

TOWARD AN EMPIRICAL DELINEATION OF A NORMATIVE STRUCTURE FOR
COLLEGE STUDENT DRINKING BEHAVIORS

LAUREL RAIMONDO MARTIN

Dissertation under the direction of Professor John M. Braxton

This exploratory study was designed to identify a normative pattern among college students with regard to drinking and drinking related behaviors. Further, this study examines how support for the normative structure varies across personal characteristics, sub group affiliations and among different levels of alcohol consumption. This study analyzed data collected using the College Student Alcohol Behaviors Inventory which asked students to indicate how they believe most students and their closest friends at their institution would define behaviors on a scale that ranges from highly appropriate to highly inappropriate. A normative structure was identified which contains behaviors that met the criteria for inviolable, admonitory and laudatory norms (Braxton and Bayer, 1999). Personal characteristics, sub group affiliations and individual drinking behaviors did influence the level of support for the normative structure among students. In addition to corroborating a previous study that showed a normative structure among college students, this exploratory study adds to the research on normative structures within college drinking and alcohol related behaviors and demonstrates that future research is warranted.

Approved _____ Date _____

TOWARD AN EMPIRICAL DELINEATION OF A NORMATIVE STRUCTURE
FOR COLLEGE STUDENT DRINKING BEHAVIORS

By

LAUREL RAIMONDO MARTIN

Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate School of Vanderbilt University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Leadership and Policy Studies

May, 2006

Nashville, Tennessee

Approved:

Professor John M. Braxton

Professor Michael McLendon

Professor James Hearn

Professor Timothy Caboni

Professor Gary Jensen

Vice President James Conneely

Copyright © 2006 by Laurel Raimondo Martin
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is a wonderful opportunity to be able to thank those around me for the gifts they have given. Throughout my time as a graduate student, there have been many people who have helped me along the way. This could not have been done without them and I am eternally grateful for their generous and helpful role each has played in this experience.

To my parents who watched me struggle to find my way as an undergraduate, thank you for the love and support you have shared with me as I learned to be the student I would become. Dad, you have always been my cheerleader and I am appreciative of the many times you provided encouragement. Mom, you have always been my source of strength when I was not sure how to pull myself up by my bootstraps. To my sister, Christa, for always being someone I could look up to and admire. Gommy, it will be fun to return to your hometown for graduation. You are always so quick to tell your grandchildren how proud of us you are and I will never outgrow the delight those words bring. To Dickey and Patsy, I am so lucky to be a part of your family. Your excitement has made the final part of this journey a wonderful experience. And then there is your son.... My husband, Greg. I had always thought that I would not be able to complete a dissertation while being married but this paper was started and completed since I was lucky enough to marry you. I can not find the words to thank you for all that your love has meant to me but hope that you understand how much joy and happiness you have brought into my life. I am so glad that you were a part of this journey. The love of my family has made this possible, as with all things I do, possible and I hope that I have made you all proud.

To my friend and fellow tadpole, Pat Helland, I owe much gratitude. It is hard to believe how much has happened in our lives since we first met. It has been fun to share it all with you and I will always appreciate your help along the way.

Accepting a position at the University of Kentucky College of Education placed me in the ideal spot to complete my dissertation. Faculty members such as John Thelin, Ralph Crystal, Beth Goldstein, Trisha Browne-Ferrigno, and Bill Stilwell made me feel welcome and have provided me with support, friendship and a sense of belonging that makes this a wonderful place to work. A special debt of gratitude is owed to Jennifer Cravens who provided a statistical support and sounding board right next door and to Cheryl Eaton who welcomed me into her study group and Chris Mueller who provided invaluable support and guidance. As promised, I must thank Lindsey Clem, the Comma Queen, for her sense of humor, her attention to detail, and most importantly, her friendship.

To my chair, John Braxton, and the other members of my committee, thank you for helping me to engage in a research project that I can be proud of and for providing me with a vein of research that I can pursue in the future. I am grateful that you all accepted the invitation to be a part of my committee. A special thank you is extended to Dr. James Conneely for sharing your campus and your insight with me. Your contributions to this process have been among those for which I am most grateful.

The decision to return to school provided an opportunity to met Trey Monroe. We covered a lot of territory between classes and I am a better person because of our

time together. Thank you for your ability to listen and provide counsel. The most significant things I learned about myself were learned in your office. Thank you.

And last, but not least, I am sure that I have forgotten someone who has helped me along this journey through their wisdom, encouragement or even just a smile. I could not have done this without your help and I am sincerely grateful for all you have given.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	ix
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Drinking in College.....	1
Conceptual Framework	5
Peer Socialization.....	5
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	9
Historical Perspective on Alcohol Problems	9
The Three National Databases	9
Normative Confusion.....	10
Injunctive and Subjective Norms.....	12
Norm Espousal Across Personal Characteristics and Sub Group Affiliations	13
Gender.....	14
Race and Ethnicity	14
Class Standing.....	15
Cumulative GPA.....	15
Age.....	15
Marital Status	16
Parents' Educational Level	16
College of Enrollment.....	16
On or Off Campus Housing	17
Greek Membership.....	17
Resident Assistant.....	17
Attend Church or Worship Regularly	18
Varsity Athletics	18
Student Leader	18
Motivation for Attending College.....	19
The Influence of Individual Drinking Behaviors.....	19
Drink to Get Drunk	20
Consumed Alcohol in Past Year	20
Times Drunk in Past Year.....	21
Times Drink in Past Year.....	21

III. RESEARCH DESIGN	22
Subjects for Research.....	22
Data Collection	23
Demographics and Sub Group Affiliations.....	24
Survey Design.....	28
Statistical Procedure.....	30
Coding of Demographic Variables	31
Coding of Alcohol Related Behaviors	32
IV. RESULTS	33
Findings.....	34
Inviolable Norms	34
Endangering Others	35
Physical Assault.....	35
Admonitory Norms	36
Harmful Aggression.....	37
Personal Disregard.....	37
Lauditory Norms.....	39
Protective Intervention.....	39
Seeking Assistance.....	40
Norm Espousal Across Personal Characteristics and Sub Group Affiliations	42
Parents' Educational Level	52
Student Leaders.....	53
Cumulative GPA.....	54
Norm Espousal Across Individual Drinking Behaviors.....	57
Drink to Get Drunk	57
Times Drunk in Past Year.....	58
Times Drink in Past Year.....	61
Consumed Alcohol in Past Year	63
V. CONCLUSIONS.....	65
Limitations	65
Summary of Findings.....	67
Implications for Future Research.....	70
Injunctive Norms	70
Parental Influence	72
Abstainers and Low Risk Drinkers	74
Implications for Practice and Policy	75

Appendix

A. COVER LETTER FOR CSABI TO SELECTED STUDENTS	78
B. COVER LETTER FOR CSABI SECOND WAVE MAILING	80
C. COLLEGE STUDENT ALCOHOL BEHAVIORS INVENTORY	82
REFERENCES	114

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Descriptive Statistics of Institution and Sample	26
2.	Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of Two Inviolable Proscriptive Norms.....	36
3.	Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of Two Admonitory Proscriptive Norms ..	38
4.	Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of Two Laudatory Prescriptive Norms	41
5.	Reliability Values for Six Composite Variables.....	42
6.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Gender.....	43
7.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Housing.....	44
8.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Collegiate Athletics.....	44
9.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Resident Assistant.....	45
10.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Race and Ethnicity	45
11.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Marital Status	46
12.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Motivation for Attending College.....	47
13.	Analysis of Variance of the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Religious Activity and Affiliation	48
14.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Greek Membership.....	48
15.	Analysis of Variance of the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Class Standing.....	49

16.	Analysis of Variance of the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: College of Enrollment.....	50
17.	Analysis of Variance of the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Age.....	51
18.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Parents' Education Level	53
19.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Student Leader	54
20.	Analysis of Variance of the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Cumulative GPA.....	56
21.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Drink to Get Drunk	58
22.	Analysis of Variance of the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Times Drunk in Past Thirty Days	60
23.	Analysis of Variance of the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Times Drink in Past Thirty Days	62
24.	Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristics: Consumed Alcohol in Past Year	63
25.	Correlations and Descriptive Statistics	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Drinking in College

Binge drinking on college campuses has been a frequent topic in the media since the term was coined by Wechsler in 1994. Since that time, data from the three national studies that examine collegiate drinking have reiterated that binge drinking is a significant problem on college and university campuses (Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Moeykens & Castillo, 1994; Presley, Meilman, Leichliter & Harrold, 1999; Johnston, O'Mailey & Bachman, 2003). In 1997, in an *Open Letter to the Presidents and Chancellors of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges*, the Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities warned that “if there is a more unhealthy factor on campus today than excessive consumption of alcohol, we cannot identify it” (p. 28). Despite the resources that institutions have dedicated to examining the quantity and frequency of collegiate alcohol consumption and providing education or policies which limit dangerous behaviors, several studies document that the rates of drinking have remained fairly consistent over the past ten years. “In 2001, approximately two in five (44.4%) college students reported binge drinking, a rate almost identical to rates in the previous three studies” conducted in 1993, 1997, 1999 (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, Seibring, Nelson, & Lee, 2002).

All three national surveys that examine collegiate alcohol use have found that excessive alcohol consumption contributes to interpersonal problems, poor academic

performance and poor retention rates among college students (Wechsler et al., 1994; Presley et al., 1999; Johnston et al., 2003). Further, all three surveys reported that binge drinking can result in other problems for the drinker such as vandalism, fights, driving a car while under the influence, missing a class and trouble with police or university authorities. In addition to the negative consequences individuals may experience as a result of their own high risk drinking, these students can have an impact on their non-drinking peers by exposing them to secondhand binge effects. The 1999 College Alcohol Study (CAS) reported that 58% of non-binge drinkers and abstainers had been interrupted while studying or been awakened at night, 50% had taken care of a drunken student, 29% had been insulted or humiliated (Wechsler, Molnar, Davenport & Baer, 1999).

Despite attempts by colleges and universities, college students do not seem motivated to change their high risk drinking behaviors. Perhaps the ineffectiveness of our current alcohol education efforts is due, in part, to the underlying assumption that college students view high risk drinking as problematic, and therefore, want to change their drinking behaviors. Vik, Cubertson and Sellers (2000) found that two-thirds of students did not see a need to change their behavior even if they met the definition of a binge drinker.

Generally, alcohol consumption is considered to provide social benefits such as facilitating peer interaction, allowing people to have more fun and enhancing sexual opportunities. Makela and Mustonen (2000) and Burke and Stephens (1999) discovered that college students refer to alcohol as a 'social lubricant' and indicate that students expect to receive positive outcomes such as relieving tension, being more sociable and

getting closer to the opposite sex as a result of drinking. These expectancies provide positive incentive to consume alcohol at high risk levels and little incentive to reduce consumption to low risk levels.

Since the initial study released by Harvard in 1993, the amount of alcohol consumed by college students has remained relatively constant. Although the number of abstainers has increased, those who continue to drink at high risk levels are consuming more alcohol during the average drinking episode keeping the total amount of alcohol consumed unchanged. Wechsler et al. (2002) compared data collected in 1993, 1997, 1999 and 2001 by the Harvard School of Public Health and found that 43.9% of students in 1993 reported binge drinking and 16.4% were abstainers while 44.4% reported binge drinking and 19.3% reported abstaining in 1999.

Norms vary across characteristics such as gender, racial/ethnic groups, class standing, on or off campus housing and Greek affiliation. Several authors have provided profiles of students who drink the least and who drink the most. Wechsler et al. (2002) provided a profile of a student who is more likely to engage in binge drinking as a white male student who is Greek and/or an athlete while the student who is likely to drink the least is enrolled at a two year, religious, commuter or historically Black college or university. Differences in drinking behaviors between various subgroups are a “function of the extent to which cultural traditions, norms and social control systems provide socialization, learning environments, and immediate situations conducive to conformity or deviance” (Akers, 1997, p. 69).

Perhaps educational models and institutional policies have not effectively changed behavior because they have failed to consider the influence of the peer group

upon drinking behaviors. Newcomb and Wilson (1966) describe the strong influence that a peer group has over individual student behavior and its ability to “weaken influences coming from the faculty and other parts of the wider environment” (p. 118). Other authors have highlighted the importance of understanding the normative structure of the collegiate peer group and have suggested that policies and programs would be more likely to impact long term behavioral change if the peer group and their influence were considered (Caboni, Braxton, Deusterhaus, Mundy, McClendon and Lee, 2005; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1991; Kuh & Whitt, 1988). To date, there has been little or no empirical research that has focused on the normative structure of college student drinking and this study begins to explore this gap in the research.

The concept of differential association found within Social Learning Theory allows us to consider both behavior interactions and normative structures. Akers (1997) asserts that “the groups with which one is in differential association provides the major social context in which all the mechanisms of social learning operate” (p. 64). This perspective allows us to consider both the interactions an individual has with their peers as well as the norms that an individual is exposed to within their peer group and provides a better understanding of what Jensen and Akers (2003) describe as “the inhibiting impact of attempts to teach norms prohibiting youthful deviance is weakened by contrary learning processes” (pg. 25).

Therefore, the research questions were:

1. Are categories of behaviors associated with college student drinking perceived by students to be inviolable, admonitory or laudatory norms?

2. If a normative structure for college student drinking does exist, how does the support for these norms vary across personal characteristics or sub group affiliations?
3. If a normative structure for college student drinking does exist, does the support for these norms vary across individual drinking behavior?

Specifically, this study examined how norm espousal differs across personal characteristics such as gender, race and ethnicity, class standing, cumulative GPA, age, marital status, parents educational level and sub group affiliations such as college of enrollment, on or off-campus housing, Greek membership, resident assistant position, religious activity, athlete, student leader positions and motivation for attending college upon the expressed norms of college students, the differences between individuals perceptions of the norms found across campus and within their immediate peer group and the impact of norms upon individual drinking choices.

Conceptual Framework

Peer Socialization

One of the things that national surveys have established is that students come to college with previous experience with alcohol and some preconceived ideas about college life. First year students begin their college career with a general understanding of the day to day happenings that occur on a college campus. However, like all new members of an organizational environment, they depend heavily on information from their peer group to provide them with norms and expectations to guide their behavior. Milem (1998) writes

that peer norms have a greater influence on student attitudes than faculty or administrator norms. When considering the norms surrounding drinking behaviors, this can quickly become problematic if the student culture has normalized high risk drinking.

The numbers of documented problems are increasing despite many programmatic and disciplinary efforts to combat this problem. An exaggerated student perception can have a negative impact on the peer socialization process when the peer culture has normalized binge drinking and has incorrect perceptions regarding the average number of drinks consumed during an average drinking episode and the average frequency of those episodes.

