



Western Michigan University
ScholarWorks at WMU

Dissertations

Graduate College

12-1-2008

Content Analysis of University Alcohol Policies: "Party Schools" Compared to Non-Party Schools

Sarah E. Pernie
Western Michigan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations>



Part of the Higher Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Pernie, Sarah E., "Content Analysis of University Alcohol Policies: "Party Schools" Compared to Non-Party Schools" (2008). *Dissertations*. 805.

<https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/dissertations/805>

This Dissertation-Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at ScholarWorks at WMU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



CONTENT ANALYSIS OF UNIVERSITY ALCOHOL POLICIES:
“PARTY SCHOOLS” COMPARED TO
NON-PARTY SCHOOLS

by

Sarah E. Pernie

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of the Graduate College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the
Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Education, Educational Leadership, Research, and Technology
Advisor: Louann BierleinPalmer, Ed.D

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
December 2008

UMI Number: 3340197

Copyright 2008 by
Pernie, Sarah E.

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3340197

Copyright 2009 by ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest LLC
789 E. Eisenhower Parkway
PO Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Copyright by
Sarah E. Pernie
2008

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to begin by acknowledging my three committee members for their support during the dissertation process. Dr. Karen Brown and Dr. Andrea Beach have been wonderful mentors and I have been privileged to have them on my committee. As for the chair of my committee, Dr. Louann Bierlein Palmer, your support has been instrumental in the success of this project.

Secondly, I would like to thank my writing partner, fellow student and colleague, Kathy Rix. She provided a driving force, laughter and an optimistic look for the light at the end of the tunnel on this long bumpy road.

Third, I would like to thank my parents, Chuck and Sharon Marlow, their encouragement and support throughout this ordeal was greatly appreciated. They deserve an honorary doctorate in parenting for supporting me as I pursued further education and attained my goals.

Fourth, I would like to thank my husband for numerous nights of playing Mr. Mom. His support was instrumental in the completion of this project.

Lastly, I would like to thank my children, Bridgette, Zachary and Lauren Pernie for tolerating Mr. Mom without driving him over the edge. You have been my driving motivation for attaining this degree so that I instill in you the importance of continued education. I hope I have demonstrated the value of lifelong learning and taught you to value everyday moments as lessons in life.

Sarah E. Pernie

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER	
1: INTRODUCTION	1
Background.....	1
Problem Statement and Research Questions.....	4
Conceptual Framework.....	7
Placement of the Researcher.....	9
Chapter 1 Summary	9
2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	11
Drinking on Campus.....	11
“People” Effects of Drinking.....	12
Institutional Issues Related to Drinking.....	13
Campus Climate/Culture and Connections to Alcohol Usage.....	15
Alcohol Policy Related Research.....	17
Effects of Societal and Institutional Policies	18
University Written Alcohol Policies: Access and Awareness	21
National Best Practice Policy Recommendations.....	23
Best Practice Recommendation # 1	23
Best Practice Recommendation # 2	25
Best Practice Recommendation # 3	25

Table of Contents-Continued

CHAPTER

Best Practice Recommendation # 4	26
Chapter 2 Literature Review Summary	27
3: METHODS	29
Research Design.....	30
Population and Sample	30
Rubric Development	32
Data Collection	35
Data Analysis	36
Limitations and Delimitations.....	41
Limitations	41
Delimitations.....	42
Chapter 3 Conclusion.....	43
4: RESULTS	44
Demographic Data	44
Variable Statistics	47
Research Question 1: Types of Content.....	48
Best Practice Category Results Narrative	50
National best practice recommendations	50
Additional rubric categories.....	57
Research Question 1 Summary	63

Table of Contents-Continued

CHAPTER

Research Question 2 : Comparison of Party vs. Non-party School Content	65
Research Questions 3: Comparison of Institutional Size and Geographic Location.....	68
Research Question 4 : Variations Based on Institutional Type	80
Regression Analysis.....	82
Narrative Summary of Quantitative Statistical Findings.....	86
Additional Qualitative Results.....	87
Theme 1 : The Smaller the Institutions, the More Difficult to Find the Policy	87
Theme 2 : Great Variation Within Length of Alcohol Policies	88
Theme 3 : Institutional Policies that Address Special Situations	91
Theme 4 : Institutional Policies that Address Climate/Culture	92
Chapter 4 Summary	93
5: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.....	95
Overall Conclusions and Discussions.....	95
Suggestions for Practice.....	99
Specific Policy Elements Recommended	102
Specific Policy Elements Not Recommended	114
Content Recommendation Summary	116
Suggestions for Further Research	116

Table of Contents-Continued

CHAPTER

Project Conclusion	117
--------------------------	-----

REFERENCES	119
------------------	-----

APPENDICES

A. The 27 Rubric Categories	132
-----------------------------------	-----

B. University Policy Sources	134
------------------------------------	-----

C. Institutional Demographic Data	143
---	-----

D. Summary Rubric Categories Broken Down by Institution	146
---	-----

E. Rubric Categories as Broken Down by Institution	149
--	-----

LIST OF TABLES

1. Schools Disaggregated by Athletic Conference and Party/Non-party Status	46
2. School Summary by Athletic Region & Type of School.....	46
3. Institutional Size: # Undergraduate Students.....	47
4. Rubric Categories.....	48
5. The 27 Categories Analyzed.....	49
6. Number of 71 Institutional Policies Examined that Include National Recommendations	64
7. Frequency of 27 Items Broken Down by Party Categorization.....	66
8. Analysis of Variance for Party Group	67
9. Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements When Compared by Party Status.....	67
10. Frequency of 27 Items Broken Down by Institutional Size.....	68
11. Analysis of Variance for Institutional Size.....	70
12. Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements (when broken down by institutional size).....	71
13. Frequency of 27 Items Broken Down by Geographic Location	72
14. Analysis of Variance for Geographic Location	74
15. Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements (when broken down by geographical location).....	75
16. Frequency of 27 Items Related to Athletic Conference.....	76
17. Analysis of Variance for Athletic Conference.....	77

List of Tables-Continued

18. Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements (when broken down by athletic conference)	78
19. Frequency of 27 Items as Broken Down by Public/Private Status	80
20. Analysis of Variance for Public/Private Status.....	81
21. Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements (when broken down by public/private status)	82
22. Correlation Table	83
23. Regression Data Analysis-National Recommendations	84
24. Regression Data Analysis-Additional Recommendations	85
25. Regression Data Analysis-Total Recommendations.....	85
26. 12 Statistically Significant Different Individual Policy Elements (across variables)	87
27. Policy Comprehensiveness	91
28. Summary of Recommended Policy Content Items and Activities.....	116

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background

Alcohol use and abuse by college students is a problem for the students, the university, and the broader community the university lies within. Previous studies indicate that underage college student binge drinking is a growing problem (e.g., Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Grossman, & Zanakos, 1997; Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, & Lee, 2000; Wechsler & Wuethrich, 2002). Increases in the number of students who are required to pay fines, attend mandatory alcohol education, and perform community service or experience similar disciplinary actions related to their use of alcohol are all indicators of this growing problem (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, Seibring, Nelson, & Lee, 2002). Former United States Surgeon General David Satcher claimed binge drinking to be “the most serious public health problem on American college campuses today” (as cited in Wechsler & Wuethrich, 2002, p. xiv).

The federal government has acknowledged the responsibility of institutions by passing the *Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act* in 1990. This act requires that, as a condition of funding or financial assistance from the federal government, higher education institutions must ascertain that they have in place a program to prevent the unlawful possession, use, or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol by students and employees (*Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act, 2006*). This includes student activities within the residence halls as well as off campus.

Institutional responsibilities also include health promotional activities, designed to enhance the health of an individual, group, or community. Dunne and Somerset (2004) report that students feel such health promotion activities must

include issues related to alcohol and drug use. University campuses can play a large role regarding alcohol use via the promotion of alternative activities that do not involve alcohol.

A number of studies have explored the multiple aspects of why students drink, the consequences associated with college drinking, and what should be done about alcohol abuse on campuses (e.g., Baer, 2002; Barnett & Reed, 2005; Dowdall & Wechsler, 2002; Wolaver, 2002). Although the biggest damage done by excessive college drinking is that done to the individuals themselves, research has shown considerable damage can be done to other people and the institution. For example, Wechsler and Wuethrich (2002) report that “By the late 1980’s the National Association of Insurance Commissioners had ranked fraternities and sororities among the top ten risks for insurance companies” (p. 43), and alcohol was involved in 78-95% of all fraternity claims.

In addition to the *Drug-Free Schools and Campuses Act*, the United States government has set national disease prevention and health promotion objectives to be achieved by the year 2010. One of the key areas of health included in these objectives is substance abuse (*Healthy People 2010*). In following with those national objectives, the American College of Health Association (ACHA) has developed their Healthy Campus 2010 objectives. As the largest governing body of college campus health clinics, the ACHA is a credentialing body focused on health issues within educational institutions. The association provides advocacy, education, communications, products, and services, and promotes research to advance the health of students and the campus community (ACHA, 2006a). One of their goals is to

decrease the amount of binge drinking among three categories of targeted individuals: high school students, college students, and adults over the age of 18.

To implement the recommendations from Healthy People 2010, all universities are encouraged to develop and implement specific *policies* related to alcohol use by their students. Gustafson, Cats-Baril, and Alemi (1992) believe such policies should “model how the best experts think and then make such models widely available in the form of support systems” (p. 3). Indeed, recommendations have been made by a number of nationally recognized institutions including the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention (HEC), and the American Medical Association (AMA), offering guidelines for institutions to help curb the increasing problem of underage drinking on college campuses.

There is little consistency, however, among these sets of recommendations, and confusion exists regarding the best way to approach the college-aged alcohol abuse problem, including no real agreement regarding essential elements to include within an institution’s alcohol policies (Abbey, 2002; Perkins, 2002). Although a few recent studies have investigated aspects of specific university alcohol policies such as ease of finding policies via the internet (Faden & Baskin, 2002) and administrators’ perceptions of their institutional alcohol policies (Mitchell, Toomey, & Erickson, 2005), little has been done to investigate what content is essential to include in a university alcohol policy, and to what extent such content has actually been adopted.

Problem Statement and Research Questions

Underage drinking on college campuses is a growing problem that needs continued attention of higher education leaders. The National Institute of Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse (NIAAA) states “The tradition of drinking has developed into a kind of culture-beliefs and customs- entrenched in every level of college students’ environments” (NIAAA, 2006, p. 1). Often college drinking is seen as a social norm that is accepted by students, peers, and parents. As a result, educational institutions have experienced high levels of binge drinking causing serious consequences including violence, sexual assault, and deaths of college students (Wechsler, Dowdall, Davenport, & DeJong, 2002).

Indeed, alcohol is such an integral part of social norms within the American higher education system that numerous entities actually rate institutions as party schools. For example, magazines such as *Playboy* have fueled this image by glamorizing the term “party school” with ideas of naked women and drinking as they have rated the top ten party schools three different times (in 1987, 2002 and 2006). *Playboy* (2006) reports “It is a distinction for a university that ranks right up there with the number of Nobel Prize winners on its faculty- at least in the minds of the students” (p. 109).

On the more serious and academic side, another source, *The Princeton Review*, a yearly publication directed towards high school seniors looking for a place to enroll in higher education, also identifies party schools within the United States. Nine of the 62 ranked categories used by *The Princeton Review* to rate higher education institutions deal with alcohol and drug use on campus. Franek, the lead

author of *The Princeton Review*, points out that their rankings can be seen as “a catalyst for change on campus” (as reported in Lipka, 2006).

In response to both the real health issues and perceived party image concerns, universities have adopted specific policies dealing with alcohol use by their students. Some limited previous research has been done on accessibility of such alcohol policies (Faden & Baskin, 2002), and the universities’ lack of follow through on current policies (Mitchell, Toomey, & Erickson, 2005). Given the gravity of the alcohol abuse issue, however, experts indicate the need for significant additional research regarding institutional alcohol policies (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996; Faden & Baskin, 2002; Mitchell, Toomey, & Erickson, 2005). In addition, given the lack of inconsistency among the best practice recommendations offered by leading groups (e.g., NIAAA, AASCU, HEC, AMA), it is important to examine the commonalities and differences within universities’ current alcohol policies and how such policies compare to best practice recommendations offered by the various national groups. It is also important to investigate if any relationships exist between the content of a given institution’s alcohol policy and the ratings assigned to that institution based upon its real or perceived alcohol use or abuse.

A final important research focus is to examine if geography plays a role in the content included with an institution’s alcohol policy. With the exception of Rhodes, Singleton, McMillan, and Perrino (2005), who looked at policies within Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) located only in the southern United States, the literature does not differentiate university alcohol policies by geographical location. Since social norms and culture may vary in the United States, examining

possible correlations between geographical location and their alcohol policy content would also add to the knowledge base.

To this end, this study analyzes the alcohol policies of universities that have been identified as “party schools” (via the Princeton Review criteria), as well as policies from similar universities not identified as party schools. In addition, all policies were compared against national best practice recommendations. To ensure a certain level of similarity between types of universities being compared, higher education institutions from within the same athletic conferences were examined. Such entities tend to be similar in size, geographic location, residential housing, and types and level of sporting programs (NCAA, 2005), all which may have an impact on the actual use or abuse of alcohol at those schools.

To accomplish this task, the following questions are of specific interest to the researcher.

1. Overall, how does the content of university alcohol policies compare to four national best practice recommendations?
2. How does the content of alcohol policies within universities identified as “party schools” and the content within the policies of similar universities not identified as party schools:
 - (a) compare with each other; and
 - (b) compare with four nationally recognized recommendations related to best policy content practices?
3. How do such policies and comparisons vary, if at all, based upon an institution’s size and geographical location?

4. How do such policies and comparisons vary, if at all, based upon type of institution (i.e. public vs. private)?

Overall, this study involves a content analysis of various universities' alcohol policies, comparing them to a rubric developed by the researcher using "best practice" policy content recommendations from four different national organizations. It also includes an analysis of similarities and differences among schools listed as party schools and similar ones not listed as party schools. Geographical location is also evaluated for significance of content themes running through similar institutions. Recommendations for university alcohol policies are formulated to help enhance current university policies, assist universities to gain a handle on underage student drinking, and enhance the health of the student population.

The next section provides the reader with some underlying theory which drove the development of these research questions and this research study.

Conceptual Framework

Society requires us to develop policies to help guide principles of every day life. The history of policy making started to evolve in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Initially policy development was seen as a role of the government, and it was not until the 1930's that the notion arose of others being involved in policy decision-making activities (Parsons, 1995). Today we know that policies are developed by a number of people involved throughout society.

Analysis of any given policy includes examination of several pieces: policy determination (or intent), policy content, policy implementation practices, and policy impact (Parsons, 1995). While policy determination (focused on the intent), and

policy implementation (focused on actual practice) are essential, the task of policy content analysis is a critical step. Such policy content analysis focuses on a critique of the actual content (e.g., words) of any given policy, and such content analysis “has proved to be a valuable research method in many areas of inquiry” (Holsti, 1969, preface).

Universities develop policies based on input from governing body officials within the institution, students, parents, community members, and other institutions of higher education (Anderson, 1997). Such policies are derived from a number of relationships interconnected as a young adult goes off to college, with such relationship usually still strong between the young adult and parent. These include relationships between the parent and the university, between the student and the university, and between the university and the community that surrounds the institution. These relationships form the basis for a “campus culture” including accepted norms and practices (Cress, 2002). Issues impacting those relationships, such as institutional policies, can perhaps change a given culture. Indeed, Gustafson, et al. (1992) state “social ties with people committed to the change need to be established within and between organizations” (p. 47).

Overall, this study focuses on assessing one small aspect of campus culture, the here and now of what content is currently included or excluded within a university’s alcohol policy. The NIAAA (2006) concludes that a culture of drinking, as perhaps identified by receiving the rating as “party school,” promotes drinking, tolerance, and the view that college drinking is a rite of passage. Such thinking can lead to a culture that society does not want instilled in future generations. This

research therefore involves policy content analysis research, with the goal of profiling the important concepts that exist within existing policies and those that should be there per the various nationally recognized best practice recommendations.

Placement of the Researcher

As a nurse, the statistics of underage drinking on college campuses are astonishing to me. The amount of violence associated with such drinking, including sexual assault to young women, is appalling. As an educator, I think that there is a distinct need for leadership within organizations to combat this growing problem. As a mother of three young children, I hope to tackle this issue before one of my own children becomes a statistic involved with underage alcohol use. Although the actual implementation (and enforcement) of alcohol policies is a very important step in the policy analysis process, I believe that research is also needed to examine the specific content found within such policies, as part of the battle to curb underage drinking on college campuses. These biases however, have not affected my ability to properly analyze the institutional policies of institutions labeled as party schools and my results remain objective.

Chapter 1 Summary

Underage drinking on college campuses is becoming an overwhelming problem for all parties involved. National recommendations have been set forth by governmental, educational, and medical agencies to provide guidance for decreasing the amount of drinking on college campuses, yet a reading of those recommendations yields few consistencies. Nor could any research be found that examines the content of actual alcohol policies, and how such content relates to the recommended national

best practices as well as to the labels bestowed on some institutions as “party schools.” To this end, I undertook this study, taking us next to Chapter 2, which reviews the literature associated with drinking on campus.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter 2 includes findings from a literature review surrounding higher education alcohol policies and related issues. Key sections to be covered include: drinking on campus, including usage patterns; “people” effects of drinking; institutional issues related to drinking; campus climate/culture and connections to alcohol usage; alcohol policy related research, including effects of societal and institutional policies; university written alcohol policies: access and awareness; and national best practice policy recommendations.

Drinking on Campus

Underage drinking on campus has been a historical problem for universities. The number of negative effects associated with underage drinking continue to grow each year (NIAAA, 2002). There are numerous statistics and studies documenting this problem. For example, using the data from the Harvard School of Public Health’s *College Alcohol Study* (CAS), one of the largest, most comprehensive studies done on college drinking, Wechsler et al. (2002) report that 44% of U.S. college students engaged in binge drinking during the two weeks prior to being surveyed. The researchers noted that individuals who were considered drinkers in high school “were three times more likely to be binge drinkers in college” (p. 2). According to the researchers, white students, athletes and/or members of a Greek organization were also more likely to be binge drinkers.

Although it is significant to examine how much and when underage drinking is occurring, it is also important to discuss the effect of underage drinking. Perkins

(2002) divided damage resulting from excessive underage drinking into three categories: damage to self, damage to other people, and damage to the institution.

"People" Effects of Drinking

Numerous studies have found frequent problems associated with alcohol use on college campuses. In 2000, Wechsler et al. found the most common self-reported problems of college students related to binge drinking were missing classes and falling behind in school work. Wolaver (2002) researched the effects of heavy drinking in college on a student's study effort, grade point average (GPA), and major choice. Wolaver used data from the 1993 College Alcohol Study and linear equation models and found that the more a student drinks, the less time he or she spends studying and the lower his or her GPA.

Giancola (2002) presented an overview of research regarding aggressive behavior associated with alcohol use in college, looking at both survey studies and experimental laboratory investigations. In all, Giancola reviewed over 20 studies and found that alcohol use was related to increases in violent behavior and also increased one's chance of being a victim of a violent act. In a similar view, Hingson, Heeron, Zakocs, Kopstein, and Wechsler (2002) used data collected by the NIAAA in 1999, and found that more than 600,000 students had been hit or injured by another student who had been drinking, and 70,000 were victims of sexual assault or date rape.

Cooper (2002) reviewed previous research from the last 10 years (N=75 different studies) using a random sample looking for associations between alcohol use and risky sexual behaviors. She found that alcohol use inhibited good contraceptive choices. She also found that drinking was inconsistently related to protective

behaviors such as condom use. In a similar vein, Abbey (2002) conducted an extensive literature review of over 60 research papers on both sexual assault and the effect alcohol has on both aggressive and sexual behavior. She found that alcohol use increases aggressive sexual behavior.

Indeed, in 2003 the Center for Disease Control and Prevention reported that 70 of 1,000 births were from the 18-19 year old age group, with a significant number of them being unintended pregnancies. As for the 20-24 year old age group, the Center for Disease Control and Prevention reported that 102.6 of 1,000 births were from this age group with a significant number of them being unintended pregnancies. Although the rate of pregnancy for both age groups has declined in recent years, these figures represent an astronomical cost for society (National Vital Statistics Reports, 2005). Note that it is important to report both age ranges to fully understand the statistics related to the college age student.

Abbey (2002) also found that alcohol use affects even those students who refrain from drinking. She concluded that there were many gaps in the research related to alcohol and sexual assault related violence. One example, by Wechsler et al. (2002) found that 55% of non-drinking students reported at least two secondhand effects of alcohol use (i.e., pushed, hit or assaulted; or studying and/or sleep interrupted).

Institutional Issues Related to Drinking

A number of studies have investigated the economic effects of college drinking (Knight, Harris, Sherritt, Kelley, Van Hook, & Wechsler, 2003; Perkins, 2002; Williams, Chaloupka, & Wechsler, 2005). For example, Knight et al. (2003)

used a questionnaire at 11 different schools surveying 1,252 students, college deans, and campus security officers within those schools, and used those results to compare student drinking rates with enforcement index scores (based on deans' and security officers reports of alcohol policy enforcement). The researchers found that individual schools within a statewide public university system vary substantially when it comes to implementing and enforcing a uniform alcohol policy. Some of the differences, but not all, were due to the various demographic data from the 11 different schools. This study was a small study looking at only 11 public schools with on-campus housing. No off-campus housed students were included in the study, thereby excluding those that lived in fraternities and sororities. The study also only focused on institutions within one particular state and offered no comparison to other geographical locations. This study also relied on self reports from both students and school administrators, not objective measures. However, the results suggest that campus security officers who are on the forefront of enforcement activities may be an important correlate to student drinking rates by being able to enforce strict policies and help curb drinking on campus.

As another example, Perkins (2002) provided a review and synthesis of 43 different research studies regarding the types, extent and patterns of negative consequences associated with college student drinking. He found that increased alcohol use lead to increased numbers of students dropping, costing the institution money from attrition rates and lost tuition. He also found that there were costs related to increased college personnel needed to deal with alcohol problems with college students. This included increased security, counseling, and administrative hearings.

Not only was there an increase in the amount of time staff were needed to deal with issues, but it also took an emotional toll on the college staff as well. Perkins also listed the expense in legal counsel the university must pay for lawsuits brought against the university for liability related to alcohol consumption on campus.

Campus Climate/Culture and Connections to Alcohol Usage

In the debate about whether drinking at college is a rite of passage or is a normally occurring event, known as social norming, there are a variety of key players. First and foremost society must look at the ramifications of glamorizing underage drinking during the college experience. Key players include the legislature, alumni, university officials, current students, community members, parents, and literature such as *Playboy* and *The Princeton Review*. Each of these groups plays a key role in how behavior affects current students and trends in campus drinking.

Institutional context and historical legacy of inclusion or exclusion is a very important factor in determining party schools and the social norming effect of such behavior. Wechsler (1996) states that all institutions are unique and each has their own special traditions, relationships, and resources that form a unique culture. Typically those institutions with large sporting events and a slew of tailgating and victory parties have a long standing history of drinking (NIAAA, 2002). Recently the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA) at Columbia University (2007) conducted an extensive analysis of substance abuse, including alcohol use, on college campuses across the nation. The report concludes that a major barrier to effective prevention efforts is the public perception that substance abuse by college students is a normal rite of passage. Anderson and Milgram (2001) also acknowledge

that universities are known to have a culture that promotes heavy drinking and experimentation in the underage population. Recognition by society that underage drinking is *not* a rite of passage or a social norm for college students would be a big step in the right direction to target underage drinking. Institutional structural diversity when related to party schools has to do with the *institutional policies* and the structure of the policies, including specific content within such policies. This concept serves as a foundational concept for this research project.

