shame and embarrassment than when the activity does not involve these elements?

Information obtained from peers is highly valued, and, therefore, some researchers believe strongly in using peer support in alcohol education efforts (Austin, 1996; Chira, 1994; Gonzalez, 1978; Keeling, 1994; Kim, 1981; Lenhart & Wodarski, 1984; Steinberg, 1996; Thorner, 1986; Wong, 1976). The Alcohol Education Seminar (AES) offered by Michigan State University involves peer interaction and conversation about alcohol. This researcher believes these same elements are present in planning or attending a formal residence hall program on alcohol.

There is no peer conversation about alcohol when a judicial violator is writing a paper, doing a bulletin board, attending study table, doing community service, visiting a university resource, or planning a non-alcohol residence hall activity. This researcher believes conversations with peers about alcohol may result in a greater impact on a violator's knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse. Therefore, the following question was asked:

Do judicial violators report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse if the

mandated learning activity involves some peer conversation about alcohol than if the activity does not?

Jessor's (1982) problem behavior theory views problem behavior as a part of normal adolescent development and states that it plays a major role in the transition to young adulthood. The legal consumption of alcohol is an age-graded occurrence and, therefore, is the adolescent's means of attaining a more mature status. He states it thusly: "Many adolescent problem behaviors serve just such a function: no longer an 'abstainer,' now a 'drinker'; no longer a 'virgin,' now a 'non-virgin'" (p. 297).

Heavy drinkers are defined by researchers as those who have five or more drinks in a sitting (Johnston et al., 1991). Heavy drinkers have peer reference groups which can create a misconception of their own behavior as moderate or normative. They choose friends whose drinking is similar to their own (Cherry, 1987; Mills & McCarty, 1983; National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 1995; Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986; Robinson, Gloria, Roth & Schuetter, 1993; Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Moeykens & Castillo, 1994; Wechsler, Moeykens, Davenport, Castillo & Hansen, 1995). The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) (1995) noted:

Heavy drinking or alcohol related problems during college maybe associated with personality characteristics, such as being impulsive, psychological problems, such as depression or anxiety or early deviant behavior (p. 2).

Although some college students may be involved in heavy drinking, and have some of the characteristics of alcoholics, they may or may not be in trouble

with their drinking; however, the mandated learning activities are not geared toward heavy drinkers.

Alcohol education is usually geared toward the general student population, those that are not heavy drinkers. These mandated learning activities are also geared toward the general student population, not heavy drinkers; however, it is reported that over 40% of U.S. college students are heavy drinkers (Wechsler et al., 1995), if learning activities are not directed toward heavy drinkers the learning activities will not be effective. Researchers tell us that in order for learning activities to be successful, innovative approaches should be aimed toward specific target groups on our campuses and settings (Ames, 1993; Ametrano, 1992; Caleekal-John & Pletsch, 1984; Globetti, 1973; Johnston, O'Malley & Bachman, 1993; Perkins & Berkowitz, 1986; Schall, Kemeny & Maltzman, 1991; Sherry & Stolberg, 1987).

The more general learning activities will probably be meaningful to general groups, who are not heavy drinkers; therefore the following question was asked:

Are judicial violators, who are defined as heavy drinkers, less likely to report change in their knowledge, attitude or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse than judicial violators who are moderate or light users?

For the past four years this researcher has facilitated a mandated alcohol learning activity for judicial offenders at a large midwestern university. While it is recognized that personal experience is not necessarily a source of scientific data, it is analogous to that of a participant observer. Precedent for this procedure has

been set by Whittmer (1970) and used extensively by various scientific researchers (Alli, 1994).

The experience gained by working with these students has been very valuable in gaining insight into their perceptions of the campus community, attitudes about their own and others' alcohol use, and their perceptions of why they were attending the learning activity. This information was acquired by being a passive observer in student to student conversations, through questions directed to me, by personal and confidential information shared with me on a one-on-one basis, as well as by some students simply feeling free within the context of the alcohol learning activity to share their ideas and perceptions. These experiences resulted in my seeking to identify and understand the factors associated with the impact of the mandated activities; hence, this dissertation study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Research Site

The factors related to effective educational learning activities required of violators of alcohol regulations were examined at one large public midwestern university. This site was selected for this study because it contained a large number of students participating in a variety of mandated learning activities. A single site was important to ensure consistency of policy, penalties, and drinking environment.

Method

A quasi-experimental method was used. Bailey (1978) stated:

Phenomena that must be studied in the natural environment are often studied by what might be called semi-experimental or quasi experimental methods. Typically, the experimenter, does not have control over the experimental stimulus and thus can not introduce it manually or physically (hence the term 'quasi-experimental') (p. 208).

In addition to being quasi-experimental, this research attempts to find "relationships with data gathered from a non-experimental setting,... rather than with data gathered in an experimental laboratory," hence the design is an ex post facto experiment (Bailey, 1978).

Subjects

There were 592 students who violated University alcohol regulations during the 1994-95 school year. They were predominately white, predominantly male, 18-19 years old, mainly freshmen and sophomores, and lived in undergraduate residence halls at the time of their violations.

A sample of 321 of the total population of student violators (54%) were identified by the Judicial Affairs Office. The sample was drawn so as to include only first time violators who were admitting to the violation and requesting that an administrator decide the action. It did not include students required to complete learning activities after denying and being found guilty by judiciaries or administrators. Therefore, the sample is not a randomly drawn one.

The Judicial Affairs Office provided the researcher with the following information for each subject:

Demographics:

Gender

Race

Age at time of violation

Name of Administrative Officer (AO)

Disciplinary Action:

Warning or Warning Probation with no mandated learning activity

Warning or Disciplinary probation with one or more of the following mandated learning activities:

Alcohol Education Seminar (AES)

Visit a university resource

Attend an alcohol program in a residence hall

Attend a non-alcohol program in a residence hall

Plan an alcohol program in a residence hall

Create a bulletin board

Write a paper

Organize an alcohol-free activity in a residence hall

Study table attendance

Community service

Assist cleaning crew in a residence hall

Apologize

Instrument

According to Dillman (1978), telephone surveys produce higher response rates than personal interviews and mail surveys. Therefore, a telephone survey was conducted (see Appendix A).

The violators were asked to indicate whether or not their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior about alcohol were impacted by the disciplinary action. They were also asked whether or not they had input into determining the disciplinary action when they met with the AO who determined the action. In addition, questions were also asked about their major and actual drinking behavior.

A pilot study using the questionnaires was done with ten judicial violators. The data collected from the pilot were used to evaluate the clarity of the questionnaires.

Interview Procedure

This researcher trained the telephone interviewers in the administration of the survey instruments. The training consisted of demonstrating and explaining:

1. that the cover page of the survey had the name, phone number, subject number, a place to put any vital statistics that were missing on page one, and to remove cover page once the survey was completed;
2. that page one of the survey had information that was needed in the research and to use it to assist the subject in remembering information for the survey;
3. how and what to put in the blanks on the survey prior to calling the subject;
4. how to read the script when the subject first answers the phone and the script at the end of the interview;
5. where to put cover page, finished surveys and those surveys that needed to have someone to try contacting the subject again.

The name and phone number was removed by the trained telephone interviewers after they interviewed the student violator in order to ensure confidentiality. This researcher was given the finished questionnaires and tabulated the responses.

Definitions of Terms

Definition 1. Peer conversation. Peer conversation is when students verbalize their thoughts, beliefs, concerns and ideas about alcohol and its impact on themselves and others.

Definition 2. Heavy drinker. A heavy drinker is a judicial violator who has five or more drinks in a sitting, three or more times in the previous two weeks, consumed an average of ten or more drinks a week and experienced memory loss due to this drinking during the last year.

Definition 3. Study Table Attendance. Study table attendance is a mandated activity that requires the judicial violator to spend a set number of hours studying in a residence hall lounge.

Definition 4. Administrative Officer (AO). An AO is a University staff member, with delegated authority from the Vice President for Student Affairs and Services, to determine the disciplinary action(s) taken with students who violate University regulations, when the option is chosen.

Definition 5. Judicial Violator. A student who has admitted to having violated University regulations.

Definition 6. Judiciary. A group of students appointed by student governing bodies to conduct hearings and make decisions about disciplinary actions when requested to do so by student violators.

Research Questions and Expected Results

The following research questions were examined:

1. Do judicial violators who are required to complete mandated learning activities report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse when compared to violators who are not required to complete mandated learning activities?
2. Do judicial violators who are required to complete two mandated learning activities report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitudes and/or behaviors relative to alcohol use and abuse than violators who are required to complete only one mandated learning activity?
3. Do judicial violators who perceive they were given input into the choice and/or the development of the mandated learning activity report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse than judicial violators who perceive they were not given input into the choice and/or the development of the learning activity?
4. Do judicial violators report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse if mandated learning activity involves the elements of shame and embarrassment than when the activity does not involve these elements?
5. Do judicial violators report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and

abuse if the mandated learning activity involves some peer conversation about alcohol than if the activity does not?

6. Are judicial violators, who are defined as heavy drinkers, less likely to report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse than judicial violators who are light or moderate drinkers?

Research by Hanson (1982), Gonzales (1982), and Pickens (1984) has shown that knowledge is more easily changed than attitude and behavior, and attitude is more easily changed than behavior. Based on that research, it was expected that more students in this study would answer yes to questions measuring change in "knowledge" than to questions measuring "attitude." More students would say yes to questions measuring "knowledge" than to questions measuring "behavior," while more students would say yes to questions measuring "attitude" than to questions measuring "behavior."

