

1-1-2007

An assessment of the CRAWL Program: A brief alcohol intervention for first time alcohol offenders at Eastern Illinois University

Catherine T. Passananti

Eastern Illinois University

This research is a product of the graduate program in [Counseling and Student Development](#) at Eastern Illinois University. [Find out more](#) about the program.

Recommended Citation

Passananti, Catherine T., "An assessment of the CRAWL Program: A brief alcohol intervention for first time alcohol offenders at Eastern Illinois University" (2007). *Masters Theses*. 137.
<http://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/137>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact tabruns@eiu.edu.

*******US Copyright Notice*******

No further reproduction or distribution of this copy is permitted by electronic transmission or any other means.

The user should review the copyright notice on the following scanned image(s) contained in the original work from which this electronic copy was made.

Section 108: United States Copyright Law

The copyright law of the United States [Title 17, United States Code] governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials.

Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the reproduction is not to be used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research. If a user makes a request for, or later uses, a photocopy or reproduction for purposes in excess of "fair use," that use may be liable for copyright infringement.

This institution reserves the right to refuse to accept a copying order if, in its judgment, fulfillment of the order would involve violation of copyright law. No further reproduction and distribution of this copy is permitted by transmission or any other means.

THESIS REPRODUCTION CERTIFICATE

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates (who have written formal theses)

SUBJECT: Permission to Reproduce Theses

The University Library is receiving a number of request from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow these to be copied.

PLEASE SIGN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS:

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

Catherine J. Pasquet

6/15/07

Author's Signature

Date

I respectfully request Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University **NOT** allow my thesis to be reproduced because:

Author's Signature

Date

This form must be submitted in duplicate.

An Assessment of the CRAWL Program: A Brief Alcohol Intervention
for First Time Alcohol Offenders at Eastern Illinois University
(TITLE)

BY

Catherine T. Passananti

THESIS

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF

Master of Science

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

2007

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE CITED ABOVE

May 7, 2007
DATE

J. A. Wallace
THESIS DIRECTOR

May 7, 2007
DATE

R. R.
DEPARTMENT/SCHOOL HEAD

ABSTRACT

Title of Thesis: An Assessment of the CRAWL Program: A Brief Alcohol Intervention for First Time Alcohol Offenders at Eastern Illinois University

Catherine T. Passananti, Master of Science in College Student Affairs, 2007

Directed By: James Wallace, Ph.D.
Professor of Counseling and Student Development

The purpose of the present study was to examine the effectiveness of an alcohol intervention program instituted at Eastern Illinois University. More specifically, the purpose was to assess how much knowledge student participants gained about their personal drinking behavior and how it affected other individuals. Results from the study include that the program had a positive educational effect on some, while other participants were in need of more individual and intensive alcohol education and counseling.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to take this opportunity to thank all of those who made it possible for me to complete this document. I would like to express my thanks and appreciation to the following people.

Dr. James Wallace, my thesis chair and professor, you set the bar high and expected me to rise up to meet it. I appreciate the time spent answering my endless barrage of questions and the time spent editing this document. Your praise and commendations inspired me to continue on in this process and complete this project.

Dr. Andrew Wall, my committee member and professor. I appreciate how timely you were throughout this process. Your critical edits of this document pushed me to be a conscientious writer. Your expertise in this area and strong writing ability were an inspiration to me throughout the process.

Mr. Mike Tozer, committee member and colleague. I appreciate you allowing me to assess your program. I only hope you find helpful results from this process. I credit you for providing me an interesting thesis topic!

I am forever grateful for the constant encouragement and support provided by friends and colleagues Terrence Brooks, Sara Schaller, Jennifer Copes, Colleen Coffey and Todd Kleine. I am also eternally grateful to have a family, particularly Mom, Dad and Grandma Margie, that learned to accept the ebbing and flowing of my moods and personality throughout the stressors of writing this paper!