Another area to consider when looking at alcohol policy content is the psychological dimension of climate and its impact on students at party schools and non-party schools, including an individual's view on partying, institutional responses to drinking on campus, and attitudes towards drinking. Wechsler et al. (2002) found that members of a fraternity or sorority were "four times more likely to be binge drinkers" (p. 208) than other students. Wechsler (1996) had previously concluded that residence or membership in a Greek organization was the strongest predictor of binge drinking. The CASA report from Columbia University (2007) found that college presidents, deans, trustees, alumni and parents have failed to become part of a solution and have further enhanced the problem of underage drinking.

Finally, the behavioral dimension of campus climate and its impact on students includes behaviors of drinking both on and off campus, as well as choices of non-alcoholic events offered throughout the community. Gose (1995) reported on "substance free" Greek organizations on college campuses. He reported that enrollment increased once an organization claimed to be substance free and that

dormitories where alcohol was prohibited were also growing in popularity with the student body.

Overall, the CASA report (2007) concluded that university and college presidents are hesitant to begin to deal with issues that may be difficult and time consuming to change. However, the report argues that it is self interest for the university to begin to investigate ways to decrease the amount of underage drinking on campus. Hurtado, Miem, Clayton-Pedersen, and Allen (1998) acknowledge that changing a culture will take time. Initially changing perceptions and the current climate within an institution will eventually lead to a change in the culture. This process will take resources, time, and patience. The first step in changing the climate might come from well written policies within institutions.

Alcohol Policy Related Research

As seen in the previous section, multiple research studies have been conducted on the people and institutional effects of drinking on college campuses. Far less research has been conducted on issues related to alcohol policies, and since that is the focus of my research, let us now turn to those studies. Since alcohol policies are meant to guide student behavior at an institution, ease of finding policies, policy content, policy implementation, and sanctions for violation are important aspects to consider when looking at alcohol policy research. The following section of the literature review focuses on previous research specifically related to alcohol policies within society and higher education institutions.

Effects of Societal and Institutional Policies

Previous research suggests that societal and institutional policies such as price of alcohol, higher minimum drinking ages, and campus bans may have an effect on student drinking. Chaloupka and Wechsler (1996) used data from a nationally representative survey of students in U.S. colleges and universities to estimate the effects of beer prices, alcohol availability, and institutional policies related to drinking under the influence of alcohol on drinking and binge drinking. They found that institutional policies may be effective in limiting those students who have a tendency to binge drink at school, concluding that institutional policies with strong consequences may prohibit students from drinking. Looking at state and federal policies, the authors state “The most widely used policy tool in the campaign against youth and young adult alcohol abuse has been higher minimum legal drinking ages” (p. 1).

In a similar vein, Williams et al. (2005) based their study on the 1997 and 1999 College Alcohol Study, looking at both societal and institutional alcohol policies. Using an odds ratio analysis, they compared the probability of whether price of alcohol had a different impact on the likelihood of students becoming drinkers compared to the likelihood of becoming heavy drinkers. The second part of the study explored whether the impact of campus-based alcohol policies depends on the availability of off-campus alternatives to drinking. The researchers concluded that banning alcohol on campus is an effective way to reduce student drinking when the community in which the institution is located also has limited off-campus alternatives. However, they found that when a community has plenty of alternative

means for student drinking, a campus ban is less effective on preventing student drinking on campus. They concluded that students who engage in drinking are responsive to both monetary and nonmonetary factors and recommend that increasing the price of alcohol should be considered as a way to help reduce excessive drinking by college students.

In reference to a policy that might completely ban alcohol, Gose (1995) researched the Alpha Tau Omega fraternity at Indiana University. In 1993 Alpha Tau Omega's national board announced that it was changing its policy and would be a dry fraternity after one of the pledges almost died from alcohol poisoning. Membership jumped from 12 to 70 since the "substance free" fraternity returned to campus.

Underage drinking on college campuses cannot be stopped unless there is support from campus security officials. Knight, et al. (2003) studied the relationship between alcohol policy enforcement by campus security and heavy college drinking. The researchers looked at 11 public institutions in Massachusetts' following the establishment of a new system-wide alcohol policy. The researchers surveyed 1,252 students to assess drinking behaviors and alcohol-associated problems. They found that stricter enforcement of college policies lead to lower rates of heavy drinking on campus. The authors strongly recommend that setting policies in place that include a punitive or consequential content area and then making sure the institution is following through with the stated consequences is instrumental in decreasing underage drinking on campus. However, they offered no concrete recommendations of what specific content should be included within the institutional policy to aid campus security officials in enforcement of such a policy.

Other studies have been conducted researching ways to prevent college drinking. Support has been given in previous sections as to why it is significant to prevent drinking at college. Chaloupka and Wechsler (1996) looked at binge drinking at college in relationship to alcohol tax, availability, and alcohol policies. When analyzing the effect the price of beer had on alcohol use in college students, no significant relationship was found. They did however, find that alcohol availability played a significant role in binge drinking at college: The more licensed establishments within a one mile radius of campus, the higher the rate of binge drinking at the institution. Wechsler et al. (1997) also found a positive relationship between where a student lives and different drinking levels.

Giancola (2002) looked at the recent research literature on alcohol-related aggression focusing on the college student. He used data from surveys and experimental lab investigations, and found that changes in social policy regarding underage drinking have an insignificant effect on the use of alcohol by underage drinkers. He believes that the focus of health promotion related to underage drinking should be on reducing the harm psychologically and physically from aggressive behavior related to alcohol use. Giancola advocates for intervention programs designed to intervene when an individual has identifiable key risk factors, that when mixed with alcohol consumption, lead to aggressive behavior. He recommends acknowledgement by society that alcohol in and of itself does not cause aggression but that it simply eliminates barriers that may have been in place to keep aggressive behavior under control. He recommends education on social interaction as well as social pressure to drink.

As a final example, Barnett and Read (2005) compared 16 previous studies of mandatory alcohol intervention programs at campuses across America. Using a review of the reports, they found that the majority of the programs were similar and received positive feedback from students. When possible, within-group and between-group effect sizes were calculated. However, they found that the previous studies had small sample sizes and had little to no follow-up. They concluded that further research was needed to distinguish which program may be the best recommendation for mandatory alcohol prevention techniques.

University Written Alcohol Policies: Access and Awareness

In this next section we will look at research specifically related to alcohol policies on campuses. Faden and Baskin (2002) researched online college alcohol policy information. They went to the websites of 52 of the nation's top universities to find each school's alcohol policy. They were evaluating each policy on ease of finding the information as well as completeness of the information once it had been retrieved from the website. The researchers concluded that the information was difficult to find in that the policy in its entirety was often found in several places. The policies online did not provide the complete details of the school's official policy. From this research they made the following recommendations: that schools post their entire policy in one location of the official website of the institution, and that basic use of the website search engine lead directly to the entire official school policy. They also recommend that each school health center's website provide a direct link to the entire policy as well as student and residential life homepages.

Also looking at specific university alcohol policies, Mitchell, Toomey and Erickson (2005) surveyed school administrators regarding institutional alcohol policies in Minnesota and Wisconsin, with the goal of determining how many institutions had an institutional alcohol policy and whether institutional characteristics predicted what was in those campus policies. These researchers then compared the survey results to what was actually posted on the college websites. They concluded that most schools prohibited beer kegs and did offer alcohol-free housing to students. A few campuses were considered dry campuses, prohibiting any alcohol from being on campus. A few schools also barred advertising in school newspapers from alcohol establishments and placed restrictions on Greek organizations regarding alcohol use. Mitchell, Toomey and Erickson (2005) also concluded that the online policies varied significantly from the information provided by the surveyed university administrators.

As another example, Rhodes, et al. (2005) looked at five historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs) located in the southern United States, to evaluate how students' awareness of college alcohol policies correlated with binge drinking on campus. They concluded that male students who reported less knowledge about campus alcohol policies were more likely to report higher numbers of binge drinking episodes than those individuals who were more aware of the policies. This led them to conclude that gender differences in awareness of alcohol policies might play a role in influencing binge drinking. This study was limited by a small sample size, only looking at HBCU's, and by limiting the study to institutions that were located within the southern United States.

Overall, as these studies indicate, some research has recently been done specifically related to the effects of both societal and institutional alcohol policies (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996; Perkins, 2002) as well as awareness of alcohol policies and the ease of finding the policies (Faden & Baskin, 2002; Mitchell, Toomey, & Erickson, 2005). Other research has studied alcohol awareness of students, institutional security, and institutional policies related to fraternal organizations and campus banning of alcohol (Knight et al., 2003; Gose, 1995; Williams et al., 2005). However, gaps still exist regarding what specific content is necessary to include within an alcohol policy to help alleviate underage drinking on campus.

National Best Practice Policy Recommendations

Due to the overwhelming problems associated with underage drinking at universities across the United States, a number of agencies have developed recommendations for campus alcohol policies. Some of these agencies are government related, others are medically related, and others have stemmed from the universities themselves. Some of the recommendations are student centered while others are community centered. Some focus on education and helping while others focus on disciplinary action. For this research, the following national policy recommendations are used to compare the current alcohol policies of the institutions used within this research study.

Best Practice Recommendation #1

The first set of recommendations used in this research project are those developed by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), the

Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism within the National Institute of Health and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. To help educational institutions fight underage drinking on college campuses, a task force was developed to research college student drinking looking at alcohol policies, prevention programs, and early intervention strategies.

A four tier approach was developed by the task force. Within each tier are strategies to help institutions. The Tiers are as follows:

Tier 1: Evidence of Effectiveness Among College Students;

Tier 2: Evidence of Success with General Populations that Applied to College Environments;

Tier 3: Evidence of Logical and Theoretical Promise, But Comprehensive Evaluation; and

Tier 4: Evidence of Ineffectiveness.

Under Tier 3 is a strategy that relates to specific university policy recommendations.

The recommendations include:

1. Reinstating Friday classes and exams to reduce Thursday night partying: possibly Saturday morning classes;
2. Implementing alcohol-free, expanded late-night student activities;
3. Eliminating keg parties on campus where underage drinking is prevalent;
4. Establishing alcohol-free dormitories;
5. Employing older, salaried resident assistants or hiring adults to fulfill that role;

6. Further controlling or eliminating alcohol at sports events and prohibiting tailgating model heavy alcohol use;
7. Refusing sponsorship gifts from the alcohol industry to avoid any perception that is acceptable; and
8. Banning alcohol on campus, including at faculty and alumni events.

Best Practice Recommendation # 2

The second set of recommendations used for this research are those developed by the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, based upon research conducted by the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study (Wechsler et al., 2002). The recommendations include five objectives to include within each alcohol policy:

1. Establish a policy of “zero tolerance” for alcohol related violence;
2. Regulate the conditions of alcohol use on campus;
3. Work with the local community to limit student access to alcohol and to support the efforts of local law enforcement;
4. Eliminate sponsorship of events by the alcohol industry and other on-campus marketing; and
5. Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency.

Best Practice Recommendation # 3

The third best practice set of recommendations to be used for this project are from the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU). The Task Force on Student Life and Alcohol Abuse was developed by the AASCU and developed The New College Task Force Report.

Recommendations from this group call for three basic steps:

1. Get Smart;
2. Get Help; and
3. Get Out.

The AASCU recommends there be mandatory education on alcohol issues and that the second time a student breaks the policy, they are offered help such as meetings, assessment services, and counseling. Under the Get Out recommendation, the AASCU recommends that if a student continually acts in a high-risk manner and continues to drink, the university should dismiss the student.

Best Practice Recommendation # 4

The fourth and final set of best practice recommendations were developed by the American Medical Association (AMA). The AMA is a large medical organization that has teamed up with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to develop ten university-community coalitions to lead a national effort to reduce underage drinking on campuses across the U.S. The American Medical Association developed a program entitled *A Matter of Degree: The National Effort to Reduce High-Risk Drinking Among College Students*. It is a seven year program designed to build partnerships between universities and the communities surrounding these universities to better the health of the students and the community. Institutions involved with *A Matter of Degree* are identifying environmental factors that lead to underage drinking on campuses. These factors include: alcohol advertising and marketing, institutional policies and practices, local ordinances, and social and cultural beliefs and behaviors.

Further recommendations include stopping the practice of discounting alcohol such as two-for-one drink specials, inexpensive pitcher sales and other promotions within communities to encourage binge drinking, and limiting sponsorship of social events including sports, concerts, and ethnic celebrations to non-alcohol industry sponsors.

Chapter 2 Literature Review Summary

Some previous studies have been conducted looking at numerous aspects of college drinking and policies that are in place to inhibit underage drinking. Although many of these studies focused on smaller samples of higher education institutions (and thus cannot be generalized to all), overall these studies reveal the following: (1) entire institutional policies may be hard to find (Faden & Baskin, 2002); (2) what is posted on-line may be different than what university administrators think is in the policy (Mitchell, Toomey & Erickson, 2005); (3) the stricter enforcement of policies have an impact on heavy drinking (Chaloupka & Wechsler, 1996; Knight et al., 2003); and (4) a campus ban on alcohol may be an effective way to prohibit underage college drinking on campuses (Gose, 1995; Williams et al., 2005). We also know that a number of nationally-based organizations have developed what they consider to be best practice recommendations for higher education institutions to consider when developing their own institution-specific policies, and that such policies are not necessarily similar in content nor structure (See Appendix A). What the literature review did not reveal was previous research that looks at a larger set of higher education alcohol policies, in order to connect those to the national recommendations

and to look for similarities and differences between schools identified by others as party schools and those not identified as such.

Although a few university alcohol policies have been analyzed and many organizations have come up with varying recommendations for combating underage drinking on college campuses across the U.S., there seems to be inconsistencies among policies and national recommendations. This study focuses on a content analysis of the alcohol policies of the universities labeled as party schools (compared to those not labeled as such), and comparison of those policies to four best practice recommendations. Let us now turn to chapter three, which details the research methods for this study.

CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Underage drinking on college campuses is a growing problem. The current national best practice recommendations are inconsistent and offer little support to institutions when they are in the process of developing policies. Few recommendations exist as to what content is essential to have within university alcohol policies to help create an environment of learning instead of an environment where underage drinking is wide spread throughout campuses.

This study looks at the content of alcohol policies of universities that have been labeled party schools by the *Princeton Review*, as well as the other schools within the same athletic conferences, to determine what content such universities have chosen to include within their alcohol policies. The policies are analyzed for content themes and compared against the best practice recommendations from four nationally recognized associations to see what, if any, of the best practice recommendations are included. According to Holsti (1969), content analysis is well used as a reputable research method when the primary data is only accessible as a document. This is the case in this research project. Upcraft and Schuh (1996) also discuss the significance of document analysis in qualitative research. They state that “Documents are readily available, provide a stable source of data, and are grounded in the setting in which they are found” (p. 70). The policies are also analyzed for both similarities and differences between the policies of those institutions listed as party schools and those that have not been listed as party schools. Geographical location are also evaluated to see if certain institutions vary in alcohol policy content related to institutional size and location. A set of recommendations by the researcher are offered

with the goal of enhancing the content within current university alcohol policies, in support of the Healthy Campus 2010 objectives related to underage drinking.

Research Design

Qualitative research is defined simply as a study which uses “nonnumeric data in the form of words” (Schwandt, 2001, p. 213). Creswell (2003) describes characteristics of qualitative research as emerging rather than predetermined. He also describes qualitative research as interpretive and notes that the researcher learns more and more about the data as it is analyzed for common themes and the emergence of similarities and differences.

There are many qualitative research designs and the one used for this study was a qualitative *content analysis*. Content analysis is a piece of the larger policy analysis, whereby the actual words within a given document are analyzed carefully (Parsons, 1995). This research is further approached from a constructivist research paradigm. Hatch (2002) discusses the constructivist paradigm and states that constructivists look at objects that come from individual perspectives to construct realities. Such an approach is used within this research to compare content within similar and different university alcohol policies amongst each other as well as with four nationally recognized best practice recommendations to formulate a set of recommendations for institutions to use.

Population and Sample

The alcohol policies of institutions labeled as party schools (by the *Princeton Review*), as well as the other schools within the same athletic conference not listed as party schools are used for this research project. Franek, et al. (2006), the researchers

for the *Princeton Review*, use anonymous surveys from more than 115,000 current college students from nearly 2,000 colleges and universities as well as interviews with admissions officers and college presidents, to compile 62 categories which rate all institutions involved in various categories. From these data, the *Princeton Review* annually identifies the top 20 party schools, using a combination of criteria from the surveys related to reports on the use of alcohol and drugs, the number of hours of study each day, and the popularity of the Greek system.

The *Princeton Review* includes all types of universities within its rating system (e.g., large and small; public and private universities and colleges, etc). Since part of my goal was to compare the content of alcohol policies within universities identified as party schools and those not, it is important that such schools have some similar characteristics. Most importantly, they should be of about the same size, and offer similar types of sporting programs, since the use of alcohol has been connected with educational institutions that offer big league sports (NIAAA, 2002). Also, the institutions must offer on-campus housing, since parties within the student dorms are one of the most common places for students to drink (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, Seibring, Nelson, & Lee, 2002). To this end, I only compared universities within the same athletic conference to each other, since those entities have some important similar characteristics.

To determine athletic conferences to include, and subsequently which universities, I examined *Princeton Review's* list of party schools for the past several years and identified those conferences which have the largest number of universities appearing on those lists. I started with the universities identified within the most

current edition (2007) of the *Princeton Review*, and continued to go back yearly, reviewing each list to identify any trends regarding which athletic conferences had the most schools on the party lists. The goal was to have institutions from the last four years of the Princeton Review listed as party schools and compare them to similar institutions within the same athletic conferences to provide for homogeneous smaller samples from which to compare party schools versus non party schools.

This type of sampling is known as purposeful sampling. Creswell (2003) states “The idea behind qualitative research is to purposefully select participants or sites (or document or visual material) that will best help the researcher understand the problem and the research questions” (p. 183). For this research purposeful sampling was required for adequate analysis. Krippendorff (1980) states “reliance of intersubjectively agreeable theories is the best strategy a content analyst can follow” (p. 104). To this end, selection of universities from within the same athletic conferences, with some identified as party schools and others not, provides commonalities amongst each other as well as differences within the sample.

Rubric Development

For this study the alcohol policies from the sample of universities were compared against a rubric designed by myself from four best practice recommendations. The rubric created and used is found in Appendix A, and shows the content areas pulled from the recommendations of the four best practice recommendations previously discussed: (1) The National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, (2) Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, (3) the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and (4)

the American Medical Association. The recommendations from all four organizations were analyzed to pull out key concepts that were identified as potential content areas within an institution's policy. From the NIAAA, 10 key policy content ideas were extracted, from the HEC only three key concepts were taken and of these three ideas two were also recommended by the NIAAA. The third set of recommendations came from the AASCU, and only one key policy content idea could be extracted: establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior. Yet, none of the other national organizations included such wording as this. The final set of recommendations came from the AMA. Four policy content ideas were extracted from their recommendations, of which three were not found in the other national recommendations on fighting underage drinking on college campuses: enforce local ordinances, limit alcohol advertising and marketing, and update policies annually. The fourth recommendation extracted from the AMA was to refuse sponsorship from the alcohol industry, which was also seen in the NIAAA recommendations. Some areas were identified by multiple organizations as being significant when handling underage drinking on campus. Other areas were identified and subsequently excluded from the rubric because, although of value, they did not address the *content* of the institutional policy upon which this study focuses on.

The initial rubric consisted of 15 content areas as described by the recommendations from four national organizations. These 15 content areas included: (1) enforce local ordinances, (2) enforce the minimum drinking age, (3) limit student access to alcohol, (4) limit alcohol advertising/marketing, (5) establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior, (6) eliminate kegs, (7) update policies

annually, (8) establish alcohol free dorms, (9) eliminate alcohol at sporting events, (10) ban alcohol on campus, (11) establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior, (12) prohibit tailgating, (13) refuse sponsorship, (14) reinstate Friday classes/exams, and (15) offer Saturday morning classes.

Although most of the content areas are rather self explanatory, some required further definition by the researcher. Establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior differs from establishing a zero tolerance for alcohol related violence by defining violence as encompassing a student's behavior as well as such actions as personal actions, group actions, sexual behaviors, and vandalism. Other content areas that need clarification include, limiting student access to alcohol and banning alcohol on campus. Banning alcohol on campus is defined as those institutions that were considered dry campuses and allowed no alcohol on campus for any reason. Limiting student access to alcohol included dry campuses as well as those institutions that included content that was specific to limiting access of alcohol to students.

Further development of the rubric did occur as I began to analyze the policies for content. Specific criteria were included within the policies that had not been identified by the four nationally recognized best practices and therefore some of this material became significant during the analysis process and was added to the rubric for comparison. An additional 12 categories were ultimately added to the initial rubric, and included the following content areas: (1) covering alcohol vs. drugs and alcohol, (2) stating campus-based consequences, (3) stating local-based consequences, (4) stating state-based consequences, (5) stating federal-based consequences, (6) assessing health risks, (7) listing availability of resources (8)

covering drinking on campus vs. in the residence halls, (9) requiring parental notification, (10) offering preventive measures, (11) eliminating drinking paraphernalia, and (12) eliminating drinking games.

Each time a new content area was identified each policy was read again to check for the inclusion of the new content added to the rubric. Multiple readings of each institutional policy took place.

Data Collection

Once the sample population had been identified, following the procedures in the previous section, the next step in the research process was to search for the policies of each institution via the World Wide Web. The national website www.collegedrinkingprevention.org has a direct link to a number of the institution's official alcohol policies. An attempt to use the most recent policy update was made for this research project by verifying when the policy was last updated. This type of data collection is termed by Hatch (2002) as "unobtrusive data." As Hatch says the data is unobtrusive "because their collection does not interfere with the ongoing events of every day life" (p. 116). Because the data are publicly available online, no one at the institution knew that their alcohol policy was being investigated. Because this is a qualitative content analysis and only policies were examined, it was not necessary to further discuss the policy with institutional personnel. Although Faden and Baskin (2002) had found it to be difficult to retrieve the entire university alcohol policy online, I did not find this to be a concern in my research. With advances in technology in the past few years, it is now easier for institutions to post their complete documents on their website. Once policies were obtained, I created a computer

generated table listing the content of each university alcohol policy compared to the rubric. Special attention was also given to areas that were specifically missing from the alcohol policies.

Data Analysis

Using the rubric, I analyzed each policy for similarities and differences among the content included within the policies, and then compared them against those policies from schools labeled party schools and those not listed as party schools. The primary research method for this project is a qualitative content analysis of the alcohol policies. In this qualitative content analysis study, the documents collected were the alcohol policies from the sample of party schools as well as those schools not listed as party schools and the best practice recommendations from four top agencies in the U.S.

Krippendorff (1980) notes that the purpose of content analysis is “to provide knowledge, new insights, a representation of “facts,” and a practical guide to action” (p. 21). This is exactly what this research project intended to do. A content analysis of best practice recommendations and university alcohol policies was done to provide guidance for the researcher to develop a set of recommendations for universities to incorporate at their institutions to help decrease underage drinking on college campuses.

Krippendorff (1980) describes several components of such content analysis. The first step is *data making*, which includes unitization, sampling and recording. The second component is *data reduction*. The third component is *inference* and the final component is *data analysis*. Each will be explained below.

