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Alcohol and drug prevention programs on college campuses have proliferated at an explosive rate since the United States Congress enacted the Drug-Free School and Communities Act of 1989. The Drug-Free School and Communities Act required universities to certify to the Department of Education by October 1, 1990 that they adopt and implement prevention policies on the illicit use of drugs and abuse of alcohol by students, staff, and faculty. The purpose of this study is to examine whether university prevention efforts, generally programs utilizing education, counseling and peer social support, impact on the alcohol and drug use of students and result in a measurable change in that alcohol and drug use.

The study is informed by data which examine the views of college students toward the prevention of alcohol and drug use. If the impact of prevention programs is found to be great enough to produce the desired changes, then researchers in the drug field may predict a reversal in the unusual recent increase of alcohol and drug use among college students (Johnston, 1993; Gliksman, 1988). Findings at the elementary and secondary levels have provided
preliminary empirical support for prevention programs, but little is known about the effects of prevention among college students whose daily experiences make the goals of prevention difficult. In addition, I discuss the university view toward alcohol and other drugs; i.e., whether to manage, control or prohibit them.

This is an initial exploratory study of prevention efforts to intervene with a university student population and actively affect changes in alcohol and drug use in the university student culture. Prevention requires a great effort at re-educating and "policing the desires" of a typical college student whose high-risk patterns of behavior associated with substance use are deemed objectionable by those with authority at the university (Watney, 1987).

This dissertation uses extensive interviews with university students and survey data to empirically evaluate the impact of campus alcohol and drug prevention programs on the students' drinking and drug use. At Lakefront and Northern Universities, two private Midwestern universities, ethnographic study of university student interactions within peer groups and prevention programs and statistical analyses of survey data are used to assess the effect of prevention programs on student behaviors and attitudes and the extent of their drinking and drug use.

The growth of campus-based prevention has led to rising expectations for a future decline in alcohol and drug use of
college students. This study will focus on the actual changes in the college drinking culture, and the specific changes in the Lakefront University institutional culture after a Department of Education F.I.P.S.E. (Fund for the Improvement for Post-Secondary Education) grant guaranteed the university financial support to begin a campus-based prevention program.

The Department of Education's F.I.P.S.E. grants encourages universities to develop standards and operate programs to reduce current student substance abuse and prevent future drug and alcohol problems. Nationwide, in 1991, the FIPSE awards totaled $10.1 million. The F.I.P.S.E. grants for comprehensive campus-based programs required a final report on what prevention activities were implemented and a pre-to-post survey of student drug use during the period covered by the grant (Werch et al, 1992). After receiving FIPSE grants, both Lakefront and Northern were required to conduct the Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (CORE) survey which is designed to elicit college students' attitudes, behaviors, and use of alcohol and drugs.

Statement of the Problem

The basic research problem can be framed in very general terms; how do university students perceive, react to, make sense of or rebel against the rules on alcohol and drug use mandated by the federal government and implemented by the university? What is the connection between
university students, who alcohol educator Gerardo Gonzalez views as a "population at risk" for substance abuse, and the student culture, which he labels a "microcosm of society"? Is a "healthy student community" concept appropriate for college drinking groups (Burns, 1989)? The fact that these questions continued to go unanswered while alcohol and drug prevention programs multiplied was what interested me in conducting this study.

What I propose to discuss in the chapters ahead are: what models of prevention programs are found on university campuses; what generates student violations of prevention policy and how frequently do they occur; which legal, social and academic problems are associated with the alcohol and drug use which appears in the college student population; and what peer social group involvement generates and inhibits these behavioral problems.

Students are classified according to the strength of attachment to the "student culture" or to a pro-social culture critical of alcohol and drug use. A pro-social culture emerges when prevention awareness levels increase. Those groups, one which maintains a "party subculture" and one which develops the drug and alcohol-free culture, will be contrasted. The general point is to give meaning to the framework of change which is found with the new focus on "drug-free" campuses. One of the strategies to reach the turning point for "drug-free" schools is to promote the pro-
social, or peer leader, student. This leaves the underage drinker or drug user defined as "deviant" in the new drug-free environment. In the chapters to follow, I use the term "deviant", in quotes, to describe students who drink or use drugs as it indicates the labelling of students as irresponsible, their conduct as illegal and their behaviors as irresponsible. A variety of other labels, "drunkards, drunken, druggies", may be more suitable descriptions of these students. The tendency to assign labels to unconventionality has been the subject of debate in the literature on the sociology of deviance (Liazos, 1972). I view the label "deviant" as a description of the distance this generation feels from those, mainly the federal government, who apply labels and new connotations to the college lifestyle.

Patterns of Student Drinking and Drug Use

The Office of Substance Abuse Prevention, the principle federal agency dealing with prevention of alcohol, tobacco and other drug problems, reports that:

While college-bound high school students generally use AODs (alcohol and other drugs) less than non-college ones, once they go to college they tend to catch up. There are very high rates of alcohol and other drug use in college, often the cause of quitting college or of being thrown out (Cahalan, 1991, pp. 54-5).

A sociological perspective, in contrast to that of the legislators, educators, or the prevention policy experts who initiated prevention programs, presents a more analytical view on the concerns society has with alcohol and drug use.
Sociological literature on alcohol abuse, including Spradley's (1970) *You Owe Yourself A Drunk* and Wiseman's (1970) *Stations of the Lost: The Treatment of Skid Row Alcoholics* and ethnographies of drug users, such as Williams (1978) *Cocaine Kids* and Gaines (1991) *Teenage Wasteland* examines the persistence of alcohol and drug use and the conditions which alienate drinkers and drug users in the society. The University of Michigan *Monitoring The Future* survey reports the 1992 levels of drug use have risen to 30.6 percent of college students who use some form of illicit drugs within the last year, and over 90 percent use alcohol. With these indicators of the persistence of substance use, the question for colleges is how can they comply, and at what cost, with federal regulations. The government's intent in establishing prevention programs at universities is a marked reduction in the consumption of alcohol and drugs for this or the following generation.

According to Gerardo Gonzalez, demonstrating the results of prevention programs is best studied at universities. Gonzalez emphasizes, "No American institution is better suited to implement and evaluate a comprehensive approach to alcohol and drug education than the colleges and universities" (1988, p. 359). He supports innovative approaches such as BACCHUS, (Boost Alcohol Consciousness Concerning the Health of University Students), a popular college alcohol education program, which recommends the
teaching of responsible use of alcohol and has recognized that "drinking is firmly rooted in American life and even more firmly rooted in college socializing" (Gonzalez, 1986a, p. 23). College drinking at the fraternity party, house party or tailgate party, in spite of posing health and legal risks, is perceived as a "rite of passage" from adolescence to adulthood. Development of a "positive" campus culture which is critical of alcohol and drug use will most likely occur if prevention providers challenge students to comply with restrictions on alcohol and drugs and target them in several facets of college life such as academic experience, their social status, and their social living and leisure groups. The challenge for prevention providers who promote basic changes in the autonomous student culture is to present a clear, well-defined policy on the use of alcohol or drugs. The challenge for today's student is to cope in a culture where one's internal and external environment is unpredictable to the extent of one's involvement in alcohol and drugs.

Prevention Definitions

In 1984, a comprehensive study of alcohol and drug prevention efforts was produced by RAND Corporation researchers (Polich et al., 1984). The RAND report defined prevention programs as those which "aim at the reduction, delay or prevention of drug use before it has become habitual or clearly dysfunctional" (Polich et al., 1984, p.
The design of the 1988 Anti-Drug Abuse Act narrowed the jurisdiction to "controlled substances" and excluded alcohol, since it is not a "controlled substance", although the intent was alcohol and drug education programs be "fully coordinated" (Cahalan, 1990, p. 19). By 1990, former "Drug Czar" Bob Martinez wrote, "the term 'prevention' has been used to refer to persuading people from ever trying drugs" and his office promoted that use of the prevention term (OSAP White Paper, 1990, p. 1).

Many prevention issues are not focused. In her book on prevention, Joy Dryfoos presents several problem areas of prevention, finding the "literature on prevention of substance abuse is extensive, diverse, uneven and difficult to summarize .. reflect(ing) the fuzziness of the subject of substance abuse prevention and the specialized interests of those who work on it" (1992, p. 150). Because of these inconsistencies, prevention education research is often misunderstood and disregarded.

Differences in the application of prevention makes the practice of prevention difficult. The two models of prevention delivery which receive the most attention are the medical model and the health belief model. The former has often been described as the "disease" concept, whereas the latter is more attitudinal-based and promotes self-improvement. Both Lakefront (LU) and Northern (NU) universities developed prevention models which reflect these
accepted models. Yet, disagreements exist, many administrators believe in strictly prohibiting underage drinking, while others want to encourage "responsible use".

It is clear that the medical, or "disease", model is not going to impact heavy drinkers under twenty years of age. The cumulative effects of prolonged drinking will not have shown up in this youth population, although college students do report a variety of drinking related problems. Herbert Fingarette, a critic of the disease model, instead advocates a more realistic policy. In his influential book, *Heavy Drinking*, he writes:

No set of social policies, however broad or imaginative, will eliminate alcohol abuse because "drinking is an important and ineradicable part of (our) culture". The task at hand is not to solve a perennially challenging social predicament. In a nation of some 240 million people, any measure that influences the drinking behavior of even 1 percent of teenagers or adults will each year save thousands of lives and prevent countless episodes of alcohol-related personal, medical, and social distress (Fingarette 1988, p. 134).

In absence of a "disease" focus, college prevention programs focus on modifying the environment, advancing an abstinence policy, teaching changes in attitudes through curriculum infusion and teaching social skills to resist pressures to use alcohol and drugs. While none of these strategies are the turning point for "drug-free" schools, these recent policies must be evaluated for their eventual impact.

**The Examination of Prevention in This Study**

In this study both the impact of prevention and the sociocultural influences which inhibit prevention are
presented. One criticism of alcohol and drug prevention studies is they ignore the complexities of the youth culture by focusing more narrowly on alcohol and drug involvement (Hebdige, 1979). Alcohol and drug use often corresponds with the disruptive events and delinquency of youth and drug field research often focuses on the serious nature of these problem events. Consequently these value-laden studies identify alcohol and drug use as "the social problem" faced by youth. Some sociologists identified and immediately correlated normative problems with alcohol and drug use (Jessor and Jessor, 1977). This rigid correspondence disregards the instrumental use of alcohol and drugs and makes little attempt at delineating the complex ways in which alcohol and drugs are subjectively characterized by the youth who use them (Glassner and Loughlin, 1987).

Are alcohol and drug prevention programs part of a viable approach to effect changes in college students' alcohol and drug use? The research in this study compares "at risk" groups to student behaviors in general. Using survey results, I identify two groups, "aware" students who are affected by prevention and "unaware" students who are not affected and profile their attitudes and behaviors in the later chapters.

Because over ninety percent of those surveyed for this study drink, virtually the entire college student population could be considered "at risk". One result of the study is
while prevention does not automatically produce the desired sobriety in the student community, it does produce some positive measures on awareness of the consequences of excessive drinking and drug use.

The Government Leads - The Universities Follow

Prevention programs have emerged as a key government anti-drug strategy in recent years. Prevention research cannot decide if prevention is "a field replete with failures" (Botvin, 1990) or if "prevention efforts have become more successful" (Flay, 1985). The Clinton administration has proposed a new adjustment in drug control dollars which will further benefit prevention over law enforcement (Chicago Tribune, May 9, 1993, p. A4). Recent statements by the Attorney General, a Supreme Court Judge and the Surgeon General indicate new solutions, such as prevention interventions, are planned. Many policy experts argue that the present framework is well intended, but often misguided, because it jails many, scares others and helps few. If prevention does represent a viable policy then the United States would stand to benefit enormously both economically and socially.

The Drug-Free Schools and Community Act of 1989 required college and universities to establish and maintain prevention programs by complying "formally and in writing - with the provisions of PL 101-226 and the Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Final Regulations" or the university may not
receive federal monies, including financial aid for its students and research money for its faculty (Kuh, 1990, p. 2). Previously, the Federal Uniform Drinking Act of July 1984 gave states until October, 1, 1986 to raise the minimum drinking age to twenty-one or have five percent of their highway construction funds withheld (Coate and Grossman, 1988). A criminal category of "underage" drinkers was created when states raised the age of legal purchase on alcohol to twenty-one years of age. Compliance with the law meant refusing the purchase beer, wine or liquor to anyone under twenty-one years of age. Both the Drug-Free Acts and the Highway Act introduced legal restraints which mandate compliance.

How do universities integrate prevention rules? One way is with prospective college-bound students, more than half of whom visit at least one college campus prior to choosing their school. Campus visitors to either Lakefront or Northern do not hear about the new restrictions on alcohol use from those who conduct pre-arranged campus tours. This is an inconsistency in their prevention approaches. If the university is vague about alcohol and drug use, when it is clearly present, they make it seem inconsequential. Ernest Boyer (1987), of the Carnegie Foundation, concluded these visits could be more effective,

---

1 A more detailed discussion on criminal and administrative enforcement of the legal minimum drinking age may be found in Wagenaar and Wolfson (1993).
During this tour, prospective students and their parents learned about festive occasions, but not who teaches undergraduate classes. They visited the student union and the dorms, but no mention was made of academic honors. Visitors heard about "keg parties", not about the concerts and lectures. One had the distinct impression that the campus was a place with abundant social life. Education was ignored (1987, p. 17).

Campus visits are usually student-initiated and are attended by parents or other people close to the student. New student orientations present the opportunity of making explicit the restrictions on underage drinking and drug use. A graduate of the University of Florida described the need for prevention information, saying:

The need for alcohol information is identified by the number of drinkers that exist on college campuses. It is a continuing need that is supported by those students who misuse beverage alcohol in spite of problems that result, whether it be academic probation, vandalism, or a conviction of his or her first DUI (Goodale, 1986, p. 46).

The admission office instead markets their university as an "outstanding" environment by featuring campus distractions, such as the athletic schedules and the active social life, mesmerizing the students as the carnival barker plying a crowd at a county fair. The initial campus visit is a missed opportunity for delivering a prevention message leaving incoming students unable to differentiate what is allowed and what is forbidden on campus.

Problems for new students at Lakefront and Northern Universities begin almost immediately when they encounter
the prevailing campus attitudes of "drinking which are firmly rooted" (Gonzalez, 1986b). Eastern Michigan University Health Services director Ellen Gold (1992) wrote:

> It is a fact that within the first six to eight weeks of school, patterns of behavior and socialization have been established by students which effect their ability to stay in school and be successful, both academically and socially (F.I.P.S.E. Conference Bulletin, p. 49).

The university must "provide a range of options for students who need more" than the majority of students to succeed (Kuh et al. 1991). The data from this study shows that students become involved in a new "social support network" in which the average LU student gets drunk nearly two times in a two week period and the average NU student gets drunk two and one half times in the same period. The expectation of prevention is to help schools to produce well-adjusted students instead of poorly-adjusted ones.

A Sociological Framework for the Study of Prevention

The notion of prevention programs for H.I.V. transmission, violent behaviors and substance abuse in the population is viewed favorably by the general public. Sociologists view the same prevention programs and find elements of social constraint or control. In the view of Emile Durkheim (1938), the French sociologist who studied group habits and social beliefs, society has a:

> peculiar characteristic of social constraint .. due .. to the prestige with which certain representations are invested. It is true that habits, either physical or social, have in certain respects this same feature. They dominate us and impose beliefs and practices upon us. But they rule us from within, for they are an
integral part of ourself. On the contrary, social beliefs and practices act on us from without; thus the influence exerted by them differs fundamentally from the effect of habit (1938, p. iv).

For Durkheim, the habit of drinking might be inhibited by the certain representation evoked by the prestige of being a "university student". But many of today's students view a social life and drinking as one in the same. Do these "social beliefs and practices", in the form of prevention, exert sufficient influence to have a measured effect on student drinking habits? The counter-balance to the students' lack of restraint would be a structural factor acting from outside. Durkheim (1938) wrote, "There is no society in which such regulation does not exist. It varies from times and places". Universities regulate student alcohol or drug use through prevention design. When little change is found with "high risk" students, the influence of drinking groups on campus must be further examined.

Drinking Groups: Unsettling Problems for the Campus

Prevention policies have a limited effect from the point of view of those in college drinking groups. This is not surprising given the history of student drinking in our culture. This 'groupiness' is viewed by some as "intrinsically criminogenic if one assumes that individuals are more susceptible to situational inducements to break the law when they are in groups than when they are alone" (Warr, 1993, p. 38).

Criminologist Thorstein Sellin noted the importance of
groups' conduct norms, arguing they "are not the creation of any ONE normative group; they are not confined within political boundaries; they are not necessarily embodied in law (Taub and Little, 1975, p. 51). Thus, obedience to the norms of one group, such as fraternities, may violate the norms of another, such as society. Drug-free norms imposed by prevention program can violate the norms of a group of "drinking groups" intent on unrestricted "consumption" of alcohol or drugs. An examination of campus life reveals the fraternities at LU and "Slackers" at NU maintain "house parties" where alcohol and drugs are made available. Both groups are discussed in the remaining chapters. 

Contemporary writer Douglas Coupland labeled the roughly 46 million 18 to 29 year-old youth as "Generation X" (1991). This label seems to underscore their perceived lack of identity. Included within Generation X is a smaller group whose informal network of members are referred to as "Slackers". Slackers, who take their name from a movie entitled "Slacker", are overeducated, overstimulated and lack opportunities to apply their education. While Generation X delay marriages, Slackers hang around the university delaying graduation. Slackers are found at Northern University and identified by their philosophy, music and drug use. They struggle against conventional values using a generational conflict approach which represents their oppositional nature to the conformist
values of the society and many of their fellow students. By choosing this lifestyle they ignore the constraints implied by educational attachments.

The Lakefront campus group which most consistently holds conformist views is fraternities. However, the fraternity culture also promotes an alcohol-intoxicated, loud, masculine environment. Fraternities are growing, there are over 400,000 men nationwide in college fraternities. At LU, about 8 percent of male students join fraternities. The fraternities also claim they are "intolerant of drugs" and "educate students in all-around ways outside the classroom". Alcohol researcher George Maddox wrote fraternities represent the institutionalization of relatively heavy drinking which, in cases of those exposed to them, sometimes intensifies existing drinking patterns (1970, p. 104). These two student groups are similar because create the excitement of an off-campus "party subculture" (Hagan, 1991). They are themselves routine law violators and therefore of great interest in prevention circles as "unhealthy" or "high risk" students.

Studies show the increased drinking age has not reduced collegiate drinking, as much as it changed its location by chasing the alcohol and drug problems off-campus (Mooney, Gamble and Forsyth, 1992; Rubington, 1993). Student apartments and fraternity houses become the "setting" for drinking and drug use and their related problems (Zinberg,
Recently, Colgate University and its Sigma Chi fraternity were sued for five million dollars by a female student, who had been raped at the fraternity house. She "charged that Colgate had been lax in enforcing rules against underage drinking" (Chronicle of Higher Education, Sept. 1, 1993, p. A4). As a result of such incidents, fraternities nationwide are unable to get commercial insurance, having been rated as high a risk as nuclear facilities, and must self-insure (M. Overstreet, personal communication, March 1, 1992). If universities are interested in cost-containment, then they must be able to control these potential conduct problems.

The sequences of socialization followed by different student groups are pre-determinants of reactions to alcohol and drug policies. The students who want to change reality and sensory perception by experimenting with illicit substance use are generally unfazed by the prevention message. Some students insisting on their right to drink, find ambiguity in only parts of the prevention message, especially the policies which restrict drinking. Most of these predilections represent social learning of pro-delinquent behaviors rather than selective recruitment. Selective recruitment argues certain types of adolescents are pre-disposed to alcohol and drug use (Elliot et al., 1985; Kandel, 1980).

The expressive currents in Slacker nonchalance and
overstimulation and the 'rah-rah' hubris of fraternities are utilitarian and establish hope in the face of an uncertain, if not diminished, future. All student groups are clearly subordinate to adult society and they themselves must compete with each other to define their age-based community (Eckert, 1989, p. 15). There are often campus tensions between excelling socially and excelling academically. I examine the "high-risk" drinking groups, such as Slackers and the Greek house residents, and their association with the drug and alcohol problems on a campus, using several key informants within the fraternity and Slacker houses. I attended the new "open" fraternity parties and ongoing Slacker parties, and observed the drinking practices of these groups, finding minimal changes imposed by prevention on the "drinking culture" of these groups. These two college drinking groups, who are found to be at the center of the excessive use of alcohol at Lakefront and Northern, are discussed in a later chapter.

Sociologist Charles Suchar has written that deviant situations arise when people, like university administrators, who are in a position to impose judgements find other peoples' behaviors unsettling (1978, p. 1). It is the "people in position to impose judgements" who develop the rationales for prevention. They use prevention to impact the entrenched student culture, whose drinking is increasingly "unsettling" to the administrators.
Lee Upcraft (1986), the Vice-President of Counseling at Pennsylvania State University, insists that "alcohol has become a central focus of social life on American campuses, but not without a price". Leon Botstein, Bard College's president, is unsettled by the actions of today's students, stating that:

students through the 1960s accepted the idea that higher education was about trying on the clothes of adulthood, so they eagerly accepted responsibility for their actions. If they got involved with someone, if they got drunk, if they hurt someone, they sought to take responsibility. Today's students believe they are not responsible; quite the opposite, they feel they are owed something - an entitlement to a reward from distress. And when they are hurt, they are more prone to call themselves victims ... (and) distribute blame elsewhere (Harpers, September, 1993).

Today's students are prone to call themselves "victims" of the surrounding adult community, resenting administrators who alienate students by labeling them irresponsible for a variety of real and perceived reasons. When the drinking laws sanction youth differently than adults, society must devote a great amount of time to apprehend these students, rather than to comprehend them.

Facing College in the Age of Anxiety

What does the outside world know about today's college students? Spin magazine publisher, Bob Guccione, Jr., commented on society's ignorance of Generation X;

The media are basically unimaginative, now they're waking up to the discovery of 46 million people, which is like all of a sudden recognizing France (Advertising Age, February 1, 1993, p. 16)

The young college-aged people, the twenty-somethings, are a
125 billion dollar market which advertisers and corporations have been trying to approach as their Baby Boomer market goes bust. They can also be viewed as having the same market share of the nation's alcohol and drug consumption. Perhaps they have an even greater share since drug users "mellow" with age (Ramos, 1980).

One university president admits, "It's awfully hard to control a mixed-age group, where some can drink and some can't, but all are students" (Leatherman, 1990, p. A33). The adverse consequences associated with student alcohol and drug abuse include a host of academic adjustment problems such as dropping out of college, accidents, DWI and vandalism. (By limiting their choices on the use of alcohol there has been an increase in these reported problem behaviors among college students (Baer et al, 1991).)

Students at residence halls, student houses and fraternities organize binge drinking contests where winners are presented tee-shirts or other prizes. Drinking contests, such as "bucket champs", occur annually at The Ohio State University. Do students recognize the connection between their own binge drinking or drug use and problem behaviors? With society's increasingly intolerant toward the alcohol and drug use of their students, the one thing the university administration does not fully control is
their students' social life.\textsuperscript{2} This means universities, obliged to make concerted efforts to monitor and discipline their students, assume that the likelihood of enforcement will deter drug use. Yet, university sanctions are shown to be inadequate in deterring college drinkers and drug users.

A national commission on youth examined this generation of students and concluded that "Never before has one generation of American teenagers been less healthy, less cared for, or less prepared for life than their parents were at the same age" (Howe and Strauss, 1993, p. 33). Their "arrested development" was reported by author, Susan Littwin, who found recent college graduates "took permanent refuge in their identity as students. ... and often this means avoiding reality and ... clinging as much as possible to the student life-style and values instead of growing" (1986, p. 59).\textsuperscript{3} Taking refuge in "student identity" sometimes means taking refuge in drinking "rites of passage" and drug taking rituals that some argue have "become a normal right of passage rather than an aberrational descent into deviance and degradation" (Wisotsky, 1990, p. 178).

\textsuperscript{2} During the course of this research, I interviewed several high ranking university officials who were concerned what neighbors, government officials and the news media thought about the university's problems with the students, but they rarely discussed what their students might think about their own problems.

\textsuperscript{3} A full account of this generation's anxieties about personal and economic fulfillment from college is outside the scope of this study. Several studies (MacLeod, 1987; Gaines, 1991; Willis, 1977) focus attention on this theme.
This study examines why students view alcohol and drug use one way, that being risky but acceptable, and college administrators view alcohol and drug use another way, as risky and unacceptable. Are universities, a unique organization with considerable influence on college students, likely to deter these types of problems?

The Problem with the Social Problem Approach

Students have not realized they are perceived as having "alcohol problems". The use of the word "problem" by prevention providers is rather subjective to their own viewpoint. The label "problem" becomes part of a redefinition campaign to support current social policy. Criminologist Richard Jessor defines problem behavior as;

behavior that is socially defined as a problem, a source of concern, or as undesirable by the norms of conventional society and institutions of adult authority, and its occurrence usually elicits some kind of control response (White, 1992, p. 413).

The Problem Behavior Theory uses three precipitating factors which are clustered together and foster problem behavior 'proness':

- the perceived environmental system,
- the behavior system, and
- the personality system (Polich et al, 1984).

The Jessors' theory combined many youthful problem behaviors such as cigarette use, precocious sexual behavior, problem drinking, use of marijuana and other drugs, stealing and aggression and produced an index which indicates youth with these problems are violators of conventional norms (White, 1992). According to alcohol researcher Helen Raskin White,
Jessor's definition fits what other sociologists have defined as "deviant" behavior.

Proponents of problem behavior theory, most notably Jessor and Jessor (1977) and Jessor, Donovan and Costa (1991), emphasize the view that behavior is purposive and meaningful action. Jessor et al. view dissimilar problem behaviors as clustered together and serving a similar social-psychological function, rather than youth with a myriad of problem behaviors sharing a common negative label and facing very similar social reactions. Problem behavior theory does not validate the culture formations of youth where "problem behaviors" are not socio-psychological in origin, but are responses to the denial of the importance of drinking and drug use and rejection of conventional values.

In a 1983 study, Perry and Jessor expand their theory by pointing out two environmental approaches to reduce drug use. They report that the two environmental factors in prevention programs are those which aim to resist or avoid the health compromising behaviors and those environmental supports for health enhancing behaviors, such as positive peer and health/fitness programs (Gonzalez, 1989, p. 494). Critics of problem behavior theories contend they neglect the personal reasons, such as loyalty to the non-conventional groups, for students or youth to engage in problem behaviors (Labouvie, 1993, p. 506).

Sociologists can better analyze prevention's claims
using a social construction approach to view how different definitions shape the "problem" and how these definitions are expressed as claims (Ibarra and Kitsuse, 1992). A process of confrontation and negotiation between "different symbolic-moral universes" occurs in the university environment (Ben-Yehuda, 1990). Most researchers acknowledge as a problem the "extremely complicated structure of the concept of alcohol consumption" (Alanko, 1984, p. 209). If problem behaviors are the focus of prevention programs, the high-volume drinking environment of the student culture will persist because problem drinking and the student culture have a mutually reinforcing effect. However, one conclusion which can be drawn from this study is much of the problem behaviors can be accounted for by variables associated with the student culture.

On the Edge of Culture

College students receive prevention messages and yet remain amenable to their way of thinking about and using alcohol and drugs. Today many Americans have come to view these activities in a less favorable light, with many organizations agreeing to control drinking and drug use within their organizational boundaries (Irwin, 1990; Falco, 1992). Catalysts for these societal changes include rising health costs attributable to addiction, the health movement and concerns over the high level of alcohol and drug abuse.

Despite the public's heightened concerns about the
"unreformed campuses", Don Cahalan (1991) finds several developments in the "public at risk" which will stymie prevention campaigns. These include:

cultural shortcomings among the general public: i.e., the public's preoccupation with "go-for-the gusto" immediate gratifications reinforced by the media; the alienation of the rootless and poverty-stricken (especially among the young); the formidable amounts spent on marketing and lobbying by the alcohol and tobacco industries; and the lack of incentive on the part of many in the medical and social welfare professions to play a more active role in prevention (Cahalan, 1991, p. xiv).

Adding to such general hindrances, are hindrances specific to young adults, including their freedom at universities for personal exploration and expression, their use of alcohol and drugs, certain clothing, certain types of pro-drug music, and communication coded in a culture segregated from the society at large.

When current drinking practices around campus go unchallenged, it sends a message that the demands for change in the alcohol-centered student culture are not serious. When the beliefs of drinking groups, such as Slackers and fraternities, go unchallenged they may use their "off-campus" location to avoid alcohol and drug laws. This "ups the ante" in alcohol control as student problems spill over into the outside community. Threatened by this, the university looks to secure more adjacent areas and students fight to defend subculture and privilege. A series of "ownership struggles", discussed in Chapters V and VI, ensue when prevention providers take action on drug and alcohol
issues. A university serious about prevention must clarify its rules and increase the commitment of students to adhere to those rules. The university which builds these workable components builds the better prevention program.

The Study of Prevention Programs

Do campus prevention policies have any likelihood for success in changing the student culture? During the 1980s universities either focused too little attention on the extent of alcohol and drug use on their campuses (Upcraft, 1990) or developed programs on alcohol education and abuse which were largely unsuccessful (Perkins and Berkowitz, 1986; Gonzalez, 1986b). Prevention has become important both theoretically and practically because prevention implies a great impact on students involved in programs. The prevention of excessive drinking and drug use is a process encompassing many events, only some of which anticipate problem behavior, while others plan for health, academic or moral outcomes.

Don Cahalan's study, An Ounce of Prevention, reported the, "difficulty in achieving successful prevention programs is the complexity and difficulty of proving their effectiveness in a culture that is skeptical about any campaign that is not an immediate success" (1991, p. 39). Several successful examples of prevention, i.e. smoking cessation and heart disease prevention and other health campaigns, show changes in attitudes but no real changes in
behavior (Cahalan, 1991). If the reduction techniques are appropriate then some changes in behavioral patterns can be demonstrated (Kumpfer, 1989). Campus based-prevention is seen as yielding a significant potential for impact:

since, 1) they are less likely to encounter problems of comprehension that would be the case in general or non-campus populations, and 2) they are likely to be transmitting information with which students are already familiar and to be reinforcing attitudes and behaviors which existed in their recent past (i.e., in their graduating year of high school) (Goodstadt and Caleekal-John, 1984, p. 738).

Prevention programs work by first educating students, then sanctioning behaviors in violation of the prescribed rules on alcohol and other drugs.

University prevention policy can sanction violations of the prescribed rules on alcohol and drugs. Sanctions are administered within the academic year, thus imposed, in most cases, much swifter than sanctions administered by society’s formal agents of control. The severity of sanctions on campus can range from a warning to expulsion. Sanctions can also include: no financial aid for convicted drug offenders, loss of special privileges, violation of housing contracts, discipline hearings, and informal sanctions of peers. Formal legal sanctions can be enforced against students under the age of 21 who purchase, serve or consume alcoholic beverages, anyone who purchases or serves alcoholic beverages to a "minor", open container laws, DUI/DWI laws, and "fake ID" laws. While enforcement of these rules is a major test of the university policy, there is also a great
deal of non-enforcement of alcohol and drug regulations at universities. Most university students go to great lengths to avoid failing and limiting their future potential, but they also support a culture of drinking and drug experimentation. Evidence of such is given in this study.

At the cultural-level, the enforcement of campus-based sanctions aimed at underage drinking and drug use are forced upon a non-receptive, defiant and non-conformist party subculture. In the case of fraternities, societal controls are relinquished to the closed "brotherhood" which practices its own rule making (New Jersey Legislature Public Hearings on College Alcohol Abuse and Hazing, 1988, p. 53). It is clear, from data in this study, that prevention with the "brotherhoods" or drinking groups have a lower chance for successful reduction of drinking or drug use. The student subcultural group acts like "brotherhoods" to "neutralize" or ignores societal values (Matza, 1966).

Indoctrination to positive peer influences may occur when prevention programming offers films or lectures, curriculum infusion, peer leader training and health education programs. These services provide information about the effects of alcohol and drugs on the body and thought processes in an attempt to change the patterns of behavior. Support for campus-based education is derived from the belief that students lack accurate information with which to make their future decisions (Schwartz, 1991, p.
Is the prevention message registering on the student culture? Evidence in this study shows that one out of five university students internalize the prevention message and report it has already changed their attitude toward drinking and drug use.

**Outline of the Study**

This study will examine the effects of campus-based prevention programs by relating both the students own point of view and the prevention provider view of "problem" behaviors among students. I have found non-compliance with the goals of prevention to be strongly associated with what I refer to as "drinking groups". The evidence shows a normative culture of student drinking groups is largely impervious to prevention messages. Universities, with more drinking groups can acknowledge this lack of compliance and choose from a range of informal and formal sanctions to further impact student behaviors. Another choice would be to continue to promote prevention activities which are more peer-orientated. This allows the students themselves to make a difference in their own alcohol and drug use.

To evaluate how prevention impacts both the student and the university, I will examine the following topics. Chapter I has served as an introductory chapter. Chapter II contains the review of the literature on substance use, prevention programs and sociological theories of deviancy and control. Chapter III serves as a method chapter.
describing how the study was conducted. Chapter IV presents a statistical analysis of the similarities and dissimilarities in Lakefront and Northern students and in drinking and drug use levels, by race/ethnicity, gender, and age. These descriptions are mainly found in the data collected from the CORE and prevention surveys. The data is used to determine what, if any, relationship exists between prevention variables and the drinking and drug use levels of college students. Chapter V describes the context of problem behaviors and the social and interpersonal changes expected by prevention providers. This chapter also covers the consequences of risky behaviors in dormitory, bar, and off-campus settings and evaluates the influence of these settings on student behaviors. In Chapter VI, I discuss the different prevention program modalities at LU and NU. The opinions of LU and NU administrators and students involved in prevention activities are studied to determine how effective they perceive their alcohol and drug prevention programs. In Chapter VII, I use interview data to describe the lifestyle of Slacker and fraternity drinking groups; groups of students whose drug and alcohol-related deviancy unsettles administrators and defies prevention objectives. In Chapter VIII, I formulate a conclusion based on a summary and analysis of the findings. Alcohol and other drug prevention programming is studied for its relationship to level of alcohol and drug use at universities.
CHAPTER II
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES AND RELATED LITERATURE

Literature in two broad areas, alcohol and drug prevention and sociological perspectives on deviancy and control, are reviewed. This literature review explores the theories on culture and subcultures; alcohol and drugs studies; social control and deviancy; and the prevention of problem behaviors as they relate to describing substance use among college students.

Sociologists in the drug field have concentrated on several theories to explain substance use. They have attributed drug use to social learning (Sutherland, 1949; Bandura, 1977; Akers, 1985, 1992), social control (Hirschi, 1969), psychological dependence (Fingarette, 1986), ecological disorganization (Wiseman, 1970), the problem behavior model (Jessor and Jessor, 1977; Filstead, 1980), selective interaction/socialization (Goode, 1989; Johnson, 1973; Kandel et al. 1992; 1978) and an integrated theoretical model (Gonzalez, 1989). These theories provide links between the current sociological and psychological literature on alcohol and drug use.
The Role of Sociological Theory

The general schools of sociology; functionalism, conflict, and symbolic interactionism, serve as models for much of the later developments in theories of deviancy. While broad in application, the general theories of sociology are often deficient and rather distant from theories that explain drug use in the society. Early American sociological theorists often viewed deviant behavior with the goal of introducing reforms for those "misguided" behaviors (Bulmer, 1986). Whereas the early sociologists used a screening out process and preordained "reforms" for all types of deviants, contemporary theorists must correct the concepts of early theorists who failed to understand the explanations for drug and alcohol use. Today sociologists argue that there are many causes, Albert Reiss termed them "pulls" (1961), and definitions of deviancy.

Studies of drug users, mainly devoted to delinquent subcultural groups, the treatment of addictions and legal definitions of crime, lend an inadequate analysis for use with students whose conduct norms include recreational drinking and drug use. All major surveys of alcohol use by college students report about 90 percent drank within the last year (Salz and Elandt, 1985; Presley et al. 1993).

Located within the literature on the use of alcohol and drugs among students is the issue of prevention of that use. Sociologists who recognize the link between policy
innovations and cultural adjustments in college students' involvement with alcohol and drugs make a contribution which social reformers ignore. This contribution focuses on the cultural differences between the "student culture" and society to help explain the variation in substance use which exists between these two populations. The second task of sociologists is questioning why the social policy strategy to prevent students from abusing alcohol and other drugs "pulls" in two different directions; towards control and towards consensus. The lengthy discussion of the evolution of rational control found in Michel Foucault's (1977) study of discipline and punishment did not include the controls employed by prevention. However, since prevention involves behavioral changes based on assessing long-term health risks it certainly fits Foucault's thesis of rational controls on the body, mind and soul.

Subcultural and Peer Group Studies

In the mid-fifties, sociologist Albert Cohen began to build on and criticize Robert Merton's explanations of innovations to conformity. Merton had declared; "aberrant behavior may be regarded sociologically as a symptom of dissociation between culturally prescribed aspirations and socially structured avenues of realizing these aspirations" and postulated that conformists would achieve the success goals of American society, while non-conformist would face frustration or "strain" in attempts at reaching these goals
These "strains" are not apparent in an examination of youth, who regard "success in occupational, educational and other conventional institutions as largely irrelevant to their most important immediate goals" (Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1985, p.312).

Albert Cohen (1955), in Delinquent Boys: The Culture of a Gang, proposed that lower-class males fit three alternative patterns; the corner boy role, the college boy role, or the delinquent boy role. While some individuals hope for success and achieving middle-class standards by adopting college boy role, the delinquent’s role is to reject middle-class roles. While some individuals may respond to the authority figures in society, the alternative authority is a gang or group which is autonomous and the focus of "attraction, loyalty and solidarity" (Cohen, 1967, p. 31). The inability of lower class youth, while desiring success in school and at work, to adjust to the values and norms of the generalized culture produce frustration and "problems of adjustment". The frustrations build in groups denied access to middle-class goals and are turned into what Cohen calls a reaction formation. In reaction to any slight or perceived injustice, the delinquent formulates overly intense responses. This hostility prevents any gains and set delinquent boys apart from conventional groups in society. Cohen argues the delinquent response confers a certain status inside the gang, but the status of delinquent
weakens outside the gang and he must reject as status sources those who reject him. Cohen's influence on British deviancy theory is discussed next.

**Perspectives of British Deviancy Theories**

The work of Albert Cohen, David Matza and others in the United States built a foundation for the British theorists studying deviancy. However, many of the labelling theorists and the radical sociologists with class conflict perspectives found the earlier work on anomie, proposed by Merton and his students at Columbia, to be unacceptable. David Downes and Paul Rock, in their book *Understanding Deviance*, review the major theories on deviancy and indicate that subcultural theories experienced a decline around 1967 when "for five years or so no substantive work appeared which derived from its (subcultural theory) central tenets or which developed its major propositions" (1989, pp. 138-39). They argued that an interplay between class conflict, youthful rebellion and media presentations was a synthesis for many modern subcultures.

In England, critical theorists were then trying to determine changes occurring in subcultures when activities, like drug use, become recriminalized. Criminologist Jock Young (1966) found the state could create more deviance than actually occurred by criminalizing morally disturbing behavior or labelling, thereby increasing the moral bias or unduly harsh penalties for such deviance. The deviancy of
drug use and sales escalates, becoming self-fulfilling, as the deviant becomes more at risk from state policy. Deviants are subject to other forms of exclusion which worsen their situation and "they are under pressure to collude with the majority view that they are essentially deviant" (Downes and Rock, 1989, p. 150). College students as today's future leaders are forced to collude with the view of a "healthy student community" or to be at risk from the force of the law. They are aware that any felony convictions can halt a law career, finish an interest in public service and may stigmatize their academic and social standing. As Stuart Hall (1977) put it, the hegemony of the dominant classes is maintained only as long as they "succeed in framing all competing definitions within their range".

Contemporary British theorist, Dick Hebdige argues that subcultures:

On one hand they warn the 'straight' world in advance of a sinister presence - the presence of difference ... on the other hand, for those who erect them into icons, who use them as words or curses, these objects become signs of a forbidden identity, sources of value (1979, pp. 2-3).

This "consciousness of kind" helps build subcultures (Gidding, 1915). Subcultural adaptations are "viewed as a compromise solution between two contradictory needs, the need to create and express autonomy and difference from parents...and the need to maintain parental identifications" (Hebdige, 1979, p. 77). For sociologist Phil Cohen, the "latent function" of subculture is to "express and resolve,
albeit magically, the contradictions which remain hidden or unresolved in the parent culture" (Hebdige, 1979, p. 77). Adults and parents represent the adult culture which is regarded as out of touch.

Paul Willis' ethnographic accounts, in his study Learning to Labor, of class differences among school children in England represents another view of cultural studies (1977). Willis studied working class students and their "sources of meaning" which devalue their lives and emerge them in a culture of masculinity, which parallels the same "culture" of masculinity found in American fraternities. Willis used the term subordinate culture rather than subculture (Downes and Rock, 1989, p. 139). The "sources of meaning" for American college students is rooted tolerant attitudes toward drinking and drugs. Since Willis views the "profane creativity" of the "subordinate" culture as a form of resistance, perhaps substance use on college campuses is part of a culture exhibiting resistance to the current restrictions by college authorities, as one of my Slacker informants at Northern University has suggested. Examples coming from England and from the Slackers' perspective in the United States illustrate that the societal reaction enforces subcultural cohesion.

Researchers now examine contemporary "cultural" patterns of deviancy from a "cultural studies" view. For Paul Willis, subcultures have an extreme orderliness in
their resistance to the schools. For Dick Hebdige, the forces of commodification render the punk subculture at "once public property and profitable merchandise" in a capitalist-market society (1979, p. 96). The cultural changes which affect contemporary American youth, outlined in Douglas Coupland's (1991) book, *Generation X*, are different than those affecting British youth and are examined next.

**Perspectives of American Deviancy Theories**

In the 1960s labeling theorists began viewing deviance as an interactive process between those who commit deviance and those who define and react to the offenders as deviant. Sociologist Howard Becker argues that labelling refers to "the process by which deviants are defined by the rest of society" (1964, p. 2). Becker wrote those "persons or groups who lobby for the deviantization of certain types of behaviors", try to restrict alcohol and find drugs "morally reprehensible" were "moral entrepreneurs" (Pfohl, 1985, p. 289).

One of the central themes of labeling is explaining the observable patterns of control and the relationship "moral entrepreneurs" have to societal control. Campus social controls have increased towards substance users, where these controls were either neutral or benign in the past. Sociologists have proposed that this public concern is generated by how other people label rule-violators. Becker
argues "whether a given act is deviant or not depends in part on the nature of the act (that is, whether or not it violates some rule) and in part on what other people do about it" (1973, p. 14). Today, the demands are mounting to do something about substance abuse.

Traditionally, symbolic interactionist theory contends that perceptions of the social world and the effect of drugs and alcohol are socially constructed (Lindesmith, 1968). The societal response, often transformed to a moral response, is similarly socially constructed. During the last decade there is evidence of a "moral panic" surrounding the use of alcohol, drugs and tobacco which has shaped the social identities of today's substance user (Ben-Yehuda, 1986). Erich Goode defines a moral panic as "a widespread feeling on the part of the public that something is terribly wrong in their society because of the moral failure of a specific group of individuals" (1989, p. 26).

Becker's study of the marihuana user demystifies deviance by not settling for mysterious invisible forces, i.e. social disorganization, as explanatory mechanisms. Becker advances the idea that an initial reaction to marijuana must be learned in the presence of older users. For the novice, this learning is instructive since he or she must have the effect of drug use defined initially. Thus, the experience of pleasure is socially constructed. Yet, so is the knowledge that that pleasure is misguided, as
deviants, "share the label and the experience of being labelled as outsiders" (Becker, 1973, p. 10). Becker observes the final step in a deviant's career is toward an organized deviant group where the deviant's conception of self becomes crystallized.

The Chicago school of sociology's focus on social disorganization included the social ecologists Faris and Dunham who developed the stress hypothesis and drift hypothesis in explaining deviant behaviors. Matza gently criticized the Chicago School, stating, while "they conceived disorganization, they described diversity" (1969, p. 48). Later delinquency and deviancy literature focuses on the socialization processes of youth maturation and experimentation. Albert Cohen (1955) argued delinquent youth accepted a subordinate value system consisting of 1) hedonism; 2) defiance of authority; 3) quest for kicks. Walter Miller (1958) examined one group of youth, the lower-class male subculture, and found their "focal concerns" included autonomy, toughness and fate. Hirschi (1969) stated that middle class youth participated in these same "focal concerns". Travis Hirschi's control theory did not consider the commitment to delinquent peers that Albert Cohen and Edward Sutherland implied as vitally important as they sought explanations for the sustained intense, deviant-inducing effect of deviant peer subcultures.

Criminologist Edwin Sutherland presented nine
propositions based on the social learning of deviant behavior in his classic theory of differential association. The theory of differential association states that deviant behavior is learned in primary groups and involves the same learning processes as nondeviant behavior. Sutherland's five main propositions of differential association are:

1) Criminal behavior is learned in social interaction with others and has no unique biological or genetic basis.

2) It is within primary groups that one learns motives and techniques for committing crimes, reasons for conforming to or violating particular rules, and what behavior is permissible in which situation.

3) A person becomes a criminal when definitions favorable to the violation of law outweigh the unfavorable ones.

4) The differential associations most likely to result in criminal behavior are frequent, long-lasting, and intense and occur relatively early in life.

5) Learning criminal behavior is the same as learning any other behavior. Thus, there is no value or need pattern unique to criminals as opposed to noncriminals. A person becomes criminal when the reinforcement for lawbreaking is stronger than the reinforcement for remaining law-abiding (Sutherland and Cressey, 1987).

Sutherland's "differential association" implied "deviants" learn to define certain situations as appropriate occasions for deviant behavior. Sutherland's conception of social learning defines certain situations as 'legitimate' for the learning deviant behavior. Acquiring the motives for deviant behavior and the mastering of deviant techniques came from intense, prior associations with other deviants.