Data Analysis

The impact of the learning activities was measured by a telephone survey in which students self-reported change in knowledge, attitude and behavior. Change was defined as a yes response on survey questions labeled "knowledge," "attitude" and "behavior." A comparison was done of differences in reported frequency of changes in knowledge, attitude and behavior between violators who report they were required to do the mandated learning activity(ies) and those that were not required or who did not complete the required activity.

A further comparison was done on the impact of mandated learning activities based on the frequency of the violator's perception that s/he did or did not have input into the choice of the assigned activity (defined as a yes response on questions labeled "Input in the choice of learning activity" on the survey for students mandated to do a learning activity).

Another comparison utilizing frequency data was done on those violators who reported change, when the mandated learning activity involved the elements of shame and embarrassment and those activities that did not.

A comparison was done on differences of those violators who reported a greater frequency of change when mandated learning activity involved peer conversation and interaction about alcohol and those activities that did not involve peer conversation.

Frequency of change in knowledge, attitude and behavior for violators who were defined as heavy drinkers was compared with students who were not defined as heavy drinkers.

Data were analyzed to determine if there were significant differences in frequencies of changes between learning activity students and non-activity students in their knowledge, attitude, and behavior. Analyses were done on the following variables: input into the choice of activity, shame and embarrassment, peer conversation about alcohol and amount of drinking of student violators. A non-parametric statistical test, chi-square (X^2), was used to determine if there were statistically significant differences in the frequency of change in items related to knowledge, attitude and behavior.

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND RESULTS

This chapter contains a presentation of the data collected and results from the telephone survey instrument and procedures described in Chapter III. The Chi Square (X^2) statistic is used as a test of frequency. An alpha level of .05 was chosen for significance.

Description of Sample and Usable Responses

There was a total population of 592 alcohol violators during the 1994-1995 school year. However, as noted earlier, this researcher had access to 321 of the violators, which was 54% of the total population. One hundred sixty-six of the sampled student violators did not take part in the survey: (thirty-three of the sampled students had unlisted or disconnected phone numbers; forty-eight could not be reached through three or more tries; and eighty-five declined participation). Thus, 155 of the sampled student violators took part in the telephone survey which was 48% of the available sample and 26% of the total population.

Violators were asked what year they were in school when the violation occurred. Of the 155 violators, 103 (66%) reported that they were first year

students; 38 (25%) reported that they were second year students; 13 violators (8%) reported that they were third year students; and one violator reported being a fourth year student. There is a higher percentage of first year students violating than is representative of the population of first year students at Michigan State. When the first and second year responding violators are combined, they more closely approximate the overall student population, especially those residing in residence halls. There is no information available from the Judicial Affairs Office about the year in school of all alcohol violators or overall judicial violators.

In order to evaluate the gender distribution of responding violators, a comparison was made between the violators and Michigan State University's overall student population of freshmen and sophomores. There are slightly more female freshmen and sophomores at MSU (60%); however, males are more likely to be judicial offenders than females. Judicial Affairs reports that the population of alcohol violators was 67% male and 33% female. The student violators who took part in this study were 60% male (92 violators), and 40% female (63 violators) which closely approximates the population of judicial violators but not the overall student population.

Of the 155 usable surveys, 97 of these (63%) were from students who completed a total of 116 mandated learning activities. These 97 respondents include 76 violators who were required to complete one mandated learning activity and did so; 20 violators who were required to complete two mandated learning activities and did so; and one violator who was required to complete two mandated learning activities but only completed one (this violator is grouped

with violators completing one mandated learning activity). Fifty-eight of the 155 usable surveys (37%) were from violators who were not required to complete any mandated learning activity.

Yes and No were the possible responses to the questions about whether there was impact on knowledge, attitude and behavior resulting from the violator's meeting with the administrative officer (AO) and their completion of the mandated learning activity. There are 155 usable responses to questions about the impact of the meeting with the AO because all violators had this meeting and were asked questions about the meeting's impact on their knowledge, attitude and behavior. There are 116 usable responses to questions about the impact of the mandated learning activity, because 20 of the 97 violators required to complete mandated learning activity(ies) were actually required to complete two activities.

Follow-up questions were asked of violators who responded that either the meeting with the AO or the completion of the mandated learning activity impacted their behavior. If the respondent said, yes, he or she used alcohol differently as the result of the meeting with the AO, then the respondent was asked, "Do you drink more or less?" A total of six of the 42 violators (14%) who said they drank differently, said they drank more. There was no difference in gender, race, class and type of violations between the violators having only the meeting with the AO (27 respondents) and those who had the meeting and then were required to complete a mandated learning activity (13 respondents). The difference between violators given one mandated learning activity, two mandated learning activities and no mandated learning activity was more by residence hall

due to the administrative officers requiring activity(ies) and some requiring none. Only one of the 13 violators (7.6%) who reported drinking differently as the result of the mandated learning activity reported drinking more.

The 42 violators who said they drank differently as the result of the meeting with the AO were asked, "Do you drink differently so as not to get caught violating?" A total of 32 of the violators (76%) who said they drank differently said they did so in order to not get caught violating. A total of 11 of these 13 respondents (84.6%) said they drank differently as the result of the mandated learning activity did so in order to not get caught violating.

Research Question #1: Mandated Learning Activity vs.

Administrative Officer Meeting

The first research question was as follows: Do judicial violators who are required to complete mandated learning activities report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse when compared to violators who are not required to complete mandated learning activities?

This question was tested by determining whether there was a significant difference in the responses to questions about impact on knowledge, attitude and behavior attributed to the meeting with the AO, compared to the responses to questions about impact on knowledge, attitude and behavior attributed to mandated learning activities.

There were no statistically significant differences in frequency of responses for items related to attitude or behavior. The following paragraph examines items related to knowledge, which showed a level of statistical significance.

KNOWLEDGE

The first survey question that examined knowledge asked, "Did you learn anything during your meeting with the AO?"

A total of 53 of the 155 violators (34.2%) reported **yes, they learned something** during their meeting with the AO. That is, 26 (44.8%) of the 58 violators given no activity reported **yes, they learned something** during their meeting with the AO; however, in contrast, twenty-seven (27.8%) of the 97 violators who were given one or more activity(ies) reported **yes, they learned something** during their meeting with the administrative officer $\chi^2(1, N=155)=4.66$, $P=.031$ (see Table 4.1). Thus, a greater percentage of the violators who were given no activity reported they learned something from the AO meeting.

Table 4.1 - Comparison of Impact of AO Meeting on Violators Completing No Activity vs. Violators Completing Activity

		No Activity		Activity					
Category	Item	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	df	N	X ²	P
<u>Knowledge</u> learned something due to AO meeting	16	44.8	55.2	27.8	72.2	1	155	4.66	.031*
know more about issues due to AO meeting	19	34.5	65.5	21.6	78.4	1	155	3.07	.080
<u>Attitude</u> thought differently of own drinking due to AO meeting	22	29.3	70.7	22.7	77.3	1	155	.85	.357
thought differently of others' drinking due to AO meeting	34	17.2	82.8	14.4	85.6	1	155	.22	.640
<u>Behavior</u> impact on own use due to AO meeting	13	25.9	74.1	21.6	78.4	1	155	.36	.548
use alcohol differently due to AO meeting	25	19.0	81.0	15.5	84.5	1	155	.32	.572

* = P ≤ .05

Research Question #2: One Mandated Learning Activity vs. Two Mandated Learning Activities

The second research question was as follows: Do judicial violators who are required to complete two mandated learning activities report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse than violators who are required to complete only one mandated learning activity?

This question was tested by determining whether there was a significant difference in the frequency of responses to questions about impact of the AO

meeting and the activity(ies) on knowledge, attitude and behavior given to violators who were required to complete only one mandated learning activity and those that were required to complete two mandated learning activities.

There were 77 violators who were required to complete one mandated learning activity. There were 20 violators who were required to complete two mandated learning activities. There were no statistically significant differences in frequency of responses noted for items related to knowledge or attitude. The following paragraph examines the impact of activity(ies) on items related to behavior, which showed a level of statistical significance.

BEHAVIOR

The survey question that examined behavior asked, "Did the activity have an **impact on your use of alcohol?**"

Thirteen of 76 violators (17.1%) required to complete only one activity compared to eight of 20 violators (40%) required to complete two activities reported **yes**, the mandated learning activity had an **impact on their use of alcohol** $X^2(1, N=76)=4.86, P=.028$ (see Tables 4.2 and 4.3). Thus, a greater percentage of violators who were given two activities reported the activities impacted their use of alcohol.

Table 4.2 - Comparison of Impact of AO Meeting on Violators Completing One Activity vs. Two Activities

		One Activity		Two Activities					
Category	Item	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	df	N	X ²	P
<u>Knowledge</u> learned something due to AO meeting	16	26.0	74.0	35.0	65.0	1	97	.64	.422
know more about issues due to AO meeting	19	19.5	80.5	30.0	70.0	1	97	1.04	.309
<u>Attitude</u> thought differently of own drinking due to AO meeting	22	20.8	79.2	30.0	70.0	1	97	.77	.380
thought differently of others' drinking due to AO meeting	34	14.3	85.7	15.0	85.0	1	97	.00	.935
<u>Behavior</u> impact on own use due to AO meeting	13	18.2	81.8	35.0	65.0	1	97	2.65	.104
use alcohol differently due to AO meeting	25	15.6	84.4	15.0	85.0	1	97	.00	.949

* = P ≤ .05

Table 4.3 - Impact of Activity(ies) on Violators Completing One Activity vs. Two Activities

		One Activity		Two Activities					
Category	Item	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	df	N	X ²	P
<u>Knowledge</u> learned something due to activity	17	46.1	53.9	40.0	60.0	1	96	.24	.628
know more about issues due to activity	20	47.4	52.6	40.0	60.0	1	96	.35	.556
<u>Attitude</u> thought differently of own drinking due to activity	23	32.9	67.1	35.0	65.0	1	96	.03	.859
thought differently of others' drinking due to activity	35	39.5	60.5	31.6	68.4	1	95	.40	.526
<u>Behavior</u> impact on own use due to activity	14	17.1	82.9	40.0	60.0	1	96	4.86	.028*
use alcohol differently due to activity	28	12.0	88.0	20.0	80.0	1	95	.40	.696

* = P ≤ .05

**Research Question #3: Input into Choice of Mandated Learning Activity vs.
No Input into Choice of Mandated Learning Activity**

The third research question was as follows: Do judicial violators who perceive they have input into the choice and/or the development of the mandated learning activity report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse than judicial violators who perceive that they were not given input into the choice and/or the development of the learning activity?