Last, I am thankful for the 21 participants who made this research project possible. Without those responses, my research project would not have come to fruition.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii.
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii.
CHAPTER I.-INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of Study.....	1
CRAWL Structure	1
Research Questions.....	4
Hypothesis	4
Significance of the Study.....	5
Limitations.....	6
Summary.....	7
CHAPTER II.-REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
Defining High Risk Drinking	8
Health Risks Associated with High Risk Drinking	9
Need for Intervention.....	10
Effectiveness of Alcohol Interventions	12
Types of Intervention.....	13
Goal Setting	13
Individual Intervention	14
Inclusion of Multiple Media	14
Peer to Peer Intervention	15
Web Based Intervention	15
Motivational Interviewing	16
Brief Interventions	16
Perceptions of Drinking.....	17
Effect of Gender on Alcohol Intervention.....	18
CHAPTER III.-METHODOLOGY	19
Purpose of the Study.....	19
Design of the Study	20
Participants	20
Site.....	20
Instrument	22
Data Collection and Treatment of Data	27
CHAPTER IV.-RESULTS	29
High Risk Drinking	29
Effects of Alcohol Related Behavior	29
Perceptions of CRAWL	31
Change in Habits	31

Readiness to Change	32
CHAPTER V.-DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
Summary of Findings	33
Limitations	33
Conclusions	35
Recommendations	36
REFERENCES	40
APPENDICES	46
Appendix A-Alcohol Policy	47
Appendix B-Substance Use Self-Assessment	49
Appendix C-Personal Drinking Profile	52
Appendix D-CRAWL Evaluation	57
Appendix E-Informed Consent for CRAWL	60
Appendix F-Worksheet for CRAWL Referral	62
Appendix G-CRAWL Assessment Instrument	64
Appendix H-CRAWL Assessment Results	70

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Alcohol and substance abuse on college campuses attracts great attention. There are countless resources citing statistics of “high risk” drinking on campuses nationwide. However, there are fewer available resources referencing successful prevention or intervention programs suited to address problematic college student drinking behavior. After analyzing statistics concerning alcohol consumption and abuse, the important question to ask is what college staff and administrators are doing to prevent or counteract these problems?

The purpose of this study is to assess one particular program Eastern Illinois University piloted targeting first time alcohol offenders. Eastern Illinois University, an institution of over 12,000 undergraduate students located in the Midwest, implemented an alcohol intervention program titled CRAWL (Choosing Responsibly And Within Limits). According to the main facilitator who implemented the program on a biweekly basis, the aim of the program was not to convince students to stop drinking. The aim of the program was to help students realize the effects of their drug and alcohol related behavior on all students, staff, and other individuals who surround them (M. Tozer, personal communication, August 2002).

CRAWL Structure

CRAWL, a three hour program, was conducted approximately every other Thursday between 7-10 pm during both fall and spring academic semesters. The first time

students were cited for violating the University's alcohol policy (Appendix A), by University staff, they were referred to the program. Upon arrival at the CRAWL site, participants paid a \$35 required fee; the purpose of which was intended to serve as a deterrent to policy violation. Participants' received designated seats at the facilitator's discretion. The program commenced when the facilitator laid ground rules for the evening's program. Once rules were established, the interactive portion of CRAWL began.

Telling their Story

Participants stood in front of the group, in a large auditorium setting (sometimes a classroom), to recount the circumstances which resulted in their attendance at CRAWL. After all the participants had the opportunity to share their story, the assembly voted on which participant had the most severe circumstance. That person, once again, stood in front of the large group and was asked more specific questions about the incident and its consequences by the facilitator and other participants. The facilitator included all participants in this process by sporadically questioning each of them. Once the participant returned to his or her seat, the entire assembly filled out a substance use assessment (Appendix B). There was a fifteen minute break after this activity.

Virtual Bar

Once participants return from break, the facilitator used the "virtual bar"; an interactive computer program that assessed blood alcohol content (BAC) levels based on the amount a person drinks in one evening. The facilitator instructed the group on how to recognize and interpret BAC markers. BAC markers are different points, while drinking, where one can learn to recognize their level of intoxication. An example was learning

how to recognize that someone is suffering from alcohol poisoning versus being passed out. The counselor also discussed what it meant to pass out and why that was a negative consequence of drinking.