Data making in this research was conducted by obtaining the policies of the institutions. The institutions are associated by their athletic conferences and whether they were listed as top party schools in the nation or not. The institutions were purposively selected by athletic conference to ensure an adequate number of schools rated as either party or non-party within each athletic conference. Within such athletic conferences similarities related to public domain, institutional size, and type of degree granting institutions are found. Among the sample, however, two main differences exist (as relevant to this research). The first is whether the school has been listed recently as a party school or not. The second is geography in that I examined different athletic conferences from different geographical locations, looking to see if the content of institutional policies from one region differs from another region of the country

Component two, *data reduction*, is simply omitting data that does not show relevance to the study. During the process of developing the rubric from the four best practice recommendations, some data was omitted because of its irrelevance to the content of institutional alcohol policies. For example, data related to off campus venues and local, state and federal laws were eliminated because they could not be analyzed from specific university policies and thus were not included as part of this study. Data related to drugs and smoking were also eliminated from the rubric as this study only focuses on alcohol.

In the case of this research project, data reduction also included eliminating data that pertained to the institution's alcohol policy but not specifically to underage drinkers. For example, some institutional alcohol policies included areas directed at

faculty and staff gatherings or banquet facilities. These data were not included in the research as they were not pertinent to help me identify areas within university alcohol policies that ultimately helped lead to recommendations that assist institutions in fighting underage drinking on campus.

According to Weber (1990), “One way the meaning of words, phrases, or other textual units is represented is through classification into a set of categories” (p. 76). To this end, component three, *making inferences* of data can be done by using four processes. The first is past successes, the second is contextual experiences, the third is established theories, in this case the national recommendations, and the fourth is representative interpreters. This project used established theories. Wording of the content that is or is not included within the institutional policies was determined by the researcher to decide what categories to look for within the institutional policies. Weber (1990) extensively discusses what he calls defining the categories. He states that a researcher must carefully consider how to define and code categories within data. He points out that some categories may be limited because of use of specific words, while others may be less limited with the use of more vague language. Specific areas identified as commonalities and differences were given key words to help identify them amongst each policy. Open coding, as described by Creswell (1998) was used to help identify the key areas of each institutional alcohol policy. Creswell states that within each category of criteria the researcher finds several subcategories.

According to George (1959, as reported in Holsti 1969) “...critics suggest that the single appearance -or omission- of an attribute in a document may be of more

significance than the relative frequency of other characteristics” (p. 10). Key areas were not always identified within some of the institutional alcohol policies. This omission of key concepts was seen as significant to the results of this study by assuming that the institution had not placed them within the given policy because of the lack of value the institution may feel these concepts had.

The coded areas from the analysis of the best practice recommendations were used to compare the institutional alcohol policies against. The analytical techniques included looking at the inclusion of indicators within the data. In the case of this research the frequency was not relevant in that I expected each content area would only be included once; either the topic was included in the policy or it was not included.

Component four, *data analysis*, is defined by Hatch (2002) as a “systemic search for meaning” (p. 148). Hatch also states that analysis of the data should occur soon after the data is collected. According to Creswell (2003), the first step of such data analysis is to organize the data. All policies were copied into a word document and saved on a memory stick. A hard copy was printed and placed in a three ring binder to allow me to gain easier access to each policy.

Once all policies were obtained, the data was organized and analyzed for content within the policies while being compared to the rubric from the best practice recommendations. This process included reading the policies multiple times, looking for the areas defined within the rubric developed from the four best practice recommendations as well as the additional 12 categories. I looked for common or independent policy criteria included in certain policies that may not be included in

other policies that were reviewed. As the data were read over and over again, common themes or patterns of key areas within each policy began to emerge from the data. I identified key content included in the policies and used key words to describe the content from within the data. Some of these themes were very upfront and forward while others did not emerge until a further analysis of each policy. Time was needed to assure an in-depth analysis of each document.

Using the rubric I developed, I began a coding process and defined a description of the codes being used, followed by identifying common themes from within the data. A table for this data analysis was developed to help organize the information obtained from the university alcohol policies (See Appendix D). According to Creswell (1998), a table is often used to help the reader visualize the data. A table of the alcohol policies used in this research was developed and placed within the appendix (See Appendix B for the web source for each policy reviewed) to allow the researcher and readers to clearly see the content areas within the policies.

The final step within data analysis, according to Creswell (1998), is to interpret the data. For this study, interpretation of the data included not only what key content was included within the policies, but also what key content was left out of each policy as recommended by the best practice recommendations. Analysis of the policies also included key areas that the institutional policies cover that were not included in any of the best practice recommendations. Interpretation of the data also included what, if any, significance geographical location and institutional size plays with specific content within institutional alcohol policies.

Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations

One advantage to policy content analysis is the ability for the researcher to schedule time to complete the research. No appointments were needed to coordinate schedules for interviews or surveys. Cost is another advantage of policy analysis. Public documents are available on the web and could either be printed or saved to a computer. No money was needed for travel, transcription of interviews or mailings of surveys.

Policy content analysis also lent some disadvantages. Content analysis can be very interpretive, which is why it is categorized as qualitative research. Content analysis is very time consuming in that the same set of data must be reviewed repeatedly. In this research, all of the data was accessible on the web.

Another important limitation to this study was that fact that the policy content elements were analyzed to determine whether a given policy element was there or not. I did not analyze the clarity or the level of detail offered for each element. These issues could be addressed in further research as part of policy implementation research.

The key limitation of content analysis listed by Parsons (1995) is the point that the content of a given policy may be strong, but the implementation of the policy may be limited or weak. Written policy may not reflect institutional or community action. Creswell (2003) also discusses limitations of using documents as a data source. He points out that some documents may be protected and difficult to retrieve. This was not the case in this study; each policy is public information and was posted

on the official university website. Parsons also points out that some documents may be incomplete or not accurate. The most recently updated version of each policy was used for this research project and the entire policy was able to be retrieved from the website.

Delimitations

Both public and private, medium to large, 4-year institutions that offer on-campus housing that were within athletic conferences that had schools listed as party schools on the *Princeton Review's* party school lists for the last 4 years were looked at in this research project. I chose not to use any two year institutions or community colleges as the majority of community colleges do not provide on campus housing. Also, online institutions of higher education were not used in this study because they also lacked campus housing. These criteria limit the analysis of this research. The results of this content analysis can only be compared to institutions with similar student and institutional demographic data.

Only a content analysis on the written university alcohol policies was completed, with no data being captured on their implementation. Schwandt (2001) defines an informant as a knowledgeable insider. Having a key informant at each of the institutions would have helped provide for more insight into the specific university alcohol policy, enforcement, and consequences associated with it. Someone that works directly with the alcohol policy at the university on a daily basis would have a vast knowledge of the alcohol policy that may not be conveyed within the actual policy itself. However, I firmly believe prior to investigating how the actual

policy is put into effect it must be determined what content is significant to include within a campus alcohol policy.

Chapter 3 Conclusion

Overall, this chapter has detailed the methods for my research study involving a content analysis of university alcohol policies from institutions labeled as party schools compared to the content from those institutions against a rubric developed in part from four best practice recommendations. Each policy's content was examined for similarities and differences among each other as well as an analysis of what role geographical location and institutional size have in the content of alcohol policies. Let us now turn to the results in Chapter 4, and a discussion of these results and recommendations in Chapter 5.

CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Demographic Data

For this research project the content of 71 college and university alcohol policies was analyzed and compared to four nationally recognized best practice recommendations. These best practice recommendations came from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention (HEC), and the American Medical Association (AMA). Appendix A includes the rubric used and summarizes which content categories were extracted from these national organizations.

The 71 institutions whose policies were examined included both schools that were listed as party schools by the *Princeton Review*, and a similar set of institutions not identified as such, with the goal being about one-half of the sample labeled as party schools (See Appendix C for a complete list of all 71 institution and various demographic variables). A purposeful sample was therefore obtained. Overall, 36 schools were identified as party schools and 35 schools as nonparty schools. The list of party schools was further broken down into the number of times the schools had been listed on the party school listing for the four years (2004 through 2007) by the *Princeton Review*. Of the 36 schools listed as party schools, ten schools were listed on the party list only one year, three schools were listed for two years, six schools were listed for three years, and 17 were listed for all four years examined for this research study.

With the goal of examining different geographic regions, the sample included all schools associated with five athletic conferences including the PAC 10, Big 10, American East, Southeastern Conference, and Old Dominion Athletic Conference (ODAC), as well as all other schools listed as party schools by the *Princeton Review* during the four-year time frame. The PAC 10 conference is an NCAA Division one athletic conference comprised of 10 total schools mainly from the pacific coast region of the United States. The Big 10 conference is a NCAA Division I athletic conference comprised of 12 total schools mainly from the Midwestern region of the United States. The American East is also an NCAA Division I athletic conference comprised of nine total schools mainly from the east and northeastern United States. The SEC is a NCAA Division I athletic conference comprised of 12 total schools located within the southeastern United States. The ODAC is a NCAA Division III athletic conference comprised of 11 schools located throughout the Eastern area of the United States. The remaining sample consisted of 17 additional non-party schools that were drawn from other athletic conferences as a way to “match” those party schools within the *Princeton Review* lists that were not within the conferences previously noted. Table 1 offers a summary of the schools broken down by party/nonparty status within each athletic conference.

Table 1

Schools Disaggregated by Athletic Conference and Party/Non-party Status

	PAC 10	Big 10	American East	SEC	ODAC	Other	Total
Non-Party	7	6	7	6	9	0	35
Party							
1 year	2	2	1	1	1	10	17
2 years	0	1	1	0	1	3	6
3 years	0	0	0	1	0	2	3
4 years	1	3	0	4	0	2	10
Total # of Schools	10	12	9	12	11	17	71

The public or private status of a school was another variable examined with the majority of schools (n=49) being public institutions while the remainder of institutions are private institutions (n=22). Of the 22 private institutions, all 11 institutions of the ODAC athletic conference are private, seven private schools came from the “other” category, and one private school was found within each of the rest of the Big 10, PAC, SEC and American East athletic conferences.

Table 2 summarizes the number of private and public schools within each athletic conference.

Table 2

School Summary by Athletic Region and Type of School

Division	PAC 10	Big 10	America East	SEC	ODAC		Total
Region	Pacific	Midwest	East/N.E	Southeast	Eastern area	Other	
# Public Schools	9	11	8	11	0	10	49
# Private Schools	1	1	1	1	11	7	22
Total	10	12	9	12	11	17	71

The sample also varied by institutional size (See Appendix C for individual undergraduate institutional size). Institutional size was obtained from data on each school's official website, listing undergraduate student population. Since this study focused on underage drinking, only undergraduate population numbers were used for comparison purposes. Eastern Mennonite College was the smallest institution with only 735 students, while Arizona State University was the largest institution with 48,955 students. Table 3 shows a categorization of the undergraduate population of each institution used in this project, as broken down by party school status.

Table 3

Institutional Size: # Undergraduate Students

# students	<= -9,999	10,000-19,999	20,000-29,999	>= -30,000	Total
# party institutions	14	3	8	11	36
# non-party institutions	12	14	9	0	35
Total	26	17	17	11	71

Variable Statistics

The rubric developed for this project was divided into the national recommendations, the additional recommendations and then looked at as a whole, combining both the national and additional recommendations. The following table shows the descriptive statistics for the three variables looked at in this research project. The following statistics were calculated by taking the number of policy elements found within each institution's alcohol policy and dividing by the total possible number of policy elements.

Table 4

Rubric Categories

	Mean	Median	Range	Std. Deviation
National Recommendations (15)	3.61	3	10	1.48
Additional Recommendations (12)	3.58	3	8	2.16
Total Recommendations (27)	7.18	7	11	2.46

Research Question 1: Types of Content

Question number one of this research project asked overall, how the content of university alcohol policies compared to four national best practice recommendations.

Initially 15 categories were created as extracted from the four best practice recommendations from national organizations: (1) enforce local ordinances, (2) enforce the minimum drinking age, (3) limit student access to alcohol, (4) limit alcohol advertising/marketing, (5) establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior, (6) eliminate kegs, (7) update policies annually, (8) establish alcohol free dorms, (9) eliminate alcohol at sporting events, (10) ban alcohol on campus, (11) establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior, (12) prohibit tailgating, (13) refuse sponsorship, (14) reinstate Friday classes/exams, and (15) offer Saturday morning classes. Each of the specific content of 71 policies was initially analyzed looking for inclusion or exclusion of these 15 categories.

While reviewing these policies, an additional 12 categories were found by the researcher to be within one or more, and thus added to the analysis rubric. These include: (1) covering alcohol vs. drugs and alcohol, (2) stating campus-based consequences, (3) stating local-based consequences, (4) stating state-based

consequences, (5) stating federal-based consequences, (6) assessing health risks, (7) listing availability of resources (8) covering drinking on campus vs. in the residence halls, (9) requiring parental notification, (10) offering preventive measures, (11) eliminating drinking paraphernalia, and (12) eliminating drinking games. Adding these two lists together resulted in 27 different categories against which the content of the 71 university alcohol policies were analyzed.

Table 5 depicts the 27 categories and the total number of institutional policies that contained content for each category, as ordered from the most to least within each section.

Table 5

The 27 Categories Analyzed

Category #	Category Analyzed	# School Policies	% of Total
National Recommendations Items			
1	Enforce local ordinances	56	79
2	Enforce minimum drinking age	51	72
3	Limit student access to alcohol	50	70
4	Limit alcohol advertising/marketing	22	31
5	Zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	19	27
6	Eliminate kegs	18	25
7	Update policies annually	13	18
8	Alcohol free dormitory	8	11
9	Elimination at sporting events	6	8
10	Ban alcohol on campus	5	7
11	Zero tolerance of alcohol related violence	5	7
12	Prohibition of tailgating	3	4
13	Refuse sponsorship	0	0
14	Reinstate Fri. classes/exams	0	0
15	Offer Sat. AM classes	0	0
Additional Items Found			
1	Alcohol vs. Alcohol/Drug policy	42	59
2	Stating campus-based consequences	36	51
3	Stating state-based consequences	30	42
4	Stating local-based consequences	29	41
5	Stating federal-based consequences	27	38

Table 5-Continued

Category #	Category Analyzed	# School Policies	% of Total
Additional Items Found			
6	Health risks	23	32
7	Availability of resources	19	27
8	Residence halls vs. campus	12	17
9	Require parental notification	10	14
10	Prevention measures	9	13
11	Eliminating drinking paraphernalia	7	10
12	Eliminating drinking games	7	10

Best Practice Category Results Narrative

Using the 27 content categories, this section summarizes the content of the 71 institutions, as broken into two subgroups: those 15 concepts depicted from the national best practice recommendations and the additional 12 concepts that evolved during the research process. Within each of the two subgroups, the categories have been organized in regards to those concepts that were found the most to those found the least in the policies. Details for each institution are found in Appendix D and E.

National best practice recommendations. The category from the national best practice recommendations rubric found most often within the policies was to *enforce local ordinances*. Overall, 56 of the 71 (79%) institutions specifically included this within their policies, while 15 institutions made no mention of enforcement of local ordinances. As an example of one which did include this, a large part of the University of Albany within the SUNY system (n.d.) is within the City of Albany and must comply with such local ordinances as Albany's open container law. Other policies with such examples include Tulane University (n.d.) whose policy states "All members of the Tulane University community must adhere to all applicable state and

local laws.” The policy goes on to clarify local laws by stating, “Consumption of alcohol in a private residence by persons less than 21 years of age and over 17 years of age is legal. However, the State of Louisiana does NOT recognize fraternity and sorority houses as private residences, and therefore alcohol can only be consumed there by persons 21 years of age or older.” Illinois University (n.d.) also enforces local ordinances and states so within the first sentence of the university alcohol policy; “All students, wherever they happen to be, are expected to observe the liquor laws of the local jurisdiction.”

The second most frequent category is to *enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency*. Of the 71 policies, 51 (72%) policies specifically discussed enforcement of the minimum drinking age. For example, The University of Arizona (2004) states within its policy that a person under the age of 21 is not allowed to buy, receive, have in possession or consume alcohol, and then within the rest of the policy states “Consumption of alcoholic beverages is permitted on University property only by persons of *legal drinking age*.” The University of California (1996) states the enforcement of the legal drinking age within the first two sentences of the alcohol policy by noting: “Possession of alcohol by persons under the age of 21 is prohibited...Persons aged 21 and over may possess alcohol in a private residential room with the door closed.”

The third most frequent category is to *limit student access to alcohol*. Fifty policies (70%) included wording that described limiting student access to alcohol. In this research project there were five “dry” institutions that completely ban alcohol on their campuses: Bridgewater College (n.d.), Eastern Mennonite University (n.d.),

Emory and Henry College (n.d.), SUNY: Albany (n.d.) and The University of Auburn (1990). Other institutions included wording that referred to limiting access to underage drinking by citing alcohol age limits that would be enforced on campus. Some institutions limited the amount of alcohol such as the use of kegs or large containers of alcohol on campus, while others limit student access to alcohol by offering alcohol free dormitories.

The fourth category is to *limit alcohol advertising or marketing*. Twenty-two of the 71 institutions (31%) mentioned within their policies limiting alcohol advertising or marketing on campus. The most comprehensive policy addressing advertising and marketing of alcohol on campus was the University of Maine (2002). Within their university alcohol policy is an entire section on their Alcohol Beverage Marketing Policy that includes listing potential problems with the misuses of alcohol and verifying that “irresponsible advertising of alcohol on a campus can further contribute to the problems of alcohol abuse.” Six areas are then addressed regarding marketing of alcohol on campus. They include: (1) advertising “...must avoid demeaning sexual or discriminating portrayal of individuals,” (2) “Alcohol ads will not encourage any form of alcohol misuse nor place emphasis on the quantity or frequency of use,” (3) “Alcohol advertising will subscribe to the philosophy of responsible and legal use of the products,” (4) advertising “...will not portray drinking as contributing to the personal, academic or social success of students,” (5) advertising “...will not associate beverage drinking with increased sexual prowness, athletic ability, or with the performance of tasks that require skill or skilled reactions

such as operation of a motor vehicle or machinery,” and (6) “distribution of free alcohol should not be used as a marketing tool.”

The fifth category was to *establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior*. Of the 71 institutions, none of the policies specifically mention “a zero tolerance” for alcohol related behavior, but because this category is somewhat interpretive, 19 (27%) schools did list some sort of zero tolerance. For example, The University of Iowa (n.d.) has a very short policy but is rather punitive by listing severe sanctions that may be taken against a student. The policy states, “Severe sanctions, including the possibility of immediate suspension from the residence halls, are imposed upon residents who host alcohol parties in their rooms or possess large quantities of alcoholic beverages, even if there are no prior sanctions on record.” The policy continues by stating that “Students who violate University Housing policies and procedures while under the influence of alcohol and/or drugs will be subject to disciplinary action on the basis of their offenses.” Ohio State University’s alcohol policy (n.d.) states that “All members of the University community are held responsible for their behavior and for respecting the rights of others.”

The sixth category is to eliminate keg parties. Of the 71 total policies analyzed, only 18 (25%) policies included the *elimination of kegs* within their policies while 53 policies made no such mention. Seton Hall (n.d.), for example, has written in their policy, “No kegs or beer balls are permitted.” The University of Maryland (n.d.) also “prohibits kegs” on campus.

The seventh category is to *update policies* annually. Of the 71 policies, only 13 (18%) policies discussed being updated annually. One policy, from Sweet Briar

College (n.d.), included content that dictated a biannual review of the institutional alcohol policy. It states, “The College will conduct a biannual review of its program to determine its effectiveness, make changes where necessary, and ensure that sanctions are consistently enforced.” Another policy from Washington and Lee University (n.d.) states that, “The University should annually communicate with students and parents regarding the responsibility of student lessees regarding alcohol and drug laws and University policies.”

Other policies made no mention within the content of the policy how often the policy would be updated. Auburn University (1990) for example, had a policy listed on the website that had not been updated since 1990. Although The University of Arkansas (n.d.) has a well rounded policy that includes previous policies and how they have been updated, its first policy dates back to May 11, 1957 with the next policy revision being listed as February 22, 1974 and no date listed on the current policy posted on the university website.

The eighth category looks at *establishing an alcohol free dormitory*. Only eight policies (11%) included content within the actual policy that states the option of an alcohol-free dormitory was available to students, and discussed this policy in relation to the alcohol-free dorm. For example, the University of Massachusetts (n.d.) states within their policy, “Possession or consumption of alcohol by any person, regardless of age, is prohibited in all areas of alcohol-free halls and floors including, but not limited to, student rooms, public corridors, stairwells, bathrooms, kitchens and lounges.” The University of Oregon (n.d.) has a short and vague policy; however, their policy does state: “Possessing or consuming alcoholic beverages is prohibited in

the residence halls (unless you are 21 years of age and older) and in all areas of the substance-free halls.” Overall, it is possible that more than eight schools do indeed offer alcohol free dorms; however, only eight of the 71 policies analyzed specifically mentioned an alcohol free dorm option.

The ninth category is to *eliminate alcohol at sporting events*. Since alcohol use and sports tend to go hand in hand on college campuses (NIAAA, 2002) it is not surprising that only six of the institutions (8%) used language within their alcohol policy to eliminate alcohol at sporting events. Eastern Mennonite University’s policy (n.d.) refers to university related functions such as sporting events and states “The possession or use of alcohol, tobacco and illegal drugs is strictly prohibited from the EMU campus as well as all university-related functions.” Similar to the policy at EMU, The University of Arkansas (n.d.), a larger, public institution, states within its institutional policy, “Possession and use of intoxicants in public areas or University facilities (including organized houses) and at official University functions held on campus is prohibited.”

The tenth category used in this study is to *ban alcohol on campus*. Of the 71 institutions used for this project, only five institutions (7%) considered themselves a dry campus and completely banned alcohol on campus. These institutions include three private institutions: Bridgewater (n.d.), Eastern Mennonite (n.d.), and Emory and Henry College (n.d.) as well as two public institutions: SUNY: Albany (n.d.) and Auburn (1990) Universities. Bridgewater’s policy gives details about Virginia’s law regarding possession, buying and use of alcoholic beverages, comments on the large undergraduate population being under 21 years old and then states “Therefore, the

possession, use, or distribution of alcoholic beverages on campus is not permitted.”

SUNY: Albany has special circumstances in that a substantial part of the University at Albany is in the City of Albany and is subject to the city’s open container laws.

The policy states “Thus no open container of an alcoholic beverage is permitted on the campus.”

The eleventh category used is to establish a *zero tolerance for alcohol related violence*. Sixty-six policies included no content within their policy about a zero tolerance for alcohol related violence, while five (7%) did offer some specific language. For example, Eastern Mennonite University (n.d.) mentions violence associated with alcohol use throughout its policy. The policy states that the use of alcohol “...contributes to behaviors that are offensive and disruptive to the campus community.” The policy goes on to state that persons who misuse alcohol on campus will be disciplined and defines misuse as “... behavior harmful or threatening to others...” The best statement on non-tolerance of alcohol related behavior comes from the University of Arkansas’s policy (n.d.). This policy states “The use of alcohol will not, under any circumstances, be accepted as an excuse for irresponsible behavior.”

The twelfth category is to *prohibit tailgating*, and only three (4%) university policies mention this component. For example, The University of Kentucky (1999) clearly states within their alcohol policy “Alcohol beverages are not permitted at University athletic events.” Both Emory and Henry (n.d.) and Eastern Mennonite University (n.d.) are dry campuses and use wording that eliminates alcohol from campus, including sporting events.

The 13th, 14th, & 15th categories used were not found in any of the university policies examined. These included *refusing sponsorship from the alcohol industry*, *reinstating Friday classes and exams to reduce Thursday night partying*, and *offering Saturday morning classes*. Of the 71 policies reviewed none (0%) of them included content within their policies about the three categories.