College students have tremendous autonomy within the collegiate environment found on many residential campuses since the decline of “in loco parentis”. While laws and campus policies regarding alcohol use provide a formal control mechanism, the typical behavior of other students and the approval they proscribe for certain types of alcohol use creates an informal system of normative support. If there are discrepancies between the behaviors proscribed in the formal and informal systems, the informal rules may provide the more effective social control mechanism, particularly, if the formal system fails to promote certain behaviors or prevent others. This is consistent with Braxton’s (1990) assertion that norms are “transmitted through expressions of preferred and prohibited behavior and through example by members of the community” (p. 463) and Akers’ (1997) definition of differential association that refers to “the process whereby one is exposed to normative definitions favorable or unfavorable to illegal or law-abiding behavior” (p. 64). Braxton (1990) asserts that the normative structure provides members with behavioral cues about community expectations and is derived

from Durkheim's (1951) suggestion that a lack of structure results in deviance while the direct interaction with members of a particular group who are engaging in and rewarding a particular behavior such as drinking provide reinforcement for those types of behaviors.

Building upon the work of previous social learning theorists, Akers (1997) proposed a social learning theory that provides "an explanation of crime and deviance which embraces variables that operate both to motivate and control criminal behavior, both to promote and undermine conformity" (p. 63). When a behavior occurs frequently within a particular group and is rewarded, it may become expected over time and, as a result, normative. If an individual is to become an accepted member of a particular subgroup, they will adopt behaviors and beliefs which are attributed to that population. This is consistent with the definition of a norm offered by Gibbs (1981) which states that "a norm is a belief shared to some extent by members of a social unit as to what conduct ought to be in particular situations or circumstances" (p. 8). According to Cohen (1971), if students frequently see their peers drinking on Thursday night that practice becomes accepted and, perhaps even a "sign of membership" (p. 57).

Through the socialization process, a student can determine which behaviors are viewed as positive, thus receiving approval, reinforcement or rewards from other peers. Conversely, students can learn which behaviors result in a punishment, penalty or sanction because they are viewed as highly inappropriate by the peer group. Morris defines norms as "generally accepted, sanctioned prescriptions for, or prohibitions against, other's behavior, belief, or feeling, i.e. what others ought to do, believe, feel and norms always include sanctions" (Gibbs, 1981, p. 8). Despite the fact that many college students are below the legal drinking age and campus policies prohibit underage drinking,

Akers (1997) suggests that the ‘definitions’, or attitudes that an individual student or larger peer group might attach to drinking, might be “so intensely held that they almost “require” one to violate the law” (p. 65).

If this research identifies a normative structure among college students with regard to drinking and drinking related behaviors, it would provide college and university administrators and faculty with a greater understanding of the espousal provided by the student body and an awareness of where the formal and informal systems are in agreement and where there are inconsistencies. It will also explore differences in normative support across personal characteristics or sub group affiliations which would provide insight into ways that programs can be customized to the needs of particular types of individual students or larger organizations. The research could prove useful to help guide campus communities as they attempt to reduce the impact of alcohol abuse on campus and its negative impact on the educational mission. Previous research in the areas of collegiate alcohol use, norms and peer influence guide this research and are highlighted in this manuscript.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Historical Perspective of Alcohol Problems on Campus

In an effort to better understand peer influence, research has approached the issue from a variety of different but related ways in order to identify factors that predict alcohol consumption. In 1953, R. Straus and S.D. Bacon published their landmark book entitled, *Drinking in College*, which documented the problems associated with alcohol use and abuse on campus. In that publication, an entire chapter was dedicated to a normative discussion about “what students think about drinking”. Since that time, there has been a significant amount of research which has attempted to understand the impact of alcohol use on college and university campuses through a variety of lens including norms.

Today, much of our knowledge about campus alcohol use comes from three national databases which provide the most extensive information regarding alcohol use among collegians and provide some insight into the behavioral norms associated with drinking on campus.

The Three National Databases

In 1994, the Harvard School of Public Health published the results of the first nationally representative *College Alcohol Study (CAS)*. Since that time, two other nationally representative samples have been created to track alcohol consumption on campus and provide insight into student drinking: *Monitoring the Future* and the *CORE*.

While some differences exist among the surveys, they capture similar information and have generated consistent findings over time and across the three databases.

The *College Alcohol Study (CAS)* focuses on the prevalence and consequences of alcohol and other drug use and college or university alcohol policies. Respondents are also asked about driving and sexual behavior while consuming alcohol and the second hand effects of other's use. The focus of the *Monitoring the Future* survey questions seek information regarding the prevalence of alcohol and other drug use and student's perception about the harm that may result from use. Finally, the *CORE Survey* is the most extensive of the three and solicits information regarding the prevalence of alcohol and other drug use and student's perception about the consequences that may result from use. Additionally, the longer version of the survey requests information about age of first use, family history, campus climate, extra-curricular or social activities available on the campus, violence and sexual behavior, beliefs about alcohol and other drugs, perceptions about harm that may result from use and the second hand effects of use by other students. Meilman, Cashin, McKillip and Presley (1998) assert that while there is some overlap between the surveys, "each was created for a specific purpose, and each has strengths and weaknesses as a description of collegiate populations" (p. 159).

Normative Confusion

A review of the literature addressing collegiate alcohol norms can be a bit confusing. While many authors have described the normative power on behavior, the term has been defined in a variety of different ways. Cialdini, Reno and Kallgren (1990) state that "norms clearly do have a considerable impact on behavior, but the force and

form of that impact can only be usefully understood through conceptual refinements that have not been traditionally or rigorously applied” to norms research (p. 1034). Within the literature, the reader finds several different ways that peers influence one another classified under the general heading of norms. In an attempt to specify how students influence one another through norms, Borsari and Carey (2001) suggest that peer influence is comprised of three different things: “overt offers of alcohol, modeling, and social norms” (p. 391). Wood, Read, Palfai and Stevenson (2001) distinguish between active and passive social norms. An active norm would include encouraging someone to drink (overt offers of alcohol) while a passive norm would include a student’s perceptions of the level of approval or disapproval espoused by other students and a student’s perception of ‘how much’ and ‘how often’ other students drink.

Initial attempts to understand collegiate drinking focused on individual quantity/frequency choices and the prevalence of high risk drinking. However, the emphasis on high risk drinking lead to concern among some that it reinforced the perception that binge drinking is a part of the college experience and is, in fact, occurring at levels higher than that actually reported by students. It is logical that if the informal socialization process contains exaggerated information, it would add a dangerous twist to the current socialization process because students trying to assimilate into the peer group and larger organizational culture would receive a message that normalized high risk drinking behaviors.

The hypothesis that misperceptions about student behaviors and attitudes will create a peer socialization process that promotes a rate that is higher than the actual norm provides the foundation for Social Norms Theory. Baer, J., Stacy, A., and Larimer, M.

(1991) found that “reports of others’ drinking were exaggerated and that these biases were particularly evident within organized social groups (i.e., fraternities and sororities) but were minimal in reference to students in general” (p. 580). Carter and Kahnweiler (2000) found that this type of intervention may have an impact on the general population but was not successful within Greek students because “there is no predominant, healthy drinking norm in this population; students are influenced more by people within their network(s) than by others; and binge drinking is the norm in this population and may serve to perpetuate the problem” (p. 66).

While the perceived consumption norms identified in previous research focused on student’s perception of quantity and frequency choices, there has been little focus in the literature on how students perceive different types of behaviors and to what degree they should be viewed as acceptable or unacceptable by fellow students, faculty and administrators. Because we have focused less attention on the degree to which students believe these behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate, a better understanding of student’s perceived levels of what constitutes appropriate or inappropriate behaviors is warranted. In fact, Trockel, Williams, and Reis (2003) suggest that “other theoretical frameworks of normative influence may be as or more valuable in improving effectiveness of social norms education” (p. 50).

Injunctive or Subjective Norms

There is limited published research that specifically seeks to identify a normative structure as measured by appropriate versus inappropriate. This particular construct has not been widely studied. Trockel et al. (2003) specifically asked fraternity members to

indicate what drinking behaviors they believed their fraternity brothers approved of as a separate measure than perceived consumption norms “defined explicitly as behavior” because they could not find any other research that had differentiated between the two different types of norms (p. 53). Caboni et al. (2005) provide a notable exception by measuring the degree to which students believed that their peers would find a behavior appropriate or inappropriate and found that a normative structure existed among college students with regard to a variety of behaviors including several associated with alcohol. Specifically, they found an admonitory norm of negligent endangerment of others that included ‘a student comes to class obviously intoxicated’; an inviolable norm of intrusive substance abuse that included ‘a student drinks to excess and drives others’; and, a laudatory norm of protecting others welfare consisting of ‘a student takes someone’s keys after that person has had too much too drink’ and ‘a student calls for help when someone has had far too much too drink.’

Norm Espousal Across Personal Characteristics and Sub Group Affiliations

Research on college alcohol use has examined the impact of several different personal characteristics and group affiliations upon perceived alcohol use, perceived support for alcohol use and the level of appropriateness found within different subgroups. Within the collegiate environment, smaller subgroups are created based on different classifications such as housing, year in school, group affiliations and reasons for attending college. To gain a better understanding of the impact these characteristics and affiliations might have upon the level of support given to different types of drinking behaviors, the second research question seeks to gain a better understanding of the influence of these smaller communities.

A review of literature focused on studies that examined the relationship between alcohol and gender, race and ethnicity, class standing, cumulative GPA, age, marital status, parents educational level, college of enrollment, on or off-campus housing, Greek membership, resident assistant position, religious activity, athlete, student leader positions and motivation for attending college is summarized below:

Gender

Men are more likely to drink than women and drink at higher levels. This has been documented in the literature by many authors (Lindquist, Cockerham and Hwang, 1999; Presley et al., 1999; Wechsler et al., 1994). However, a trend in the literature indicates that women's levels of drinking has been increasing in recent years, particularly at all-women's colleges where students have traditionally been less likely to participate in binge drinking behaviors or experience alcohol related problems such as having to take care of a friend that is drunk. Wechsler et al. (2002) reported that the results from the 2001 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study found a "sharp rise in frequent binge drinking was noted among students attending all-women's colleges" (p. 203).

Race and Ethnicity

A review of the literature exploring the relationship between race and alcohol consumption among college students discovered that Caucasian students have traditionally consumed alcohol in higher amounts than other ethnic groups. Since 1993, all four College Alcohol Surveys have found that African American students reported

significantly lower rates of drinking than their peers. O'Malley and Johnson (2002) write that race and ethnicity differences found in the data from the national databases has remained relatively consistent since 1980 and that "white students are highest in heavy drinking, black students are lowest and Hispanic students are intermediate" (p.10).

Class Standing

Despite the traditional age of first year college students falling below the legal drinking age, student drinking seems to be consistent across the freshman, sophomore, junior and senior years. Wechsler (1995) reported that "there is no relationship between year in school and binge drinking" (p. 1679)

Cumulative GPA

One of the alcohol-related problems experienced by college students is that alcohol use has a negative impact upon academic performance. The 2005 CORE Survey identified several items such as 'missing class', 'perform poorly on a test/project' and 'had a memory loss' that could have an impact on academic performance. Several authors have documented the inverse relationship between alcohol consumption and academic performance as measured by GPA (Ford & Carr, 1990; White, Jamieson-Drake & Swartzwelder, 2002).

Age

Despite the legal drinking age and university policies that prohibit drinking by students under the age of twenty-one, Wechsler et al. (1994) reports that data collected by

the College Alcohol Study indicates that the “minimum age drinking laws have virtually no impact on bingeing” (p. 1679).

Marital Status

Traditional students who are not married tend to be more involved in campus life and are more likely to live on campus. In 1995, Wechsler reported that having never been married is a predictor of the likelihood that a student will participate in binge drinking. However, Wechsler et al. (2002) did find that the “rate of binge drinking among students living with a spouse off campus was significantly higher in 2001 than in earlier years” (p. 207).

Parents’ Education Level

Research has found a relationship between alcohol use and parental education level. For example, Wechsler (1995) notes that students who have one or more parents who are college educated are more likely to participate in binge drinking.

College of Enrollment

While not considered a significant factor in the literature, this variable was included because subjects are enrolled at an institution that provides students with an opportunity to pursue a degree from the College of Justice and Safety. The College of Justice and Safety is a large academic program which attracts students who are considering a career in law enforcement and who might be more supportive of alcohol related policies and drinking laws than students enrolled in other academic programs.

On or Off Campus Housing

Students who live on campus tend to drink more than students who live off campus. Several authors have found that students who live on campus drink more than students who live in off campus housing (Presley, et al., 1999; Wechsler et al., 1999; O'Hare, 1990). Specifically, Wechsler, Kuh and Davenport (1995) noted that on campus students who live in Greek houses or in co-educational residence halls are the most likely to engage in binge drinking.

Greek Membership

Researchers have consistently found that Greek members drink more than students who are not members of Greek organizations (Johnston, et al., 2003; Presley, et al., 1999; Wechsler, et al., 1994). This is supported by Wechsler et al. (1995) who found that Greek membership and living in a Greek house were the two strongest indicators of binge drinking and that residents of Greek housing reported more alcohol related problems than unaffiliated students.

Resident Assistant

The beliefs and behaviors of resident assistants are of particular interest in this study because they are expected to educate students about the campus policies and confront policy violations among their peers. In an effort to avoid a confrontation with their peers, resident assistants may educate students about how to get around policies. Research shows that resident assistants model typical alcohol behavior as their drinking

tends to be fairly consistent with other students at their institution (Andrews, 1987; Berkowitz & Perkins, 1986). However, Wesley Perkins (2002) asserts that their most significant influence may result from communicating their own misperceptions of alcohol behavior on campus to the students who live on their floors.

Attend Church or Worship Regularly

Although there are differences between denominations, there are several studies that draw connection between religious affiliation and alcohol use. Wechsler et al. (1995) found that “students who stated that participating in religion was “not at all important” to them had a much higher likelihood of bingeing than other students” (p. 922)

Varsity Athletics

Student athletes drink at higher rates than the general student population. For example, Nelson and Wechsler (2001) found that student “athletes reported more binge drinking, heavier alcohol use, and a greater number of alcohol related problems” than their classmates who did not participate in athletics (p. 43).

Student Leader

Among different student organizations, student leaders self report that they drink more than their peers. For example, Cashin, Presley and Meilman (1998) found that “the leaders of fraternities and sororities consumed alcohol, engaged in heavy drinking and experienced negative consequences at levels at least as high and in some cases higher than that of other Greek members” (p. 63). Cashin et al. (1998) assert that the

implications for these findings result in the leaders of Greek organizations setting heavy drinking norms for the rest of their members.

Motivation for Attending College

In 1966, Burton Clark and Martin Trow created a typology of students to better understand the different types of motivation for attending college. The four different typologies were used in this study to see if there was a significant relationship between the motivations for attending college and drinking behaviors. Students were asked to select the sentence that best captured their motivations for attending college. Researchers at the University of Minnesota found that students who select the statements that correspond to the Collegiate subculture on the Student Interest Survey (2002) tend to be more interested in the social and co-curricular aspects of college and tend to drink at higher levels than those students who attend for academic purposes.