Once the virtual bar exercise ended, the facilitator walked participants through the process of filling out a Personal Drinking Profile (Appendix C). This task required between 15-20 minutes for participants to complete. It asked specific questions about the amount of alcohol a student drank on an average weekday, weekend, and etcetera. This document is turned into the University Health Center. As participants complete the Personal Drinking Profile they were allowed to begin their second break.

The Jury

The last section of CRAWL required the most assembly participation. The facilitator asked for 6 men and 6 women to volunteer. The 12 volunteers were placed in the very front row of the auditorium seating. The facilitator brought up the participant(s) whose violation affected the greatest number of people (i.e. a belligerent student who started a fight after returning from a house party versus a student who returned from a house party and woke his/her roommate from sleep). The facilitator placed this student or students "on trial". The 12 volunteers served as a jury. The participant(s) "on trial" told their story and pleaded their case. The jury was then charged with the duty of assessing a reasonable consequence for that participant that he or she would have to carry out after CRAWL. Once the jury decided on the outcome, the facilitator allowed them all to return to their original seats. The facilitator then closed the evening and distributed a short survey of CRAWL (Appendix D). Once participants completed the survey they were dismissed from CRAWL.

CRAWL's goal was to make participants aware of the effect their drinking behaviors have on others. Its current evaluation leaves room for expansion to gain more specific details that will be beneficial in continuing CRAWL. The goal of this research project was to assess CRAWL in great detail by obtaining the perceptions of participants who experienced the program during the 2005-2006 academic year.

Research Questions

1. What percentage of participants self-identified as high risk drinkers?
2. Do participants become more aware of the effects their drinking has on others? Is that awareness based on CRAWL attendance?
3. What are participants' perceptions of CRAWL?
4. Do participants report a change in the amount of days per week/weekend spent drinking? Do participants report a change in the amount of alcohol consumed per drinking period?
5. Which portion of CRAWL has the strongest effect on participants?
6. How many participants share that they feel they need to change and are ready to change?

Hypothesis

Significant research has been conducted in the area of alcohol issues and college students. More recent research delves into possible interventions or prevention methods for excessive drinking on campus. Eastern Illinois University has recently implemented Alcohol Edu for all incoming students as well as the CRAWL program for first time

offenders. This research project is based on student feedback of the CRAWL program. Based on Eastern Illinois University students and the structure of CRAWL, there will be evidence to show that students need more individual, specific counseling due to the varying degrees of violations that result in CRAWL attendance.

Significance of the Study

This study was conducted with hopes that it will contribute to the understanding of the effectiveness of the CRAWL program and its impact on the drinking behavior of Eastern Illinois University students. The specific intent of the present study was to demonstrate, through evaluation and assessment, the effectiveness of alcohol interventions in place at Eastern Illinois University during 2005-2006. The CRAWL intervention program participants were referrals from University Housing professionals, Judicial Affairs officers, the Counseling Center staff, and the University Police Department. Individuals working in each of the subunits mentioned may benefit from the findings of this study. Professionals in the counseling center, who are mainly responsible for implementing this program, will gain knowledge on CRAWL's strengths and weaknesses. They will then be able to better develop the program in future years.

The purpose of this assessment was to address the strengths and weaknesses of CRAWL so that it best serves students who participate. Several research studies show that brief, personalized interventions are most successful. CRAWL was initially implemented in 2005 at Eastern Illinois. The counselors involved in the program are eager to learn how well it served the attendees and what program components might be improved in the years to come.

Limitations of the Study

There are five limitations in the findings of this study. The first limitation is that the results are not statistically significant. 292 potential participants were emailed the survey, 49 visited the website, and 21 completed the survey. However, these findings give some insight into strengths and weaknesses of the CRAWL program.

The second limitation concerns the instrument. The online instrument used in this survey was created by the researcher and never used in previous empirical data collection. The instrument did utilize several forms of questioning including Likert scales, open ended questions, and multiple choices. Instituting different data collection formatting was intended to suit a wider variety of participants' preferred response methods. Participants were given the opportunity to share any thoughts they had about CRAWL that may not have been specifically addressed in any one survey question.

The third limitation is the self reported data. All data collected in this research study was self-reported. Participants were asked to share estimates of the amount and frequency of their drinking before and after their attendance at CRAWL. Their numbers may be exaggerated or underestimated based on their own thoughts and feelings on how their drinking may be perceived by others.