Overall, none of the 71 university policies examined for this study included all criteria from all the best practice recommendations from four national organizations. In fact most of those recommendations were not included in any of the policies. Refer to Appendix D that lists the number of rubric categories included within each individual institution's policy.

Additional rubric categories. The first content area, from the additional categories that evolved during the research process, looks at whether the institution had a *stand alone alcohol policy* or whether the institutional alcohol policy was included with drugs and alcohol. Twenty nine policies listed alcohol alone, while 42 policies (59%) included alcohol within a policy that also included other drugs.

The 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th additional categories of this study look at whether or not the policy content included anything about *consequences of underage drinking on campus*. These included consequences from the *school*, the *local community*, as well as *state* and *federal consequences*. Of the 71 schools, just over half (n=36; 51%) included consequences from the school, while 29 (41%) policies included consequences from local authorities. Thirty policies (42%) included state consequences, and 27 (38%) institutional policies included federal consequences for underage drinking on campus. For example, Boston University (n.d.) has a rather

short alcohol policy; however, the majority of the policy lists various state and federal laws and sanctions concerning drugs and alcohol, including consequences for public consumption, drinking and driving, and underage drinking. The University of Massachusetts (n.d.) lists possible consequences for violating campus alcohol policies. The policy includes a table that shows violations of various parts of the alcohol policy and first, second, and third offense consequences.

As another example, Washington and Lee University (n.d.) has a very punitive policy that includes sanctions for first strike, second strike, and third strike. These sanctions are especially enforced in a punitive format if the 2nd or 3rd occurrences are within 12 months of the first occurrence. Although dismissal of the student can occur at any strike, the penalty for three occurrences within a 12 month period include dismissal from the university and parental notification. The University of Mississippi alcohol policy (n.d.) includes a link to campus sanctions for alcohol and drug violations that is entitled, “the two strike policy.” This policy includes campus disciplinary action, as well as potential civil liability and/or criminal prosecution.

As a final example for these categories, The University of the South (n.d.) has an entire one page table dedicated to sanctions for drug and alcohol violations, including first and second offenses for different violations that range from fines to parental notification, services, social probation, loss of campus privileges, and suspension.

The sixth additional category looks at the *health risks associated with alcohol use* being described within the policy. The risk of underage drinking has been researched extensively (e.g., Wechsler et al., 1997; Wechsler et al. 2000). Inclusion of

such risks would be beneficial to educate students about the potential danger when consuming alcoholic beverages, yet only 23 of the 71 (32%) policies list health risks associated with drinking within their policies. For example, Purdue University (n.d.) vaguely mentions the health risks associated with drinking on campus by stating, “The University recognizes the health risks associated with controlled substances use and alcohol misuse and is committed to supporting students and employees who seek treatment for these conditions.” In a similar manner, Stanford University (2006) states, “The health risks associated with the use of illicit drugs and the abuse of alcohol include various deleterious physical and mental consequences including addiction, severe disability and death.” In contrast, Louisiana State University (2003) has a much more comprehensive listing of health risks. That policy allots four paragraphs to the “Effects of Alcohol” and discusses changes in behavior, dependence, drinking during pregnancy, and the primary effect of alcohol misuse upon the individual, other people, and the community.

The seventh additional category used for this project is the *availability of resources* listed within each policy. Multiple resources are available on campus, within the community, and on the internet for students dealing with issues regarding alcohol. However, only 22 institutions (31%) list such resources for their students. The majority of the institutions that list resources identify the campus health center as the primary resource for help with alcohol abuse. For example, the policy at Roanoke (n.d.) states “There are college personnel available to counsel students about alcohol problems, and local drug treatment centers where individuals may be referred for

additional help.” However, the policy fails to list those personnel or treatment centers nor does it list how to get in contact with such people or places.

One of the most comprehensive lists of resources within an institutional policy comes from The University of Maryland-College Park (n.d.). Their alcohol policy lists nine university Health Center Substance Abuse Programs including a short synopsis of each program. Also listed within this policy are three other campus resources, including a short description of services offered and contact information for eleven community resources including outpatient services, hotlines, additional information and websites. Lastly, there is information regarding 12-step programs including Alcoholics Anonymous, Al-Anon, Narcotics Anonymous, and Marijuana Anonymous.

The eighth additional category analyzed is whether the policy covered content pertaining to only *drinking in the residence halls or drinking throughout campus*. Of the 71 institutions, 59 (83%) included content that pertained to the entire campus while only 12 institutions wrote about drinking in the residence halls and made no mention of other areas of campus. It is important for policies to include content that specifies that underage drinking will not be tolerated anywhere on campus.

Indiana University (n.d.), for example, uses terminology within their policy that covers all university property. The policy states “The University may discipline a student for the following acts of personal misconduct which occur on university property.” The policy further delineates violations in graduate housing, residence halls, undergraduate residences, family housing, and Union buildings. In addition to the University-wide alcohol policy, Seton Hall University (n.d.) has an additional

policy that applies just to the use of alcohol in university housing. This policy includes listing alcohol-designated areas and residence halls where the possession or consumption of any alcohol is prohibited.

The ninth additional category used is *parental notification*. Ten institutions included notification of parents (14%), while 61 policies did not include such language. The University of Wisconsin (n.d.) specifically mentions within their policy that parents will be given information regarding the institution's alcohol policy at student orientation, advising and registration. Emory and Henry (n.d.) also specifically mention within their policy parental contact, by stating; "The College reserves the right to contact a student's parent(s) or guardian(s) in the event of any accident, illness, or mental distress, or for disruptive behavior." The University of Georgia (n.d.) also states within its policy that, "parents or guardians will be notified every time a student under 21 violates policies on possession of alcohol or drugs."

Another policy from the University of Maine (2002) has a lengthy component within the student handbook specific to parental notification. In general it states that, "The University of Maine Parental Notification Policy allows the institution to notify parents of certain behaviors committed by students that are prohibited by the Student Conduct Code." It cites Federal law and the Higher Education Amendments of 1998 that permit educational institutions to disclose to parents information regarding violation of federal, state, or local laws. The policy also lists specifically when the university will notify parents of behaviors of those students that are under 21 years old, including: being under the influence of alcohol or other drugs; when the student has been taken into custody by the police; vandalism or destruction of property

related to alcohol or drug use; operating a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or other drugs; when the student was transported to a medical facility for the treatment of alcohol or other drugs; any time the student is involved in a violation that may require suspension or dismissal from the university or removal from campus housing; and lastly, any other circumstances the Dean of Students determines necessary. This policy from the University of Maine is by far the most comprehensive policy regarding parental contact of the 71 policies used in this study.

The tenth additional category is the *mention of prevention measures*.

Prevention of alcohol use and abuse is a major factor in looking at underage drinking on college campuses. Only nine institutions (13%) mentioned prevention measures within their institutional policies. One of the nine institutions, the University of Arkansas (n.d.) notes that it has a Student Assistance Program (SAP) at the university health center that is designed to help students prevent harmful involvement with alcohol and other drugs they may experience on campus. The University of Arkansas' policy also refers to a program called CAPS, Counseling and Psychological Services, that is available on campus for students who need treatment for alcohol use. Referral to either of these two resources can be made by the judicial board, resident assistant, peers, faculty, and staff. As another example, the Catholic University of America (2000) states within its policy that the institution "...strives for the prevention of alcohol abuse through teaching responsible use."

The 11th and 12th additional categories used in this analysis are the *elimination of drinking games* and the *elimination of drinking paraphernalia* such as beer bongs. Only seven (10%) policies contained verbiage prohibiting drinking games on campus.

Six of those institutional policies also contained wording to prohibit drinking paraphernalia. Two other schools provided language to eliminate drinking paraphernalia but did not include language prohibiting drinking games. Including this content in policies is a good idea to specify to underage students and to students of legal drinking age that this type of behavior is prohibited on campus.

For example, The University of Mississippi's policy (n.d.) contains specific words related to the elimination of drinking games and paraphernalia by noting; "Drinking games and rapid consumption techniques and devices (e.g., funnels, shots, etc...) by their nature promote abusive consumption of alcohol and thus violate this policy." Loyola University (n.d.) also prohibits such activities by stating, "The possession of alcohol paraphernalia that is designated for the irresponsible use of alcohol is not permitted on Loyola's campus (e.g. beer bongs, funnels, etc.)." The policy then states, "Drinking games or other activities which deliberately encourage the consumption of alcohol are prohibited."

Research Question 1 Summary

Overall the research shows that inconsistencies exist across policies in relation to the four best practice recommendations. Not only were few of the best practice recommendations noted to be included in each policy, but for the most part, those that were included were sporadically so. After further review, no single set of best practice recommendations from the four national organizations was made to stand out as a leader in reference to those items actually found in the content of university alcohol policies.

Table 6 summarizes how many of the 71 total institutional policies reviewed contained any element of the 4 national organizations recommendations.

Table 6

<i>Number of 71 Institutional Policies Examined that Include National Recommendations</i>				
	NIAAA	HEC	AASCU	AMA
Enforce local ordinances	-	-	-	56
Enforce minimum drinking age	51	51	-	-
Limit student access to alcohol	-	50	-	-
Limit alcohol advertising and marketing	-	-	-	22
Establish zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	-	-	19	-
Eliminate keg parties	18	-	-	-
Update policies annually	-	-	-	13
Establish alcohol free dorms	8	-	-	-
Eliminate alcohol at sports events	6	-	-	-
Ban alcohol on campus	5	-	-	-
Establish zero tolerance for alcohol related violence	5	5	-	-
Prohibit tailgating	3	-	-	-
Refuse sponsorship from the alcohol industry	0	-	-	0
Reinstate Friday classes	0	-	-	-
Offer Saturday morning classes	0	-	-	-

Note: NIAAA stands for National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. HEC stands for Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention. AASCU stands for American Association of State Colleges and Universities. AMA stands for the American Medical Association.
 --did not contain that recommendation

As discussed earlier, a few of the rubric categories seemed to flow together. For example, those institutions that included content within the institutional policy about eliminating drinking games (n=7) also specifically included content about eliminating drinking paraphernalia (n=6). Other categories that seemed to flow together included those regarding consequences. For the most part, if an institution had consequences listed within the policy, it listed campus, local, state and federal consequences.

Research Question 2: Comparison of Party vs. Non-party School Content

Research Question number two asks how the content of alcohol policies within universities identified as “party schools” and the content within the policies of similar universities not identified as party schools compare with each other, as well as compare with the four national best practice recommendations. For this part of the research project, the data was analyzed by looking at the rubric in 3 separate areas. First I looked at the national recommendations, then the additional recommendations, and finally I looked at the rubric as a whole using both the national recommendations and the additional recommendations.

Next the sample was categorized into three groups: those schools never listed on the party list, those schools listed on the list for one to two years, and those schools listed on the party list for three to four years. There were overall 35 nonparty institutions, 23 schools in the 1-2 year category, and 13 schools having been on the party school list 3 or 4 years. The overall mean of policy content for the 35 non-party schools was 7.43, while the overall mean of the schools on the party list for 1-2 years was 6.78. The mean of the schools that were found on the party list for 3-4 years was 7.23. Table 7 depicts the frequency of the 27 items related to categorized party status.

Table 7

Frequency of 27 Items Broken Down by Party Categorization

Content Items	# Non-Party Schools n (%) n=35	# Party (1-2 yrs) Schools n (%) n=23	# Party (3-4 yrs) Schools n (%) n=13
Items Extracted from National Recommendations			
1. Enforce local ordinances	27 (77)	18 (78)	9 (69)
2. Enforce minimum drinking age	26 (74)	16 (70)	9 (69)
3. Limit student access to alcohol	24 (69)	18 (78)	8 (62)
4. Limit alcohol advertising/marketing	11 (31)	8 (35)	3 (23)
5. Zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	11 (31)	5 (22)	3 (23)
6. Eliminate kegs	8 (23)	6 (26)	4 (31)
7. Update policies annually	7 (20)	3 (13)	3 (23)
8. Alcohol free dormitory	2 (6)	4 (17)	2 (15)
9. Elimination at sporting events	5 (14)	1 (4)	0 (0)
10. Ban alcohol on campus	4 (11)	0 (0)	1 (8)
11. Zero tolerance of alcohol related violence	5 (14)	0 (0)	0 (0)
12. Prohibition of tailgating	3 (9)	0 (0)	0 (0)
13. Refuse sponsorship	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
14. Reinstate Fri. classes/exams	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
15. Offer Sat. AM classes	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Additional Items Found			
1. Alcohol vs. Alcohol/Drug policy	21 (60)	14 (61)	7 (54)
2. Stating campus-based consequences	21 (60)	9 (39)	6 (46)
3. Stating state-based consequences	14 (40)	10 (43)	6 (46)
4. Stating local-based consequences	14 (40)	9 (39)	6 (46)
5. Stating federal-based consequences	13 (37)	10 (43)	4 (31)
6. Health risks	14 (40)	6 (26)	3 (23)
7. Availability of resources	12 (34)	5 (22)	5 (38)
8. Residence halls vs. campus	4 (11)	4 (17)	4 (31)
9. Require parental notification	6 (17)	2 (9)	2 (15)
10. Prevention measures	5 (14)	2 (9)	2 (15)
11. Eliminating drinking paraphernalia	1 (3)	3 (13)	3 (23)
12. Eliminating drinking games	0 (0)	3 (13)	4 (31)
Mean	7.43	6.78	7.23

A one-way ANOVA was used to compare the mean scores for the three variables. Using a p value of 0.05, there were no statistically significant differences

found between the mean policy content of the three categories of party/non-party schools (See Table 8).

Table 8

<i>Analysis of Variance for Party Group</i>				
Source	Df	Mean Square	F	P
Between subjects				
National	2	2.36	1.081	.345
Additional	2	1.77	.371	.691
Total	2	2.91	.475	.624
Within subjects				
National	68	2.18		
Additional	68	4.76		
Total	68	6.13		

Next an ANOVA was run for each individual policy element to examine differences as broken down by the three variables. Table 9 shows that when looking at party status variable differences the only policy element that was found to show statistical significant differences was to Eliminate Drinking Games.

Table 9

<i>Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements When Compared by Party Status</i>					
	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Tukey results
Between Groups					
Eliminate Drinking Games	2	.466	5.892	.004*	2-0
Within Groups					
	68	.079			

*p≤.05

Note: 0=Never on the party list, 1=1-2 years on the party list, 2=3-4 years on the party list

Research Question 3: Comparison of Institutional Size and Geographic Location

Research question three examined how university alcohol policy content varies, if at all, based upon an institution's size and geographical location. Institutional size was used as a variable to determine if there was a connection between size and policy content. Actual student population was collected for each institution, however, the data was categorized to better specify if there was a relationship between institutional size and policy content. The institutions were broken down into 4 categories: those with less than 9,999 (n=26), institutions with an undergraduate population between 10,000 and 19,999 (n=17), institutions whose undergraduate student population was between 20,000 and 29,999 (n=17) and finally institutions with an undergraduate student population of greater than 30,000 (n=11). Table 10 depicts the frequency of the 27 items as broken down by institutional size as well as the mean number of policy categories within each subgroup.

Table 10

Frequency of 27 Items Broken Down by Institutional Size

Items Extracted from National Recommendations	</= 9,999 n=26 n (%)	10,000 - 19,999 n=17 n (%)	20,000 - 29,999 n=17 n (%)	>/= 30,000 n=11 n (%)
1. Enforce local ordinances	19 (73)	16 (94)	10 (59)	6 (55)
2. Enforce minimum drinking age	16 (62)	16 (94)	9 (53)	6 (55)
3. Limit student access to alcohol	17 (65)	16 (94)	10 (59)	3 (27)
4. Limit alcohol advertising/marketing	5 (19)	0 (0)	11 (65)	5 (45)
5. Zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	4 (15)	1 (6)	6 (35)	5 (45)
6. Eliminate kegs	7 (27)	5 (29)	2 (12)	1 (9)
7. Update policies annually	3 (12)	0 (0)	5 (29)	5 (45)
8. Alcohol free dormitory	3 (12)	4 (24)	0 (0)	0 (0)
9. Elimination at sporting events	1 (4)	2 (12)	2 (12)	0 (0)
10. Ban alcohol on campus	1 (4)	2 (12)	0 (0)	0 (0)
11. Zero tolerance of alcohol related violence	2 (8)	1 (6)	0 (0)	1 (9)
12. Prohibition of tailgating	1 (4)	1 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Table 10-Continued

Items Extracted from National Recommendations	</=	10,000	20,000	>/=
	9,999	19,999	29,999	30,000
	n=26	n=17	n=17	n=11
	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
13. Refuse sponsorship	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
14. Reinstate Fri. classes/exams	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
15. Offer Sat. AM classes	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Additional Items Found				
1. Alcohol vs. Alcohol/Drug policy	10 (38)	11 (65)	11 (65)	5 (45)
2. Stating campus-based consequences	12 (46)	9 (53)	7 (41)	3 (27)
3. Stating state-based consequences	7 (27)	4 (24)	11 (65)	5 (45)
4. Stating local-based consequences	7 (27)	3 (18)	11 (65)	5 (45)
5. Stating federal-based consequences	6 (23)	4 (24)	10 (59)	4 (36)
6. Health risks	11 (42)	6 (35)	3 (18)	3 (27)
7. Availability of resources	8 (31)	3 (18)	5 (29)	4 (36)
8. Residence halls vs. campus	3 (12)	1 (6)	5 (29)	3 (27)
9. Require parental notification	2 (8)	3 (18)	1 (6)	1 (9)
10. Prevention measures	4 (15)	1 (6)	4 (24)	0 (0)
11. Eliminating drinking paraphernalia	3 (12)	1 (6)	1 (6)	1 (9)
12. Eliminating drinking games	2 (8)	2 (12)	1 (6)	1 (9)
Mean	7.96	6.59	7.29	6.09

A one-way ANOVA was used to compare the mean scores of the schools from each category of institutional size. The mean score for the smallest institutions, those with less than 9,999 undergraduate students was 7.96 while the mean score for the largest set of institutions (those over 30,000 undergraduate students) was 6.09. Table 11 summarizes the ANOVA data for institutional size. No statistically significant differences were found between the means of the schools when comparing them by institutional size.

Table 11

Analysis of Variance for Institutional Size

Source	Df	Mean Square	F	p
Between subjects				
National	3	4.89	2.37	.078
Additional	3	11.07	2.02	.119
Total	3	6.23	1.36	.262
Within subjects				
National	67	2.06		
Added	67	5.78		
Total	67	4.61		

Next, the specific 27 policy elements were looked at in relation to institutional size. Five of the specific elements were found to have statistically significant differences. Table 12 shows the results of the specific elements. The final column of the table gives the results of the Post-hoc Tukey test. The numbers shown indicate the categories between which significance was found when the Tukey was run. For example in the second policy element "Update Policies Annually" category 1 (institutions with $\leq 9,999$) was significantly different when compared to categories 2 (institutions with 10,000-19,999) and 4 (institutions with $\geq 30,000$).

Table 12

Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements (when broken down by institutional size)

	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Tukey results
Between Groups					
Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency	3	.616	3.295	.026*	No sig.
Update policies annually	3	.570	4.284	.008*	1-2 1-4
Limit alcohol advertising and marketing	3	1.319	7.875	.000*	1-3 2-3 2-4
Enforce local ordinances	3	.733	5.098	.003*	1-3 1-4 2-3 2-4
Consequences-Local	3	.640	2.816	.046*	1-2 1-3
Within Groups					
Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency	67	.187			
Update policies annually	67	.133			
Limit alcohol advertising and marketing	67	.168			
Enforce local ordinances	67	.144			
Consequences-Local	67	.227			

*p≤.05

Note: 1=≤ 9,999, 2=10,000-19,999, 3=20,000-29,999, & 4=≥ 30,000

Eight areas of the country were identified to place each institution within to analyze the data. Table 13 depicts the frequency of the 27 items as broken down by area of the country used in this study as well as the means of each geographical location.

Table 13

Frequency of 27 Items Broken Down by Geographic Location

	MW n=6 n (%)	NE n=9 n (%)	E n=14 n (%)	SE n=15 n (%)	S n=11 n (%)	SW n=5 n (%)	W n=6 n (%)	NW n=5 n (%)
<i>Items Extracted from National Recommendations</i>								
1. Enforce local ordinances	2 (15)	13 (100)	11 (79)	15 (100)	4 (100)	4 (100)	4 (100)	3 (75)
2. Enforce minimum drinking age	1 (8)	13 (100)	9 (64)	14 (93)	3 (75)	3 (75)	4 (100)	4 (100)
3. Limit student access to alcohol	2 (15)	12 (92)	10 (71)	15 (100)	3 (75)	3 (75)	3 (75)	3 (75)
4. Limit alcohol advertising/marketing	10 (77)	3 (23)	3 (21)	1 (7)	1 (25)	2 (50)	1 (25)	1 (25)
5. Zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	11 (85)	0 (0)	6 (43)	1 (7)	1 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
6. Eliminate kegs	2 (15)	4 (31)	4 (29)	3 (20)	2 (50)	1 (25)	1 (25)	1 (25)
7. Update policies annually	10 (77)	0 (0)	3 (21)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
8. Alcohol free dormitory	0 (0)	3 (23)	2 (14)	0 (0)	1 (25)	0 (0)	1 (25)	1 (25)
9. Elimination at sporting events	2 (15)	0 (0)	2 (14)	1 (7)	1 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
10. Ban alcohol on campus	0 (0)	1 (8)	3 (21)	1 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
11. Zero tolerance of alcohol related violence	1 (8)	0 (0)	2 (14)	1 (7)	1 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
12. Prohibition of tailgating	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (14)	1 (7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
13. Refuse sponsorship	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
14. Reinstate Fri. classes/exams	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
15. Offer Sat. AM classes	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Table 13-Continued

	MW n=6 n (%)	NE n=9 n (%)	E n=14 n (%)	SE n=15 n (%)	S n=11 n (%)	SW n=5 n (%)	W n=6 n (%)	NW n=5 n (%)
Additional Items Found								
1. Alcohol vs. Alcohol/Drug policy	7 (54)	6 (46)	9 (64)	10 (67)	2 (50)	4 (100)	2 (50)	2 (50)
2. Stating campus-based consequences	2 (15)	6 (46)	8 (57)	9 (60)	4 (100)	1 (25)	4 (100)	2 (50)
3. Stating state-based consequences	8 (62)	4 (31)	3 (21)	4 (27)	3 (75)	2 (50)	3 (75)	3 (75)
4. Stating local-based consequences	8 (62)	4 (31)	3 (21)	4 (27)	3 (75)	2 (50)	3 (75)	2 (50)
5. Stating federal-based consequences	7 (54)	4 (31)	3 (21)	2 (13)	3 (75)	2 (50)	3 (75)	3 (75)
6. Health risks	1 (8)	7 (54)	5 (36)	4 (27)	3 (75)	0 (0)	2 (50)	1 (25)
7. Availability of resources	2 (15)	6 (46)	5 (36)	3 (20)	3 (75)	0 (0)	2 (50)	1 (25)
8. Residence halls vs. campus	8 (62)	1 (8)	2 (14)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)
9. Require parental notification	0 (0)	2 (15)	2 (14)	5 (33)	1 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
10. Prevention measures	1 (8)	2 (15)	3 (21)	0 (0)	1 (25)	0 (0)	1 (25)	1 (25)
11. Eliminating drinking paraphernalia	1 (8)	0 (0)	1 (7)	4 (27)	1 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
12. Eliminating drinking games	0 (0)	1 (8)	1 (7)	4 (27)	1 (25)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Mean	7.67	6.56	7.29	6.80	7.09	8.20	8.33	6.40
Note: (MW) =Midwest, (NE) =Northeast, (E) =East, (SE) =Southeast, (S) =South, (SW) =Southwest, (W) =West, (NW) =Northwest.								