The Influence of Individual Student Drinking Behavior

The surveys used by the three national studies ask respondents to provide information about their own personal drinking behavior. To gain a better understanding of the impact personal drinking choices might have upon the level of support given to different types of drinking behaviors, the third research question seeks to explore the influence of those choices.

Lee, Gledhill-Hoyt, Maenner, Dowdall, and Wechsler (1998) summarized student responses to the 1993 and the 1997 *College Alcohol Study* and found that individual drinking behaviors changed very little during that four year period. A review of the

responses to the College Alcohol Surveys regarding individual drinking behaviors are summarized below: drink to get drunk, consumed alcohol in past year, the number of times they have been drunk in past thirty days, the number of times they have had something to drink in the past thirty days.

Drink to Get Drunk

Despite increased efforts to educate students about the problems associated with binge drinking, Lee et al. (1998) reports that the number of students who reported gave “drinking to get drunk as a reason for drinking” increased in 1997 from the previous survey to 52.3% (p. 64).

Consumed Alcohol in Past Year

Of the students who reported drinking alcohol on at least one occasion in the past year, 53% of the them reported drinking at levels that meet the criteria for binge drinking. The College Alcohol Survey classify a student as a moderate binge drinker if they have binged one or two times in the past two weeks and as a frequent binge drinker if they have binged three or more times within the past two weeks.

Students who had not consumed alcohol in the past year were classified as abstainers in the *College Alcohol Survey*. There was an increase in the number of students who reported that they had not consumed alcohol in the past year from 15.6% in 1993 and 19% in 1997.

Times Drunk in Past Thirty Days

Lee et al. (1998) found an increase in the number of times students reported they had been drunk in the past 30 days over the earlier survey. Specifically, “drunkenness three or more times in the past month increased from 22.9% in 1993 to 27.9% in 1997” (p. 65).

Times Drink in Past Thirty Days

If a student had consumed alcohol in the past thirty days, the College Alcohol Survey asked the respondent to indicate how many times during the past month they had consumed alcohol. Lee et al. (1998) reported that more students reported drinking on 10 or more occasions in 1997 than did in 1993.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

Subjects for Research

Eastern Kentucky University (EKU) is a Comprehensive University I located in a rural area in the southeast. Originally founded as the Eastern State Normal School in 1906, Eastern's mission was to educate teachers as one of two normal schools within the state (Dorris, 1957). Today, EKU articulates its continued focus on teaching within its mission statement that concludes "...where students come first."

Undergraduate enrollment totals 13,567 with 10,449 students registered as full-time. The undergraduate population is 60% women, 90% white, and 32% live on campus. The average composite ACT score of first-time freshmen was 20 in 2003-2004 and 37% of first year students who began in 1997 graduated within six years. EKU has students from forty-one states and 132 countries while 58% of the total student population is from one of the twenty-two counties within the service region located in the southeastern part of the state. A majority of students are defined as traditional college age with 73% under twenty-five years of age and 37.9% falling between the ages of seventeen and twenty years of age (2003-2004 EKU Factbook).

Eastern Kentucky University was a sample of convenience; however, the institution and surrounding community has an interesting history relative to alcohol consumption and underage drinking. Despite the fact that the state passed an ordinance prohibiting individuals younger than twenty-one from entering establishments that served

alcohol in the early 1980's, Madison County public officials, law enforcement and retail establishments did not enforce it until 2001 when a grass-root citizen group called Community Partnership began working with local law enforcement to reduce the accessibility of alcohol to minors through increased enforcement. The campus had developed a reputation for being a 'party school' based in part upon the accessibility to alcohol found in the surrounding community. In recent years, the campus has worked to change the campus alcohol culture by encouraging students to stay on campus over the weekend and providing alcohol-free activities. Today, the "party campus" environment seems to have evolved into one that is much more moderate. All students take the *CORE* Survey and their levels of drinking are very consistent with the national average suggesting that this is no longer an environment that would be considered a "party campus". This institution provides an opportunity to explore norms within a campus culture that has traditionally been very influenced by alcohol and alcohol consumption but has attempted to distance itself from that part of their history in recent years.

Data Collection

A total of 1800 sophomore, junior and senior subjects were randomly selected from the undergraduate population at Eastern Kentucky University, a predominately residential regional institution, and surveyed during spring, 2005. First year students were not surveyed based on the assumption that they have not been on campus long enough to have adopted the campus values and norms. Subjects were asked to complete a survey they received via their university email account. All students returned their survey online. Of the 1800 students selected, 600 were classified as sophomores, 600 as

juniors and 600 as seniors. In a previous study, Caboni et al. (2005) were unable to resurvey their population and did recommend that future research build that ability into their study to ensure a more representative response. In this study, the survey was resent ten days following the initial email.

There were a total of 132 surveys returned. Of those, it was noted that some students had not answered every question. In particular, they did not answer the second set of questions designed to gather information regarding their perception of how their closest friends at ECU would respond. All surveys that did not have a valid response to the demographic question regarding gender were rejected. This resulted in ninety-one (91) usable surveys and an 8.7% response rate. In addition to the low response rate, the sample is not representative of the Eastern Kentucky University campus creating an inability to generalize results to the larger campus population or students at other institutions.

Demographics and Sub Group Affiliations

Of the students who returned the survey, 98% were white compared to 91% at ECU, 69% had a cumulative GPA of 3.0 or higher compared to 41% at ECU, 73% were twenty-one years of age or older as compared to 62% at ECU, 82.4% were single and 53.8% had at least one parent with a college degree. In addition, 14% belonged to a Greek organization as compared to 10% at ECU, 46% lived on-campus as compared to 32% at ECU, 8% were Resident Assistants as compared to 3% at ECU, 11% considered themselves to be student leaders and 50.5% attended church or were involved in church-related activities. The class standing was represented by 24% sophomores, 31% juniors

and 45% seniors as compared to 18% sophomores, 18% juniors and 24% seniors at ECU. Only one student indicated that he/she was involved in intercollegiate athletics representing 1% as compared to 4% at ECU. As previously mentioned, this sample is not representative of the larger campus population creating an inability to generalize results to the larger entire student population or to students at other institutions.

TABLE 1
Descriptive Statistics of Institution and Sample

Variable Name	Institution #	Institution %	Sample #	Sample %
Undergraduates				
Total	13,567	100%	91	100%
Full Time	10,449			
Part Time	3,118			
Gender				
Male	5,315	39%	28	31%
Female	8,252	61%	63	69%
Race				
African American	617	5%	1	1%
Asian American	148	1%	1	1%
White Caucasian	12,336	91%	89	98%
International	79	0.06%		
Other	387	3%		
Race (Binary)				
White	12,336	91%	89	98%
Non-White	1,231	9%	2	2%
Class Standing				
Freshman	4,113	30%	22	24%
Sophomore	2,439	18%	28	31%
Junior	2,385	18%	41	45%
Senior	3,304	24%		
Post-Bacc Degree-Seek	313	2%		
Post-Bacc Certificate	9	0%		
Post-Bacc - Nondegree	26	0%		
Undergraduate-Nondegree	656	5%		
Auditor	9	0%		
High School	313	2%		
Cumulative G.P.A.				
<1.00	844	6%	0	
1.00-1.50	290	2%	0	
1.51-2.00	829	6%	0	
2.01-2.50	2,310	17%	9	10%
2.51-3.00	3,678	27%	20	22%
3.00-3.50	3,276	24%	37	41%
3.51-4.00	2,340	17%	25	28%
Fraternity/Sorority Membership				
*3 missing Fraternity Member	417	3%	6	7%
Sorority Member	516	3.80%	6	7%
Non-Affiliated	12,634	93%	76	84%
Greek Membership (Binary)				
*3 missing Greek	933	10%	12	14%
Non-Affiliated	12,634	90%	76	84%
College of Enrollment				
*4 missing Arts & Sciences	2,998	22%	40	44%
Business & Technology	1,862	14%	14	15%
Education	1,365	10%	8	9%
Health Sciences	2,650	20%	14	15%
Justice & Safety	1,161	9%	11	12%
Undecided/Undeclared	2,527	19%		
Nondegree	1,004	7%		
Age				
*12 missing vs 19 or younger	3,595	26%	12	13%
20 years of age	1,591	12%	13	14%
21 years of age	1,583	12%	21	23%
22 or older	6,786	50%	45	50%
Marital Status				
*1 missing Single	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	75	82%
Married	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	15	16%

TABLE 1 (Continued)
 Descriptive Statistics of Institution and Sample

Variable Name	Institution #	Institution %	Sample #	Sample %
Parents Education Level				
College Degree	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	49	54%
No College Degree	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	42	46%
Housing				
On Campus	4,274	32%	42	46%
Off Campus	9,293	68%	49	54%
Collegiate Athletics*				
*2 missing Yes	400	4%	1	1%
No	13,167	96%	88	97%
Residence Assistants				
*1 missing Yes	124	3%	7	8%
No	4,150	97%	83	91%
Student Leadership				
Yes	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	10	11%
No	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	81	89%
Religious Activity and Affiliation				
Yes	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	46	50%
No	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	45	50%

*Representative at > or < 5% difference between sample and population

Survey Design

The survey utilized in this study had a total of one hundred and twenty-six (126) items and was comprised of twenty-two (22) statements taken directly from the questions dealing with alcohol use obtained from the “College Student Behaviors Inventory” (CSBI) instrument and three (3) more questions were modified versions of questions found on the CSBI developed by Caboni et al. (2005). Twenty-seven (27) statements were created utilizing the alcohol-related problems from the “College Alcohol Study” conducted by Harvard University College of Public Health (Wechsler et al., 1994). Subjects were asked to indicate how they believed most students at ECU would respond to the questions. Subjects were then asked to respond to the same set of questions a second time as they believed their closest friends at ECU would respond. Seventeen (17) additional questions were included to obtain demographical information designed to identify personal characteristics and sub-group affiliations, four (4) questions were intended to obtain the respondents drinking behaviors and one (1) question developed to learn if the students believed that the violations of the alcohol policy outlined in the *ECU Regulations and Judicial Sanctions* were a deterrent to breaking the rules.

The College Student Alcohol Behavior Inventory was comprised of questions that were selected to cover a range of behaviors that fell within seven broad categories of drinking related behaviors. These categories include: Abstinence, Reporting Peers to Campus Officials, Seeking Assistance, Quantity/Frequency, Policy or Law Violations and Sanctions, Alcohol Related Problems, Second Hand Alcohol Related Problems.

Respondents selected a response from a nine-point Likert scale with 1=very inappropriate, the student should be removed from the university and 9=very appropriate,

the student should be praised and recognized by the university. Respondents indicated where they believed the general student body would say behaviors fell on a scale from highly appropriate and highly inappropriate for the first fifty-two (52) questions and then the respondents were asked to answer the same group of questions as they believed their close peer group at the institution would indicate that behaviors fell on a scale from highly appropriate to highly inappropriate. The remaining twenty-two (22) questions were designed to obtain demographical information, identify personal characteristics and sub-group affiliations, and respondents drinking behaviors and beliefs about the alcohol policy outlined in the *EKU Regulations and Judicial Sanctions*. These questions were multiple choice and fill-in-the-blank.

The survey design was modeled after the technique used by Braxton and Bayer (1999) in their study on faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching and by Caboni et al. (2005) in their study of norms regarding campus behavior. Most items were phrased negatively since this was consistent with the methodology used by Braxton and Brayer which cited Durkheim's (1951) postulate that norms are easier to recognize when they are violated.

The response categories were modeled after the survey instrument used by Caboni et al. (2005) and were coded on a nine point Likert scale with the following values: 1= very inappropriate, the student should be removed from the university; 2= very inappropriate, the student should be excluded from the group; 3=inappropriate behavior, someone should talk to the student about the behavior and suggest change or improvement; 4= mildly inappropriate behavior, generally to be ignored; 5= behavior which is neither appropriate or inappropriate; 6= mildly appropriate behavior, generally

to be accepted; 7= appropriate behavior, the student should be encouraged to engage in such behavior; 8= very appropriate behavior, the student should be praised/recognized by the group (class, organization, peer group or residence hall); and 9=very appropriate, the student should be praised and recognized by the university.

Statistical Procedure

After the surveys were collected, means were calculated for each of the behaviors to determine which met normative criteria. The means were divided into three categories based upon the methodology utilized in the Braxton and Bayer (1999) and by Caboni et al. (2005). The categories were created to classify behaviors as being inviolable, admonitory or laudatory norms. Inviolable norms are behaviors which are viewed as very inappropriate and requiring the most severe sanction or response. Braxton and Bayer utilized this definition because it was “consistent with Durkheim’s observation that norms are best identified through the degree of moral outrage or anger their violation elicits from other” (p. 21). While not as severe, admonitory norms invoke a negative response from peers. Laudatory norms provide reinforcement, praise or encouragement for positive behaviors. For example, in the Caboni et al. (2005) study, “there was a high level of agreement on how much encouragement should be given to those who engage in the normative pattern of protecting other’s welfare” through behaviors such as seeking self-help and protecting other’s welfare (p. 14).

The questions that comprise the survey were developed by utilizing the alcohol-related questions from the *College Student Behaviors Inventory* survey conducted by Vanderbilt University Peabody College of Education, the *College Alcohol Study*

conducted by Harvard University College of Public Health and the sanctions for violations of the alcohol policy outlined in the *EKU Regulations and Judicial Sanctions* (Caboni, et al., 2005; Wechsler et al., 1999).

Coding of Demographic Variables

The demographic variables were: Gender (1= Male, 2=Female); Race and Ethnicity (1= African American, 2=Asian American, 3= Hispanic American, 4=White Caucasian, 5= International, 6=Other); Class Standing (1= Sophomore, 2=Junior, 3= Senior) ; Cumulative G.P.A. (1= <1.00, 2=1.00-1.50, 3= 1.51-1.99, 4=2.00-2.50, 5= 2.51-2.99, 6=3.00-3.50, 7= 3.51-3.99); Greek Membership (1= Fraternity, 2=Sorority, 3= Non-Greek); College of Enrollment (1= Arts & Sciences, 2=Business & Technology, 3= Education, 4=Health Sciences, 5= Justice & Safety); Age (1= 19 or younger, 2=20, 3= 21, 4=22 or older); Marital Status (1=married, 2=single); Do one or both of your parents have a college degree (1=yes, 2=no); Housing (1=on-campus, 2=off-campus); If on-campus, please list your residence hall _____; Varsity Athlete (1= Yes, 2=No); Resident Assistant (1= Yes, 2=No); Student Leader (1= Yes, 2=No); If Yes, Most Significant Position to date _____; Attend church or worship regularly (1= Yes, 2=No); If Yes, please list your denomination _____; Motivation for Attending College (1= “Although I may be ultimately concerned about a career, currently I am interested in enriching myself through education focusing on the world of knowledge and ideas.”, 2= “Although my academic work and progress are important, I believe an equally significant part of college experience exists outside the classroom. Participation in campus life and activities is important to me.”, 3= “Of greatest important to me is getting a degree in my

chosen field. Consequently, other intellectual and social activities are necessarily of secondary important to me.” 4= “Although I find the University environment stimulating, I feel alienated from the institution and its formal programs and activities. Currently, I am interested in pursuing the meaning and purposes of life through involvement and self-exploration outside the University.” (University of Minnesota Student Interest Survey Report, 2001)

Coding of Alcohol Related Behaviors

The individual drinking behavior variables were: Drink to Get Drunk (1= Yes, 2=No); Consumed Alcohol in Past Year But Not Drunk (1= Yes, 2=No); Number of Times Drunk in Past Thirty Days (1= I have not been drunk in past thirty days, 2= I have been drunk on one or two occasions in the past thirty days, 3= I have been drunk on three to five occasions in the past thirty days, 4= I have been drunk on six to nine occasions in the past thirty days, 5= I have been drunk on ten to nineteen occasions in the past thirty days, 6= I have been drunk on twenty to thirty occasions in the past thirty days); Number of Times Drink in Past Thirty Days (1= I have not had alcohol to drink in past thirty days, 2= I have had alcohol to drink on one or two occasions in the past thirty days, 3= I have had alcohol to drink on three to five occasions in the past thirty days, 4= I have had alcohol to drink on six to nine occasions in the past thirty days, 5= I have had alcohol to drink on ten to nineteen occasions in the past thirty days, 6= I have had alcohol to drink on twenty to thirty occasions in the past thirty days); Are the sanctions for violating the ECU policies a deterrent to breaking the rules (1= Yes, 2=No).