The fourth study limitation was that the participants were able to complete the survey at a computer in any environment they chose. Environmental factors such as roommates, friends, and noisy locations could have played a role in how a participant responded. Research shows that people are more honest when they can fill out a survey

online and in private. However, there is no way of knowing how the participants filled out the survey. Such factors could have skewed the data.

The fifth limitation concerns the population. By design, this study excluded many average college drinkers. Most participants in CRAWL were drinkers who had drawn attention to their drinking situation and were documented by university staff. Most documented participants were found violating residence hall policy. This population is not inclusive of the entire drinking population at Eastern Illinois University.

Summary

This research project is a significant starting point for student affairs professionals, health educators and professionals, and students to critically assess the drinking behavior at Eastern Illinois University and methods in place to address such behavior. Drinking is a significant issue on many college campuses. Prevention and abstinence projects are certainly in place and talked about. However, there still remains a population of students that have begun drinking. It is important to have successful intervention programs in place to deal with that population.

There are limitations to the data in this research project as it utilizes a novel survey assessing a novel intervention program. Whether the data from the survey supports the current facilitation of CRAWL or critiques it, the findings will help the facilitators and other professionals gain a better understanding of participants' thoughts of the program and their outstanding needs. The student participants are the main target of education through CRAWL. Their thoughts are crucial to shaping the program in such a way that it can continue to reach and educate the largest number of student participants.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Defining High Risk Drinking

Nearly all literature concerning college students and their drinking behaviors used the terms “high risk” or “binge drinking” to identify the type of drinking in which students participate. The definition of “binge drinking” varies from four to five drinks in one sitting. A major weakness of such a definition is that it seldom defines the length of time considered to constitute a sitting. A more recent and more accurate term used in the literature is “high risk” drinking. Both of these terms are commonly used when discussing college students. Heavy drinking typically peaks when students are between 18 or 22 years old and decreases steadily thereafter (Larimer et al., 2004/2005; Bailey et al., 2004). Bailey et al. (2004) identifies misuse of alcohol and other drugs to be a lead killer of adolescents aged 14-19 years. This age range includes many of the college groups included as high risk drinkers: first year students, particularly those living on campus, students involved in Greek life, and student athletes.

At risk college students are consistently identified as members of fraternities and sororities, among the highest, athletes, and first year students living in the residence halls. In each of these categories men are considered to drink heavier than women (Larimer et al., 2004/2005). O’Hare and Sherrer (1999) identified on campus students to consume more alcohol than those living independently or with their parents. Among that high risk group are men associated with Greek life organizations. These men are reported to

consume greater amounts of alcohol per occasion than students not affiliated with Greek life (Larimer et al., 2001).

Of all college students, in a study by Walters and Neighbors (2005), more than half report to have participated in heavy drinking in the past two weeks. It is reported that one in five students is considered a binge drinker (Wechsler, Nelson, & Weitzman, 2000). It is important to note that studies find students' consumption to be related to their perception of how much other students drink. Students affiliated with social Greek associations may view high alcohol consumption as more acceptable than other students (Larimer et al., 2001). If students perceive themselves to be at a "party school" they may drink accordingly. This leads there to be some truth behind the reputation of some colleges and universities (Wechsler & Kuo, 2000).

Health Risks Associated with High Risk Drinking

It is important to understand what binge drinking is and next, the impact it has on a person's body. One article found heavy drinking to lead to a higher stroke risk in both men and women along with an increased risk for cancer of the head, neck, digestive tract and breast. The same article highlighted the fact that there is no safe amount of drinking that ensures a risk free outcome. The most important factor in the health related issues is how early abuse affects people later in life. "Among teenagers and young adults in particular, the risks of alcohol use outweigh any benefits that may accrue later in life; since alcohol abuse and dependence and alcohol-related violent behavior and injuries are all too common in young people and are not easily predicted" (Alcohol Research & Health, 2000). Helmkamp et al. (2003) specifically points out that "binge drinking can set

the stage for alcohol dependence” later in life. The actions and behaviors of students during their college years can significantly impact their adult life.