When comparing policy content to geographical location, a one-way ANOVA was again used to compare the mean scores of the schools for each geographical location. The mean of scores of the schools for each geographical location ranged from 6.40-8.33. Table 14 shows the ANOVA data results using geographical location as the variable. No statistically significant differences were found ($p>0.05$) when comparing the mean scores of various geographical locations.

Table 14

Analysis of Variance for Geographic Location

Source	Df	Mean Square	F	p
Between subjects				
National	7	.764	.326	.939
Additional	7	4.37	.928	.491
Total	7	3.37	.531	.807
Within subjects				
National	63	2.34		
Additional	63	4.71		
Added	63	6.33		

Next an ANOVA was run on the specific policy elements to see if any of the categories were significantly related to Geographical location. Table 15 shows the findings. Seven policy categories were found to be statistically significant related to geographical location. The final column of the table again gives the post hoc Tukey test. The letters shown indicates the categories between which significance was found when the Tukey was run. Although no one specific geographical location was found to be statistically significant with the total policy recommendations, the South continued to show significance among the specific policy elements.

Table 15

Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements (when broken down by geographic location)

	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Tukey Results
Between Groups					
Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency	7	.745	5.130	.000*	S-MW S-NE S-SE S-NW
Update policies annually	7	.828	10.801	.000*	S-MW S-NW
Limit alcohol advertising and marketing	7	.648	3.832	.002*	S-NE S-E S-SE
Enforce local ordinances	7	.618	5.187	.000*	S-MW S-SW
Establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	7	.826	6.402	.000*	S-MW S-NE S-SE S-SW S-NW
Between Groups					
Residence Halls vs. campus	7	.295	2.348	.034*	S-SE
Consequences-Federal	7	.568	2.804	.013*	No sig.
Within Groups					
Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency	63	.145			
Update policies annually	63	.077			
Limit alcohol advertising and marketing	63	.169			
Enforce local ordinances	63	.119			
Establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	63	.129			
Residence Halls vs. campus	63	.126			
Consequences-Federal	63	.203			

*p≤.05

Note: In the Tukey results column (MW) =Midwest, (NE) =Northeast, (E) =East, (SE) =Southeast, (S) =South, (SW) =Southwest, (W) =West, (NW) =Northwest.

Athletic conference was also chosen as a variable that may play a role in the content within an institutional alcohol policy. Table 16 summarizes the 27 rubric categories related to athletic conference as well as the mean policy content within each conference group.

Table 16

Frequency of 27 Items Related to Athletic Conference

27 Items	Big 10 n=12 n (%)	PAC n=10 n (%)	SEC n=12 n (%)	Am East n=9 n (%)	ODAC n=11 n (%)	Remaining Party n=17 n (%)
Items Extracted from National Recommendations						
1. Enforce local ordinances	1 (8)	9 (9)	12 (100)	9 (100)	10 (91)	15 (88)
2. Enforce minimum drinking age	0 (0)	10 (100)	11 (92)	9 (100)	9 (82)	12 (71)
3. Limit student access to alcohol	0 (0)	6 (60)	12 (100)	9 (100)	10 (91)	13 (76)
4. Limit alcohol advertising/marketing	11 (92)	3 (30)	0 (0)	3 (33)	2 (18)	3 (18)
5. Zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	12 (100)	0 (0)	1 (8)	0 (0)	6 (55)	0 (0)
6. Eliminate kegs	1 (8)	2 (2)	2 (17)	2 (22)	5 (45)	6 (35)
7. Update policies annually	11 (92)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (18)	0 (0)
8. Alcohol free dormitory	0 (0)	2 (20)	0 (0)	1 (11)	2 (18)	3 (18)
9. Elimination at sporting events	2 (17)	0 (0)	2 (17)	0 (0)	2 (18)	0 (0)
10. Ban alcohol on campus	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (8)	0 (0)	3 (27)	1 (6)
11. Zero tolerance of alcohol related violence	1 (8)	0 (0)	1 (8)	0 (0)	3 (27)	0 (0)
12. Prohibition of tailgating	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (8)	0 (0)	2 (18)	0 (0)
13. Refuse sponsorship	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
14. Reinstate Fri. classes/exams	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
15. Offer Sat. AM classes	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Additional Items Found						
1. Alcohol vs. Alcohol/Drug policy	5 (42)	6 (60)	8 (67)	6 (67)	7 (64)	10 (59)
2. Stating campus-based consequences	7 (58)	7 (70)	5 (42)	4 (44)	2 (18)	5 (29)
3. Stating state-based consequences	7 (58)	8 (80)	3 (25)	5 (56)	2 (18)	5 (29)
4. Stating local-based consequences	7 (58)	7 (70)	3 (25)	5 (56)	2 (18)	5 (29)
5. Stating federal-based consequences	7 (58)	8 (80)	1 (8)	4 (44)	2 (18)	5 (29)
6. Health risks	1 (8)	3 (30)	5 (42)	5 (56)	4 (36)	5 (29)
7. Availability of resources	1 (8)	3 (30)	4 (33)	4 (44)	4 (36)	6 (35)
8. Residence halls vs. campus	8 (67)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (11)	0 (0)	3 (18)
9. Require parental notification	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (33)	1 (11)	2 (18)	3 (18)
10. Prevention measures	1 (8)	2 (20)	1 (8)	1 (11)	3 (27)	1 (6)

Table 16-Continued

27 Items	Big 10 n=12 n (%)	PAC n=10 n (%)	SEC n=12 n (%)	Am East n=9 n (%)	ODAC n=11 n (%)	Remaini ng Party n=17 n (%)
Additional Items Found						
11. Eliminating drinking paraphernalia	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (25)	1 (11)	1 (9)	2 (12)
12. Eliminating drinking games	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (25)	0 (0)	1 (9)	3 (18)
Mean	6.42	7.60	7.17	7.89	8.27	6.41

The mean scores for the various athletic conferences ranged from 6.41-8.27.

Using a one-way ANOVA to compare the means for the different athletic conferences, statistical differences were found within the national recommendations across the different athletic conferences ($p < 0.05$). The final column of the table shows the results from the post hoc Tukey. The significance among the variables can be seen when the Tukey was run. Using the national recommendations, the ODAC showed significant differences with three of the five other athletic conferences; a significant difference with the Big Ten ($p < .05$), with the PAC ($p < .05$) and with the remaining party schools ($p < .05$). Table 17 shows the Tukey related to athletic conference. No statistical differences were found when broken down by the additional recommendations, and using the rubric as a whole.

Table 17

Analysis of Variance for Athletic Conference

Source	Df	Mean Square	F	p	Tukey Results
Between subjects					
National	5	6.30	3.37	.009*	ODAC-BIG10 ODAC-PAC ODAC-REMAINING
Additional	5	3.12	.651	.661	
Total	5	7.29	1.23	.307	

Table 17-Continued

Source	Df	Mean Square	F	p	Tukey Results
Within subjects					
National	65	1.87			
Additional	65	4.80			
Total	65	5.94			

* $p \geq .05$

Note: In the Tukey results column 1=Big 10, 2=PAC 10, 3=SEC, 4=ODAC, 5=American East, 6=Remaining Party Schools

An ANOVA was run for the specific policy elements related to athletic conference. Nine content items were found to be statistically significant when compared to athletic conference. Table 18 shows the ANOVA results. The final column of the table again shows results from the post hoc Tukey test. The letters shown indicate the categories between which significance was found when the Tukey was run.

Table 18

Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements (when broken down by athletic conference)

	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Tukey Results
Between Groups					
Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency	5	1.657	17.705	.000*	BIG10-PAC BIG10-REMAINING
Update policies annually	5	1.613	41.075	.000*	BIG10-PAC BIG10-REMAINING
Limit alcohol advertising and marketing	5	1.212	8.634	.000*	BIG10-PAC BIG10-REMAINING

Table 18-Continued

	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Tukey Results
		Within Groups			
Enforce local ordinances	5	1.468	21.251	.000*	BIG10-PAC BIG10-REMAINING
Between Groups					
Establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	5	2.054	36.644	.000*	BIG10-PAC BIG10-REMAINING PAC-BIG10 PAC-ODAC SEC-BIG10 SEC-ODAC ODAC-BIG10 ODAC-REMAINING AE-BIG10 AE-ODAC
Residence Halls vs. campus	5	.789	8.512	.000*	BIG10-PAC BIG10-REMAINING
Consequences-Federal	5	.782	3.966	.003*	PAC-SEC PAC-ODAC
Consequences-campus	5	.612	2.709	.028*	BIG10-PAC BIG10-SEC
Consequences-State	5	.634	2.911	.020*	PAC-ODAC
Within Groups					
Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency	65	.094			
Update policies annually	65	.039			
Limit alcohol advertising and marketing	65	.140			
Enforce local ordinances	65	.069			
Establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	65	.056			

Table 18-Continued

	df	Mean Square Within Groups	F	Sig.	Tukey Results
Residence Halls vs. campus	65	.093			
Consequences-Federal	65	.197			
Consequences-campus	65	.226			
Consequences-State	65	.218			

* $p \geq .05$

Note: In the Tukey results column 1=Big 10, 2=PAC 10, 3=SEC, 4=ODAC, 5=American East, 6=Remaining Party Schools

Research Question 4: Variations Based on Institutional Type

The fourth and final research question of this project asked how do such policies and comparisons vary, if at all, based upon type of institution, i.e. public vs. private? Table 19 summarizes the 27 categories related to the institutions status as either a public or private entity along with the means of both categories. The mean score of the public institutions was 6.92 while the mean score of the private institutions was 7.78.

Table 19

Frequency of 27 items as Broken Down by Public/Private Status

27 Items	Public n (%) n=49	Private n (%) n=22
Items Extracted from National Recommendations		
1. Enforce local ordinances	36(74)	20(91)
2. Enforce minimum drinking age	35(71)	16(73)
3. Limit student access to alcohol	32(65)	18(82)
4. Limit alcohol advertising/marketing	18(37)	4(18)
5. Zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior	12(24)	7(32)
6. Eliminate kegs	15(31)	9(41)
7. Update policies annually	10(20)	3(14)
8. Alcohol free dormitory	4(8)	4(18)
9. Elimination at sporting events	4(8)	2(9)
10. Ban alcohol on campus	2(4)	3(14)
11. Zero tolerance of alcohol related violence	2(4)	3(14)

Table 19-Continued

27 Items	Public n (%) n=49	Private n (%) n=22
12. Prohibition of tailgating	1(2)	2(9)
13. Refuse sponsorship	0(0)	0(0)
14. Reinstate Fri. classes/exams	0(0)	0(0)
15. Offer Sat. AM classes	0(0)	0(0)
Additional Items Found		
1. Alcohol vs. Alcohol/Drug policy	30(61)	12(55)
2. Stating campus-based consequences	22(45)	14(64)
3. Stating state-based consequences	22(45)	8(36)
4. Stating local-based consequences	21(43)	8(36)
5. Stating federal-based consequences	20(41)	7(32)
6. Health risks	15(31)	8(36)
7. Availability of resources	14(29)	8(36)
8. Residence halls vs. campus	9(18)	3(14)
9. Require parental notification	6(12)	4(18)
10. Prevention measures	6(12)	3(14)
11. Eliminating drinking paraphernalia	4(8)	3(14)
12. Eliminating drinking games	5(10)	2(9)
Mean	6.92	7.78

Using an ANOVA, statistically significant differences were found when the data was analyzed to look at any variations in institutional policies in regards to the whether the institution was either a public or private institution ($p < 0.05$). Significant differences were found within the national recommendations, while the additional recommendations and the rubric as a whole were not found to be statistically significant accounting for public or private status of an institution (See Table 20).

Table 20

<i>Analysis of Variance for Public/Private Status</i>				
Source	Df	Mean Square	F	p
Between subjects				
National	1	8.98	4.30	.042*
Additional	1	11.08	1.86	.177
Total	1	.111	.023	.879

Table 20-Continued

Source	Df	Mean Square	F	p
Within subjects				
National	69	2.09		
Additional	69	5.96		
Total	69	4.74		

Note: * $p < .05$

An ANOVA was run on the specific policy elements when compared to public/private status of an institution. Table 21 shows the results. Eliminate keg parties was the only policy element that was found to show statistically significant differences when looking at public/private status of an institution.

Table 21

Analysis of Variance for Individual Policy Elements (when broken down by public/private status)

	Df	Mean Square	F	p
Between Groups				
Eliminate keg parties	1	.771	4.203	.044*
Within Groups				
Eliminate keg parties	69	.184		

Note: * $p \leq .05$

Regression Analysis

Table 22 shows a correlation table between the different variables used in this project. Public/Private status of an institution significantly correlated with both geography of an institution as well as athletic conference ($p = 0.05$). When the p value was set at 0.01 a correlation was found between geography and athletic conference as well as institutional size. Athletic conference was correlated to institutional size and

institution size was correlated to both the categorized party status and public/private status of an institution (See table 22).

Table 22

Correlation Table

	Geography	Athletic Conference	Institutional Size	Party Status Categorized	Public/Private
Geography	1.00	-.621(**)	.402(**)	-.038	.264(*)
Athletic Conference		1.00	-.427(**)	.210	-.289(*)
Institutional Size			1.00	.310(**)	.743(**)
Party Status				1.00	.219
Private/Public					1.00

Note: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As a final statistical analysis of the data, I attempted to see if any of the variables (size, location, and party status) were a predictor of significant differences among institutional policies. The three dependent variables of national policy recommendations, additional recommendations and the total rubric, and the independent variables of institutional size, type of school, and party vs. nonparty status were used in a regression analysis. Because a regression uses only ratio or scaled data and cannot analyze categorical variables beyond dichotomous (0,1) data, a dummy variable was created for both geographical location using the south as “1” and all other locations as “0” and athletic conference using the ODAC as “1” and all other conferences as “0”.

When looking at the national recommendations, a significant difference was found with athletic conference whereby the move towards the ODAC from all other athletic conferences predicts an increase in the number of national policy elements.

Institutional size of an institution approaches the 0.05 significance level, but is not statistically significant. This makes sense as most of the institutions from the ODAC are smaller schools. Table 23 summarizes the regression analysis of the national recommendations.

Table 23

Regression Data Analysis-National Recommendations

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
Constant	3.669	.490		7.481	.000
Geo Dummy South	.362	.508	.086	.713	.479
Conf Dummy ODAC	1.699	.624	.405	2.724	.008
Institutional Size	-4.33E-005	.000	-.341	-1.963	.054
Public/Private	.827	.590	.252	1.403	.166
Party Status	-.160	.350	-.052	-.456	.650

*p≤.05

This model also found a relatively high R Square value of .24, meaning the ODAC variable accounts for approximately 24% of the variance in this model.

Table 24 shows the regression analysis when run using the additional recommendations. None of the variables were found to be statistically significance in their ability to predict the number of additional policy recommendations.

Table 24

Regression Data Analysis-Additional Recommendations

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
Constant	4.13	.781		5.28	.000
Conf Dummy South	.870	1.116	.147	.780	.439
Conf Dummy ODAC	-.920	.995	-.155	-.925	.358
Institutional Size	2.56E-006	.000	.014	.072	.943
Public/Private	-.435	.940	-.094	-.463	.645
Party Status	-.158	.555	-.037	-.285	.777

Table 25 shows the regression analysis results when using the rubric as a whole. None of the variables were found to be predictive of the number of policy elements used from the total set of recommendations.

Table 25

Regression Data Analysis-Total Recommendations

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	
Constant	7.51	.864		8.69	.000
Geo Dummy South	1.63	1.23	.242	1.32	.191
Conf Dummy ODAC	.867	1.100	.129	.788	.434
Institutional Size	-3.75E-005	.000	-.184	-.952	.345
Public/Private	.436	1.04	.083	.419	.677
Party Status	-.251	.613	-.052	-.410	.683

Narrative Summary of Quantitative Statistical Findings

In summary, using a number of ANOVA tests I found a few significant differences among the variables. When looking at the national recommendations and athletic conference, the ODAC was found to be statistically significantly different from the other athletic conferences. Since schools from the ODAC are smaller private institutions, this followed along with the next finding that public/private status of a school was statistically significantly different when looking at the national recommendations. While running other tests, the institutions from the south continued to show significance in the post-hoc Tukeys. From this information a model was created to run a regression analysis using the variables of party status, institutional size, public/private status, the ODAC and the south to see if any of the variables were predictors in the number of policy elements from each of the national, additional and total policy recommendations. Only the ODAC was predictive of the number of national policy elements within a given policy. No significant differences were found between the rubric elements and party status, geography, and public/private status of an institution.

ANOVAs were also run on the specific policy elements. The results showed 12 policy content areas for which significant differences across different variables were found. Party status along with public/private status had one significant element, institutional size had five policy elements, and geography had seven statistically significant elements. The athletic conference variable had the most policy elements that were found to be statistically significant whereby nine elements within the

athletic conference variable were significant. The 12 policy elements can be seen in Table 26.

Table 26

12 Statistically Significant Different Individual Policy Elements (across variables)

	Party Status Categorized	Institutional Size	Geography	Athletic Conference	Public/Private Status
Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency		X	X	X	
Update policies annually		X	X	X	
Limit alcohol advertising and marketing		X	X	X	
Enforce local ordinances		X	X	X	
Establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior			X	X	
Residence Halls vs. Campus			X	X	
Consequences-Local		X			
Consequences-Federal			X	X	
Consequences-campus				X	
Consequences-State				X	
Eliminate Drinking Games	X				
Eliminate Keg Parties					X

Additional Qualitative Results

Other themes resulted from the review of the policies that were not specifically analyzed as research questions, but are noteworthy in this project. These include the following: ease or difficulty of finding the policy; policy comprehensiveness or lack thereof; special circumstance policies; and climate/culture associated with campus life and alcohol use.

Theme 1: The Smaller the Institution, the More Difficult to Find the Policy

As I began to collect the policies, one thing I noted concerned the task of finding the policies online. Each institutional policy was retrieved from each school's

official website. The majority of the time the websites search engine was used with the criteria of “student alcohol policy.” This often resulted in the policy being brought up immediately. If the policy was not directly found using “student alcohol policy,” the words “student code” or “student handbook” were used to retrieve the policy. The majority of policies were obtained within the first few clicks of entering the schools website. However, I did note that the institutions of the ODAC athletic conference, which consists of smaller, private colleges, were much more difficult to obtain. Although each policy was indeed obtained for this project, the policies from smaller private educational institutions were not as easy to obtain as the remainder of the policies. Often multiple search categories and words had to be used on the search engine of these institutions.

Theme 2: Great Variation Within Length of Alcohol Policies

Another theme that emerged from this research was the length of some policies. Some institutional policies were multi-page documents while others offered little more than a structured policy consisting of 1-2 paragraphs with a generalized statement on alcohol use on campus. For example, West Virginia University (2006) had a very short and vaguely written policy regarding alcohol use on campus; Arizona State University (n.d.) has a short vague policy regarding drinking on campus and the University of Oregon (n.d.) has a one paragraph policy that simply states “All state and federal alcohol laws are in effect inside the residence halls, Greek houses (fraternity or sorority), and all university owned or controlled property.” There is no mention of what the state and federal alcohol laws are or consequences for violating such laws.

On the other hand, Vanderbilt University (n.d.) proved to have the lengthiest policy using a web page related specifically to their alcohol policy. The webpage is a homepage focused on the broader Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Prevention issues. The university alcohol policy is accessible from that informational website. There also is a large amount of additional information that may be helpful to those interested in alcohol use at Vanderbilt University. The left side of the page consists of an area for students that include topics such as: How to help a friend, all students, first year students, Greeks, student athletes, adult children of alcoholics, recovering students and resident assistants. There is also a section for parents that includes Vanderbilt University resources, advice for first year parents, and advice for high risk times for students. Another section is tabbed for the Vanderbilt University staff and contains current national statistics.

Another institution that offers a lengthy policy is the University of Massachusetts (n.d.). This policy has been used in multiple examples mentioned previously. The policy includes both drugs and alcohol, however, it still offers the stated policy, consequences, description of sanctions, a Good Samaritan Protocol, the BASICS Program, a listing of additional publications available from the Dean of Students Office and Campus and Local Resources available to students in need of help for drug and alcohol use.

New York University's (n.d.) *Policies on Substance Abuse and Alcohol Beverages* is another lengthy document consisting of 17 pages of details related to substance abuse and the use of alcohol on the University campus. The policy lists the standards of conduct expected by the university, includes a policy statement on the

use of alcohol on campus, lists both university and criminal sanctions, and the health risks associated with alcohol abuse, as well as offers counseling and support programs, including on-campus and off-campus resources.

Another lengthy policy within the 71 used in this research project is the policy from The University of Maryland-College Park (n.d.). This policy is an eight-page document that includes both the use of alcohol and other drugs. The official policy on the use of alcohol on campus is described, as are disciplinary sanctions for violation of the stated policy. Also included within this policy are health risks associated with alcohol use; local, state and federal descriptions relating to alcohol; an informational section on the effects of alcohol; information regarding what to do if students are concerned about a friend or a loved one; a ten-question survey related to assessing risks for alcohol or other drug problems; and lastly, a very comprehensive list of university, community and national resources available to those in need of help with alcohol or drug abuse.

Another example is The University of Southern California (2007) which requires all incoming freshman to log on to <http://college.alcoholedu.com> and complete the program on drinking at school. This is an informative online program that educates the student body on the significance of drinking on campus.

As for the inclusion of the 27 policy elements, only 14 institutions included 10 or more policy elements within their policy. Of those 14 institutions, only one included 10 or more of the national recommendations. Looking at the institutions that included more than 10 of the total rubric categories, the majority of those institutions

only included 3-4 of the national content elements. Overall, Table 27 lists those schools with the most rubric categories included in the institutional policies.

Analysis of the policies led me to discover that although some policies were indeed lengthier than others, this did not indicate that they were more inclusive of the policy elements. Although these lengthy policies provided more detail within their policy than other policies this did not indicate that they included more of the individual policy elements used from the rubric in this project.

Table 27

Policy Comprehensiveness

	# of content items within national n=15 n (%)	# content items within total rubric n=27 n (%)	Athletic Conference
Institutions			
DePauw University	6(40)	13(48)	Remaining Party
Randolph-Macon College	5(33)	12(44)	ODAC
Eastern Mennonite University	10(67)	11(41)	ODAC
Virginia Wesleyan College	4(27)	11(41)	ODAC
Louisiana State University	3(20)	11(41)	SEC
University of Florida	4(27)	11(41)	SEC
Boston University	3(20)	10(37)	AE
Hartford	4(27)	10(37)	AE
University of Maryland	3(20)	10(37)	AE
Emory and Henry College	8(53)	10(37)	ODAC
University of California-Los Angeles	4(27)	10(37)	PAC
University of Arkansas	6(40)	10(37)	SEC
University of Georgia	3(20)	10(37)	SEC
University of Wisconsin-Madison	4(27)	10(37)	Big10

Theme 3: Institutional Policies that Address Special Situations

After reviewing the content of 71 alcohol policies across the nation, I found that a few institutions had separate policies for specific situations. For example, The University of New Hampshire (2005) includes within their policy the notion that a

different policy exists for arena and skyboxes. Washington State University (n.d.) also has a separate policy for home football game days than the original policy. Within the University of Massachusetts (n.d.) alcohol policy is a Good Samaritan Protocol. The protocol acknowledges that sometimes people may be reluctant to seek medical attention because of potential consequences to themselves for being involved in such behavior. The protocol points out that at times these situations may be life threatening and medical attention is necessary. Because of the potential that students may delay calling for assistance because of the fear of punishment, the university put into place the Good Samaritan Protocol. This protocol has been put in place to, “increase the likelihood that UMass community members will call for medical assistance when faced with an alcohol-related emergency.”