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results from the statistical analysis are presented in this section. First, the categories of behaviors associated with college student drinking that met the normative criteria for inviolable, admonitory and laudatory norms are identified. Second, a description of how behaviors that met normative criteria vary across personal characteristics or subgroup affiliations is presented. Finally, how the norms identified influence individual drinking behaviors are described.

Means were calculated for each of the 104 of behaviors on the CSABI to determine which met normative criteria. The means were divided into four categories based upon the methodology utilized in the Caboni et al. (2005) study and by Braxton and Bayer (1999). The categories were created to classify behaviors as being inviolable, admonitory or laudatory norms.

The means were calculated to see if they meet normative criteria as defined by Braxton and Bayer (1999). Given the response categories utilized, mean values less than 2.49 signify an inviolable norm, mean values ranging greater than 2.49 and less than 2.99 represent admonitory norms, mean values ranging between 3.00 and 7.00 represent indifference and mean values greater than 7.0 represent laudatory norms.

Findings

This section outlines the findings from the statistical analyses performed on the collected data. First, the identified inviolable patterns of behavior are presented. Second, admonitory patterns of student behavior are described. Third, laudatory normative patterns are presented. Finally, the differences across personal characteristics, group affiliations and personal drinking behaviors on the espousal of inviolable, admonitory and laudatory norms are outlined.

Inviolable Norms

Specific behaviors are defined as inviolable if their mean values were 2.49 or lower on the sanctioning scale. Of all fifty-two (52) student behaviors on the CSABI considered from the perspective of most students at EKU and the same fifty-two (52) student behaviors considered again from the perspective of their closest friends at EKU, seven (7) met the criterion of 2.49 or lower for inviolable norms. These seven items were then subjected to exploratory factor analysis using the principal components method. This method was used because no *a priori* theory existed about the factors which were derived from the analysis. A two-factor solution was chosen using the Scree test. The two factors were then rotated using the Varimax method to identify the normative pattern underlying the specific behaviors and alpha levels were computed. Within each of the inviolable composite variables, one behavior was dropped to increase the alpha reliability for that norm. Because the study is exploratory in nature, Varimax rotation was used to maximize the distance between factors. Factor-based scores were created for each of the normative constructs by totaling the responses for each individual behavior and dividing

the total by the number of behaviors in that construct. Factor-based scores were used in lieu of factor scores so that equal weight would be given to each of the items loading on the factor (Kim & Mueller, 1978). All questions with factor based scores that fell below .40 on the factor loadings were dropped.

From these analyses, two inviolable normative patterns emerged. The two patterns of inviolable proscribed norms identified are: endangering others and physical assault. Endangering others is comprised of two behaviors that are considered from the perspective of most students while physical assault is comprised of two behaviors that are considered from the perspective of the respondent's closest friends at ECU.

Endangering Others

Behaviors by most students which involve drinking and driving others or getting a date drunk in order to have sex constitute the normative cluster censuring endangering others. Specifically, Q31 asked how most students at ECU would feel about a student who drinks to excess and drives others while Q32 asked how most students at ECU would feel about a student who knowingly gets his or her date drunk in order to have sex are two questions that comprise the inviolable normative pattern of endangering others.

Physical Assault

Physical assault describes behaviors by students which involve acts of aggression such as pushing or assaulting another student or vandalism of property. Specifically, Q93 asked how your closest friends at ECU would feel about a student who gets drunk and damages property while Q98 asks how your closest friends at ECU would feel about a

student who pushes or assaults another student comprise the inviolable normative pattern of physical assault.

TABLE 2
Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of Two Inviolable Proscriptive Norms

	Loading
Endangering Others	
CSABI Item	
Q31: How most students at EKU would feel about a student who drinks to excess and drives others	0.88
Q32: How most students at EKU would feel about a student who knowingly gets his or her date drink in order to have sex	0.89
Note: Percent of explained variance =58.88; Cronbach alpha = .870; Mean=2.17, SD=1.30	
Physical Assault	
CSABI Item	
Q93: How your closest friends at EKU would feel about a student who gets drunk and damages property	0.88
Q98: How your closest friends at EKU would feel about a student who pushes or assaults another student	0.88
Note: Percent of explained variance =15.66; Cronbach alpha = .870; Mean=2.36, SD=.949	

Admonitory Norms

Specific behaviors are defined as admonitory if their mean values were greater 2.49 and less 2.99 on the sanctioning scale. Of all 52 student behaviors on the CSABI considered from the perspective of most students at EKU and considered again from the perspective of their closest friends at EKU, nine (9) met the criterion for admonitory norms. These nine (9) items were then subjected to the same factor analyses described previously for inviolable norms. From these analyses, two admonitory normative patterns emerged: harmful aggression and personal disregard.

Harmful aggression is comprised of four behaviors that are considered from the perspective of the respondent's closest friends at EKU while personal disregard is

comprised of four behaviors that are considered from the perspective of most students at EKU.

Harmful Aggression

Harmful aggression involves a student who drives after consuming five or more drinks, gets drunk and damage property, makes unwanted sexual advances towards another student or comes to class obviously intoxicated. This normative structure includes Q64 which asks how your closest friends at EKU would feel about a student who drives after having five or more drinks, Q75 which asks how your closest friends at EKU would feel about a male student who engages in sexual activity, Q97 which asks how your closest friends at EKU would feel about a student who harasses non-drinkers and Q101 which asks how your closest friends at EKU would feel about a student who comes to class obviously intoxicated. Q75 on the CSABI is similar to Q15 on the CSBI used by Caboni et al. (2005) which asked about a male student who engages in sexual activity with someone who is intoxicated and was one of the questions within the admonitory proscriptive norm of negligent endangerment of others.

Personal Disregard

The normative pattern of personal disregard prohibits behaviors by students which could put other students in danger as a result of careless actions. This normative pattern includes Q13 which asks how most students would feel about someone who drives after having five or more drinks, Q42 which asks how most students at EKU would feel about a student who gets drunk and damages property, Q49 which asks how most students at

EKU would feel about a student who makes unwanted sexual advances towards another student and Q50 which asks how most students at EKU would feel about a student who comes to class obviously intoxicated. Q50 on the CSABI is similar to Q161 on the CSBI used by Caboni et al. (2005) which asked about a student who comes to class obviously intoxicated and was one of the questions within the admonitory proscriptive norm of negligent endangerment of others. While consisting of different behaviors, this normative structure bears the same name as an inviolable norm of personal disregard found in a study on faculty misconduct in academic teaching conducted by Braxton and Bayer (1999).

TABLE 3
Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of Two Admonitory Proscriptive Norms

	Loadings
Harmful Aggression	
CSABI Item	
Q64 How your closest friends at EKU would feel about a student who drives after having 5 or more drinks	0.72
Q75 How your closest friends at EKU would feel about a male student who engages in sexual activity with someone who is intoxicated	0.74
Q97 How your closest friends at EKU would feel about a student who harasses non-drinkers	0.79
Q101 How your closest friends at EKU would feel about a student who comes to class obviously intoxicated	0.80
Note: Percent of explained variance =12.85; Cronbach alpha = .90; Mean=2.64; SD=1.17	
Personal Disregard	
CSABI Item	
Q13 How most students at EKU would feel about a student who drives after having 5 or more drinks	0.81
Q42 How most students at EKU would feel about a student who gets drunk and damages property	0.88
Q49 How most students at EKU would feel about an intoxicated student who makes unwanted sexual advances towards another student	0.72
Q50 How most students at EKU would feel about a student who comes to class obviously intoxicated	0.73
Note: Percent of explained variance =53.80; Cronbach alpha = .82; Mean=2.77; SD=.97	

p < .05

Laudatory Norms

Behaviors were considered laudatory if the item mean was greater than 7.0. Of all fifty-two (52) student behaviors on the CSABI considered from the perspective of most students at ECU and considered again from the perspective of their closest friends at ECU, six met laudatory normative criteria. Five behaviors emerged as laudatory which were used to create two scales and alpha reliabilities were computed to determine internal consistency. Composite scores were then created for each normative pattern by adding the responses for each individual behavior and dividing the total by the number of behaviors in the construct. The two laudatory prescribed norms are: protective intervention and seeking assistance.

Protective intervention is comprised of three behaviors that are considered from the perspective of most students while seeking assistance is comprised of two behaviors that are considered from the perspective of the respondent's closest friends at ECU.

Protective Intervention

Protecting others' welfare deals with behaviors by most students which keep other students from doing things which might cause self-injury. These behaviors include Q5 which asks how most students at ECU would feel about a student who calls for help when someone has had too much to drink, Q6 which asks how most students at ECU would feel about a student who takes another student to the emergency room when they have had too much to drink and Q21 which asks how most students at ECU would feel about someone who takes someone's keys after they have had too much too drink. Among respondents, there is a high level of agreement on how much encouragement

should be given to those who engage in the normative pattern of protecting others' welfare.

Q5 on the CSABI is similar to Q152 on the CSBI used by Caboni et al. (2005) which asked about a student who calls for help when someone has had too much to drink and Q21 on the CSABI is similar to Q110 on the CSBI which asked about a student who takes someone's keys after that person has had too much to drink. Both were questions within laudatory proscriptive norm of protecting other's welfare.

Seeking Assistance

Seeking assistance deals with behaviors which enlist the help of others to assist someone who has had too much to drink and may be at risk for medical problems associated with high risk drinking. The two questions that comprise this normative pattern are Q56 which asks how your closest friends at ECU would feel about a student who calls for help with someone has had too much to drink and Q57 which asks how your closest friends at ECU would feel about a student who takes another student to the emergency room because they might have alcohol poisoning.

TABLE 4
Factor Loadings of Specific Behaviors of Two Laudatory Proscriptive Norms

	Loadings
Protective Intervention	
CSABI Item	
Q5	0.83
Q6	0.84
Q21	0.85
Note: Percent of explained variance =44.95; Cronbach alpha = .870; Mean=7.63; SD=1.02	
Seeking Assistance	
CSABI Item	
Q56	0.91
Q57	0.92
Note: Percent of explained variance =27.11; Cronbach alpha = .809; Mean=7.35, SD=.949	

Composite variables which represent the normative structures were created using factor based scores from responses for each of the specific behaviors of each of the nine response categories for questions about the general student body and the respondent's close peer group at the institution. These six composite measures representing normative patterns were calculated to determine the degree of norm espousal across personal characteristics or sub-group affiliations.

TABLE 5
Reliability Values for Six Composite Variables

Normative Pattern	N	Mean	SD	Cronbach Alpha
Inviolable Norms				
Endangering Others	2	2.17	1.30	0.87
Physical Assault	2	2.36	0.95	0.87
Admonitory Norms				
Harmful Aggression	4	2.64	1.17	0.90
Personal Disregard	4	2.77	0.97	0.82
Laudatory Norms				
Protective Intervention	3	7.63	1.02	0.87
Seeking Assistance	2	7.35	0.95	0.81

Norm Espousal Across Personal Characteristics or Sub Group Affiliations

In an effort to identify how personal characteristics or sub group affiliations influenced these behaviors, t-tests ($p < .05$) were conducted to determine if there were significant differences on each of the six normative patterns by parents' education level, student leader, gender, on or off campus housing, collegiate athletics, resident assistant position, race and ethnicity, marital status and motivation for attending college. Of the nine variables considered, two were significant: parent's education level and considering yourself a student leader.

Analysis of variance tests were performed to determine if there were significant differences ($p < .05$) on each of the six normative patterns by cumulative GPA, religious activity, Greek membership, class standing, college of enrollment and age. Of the six variables considered, one was significant: cumulative GPA.

Scheffe post hoc mean comparison tests were performed on those characteristics that were significant.

Gender (See Table 6), on or off-campus housing (See Table 7), collegiate athlete (See Table 8), resident assistant position (See Table 9), race and ethnicity (See Table 10), marital status (See Table 11), motivation for attending college (See Table 12), religious activity (See Table 13), Greek membership (See Table 14), class standing (See Table 15), college of enrollment (See Table 16) and age (See Table 17) within the larger campus and the more immediate peer group did not produce statistically significant ($p < .05$) differences on any of the 6 normative patterns.