This research question was tested by determining whether there was a significant difference in the frequency of responses to questions about the impact of mandated learning activities on knowledge, attitude and behavior between judicial violators who perceived they had input into deciding what the disciplinary action would be and those who said they had no input.

A total of 38 of 116 mandated learning activities (32.8%) were completed by violators who reported they had input into deciding what the disciplinary action would be. There were no statistically significant differences in frequency of responses for items related to knowledge, attitude or behavior (see Table 4.4).

Table 4.4 - Impact of Activity when Violator had Input into Choice of Activity vs. No Input

		Choice in Activity		No Choice in Activity					
Category	Item	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	df	N	X ²	P
<u>Knowledge</u> learned something due to activity	17	29.2	70.8	35.3	64.7	1	116	.48	.488
know more about issues due to activity	20	34.7	65.3	30.8	69.2	1	114	.20	.657
<u>Attitude</u> thought differently of own drinking due to activity	23	30.6	69.4	33.8	66.2	1	116	.12	.734
thought differently of others' drinking due to activity	35	38.5	61.5	30.3	69.7	1	115	.78	.376
<u>Behavior</u> impact on own use due to activity	14	46.2	53.8	28.9	71.1	1	116	2.72	.098
use alcohol differently due to activity	28	41.2	58.8	31.3	68.7	1	116	.64	.423

* = $P \leq .05$

Research Question #4: Impact of Mandated Learning Activities With Shame vs. Mandated Learning Activities With No Shame

The fourth research question asked: Do judicial violators report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse if the mandated learning activity involves shame and embarrassment, than when the activity does not?

This question was tested by examining whether there was a significant difference in the frequency of responses on questions assessing impact on knowledge, attitude and behavior due to mandated learning activities that involve

shame and embarrassment when compared to mandated learning activities that do not involve shame and embarrassment. There was a total of 116 mandated learning activities, with 18 mandated learning activities involving shame and embarrassment and 98 involving no shame. There were no statistically significant differences in frequency of responses found for items related to knowledge, attitude, or behavior (see Table 4.5).

Table 4.5 - Impact of Activity(ies) with Shame vs. Impact of Activity(ies) with Non-Shame

		Shame		Non-Shame					
Category	Item	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	df	N	X ²	P
<u>Knowledge</u> learned something due to activity	17	14.6	85.4	16.2	83.8	1	116	.05	.815
know more about issues due to activity	20	12.2	87.8	15.4	84.6	1	114	.23	.632
<u>Attitude</u> thought differently of own drinking due to activity	23	16.7	83.3	15.0	85.0	1	116	.05	.818
thought differently of others' drinking due to activity	35	10.3	89.7	18.4	81.6	1	115	1.30	.253
<u>Behavior</u> impact on own use due to activity	14	15.4	84.6	15.6	84.4	1	116	.00	.983
use alcohol differently due to activity	28	29.4	70.6	13.1	86.9	1	116	2.93	.086

* = $P \leq .05$

**Research Question #5: Mandated Learning Activities involving Peer
Conversation vs. Mandated Learning Activities With No Peer Conversation**

The fifth research question was as follows: Do judicial violators report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse if the mandated learning activity involves peer conversation about alcohol than if the activity does not?

This question was tested by examining whether there is a significant difference in the frequency of responses to questions about the impact of mandated learning **activities involving peer conversation about alcohol** on knowledge, attitude and behavior, compared to responses to questions about the impact of mandated learning **activities that do not involve peer conversation about alcohol**.

There were a total of 116 mandated learning activities. Eighty-two involved peer conversation about alcohol and 34 did not. There was no statistical significance in frequency of responses for items related to behavior. The following paragraphs examine items related to knowledge and attitude, which showed levels of statistical significance (see Table 4.6).

Table 4.6 - Impact of Peer Conversation Activity vs. Impact of Non-Peer Conversation Activity

		Peer Conversation		Non-Peer Conversation					
Category	Item	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	df	N	X ²	P
<u>Knowledge</u> learned something due to activity	17	85.4	14.6	60.3	39.7	1	116	8.57	.003*
know more about issues due to activity	20	81.6	18.4	64.6	35.4	1	114	4.00	.045*
<u>Attitude</u> thought differently of own drinking due to activity	23	83.3	16.7	65.0	35.0	1	116	4.03	.044*
thought differently of others' drinking due to activity	35	89.7	10.3	61.8	38.2	1	115	9.81	.001*
<u>Behavior</u> impact on own use due to activity	14	80.8	19.2	67.8	32.2	1	116	1.64	.200
use alcohol differently due to activity	28	70.6	29.4	70.7	29.3	1	116	.00	.102

* = $P \leq .05$

KNOWLEDGE

The first survey question that examined knowledge asked, "Did the violators learn anything from the activity?"

Violators reported **yes**, they **learned something** from completing 48 of 116 mandated learning activities (41.4%). Violators reported **yes**, they **learned something** from seven of 34 mandated learning activities (20.6%) that involved no peer conversation about alcohol. Violators reported **yes**, they **learned something** from 41 of 82 mandated activities (50%) that involved peer conversation about alcohol $X^2(1, N=82)=8.57, P=.00$ (see Table 4.6). Therefore, a

greater percentage of violators reported they learned something from their learning activity that involved peer conversations.

The second survey question that examined knowledge asked, "Do you **know more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse** as the result of the activity?"

Violators reported **yes, they know more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse** from completing 49 of 114 mandated learning activities (43.0%). Violators reported **yes, they know more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse** from nine of 32 mandated learning activities (28.1%) that involved no peer conversation about alcohol. Violators reported **yes, they know more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse** from 40 of 82 mandated activities (48.8%) that involved peer conversation about alcohol $\chi^2(1, N=98)=4.00, p=.04$ (see Table 4.6). Thus, a greater percentage of violators reported they learned more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse due to their learning activity that involved peer conversation.

ATTITUDE

The first survey question that examined attitude asked, "Have you **thought any differently about your drinking** since the activity?"

Violators reported **yes, they thought differently about their drinking** after completing 36 of 116 mandated learning activities (31%). Violators reported **yes, they thought differently about their drinking** after completing six of 34 mandated learning activities (17.6%) that involved no peer conversation about alcohol. Violators reported **yes, they thought differently about their drinking**

after completing 30 of 82 mandated activities (36.6%) that involved peer conversation about alcohol $\chi^2(1, N=82)=4.02, P=.04$ (see Table 4.6). Therefore, a greater percentage of violators reported change in attitude toward their own drinking due to their learning activity.

The second survey question that examined attitude asked, "Have you **thought differently about other people's drinking** as the result of the activity?"

Violators reported **yes, they thought differently about other people's drinking** after completing 39 of 115 mandated learning activities (33.9%). Violators reported **yes, they thought differently about other people's drinking** after completing four of 33 mandated learning activities (12.1%) that involved no peer conversation about alcohol. Violators reported **yes, they thought differently about other people's drinking** after completing 35 of 82 mandated activities (42.7%) that involved peer conversation about alcohol $\chi^2(1, N=82)=9.80, P=.00$ (see Table 4.6). Thus, a greater percentage of violators reported change in attitude toward others' drinking due to their learning activity that involve peer conversation.

Alcohol Education Seminar (AES) - A Specific Mandated Learning Activity vs. Other Mandated Learning Activities

The Alcohol Education Seminar (AES) is a mandated learning activity that involves no shame, but does involve peer conversation. Seventy-four of the 116 learning activities (63.8%) involved an AES. There was no statistical significance difference in frequency of responses for items related to behavior. When the impact of AES was compared to the other 42 non-AES mandated learning activities, there were statistically significant differences in frequency of responses

in impact for items related to knowledge and attitude. The following questions and paragraphs examine the impact for items related to knowledge and attitude.

KNOWLEDGE

The first question that examined knowledge asked: "Did you learn anything from the activity?"

Violators reported **yes, they learned something** from 48 of 116 mandated learning activities (41.4%). Twelve of 42 violators (28.6%) in mandated non-AES activities reported **yes, they learned something** from the activities. Thirty-six of 74 violators (48.6%) in mandated AES reported **yes, they learned something** from AES, $\chi^2(1, N=74)=4.45$, $P=.03$ (see Table 4.7). Therefore, a greater percentage of violators reported they learned something due to their learning activity that involve AES.

The second survey question that examined knowledge asked: "As a result of the activity do you believe you know any more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse?"

Violators reported **yes, they know more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse** from 49 of 114 mandated learning activities (43%). Eleven of 40 violators (27.5%) in mandated non-AES activities reported **yes, they know more about alcohol use and abuse**. Thirty-eight of 74 violators (51.4%) mandated AES reported **yes, they know more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse** $\chi^2(1, N=74)=6.03$, $P=.01$ (see Table 4.7). Thus, a greater percentage of violators reported they know more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse due to their learning activity that involved AES.