Theme 4: Institutional Policies that Address Climate/Culture

Although this research project did not focus on the current climate and the affect drinking plays on climate and culture of an institution, a number of policies specifically mention climate and/or culture within their university alcohol policy. For example, although not directly stated within UCLA’s policy (1996), the university acknowledges the importance of social activities on campus. The first sentence of the policy states, “Social activities are an important part of the life and atmosphere of UCLA’s multifaceted campus community.” Randolph-Macon (n.d.) also states within the first paragraph, “Social life at College is an important aspect of the total collegiate experience, and Randolph-Macon recognizes that fact in many ways.”

Those specifically mentioning culture within their policies include the alcohol policies of DePauw University (2005) and Ohio State University (n.d.). DePauw

University's policy states, "Excessive alcohol consumption is an unfortunate part of the student social culture on campuses today." The introductory paragraph of the policy from Ohio State University states, "We value an alcohol-free environment. However, we also recognize that alcohol beverages may be available at some campus activities and events. These activities are consistent with the University cultural values when they foster moderation, responsibility, and safety in alcohol consumption."

Chapter 4 Summary

This research project consisted of both a qualitative and quantitative analysis of policy content of university alcohol policies. When analyzed quantitatively, no overall statistically significant differences were found among the number of elements found in their policies and the rubric developed for this study based on major variables of institutional size, geographical location, and athletic conference. The elements included in the rubric were sporadically placed among the different policies analyzed. No consistencies were noted among those institutions even from within the same demographics.

A quantitative analysis was then done on the rubric dividing it into three separate variables: those that included the national recommendations, inclusion of the additional recommendations and finally using both the national and additional categories. These analyses found statistically significant differences when looking at individual policy content items included in multiple university alcohol policies when compared across a variety of variables. Significant differences were found among the

inclusion of national policy recommendations by both athletic conference and public/private status of an institution.

Although the south geographical location showed significant differences to multiples other geographical locations. I attempted to make a regression of multiple variables to look at factors that may be significant when related to the content within an alcohol policy, using party status, geography, athletic conference, public/private status of a school and institutional size. The regression analysis found statistical significant relationships among the ODAC and the national policy recommendations. Institutional size approached significance as a predictor but was not statistically significant.

Other qualitative findings emerged from this research, including the difficulty of finding some policies. All policies were obtained via an online search; however, typically the smaller the institution the more difficult it was to locate the policy on the official school website. Another finding included the comprehensiveness of each policy. Some institutional policies were no more than a few short paragraphs while other institutional policies were comprehensive web pages directed towards stopping underage drinking on their campuses. A third qualitative finding resulting from this research was the specificity of some policies for special circumstances that may occur on campuses, such as game day policies and arena/skybox policies. The final finding of this research was the actual use of terminology within some of the policies associated with the use of alcohol and the impact on campus climate and/or culture.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

This study involved a content analysis of 71 university alcohol policies; comparing them to a rubric I developed in part by using “best practice” policy content recommendations from four different national organizations. It also included an analysis of similarities and differences among schools listed as party schools and similar ones not listed as party schools. Geographical location, institutional size, and public private status of an institution were variables also evaluated. Chapter 4 offered the results, while I discuss the key findings in this chapter. I will also offer recommendations for university alcohol policies to help enhance current university policies, which in turn may assist universities to gain a handle on underage student drinking and enhance the health of the student population.

Overall Conclusions and Discussions

The first major conclusion noted from within this research is that, when qualitatively analyzed, the policy content recommendations from four major organizations working to prevent underage drinking on college campuses are NOT consistently being reflected within the university alcohol policies examined in this study. In fact, the results of this study found that not one institution is following all 15 nationally recommended rubric categories, and even those institutions that include the most content, have only about half of the recommended content. The institutions that tended to include the most content are smaller, private educational institutions, and yet these smaller, private institutions serve only a small percentage of college-age students.

This indicates that either the national organizations are not being successful in sharing their recommendations and/or universities are consciously choosing not to include such language within their policies. A large part of this may be related to the fact that, across the four national organizations, many variations in their recommended content exists with little consistency across the four national sets of recommendations. This was certainly noted as I, as the researcher, had to spend quite a bit of time extracting key ideas from the four national organization's recommendations.

In addition, the national recommendations are not that comprehensive in that I was able to identify an additional 12 rubric categories not included within any of the four sets of national recommendations. These additional categories were identified as important to include based upon other research findings from the literature and the qualitative analysis on this project. See Appendix A for a complete listing of the 27 rubric categories which visually shows the reader these inconsistencies and missing content ideas.

The second conclusion from this research relates to the analysis of any policy differences between those identified as party schools and those not identified as such. Although one can argue that being labeled a party school by Princeton Review is not necessarily a scientific process, it does represent a potential proxy as some type of "outcome" variable. Therefore specific policy elements were examined to see if any differences existed between those institutions being categorized as a party or nonparty school. Overall, this research did not reveal any statistically significant differences

between these groups of institutions in reference to the overall number of national and additional policy elements contained within their policies.

When looking at individual policy elements, significant differences were found for one item, the elimination of drinking games. However, policy content related to this policy element was counterintuitive, whereby those policies that included wording related to the elimination of drinking games were actually the party schools, while none of the non-party schools had that specific element in their policies. It is important to note that this element was only found in a total of 7 institutions (which is only 10% of the 71 institutions studied). Therefore, the “n” is just too small to conclude the potential impact of having this element within their policies or not (as it relates to things that caused them to be labeled a party school or not).

The lack of statistically significant differences between the party and nonparty schools overall, and for all but one individual policy element, could be related to the fact that very few policies examined in this project were comprehensive policies and most only included a handful of the policy elements. Had the policies in this study included more of the national and additional recommendations used in the rubric, more differences may have been found. But absent any such findings, no conclusions can be drawn from this study regarding to the party vs. nonparty school policy comparisons relative to any given policy elements being more important than any other to include within an institutional alcohol policy.

The final conclusion from this research is related to the demographic variables used in this study: Athletic conference, institutional size, geography and

public/private status of an institution. When examining the total number of policy elements, no significant differences were found when broken down by any of the variables. But when examining each individual policy element, some statistically significant differences were found. Most importantly, when looking at institutional size, 5 policy content elements were different: Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency, update policies annually, limit alcohol advertising and marketing, enforce local ordinances and local consequences with the smaller institutions overall having more elements. Within the geographic breakdown 7 policy content elements were different: enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency, update policies annually, limit alcohol advertising and marketing, enforce local ordinances, establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior, residence halls vs. campus policies, and federal consequences with the west overall generally having more elements. And for athletic conference breakdowns, 9 elements were different: enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency, update policies annually, limit alcohol advertising and marketing, enforce local ordinances, establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior, residence halls vs. campus policies, and federal, campus and state consequences, with the ODAC overall generally having more elements. The regression analysis also revealed that the policies from the ODAC differed in the number of elements within a given policy. Institutional size approached significance but was not actually found to be a predictor.

Based upon these findings, it can be concluded that smaller, ODAC institutions as well as those institutions from the south had more policy elements and might be better model policies to examine. However, even these smaller, ODAC or

southern institutions only had 10-13 of the 27 total policy elements (37%-48%) and were not considered to be comprehensive policies.

Given the findings that the recommendations from current national organizations investing time to fight underage drinking on college campuses are not being addressed within institutional alcohol policies, and that no specific policy elements were found to be statistically significant, its necessary to conclude this study by highlighting other work which points to the importance of inclusion of some elements within a university alcohol policy. It is necessary to further explore alternative ideas that may enhance a university alcohol policy to address the alarming statistics on underage drinking on college campuses. To that end, the next section offers thoughts on what content should be specifically included within a given policy to best decrease underage drinking on campus. These recommendations are based upon what I learned qualitatively from analyzing the 71 policies for this study, and previous research about factors which impact alcohol use on campus.

Suggestions for Practice

Overall, policy content of existing institutional alcohol policies is inconsistent and does not correlate with national best practice recommendations or with similar institutions. Given the need for local buy-in as part of policy development (Parsons, 1995), I do not support a cookie cutter type policy. However, this project has led me to conclude that there are specific criteria that must be included in each institutional policy if one means to help fight underage drinking on college campuses. Using the research completed in this project, national best practice recommendations, and a review of literature, I have developed a set of recommendations regarding the content

that should be included in institutional alcohol policies. The goal is to help guide current and future leaders at institutions to reexamine their policies as part of their effort to curb underage drinking on college campuses.

My personal philosophy is that drinking on college campuses across the United States is a long standing part of campus traditions that has helped form the culture of each institution. When associated with responsible behavior, students of age choosing to drink on campus is acceptable. Underage drinking on campus however, is not acceptable and should not be tolerated by educational institutions. Over the years this tradition has begun to get out of hand for campuses as well as communities to control (NIAAA, 2002). An increase in violence (Abbey, 2002; Giancola, 2002), destruction of property (Giancola, 2002), and death of young adults (Hingston, et. al, 2002), has prompted a cry for help from institutions to address the seriousness of this issue. I believe that educating students regarding these issues is important for educational institutions to help manage the problem of underage drinking on campus. The following recommendations for policy content evolve from this philosophy. Better education of students on the many aspects of underage drinking on campus, including laws, health risks, resources, and consequences is a beginning step to help decrease the number of problems associated with underage drinking. An institutional policy can serve as the basis for education of the student body on the responsible use of alcohol.

Fifteen initial categories were extracted from the four best practice recommendations from national organizations: enforce local ordinances, enforce the minimum drinking age, limit student access to alcohol, limit alcohol

advertising/marketing, establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior, eliminate kegs, update policies annually, establish alcohol free dorms, eliminate alcohol at sporting events, ban alcohol on campus, establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related violence, prohibit tailgating, refuse sponsorship, reinstate Friday classes/exams, and offer Saturday morning classes. Twelve additional categories were found by the researcher to be within one or more existing policies, and thus added to the analysis rubric. These include: covering alcohol vs. drugs and alcohol, stating campus-based consequences, stating local-based consequences, stating state-based consequences, stating federal-based consequences, assessing health risks, listing availability of resources, covering drinking on campus vs. in the residence halls, requiring parental notification, offering preventative measures, eliminating drinking paraphernalia, and eliminating drinking games.

Although each of the policy content items may play a significant role in decreasing underage drinking on campus, the inclusion of every item in detail may prove too cumbersome. According to Parsons (1995), content within a given policy should be concise and to the point. Limiting the amount of content within a given policy to only pertinent concepts is important to allow the reader a better understanding of the policy. Frivolous data within a policy only confuses the reader and makes it difficult for people to follow the policy. Other ideas such as vagueness within a policy can make it harder to enforce the policy. Finally, content of a policy should include clear directions to ease enforcement of the policy (Parsons, 1995). To this end, I will offer recommendations regarding each of the 27 categories analyzed in this study and offer their relevancy for inclusion within an institutional policy. Please

note that I have numbered the content items which I recommend, but these do not depict order of importance, (because all recommended items are important).

Specific Policy Elements Recommended

The first content category recommended for inclusion within an institutional policy is that of *enforcing local ordinances, including the minimum drinking age, on all university property*. Obviously there are legal issues that arise when local ordinances are not followed. The institution needs to partner with the community in which it lies by adhering to laws that maintain a beneficial relationship between the institution and the community members. This information should be included within each policy so the student is aware of what the local ordinances are and cannot use the excuse of lack of information as a reason for their behavior.

Since 1988 every state has raised the legal drinking age to 21. Although the majority of Americans agree with the drinking age of 21 years old, there are some opponents to the law (Flynn, 2007). Their argument is that the law is inconsistently enforced and monies would be better spent on education of 18-21 years old on drinking responsibly. The institution is obligated to enforce the legal drinking age at all times. This information should be included up front within the policy so that students are made aware of the institution's stand on underage drinking on campus.

Enforcement of the alcohol policy should occur on all university property. O'Hare (1990) found differences in drinking rates depending on where a student lived. Students living at home and commuting to campus drank less than those students living on campus. Although the campus environment can be difficult to define (Presley, Meilman, & Leichliter, 2002), most drinking happens within the

student's living area on campus. However, not all underage drinking on campus does. Klein (1989), Lo and Globetti (1993), and Werner and Greene (1992) each researched the presence of a Greek system and underage drinking. Each study concluded that living in a Greek house is correlated with higher rates of heavy episodic drinking. I support inclusion of content that relates to prohibiting underage drinking anywhere on university property as well as drinking on property of organizations associated with the institution such as Greek houses.

The second category recommended is to *limit student access to alcohol by prohibiting kegs, drinking paraphernalia, and drinking games*. While I do not support a campus ban on alcohol for those of legal age, I do support limiting student access to alcohol. Limiting student access to alcohol can be done in a variety of ways, such as limiting advertising/marketing of alcohol on campus, establishing alcohol free dorms, eliminating drinking paraphernalia and drinking games; all of which will be further discussed in detail in the upcoming paragraphs.

Large consumption of alcohol especially at fast rates has been known to be deadly to students. David J. Hanson of the State University of New York at Potsdam (as cited in Flynn, 2007) stated "I think we should teach young people *how* to drink as well as how *not* to drink" (p. 5). Keg parties are meant to increase that amount of alcohol a person ingests within a short amount of time which can be deadly to students. Studies show that consumption of large quantities of alcohol is far more detrimental to students (Rehm et al., 2002). Policies must therefore specifically outline the amount of alcohol that will be allowed by persons of age on campus.

Including words that specifically prohibit kegs, trash can, or bath tub parties on campus are a must for educational institutions.

Educating students about the increase in alcohol consumption along with the risks of participating in drinking games is an important area for institutions to address. The website www.jointogether.org is put together by Boston University School of Public Health (2008). It contains many items related to college drinking. According to the site, drinking games have been around for quite some time and have been glamorized similar to the status of party school. Drinking games can be traced as far back as the 4th to 5th centuries BC and glamorization of the concept has occurred by such ideas as The Guinness Book of Records which began a category for speed drinking in the early 1960's and continued into 1990 when the records were dropped. The website also provides an advocacy campaign against underage drinking and recently targeted a number of large department store retailers such as Kohl's and Target for selling alcohol-themed games. Even using a search engine for "drinking games" brings up a number of websites featuring specific games and party ideas that encourage such behavior.

Drinking games have been associated with many deaths of college students. Rehm, Gmel, Sempos, and Trevisan (2002) reported an increase in stroke and sudden cardiac death with irregular heavy drinking episodes. Studies show that consumption of large quantities of alcohol is far more detrimental to students (Rehm et al., 2002). Recent research shows that parties that featured drinking games resulted in an increase in alcohol consumption (Boston University School of Public Health, 2008).

The third category that is recommended to be included within a policy is to *limit alcohol advertising or marketing by refusing sponsorship from the alcohol industry*. According to The Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth (CAMY) (2003), advertising and marketing of alcohol can be misleading to the young adult population. CAMY is located at Georgetown University and focuses on alcohol industry advertising that may “jeopardize the health and safety of America’s youth” (p. 2). CAMY lists 12 recommendations related to alcohol advertising: (1) prohibit false or misleading alcohol advertising, (2) prohibit alcohol advertising that targets minors, (3) prohibit images of children in alcohol advertisements, (4) prohibit images or statements that associate alcohol with athletic achievement, (5) prohibit images or statements that portray or encourage intoxication, (6) establish explicit jurisdiction over in-state electronic media, (7) restrict outdoor advertising in locations where children are likely to be present, (8) prohibit outdoor alcohol advertising near schools, public playgrounds and churches, (9) restrict alcohol advertising on alcohol retail windows and outside areas, (10) prohibit alcohol advertising on college campuses, (11) restrict sponsorship of civic events, and (12) limit giveaways (contest, raffles, etc.).

I recommend that institutions include content within their alcohol policy as recommended by CAMY (2003) to prohibit alcohol advertising on college campuses. I would recommend using wording similar to that from The University of Maine (2002). Their policy includes specific criteria that advertising of alcohol must meet to be allowed on campus. It included such verbiage as avoiding:

demeaning sexual or discriminating portrayal of individuals,...Alcohol ads will not encourage any form of alcohol misuse nor place emphasis on the quantity or frequency of use,...Alcohol advertising will subscribe to the philosophy of responsible and legal use of the products,... advertisement...will not portray drinking as contributing to the personal, academic or social success of students,... advertising...will not associate beverage drinking with increased sexual prowess, athletic ability, or with the performance of tasks that require skill or skilled reactions such as operation of a motor vehicle or machinery, and finally distribution of free alcohol should not be used as a marketing tool.

Key areas to prohibit alcohol advertising include: the school newspaper and other publications, handbills hung on campus and also include any college campus on state land. Inclusion of such specific wording within an alcohol policy should limit the marketing of alcohol on campus and thereby impact the desire to drink.

The fourth recommended category is to *establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior and violence*. Of the 71 institutions, 19 state something related to having a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior. Research (e. g., Giancola, 2002) found an increase in violence connected with alcohol use and therefore wording within a policy should include that such behaviors will not be tolerated at any time. The NIAAA (2002) estimated that alcohol is involved in 70,000 cases of sexual assault every year while the AMA reports that 65% of attacks are unreported (American Medical Association, 1996). The NIAAA report concluded that annually

600,000 college students in the United States are hit or physically assaulted by students that have been drinking.

Violence, regardless of its relation to the use of alcohol, should not be tolerated on any campus. Education of an increase in violence related crime when someone uses alcohol should be included within a given policy to help educate students of how their behavior may be affected and the consequences for such behavior if they choose to use alcohol. I maintain that the best statement on non-tolerance of alcohol related behavior comes from the University of Arkansas's policy, "The use of alcohol will not, under any circumstances, be accepted as an excuse for irresponsible behavior." I agree that under no circumstance should a student be given lenience for their poor choices due to the use of alcohol and as such should be stated within a given policy.

The fifth category recommended looks at *establishing an alcohol free dormitory*. Wechsler, Lee, Gledhill-Hoyt, and Nelson (2001) researched colleges that ban alcohol. Although not specifically looking at prohibition of alcohol within a student's living area, the authors point out that restricting alcohol on campus may push students to move their drinking off campus, causing an increase in drunk driving. I believe all campuses should provide the option of alcohol free dorms for students living on campus. However, I do not support a campus ban on alcohol and think that students of age should be allowed to drink within their rooms. I suggest that there are ways to limit student drinking within the residence halls by offering alcohol free dorms, dorms for students over the age of 21 years, and inclusion within a university policy of prohibiting those students 21 years and older sharing living

quarters with those students under the age of 21. Another consideration may be limiting the number of students assigned to a dorm room. Hartford, Wechsler, and Rohman (1983) found that the more roommates a student had, the more likely he or she was to drink.

The sixth category recommended is to: *Reinstating Friday classes and exams to reduce Thursday night partying*. As Wechsler (1996) states in his 12 step model for institutions, “A college should not be an enabler for students who drink from Thursday to Sunday” (p. 6). To this end, I support the idea that core curriculum courses within every program should hold classes on Friday morning to help prevent Thursday evening partying.

The seventh category recommended is listing specific *consequences for underage drinking*. These included consequences from the school, the local community, and state and federal consequences. Barnett and Read (2005) conducted a review of intervention programs of various colleges across the U.S. and found that programs ranged from alcohol education classes, to group and individual meetings with school counselors, and alcohol awareness workshops. The program content of mandatory alcohol education classes included such things as: presentation from peers, AA members, and physicians; lectures; films and discussions. The length of the various mandated programs ranged from 3 hours to 18 hours depending on the institution. When they finished their study they concluded that mandatory interventions show promise of decreasing risky behaviors of students when related to alcohol use on campus.

As stated earlier, I think it is critical that laws governing the use of alcohol be included within a policy. Following this should be the inclusion of consequences for violating the law. Students should know the legal drinking age is 21 years old, but they may not think that breaking this law is a big deal. If given the consequences ahead of time they may rethink their choice of using alcohol. Consequences from the school are especially important and criteria of when local, state, and federal officials will be contacted, and what may happen, could be linked or listed as references for the student to turn to if necessary.

Such consequences could include first and second offenses for different violations that include fines, parental notification, services, social probation, loss of campus privileges, and suspension. Policies should be specific as to how many times such behavior will be tolerated, such as the University of Delaware that instituted a three strike policy. After creating such a policy, the university had a documented reduction in secondary effects of alcohol use (Thomas, 1998).

The eighth category recommended is to *identify prevention measures, health risks and available resources associated with alcohol abuse*. Prevention of alcohol use and abuse is a major factor in looking at underage drinking on college campuses. Previous examples of stellar policies include; The University of Arkansas (n.d.), which has a Student Assistance Program (SAP) as well as Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) on campus designed to help students prevent or treat problems with alcohol. Also, the inclusion of a requirement for such programs as <http://college.alcohol.edu.com> for all incoming freshman would be good use of educating students on prevention measures. I believe the most effective prevention

measure would be education regarding the use of alcohol. I believe that including content within an institutional policy that includes such things as risk factors, medical problems and responsible drinking related to alcohol is a must for institutional policies.

The risk of underage drinking has been researched extensively (NIAAA, 2002). Again, I support the education of students of legal age regarding their choice to use alcohol on campus. I recommend the inclusion of the health risks associated with the use of alcohol within an institutional policy. Important factors should include changes in physical health status and behaviors, risk of dependence, drinking during pregnancy, and the effects on not only the individual but family, friends, the institution, and the community.

Many campus and community resources exist for people who misuse alcohol. Programs such as AA have great success in treating people that abuse alcohol (Alcoholics Anonymous, 2008). Riley, Durbin, and D'Ariano (2005) reported from Georgetown University that "Curriculum infusion exposed students in the class to campus resources relating to alcohol, in particular to Health Education Services" (p. 204) that were offered on campus. Many schools have a health facility on campus that has staff trained to deal with students having problems with the use of alcohol. Many communities have local organizations or facilities as well as many state, national and online resources that are available. Inclusion of a comprehensive list of such resources would benefit the students to know where to turn for help if they or a peer may be in need of assistance.

The ninth category recommended is *parental notification of underage drinking while away at school*. In general, college students are 18 years old or older and are no longer considered to be minors. However, I believe parental support is still needed during these crucial developmental years as well as most parents bear the financial responsibility of college costs. According to Reisberg (1998) a number of educational institutions are moving towards parental notification when a student breaks the law regarding underage drinking while away at school. A few areas remain debatable regarding parental notification: first, should students be aware of a parental notification policy and when should parents be notified.

I believe it would be best to include content regarding parental notification within a university's policy. I think it is important to maintain open communication between administrators, the student body, and parents. Also, I see no reason that students should be kept in the dark of potential consequences such as parental notification when the institutional policy has been violated. I recommend that institutions develop a set of standards that help define when a parent should be contacted. I previously used an example from the policy of the University of Maine (2002) that includes very specific content related to parental notification and I would recommend use of similar verbiage for when the university will notify parents of behaviors of those students that are under 21 years old. The University of Maine policy also includes those times when the student has been taken into custody by the police, vandalism or destruction of property related to alcohol or drug use, operating a vehicle while under the influence of alcohol or other drugs, when the student was transported to a medical facility for the treatment of alcohol or other drugs, any time

the student is involved in a violation that may require suspension or dismissal from the university or removal from campus housing and lastly, any other circumstances the Dean of Students determines necessary.