TABLE 6
Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Gender

Normative Pattern	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	<i>t</i> -value
	Male	Male	Male	Female	Female	Female	
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	2.20	25	1.15	2.16	58	0.96	0.18
Physical Assault	2.42	19	0.91	2.35	58	0.97	0.34
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	2.64	28	1.07	2.63	60	1.22	0.04
Personal Disregard	2.93	22	0.91	2.71	60	0.99	0.89
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	7.74	28	0.9	7.58	60	1.14	0.62
Seeking Assistance	7.21	21	1.33	7.39	57	1.29	-0.54

* $p < .05$

TABLE 7

Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: On or Off Campus Housing

Normative Pattern	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	<i>t</i> -value
	On Campus	On Campus	On Campus	Off Campus	Off Campus	Off Campus	
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	2.05	39	0.92	2.27	44	1.09	0.99
Physical Assault	2.39	36	0.95	2.39	41	0.95	-0.33
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	2.44	41	1.01	2.81	47	1.28	-1.49
Personal Disregard	2.75	37	0.98	2.78	45	0.97	-0.13
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	7.79	41	0.90	7.50	47	1.18	1.27
Seeking Assistance	7.46	34	1.30	7.26	44	1.30	0.66

**p*<.05

TABLE 8

Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Collegiate Athletics

Normative Pattern	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	<i>t</i> -value
	Athlete	Athlete	Athlete	Non-Athlete	Non-Athlete	Non-Athlete	
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	1.00	1		2.18	80	1.02	-1.14
Physical Assault	1.00	1		2.37	74	0.95	-1.43
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	1.25	1		2.65	85	1.18	-1.18
Personal Disregard	1.50	1		2.79	79	0.97	-1.33
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	7.34	1		7.66	85	1.05	-0.31
Seeking Assistance	6.50	1		7.35	75	1.31	-0.64

**p*<.05

TABLE 9
 Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic
 Resident Assistant

Normative Pattern	Mean RA	N RA	SD RA	Mean Resident	N Resident	SD Resident	<i>t</i> -value
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	2.29	7	1.22	2.15	75	1.01	0.34
Physical Assault	2.92	6	1.53	2.30	70	0.89	1.54
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	2.82	7	1.59	2.62	80	1.15	0.44
Personal Disregard	3.25	6	1.63	2.73	75	0.91	1.27
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	7.79	7	0.93	7.62	80	1.09	0.39
Seeking Assistance	7.83	6	1.03	7.31	71	1.32	0.94

**p* < .05

TABLE 10
 Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Race and Ethnicity

Normative Pattern	Mean Non-White	N Non-White	SD Non-White	Mean Caucasian	N Caucasian	SD Caucasian	<i>t</i> -value
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	1.50	2	0.71	2.19	81	1.02	-0.94
Physical Assault	2.25	2	0.35	2.36	75	0.96	-0.16
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	2.25	2	0.71	2.65	86	1.18	-0.47
Personal Disregard	2.13	2	0.53	2.79	80	0.97	-0.96
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	7.00	2	2.36	7.65	86	1.04	-0.85
Seeking Assistance	8.25	2	0.35	7.32	76	1.30	1.00

**p* < .05

TABLE 11

Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Marital Status

Normative Pattern	Mean Single	N Single	SD Single	Mean Married	N Married	SD Married	<i>t</i> -value
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	2.46	12	1.14	2.12	70	1.00	-1.06
Physical Assault	2.54	13	0.95	2.33	63	0.96	-0.73
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	2.96	14	1.74	2.57	73	1.04	-1.15
Personal Disregard	2.77	15	0.93	2.79	66	0.98	0.07
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	7.47	15	1.34	7.70	72	0.97	0.79
Seeking Assistance	6.86	14	1.76	7.46	63	1.16	1.53

* $p < .05$

TABLE 12

Results of Analysis of Variance of the Inviolable, Admonitory and Laudatory Normative Patterns by Motivation for Attending College

Normative Pattern	F-Ratio	N	Academic			Collegiate			Vocational			Non-Comformist		
			Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD
Inviolable Norms														
Endangering Others	1.67	80	1.95	11	1.21	1.90	25	0.92	2.27	33	1.06	2.64	11	0.74
Physical Assault	0.14	73	2.15	10	1.13	2.33	23	0.76	2.36	29	1.03	2.36	11	0.78
Admonitory Norms														
Harmful Aggression	0.95	84	2.56	12	1.21	2.41	27	0.84	2.74	34	1.46	3.07	11	0.67
Personal Disregard	0.60	78	2.70	11	1.22	2.73	24	0.91	2.66	31	0.85	3.09	12	1.06
Laudatory Norms														
Protective Intervention	1.29	84	7.60	12	0.96	7.91	27	0.85	7.59	33	1.21	7.19	12	1.26
Seeking Assistance	1.33	74	7.15	10	0.91	7.72	23	0.82	7.02	30	1.71	7.41	11	1.04

*p< .05

TABLE 13

Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic:
Religious Activity and Affiliation

Normative Pattern	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	<i>t</i> -value
	Religious	Religious	Religious	Not Religious	Not Religious	Not Religious	
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	2.22	44	1.16	2.12	39	0.83	0.45
Physical Assault	2.29	39	0.95	2.42	38	0.96	-0.58
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	2.67	46	1.37	2.60	42	0.91	0.27
Personal Disregard	2.66	41	0.91	2.88	41	1.02	-0.99
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	7.54	45	1.18	7.73	43	0.93	-0.84
Seeking Assistance	7.56	41	1.09	7.11	37	1.47	1.56

**p* < .05

TABLE 14

Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic:
Greek Membership

Normative Pattern	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	<i>t</i> -value
	Greek	Greek	Greek	Non-Affiliated	Non-Affiliated	Non-Affiliated	
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	1.50	3	0	2.35	33	1.12	0.19
Physical Assault	2.83	3	0.76	2.33	32	0.87	1.60
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	2.50	3	0.75	2.87	34	1.37	0.10
Personal Disregard	2.83	3	0.14	2.79	35	0.83	1.46
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	6.94	3	1.29	7.49	35	1.18	0.29
Seeking Assistance	7.33	3	0.58	7.34	34	1.15	0.59

**p* < .05

TABLE 15

Results of Analysis of Variance of the Inviolable, Admonitory and Laudatory Normative Patterns by Class Standing

Normative Pattern	F-Ratio	N	Sophomore			Junior			Senior		
			Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD
Inviolable Norms											
Endangering Others	0.31	83	2.11	22	0.95	2.07	23	0.97	2.26	38	1.01
Physical Assault	0.05	77	2.29	17	1.12	2.39	23	0.01	2.36	37	0.86
Admonitory Norms											
Harmful Aggression	1.16	88	2.33	22	1.04	2.63	27	1.03	2.81	39	1.31
Personal Disregard	0.03	82	2.72	18	0.92	2.79	24	1.28	2.78	40	0.78
Laudatory Norms											
Protective Intervention	1.17	88	7.89	22	1.02	7.67	26	0.91	7.47	40	1.17
Seeking Assistance	1.60	78	7.76	17	1.03	7.02	22	1.72	7.35	39	1.08

*p < .05

TABLE 16

Results of Analysis of Variance of the Inviolable, Admonitory and Laudatory Normative Patterns by College of Enrollment

Normative Pattern	F-Ratio	N	A & S			B & E			Education			Health Sciences			Justice & Safety		
			Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD
Inviolable Norms																	
Endangering Others	1.41	82	2.14	36	0.98	2.50	14	1.30	2.58	6	0.86	2.33	12	1.05	1.73	11	0.72
Physical Assault	1.42	76	2.27	35	0.85	2.29	12	0.89	2.29	7	1.41	2.18	11	0.90	3.19	8	1.10
Admonitory Norms																	
Harmful Aggression	1.28	87	2.53	39	0.98	2.95	14	1.34	3.43	7	2.03	2.40	14	1.14	2.63	10	0.94
Personal Disregard	0.38	81	2.71	38	0.9	2.67	13	0.66	2.64	7	1.44	2.81	12	1.26	3.19	8	1.08
Laudatory Norms																	
Protective Intervention	1.29	87	7.65	40	0.85	7.24	14	1.45	7.26	7	1.72	7.79	14	0.99	7.93	10	0.72
Seeking Assistance	0.85	77	7.38	36	0.97	7.69	13	0.97	7.60	5	0.96	6.83	12	2.18	7.00	8	0.62

*p < .05

TABLE 17

Results of Analysis of Variance of the Inviolable, Admonitory and Laudatory Normative Patterns by Age

Normative Pattern	F-Ratio	N	19 or younger			20			21			22 or older		
			Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD
Inviolable Norms														
Endangering Others	0.86	83	1.88	12	0.93	2.50	11	1.00	2.29	19	0.95	2.11	41	1.08
Physical Assault	0.34	77	2.39	9	1.24	2.29	12	0.96	2.56	16	1.05	2.29	40	0.85
Admonitory Norms														
Harmful Aggression	1.25	88	2.17	12	1.10	3.08	12	1.04	2.69	21	0.91	2.63	43	1.31
Personal Disregard	1.40	82	2.52	9	0.96	2.73	12	1.06	3.17	18	1.22	2.67	43	0.79
Laudatory Norms														
Protective Intervention	0.88	88	8.03	12	0.78	7.36	11	1.20	7.71	21	1.04	7.56	44	1.11
Seeking Assistance	0.29	78	7.75	8	1.25	7.25	10	0.49	7.33	18	1.42	7.30	42	1.40

*p < .05

The three personal characteristics and sub group affiliations that had a significant influence or association upon the respondent's perception of how most students on campus would respond were: *student leader, parent's education level and cumulative GPA*. The personal characteristics or sub group affiliations that had a significant influence or association upon the respondent's perception of how their closest peer group at ECU would respond were *student leader and parents' education level*.

Parents' Education Level

While not significant, an association was noted where students from households where one or both parents had a college degree on one of the two inviolable norms and one of the two admonitory norms. To assess which mean differences were significant, the Scheffe post hoc mean comparison test was performed. There was a relationship between parents' education level and the espousal of the inviolable norm endangering others ($t = -1.94, p = .056, ES = .047$) Students from households where one or both parents had a college degree ($m = 1.98$) expressed slightly more disapproval of endangering others than those from households where neither parents had a college degree ($m = 2.41$).

While not significant, an association was noted between parents' education level and the espousal of the admonitory norm harmful aggression ($t = -1.95, p = .055, ES = .072$). Students from households where one or both parents had a college degree ($m = 2.42$) expressed slightly more disapproval of harmful aggression than those from households where neither parents had a college degree ($m = 2.90$).

TABLE 18

Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Parent's Education Level

Normative Pattern	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	<i>t</i> -value	Effect Size
	College	College	College	No College	No College	No College		
Inviolable Norms								
Endangering Others	1.98	46	0.89	2.41	37	1.12	-1.94	0.05
Physical Assault	2.31	43	0.90	2.41	34	1.02	-0.45	0.02
Admonitory Norms								
Harmful Aggression	2.42	48	0.94	2.89	40	1.36	-1.95	0.07
Personal Disregard	2.79	44	0.86	2.74	38	1.09	0.27	.00
Laudatory Norms								
Protective Intervention	7.78	48	0.90	7.47	40	1.22	1.32	0.07
Seeking Assistance	7.35	44	1.31	7.34	34	1.30	0.05	.00

**p* < .05

Student Leaders

While not significant, an association was noted between students based upon their perception that they are a student leader. To assess which mean differences were significant, the Scheffe post hoc mean comparison test was performed. An association was found between students who defined themselves as student leaders and the admonitory norm harmful aggression ($t=1.86$, $p=.07$, $ES=.06$). Students who defined themselves as student leaders ($m= 3.28$) expressed slightly less disapproval of harmful behaviors than those who did not define themselves as student leaders ($m= 2.55$).

TABLE 19

Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Student Leader

Normative Pattern	Mean Leader	N Leader	SD Leader	Mean Non-Leader	N Non-Leader	SD Non-Leader	<i>t</i> -value	Effect Size
Inviolable Norms								
Endangering Others	2.40	10	0.99	2.14	73	1.02	0.77	0.02
Physical Assault	2.55	10	0.80	2.33	67	0.97	0.69	.00
Admonitory Norms								
Harmful Aggression	3.28	10	1.55	2.55	78	1.10	1.86	0.06
Personal Disregard	2.78	10	0.80	2.77	72	0.99	0.02	.00
Laudatory Norms								
Protective Intervention	7.42	10	1.62	7.66	78	0.98	-0.69	.00
Seeking Assistance	7.35	10	0.53	7.35	68	1.37	0.01	.00

* $p < .05$

Cumulative GPA

There was one statistically significant difference between students based upon their cumulative GPA. To assess which mean differences were significant, the Scheffe post hoc mean comparison test was performed. A significant relationship was found between students based upon their cumulative GPA and the inviolable norm personal disregard ($f=3.996$, $p=.011$, $ES=.169$). Students with a cumulative GPA between 3.51-4.00 expressed the highest level of disapproval for behaviors within the normative pattern of personal disregard ($m=2.41$) which was slightly more disapproval than was indicated by students with a cumulative GPA between 2.51-2.99 ($m=2.45$) and students with a cumulative GPA between 3.00 and 3.50 ($m=3.13$).

While not significant, an association was noted between students based upon their cumulative GPA and the admonitory norm protective intervention ($f=2.449$, $p=.065$, $ES=.089$). Students with a cumulative GPA between 3.00-3.50 expressed the most

approval of protective intervention ($m= 7.76$) than that expressed by students with a cumulative GPA between 2.51-2.99 ($m= 7.72$) and students with a cumulative GPA between 3.51 and 4.00 ($m=7.21$).

When controlling for all other variables, none of the individual characteristics or group affiliations were significant.

TABLE 20

Results of Analysis of Variance of the Inviolable, Admonitory and Laudatory Normative Patterns by Cumulative GPA

Normative Pattern	F-Ratio	P Value	2.01-2.50			2.51-2.99			3.00-3.50			3.51-4.0			Effect Size
			Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	
Inviolable Norms															
Endangering Others	0.21	0.89	2.06	9	1.07	2.32	19	1.26	2.17	32	0.86	2.09	23	1.03	0.01
Physical Assault	1.79	0.16	2.75	8	1.04	2.25	18	0.86	2.55	29	1.08	2.05	22	0.72	0.09
Admonitory Norms															
Harmful Aggression	0.03	0.99	2.53	8	0.90	2.68	20	1.24	2.64	35	1.00	2.63	25	1.45	0.01
Personal Disregard	4.00*	0.01	3.11	8	1.17	2.45	20	0.69	3.13	32	1.02	2.41	22	0.84	0.17
Laudatory Norms															
Protective Intervention	2.49	0.07	8.23	8	0.65	7.72	20	0.93	7.76	35	0.87	7.21	25	1.38	0.09
Seeking Assistance	0.39	0.76	6.86	7	1.79	7.35	20	1.68	7.37	30	1.12	7.48	21	0.94	0.02

p< .05

Norm Espousal Across Individual Drinking Behaviors

To answer the third research question, the impact of norms across individual drinking behaviors was explored. T-tests ($p < .05$) were conducted to determine if there were significant differences on each of the six normative patterns by whether or not a student drinks to get drunk and whether or not they had consumed alcohol in the past year. Of the two variables considered, one was significant: whether or not a student drinks to get drunk.

Analysis of variance tests were performed to determine if there were significant differences ($p < .05$) on each of the six normative patterns by the number of times the student reported being drunk in the past thirty days and the number of times the student reported having consumed alcohol in the past thirty days. Of the two variables considered, two were significant: the number of times the student reported being drunk in the past thirty days and the number of times the student reported having consumed alcohol in the past thirty days.

Consumed alcohol in the past year (See Table 12) did not produce statistically significant ($p < .05$) differences on any of the 6 normative patterns.

In general, students who reported less support for the normative structure were more likely to drink higher quantities and more often than their peers who reported drinking at lower levels and less often.

Drink To Get Drunk

There were two statistically significant differences between students who did or did not indicate they drink to get drunk. A significant relationship was found between

students who drink to get drunk and the inviolable norm of personal disregard ($p = .009$). Students who drink to get drunk expressed less disapproval of the norm of personal disregard ($m = 3.34$) than that expressed by students who do not “drink to get drunk” ($m = 2.65$).