Ronald Akers is another proponent of social learning,
further refining social learning to include conditions set forth in his "differential reinforcement" theory. Akers introduced this paradigm with regards to the choices behind alcohol and drug use, arguing:

Drugs and alcohol behavior are viewed as socially influenced behaviors of individuals acquired and sustained through a learning process. Behavior is learned by instrumental conditioning by imitation or modeling of others' behavior. The probability that behavior will occur is increased by actual or anticipated reward or positive consequences (positive reinforcement) and avoidance of punishment or negative consequences (negative reinforcement) and is decreased by the adverse consequences (positive or direct punishment) and lack of reward (negative punishment). Whether individuals will abstain from or take drugs (and whether they will continue or desist) depends on past, present and anticipated future rewards and punishments perceived to be attached to abstinence and use (differential reinforcement). The person learns attitudes, orientations, and evaluative knowledge that are favorable or unfavorable to using drugs (definitions). These are themselves verbal or cognitive behavior that can be directly reinforced and can also act as cue stimuli for drug use. The more individuals define drug behavior as good or at least as justified or excusable rather than holding to general beliefs or specific attitudes counter to a drug, the more likely they are to use that drug (1992, p. 12).

Akers (1992) uses a behavioral model, where influences, or reinforcers or punishers, can be nonsocial and include the direct effect of the drug, i.e., pleasurable or depressing. But the most influential group on the drinking and drug use of individuals will be the family, peers and friendship groups of those individuals (Botvin, 1990).

The positive or negative sanctions applied to behaviors such as drug use, irresponsible sexual behaviors and drunkenness, can sustain or discourage these behaviors
Akers contends the social learning theory "provid(es) the connection between social structure (macro-level factors) and the behaviors of individuals (micro-level)" and to why youth engage in deviant or conventional behaviors (1992, p. 13).

Additional arguments for the cause of delinquency lie with the youth culture argument which contends youth become more alienated from the values of their parents and the adult world. Evidence shows that a separate youth culture, associated with both the "grunge" music and "rap" music scenes, has developed around youth who feel trapped in an unskilled or changing labor market where much of their energy is turned towards alienation and drug and alcohol dependency. Youth culture adherents will commit delinquent behaviors in accordance with their principles.

Lamar Empey (1982) summarizes the delinquent subculture in four propositions:

1) the position of middle-class adolescents in society is uncertain; 2) this lack of clarity of status in society separates youth from the adult world of work and responsibility; 3) the separation of youth from adults in society generates a "middle-class youth subculture"; 4) the middle-class youth subculture contributes directly to delinquency by spreading a sense of "hedonism and irresponsibility" among youth in society (Shoemaker, 1991, p. 277).

Through their separateness youth resist "efforts by family, school, or other sources of authority to control their behavior" (Siegel, 1989, p. 172).

David Matza has suggested that drift into teenage
subcultures has curbed some more serious deviancy (Hagan, 1991). He found a "subterranean convergence" where the delinquents held values of the subculture and conventional culture, drifting between them and thereby not insulated from conventional adults. Matza (1964) argued that most delinquency theories are overly deterministic because people also have the capacity to modify organizational influences and choose what will affect their decisions and behaviors. Matza assumed delinquency was 'willed behavior' which is intermittent and mundane and decreased rapidly with age. Both willed behavior and the maturation hypothesis can be applied to understanding college students and their problem drinking. In conducting this research, the data points to students modifying rules which affect their behaviors. As Matza argued, youth use 'Everybody does it' as a 'techniques of neutralization' to solve the problem of moral scruples (Downes and Rock, 1988). Thus, it is not simply a failure of prevention to establish restrictions on alcohol and drug use, but college students have written their own rules regarding alcohol and drug use.

Criminologist Lewis Yablonsky described the latent context of deviant youth as "near-group as associative contexts where deviance may be encouraged but not in the explicit manner of an all-encompassing subculture" (Pfohl, 1985, p. 271). Juvenile gangs or near-groups are characterized by diffuse role definitions, limited cohesion,
impermanence, minimal consensus about norms, shifting membership, disturbed leadership and a limited definition of membership expectations. A "near group concept" is applicable to college students informally coming together to "toot" or sniff cocaine or "get wasted" on alcohol.

Peer or teen-age use of alcohol and drugs appears to have symbolic meanings including status transformation and group identification (Maddox and McCall, 1964). MacAndrew and Edgerton's cross-cultural study of alcohol, *Drunken Comportment*, discusses the "powerful role" in different cultures of escapist drinking, which appears when college student drinking habits are studied. Researchers begin to see how college students abuse alcohol to escape the pressures of student life. Alcohol satisfies the "criteria that might reasonably be proposed for an ideal Time-Out producing agent" (1969, p. 171). A time-out is when certain behaviors are accepted which without alcohol are unacceptable - a pinch on the butt, telling offensive jokes or just doing offensive things. The "time-out" period seems to occur in all societies where drinking is allowed. It is when their members are not held accountable for their actions. Avoidance of responsibility is contrary to prevention strategies. Prevention programs focus on user accountability. The college prevention message implies more damage. Some students in this study report personal risks, vandalism and other "risks" as a result of their drinking.
Socialization and Deviant Behavior

Many sociological theories attempt to predict whether determinants of unconventional or "deviant activities" among college youth stem from learned behaviors (Akers, 1992) or poor relationships with others (White et al., 1986). This study, and other youth culture studies, finds a great deal of problem behaviors, even illegal behaviors, are outcomes of participation in the youth culture. Students are often proponents of an "oppositional culture" (Yinger, 1978, p. 478). Other studies which focus on subcultures include Hebdige's study (1977) of subcultural youth adaptations, Vaz's study of middle-class delinquency (1967), Johnson's marijuana subculture (1973); Kandel's drifter subculture (1978) and Hagan's party and delinquency subcultures (1991).

Kandel, Glassner and Becker all place importance on the process of socialization, finding that adolescents gravitate to groups with similar views and problems, thus the strong association of personal use and friend's use of drugs. The concept of peer pressure is a way of negatively stereotyping adolescents and is seldom applied to adult behaviors. Indeed, the fact that many young people begin their drinking or drug use before their peers is frequently overlooked. Kandel argues that while parents tend to be the most influential in forming broader long-term values and behavior, peers are more influential for immediate lifestyle behavior and values (1980, p. 257). Kandel (1980) and
Glassner (1987) argue that youth who eventually use drugs are not significantly different from those who do not. They reject "selective recruitment" which states that drug users are different, even before use takes place, than non-users.

University drug abuse revolves around heavy drinking, while hard drug users are increasingly are found in subcultural criminal gangs or drug dealing networks outside the university. It is important to distinguish between the two group; students may be supplied by drug networks, but by in large are themselves absent from mid-level or top-level drug trafficking and students are very much engaged with the mainstream, while hard drug abusers continue to be excluded from the mainstream. Similarities, among these two groups, include sharing qualities found among marginalized groups in the society.

Theoretical Perspectives on Social Reproduction

Subcultural relationships are created from the relationship of education and society which is reviewed next from both the critical and functionalist perspectives. Critical theorists Bowles and Gintis have proposed a "correspondence principle" where structural similarities can be demonstrated between the constructs of educational system and industry. This "correspondence" exists in the following four areas: 1) the organization of power and authority in the school and in the workplace; 2) the students' lack of control and workers' lack of control; 3) the role of grades
as rewards and the role of wages as rewards; and 4) competition among students and the specialization of academic subjects and competition among workers and the fragmented nature of jobs (MacLeod, 1987, p. 10). Bowles and Gintis argue the American educational system "tailors the self-concepts, aspirations, and social class identifications of individuals to the requirements of the social division of labor" (MacLeod, 1987, p. 10).

Emile Durkheim, in the Division of Labor in Society, anticipated a meritocracy governing the allocation of opportunity and justifying inequality in society. The social structure contributes forces shaping our collective conscience, these forces would be "capable of exercising over the individual exterior constraint" (Durkheim, 1938, p. 13). Social order is only possible when human nature is restrained through a morality represented in the collective force of the dominant normative system (Kerbo, 1983, p. 117). To act morally is to do one's duty and all duty is limited by other duties. Everything that is a source of solidarity is moral (rules, laws, etc.), but modern regulations slowed the development of "organic" collective conscience. Institutions, like the Catholic Church which represents a moral force to many of the university students in this study, would act to establish order in a society. As an institution, the Catholic Church did not condemn the use of alcohol as many Protestant churches had a history of
doing (Siegel, 1989). The basic difference between these two perspectives is functionalists view education as serving the "needs of society" and critical theorists view it as serving the particular interests of the capitalist class.

**Youth Networks: Alternative Cultural Production**

When strong parental or institutional attachment is missing the strong social ties are found within youth networks, where the predilection toward problem behaviors may begin. Bruce Johnson (1973) utilized subcultural theories to study drug use among college students. According to Johnson, drug use occurs because "adolescents are socialized into progressively more unconventional groups" (1973, p. 5). This occurs because adolescents become more isolated from the parental subculture and more involved with the teenage peer subculture thus increasing the likelihood of experimenting with drugs. Johnson finds the peer subculture provides a transition between the parental and the drug subcultures (Goode, 1989). With strong attachment to parents, teenagers may support their values and follow their norms of conduct, however the teenager who is "isolated from his or her parents and involved with peers, who favors more unconventional norms,...is more likely to accept certain forms of recreational drug use" (Goode, 1989, p. 72).

Johnson concluded that isolated teens receive status as a consequence of the activities and values which depart
significantly from those of the parental generation. These might include "alcohol consumption, marijuana use, the use of certain hard drugs, some delinquent activity, including what Johnson calls automobile deviance (speeding, driving without a license, and so on), shoplifting, hanging out, cruising and so on" (Goode, 1989, p. 72). At college, Johnson states, "It may be that patterns of unconventional behavior shift from juvenile delinquency to drug use, political militancy and sexual permissiveness for large numbers of college students" (1973, p. 165). Without knowledge of early delinquency, my study cannot be used to make causal inferences toward the current behaviors of college students.

Denise Kandel’s model of adolescent drug use incorporates the study of drug use networks. Youth who associate with adolescents who drink will be more likely to drink than those whose associations are with non-drinkers. Kandel views parental influence as promoting a specific use; that is parents who use legal drugs will more likely, than abstainers, have children who use illegal drugs. Abstainer parents will more likely have children who abstain.

Kandel’s interaction/socialization claims that early adolescents are "drifters" and will participate in peer networks where beer and wine use leads to mild drug use, while older teens will then begin to associate with each other based on the similarity of lifestyles. Her analysis
of drug use "sequences" places emphasis on the stages when drugs are used, especially the gateway drugs. The stages are 1) beer and wine, 2) cigarettes or hard liquor, 3) marijuana, and 4) other illegal drugs. Adolescents rarely skip a stage in this time-ordered sequence (Goode, 1989, pp. 74-75). This implies that prevention programs can be aimed at the early legal substances and can target "precipitating factors" which might not work with the other drugs (Polich et al, 1984, p. 125). Polich argues that prevention efforts early in the "sequence" can "profitably focus on both legal and illegal substances - that preventing or delaying cigarette smoking might have spillover effects on marijuana use, and that retarding the latter might also reduce experimentation" (1984, p. 124).

In time, the peer group declines in importance and having at least one specific friend who uses illegal drugs assumes central importance. Kandel and Davies (1991) find that drug networks, where strong social ties exist among male users make it difficult for prevention strategies to be targeted toward individual users. The individual who progresses to later stages of drug use experiences family difficulties, discards past long-term friendships and "seeks less intimate relationships with those who share his attitudes, behaviors and problems (Kandel, Kessler and Margulies, 1978, p. 36). This person is no longer a "drifter", but a "seeker" (Goode, 1989, p. 75).
Intoxication Effects

There is a continuing disagreement in the literature on the typical drinking behavior of college students - do they drink responsibly or binge drink (Trice and Byer, 1977; Klein, 1991). James Orcutt studied the effects of intoxication and reported that the external-orientation "outcome of alcohol intoxication may be so diffuse in college populations that group variations in these particular norms are minimal" (1978, p. 394). Orcutt's (1978) theory of intoxication found the norms for drug intoxication effects differ when subcultural use is drug-specific. He also argues norms which define a marijuana "high" differ as to the degree of participation in marijuana-using groups.

Sociologists Barry Glassner and Julia Loughlin (1987), authors of the book Drugs in Adolescent Worlds, argue the major role of the "heavier drugs" in adolescent worlds is to mark off regular from special events and to examine one's abilities of self-control, not their physiological effects. They use Monitoring the Future survey data of high school students' drug use finding it mostly for instrumental reasons and occurring during routine events. Rather than drug use being physiological, mood altering, pathological, or morally abhorrent, their "rich description" of adolescent drug use shows that drugs are used for social reasons rather than pharmaceutical effects. They hypothesized that
moderate users and heavy users often participate in different worlds and the experience of being "high" varies by social world (1987, p. 253). Glassner notes, "Drug effects serve primarily as topics for conversation. The act of taking a drug, far more than its effects, is consequential to an event" (1987, p. 250). Adolescent drug taking is mentioned as things they do with friends by forty percent of heavy users, strikingly similar to light and moderate users. Two other reported activities, including Dungeons and Dragons and mall-walking, are used similarly to drug taking.

Alcohol surveys have identified the first year of college as the transition period where the greatest change in alcohol consumption occurs (Perkins, 1987). Social science research done on college students indicate numerous changes throughout the college years, but not in a developmental or stage fashion, that is maturation from adolescence to adulthood (Klein, 1991; Pittman and White, 1991). One study suggests that college represents little more than a period of protracted adolescence, when the student must cope with more freedom than previously was experienced with their families (Klein, 1991). Becker pointed out that there are stages in the freshman's first year; getting used to living in a residence hall, making friends, doing academic work, and participating in extracurricular affairs, including drinking (Becker et al.,
1962). The subcultural adjustments of middle-class university youth is informed by the ethnographic work done at Northern and Lakefront universities and presented in later chapters.

**Alcohol and Drug-Related Literature**

Alcohol and drug prevention and education literature can be organized into the following types of studies: 1) those that have investigated drug and alcohol knowledge; 2) those that have examined drug and alcohol attitudes; 3) those that examined both; and 4) those that explored the use of drugs and alcohol (Scarpitti and Datesman; 1980). In addition, the prevention literature encompasses reducing or delaying the use of alcohol and other drugs and related disorders such as the prevention of mental illnesses, social disorders and crime. It is the topic of prevention which has been neglected by studies on alcoholism and drug addictions and treatment of such abuse. While the tenacity of the American drug problem requires careful study, several theorists have pointed to the lack of an integrated theory on the prevention of substance abuse problems (Gonzalez, 1989; Polich et al, 1984). College alcohol and drug use literature is examined next.

**Alcohol in Society and on Campus**

One recent volume on cross-cultural drinking proposed not enough has been written on "normal drinking" (Douglas, 1987). Normal drinking may be defined as a complex
interaction between individual and situational factors (Gonzalez, 1990, p. 27). Alcohol and drug use by college students is viewed as normal in many traditions and ceremonies, spring break and college football being two such rituals. Bacon and Straus' (1953) classic study examining twenty-seven campuses between 1949-1951 reported on the socio-cultural drinking customs of American students. They argued that:

The most frequently expressed views about college drinking or any category of drinking do not consider it as a cultural or social phenomenon. The usual explanations describe it in terms of free rational choice of the individual; of a desire to experience the anesthetic efforts or to satisfy a specific taste; a need to show off, act perversely, or defy authority; as a response to ubiquitous advertising, or, reflecting older theoretical traditions, as related to a biological factor (undefined) which "demands" alcohol consumption. These chapters clearly indicate that such explanations have at best a secondary significance; within particular sociocultural settings their effect may or may not become more important. ... Recorded data on the facts of drinking show that it is not only a sociocultural phenomenon but a complex one with many patterns. ... Recognition of drinking as a cultural and social phenomenon allows greater insight into drinking behavior. It also enables one to perceive more specifically the variations within the patterns, together with the related behavior commonly labeled "problems" (1953, p. 127-29).

Since 1953, their "cultural arguments" are used to measure changes in student drinking practices.

Don Cahalan, a chief researcher at the University of California's Alcohol Research Group, studied American drinking use and found 22 percent abstain from drinking. Cahalan concluded that Americans general attitude toward drinking in moderation was favorable, but unfavorable toward
persistent heavy drinking or loss of control from "problem drinking", done by only a small minority (1970, p. 2). Cahalan and his colleagues (Cahalan, 1970; Cahalan et al, 1969; Cahalan and Room, 1974, Clark and Cahalan, 1976) have demonstrated that contrary to predictions of progressively severe drinking symptoms, a substantial group of young men in their early twenties who reported a variety of serious drinking related problems turned out to be "normal" or "social" drinkers several years later.

College students will approach adulthood and enter situations where the "regular use of alcohol is both normative and unrestricted" (Blane and Chafetz, 1979). Students' problem behaviors from drinking generally include residence hall damage, sexual assault, fights, drunk driving and lower grade averages (Presley et al., 1993). Kraft concludes that, "Since problem drinking in college is only moderately correlated with alcoholic patterns later in life, prevention and treatment programs at the college level need to focus on reducing alcohol problems, not solely on preventing alcoholism" (1988, p. 37).

Anthropological Literature

The social construction of drug and alcohol use is determined by such labels as "alcohol problem" or "drug epidemic" which are applied to behaviors when society ironically, according to anthropologist Dwight Heath, overlooks the cause of the real activities. Heath finds
It is understandable that the social history of alcohol is intertwined with social control policy given that alcohol can produce a variety of pleasant and unpleasant effects.

Robert Popham's study, entitled "The Social History of Taverns", examined the use of alcohol in rituals and ceremonies in traditional societies. He focused on the history of taverns from its primitive background, when it was associated with totemism, to the more recent ethnography of a formally organized grouping in modern society, as a club, lodge or fraternal society. The tavern is central to establishing informal groups among college students.

Social Control Literature

Social control is a term sociologists use to refer to social processes by which people are taught, persuaded or forced to conform to norms. Legal penalties are sometimes ignored and one example is with early penalties applied to drug and alcohol use. The enforcement of the Harrison Stamp Tax Act of 1914 which restricted narcotics was difficult because widespread violations occurred. The reason, in part, was that people did not have respect for the law and wished to show their contempt for the law (Kaplan, 1984, p. 17). Some people continued to use narcotics because they did not think it was wrong, no matter what the law said.

Ronald Akers finds law violators engage in a deviance-amplification effect. The conducive environment that is found at universities and the enduring social patterns of
peer support for heavy alcohol intake and drug experimentation can "eventually amplify into involvement in more serious forms of delinquent behavior" (Akers et al, 1979). On the other hand, research also reports that there is a good deal of moving "in and out" of what might be called "deviant drinking" behavior (Cahalan, 1970).

Prevention is a weak form of social control. One informal control, reintegrative shaming for controlling criminal or deviant behaviors has been widely discussed as an alternative to formal criminal justice sanctions. Criminologist John Braithwaite argues that shame must precede reintegration of the apprehended and sentenced criminal. Braithwaite suggests:

reintegrative shaming is not necessarily weak; it can be cruel, even vicious. It is not distinguished from stigmatization by its potency, but by (a) a finite rather than open-ended duration which is terminated by forgiveness; and by (b) efforts to maintain bonds of love or respect throughout the finite period of suffering shame (1989, p. 101).

Shame cannot be considered an appropriate control because all involved have to perceive alcohol as a problem and students clearly do not see it as a problem. The generation at college today often resolves to not be pressured by the "shame" of deviant acts. Recently a Rutgers student published a book on cheating where he states that cheating is "only wrong when you get caught" (Howe and Strauss, 1993, p. 78). Getting high, binge drinking or cheating seem to flourish on college campuses. Peer education generally does
not attempt shaming to compel obedience because many students feel they have the "right" to drink.

Measuring of Youth Alcohol and Drug Prevalence

Since 1975, the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, has measured the trends of alcohol and drug use among the nation's high school seniors. The project, known as the Monitoring the Future (MTF) study, attributes the declining drug use trend to a fear of the hazards of drugs and that young people are increasingly disapproving of the world of drugs. MTF’s director Lloyd Johnston stated, "We believe these changes in perceived risk and peer norms have been the major determinants in the downturn, not a reduction in supply" (Treaster, 1992). Some decline in drug use appears a result of the health consciousness movement (Treaster, 1992; Cahalan, 1991). The federal government’s drug policies are succeeding in spite of themselves because the real reduction comes from the movement towards healthier life styles.

The trend towards healthier lifestyles is welcomed by prevention providers, however they are concerned that binge drinking is also increasing. Persistent "binge" drinking at colleges occurs despite campus restrictions. Earl Rubington tested a sanctions theory which "holds that the greater the risk of apprehension, the lower the chances of deviant behavior" (1991, p. 375). He found differential enforcement of rules among different dormitories. The fact that
drinking by college students is a frequent event (Kraft, 1988) weakens Rubington's sanctions theory (Rubington, 1991). When the increase in the purchase age is enforced there is a decrease in campus incidents of problem behavior, however these same negative behaviors increased off-campus, suggesting that the policies and stricter enforcement export deviance off-campus (Rubington, 1990; Kuh, 1990). Evidence provided in Rubington's study of dorms is examined further in Chapter V.

Without an increasing disapproval by young people of the world of drugs or, more specifically, alcohol, then the effects of prevention must be questioned. Johnston et al.'s study of young adults, age 19 to 22, found over half say their friends would not disapprove of heavy weekend drinking (1990). Young adult (age 19 to 26) groups also disapprove of daily drinking (69%) and heavy daily drinking (92%). Johnston reports norms regarding alcohol use have remained stable. Peer acceptance of light daily drinking increase slightly with age. The age group with the highest prevalence of heavy weekend drinking, 19-22, show the least disapproval for this behavior (49%).

Social acceptability regarding marijuana use has decreased from 1980 to 1987 with 55% stating they thought their friends would disapprove of their trying marijuana and 66% would disapprove of occasional use. MTF's most recent data shows the proportion of college students who used
illegal drugs, mainly marijuana, within the previous 12 months had increased to 30.6 percent from 29.2 percent in 1991. The proportion of students who reported illegal drug use had been on the decline since 1980, when 56 per cent of those surveyed had reported using one within the previous year (Johnston, 1993). The Gordon B. Black Corporation’s survey of 1,461 college students in 1988, reported that only 6% of college students, ages 18 to 24, acknowledged "occasional" use of cocaine that year, down from 11% in 1987 and the "use of cocaine and marijuana among many segments of the population, particularly middle-class professionals and college students has declined sharply" (Musto, 1989, p. 63).

Society is tightening restrictions on the consumption of alcohol beverages. According to Heath, youth find, "often a minimum age is set for the purchase (and sometimes consumption) of tobacco or alcohol, which is clearly prohibition from the point of view of the young (1990, p. 133). Several researchers have tested the effects of legislation raising the minimum age and have either found, 1) that the legal age has no effect on teenage drinking (Smart and Goodstadt, 1977) or that 2) a higher age limit may encourage alcohol use (Mooney et al, 1992; Rooney and Schwartz, 1977). Ruth Engs and D.J. Hanson’s (1985) survey of 6,115 college students from every state concluded that 81.9% drink at least once a year and 20.2% can be categorized as heavy drinkers. One study found 7% of
students to be alcoholics (Seay and Beck, 1984). According to Salz and Elandt, "journal articles appearing in the last few years have begun to see student drinking problems as worthy of attention in their own right" (1986, p. 118). Educators find that validating the sense of self in students is more important than denying the impulse to binge drink or experiment with drugs. Early alcohol education failed to change student behaviors by employing ineffective scare tactics, which rarely worked because students experienced alcohol very differently from the examples given by educators.

The gratification, needs, aspirations and motives that many students relate with alcohol use include; (1) physical relaxation; (2) enhancement of sexual experience; (3) psychological escape; (4) release of normal tension, anxiety, and conflict; (5) emotional relaxation; (6) mood alteration; (7) desire for privacy; (8) intensification of personal courage; (9) increase of self-esteem; (10) gain in peer recognition; (11) facilitation of social interaction; (12) reduction of boredom; (13) increase in enjoyment of artistic production; and (14) desire for fun (Goodstadt and Celeekal-John, 1984, p. 735). In summary, there are advantages for students in having alcohol widely available.

Prevention Programs and Their Effect on Students

Researchers have found that telling students and young people not to do something has often produced the opposite
reaction. They cite an increase in student drug use after attending prevention programs (Goodstadt, 1980; Swisher and Hoffman, 1975; Tolone, Tieman and Zuelke, 1991). As Botvin points out these 'information-dissemination models' often lead to increased usage, attributed to adolescent's curiosity (Botvin, 1990, p. 487). Extensive evaluations of existing primary or secondary education programs including the DARE program (Tolone, Tieman and Zuelke, 1991; Harmon, 1992), EACH ONE-REACH ONE (Calabro, 1992), Rutger's Health and Human Development project (White, 1992) and California's Project ALERT (Ellickson and Bell, 1992) have been conducted and mixed results in their efficacy are reported.

After the perceived failure of the traditional prevention approaches such as information-dissemination, fear arousal, or moral suasion, researchers (Evans, 1976; Evans et al. 1978) focused on the social and psychological factors which cause the onset of substance use. Botvin (1986, 1990) and Flay (1985) find these 'psychosocial' approaches to be the most promising. Several studies have examined age, period and cohort effects from self-reports on drinking-related problem behaviors (Menard, 1990; Bachman et al., 1989). Curtis found that race and gender affected the self-reported drinking with white males reporting more drinking and more problem behaviors associated with drinking (Curtis et al, 1990). Chudley Werch (1990) focused on behavioral self-control strategies which are practiced and
can decrease alcohol consumption. These include resisting driving or riding in an automobile after drinking, limiting drinking, and promoting health beliefs. The two specific self-control measures most likely to predict alcohol-related variables were confining drinking to certain times and refusing unwanted drinks. Social-modeling is used to deter students from drug-taking activities, including smoking (Evans, Rozelle et al. 1978; 1981; Evans, 1976). Smoking has also been reduced using the resistance-skills model (Botvin, 1990). But how many students employ resistance-skills and social modeling strategies and how will prevention providers know what controls will work with whom?

Bandura analyzed that all "social influences are of themselves a product of the interaction between individual learning histories and forces in both the community and the larger society" (Botvin, 1990, p. 492). But, while many of the environmental and behavioral factors discussed previously are complex in nature, by contrast, prevention programs are much narrower in scope seeking to reduce, delay or prevent the use of drugs or alcohol before it becomes habitual or clearly dysfunctional (Polich et al., 1984). Prevention approaches based on social learning have demonstrated some changes (Botvin, 1990) while educational prevention programs significantly improve knowledge but provide few changes in use (Meacci, 1990).

In a review of the relevant prevention literature,
Gerardo Gonzalez found much of it critical of alcohol and drug education as an effective means of prevention of related problems (1988, p. 355). Davis and Reynolds (1990) have examined levels of alcohol use before and after the raising of the drinking age in New York, where ninety percent of undergraduates continued to drink. The quantity of that drinking was moderated only slightly by the new law. Another study following New York's changes, George et al. (1989) found a decrease in the numbers of drinking days, but not the abstention rate or number of drinks per week. A dramatic increase in alcohol consumption in automobiles also followed the change in law.

Social Control by the Media

Alcohol prevention campaigns have failed to change students' attitudes and behaviors, while the opposite can be said concerning student attitudes and behaviors towards drugs. Part of the reason for a decline in the use of drugs among youth were the deaths of sports figures Don Rogers and Len Bias (Tieman et al. 1990). Part of the reason for the decline in drug use among middle class youth is found in the successful sustained public media campaign of The Partnership for a Drug-Free America. This non-profit organization, with funding and input from the major advertising agencies, conducts a national campaign to encourage negative attitudes towards drugs. In what it calls "denormalizing" drug use, the Partnership's
advertisements include the famous Public Service Announcement, "This is your brain. This is drugs. This is your brain on drugs". The sequence of images, familiar to every television viewer, includes three images; the first is a hand with an egg, the second, a sizzling frying pan, and finally a fried egg in the pan, with a written message appearing announcing the Partnership for A Drug-Free America 800 telephone number.

Another Partnership advertisement has several drug dealers talking about selling drugs to some young users and planning on molesting a girl among them, a background voice warns, "Drugs. It's them against you, kid". Kraft noted that mass-media approaches focus community attention and mobilize support (1988, p. 49). Survey research conducted by the Gordon Black Company to find out the effectiveness of the advertisements demonstrated a significant impact on the targeted public. Over 60 percent of teenagers who recall at least 5 Partnership messages reported they were less like to use cocaine, around 40 percent would disapprove of marijuana at a party, and over 40 percent discouraged a friend's marijuana use (National Drug Control Policy, White Paper May, 1992). These examples illustrate scare campaigns have some effect with drugs, but alcohol's allure and image for youth is considerably less frightening.

The failure of prevention efforts on campuses is both cultural and environmental. The advertisers use mass media
images of "babes, beaches and beer" to inundate students at forlorn college towns thousands of miles from the beaches. Challenging the messages of the brewers and distillers with messages of prevention has been as unsuccessful as their messages have been successful. Kraft reported that "Media saturation of the entire student community plus single session workshops with 5-14% of students each year ... did not result in desired changes in drinking behaviors of a random sample of students" (1988, p. 47). Smith and McCauley's (1991) study of college students found that perceived personal risk factors were correlated with less alcohol consumption whereas general risk factors associated with drinking were not (Tieman et al., 1991, p. 4). Educators have a hard time promoting policies to restrain fun-seeking 18 to 20 year old college students. Consequently, the promise of significant prevention impact on the use of alcohol by college students is limited. The informal controls of parents, peers and professors, rather than the formal control of the universities promises more hope for the desired changes.

Descriptions of Prevention Literature

There are two general models in the history of prevention programs: first, prevention by control and; second, a public health model. The latter, a public health model for prevention is probably the most widely understood. The general public has accepted the medicalization of health
problems which have been expanded to include eating, drinking and other self-centered activities\(^1\). Some argue that this is part of:

> a historical trend whereby persons deemed incapable of willful criminal or wrong intent have been subjected to "treatment" rather than punishment (which) has been called the "divestment" of the criminal justice system and the rise of the "therapeutic state" (Schneider, 1978, p. 363).

The medical model controls the public by disguising its moral judgments in neutral-sounding references of "syndrome or dependency". Kay Backett labels the general public's understanding of the medical model as "lay health moralities" (1992).

Students share misconceptions about the evidence of the health risks from alcohol and other drugs imparted by supporters of the public health approach to drug prevention (Gonzalez, 1989; Perry and Jessor, 1983). One survey of 17 to 22 year old undergraduates showed their health-related beliefs are centered in a social context of sport and athletic activity while issues of health-related problems, disease or substance use are not considered as important (Backett, 1992). Prior research indicates that by the time adolescent graduates from high school, he or she has quite probably established a regular, light to moderate drinking

---

\(^1\) Sources on the medicalization of deviance or substance abuse should also include criticism of the medical model. Two important sources are Peter Conrad and Joseph Schneider’s book *Deviance and Medicalization: From Badness to Sickness* (1980) and Hebert Figarette’s book *Heavy Drinking* (1988).
pattern (Thornburg, 1982, p. 355). In spite of this drinking pattern, young people are naive to marketing techniques of the liquor industry. One discouraging study by the Department of Health and Human Services found that two out of three teenagers cannot distinguish alcoholic beverages from non-alcoholic beverages by their packaging (Flax, 1991).

The Campus Environment

The construction of responses to campus alcohol use is executed by top campus administrators like Rutgers Vice-President, W. David Burns. He asks questions about their mission, "Is the vision of a drug-free university a correlative, delusion bound up in denial? How are issues of community and substance abuse related?" (1989, p. 54). The American Council on Education, in a recent white paper on tort liability in alcohol policies, found that a lack of written alcohol regulations involves a "duty to care" void and that serious litigation might occur. The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators takes the position that:

While rules and regulations are important and necessary, the reduction of problems related to the misuse of alcohol cannot be achieved solely through the development of rules and regulations; students must be educated about the principles behind these policies. ... Clear-cut guidelines give students an understanding of how they may use their substantial peer influence in a positive manner (Goodale, 1987, p. vii).

Earl Rubington (1991) and Burns (1989) find students intent on drinking and do not find the substantial peer influence
pointed in a positive direction. Both scholars discuss students seeing themselves as having a "right to drink".

Academic life presents the student with a day to day standardized environment marked by repetition, redundancy and ritual (Gubrium and Burkholdt, 1977). Evaluations are based on the mid-term and final examinations, some perfunctory research and goal motivation. Student lifestyles revolve around out-of-class activities such as weekly parties, drug experimentation, Greek hazing, property destruction, and fighting along with those rigors of academic life. What can university officials do to change this social climate on campuses? What recommendations for reduction or abstinence can prevention programs make to students? Do educators instead focus on commitment to conventionality, absolving students of "minor" infractions surrounding alcohol and recreational drugs, or insist upon the federal government's legal definitions of abuse?

The traditional partying practices of American college students over the past two hundred years are being challenged and regulated by the new world of the "healthy student community" (Bacon and Straus, 1953; Nuweer, 1991). Student attitudes expressed towards prevention campaigns do not depend solely on individual students themselves but are collectively expressed in the student culture and the university environment. The particular culture of students includes shared, mutually shaping patterns of belief. These
assumptions, values, norms, practices, and artifacts influence behavior of students, faculty and others (Kuh, 1990, p. 24). Kuh reports that "large scale manipulation of contextual variables, such as enforceable party-planning guidelines, have not been particularly successful" (1990, p. 27). Social constructionists view the students' attitudes about partying and alcohol as part of their sensation-seeking identity (White et al., 1985). Drinking at college for underage students, especially among males, involves the thrill generated by doing something "wrong".

Certain lifestyles at school are not affected by prevention, just as certain lifestyles outside of school are not affected by prevention. Denise Kandel, proposed that male drug using networks, who used from their teenage years until their thirties, are virtually immune to the messages of prevention (1992). Purposeful drug-involved interactions reinforce the sense of belonging to drug-taking groups. Prevention is flawed when it does not attempt to intervene with these high-risk groups.

The Evolution of Prevention Programs

During the last decade there were numerous attempts to reduce the use of alcohol, drugs and tobacco among university students. The "healthy student community" perspective is widely discussed in a review of the literature on prevention (Burns, 1989; Swisher, 1992; Upcraft, 1990). The recent decline in drug use appears as a
result of the "health consciousness movement" in the society (Cahalan, 1991). This makes the "healthy student community" program popular and convenient to administer.

University and college administrators, surveyed by the Carnegie Foundation, are concerned with the behavioral problems caused by alcohol and drug use among their students. Sixty-seven percent of all college presidents and eighty-two percent of research and doctorate university presidents reported a "moderate to major" problem with alcohol abuse on their campus (Boyer, 1990). Another survey of college administrators show they believe alcohol to be a factor in 34 percent of all academic problems and 25 percent of all dropout cases (Anderson, 1988). Pennsylvania State's Vice-President for Counseling, Lee Upcraft, wrote that "once a college or university admits a problem exists, the next step is for the institution to commit itself to a comprehensive (prevention) approach" (1990, p. 10). Although prevention research is "a field replete with failures" (Botvin, 1990), universities support programming without much thought.

In 1984, Howard Blane spoke at the American College Health Association saying:

There is no evidence that anything that has been done in the past works on changing attitudes, knowledge, or behavior - mainly behavior. The extent to which the programs reach and compel their audiences is known, but available evidence indicates that exposure is probably limited in the overall impact on alcohol misuse (1984).

Blane was referring to the 1970s style of prevention which
focused on information. Previous prevention studies examining school-based prevention are often cited for the following limitations: in scope, lack of random assignment, faulty implementation, unanswered questions about the accuracy of reported drug use, and inadequate statistical controls (Ellickson and Bell, 1992; Moskowitz 1989, Biglan and Ary, 1985). Some rigorous methodological studies such as Williams et al. (1990), have studied alcohol consumption using pre and post surveys conducted before and after state restrictions on alcohol use were implemented. Statistical interpretation found success was not evident from prevention efforts, however factor analysis reported natural groupings of student along sets of values.

The attempts at "values clarification", according to Moskowitz et al. (1983), were found not to work. Preliminary studies on the recent peers counselor and skill-building programs have not given much support to their outcomes. While prevention programs continue to use social-influence strategies featuring peer leaders, they tend to have been used as support personnel rather than primary program facilitators (Botvin, 1990). Program administrators realize what happens at presentations may not continue outside the peer-led program. There are also gender differences, with women being more effected by these programs than men (Botvin, 1990, p. 495). Botvin concludes the additional advantages of peer leaders include their
greater credibility with adolescents concerning issues of smoking and drinking, however the disadvantages are they lack the teaching and classroom management skills; peer leader programs require a considerable effort in training, coordination, scheduling and maintenance, plus enthusiasm must be maintained in the face of normal student attrition (1990, pp. 501-02). The best scenario would include peer leaders serving as positive-role models by maintaining the kind of skills and behaviors being taught in the program and assisting the teacher in program implementation (Botvin, 1990, p. 502).

**Persuasive Communication**

One design implemented in a wide range of prevention, advertising, marketing and consumer research is persuasive communication research which states:

the best predictor of whether or not a person will engage in a behavior is the person's intention to engage in the behavior. A person's intention is, in turn, determined by two components, one personal (the person's attitude toward the behavior) and the other social in nature (the subjective norm - the person's perception that people who are important to him or her think they should engage in that behavior). The attitude toward the behavior and the subjective norm jointly determine the intention to engage in the behavior. The importance of the two factors differs from situation to situation depending on a number of factors, such as the behavior and the population being studied (Donohew et al, 1990, p. 63).

This 'Theory of Reasoned Action' is useful in designing communication aimed at encouraging, rather than discouraging, people to perform a behavior. Persuasive communication hinges on the fact that the education provided
intending to change behavior must be designed and aimed at the underlying beliefs associated with the behavioral intentions of the population under study. Alcohol prevention would not be consistent with the underlying beliefs held by college students, especially those in drinking groups.

Information Dissemination

Prevention expert Mathea Falco, author of the book *The Making of a Drug-Free America: Programs That Work*, argues:

> We also know that even the best school prevention programs do not inoculate children against drugs for the rest of their lives. Thus successful prevention efforts must expand beyond the classroom to include the larger environment which shapes our attitudes towards drugs—families, neighborhoods, churches, businesses, the media (*Carnegie Quarterly*, 1992, p.1).

According to Falco, these institutions should in the long run minimize harm rather pass judgement. A social contract means, to Falco, that "The laws set the limits of legally permissible behavior, but education, treatment, and social attitudes can have a more powerful effect on individual decisions about smoking, drinking and use of illegal drugs" (*Carnegie Quarterly*, 1992, p.1). Falco studied more that twenty programs, some school-based and other community-based, which have reduced drug use and crime. Falco's comprehensive study of public policy advocated a vast expansion of drug treatment programs for addicts, an organized community effort to reclaim the streets from dealers and prevention and education in the schools and
through the media. Falco is disdainful of legalization proposals. The laws and restrictions on drugs and alcohol may, Falco concedes, affect the middle class, while others in the poor and disadvantaged population will make no substantial progress.

A new consensus, a healthy drug-free lifestyle, is the goal of the prevention policy. Falco claims "affective education" programs which try to improve student's images, self-esteem, their general communication and decision-making skills were not successful in drug reduction because they are based on faulty assumptions. In recent years, a new approach, "social influence" which looks to change social influences that promote drinking, smoking and drug use. The new programs rejected using misinformation, because scare tactics only "served only to prove that adults did not know what they were talking about or were prepared to lie to force conformist behavior on young people" (Falco, 1992, p. 33). The prevention experts must face the fact that in their desire to be accepted, youth will copy adult behaviors they witness be it healthy or unhealthy. In constructing prevention programs, the goal should be to help students understand that the pressures they feel do exist. According to Falco, the best programs teach resistance skills and explicit strategies for avoiding risky situations without the fear of being rejected. Prevention must assist in overcoming the pervasive attitude that because "everyone is
Fear Arousal: Morals and Prevention

While current government policies instruct that schools focus on user accountability, the OSAP White Paper (1990) states "User accountability is best attained through policies that are unambiguous, straightforward, and consistently applied" at school, the prevention of an array of behaviors was historically tied to a preoccupation with moral issues. Psychologist Norman Zinberg conducted early research on both sex education and drug education in the 1960s and 1970s. Criticism of these models is currently discussed in the A.I.D.S. prevention literature, where prevention campaigns have also been closely tied to morals (Watney, 1987).

Drug education courses, in an earlier era, were modeled on sex education, although the content obviously differed, and were "clearly designed to frighten people away from drug use" (Zinberg, 1976, p. 5). Zinberg states, "Such information has frequently been laden with ethical and moral judgements so that the 'proper' decision for the individual has been preordained" (Abadinsky, 1984, p. 204).

The difference with sex education was prevention providers could be positive regarding sex education, especially with heterosexual marital sex practices, but could never be positive on the topic of drugs. Another "moral concern" is street knowledge from peers continued to
be their main source of obtaining information on such topics. Zinberg concluded that not much attention was paid to how the course material was used or not used. Street knowledge should be examined as alternative prevention strategy to reach those 'high risk' students most involved with alcohol and drugs. The misinformation in program materials and deficiencies in program design will limit the desired changes in the population.

Alcohol and drug regulations enforced in a school environment should benefit students and provide for a "healthy student community" (Burns, 1989). Burns admits this context will only be achieved when universities endorse the programs needed to treat and prevent alcohol problems and reject the hypocritical measures to date. As Thomas Harford of the N.I.A.A.A. stated, "one of the difficulties in studying the perceived, or psychological, environment is that no provision is made theoretically to examine how the objective environment are transformed into psychological (sociological) reality" (Blane and Chafetz, 1979, p. 162). Sociologists use their perspective on social or behavioral theories to better inform others and help explain the magnitude of drug and alcohol use on campus and in society.

Conclusion

The assumptions of both methods of prevention, prevention by control and the public health model, should be tested with controlled studies on several campuses to
evaluate their impact. Not every campus is alike. Don Cahalan appraised the current approach to prevention as "most control programs are launched only when the iron is sufficiently hot, but the sponsors are reluctant to hold up their campaigns for the many months to years it might take to run a conclusive test experiment" (1991, p. 42). Still no departure from the current alcohol and drug controls has been attempted.

Kuh found drinking increased at selective/affluent institutions and drinking was lower at institutions where a sense of community was stronger and norms for appropriate behavior were clearer (1990, p. 21). Comparative survey research on the variations in social characteristics of users and the extent of substance use on different campuses permits us to measure how environmental, individual and situational factors effect trends in the "healthy student community" or drug-free school. The research found in this study can contribute towards understanding whether a drug-free school model, a control model, a "healthy student community", or a consensus model, should be supported. The findings in this study will hopefully be useful to any college or university of any rank or size. The next chapter explains the method used in examining alcohol and drug prevention programs at Lakefront and Northern Universities.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The study of campus-based prevention programs has generally been atheoretical and based on educational judgements which are not supported in the literature (Gonzalez, 1988; Salz and Elandt, 1986). Student affairs staff primarily develop prevention programs and evaluate them for their purpose in the literature (Gonzalez, 1989). In describing my approach, I integrate a qualitative study with survey data on Northern and Lakefront students attitudes, beliefs and frequency of alcohol and drug use. The social world of students attending the university is one which involves them in the regular drinking and drug use found in the student culture.

Research Propositions

The research problem is to investigate alcohol and drug use among undergraduate students to find if any changes occur which might establish the prevention program’s effectiveness with this student population. In Chapter I, the government and university administrations were shown to have increased existing support for prevention. To

1 Literature written by prevention providers is found in a series of topical monographs published by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA).
policymakers committed to the "bottom line" results, the outcome of more financial support should be increased effectiveness. How closely prevention programs can perform this function, will be examined in the next chapter.

However, universities have a duel commitment in providing an education. Their playing field is off-campus with business and society and also on-campus with their students. Universities are institutions which "bridge" the gap between students and the "others", a wider group in the society. This research concentrates on the patterns of behaviors in the student population which conflict with society. To be effective with college students and abide by the current government policy, the prevention program should, both; support an "awareness" level at the university which leads to both an absence of illegal drug use and underage drinking. The general effectiveness of program outcomes is measured by self-report data on prevention awareness or declines in alcohol and drug-related problems, all of which help to substantiate the apparent benefits of prevention for college students. Prevention will never surpass the bureaucratic organization in terms efficiency because it is difficult to measure that which does not occur. This is an exploratory examination of applied evaluation research on the effect of campus-based prevention. Researchers and prevention providers can then use the substantive results in other locations.
Timeframe of the Study

This study began on June 6, 1991 with the First Annual Meeting of the Jesuit Consortium of Substance Abuse Prevention Specialists, where I conducted my initial data collection. By the time the Second Annual Jesuit Consortium was held on June 4, 1992, most data collection had ended. The CORE surveys were conducted in the 1990-91 and 1991-92 academic years. The only financial support for my study came from Lakefront's Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Education which funded distributing the LU survey and gave me some travel monies.

The Setting of the Study

Lakefront University and Northern University are compared for regularities and variations in student patterns of substance use. Emile Durkheim validated this comparative approach in The Rules of Sociological Method to compare "social facts" by searching for regularities and variations within one society at a given time (1938). The universities, located in the Midwest, are both comprehensive private Catholic schools. Their students have distinct alcohol and drug consumption patterns. The main variance between the two universities is that Northern students drink and get drunk more, affirming their "party school" reputation. Another variance is NU has the longer history of prevention programming, existing since the late 1970s.
these two campuses may depend on different social environments on each campus. The differences may also occur because their "states of collective consciousness are different in nature from (their) states of individual consciousness" (Durkheim, 1966, p. xlix). Or the differences might stem from the degree of adherence to the "college drinking ethic" at each university. These differences might be explained by a "consistency of results across studies (which) is perhaps the most persuasive evidence concerning the efficacy of these prevention approaches" (Botvin, 1990, p. 500).

**Operationalizing the Study**

The methodology utilized to operationalize the study included; 1) a survey of NU and LU students at two points in time and analyzing the results of the CORE survey for these two populations; 2) qualitative interviews sampling various university groups, i.e. resident assistants, "Greek" membership, prevention providers and members of alternative groups, and 3) comparative results of the above groups. I was able to operationalize this study of prevention only after a triangulation of methods because singular methods consistently fail to reveal the complexities involved with drug and alcohol use. Often social science "research that is driven by interest in a particular variable or single measure ... has little likelihood of capturing the complexity of human action and the richness of individual
and contextual variation" (Jessor et al., 1990, pp. 9-10). The design of this study was to capture the variation in campus setting by focusing on these two different student populations.