Table 4.7 - Impact of AES vs. Non-AES Activity

		AES Activity		Non-AES Activity					
Category	Item	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	df	N	X ²	P
<u>Knowledge</u> learned something due to activity	17	75.0	25.0	55.9	44.1	1	116	4.45	.034*
know more about issues due to activity	20	77.6	22.4	55.4	44.6	1	114	6.02	.014*
<u>Attitude</u> thought differently of own drinking due to activity	23	77.8	22.2	57.5	42.5	1	116	4.41	.035*
thought differently of others' drinking due to activity	35	84.6	15.4	53.9	46.1	1	115	10.57	.001*
<u>Behavior</u> impact on own use due to activity	14	73.1	26.9	61.1	38.9	1	116	1.25	.263
use alcohol differently due to activity	28	58.8	41.2	64.6	35.4	1	116	.21	.644

* = P ≤ .05

ATTITUDE

The first survey question that examined attitude asked: "Have you thought any differently about your drinking since the activity?"

Violators reported **yes, they thought differently about their drinking** after completing 36 of 116 of mandated activities (31%). Eight of 42 violators (19%) mandated non-AES reported **yes, they thought differently about their drinking** after completing the activities. Twenty-eight of 74 violators (37.8%) in mandated AES reported **yes, they thought differently about their drinking** after completing AES $X^2(1, N=74)=4.42, P=.03$ (see Table 4.7). Therefore, a greater percentage of

violators reported they thought differently about their own drinking due to their learning activity that involved AES.

The second survey question that examined attitude asked: "Have you thought any differently about other people's drinking as the result of the activity?"

Violators reported **yes, they thought differently about other people's drinking** after completing 39 of 115 mandated activities (33.9%). Six of 41 violators (14.6%) completing non-AES activities reported **yes, they thought differently about other people's drinking**. Thirty-three of 74 violators (44.6%) in mandated AES reported **yes, they thought differently about their drinking** after completing AES $\chi^2(1, N=74)=10.57, P=00$ (see Table 4.7). Thus, a greater percentage of violators reported they thought differently about others' drinking due to their learning activity that involved AES.

Research Question #6: Impact of Mandated Learning Activities on Heavy Drinkers

The sixth research question was as follows: Are judicial violators who are defined as heavy drinkers, less likely to report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse than judicial violators who are moderate or light drinkers?

A heavy drinker is defined as: (1) a violator who reports consuming five or more drinks in a sitting, on three or more occasions in the previous two weeks; (2) consumes an average of ten or more drinks in a week; and (3) reports having at least one memory loss due to alcohol in the previous year.

A review of the 155 violators indicates that 43 violators (27.7%) reported having consumed five or more drinks in a sitting, on three or more occasions in the previous two weeks. Sixty-four violators (41.3%) reported consuming an average of ten or more drinks in a week. Seventy-one violators (45.8%) reported at least one memory loss due to drinking during the previous year.

This question examines the impact of mandated learning activities on violators meeting all three of the above criteria. Thirty-two of 116 of the mandated learning activities (27.6%) were completed by violators who met all three of the above criteria. There were no statistically significant differences in frequency of responses to the impact of the learning activities on items related to knowledge, attitude or behavior reported by the heavy drinkers when compared to the light or moderate drinkers (see Table 4.8).

Table 4.8 - Impact of Activities on Heavy Drinkers vs. Light/Moderate Drinkers

		Heavy Drinker		Light/ Moderate Drinker					
Category	Item	% Yes	% No	% Yes	% No	df	N	X ²	P
<u>Knowledge</u> learned something due to activity	17	20.8	79.2	32.4	67.6	1	116	1.87	.171
know more about issues due to activity	20	28.6	71.4	26.2	73.8	1	114	.08	.773
<u>Attitude</u> thought differently of own drinking due to activity	23	19.4	80.6	31.2	68.8	1	116	1.73	.188
thought differently of others' drinking due to activity	35	25.6	74.4	27.6	72.4	1	115	.05	.819
<u>Behavior</u> impact on own use due to activity	14	26.9	73.1	27.8	72.2	1	116	.00	.931
use alcohol differently due to activity	28	23.5	76.5	28.3	71.7	1	116	.16	.685

* = P ≤ .05

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The researcher's overall purpose in this study was to investigate which features of mandated learning activities impact judicial violators' knowledge, attitude and/or behavior with regard to alcohol use and abuse. The main question of this study was, "Do judicial violators who were required to complete mandated learning activities report a greater frequency of change in their knowledge, attitude and/or behavior relative to alcohol use and abuse?"

Discussion

Impact of Administrative Officer Meeting

The administrative officer meeting is the occasion when the student accused of violating university alcohol regulations is given the choice of admitting or denying violating the regulations. Violators also have the choice of having their case resolved by an administrator or a judiciary. In this study we only examined violators who admitted violating university alcohol regulations and had the administrative officer decide on the disciplinary action. Violators who were required to complete a mandated learning activity as part of their disciplinary

action were compared with violators who were not required to complete a mandated learning activity.

Research question one compared the impact of the AO meeting on violators who completed no activity with those who completed one or more activities.

Forty-five percent of violators who were not given a mandated learning activity reported their knowledge was impacted by the AO meeting. Only 28% of violators given mandated learning activities reported their knowledge was impacted by the administrative officer meeting. This difference was statistically significant (see Table 4.1). Perhaps this result was due to more teaching taking place between the administrative officer and the violator because the administrative officer viewed the meeting as the only opportunity to do some educating about the impact of alcohol use and abuse on the violator's life and the lives of others in the residence hall community.

Surprisingly, all items which measured knowledge, attitude and behavior indicated that violators who were required to complete an activity reported less impact from the administrative officer meeting than violators who were not required to complete an activity. Perhaps this suggests that when the administrative officers did not require an activity, they may put more energy into their meeting, and thereby accomplish some of the objectives the required learning activity is designed to achieve.

It is interesting to note that the highest percentage of student violators who reported an impact of the administrative officer meeting, reported an impact on their knowledge. The percentage of violators who reported an impact steadily

declines as one moves from knowledge, to attitude, and then to behavior. The one exception was an attitude item which asked violators if they "thought differently of others' drinking due to administrative officer meeting." Seventeen percent of violators not required to do activities and 14% of those required to do activities reported they thought differently due to the administrative officer meeting. This is in contrast to the responses on the other attitude measure, which asked about impact on their "thoughts about their own drinking." Twenty-nine percent of violators not required to do an activity and 23% of those required to do activities reported impact on this attitude measure.

Even though the above differences were not statistically significant, the trend shown in Table 4.1 demonstrates that behavior may be more difficult to impact than attitude and knowledge. These results seem consistent with other research that shows knowledge is easier to impact than attitude or behavior, and attitude is easier to impact than behavior (Gonzalez, 1990; Pickens, 1984). Thus, this study also seems to be suggesting that behavior is the most difficult parameter to change.

It also seems to suggest that administrative officers may be working harder to teach when not requiring an activity, but they may neglect discussion about attitude toward others' drinking.

Impact of AO Meeting on Violators Completing One Activity
versus Those Completing Two Activities

Research question two compared the frequency of responses for the impact of the administrative officer meeting on violators completing one activity versus those violators completing two activities. Interestingly, the impact of the administrative officer meeting on violators given one activity versus those given two activities showed no statistically significant difference with regard to knowledge, attitude or behavior. The actual percentages were similar, except for one attitude measure and one behavior measure which were the same. This attitude measure was "thought differently of others' drinking," which again suggests that perhaps during the administrative officer meeting the topic of others' drinking is discussed very little or perhaps not at all.

The behavior measure, "use alcohol differently," has some inherent limitations as a measure because it does not indicate whether the violator was using more or less. A follow up question was asked of some violators who responded that either the meeting with the administrative officer or the completion of the mandated learning activity impacted their use of alcohol. However, only 14% of all the violators (six individuals) who responded that they use alcohol differently as the result of an administrative officer meeting or attendance at one or more activities said they used it more. Perhaps this finding may be due to heavy drinkers responding who have other "psychological" or behavioral problems (NIAA, 1995).

Thirty-five percent of violators given two activities reported they learned something from the administrative officer meeting. Only 26% of violators required to do one activity reported they learned something from their meeting with the administrative officer. The percentages of violators reporting impact get smaller as one moves from knowledge to attitude to behavior, but the differences between one activity and two activities continue except for the two items already mentioned. In other words, violators given no activity report the most impact from the administrative officer meeting. Those violators given two activities reported the next highest impact from the administrative officer meeting, and those violators given one activity reported the least impact (see Table 4.2).

Impact of Activities

Violators given two activities reported a greater frequency of responses for impact on knowledge and behavior than on attitude. Those given one activity reported more impact of the activity on knowledge than on attitude and behavior (see Table 4.3).

The impact of activities on knowledge was usually greater, although not statistically significant, than that of the administrative officer meeting, with one exception. The AO meeting showed statistical significance for the knowledge measure "learned something" due to AO meeting (see Tables 4.1 and 4.3). The attitude measure, "thought differently of others' drinking due to activity," appears to be a topic discussed in the activities but not in administrative officer meetings.

The focus of these discussions may frequently have been the drinking of parents, siblings, and friends.

"Impact on own use due to activity" showed a statistically significant difference (see Table 4.3) for violators required to do one activity (17.1%) compared to violators required to do two activities (40%).

Input into Choice

Research question three examined the frequency of responses for impact of activity on violators who perceived they had input into the choice of activity, compared to violators who perceived they had no input into choice of the activity.