A significant relationship was found between students who drink to get drunk and the inviolable norm of physical assault ($p = .032$). Students who drink to get drunk expressed less disapproval of the norm of physical assault ($m = 2.83$) than students who did not drink to get drunk ($m = 2.25$).

TABLE 21
Bivariate Relationships Between the Six Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Drink to Get Drunk

Normative Pattern	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	<i>t</i> -value
	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	2.25	18	0.83	2.14	62	1.07	0.41
Physical Assault	2.83	15	0.96	2.25	60	0.91	2.19*
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	2.80	20	0.85	2.62	65	1.26	0.62
Personal Disregard	3.34	16	1.03	2.65	64	0.90	2.66*
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	7.66	20	0.99	7.59	65	1.09	0.23
Seeking Assistance	7.13	15	1.26	7.38	61	1.31	-0.65

* $p < .05$

Times Drunk in Past Thirty Days

There was one statistically significant relationship between students based upon the number of times they reported they had been drunk within the past thirty days and the admonitory normative pattern of personal disregard ($p = .001$). Students who had not

been drunk within the last thirty days expressed disapproval of violations of the norm of personal disregard ($m= 2.54$) while students who had been drunk between one and ten times within the past thirty days ($m= 3.16$) and students who had been drunk more than ten times within the past thirty days ($m=4.38$) did not express levels of disapproval that met with normative criteria.

While not significant, an association was noted between the number of times a student had been drunk within the past thirty days and the laudatory norm protective intervention ($p =.08$). While all respondents expressed levels of support that met normative criteria for laudatory norms, students who had been drunk between one and ten times within the last thirty days expressed the most support of the norm of protective intervention ($m= 7.97$) while students who had not been drunk within the past thirty days ($m= 7.43$) and students who had been drunk more than ten times within the past thirty days ($m=7.33$) expressed less approval.

While not significant, a second association was noted between the number of times a student had been drunk within the past thirty days and the admonitory norm physical assault ($p =.08$). Students who had not been drunk within the last thirty days expressed disapproval of the norm of physical assault ($m= 2.19$) while students who had been drunk between one and ten times within the past thirty days ($m= 2.66$) and students who had been drunk more than ten times within the past thirty days ($m=3.00$) did not express levels of disapproval that met with normative criteria.

TABLE 22

Results of Analysis of Variance of the Inviolable, Admonitory and Laudatory Normative Patterns by Times Drunk Past Thirty Days

Normative Pattern	F-Ratio	N	Never Drunk			1-10 Times			> 10 Times		
			Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD
Inviolable Norms											
Endangering Others	0.10	80	2.20	51	1.14	2.09	27	1.06	2.25	2	1.06
Physical Assault	2.62	75	2.19	48	0.94	2.66	25	0.92	3.00	2	.00
Admonitory Norms											
Harmful Aggression	0.29	85	2.62	54	1.36	2.69	29	0.75	3.25	2	.00
Personal Disregard	7.45*	80	2.54	52	0.96	3.16	26	0.82	4.38	2	1.94
Laudatory Norms											
Protective Intervention	2.67	85	7.43	54	1.17	7.97	29	0.74	7.33	2	0.94
Seeking Assistance	0.47	76	7.39	49	1.44	7.28	25	0.91	6.50	2	2.12

*p .05

Times Drink in Past Thirty Days

There was a statistically significant relationship between the number of times a student had been drinking in the past thirty days and the admonitory norm personal disregard ($p = .001$). Students who had not had anything to drink within the last thirty days ($m = 2.48$) and students who had less than ten drinks within the past thirty days ($m = 2.89$) expressed disapproval that met the normative criteria for personal disregard while students who had been drinking on more than ten occasions within the past thirty days ($m = 4.10$) did not express levels of disapproval that met with normative criteria.

While not significant, an association was noted between the number of times a student had been drinking in the past thirty days and the inviolable norm physical assault ($p = .086$). Students who had not had anything to drink within the last thirty days expressed normative levels of disapproval of the norm of physical assault ($m = 2.16$) while students who drank between one and ten times within the past thirty days ($m = 2.45$) and students who drank on more than ten occasions within the past thirty days ($m = 3.10$) did not express levels of disapproval that met with normative criteria.

TABLE 23

Results of Analysis of Variance of the Inviolable, Admonitory and Laudatory Normative Patterns by Times Drink Past Thirty Days

Normative Pattern	F-Ratio	N	Never Drink			1-10 Times			11-20 Times		
			Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD
Inviolable Norms											
Endangering Others	0.02	80	2.18	33	1.22	2.15	42	0.87	2.10	5	0.82
Physical Assault	2.54	75	2.16	32	0.95	2.44	38	0.94	3.10	5	0.42
Admonitory Norms											
Harmful Aggression	0.26	85	2.59	36	1.34	2.67	44	1.08	3.00	5	0.61
Personal Disregard	7.84*	80	2.48	35	0.94	2.89	40	0.81	4.10	5	1.18
Laudatory Norms											
Protective Intervention	0.42	85	7.49	36	1.10	7.70	44	1.06	7.73	5	0.72
Seeking Assistance	0.05	76	7.30	33	1.65	7.37	38	0.92	7.20	5	1.35

p< .05

Consumed Alcohol in Past Year

There were no statistically significant relationships or trends found between the students who had consumed alcohol within the past year or abstained and any of the normative patterns.

TABLE 24
Bivariate Relationships Between the SIX Normative Patterns and the Student Characteristic: Consumed Alcohol in Past Year

Normative Pattern	Mean	N	SD	Mean	N	SD	<i>t</i> -value
	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Inviolable Norms							
Endangering Others	2.26	42	0.95	2.08	37	1.10	0.79
Physical Assault	2.35	39	0.95	2.40	35	0.97	-0.24
Admonitory Norms							
Harmful Aggression	2.64	44	1.07	2.72	40	1.28	-0.30
Personal Disregard	2.80	41	1.01	2.78	38	0.93	0.08
Laudatory Norms							
Protective Intervention	7.55	43	1.07	7.65	41	1.06	-0.41
Seeking Assistance	7.45	40	0.95	7.16	35	1.61	0.97

* $p < .05$

Given the sample size, Pearson correlations were run to determine if there were any significant relationships between drinking behaviors and support of the normative structures. While it is not possible to determine what is causing these relationships, correlations were found. (See Table 25) Drink to Get Drunk was positively correlated with the admonitory norm of personal disregard, Times Drink in Past Thirty Days was positively correlated with the inviolable norm of physical assault and the admonitory norm of personal disregard and Times Drunk in Past Thirty Days was positively correlated with the inviolable norm of physical assault and the admonitory norm of personal disregard. Students who reported drinking more frequently and being drunk

more often voiced less disdain for the inviolable norm of personal disregard and the admonitory norm of physical assault than those who reported drinking on fewer occasions or reported being drunk less often. Further research would allow for different analysis and provide a better understanding of the relationship between drinking behavior and normative support.

Table 25
Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Physical Assault	---									
2. Harmful Aggression	.531**	---								
3. Seeking Assistance	-0.131	-0.049	---							
4. Times Drunk	.261*	0.107	-0.13	---						
5. Protective Intervention	-0.089	-.558**	0.157	0.098	---					
6. Personal Disregard	.736**	.385**	-.270*	.421**	-0.077	---				
7. Endangering Others	.338**	.790**	0.046	-0.001	-.478**	.338**	---			
8. Drink to Get Drunk	.248*	0.078	-0.081	.625**	0.012	.291**	0.042	---		
9. Drink in Past 30 Days	.269*	0.077	-0.099	.794**	0.038	.434**	-0.038	.365**	---	
10. Consume Alcohol	-0.036	-0.068	0.133	0.012	-0.01	0.008	0.009	-0.073	-0.019	---
Mean	2.36	2.64	7.34	1.55	7.63	2.77	2.17	---	2.13	---
SD	0.95	1.17	1.3	1.03	1.06	0.97	1.02	---	1.34	---

*Correlations is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

**Correlations is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Limitations

This research serves as a preliminary study and lays the ground work for larger and more representative studies by providing insight into the normative structure of collegiate drinking behaviors and the impact of personal characteristics, group affiliations and individual drinking behaviors. However, it is important to acknowledge that it is not possible to generalize the findings beyond the group of students who responded to the survey due to the low response rate and because the respondents are not representative of the larger campus population.

While there was no significant relationship between the normative structure identified in this study and the following personal characteristics or group affiliations: gender, race and ethnicity, class standing, age, marital status, on or off-campus housing, Greek membership, resident assistant position, religious activity, athlete and motivation for attending college, it is recommended that they be included in future studies conducted with larger and more representative samples.

Due to the low response rate, the ethnicity and race responses and the Greek membership responses were combined to create binary variables. However, further studies will want to obtain a response rate that allows for the examination of the levels of support provided by individual ethnic groups and to examine if there are any differences between the levels of support provided by fraternity and sorority members.

On this particular campus, the Institutional Technology Department was unable to distinguish between active and inactive university email accounts. While the campus is moving towards campus-wide use of institution-issued email accounts, some students are still using other email accounts to communicate with teachers and friends. The Institutional Technology Department was unable to distinguish between accounts which were active and those which were not resulting in an inability to distinguish between surveys that were sent to inactive accounts and never received by the intended student versus surveys which were received by the intended student who opted not to participate. Future studies will want to ensure that the campus culture actively communicates using the institution-issued email accounts and that the Institutional Technology Department is able to provide additional addresses to replace those that are returned as undeliverable or distinguished between active and inactive accounts to ensure a higher response rate. If this is not possible, distributing the survey through another method such as sending it through postal mail or having residence hall advisors distribute the surveys would be recommended.

While the students who responded to the survey were not coerced or compensated in any way for their participation, the responses were collected via self-report and as such can be subject to bias. Students were asked to provide information about their own drinking behaviors and self reported data can be unreliable. However, Dowdall and Weschler (2002) state that “a substantial body of empirical research supports that self-reports by adolescents about alcohol yield valid and reliable measures” (p. 1431).

Despite these limitations, this study still adds to the research on normative structures within college drinking and alcohol related behaviors by identifying a normative structure and demonstrates that future research is warranted.

Summary of Findings

The first research question sought to identify whether or not categories of behaviors associated with college student drinking were perceived by students to be inviolable, admonitory or laudatory norms. Within the group of students who responded to this survey, a normative structure for college student drinking does exist. This structure was made up of two inviolable, two admonitory and two laudatory norms.

The two inviolable normative patterns identified were endangering others and physical assault. Endangering others includes behaviors by students which involve drinking and driving others or getting a date drunk in order to have sex while physical assault describes behaviors by students such as pushing or assaulting another student or vandalism of property. The two admonitory normative patterns that emerged were harmful aggression and personal disregard. Harmful aggression involves a student who drives after consuming five or more drinks, gets drunk and damage property, makes unwanted sexual advances towards another student or comes to class obviously intoxicated while the normative pattern of personal disregard prohibits driving after having five or more drinks, engaging in sexual activity with someone who is intoxicated, harassing non-drinkers or coming to class obviously intoxicated. The two laudatory prescribed norms found were protective intervention and seeking assistance. Protective intervention includes calling for help when someone has had too much to drink, taking

another student to the emergency room when they have had too much to drink and taking someone's keys after they have had too much too drink while seeking assistance includes calling for help when someone has had too much to drink and taking another student to the emergency room when they have had too much to drink.

The second research question sought to identify if personal characteristics or sub group affiliations influenced the level of support given to the normative structure. While gender, race and ethnicity, class standing, age, marital status, college of enrollment, on or off-campus housing, Greek membership, resident assistant position, religious activity, athlete and motivation for attending college within the larger campus and the more immediate peer group did not produce statistically significant ($p < .05$) differences on any of the 6 normative patterns, three of the personal characteristics did have a significant influence or association. In general, students who had at least one parent with a college degree were more supportive of the normative structure than those who did not, students with higher cumulative grade point averages were more supportive of the normative structure than those with lower cumulative grade point averages, and students who considered themselves student leaders were less supportive of the normative structure than those who did not consider themselves student leaders.

The third research question sought to understand if the support for the norms identified varied across individual drinking behaviors. The normative structure identified received less support from students who reported that they drink to get drunk, who had been drunk more often during the past thirty days and who had reported drinking on more occasions in the past thirty days than other respondents. In general, students who reported less support for the normative structure were more likely to drink higher

quantities and more often than their peers who reported higher levels of support for the norms identified.

Whether or not a student drinks to get drunk had a positive relationship on the respondent's perception of the level of support most students on campus would provide for the normative constructs of personal disregard and the level of support their closest peer group would provide for the inviolable normative construct of physical assault.

The number of times a student had been drunk in the past thirty days was positively correlated with the respondent's perception of the level of support most students on campus would provide for the normative constructs of personal disregard while a positive association was noted with the laudatory normative construct of protective intervention and the level of support they believed their closest peer group would provide for the inviolable normative construct of physical assault.

Despite these limitations, this study grows the injunctive norm research by establishing that a normative structure exists within college student perception of others drinking behaviors. Additionally, this study establishes that a relationship between some demographic or affiliation variables and a student's level of support for the normative constructs. Finally, this study establishes a relationship between quantity/ frequency choices and a student's level of support for the normative structures.

Several implications for further research and practice can be supported from the finding of this study. Specifically, additional research within the areas of injunctive norms, parental normative beliefs, and of students who abstain from drinking or engage in low risk drinking is warranted. This research could be used to inform staff responsible

for developing and enforcing the campus alcohol policies and those charged with developing and implementing educational programs desired to create behavior change.

Implications for Future Research

Injunctive Norms

While much of the norms literature has focused on consumption norms, little attention has been paid to understanding the normative structure supported by students and student's perception of what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable behavior. Reno, Cialdini, and Kallgren (1993) define perceived norms as being comprised of "perceptions of how much others drink as well as what others consider to be acceptable drinking practices" (p. 104). Walters and Neighbors (2005) assert that "students use peers to gauge the acceptability of their own drinking practices" (p. 1175). While students who responded to this survey expressed indifference to violations of campus alcohol policies and state alcohol laws, there was support for behaviors which prevented others from driving after they had been drinking or praised those who were willing to seek medical assistance for someone who has had too much to drink. This is consistent with some of the findings by Caboni et al. (2005) who reported some core norms that received support across the board such as *tampering with fire equipment*, *protecting others welfare* and *seeking self help* and asserted that these norms "provide boundaries for behaviors for college students" (p. 26).

The collegiate peer group has a tremendous influence over new members who look to them for behavioral cues and messages about how to act and to define what is appropriate or inappropriate. Research that provides insight into the normative structure that exists within the student culture or within student sub-groups may shed some light on places where the student culture may override messages coming from faculty or staff and where contrary learning processes might exist. In addition, research that provides a shared understanding of where there is agreement between the student and administrator/faculty culture on what constitutes appropriate behavior worthy of praise or inappropriate behavior worthy of punishment would ensure that future conversations regarding policy development and enforcement could begin in a more appropriate place and hopefully result in a more productive conversation about alcohol use on campus. Policies and programs developed with this knowledge may be more successful in creating actual behavior change.