**Data Collection and Research Instrument**

The CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey self-report questionnaire was used to measure alcohol and drug use, attitudes and perceptions of university students. The CORE was developed by the United States Department of Education "in response to the stated need of FIPSE-funded Grantees for an evaluation instrument that was uniformly comparable, easy to use within program structures, and which specifically targeted the post-secondary age population" (Presley et al. 1990). The CORE User's Manual states the CORE items will help gather information regarding personal characteristics of the students, use habits, behaviors and consequences of drug and alcohol use, and perceptions of campus norms of alcohol and drug use. The Manual states the validity and reliability of the CORE survey instrument has been reviewed through a process of prior testing (Presley et al, 1993). Validity assumes the instrument measures what it supposed to measure. Reliability refers to the prospects for obtaining consistent and similar measurements when the data collection procedure is replicated. The CORE Survey Instrument, used for the first time only in 1989, is now widely used at institutions of higher learning. The CORE Survey Instrument
is reproduced in Appendix A.

The key variables from these surveys I looked at to better understand how college prevention polices affect their use and attitudes towards alcohol and drugs are; knowledge dissemination and prevention exposure. The key alcohol and drug-related variables are; prevalence of use alcohol, marijuana and hallucinogens within the last year and the prevalence of binge drinking.

**Chi-square Test of Independence**

The statistical measure I used to establish this relationship was the Chi-Square test for independence of two samples. The variables which appear on the CORE are generally defined as nominal measures with characteristics of mutual exclusiveness and exhaustiveness. Nominal measure are ideal for Chi-square tests because they are categorical measure and non-parametric. The test of significance which is utilized with the Chi-square is the gamma, a measure of the strength of association. If the association of any two variables is statistically significant then they are regarded as representing a genuine association between the two variables (Babbie, 1979, p. 485). If not, then generally researchers accept a null hypothesis stating there is "no relationship" between the two variables. The logic is the:

Chi-square first establishes the hypothetical distribution of variables for a population in which there is no relationship between variables. Then, the observed distribution is compared with the hypothetical
distribution. If the difference between the observed and the hypothetical distribution is large, the likelihood is small that sample was drawn from an actual population with a distribution similar to the hypothetical one. Consequently, it can be inferred that the sample observations did not occur by a chance drawing of a particular sample but occurred because the sample was representative (Eckhardt and Ermann, 1977, p. 180).

The rejection of a null hypothesis occurs when the significance level is .05, or less, indicating that the chances are five out of a hundred that no relationship between the variables would exist in the whole population.

**Designing Prevention Surveys**

The CORE instrument does not provide adequate information on prevention, including only one five-part question on prevention. After examining the CORE’s first year results at Northern and Lakefront I concluded its "knowledge of prevention" question was too limited. This near omission of questions on prevention programs led me to develop a prevention survey, Survey B, for distribution in the second year, 1991-92, of the survey. Survey B is reproduced in Appendix B. The two surveys were administered together ensuring one and only one student would provide answers to both surveys, which would later be entered on the computer as one record.

On Survey B, I included items which measure pressures on students to use alcohol or drugs; the various attitudinal effects of prevention; and commonly reported violations of university drug and alcohol regulations. The development of
questions which deals with peer, parental or school influences were stimulated by an earlier debate in the methodological literature involving James Coleman's 1961 study, *The Adolescent Society*, and later work by David C. Epperson (1971). Several questions were included to measure what effect, if any, formal and informal sanctions, by the university, their parents and their social networks, had on students. This set of questions (q29a through q31c) were designed to support or reject a thesis of a youth subculture, as expressed by peer disapproval scores if a student was caught using marijuana, cocaine or drinking underage. Other question allowed students to check off their prevention experiences. A negatively worded question was added to thwart any response set.

Most CORE questions measure frequencies of use or incidents of problem behaviors. While useful, these questions conveyed no idea of their likelihood of involvement or desistance. There were no Likert-scale questions on the CORE instrument. Likert-scale questions produce measures such as like/dislike, agree/disagree or change/don't change. These response categories help ensure a uniform scoring and each item has about the same intensity as the rest. I designed several Likert-scale questions for inclusion on Survey B to test the statistical relationships of prevention to other items. My analysis, found later in
the study, indicates this additional survey proved useful. The Sampling Method at Lakefront

LU administrators designed the initial sampling method for the 1990-91 CORE survey and I replicated their design for the following year. The design was a stratified random sample of courses, not students. Courses were sampled, from the undergraduate colleges of Arts and Sciences - Lakefront; Arts and Sciences - Downtown; College of Education; and College of Nursing, in order to obtain a general representativeness of the undergraduate enrollment at the university. Each of the surveys, the CORE and Survey B, were coded the same to ensure they would later be correctly matched. The surveys were distributed in-class, where an advantage of classroom sampling was a quick completion of the LU survey, and students were requested to fill them out.

The sampling design was a replication of the original method. LU’s Institutional Research Office had initially used a purposive selection process sampling with a preference for a physical science, a humanities, and a social science course at both the 100 level and 300 level in both Arts and Sciences Colleges. In Nursing and Education, I randomly selected only one 100 and one 300 level course,

2 Several questions (q24 to q26a) on Survey B came from the Monitoring the Future questionnaires developed by J.G. Bachman, L.D. Johnston, and P.M. O’Malley at the University of Michigan’s Institute for Social Research. Used annually since 1975, Monitoring the Future has been shown to be reliable and valid by the original authors.
which were viewed as sufficient for colleges with low enrollment. This method resulted in choosing the courses in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses in the Sampling Frame - LU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courses offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; S - Lakefront</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; S - Downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Nursing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In replicating the original design, I went to the random number table and selected the number in second row and ninth column, because it was February 9th, 1992, and began random course selection for the college of Arts and Science - Lakefront (Bailey, 1982, p. 506). This same process was continued for all the colleges to ensure a random start. This method was chosen deliberately not to be formally random. The Student Affairs administrators considered the initial survey to be a public relations venture to illustrate the university's concern for substance abuse at LU. The LU administration wrote a letter of support to enclose in the packet sent to professors. Their letter is found in Appendix C.

Since this was a purposive selection of courses, I conducted a stratified sampling of those courses which fit the design (Medenhall, Ott and Scheaffer, 1971; Bailey, 1984). The sample at LU is a proportional stratified random
sample of courses; if a student came to a class which was surveyed they were in the sample. Two exceptions to the general stratified sampling procedures were made. First, the School of Business refused to cooperate in the original survey, so they were also excluded from the follow-up survey. However, most business students attend Arts and Sciences courses, so many were surveyed in those courses. Second, Physical Education courses were eliminated because they are offered only at the 100 level; some are offered only to women or only to men, and because of the hardship in conducting survey in P.E. class sites, i.e. playing fields.

The Sampling Method at Northern

At both universities the same 23 item CORE questionnaire was used, but at NU the survey was distributed in the student union. In the spring of 1992, I used this union intercept method to gather the second Northern CORE sample, because the Director of the Counseling Center assured me that this was traditionally the way most campus surveys were conducted. They use this method to survey students who pass through the union building, which occupies the center of the campus, on their way to class.

The survey at NU was administered by myself, James Wendt, the Assistant Director of Counseling, and the PPA students. Either I or the peer facilitators would ask students passing by a drug and alcohol awareness table, placed there for Drug Awareness Week, if they would fill out
a survey on drug and alcohol use. Occasionally, the table was staffed with various athletic team members and other volunteers over a three day period. Students were drawn to the NU table by the crowds, some refreshments and their friends. Very few students repeated the twenty minute survey and those surveys that were repeated were discarded.

The Differences in Sampling Methods at the Universities

In order to address issues regarding the differences in how surveys at the two universities were conducted, this section reflects an attempt to discuss potential limitations in survey design. Methodologist Earl Babbie remarked, a "survey population is that aggregation of elements from which the survey sample is actually selected" (1979, p. 166). Both surveys allowed for a cross-section of the student population to be selected. Graduate students were excluded from the final sample. A comparison of the sample's demographic statistics indicate it reflects the actual student populations' parameters. Using LU and NU registrar's data I compare the sample's characteristics with those in the population at large at the each university. The following table, Table 2 shows that on those variables which I can check, this study comes very to the actual numbers.
Table 2
School Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lakefront</th>
<th>Northern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1991-92 CORE Results</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86 (34%)</td>
<td>203 (51.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>163 (66%)</td>
<td>190 (48.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **91-92 Registrar Enrollments** |       |          |
| Male                            | 2,564 (38%) | 4,243 (50%) |
| Female                          | 4,182 (62%) | 4,217 (50%) |
| Total                           | 6,746      | 8,460    |

The responses of 1,625 undergraduates, collected over a two year period at LU and NU, are included in this study. The size of the populations surveyed reflected an adequate sample size for statistical analysis. Alcohol and other drug prevalence and many behavioral and attitudinal measures were constant over a period two years, leading me to conclude that replication shows these samples to be reliable. When compared to results found in standard instruments they appear valid in the predicting of onset of use, patterns of drug use, and the decay in drug use.

**Limitations**

In certain regards the LU and NU samples cannot be certified representative. A basic sampling principle states, a "sample will be representative of the population from which it is selected if all members of the population have an equal chance of being selected in the sample" (Babbie, 1989, p. 165). At LU the sampling frame was a Spring Semester course listing making it possible that a student failed to attend when the survey was being conducted.
or students chose not to attend because the class or professor lacked pizzazz, elements which despite the purposive and random design are not predicable. LU's sample is not representative in all respects and the Institutional Research Office suggests given the non-random limitation "one should keep in mind the problems of reliability and validity with respect to inferences and interpretations concerning the results of any analyses" (Steinbrecher and Hurst, 1991).

The NU sample was the choice offered within the research time frame and it can not be considered representative. However, those students who were surveyed as they walked through the central Student Union building, are representative of those who attend Northern based upon the registrar data in Table 2. The representative nature of the CORE is discussed in the CORE Institute Center for Alcohol and Drug Studies' Manual (Presley et al. 1990). Finally the 1989-92 CORE Surveys should be considered comparable, despite minor revisions.

**Literature which Supports the Current Methodologies**

There is support in the literature for the methodologies used for this research. The in-class survey, used at LU, has been given a great deal of support in methodological literature. The most well-known use of the in-class survey is *Monitoring the Future* (Bachman, O'Malley and Johnston, 1991). It rates the student refusal rate at
one percent for the in-class survey (Bachman, O’Malley and Johnston, 1991, p. 7). In addition to absenteeism, only schedule conflicts bias the in-class survey. When self-reports on student issues and cost-containment are the concerns of the researcher, the in-class survey has many pluses.

Campus surveys are conducted using other methods. Klein (1991) surveyed only dorm residents for gender drinking differences among single-sex and mixed dorm floors. Perkins and Berkowitz (1986) have surveyed the entire college student body in order to study the community norms of alcohol use among students.

The surveys at NU’s union are structured similarly to the Gordon S. Black Corporation’s survey for the Partnership for Drug-Free America. This survey is characterized as the "largest attitudinal study of drug abuse ever conducted" and the survey "used a mall-intercept method - that is, interviews conducted at shopping malls" (Goldstein et al., 1990, p. 14). After 7,000 initial interviews in 1987, the Gordon S. Black Corporation conducted a second-wave of the survey in 1988, again using a mall-intercept method. They found that the very young children, ages 9 to 12, and college students had the greatest increase in antagonism.

---

3 Criminologist Charles Tittle supports the use of surveys, including self-reports, to "get right to the critical subjectual components which are ignored with other methodologies" (1980: 7).
toward drug use. The survey sponsors interpret the results as anti-drug messages are effective in changing attitudes and their advertising is working (Goldstein et al., 1990; Zastowny et al., 1993). Rather than a mall location, the NU survey is an equivalent method at a school. Because of the results obtained, I concluded that surveys using dissimilar methods can be integrated and compared.

The Field Work - Qualitative Methods

In addition to using surveys, I conducted interviews with knowledgeable sources on campus prevention - the students themselves. The interviews I conducted were open-ended and unstructured. This was intentional on my part because I assumed the intensely personal, revealing stories of students' drinking and drug use would be divulged more easily in unstructured interviews. "Sub pop music", "scamming", the news of a "party", these are just a few of the concepts or events which I would not have been able to discuss in this study if my key informants had chose to exclude me from the sources, content and meaning in their "student culture". The sampling method I used to contact these students on campuses was a snowball sample, which is a nonprobability sampling method often used in field research (Babbie, 1979; Irwin, 1990). The interview sample, while not representative, reflects the characteristics of drinking groups where the prevention message is ignored and a few pro-social students who seem to be accepting the prevention
message.

From my prior "participatory sociology" research, I knew I was regarded as trustworthy by drug-using groups. I believed it was critically important to have the students "help define what are the proper and needed avenues for investigation" (Moskos, 1969). Most Slackers recognized my study was non-threatening but there was some uneasiness expressed about my presence by certain Slackers. One Slacker band member, Marty, was "leery" about me and ignored me in situations when we were in a room together. I suppose he mistrusted me, I even thought he might consider me a police informant. Research among fraternities can be difficult because fraternities are secretive organizations. My key informant, Rod Builder, an Acca Sacca fraternity president, explained that, "Greeks don't say anything bad about other Greeks". The Slackers and the fraternities guarded their turf by applying social pressures within their groups. I represented a risk to their expression of the freedoms that meant a great deal to them.

I had the opportunity to observe students in their campus activities and their social interaction in living and party settings. The surroundings in which I observed "partying" students were mainly the big, drafty student houses where alcohol is frequently consumed and drug use is socially acceptable. The incidents and stories which I was privy to were revealed by acts of gradual disclosure.
Erving Goffman wrote, in *Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, how gradual disclosures were accomplished:

In everyday life, where individuals have no secret society to disclose their membership in, a more delicate process involved. When individuals are unfamiliar with each other's opinions and statuses, a feeling-out process occurs whereby one individual admits his views or statuses to another a little at a time. After dropping his guard just a little he waits for the other to show reason why it is safe for him to do this, and after this reassurance he can safely drop his guard a little bit more. By phrasing each step in the admission in an ambiguous way, the individual is in a position to halt the procedure of dropping his front at the point where he gets no confirmation from the other, and at this point he can act if his last disclosure were not an overture at all. Thus when two persons in conversation are attempting to discover how careful they are going to have to be about stating their true political opinions, one of them can halt his gradual disclosure of how far left or how far right he is just at the point where the other has come to the furthest extreme of his actual beliefs. In such cases, the persons with the more extreme views will tactfully act as if his views are no more extreme than the other's (1959, pp. 192-93).

Often, in the act of interviewing, I was aware that a students, alone or in a small group, were "dropping their guard" through this process of gradual guarded disclosure. The act of gradual disclosure was an integral part of the relationship between myself and both of my key informants at each university.

Gradual disclose was especially problematic when the student had organizational ties at the university which made the disclosure risky to the role of that the student. For example, Cameron, a PPA at Northern, gave me his phone number and said he would like to talk away from the Counseling Center. It was through his contact that I was
first invited to the Slacker house. I also had the similar impression from my first interview with Rod, that he wanted me to know some things about the fraternity guys. The thing I wanted both groups of students to know was they could share their impressions and that anything they divulged would not betrayed in a way which would do them any harm. In an ostensibly open context at school, these high-risk groups were still condemned by others. Researchers must insist they would like to understand their rationale for their social interactions and not get so involved as to pass judgement.

To gain access to each group was not difficult for me, since I am both able to look and the fit the part of a university student. When I got past the early stages, I became less the observer and more the insider. I refrain from calling myself a participant even though as a sociological researcher I had a participant role. This hesitation from calling myself a participant comes from the frequent drug use I observed, especially with the Slackers, and the obvious mistake I would have made to make the pretense of using drugs with the students at either university. For me, drug use represented a two-fold danger. First, to really go "underground" I might have tried the marijuana, that was frequently used around me, without too great an effect. However, drugs are used in varying degrees. I felt the situation could escalate and eventually
it did when on a couple of occasions students used LSD.

I chose not to partake in any of the illegal drugs used by the students. During the early stages of my stay with the Slackers, I had to engage the "art of impression management" as they would test me in a feeling-out process (Goffman, 1959). If they had marijuana, it would eventually be used in front of me during the long interviews I conducted. The rest of the people in the Slacker house watched the reaction of Gary, Cameron or someone they knew was a "trusted" pot smoker and based on that reaction, virtually ignored my refusal of their drugs. After one or two avoidances on my part, the Slackers returned to nonchalance with their use of drugs. The one or two occasions, this happened only at NU, where I witnessed someone on LSD, I was not able, nor willing, to observe them for long due to their heightened sense of self-awareness, introspective attitude and the closeness of those "dropping acid" together. Incidents of "dropping acid" are discussed later in this study.

The second danger, obvious to users and non-users alike, was the police. I knew the Slackers and some fraternity guys used drugs. While they were frequent users of drugs, their use was generally the by-product of social occasions or routine use patterns. This type of casual user has been distinguished from those who deliberately seek out the drug (Ungerleider and Beigel, 1980; McAlister et al.,
1980). Among Slackers, I found that two types of drug use exist; the social and the deliberate. While at their house, I was at risk for being caught in a raid due to their house being a primary gathering place where drug use frequently occurred. Although the Slackers are not deeply involved in drug transactions, I felt the group, not me, was at risk in their routine drug-seeking activities and drug transactions. While my interaction remained trusting and intimate, I never witnessed drugs being bought or sold, so I can not be sure they had completely let down their guard.

My involvement with the students' other drug of choice, alcohol, was different. I participated in drinking with students at both the Slacker and fraternity houses and various bars. I drank with my informants mainly because drinking activities are a regular part of their evenings and I was in the field to learn more about why they did or did not drink and how much they drank. I dislike the taste of beer and beer is what the vast majority of my informants and other students drank. They partied with beer and on several occasion at parties I drank the beer supplied from kegs. This was done on purpose on my part and largely a matter of skill in playing my role. Bar drinking was a more frequent activity which I found students engaged in. At bars I drank what I preferred, wine. As my informants continued to drink their huge quantities of beer, I just stated my preference for wine. This preference worked out very well in the field
because had I been able to keep up with their voluminous intake of beer I would never have been coherent enough to take field notes or even to operate the tape recorder. So when pitchers were ordered and consumed, I sipped wine and observed and recorded the activity. I also limited my drinking, I think because I was sensitive to any change in my thinking and did not want to mistake any observations that I might find in the field. I also did not get into the habit of buying drinks for my informants because it would have cost me a small fortune.

I wanted to appraise their great affection for alcohol and this required spending a great deal of time where alcohol was served or where alcohol was present. It was not always "fun" when drinking was the main activity. At one "Senior Week" party, a few of the Slackers, Cameron, his girlfriend Joan, Faith, and Mitch were playing a drinking game when I arrived. It was excessive and risky drinking but I said nothing except to inquire how the game was played. At another NU party, an outdoor fraternity party when foul weather drove the partiers under a tent canopy, I found myself in the company of several wrestlers and rugby players, famous on NU's campus for their rowdy drunken escapades. These scenes had the potential for becoming unpleasant but I was grateful nothing too crazy occurred.

People drank and drank and drank and then vanished.

Everywhere I went the environment supported drinking.
It was very gratifying that my role as researcher generally went unchallenged. The Slackers or fraternity guys would let others know I was a graduate student doing research. For the fraternity's benefit, Rod claimed me as his professor, who was studying alcohol and drug use among college students for his dissertation. My informants took it upon themselves to define my role and gave me entrance into their student world. Since my own undergraduate days in the 1970s, the attitudes towards drug use had changed to one of less tolerance and alcohol had become the students "drug of choice". I had kept up with the changes, but I was happy to be "sponsored" as one of the gang in most instances. The couple of students who were not happy with my presence eventually found me less and less of a threat.

The qualitative interviews were almost always free of tension between myself and the respondents because there was balanced power relations. The exception I felt to this was when someone had too much to drink or when someone was obviously too high on drugs to make their point known to the group or myself. Whenever possible I tape recorded the interviews. The interviews were transcribed at a later date and I was able to contact the participants in the study if I felt something was unclear. I first gave and collected the CORE survey, and secondly, I conducted interviews and observations in the field and in this manner I was able to complete this study in a little more than a year.
CHAPTER IV

THE PREVENTION PROFILE: AN ANALYSIS OF STUDENT DATA

This chapter describes 1) the demographic profile of students at Lakefront and Northern and their comparisons to a national sample of college students; 2) a measure of prevalence of alcohol and drug use of LU and NU students and comparisons of a national sample of college students; 3) the differential effects of prevention's impact on student alcohol and drug use; and 4) distinguishes the differential receptivity of prevention among student groups.

Differential receptivity, Robert Granfield states, "refers to the degree to which students accept or reject normative messages communicated through formal education based upon student behavior and social situations" (1991, p. 82).

The initial presentation of demographic data in this study will give the reader a "snapshot" of certain factors within a student culture. Following this depiction, I will introduce the effects of prevention programs in the high-risk "student culture" environment. Finally, I will present data on student rejection of prevention information.

An important research question examined in this chapter is; are individuals or groups of college students influenced to a greater degree by the student culture or by prevention programs? What descriptive characteristics are associated
with an increased likelihood to report effects of prevention programs? The indication is that to the extent that prevention training exists, students who utilize it report its effectiveness. For one out of every five students in the sample, prevention was found to affect their attitudes and behaviors regarding alcohol and drug use. The findings supporting the effects of prevention on college students drinking and drug use are found in Tables 10 to 13.

**Descriptive Characteristics of Study Sample**

The demographic profile of students attending the universities in the sample are found in Table 3. Comparisons between the two schools are meaningful, because despite their similarities, it delineates that their students drink and use drugs quite differently. To compare these differences, the profile of student characteristics from the national CORE Survey data, conducted in 1989-90 academic year, were selected for comparison with the two university sample. While "comparable and national norm data has been scant" (Presley et al, 1993) similar results from this study’s surveys and the CORE survey would strengthen the interpretation of the findings on alcohol and drug prevalence measures at universities.
Table 3
Demographics of 1991-92 Sample Compared to National 1989-90

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>NU % Total (N=412)</th>
<th>NU % Total (N=259)</th>
<th>LU % Total (N=44,985)</th>
<th>4-year U.S. % Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 18</td>
<td>7.9% 32</td>
<td>8.6% 22</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 or 20</td>
<td>40.5 163</td>
<td>33.7 88</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or 22</td>
<td>45.1 182</td>
<td>41.2 105</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 or 24</td>
<td>4.2 17</td>
<td>10.2 26</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 or older</td>
<td>2.1 9</td>
<td>6.4 16</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.7 203</td>
<td>34.0 83</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48.3 190</td>
<td>66.0 161</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Indian</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>6.3 25</td>
<td>6.6 29</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>5.3 21</td>
<td>11.6 17</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81.9 326</td>
<td>74.7 186</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5.3 21</td>
<td>3.6 9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.3 5</td>
<td>3.2 8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School Residence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On campus</td>
<td>24.6 89</td>
<td>32.9 80</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off campus</td>
<td>75.4 273</td>
<td>67.1 163</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year in School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fresh</td>
<td>15.5 64</td>
<td>10.0 26</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soph</td>
<td>18.4 76</td>
<td>25.5 66</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>34.2 141</td>
<td>25.9 67</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>31.8 131</td>
<td>38.6 100</td>
<td>20.1(^1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Core Institute data includes 5.6 percent who are graduate or non-degree seeking students.
Table 3 presents a comparison of five variables. Three of these; age, race and gender, are exogenous variables, coming prior to their attendance at the university. Two are endogenous, school residence and year in school, coming after their attendance at the university. The students at NU and LU appear to be representative of the college population surveyed using CORE survey. This study utilizes the CORE survey data collected at two comprehensive universities to consider the effects of prevention. The substantial efforts in building this database on the alcohol and drug use of college students allows for further research on this neglected subject area. Research of a comparative nature will shape this field for a long time to come.

There are considerable sample differences between the national CORE and both NU and LU sample with the age variable. In the national CORE sample 56.7% of the students are under age 21, while they comprise 48.4% and 42.3% of the NU and LU samples, respectively. These same percentages also represent the share of potential underage drinkers on each campus.

2 The study covered two academic years, 1990-91 and 1991-92. Unless otherwise noted, data from the 1991-92 academic year is reported in this study.

3 Explanation of Age Variable: Since those students under 21 who drink are drinking illegally, age groups, underage and legal age, make a convenient marker for the prevalence of student drinking and drugs use. Age is also outside the causal model if prevention of alcohol and drug use on campus is tested for having any effect on any student who belongs to the sample (Babbie, 1979).
Also found in Table 3, is that the national CORE sample has 41.7% of students who are males, while males comprise 51.7% and 34.0% of the NU and LU samples, respectively. The racial and ethnic imbalance at colleges and universities is widely acknowledged. Because of the small numbers of individual minority groups, in this research race-ethnicity is aggregated into dichotomous categories of "white" and "minority". Both NU and LU have few minorities, but in the national sample even fewer minorities, 13.6%, make up the sample. The highest percentage of all minority students combined is found in the LU sample, 25.3%, while at NU there are 18.1% minority students. In statistical sampling these small numbers make it difficult to infer any relationship between drinking and drug use and minority status. Rather than base the results on such few cases, the decision was made not to focus on the relationship of minority students and drug use, although they are included in the sample. The results of this study concur with other studies finding, the "heaviest, most frequent, and most problematic drinking in college occurs among males (Berkowitz and Perkins, 1987) whites, and Catholics and Protestants (Kuh, 1990, p. 9). Other research has shown blacks have a higher proportion of abstainers from alcohol than do whites (Barnes and Welte, 1988a; Hilton, 1988; Knupfer, 1989).
Measures of Prevalence of Drinking and Drug Use

The six columns in frequency table below, Table 4, compare the differences in alcohol and drug use at NU and LU and the national CORE. The national CORE results show the level of substance use at universities nationwide. They are presented for estimation purposes so that the drug use patterns at NU and LU are placed in the national context.

The pattern of use at colleges becomes a very important variable in designing better prevention programs. Misconceptions associated with categories like "casual" or "heavy" users continue to occur in drug research. There are many drug users who have used drugs very infrequently, perhaps only once. The problem with "use" is it is not necessarily a linear variable, with use increasing after onset. This study will utilize only the CORE and Survey B instruments to avoid misconceptions in measurement. The prevalence measure refers to the number of persons in a population who report using a specified drug with a designated period of time (Elliot et al, 1989). Table 4 contrasts the more problematic "ever used" category with the more recent "use in the last year" category for all the major drugs.
Table 4
Percentage of Surveyed Students Reporting Ever Having Used; Used in Past Year; Alcohol or Other Psychoactive Substances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Drug</th>
<th>ever used</th>
<th>past year</th>
<th>ever used</th>
<th>past year</th>
<th>ever used</th>
<th>past year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOBACCO</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALCOHOL</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>87.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARIJUANA</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCAINE</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMPHETAMINES</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEDATIVES</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALLUCINOGENS</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPIATES</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 'use last year' of legal drugs, alcohol and tobacco, are roughly equal at LU and NU. Both legal drugs are used substantially less by students in the national CORE. Marijuana and hallucinogens remain the most frequently used illicit drugs. The use of hallucinogens, mainly LSD, and marijuana are markedly higher at NU than the national CORE, and somewhat higher at LU than the national CORE. Among students using cocaine within the last year, when 2.2% of NU and 3.1% of LU students reported using cocaine. The use of cocaine among students in the national CORE is more substantial, 4.7% of college students report use last year. The remaining "hard drugs", amphetamines and
opiates, are used by a slightly larger percentage of students in the national CORE. The highest percentage of sedative users, 2.3%, are LU students, but the differences are not large. By far, "the drug of choice" for students is alcohol, which is discussed next.

Age Relationship to Drinking

The use of alcohol, specifically heavy drinking, by youth and the social and interpersonal problems associated with youth drinking has led to research investigating the control of underage drinking (Blane and Chafetz, 1979). Control measures involve assessing which policies will restrict the under 21 age group or "underage" group, while allowing those students older than 21 their freedoms.

Theoretical studies have advanced the importance of age and peer relations. Stephen Warr (1993) utilized the National Youth Survey and found that the amount of time spent with peers was highest for 18-year-old youth. The importance that respondents place on activities with their peers peaked at age 17. Warr found that the relevance of peers in "the life of young persons reaches its zenith in middle-to-late teens" (1993, p. 25), matching the years when their drinking is prohibited. If a common "developmental pathway" (Kandel, 1978) for underage students is used by prevention providers to avert inappropriate behaviors, then establishing positive peer networks "may hold significant opportunities for limiting problem drinking in peer-
intensive environments" (Sherwood, 1987, p. 72).

Another approach to the National Youth Study was taken by Elliot et al. (1985; 1989) who employ a non-linear analysis of age and maximum drug prevalence values. These studies attempt to understand the use, in their early years, of alcohol by delinquents. Alcohol use by peers also has been found to contribute to the amount and frequency used by college students (Granfield, 1991). If we accept the BACCHUS claim that drinking is firmly rooted in "college socializing", then drinking behavior is motivated out of group ideas which influence drinking (Gonzalez, 1986a, p. 23). As shown in Table 4, the drinking among NU and LU students is especially heavy. This "drinking culture" found at college will not change unless heavy drinking is subject to intervention, when students first arrive at college.

Underage Drinking: The Number One Youth Drug Problem

When compared with the over 21 age group, "underage" students at Northern and Lakefront drink less often within the last year. Tables 5 and 6 reveal the older age group drinks more frequently. The results of the age and drinking relationship are displayed below in two chi-square tables, Table 5 for NU and Table 6 for LU.
Table 5

NU Findings on Maturation and Drinking Within the Last Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Use by Age Group</th>
<th>Underage</th>
<th>Legal age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biweekly</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=192</td>
<td>N=204</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-sq. 27.9</td>
<td>sig. 0001</td>
<td>γ.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

LU Findings on Maturation and Drinking Within the Last Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Use by Age Group</th>
<th>Underage</th>
<th>Legal age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biweekly</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=108</td>
<td>N=146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-sq. 19.5</td>
<td>sig. 001</td>
<td>γ.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 and Table 6 confirm the significance of relationship between age group and drinking and the gamma at .4 or above confirms the relationship’s strength. Frequent drinking is greater for those students of legal age, which refutes the maturation hypothesis that students will age out of drinking and supports the "student culture" hypothesis that youth drink more after experiencing the drinking
influences found at colleges. Do Tables 5 and 6 show support for a student culture effect? Is it likely that prevention or the raising of the mandatory drinking age to twenty-one significantly effects underage student drinking? In Table 5 and Table 6 the relationship between the variables at the two universities are nearly the same, based on the Chi-square test of independence between the age of the student and drinking within the last year. The tables show the results of the two groups at LU and NU are statistically similar even though the LU and NU variables percentage distributions are not similar. In summary, the results from Tables 5 and 6 reveal drinking at LU and NU increases as students get older. The effect of student culture presumably is a major cause for the increase. The differences between younger students and older students drinking is a matter of the legal questions which face the "underage drinker" because the "age range among college students is too small to make any definite conclusions" on attitudes towards drinking (Johnson, 1973).

An additional test from the CORE is provided to supply further evidence as to whether underage students are drinking less than their older counterparts. The two-tailed test of significance is used because it allows the researcher to compare two means and describe whether they are significantly different from each other. If the means are different an alpha (α) should be .05 or less. The means
on 'friends' frequency of alcohol use' and on the frequency of having '5 or more drinks in one setting in the last two weeks', or simply, the frequency of getting drunk, were found to significantly differ at both LU and NU. A t-test for each measure reveals the following:

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Under 21</th>
<th>21 or Older</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>α=.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends often Use Alc.</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>α=.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakefront</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>α=.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends often Use Alc.</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>α=.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of Table 7 reveal a t-test on the measure '5 + drinks in the last 2 weeks' at LU suggests older students get drunk significantly more often than underage students at the α.027 level; on the measure 'friends' frequency of alcohol use' a t-test suggests older students have friends who drink significantly more often than the friends of underage students at the α.001 level of significance.

The results of a t-test on the measure '5 + drinks in the last 2 weeks' at NU, suggests older students get drunk significantly more often than underage students at the α.000 level; on the measure 'friends' frequency of alcohol use', a t-test suggests older students have friends who drink significantly more often than the friends of underage
students at the $\alpha = 0.000$ level of significance.

The effect of laws to criminalize underage drinking are important because they drive these students underground until reaching a legal age. When drinking was not restricted and viewed as deviant, more moderate drinking habit might have been displayed by college students. In examining the social correlate of age and its effect on student drinking, I can determine that the effect of age on drinking is that as age increases, drinking increases for the college students at these two schools.

Gender Relationship to Drinking

Several measures from the CORE, binge drinking, drinking frequency and friends drinking frequency examine whether male or female students drink less.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>$\alpha = .000$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends often Use Alc.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>$\alpha = .050$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freq Alc. Use Last Yr.</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>$\alpha = .031$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakefront</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binge</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends often Use Alc.</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freq Alc. Use Last Yr.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While being female has been viewed as an inhibitor of substance use, a recent comparison of 28 studies of college drinking prevalence reports a convergence among male and female students drinking (Salz and Elandt, 1988). Results
from Table 8 show testing by t-scores at NU reveal males, based on the measure '5 + drinks in the last 2 weeks', get drunk significantly more often than females at the $\alpha_{.000}$ level; a t-test on the measure 'friends' frequency of alcohol', suggests males have friends who drink significantly more often than females friends at the $\alpha_{.05}$ level; and on the measure 'frequency of alcohol use last year', a t-test suggests males drink significantly more often than females at the $\alpha_{.031}$ level. At LU none of these measures were found to be significant, suggesting that gender differences disappear at LU, although LU males still binge drink more frequently and LU females drink more often than males! Overall, being female is not a direct inhibitor to drinking frequency at LU. The relationship at LU appears to indicate a convergence between male and female drinking. Because of the higher drinking levels at NU, NU females report high levels of drunkenness within the last two weeks, which from the prevention point of view their slightly "lower" levels than male students remain disappointing.

Reporting the Effects of Prevention

During the past twenty-five years, substance use "appears to have become a part of the normal rites of passage for many America youth" (Botvin, 1990) and a subject of great concern to society (Barnes et al., 1987). College students consider drinking and drug use to be a "rite of passage" and can experience many substance abuse-related
problems as a result of their substance abuse. The aim of prevention is the reduction, delay or prevention of drug use before it has become habitual or clearly dysfunctional (Polich et al., 1984, p. 117). This study evaluates what levels of attitudinal and behavioral changes prevention has promoted among college students. This chapter examines only the prevalence of alcohol use and the subsequent effect of prevention based on student self-reports. If prevention programs have an effect, it is important to show that effect with research findings. The potential effects of prevention are best addressed using two specific hypotheses to test their subsequent results. The two hypotheses are:

HYPOTHESIS I: Are student who are more aware less likely to use alcohol than other students?

HYPOTHESIS II: Are younger students who are aware consuming less alcohol than younger unaware students?

Reviews of the literature usually report "alcohol education outcomes indicates that these interventions do little to modify individual drinking behavior" (Granfield, 1991, p. 81) or "rarely have any of these interventions had an impact on substance-use behaviors" (Botvin, 1990, p. 461). In Rubington’s (1991) study of dorms he argues that the demand for students not to drink will be difficult since most college students report their age at first use of alcohol was 13 on average. The time ordering of any changes from college prevention would be drinking first and the effects of prevention second, with the possibility of other
intervening variables. This is not to rule out a few students who might first try alcohol at college, but overwhelmingly students learn to drink prior to college. Many students are also exposed to school-based primary prevention, but many are not.

In order to assess the change effects, both attitudinal and behavioral, of prevention at NU and LU, I first focused on both samples, LU and NU, and found that 74 percent reported "never" having a prevention experience from choices listed in question 36 of Survey B. Nonetheless, 72 percent of LU students report knowledge that the university has alcohol and drug prevention policies and at NU 85 percent of students report knowledge of the university alcohol and drug prevention policies⁴. In sum, about one out of four students had prevention experiences, almost three out of four know the policies or programs exist.

The direct effects of prevention from the responses to single prevention items on the questionnaires were significantly correlated with alcohol and drug-related variables about half the time. This led me to focus on a integrated model of prevention which might produce a more significant effect. Analysis of several Chi-square tests between alcohol and drug use and the single knowledge and exposure to prevention items are displayed in Table 9.

⁴ The variable, Knowledge, is the level of knowledge that an alcohol and drug prevention policy or program exists on the campus.
Table 9

Bivariate Relationships between Knowledge and Exposure to Drug Prevention and Student Drinking Variables at LU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge N.S.*</td>
<td>5 + Drinks in Last 2 Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; favorable drug N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; favorable alc p&lt;.01 γ-.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; try drug N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; try alc p&lt;.01 γ-.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge N.S.</td>
<td>Alcohol Use in Last Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; favorable drug p&lt;.01 γ-.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; favorable alc p&lt;.001 γ-.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; try drugs N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; try alc p&lt;.01 γ-.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bivariate Relationships between Knowledge and Exposure to Drug Prevention and Student Drinking Variables at NU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge N.S.*</td>
<td>5 + Drinks in Last 2 Weeks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; favorable drugs N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; favorable alc p&lt;.05 γ-.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; try drugs p&lt;.001 γ-.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; try alc p&lt;.05 γ-.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge N.S.</td>
<td>Alcohol Use in Last Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; favorable drugs N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; favorable alc p&lt;.01 γ-.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; try drugs p&lt;.05 γ-.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educ-you &lt; try alc N.S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significance based on chi-square test. N.S. = Not Significant.
If I had gone no further than the results of single items, I would have inconclusive evidence on the effectiveness of prevention. Rather than accounting for a single source of variation on the associations between survey items, I chose to combine them into an 'integrated' model, which assumes a prevention effect becomes clearer when the items are combined. Consequently, I began developing a "prevention" variable which expressed the changes in student behaviors and knowledge from an awareness of prevention programs.

'Combined' Effect of Prevention

A combined variable was needed to measure the effects of prevention on the students who self-report a change in behaviors and knowledge. To construct such a measure, henceforth known as 'awareness', I combined the percent of students self-reporting any knowledge of prevention with those reporting any effects of prevention. The "aware" category is a combination of a student self-report on having knowledge about prevention programs and a student self-report that prevention programs have effected them by making them "less favorable toward" and "less likely to use" alcohol and drugs. In order that a student be counted as 'aware' both knowledge items and all four items on student

---

5 This required combining several survey questions, items 12a and 12c on the CORE, and items 25, 25a, 26, 26a on Survey B to compute another variable, 'Awareness' with two categories; aware and unaware. For further detail see appendices A and B.
perception of the impact of prevention on their drinking or
drug use must have been reported as having affected them.
The variable, 'aware', divides those students who report
some effectiveness of prevention and are categorized as
'aware' from those who do not fit the criteria of reporting
an effect on each measure of prevention and who are
categorized an 'non-aware'.

This "combined" index, referred to as 'awareness', is
significantly associated with the measures of college
drinking; alcohol use last year (Tables 11 and 13); 5 +
drinks in the last 2 weeks (Tables 10 and 12). Although not
denying the possibility of direct effects of separate
measures, the combined prevention variable, 'awareness',
produces a model which specifies an active process of
prevention which affected the behaviors of college students.
Remembering the aim of prevention is to "reduce, delay or
prevent" substance use, increasing the 'awareness' of
students has a significant effect on alcohol use. Data
from the following tables, Tables 10 to 13, compare the
effects of prevention on alcohol use.
Table 10

The Effect of Awareness on Student Binge Drinking in the Last 2 Weeks at NU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binge</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 x’s</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=77</td>
<td>N=331</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-sq. 7.26 sig. 05 γ .25

Table 11

The Effect of Awareness on the Frequency of Student Drinking in the Last Year at NU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infreq.</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biweekly</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=77</td>
<td>N=327</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-Sq. 13.95 sig. 01 γ .33
Table 12

The Effect of Awareness on Student Binge Drinking in the Last 2 Weeks at LU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Binge</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 x's</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-sq. 9.26 sig. 01 \( \gamma \) .48

Table 13

The Effect of Awareness on the Frequency of Student Drinking in the Last Year at LU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Not Aware</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infreq.</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biweekly</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-sq 9.35 sig. 05 \( \gamma \) .38

In these four tables, Tables 10 to 13, the relationship between drinking frequency measures and drunkenness and prevention is statistically significant at both campuses. These Chi-square tables distributions confirms the
relationship between prevention and a decrease in drinking frequency exists among 'aware' NU and LU students. In tables 10 to 13, the ongoing relationship is 'aware' NU and LU students drink or get drunk significantly less than unaware students.

These measures show a statistically significant decrease in drinking among students who report they "are less likely or less favorable to drink or use drugs" at both universities. These results indicate that prevention programs at universities, where students consider drinking a "rite of passage", can help reduce the drinking of such students. No other single measure on attitudes or experience with prevention will consistently produce the result that causes a null hypothesis of "no relationship" between the separate measures of 'alcohol use last year' and 'binge drinking' and prevention to be rejected. Tables 10 to 13 have confirmed HYPOTHESIS I, that prevention, as measured by the variable 'aware', has a significant effect on student drinking. The effect is moderate to substantial as shown by $\gamma$ strength of association between .25 and .48. This statistically significant relationship appears only when an index of prevention measures, combining attitude and knowledge, or an 'combined' model is used.

Finally, the unexpected result, introduced by the study's comparative focus on prevention at two universities, was that a nearly identical measure of the effect of
prevention exists at both LU and NU. At NU 18.9 percent of the students were categorized as 'aware' in the model measuring prevention’s effect on binge drinking. Nearly the same percent, 18.3 percent, of LU students were also categorized as 'aware' for this relationship. Similarly, the measure of frequency of drinking last year revealed 19.1 percent of NU and 17.8 percent of LU students can be categorized as 'aware'. These numbers offer evidence that these 'aware' students on both campuses can expand their social influence.

Because NU has been active in prevention for many years, the similarity in the results of 'awareness' at NU and LU were surprising and central to the question; does prevention work. It appears that the quality and scope of programming, while much broader at NU, does not produce a direct result of increasing student receptivity to the prevention message. In layman’s term, bigger does not necessarily mean better. One obvious questions is how can we resolve a lack of differences in NU and LU awareness levels? The answers are not easily forthcoming, but I assume, after conducting interviews with students who drink or use drugs and with those who are peer leaders, that cultural deviancy, as defined by prevention messages, within student culture limits the effects of prevention programs. I maintain that although awareness reaches 18 to 19 percent on certain measures of drinking, the student culture affects
the drinking frequency of the remaining 80 percent. That leaves the distribution skewed toward drinking, however it also certainly shows prevention programs have and will continue to have an impact on university students.

Measuring the student awareness of prevention and the effect of that awareness on student substance use is an attempt to present the results of survey data, not necessarily a causal ordering. Presumably their awareness will impact their current and future drinking and drug use. With regards to causal ordering, I am using only a self-report retrospective survey from a single point in time. I do not have the basis to sort out prior perceptions and this current context.

Summarizing the influence of prevention and its effect on drinking measures, I found one out of four students have had prevention experiences. Nearly one out of five at both NU and LU report they are affected by prevention.

Adding Age to the Prevention Model

Since prevention programs refer to age-restrictions on drinking, when the data is examined with age as a "control" variable a few effects of prevention change. As shown next, in Tables 14 and 15 drinking increases with 'age.'
### Table 14

The Effect of Prevention at NU on Alcohol Use in the Last Year by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Alcohol Use</th>
<th>Under 21</th>
<th>21 or older</th>
<th>Under 21</th>
<th>21 or older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>Aware</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>Aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biweekly</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x week/ Daily</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Sq./ Sig.</td>
<td>n=142</td>
<td>n=50</td>
<td>n=177</td>
<td>n=27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-sq. 12.3</td>
<td>sig.001 γ=32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-sq. - N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15

The Effect of Prevention at LU on Alcohol Use in the Last Year by Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Alcohol Use</th>
<th>Under 21</th>
<th>21 or older</th>
<th>Under 21</th>
<th>21 or older</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>Aware</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>Aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrequent</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biweekly</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x week/ Daily</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-sq./ Sig.</td>
<td>n=80</td>
<td>n=28</td>
<td>n=129</td>
<td>n=17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-sq. - N.S.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chi-sq. - N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The statistical evidence of an effect of prevention on the drinking culture at NU is significant only among younger 'aware' students who drink one third as much in the most frequent measure. There is no significant effect of 'awareness' among older NU students where the drinking culture impacts NU students.

While the age/prevention relationship is not statistically significant at LU, the "3x week/daily" drinking measure among legal age students who are unaware is twice that of the 'aware' students. Among LU underage students, only 7.5% of 'unaware' students drink "3x week/daily" and no 'aware' LU student drinks that frequently.

Summarizing the influence of prevention, the effect at LU is to "reduce, delay or prevent" alcohol use and is seen as a measure of student receptivity to the program's objectives. At NU the effect of prevention is to "delay" alcohol use until legal age. By adding age to the model, HYPOTHESIS II or prevention's effect of delaying alcohol use has been shown to work only at NU because underage students are significantly affected by awareness or this could occur because of excessive drinking among legal age students. The model with age in it does not significantly explain prevention's effect on student drinking.

Based upon the current reality of campus drinking culture, most students drink and consider alcohol to be an
important part of "good times". The change in drinking behaviors which comes from delaying drinking among college students is profound. This is reflected in three main effects; 1) students will face fewer formal sanctions if they delay drinking to age 21; 2) many problem behaviors are avoided, especially destructive behaviors which are closely associated with drinking during teenage years; and 3) delaying drinking until students are more mature. Incoming freshman are of special concern because they are affected by the existing student culture and the social reorganization in their new life. Freshmen are the group most likely to increase their drinking at the university (Perkins and Berkowitz 1986). Earlier efforts among 'aware' students to be more actively involved in campus culture might have been inhibited, today, at nearly twenty percent, they can be active. Perkins and Berkowitz have reported that "peer influences may actually result from perceptions of peer attitudes rather than from actual peer student behaviors" (1986, p. 962).

The Campus Environment - What Kind of Parties are Preferred?

In order to control college students and their behaviors drug education must focus on the environment where alcohol and drugs are used. The efficacy of prevention programs is seen when youth internalize these ideals on both the belief and attitudinal levels and incorporate them in the student culture. This drug-free
internalization represents a displacement of the drug use on
campus which is normative, recreational and peer-driven and
student perceptions must be assessed to document complex
effects of the environment on drinking and drug use. The
CORE Institute study reports:

A frequently held perception is that college students
drink or want to drink and are ambivalent about other
drugs. Some models of prevention assume there is a
critical mass of students who want to live in an
alcohol-free and drug-free environment. In order to
determine the numbers of such students, a question was
included on the CORE survey which asked whether
students would or would not prefer to have alcohol and
other drugs available and used at social events in and
around campus (Presley et al., 1993, p. 65).