Need for Intervention

Seventy percent of college presidents consider binge drinking on their campus to be a problem. This group of administrators should take into consideration that the drinkers on campus are typically the minority, however, they are the more vocal and visible group (Wechsler, Nelson, and Weitzman, 2000). The large body of research conducted around college students highlights a need for prevention and intervention geared toward alcohol use and abuse. “The same number of college students will die of alcohol-related causes as will earn masters and doctoral degrees” according to Ostrander and Marinho (1998). Sullivan and Risler (2002) found an inverse relationship between grades and alcohol consumption. Since first year students in residence halls are among the high risk drinking crowd, it is important to note that their academics are likely to be effected by their habits and could jeopardize the remainder of their college career. Factors such as campus climate, social norming, atmosphere of the college town, access to bars and other venues, along with campus education and prevention efforts need to be considered when developing an intervention for at risk college drinkers.

Wechsler, Nelson, and Weitzman (2000) wrote an article with a section discussing education on alcohol as not enough of an effort to have a large impact on students’ views on drinking. This belief can largely be attributed to high risk students not considering themselves among students with drinking problems. These students are likely to ignore publicity about alcohol problems because they consider themselves outside such

a group. The same article cites that a large percentage of alcohol programming efforts are geared toward athletes, fraternity men, and sorority women. Each of these groups is still considered to be the heaviest and most at risk drinkers on college campuses. All groups on campus are not necessarily targeted and educated equally. This may lead researchers to assume that current prevention efforts are not successful.

If prevention efforts are failing it is important to implement successful intervention programs to address at risk students before they venture too far down and unhealthy path. Higher rates of drinking show a drop in grades (Sullivan & Risler, 2002). Only one in five students (Wechsler, Nelson, and Weitzman, 2000) participates in high risk drinking. Though these drinkers receive a large amount of attention they are not the majority of students on most campuses. Sullivan and Risler (2002) quoted Wechsler, Molnar, Davenport, & Baer when they stated that “binge-drinkers as a whole represent less than half of the college population (44%), but they account for almost all (91%) of the alcohol consumed by college students”. It is reported that “77% of non-binge drinking students report experiencing at least 1 secondhand effect of others’ misuse of alcohol” (Sheffield, Darkes, DelBoca, & Goldman, 2005). Non drinking students are not the only people greatly affected by the heavy consumption of binge drinkers. Increased rates of drinking correlate with increased assaults, rape, cost increased financial burden on colleges, hospitals, an the legal system (Walters & Neighbors, 2005). Despite the fact that it is a minority of students that fall in the category of high risk drinking, they are in need of attention therefore intervention efforts must still be addressed.

Effectiveness of Alcohol Interventions

According to Werch et al. (2000) binge drinking on college campuses has remained virtually unchanged for the last decade. Although the level of drinking is not on the rise “the prevalence of social consequences and dependence symptoms associated with drinking” has not declined (Walitzer & Connors, 1999). If there has been virtually no change in the last ten years that means the best efforts at alcohol prevention and intervention has not been truly successful.

There are endless opportunities that may be successful in combating high risk alcohol drinking. Tactics the media uses may be considered to be an intervention (Glindemann, Geller, and Ludwig, 1996). Many studies have been conducted that attempted to implement successful interventions. Some studies discussed long interventions to be successful, however most studies and research demonstrated that brief, personal interventions are most well received by students and show the greatest success rate. Chiauzzi et al. (2005) added another element of success to brief alcohol interventions. They created a website that students accessed and self reported data about their drinking behaviors. Students then received personal feedback along with strategies to combat high risk drinking. Walters found that a single hour of advice was nearly as successful as a six week program. He also mailed personal feedback. Students who received that feedback reported the largest decrease in the amount of drinks they consumed each week. A similar study implemented follow-up phone calls to ask about a student’s drinking habits (Werch et al., 2000).

Most studies included in this review dealt with students’ self reported data. Helmkamp et al. (2003) pointed out that students will report their behavior more honestly

when they perceive neither a gain nor loss based on their responses. When creating or selecting an intervention instrument it may be important to keep this fact in mind. Another important item researchers Chiauzzi, Green, Lord, Thum, and Goldstein (2005) discovered was how the intent of an intervention played a strong role in the overall outcome. "Interventions aimed at altering attitudes or improving personal skills have had great effect." This attitude alteration can take place on a personal level as well as attempting to change the attitude and norm of an entire group or campus according to Sullivan and Risler (2002).