Further exploration regarding the impact of personal characteristics and group affiliations on the level of support provided for the normative structure is warranted. As mentioned earlier, there was no significant relationship between the normative structure identified in this study and many of the personal characteristics or group affiliations considered but it is recommended that they be included in future studies conducted with larger and more representative samples.

Drinking is a complex issue and studies that are conducted at different types of institutions provide us with more specific information about the implications of institutional type. While some researchers have examined the impact the type of institution has on drinking consumption norms, there is limited research in the area of

injunctive norms and institutional type. Using data from the *College Alcohol Survey*, Presley, Meilman & Leichliter (2002) classified institutions based upon their overall percentage of heavy episodic drinking (HED) and have created a classification system that divides schools into low, medium and high HED schools which could serve as a starting point for this type of inquiry.

Parental Influence

It is well documented in the literature that students come to college with established drinking patterns. While research has indicated that parental influence can be fairly weak once students begin college, one might expect that they would have a significant influence in the lives of their children while they are living at home and attending junior high and high school. Wood, Read, Mitchell and Brand (2004) found that “parent’s behaviors and attitudes toward underage alcohol use continue to have a meaningful influence well into late adolescence” (p. 25). A greater understanding of the normative support that parents have for alcohol related behaviors and messages about what constitutes acceptable or unacceptable alcohol related behavior would provide additional insight into the parental norms that were in place when students were beginning to experiment with alcohol and establishing their drinking behaviors.

One way to continue this line of inquiry would be to survey first year students and parents about alcohol-related behaviors to establish where parents, students and the institution agree or disagree about what constitutes appropriate or inappropriate behavior norms. This research would provide insight into the alcohol-related behaviors that parent’s prescribe or proscribe and the value structure that students bring with them when

they arrive on campus during New Student Orientation before students have had a chance to acclimate to the campus norms and culture.

Deeper examination might explore the impact of parent characteristics and subgroup affiliations and their impact upon alcohol-related behaviors, expectations, and consequences. Examples of these relationships might include: Are highly educated parents more likely to support norms that encourage their children to enjoy alcohol in moderation but discourage high risk drinking by role modeling moderate alcohol use by sharing a glass of wine with their children with dinner before they have reached the legal drinking age than parents with less education? Are parents in the southeast more likely to support a norm of abstinence and encourage their children to avoid alcohol by not have it in the house or drinking themselves because their church doctrine forbids the use of alcohol than parents who live outside the ‘bible belt’?

At a time when some institutions seem to be less tolerate of drinking on campus and are accused of ‘forcing’ students to drink off campus, parents may be more likely to approach the issue by encouraging their young person to drink at home so that they can supervise their activities and protect them from harming themselves or others. Findings of this nature would highlight a disparity between parental and institutional norms and expectations and any possible inconsistencies between the two messages that are relayed to the student. Policy makers and those charged with enforcing the campus alcohol policies would be well-served to learn that they have more restrictive norms and expectations for students than their parents. First year students arriving on campus in 2006 to find that they must share a 12X12 residence hall room with a roommate after having left a private room and bathroom may also find that they were able to drink in

their homes in high school but that campus policies prevent them from drinking in their campus housing even during their senior year after reaching the minimum legal drinking age.

Abstainers and Low Risk Drinkers

Alcohol on a college campus has been called the ‘social lubricant’ and several studies indicate that students expect to receive positive outcomes such as relieving tension, being more social and getting closer to the opposite sex as a result of drinking (Makela, K. & Mustonen, H., 2000; Burke & Stephens, 1999). These expectancies provide positive incentive to consume alcohol at high risk levels and little incentive to reduce consumption to low risk levels. As was mentioned earlier, there has little change in the drinking habits of college students during the past fifteen years. However, one of the trends detected by the *College Alcohol Study* between 1997 and 2001 was a polarization of drinking behaviors. Wechsler et al. (2001) found that while the number of students who reported an excessive drinking pattern had grown significantly, the number of abstainers had also increased between 1993 and 2001 as well. While considerable media attention has been given to the 48% of students who binge drink, the other 52% of students provide researchers with a variety of possible lines of inquiry.

If moderate drinking behavior is more desirable because it has not been linked to the alcohol-related problems documented in the literature, a greater understanding of the normative structure that exists among moderate drinkers and abstainers would provide another way to examine the complex problem of collegiate alcohol use. Are these students motivated to abstain because they have had a negative experience with alcohol,

because they belonged to Students Against Drunk Driving in high school or because they are motivated to earn good grades in anticipation of applying for medical school? Do individual characteristics or sub-group affiliations influence the decision to abstain from alcohol or drink at low risk levels within a culture that some suggest has normalized it? Do students abstain from alcohol or drink at low risk levels at religious-affiliated institutions at a rate higher than those who attend other types of institutions because of individual religious beliefs or because the enforcement of campus policies involve more significant consequences for those who are caught violating the policies? Are students who attend private liberal arts institutions more likely to abstain or drink moderately because the academic requirements are more rigorous or because they are usually located in geographical areas that have more limited access to bars and alcohol outlets? A greater understanding of the norms found within this population would provide additional findings for both researchers and practitioners to consider.

Implications for Policy & Practice

As discussed earlier, formal structures of social control such as the minimum legal drinking age and campus policies which prohibit drinking within residence halls or on campus may not be successful in preventing alcohol related behaviors because informal social controls support and encourage drinking as part of the student culture. However, college and university administrators may be able to create more effective educational programs and sanctions if they have a better understanding of the normative structure that exists on their campus. To develop more effective programming and educational sanctions, administrators must first understand the degree to which students

believe behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate. If educational programs were developed with an understanding of those behaviors that the informal and formal structures agree to be acceptable or unacceptable, more honest dialogue and behavior change may be possible. However, assessment is necessary to ensure that these programs are effective. Boyd and Faden (2002) suggest that most colleges and universities fail to evaluate their programs to determine whether they are effective or ineffective and this final step is critical.

If peers are more influential than faculty, programs that involve student presenters who can articulate and model the norms the campus is hoping to promote might prove more successful than other educational models. Many campuses invite students who have experienced alcohol-related problems to speak to student groups about the negative consequences that resulted from their drinking. While the intent of these programs is to discourage certain alcohol related behaviors, the students may deduct that drinking at high risk levels is the norm on that campus rather than the message intended by administrators. Given the potential influence of peers, a panel of students who hold leadership positions on campus who can articulate the reasons they do not drink at high risk levels and the factors that motivate them to drink at low risk levels might provide a message that normalizes drinking at low risk levels. With a greater understanding of factors that motivate students' individual drinking choices, alcohol education programs could attempt to harness the power of the peer socialization process. Therefore, this type of programming has the potential to impact the campus culture by educating new students about a healthier injunctive norm.

Campus policy makers should pay close attention to the informal sanctioning process. Formal conduct codes may prohibit certain things while students proscribe them. While campus policies will continue to support state and federal law and to condone behaviors that are inconsistent with the academic mission, an understanding of the support the informal structure provides to the policies and their perceptions of the sanctions is necessary information. If the judiciary process is to be an educational one, it is critical that administrators have a clear understanding of how students feel about the sanctions. Vik et al. (2000) found that problem drinkers were likely to change their behaviors only when the costs outweighed the benefits of drinking. Involving students in the conversation about what constitutes an effective sanction is important. Exploring notions that involve the loss of certain campus privileges such as the inability to obtain a parking sticker or the loss of priority within the campus housing lottery may provide more 'teeth' than being placed on "social probation" for six months.

If there are differences between student groups based on characteristics or by group affiliation, these group differences should be further considered when addressing educational and policy development and evaluation. As discussed earlier, Greek organizations may not have a healthy drinking norm and less normative support for alcohol related behaviors while students who are involved with religious organizations are least likely to engage in heavy drinking and are more likely to provide higher levels of normative support. An understanding of these differences could be used to customize alcohol education programs for campus organizations and populations.

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER FOR CSABI TO SELECTED STUDENTS

CSABI

College Student Alcohol Behavior Inventory

Eastern Kentucky University is participating in an important study that seeks to better understand your opinions about college drinking and drinking related behaviors. Similar surveys have been distributed at schools around the country.

You were recently selected to complete a web version of the survey and should have recently received it via email. Please take this opportunity to complete the survey now. The survey is self explanatory and easy to follow. The survey can be found at <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=87043925910>.

It will take no longer than 15 minutes. It asks how you believe most students at ECU view college drinking and related behaviors and how you feel your closest friends at ECU might respond to the same set of questions.

ALL your responses are anonymous and cannot be linked back to you in any way. You are not required to provide any personal information. ECU will simply receive a summary of all responses. You are encouraged to answer all the questions frankly and honestly since the results will be of little value to ECU unless they are accurate.

If you have any questions about any aspect of this survey, please call Laurel Martin at 859.327.4881 or email at laurel.martin@eku.edu. You may stop or pause at any time during the survey by clicking in the top right hand corner of your screen.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated! THANK YOU!

Sincerely,

Laurel Raimondo Martin

Laurel Raimondo Martin
Principal Investigator

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER FOR CSABI SECOND WAVE MAILING

CSABI

College Student Alcohol Behavior Inventory

Eastern Kentucky University is participating in an important study that seeks to better understand your opinions about college drinking and drinking related behaviors. Similar surveys have been distributed at schools around the country.

You were recently selected to complete a web version of the survey and should have recently received it via email. If you have already completed the survey, thank you for your participation in this project.

If you have not yet completed the survey, please take this opportunity to complete the survey now. The survey is self explanatory and easy to follow. The survey can be found at <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=87043925910>.

It will take no longer than 15 minutes. It asks how you believe most students at EKU view college drinking and related behaviors and how you feel your closest friends at EKU might respond to the same set of questions.

ALL your responses are anonymous and cannot be linked back to you in any way. You are not required to provide any personal information. EKU will simply receive a summary of all responses. You are encouraged to answer all the questions frankly and honestly since the results will be of little value to EKU unless they are accurate.

If you have any questions about any aspect of this survey, please call Laurel Martin at 859.327.4881 or email at laurel.martin@eku.edu. You may stop or pause at any time during the survey by clicking in the top right hand corner of your screen.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated! THANK YOU!

Sincerely,

Laurel Raimondo Martin

Laurel Raimondo Martin
Principal Investigator

APPENDIX C

COLLEGE STUDENT ALCOHOL BEHAVIORS INVENTORY

CSABI

College Student Alcohol Behavior Inventory

Being a college student is a complex activity composed of many behaviors and expectations. Listed below are some behaviors related to college drinking and drinking behaviors. These behaviors may be seen as appropriate or inappropriate to some students and not to others.

Using the response categories below, please indicate how you think students in general at ECU would reply. In the second set of questions, you will be asked to indicate how your closest group of friends at ECU would reply.

Your responses are anonymous. An independent company manages the survey and ECU will only receive summary information.

Click "Next" to get started with the survey. If you'd like to leave the survey at any time, just click "Exit this survey". Your answers will be saved.

Next >>

Using the response codes listed below, please indicate how you believe MOST students at ECU would feel about the different alcohol related decisions and behaviors.

1. A student decides never to drink.

Very inappropriate: remove from the university

Very inappropriate: remove from the group

Inappropriate

Mildly inappropriate

Neither appropriate or inappropriate

Mildly appropriate

Appropriate

Very appropriate: praised by the group

Very appropriate: praised by the university

2. A student decides not to drink at a party

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

3. A twenty-one year old student drinks alcohol in his/her dorm room.

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

4. An RA reports a student for an alcohol violation

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

5. A student calls for help when someone has had too much to drink

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

6. A student takes another student to the emergency room because they might have alcohol poisoning

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

7. A student rearranges his or her class schedule to accommodate social activities

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

8. A student does a keg stand at a party

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

9. A student engages in binge drinking

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

10. A student who drinks on more than 10 occasions in ten days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

11. A student who was drunk three or more times in the past month

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

12. A student who drinks to get drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

13. A student who drives after having five or more drinks

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

14. A student who has gotten drunk one or two times in a two week period

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

15. A student who has gotten drunk three or more times in a two week period

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

16. A student has been drinking on one or two occasions in the past thirty days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

17. A student has been drinking on three to five occasions in the last thirty days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

18. A student has been drinking on ten to nineteen occasions in the past thirty days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university
Appropriate

19. A student has been drinking on twenty to thirty occasions in the past thirty days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

20. A person who doesn't drink because they are afraid they will get written up

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

21. A student who takes someone's keys after they have had too much to drink

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

22. A student who drinks while wearing their Greek letters

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

23. A group of students plays drinking games

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

24. A male student engages in sexual activity with someone who is intoxicated

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

25. An underage student consumes alcohol

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

26. A student does a beer bong at a party

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

27. A student provides/buys alcohol for minors

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

28. A student encourages others to drink beyond the point of intoxication

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

29. A student presents a fake ID to a residential life staff member

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

30. A student drinks alcohol in his/her dorm room

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

31. A student drinks to excess and drives others

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

32. A student knowingly gets his or her date drunk in order to have sex

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

33. A student has a fake ID

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

34. A student drinks underage

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

35. A student skips class the next morning after a night of heavy partying

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

36. A student drinks to excess and gets sick in his/her dorm/apartment

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

37. A student drinks to excess and gets sick at a party

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

38. A female student engages in sexual activity with someone who is intoxicated

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

39. A student has a hang over

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

40. A student does something they regret after getting drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

41. A student does not remember what they did last night after they got drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

42. A student gets drunk and damages property

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

43. A student gets in trouble with campus or local police because they are drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

44. A student pressures friends to socialize before they finish their academic work

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

45. A student throws up in a residence hall common area

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

46. A student harasses non-drinkers

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

47. A drunk student pushes or assaults another student

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

48. A student must take care of their roommate because they are drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

49. An intoxicated student makes unwanted sexual advances towards another student

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

50. A student comes to class obviously intoxicated

- Very inappropriate: remove from the university
- Very inappropriate: remove from the group
- Inappropriate
- Mildly inappropriate
- Neither appropriate or inappropriate
- Mildly appropriate
- Appropriate
- Very appropriate: praised by the group
- Very appropriate: praised by the university

51. A student reports another student for an alcohol violation

- Very inappropriate: remove from the university
- Very inappropriate: remove from the group
- Inappropriate
- Mildly inappropriate
- Neither appropriate or inappropriate
- Mildly appropriate
- Appropriate
- Very appropriate: praised by the group
- Very appropriate: praised by the university

<< **Prev Next** >>

Exit this survey >>

Using the response codes listed below, please indicate how you believe YOUR CLOSEST FRIENDS AS EKU would feel about the different alcohol related decisions and behaviors.