This question posed by this is whether student perceive
their environment should be free of alcohol or drugs or if
they should be available. The CORE Institute reports that
"more than one third of the students preferred an alcohol-
free environment and 87 percent preferred a drug-free
environment" (Presley et al, 1993, p. 8). Table 16 shows
the percentage of NU and LU students with a preference for
an alcohol or drug-free environment in 1991-92.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance Free</th>
<th>Lakefront</th>
<th>Northern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drugs Should not be Available</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Should not be Available</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students most willing to change their environment are
found on LU's campus. Twenty-one percent of LU students are willing to have an alcohol-free environment. Many fewer NU students, only 12.2 percent, are willing to change the environment to an alcohol-free one. Smith (1989) has found a "critical mass" occurs when 20 percent of students, an appropriate number to support the learning and development of its members, want a change - in this case to an alcohol-free environment. If Smith's "20 percent" is true, based on results at LU there is a critical mass in support of alcohol-free environment. But this "critical mass" is not having much effect on LU students, 90 percent of whom drink. Summarizing the student perception of a drug-free environment, both universities have a vast majority of students preferring a drug-free environment.

Since some "models of prevention assume there is a critical mass of students who want to live in an alcohol-free and drug-free environment" (Presley et. al, 1993), I test this outcome with the variables 'Knowledge' and 'Awareness' of prevention and Table 17 demonstrates how they differ.

Table 17

Bivariate Relationships between Knowledge and Awareness of Prevention and Support for a Substance-Free Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEPENDENT VARIABLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge at NU</td>
<td>N.S.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge at LU</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness at NU</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Awareness at LU        | p<.001 γ-.6         |—Alcohol-Free Environment
Table 17 cont’d.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge at NU</th>
<th>N.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge at LU</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness at NU</td>
<td>p&lt;.01 ( \gamma = -0.55 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness at LU</td>
<td>p&lt;.01 ( \gamma = 1.0 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Level of significance based on chi-square test of statistical significance; N.S. = Not Significant.

The measure, 'Knowledge' does not affect the desire for change in environment, however the measure, 'Awareness' does. The exception is 'aware' NU students do not significantly change their preferences for an alcohol-free environment. The drinking culture at NU negates the effect of prevention; to reduce, delay or prevent substance use.

This shows the importance of the contextual factor, whether or not the college environment will be one where alcohol and drug use is open and acceptable. The party subculture is a social world which exerts influence upon the entire student community. Consciousness raising with students ultimately relies on attention the prevention programs receive in the university setting and whether that attention impacts on students with abusive drinking patterns. The remainder of this chapter focuses on those missed by prevention’s efforts.

**Binge Drinking**

The abusive drinking patterns which are evident on campuses, referred to as "binge" drinking, is operationalized on the CORE questionnaire as students who drink five or more
drinks in one sitting in the last two weeks. Rabow and Neuman (1984) observed college students have a tendency to binge drink and specific drinking practices are associated with social living groups, such as fraternities and dormitory groups (Berkowitz and Perkin, 1987; Igra and Moos, 1984). Many college students view their social life and drinking as one in the same. The survey results indicate binge drinking is significant problem at Northern and serves as a reminder of the university’s drinking culture. When comparing NU and LU as variables crosstabulated with binge drinking to determine whether a statistically significant relationship between the universities and binge drinking exists, a Chi-square test of independence was used. The results of the Chi-square test, at Chi-sq. 52.6 p.<000, find there is a significant relationship between universities and binge drinking which is statistical significant for the 1991-92 year. Results of binge drinking of NU and LU students are displayed in Table 18.

Table 18

Frequency of Binge Drinking Episodes: NU and LU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5+Drinks/ last 2 Weeks</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 times</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column %</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-sq. 52.62</td>
<td>Sig.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Binge drinking is a statistically significant problem on the NU campus. The evidence points to NU's party school reputation as a well-deserved. About 60 percent of NU students are frequent binge drinkers. Because one third of Northern students binge drink three or more times in the last two weeks, Northern binge drinking can be categorized as a severe problem when compared to Lakefront binge drinking, where only 39.4 per cent of students binge drink once or more in the last 2 weeks. Only 9.7 per cent of Lakefront's students report binge drinking 3 or more times in the last 2 weeks. A safeguard for campuses is to actively intervene with repeat binge drinkers, whose excessive drinking is related to many of the problem behaviors on campus.

Preventing Drinking and Drug Use in Student Groups

An argument could be made that distinct student cultures exist at the two universities. At NU socializing with peers who drink and use drugs produces the significant differences in drinking and drug use among their students 'aware' and 'non-aware students'. Binge drinking and other "drug" problems on college campuses can be better explained by determining if students report their friends drink or use drugs and then pressure others to drink and use drugs. These two measures are examined next. These results are given in Table 19 by those who are 'aware' and 'non aware'.
Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Unaware</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northern</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured by others use Drugs</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>α=.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured by others to Drink</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends frequency Alcohol</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>α=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends frequency Drugs</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>α=.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lakefront</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured by others use Drugs</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressured by others to Drink</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends frequency Alcohol</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends frequency Drugs</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>α=.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19 shows NU results of a t-test on the measure 'pressed by others to use drugs' suggests a significant difference among aware and non-aware students at the α.006 level; a t-test on being 'pressed by others to drink' suggests no significant difference among aware and non-aware students; a t-test on 'friends' frequency of alcohol use' suggests a significant difference among aware and non-aware students at the α.001 level; and a t-test on 'friends frequency of drug use' suggests a significant difference among aware and non-aware students at the α.001 level.

The LU results of t-tests on the measure 'pressed by others to use drugs'; on being 'pressed by others to drink' and on 'friends frequency of alcohol' use suggests no significant difference among aware and non-aware students; and finally on 'friends frequency of drug use' a t-test suggests a significant difference among aware and non-aware students at the α.027 level.
In summary, there is persistent evidence of "binge" drinking and drug experimentation occurs on a widespread scale in spite of the university itself exerting social controls. Predictably, drinking groups have significant influence in negating the sanctions on college campus. At NU those students who are 'aware' of the pressure being applied are significantly affected in the outcome of whether to succumb to the pressures, except among those being pressured to drink. This may again indicate that drinking at NU is so prevalent that students are not aware of the obvious pressure to drink. At LU the effect is not there, so no speculation is made as to how students deal with the pressures applied by other students. The social context of drinking at NU shows that drinking to be associated with "good times" and other students are a powerful source of influence that promote and support substance use.

**Conclusion: Evaluation of the Sample and Prevention Programs**

Gerardo Gonzalez (1986a) has stated various attempts at evaluating the efficacy of university education and prevention programs have been hampered by poor evaluation techniques. For Gonzalez (1986b, p. 27), this raises a:

legitimate question concerning long-term evaluation of campus education programs must be whether the campus environment (the contextual factor) is changing significantly as a result of alcohol education. And further, if positive changes are taking place in the campus environment, is there any indication that these changes are accompanied by a reduction of excessive alcohol consumption and related problems on campus.

Gonzalez, using limited data, found current trends indicate
changes are occurring because of prevention on campus which leads to a reduction of excessive alcohol consumption and related problems. This chapter provides results from the surveys at NU and LU which reflect a positive change in the campus environment. Gonzalez, above, asks what changes are occurring? Here, it was discovered that older students at Lakefront and Northern binge drink in greater proportion than their younger successors. This could be attributed to knowing much less about prevention or the age restrictions placed on alcohol. However, these findings must be investigated by prevention providers to discover the reasons why the older students are not modifying their drinking habits. While now they drink legally, they are binge drinking more frequently. Perhaps, this group is ignored by prevention mechanisms because the university is not obligated "legally" to that age group.

Summary

This chapter initially profiled the background of the Northern and Lakefront students and then found important differences exist in drinking among female and underage groups, both variables are found to inhibit substance abuse. Both of these inhibiting effects can be demonstrated at NU, while drinking among LU females is converging with males levels. Males show no sign of maturing out of heavy college drinking. Gender only seemed to inhibit very heavy drinking at NU. It can be shown that gender differences can be at
the same time an inhibitor to the frequency of drinking and a progenitor of social activities of a campus. One finding from the interview data at NU, shows women who live together off-campus enjoy throwing parties because of the "security of being in control of the situation". The opposite effect is reported by women attending fraternity parties, where women feel a "loss of control".

On all drinking measures Northern students are more likely to drink on average more drinks, get drunk more often and to smoke more marijuana. Since the dependent variable in the study is alcohol and drug use, the fact remains that NU students use all drugs in greater proportion to LU students using any number of independent variables measures, especially those associated with prevention.

The most hopeful sign of the effect of prevention was found in the variable, 'Awareness', which indicates an active effect on alcohol and drug use. Prevention is reported to be a factor in reducing alcohol use among as many as 18 percent of students at NU and LU. Therefore, in the view of this researcher, the implication from students reporting they are less likely or less favorable to drink or use drugs because of prevention shows they prefer a change in existing culture which is a significant indicator that positive changes in alcohol and drug use occur because of campus-based prevention. Similarly, the fact that prevention can delay alcohol use among those students under
the age of twenty-one at NU and LU again indicates younger students prefer a modification of the campus drinking culture. From the early 1990s when the CORE was first used to the end of the decade and beyond, a pattern should emerge to test these very preliminary results and measure the ongoing effects of prevention.

A comparison of the drug prevention efforts at these two Catholic universities may produce the positive results that can assist in decreasing substance abuse on other college campuses. Rules concerning illegal use of alcohol among underage groups and the violation of restrictions on alcohol and drugs in university housing must provide students with information and some reasonable guidelines in order to achieve any control on their behaviors. Efforts at prevention which do not inform students of these "important needs" are doomed to fail.
I don't have a drinking problem.
I drink till I fall down, no problem.

LU Student Tee-Shirt

Correlates and risk factors, such as being 'nonaware', associated with heavy drinking and drug abuse among college students were described in Chapter IV. This chapter will describe the problem behaviors of individuals or groups of student drinkers and drug users and controls imposed on their behaviors by prevention programs. In addition, this chapter addresses some of the legal, educational and health problems resulting from the alcohol and drug use of college students.

Social Control and Prevention

Richard Clayton and Anne Cattarello, leaders in prevention research, write, "Prevention intervention research is a 'new' field" (1991, p. 29). As a practice, prevention, its results and efficacy, would be considered as mere "wishful" thinking unless it is subjected to a social science analysis to lend it scientific credibility and measure significance. A useful conceptual model of drug education must focus on the contextual environment where alcohol and drugs are used. The efficacy of prevention
programs is seen when youth internalize these ideals on both the belief and attitudinal levels and incorporate them in the student culture. This drug-free internalization represents the displacement of the drug use on campus which is normative, recreational and peer-driven (Robins and Johnson, 1992).

With many serious alcohol and drug-problems occurring on college campuses, prevention programs have a great deal to accomplish. They identify this normative alcohol and drug use as the main problem faced by college students and design prevention programs to "benefit" students. According to prevention research Gilbert Botvin (1990), approaches based on social learning theory and problem behavior theory have demonstrated effectiveness in reducing substance-use behaviors. However, students do not receive the same exposure to the prevention "benefit". Prevention, unlike other social experiments, cannot be carried out in a controlled fashion and has limits on exact measurement of its effects.

The Symbolism of the "Healthy Student Community"

Until recently educational control has been accomplished by employing mainly moral guidance on an individual basis based on individual problems. The change in the law of minimum age of legal purchase has had profound effects on the student culture. First, it has shifted the emphasis from individual controls to controlling "high risk"
groups. Second, it established a "drug-free" normative context within a student culture adverse to these norms. When government redefined young adults who drink as law violators, the colleges were charged with controlling and modifying student behaviors in a "high risk" environment. The third effect of the law was to view student drinking as a special case of status degradation based on age grading.

Geertz reminds us that, "Culture meanings are stored in symbols" (1973, p. 27). The Undergraduate Catalog at Northern University informs students that Northern "is committed unreservedly to open and free inquiry and to the development of the student as a total human person" (1992-93, p. 5). In their catalogs and new student orientations, universities invoke symbolism. Hallways in universities become "hallowed hallways", the colleges themselves "citadels of higher learning". Symbolism is crucial to prevention where concerns are discussed in the language of "health compromising" behaviors and the "healthy student community" (Gonzalez, 1989; Burns, 1989). Thus educational control is usually couched in the symbolic language of concern.

Prevention providers insist on developing a "healthy student community", but their narrow intention is compliance with the legal constraints from various government agencies. Ronald Glick, a sociologist who studies prevention, states, "Encouraged by federal funding and spurred by new federal
regulations, college campuses throughout the country are giving increased attention to the problem of student substance abuse" (Glick, 1993, p. 1). Prevention services, including values clarification, peer counseling, self-esteem enhancement, the appropriate expressions of emotions and awareness of the severity of alcohol and drug problems are building blocks for the "healthy student community".

University Culture

The present effort is not undertaken to examine youth culture, although the student culture and youth culture are related, but to compare Northern and Lakefront students who disagree with, or at least disregard, what is being told to them by the prevention providers. As the minimum age laws create a new underage status offender, prevention likewise stimulates the development of subcultural adaptations at the university. Students contend this authority violates their "rights to drink" and creates the tension which drives students into subcultures and undermines the "positive" prevention experiment (Rubington, 1991; Burns, 1989). Pro-deviant students reject this intervention and try new lines of action in response to the challenges of prevention and "drug-free" campuses. Groups at the "edge of the culture" including, among others, Slackers, fraternities and rugby teams are linked to "risky behaviors", and will be examined in the remainder of the chapter.

Faith, an NU Slacker, is not troubled by her
unconventional reputation. She felt that other NU students tend to think she takes a lot of drugs, saying, "Actually for the most part, I really don't care what anybody thinks about me. Because if anyone really cares, they'll get to know me and they'll find out firsthand whether I do that kind of thing or not". Faith intends to do "her own thing" but she and others are targeted by control agents and prevention providers who regard their unconventional behaviors as either illegal or suspect.

How does control come from drug education programs? Control rarely begins on college campuses, which value their attractiveness and openness to new ideas. However, control in education sometimes involves educators. Former Secretary of Education and then Drug Czar, William Bennett, wrote:

Though the legislated mandate of the Office of Drug Control policy excludes alcohol (since it is not a controlled substance under the law), it must be recognized that alcohol is still the most widely abused substance in America. It is illegal for young people to purchase or consume alcohol. Prevention programs must obviously take this fact into account (Office of National Drug Control Policy, 1989, p. 48).

Secretary Bennett employs the attributes of power from his Washington D.C. office to advance the drug control policies on prevention programs. Stricter control of student behaviors, like the prevention programs themselves, are imposed by those already fighting the war on drugs.

Various audiences such as community organizations, government, public policy makers, foundations, and the scientific community culturally reproduce their values at
universities. Ernest Boyer, of The Carnegie Foundation, stated that goals of universities "flow from the needs of society and also from the needs of the persons seeking education" (1987, p. 58). Jencks and Riesman state bluntly, that "The central purpose of a college can thus be defined as socialization" (1968, p. 28).

A visible objective of prevention is the re-socialization of students to the needs of a changing society and to the values of the moral entrepreneurs in the drug war. Students at colleges have previously resisted changes by social control agents. One writer described the attitude of late nineteenth century students as forming "a society where they did not make or enforce the rules. The world that some of them created -college life- was their effort to protect themselves from the harsh and seemingly arbitrary authority of their faculty" (Horwitz, 1990, p. 12). What passed for college life in this earlier historic period is today tinged with new "deviant" connotations, i.e; irresponsible, illegal and uncontrollable. In the place of earlier social control agents, universities today use prevention controls and drug-free ideology. Recall, cultural deviancy theory proposes that "deviants" have a different value system (Kandel and Davies, 1991). It is the university which can withhold from the "deviant" students access to the better prospects in society.

University culture, according to George Kuh and
develops from an interplay between the external environment and salient institutional features, such as an institution's historical roots ... the academic program ... cultural artifacts ... distinctive themes that make up the institution's ethos; and the contributions of individual actors, such as a charismatic president or innovative academic dean (1988, p. v).

The environment may vary from laboratories at M.I.T. to the open spaces at the University of Southern California. The academic programs can vary from Anthropology to Zoology. Student use of alcohol and drugs will vary from university culture to university culture. Students both shape and are shaped by their university. Some college students aspire to academic success, others are earnest about varsity or intramural athletics, and others prefer to use alcohol and drugs, often in combination with other interests. Students themselves, not administrators, claims ownership of alcohol and drug issues in college life.

Sociological studies show "peers' behaviors and expectations provide dramatic points of reference in building one's own social identity" (Glassner and Loughlin, 1987, p. 158). The sociogenic model discussed by Glassner and Loughlin (1987) proposes youth drug use is normative, recreational and peer-driven within their "social world". Others find that building one's own social identity should conform to society's need. According to delinquency theorist Howard Kaplan, an individual's important needs are: satisfied by conforming to expectations that are
applicable to those who share his social identities, and that the satisfaction of salient needs is threatened by deviating from social identity-appropriate expectations (1984, p. 142).

For prevention providers it is important to assess the variation in drug use within the student culture. Does it produce moderate or excessive drinking or drug use? Can adjustments be made to decrease the alcohol and drug use? Prevention programs will likely impact some users without changing the values and interaction patterns of the well-defined subcultures on campus. Because the student culture is often inaccessible to those in authority, this isolation allows students to violate conventional standards. Impacting these "deviant" patterns and changing the values of the student culture will be the greatest challenge to the success of prevention.

Risk, Recklessness and Prevention Strategy

One young NU student portrayed her friends standing out from other "identical" students:

When you see the people who hang out at Vintages walking on the street around NU, in a way you can pick them out just by what they look like. By what they’re wearing. Long hair on a guy. Not very concerned with his clothes. Women don’t go there with a ton of makeup to make sure they look a hundred percent right. They go how they feel. Its kind of different from the rest of the people at NU (M. Rivers, personal communication, March 17, 1992).

To join the NU student group at Vintages one must be young, pro-alcohol and pro-drug. Recognizable to others, students in the Vintage group, drink pitchers of beer, smoke marijuana in the back entrance while listening to the pro-
hallucinogenic "Grateful Dead" band. Without performing these patterned activities, students cannot fit into the Vintage group. Membership, as sociologist Rosabeth Kantor (1977) put it, has a cost. The "costs" of membership in the larger society can be too deterministic for many students who are unconcerned with the wider society which they perceive to be "uncool". For the students at Vintages to conform to the conventional values of the society would require a crucial shift away from membership in college drinking groups. The individual who did not experience college drinking would be abnormal (Durkheim, 1966).

The 'groupiness' of students at Vintages distinguishes them from other NU students (Warr, 1993). However, it is too simplistic to view this group as separate from other groups on campus and label it a delinquent subculture, as Kaplan defines such groups. Labelling attached to drug-related behaviors is becoming acceptable on the drug-free campus. On the group level, students face a disruption of their push toward independence and adulthood because of raising of the age of legal purchase of alcohol to 21 years of age. This ties the various campus groups together in a sustainable deviant response to the social disruption of their culture. The student reaction to such changes is the strengthening of a "party culture" where they "flirt with illegal behaviors in their collective search for fun" (Warr, 1993, p. 38). Despite prevention effects, excessive alcohol
use by NU and LU students results in a great deal of undesirable conduct, the conduct deemed illegal and uncontrollable.

Undesirable Conduct: Structural Context of Drinking

In the university setting, students are wary of the proscriptive demands from control agents, but are also sensitive to the expectations that the society has for them. This is especially pronounced with fraternities who share some similar concerns with their host, the university. The institutions of higher education inflict economic uncertainty upon students for future rewards. At the same time the state is "policing desires" by inflicting punishment on their substance use. When drinking laws are directed at students, it is not only students who are affected, their culture changes with the introduction of new laws. To Rod Builder of the Acca Sacca fraternity, his job as the president of his fraternity is to isolate the behaviors which can cost their members their charter. He draws the line at drug use which:

is handled a little bit more stringently than an alcohol violation or a alcohol problem. We will not tolerate whatsoever at all, if we find out it is there, the chapter will be closed. (IRWIN - So really your looking at the legality of it.) Correct. Same as the alcohol. That is all viewed as one area of the fraternities risk management guidelines. Alcohol, drug abuse, each fraternity has position statements on them. We view that as the same situation as far as the disciplinary action goes we are a little bit more harsh on the drug infraction. Right or wrong that's kind of the way we do it. I guess society views drugs as a little bit more dangerous than just plain alcohol (R. Builder, personal communication, April 20, 1992).
Whether or not students agree with the drinking laws, if they drink they belong to the "new class" of criminals. These "criminals" are found at the "Slacker houses", in the dorms or anywhere college parties are held. Their attitudes range from disagreement with, or at least disregard for, the guidance of prevention providers to flirting "with illegal behaviors in their collective search for fun" (Warr, 1993). During their time at college, these students will be asked to conform to the rules or face possible discipline.

Most prevention measures and sanctions are mild, inefficient and weak forms of control, perhaps because they are not very threatening when compared to society’s formal penalties (Nuweer, 1990). The enforcement of the legal drinking age of 21 has had very little impact on underage drinking, although bars around both Lakefront and Northern are raided by police for underage patrons. In the case of a DUI offense, a student will lose their license and may drive without a license. The DUI sanctions may not, however, significantly affect the Slackers who have no running cars. In general, the university’s codes of discipline are not motivation enough for students to change their behaviors. Disorderly underage drinking continues in off-campus apartments or fraternity houses at colleges everywhere.

Beyond Pranks: The Recklessness of Campus Culture

The litany of complaints about student drinking at both Northern and Lakefront include the unfortunate fact that
students have been injured or killed in drinking-related accidents. These incidents, added to complaints about the general drunken behaviors of students, demonstrate the need for campus-based prevention. The alcohol and drug-related injuries and problem behaviors on campus, as shown later in Table 20, are similar to those in society. Statistics on drinking connect alcohol with one half of the 46,386 automobile accident deaths, from 20 to 36 percent of suicide victims have histories of alcohol abuse or were drinking prior to death and alcohol is the major factor in accidental falls, fires and burns (N.I.A.A.A.; Seventh Special Report to the U.S. Congress on Alcohol and Health - 1990).

Since serious progressive illnesses are only associated with prolonged heavy drinking educators often believe that young, strong students are not diseased just drunk, not at risk, rather habitually intoxicated and within twenty-four hours they are as good as new. The college prevention message implies more damage. Health problems do occur, for example one minority student at LU started drinking as an adolescent to "belong to a neat group". She reported her heavy drinking led to a damaged larynx and a permanent speech problem, in the end she quit drinking and hopes someday to quit smoking cigarettes. As the influence of prevention become stronger, the belief is students will make better decisions thereby decreasing the quantity and frequency of injuries. Continued prevention guidance
perhaps can adequately address these recurring situations, for instance that 11.7 percent of NU students vandalize property or pull fire alarms, compared to only 1.6 percent of LU students, while drinking or using drugs.

Sensational incidents of alcohol abuse on campuses receive widespread media attention and stereotype student behaviors. Media presentations about alcohol abuse focus on statistics about the college student behavioral problems without considering whether or not there is an empirical link between the two, stripping fact from its original context. For example, Money magazine, reported that a junior at Indiana State University was killed while "elevator surfing" (Money College Guide 1992, p. 12). This sport is described as a new campus fad where students ride atop elevators and jump on to the next elevator located in hi-rise dorms. A Florida paper reported that the University of Florida's O'Connell Athletic Center, nicknamed the "Condom", is plagued by intoxicated "moonwalkers" who seek thrills from walking or bouncing on top of the stadium's inflated dome.

Prevention expert John Swisher (1993) refers to the alcohol-related injuries, deaths and sensational events as "critical incidents" and advises universities to use these events to stimulate drug awareness. However, these "critical incidents" fuel the negative reactions of parents and state governors who mobilize campaigns to change the
university's "party" image or restrict university resources. The next section will examine why the settings of large events, student athletic clubs and student bars negate the social controls of prevention.

Social Control and Bar Behavior

In the past when the breweries, universities and the bars near campus "ran" some campus activities together, they might have jointly attempted to control the students. Today university restrictions no longer allow the formerly close relationship with the alcohol industry to survive, but students preserve their prior, "bacchanalia", intemperate standards. The bar settings; i.e., the sports bar, the pick-up bar or the dance bar, caters to the student interest in socializing by offering an escape. At such settings, students observe the support given the dominant "drinking" culture of the university. One college researcher contends that "dominant student cultures may or may not reflect the values and ideals of the institution as a whole, but they nevertheless exert a significant influence on an institution's culture" (Clark, 1970).

"In Birra Veritas": The Naked Slide

The "Volcano Bar" is across the street from NU's campus and is known as a "senior" bar. The Volcano smells of vomit and the wet concrete floor is sticky with spilled beer. A warning sign hangs at the Volcano Bar which reads, "The Volcano and the Northern City Police Department strictly
prohibit beer slides, violators will be prosecuted". The message took awhile to get the NU students' attention and by the time it did, NU had become famous for the Naked Slide. I had heard about this extraordinary event while in the initial stages of this study. Everyone had a story on this bizarre behavior which had attracted reporters and camera crews to a student tavern across the street from campus. In the Volcano Bar, students will dump their beers on the floor and spontaneously one or more of them take their clothes off, run and slide as far as they can down the floor. The longest slide received some prize. Crowds both pressure and cheer the participants.

Talking to the Para-professional students (PPAs) at the NU Counseling Center, I wanted to learn more about the Naked Slide. Betty spoke up when I asked about the Naked Slide, if it happened and when it happened, and if anybody had been to a Naked Slide at the Volcano? Betty said,

I wasn't participating, but I was there, yeah. I think this guy actually made it a habit. He had done it before, I don't think it was the first time he had ever done it. Yeah, I was standing right there. (To Cameron) I agree with you I wouldn't want to touch any part of my body to anything in the Volcano. This guy didn't seem to mind. It was probably like one in the morning on either a Friday or Saturday, it wasn't a weeknight. I don't remember anymore. I remember he had a hockey shirt on. I didn't even pay attention, all of a sudden I turned around and looked and people said "look at him, look at him, the Naked Slide". I was like, wow.

The reputation of the Naked Slide spread until the Northern City police had to crack down on the Slide because all types of people, including students from Lakefront City,
were coming up to see it. Betty confirmed this, saying;

That's why they don't do it anymore. Because a girl did it and the police came. It was a big deal. It was in the summer and that's probably why you don't know about it. I was still living in Northern City and it was all in the newspapers, everything that a girl did it. And the police arrested her and she had a 600 dollar fine. Now they don't do it anymore, I wasn't there when she did it. (IRWIN - The police were in the bar when she did it?) I guess what happened was what I heard and what they said in the paper was that she did it and someone pushed her outside for a second and she ran back in. I don't know if there were cops just sitting in the area or something or if they knew something was going on and they came in and arrested her. (IRWIN - and the bartender?) I don't know, I think the bar got a fine too. I know she got a 600 dollar fine, I don't know what happened to the bar, all I know is they have big signs now, "You can no longer do Naked Beer Slides".

The Volcano was the favorite hangout of the students and place where you find excessive drinking. When I first walked into the Volcano, I saw a large man, obviously drunk, crash to the floor straight down from a bar stool. At the Volcano, many of the seniors have their own beer mug hanging on a hook and they receive a discount on beer served in their mugs. Both beer and the Volcano have a very strong impact on NU's reputation, on and off this campus. A famous alumni, now associated with a network comedy show, jokes he spent his "senior year" at the Volcano. The structural context of drinking can be observed at this traditional "student bar" where the NU student culture flaunts very risky behaviors.

Even when bars close and drinking mugs are returned to the shelf, it is still "party time" for many college
students who drink excessively at late night "after-bars". In their "community of fellow-adventurers" (Cohen, 1955), NU students view "after-bars" drinking as legitimate social events which start after the 2 a.m. bar closing and last till early morning. Cameron, as the PPA, said:

Students will buy kegs and they will not tap them until after the bars are closed at 2 a.m. and parties will go until 8 in the morning sometimes. With that students, have sometimes been drinking since 6 in the afternoon. And they’ll continue to drink at the bars and then go to the after-bars, and you get to the point where students are inebriated and have no idea what is going on. I think a lot of sexual harassment occurs at those places too (C. Johnson, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

However, Cameron, as a Slacker, and Gary had combined both alcohol and LSD at an "after-bar". Gary told the story:

The last time I got really sick Cameron and I had dropped acid, went to this party we were watching Saturday Night Live. So we went to this party. You know when you’re on acid the effects of drinking are far less felt. So we just kept drinking and drinking and by the time that acid hit us, we were completely wasted. It was far too late to do anything about it. So after the party we went to an afterbar at your place and we drank until about six in the morning. We got to his house. You were looking like you were going to die and I probably was too. We went back to his place and we were moving so it was okay. But as soon as we got to his doorway, I guess I just passed out and he had to drag me up a flight of stairs and put me to bed (G. Skelly, personal communication, April 15, 1992).

As a result, Gary said they both had the "hangover from hell" the next day. Accordingly, prevention at NU must develop strategies for heavier drinkers who frequent bars, after-bars, fraternity and apartment parties.

Social Control at Social Events

Universities and drinking are very much associated by
the rituals around drinking; most noteworthy are the spring break ritual and college football games. Many student activities are transformed after student drinking influences their original purpose of athletic or social events. Carla, a senior at NU who works for Miller Brewing and a local bar, was convinced that university sponsored events should have alcohol, saying, "dry campuses are sending the wrong message. Because when people do get a hold of it, they do it so much more".

A Harvard study found students "do it" more. They surveyed "1,669 college freshman (and) found a radical increase in students drinking to get drunk since 1977. Many women binge drink as well" (Matthews, 1993). Biber et al. has found men are much more likely to drink outdoors and at athletic events (1980). Females prefer drinking in structured social situations and males in the aforementioned social environments (Engs and Hanson, 1986).

There has also been a rise in alcohol-related disturbances on campus in the last several years. Today, it does not seem unusual that violence affects college students as it does any other segment of the society. However, towns, municipalities and police forces, not just students, are put at risk by the combination of alcohol and student events. Heavy drinking leads to a disturbance at these campus events such as the University of Michigan's 1992 loss to Duke in the college basketball finals, which was reported
in the following account:

The police fought a crowd gathered near the campus of the University of Michigan after the university's basketball team lost its national championship to Duke University. Police officers fired tear gas into the crowd and arrested five people. Less than an hour after the end of the game, mounted police officers wearing riot gear tried to disperse about five hundred people. The police said the tear gas was used when intoxicated fans threw bottles and refused to leave the area. *(Chronicle of Higher Education, April 15, 1992)*.

When college crowds gather for the purpose of consuming alcohol at an event, many times alcohol becomes the precipitating cause for police or security intervention. A little more than a week after the Michigan "riot", Southern Illinois University held their annual Springfest event which drew 10,000 people, many of whom drank and used other drugs to enjoy the music. Again a disturbance was reported;

Over the weekend, 95 Springfest celebrators were arrested, mostly for alcohol related offenses. Memorial Hospital of Carbondale treated 34 people, most of them for minor injuries. "There were a lot of keggers (beer parties) last night" Police Chief Don Strom said Saturday. He said officers patrolling the strip of bars along South Illinois Avenue were targets for beer bottles and bottle rockets. Strom said early reports that police had used tear gas grenades were incorrect *(Chicago Tribune April 27, 1992, p. 1, 10)*.

Southern Illinois University must wish its $600,000 a year budget for its Wellness Center, which includes drug and alcohol counseling, would reduce this type of behavior. It seems anywhere college students go, alcohol abuse is associated with them. Disturbances can occur at the beach and resort towns the college students flock to for Spring
Break and in a matter of minutes these events change from their intended purpose and become 'unhealthy' activities. Students view these activities and the drinking which accompanies them as a "time-out" or some needed socializing and relaxing among peers.

Social Control and Sports Clubs

One on-campus group which has earned a well-deserved reputation as a "drinking group" is rugby intramural teams. College rugby teams, or clubs, are known for their rituals, sexist drinking songs and errant behavior and are the epitome of "drinking groups". Sociologist Stephen Schacht played a season with a Midwest college rugby team and portrays them as crudely "exemplifying masculinity" by playing hard and partying hard (1992). The NU students, who themselves party hard, mythologize the escapades of the NU Rugby Club. LU also has a rugby club, which hosts parties nearly every week where underage students are served. At LU little concern has been generated about rugby "highjinks", but the experiences with rugby at NU may cause those at LU to review the risks involved with rugby teams. Cameron told me about the NU Rugby Club's "initiation":

Part of rugby initiation or someone’s birthday is they have to go to a bar naked. I remember ... them in the sprinklers in front of the union, on Wales Street without any clothes on. Naked and no clothes to be seen anywhere, he didn’t get there and then get undressed. I’ve been to parties where men and WOMEN have been walking around naked. They are usually so drunk that they’re not really conscious, they’re not aware of what is going on around them. It’s just very offensive. (C. Johnson, personal communication, April
7, 1992).

Schacht (1992) finds rugby players rituals "maintain male cultural hegemony", but a female student at NU put it in simpler terms, "Men are exhibitionists at Northern". These rituals are associated with reckless behaviors and are "time-outs" when alcohol is ingested and certain behaviors are accepted which without alcohol are unacceptable (MacAndrew and Edgerton, 1969). For example, a rugby initiate can be degraded in a drunken "rite of initiation" ceremony, which Cliff, a NU Slacker, described:

The rugby team gathered around a barrel (keg) and they're all drinking and that was fine. And then one went on their porch, which was about six feet high, and with their full 24 oz. rugby mug of beer and he drops his pants and start chugging, while the others are yelling at him. (C. Pence, personal communication, April 8, 1992).

Everyone on the NU campus had an opinion on rugby players, as they did the Naked Slide and drinking. Confined to play on the field the rugby team's bravado may not cause harm, however eventually the NU rugby players get into trouble with their "play" off the field. They perform a ritual known as the "crowning the rugby queen" which involves unsolicited serenading of a women who happens to be in a rugby bar with what first appears to be a song of praise to their "rugby queen". Cameron discussed how these events escalate:

Two years ago, the rugby team was brought up on charges by a girl. The NU student government dealt with part of it. The rugby team was disbanded for that year and part of the next year.(IRWIN - Was it a gang rape?) No,
but it was close. It happened in a bar and they had just won a game and Vintages was their hangout for awhile. But they picked what they call the "Rugby Queen". And they put this girl on a stool and they tried to undress her and they were yelling insults and being very derogatory sexually to her. It was so scarring to her that she dropped out of the university and now goes to school in Illinois. But she brought charges against them and the team was disbanded (C. Johnson, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

When university teams or clubs are faced with these types of problems, justice is often meted out in peculiar ways. Justice is convoluted because of campus traditions, some mutual responsibility and undoubtedly the part alcohol plays in these events confuses charges being brought against anyone. What is certain is in an environment where alcohol and drugs are used, be it Vintages, after a rugby game or in the dorms at LU, there are great risks of sexual assaults on female students. Sexist rituals, date rape and damaged social relations have been reported at LU and NU.

This study finds the social context of college drinking leads to the unruly social event and disorderly conduct. The principal offenders engage in deviant activities off-campus in uncontrolled clubs and taverns. Kuh reports very little is known about "the influence of ... off-campus environments and the physical setting and cultural elements of campus life on alcohol and other drug use" (1990, p. 44).

These gaps in prevention policy must be addressed to change student behaviors and help prevent the exploitation of those already under the influence of alcohol and drugs. Universities have the greatest control with on-campus
students, whose alcohol and drug use is discussed next.

Social Control and University Residence Halls

Sociologist Earl Rubington maintains "campus alcohol problems raise questions for sociological theory" (1991, p. 374). The main problem Rubington (1991) found is most college students under 21 had started drinking at age 13, long before college. Historically tolerated, permitting alcohol use by students living in residence halls is rapidly disappearing because of age restrictions and insurance liabilities.

Depriving dormitory residents of their "right to drink" is the job of the residence hall staff. Lakefront and Northern Resident Assistants (R.A.s) are complemented by student affairs staffs who comprehend the scope of alcohol abuse problems in the student culture. They recognize that the behavior of students change when alcohol is present. For example, at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst, "Demonstration Project" trained staff to plan non-drinking parties and trained peers to confront alcohol abusers and suggest they seek treatment and stop their obnoxious behaviors (Kraft, 1988, p. 44). Some "student affairs staff have a broad view of higher education and understand how in-class and out-of-class experiences are complementary" (Kuh and Whitt, 1991, p. 259). Kuh insists that student affairs staff:

are the heart of the early warning system and safety nets that signal the need to assist student who are in
academic, social, emotional or physical difficulty. These same supports encourage students to take responsibility, take risks, and learn about themselves as well as those different from themselves (1991, p. 259).

Residence assistants do supervise students in these "high-risk" situations, however this intervention does not prevent problems from reoccurring in the dorms. Kraft reports dormitory damages rose in a five year period from $6.70 per resident in 1975-76 to $19.24 in 1979-80 (1988, p. 39).

Rubington addressed the question of non-enforcement of policy and inadequate social control at several dormitories at an unspecified university by examining the students' perceptions of sanctions (1990; 1991; 1993). His studies found a decrease in the numbers of infractions for alcohol use in dorms from 1989 to 1992. He studied the variance in resident assistant enforcement of restrictions on alcohol by rating their enforcement. If the R.A.s applying the rules become "overenforcers", students can move their deviance to another area more sympathetic to drinking where the residents can hide things behind closed doors. Rubington labels this "exporting deviance". He argues that overall, the norms in university dorms are "MYOB" - mind your own business. If students maintain this "etiquette" of expected behaviors, most R.A.s will respond to alcohol use by selectively enforcing or "busting" those who have the most flagrant violations. R.A.s can "teach" residents to break rules with discretion or selectively enforce, overenforce or
underenforce the rules as R.A./resident relations evolve during the school year (1990).

Father Frank Lenihan, the NU Vice-President, discussed NU’s problems with residence halls, saying;

All residence hall policies are built around the policy that all underage students are not to drink. But realistically we certainly know we’re not going to end underage drinking no matter what we’re going to try to do. There are still students who are going to experiment and there are some who are going to do more than experiment. We’d like in the ideal world that there would not be underage drinking. But I don’t think its realistic to say that a university can come up with policies that will eliminate underage drinking. I think its far better to say education programs have to be built in. And in the residence hall, questions have to be raised in students’ minds about how they are using alcohol, how do they integrate sexuality into their lives. We deal with a lot of the negative consequences of excessive drinking whether its people getting hurt, date-rape situations, or simply embarrassing situations for the students. But officially, yes, we’d say state law, says this. (F. Lenihan, personal communication, April 10, 1992).

Father Lenihan surely understands what dorm living is like, he has lived in one for the last six years!

The dorm residents are social living groups, the majority of whom are under 21 and placed with unfamiliar roommates. At the "Living-Learning Center", LU’s newest residence hall, students are expected to aspire to the traditional value system at LU. The floors are evenly populated by males and females, but curfew requires that females students be in their rooms or in the lounge by 12 a.m. and males by 2 a.m.. Students may request living on substance-free floors at the residence hall. Roommates sign contracts not to smoke, drink or use drugs before being
assigned to these floors.

Despite the rules, some very serious incidents happen. The following incidents were described by students living in the Center; a "puke" sheet was hung up in a hall to record who vomited and how often; as a practical joke a student was handcuffed to his bed all night and when the keys were lost, LU security had to cut his hand free, as a result he suffered bruises on his wrists; fights broke out; vandalism occurred and a student was arrested by police on a serious felony, which was unrelated to his living there. These types of alcohol-related problem behaviors are quietly discussed, few students betray their peers to the authorities, throughout LU's residence halls.

An R.A.'s Story

Students complain that residence assistants "police" them. Authority at LU's Tower Residence Hall, a freshman residence, rests with R.A.s like senior Amy Depp, who is in charge of 35 women residing in 24 rooms. Amy would not be defined as an "overenforcer", she sees her role involving alcohol education as limited, saying:

We've done alcohol awareness programs during the AA week. On my floor we did alcohol awareness jeopardy, with questions like the Jeopardy program, but they pertained to alcohol. We did Mocktails which are making different non-alcoholic drinks (A. Depp, personal communication, May 2, 1993).

Amy receives 75 dollars a semester to spend on a program area. R.A. duties require them to present one program a semester, from five program areas: 1) social; 2)
recreational; 3) spiritual; 4) educational and 5) values to the community. The money in the most recent semester, was spent on the "social" area for pizza and a floor decorating get together. Non-alcoholic socials are sponsored by university housing, but their socials are not the only party in town. Alcoholic parties within the dorm are prohibited, but have been uncovered by the R.A.s. Amy discussed their response to alcoholic parties in the dorm:

If we find out about one, we evacuate the rooms and try to write down names, which is hard because a lot of them bail. We tell them what they're being documented for and what rules they're violating. If its a really big party, I have a duty partner in Tower Hall, or often we'll call Security. If there is someone passed out or some kind of alcohol poisoning we'll call Security and they'll get an ambulance. I never had to call Security on my floor. I've called Security in the building before. (A. Depp, personal communication, May 2, 1993).

Amy describes these incidents in para-military terms. RAs must "evacuate" the rooms as some students "bail" while others wait to be "documented". If a mop-up is needed Amy or her "duty partner" call Security, who arrive to control the students. When staff report an alcohol-related incident, the students are often alienated. Amy does not escape the repercussions. The students also employ language as a weapon in their relations with the R.A.. She described the reaction of those she apprehends; "They call me a DA (district attorney), instead of RA. Real Asshole. Names like that. Nothing too creative". Unauthorized students activities tend to cause R.A.s to be disciplinarians.
Residence life staff communicate with "secret" language often associated with the military or law enforcement. Erving Goffman states that, "Persons who are admitted to this secret communication are placed in a collusive relationship to one another vis-a-vis the remainder of the participants" (1959, p. 177). The specialized language of counselors, peer coordinator or administrators is used as a means of control which reenforces the collusive relationship which develops around prevention team. R.A.s do not deal with penalties, that is done in a "special conduct process" within Residence Life. Amy, herself, admits that the perception of her at Tower Hall is, "Not strict, but I do enforce policy". Sanction depend on how many offenses and the type of offense, any minor offense like having someone in the room after curfew is forgiven, while throwing a keg party means being referred to the Hall director.

While some students reject the R.A.s' influence, others require their help. Amy often spoke poorly of "men who are always making snide comments and giving us problems". Two women on Amy’s floor had been raped at a fraternity party. She condemned the fraternity incident, saying;

My residents have reported a lot of problems with the fraternities, so I’ve chosen not to go. Last year two acquaintance rapes were reported to the university conduct board, they were women on my floor. This year - there has been sexual assault, but no rapes. Maybe as a whole, I don’t like those groups, but I have good friends who are in fraternities or sororities. Victims aren’t allowed to find out what happened (penalties) with rapists. They didn’t have to testify at the Conduct board. She didn’t file a formal complaint with
the police department. (A. Depp, personal communication, May 2, 1993).

I asked how the victim was affected. Amy replied, "Unfortunately she had been raped in high school. She was negatively affected by it". I felt I knew the answer to the next question before I asked it, "Did she leave school"?. Amy replied, "Yes, as a matter of fact, she did". Amy claimed that 90 percent of the incidents she reports involve male students and that documenting such incidents requires 30 percent of her time.

College women experience adverse effects from the context of excessive campus drinking and their social distresses should be addressed by intervention which reduces such incidents. In the last semester at LU, the Director of the prevention program, Andy Accardi, has dealt with five students faced with sexual assaults at conduct board hearing, each one involving the use of alcohol. 10.2 percent of LU students and 15.8 percent of NU students, presumably women, reported being sexually taken advantage of once or more on the CORE survey.

Lakefront University has had some destructive incidents involving persons and property at Tower Hall. Late in the 1992-93 school year, a student broke out the fire hose on the eleventh floor and turned it on and subsequently could not turn it off. Water poured down through the elevators and stairwells damaging rooms and a reception area. Amy told me, "We don't know who did it. Most of the time when
someone does damage, they do it on a floor that isn't their own". Several times a semester Tower Hall has fire drills. False alarms often occur near or after curfew. Students pull the fire alarm and when the entire 18 floor dorm evacuates, they sneak off to the local bar. These students jeopardize others who may lose sight of fire safety goals.

Prevention programs can introduce control measures to students living in residence halls. Summarizing this study's findings, whether a student lives on or off-campus is not statistically significant at either university in the relationship to the 1) amount of binge drinking; 2) the frequency of alcohol use by friends; or the 3) the frequency of drug use by friends. Students will carry on such activities whether living on or off-campus. One effect of off-campus residency at both universities is off-campus students are less informed about the prevention programs.

Establishing Control at Universities

University officials anticipate two main results from their investment in prevention programming. The first is to abide by legal restrictions placed on them by the federal government and the second is to decrease problem behaviors, such as residence hall damage, which are very costly to the institution. When administrators are uncertain about the extent of student involvement in alcohol and drugs they either entirely or partially misconstrue the problem. Administration officials seem to realize that the open,
stated, or manifest goal of prevention may work too well producing an unintended or latent consequence of decreasing student enrollment at that institution. A balance is maintained at some universities which use their student subcultures to promote student behaviors compatible with the university’s educational purposes. University officials hope that the "behavioral repertoire", whether it is a prevention, diversity or extracurricular program, will make their students academically and socially successful.

The NU administration is aware of the extent of student drunkenness, which is legendary, however for a long time it acquiesced to the existing patterns of alcohol and drug use by their students. At LU many faculty and administrators were "not sure of a problem". I found LU campus security uncertain, or unwilling, to talk about the numbers of alcohol and drug offenses or incidents on campus. At NU the response could be characterized as "collective collusion", while at LU the situations could be characterized as "collective denial". It became increasingly clear that the CORE survey would provide the best picture of alcohol and drug-related behaviors occurring on these college campuses.

**The Effect of Age Group on Problem Behaviors**

University officials are concerned with problem behaviors, especially among the population of underage students. LU campus officials sanction almost a thousand incidents annually. Alcohol or drug-related problem
behaviors which are reported on the CORE Survey appear in Table 20 which examines the percentage of underage and legal age students who reported problem behaviors at least once in the last year.