There is a steady increase in the percentage of violators who reported impact due to activity as one moves from knowledge, to attitude and then to behavior (Ames, 1992; Rogers & Freiberg, 1994). Once again, the attitude measure, "thought differently about others' drinking due to activity," appears to be a topic discussed during the activity, in comparison to the attitude measure, "thought differently about own use of alcohol due to activity" (see Table 4.4).

Forty-six percent of violators who perceived they had input into choice of activity reported an impact on their use due to the activity. Only 29% of violators who perceived they did not have input into choice of activity reported impact on their own use. Forty-one percent of the violators given input said they use alcohol differently due to the activity. Thirty-one percent of the violators given no input report they use alcohol differently due to the activity. Those violators who perceived they had input into the choice of activity reported a higher percentage

of impact on behavior; however, no statistically significant differences were found in impact for violators who perceived choice of activity versus those who perceived they had no input, for the measures of knowledge, attitude or behavior.

Impact of Shame

Research question four compared the frequency of responses for impact of activities involving shame and embarrassment versus the impact of activities involving no shame and embarrassment. No statistically significant differences in frequency of responses were found for knowledge, attitude or behavior.

Activities that have shame and embarrassment are:

1. alcohol education bulletin board in the residence hall;
2. presenting an alcohol education program in the residence hall;
3. attending an alcohol education program in the residence hall;
4. study table attendance in the residence hall; and
5. organizing a residence hall activity that does not focus on alcohol.

The activities that involved shame and embarrassment took place in the residence hall context. Non-shame and embarrassment activities are:

1. AES;
2. write an alcohol education paper;
3. perform community service; and
4. visit a university resource.

The non-shame activities took place outside of the residence hall context.

Violators who were given an activity involving shame reported less frequency of responses on the items which measured knowledge and attitude, but one of the behavior measures, "use alcohol differently" showed greater frequency of responses. Twenty-nine percent of violators reported they "use alcohol differently" due to the activity involving shame, in comparison with 13% of violators reporting impact who were given an activity not involving shame. These behavior findings appear to agree with other researchers who say shame impacts behavior (Lindsay-Hartz et al., 1995; Miller, 1995).

Although no statistically significant differences were found in frequency of responses for items related to knowledge, attitude or behavior between violators who were given activities involving shame and those given non-shame activities, the attitude measure, "thought differently of others' drinking due to the activity," showed violators given activities involving shame reported less impact (10%), compared with those violators (17%) who "thought differently about their own drinking" due to the activity involving shame. On the attitude measure "thought differently about others' drinking," 18% of violators given non-shame activity reported impact, versus 15% reporting they "thought differently of their own drinking" due to the non-shame activity. Perhaps the context in which the non-shame activity took place, outside the residence hall, somehow had more of an impact on the attitude measure, "thought differently of others' drinking."

Impact of Peer Conversation

Research question five compared the frequency of responses for impact of activities involving peer conversation with the impact of activities that did not. More violators reported that their knowledge and attitude had been impacted by the learning activity. The literature suggests that some researchers strongly believe in using peer support in alcohol education efforts and that information obtained from peers is highly valued (Keeling, 1994; Wong 1976). Those learning activities that involved peer conversation and interaction about alcohol were:

1. attend a formal residence hall program on alcohol;
2. plan a formal residence hall program on alcohol; and
3. alcohol education seminar (AES).

Peer conversation and interaction about alcohol appears to have a significant impact on knowledge and attitude.

The measures for knowledge and attitude showed a statistically significant difference in frequency of responses for violators required to do activities involving peer conversation versus those violators who performed non-peer conversation activities (see Table 4.6). These findings seem consistent with other research (Chira, 1994; Jessor, 1982; Thorner, 1986). Although the behavior measures showed no statistically significant differences in frequency of responses, 81% of violators required to complete peer conversation activities reported higher "impact on own use." Findings for the other behavioral measure, "use alcohol differently," seem to show an anomaly for the behavior measure "use alcohol

differently" (71%), for activities involving peer conversation activities versus non-peer conversation activities.

Impact of AES

The Alcohol Education Seminar (AES) is a specific mandated learning activity, and it was compared with the other (non-AES) mandated learning activities. AES comprised 63.8% of all of the mandated learning activities assigned. When AES was compared with all other mandated learning activities, AES participants had a higher frequency of yes responses, thus suggesting that AES was more effective in impacting knowledge and attitude. Perhaps because by definition, AES was categorized as a peer conversation activity, as well as a non-shame activity, which may have been features that accounted for these findings. All this researcher could ascertain is that there is a greater frequency between attendance at AES and student violators who reported impact on their knowledge and attitude. It is not clear if this was due solely to the fact that AES had an element of peer conversation.

There were statistically significant differences in frequency of responses for the measures on knowledge and attitude. Table 4.7 shows a steady increase in percentage of violators who reported impact on knowledge and attitude due to the AES activity.

The attitude measure "thought differently of others' drinking" due to the AES activity shows a higher percentage, 85%, of reported impact in contrast to

78% of the responses on the other attitude measure "thought differently of their own drinking" due to the AES activity.

Violators who were required to complete AES reported a higher percentage of responses (73%) of impact on the behavioral measure "impact on own use." Although these differences were not statistically significant, the trend shown in Table 4.7 demonstrates behavior may be more difficult to change than knowledge or attitude. These results seem consistent with findings of other researchers (Goodstadt, 1980; Hanson, 1982; Hewitt, 1981).

Heavy Drinker versus Light/Moderate Drinkers

Research question six compared the frequency of responses regarding impact of mandated learning activities on heavy drinkers versus those that were moderate or light drinkers. No statistical significance was found in frequencies for items related to knowledge, attitude or behavior, but perhaps the three criteria used to define the heavy drinker contributed to these non-significant findings.

This study defined a heavy drinker as a judicial violator who had five or more drinks in a sitting three or more times in the previous two weeks, who consumed an average of 10 or more drinks per week, and who experienced memory loss due to this drinking during the last year. Even though there were no statistically significant differences in frequency of responses for knowledge, attitude or behavior, light to moderate drinkers reported a generally higher percentage of impact on the measures of knowledge, attitude and behavior, in contrast to heavy drinkers (Ametrano, 1992; Robinson et al., 1993; Weschler et al., 1993).

Thirty-one percent of light to moderate drinkers reported a higher frequency of responses to the attitude measure "thought differently of own drinking," in contrast to 28% who reported they "thought differently of others' drinking." The opposite was found for violators who were heavy drinkers in their responses to the two attitude measures, "thought differently of their own drinking," 19%, versus 26% who "thought differently of others' drinking."

Violators who were light to moderate drinkers reported a greater frequency of responses for the behavior measures than did heavy drinkers, even though there was no statistical significance for the behavior measures (see Table 4.8).

Limitations of the Study

Since the design of this study was quasi-experimental, ex post facto experiment, there was no control of the experimental stimulus.

The study focused only on self reported change in knowledge, attitude and/or behavior about alcohol and alcohol abuse (Cooper, Sobell, Sobell & Maistro, 1981; Freier, Bell & Ellickson, 1991; Modanik, 1991; Reinisch, Bell & Ellickson, 1991; Room, 1971). It did not examine the consistency with which learning activities were being assigned, or take into account all the goals expected to be achieved by the administrative officers assigning the mandated learning activities; nor was it able to demonstrate cause and effect.

This research was done with students who may be at risk for problem drinking, but who were not necessarily problem drinkers. Therefore, it is not generalizable to mandated programs for problem drinkers.

Additionally, there is no guarantee that the same principles were being used by all the Administrative Officers (AOs) who assigned mandated learning activities. For example, some of the administrative officers assigned activities not for the learning value but for the value of public embarrassment and shame. These officers believe certain activities have a positive impact on the student because of the elements of shame and embarrassment so some activities studied also have public embarrassment and shame as a dimension. Shame and embarrassment may be what contributed to the attitude and behavior change, not the educational components of the activity. Public embarrassment and shame may thus be confounding elements and not part of a learning activity.

The students were first time violators of alcohol regulations and there was no means to identify who went on to violate again.

A telephone survey was chosen because one of its features is a high response rate; however, there were a large number of unreachable students due to unlisted, disconnected phone numbers, and those students who were never in, even though three or more attempts were made to contact them.

Another limitation was there were more measures of knowledge and behavior, than measures of attitude. More attitude questions could have been asked in order to measure the violators' attitudes about more than "thoughts about own drinking" and "thoughts about others' drinking." We do not know whether what violators "thought" really measured attitude. More violators reported yes to impact on knowledge than attitude and behavior, and more responded yes to impact on attitude than behavior. However, after doing the research

there is some question about the attitude measures, because they were very general. Nevertheless, the pattern expected held true, just as other researchers had shown.

The method of analysis (χ^2) is also a limitation in that one can only generalize about differences in frequency of responses.

This researcher further believes the alcohol violators gave honest answers, but there may have been some limitations in using student interviewers, even though they were trained to do the interviewing.

Recommendations

It is recommended that a larger and more in-depth research study be done over a long period of time to examine the issues in this study more completely than is possible in this one-time self-report survey.

Perhaps standardized criteria should be established to determine whether mandated learning activities are successful and ascertain which features of those alcohol education activities show the most promise. At this time, peer conversation and interaction appear to be the features that show the most promise. The element of shame is another feature researchers should examine in more depth to see if it has impact and how.

Campus subgroups such as light to moderate drinkers, who comprise the majority of students living in the residence halls, and heavy drinkers, should be the focus of research into ways of utilizing peer conversation and interaction in

mandated learning activities focused on each specific group rather than generically.