52. A student decides never to drink.

- Very inappropriate: remove from the university
- Very inappropriate: remove from the group
- Inappropriate
- Mildly inappropriate
- Neither appropriate or inappropriate
- Mildly appropriate
- Appropriate
- Very appropriate: praised by the group
- Very appropriate: praised by the university

53. A student decides not to drink at a party

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

54. A twenty-one year old student drinks alcohol in his/her dorm room.

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

55. An RA reports a student for an alcohol violation

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

56. A student calls for help when someone has had too much to drink

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

57. A student takes another student to the emergency room because they might have alcohol poisoning

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

58. A student rearranges his or her class schedule to accommodate social activities

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

59. A student does a keg stand at a party

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

60. A student engages in binge drinking

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

61. A student who drinks on more than 10 occasions in ten days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

62. A student who was drunk three or more times in the past month

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

63. A student who drinks to get drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

64. A student who drives after having five or more drinks

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

65. A student who has gotten drunk one or two times in a two week period

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

66. A student who has gotten drunk three or more times in a two week period

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

67. A student has been drinking on one or two occasions in the past thirty days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

68. A student has been drinking on three to five occasions in the last thirty days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

69. A student has been drinking on ten to nineteen occasions in the past thirty days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

70. A student has been drinking on twenty to thirty occasions in the past thirty days

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

71. A person who doesn't drink because they are afraid they will get written up

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

72. A student who takes someone's keys after they have had too much to drink

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

73. A student who drinks while wearing their Greek letters

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

74. A group of students plays drinking games

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

75. A male student engages in sexual activity with someone who is intoxicated

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

76. An underage student consumes alcohol

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

77. A student does a beer bong at a party

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

78. A student provides/buys alcohol for minors

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

79. A student encourages others to drink beyond the point of intoxication

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

80. A student presents a fake ID to a residential life staff member

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

81. A student drinks alcohol in his/her dorm room

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

82. A student drinks to excess and drives others

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

83. A student knowingly gets his or her date drunk in order to have sex

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

84. A student has a fake ID

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

85. A student drinks underage

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

86. A student skips class the next morning after a night of heavy partying

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

87. A student drinks to excess and gets sick in his/her dorm/apartment

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

88. A student drinks to excess and gets sick at a party

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

89. A female student engages in sexual activity with someone who is intoxicated

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

90. A student has a hang over

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

91. A student does something they regret after getting drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

92. A student does not remember what they did last night after they got drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

93. A student gets drunk and damages property

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

94. A student gets in trouble with campus or local police because they are drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

95. A student pressures friends to socialize before they finish their academic work

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

96. A student throws up in a residence hall common area

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

97. A student harasses non-drinkers

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

98. A drunk student pushes or assaults another student

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

99. A student must take care of their roommate because they are drunk

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

100. An intoxicated student makes unwanted sexual advances towards another student

Very inappropriate: remove from the university
Very inappropriate: remove from the group
Inappropriate
Mildly inappropriate
Neither appropriate or inappropriate
Mildly appropriate
Appropriate
Very appropriate: praised by the group
Very appropriate: praised by the university

101. A student comes to class obviously intoxicated

- Very inappropriate: remove from the university
- Very inappropriate: remove from the group
- Inappropriate
- Mildly inappropriate
- Neither appropriate or inappropriate
- Mildly appropriate
- Appropriate
- Very appropriate: praised by the group
- Very appropriate: praised by the university

102. A student reports another student for an alcohol violation

- Very inappropriate: remove from the university
- Very inappropriate: remove from the group
- Inappropriate
- Mildly inappropriate
- Neither appropriate or inappropriate
- Mildly appropriate
- Appropriate
- Very appropriate: praised by the group
- Very appropriate: praised by the university

<< **Prev Next** >>

Exit this survey >>

Please mark the best answer in each category.

103. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

104. Which racial/ethnicity group do you classify yourself?

- African American
- Asian American
- Hispanic American
- White Caucasian
- International
- Other

105. What is your marital status?

Single
Married

106. What is your age?

19 or younger
20
21
22 or older

107. Do one or both of your parents have college degrees?

Yes
No

108. In which college are you enrolled?

Arts and Sciences
Business and Technology
Education
Health Sciences
Justice and Safety

109. What is your cumulative GPA?

< 1.0
1.00-1.50
1.51-1.99
2.00-2.50
2.51-2.99
3.00-3.50
3.51-4.00

110. What is your class standing?

Sophomore
Junior
Senior

111. Do you live on-campus or off-campus?

On-campus
Off-campus

112. If on-campus, in which residence hall do you reside?

113. Are you a member of an intercollegiate athletic team?

Yes
No

114. Are you a RA (Resident Assistant)?

Yes
No

115. I am:

A member of a social fraternity
A member of a social sorority
Not affiliated with a fraternity or sorority

116. Are you a student leader?

Yes
No

117. If yes, name your most significant leadership position on-campus to date.

118. Do you attend church or worship regularly?

Yes
No

119. If yes, please list your denomination

120. Please mark the statement that most accurately describes your motivation for attending college:

Although I may be ultimately concerned about a career, currently I am interested in enriching myself through education focusing on the world of knowledge and ideas

Although my academic work and progress are important, I believe that an equally significant part of the college experience exists outside the classroom. Participation in campus life and activities is important to me.

Of greatest important to me, is getting a degree in my chosen field. Consequently, other intellectual and social activities are necessarily of secondary importance to me.

Although I find the university environment stimulating, I feel alienated from the institution and its formal programs and activities. Currently, I am pursuing the meanings and purposes of life through involvement and self-exploration outside the university.

<< **Prev Next** >>

Exit this survey >>

Please select the response that most accurately describes your drinking behavior.

121. I typically drink to get drunk

Yes
No

122. I have consumed alcohol in the past year but not been drunk.

Yes
No

123. Please mark the statement that most accurately describes the number of times that you have been drunk in the past thirty days.

I have not been drunk in the past thirty days
I have been drunk on one or two occasions in the past thirty days
I have been drunk on three to five occasions in the past thirty days
I have been drunk on six to nine occasions in the past thirty days
I have been drunk on ten to nineteen occasions in the past thirty days
I have been drunk on twenty to thirty occasions in the past thirty days

124. Please mark the statement that most accurately describes your drinking in the past thirty days

I have not had alcohol to drink in the past 30 days
I have had alcohol to drink on one or two occasions in the past thirty days
I have had alcohol to drink on three to five occasions in the past thirty days
I have had alcohol to drink on six to nine occasions in the past thirty days
I have had alcohol to drink on ten to nineteen occasions in the past thirty days
I have had alcohol to drink on twenty to thirty occasions in the past thirty days

125. Are the sanctions for violating the EKU alcohol policies a deterrent to breaking the rules?

Yes

No

<< Prev Next >>

CSABI

College Student Alcohol Behavior Inventory

I appreciate your feedback and wish you all the best on your upcoming finals.

Thanks again!

Laurel Raimondo Martin
Principal Investigator

<< Prev Done >>

REFERENCES

- Akers, R.L. (1997). *Criminological Theories: Introduction and Evaluation*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Andrews, M.L. (1987). The knowledge, attitudes, and behavior concerning alcohol use of resident assistants and residence hall students. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 33*(1), 86-90.
- Baer, J., Stacy, A., & Larimer, M. (1991). Biases in the Perception of Drinking Norms Among College Students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 52*(6), 580-586.
- Berkowitz, A. D. & Perkins, H.W. (1986). Resident advisors as role models: A comparison of drinking patterns of resident advisers and their peers. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 27*, 69-85.
- Borsari & Carey (2001). Peer influences on college drinking: A review of the research. *Journal of Substance Abuse, 13* (4), 391-424.
- Boyd & Faden. (2002). The Contexts and Consequences of College Drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 63*(2), 1-23.
- Braxton, J. M. (1990). Deviancy from the norms of science: A test of control theory. *Research in Higher Education, 31*, 461-476.
- Braxton, J. M. & Bayer, A. E. (1999). *Faculty misconduct in collegiate teaching*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Burke, Randy S. & Stephens, Robert S. (1999). Social anxiety and drinking in college students: A social cognitive theory analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 19*, 513.
- Caboni, Timothy C., Braxton, J.M., Dusterhaus, M.B., Mundy, M., McClendon, S. & Lee, S. (2005). Toward an empirical delineation of a normative structure for college and university students. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*, 519-544.
- Carter, Colleen & Kahnweiler, William (2000). The Efficacy of the Social Norms Approach to Substance Abuse Prevention Applied to Fraternity Men. *Journal of American College Health, 49*(2), 66-71.
- Cashin, J.R., Presley, C.A. & Meilman, P.W. (1998). Alcohol use in the Greek system: Follow the leader? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol. 59*(1), 63-70.

- Cialdini, R., Reno, R. & Kallgren, C., (1990). A Focus Theory of Normative Conduct: Recycling the concept of norms to reduce littering in public places. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(6), p. 1015-1026.
- Clark, B. R. & Trow, M. (1966). The Organizational Context. In T.M. Newcomb & E.K. Wilson (Eds.), *College Peer Groups: Problems and Prospects for Research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Cohen, Albert K. (1971). *Delinquent Boys: The Culture of the Gang*. New York: The Free Press.
- Dorris, Jonathan T. (Ed.). (1957). *Eastern Kentucky Review*. Volume XLVII, No. 5
- Dowdall, G.W. & Weschler, H. (2002). Studying collegiate alcohol use: Widening the Lens, sharpening the focus. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 63(2), p. 1422.
- Durkeim, E. (1951). *Suicide*. Translation by Spaulding and Simpson. New York: Free Press.
- (2003-2004). Factbook. Eastern Kentucky University, Office for Institutional Research.
- Ford, D. S. & Carr, P. (1990). Psychosocial Correlates of Alcohol Consumption among Black College Health Students. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 26(1), p. 45-51.
- Gibbs, Jack P. (1981). *Norms, Deviance, and Social Control: Conceptual Matters*. New York: Elsevier Science North Holland, Inc.
- Jensen, G. F. & Akers, R.L. (2003). Taking Social Learning Global: Micro-Macro Transitions in Criminological Theory. In R.L. Akers & G.F. Jensen (Eds.), *Social learning and the explanation of crime* (pp. 9-37). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publisher.
- Johnston, L.D., O'Mailey, P.M., and Bachman, J.G. (2003). Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975-2002. Volume 11: College student and adult ages 19-40 (NH Publication No. 03-5376). Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.
- Kellogg Commission. (1997). Returning to Our Roots: The Student Experience. Kellogg Commission on the Future of State and Land-Grant Universities. *An Open Letter to the Presidents and Chancellor of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges*. 1-41.
- Kim, J.O. & Mueller, C.W. (1978). *Factor Analysis: Statistical methods and practical issues*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Kuh, G. D. & Whitt, E. J. (1988). *The Invisible Tapestry: Culture in American Colleges and Universities*. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report Volume 17, No. 1, Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.
- Lee, H., Gledhill-Hoyt J., Maenner G., Dowdall, G. & Wechsler, H. (1998). Changes in Binge Drinking and Related Problems Among American College Students Between 1993 and 1997. *Journal of American College Health*, 47, 57-68.
- Lindquist, C., Cockerham, W. & Hwang, S. (1999, September). Drinking patterns in the American Deep South. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 60(5), 663-664.
- Makela, K. & Mustonen, H. (2000). Relationships of drinking behavior, gender and age with reported negative and positive experiences related to drinking. *Addiction*, 95(5), 727.
- Meilman, P.W., Cashin, J.R., McKillip, J.A. & Presley, C.A. (1998). Understanding the three national databases on collegiate alcohol and drug use. *Journal of American College Health*, 46, 159.
- Milem, J. (1998). Attitude change in college students: Examining the effect of college peer groups and faculty normative groups. *Journal of Higher Education*, 69(2), 117.
- Nelson, T.F. & Wechsler, H. (2001). Alcohol and College Athletes. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, 33(1), 43-47.
- Newcomb, T. & Wilson, E. (1966). *College peer groups*. Chicago: Aldine.
- O'Hare. (1990). Drinking in college: consumption patterns, problems, sex differences, and legal drinking age *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 51, 536-541.
- O'Malley, P. & Johnson, L. (2002). Epidemiology of alcohol and other drug use among American college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 63, 1-20.
- Pascarella, E. & Terenzini, P. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Perkins, H. W. (2002). Social norms and the prevention of alcohol misuse in collegiate contexts. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 63(2), 164.
- Presley, C.A., Meilman, P.W. & Leichliter, J.S (2002). College factors that influence drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 63(2), 82-87.
- Presley, C.A., Meilman, P.W., Leichliter, J.S., & Harrold, R. (1999). *The Core Alcohol and Drug Survey User's Manual, 17th Edition*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University.

- Straus, R. & Bacon, S.D. (1953). *Drinking in College*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- (2002). The Activities, Interests, and Characteristics of Students: 2001 Student Interest Survey Report. University of Minnesota, Office for Student Affairs. Retrieved from <http://www.osa.umn.edu/reports/>
- Trockel, M., Williams, S., & Reis, J. (2003). Considerations for more effective social norms based alcohol education on campus: An analysis of different theoretical conceptualizations in predicting drinking among fraternity men. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 64(2), 50-59.
- Vik, P.W., Culbertson, K.A., & Sellers, K. (2000, September). Readiness to change drinking among heavy-drinking college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 61(5), 674.
- Walters, S.T. & Neighbors, C. (2005). Feedback interventions for college alcohol misuse: What, why and for whom? *Addictive Behaviors*, 30(6), 1168-1182.
- Wechsler, H. (1995). Correlates of College Student Drinking. *American Journal of Public Health*, 85, 921-926.
- Wechsler, H., Davenport, A., Dowdall, G., Moeykens, B., & Castillo, S. (1994). Health and behavior consequences of binge drinking in college: A national survey of students at 140 campuses. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 272(21), 1672-1677.
- Wechsler, Kuh, & Davenport. (1995). Fraternities, Sororities and Binge Drinking: Results From a National Study of American Colleges. National Association of Student Personnel Administrators. 33(4), 260-279.
- Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Kuo, M. Le, H. (2000). College binge drinking in the 1990's: A continuing problem. Results of the Harvard School of Public Health 1999 College Alcohol Study. *Journal of American College Health*, 48(10), 199-210.
- Wechsler, H., Lee, J.E., Kuo, M., Seibring, M., Nelson, T.F. and Lee, H. (2002). Trends in college binge drinking during a period of increased prevention efforts: Findings from 4 Harvard School of Public Health Surveys 1993-2001. *Journal of American College Health*, 50(5), 203.
- Wechsler, H., Molnar, B.E., Davenport, A.E., & Baer, J.S. (1999). College alcohol use: A full or empty glass? *Journal of American College Health*, 47, 247-252.

- White, Jamieson-Drake & Swartzwelder. (2002). Prevalence and correlates of alcohol-Induced Blackouts among college students: Results of an email survey. *Journal of College Health*, 51(3), 117-131.
- Wood, M., Read, J., Mitchell, & Brand. (2004) Do parents still matter? Parent and peer Influences on alcohol involvement among recent high school graduates. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 18(1), 19-30.
- Wood, M., Read, J., Palfai, T. and Stevenson, J. (2001). Social influence processes and college student drinking: The mediational role of alcohol outcome expectancies. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 62(1), 32-43.