**Table 20**

The Effect of Age Group on Problem Behaviors

**Percent Experienced Consequence within Last Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Underage</th>
<th>Legal age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hangover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poor Test Score</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trouble w/Police, etc</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Damaged Property</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Argument/Fight</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nausea/Vomit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driven Under Influence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Missed Class</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** Been Criticized **</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thought I Had Problem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Had A Memory Loss</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Later Regretted Action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percent Experienced Consequence within Last Year (cont’d)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Underage</th>
<th>Legal age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arrested for DWI/DUI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taken Sexual Advantage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Been Taken Advantage Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thought of Suicide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tried Suicide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tried/failed to stop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Been hurt/Injured</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Age Group Effects**

Overall a clustering of problem behaviors occurs in the legal age group supporting the influence of the "student culture" hypothesis that students drink more, as a result engage in more problem behavior, after being influenced by heavy drinking at college. The students in this sample appear to 'progress' toward further involvement in pro-deviant situations as they age. This finding is not what we would expect because the literature indicates that problems resulting from drinking appears to be stable, or decline slightly, from adolescence to young adulthood (Grant, Hartford and Grigson, 1988; Gallup, 1985) and markedly decline as women mature (Klein, 1992). Criminologists refer
to this as the 'aging out' or 'desistance phenomenon' (Farrington, 1986). Sociologists tend to refer to this as a 'maturation process' where delinquency decreases with age (Gubrium and Buckholdt, 1977). One explanation of the persistence of problem behaviors in this sample is college students typically feel freer from academic responsibilities as they advance in college. Another explanation might be minimum age laws or prevention are decreasing problem behaviors among underage students, who remain pent-up until reaching a legal age. A third explanation is Catholic college students report heavier drinking than their secular counterparts (Wernig, 1991).

With respect to differences between LU and NU students, the NU alcohol use appears to strongly affect their students academic success. NU students are more likely, about double, than their LU counterparts to receive 'poor test scores' and 'miss classes'. Yet, these NU students still manage to remain in college. There is also an exceedingly high measure of 'damage to property' at NU in contrast to LU. NU underage students are 15 times more likely to commit this offense. This high rate at NU indicates there is a 'pro-deviant' culture where problem behaviors are clustered. At NU, sexual problem behaviors occur in greater frequency among older students than underage students and in greater frequency than any students at LU. All these occur despite the fact that on the measures of alcohol intoxication
problems, hangovers and nausea, LU and NU numbers are nearly identical.

Generally, problem behaviors increase as students age. At Northern University we could anticipate seeing these problem behaviors increase because the frequency of alcohol consumption increases in relation to the increase in age. This relationship indicates a party subculture affects the identity of many students producing an alcohol-centered identity. At Lakefront problem behaviors decrease with age which diminishes the effect of a party subculture.

The Effect of Prevention on Problem Behaviors

What is most indicative of the alcohol-centered culture at NU is problem behaviors measures are far higher than similar LU measures. Since the changes in the age for legal purchase, there seems to have been an increase in many problem behaviors (Baer et al., 1991). Overall, data collected on the problem behaviors of university students during the University of Massachusetts Demonstration Project, 1975-1980, show a pattern of increase in the self-reported alcohol related problems. Injuries in the 1975-80 period totaled 17%; destruction of property 7%; trouble with authorities 4% and drunk driving was 33% (Kraft, 1988, p. 39). Today, all of these measures are higher at NU.

The next table, Table 21, compares what occurs among those NU and LU students who report problem behaviors occurring at least once in the past year when they aware and
nonaware of prevention goals. A Chi-square gamma level of significance is given to show the relationship between problem behaviors and awareness.

Table 21

The Effect of Prevention on Problem Behaviors
Percent Experienced Consequence within Last Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Unaware</th>
<th>Chi-Sq. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hangover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Test Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trouble w/Police, etc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged Property</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argument/Fight</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausea/Vomit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven Under Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed Class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been Criticized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>p&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought I Had Problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had A Memory Loss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later Regretted Action</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrested for DWI/DUI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Percent Experienced Consequence within Last Year (cont’d)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequence</th>
<th>Aware</th>
<th>Unaware</th>
<th>Chi.Sq. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taken Sexual Advantage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Been Taken Advantage Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thought of Suicide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tried Suicide</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tried/failed to stop</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Been hurt/Injured</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NU</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>p&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Prevention Effects**

These findings show that LU and NU aware students compared to their unaware peers are less likely to engage in problem behaviors. The only measures where aware LU students are significantly less likely to report problem occurrences than unaware students are alcohol intoxication effects; i.e, hangovers and driven under the influence. The measures where aware NU students are significantly less likely to report problem occurrences than unaware students are; hangovers, poor test scores, trouble with police, driven under the influence, been criticized, and been injured. The 'been criticized' measure may also be an effect of Catholic students. If drinking is the custom of students at Catholic schools, perhaps to criticize this behavior is also considerably more pronounced. What
accounts for the effects of awareness on problem behaviors at either school cannot directly be proven because the data is inconsistent. No clear pattern emerged as was previously shown for age, where at least at NU, problem behaviors were shown to increase with age.

**Incubation of High-Risk Groups**

Peer prevention programs seeking to the influence of alcohol at Northern have a long way to go and at the present time wisely focus on crisis intervention. Preventing alcohol and drug use on the NU campus requires challenging the influence of long-standing campus traditions such as the "Lil Sibs" weekend. The university designates a weekend where students are supposed to entertain their little brothers and sisters on campus. This tradition consists of students getting their siblings "totally wasted" when they visit maintains the alcohol culture on campus.

The Slackers felt that the Northern experience of "Lil Sibs" was especially degrading, saying;

Steve - I don’t know how many people I’ve known who go here, whose brother or sister has come up here to party with them and they’ve said "oh its great its the best time". When you’re in high school and you’ve had a great time with your brother or sister at Northern that draws a lot of people here.

IRWIN - Would you agree its an unhealthy environment?

Group - Totally.

Frank - That sibling thing, when you bring your siblings up here, you don’t bring them up here to get high, you bring them up here to get wasted. Whenever you bring younger siblings here, its like here people say on Monday mornings, they got them "trashed". You
don't try to get them high, you get them so rocked, that they've never been so rocked before. You bring up 15 or 16 year old kids and then you just get them wasted and then you brag about it all week like how drunk you got your younger siblings.

By definition, anticipatory socialization is the "process by which newcomers become familiar with the values, attitudes, norms, knowledge, and skills needed to function acceptably in a new role or environment prior to actually entering the setting" (Kuh et al., 1991, p. 128). The anticipatory socialization at Northern is according to Jane, "sick", to Frank, "totally pathological" and Faith says "its really weird, really weird". Some institutions' immediate environment "incubates" alcohol and drug use, while others may prevent it.

Is The University Collegiate Or Custodial: Two Solutions?

The university administration approaches the problem behaviors of its students using a very similar style found with societal controls. Ronald Akers writes the social control policies on alcohol have revolved around two strategies, 1) regulation and prevention in the general population and 2) law enforcement and treatment programs directed toward populations of deviant and problem drinkers (1993, p. 218). A sociological perspective can contrast the theory-based educational programs designed to change the normative culture which have been effective with those justifying discipline and controls which are ineffective in decreasing problem alcohol and drug-related problem
behaviors (Tittle, 1980; Jessor et al., 1977; Akers, 1992; Gonzalez, 1988). Discussed next are the cultural solution and conflict solution, both used in the campus setting.

The Cultural Solution

Carla, an NU student, told me the alcohol industry has a "new pitch they are trying to pull off". For brewers and distillers, an effective solution to the possibility of even more regulations on their business is the promotion of moderate alcohol consumption. Carla said:

In the summertime, I do PR for Miller. I work for their marketing firm. They’re responsible with that "Think when you drink" thing. And all the bands we worked with on the Miller music do public service announcements and they don’t even mention the product, they just mention their band name. Like, "I’m Mark from the Bone-Daddies and when we play we just want to have a good time, so just remember think when you drink". There is no pitch, there is no mention of the product. You might know that its Miller because of you just remember, "Think when you drink". If you didn’t know that, you’d just think it was another ad. (C. Harris, personal communication, May 6, 1992).

Ronald Akers labels this as a "cultural or persuasional" approach where the goal is not a decline in alcohol consumption but to "spread out that consumption more among moderate and light drinkers so that abusive drinking will decline" (1992, p. 219). Those involved in the cultural approach include the alcohol industry, advertisers, campaigns featuring designated drivers and the BACCHUS campus group. Their message is one of responsible drinking. Akers (1993) points out, unlike drug prevention, the goal is to prevent only abusive alcohol use.
The Conflict Solution

In spite of the sensibility of a "responsible use" campaign among college students, prevention programs must impose more control to challenge the students. Andy Accardi ironically dismissed the alcohol industry "pitch":

Scholarships are offered by brewers. Their slogans are "Don’t stretch it" and "Know when to say when". They come on really nice posters to give to students. It implies it’s okay to drink. These posters are not going up. I’m not a puritan. How does somebody like me, who knows it goes on, act? As fatherly advice I’d tell them to limit it. But as part of the program I’m telling them not to drink (A. Accardi, personal communication, August 5, 1992).

Students may not care for this policy, but universities are mandated to carry it out. If prevention fails to influence student lifestyle decisions, then the university imposes disciplinary actions which attempt to reestablish conformist group standards. University disciplinary procedures are known by different names. Northern has a Judicial board (J-board) and Lakefront has a Student Conduct Board. The next table, Table 22, portrays the frequency of disciplinary consequences in the 1990-92 academic years at NU and LU.
Table 22

1990-92 Northern University Behavioral Report Discipline Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct Infraction</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Univ. Board</th>
<th>Student Board</th>
<th>Univ. Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusing Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Drug Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sanctioned</strong>*</td>
<td>680</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanction Rate Per 100 Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>621</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 1990-91 the maximum sanctions for alcohol-related offenses were Warnings/Counseling; for drug-related offense Probation. In 1991-92 the maximum sanctions for both alcohol-related offenses was Probation.

---

1990-92 Lakefront University Behavioral Report Discipline Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conduct Infraction</th>
<th># of Students</th>
<th>Univ. Board</th>
<th>Student Board</th>
<th>Univ. Student Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abusing Alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal Drug Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>6,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sanctioned</strong>*</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanction Rate Per 100 Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-91</td>
<td>929</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In 1990-91 the maximum sanctions for alcohol-related offenses were Warnings/Counseling; for drug-related offense Probation. In 1991-92 the maximum sanctions for both alcohol-related offenses was Probation.
Sociologist Kai Erikson studied deviance in Puritan America and has suggested that deviance is allowed or produced by the society in proportion to its capacity for social control. Erikson is careful to state that for one region and one period of history, "the offender rate seems to have remained quite stable" (1966, p. 181). Table 22 compares these universities reactions to undesirable behaviors of students during the years of this study and the stability of "deviants" at universities indicates no widespread "enforcement" effort has occurred because the sanction measures are constant. The results of student discipline actions produce similar outcomes as the phenomenon discussed by Erikson. Deviance exists in schools in proportion to their capacity for social control. The focus on deviant stabilization requires more research to affirm this interpretation regarding undergraduate deviancy and is beyond the scope of this study.

The full force which can be directed toward misbehaving students is expulsion, but this is only used for the most serious of incidents. The application of formal discipline is a stable phenomenon and sanctions apply to a certain number of violators. The reason, I believe, is universities have a large pool of "deviants" given the new regulations, but few incidents of disciplinary action. No expulsions occurred within the time frame of this study at either Northern or Lakefront. However, within the recent past,
Northern University suspended two student rugby club members for sexual assault and Lakefront negotiated the withdrawal of students for minor drugs, weapons and stalking offenses. The sanction figures for both universities are stable reflecting an acknowledgement of only some student deviancy.

Students who cause major troubles for college authorities are handled by the police. The police are never called to campus unless there is need for an arrest or hospitalization. Police departments will respond to the off-campus problems involving students. One incident occurred last year while Northern City Police were on nightly patrol near the "bar strip". I talked to two officers one night and one officer mentioned that she responded to a recent stabbing incident involving college students. She responded after being flagged down by NU Security, who requested assistance. There had been a party at a nearby apartment complex and words were exchanged. A local state university student pulled a knife and stabbed three victims, all NU students. She said, "The call came over the radio that I had three suspects in the alley and I pulled in the alley and caught three suspects. It was pretty evident they had done it, they were covered with blood. Somebody didn't use their rational sense to sort it out. It was pretty gruesome". I then asked the male officer, "What do you feel about student drinking?". He said, "When your a college student you're supposed to party
like a fucking animal. At least that’s the way it was when I went to school". It is no wonder that there is a significant problem educating students as to how the laws have changed.

The conflict perspective views the powerful segment of society as wishing to control by sanctioning and labeling less powerful groups who commit acts which the powerful forbid (Vold, 1958). Arguably no longer the moral force they once were, community leaders coerce others to control youthful behaviors. Schools are increasingly charged with implementing disciplinary procedures. University administration is a "moral science" which "involves the establishment of a community and a culture within an organization and the development of an organization’s self-reflective ability to analyze its purpose and goals" (Foster, 1986, p. 10). Today, administrators are held accountable for their students substance use and misconduct.

Whether or not administrators consider "high-risk" groups such as Slackers and fraternities as part of the approved campus culture, interventions with them are part of their duty. Party subcultures resist the nominal authority of the university. These non-conformist students interrupt the social relations of the approved campus culture and require "school-based" interventions.

Administrative participation in student services is "an initial point at which positive steps can be taken is in the
area of building a sense of community on our campuses" (Nelson, 1979, p. 5). Administrators who take steps to "build" a campus "community" may get an increased commitment to education and greater retention, but no reduction in student delinquency (Gottfredson, 1986). The universities attempts to change the student culture are falling short of the government demands. Some conclusions are discussed next.

Discussion and Summary

At NU, students face a tremendous barrier in overcoming the pervasive attitude of "everyone does it" which supports drinking. Many campus groups support an "alcohol-centered" identity, which leads to the "mythological" exploits of the NU Rugby Club. Ironically, the two student clubs which reject NU's active drinking culture are the Irish Club and Omega Septa, a Black fraternity group. I found no other groups adverse to alcohol use at NU, including the Peer Paraprofessionals themselves.

At NU, Father Lenihan does not seem to recognize the "average" student coming to NU may have initially been exposed to just such an NU academic tradition. When asked if he thought students go to NU because it is a party school, he said,

If a student decides not to come here because the so-called bar scene is less, that won't make me weep at all. Chances are that is not a student that would be all that involved in giving himself or herself to academics or social service projects. If they make their judgement on that basis, I'm not particularly
worried. I’d say it’s their loss.

Father Lenihan has to recognize that students do come to Northern because of the "bar scene". NU’s party subculture was given a permanent expression when for many years the university hosted block parties where the beer distributors would provide beer by driving their beer trucks on campus. These trucks had taps mounted on the side - in effect they were kegs on wheels. At these block parties 18 years of age and older students drank free beer. There was a carnival atmosphere, with promotion materials such as tee-shirts and beer mugs. In 1985 the drinking age was raised and NU switched to selling beer at block parties. In the 1986-87 academic year, a transitional year as their Dean told me, NU; "had kegs on the Mall, next to dorms, and next to the buildings" and ended its traditional block parties.

As Durkheim theorized, the tradition is repeated mouth to mouth and the heavy drinking does not disappear. At Lil Sibs weekends or the block parties, NU traditions are passed on. This indicates why students are still partying today, the institution’s longstanding traditions are more influential than the new alcohol controls. The norms of any society are by definition shared by the members of society. To violate those norms is to act contrary to their social world, hence few students violate pro-drinking norms within their drinking culture

In a recent book, Generation X: Tales from An
Accelerated Generation, Douglas Coupland describes an accelerated culture of the college-age generation (1991). How do students slow down and find time to relax in this accelerated generation? This research shows they drink heavily and use the soft drugs available on campus. If fraternity parties are shut down, then neighborhood parties become popular. In large cities, students often party at raves, large parties held in isolated warehouse districts. In these isolated settings students take control in the absence of outside control. One consequence of the partying at these settings is the numerous reports of alcohol and drug-related problem behaviors. Student may prefer parties where they can freely associate while they drink, however they recognize that any "open" party is apt to be challenged by the authorities.

Universities must operate according to the rules imposed by the Drug-Free School and Drug-Free Workplace Acts and with constraints imposed by the local community. Since they are charged with solving the "alcohol problem" of students, universities primarily utilize prevention to abide with the existing laws and only then do they seek to counteract social influences that promote drinking, smoking and drug use. University concern and control may decrease the quantity and frequency of problem behaviors if changes in the student culture accompany their efforts or if the available conventional opportunities begin to satisfy the
student's "important needs". Otherwise, the students will not feel obligated to change their culture.

Slackers organize their own "drinking house" where they feel comfortable with a Slacker lifestyle designed to cope with an accelerated culture and a lack of available conventional opportunities. Student groups, like Slackers, will continue to reject conventional values, despite prevention's guidance or restrictions, and follow their own standards. It may well be that other students, discussed in the next chapter, will disapprove of the "party subculture" and begin to believe prevention programs can assist them in coping with some of the challenges with which they are inevitably confronted at college.
CHAPTER VI

THE IMPACT OF PREVENTION ON UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES

The effects of the sociocultural background and immediate student culture influences upon the behaviors of university students, as they relate to the development of drinking behaviors during the college years, are well documented (Straus and Bacon, 1953; Saltz and Elandt, 1986). Kraft (1990) reported that prevention intervention should be targeted at those groups most at risk and their environments. Kraft included; men, traditional-age first year students, residents of all-male residence halls, Greek organization members, fraternity house residents, and children of alcoholics; as high risk students (1990, p. 31). However, in general prevention programming results, using either targeted or campus-wide approaches, remain undocumented at this time.

Prevention programs have proliferated, in some form, on every American college campus. The "drinking culture" also proliferates on college campus, why is there an apparent failure of prevention programs among college students? Despite their widespread implementation, the programs are ignored by many college students who remain tolerant of alcohol and drugs and frequently get drunk, often several
times a week, or use drugs. The activities of such students in pro-deviant groups seem to lay outside the influence of prevention programs which signify how little progress, despite an effect on around 18 percent of students, prevention programs have made in the overall reduction in the levels of alcohol and drug use among college students.

The question of what might have affected the 18 to 19 percent of aware students, discussed in Chapter IV, from the LU and NU samples who are impacted by prevention can now be addressed. Although there are multi-causative factors at work, this reported reduction in the demand for alcohol and drugs must be assessed for its significance in affecting the student culture. In order to avoid reductionism to the prevention program, a complete study of all variables which reduce, prevent or delay substance use, i.e. legal, social and educational variables, must be explored. However, this chapter will introduce some rare promising results coming from college prevention programs.

A Sociological Analysis of Alcohol and Drug Use Prevention

College students now face the strictest measures on alcohol since prohibition (Heath, 1990). With little feedback on prevention’s results, many new questions arise. The first area of inquiry in a sociological analysis of alcohol and drug prevention on campuses must focus on the institution. This level of analysis will ask; what are the substance use-related issues that colleges are most
interested in? What are the consequences of substance abuse prevention at the higher education level? When researchers examine prevention providers, they learn that "alcohol is the biggest problem on campus". When you talk with a prevention provider, you get a prevention "talk".

The second area of inquiry focuses on students and asks; what can colleges do to interest students in supporting the development of prevention programs? The prediction that the greater the support among students, the greater the results can be studied especially among Greek groups who are under a great pressure to change their social environment. Can prevention programs be engineered to benefit the various social groups found on college campuses?

A third area of inquiry combines the previous institution and student focuses and describes the difference in the programs' claims of influencing student behaviors and actual student behaviors. Does the influence of prevention exceed or even match the influences that peers or parents have on college students' alcohol and drug use? These are basic research areas in this chapter.

It is hoped that this account of what prevention providers say they do and what students say they do will better assess the effects of prevention programs on student use of alcohol and drugs. For students to learn not to drink excessively will require, among other things, better models of social learning and more patience. For program
An Overview of Prevention

Several models are utilized in the prevention setting to attempt the difficult task of achieving and sustaining behavioral changes. This section outlines the main types of prevention programs. Theorists recognize the variety and complexity of individual, family, peer and community risk factors of alcohol and drug abuse. This recognition has led to the development of at least four types of prevention programs, which prevention expert Lewis Donohew lists as: 1) information programs which describe the physical and psychological effects of drug and alcohol usage; 2) education programs which are designed to remedy deficiencies in the life skills which improve communication and instill refusal skills to combat pressures to use drugs or alcohol; 3) alternative programs which give youth opportunities to get experiences or perform activities which offer positive alternatives to drug and alcohol use; and 4) intervention programs which will provide special assistance for those individuals already showing signs of alcohol and drug dependency and will provide crisis intervention, peer counseling and psychological counseling (Donohew et al, 1991, p. 8-9).

In offering these wide range of services, the provider
will be able to incorporate all the above models into an comprehensive prevention model flexible enough to work with any group, whether or not they are involved in substance use. Donohew suggests;

Given the complexity of the drug abuse problem, its pervasive negative influence on society, and the multiple pathways that can lead to drug use onset and progression, its appears that comprehensive prevention programming may be the most appropriate public health approach to the drug abuse problem (1991, p. 9).

Most prevention providers start with the premise that as providers they must offer a "combination of prevention strategies consistent with the needs and developmental level of the individual" or target group (Donohew et al., 1991, p. 8).

Traditionally college prevention programs concentrate on changing individual awareness or attitudes and on regulation of consumption. Many primary prevention programs are, "programs about the effect of excessive alcohol consumption and the development of policies to limit locations and times that alcohol is provided" (Perkins and Berkowitz, 1987, p. 71). Secondary prevention activities include the training of students and staff in the identification and referral of educational programs for groups exhibiting high school use or at risk for alcohol problems. Tertiary prevention, "the most common element in college programs, typically includes required or self-initiated individual counseling with health center staff" (Perkins and Berkowitz, 1987, p. 71). Do these programs
motivate college students to make informed decisions? Does "delinquent" social learning change to pro-social learning with prevention on campus? Some opportunities for changes in alcohol and drug use at Northern and Lakefront universities are described next.

Focus on the Institutions

The rest of the chapter describes steps in the evolving prevention program at Lakefront University and a different program design of intensive intervention at Northern University. The direction and the dynamics of prevention programs at Northern and Lakefront differ in important aspects, as does their involvement and their commitment to prevention. This research describes the efforts to effect behavioral changes in the student community.

The classic study, *Drinking in College*, by Straus and Bacon (1953) found that universities with more permissive policies will have more drinkers, with fewer problem drinkers, while universities with more prohibitive policies will have fewer drinkers, many of whom are problem drinkers. Overall, campuses are faced with an inability to exercise social control with their students. Most campus debates are handed, but not the debates over alcohol and drug use where the conflict between each side proves intransigent. The paradox of prevention programs is they impose views, not negotiate terms, with the other party - the student culture.

Today’s youth culture is in conflict with the culture
of those schooling them. The last great campus conflict with the society was over the Vietnam war and wider cultural issues. The current generation gap has established legal issues where both sides disagree over the notion of personal freedoms. The aspersions which are cast on each side amount to a struggle over defense of personal lifestyles. The personal use of alcohol and drugs has become less romanticized than its use by the baby-boomers a generation earlier. Studies detail "adolescent worlds" where youth are "engaging in recreational activities that include drug-taking and usually delinquency, at non-conventional times" (Glassner and Loughlin, 1987, p. 130). Prevention is not reaching this "adolescent world" of drinkers and drug takers where drugs are used for instrumental and routine purposes, similar to other activities like "mall walking and Dungeons and Dragons" (Glassner and Loughlin, 1987, p. 177).

Sociologists can help foster open communication by demonstrating the differing perceptions surrounding campus-based prevention. The simultaneous study of both the prevention providers and student groups showed the former values an alcohol and drug-free environment and the latter, for the most part, values alcohol and drugs. Since drinking is socially approved in the college environment the controls on drinking are negated. "Pro-deviant" students socialize with a greater intensity and redefine the prevention issues as "cautious, an overreaction or lame". Deviant action
follows this deviant learning.

Prevention providers report a social climate on campus where students have a cognitive dissonance between education on the restrictions on alcohol and their actual behaviors. Goodstadt (1978) found the educators' assumption that an increase in knowledge from informational programs would result in attitude and behavioral changes "seriously flawed". Ingrained consumption of alcohol is a way of life for today's college students. One measure of popularity of its use on campuses comes from former United States Surgeon General Antonia Novello who estimates that "college students spend $4.2 billion annually on alcoholic beverages, even though most of them are too young to drink legally" (Connor, 1991). Efforts to restrain the "party subculture" and reduce excessive drinking and drug use which may adversely effect the students' life chances, are discussed next.

Students and Social Change

Father Lenihan knew best. The NU's Vice-President's knowledge of student culture came from his years of living in the student dorms. He believed the student culture establishes an "ownership" of territory, saying:

My sense is that Wales Street is seen as their territory. Its their chance to have fun. They feel that the university has no right to do any intervention on that side of the street. (F. Lenihan, personal communication, April 10, 1992).

Adjacent to the NU campus, Wales was a street lined with bars, a pizza parlor, a deli and a couple of liquor stores
and fast-food restaurants. Father Lenihan recognized that NU students control more than just Wales Street, saying;

If they want to have a party at a house, they shouldn’t be able to do anything they want. Its as if they are oblivious to the neighborhood around them. It is a problem for the university when our students get drunk, vandalize, be loud or just make a disturbance in the neighborhood. (F. Lenihan, personal communication, April 10, 1992).

The Father confessed to more pandemonium, saying that student control of bars on Wales was a problem for NU. The university’s response to the problem is Campustown, an urban renewal program, which students view as a cultural restraint on their partying. Father Lenihan continued:

And when the Volcano Bar, which had a reputation, at least last year, for Naked Beer Slides, that kind of behavior reflects upon the whole institution. So when a Campustown develops something on Wales Street, and let’s say there is a bar going to be there, that bar will have to abide by these provisions which require strict carding of students. Then they’re going to be expected as any bar is in this country to abide by this legal obligation. If someone is drunk, you can’t serve more liquor to that person and we will insist upon it. (F. Lenihan, personal communication, April 10, 1992).

Father Lenihan plans for the future when NU will redesign the community with its Campustown renewal project and students will be more in-tune with drug-free values. He does not seem to approve of the students’ control of the street, their domiciles and the bars. On a recent recruiting trip to Chicago, he was:

very struck by the number of students who mentioned in their letters that they’d been involved in alcohol and drug education programs in their high schools. That was very gratifying to hear and its new to me that there would be that many students in high school that had done that. It makes me feel good about the future
because if they'd had serious contact and questions in the last 3 to 4 years we can build on that. So it won't be a new thing for someone to say you've got to look at your use of alcohol. The idea of assessment, going to drug and alcohol assessment will not be a new thing. (F. Lenihan, personal communication, April 10, 1992).

The modification of the negative impact of the "drinking" culture is one goal of prevention. One study on the history of alcoholism expressed this course of action as necessary to stem the influence of alcohol, arguing:

The struggle against alcoholism must be taken up afresh by each new generation and in scope should be wide enough to include everybody. Where children are concerned, it is impossible to say what the long-term effect of specific teaching will be. Whatever the case, such educational programs, tailored to the prevailing social and cultural climate, must continue (Sournia, 1990, p. 180).

Today, the prevailing social climate resembles the climate from an earlier drug control era. Sociologist Joseph Gusfield's (1975, 1981) studied the response process to alcohol control in the Temperance Movement as an "ownership struggle in which interest groups vie for control over the definition of and remedy to the problem, using political strategies, such as developing constituencies and forming coalitions" (Peyrot, 1984, p. 83). When social reality is negotiated the parties usually have unequal power. Father Lenihan and others support the prevention efforts at NU as alternatives to the bar scene and are attempting to control a wide range of student behaviors by closing the student bars with their Campustown project. Father Lenihan says:

there definitely is a culture which is already in the minds of students before they come here. It's sometimes
just astounding to talk to students and to hear about how at high school they drank a lot and the pattern continues. A number of students on this campus, this is the first time they’ve ever had groups who said you shouldn’t being drinking the way you drink. I’m sure the high schools have tried to get their attention. See now they’re more willing to kind of look at it. Partially, I think, because they see firsthand some of the evidence of what can go wrong with drinking. (F. Lenihan, personal communication, April 10, 1992).

While NU students do get first-hand evidence of what can go wrong with drinking, clearly NU students continue to drink excessively.

In both a sociological and ecological sense, students attending Northern will find the influences of intervention overshadowed by the influence of alcohol use. Despite neighborhood groups, who are critical of them, prevention providers who target their alcohol-related behaviors and some peer counselors who perceive their drinking as risky, NU’s students continue their excessive drinking. NU’s Katy Rora, a student representative on their University-wide Alcohol and Drug Prevention Committee, feels the student culture practically dictates they drink and they will drink by resorting to more savvy methods or drink in more remote areas if harassed. Sue McCourt, in NU’s Student Affairs Office and a NU alumni, told me, "Northern students work hard and play hard. They study and boy do they drink!". These observers at NU are circumspect of mandating changes in the traditional student culture. When students are accustomed to using these substances, some may accept changes, but the student culture changes very slowly.
Most studies on deterrence correlate some degree of non-compliance with sanctioned acts with a lack of knowledge of what is being sanctioned (Tittle and Logan, 1978). To what extent does prevention program longevity affect student receptivity? Although, NU prevention services have been available for a long time and are better known on that campus among all age groups than LU's program, both have about 18 percent of their students reporting an effect of prevention. During the time of this study, the prevention program at LU moved towards a more vigorous approach. Consciousness raising with students ultimately relies on the attention prevention programs receive in the university setting. The fact that LU's program is more recent may be related to its younger students being more 'aware' and having more knowledge of prevention than its older students.

Students were surveyed as to how many of the following basic prevention program modalities they had experienced; at NU 2% and at LU 2.5% reported special courses about alcohol and drugs; at NU 3.2% and at LU 4% reported films, lectures and discussions in their regular class; at NU 4% and at LU 3.4% reported films, lectures and discussions outside of their regular class; and at NU 4.8% and at LU 3.7% reported special discussions (rap groups) about alcohol and drugs. The strategies to change the level of substances use may be supplemented by more diverse alternatives at other campuses.
The Effect of Awareness on Alcohol and Drug Use

Recalling the initial interpretation of results on 'awareness', discussed in Chapter IV, where alcohol use was shown to decrease with student participation in prevention, the same reported effects of prevention are also shown to decrease student illicit drug use. In table 23, the prevalence of use of alcohol and the major drugs at each university are displayed.

Table 23

Prevalence of Use of Alcohol and Drugs at Universities among Aware/Non-Aware Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Student Use</th>
<th>LAKEFRONT</th>
<th>NORTHERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aware n=46</td>
<td>N-Aware n=212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five + Drinks in last Two Weeks</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Tobacco</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Alcohol</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Marijuana</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Cocaine</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Amphetamines</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Sedatives</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Hallucinogens</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Awareness, clearly, determines the difference between the absence of hard drug use and hard drug experimentation. Virtually all hard drug use at both universities is by those
in the non-aware group. For each hard drug in the last four rows of Table 23 there was only one user at LU who belonged to the aware group. An even stronger association between hard drugs use and awareness is found at NU. At NU hard drug use is almost totally absent among aware students. The most popular hard drug, LSD and hallucinogens, are used exclusively by non-aware NU students. There are 37 NU students who use hallucinogens, all in the non-aware group. Only one of the 15 LU hallucinogens users is in the aware group. The marijuana use among non-aware students is twice that of aware students at both schools.

Awareness determines the difference between moderate use of alcohol and tobacco and their heavy use. The percent of drinkers last year reveals a strong association with reported prevention effects. At both schools the 'use last year' measure shows little difference in the prevalence of drinking in either non-aware or aware groups. Binge drinking is two and one half times greater among aware students at NU than aware students at LU, and one third more among non-aware students at NU than LU. The student culture is a drinking culture. The majority of drinking studies concur that over 90 percent of college students drink (Salz and Elandt, 1986). This similarity makes virtually any college student susceptible to the problems discussed in this study. This correspondence does not extend to campus prevention program delivery.
Table 24 shows that there are statistically significant relationships between awareness and many alcohol and drug-related variables.

**Table 24**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Student Use</th>
<th>Awareness at LAKEFRONT</th>
<th>Awareness at NORTHERN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Five + Drinks in last Two Weeks</td>
<td>9.2 ( p&lt;.01 )</td>
<td>7.2 ( p&lt;.05 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Tobacco</td>
<td>4.05 N.S.</td>
<td>18.8 ( p&lt;.001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Alcohol</td>
<td>9.3 ( p&lt;.05 )</td>
<td>13.9 ( p&lt;.01 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Marijuana</td>
<td>5.7 ( p&lt;.05 )</td>
<td>15.1 ( p&lt;.001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Cocaine</td>
<td>.1 N.S.</td>
<td>2.1 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Amphetamines</td>
<td>.5 N.S.</td>
<td>2.0 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Sedatives</td>
<td>.0 N.S.</td>
<td>.4 N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Last Year: Hallucinogens</td>
<td>1.6 N.S.</td>
<td>9.5 ( p&lt;.01 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The outcome of drug prevention and alcohol prevention appear to be very different. There are groups which are affected by drug prevention and not affected by alcohol prevention. Drug prevention education employs the strategy of fear arousal to dramatize the risks associated with drug use (Botvin, 1990). The differences in program delivery at any university may depend on how prevention programs choose to deal with student culture differences.
Comparison of Prevention Programs at Northern and Lakefront

Though organizationally very similar, Northern and Lakefront universities have prevention approaches which differ greatly. Because the two programs differ greatly, a natural conclusion would be one might produce better results. In fact, they produce nearly identical percentage of students responding to their interventions, measured by the level of student awareness of prevention. The answer to why a considerable variance in program delivery produces the same effect is found partially in the negating effects of a student culture where drinking is a central activity.

Universities promote control against the backdrop of a student culture. Two common institutional patterns of intervention occur at universities where;

institutional agents have given up the pretense of being in control of student behavior and instead require students to become responsible for their own behavior. ...At other institutions,... student life staff play a very active role in requiring that students make choices consistent with the institution's mission and the expectations of parents (Kuh, 1991, pp. 172-73).

At the first type of institution, "the absence of rules does not indicate lack of care or concern but rather is evidence that the institution is willing to encourage students to take risks to become responsible for their own behavior" while at the other institutions, "the types of students they attract might not be able to succeed without such guidance" (Kuh et al. 1991, p. 143). Some school official must watch their fraternities very closely, others enforce residence
hall restrictions, still others with more permissive policies will trust their students to do the right thing. As Catholic universities, Lakefront and Northern must be placed somewhere in the middle of these two types. The remainder of this chapter describes their differences in intervention approaches to substance use.

**Prevention at Northern's Counseling Center**

Anything short of divine intervention may not produce real success at Northern University. Northern’s program, known as the Counseling Center, is administered by a large staff of prevention professionals and professionals in training. The staff at Northern includes a director, assistant director, two psychologists, one full-time and one part-time counselor, several graduate student interns and the Peer Paraprofessional Students or PPAs which combine for a full-service prevention to assist "troubled" NU students. NU’s campus is affected by drugs, primarily alcohol, and the Counseling Center is the "shock absorber" where severe problems can be dealt with efficiently within the psychological model of health prevention.

The Counseling Center is central to the prevention effort and also is the direct provider of services of alcohol and drug education at NU. The staff must "cover the bases" which are mandated by law. NU’s University Student Handbook states, "All counseling sessions are confidential. Visits are not recorded on your permanent University
Northern's program has a twelve year history. Northern initially attempts to educate students with "Informed Choices", a booklet distributed by Northern's Counseling Center. The Center's specialized services include "Alternative to the Bars", now called "Friday and Saturday Night Live", which provides a place where students can meet and hold activities outside of the bar scene.

The Counseling Center had established a peer para-professional program (PPA) where students help students decide how to handle issues of substance use or sexuality. The PPA program teaches peer-counselors to lead discussions and make presentations in one of the PPA tracks which include the Alcohol and Drug Use Program, the Study Skills Assistance Program, AIDS Awareness Program and the Rape Awareness Program.

Counseling Center: An Important Transition in Leadership

Nora Pada, an energetic woman and the Coordinator of Alcohol and Drug Education at NU, oversaw prevention, counseling and treatment services at Northern University for many years as their Assistant Director of the Counseling Center. In 1991, Nora was faced with her own serious health problem which required a heart transplant. Although she worked off and on during 1991, she was mainly bedridden at her home. Awaiting the heart transplant, Nora passed away in early 1992. The peer para-professional students (PPAs) working with her were deeply saddened and they, themselves,
met for counseling and support. Despite the tragedy, the PPAs reported their psychological training was effective helping them to overcome their loss.

James Wendt, assumed Nora's position, after being Acting Coordinator during the 1991-1992 academic year while Nora was ill. In his professional work, Jim had a psychological practice where he supervised and worked on dual diagnosis programs in psychiatric hospitals. In addition he developed programs for runaway youth at a local shelter. Jim had a sympathetic, psychological perspective. He was soft-spoken, prematurely grey and asked people in the room if he could smoke cigarettes prior to lighting one up. He said his role at the Counseling Center had "been real clear and defined as assessment and control, so treatment is not part of that role. So by the nature of the position, I'm doing assessment and not primary treatment".

Jim has won respect for his ability to work with the "crisis" of alcohol use at Northern. Where Nora had been a natural organizer, Jim is the consummate professional. Jim conducts intake assessments using psychological testing measures, such as the Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (MAST), and an alcohol assessment test designed by a psychologist who practices in Northern City. His duties involve psychological counseling, therapy, assessment and referrals.
Northern Exposure - Where "You Make the Call"

I worked closely with Jim and his paraprofessional student counselors when we conducted the second F.I.P.S.E. survey during Drug Awareness Week in 1992. One afternoon I scheduled interviews with Jim to discuss the program. I began by inquiring about the jargon used in the Counseling Center. I asked Jim to explain NU's program, "You Make the Call". He said it was a mandatory response which consists of holding group sessions with students who were reported in disciplinary incidents. Jim explained;

Sometimes it's a group we make because it was a marginal offense, or if there was really something going on I'd rather see them in individual session. Then it's two group session and one individual session. We bring them in and have them fill out an assessment form, it's like a lecture format. These are mainly kids who have to be there but don't want to be there, it's not a fun function. In a group they are more apt to be entertained. There have been two already this semester. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Eventually, with such an emphasis on drinking among NU students, the problem abuser of drugs and alcohol would need assistance. I asked Jim what intervention is done with the abusers. He replied;

Well, really the mandate for us is only prevention. I think in the long run prevention is absolutely the way to go. So in effect the only intervention we do is by referral. It would be to a Judicial hearing. Or referral to an outpatient program. I do a lot of referring to drug and alcohol programs. We have a local hospital downtown here just a couple blocks, Mt. Shasta, which I use primarily because in terms of distance and logistics. Mt. Shasta will take people in-patient who don't have insurance under what is called 51-42 funds, which is a federal grant. And that is mandated that they do that. But it would generally be a students' private insurance. (J. Wendt, personal
NU had an adequate intervention service, something LU had not attempted by the end of this study. I asked Jim if students came to the Counseling Center by a self-referral or other types of referral. He told me:

It could be and is both. In fact I just got a call now from a kid, who is probably an in-patient referral who is coming in tomorrow morning. But a lot of people get to me via other counselors who will see somebody, who comes in because they’re depressed and it turns out they’re drinking 12 beers nightly. So I get a lot of referrals via other counselors here. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

During PARTY Week at NU, the PPAs ask students to sign a contract to abstain or decrease their drinking. I asked if the students who pledge not to drink for a contracted time have complied with their pledge. Jim told me:

I think it was an effort to work towards having people accept responsibility and seeing if they could limit their own drinking, to me its a version of an acid test. Again, since I wasn’t involved in the planning or philosophy of it from the beginning, how Nora would have described it I don’t know. When I got here, in essence, it was one of the events we needed to have happen. ... The acronym is to get their attention, it’s also known as Alcohol Awareness Week. The intent is to educate them about alcohol use and abuse. The focus, I think it is signing contracts to not drink for a period of time and doing acid tests, which are seeing if you can limit yourself to two drinks a night for six weeks. It was very much like this (Drug Awareness) week. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Since 18, 19 and 20 years of age, students are by law are prohibited from drinking, underage drinking was being tacitly acknowledged by the PPA pledge campaign. Cameron, who was my Slacker informant and a PPA, concluded that even
if the students did not change their drinking, the pledge would get them thinking, "Wait a minute, I signed a pledge not to drink and I cannot keep it".

Around campus several opinions were offered as to the deterrent for underage drinking. Katy, from the University-Wide Committee, told me a real deterrent was the rumor that the Volcano bouncer was cutting up fake IDs with a pair of scissors. The definition a Northern Dean of Students gave for prevention was "trying to educate them about the law". I asked Jim if 18, 19 and 20 year old students were changing their behavior because of a law. Jim said;

They can go across the street to bars and go drinking and nobody will stop them, its not going to change their behavior a whole lot. But I think the fact that kids are getting fined in droves. I think there is some deterrent factor to setting limits on kids around alcohol use and more of that is happening. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Is strict prohibition, as required by law with the underage student, a viable option at NU? I believed this option was disregarded because the environment at Northern included very few events that could be labeled non-alcoholic social activities. NU’s Parents Association has funded "alternative activities" such as extra hours at the Recreation Center and movies in the past. Campus events, such as union dances or basketball games, were more strictly controlled, but there are hardly any controls when students attend these events after being at the nearby bars or house parties. In this context, student drinking would be the
determinant factor and not the campus guidelines. NU's comprehensive prevention services did not appear to include education within the curriculum. Prevention providers label their academic focus as "Curriculum Infusion". Faculty are usually recruited and asked to familiarize themselves with substance abuse issues. Often some incentives are given to these faculty recruits who build these themes into courses. I asked Jim about curriculum infusion at NU. He replied;

There are special academic courses. A couple of the departments have alcohol related courses. I think again, because of Nora's illness the last couple of years, the committee that is supposed to be the committee on Prevention efforts has sort of been put on hold. ... But the committee has been mandated to do prevention. You saw the mandate of that committee. So there are some courses, there are some AA and ACOA groups on campus. Its now acceptable, quote unquote, for faculty to admit problems. I've had faculty tell me that as recent as five years ago they wouldn't have used their own insurance for alcohol or drug treatment because they felt stigmatized. I think there is a little bit more permission to get treatment and the AA and ACOA groups are more popular. I mean I've heard from other campuses that drug and alcohol prevention is minimal and I think NU made probably a little more of an effort and it still needs to do a lot. So the prevention efforts are via the PPAs and the presentations they make. Referrals come from other counselors, parents, faculty. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

These changes in faculty and student behavioral expressions represent only a small commitment to change and did not make an overt change in the campus environment. The previously reported environmental changes, like Campustown, as well as the prevention policy tended to reach the student body through NU's administration. Other environmental
restrictions, such as requiring freshmen to live on campus, if not living with relatives, were also administrative policy. Off-campus students continued to cause problems with both campus and city authorities. The strategies designed to effect off-campus students, at both NU or LU, were troubled or have failed. Jim felt that:

The problem, in part, is a mixed message. That it is okay to have 50 bars close to campus. So I think the message has been a mixed message up to recently. The university has been encouraging the city police to raid bars and they’ve done that a number of times this year giving out tickets for underage drinking. (IRWIN -Do you know what that costs a student). I think a hundred bucks. (IRWIN -Can they lose their license for that offense). I don’t think so. When people get municipal citations that referral doesn’t come to me, because that is city police and they are separate from the campus. So they would not be directed to me. But the first time a person is caught underage drinking is in essence a fine. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Jim hopes that a demand-reduction will result from the university’s increasing controls. Jim described what "user accountability" measures are employed when an NU student is caught drinking illegally:

There is a gradation from a limitation of privileges to mandatory sanctions. I think everybody I saw this year had been caught for the second time. But this also involves people who are sitting around in their dorm room with four guys and literally just have one beer. So this is more of a message. They don’t differentiate. It’s illegal to have alcohol in the dorm, if you have any alcohol you are referred, you are limited some way with privileges, but it doesn’t differentiate between the guys who have a lot of booze and do a lot of heavy drinking versus the guy who only has one beer. So the differentiating between the problem drinker who is experimenting and has a problem episode versus ... yeah the acute versus the chronic is not very well separated. What I mean by that, is somebody who is a freshman and they go out and they get
drunk once and they've never drunk before. And they're a lot of people like that. So I think there are some people who drink who do need education but do not need intervention per se. There is some kind of continuum. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

There is a continuum in attitudes and behaviors among college students. While many continue to "party", there are few reports that "user accountability" measures cause students to refrain from partying. Current approaches at NU continue to focus on the prevention and treatment of drinking-related problems, especially among the high-risk groups. Accountability and responsibility are only buzz words and NU finds intervention necessary with many "hard-core" students.

Assessing the Counseling Center's Impact

A campus tradition and culture has grown up around alcohol use at NU. A strategic prevention plan had been devised in response to widespread alcohol abuse and a series of well-publicized alcohol-related injuries. The mid-1980s at NU had been a time when the star basketball player caused an injury to a women who fell from his car and a student leader had formed a one-man BACCHUS program on campus. These are referred to as "critical incidents" by prevention expert John Swisher and are meant to be used a "springboard for further program and policy development" (1992). Since NU had this troubled past, I was anxious to learn about the outcome of NU's prevention program on its drinking culture. Jim evaluated his program's success:
I think that drug prevention succeeded, alcohol is a drug obviously. I think that alcohol prevention has been not successful. So that kind of attempt is a token endeavor at this point. With drug prevention, people have been much more open in terms of hard drugs. People have been much more willing to listen to "don't smoke dope, don't smoke cocaine, stay away from crack". So the Northern populace is still not at a point of looking at alcohol in a serious way. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Where the Counseling Center has recorded the least success was in getting its large and well trained staff to delve beyond crisis intervention and dig for underlying causes to addiction and abuse. Jim had no trouble explaining the current emphasis on drinking which brought so many students to his service:

NU is much more of a party school than I thought it would be. I think there are places which truly are party schools for four years. I think at NU there is some of the image of it being a four year party school, but also academically it is also more demanding and on campus there is less acceptance of drinking. I know this is a dangerous analogy, if taken literally it falls apart. But in terms of a general message, I do think there is a parallel in terms of smoking. Where there are places now on campus where it is not okay to be drunk. That was not true 5 or 10 years ago. So there is some peer pressure to not throw up on Wales, and to not slide nude on the floor of the Volcano, which was one of their favorite things. In reality, it got a lot of publicity, but it wasn't that common. I think there is more peer pressure, I think there is more awareness by the adults, the faculty. There is less tolerance of faculty abuse. So I think its getting there, but I still think there is a ways to go. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Jim discussed NU's campus culture and the tremendous changes that the NU administration had planned. Jim said the Counseling Center had plans for the new look:

I think one of the push of the Campus-wide Alcohol and Drug committee is to use some of that space for
alternatives. A lot of students don’t like to go to the union for entertainment. So here is a way for us to have entertainment that would strongly downplay drinking and that would be palatable for the average student. Right now the average student tends to go to bars on the weekends. So there is still too much drinking in general, there needs to be more prevention, there need to be more alternatives. There is always going to be the 5 percent who are truly hard core alcoholics and absolutely need in-patient treatment. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Oftentimes, treatment became necessary because of a student’s family history. Jim explained that:

in terms of education and prevention somebody who has two parents who are alcoholics and comes from a highly dysfunctional setting is more apt to engage in severe problem drinking. So if somebody has a pretty clean history and seems reasonably healthy and went out and drank four beers and somebody referred them, it would not pique my interest as much. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

At NU, due to the prevalence of drinking, even counseling services must be triaged. Prevention remains a goal at NU, but the strategy is to deal with the extreme cases of alcohol abuse.