One potential reason for the wide range in effective alcohol interventions may depend on the populations' readiness to change. College students may range on their level of preparedness to change. If students are members of a large intervention group and vary in their readiness, no one intervention will suit the entire group. One scale has been created to assess readiness to change as it relates to alcohol and drug use. The Stages of Change Readiness and Treatment Eagerness Scale (SOCRATES) addresses that "change is thought to be malleable, with the potential for enhancement through motivation interventions" (Mitchell, Francis, and Tafrate, 2005). This scale supports the idea that individual interventions may be a key to successful intervention.

Types of Intervention

Goal Setting

Walitzer and Connors (1999) identified goal setting as a strategy to reduce drinking levels. Using this strategy students determine their own reduced drinking levels and then monitor them which allows students to "maximize motivation, personal control,

and responsibility”. There are guidelines set in place to set goals such as choosing a maximum number of drinks per week and selecting a number of days out of the week when the student will not drink. A type of goal setting is bibliotherapy. Bibliotherapy utilizes self help books that include instructions on monitoring one’s behavior and goal setting. Five of the ten studies on bibliotherapy concluded there to be a reduction in the level of drinking. Other studies noted bibliotherapy to be beneficial when paired with another type of intervention.

Individual Intervention

Chiauzzi et al. (2005) discuss the effectiveness of individual intervention methods versus group methods. They highlight the fact that students can easily access computers and computer programs. This access increased the amount a student self disclosed about sensitive topics including alcohol consumption. Students seem to be more responsive to an intervention that provides them immediate, personal feedback. Interventions of this type provide feedback about the amount a student drinks along with the average amount they spend on alcohol per month. After initial reports these students drastically reduced their monthly spending according to Walters (2000).

Inclusion of Multiple Media

Werch (2001) identifies “the importance of employing...multiple media...as an important improvement to tailoring health communications”. Multiple media usage is likely to speak to a larger base of an audience due to different learning styles. Werch also mentions that multiple media will likely reduce motivation to take part in a health-

damaging behavior as well as increase motivation to reduce the target behavior. He found this information through utilizing a stage acquisition model of intervention. This model aims to decrease unhealthy drinking using a progressive stage process.

Peer to Peer Intervention

Utilizing peers to educate their peers about dangerous drinking behavior can be advantageous for several reasons. One reason is cost. Student to student interactions need not be funded the same as professional intervention facilitators need to be. Another reason that this type of intervention may be effective may have to do with social norms. If a heavy student drinker talks with a non drinking student it may appear to be “normal” not to drink as heavy. There is little empirical data to support this idea (Larimer et al., 2004/2005).

Web Based Intervention

Web based interventions are similar and often equivalent to individual interventions. Most, if not all, web based interventions are available for students to take at their own computer and they are able to receive immediate feedback. Immediate feedback, personal and internet based, showed great success when researchers checked up on students months after the initial intervention (Walters & Neighbors, 2005). Web based methods are beneficial because of the increase in access to personal computers (Chiauzzi, Green, Lord, Thum, & Goldstein, 2005). Students are more likely to self disclose when they perceive it to be a one on one interaction where they will receive information in return. According to Squires and Hester (2004), who utilize the Drinker's

Check-Up Software Program which assesses and provides feedback and assistance to individuals with drinking problems, found “personalized feedback significantly reduced consumption in a population of heavy drinking college students relative to controls”. Overall, successful intervention appeared to be those in which students were educated about the personal effect drinking had on them and the discovery that the majority of students do not participate in high risk drinking.

Motivational Interviewing

Motivational Interviewing is an approach to counseling that educates and empowers the client to make free choice to change their behavior. The approach is based on four main principles: 1) expressing empathy, 2) developing discrepancy, 3) rolling with resistance, and 4) supporting self-efficacy (Burke & Menchola, 2003). The goal is to assess a client’s readiness to change and let the counselor provide the tools for the client to make the change they choose and are prepared to make. Larimer et al. (2001) cited that the group in their study who self-monitored their behavior significantly reduced their alcohol consumption compared to groups given educational components only. Much of the success of Motivational Interviewing comes from the therapist’s use of reflective listening and empowering the client to feel able to change. Fifteen minute Motivational Interviews were found to reduce alcohol use six months later (Miller, 1996).