The 10th recommendation is that each university *have a stand alone alcohol policy that is readily available, updated on a regular basis, and reviewed with students during a freshman seminar class*. Research shows that addressing too many topics within the same policy is detrimental to the development of the policy. As previously mentioned, Parsons (1995) states content should be specific and address the topic at hand. Although underage drinking and tobacco use, as well as drug use, are similar in that they are unhealthy, dangerous and illegal, each topic should have a separate policy that is specific to each of the three different topics. This will allow for specific enforcement as well as a separate set of consequences that specifically address each situation. If institutions want to take on underage drinking seriously, then they need to have a policy that reflects the seriousness of the situation and address the issue as a single policy not combined with drugs and in some instances tobacco use on campus.

Students should be given a written copy of the institution's alcohol policy and should be able to easily access the policy via the school's homepage, and a signed confirmation of receipt should be submitted to the institution by the student. Parents of students should also be made aware of the alcohol policy and the university's stand on underage drinking on campus.

Parsons (1995) describes evaluation and change/continuity as important aspects of policy analysis. During the evaluation period, institutions can evaluate how

effective their policy is by conducting research studies within the organization, and then can change a current policy based on the results and/or by learning from past experiences. Gustafson, et al. (1992) describe the life cycle of policy development, and state “A smart policy analysis unit will constantly monitor the environment to see if it is likely to awaken dormant issues” (p. 65). I think that maintaining updated policies is an important step in the process of fighting underage drinking on college campuses. Campuses that have not experienced major problems with underage alcohol use on campus may not have addressed such issues within their policies and thereby are denying that such problems exist on their campus. Institutions need to take a proactive approach to fighting underage drinking instead of waiting until a major disaster happens and then updating such policies.

Policies must be updated on a regular basis and should be reviewed anytime throughout the year if problems arise. Previous research by Gose (1995) found that most policies are updated only after a significant incident happens at an institution. Universities need to take a proactive approach to try to prevent such incidents by regularly updating policies. A committee consisting of school officials, students and community members should be involved in this updating process. This is necessary to make sure the policy is working in its current state and make changes as necessary to benefit all involved. Any updates should be immediately available to students and parents.

All incoming freshman should be required to complete a freshman seminar class that addresses multiple issues pertinent to the safety and well being of students including the use of alcohol on campus that could include such issues as local, state,

and federal laws regarding alcohol, binge drinking, and health risks with such risky behavior, and campus and community resources available to students. Programs such as <http://college.alcohol.edu.com> are available to make students aware of the issues of drinking on campus. Other ideas could include implementation of a proactive approach such as the one at Georgetown University as described by Riley, et al. (2005). Georgetown University has tried multiple approaches to tackling underage drinking on campus and now has implemented a program that takes alcohol issues into the classroom. The focus of the program is to “enhance student lives and campus unity by reducing the adverse effects of alcohol use and abuse on campus” (p. 203). One way this is accomplished is through a mandatory health studies course that all freshmen must take.

Specific Policy Elements Not Recommended

The first category from the rubric used in this research that is not recommended is to *eliminate alcohol at sporting events*. One thought regarding schools listed as party schools, is that traditions help form an institution’s climate and culture, especially when related to athletics such as football (NIAAA, 2002). Institutional culture and climate are very large areas that may be of significance when looking at underage drinking rates on college campuses. The NIAAA (2002) reports a link between sporting events and underage drinking on college campuses. Leichter, Meilman, Presley and Cashin (1998) and Wechsler et al. (1997) also linked students involved with sports having a positive association with heavy episodic drinking. I do believe that university sporting events and the responsible use of alcohol at such events are an important part of college life that help form a longstanding tradition and

help shape the culture of each institution, however, I do not support the complete elimination of alcohol at such sporting events. Instead, I do support the inclusion of language within a given policy to include education of the responsible use of alcohol at such events and to reiterate the laws regarding the use of alcohol on campus.

The second category not recommended is to completely *ban alcohol on campus*. Wechsler, et al. (2001), concluded that students at schools that have a campus ban on alcohol engage in the same amount of extreme drinking as those institutions that do not ban alcohol. They also concluded that the schools that ban alcohol experience the same rate of problems associated with alcohol. I believe this to be true. I also believe a number of students are over the age of 21 and legally allowed to drink, and they should be allowed to do so responsibly. I do not support the inclusion of a ban of alcohol on campus.

The third category not recommended is to *prohibit tailgating*. The NIAAA (2002) reports that sporting events and tailgating help form a culture at an institution. Leichliter et al. (1998) and Wechsler et al., (1997) found that student involvement in athletics was positively associated with heavy episodes of drinking and that athletes were more likely to experience negative consequences of alcohol misuse. Rosenbluth, Nathan, and Lawson (1978) found the larger the group of college students the greater the consumption of alcohol. Athletic events such as basketball and football games provide for large numbers of students to congregate in one area. Yet, banning alcohol on campus may increase the likelihood that students of age will move drinking to an off campus location and then increase their risk by drunk driving. Therefore, I do not support the complete banning of tailgating for those of legal age at any sporting

events; instead I support policy content that includes the enforcement of campus and local laws as well as the education of responsible alcohol choices while tailgating.

Content Recommendation Summary

In summary, this research supports the inclusion of a number of content elements within an institutional alcohol policy (See Table 28).

Table 28

Summary of Recommended Policy Content Items and Activities

1. Enforce applicable local and state ordinances on all university property (including Greek housing, etc.) related to alcohol use, including the minimum drinking age
 2. Limit student access to alcohol by prohibiting kegs, drinking paraphernalia, and drinking games
 3. Limit alcohol advertising or marketing by refusing sponsorships from the alcohol industry
 4. Establish zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior and violence
 5. Offer alcohol free dormitories
 6. Ensure Fri. classes/exams are offered
 7. Identify campus, state, local and federal consequences
 8. Identify prevention measures, health risks and available resources associated with alcohol abuse
 9. Require parental notification of any underage drinking violations
 10. Have a stand alone alcohol policy that is readily available, updated on a regular basis, and reviewed with students during a freshman seminar class.
-

*Note: Although the recommended items are numbered this does not imply that are in any order of importance

Suggestions for Further Research

This analysis has led me to find a number of areas that need further research. Content of an institution's alcohol policy is a critical *first* step in decreasing underage drinking on campus; however, words on paper are nothing without proper distribution and enforcement of such policies. Further research should definitely include analysis of different ways to ensure that each and every student and parent read the written policy. Studies including analysis of the most significant way to get the message out

to the student body would be of value. Peer educators, theatrical presentations, literature and freshmen seminar classes are options currently being used to educate incoming freshmen on the use of alcohol on campus. Studies should be conducted to see if any one or more of these methods are more appropriate for lowering the incidence of underage drinking on campuses.

Further research should also include such issues regarding alcohol policies as implementation of such a policy, as well as enforcement of the policy and the judiciary process within each institution. Different alcohol policies, consequences for violating the policy, and policy enforcement should be compared to underage drinking rates of campuses to see what, if anything, can be correlated to play a significant role in reducing the use of alcohol on college campuses by underage drinkers. Future studies should also look at those students of the legal drinking age as they still participate in some college drinking rates.

Project Conclusion

This research project included a policy related literature review of the problem associated with underage drinking on campuses throughout the United States. Seventy-one institutional policies were analyzed for policy content and compared to a rubric developed from four best practice recommendations as well as 12 additional categories. The content of the policies was analyzed in relation to their status of party vs. nonparty schools as well as their institutional size, geographical location, athletic conference and type of institution.

Most importantly, this study revealed that although the policies from the ODAC athletic conference tend to include more policy elements within their

institutional policies, the majority of institutions in this study are not following the recommendations from national organizations that have set forth to fight underage drinking on campus. I encourage those national organizations to reexamine their recommendations and to work together to create a single list of recommended content items (perhaps using Table 28 as their core). I also encourage all higher educational institutions to reexamine their current policies and improve. Without comprehensive alcohol policies including key content areas, I question the value of current institutional policies to really impact the underage drinking crisis on university campuses.

REFERENCES

- Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem among college students. *Journal of the Studies of Alcohol, 14*, 118-128.
- Alcoholics Anonymous. 2008. Retrieved April 8, 2008, from http://www.alcoholics-anonymous.org/en_information_aa.cfm?PageID=2&SubPage=60.
- American College Health Association [ACHA]. *Mission & goals*. Retrieved June 25, 2006, from http://www.acha.org/about_acha/mission.cfm.
- American College Health Association [ACHA]. *Healthy campus 2010*. Retrieved June 25, 2006, from http://www.acha.org/info_resources/hc2010.cfm.
- American Medical Association. (1996). Sexual assault/rape statistics. Retrieved April, 2, 2008, from <http://www.gmu.edu/facstaff/sexual/>.
- Anderson, J. E. (1997). The study of public policy. *ASHE Reader: Public Policy and Higher Education*, 172-188.
- Anderson, D. S., & Milgram, G. G. (2001). *Promising practices: Campus alcohol strategies*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- Arizona State University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.west.asu.edu/publicaffairs/publicevents/alcoholpolicy.cfm>
- Barnett, N. P., & Read, J. P. (2005). Mandatory alcohol intervention for alcohol-abusing college students: A systematic review. *Journal of Substance Abuse and Treatment, 29*, 147-158.
- Baer, J. S. (2002). Student factors: Understanding individual variation in college drinking. *Journal of Alcohol Studies, 14*, 40-53.

Boston University. (n.d.). *University statement on illegal drugs and alcohol*.

Retrieved June 7, 2007, from www.bu.edu/lifebook/university-policies/policies-drugsalcohol.html

Boston University School of Public Health. (2008). *Join together*. Retrieved July 31, 2008, from www.jointogether.org.

Bridgewater College. (n.d.). *Alcoholic beverages*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from <http://www.bridgewater.edu/index.php?id=858>

Catholic University of America. (2000). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from <http://www.policies.cua.edu/studentlife/studentconduct/alcoholdrugs.cfm>

Chaloupka, F. J., & Wechsler, H. (1996). Binge drinking in college: The impact of price, availability, and alcohol control policies. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 14(4), 112-124.

Cooper, M. L. (2002). Alcohol use and risky sexual behavior among college students and youth: Evaluating the evidence. *Journal of the Studies of Alcohol*, 14, 101-117.

Cress, C. M. (2002). Campus climate. In A. M. Martinez Aleman & K. A. Renn (Eds.), *Women in higher education: An encyclopedia* (pp. 390-397). Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- DePauw University. (2005). *Student policy on the use of alcoholic beverages*. Retrieved June 15, 2007, from www.depauw.edu/student/safety/alcoholpolicy.asp
- Drug-Free schools and campuses act [DFSCA], and Drug-Free schools and campuses regulations. (April 24, 2006). Retrieved July 25, 2006, from <http://www.higheredcenter.org/dfsc/>.
- Dowdall, G. W., & Wechsler, H. (2002). Studying college alcohol use: Widening the lens, sharpening the focus. *Journal of Alcohol Studies*, 14, 14-22.
- Dunne, C., & Somerset, M. (2004). Health promotion in university: What do students want? *Health Education*, 104(6), 360-370.
- Eastern Mennonite University. (n.d.). *Alcohol, tobacco and illegal drug policy*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from <http://www.emu.edu/physicalplant/security/policy.html>
- Emory and Henry College. (n.d.). *2006-2007 student handbook*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from <http://www.ehc.edu/pdfs/studenthandbook07-08.pdf>
- Faden, V. B., & Baskin, M. L. (2002). An evaluation of college online alcohol-policy information. *Journal of American College Health*, 51(3), 101-107.
- Flynn, S. (2007, August 12). Should the drinking age be lowered? *Parade*, 4-5.
- Franek, R., Meltzer, T., Maier, C., Olson, E., Brown, C., Doherty, J., et al. (2006). *The best 361 colleges: The smart student's guide to colleges*. (2007 ed.). New York: The Princeton Review.

- Gose, B. (1995). Partying without alcohol. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 41(27), A31-A32.
- Giancola, P. R. (2002). Alcohol-related aggression during the college years: Theories, risk factors and policy implications. *Journal of the Studies on Alcohol*, 14, 129-139.
- Gustafson, D. H., Cats-Baril, W. L., & Alemi, F. (1992). *Systems to support health policy and analysis: Theory, models, and uses*. Ann Arbor, MI: Health Administration Press.
- Hartford, T. C., Wechsler, H., & Rohman, M. (1983). The structural context of college drinking. *Journal of the Studies on Alcohol*, 44, 722-732.
- Hatch, J. A. (2002). *Doing qualitative research in education settings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Healthy People 2010. October 2002. Retrieved from <http://www.healthypeople.gov/LHI/Resources.htm>.
- Hingson, R. W., Heeron, T., Zakocs, R. C., Kopstein, A., & Wechsler, H. (2002). Magnitude of alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among U.S. college students ages 18-24. *Journal of the Studies on Alcohol*, 63, 136-144.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Hurtado, S. Miem, J. F., Clayton-Pedersen, A. R., & Allen, W. R. (1998). Enhancing campus climates for racial/ethnic diversity: Educational policy and practice. *The Review of Higher Education*, 21(3), 279-302.

Indiana University. (n.d.). *Indiana university alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.indiana.edu/~sao/greek/resources/alcoholpolicy.htm>

Klein, H. (1989). Helping the college student problem drinker. *The Journal of College*

Student Development, 30, 323-331.

Knight, J. R., Harris, S. K., Sherritt, L., Kelley, K., VanHook, S., & Wechsler, H. (2003). Heavy drinking and alcohol policy enforcement in a statewide public college system. *Journal of the Studies of Alcohol*, 64, 696-703.

Krippendorff, K., (1980). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Leichliter, J. S., Meilman, P. W., Presley, C. A., & Cashin, J. R. (1998). Alcohol use and related consequences among students with varying levels of involvement in college athletics. *Journal of American College Health*, 46, 257-262.

Lipka, S. (2006). And this year's top 'party school is.... *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(102), 1-3.

Lo, C. C., & Globetti, G. (1993). A partial analysis of the campus influence on drinking behavior: Students who enter college as nondrinkers. *The Journal of Drug Issues*, 23, 715-725.

Louisiana State University. (2003). *Illegal or abusive use of alcohol or other drugs by students*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from

[http://www.appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/0/30F06B9F55E5A37D86256CD3007F0118/\\$File/PS75+R01.pdf](http://www.appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/0/30F06B9F55E5A37D86256CD3007F0118/$File/PS75+R01.pdf)

Loyola University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved June 15, 2007, from www.luc.edu/policy/

Mitchell, R. J., Toomey, T. L., & Erickson, D. (2005). Alcohol policies on college campuses. *Journal of American College Health, 53*(4), 149-157.

National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse at Columbia University (CASA). (2007). *Wasting the best and brightest: Substance abuse at America's colleges and universities*. Retrieved from www.casacolumbia.org 3/15/07.

National Collegiate Athletic Conference (NCAA). (2005). *Our mission*. Retrieved from <http://www.ncaa.org> 3/18/07.

National Institute of Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse (NIAAA). (2002). *Changing the culture of campus drinking*. Retrieved from <http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov> 6/20/06.

National Institute of Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse (NIAAA). (2006). *College drinking is a culture*. Retrieved from <http://www.collegedrinkingprevention.gov> 9/20/06.

National Vital Statistics Reports (NVSS). (2005). *Births: Final data for 2003, 54*(2), 1-116. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov>.

New York University. (n.d.). *New York University policies on substance abuse and alcoholic beverages 2006-2007*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from http://www.nyu.edu/shc/pdfs/policies_on_substance_abuse_and_alcohol.pdf

O'Hare, T. M. (1990). *Drinking in college: Consumption patterns, problems, sex*

differences and legal drinking age. *Journal of the Studies on Alcohol*, 51, 536-541.

Ohio State University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from http://www.studentaffairs.osu.edu/safety_crime_alcohol.asp - 56k

Parsons, W. (1995). *Public policy: An introduction to the theory and practice of policy analysis*. Northhampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Perkins, H. W. (2002). Surveying the damage: A review of research on consequences of alcohol misuse in college populations. *Journal of the Studies on Alcohol*, 14, 91-100.

Playboy's top ten party schools (2006, May). *Playboy*, 5, 109-115.

Presley, C. A., Meilman, P. W., & Leichter, J. S. (2002). College factors that influence drinking. *Journal of the Studies of Alcohol*, 14, 82-90.

Purdue University. (n.d.). *Purdue alcohol policy (untitled)*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.purdue.edu/policies>

Randolph-Macon. (n.d.). *Policy on alcohol*. Retrieved August 2, 2007 from <http://www.rmc.edu/current-students/handbook.pdf>

Rehm, J., Gmel, G., Sempos, C. T., & Trevisan M. (2002). Alcohol-Related morbidity and mortality. *Alcohol Research and Health*, 27(1), 39-42.

Reisberg, L. (1998). When a student drinks illegally, should colleges call mom and dad?

Chronicle of Higher Education, 45(15), A39-A40.

Rhodes, W. A., Singleton, E., McMillan, T. B., & Perrino, C. S. (2005). Does knowledge of college drinking policy influence student binge drinking?

Journal of American College Health, 54(1), 45-49.

Riley, J. B., Durbin, P. T., & D'Ariano, M. (2005). Under the influence: Taking alcohol

issues in to the college classroom. *Health Promotion and Practice*, 6(2), 202-206.

Roanoke College. (n.d.). *Student Handbook. Appendix F-Alcohol beverages and party policies*. Retrieved August 2, 2007 from

<http://www.roanoke.edu/reslife/rules.htm>

Rosenbluth, J., Nathan, P. E., & Lawson, D. M. (1978). Environmental influences on drinking by college students in a college pub: Behavioral observation in the natural environment. *Addicted Behaviors*, 3, 117-121.

Schwandt, T. A. (2001). *Dictionary of qualitative inquiry* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Seton Hall University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policies*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from

http://studentaffairs.shu.edu/handbook/pp_alcohol.html

Stanford University. (2006). *Controlled substances and alcohol*. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from http://adminguide.stanford.edu/23_6pdf

State University of New York as Albany. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy and enforcement guidelines for University at Albany officials*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 21, 2007, from www.albany.edu/judicial/alcohol.shtml

Sweet Briar College. (n.d.). *Drug policy*. Retrieved August 2, 2007, from www.ccl.sbc.edu/general/documents/handbook_2007_2008.pdf

Thomas, B. (1998, December 3). Drinking survey indicates change in campus climate.

University of Delaware Update: A University Community Newspaper.
Newark, DE: University of Delaware.

Tulane University. (n.d.). *Alcohol beverage policy, 2001-2002*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from www.tulane.edu/~stuafrs/policies_procedures/alcohol.html

University of Arizona. (2004). *Alcohol policy and regulations*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.policy.web.arizona.edu/Alcohol.pdf>

University of Arkansas. (n.d.). *University policies on alcohol and other drugs*. (n.d.). Retrieved August 2, 2007 from <http://pigtrail.uark.edu/catalogof studies/>

University of Auburn. (1990). *A drug-free campus and workplace policy for Auburn University and Auburn University at Montgomery*. Retrieve June 1, 2007, from http://humsci.auburn.edu/italy/files/alcohol_use_statement.pdf

University of California: Los Angeles. (1996). *UCLA student alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from www.deanofstudents.ucla.edu/Alcohol_Policy.pdf

University of Georgia. (n.d.). *UGA policy on alcohol and other drugs*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from www.uga.edu/drugpol/

University of Illinois. (n.d.). *Campus alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from www.uillinois.edu/about/policies.cfm

University of Iowa. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~vpss/policies>

University of Kentucky. (1999). *University of Kentucky alcohol policy (untitled)*.
 Retrieved June 1, 2007, from www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/Code/part4.html

University of Maine. (2002). *UMAINE Student Handbook. Policies*. Retrieved June 8,
 2007, from www.umaine.edu/handbook/

University of Maryland. (n.d.). *University of Maryland substance abuse policy*.
 Retrieved June 8, 2007, from www.resnet.umd.edu/policies/alcoholpolicy

University of Maryland-College Park. (n.d.). *Student alcohol and other drug policy
 and resource guide 2006-2007*. Retrieved June 22, 2007, from
www.resnet.umd.edu/policies/alcoholpolicy/

University of Massachusetts. (n.d.). *Alcohol and drug policies: What every student
 should know!* Retrieved June 22, 2007, from
<http://media.umassp.edu/massedu/policy/StudentAlcoholDartmouth.pdf>

University of Mississippi. (n.d.). *The University of Mississippi alcohol policy*.
 Retrieved June 1, 2007, from www.olemiss.edu/news2/alcohol/policy.html

University of New Hampshire. (2005). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved June 8, 2007, from
www.unh.edu/student-life/judprograms/resalcohol.htm

University of Oregon. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy at the University of Oregon*. Retrieved
 April 1, 2007, from
http://www.housing.uoregon.edu/reshalls/alcohol_drugs.php

- University of South Carolina. (2007). *University policy and guidelines on the use of alcohol by students*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from www.sc.edu/policies/staf/staf302.doc
- University of the South. (n.d.). *Alcohol and drugs*. Retrieved June 22, 2007, from www2.sewanee.edu/studentlife/alcoholpolicy.pdf
- University of Wisconsin. (n.d.). *University housing policies*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from www.vc.wisc.edu/AlcoholPolicy.html
- Upcraft, M. L., & Schuh, J. H. (1996). *Assessment in student affairs: A practical guide for practitioners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Vanderbilt University. (n.d.). *Vanderbilt University alcohol policy (untitled)*. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/alcohol/>
- Washington and Lee University. (n.d.). *Substance abuse policy*. Retrieved August 2, 2007, from <http://www.registrar.wlu.edu/handbook/95-96/ualcohol.html>
- Washington State University. (n.d.). *Alcohol and drug policy*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from <http://www.studentaffairs.wsu.edu/parents/handbook/alcoholPolicies.asp>
- Weber, (1990). *Basic content analysis: Quantitative application to the social sciences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wechsler, H. (1996). Alcohol and the American college campus. *Change*, 28(4), 20-25.
- Wechsler, H., Davenport, A., Dowdall, G., Grossman, S., & Zanakos, S. (1997). Binge drinking, tobacco, and illicit drug use and involvement in college athletics. *Journal of American College Health*, 45, 195-200.

- Wechsler, H., Dowdall, G. W., Davenport, A., & DeJong, W. (2002). *Binge drinking on campus: Results of a national study*. The higher education center for alcohol and other drug prevention, [Bulletin Series: Alcohol and other drug prevention], 1-8.
- Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Gledhill-Hoyt, J., & Nelson, T. F. (2001). Alcohol use and problems at colleges banning alcohol: Results of a national survey. *Journal of Alcohol Studies*, 62, 133-141.
- Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Kuo, M., & Lee, H. (2000). College binge drinking in the 1990's: A continuing problem. College Alcohol Studies Report. *Journal of American College Health*.48(10), 199-210.
- Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Kuo, M., Seibring, M., Nelson, T. F., & Lee, H. (2002). Trends in college binge drinking during a period of increased prevention efforts. *Journal of American College of Health*, 50, 203-217.
- Wechsler, H., & Wuethrich, B. (2002). *Dying to drink: Confronting binge drinking on college campuses*. New York: Rodale Inc.
- Werner, M. J., & Greene, J. W. (1992). Problem drinking among college freshmen. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, 13, 487-492.
- West Virginia University. (2006). *WVU student handbook-code of student's right and responsibilities*. Retrieved June 22, 2007, from http://studentaffairs.wvu.edu/alcohol_policies

- Williams, J., Chaloupka, F. J., & Wechsler, H. (2005). Are there differential effects of price and policy on college students' drinking intensity? *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 23(1), 78-90.
- Wolaver, A. M. (2002). Effects of heavy drinking in college on study effort, grade point average, and major choice. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 20(4), 415-428.