Given the low number of people of color (four Asian/Pacific Islanders, two Hispanics, no African Americans or Native Americans) represented in this study, a specific study should be done with people of color, who are alcohol violators, to understand the impact of alcohol learning activities on this population. Likewise, a study should be done specifically with females.

These results also have implications for schools, teachers and policy makers. Policy makers should consider the public health model in their decision making. Teachers and schools should likewise consider the public health model in their programming and in designing curriculum and courses for alcohol education.

Contextual factors need to be researched through examination of specific peer groups, and those residence halls and floors where heavy drinking is taking place. Because behavior is the most difficult parameter to change, educators who design mandated learning activities should take into consideration the public health model and the impact it has had in successful campaigns over the years.

Finally, a study should be conducted in such a way as to make use of more sophisticated statistical methods.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Alli, B. A. (1994). The diagnosis and treatment of alcohol withdrawal. Journal of the Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, 1(2), 8-11.
- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. Journal of Educational Psychology, 84(3), 261-271.
- Ametrano, I. M. (1992). An evaluation of the effectiveness of a substance-abuse prevention program. Journal of College Student Development, 33(6), 506-515.
- Anderson, D. S. & Gadaletto, A. F. (1991). The college alcohol survey. George Mason University.
- Andrews, M. L. (1987). The knowledge, attitudes, and behavior concerning alcohol use of resident assistants and residence hall students. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 33(1), 86-90.
- Austin, B. W. (1996). Repairing the Breach: Report of the National Task Force on African American Men and Boys. Alpin Guild, Inc: Dilon, Co.
- Bailey, K. D. (1978). Methods of social research. Free Press: New York, pp. 208-209.
- Bangert-Downs, R. L. (1988). The effects of school-based substance abuse education -- A meta-analysis. Journal of Drug Education, 18(3), 243-265
- Barnes, G. M. (1975). A perspective on drinking among teenagers with special reference to New York State studies. Journal of School Health, 45(7), 386-389.
- Blane, H. T., & Hewitt, L. E. (1977). Alcohol and youth: An analysis of the literature (Report No. PB-268-698). Rockville, MD: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.
- Boyce, B., & Wayda, V. (1994). The effects of assigned and self set goals on task performance. Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 16(3), 258-269.

Brown, J. L. (1989). Alcohol consumption among Kansas State University Freshmen by probation and non-probation status. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 34(3), 14-21.

Burrell, L. F. (1990). College students' recommendations to combat abusive drinking habits. Journal of College Student Development, 31(6), 562-563.

Center on Addictions and Substance Abuse (CASA) Commission on Substance Abuse at Colleges and Universities (1994). Rethinking rites of passage: Substance abuse on America's campuses. New York, N.Y.: Columbia University.

Caleekal-John, A., & Pletsch, D. H. (1984) An interdisciplinary cognitive approach to alcohol education in the university curriculum. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 30(1), 50-60.

Celis, W. (1994). Drinking by college women raises new concern. New York Times, 143, 88.

Cherry, A. L. (1987). Social bond theory and alcohol use among college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28(2), 269-170.

Chira, S. (1994). Worry and distrust of adults beset teenagers, poll says. New York Times, 143, 1.

Cooper, A. M., Sobell, M. B., Sobell, L. C., & Maisto, S. A. (1981). Validity of alcoholics' self-reports: Duration data. International Journal of Addictions, 16(3), 401-406.

Daugherty, R., & O'Bryan, T. (1989). On-campus talking about alcohol. Lexington, KY: Prevention Research Institute.

Dillman, D. (1977). Mail and telephone surveys, the total design method. John Wiley & Sons: New York.

Dunham, R. & Mauss, A. (1982). Reluctant referrals: The effectiveness of legal coercion in outpatient treatment programs for problem drinkers. Journal of Drug Issues, 12(1), 5-20.

Eagle, E. & Schmitt, C. (1990). Patterns and trends for dropping out from post-secondary education: 1972, 1980 and 1982 high school graduates, National Center for Educational Statistics, January.

Engs, R. C., & Hansen, D. J. (1990). Gender differences in drinking patterns and problems among college students: A review of the literature. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 35(2), 36-47.

Federal Register. (1990). Part II department of education-34 cfr part 86 drug-free schools and campuses: Final regulations, 55(159), 33580-33601.

Fleming, M. & Levie, W. H. (1978). Instructional message design. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications.

Flynn, C. A. & Brown, W. E. (1991). The effects of a mandatory alcohol education program on college student problem drinkers. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 37(1), 15-24.

Fournet, G. P., Estes, R. E., Martin, G. L., Robertson, E. D., & McRary, J. S. (1990). Drug and alcohol attitudes and usage among elementary and secondary students. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 35(3), 81-92.

Freier, M. C., Bell, R. M., & Ellickson, P. L. (1991). Do teens tell the truth? The validity of self-reported tobacco use by adolescents. RAND Publication, N-3291-CHF.

Friend, K. E., & Koushki, P. A. (1984). Student substance use: Stability and change across college years. International Journal of the Addictions, 19(5), 571-575.

Gibbons, F. X. (1990). The impact of focus of attention and affect on social behavior. In W. R. Crozier (ed.), Shyness and embarrassment: Perspectives from social psychology. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Glassco, K. (1975). Drinking habits of seniors in a southern university. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 21(1), 5-29.

Globetti, G. (1973). Approaches to the control of alcoholic beverages in the United States. Journal of Drug Issues, 3(1), 260-266.

Gonzalez, G. M. (1978). What do you mean prevention? Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 23(3), 14-23.

Gonzalez, G. M. (1982). Alcohol education can prevent problems: A summary of some unique findings. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 27(3), 2-12.

Gonzalez, G. M. (1990). Effects of raising the drinking age and related campus initiatives on student alcohol consumption and alcohol-related problems. Journal of College Student Development, 31(2), 181-183.

Gonzalez, G. M., & Broughton, E. A. (1986). Status of alcohol policies on campus: A national survey. NASPA Journal, 24(1), 49-58.

Goodstadt, M. S. (1980). Drug education - a turn on or a turn off? Journal of Drug Education, 2, 89-99.

Goodstadt, M. & Caleekal-John, A. (1984). Alcohol education programs for university students: A review of their effectiveness. The International Journal of the Addictions, 19(7), 721-741.

Greene, E. (1987). 'I wind up taking a bong hit': Drugs at one urban university, The Chronicle of Higher Education, 33(28), 1-34.

Grey, P. M. (1981). An evaluation of industrial programming for alcohol problems. Ph.D. dissertation.

Hanson, D. J. (1982). Alcohol and drug education: An assessment of effectiveness. Education, 102, 328-339.

Hartford, T. C., Wechler, H. & Rahman, M. (1983). The structural context of college drinking. Journal of Studies of Alcohol, 44(4), 722-738.

Haworth-Hoeppner, S., Globetti, G., Stem, J. & Morasco, F. (1989). The quantity and frequency of drinking among undergraduates at a southern university. International Journal of the Addictions, 24(9), 829-857.

Hewitt, L. E. (1981). Current status of alcohol education programs for youth. In National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Special population issues (Alcohol and Health Monograph No. 62). Rockville, MD: The Institute.

Hill, F. E. & Bugen, L. A. (1979). A survey of drinking patterns among college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 20(3), 236-243.

Howe, L., & Howe, M. (1975). Personalizing education. New York: Hart.

Hughes, S. & Dodder, R. (1983). Alcohol consumption patterns among college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 24(3), 257-264.

Janosik, S. M., & Anderson, D. S. (1989). An assessment of alcohol risk management practices on the college campus. NASPA Journal, 26(3), 93-201.

Jessor, R. (1982). Problem behavior and developmental transition in adolescence. Journal of School Health, 52(5), 295-300.

Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M. & Bachman, J. G. (1991). Drug use among American high school seniors, college students and young adults, 1975-1990, National Institute on Drug Abuse, Washington, DC.

Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., & Bachman, J. G. (1993). National survey results on drug use from monitoring the future, 1975-1992, vol. II, College students and young adults, National Institute on Drug Abuse, Washington, DC.

Keeley, K. A., & Solomon, J. (Eds.) (1982). Perspectives in alcohol and drug abuse. Boston: Wright.

Keeling, R. (1994). Changing the context: The power in prevention alcohol awareness, caring and community. Journal of American College Health, 42(6), 243-247.

Kim, S. (1981). An evaluation of the ombudsman primary prevention program on student drug abuse. Journal of Drug Education, 11(2), 27-36.

Kinder, B. N., Pape, N. E. & Walfish, G. (1980). Drug and alcohol education programs: A review of outcome studies. The International Journal of the Addictions, 15(7), 1035-1054.

Knowles, M. (1975). Self-directed learning. Chicago: Follett.

Lenhart, S. D., & Wodarski, J. S. (1984). Comprehensive program for student alcohol abuse: A group approach. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 30(1), 36-43.

Lindsey-Hartz, J., De Rivera, J. & Mascolo, M. F. (1995). Differentiating guilt and shame and their effects on motivation. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (eds.), Self-conscious emotions the psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride, (274-300). New York: Guilford Press.

Magner, D. K. (1988). Alcohol-related problems have not decreased on most college campuses, survey indicates. The Chronicle of Higher Education, pp. A35, A37.

Maney, D. W. (1990). Predicting university students' use of alcoholic beverages. Journal of College Student Development, 31(1), 23-32.

McGuire, W. J. (1974). Communication-persuasion models for drug education. In M. Goodstadt (ed.), Research on Methods and Programs of Drug Education. Ontario, Canada: Addiction Research Foundation.