NU is a drinking campus, the environment supported drinking and NU had achieved a reputation as a "party" school. A certain group on campus, mainly the Slackers, ensured the availability of drugs for NU students. Drug use at NU is less obvious than alcohol use, although marijuana was used openly at some bars. Jim told me drug use was not:

widespread, there are some drugs other than alcohol. Drugs are here, they can be a problem. But there is virtually no crack use here. Marijuana has been so expensive. Marijuana is certainly here, but speed, crack, marijuana are problems. But percentage wise, we're talking alcohol being 90% of the problem, other drugs 10% of the problem. I do get referrals from
people who are caught with other drugs. I was surprised by two things with my short tenure here, one is the extreme alcohol use and the second one is the low level of other drug use and abuse. There is certainly some experimentation in terms of smoking pot or whatever. And there is some increase in LSD and that is something we are keeping an eye on. Obviously crack is so incredibly problematic, that one time use is in fact abuse and addiction. (J. Wendt, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Northern University would never change Northern City's reputation as a town full of bars. The prevailing "wet" attitude of students on NU's campus was to continue the city's tradition, despite Campustown.

The PPAs - Peer Leadership as a Prevention Strategy

To change the social context of drinking at NU's campus will require providing students with a new sense of group identity. As one of the few student groups not completely involved in the traditional drinking identity, the Peer Paraprofessional Students (PPAs) are on the front-line of prevention at Northern. The PPA program draws on a select number of volunteers from the freshman and sophomore class who are trained in basic helping skills and group processes and assist with the activities of the Center. The PPAs train for a year before ever facilitating a presentation. The PPA's are the type of student group which administrations promote to fight and win the battle against substance abuse from within their generation. Lakefront is developing a peer leadership program, known as the PACT 2000, but it is not yet in the field.

"Peer" leadership programs are directly tied to the
idea that youth's perception of alcohol and drug use is a prominent factor of peer usage (Gonzalez, 1989). These pro-social students are known as PPAs at NU or Student Assistance Programs (SAPs) at LU. The benefits they receive, besides feeling they are doing something "good", include holding monthly meetings in conference rooms, getting a budget and enhancing their status on campus. If the peer group is a major influence, as research by Travis Hirschi (1969), Denise Kandel (1978) and Glassner and Loughlin (1987) demonstrates, then the university can attempt to counteract the negative influences of pro-deviant groups by inculcating a large number of students with an awareness about drugs and alcohol abuse.

Often the students' reactions to prevention may be less than desired. For the students who abuse alcohol and become discipline cases, participation in prevention is often viewed as punitive. Except the few who are involved in student peer leader groups, students generally participate only when they are targeted. Students resent the "infomercial" content of prevention programming. Even if they are required to attend a mandatory presentation or other lecture, some poorly organized presentations ignore the students and focus attention to the stage and lack an evaluation of their "shows".

Sociologists recognize the central role played by social factors, particularly those negative influences of
friends or peers, in promoting substance abuse (Botvin and Tortu, 1988; Kandel, 1992). Psychologist Albert Bandura’s studies (1977, 1984) on social learning helped conceptualize alcohol and drug use as socially learned, purposeful and functional behavior which is the result of interplay of socioenvironmental factors and personal perceptions (Gonzalez, 1989). Substance use is a social behavior and program providers find it difficult to intervene with "negative" social learning situations. Negative social learning may further encourage acts of date rape, racial intolerance and substance abuse which occur on campus and have college administrators concerned for their institutions (Boyer, 1990). Prevention theory argues primary prevention programs with peer networks "may hold significant opportunities for limiting problem drinking in peer-intensive environments" (Sherwood, 1987, p. 72).

An Interview with a PPA Peer Leader

I arranged one afternoon to talk with the PPAs during their weekly meeting. I first wanted to know what motivated the PPAs in their unpaid, non-credit prevention work. The reasons they gave ranged from helping out fellow student and helping them reach their fullest potential, doing it for knowledge’s sake or putting it on a resume. Asian-American senior, Jerry Tang, discussed his feelings and what he received as a PPA, saying:

knowledge about alcohol abuse. We’ve done the Jellinek Chart, that is what we do when we do outreach to the
dorms and the students. The progression from Early phase to Middle phase to recovery. Not so much about the drug aspect just because our program has been through a couple directors so there hasn’t been a fluid leadership role by getting knowledge automatically. Basically, the requests we get from the dorms are alcohol-related. (J. Tang, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

In addition to being a PPA, Jerry served on the Judicial Board (J-Board), a disciplinary board for student infractions. He told me how disciplinary infractions on campus were handled:

The Judicial Board, it's for residence halls, anything that happens in the residence halls, there is also a J-Board for the university. I think if it deals with drugs or possession of it they bring in Public Safety and the Northern City Police and they deal with that. At the same time they also must go to the J-board. (J. Tang, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

The J-Board is a student controlled board which sits in judgement of other students' behaviors. After a J-Board referral, a student would be ordered to go to the Counseling Center. The penalties for students ranged from a single session crisis intervention to the mandatory response three week disciplinary action, "You Make the Call". By disciplining sanctioned behaviors, the student-run J-Board kept alienation and unequal power relations at a minimum. The Counseling Center places a rather low value on sanctions. It was clear prevention at NU had taken the psychological counseling approach over the sanctions approach to deal with the large numbers of errant students.

Yet, the PPAs performed a control function, almost as a citizen-patrol like the Guardian Angels. Were PPAs the
front line troops against a drug and alcohol "enemy"? I asked Jerry about their role on campus, and he said that,

The PPAs, they offer a lot of different services, not just alcohol awareness but also school related and stuff like that. I don't know if enough people know about us, the Counseling Center itself that it exists and the programs we offer. I don't know if the word is out on us as much as it should be. (J. Tang, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

The "involved citizen" role in response to social problems is clearly on the rise as the public searches for solutions to societal problems. Examples of similar "involved" solutions include; M.A.D.D. mothers, who started an effective alcohol intervention and concern with the individual responsibility for social problems (Ross, 1987). Similarly, the victims right's movement examines why the rights of the less powerful group is ignored as a consequence of crime (Block, 1973).

Would a student who was in trouble with alcohol or drugs go to the Center to get help? Jerry thought, "initially they would go, if they were a freshman or living in the dorms, they would go to their R.A. Their R.A. knows from their training that they would refer them to the Counseling Center. So they would end up here".

Do PPAs have an impact? Jerry said, "I think it gives them an awareness of the problem that is going on. But I think part of a college career is learning through experience, I think they're going to go out and make their mistakes". This attitude represents a very deep current in
prevention to teach "responsible use" and to do nothing else unless a crisis occurs. The "learn as you go" method is natural to the average student experimenter, they make some mistakes and should learn by their experiences.

Jerry estimated a large percentage of NU students are making "mistakes", saying "excessive consumption of alcohol about is 30 to 40% and recurrent drunkenness occurs among 50% of those who drink". "People I see who are real heavy drinkers you don’t see them go to class the next day", Jerry reflected. He blamed much of this on alcohol’s widespread availability, saying:

In the immediate area, there isn’t a lot of things to do. So, like I say, there are parties everywhere. If you want alcohol its readily available. At house parties, not so much at the bars because they’re always cracking down. But there is always house parties, fraternity houses, sorority parties. (J. Tang, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

When asked to describe how a "typical college student experiences drinking and other drug use", Jerry provided a disturbing picture of that typical experience. He told me:

Every weekend night living in the dorms, you’ll experience going out and getting drunk and getting sick, maybe, or just seeing other people in the dorms getting sick. I can’t remember how times, when I was a freshman and sophomore, hearing people come in being loud or obnoxious or puking in the hallway, on the way to the washroom or in their rooms. (J. Tang, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Jerry had college friends who had been through these "learning experiences" at NU, saying:

Yeah, I’ve seen it a lot. I’ve seen people come and go. I know people who are in recovery right now. I’ve known people who have suffered academic failure and
have had to go home for a year or a semester just because they have screwed up so bad. As a result of what I think is their drinking problem. And most of them come back and they’re not the same as they were. (J. Tang, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Problem students, according to Jerry, suffer academically and have gaps in their academic careers. Services which reduce academic failure will assist both the students and the schools.

Serious dangers do exist when heavy drinking, drunkenness and drug use coexist in an university environment. "High-risk" students, described in greater detail in the next chapter, typically experience the negative consequences of drinking, such as sexual assault, arguments and fights, risky behaviors and frequent injuries.

I asked Jerry the question "What prevention strategy will work to reduce these behaviors", to which he offered a very simple answer:

I think one thing we do on outreach is we tell them is when they do go out, they go out in groups. Whenever you have friends looking out for each other, we ask them to confront them or help them out or something like that. (J. Tang, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

Besides "constructive confrontation", I asked if he thought there is anything that can be done to prevent the excesses at NU and Jerry said,

I don’t know. Its real hard because it seems like drinking is the social outlet and people are going to do it. I think just by going out to the dorms and say problems can occur due to excessive drinking. There is no main solution or the solution of all solutions. But I think just being able to talk about it with your friends, because I think alcohol is always going to be
there if they want to go get it. (IRWIN - So having friends who have stayed sober during the day, is that prevention?). Yeah. It can’t hurt. (J. Tang, personal communication, April 7, 1992).

A "buddy system" for protection against substance abuse is used in the Washington D.C. public school prevention programs (Brounstein, 1990, p. 92). "School-based" drug prevention in Washington D.C. has been instrumental in socializing and teaching life skills to public school students. Prevention policy statements out of Washington D.C.’s Department of Education have also been instrumental to Lakefront University’s Alcohol and Drug Prevention and Education program (hereafter known as ADAPE), as ADAPE was first funded by the Department of Education’s monies. ADAPE is described in the next section.

Lakefront - The Federal Government’s Model of Prevention

The Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Education program (ADAPE) has only been in existence at LU for three years. ADAPE’s "Three Year Strategic Plan" summary report acknowledged the government’s role in Lakefront’s prevention efforts:

As the 2nd year of the project draws to a close, it will also signal end of the grant period. LU has had the vision to do what the government is hopeful all institutions of higher education will do and that is to Institutionalize the program. Not only was the position of Project Coordinator made permanent with the title of Director assigned but a modest budget for this Department has been introduced into the Student Affairs overall budget (October 22, 1992).

The utilization of the F.I.P.S.E. monies was more than just a transformation of prevention services, it was the
genesis of prevention at LU. The F.I.P.S.E. Drug Prevention Program Office in Washington proclaims their "vision of comprehensive institution-wide prevention programs" is succeeding at universities (Bucknam, 1992). Their involvement in prevention at Lakefront aptly fulfills this objective. Lakefront conducts prevention activities by having one full time administrator for the program. Mr. Andy Accardi, the Director of ADAPE at Lakefront University, is a former high school principal and by all accounts a very pleasant, enthusiastic, hard-working individual. Andy had been hired on grant monies from a Institution-wide F.I.P.S.E. grant, one of the four types of the Department of Education makes to universities. After the F.I.P.S.E. grant, LU hired him on a permanent basis to continue the program. Andy discussed his duties as ADAPE’s director, a position he had held for a year and a half at the time of our interview:

Basically, I am to coordinate, develop, establish, and oversee all the programs that deal with alcohol and other drug prevention programming and training on all of Lakefront’s campuses not just the main campus. Since we’re housed here, our office is here, people sometimes get the impression that we’re addressing the issues just on this campus. We are responsible - my responsibilities - includes all the campuses and all the constituents whether it be faculty, students, staff, or administrators. I am a director of the Department we established which was the Department of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Education. This is the official title. It goes by the acronym ADAPE. (A. Accardi, personal communication, August 5, 1992).

ADAPE professes comprehensive prevention objectives which will "expand its program scope to reach all of LU’s campuses" in its ‘Action Plan’. LU is underestimating what
needs to be accomplished with prevention at LU's four campuses with over 6,700 undergraduates.

One person cannot be accessible at all times at a large, organizationally complex university, yet Andy always seemed in control of the events and tasks which he aimed to accomplish. While ADAPE appears overextended to the outside observer, it accomplishes a great deal. A yearly summary titled "WORKSCOPE", shown in Table 25, indicates what happens in the space of a year.

Table 25
ADAPE WORKSCOPE 1992-1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R.A. Training</td>
<td>60 Resident Assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, Chairs, Deans</td>
<td>40 Faculty, Chairs, Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation on Responding to the needs of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleagues as it relates to A/D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Orientation - Lakefront</td>
<td>In-coming Frosh/Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman Orientation - Downtown</td>
<td>In-coming Frosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation to Nurse Managers at MedCenter</td>
<td>30 Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACT 2000 Peer Leadership Training</td>
<td>40 Univ. students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol/Drug Awareness Week</td>
<td>Total univ. population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIDS/Drug Awareness Week</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Fair</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Employee Fitness Week</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Andy's additional staff at LU include two grad assistants, both limited to 20 hours weekly and a paid consultant John Rollo, who is employed part time as a Trainer. F.I.P.S.E. grants encourage training student trainers to instruct other students on drug and alcohol issues and build self-esteem, leadership and refusal skills. LU has just recently built a network of these student trainers.

I worked closely with LU's Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention and Education Office, being involved with the program since the earliest months. I served on the Evaluation Committee for ADAPE. I spent a great deal of time with the director, Andy Accardi, observing how LU's alcohol and drug abuse prevention program operated. I also analyzed ADAPE documents, conducted their 1992 CORE survey and wrote up the results in the form of this present study. In this section, I examine ADAPE's views toward substance use, i.e., whether they manage, control or prohibit it.

Charting Prevention at Lakefront

To engage in all the activities in WORKSCOPE, LU's ADAPE office is busy writing grant applications. On a grant application for funding a Peer Leaders Network Conference, Mr. Rollo was asked to describe ADAPE's prevention philosophy on alcohol for youth and adults. Rollo's written response was "YOUTH - The Agency supports a no use message for all those under 21 years of age. ADULTS - The Agency
supports a no use of drugs message and a responsible use message of alcohol". These statements are routine on grants. The private funding agency grant's next question read, "Does agency accept any monies from the alcohol industry?". Rollo answered, 'No', with a clean conscience, because they do not receive any monies from the alcohol beverage industry. NU has received the industry's money in the past.

In its rush to establish prevention programming ADAPE has made some mistakes in program content detected earlier at other campuses. For example, the campus still relies on single-session presentations in front of large groups, usually in freshman orientations. Alcohol education at LU regularly features motivational speakers and special events. These special events have included, positioning gravestones around campus with epitaphs attributing the "person's" death to drugs or alcohol, wrecked autos on display also attributing death to alcohol, and juice bars during the annual Drug and Alcohol Awareness Weeks. The single-session presentations were the staple of its first two years and ADAPE still does not provide intervention and treatment. As of yet, it has no formal ties to curriculum.

While ADAPE is still learning what works, their present "Workscope" is a curious mix. The lack of curriculum infusion is peculiar because Andy, as a former public school principle, works very closely with elementary schools to
develop materials and educate about alcohol and drugs.

ADAPE has recently again received federal monies to conduct training sessions for elementary school teachers and administrators. ADAPE’s lack of approaching the professors suggests the organizational structure at LU is too rigid. Prevention at LU may continue to affect the students without their professors ever hearing of ADAPE. However, ADAPE is indispensable to the Residence Life Department in providing trainers for sessions where "repeat violators" in dormitory settings are disciplined. These students are not handled by ADAPE, but by parallel judicial systems in the Residence Housing or Student Affairs offices.

The ADAPE program began at LU after a recognition of a need and the funding of a F.I.P.S.E. grant. At LU, the hierarchical flow of services are accomplished in a system where committees and extensive memorandums produce results. However, once in awhile a single person recognizes the need for a change and Student Affairs Vice-President Ted Vandiver, was an early advocate of drug and alcohol prevention at LU. As an administrator, Vandiver attends national meetings of Jesuit college officials and attempts to convince his fellow administrators to develop alcohol and drug prevention programs at their universities. Among his staff, rumor has it that he, himself, was a fraternity member and is interested in making the fraternities tow the line on the new restrictions to ensure they remain at LU.
However, fraternities such as Acca Sacca, described in the next chapter, have not received much good will from his office and were suspended last year for holding non-approved parties.

Outside Prevention Evaluations: Auditing LU’s ADAPE

Lakefront’s ADAPE was evaluated by a team of independent evaluators, led by a prominent prevention specialist Dr. John Swisher, a consultant for the Department of Education. I utilize the "Swisher" evaluation as a supplemental document about the state of prevention at Lakefront. In the Swisher report one detects an overwhelming sense of optimism. The report’s complementary review of ADAPE lauds the achievements of a program, which has a very small support staff and had only existed for one and a half years at the time of the report.

Swisher’s committee evaluated Lakefront’s policy review, development, and implementation finding a "proactive campaign to educate faculty, students and staff regarding new and existing policies" had occurred (1992, p. 2). As an instructor during the years in review, I knew of no "proactive" campaign efforts to include the new or existing policies in class.

The students must pick up materials or review a campus handbook to learn of the existing policies. The student newspaper may run an article on prevention policies and LU does a mailing of "drug laws and penalties" letter, but this
approach can hardly be defined as "proactive". Swisher’s only criticisms of ADAPE was outside of the program’s control, that is was given too small a budget and had a critical turnover in the mainly volunteer student staff which dealt with the dorms and student orientations.

The "Swisher Evaluation Report" went well for ADAPE and may have helped to secure permanent funding for it at the university. LU had established five major components (Curriculum, Policy, Program, Training and Evaluation) for the basis of their grant request and 10 objectives to meet before F.I.P.S.E.’s completion in October 1992. Written communication out of ADAPE would constantly refer to these benchmarks and address their status. Progress in these areas was summarized in ADAPE’s annual review. Evaluations were extremely important to ADAPE, and were presumably used to the follow-up on results of program delivery. ADAPE had a "do things by the book approach" based on their efforts to fulfill the program’s objectives.

The Bud Bus: A Flurry of Attention for Prevention

Swisher’s proclamation that there was a "proactive campaign" was either self-serving or very overenthusiastic. There were some victories and some results from prevention at LU. ADAPE brought the Names Project Quilt Panels to the LU campus, an obvious statement about the need for prevention, in this case A.I.D.S. prevention. ADAPE had hosted the National Peer Leaders Network Conference.
On the positive side, ADAPE has removed beer company sponsorship of the bus to the home basketball games. ADAPE sponsored a "Rename the Bud Bus Contest" where the students renamed the old Bud Bus. The Swisher report had high praises for this, stating:

One of the unique policy changes that will have an impact on student outlook was to change the name of the transportation to events. By changing the name the presence and/or endorsement of alcohol at these events has been changed (1992, p. 2).

The Swisher report is describing the outcome of the first major battle in the history of ADAPE. At Lakefront, the "Bud" Bus was one of the most popular methods for students to attend their home basketball games. A series of articles in the Phrantic newspaper described the ADAPE-initiated changes and the students' largely negative response to these changes. The Bud Bus, sponsored by the Budweiser Company, transported LU students from the local bars, like R.E.O.'s and the Shoreline, on scheduled runs to the suburban pavilion where Lakefront home games were held. Andy felt having the Bud Bus associated with the university was sending the wrong message. After getting reluctant cooperation from LU's Athletic Department, he authorized ADAPE's funding of a substitute bus, with no drinking but "brats" and other food.

The events surrounding the canceling of the Bud Bus did not unfold smoothly. At first the Bud Bus was simply canceled. Then some students complained in LU's newspaper,
the Phrantic. The Phrantic editorialized that the local Budweiser distributor funded the Bud Bus and the students benefitted by having a way to the home games. By the next issue of the Phrantic, Accardi countered the negative publicity by funding a bus with no drinking but "brats and food". Although, students missed the "carnival atmosphere" of drinking mugs, tee-shirts, beach hats and cup holders from the beer distributor. Andy felt he defused the negative reaction because the "bus was packed and basically we are trying to provide an alcohol free bus". The trial by publicity was over, the prevention group had triumphed.

As previously discussed, heavy drinking is a common occurrence at athletic events. Lakefront home crowds would change with the change in the bus service. The "Bud" crowd was out and the clean crowd was in. The Bud Bus did not card students to ride the bus. The Bud Bus did not sell alcohol, but students were allowed to bring it on board with them. Being in close proximity with others, students riding the "Bud Bus" passed beers around. On board the bus, beer and liquor were readily available to underage students. Any student who managed to get into R.E.O. or the Shoreline, either legitimately and or with a fake ID, got to ride Budweiser's bus. The restoration of university sponsorship produced a visible symbol of having sober students attend home games. It was viewed as a positive change for the campus, but it produced invisible effects such as shuffling
drunken students to other places, having them driving drunk

to the game, or simply keeping them at the bars. Budweiser
still continues to provide advertising on LU's basketball
team's schedule calendars, a matter which continues to
irritate Andy.

LU was just now coming into compliance with the major
resolutions promoted by National Association of Student
Personnel Administrator ten years ago. Among other things,
they recommended:

Alcohol beverage marketing programs specifically
targeted for students and/or held on campus should
conform to the code of student conduct of the
institution and should avoid demeaning sexual or
discriminatory portrayal of individuals.

Beverage alcohol (such as kegs or cases of beer) should
not be provided as free awards to individual students
or campus organizations.

Display or availability of promotional materials should
be determined in consultation with appropriate
institutional officials (Goodale, 1986, p. 56).

All three of these items are routinely violated at
universities. Sometimes businesses or charities give away
prizes of free beer to students. NASPA also requests
"support" for prevention from the beverage alcohol
marketers. The battle with alcohol industry is an ongoing
one for prevention providers. Changes do occur and the non-
alcohol sponsor for athletics is highly sought after on
today's drug-free campus.

At Lakefront, Andy continues his efforts to reduce the
use of alcohol. He has been a regular in the President's
Golf Tournament. He observed one year that the players in golf game were imbibing on the greens as they played. Although not recommending teetotalism, he believed that drinks should only be served only after the golf game. The next year it changed. Other changes included, fraternities pledged not to drink on Wednesdays, and a nun started a juice bar on Wednesday night. Although none of the fraternity guys materialized at Sister Vilma’s juice bar.

**ADAPE's Current Prevention Efforts**

Andy Accardi goes out of his way for LU students. He was also supportive of my goals to study the effectiveness of ADAPE’s prevention efforts. He hoped this research would show the F.I.P.S.E. grant, which the university had been awarded $129,820 through a competitive process, was well spent on surveys, conferences and orientation presentation. One requirement of the F.I.P.S.E. grant was that the CORE survey be given three times during the granting period. ADAPE welcomed my research which required giving the CORE Survey a second time. With ADAPE’s cooperation, I conducted the CORE Survey in Spring 1992. The university had conducted the initial CORE and a very limited CORE in 1993. I cooperated with the university in sharing data and they certainly did likewise.

**A Split in the "Mission"**

Andy has called intervention "our missing component". He believes ADAPE’s range of services should be expanded,
saying, "Our program needs a middle-step, that's pre-assessment. We're not into the counseling end. They've told us that legally we can't go and tell a student they should go to the Counseling Department, if they don't ask us for help". So the frustration builds among the prevention providers at LU because of the realization that they can educate, and perform but legally they cannot intervene.

Although the ADAPE program was young, there were institutional obstacles to further program delivery. LU's Counseling and Developmental Center supervisor, Tim Carnes remains ideologically opposed to and will not accept any mandated or disciplinary referrals. Carnes' staff only accept self-referrals. ADAPE's Evaluation Committee was interested in knowing how many students go to Counseling for other causes and admit to a drug or alcohol problem.

This approach to student services poses a dilemma because the organizational structure at LU is rigid and may be a barrier to progress with this particular student safety and health issue. Other student services cross organizational lines, but alcohol and drug education seems orphaned and alone. The explanation for this turf battle might be attributed to the specialized nature of departmental work at universities. I asked Andy about the lack of counseling for the student who needs it, he said:

I think its a health issue, the Student Health Services probably sees more students with health related problems directly resulting from hangovers and drug stuff than does the Counseling Center. I don't have
the statistics at hand because in talking to some of the personnel in Counseling and Developmental Services first and foremost it is self referral, this university does not mandate anybody having to go there, and so what happens is often times when they are doing counseling ancillary to all this the problem they might have with alcohol or drugs in their lives comes up in the conversation. (A. Accardi, personal communication, August 5, 1992).

The expertise of the Counseling Department lies in basic services for mental health problems, like depression, test anxieties, study habits and relationship problems. None of the staff at the Counseling and Developmental Services staff has been trained as drug and alcohol counselors or addiction counselors. If specific problems with substance abuse come up, then students may be referred to a professional alcohol and drug counselors.

Andy hopes to begin a pre-assessment program, believing there is a need for it. He said:

Because we are a new program, I would suspect that in the next two year this kind of work will become part of our daily routine. That is, we will be commonly asked to deal with some of the more severe cases in terms of the conduct and that becomes maybe a pre-assessment. Once again, I want to clarify we do not assess or counsel in this office. The pre-assessment I conducted was based on twenty questions that went over some information about the students use of alcohol in the fact that person had gotten into severe trouble over the course of the time that that person spent here as a student and so it was a pre-assessment, no judgmental kind of thing. Basically, with this particular student, the Dean of Students, and myself conducted the Pre-assessment and the end result was to encourage the student to seek an assessment at a facility that could do it because LU doesn’t do it either. (A. Accardi, personal communication, August 5, 1992).

Andy’s goals could be achieved if LU could align the existing resources, thereby increasing cooperation. Carnes’
counselors may continue to bypass the discipline and mandatory cases, but these kind of cases occur at LU. Relying on the organizational chart to assist with these problems at LU diffuses the multiple skills at Counseling, Student Health and ADAPE and keeps them from knowing what the other one is doing. In contrast, NU’s Counseling Center brings together many of these same resources under one roof.

"We’re Drunks" - Repeat Violators Sessions

Five university-wide committees were established, ensuring widespread support of prevention, to develop LU’s prevention programming. Andy was, as usual, energetic, the campus-wide advisory committees met and produced memorandum, student volunteers ran education programs, yet as of October, 1993, no Student Assistance Program was developed and no interventions were conducted. In Fall of 1993, all committees, except the Evaluation Committee, adjourned as the F.I.P.S.E. grant was completed. The Evaluation Committee kept on meeting and discussing the issues of prevention.

Residence Hall Graduate Student Assistant, Marlene Adair, spoke at an Evaluation Committee meeting and told us some personal stories of LU students from her last session. Discipline sessions are facilitated by Marlene, who works at both Residence Life and ADAPE. All alcohol and drug first offenders, who are usually violators from the dorms, are offered two sessions, but are only required to attend one
session. Second offenses require a second session.

The students talked to Marlene about drinking for days in a row and going for weeks in a row without attending classes. The students had told her, "Your education, we’re beyond that, we’re drunks". Marlene left the session and told Andy, "Andy, its beyond me, I had to get to you guys". Marlene had students telling her "You can show all the videotapes you want, it won’t do any good". These cases, Marlene pleaded, require more intervention because the students are frustrated with prevention approach to their "repeat violator" situation.

After Marlene had made her presentation, the Evaluation committee discussed the problems Marlene brought to the meeting. The Evaluation Committee was concerned about what significance, if any, these mandated sessions had for the 22 students. Andy saw a need for expanding prevention services with these students who were experiencing negative consequences due to their alcohol abuse. John Rollo, Andy’s assistant, lamented, "We’re giving them a mixed message, but with only prevention and early intervention offered, when something finally appears we’re not able to do anything with them". Rollo said these "problems" indicate we "might start up a serious intervention response".

There was no consensus in the committee to move in the direction of providing direct intervention. Dr. Eva Stradun, an LU administrator, agreed to "early
interventions" with this population because "we're providing future leaders who can take the problems to work, where it costs business millions of lost dollars, and loss of productivity". The students social context of drinking and drug use is far different from that of the workplace. Eva had not recognized the social nature of student drinking. LU students consider partying part of a contemporary student life style which recedes the day they graduate.

Dr. Jack Slocumb, M.D., an administrator at LU's Medical Center, stated it was entirely possible to get money from LU for an intervention program which would function to retain the student abusers. But Slocumb hedged any action on it, saying,

LU-Medical Center is not in the business of drug and alcohol prevention, its perceived as someone else's thing. It's not cancer research, it's not transplants. But the retention issue is important to keep students who will fail out solely for drug and alcohol problems in school. It is strictly good business and could be sold to the administration on these terms. (J. Slocumb, personal communication, March 10, 1993).

To the extent that LU can financially reap benefits, there is widespread support for intervention. The Evaluation committee ended the debate on the retention of student users because they were not empowered to create an intervention component. LU was left without a fully-developed counseling/referral policy and LU students were left with a videotape developed to function as intervention with the problem drinkers and drug users. Questions of service delivery accountability remain. How does a "repeat
violator" get better from a repeated videotape?

Because of program inadequacies, when drug-related incidents occur at Lakefront, they are quite often are handled without anyone from ADAPE hearing about them. They are often bounced to LU security. Recently, students asked LU security officers what they should do when they found a woman passed out on a sidewalk. LU Security responded and had the woman, a non-student, rushed to the hospital where she spent three days in a drug-induced coma. Another incident involved a student who was growing and selling marijuana dipped in formaldehyde. LU Security began an investigation which closed down his unhealthy and illegal trade.

Peer Programs Trends

Andy looks toward the trend of a partnership with students and administrations working together to develop the content, style and form of prevention materials and presentations on campus. The Student Assistance Program, or SAP, is a real "partnership for drug-free America" which is slowly being adapted by many universities. One of ADAPE's goals is to reestablish rules which might inhibit drug use. An ADAPE information sheet gave the following definitions of its peer program components. It reads:

Positive peer influence programs can help to channel peer pressure in positive directions; they can also help to develop and enhance self-esteem and problem-solving and decision-making skills.
Peer teaching programs address the need not just for useful information and skills among youth, particularly in relation to academic success in school but they also provide participating youth with meaningful roles and real-world responsibilities at a time when youth are increasingly isolated from such roles and responsibilities in the prolonged adolescence of the peer culture.

Peer counseling programs assist young people in coping with some of the challenges with which they are inevitably confronted in modern society; family problems and problems with friends and school are commonly dealt with in these kinds of programs (ADAPE Prevention Material).

These definitions are common to SAP and PPA programs.

At LU, Andy hopes to "help a student to begin thinking about a much more healthy lifestyle than going out every Thursday or Friday night and drinking themselves under the table and then trashing their room when they come back". He felt being a "puritan" would not work, so he is counting on "peer student leaders" to get involved. He told me:

I think we can get other students to do that. One of the major pieces of our program is our PACT 2000 program. That’s the Peer Leadership. Colleagues helping colleagues. That’s our baby. That’s our main cornerstone of our program as peer educators. And that’s the PACT 2000 program we started out with having 40 students go away and get trained and we’re utilizing them in all of our presentations as spokesperson for what we are saying. So that it’s not just Andy Accardi or Al Rollo getting up in front of a group of students and telling them what we think. It’s their own peers getting up and saying we want you to consider healthier lifestyles and this might mean self-esteem issues leadership issues, communication issues. So we’re developing a network. (A. Accardi, personal communication, August 5, 1992).

One of LU’s strengths is Andy’s energy, another is its various student groups which come together under the auspices of ethnic and racial clubs. LU currently has a 25 percent minority enrollment and ADAPE may benefit by having
greater involvement with these student clubs. Analysis of survey data on groups listed in question 32 (See Appendix B) reveals students clubs have the most positive peer influence among groups at either NU or LU. The main function of these groups is to provide social supports and Andy would like to involve them in his activities, saying the:

"The design of the program is to draw from constituents from ethnic groups, from age populations, etc. from anyway we can. Ideally, you could say that it would be good to have binge drinkers and alcohol and drug users but that's not the case either. The point is that if you keep spreading the good amongst those that are maybe in the minority of being those that are really problems, you may be able to infiltrate that with the good elements. I'm not indicting the student population here, basically what I'm saying is that it's not necessary to have just all the people in the training because then what we would be doing is counseling and that's not what we're here to do. (A. Accardi, personal communication, August 5, 1992)."

The prevention strategy Andy is discussing is known as "coverage accountability". Coverage accountability asks the question; are the persons served those who were designated as targets (Rossi and Freeman, 1982). Andy has made a choice not to target abusers. His choice is supported by literature which finds "it is difficult to determine the extent to which these prevention programs might have an impact on those individuals most likely to develop more extensive patterns of substance use" (Botvin, 1990, p. 494). ADAPE is also legally bound to refrain from counselling.

ADAPE has moved in certain circles. The heavy users are never easy to reach, but they are not designated as targets in ADAPE’s current service plan. ADAPE is serving
the more sociable people on campus and designs services for these groups. The PACT 2000 peer leaders are overachievers; they get involved on campus and already belong to other clubs and student groups. Resource alignment may still occur at LU, still Andy does get quite a bit accomplished with ADAPE's limited resources. Andy knows how to be a "friend" to the student groups, to solve problems for Residence Life, to stage events and to channel new students into ADAPE during orientation. Any future improvements depend on a sound program which gets the younger students involved.

New Controls at the University Versus Parental Controls

Younger students reported they would face strong parental or peer disapproval if caught using alcohol or drugs. Andy claims previous cultural restraints are broken at LU, because:

the idea that this is a free, open, experiential, away from home, that whole mix spells trouble for those people who do not have the discipline. And let's face it, when you get individuals at this age that are surrounded by the freedom, total freedom that they have in many cases, the mix of alcohol is ... what to do to have fun ... That is the reason that people drink to the excess that they do, is that what else is there to do that is fun. So I view it as a developmental thing in a person. It's like the parental guidance, some of the overriding rules that have been established for 4, 5, 6 or 7 years while they were going through junior high and high school, they get to college man, goodbye. (A. Accardi, personal communication, August 5, 1992).

The relative newness of prevention programs leaves researchers with scant information of their efficacy in dealing with family problems and problems with friends or at
school. But the debate on the strength of the influence of peer culture over that of the educational or parental attachments has long been a focus of sociologists (Coleman, 1961; Hirschi, 1967; Dembo et al., 1986). The question drug researchers want to answer is; what affect does peer, educational or parental attachments, or any combination of these, have on drug use? The lack of this disapproval of a significant "attachment" may lead students to act deviantly (Hirschi, 1969). The next table, Table 26, compares the students' self-reported perception of informal sanctions imposed by attachment groups on inappropriate drug behavior.

Table 26

Percent of Students who Report Universities, Parents and Peers would "Strongly Disapprove" of Sanctioned Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>University NU</th>
<th>University LU</th>
<th>Parents NU</th>
<th>Parents LU</th>
<th>Friends NU</th>
<th>Friends LU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caught Smoking Marijuana</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>79.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caught Drinking Underage</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caught using Cocaine</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion of Informal Sanction's Effect

Typically students encounter the most disapproval by parents, next from the institution, and finally from their peers. But of these, it is the institution where liability is centered and regulations are enforced. The casual use of alcohol and drugs, although not cocaine, is tolerated within
the peer circles where Table 26 reports the least 'strongly disapprove' percentage.

Peer attachment may not support the same ties to conventional norms which parents and universities support. Johnson (1973) found the transition from a parental subculture to a peer subculture is a period when drug use increased. There are clear university differences with regards to being "caught drinking underage". Students at NU are not expecting very great disapproval by any of the three groups, while more than half of LU students are fearful of the university's reaction. The fear of strong disapproval of underage drinking by parents is 32.8% at LU and drops to just over 22% at NU. The majority of students have not reported that their parents would strongly disapprove of their being caught at underage drinking.

While institutions impose controls on the student culture and parents on their children, results from Table 26 show it is the perception of control felt by students which may challenge the drug use norms. These results suggest some interactive effect between prevention programming experienced by students and the social bond and conventional ties of students which will act to inhibit drug use. The trick which prevention programming must perform is decreasing the effects of the student culture. Students who hold moderate norms regarding drinking may be lost because "students tend to misperceive their normative environment
Although, parents are the highest 'disapprovers', some students are not affected by the "parental culture" in the same way as others, perhaps as a result of family disruption or alcoholism. Since very little prevention practice is found in the medical establishment, parents and educators have been left in charge of prevention. Parental guidance, as shown next, can help students avoid alcohol problems.

**Parental Involvement at NU**

Botvin reported that what has come to be called the Parent's Movement is a growing force in prevention (1990). Many parents of NU students are alumni of NU themselves. During Parents Weekend, I saw many parents out for a drink with their sons or daughters. Anthropological literature on the family mentions the effect of informal controls:

> the kinds of control that are exercised by parents, peers, and other people are far more important than those exercised by institutions. That basic differentiation is at the root of the sociological distinction between "formal" and "informal" controls. ... In fact informal controls, such as peer pressure, parental guidance, gossip, shunning, and so forth, play a larger part in the lives of most people than do formal controls. ... formal controls should be invoked only in those rare instances when informal controls have proven to be ineffective (Heath, 1990, p. 139).

If parental informal controls fail, then campuses may have to apply more formal controls with abusive drinking. In 1987, parents at the NU Parents Association Board meeting tried a different tact to deter their kids' drinking and drug use, outlining how to spent the Parent's Fund:
It was suggested that the 1987-88 fund be used for three purposes; (1) to create a network for coordinating those programs (BACCHUS, AA, Al-Anon Counseling Center) we already have on campus; (2) to provide funds to publicize those programs mentioned above and to publicize the alternatives activities that are available; (3) to provide funding for alternatives ... The parents feel that if this goal were set, they would be fulfilling their role as parents, and that the University would be fulfilling its responsibility in providing education and alternatives. (1987 Counseling Center document).

The NU Parents Association emphasized their parental role with regards to intervention with alcohol and drug use. The funding of alternative activities is indicator of parents continued normative control over their children’s lives.

Conclusion

The success of the NU Parents Association is lauded by the NU administration and the Counseling Center. They value money and support from all sources, but are especially appreciative of parental support, mentioning it to me several times even though it occurred years ago. They know many parents are NU alumni who therefore "understand" the social context of the environment at NU and the special needs of NU students. At LU, ADAPE’s accomplishments include monitoring the fraternity rush and halting their keg parties and modifying their social context of off-campus fraternity parties. LU had also begun substance-free housing where certain floors in the dorms were designated as chemical free or substance free. The student’s positive reactions to their "drug-free" dorm rooms and roommates reported in a city newspaper article was very good for LU’s
image. Substance-free housing helps transform the dorm culture towards a "drug-free" culture. LU has developed innovative measures for its campus residents.

Despite the management of alcohol and drug problems at these schools, questions remain. Is prevention designed to assist the nation's brightest students in their transition to leadership positions or is it a bureaucratic tangle of unenforceable regulations? Providing prevention on college campuses is a "side-bet" (Becker, 1964). Prevention positions a safety net where crises are handled. Kuh uses the term "invisible safety net" for a wider crisis management which Residence Deans use "to coordinate institutional resources (faculty, medical and counseling resources, parents and others) in response to students who are in trouble academically, socially, emotionally, or physically" (1991, p. 140). Student understand two "invisible nets" exist; one where social control agents apprehend the students, one where prevention resources respond to students with problems of substance use. While Kuh (1991) argues resident assistants "are not responsible for discipline or 'police' functions", students may confuse the real and imagined roles of the use of personnel and resources.

Organizing their deviance, as students must now do, by holding parties, raves and other deviant exchanges requires them to avoid the "invisible net" of social control.
Whether or not this control is derived from a resident assistant or a police officer, students hope to avoid identification and apprehension. Students may avoid controls because, "faced with aggressive social control tactics, deviants need more elaborate defenses to protect themselves" (Best and Luckenbill, 1994, p. 217).

Rubington’s studies report students "export deviance" (1990, 1991). This study finds a great deal of underage drinking occurs in Slacker houses or at fraternities. Even with raising of the drinking age, students do not fear 'strong disapproval' of the university when caught drinking underage. It is likely they export drinking to these off-campus locations because the availability of alcohol was affected by the laws and they are faced with apprehension by formal social control agents; i.e. police.

Prevention programs make the university appear to be doing something to combat substance use which deflects the criticism of what few changes they really initiate in the student culture. With prevention programs impacting one fifth of students and the student culture impacting the rest, the student culture is now likely the dominant force. This research finds "social deviance" on campuses is organized, rather than disorganized (Suttles, 1972; Best and Luckenbill, 1994). As prevention programs challenge the existing student culture, new deviant patterns emerge. Gonzalez’s integrated model of prevention incorporating
social learning, health belief and problem behavior theory may further organize prevention programs. When prevention programs become more organized, then they will have a greater effect on the student culture. Gonzalez advocates the management of social activities where alcohol is served, which affects a large percentage of students, especially those in fraternities and residence halls. He predicts, "once students see that the management of alcohol can enhance rather than hinder social dynamics, even off-campus events can begin to reflect responsible strategies and expectations" (Gonzalez, 1986b, p. 14).

The universities must evaluate their coverage accountability with prevention targeting certain groups. Universities like LU, with a moderate drinking culture, might reorganize a streamlined service delivery, while others like NU, with a heavy drinking culture, must organize for the long-term. This re-evaluation is anticipated as the F.I.P.S.E. grants run out and universities must determine how much service they alone can afford and how much service their students need. Prevention has the law behind it, the community demanding it, but it does not enjoy the support of the drinking cultures described in the next chapter.
CHAPTER VII

SLACKERS AND FRATERNITIES: THE CULTURAL CHALLENGE TO PREVENTION AT UNIVERSITIES

Two campus drinking groups, Slackers and fraternities, who never had drug-free values are the focus of this chapter. The behaviors of Slackers and fraternities disturb the "drug-free" moral entrepreneurs and prevention providers whose rational culture and standards are troublesome to these drinking groups. Slackers and fraternities ignore the controllers warnings, sanctions and expulsions, as a poster at the LU Acca Sacca fraternity house wall reads, "In search of the eternal buzz".

A similar disregard of formal regulations exists at the Slacker house located near NU. The first place to begin an examination of these two groups is at the houses where they live. Being a participant-observer with these drinking groups, I was able to gain access to, and more importantly, to gain knowledge of the social context of student alcohol and drug use which continues to challenge prevention providers.

One night I saw Gary, a Slacker "cultural leader", searching, amongst disheveled and unclean dishes in the kitchen, for a clean glass. The glass, he explained, was
necessary to take a couple of aspirins. I asked if he had a headache or felt bad. Gary replied that he regularly took aspirins before going to bed when he anticipated a hangover in the morning. Gary had drank three pitchers of beer that night and knew what to expect. Gary's routine, according to the opinions of other students, was to drink and watch television or use drugs, if they were available. Gary has a poor self-concept and often escapes by drinking. He told me, "See I don't get hung-over too bad. When I do, it's horrible. But I drink almost nightly, so I have a tolerance". I then asked, "So it really wouldn't be Northern without all these parties, would it"? Gary replied, "Our existence would be changed".

Gary, the other NU Slackers and LU fraternities do not seem to care that university officials would like nothing better than to see that their existence changed through alcohol and other drug prevention efforts. What university officials can do to change the drinking groups behaviors is an entirely different question. Criminologist John P. Conrad (1986) states that all modern social systems use both "benign" and "coercive" controls as forms of regulating social order. These controls can be defined as:

Benign control refers to culturally patterned, informal and socially approved modes of regulation. Coercive control entails force or the threat of force. We often do not think of shame or ridicule as forms of control, but social pressure can often act to restrain deviant behavior (Davis and Stasz, 1990, p. 62).

Benign control has a powerful leverage on campuses because
students would not want to be estranged from the campus culture. Heretofore, the conventional standards at the university tolerated student "deviance" within certain limits. An decreased tolerance of drinking group behaviors occurred when the states raised the drinking age.

Criminologist Les Wilkens has argued that this type of coercive control and the subsequent requirements are sources of the amplification of deviance (Davis and Stasz, 1990, p. 62). The new alcohol laws with their age restrictions have led to the perpetuation of deviance and many forms of new deviance such as illegal consumption of alcohol by a minor, illegal possession of alcohol by a minor and misrepresentation of age by a minor. Documentation of the true effects of benign and coercive controls on the behaviors of drinking groups is required for administrators to apply the necessary amount of control.

The control of drinking groups at universities begins more with benign control and talking about coercive controls than with taking action on the threat implicit in coercive control. This suggests such controls can be dismissed as symbolic because universities are sending students "mixed messages". Both Slackers and fraternities are directly affected by increased controls, but, as this chapter explains, they use their organizational abilities to "manage" this control and "they screen their activities from conformists and regulate both their own conduct and that of
other similar deviants" (Rubington, 1973, p. 91). Rubington (1973) has argued, theoretically, the solution for these problems of drinking groups comes from a deviant subculture.

**Subcultures: The Off-campus Drinking Groups**

Slackers and fraternities form subcultures which are dissimilar and at odds with each other on campus. The Slackers are an alternative, accelerated subculture who have set themselves apart from the campus and its rules. Slackers warn the 'straight' world in advance" of their "presence of difference" as they live in an accelerated world where immediate feedback from television and computers promote their "forbidden identity" (Hebdige, 1979). The fraternities are a retro/hangover subculture who position themselves near the center of the campus and evade its rules. Maddox (1970) refers to them as representing "institutionalized drinking" on campus. Both groups are similar in their excessive use of alcohol and familiarity and fondness for drugs. The alcohol and drug-centered behaviors of these groups endure, in part, as Earl Babbie writes, because "one of the things that makes groups special is that they persist, even though the individuals involved come and go" (1994, p. 49).