Appendix A
The 27 Rubric Categories

The 27 Rubric Categories Examined

<i>Extracted from National Recommendations</i>	NIAAA	HEC	AASCU	AMA
1. Enforce local ordinances				X
2. Enforce the minimum drinking age law with firmness and consistency	X	X		
3. Limit student access to alcohol		X		
4. Limit alcohol advertising and marketing				X
5. Establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related behavior			X	
6. Eliminate keg parties	X			
7. Update policies annually				X
8. Establish alcohol free dorms	X			
9. Eliminate alcohol at sports events	X			
10. Ban alcohol on campus	X			
11. Establish a zero tolerance for alcohol related violence	X	X		
12. Prohibit tailgating	X			
13. Refuse sponsorship from the alcohol industry	X			X
14. Reinstate Friday classes and exams to reduce Thursday night partying	X			
15. Offer Saturday morning classes	X			

Additional Rubric Categories

1. Alcohol vs. Drug/Alcohol policy
2. State campus-based consequences
3. State local-based consequences
4. State state-based consequences
5. State federal-based consequences
6. Assess health risks
7. List availability of resources
8. Distinguish between drinking on campus and in the residence halls
9. Require parental notification
10. Offer preventative measures
11. Eliminate drinking paraphernalia
12. Eliminate drinking games

Note: NIAAA stands for National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. HEC stands for Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention. AASCU stands for American Association of State Colleges and Universities. AMA stand for the American Medical Association.

Appendix B
University Policy Sources

Policy References

- Alabama State University. (2006). *Official Student Handbook of Alabama State University*. Retrieved August 2, 2007, from www.alasu.edu/studentaffairs/applications/documentlibrary/The%20Pilot.pdf
- Arizona State University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.west.asu.edu/publicaffairs/publicevents/alcoholpolicy.cfm>
- Auburn University. (2007). *University alcohol policy*. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from www.auburn.edu/public_html/policies
- Berkeley. (n.d.). *General residential hall conduct policies*. Retrieved November 3, 2006, from http://www.housing.berkeley.edu/student/res_conduct.html
- Binghamton. (n.d.). *Alcohol and other drugs*. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from <http://www.smartchoices.binghamton.edu/SUNY/policy.html>
- Boston University. (n.d.). *University statement on illegal drugs and alcohol*. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from www.bu.edu/lifebook/university-policies/policies-drugsalcohol.html
- Bridgewater College. (n.d.). *Alcoholic beverages*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from <http://www.bridgewater.edu/index.php?id=858>
- Catholic University of America. (2000). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from <http://www.policies.cua.edu/studentlife/studentconduct/alcoholdrugs.cfm>
- Clemson University. (n.d.). *Philosophical statement on alcohol at Clemson University*. Retrieved Jun 8, 2007 from, www.clemson.edu/studentaffairs/studenthandbook/alcohol-drug.php

DePauw University. (2005). *Student policy on the use of alcoholic beverages.*

Retrieved June 15, 2007, from

www.depauw.edu/student/safety/alcoholpolicy.asp

Eastern Mennonite University. (n.d.). *Alcohol, tobacco and illegal drug policy.*

Retrieved August 1, 2007, from

<http://www.emu.edu/physicalplant/security/policy.html>

Emory and Henry College. (n.d.). *2006-2007 student handbook.* Retrieved August 1,

2007, from <http://www.ehc.edu/pdfs/studenthandbook07-08.pdf>

Florida State University. (n.d.). *Campus alcohol policy.* Retrieved June 15, 2007,

from www.tshc.fsu.edu/par/documents/FSUALcoholPolicy.pdf

Guilford College. (n.d.). *Campus policies and conduct standards.* Retrieved August 1,

2007 from http://www.guilford.edu/about_guilford/values/handbook/

Hampden-Sydney. (n.d.). *The Student Justice System. Appendix I: College alcohol*

policy. Retrieved August 1, 2007 from

<http://www2.hsc.edu/security/alcdrug.html>

Indiana University. (n.d.). *Indiana university alcohol policy.* Retrieved April 8, 2007,

from <http://www.indiana.edu/~sao/greek/resources/alcoholpolicy.htm>

Lehigh University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy.* Retrieved June 15, 2007, from

http://www.lehigh.edu/~insch/assets/pdf/handbook_07_08.pdf

Louisiana State University. (2003). *Illegal or abusive use of alcohol or other drugs by students.* Retrieved June 1, 2007, from

[http://www.appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/0/30F06B9F55E5A37D86256CD3007F0118/\\$File/PS75+R01.pdf](http://www.appl003.ocs.lsu.edu/ups.nsf/0/30F06B9F55E5A37D86256CD3007F0118/$File/PS75+R01.pdf)

- Loyola University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved June 15, 2007, from www.luc.edu/policy/
- Michigan State University. (n.d.). *Drugs and alcohol*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from www.hr.msu.edu/HRsite/Documents/Staff/Policies/MSU+Drug+and+Alcohol+Policy.htm
- Mississippi State University. (2006). *Student affairs OP 91.119: Sanctions for alcohol offenses*. Retrieved June 1, from <http://www.msstate.edu/dept/audit/91119.html>
- New York University. (n.d.). *New York University policies on substance abuse and alcoholic beverages 2006-2007*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from http://www.nyu.edu/shc/pdfs/policies_on_substance_abuse_and_alcohol.pdf
- Northwestern University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy for students*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.norris.northwestern.edu/org-policies.php>
- Ohio State University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from http://www.studentaffairs.osu.edu/safety_crime_alcohol.asp - 56k
- Ohio University. (2007). *Current Policy*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from <http://www.ohiou.edu/policy/24-001.html>
- Oregon State University. (n.d.). *Oregon State University alcohol policy (untitled)*. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from <http://oregonstate.edu/admin/stucon/oars.htm>
- Penn State University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.sl.psu.edu/Information/Safety/26027.htm>
- Purdue University. (n.d.). *Purdue alcohol policy (untitled)*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.purdue.edu/policies>

- Randolph-Macon. (n.d.). *Policy on alcohol*. Retrieved August 2, 2007 from
<http://www.rmc.edu/current-students/handbook.pdf>
- Roanoke College. (n.d.). *Student Handbook. Appendix F-Alcohol beverages and party policies*. Retrieved August 2, 2007 from
<http://www.roanoke.edu/reslife/rules.htm>
- Saint Bonaventure University. (n.d.). *Drug and alcohol policy*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from <http://www.sbu.edu/campus-life.aspx?id=4852&terms=drug+and+alcohol+policy>
- Seton Hall University. (n.d.). *Alcohol policies*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from
http://studentaffairs.shu.edu/handbook/pp_alcohol.html
- Stanford University. (2006). *Controlled substances and alcohol*. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from http://adminguide.stanford.edu/23_6pdf
- State University of New York at Albany. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy and enforcement guidelines for University at Albany officials*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 21, 2007, from www.albany.edu/judicial/alcohol.shtml
- State University of New York at Stony Brook. (2006). *State University of New York at Stony Brook alcoholic beverages on state property policies and procedures*. Retrieved June 8, 2007, from
http://studentaffairs.stonybrook.edu/departments/jud/docs/Alcohol_Policy.pdf
- Sweet Briar College. (n.d.). *Drug policy*. Retrieved August 2, 2007, from
www.ccl.sbc.edu/general/documents/handbook_2007_2008.pdf
- Tulane University. (n.d.). *Alcohol beverage policy, 2001-2002*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from www.tulane.edu/~stuaffirs/policies_procedures/alcohol.html

University of Alabama. (n.d.). *Social alcohol policy*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from www.sa.ua.edu/campusactivities/Alcohol.html

University of Arizona. (2004). *Alcohol policy and regulations*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.policy.web.arizona.edu/Alcohol.pdf>

University of Arkansas. (n.d.). *University policies on alcohol and other drugs*. (n.d.). Retrieved August 2, 2007 from <http://pigtrail.uark.edu/catalogof studies/>

University of Auburn. (1990). *A drug-free campus and workplace policy for Auburn University and Auburn University at Montgomery*. Retrieve June 1, 2007, from http://humsci.auburn.edu/italy/files/alcohol_use_statement.pdf

University of California: Los Angeles. (1996). *UCLA student alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from www.deanofstudents.ucla.edu/Alcohol_Policy.pdf

University of Colorado. (n.d.). *Alcohol and drug policies*. Retrieved June 21, 2007, from <http://www.colorado.edu/alcohol/>

University of Florida. (2004). *University of Florida alcohol policy 6C1-2.019*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.generalcounsel.ufl.edu/policies.htm>

University of Georgia. (n.d.). *UGA policy on alcohol and other drugs*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from www.uga.edu/drugpol/

University of Hartford. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from www.hartford.edu/thesource

University of Illinois. (n.d.). *Campus alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from www.uillinois.edu/about/policies.cfm

University of Iowa. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.uiowa.edu/~vpss/policies>

University of Kentucky. (1999). *University of Kentucky alcohol policy (untitled)*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from www.uky.edu/StudentAffairs/Code/part4.html

University of Maine. (2002). *UMAINE Student Handbook. Policies*. Retrieved June 8, 2007, from www.umaine.edu/handbook/

University of Maryland. (n.d.). *University of Maryland substance abuse policy*. Retrieved June 8, 2007, from www.resnet.umd.edu/policies/alcoholpolicy

University of Maryland-College Park. (n.d.). *Student alcohol and other drug policy and resource guide 2006-2007*. Retrieved June 22, 2007, from www.resnet.umd.edu/policies/alcoholpolicy/

University of Massachusetts. (n.d.). *Alcohol and drug policies: What every student should know!* Retrieved June 22, 2007, from <http://media.umassp.edu/massedu/policy/StudentAlcoholDartmouth.pdf>

University of Michigan. (n.d.). *UM alcohol and other drugs policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from www.studentpolicies.dsa.umich.edu/studentalcoholdrug.htm

University of Minnesota. (n.d.). *UMD drugs and alcohol policy*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from <http://www.duluth.umn.edu/assl/conduct/proced/drugumd.html>

University of Mississippi. (n.d.). *The University of Mississippi alcohol policy*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from www.olemiss.edu/news2/alcohol/policy.html

University of New Hampshire. (2005). *Alcohol policy*. Retrieved June 8, 2007, from www.unh.edu/student-life/judprograms/resalcohol.htm

University of Oregon. (n.d.). *Alcohol policy at the University of Oregon*. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from http://www.housing.uoregon.edu/reshalls/alcohol_drugs.php

University of South Carolina. (2007). *University policy and guidelines on the use of alcohol by students*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from www.sc.edu/policies/staf/staf302.doc

University of Southern California. (n.d.). *Alcohol and other drugs*. Retrieved April 1, 2007, from <http://web-app.usc.edu/scam-on-alcohol-and-other-drugs/>

University of Tennessee. (n.d.). *Alcohol on campus*. Retrieved June 1, 2007, from <http://www.utc.edu/Administration/DepartmentOfPublicSafety/alcohol.php>

University of Texas. (n.d.). *Standards of conduct*. Retrieved June 22, 2007, from www.utexas.edu/student/vpsa/security/drugfree07.pdf

University of the South. (n.d.). *Alcohol and drugs*. Retrieved June 22, 2007, from www2.sewanee.edu/studentlife/alcoholpolicy.pdf

University of Vermont. (2006). *Student alcohol and other drug*. Retrieved June 8, 2007, from www.uvm.edu/~uvmppg/ppg/student/drugandalco.pdf

University of Washington. (2007). *Alcohol and drug abuse policy*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from www.washington.edu/admin/rules/APS/13.07.html

University of Wisconsin. (n.d.). *University housing policies*. Retrieved April 8, 2007, from www.vc.wisc.edu/AlcoholPolicy.html

Vanderbilt University. (n.d.). *Vanderbilt University alcohol policy (untitled)*. Retrieved June 7, 2007, from <http://www.vanderbilt.edu/alcohol/>

Virginia Wesleyan College. (n.d.). *Virginia Wesleyan statement and policy on alcohol and other drugs*. Retrieved August 2, 2007, from

www.vwc.edu/security/policies.php

Washington and Lee University. (n.d.). *Substance abuse policy*. Retrieved August 2, 2007, from <http://www.registrar.wlu.edu/handbook/95-96/ualcohol.html>

Washington State University. (n.d.). *Alcohol and drug policy*. Retrieved August 1, 2007, from

<http://www.studentaffairs.wsu.edu/parents/handbook/alcoholPolicies.asp>

West Virginia University. (2006). *WVU student handbook-code of student's right and responsibilities*. Retrieved June 22, 2007, from

http://studentaffairs.wvu.edu/alcohol_policies

Appendix C
Institutional Demographic Data

Institutional Demographic Data

Institutions	Athletic Conference Region	Institutional Under- graduate Size	Party status (# years)	Private/ Public
Albany State University	American East	3927	0	Public
Binghamton	American East	11174	0	Public
Boston University	American East	15981	0	Public
Hartford	American East	4545	0	Private
SUNY-Stony Brook	American East	22527	0	Public
University of Maine	American East	8972	0	Public
Univ. of MD- Baltimore County	American East	9668	0	Public
University of New Hampshire	American East	13544	2	Public
University of Vermont	American East	9040	1	Public
Bridgewater College	ODAC	1515	0	Private
Catholic University of America	ODAC	2587	0	Private
Eastern Mennonite University	ODAC	998	0	Private
Emory and Henry College	ODAC	1000	0	Private
Guilford College	ODAC	2682	0	Private
Hampden-Sydney College	ODAC	1082	0	Private
Randolph-Macon College	ODAC	1146	1	Private
Roanoke College	ODAC	1970	0	Private
Sweet Briar College	ODAC	735	0	Private
Virginia Wesleyan College	ODAC	1446	0	Private
Washington and Lee University	ODAC	1755	2	Private
Arizona State University	PAC-10	48955	0	Public
Oregon State University	PAC-10	15829	0	Public
Stanford	PAC-10	6689	0	Private
University of Arizona	PAC-10	28442	1	Public
Univ. of CA-Los Angeles	PAC-10	25432	0	Public
Univ. of CA-Santa Barbara	PAC-10	17726	4	Public
University of Oregon	PAC-10	16475	1	Public
University of Southern California	PAC-10	16729	0	Public
University of Washington	PAC-10	30790	0	Public
Washington State University	PAC-10	20000	0	Public
Auburn University	SEC	19780	0	Public
Louisiana State University	SEC	28423	4	Public
Mississippi State University	SEC	12630	0	Public
University of Alabama-Tuscaloosa	SEC	17550	1	Public
University of Arkansas	SEC	14353	0	Public
University of Florida	SEC	34612	4	Public
University of Georgia	SEC	24243	4	Public
University of Kentucky	SEC	19292	0	Public
University of Mississippi	SEC	16300	4	Public
University of South Carolina	SEC	18648	0	Public

University of Tennessee-Knoxville	SEC	34539	3	Public
-----------------------------------	-----	-------	---	--------

Institutional Demographic Data-Continued

Institutions	Athletic Conference Region	Institutional Under- graduate Size	Party status (# years)	Private/ Public
Vanderbilt University	SEC	6378	0	Private
Indiana University- Bloomington	Big 10	29828	4	Public
Iowa State University	Big 10	22000	0	Public
Michigan State University	Big 10	35821	0	Public
Northwestern	Big 10	7826	0	Private
Ohio State University	Big 10	38479	0	Public
Penn State University	Big 10	36612	4	Public
Purdue University	Big 10	30779	0	Public
Univ. of IL-Urbana-Champaign	Big 10	31472	1	Public
University of Iowa	Big 10	20738	2	Public
University of Michigan	Big 10	25555	1	Public
University of Minnesota	Big 10	28740	0	Public
University of Wisconsin-Madison	Big 10	28462	4	Public
Clemson University	Remaining party	14172	1	Public
DePauw University	Remaining party	2350	1	Private
Florida State University	Remaining party	31058	1	Public
Lehigh University	Remaining party	4679	2	Private
Loyola University-New Orleans	Remaining party	3000	1	Public
New York University	Remaining party	20965	1	Private
Ohio University-Athens	Remaining party	28804	3	Public
Saint Bonaventure University	Remaining party	1900	1	Private
Seton Hall University	Remaining party	5200	1	Private
SUNY-Albany	Remaining party	12013	4	Public
The University of Texas-Austin	Remaining party	36878	4	Public
The University of the South	Remaining party	1383	1	Private
Tulane University	Remaining party	6533	1	Private
University of Colorado-Boulder	Remaining party	24000	1	Public
Univ. of MD-College Park	Remaining party	25154	2	Public
Univ. of MA-Amherst	Remaining party	19934	3	Public
West Virginia University	Remaining party	20595	2	Public

Appendix D
Summary Rubric Categories Broken Down by Institution

Summary Rubric Categories Broken Down by Institution

	Best Practice Recommendation	Additional Rubric Categories	Total
BIG 10			
<i>Non-party</i>			
Iowa State University	4	5	9
Michigan State University	3	1	4
University of Minnesota	3	1	4
Northwestern	4	5	9
Ohio State University	3	4	7
Purdue University	3	2	5
<i>Party 1-2 Years</i>			
University of Iowa	2	5	7
Univ. of IL-Urbana-Champaign	3	1	4
University of Michigan	4	3	7
<i>Party 3-4 Years</i>			
IN Univ.-Bloomington	3	4	7
Penn State University	3	1	4
University of WI-Madison	4	6	10
AMERICAN EAST			
<i>Non-party</i>			
Albany State University	3	6	9
Binghamton	4	0	4
Boston University	3	7	10
Hartford	4	6	10
University of Maine	4	5	9
Univ. of MD-Baltimore County	3	7	10
SUNY-Stony Brook	4	1	5
<i>Party 1-2 Years</i>			
University of NH	4	1	5
University of Vermont	4	5	9
<i>Party 3-4 years</i>			
None			
SOUTHEASTERN CONFERENCE			
<i>Non-party</i>			
University of Arkansas	6	4	10
Auburn University	4	2	6
University of Kentucky	5	1	6
Mississippi State University	3	3	6
University of South Carolina	3	3	6
Vanderbilt University	3	3	6
Univ. of AA-Tuscaloosa	3	1	4
<i>Party 3-4 Years</i>			
University of Mississippi	3	3	6

Summary Rubric Categories Broken Down by Institution-Continued

	Best Practice Recommendation	Additional Rubric Categories	Total
Louisiana State University	3	8	11
University of Florida	4	7	11
University of Georgia	3	7	10
Univ. of TN-Knoxville	3	1	4
PACIFIC ATHLETIC CONFERENCE			
<i>Non-party</i>			
Arizona State University	2	4	6
Oregon State University	4	1	5
Stanford	2	6	8
UCLA	4	6	10
USC	3	6	9
University of Washington	2	6	8
Washington State University	4	5	9
<i>Party 1-2 Years</i>			
University of Arizona	4	5	9
University of Oregon	3	3	6
<i>Party 3-4 Years</i>			
Univ. of CA-Santa Barbara	5	2	7
OLD DOMINION ATHLETIC CONFERENCE			
<i>Non-party</i>			
Bridgewater College	6	3	9
Catholic Univ. of America	3	4	7
Eastern Mennonite Univ.	10	1	11
Emory and Henry College	8	2	10
Guilford College	6	1	7
Hampden-Sydney College	2	2	4
Roanoke College	3	2	5
Sweet Briar College	4	3	7
Virginia Wesleyan College	4	7	11
<i>Party 1-2 Years</i>			
Randolph-Macon College	5	7	12
Washington and Lee Univ.	5	3	8
<i>Party 3-4 years</i>			
None			

Appendix E
Rubric Categories as Broken Down by Institution

Appendix E
Rubric Categories as Broken Down by Institution

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	Grand Total
BIG 10														
<i>Non-party</i>														
Iowa State University	X		X		X		X		X		X		4	5
Michigan State Univ.	X		X		X								3	1
University of MN-	X		X		X								3	1
Northwestern	X	X	X		X					X			4	5
Ohio State University	X				X		X						3	4
Purdue University	X		X		X				X				3	2
<i>Party 1-2 Years</i>														
University of Iowa	X		X										2	5
Univ. of IL-Urbana-Champaign	X		X		X								3	1
University of Michigan	X		X		X						X		4	3
<i>Party 3-4 Years</i>														
IN Univ.-Bloomington	X		X		X								3	4
Penn State University	X		X		X								3	1
Univ. of WI-Madison	X		X		X								4	6
AMERICAN EAST														
<i>Non-party</i>														
Albany State University	X			X		X							3	6
Binghamton	X			X		X							4	0
Boston University	X			X		X							3	7
Hartford	X			X		X							4	6
University of Maine	X	X		X		X							4	5
Univ. of MD-Baltimore County	X		X	X		X							3	7
SUNY-Stony Brook	X	X	X	X		X							4	1
<i>Party 1-2 Years</i>														
University of NH	X		X	X		X							4	1
University of Vermont	X	X	X	X		X							4	5
<i>Party 3-4 years</i>														

Appendix E
Rubric Categories as Broken Down by Institution

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	Grand Total
None														
SOUTHEASTERN CONFERENCE														
<i>Non-party</i>														
University of Arkansas	X	X	X	X			X		X	X			4	10
Auburn University	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		X			2	6
University of Kentucky	X	X	X	X	X	X							1	6
Mississippi State Univ.	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	3	6
University of SC	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	3	6
Vanderbilt University	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	3	6
<i>Party 1-2 Years</i>														
Univ. of AL-Tuscaloosa	X	X	X		X	X				X			1	4
<i>Party 3-4 Years</i>														
University of Mississippi	X	X	X	X	X	X			X				3	6
Louisiana State Univ.	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X	8	11
University of Florida	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			7	11
University of Georgia	X	X	X	X	X	X			X	X			7	10
Univ. of TN-Knoxville	X	X	X	X	X	X				X			1	4
PACIFIC ATHLETIC CONFERENCE														
<i>Non-party</i>														
Arizona State University	X				X	X			X				4	6
Oregon State University	X		X		X	X			X				1	5
Stanford	X				X	X			X	X			6	8
UCLA	X	X	X	X	X	X			X				6	10
USC	X	X	X	X	X	X				X	X		6	9
University of WA	X				X	X			X	X			6	8
Washington State Univ.	X	X	X	X	X	X					X		5	9
<i>Party 1-2 Years</i>														
University of Arizona	X	X	X	X	X	X							5	9

Appendix E
Rubric Categories as Broken Down by Institution

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total	Grand Total
University of Oregon			X	X		X							3			X	X				X					3	6
Party 3-4 Years																											
Univ. of CA-Santa Barbara	X	X	X	X		X						X	5							X		X				2	7
OLD DOMINION ATHLETIC CONFERENCE																											
Non-party																											
Bridgewater College	X	X	X	X		X		X					6								X	X				3	9
Catholic Univ. of America		X	X	X		X							3								X	X				4	7
Eastern Mennonite Univ.	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	X	X	10										X			1	11
Emory and Henry Coll.	X		X	X			X	X		X	X		8							X				X		2	10
Guilford College	X	X	X	X		X	X					X	6							X	X					1	7
Hampden-Sydney Coll.		X				X							2						X		X					2	4
Roanoke College		X	X	X		X							3						X				X			2	5
Sweet Briar College	X	X	X	X		X							4					X	X		X	X	X			3	7
Virginia Wesleyan Coll.	X	X	X	X		X					X		4			X	X	X	X		X	X		X		7	11
Party 1-2 Years																											
Randolph-Macon Coll.	X	X	X	X		X					X		5		X	X	X	X		X						7	12
Washington and Lee University	X	X	X	X		X							5								X		X			3	8
Party 3-4 years																											
None																											
Total	19	41	19	38	13	39	5	4	0	3	6	5	0	5		4	22	25	24	28	9	32	16	18	8	7	