Meacci, W. G. (1990). An evaluation of the effects of college alcohol education on the prevention of negative consequences. Journal of College Student Development, 31(2), 66-72.

Michigan State University Administrative Officer Manual (1995), pp. 1, 26-27.

Miller, R. S. (1995). Embarrassment and social behavior. In J. P. Tangney & K. W. Fischer (eds.), Self-conscious emotions the psychology of shame, guilt, embarrassment, and pride, (119-143). New York: Guilford Press.

Millner, D. (1991). The move is on how to make campuses drug free. The Black Collegian, 22(1), 68(5).

Mills, K. C. & McCarty, D. (1983). A data based alcohol abuse prevention program in a university setting. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 28(2), 15-27.

Modanik, L. (1988). Validity of self-reported alcohol use: A literature review and assessment. British Journal of Addiction, 83, 1019, 1030.

National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (1995). Alcohol Alert, No. 29 PH 357.

O'Connell, D. F. & Beck, T. (1984). An involuntary therapeutic group for alcohol abusers, Journal of College Student Personnel, 25(6), 547-549.

Pascale, P. J., Trucksis, F. E., & Sylvester, J. (1985). Regional trends and sex differences of drug use and attitudes in high school students in northeast Ohio 1977-1983. Journal of Drug Education, 15(3), 241-251.

Perkins, H. W., & Berkowitz, A. D. (1986). Perceiving the community norms of alcohol use among students: Some research implications for campus alcohol education programming. International Journal of the Addictions, 21(9-10), 961-976.

Phelps, L. & Burchell, M. (1991). Welcome to the world of creative sanctions: "A collaboration of innovative sanctioning ideas: Past and current."

Pickens, K. (1984). The effects of alcohol education: A review of research 1980-1984. (Report No. CG 017 812). Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250613).

Pintrich, P., & DeGroot, E. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82(1), 33-40.

Presley, C. A., Meilman, P. W. & Lyster, R. (1993). Alcohol and Drugs on American College Campuses: Use, consequences, and perceptions of the campus environment. Vol. I: 1989-91, Monograph, CORE Institute: Ill.

Reinisch, O. J., Bell, R. M., & Ellickson, P. L. (1991). How accurate are adolescent reports of drug use? RAND Publication, N-3189-CHF.

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. (1993). Substance abuse: The nation's number one health problem, key indicators for policy. Princeton, N.J.: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.

Robins, L. N., & Przybeck, T. R. (1985). Age of onset of drug use as a factor in drug and other disorders. In Etiology of Drug Abuse: Implications for Prevention, C. S. Jones and R. I. Battjes (Eds.). NIDA Research Monograph 56.

Robinson, S. E., Gloria, A. M., Roth, S. L., & Schuetter, R. M. (1993). Patterns of drug use among female and male undergraduates. Journal of College Student Development, 34(2), 130-137.

Robinson, S. E., Roth, S. L., Gloria, A. M., Keim, J., & Sattler, H. (1993). Influence of substance abuse education on undergraduates' knowledge, attitudes and behaviors. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 39(1), 122-130.

Rogers, C. (1979). Freedom to learn. Ohio: Charles Merrill.

Rogers, C., Freiberg, H. (1994). Freedom to learn. New York: Merrill.

Room, R. (1971). Survey vs. sales data for the U.S. Drink Drug Practice Survey, 3(2), 15-16.

Rosenberg, M. & Liftik, J. (1976). Use of coercion in the outpatient treatment of alcoholism. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 37(1), 58-65.

Ryan, M., Connell, J., & Deci, E. (1985). A motivational analysis of self-determination and self regulations in education. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.) Research on Motivation in Education, Vol. 2 (pp. 13-50). San Diego: Academic Press.

Ryan, R., & Grolnick, W. (1986). Origins and pawns in the classroom: Self-report and projective assessments of individual differences in children's perceptions. Journal of personality and Social Psychology, 50(3), 550-558.

Schall, M., Kemeny, A., & Maltzman, I. (1991). Drinking by university dormitory residents: Its prediction and amelioration. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 36(3), 75-86.

Schall, M., Kemeny, A., & Maltzman, I. (1992). Factors associated with alcohol use in university students. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 53, 2, 122-136.

Schaps, E., Churgin, S., Palley, C. S., Takata, B., * Cohen, A. Y. (1980). Primary prevention research: A preliminary review of program outcome studies. International Journal of the Addictions, 15, 657-676.

Scoles, P. & Fine, E. (1977). Short-term effects of an educational program for drinking drivers. Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 38(3), 633-637.

Serdahely, W. (1984). A nontraditional approach to college drug education. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 29(2), 40-54.

Sherry, P., & Strolberg, V. (1987). Factors affecting alcohol use by college students. Journal of College Student Personnel, 28(4), 350-355.

Short, P., & Greer, J. (1994). Empowering students: Variables impacting the effort. Education, 114(4), 503-518.

Steinberg, L. (1996). Beyond the Classroom. Simon & Schuster: New York.

Thorner, G. (1986). A review of the literature on alcohol abuse and college students and the alcohol awareness program at SUNYAB. Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 31(3), 41-53.

Toohey, J. V. (1971). An analysis of drug use behavior at five American universities. School Health, 41, 464-468.

Vischi, T. R., Jones, K. R., Shrank, E. L., & Lima, L. H. (1980). ADAMNA national data book. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Waddell, R. (1993). Alcohol's effect on learning. New York Times, 142, 6.

Werch, C. E., Gorman, D. R., & Marty, P. J. (1987). Relationship between alcohol consumption and alcohol problems in young adults. Journal of Drug Education, 17(3), 261-277.

Weschler, H. (1995). Binge drinking on American college campuses: A new look at an old problem. Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, Massachusetts.

Weschler, H., & Isaac, N. (1992). Binge drinkers at Massachusetts colleges: Prevalence, drinking styles, time trends and associated problems. Journal of American Medical Association, 267(1), 2929-2931.

Weschler, H., Davenport, A., Dowdall, G., Moeykens, B., & Castillo, S. (1994). Health and behavioral consequences of binge drinking in college: A national survey of students at 140 campuses. Journal of American Medical Association, 272(2), 1672-1677.

Weschler, H., Dowdall, G., Davenport, A., & Castillo, S. (1995). Correlates of college student binge drinking. American Journal of Public Health, 85(7), 921-926.

Weschler, H., Dowdall, G., Davenport, A., & Rimm, E. B. (1995). A gender-specific measure of binge drinking among college students. American Journal of Public Health, 85(7), 982-985.

Whittmer, J. (1970). Homogeneity of personality characteristics: A comparison between older order Amish and non-Amish. American Anthropology, 72(5), 1063, 1068.

Wong, M. (1976). Different strokes: Models of drug abuse prevention education. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 1(4), 285-303.

Yu, I. & Williford, W. (1990). Gateway hypothesis revisited: Onset age of alcohol drinking and drug use patterns. Research Note, 90, 8. New York State Division of Alcoholism and Alcohol Use.

APPENDIX A - Student Questionnaires

Please Remove this Sheet Prior to Giving Survey to Researcher

Name _____

PID _____ Subject # _____

Phone # _____

Need the following information:

___ Gender _____

___ Birthdate _____

___ Race/Ethnicity _____

ACTIVITY STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1) _ _ _ SUBJECT NO. _____
(3 digits)

Date/Time of Effort to Contact: 1) _____ 2) _____ 3) _____

2) Contacted? NO(1) YES(2)

3) _ Action and Activity: _____ Activity in Peer Setting(4), Activity in Non-Peer Setting(5), Two Activities(6)

4) _ Violation After Disciplinary Action Taken? NO(1) YES(2)

5) _ Gender of Student: Male(3) Female(4)

6) _ _ Age at time of violation: _____

7) _ Race: White(3) Black(4) Asian/Pacific Islander(5)
Native American(6) Hispanic(7)

8) _ _ Name of Administrative Officer _____

Hi! My name is _____, and I'm calling from the Judicial Affairs Office. We are collecting information on the impact and value of disciplinary actions as part of the research for a graduate student working on a dissertation. The information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. The graduate student will not be given your name or phone number, only your responses to the questions. Would you be willing to spend ten minutes answering some questions about your experience with the judicial process?

9) _ NO(1) (go to letter A.) YES(2) (go to letter B.)

A. Thanks anyway, and have a good day/night (or have a good test, etc.).

B. There is no known risk in your participating in this research. Your participation is completely voluntary, so if you don't want to answer a question, say so and we will go on to the next question. We would like you to be as honest as possible when responding to the questions. Do you understand?

10) _ _ What is your major? _____

Records in the Judicial Affairs Office indicate that you met with _____ and that the following action was taken _____. Did you complete this activity? If YES, go on to question 11. IF NO, ask the student, "How come you didn't?" If the student says, "If I answer this truthfully, will I have to do it?" Caller should answer "No, your answer is for research."

11) _ What year were you when your violation occurred? _____

When you met with the administrative officer did you have any input into deciding what the action would be?

12) _ NO(1) YES(2) (What was your role in helping to decide the action?)

Did meeting with _____ have an impact on your use of alcohol?

13) _ NO(1) YES(2)

Did _____ have an impact on your use of alcohol?

14) _ NO(1) YES(2)

15) 8

Did you learn anything during your meeting with _____?

16) _ NO(1) YES(2)

Did you learn anything from _____?

17) _ NO(1) YES(2)

18) 8

As the result of your meeting with _____ do you believe you know anything more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse?

19) _ NO(1) YES(2)

As the result of _____ do you believe you know anything more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse?

20) _ NO(1) YES(2)

21) 8

Have you thought any differently about your drinking since meeting with _____?