According to research conducted by Ruth Engs and David Hanson, to be most effective collegiate alcohol policies and programs must examine the problems of college students and "aim programming at those groups exhibiting the most problem
behaviors" (Sherwood, 1985, p. 64-5). At LU, Andy Accardi selects those without problem behaviors, saying he is "spreading good", not targeting those who binge drink or use drugs. I talked at length with Father Lenihan about the qualities of the NU Campus, the students and their problems. His dorm living had caused him to observe the activities of students which he listed as:

There's class, there's study time, and there is just the informal chatting. A lot of chatting goes on, its partly watching television. Doing video rentals. Its certainly big in the residence halls, our students love to get a video and they'll get pizza, and they'll drink in their rooms. Administratively, it is not approved but we know it happens. (F. Lenihan, personal communication, April 10, 1992).

The tightening of controls on alcohol is changing the student culture Father Lenihan has described. The focus of the university is on excessive on-campus drinking which often "legitimizes" off-campus partying. Residence hall students recognize the visible involvement of the college administration and respond by exporting their drinking off-campus. The university concerns and controls appear to decrease in relation to the distance the problem occurs from the campus.

Off-campus students do not fear university disapproval. A few blocks from campus, inside the bar where we talked, the discussion among the Slackers was lively, centering around their generation's identity. Cameron told me, "I don't think we're trying to rebel, every generation has said, 'Hey they don't understand us'". A Slacker lifestyle
includes a chic poor, drugs, "grunge" music and parties which are an acceptable identity to students who are not attracted to the university-approved lifestyles such as athletics, student clubs or the Greek system. The Slackers are marginal, preferring alternative lifestyles which are inappropriate to the mainstream views of the approved student groups. Anomic conditions off-campus add to the distance felt between Slackers and their peers, especially the Greeks. Slackers live in disorganized areas where the pulls of the drinking groups outweigh the pulls of the university. Can the university expect to strengthen this group's missing ties to the conventional order and to their more involved peers?

Hey they don't understand us: The Life and Times of Slackers

I was told in a serious conversation that you really could not be a Slacker as an individual, but could be Slackers, plural. Field work on Slackers shows these students at the Slacker house were sure of their collective Slacker identity, but it was never reified as somebody directly putting "airs" of being a Slacker.

In terms of a concentration, the student culture is the "critical mass" where Generation X's interests emerge. Slackers are comfortable with participation in the student culture and may not exist without it. Faith discussed the "groupiness" existing at NU, in this time in their lives:

Where else in your life are you going to have 10,000 eighteen to twenty-two year olds concentrated in the
same place. All with the same mentality going through the same thing. (F. Josten, personal communication, April 8, 1992).

One function of face-to-face conversations among Slackers is to agree on suitable definitions of their social world. The method used is bantering or arguing before reaching consensus. The first unsolicited reply to Faith's comment came from Cliff, who said, "Not all with the same mentality, but having to deal with the same basic situation. They have to change at the same time". Ken replied, "Different people reacting to the same situation in the same ways". The Slackers "ways of talking" point to a common set of symbols and attitudes within the student "culture".

Young adults transmit a particular set of values while attending college. These values are found in dorms, fraternities, almost anywhere in the student setting. Slackers and fraternity members support values, beliefs and norms which revolve around their drinking-centered existence. For Slackers hanging out at bars is a scene which Cliff says, "is old, but we always go back to it". Before moving on to Slacker drinking and drug use, the implications of a valid "Slacker culture" should be considered. If the bar scene is old, why are Slackers, a new culture, attracted to it? Ken's answer was "Different people react to the same situation in the same ways". Non-Slacker student are similar in many ways to Slackers, they have a common "culture" (Willis, 1990). The transitory
experiences within the student culture are widely shared.

The interpretive view of Slackers stress how society and culture shape their behaviors which may differentiate them from other student drinkers. Slackers feel that they are different. Ken, a philosophy major, stated:

We’re in a more relativistic generation. The rules are changing the way to live. The technology is changing, you can’t even communicate the technology from one generation to the next. The social environment is so different from before. The rules have broken down. They don’t even apply. (K. Bonning, personal communication, April 16, 1992).

Social change, accompanied by the breakdown of societal rules, has occurred as recently as the 1960s generation, when university students were exhorted by the LSD guru Dr. Timothy Leary, to "Turn on, tune in, drop out". Slackers, who retain an affection for Leary, instead "Turn on, tune out, hang on". Slackers attempt to hang on to the university culture because they are wary of the "McJobs" which await them (Coupland, 1991). "McJobs" are entry-level jobs which do not utilize their education and which Slackers believe any effort, great or small, offers no payback.

The Texas legislature is acting to force Slackers, who delay graduation, to work harder to graduate. A recent Wall Street Journal article described how the Texas state government wants Slackers, after completing more than 157 semester hours, to pay 700% more tuition. The portrayal of Slackers in Austin, Texas where the cult film "Slacker" was filmed, was the catalyst for the bill's sponsors who took,
aim at academia's hangers-on, particularly those at the University of Texas in the state capital of Austin. Their subculture was immortalized in "Slacker," a locally produced low-budget film that profiles some of the writers and thinkers who hang around the university, enrolling in classes after class and taking root in the bookstores and coffeehouses around campus (April 16, 1993).

One definition of culture states it is a common shared location where members call themselves by the same name and establish patterned activities to help the culture to survive (Hess et al, 1991). The Slackers relate to the "popular culture" which is common to college students today. Here there is a wide gulf with more conventional mainstream culture. The Wall Street Journal article continues:

Many of those profiled in the film have no visible means of support. One is a Kennedy assassination buff hoping to get rich with a book titled "Conspiracy-a-Go-Go"; another claims to have Madonna's Pap smear for sale.

...the sponsor of the antislacker bill ... is cracking down on what he says are essentially professional students .. The measure has won the senator few friends in the slacker community... "He's thinking in a real industrial, utilitarian, capitalist sort of way," says Richard Linklater, director of the movie. The Austin Chronicle, ... newspaper editor Louis Black says the bill is part of an old feud. Slackers, he says, have long irritated career-minded lawmakers and irked local economic boosters, who have sought to "portray Austin as a gung-ho, high tech business haven. This lifestyle drives people up a wall," Mr. Black says, "It's like they're getting away with something" (April 16, 1993).

The Wall Street Journal joins the Texas legislature in relying on a scripted movie for the inside look at this subgroup of Generation X. A more realistic account was found in the October 25, 1993 Time magazine which described Austin, and other cities like Seattle, Portland, San Diego,
Athens and Minneapolis, as having a "healthy slacker class". Sociologist Albert Cohen described the process of youth group incipiency, as "The crucial condition for the emergence of new cultural forms is the existence, in effective interaction with one another, of a number of actors with similar problems of adjustment" (Downes and Rock, 1989, p. 141). Slackers make up for their "problems of adjustment" by living accelerated lives influencing the student culture.

Slacker Characteristics and Customs

"Slackers" proved to be an interesting group to observe. In many ways, the Slackers live on the border of conventional society. As a small group in the NU neighborhood, Slackers contrast with both the local and student population. The Slacker House is a huge, drafty, century old house in a decaying, racially mixed neighborhood. It is across the street from the Circle Children's Hospital which anchors the neighborhood and provides security from the encroaching urban decay. Other security is provided by police patrols which can be spotted frequently using a police call box on a corner near the Slacker House. Their front door has a peep hole at eye level and a SUB POP, a record company label, decal placed on a small window at a height considerably higher than eye-level. The house is known as the Sub Pop house.

The Sub Pop house seems to have unlimited bedrooms and
sleeping areas. The basement is a utilitarian space for the purposes of storage, laundry and band practice. The main floor has a living room which has a large matching sofa and chair, assorted chairs, an unused organ, a large stereo system and CD collection. The adjoining former dining area is used as a TV room and it too has a sofa and several chairs. The downstairs bathroom has a constantly dripping faucet.

There are five bedrooms on the second floor. The second floor bathroom has a claw-leg bathtub. Gary had tried to fix a leak in the sink and had taken out the whole J-pipe leaving the drain hole leading to a plastic bucket. The person using the sink would view the bucket through the open drain hole. The third floor, an attic, has two bedrooms where Cliff and Mitch, other Slackers, reside.

A certain decor is found in the Slacker house. The decor is a mix of posters, trinkets and an occasional family memento. The week I stayed at the Slacker house, Cameron was moving in and there was a change of decoration in the main room to include his poster collection. The consensus was to move the Bob Marley and Jimi Hendrix posters out of the livingroom to the wall on the front stairwell. There these posters would join a Miles Davis poster and be placed "in order of their death". The livingroom was decorated with posters of "Sub Pop" recording stars Sonic Youth and Red Hot Chili Peppers. A bit out of place were a Jerry
Lewis poster and a gold framed photograph of Gary's grandmother and her brother as children.

Each bedroom was decorated more individually by the occupants. Berry's room had various Escher posters on the walls. Gary's room had autographed musicians photographs such as the two Red Kross posters which were salaciously dedicated in androgenous sexual language. One theme in the various rooms is a collection of posters from a televanglist. Apparently, the Slackers, who love television, are enamored with his show. Ken sent away for further information. Back came a donation request from the televangelist's ministry. Ken sent it back, without any donation and continues receiving the posters and requests. The posters have a picture of the televangelist and always require the household to do some religious activity - search for peace, get on your knees and pray - which would lead to salvation. They consider him a TV phenomenon and find his television delivery of the "Lord's word" powerful, if not totally misdirected.

Although, they are not openly religious, most are non-practicing Catholics, they seek their inspiration from television. They share many common experiences while in front of the TV. Their favorite shows are the comedies, such as the Simpsons and Steinfeld, and shows such as Star Trek. Gary is a broadcasting major and a major definer of Slacker culture. He acts as the critic and purveyor of TV
culture for the Slackers. He is especially influenced by Mister Rogers Neighborhood's Fred Rogers and Sesame Street's Jim Henson. He displays, in the livingroom, a poster of Mr. Rogers Neighborhood of Justice which was from his childhood. They watch Mister Rogers’ Neighborhood and Sesame Street for the production quality and the messages about a peaceful and loving world found on children’s shows. It is easy to portray Gary’s attention to TV, for example his devotion to Jim Henson, the puppeteer creator of Kermit the Frog, the Cookie Monster and Ernie, caused Gary after hearing of Henson’s death to go to his family’s garage and make several hand puppets. The artistic rendering of the puppets show a talent which only a few possess. Friends comment that Gary can see TV for its "messages, purpose and how each are produced and delivered" instead of simply viewing TV as part of its "sucked in" audience. Gary likes TV shows which express what "our generation thinks about". The Slackers have anticipated a mitigating role for television surrounding issues of morality such as when Vice-President Dan Quayle made an issue out of a television character raising an "illegitimate" child.

Are any Slacker "events" ever planned? Fraternities plan mixers with sorority chapters. With Slackers, these signifiers of group existence do not formally exist, yet their "groupiness" is organized, albeit loosely. Slackers have a language of their own, perhaps borrowed from the
visual world of television. When Slackers want to eat they say "I'm going to run for the border" which means getting burritos at the local Taco Bell! At the Sub Pop house, gatherings for events like "afterbars" or TV viewing of favorite programs occur regularly. Schedules are not that important to Slackers, TV is. TV is accelerated, school is tolerated. The sociability among members of this "drinking group" is determined by regular attendance at such events. Some events were loosely planned. Bowling with the Slackers was unusual because they went to mini-lanes, which had an unusually short distance to the pins. Apparently "nude bowling" had been a phenomenon at the campus earlier.

After spending time with the "Slackers" group and their drug and party culture, and listening to their alternative music, I became "aware" of their image of themselves. Adapting to their surroundings involves adding some structure, i.e., a house and a drinking group, to their otherwise marginal position at NU. In the view of the NU administrators, marginality signifies the Slacker's place in the "approved campus" culture. In the view of fellow students, Slackers are a fixture on campus where many groups survive in the rarified campus atmosphere. Next, I examine the group and their drug use.

Slackers and Drug Activity: Sensation not Sacrament

The Slackers' nightly routine of alcohol intoxication, the cheapest of drugs, is much the same as the experiences
of fraternity guys. The differences between the two is Slackers relish an "accelerated" assault on their senses from illicit drugs, primarily marijuana and LSD. Marijuana and LSD are not used as "sacraments" the way hippies of the 1960s used them. The Slackers use these drugs as a "reality check", their drugs give them days which are "better" than other days, some of which are accelerated and others which are blase. Slackers take up where hippies left off with the drug LSD, using it for sensation-seeking, transference and self-exploration.

The response of Slackers to the messages from the Counseling Center is largely to ignore them. I found the Slackers genuinely did not "get it" preferring to substitute their own values in place of the prescribed values vaunted by prevention. In fact, Cameron, my original key informant and a Para-professional Assistant at the Center, also leads a double life as a frequent LSD experimenter. He quotes the drug prophet, Timothy Leary, who spoke recently at an NU debate on drug use, saying, "I give the freedom to use and operate your own mind". Slackers hope to use drugs and alcohol relatively unmolested. Can the temporal control of school authorities reduce or control the desires of students for sensation-seeking, fun and escape? Exposure to the current prevention programming produced the following Slacker comments. From Steve, "If you've ever read the acid pamphlet from Northern, it's like use acid because it won't
hurt you". Candy said, "People who do drugs aren't going to listen to that stuff anyway. Obviously they were told the same thing by their parents, why would the prevention program make any difference?". The pressure on students to restrict their drug use is examined next.

Prevention providers such as Jim Wendt, at the NU Counseling Center, can only "keep an eye" on LSD and hallucinogens and the other frequently used drugs. While the use of hallucinogens has not spread to the whole generation, a substantial percent of NU students, 9.2 percent, surveyed reported hallucinogen use within the last year, 13.2 percent in their lifetime. At LU 6.2 percent used within the last year, 11.7 percent in their lifetime. Presumably some hallucinogen use occurs in the designer drug (MDMA, ecstasy) CORE item, which is a separate category. At NU 1.9 percent used designer drugs, at LU .4 percent, within the last year. What keeps a sensitive, overly bright young person who has an interest in alternative lifestyle on campus from experimenting with these hallucinogens? One such LU student told me he has an "intellectual fascination with LSD, but the health risks outweigh the benefits". This student has refrained from using his peer's drug of choice for reasons which are promoted by the health-belief model of prevention (Gonzalez, 1986b).

The Slackers had chosen to defy prevention for reasons such as Faith gave, "Its just another authority". Since
most of the Slackers readily admit to drug use, I wanted to know when and where that use occurred. The drug that many Slackers experiment with is LSD. In the discussion that ensued most Slackers claimed they felt little need to conceal public drug use. Gary said he would take drugs in public, knowing full well he might encounter situations out of his control. Gary said:

Cameron and I were tripping one day early this year when we first got this house and there was no furniture in here. We were having just a really great time, we were watching a really intense episode of Star Trek. I decided I needed some more cigarettes and they wanted some munchies. So we went to the Corner Store. And he was wearing his Detroit baseball cap. And so this guy, this Black guy, was there in the store, asked Cameron if he was from Detroit. Cameron said yeah. Then he said, "Oh are you guys tripping". He meant were we road tripping, like are we coming from Detroit and passing through. I just freaked out and yelled, "That's us, that's us, we are doing that, you got us". Then I realized what it was I was saying afterwards. (G. Skelly, personal communication, April 15, 1992).

Behaviors are distorted when the user is high on LSD (Weil, 1985). Steve told me about his angst under the influence of LSD, saying:

Sometimes when you're tripping and you're crazy and you don't care what everybody else thinks and you don't care how you act. (Gary: Those are the good times). Yeah, and other times when you're tripping and anybody else who isn't tripping you're scared of. Well I am. I feel like people are either judging you, like if they know you're tripping and they aren't tripping then "you're not in the same mind frame as I am right now". You can't help it, you don't want to digress, but I can't help it I totally digress, unless I'm tripping or if I'm with some people who just started tripping, its like a little group thing, unless I am with them I can't really deal with people. But then you can try to deal with going to get food, saying "Okay I can handle this". It's like a challenge, can I deal with reality? (S. Todd, personal communication, April 15, 1992).
Gary added, "The problem with it is, I don't know if it's a problem. It's a factor. It's really hard to communicate your thoughts because they're so scattered, so erratic and going a mile a minute. You're lost for twenty minutes and then you collect your thoughts again". There is a cognitive dissonance between the use of drugs and the way drugs are used. The real behavior of a drug user is different from the way he or she imagines they behave. There are few known methods to make up for the "lost" twenty minutes in the mind of the user.

These stories about experiences surrounding drug and alcohol use are shared to bolster group solidarity much the same way military veterans share war stories. Drug users consider it a challenge to navigate through unusual situations or events during their LSD trips. The stories of how someone handled being really "stoned" are shared with the larger group and become shared recollections. The group will remember that Cameron and Gary had some trouble when they went to the Corner Store. That is a primary reason which Slackers and other student attend festivals and concerts where they feel strength in numbers and in purpose.

The festivals, like the annual Jiggles Fest, is where students openly indulge in drug and alcohol use. The particular event described is a Spring event which is held in order to "party". Gary designed the commemorative tee-shirts for the Jiggles Fest to be held at the lakefront, but
it was cancelled because the city would not grant a permit to use the lakefront. Northern City prohibits drinking at waterfront events. Gary discussed the festival's history:

There's only been one great Jiggles Fest - Freshman year. It was a glorious sunny day, smoking pot on the lawn, nobody cared. It was more of a druggy thing than it was alcohol. Nowadays it's a big booze thing. They're people doing upside down beer bongs. There are kegs everywhere. It's more the animalistic. I remember being so scared and in my hallucinogenic state everybody looked so blue. Purple faces everywhere and ugly red faces from drunkenness. I don't know if it was real or not. Do you remember the bugs, we were sitting there being bothered by these bugs, we were swatting them away until somebody came over and asked us what we were doing and said there weren't any. Well we both saw the bugs man. I remember, Ken will attest to this, last year Jiggles Fest, we did two hits of acid. I had never done two hits before, I had only done one. The reason I done that is I really wanted to see some visuals. I'd always heard about them but I'd never really had them. It was bright and weird, oh my God. But it was also really really potent acid. I think it was sort of made unevenly. Because some people were saying they didn't get anything off of that stuff, but I got visuals stuck down my throat. (G. Skelly, personal communication, April 15, 1992).

Slackers really "party" at these events, much more than their usual heavy drinking and drug use. Faith was annoyed more by the subcultural division at the event, saying, "Last year, was such a mess because I think it got out of the hands of the hippie crowd and into the hands of the frat crowd". This made things difficult for students who think differently to mingle in the same crowd.

If prevention programs are not giving any good reason not to use drugs, most students are giving their friends good reasons to use drugs. Steve gave some reasons why no one would listen to the health-centered programs, "None of
programs give any good reason for not doing drugs. Some say you lose brain cells. But you lose brain cells running or drinking". Ignoring the "healthy lifestyle message", these drinking groups plan diversions and parties. Gary entertains groups of students with his puppets. On last Halloween, he went as a giant Sesame Street Ernie puppet to a Halloween party. Usually the Slackers "drop acid" on Halloween. They get dressed up and "do acid" which is a drug of choice when it is available. Whether these activities are scheduled or just happen on a random basis, the Slackers will use them as an excuse for drug use.

Gary is withdrawn from a lot of the social activities at college. He has no steady romantic relationship and somehow feels his appearance has something to do with a lack of female companionship. His general appearance is big, over six feet tall and heavy, without being grossly overweight. His beer drinking, at times he drinks a case of beer himself, is contributing to a beer belly in this 23 year old man. His appearance was discussed with him one night when Faith told him, "You’re cultivating a beer gut. I read an article last night about beer guts. Gary replied, "Are they sexy, is that what it said? (Faith - No!) Damn". Faith continued, "It said that what alcohol does to you is stores calories to give you a beer gut, but it also slows down the body’s ability to metabolize fat". Another Slacker said, "I read that too, its one fourth to one third -
something significant. They don't know why". Gary then tried to find some humor in their discussion by affecting a voice and saying, "I'm destined to be large. I am a man of enormous girth". While being overweight is currently seen as a problem by many, prevention providers would be satisfied if Gary and the others would not be "destined" to continue their risky drug use.

Slackers also take different trips. These trips are "road trips" where some reason exists or is invented to leave Northern City by car. They usually must devise reasons for the "road trips" which cause them to skip class, shut down the Sub Pop house and leave the city. For Slackers, Spring-Break pilgrimages to Daytona Beach or scheduled university dances are not big events, concerts which feature alternative music are. Ken and Max and Max's girlfriend were on one recent road trip to Southern Illinois University. The reason was Max's brother had a supply of home-grown marijuana to harvest. The trip became Ken's, a heavy "pot" smoker even among Slackers, chance to get a high-quality supply, or stash, of marijuana. They left for a week and a half. Reality is what they make it, and they change reality with marijuana smoking.

Every night, at 11 p.m., but rarely before, the Slackers head to the bars. The goal of their drinking is to promote fun and to let off pressure. The "usual suspects", Gary, Cameron, Ken and Mark, spend time together or with
friends or girlfriends at a couple of bars, Timmy's or the Shamrock. The Slacker musicians might take off to play a "gig" somewhere. It is the nightly lively action in public spaces where drug counseling activities have not occurred. Prevention skills, which utilize health-enhancing strategies and risk aversion, have nothing to do with the drinking skills which Slackers utilize in bars.

The Slackers have chosen the bars to socialize presumably to deal with the multiple pressures faced off-campus. Gary focused in on how their environment is challenging, saying;

We live in the ghetto, on 26th street. What Campustown is talking about is trying to make us an island. Why not put a dome over it? We were both mugged last year by 8 guys with a sawed off shotgun. I've been hustled, pan-handled, faced dope-sellers, every day this happens on my way to school. The suburbs are different, they got no problems and are not that rebellious. I'm never going to forget that I lived in a poor neighborhood. After I got mugged, I felt prejudice. I went to talk to Dan about it at the Counseling Center. I felt prejudice which meant I became conscious of who people are - whether they are black or white. What I lost was that I begin to see them as trouble. I get hair standing on the back of my neck, that's what I was robbed of.

In prevention terminology, refusal "skills" should be able to deal with the multiple pressures faced on campus. But how do you refuse to get mugged? In a more tragic situation, the whole NU campus felt a loss of freedom of movement when a fraternity member was killed by a fifteen year old robbing him of a car stereo. The administration moved the fraternity on-campus until new housing was found.
Language is also a powerful symbol to the students who use drugs and alcohol to cope with "problems of adjustment". They employ slang terms in everyday speech. Slang is loaded with meaning in the non-conventional Slacker "vocabulary". Examples include:

**Acid binge** - frequent LSD user

**Alcohol** - Beers; do the Jaegermeister; Do a shot

**Attitude changed** - 'guy, woman, who pounds his beer'

**Beer bong** - former drug pipe now rigged to force alcohol down the throat.

**Coke** - Blow; line; (wide line) cable

**Drunk** - schnockered; blottoed; pickled; (butt; butt-fucking; shit-faced; shit fucking) wasted

**Pot** - onie (one hit pipe); chitter; bat; bowl; wackie tobacci; joint; doobie

**Pothead** - Stoner; Slacker; Hippie; Wastiod - out of it.

**Stopper** - refers to anything that messes up your head. Common phrase - "Hey do you have the stopper".

These phrases indicate that few older people, myself included, even drug counselors could act to change the Slackers non-conventionality because they are left out of the Slackers' argot. Basically "outsiders" do not know what the Slackers are saying. Bruce Johnson has argued that the desire, "to get high, agreeing that drugs provide certain benefits, or living a relatively 'hip' life style may be values and products of participation in the drug subculture, rather than independent factors in drug use" (1973, p. 142).

Besides their unique vocabulary, Gary describes a
distance with outsiders, saying "Slackers are viewed as unmotivated, 'sarcastic' in the eyes of the older generation". Ken "avoids" any group more "formal" than his friends. I was made aware that the "Slackers" stigma existed because others, outside of the group, reacted to their "spoiled identity" (Goffman, 1975). An engineering professor had sternly addressed Cliff, an engineering student, about his academic shortcomings in my presence. Cliff personified Aichhorn's "Wayward Youth" whose professor does not understand the out-of-character ways which this particular engineering student behaves (Jacoby, 1979). I felt the professor was engaging in a "correction" to mildly humiliate Cliff in front of me. Cliff was sensitive to the professor's position, although he took the path of least resistance by hearing his professor out and then telling me that "slacking off wouldn't be a problem this semester".

Maintenance and Complications within Family Relationships

While at school Slackers can escape their family problems. Gary felt distance from his parents, who had taken him to family therapy believing he "hated" his family. Gary said, "I think that's where the differences are the strongest - with parents. I fight with my parents constantly". He seemed resigned to the estrangement with his parents, but also confessed, "I haven't been exposed to the real world". To a much greater degree than the other Slackers, Gary is plagued by family pressures. Do these
alleged family "pressures" produce any increased deviant patterns? It is hard to discern from my observer's role, when the family counselors would perhaps be in a better position to discern dysfunctional family interactions. Gary has had trouble in living up to his parents' expectations. They tell him his sisters have no major character flaws, but his activities are profoundly disturbing. For example, the clothes Gary wears bother his mother. Gary usually wears casual clothes consisting of a flannel shirt and blue jeans, Keds black ankle-high sneakers and a black fabric flight jacket. On a college campus, his dress conforms. His sleeping times bother his mother, Gary finds this ridiculous and continues to go to bed between 2 and 4 a.m. and rise at noon or one in the afternoon. Again, this behavioral pattern conforms to college life, not home life. Due to these outward signs of his "not acting normal", his parents discover his "dope pipe" and that his two best friends are gay, all of which cause the Skelly family to seek family counseling. Gary tried to "smooth over" the family's concerns explaining the dope pipe was as a "key chain". When Gary would hear his father complain that his going to gay bars would cause people the father knew to find out, Gary answered, "Why are your friend's gay, Dad?". When the familial problems became aggravated, the entire family went to a counseling session. Gary felt vindicated because the counselor said a "A 21 year old will do as he pleases".
Afterwards, in the car his mother was crying and told him that "You’re good, you’re really good" whereupon he burst into tears. The mother changed her mind and told him they would not interfere with his ways.

A mother's concern with her son, who had "turned bad" is understandable. Gary, in a later interview, would say:

What I’ve been thinking lately is since I’m graduating, right after graduation do some coke, or during graduation do some coke. I’d be really up there. I’d see my parents and be laughing. I’d be like their super son. I think that would be like the ultimate me. No, what you’ve seen so far has been like the ordinary me. I don’t have any money to get it and actually do it. I’d like to get some money out of my parents. Get it and do it. (G. Skelly, personal communication, May 15, 1992).

Immersed in the party environment, Gary is a challenge to prevention. Gary was troubled at home and a big drinker in the bars. Since he was already twenty-three, society's efforts to criminalize his drinking were over. He is presently entangled in an adventure, that of soliciting a prostitute, which began with his bar activities. He says:

I came to Timmy's for a couple of beers. A Black woman came and asked for a couple of beers, and then she wanted a ride to 26th and Wells. I can be accused of being stupid. The police pulled us over and accused us of solicitation of a prostitute because of the Black woman in our car. They confiscated our license and $150. They didn’t understand we were just giving her a ride home. I had to spend the next 12 hours in jail. The cops also found a 1/4 ounce of marijuana in the truck. (G. Skelly, personal communication, April 15, 1992).

Gary was charged, after spending the night in jail, with "solicitation of a prostitute". He complained that this was a rough time and he had been harassed by the cops. When
they questioned him not having a "job", he told them that he worked for NU. The police replied, "Those Jesuits are going to be real happy you’re soliciting a prostitute". Gary recounts his arrest in terms of harassment and racism and both elements appear likely. However, the third element he was unable to consider is his self-destructive behavior associated with drinking. He is constantly drinking and his involvement with alcohol and drugs is shaping the behavioral patterns in his life. Steve told him "You can drink almost all night from 5 or 6 in the evening till 3 or 4 am."

Perhaps Gary, the young woman, and his friend were falsely accused but he admitted they "were cruising an area of high prostitution and loitering. But that’s where we live and we were on our way home". What is more telling about this rather farcical incident is Gary’s expectations where he "figured I’d be in jail sometime during my 5 years at NU, but I figured it would be for drugs, not for prostitution".

This anecdote of the context of the Slacker "groupiness" illustrates their peer influences diminish the controls of earlier socialization. Still, Gary’s forecast of trouble with police over drugs does point to the "criminogenic" predilection of Slacker groupiness. John Hagan has argued that it is not the attitudinal or behavioral measures, rather "the cultural tastes and style formed in adolescence as the strongest influence" in adult status attainments (1991, p. 573). This points to the
Slacker lifestyle following them into adulthood.

Gary is a leader among the Slackers. Gary can be found at an "afterbar" or "pulling a bong or two" of marijuana. Gary says he "won’t smoke dope unless I’ve been drinking for awhile". This ritual he explains is because "I found that just getting high I just get real internal, apathetic, I don’t communicate very well". Gary disliked being unable to communicate, maybe because it is his major. So he would get "a drunk buzz going" and be "somewhat more gregarious and happy then I’ll smoke a jay and finish the job". When Slackers hear people say alcohol is different because you get real friendly and sociable, they reserve some criticisms. Gary says alcohol is "the great leveler". Cameron warns that not to "drink and talk is the new motto, because you end up making an ass of yourself". Gary replies, "Yeah, but you’re making an ass to other asses". Finally Mark adds "What’s an ass to an ass". "The lowest common denominator", Gary retorts, but continues in his routine drinking.

As universities initiate "user accountability" in their dealings with their offending students, they hope to achieve results when students have a greater knowledge of the punitive costs of breaking alcohol and drug laws. Today, in part because the federal laws mandate the university wage a battle to decrease their students alcohol and drug use, some modest changes are occurring.
Overall, though universities, which would like students to replace going to bars as the "core" of the student scene, will be disappointed. I spoke with NU's Dean of Student Affairs who told me:

NU students socialize in bars and party in apartments off-campus which is similar to a fraternity party culture. They insist that the alcohol is an adjunct to socializing. The whole culture changed. The whole student environment shows alcohol was no longer an occasional thing. We started noticing the early onset of drinking. Since drinking age has changed, instead of alcohol being removed its going underground. We're trying to teach them the law. Whether its violence or pranks, underlying thing is the alcohol. Every date rape we investigate is alcohol related and they need to be counseled. (P. Howe, personal communication, April 9, 1992).

Overall she admitted that "to be totally drunk is the only thing which is less acceptable than it was". The decrease in drunk driving has been noted in earlier studies (Hanson and Engs, 1986). At the University of Virginia, Dr. Richard Keeling, director of the Student Health Services, reports the risks of inebriated behavior are still numerous, saying:

Alcohol is the lubricant that makes other risks easy and acceptable. Students drive intoxicated; they don't use condoms when they have sex, so they are more likely to suffer unwanted pregnancies and sexually transmitted diseases; they neglect their studies; they become discipline problems (Money College Guide 1992, p. 12).

The breadth of educational and health problems resulting from student drug use constitutes a problem of major social significance. Logically, the influence of Slacker and fraternity groups will contribute to this drug use and excessive drinking on college campuses unless acted upon by countervailing forces.
Fraternities: Prevention’s Target Group

From the university administration point of view more control over Greeks, who must recruit their members from the campus setting, is possible than with Slackers. Benign control is more effective with the fraternities who place a high value on their reputations on campus. To the Slackers and many of their peers, Greeks are either simply despised or are not found to be redeemable. Cameron had dated an "Alpha Phi" young woman. She told him about Greeks' requirements for recruitment, which he said were "how much money their parents make, what kind of car they have, their appearance - are they clean looking, do they wear nice clothes, do they wear a lot of Polo and Ralph Lauren, that's what they look at". At LU's Acca Sacca fraternity, beer and "brats" would be the order of the day, not the "premature affluence" Cameron heard about NU's Greeks (Bachman, 1983).

When I spent time with the fraternities at LU, I found shared some similarities with the social "network" of Slackers. They both are located in big, drafty male-populated houses off-campus. Supporters of the fraternities would argue they can "provide powerful human scale environments" at large universities (Kuh, 1990). Critics say their support to their peers is exacted by discipline over the "pledges" and lower status members. They discuss some members as "sympathy pledges" - guys who the other fraternities would not pledge them. This is not to say...
friends are not made in fraternities, but they, for example, have engaged in physical fights and steal from each other, something that Slackers will not do.

Rod Builder, the 20 year old Acca Sacca president and my key informant within the fraternities, suggested I attend the new restricted fraternity parties, and observe the drinking practices and drinking related-behaviors of his members. Focused drinking done by students at multi-keg fraternity parties means a "party" identity can be created. While much of the fraternity member's identity comes from belonging to a chapter which throws a good party, a great deal of fraternity activity can be destructive to a member's identity. Certain fraternity activities can be indirectly attributed to drinking practices. These may include personal servitude, repeated calisthenics, paddling, branding and other forms of disruptive behaviors (Nuweer, 1990). More alarming is underage students attend fraternity parties, where little control is imposed on their drinking. Both universities and the National Interfraternity Council (NIC), which represents the Greek system, use their power to censure errant chapters over such violations.

In response to their drinking-behaviors and accompanying rule-breaking, the Acca Sacca fraternity and Lakefront's Office of Student Life are involved in many disputes. The Office of Student Life introduced a two party limit, where fraternity parties are required to have an open
party policy to anyone over 21, no kegs, only BYOB (Bring Your own Bottle), a security firm must card people at the door, they must have adequate insurance and they must post the neighborhood that they are holding a party and the hours it will last. Adding to this damper, NIC proposes that fraternities enforce other regulations:

For example if we’re going to hold a party you can only bring a six-pack of beer. You can’t bring any wine coolers. You can only bring a six-pack and they have to be in cans. You check the beer in at the door, they check your ID to make sure you’re of legal age, you give them your beer, they give you back your ID and a card that says you brought let’s say a six-pack of Busch Light. So anytime you want a beer, you’d have to go up to the bartender and show him your card, he’d punch a hole in it and he’d give you a Busch Light. Now, if you drink your beer, and you wanted another one, you take the empty can back, as well the card, then they’d give you another one. Also the bartender reserves the right ... if you’ve had too much alcohol ... to keep your alcohol. And then you could come back the next day when you’re sober and get your alcohol. There’s rides provided at the party to make sure nobody drives home who has been drinking or somebody walks them home. Its a pretty safe way to hold a party. (M. Overstreet, personal communication, April 22, 1992).

The Acca’s are not the party givers that they were last year! Rod told me, "It’s boring since the new rules, BYOB, means that our parties are lucky to have 50 to 75 people, when last year when we had 10 to 15 keggers we would get 500 people". I asked Rod how much beer got consumed at one of these BYOB parties on the average, he answered, "I’d say most people tonight will consume 4-6 beers an hour". Since Rod had so often mentioned his responsibility as a role model for his pledges and associates, I asked about his alcohol consumption. He replied, "I had about 7 beers
between 5 o’clock and before I came, this is my second here, and the one in my pocket will be my third”. Adding the seven beers to those he was going to drink, it came to ten beers that evening. Rod admitted:

I’m buzzed right now, I’m not drunk, I’ve felt worse. But this won’t do anything for me, I’m not driving. I would be legally intoxicated if I was driving. So it puts me in a social atmosphere, I don’t do it a lot. I’m out quite often, I just don’t get buzzed that often. Mostly on weekends. (R. Builder, personal communication, March 22, 1992).

Although of little concern to Rod, his consumption of alcohol would be a concern to either those charged with increasing controls on fraternities or those concerned with violations of the underage law. David Matza defined the differences between legal and delinquent views. For the law there is no defense to crime, while, according to Matza, the tenets of subcultural delinquency are more generous. The view of the delinquent, Matza wrote, "differs from the legal view" because "the subculture of delinquency allows a rule of proportionality" (1966, p. 76). The alcohol consumption of this under-age Acca president was not modified and he adheres to the rule of proportionality which allows his group to stand up to outsider’s rules. He was not phased with the new restrictions until the loss of their house was brought into the equation. Rod later resigned his presidency of the chapter because of the new restrictions.

I wondered how this departure would affect Rod, who had undergone an earlier transformation to become his
fraternity's president. He had been a "Deadhead", a follower of the Grateful Dead band who when he "got my hands on drugs I did them". Later, Rod realized that his own upbringing was opposed to him continuing that lifestyle so he then turned to the fraternity because it was "what I wanted to do with my life". The fraternity guys were the guys he wanted to hang out with. Rod told me "I turned away from the drug scene. Now as president, I’ve been straight for over a year. No drugs, besides the alcohol". Interestingly, the next Acca president, Barry, was a recovering alcoholic.

During the academic year, Rod tried to keep this group out of trouble both in the house and outside the house. At the Delt’s party, I asked him to describe the average drinker at the party. He told me;

Well here right now, its split. A lot of the people I’ve seen I consider them alcoholics. They’re out Wednesday, Thursday and Friday and Saturday night. I see them all the time they’re always drunk, leaving the bars early because they can’t stand or they don’t know what’s going on. So they end up sick. The other half know what’s going on when it comes to liquor. They might get buzzed or get partially drunk or drunk, but they wake up for class, they finish their material, they’re doing well in school.

At the party, Rod begin discussing cocaine "addicts". I asked, "How many students at Lakefront percent-wise use cocaine? What’s your perception of student use?" After Paul, a non-resident Acca member, said only 20 percent, Rod replied it was 30 to 40 percent. I had completed the 1991 surveys and I told them that only 4.5 percent admit cocaine
use last year. Rod defended his view of the matter, saying;

I know it for a fact, that’s bullshit. I’m serious from the people I know, which are both resident and commuter students, at least 40 percent do. (IRWIN - That means 4 out of every 10 people you hang with use cocaine). Cocaine, probably about 3. Not on a regular basis.

Paul - As far as people I know and am acquainted with, I’d have to say 25 to 30 percent I know use cocaine.

IRWIN - How can they blow a hundred dollars on cocaine? Where does that money come from?

Paul - For one thing parents.

IRWIN - Did you say that its in the frat system today or even here locally at this campus.

Paul - I am not so sure that it is in the fraternity system, I see it more at small private schools basically because you have individuals there coming from your Morganstein families, your wealthier families. Small private schools have the same things like cocaine and marijuana are the two things that I’ve seen. But you go to your larger state schools and you don’t see as much of it. Granted it exists, you have good percentages, but it is not as prevalent as it is in the smaller, private schools.

Although, Paul is basing his view on some smaller colleges, the CORE survey results confirm the smaller, private and Northeastern colleges have a higher prevalence of substance abuse (Presley et. al, 1993). However, I knew Rod from a class I had taught and I also knew he was prone to exaggeration. I also knew that drinking at his fraternity goes on every night. I asked him, "You said four nights a week, five nights a week, you guys are drinking, right?". Paul affirmed this, and said he had developed a few problems from his fraternity drinking practices. Paul confessed;

As far as drinking and me, last year I really did it in excessive quantities. I was drinking all the time and
I ended up with a 2.0.

When a member, like Paul, hits bottom, fraternities tend to ignore the consequences. Many fraternity incidents are "victim-precipitated". The Accas may fight the Delts over a past weekend occurrence and the police may get called by neighbors. In the case of student injuries, it is just not individuals that land in court, but as Mike Overstreet, an NIC Leadership Consultant, told me the ones with the "deep pockets", i.e., a university or a fraternity chapter.

The fraternities at LU are on a rise in popularity at LU with 8 percent of males joining them. They operate in a secretive fashion which becomes visible when they throw their officially allowed two parties per semester per frat. Rod said, of the secretive lifestyle of fraternity members, that, "No matter what anybody says, the Greeks won't say anything bad about another Greek to someone outside of the Greeks". However, there are "high status" and "low status" fraternities. Jay's fraternity, Sigma Beta has a higher social standing and reinforce their image as "movers and shakers". Rod's fraternity contains outsiders like the guys of "Animal House". Rod called them "the biker frat", although no one drives a motorcycle. He recognizes the other fraternities look down on his guys. They often reinforce their image by not going after the "best girls" or by taking in a large number of "sympathy" pledges.

What attraction do the Greeks have if they are losing
their "party animal" status at LU? Jay, a Sigma Beta Vice President contends that social status reasons exist for joining fraternities. The pageantry surrounding "rush" or recruitment were designed to find available male students who could contribute certain socially-approved characteristics to the Sigma Beta fraternity. Jay reported that, "We are looking for a number of things. There is no one main thing - you meet a guy and he knows you’re in a fraternity and he is a nice guy, you would want him in. We’re not looking for any one type. We look for leadership qualities, that he is not a troublemaker. Academic standing is important". Jay’s fraternity emphasizes social standing, something Rod’s "biker" frat could never accomplish.

Richard Sigal, a professor of sociology at New Jersey’s County College of Morris, was, himself a fraternity member, blames the movie "Animal House" for projecting a mindless, pro-hazing, anti-feminist image that many fraternity men believe is sine qua non for the Greek good life. Irving L. Janis, a Yale psychology professor emeritus and author of *Victims of Groupthink*, found "a basic aspect of group psychology" where according to his theory, pledges have;

the enormous fear ... that to refuse puts one in danger of being deviant by violating a group norm. ... They themselves have gone through the initiation rite. The members merely tend to think of what they are doing as simply parallel to what they endured. Its a matter of misjudgment. None of them wants to commit manslaughter. Its a very sloppily made decision, one made in the stages of conviviality. Everyone perceives what is happening as in the range of what has always been done (Nuweer, 1990, p. 236-7).
In witnessing something which could be humiliating or even criminal, pledges are likely to join in, although they never believe themselves capable of such things. Matza contends that since subcultural members are so routinely disloyal in conventional pursuits, total loyalty is exhibited by the commission of risky and dangerous acts for the purposes of reputation (1966, p. 158). As a measure against these upsetting activities, many chapters, Acca Saccas included, have a so-called "house corporations" made up of alumni who serve as watchdogs over finances and keep up the house and the fraternity’s observance of risk management policies regarding alcohol, hazing and drug abuse (Nuweer, 1990, p. 237).

Rod knew that much of Acca’s attraction came from it being one of three fraternities with houses. Rod was a "go-getter" and hoped to build the image of his "biker" fraternity. Earlier in the evening of the Delt’s party, Rod had played host to the Acca Sacca alumni St. Patrick’s Day party. Rod began setting up for this night earlier that week by cleaning up the house and ordering the liquor. He played host to about 200 alumni, from ages 22 to 55, and discussed the changes in the house and at LU and held a fundraising raffle. His opinion of this event was that the alumni left with a good impression from the annual Acca Sacca St. Patrick’s Day get together. Occupied by only fourteen men, one of whom, David, was not a student, but a
county sheriff, and another of whom, Rick, was an accused
drug dealer, the Acca Sacca house had become LU's "Animal
House" and an irritant to LU's Office of Student Life.
Among the other dozen men at the Acca Sacca house was one
grossly overweight guy, Tim, whose claim to fame at LU was
the night he ran through a dormitory wall and came out the
other side, in one piece and thoroughly intoxicated. After
the university cancelled his housing contract, the Acca's
pledged him.

After paying fraternity dues, amounting to 150 dollars
per semester, the guys at Acca Sacca still had to pay 200
dollars in rent a month for their rooms. The Accas were
mainly "blue collar" as Rod put it. To maintain their
dazzling life as "big men" most of the Accas had to work.
Rod would be a natural in any line of work because he was a
fast talker on any subject. Instead of holding a normal
job, Rod ran his own asphalt business in the summer.
Andrew, the oldest guy at 27, was returning to school after
a stint in the Army. Presently he had a job taking phone
orders at a local pizzeria. Rick, the accused drug user who
had brought the local chapter to the attention of the
national, was a landscaper during the summer. Rod has been
put on notice that Rick must go. One non-resident, Paul had
a newspaper route. Another guy, Patel, helped run his
father's liquor store. David was the County Sheriff. Most
of the "brothers" spent summers away and were full-time
students during the academic year.

In contrast to the Slackers, fraternities do not have to add structure to their group, they already operate within the boundaries of a campus social structure. Certain fraternity activities are student-centered, but others such as fraternity parties must be cleared with the LU administration. The LU policy on parties overlaps with their policy on alcohol use on campus, they restrict both activities. These alcohol restrictions at LU are an important area of disagreement between the Greek Council and the LU Office of Student Life. In the wider city community, fraternities are best known for their drinking. Several businesses will contribute kegs to the fraternities. One Mexican restaurant owner told me that when he first opened he had offered a keg of beer to a fraternity president if he would bring in 100 customers. The keg was soon delivered to the frat house. The largest Catholic charity near LU's campus was rewarded a keg to the fraternity that collected the most money on their Candy Day drive each year. The wider community recognizes that the cultural ritual of drinking is of great significance to fraternities. These type of transactions lead fraternities into a self-fulfilling process which they gain rewards, in the community, for drinking and they face sanctions, from the university, for the same activity. Aware of the ambiguousness of their situation and that drinking is a
fulfillment of their culture at the university, fraternities use the opportunity to profit from the sanctioned acts. Edwin Lemert's concept of secondary deviance advises that sanctioning can occur when the event, drinking, comes to the attention of agents of social control who apply society's negative sanctions and label the drinker as an offender (Siegel, 1992, p. 240). The process of labeling may increase when the person employs the deviant behavior as a "means of defense, attack or adjustment" to the problems caused to the person by societal reaction (Lemert, 1951).

A tragic example at the Acca Sacca house is Tim, an overweight guy with almost nothing going for him. He was labeled a behavior problem in the LU dorms after he ran through a dorm wall while intoxicated. As labeling theory indicates, Tim now began to reorganize his behavior around the consequence of his deviant act. He pledged the Accas, the most unsavory fraternity, and at length told me in one interview how dorm officials, Student Affairs and the students at the Tower Dorms all had reacted to his wall-breaking night. After Tim had his troubles with LU Housing, he would become part of another troubled group, the Accas. When the Accas slipped up in the 1992-93 academic year their "house corporation" was there to step in and save them.

Frat Houses on College Streets - A Neighbor's Nightmare

According to Rod, their neighbors kept phoning LU's Office of Student Affairs and complaining about them holding
parties, dealing drugs, reducing property values, their late-night noise and their loud use of profanity at the house. One man even insinuated his adolescent daughter might be raped if the house was not closed down. It was the last type of comment that made LU's Office of Student Life decide to appoint a committee to hold a hearing on whether the house should be closed. Rod claimed that this "non-biased" committee would close Acca Sacca house down so the neighbors' complaints would cease. The fix, he felt was in.