22) _ NO(1) YES(2)

Have you thought any differently about your drinking since _____?

23) _ NO(1) YES(2)

Do you use alcohol differently as the result of your meeting with _____?

25) _ NO(1) (Go to Q28) YES(2) (Go to Q26)

The next two questions are about the ways you use it differently as the result of your meeting with _____. (not as the result of their participation in the learning activity)

Do you drink more or less as the result of your meeting?

26) _ MORE(1) LESS(2)

Do you drink differently so as not to get caught violating as the result of the meeting?

27) _ NO(1) YES(2)

Do you use alcohol differently as the result of _____?

28) _ NO (Go to Q34) YES(2) (Go to Q29)

The next two questions are about the ways you use it differently as the result of _____.

Do you drink more or less?

29) _ MORE(1) LESS(2)

Do you drink differently so as not to get caught violating?

30) _ NO(1) YES(2)

31) 8

32) 8

33) 8

Have you thought any differently about other people's drinking as the result of your

meeting with _____?

34) _ NO(1) YES(2)

Have you thought any differently about other people's drinking as the result of your _____?

35) _ NO(1) YES(2)

36) 8

(A drink is a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink, Ice beer would be two drinks.) How many times during the last 2 weeks have you had 5 or more drinks at a sitting?

37) _ None(1) Once(2) Twice(3) 3-5 times(4) 6-9 times(5) 10 or more times(6)

38) _ _ *What is the average number of drinks you consume in a week? _____*

At what age did you first use alcohol?

39) _ Never(1) Under 10(2) 10-11(3) 12-13(4) 14-15(5) 16-17(6) 18-20(7)

How often have you experienced memory loss due to drinking during the last year?

40) _ Never(1) Once(2) Twice(3) 3-5 times(4) 6-9 times(5) 10 or more times(6)

How often have you missed class due to your drinking during the last year?

41) _ Never(1) Once(2) Twice(3) 3-5 times(4) 6-9 times(5) 10 or more times(6)

Participation includes doing or listening or speaking. Using the scale of 1 to 6, with 6 being very high participation and 1 being very low participation, how would you rank yourself in your participation in _____?

42) _ 1 2 3 4 5 6

43) 8

44) _ Gender of Caller - MALE(3) FEMALE(4)

Thank you very much for your participation. Name of Caller _____

Please Remove this Sheet Prior to Giving Survey to Researcher

Name _____

PID _____ Subject # _____

Phone # _____

Need the following information:

___ Gender _____

___ Birthdate _____

___ Race/Ethnicity _____

NO ACTIVITY STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

- 1) _ _ _ SUBJECT NO. _____
(3 digits)

Date/Time of Effort to Contact: 1)_____ 2)_____ 3)_____

- 2) Contacted? NO(1) YES(2)
- 3) _ Action and Activity: _____ Activity in Peer Setting (4),
Activity in Non-Peer Setting (5), Two Activities (6)
- 4) _ Violation After Disciplinary Action Taken? NO(1) YES(2)
- 5) _ Gender of Student: Male(3) Female(4)
- 6) _ _ Age at time of violation: _____
- 7) _ Race: White(3) Black(4) Asian/Pacific Islander(5)
Native American(6) Hispanic(7)
- 8) _ _ Name of Administrative Officer _____

Hi! My name is _____, and I'm calling from the Judicial Affairs Office. We are collecting information on the impact and value of disciplinary actions as part of the research for a graduate student working on a dissertation. The information you provide will be kept strictly confidential. The graduate student will not be given your name or phone number, only your responses to the questions. Would you be willing to spend ten minutes answering some questions about your experience with the judicial process?

- 9) _ NO(1) (go to letter A.) YES(2) (go to letter B.)

A. Thanks anyway, and have a good day/night (or have a good test, etc.).

B. There is no known risk in your participating in this research. Your participation is completely voluntary, so if you don't want to answer a question, say so and we will go on to the next question. We would like you to be as honest as possible when responding to the questions. Do you understand?

- 10) _ _ What is your major? _____

Records in the Judicial Affairs Office indicate that you met with _____ and that the following action was taken _____.

Did you complete these activities? (If YES, go on to question 11. If NO, ask the student, ``How come you didn't \_\_\_\_\_?" If the student says ``If I answer this truthfully, will I have to do it?" Caller should answer ``No, your answer is for research") _____

11) _ *What year were you when your violation occurred?*

When you met with the administrative officer did you have any input into deciding what the action would be?

12) _ NO(1) YES(2) *(What was your role in helping to decide the action?)*

Did meeting with _____ have an impact on your use of alcohol?

13) _ NO(1) YES(2)

14) 8

15) 8

Did you learn anything during your meeting with _____?

16) _ NO(1) YES(2)

17) 8

18) 8

As the result of your meeting with _____ do you believe you know anything more about the issues associated with alcohol use and abuse?

19) _ NO(1) YES(2)

20) 8

21) 8

Have you thought any differently about your drinking since meeting with _____?

22) _ NO(1) YES(2)

23) 8

24) 8

Do you use alcohol differently as the result of your meeting with _____?

25) _ NO(1) (Go to Q34) YES(2) (Go to Q26)

The next two questions are about the ways you use it differently as the result of your meeting with _____

Do you drink more or less as the result of your meeting?

26) _ MORE(1) LESS(2)

Do you drink differently so as not to get caught violating as the result of your meeting?

27) _ NO(1) YES(2)

28) 8

31) 8

32) 8

33) 8

Have you thought any differently about other people's drinking as the result of your meeting with _____?

34) _ NO(1) YES(2)

35) 8

36) 8

(A drink is a bottle of beer, a glass of wine, a wine cooler, a shot glass of liquor, or a mixed drink, Ice beer would be two drinks.) How many times during the last 2 weeks have you had 5 or more drinks at a sitting?

37) _ None(1) Once(2) Twice(3) 3-5 times(4) 6-9 times(5) 10 or more times(6)

38) _ _ What is the average number of drinks you consume in a week? _____

At what age did you first use alcohol?

39) _ Never(1) Under 10(2) 10-11(3) 12-13(4) 14-15(5) 16-17(6) 18-20(7)

How often have you experienced memory loss due to drinking during the last year?

40) _ Never(1) Once(2) Twice(3) 3-5 times(4) 6-9 times(5) 10 or more times(6)

How often have you missed class due to your drinking during the last year?

41) Never(1) Once(2) Twice(3) 3-5 times(4) 6-9 times(5) 10 or more times(6)

Participation includes doing or listening or speaking. Using the scale of 1 to 6, with 6 being very high participation and 1 being very low participation, how would you rank yourself in your participation in

_____?

42) _ 1 2 3 4 5 6

43) 8

44) Gender of Caller - MALE(3) FEMALE(4)

Thank you very much for your participation.

Name of Caller _____

APPENDIX B - Public Law 101-226

Attachment
GEN-90-9

Section 22: The Drug Free Schools and Communities Act Amendment of 1989
(Public Law 101-226)

SEC - DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND CAMPUSES.

(a) IN GENERAL -

(1) CERTIFICATE OF DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM. - Title XII of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end a new section 1213 to read as follows:

"DRUG AND ALCOHOL ABUSE PREVENTION

"SEC. 1213. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no institution of higher education shall be eligible to receive funds or any other form of financial assistance under any Federal program, including participation in any federally funded or guaranteed student loan program. Unless it certifies to the Secretary that it has adopted and has implemented a program to prevent the use of illicit drugs and the abuse of alcohol by students and employees that. At a minimum. Includes -

"(1) the annual distribution to each student and employee of-

- "(A) standards of conduct that clearly prohibit. At a minimum. The unlawful possession. Use. Or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol by students and employees on its property or as part of any of its activities:
- "(B) a description of the applicable legal sanctions under local. State. Or Federal law for the unlawful possession or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol:
- "(C) a description of the health risks associated with the use of illicit drugs and the abuse of alcohol:
- "(D) a description of any drug or alcohol counseling, treatment. Or rehabilitation or re-entry programs that are available to employees or students: and
- "(E) a clear statement that the institution will impose sanctions on students and employees (consistent with local. State. And Federal law). And a description of those sanctions up to and including expulsion or termination of employment and referral for prosecution. For violations of the standards of conduct required by paragraph (1XA); and

"(2) a biennial review by the institution of its program to -

- "(A) determine its effectiveness and implement changes to the program if they are needed: and
- "(B) ensure that the sanctions required by paragraph (1XE) are consistently enforced.

APPENDIX C - UCRIHS Approval Letter

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

March 1, 1996

TO: Katherine Sullivan

RE: IRB#: 96-067
TITLE: SELF-REPORTED IMPACT OF JUDICIALLY MANDATED
ALCOHOL EDUCATION ACTIVITIES OF COLLEGE STUDENTS
REVISION REQUESTED: N/A
CATEGORY: 1-C
APPROVAL DATE: 02/29/96

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 and any revisions listed above.

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.

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.



OFFICE OF
**RESEARCH
AND
GRADUATE
STUDIES**

**PROBLEMS/
CHANGES:**

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.

If we can be of any future help, please do not hesitate to contact us at (517) 355-2180 or FAX (517) 432-1171.

University Committee on
Research Involving
Human Subjects
(UCRIHS)

Michigan State University
232 Administration Building
East Lansing, Michigan
48824-1046

517/355-2180
FAX 517/432-1171

Sincerely,

David E. Wright
David E. Wright, Ph.D.
UCRIHS Chair

DEW:bed

cc: Lee N. June

The Michigan State University
IDEA's Institutional Diversity
Excellence in Action

MSU is an affirmative action
equal-opportunity institution

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293014271716