It was then that the fraternity mobilized its resources to combat their demise. Since their troubles with the neighbors led to troubles with LU, they needed support. They sought the help of their "house corporation", several of whom are lawyers, who own their house. Rod represented the frat at the first neighbor-frat-LU meeting but brought an alumni lawyer with him. After several meetings the whole "justice" process came to an end, the fraternity kept its house but was suspended from engaging in any chapter activities for one year. No rush, no recruitment of new members, no parties, ergo, no reason for being a frat house.

Although Alfred University in upstate New York challenges the behaviors of students belonging to fraternities since a fatal alcohol poisoning of a student during Pledge Week years ago, they have yet to make fundamental changes in the fraternity system. In a 1988 fraternity party at Lambda Chi fraternity at Alfred, with
the help of their attorney, threw a 29 keg party and all guests had to sign a contract upon entering that said they were not connected to or affiliated with any law enforcement agency (Nuweer, 1990, p. 278). On February 11, 1988 a hazing incident occurred at Rutgers University where the Lambda Chi Alpha chapter served fourteen associate members 300 kamikazes (triple sec, vodka and lime juice) encouraging them to drink all in one hour or until they vomited. Lawyers defending the 15 members indited on hazing charges said that the associates were strongly encouraged to drink but could have refused.

Should the institution of fraternities, whose members are devoted to drinking, be saved? Hank Nuweer, in his book on fraternities, Broken Pledges, came to the conclusion that "an educational institution that often touts its educational value to members - the fraternity system - has little interest in intellectual pursuit of truth" (1990, p. 239). The LU Greeks collectively believe that because of the assault on fraternity parties, the whole Greek system "is being destroyed by the LU administration". The Greek network nationwide is each year under siege by lawsuits.

Fraternities today have gone "offshore" and allow private entertainment corporations to stage parties at the fraternity house. Using these tactics of evasion, the LU TKEs were able to stage parties, one featuring a huge inflatable gorilla, and declare it was not their party and
they were not liable. Observing the fraternities at LU, I found it "unrealistic" to believe this cover. A vice-president of the Delts assured me they already devised a "cover", they can have just a piece of paper saying Bozo Entertainment is throwing this party and all sales and profit from sales of alcohol goes to Bozo Entertainment. To the university, it appears the Delts had hired a professional entertainment group. NIC’s Mike was unaware of this charade and claimed "You’d almost have to have a full time person investigating all these things or trying to follow up on these things". As luck would have it, Rod’s fraternity had caused enough trouble to bring Mike to town to check up on the Acca Sacca fraternity.

The NIC - Successful Supervision?

One group serves as a clearinghouse and does public relations for the all fraternity chapters - the National Interfraternity Council (NIC). "Our group is much like a Chamber of Commerce. We try to provide the best possible information to our sixty individual membership groups, and then they have their own decision-making process", says Jonathan Brant, NIC’s Executive Director. Brant claimed that NIC was "not a rules and regulations body" and to "picture the fifty nine member fraternities as spokes not all the same thickness, length or strength" (Nuweer, 1990, p. 239). Fraternities do not agree on all important issues, nor would they always agree with the sorority’s conference,
the National Panhellenic Conference.

Although the NIC serves as a clearinghouse, many deaths and hazing incidents are not accurately reported. I asked Mike, a NIC Leadership Consultant whose territory was nation-wide and covered 17 of the NIC chapters, "Do you know of any suits against any chapter of your frat which directly deal with drinking"? Mike admitted:

They're very common. I believe every fraternity whether they have been successfully sued or not has at least been involved in some sort of court action or litigation, possibly dealing with alcohol. There are several stories, you can read about them in the Chronicle of Higher Education or in any publication that comes out from the NIC. Recently, we had an incident where an underage person was at one of our chapter's parties. He wasn't invited. He ended up crashing the party. And the men at the fraternity tried to do what they thought was the correct thing, by trying to ask the person who crashed the party to leave. He didn't leave so they kind of resorted to physical force to get him to leave the party. They ended up ejected this person from the party. He ended up on the porch of the chapter house and drowned in his own vomit, if you will. So there's a lawsuit over that. He did die. He did not consume alcohol on the property. But because alcohol was there and he was at the party, and the membership tried to get him to leave, there was a lawsuit. With these BYOB policies there are such strict guidelines that hopefully nothing like that will happen. (M. Overstreet, personal communication, April 22, 1992).

Brant, at NIC, says that only five percent of the members haze. If accurate that is 20,000 plus men hazing each year. According to Mike, the process of enforcing the rules forces the NIC into a social control framework:

The NIC works as a co-op for fraternities in general. Basically frats across the nation are running into problems, which started in the 70s, with a lot of alcohol problems. And you know as well as I do that's with organizations its tough to combat these problems
individually. The NIC is helping all the frats to group together to try to come up with programs to help our members do responsible social programming, rush and those type of things. It's a program assistant type of organization. For example, they're responsible for putting out a video on how to put on a party the correct way. For example, showing members using wrist bands if you're of legal age, showing people how to check in their beer. Most of the parties have gone to BYOB. (IRWIN - Have they gone to BYOB, or have they been requested to?). About two years ago there was a group started called FIPG, Fraternity Insurance Purchasing Group. Again it was started as kind of a co-op, fraternities going together and purchasing insurance as a group. This policy mandated that frats use one of two policies, either BYOB or if they're going to have liquor there, they'll have to have alcohol served by a caterer with a liquor license. Basically, frats can no longer purchase liquor through their chapter funds nor can they purchase it through anybody, it has to be on an individual basis. (IRWIN - So insurance is driving the change, why was it necessary to buy insurance through this co-op?). Basically, about 4 or 5 years ago there was only one insurance agency we could find in the whole world, who would carry frats in general. And that was Lords (sic) of London. And insurance premiums were just sky high, and they proposed that if you want us to cover fraternities there are certain procedures we'd like you to adopt. That being the alcohol policy guidelines. Well, now that every frat is being forced into those alcohol policy guidelines, which is probably for the betterment of society and individual, the insurance premiums have dropped and there's more insurers for frats in general. But at one time there was only one insurance carrier. In fact, at one time frats were among the highest risk groups of any corporation or organizations or whatever, they were right up there with nuclear reactor or nuclear power facilities. And that's pretty crazy. (M. Overstreet, personal communication, April 22, 1992).

The fraternities are reviewed closely by the insurance companies and there has been a proliferation of anti-hazing laws passed by 37 states. But can restrictions on these drinking groups decrease their drinking? Problems caused by the perception of fraternity alcohol abuse have been studied
by Baer, Stacy and Larimer who report that exaggerated beliefs about the drinking habits of students exacerbates risky drinking and "poses an order of resistance to prevention efforts" (1992, p. 585). Their research found across fraternity, sorority and dormitory groups, students perceive that their friends "party" more often than they do.

When insurers will not insure fraternities, this points not to problems of perception as Baer et al. report, but to real problems in frat houses. Mike said frat houses were:

operating as a bar without a liquor license or vendors license. They were using parties as their main source of fundraising. They'd go out and purchase all this alcohol at 30 dollars a keg. Maybe purchase 40 kegs. Go out and hire a band and operate as a bar. So what would happen is they'd charge admission to people coming into their party, maybe four or five dollars. Well you figure you have 400 people showing up to this party at $4 a head you're going to make around a $1000 net on one evening. The parties were getting out of hand, people were getting injured, because they weren't run safely, there was no carding, a lot of underage drinking, there was no responsible programming at all or alcohol programming. (M. Overstreet, personal communication, April 22, 1992).

Confronting the fraternity chapters was a big step for the NIC. Following that bold step, they may want to pass a second policy making fraternities an integral part of the prevention of drinking and drug use on campus and reinforce their continued compliance. I wondered if the NIC had any compliance with their rules already being implemented. I asked Mike, "Do you find fraternities are complying with your new rules"? "No, he said frankly. LU's Greek System and its compliance with prevention is discussed next.
Changes at the Acca Sacca House

At LU, the other Greeks, the six fraternities and five sororities, would later state the "Accas deserved the suspension for holding unauthorized parties" and treated them badly. These informal sanctions worked with the Accas who had "sympathy pledges" and now neither had parties nor a sense of belonging to their "student culture". That year, and probably beyond since the Greeks are obsessed with history, the Accas had a "spoiled identity". Things also changed at the house, they painted over the sign reading "In search of the Eternal Buzz". Even before their suspension, the Accas had told me they can not sell alcohol because of the new restrictions and that instead of 2,000 dollars take at the door they do not even expect to break even on parties. A sorority sister provided a picture of the decreased return on parties, saying:

Last year you could get a cup at the door and drink all the beer you wanted. Now you can’t get all the people. You have to bring your own beer or alcohol. People don’t want to pay, plus pay for their own alcohol, buy it somewhere else and have to bring it here. (E. McGiver, personal communication, March 22, 1992).

Rod was philosophical about the restrictions involving alcohol. On one hand he saw pluses, they could attract and maintain a higher academic quality and the atmosphere was different with less inanity, but the problem was his house lost a revenue source - selling booze. Added to his dismay, was the censure by the LU administration which stopped dues from being collected. It was tough times at the Acca Sacca
house. But the university was benefiting, they would not need to expend personnel to monitor the Acca Sacca parties and their phone was no longer ringing off the hook. In short, LU would be able to control one of three fraternity houses and one of three off-campus party sites.

Conclusion

The research setting to conduct observation on Slacker drinking and drug use is campus areas where alternative lifestyle are clustered. Slackers group themselves at universities like the University of Texas and Northern University, schools which attract heavy drinkers and marijuana and psychedelic drug users. Further research should be conducted on the emergence of this distinct, diverse youth subculture chronicled by empirical indicators, validated in this study, such as slang, alienation, lowered aspirations which are manifested in their exceedingly high levels of alcohol and drug use. The other manifestations of a Slacker lifestyle include problems with time management, problems of adjustment and a present, rather than a future, orientation. In my view, a sociological view, their subculture, especially the drug use, is informative and points to the causes of other "Slacker" attributes and attitudes.

NU Slackers or LU fraternity members are similar in their direct challenge to prevention programs and their "party subculture" lifestyle. Both groups are similar in
their excessive alcohol and drug use. As David Matza and Greshem Sykes (1957) explain, techniques of neutralization allow delinquents to engage in deviant behaviors by neutralizing the normative social world whose rules they violate. Similarly, the rules of drinking groups provide allowances for alcohol consumption or drug use. The two drinking groups in this study cannot modify their drinking in order to comply with prevention rules because it violates their group values. Students in the drinking groups will recognize that they are being morally challenged to control their behaviors. Efforts at changing behaviors should either overlap with the students needs or avoid a direct challenge to their social identity.

At Rutgers, W. Burns (1989) proposes that a "healthy student community" could be the focus of the prevention programs on American campuses. Burns correctly notes that the first place to begin to change student behavior is with the faculty and the administration which both are influential and involved with the student culture. His argument is that the university is hypocritical because it tends to present alcohol as a privilege and this promotes alcohol use among students. Catholic universities are especially identified with alcohol use within their institutional culture. The push toward a "drug-free" environment must be a concerted effort, not one which separates the campus groups but one which unites them.
Lemert would argue these social dynamics of accepting conventional definitions of deviance occurs when behaviors are "effectively disapproved of in social interaction" (Pfohl, 1985, p. 285). To effectively change student behaviors, the adults who students learn these behaviors and lifestyles from must also change their social interactions.

I propose further research on college drinking groups' similarities and differences so that they may be understood in a wider context of the social environment of their campus. A theoretical integration of the broad peer-subcultural attitudes towards drugs and alcohol may create a greater understanding of why these groups are so resilient.

These student groups have many facets, but I propose they will be more understood by involving them "in" the university, not simply acknowledging they are "of" the university. Yet, current policy at universities would sanction much of these two groups' behaviors. Outside the university their behaviors are labelled as unacceptable using the morals of today's "claimsmakers". While conformity to "deviant action proves successful" at establishing a member's identity within peer groups, a great deal of drinking group activity can be destructive to a member's personal identity. This chapter has shown that both Slackers and fraternity groups defy the new alcohol restrictions and maintain the continuity of an alcohol and drug use culture at universities.
CHAPTER VIII
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

As a result of the initiation of prevention programs on the university campus, I chose to conduct a year-long examination of campus life and its connection to the goals of prevention of student alcohol and drug abuse. The effects of prevention programs are unknown and nearly unstudied. This study examined the impact of prevention on the student culture and the attitudes of students towards drinking and drug use. The concepts of prevention programs and functions of campus-based prevention at two universities were discussed. These universities have distinct patterns of alcohol and other drug consumption. At NU, the extent of the drinking problems are a long-standing concern to administrators who manage the crisis by stabilizing some very serious student behaviors which involve anti-social, illegal and disorderly conduct. While at LU, a school with a "moderate drinking" culture, prevention is designed to impact students by "the provision of factual information" and the promoting of prevention "events" (Botvin, 1990).

At both schools there is hope that prevention will provide answers for their students' "problems". Still, several reasons are often stated for the ineffectiveness of
prevention and education programs. These reasons include failing to establish sobriety or a reduction in use (Falco, 1992). Cornell University Medical School's, Gilbert Botvin states "considering the complex etiology of substance abuse, it is not surprising that approaches that rely on the provision of factual information are ineffective" (1990, p. 487). This perception of program failure is compounded because the goals of alcohol and drug prevention are unclear. According to Ronald Akers, "In spite of some promising leads, the truth is that we still have not clearly established whether or not the programs are having the desired effect, no effect, or undesirable effects" (1992, p. 181).

Prevention programs rely on predictions of future behaviors from attitude measures, which many social scientists regard as inaccurate and not possible with the techniques generally employed (Akers, 1992). Students give unsure responses when questioned about prevention's effects. Slackers dismiss prevention's impact on their drug use as hypocritical. Cameron said, "The university isn't aware, it's really quiet about drinking". Candy retorted, "No, I see a lot of people who are really against drugs, I see them really 'wasted' on alcohol". Gary, however, told me he did not consider NU's prevention effort to be "heavy-handed".

I believed I would find a wide divide between prevention goals and actual students behaviors and substance
use. Despite my initial doubts about prevention, I have found a measure of change in the social attitudes of students resulting from college based alcohol and drug prevention programs. When I conducted extensive field research among "drinking groups", I found they made almost no attempt to hide their episodes of drinking or drug use or to adopt to the commitments of prevention.

The Subcultural Orientation of "Drinking Groups"

Instead being of deterred, drug-involved adolescents are said to move away from the norms and values of mainstream social culture in favor of a peer-based subculture which reinforces the acceptance of alcohol, drugs and anti-social behaviors (Brounstein et al, 1990; Parrella and Filstead, 1987). I argue that the subcultural adaptations of both Slackers and fraternities occur because of the socialization and learned-behaviors found among these "drinking groups". Students bonding with these groups are likely to share their fondness for drugs. This association introduces a number of different "risk factors". As Robert DuPont, a former director of National Institute of Drug Abuse, argues, youth are particularly at risk for alcohol and other drug use "when young persons use it with support from peers, when it is perceived as an acceptable norm, and when it continues over time" (Cahalan, 1991, p. 49). Evidence shows that the "social learning" of alcohol and drug use occurs in much larger circles within the "student
culture", especially at NU. Over ninety percent of students use alcohol, the "domesticated drug", as a social facilitator which they consider a natural part of growing up. Half as many students use marijuana or at least try it to find out what others mean when they say they get "high" on marijuana.

Students are confronted with a transition which Hagan indicates shows these "adolescent subcultural adaptations are partly adaptations to the pressures of the passage to adulthood" (1991, p. 569). Youth groups cannot completely feel enfranchised in the adult world. Youth of today, in a continuous state of social change, must be orientated to a future which no adult can fully comprehend. Because adults refer back to what has worked for them and youth are trying to prepare for an unknown future, a great deal of adult-youth contact is stressful. The role of parents in preparation of their children's future occupational skills is correspondingly diminished.

This estrangement leads to a segregation of youth and the emergence of youth subcultures. The subcultures have norms and values that work for them, which Hebdige (1979), Cohen (1955) and Willis (1977) have previously outlined as sharply divergent from adult society. David Matza proposed youth culture may converge or drift in and out of contact with adult values (Hagan, 1991; Matza, 1964). Matza (1964) also suggested that teenage culture may sometimes curb

If Slackers and fraternities appear to be a "subculture delicately balanced between crime and convention", then they may fit Matza's "converging" position of subculture which is in-between conventionality and criminality (Matza, 1964, p. 63). However, it appears the existence of these "drinking groups" at educational institutions simply reflect the content of tried and true college life, which Slackers and fraternities try to preserve in face of the onslaught of prevention restrictions. The meaning college students applied to drinking was "fun" before prevention providers redefined "drinking groups" as aberrant.

The Impact of Prevention Efforts on the Student Culture

In this study, I examined the results of university involvement in prevention programs and the "healthy student community" and found the results are mixed. Some results of changes in student substance use point to prevention, other results point to the unmeasured influence of student culture. Both schools have some limited success which can be reported. It was determined that 18.9 percent of NU students and 18.3 percent of LU students reported their attitudes toward binge drinking have changed as a result of prevention. In addition, I interviewed students at each university to ascertain if any behavioral changes are attributable to campus-based prevention efforts. Here little success was found among "drinking groups", but other
positive results included "substance-free" dormitory floors and peer-leader programs.

Lakefront University, despite a more modest effort being expended on prevention, has less of a substance use problem. While Northern University expends more effort, historically and at present, it continues to have more pronounced substance use problems. At Northern, the students drink excessively and many consume the drugs, LSD and marijuana. All three drugs have student activities, such as block parties, Jiggles Fest, and the Vintages Saloon scene, patterned around their use.

Since universities are to be the proving ground for prevention, I observed students at the two campuses to find any evidence if the attempts to intervene were working. If prevention policies are viable, some changes in student culture may be apparent to the observer. What I observed was a drinking culture which provides varied settings for alcohol use and abuse. These settings motivate "deviant" exchanges. For example, NU students will agree to share backyards for block parties. The students will purchase 10 or more kegs, post signs of the upcoming event, while the only response of the university is to send Public Safety officers to monitor the event from the perimeter. The NU block party I attended started around noon with three live bands and 10 kegs, which were quickly depleted. Another 10 kegs arrived providing beer well into the night. Students
wandered in and out houses which were left open for the party. However, this also had the effect of letting neighborhood children wander outside and mingle with the partiers. In effect, the college students were in control and no adult control was present. The participation of students in these activities makes virtually any college student susceptible to the problems discussed in this study. With more studies of college student drinking we can come to a better understanding of the normative context of student culture by understanding how unregulated drinking occurs and how it might be controlled.

What Results Does Campus-Based Prevention Produce?

Alcohol and other drug prevention may challenge "deviant" high-risk patterns of college student substance use. It is clear from the Monitoring the Future (Johnston, O'Malley and Bachman, 1988) surveys that alcohol and drug use is present before most students enter their college years. While Robert DuPont has stated students who go on to college use less drugs in high school, they quickly "catch-up" at college, this will generally be determined by the social interactions of college students (Cahalan, 1991). Positive social interactions promoting drug-free values have been shown in this study to impact some college students.

Awareness, as shown in Chapter VI, determines the difference between the absence of hard drug use and hard drug experimentation and use. Virtually all hard drug use
at both universities is by those in the 'non-aware' group. For Slackers, hard drugs such as LSD and cocaine are a part of their routine activities. As drug users, Slackers do not belong to the 'aware' group since hard drug use is almost totally absent among 'aware' students. Recall, the most popular hard drug used is LSD reportedly taken by 37 NU students, all of whom were 'non-aware'. At LU the same effect of prevention can be found with hallucinogens users, only one of the 15 users is in the 'aware' group. The use of marijuana, the "drug of choice" for college students, is twice as much among 'non-aware' students as among 'aware' students at both schools.

Again, awareness determines the difference between moderate use of alcohol and tobacco and their heavy use. The percent of 'alcohol use within the last year' reveals a strong association with reported prevention effects. At both schools the 'use last year' measure shows little difference in the prevalence of drinking in either 'non-aware' or 'aware groups', because at LU 91.9 percent and at NU 90.6 percent of the students drank alcohol within the last year. As shown in Chapter IV, awareness does decrease the quantity and frequency of alcohol use. Binge drinking, being intoxicated for more than one day in a row, is much greater among 'non-aware students' than 'aware' students.

The assessment of prevention programs in this study indicates that both university program designs had an impact
on about 18 percent of the students anticipated use of alcohol. This reported change in attitudes toward alcohol and drug use is viewed as modifying or eroding the effect of the more influential "party" culture of students. This is a significant change in attitude, where the corresponding number of students on a campus of 10,000 students would include 1,800 who decrease their use of alcohol because of prevention programs. Although students at NU and LU are not very likely to favor to change dramatically to an "alcohol-free environment", with only 12.2 percent of NU and 21 percent of LU students prefer a decreased availability of alcohol. Despite the efforts behind NU's Campustown, campuses are not, as this study shows, going to be "dry".

The problems of alcohol and drug abuse are disruptive events and therefore easier to identify than the effects of prevention programming. In contrast, prevention of alcohol and drug abuse is a process encompassing many events, only some which are anticipated and planned. While NU's Campustown has plans to close bars, an unanticipated consequence may be that students will drive further to "get wasted" and drive back to campus "under the influence".

Summarizing the study's findings, it is possible to state that drinking and drug use is viewed more negatively by about 18 percent of the student population due to prevention programs. These retrospective survey results
come from a single point in time and must be submitted to further testing. This relationship emerged in the combined model which combines both the CORE survey's knowledge of prevention question with Survey B's, the prevention issues survey, questions denoting any changes in student behaviors. This being the case, a null hypothesis that awareness of prevention has no effect on student drinking, was rejected in Chapter IV. The effect of being 'aware' is a reduction in drinking, especially among the younger 'aware' student. This study found younger students can be guided by prevention programming to reduce, delay or prevent drug use before it has become habitual or clearly dysfunctional, a major step towards the future possibilities for "drug-free" schools (Polich et al., 1984, p. 117).

**Educational Models of Prevention**

The educational model of prevention must provide some resistance skills for students to counteract motivations for drug use because the college peer groups will influence group and individual attitudes (Newcomb, 1961; Kandel et al. 1978). This influence is especially problematic because studies have shown that high school drinking patterns are the strongest predictor of collegian's drinking behaviors (Lo, 1993). Prevention programs must involve those students who drink and use drugs in high school and bring their activities to college. Prevention programs must make "anti-drug" regulations explicit so new students know what to
expect.

A strong recommendation would be to provide prevention programming early for beginning students, who as Ellen Gold states, "within the first six to eight weeks of school, patterns of behavior and socialization have been established by students which effect their ability to stay in school and be successful" (F.I.P.S.E. Annual Meeting Program, 1992). This can minimize the effects of the "student culture", which produces more drinking among older students, by shaping the new students attitudes toward alcohol and drugs. Studies show many students hold moderate norms regarding drinking but their potential value may be lost because "students tend to misperceive their normative environment" (Perkins and Berkowitz, 1986, p. 970).

Universities and the federal government might find a payback to their resources if they are expended properly on campus-based prevention. One weakness of the educational model is educating youth on the potential negative consequences of substance abuse when these consequences are more often related to chronic use. A panel commissioned by Miller Brewing Company to study the drinking patterns of college students, presented an accurate picture, finding:

Drinking is an extremely important part of the college experience. It is the facilitator that accompanies every meaningful social event and is the sign of a person's well adjusted sociability. It is normal to drink. Those who don't drink are the weird ones. It is a way of establishing yourself socially, creating a niche for yourself in meeting people, which is the primary adjustment in coming from high school to
college. It is a social learning experience in which teenagers learn how to handle alcohol, test their limits, and prepare for later roles (1984, p. 3).

One ineffective drug prevention strategy is employing scare tactics, such as reporting statistics on drug overdose, because students rarely question their own mortality. An effective drug prevention strategy may come from the Dutch idea of a harm reduction drug policy, which targets the heavy and long-term drug users. Mathea Falco and other reformers of drug policies find the benefits of such prevention would be to "minimize harm rather than pass judgement" (Carnegie Quarterly, 1992, p. 1).

A Useful Program Design

In Chapter V, my focus was on the "undesirable conduct" which students exhibit. Indirectly much of this conduct was shaped by the larger environment at the university. The university tantalizes its campus visitors by emphasizing campus distractions such as athletics or the social life and not emphasizing the "healthy student community". Directly or indirectly, campuses promote "drinking" events such as the Jiggles Fest or Springfest. Universities must instead provide a range of options for students, in every setting, to form "break-out" groups to confront the issue of substance use on campus. Thus, athletes could "network" during the season, dorm residents could "network" in social living situations and other groups could "network" within their own social worlds. These "break-out" sessions would
establish pressure from within, rather than from the outside and reverse the current "pressure" towards drinking or drug use.

The prevention programs must devise salient programs to mesmerize and hold the 18 percent of students they are dissuading from alcohol and drug use. If the 18 percent are going to follow through on changing their behaviors, support must exist for them. Gonzalez (1986b) correctly states, if after prevention exposure, students return to a negative environment the changes in attitude are not "enough to offset the environmental pressures". One recommendation of the annual Jesuit Consortium Conference was to stage alternative activities, however never to call them "alternative" because the students would not show up. Effort should be centered on just such program creation and how prevention programs can target messages and resources which extend their influence into the student culture. Following any type of prevention program a complete evaluation of the program results must be conducted by utilizing the appropriate "reaction" instrument.

What about those who never choose to attend the alternative programming or listen to the prevention message? The subcultural preferences of Slackers or fraternity members are a cause for concern because of the adverse consequences of their substance abuse. This research reports that even with the growing intervention measures and
widespread prevention knowledge these groups still support their "right" to drink or take drugs. This study has acknowledged the need to use benign control to cause the "drinking groups" to fear a loss of their status on campus. If the status of the "drinking groups" is not diminished, they will continue to mesmerize other students, who may join them. However, escalating control to the use of coercive control is to bring about both a failed policy and an ineffective policy in controlling substance use. Impartial observers, both inside and outside the government, find drug control policy expensive and intrusive and call for more drug prevention efforts (Benjamin and Miller, 1993).

**Integrated Policy: Government and Educators Lead Together**

Coercive control is evident in the government efforts to crack down on drinking and drugs. Bill Modzeleski, at the Department of Education’s outreach office, wishes to inform the universities that:

> All you have to do is speak to any student on any college campus anywhere in the U.S., and they will tell you there are intolerably high rates of drug and alcohol use. Yet, people still think it is a right of passage or a right inherent to a college education (Selz, 1992, p. A5).

The government is involved with the promotion of prevention programs for educational institutions and the universities have to conform to the purpose of the Drug-Free Schools and Community Act. Is this a perfect union?

As stated earlier, control in education sometimes involves educators. The U.S. Department of Education is
required to evaluate the effectiveness of all educational institution's substance abuse policies. At what point does this purpose take precedence over university education and work against openness, experimentation and discovery? Educational groups are finding it difficult to be heard over those legions engaged in drug control, i.e., prevention, housing and security services at American universities. It may not be too far in the future, the Clinton administration is currently pursuing some drug reforms, that the government recognizes that law enforcement's efforts can be judged as unsuccessful in reducing the demand for drugs. The government produces drug education materials, some of which refute law enforcement agencies claims of victory in the "war on drugs".

NU's Father Lenihan disagrees with the need for government involvement in college policy, saying:

I would prefer the federal government allow the schools to set their own policies, but I realize there's a lot of concern within the American public about drugs and alcohol. It's kind of one lawmaker's gesture getting that piece of legislation through. It's a popular cause. It probably does raise some consciousness about the importance of looking at the drug and alcohol question. The wrong people see those forms though. The students never get touched by that. (F. Lenihan, personal communication, April 10, 1992).

The universities are left to implement controls and possible solutions to their students alcohol and drug use. Universities are balancing government regulations with the attractiveness of student life in a competitive educational market. Perhaps the universities are not very interested in
the programs succeeding. However, universities like Northern or California State University-Chino will no longer allow the "party school" reputations to go unchallenged. Costly and undesirable conduct at schools provide a forceful argument for the need for campus-based prevention.

Arguments for Prevention

This study has presented the prevention providers view that alcohol and other drug use is a problem, although many students have not realized they are perceived as having "alcohol problems". The label "problem" becomes a convenient part of a redefinition campaign to change the alcohol and drug-related behaviors of college students. The fraternity row or Slacker areas are one "problem" for the prevention providers who must decide if should they should act to disperse the "deviant" students or continue to allow their concentration. LU's Andy Accardi complains, "At the university, it's binge drinking and the students are initiated into it as soon as they get to campus".

According to Andy and others their educational programs are very much needed. Andy claims by law he has to instruct students to "abstain". But for students, though they are violating the laws, it is important to demonstrate responsibility by recognizing that alcohol is a powerful drug and must be used cautiously. M. E. Chafetz instructs those who use alcohol to "drink responsibly". This information is necessary for today's college student.
Chafetz’s recommendations include:

1) Alcohol should not be used to deal with loneliness or emotional upset. Alcohol is no substitute for another person.

2) One should have an image of alcohol use which excludes drunkenness as acceptable behavior.

3) Know the actions and effects of alcohol. Being unaware of what effects alcohol can have on you puts you at risk (Rivers, 1994, p. 18-19).

If increased monitoring of student behaviors is the design of prevention programs and if this monitoring is expected to modify the "drinking groups" lifestyles, then these expectation will not be met. This study found Slackers and fraternities base their reputations on being able to host a "great" party. Hence, these groups will conflict with any prevention message, whether its abstinence or responsible drinking. Faced with this conflict, these groups choose to live outside the law and some distance from their school’s regulations. The Slackers operate at a "distance" from NU and the Acca Saccas were "suspended" at LU. All involved, both inside and outside universities, should evaluate how other groups, i.e., the homeless substance users, drug offenders in prison, and those countless drug users and alcohol abusers in the society have not had their alcohol or drug problems adequately addressed by increased monitoring or sanctioning and have been labeled "outsiders" by those in the society with the power to exclude such groups (Becker, 1973).

Drinking groups are outside the boundaries of the
campus, both physically and, with regards to enforcement of the rules, legally. Social control agents are able to reverse the status of these college students, possibly treating them as "outsiders". Social control agents, including prevention providers, must review their policies and begin excluding groups to control rather than the present trend of expanding controls. An overriding question remains, what possible need is there for coercive control among the college population? If we apply Matza's "delinquency and drift" concept, then most delinquents do not become adult offenders and are "apart from intermittent misbehaviors, conventional and law-abiding" (Davis and Stasz, 1990, p. 41).

The outcome of increased sanctions is an increase in the "stigma" of "drinking groups". Slackers would be transformed from students at NU into the "next generation of young criminals and youthful deviants" (Ramos, 1980). The characteristic deviant and anti-social attitudes, behaviors, and beliefs of Slacker and fraternity "groupiness" may escape the casual observer, yet if an "invisible net" of control is expanded those "appended" in the net will include Slackers and fraternity members. Prevention providers, whose "drug-free" values express conventional views, will best expend their resources toward peer-programming where students challenge each other, not towards the proscriptive "policing of desires" which is too big and unworthy a job.
However expanding prevention with its prescriptive form of social control, promoting a "healthy student community", is a process which has produced some results, as shown in Chapter IV, and will eventually impact on more and more students. By the laws of physics if this current 18 percent grows, then concomitantly the "party" student culture must shrink.

Recommendations and Conclusion

If intervention with students can be carried out from within the student culture itself using peer leaders, then the expectation is the present 18 percent base of "drug-free" students will be expanded. Impressive results using those peer leader programs, were found at LU, with its initial recruitment of peer leaders for PACT 2000 among student club members. NU currently employs their PPAs as both "crisis managers" and peer educators. Changes reported at both universities in attitudes of students in the 'aware' group indicate a decrease in alcohol and drug use, although these results are preliminary and must be verified by other studies. Other studies will ultimately confirm this study's exploratory results on 'awareness' by elaborating the effects of campus-based prevention which are currently in use on over 3,000 colleges and universities.

Slackers and fraternities are in many respects the creation of the universities, which remain the appropriate place for changing their creation. These drinking groups,
in their current state, are of interest to prevention providers as "unhealthy" or "high risk" students. If these students do not receive the prevention messages and get away with their alcohol and drug use, then it sends a message that the demands for change in the alcohol-centered student culture are not serious. When drinking groups, such as Slackers and fraternities, beliefs go unchallenged they use their "off-campus" location to avoid alcohol and drug laws. Development of a "positive" campus culture critical of alcohol and drug use will most likely occur if prevention providers target groups such as Slackers and fraternities by requiring them to comply with rules on alcohol and drugs.

Once exposed to prevention messages, Slackers and fraternities either accept or reject these messages. Typically, these groups fail to internalize the message of alcohol and drug prevention after already failing to stop illegal drinking and drug use after their initial initiation to that use. Prevention providers themselves must be 'aware' of the reasons for these failures.

As it turns out, both drinking groups are likely to gain some rewards for their alcohol and drug use during their college years. Slackers enjoy their unconventionality, while fraternities appear strengthened by being the easy targets for prevention. This creates difficulties with intervening in their "social world". College youth avoid these intervention strategies and still
get what Jessor et al. (1991) call a "second chance".

The probability of a "second chance" is posited by Jessor, Donovan and Costa (1991) and developed from their study of adolescents in the National Youth Survey. They argue that while some problem behaviors will persist, those behaviors do not affect adult status attainment. They state:

First, our research involved normal rather than clinical samples, and the extent of their adolescent/youth involvement in problem behavior - even at its greatest - has to be seen as moderate for the most part. Second, our samples were largely middle class in socioeconomic status, and the openness of the opportunity structure for them and their access to "second chances" have to be seen as far greater than might be the case for disadvantaged youth who have been involved in problem behavior. Third, ..., even for samples such as ours, there can still be compromising outcome (yet) to be manifested (1991, pp. 268-69).

It is such groups, middle-class youth who have access to "second chances", which sustain the alcohol and drug culture at universities among the other "healthy" facets of college life and "positive" school experiences.

Will these drinking groups end up taking their "second chance" by eventually becoming "conventional and law-abiding"? Most college drinkers and drug users will probably drift toward a conventional, law-abiding life after graduation. Further research on drinking groups should be conducted to assess what percent of the students involved maintain their "deviant" behaviors into later life. This research would uncover how resilient the identity of the drinking group is or if prevention programs are challenging
that group identity. Peer education may someday create a student culture where bragging about abstinence from alcohol and drugs will be accepted as an accomplishment in the same way bragging about "being wasted" on alcohol or drugs is today.

The challenge for prevention providers who promote basic changes in autonomous student culture where "drinking is firmly rooted" is to present a clear, well-defined policy on the use of alcohol or drugs. It is time to "comprehend" this generation of youth, which prevention providers appear ready to help educators accomplish, rather than to "apprehend" them using prevention providers functioning as agents of social control.
APPENDIX A. Core Alcohol and Drug Survey

Core Instrument

1. Classification: Freshman ☐ Other ☐
   Sophomore ☐ Other ☐
   Junior ☐ Other ☐
   Senior ☐ Other ☐
   Not enrolled in a degree program ☐

2. Age: ☐ 19 or younger ☐ 20-24 ☐ 25-29 ☐ 30-39 ☐ 40 or older

3. Ethnic origin: American Indian/Alaskan Native ☐
   Hispanic ☐ Other ☐
   Asian/Pacific Islander ☐ Other ☐
   White (non-Hispanic) ☐ Other ☐
   Black (non-Hispanic) ☐ Other ☐
   Other ☐

4. Marital status: Single ☐
   Married ☐
   Separated ☐
   Divorced ☐
   Widowed ☐

5. Gender: Male ☐ Female ☐ Other ☐

6. In your current residence as a student: On-campus ☐
   Off-campus ☐

7. Are you working? Yes, full-time ☐
   Yes, part-time ☐
   No ☐

8. Living arrangement: (mark all that apply)
   Residence hall ☐
   Approved housing ☐
   Fraternity or sorority ☐
   With roommate(s) ☐
   Alone ☐
   With parent(s) ☐
   With spouse ☐
   With children ☐
   Other ☐

9. Approximate cumulative grade average (choose one)
   A+ ☐ A ☐ A- ☐ B+ ☐ B ☐ B- ☐ C+ ☐ C ☐ C- ☐ D+ ☐ D ☐ D- ☐ F ☐

10. The primary focus of your coursework at the moment: (choose one)
    Regular college courses ☐
    Basic skills ☐
    English as a second language ☐
    Other ☐

11. Student status:
    Full-time (1+ credits) ☐
    Part-time (1-11 credits) ☐

12. Campus situation on alcohol and drugs:
    a. Does your campus have drug and alcohol policies? ☐
       ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Don't know
    b. If so, are they enforced? ☐
    c. Does your campus have a drug and alcohol prevention program? ☐

13. Place of permanent residence:
    In-state ☐
    USA, but outside of state ☐
    Country other than USA ☐

14. Think back over the last two weeks. How many times have you
    had five or more drinks* at a sitting? None ☐
    Once ☐
    Twice ☐
    3 to 5 times ☐
    6 to 9 times ☐
    10 or more times ☐

15. Average # of drinks* you consume a week
    None ☐
    1-2 drinks ☐
    3-4 drinks ☐
    5-6 drinks ☐
    7-8 drinks ☐
    9-10 drinks ☐
    11 drinks ☐
    12 or more drinks ☐

16. At what age did you first use... (mark one for each)
    a. Tobacco (smoke, chew, snuff) ☐
    b. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor) ☐
    c. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil) ☐
    d. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase) ☐
    e. Amphetamines (upper, speed) ☐
    f. Sedatives (downers, ludes) ☐
    g. Hallucinogens (LSD, PCP) ☐
    h. Opiates (heroin, smack, horses) ☐
    i. Inhalants (glue, solvents, gas) ☐
    j. Designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA) ☐
    k. Steroids ☐
    l. Other drugs ☐

17. Have you ever used... (mark one for each)
    a. Tobacco (smoke, chew, snuff) ☐
    b. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor) ☐
    c. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil) ☐
    d. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase) ☐
    e. Amphetamines (upper, speed) ☐
    f. Sedatives (downers, ludes) ☐
    g. Hallucinogens (LSD, PCP) ☐
    h. Opiates (heroin, smack, horses) ☐
    i. Inhalants (glue, solvents, gas) ☐
    j. Designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA) ☐
    k. Steroids ☐
    l. Other drugs ☐

18. How many of the students on this campus do you think use...
    (mark one for each)
    a. Tobacco (smoke, chew, snuff) ☐
    b. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor) ☐
    c. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil) ☐
    d. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase) ☐
    e. Amphetamines (upper, speed) ☐
    f. Sedatives (downers, ludes) ☐
    g. Hallucinogens (LSD, PCP) ☐
    h. Opiates (heroin, smack, horses) ☐
    i. Inhalants (glue, solvents, gas) ☐
    j. Designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA) ☐
    k. Steroids ☐
    l. Other drugs ☐

19. Where have you used...
    (mark all that apply)
    a. Tobacco (smoke, chew, snuff) ☐
    b. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor) ☐
    c. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil) ☐
    d. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase) ☐
    e. Amphetamines (upper, speed) ☐
    f. Sedatives (downers, ludes) ☐
    g. Hallucinogens (LSD, PCP) ☐
    h. Opiates (heroin, smack, horses) ☐
    i. Inhalants (glue, solvents, gas) ☐
    j. Designer drugs (ecstasy, MDMA) ☐
    k. Steroids ☐
    l. Other drugs ☐

20. Please indicate how often you have experienced the following due to your drinking or drug use during the last year...
    (mark one for each)
    a. Had a hangover ☐
    b. Performed poorly on a test or important project ☐
    c. Been in trouble with police, residence hall, or other authorities ☐
    d. Damaged property, stolen or damaged ☐
    e. Got into a fight or threatened someone ☐
    f. Got arrested or convicted ☐
    g. Missed school or work due to drinking or drug use ☐
    h. Missed class or work due to drinking or drug use ☐
    i. Missed a meal or did not eat due to drinking or drug use ☐
    j. Missed work or school due to drinking or drug use ☐
    k. Missed work or school due to drinking or drug use ☐

21. Have you or any member of your family had alcohol or other drug problems: (mark all that apply)
    a. Mother ☐
    b. Father's parents ☐
    c. Father ☐
    d. Stepfather/stepmother ☐
    e. Aunt/uncle ☐
    f. Aunt/uncle ☐
    g. Brother/sister ☐
    h. Brother/sister ☐

22. Some students have indicated that alcohol or drug use at parties they attend in and around campus reduces their enjoyment, often leads to negative situations, and, therefore, they would rather not have alcohol and drugs available and used. Other students have indicated that alcohol and drug use at parties increases their enjoyment, often leads to positive situations, and, therefore, they would rather have alcohol and drugs available and used. Which of these is closest to your own view?
    With regard to drugs? ☐
    With regard to alcohol? ☐

23. What other social problems do you think that alcohol and drug use pose on and around campus?

24. Have you ever been cautioned or disciplined by a school official or a campus staff member about your drug or alcohol use?
    a. Yes ☐
    b. No ☐

25. Have you ever been awarded for outstanding academic achievement or community participation?
    a. Yes ☐
    b. No ☐

* 5 or more drinks at a sitting is defined as excessive drinking for the purposes of this survey.
Appendix B: Prevention Issues Survey

Continue answering all questions for the last year's period. Circle only one answer unless otherwise indicated.

This series of questions asks about alcohol and drug prevention at Loyola.

Have alcohol and drug prevention programs at Loyola...

24. Made students less favorable toward drugs.
   1. Not at all
   2. To a little extent
   3. To some extent
   4. To a great extent
   5. To a very great extent

24a. Less favorable toward alcohol.
   1. Not at all
   2. To a little extent
   3. To some extent
   4. To a great extent
   5. To a very great extent

25. Made you less favorable toward drugs.
   1. Not at all
   2. To a little extent
   3. To some extent
   4. To a great extent
   5. To a very great extent

   1. Not at all
   2. To a little extent
   3. To some extent
   4. To a great extent
   5. To a very great extent

26. Made you less likely to use drugs.
   1. Not at all
   2. To a little extent
   3. To some extent
   4. To a great extent
   5. To a very great extent

26a. To use alcohol
   1. Not at all
   2. To a little extent
   3. To some extent
   4. To a great extent
   5. To a very great extent

27. Overstated the dangers or risks of drug use.
   1. Not at all
   2. To a little extent
   3. To some extent
   4. To a great extent
   5. To a very great extent

27a. Of alcohol use.
   1. Not at all
   2. To a little extent
   3. To some extent
   4. To a great extent
   5. To a very great extent

28. Have you ever been pressured by other college students to drink?
   1. Never
   2. Seldom
   3. Sometimes
   4. Most times
   5. Always

28a. Pressured to use drugs.
   1. Never
   2. Seldom
   3. Sometimes
   4. Most times
   5. Always

29abc. If you were caught smoking marijuana at Loyola what would be your university's reaction?
   1. Not disapprove
   2. Disapprove
   3. Strongly disapprove

   parent's reaction?
   1. Not disapprove
   2. Disapprove
   3. Strongly disapprove

   friend's reaction?
   1. Not disapprove
   2. Disapprove
   3. Strongly disapprove

30abc. If you were underage and caught drinking at Loyola what would be your university's reaction?
   1. Not disapprove
   2. Disapprove
   3. Strongly disapprove

   parent's reaction?
   1. Not disapprove
   2. Disapprove
   3. Strongly disapprove

   friend's reaction?
   1. Not disapprove
   2. Disapprove
   3. Strongly disapprove

31abc. If you were caught using cocaine at Loyola what would be your university's reaction?
   1. Not disapprove
   2. Disapprove
   3. Strongly disapprove

   parent's reaction?
   1. Not disapprove
   2. Disapprove
   3. Strongly disapprove

   friend's reaction?
   1. Not disapprove
   2. Disapprove
   3. Strongly disapprove

This series of questions concerns student lifestyles.

32. Are the groups which you socialize with best described as (Circle all that apply):
   1. School clubs.
   2. Athletic teams.
   3. Fraternities/Sororities.
   5. Political action groups.
   6. Friends from work.
   7. Recovery, Self-help groups.
   8. Other.
   9. I have an independent and solitary lifestyle

33. How often do you meet with friends, informally?
   1. Almost everyday
   2. At least once a week
   3. Once or twice a month
   4. A few times a year
   5. Never

34. How often do your friends drink?
   1. Almost everyday
   2. At least once a week
   3. Once or twice a month
   4. A few times a year
   5. Never

35. How often do your friends use illegal drugs?
   1. Almost everyday
   2. At least once a week
   3. Once or twice a month
   4. A few times a year
   5. Never

36. How many alcohol and other drug education or prevention experiences have you had at Loyola?
   (Circle all that apply)
   1. A special course about alcohol and other drugs.
   2. Films, lectures or discussion in my regular classes.
   3. Films or lectures outside my regular classes.
   4. Special discussion (rap groups) about alcohol and other drugs.
   5. None

37. Is this the only CORE Alcohol and Drug Survey which you have filled out at Loyola this year?
   1. Yes
   2. No

Thank you for your participation in our survey.
TO: University Colleagues

FROM: Tom Gagliardi
     Director of the Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Education

DATE: February 7, 1992

RE: Continuation of Alcohol and Drug Core Survey

================================================c=============•====

In the fall of 1990, Loyola University administered an initial Alcohol and Drug Core Survey sampling over 1300 Loyola undergraduate and graduate students representing all four university campuses. This survey came under the direction of personnel in the Student Affairs Division.

At this time we are interested in continuing this process of surveying students in several university departments utilizing the alcohol and drug core survey again with some minor modifications.

We are requesting your support and cooperation in administering this survey to students presently enrolled in your classes. Besides your academic department, we have identified several other academic departments to approach with our request.

Darrell Irwin, a Loyola University Doctoral candidate in Sociology under the direction of Dr. Richard L. Block, Professor of Sociology, will be conducting this survey process. Loyola's Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention and Education within the Division of Student Affairs supports Mr. Irwin's work and will aid him in completing this process.

Mr. Irwin will be contacting you on February 11 and 12 to outline the simple procedure and time efficient process necessary to gather the data. At this point we estimate that 20-25 minutes of your class time will be needed to complete the survey. We are targeting February 28, 1992 as the date when all surveys will be completed and returned to Mr. Irwin. A return label is provided for your convenience.

The results of the entire survey will be shared with key university personnel and with those that develop alcohol and other drug prevention programs for Loyola University.

Loyola University's Institutional Review Board has given its approval for Mr. Irwin's survey. This approval guarantees complete confidentiality for all respondents.

Your support and cooperation will be greatly appreciated.
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