Brief Interventions

Brief interventions typically involve comprehensive assessment, brief counseling, and check ups (Spivak, Sanchez-Craig, & Davila, 1994). These interventions may last

from 15-60 minutes and may occur 1-4 times. Brief interventions are shown to be extremely successful as cited though many follow up checks. Sanchez-Craig et al. (1989) that those not severely dependent on alcohol receive brief interventions well and 50-80% show decreased alcohol consumption up to two years later. Larimer et al. (2001) noted that brief interventions effectively reduce high risk drinking. One study showed beneficial effects of brief interventions to be in tact 5 years after the intervention (Heather, 2003).

Perceptions of Drinking

Several studies have been conducted focused on the effect social norms have on college students and their attitude toward drinking. Haines and Spear (1996) found students to overestimate the amount of binge drinkers that exist on campus. Walters and Neighbors (2005) conducted research that gauged students to over estimate the drinking of their peers. The aim of their study and similar others is to find the effect marketing campaigns geared toward social norms have on students. One example of this type of effort is the D.A.R.E. project that aims to educate students on drug abuse prevention. Haines and Spear (1996) found 69.7% of the students in their study to believe binge drinking to be the norm. Greeks are among a particularly risky group who view heavy drinking to be more acceptable (Larimer et al., 2004/2005). Normative expectancies among such groups reinforce excessive drinking (White, 2006). There seems to be evidence that marketing campaign interventions decrease drinking trends but other studies show little change and the change may not be attributed to the campaign.

Effect of Gender on Alcohol Intervention

Sullivan and Risler (2002) put forth the idea that separating intervention groups by gender may be beneficial because men seeking help may still have a “desire to conceal vulnerabilities and projection of self-assurance”. Women, on the other hand, tend to have different drinking habits and are socially pressured differently than men (Hodgson & John, 2004). Mumenthaler et al. (1999) highlight the fact that 2% of women are heavy drinkers compared to 9% of men. Women have also shown to be more susceptible to long term effects of drinking due to the body’s chemical make up (Mumenthaler et al., 1999). In order to have an effective intervention it is crucial to understand the group at hand and personalize the treatment. Separating men and women may be one method to cater to the students in need of help.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of a brief alcohol intervention in place at Eastern Illinois University titled CRAWL (Choosing Responsibly And Within Limits). The survey was administered to CRAWL participants from the 2005-2006 academic year. These students were targeted for the researcher to gain an understanding of their perception of CRAWL. The CRAWL program is geared toward students who are first time policy violators of the Eastern Illinois University alcohol policy. The intent of CRAWL is for participants to realize the effects their drinking behavior has on others. This survey instrument intended to gauge related feedback.

An online survey method was selected to gather data from CRAWL participants. This particular method was chosen because “computerized programs for young people increase self-disclosure in sensitive areas” (Chiauzzi et al., 2005). The instrument collected data in the form of open ended questions as well as responses to multiple choice questions and Likert scales. However, a limitation in this area may be associated with participants feeling there are continued judicial consequences from filling in the survey. Of all possible methods, an online survey has the potential to reach the largest number of participants.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of a brief alcohol intervention in place at Eastern Illinois University titled CRAWL (Choosing Responsibly And Within Limits). The survey was administered to CRAWL participants from the 2005-2006 academic year. These students were targeted for the researcher to gain an understanding of their perception of CRAWL. The CRAWL program is geared toward students who are first time policy violators of the Eastern Illinois University alcohol policy. The intent of CRAWL is for participants to realize the effects their drinking behavior has on others. This survey instrument intended to gauge related feedback.

An online survey method was selected to gather data from CRAWL participants. This particular method was chosen because “computerized programs for young people increase self-disclosure in sensitive areas” (Chiauzzi et al., 2005). The instrument collected data in the form of open ended questions as well as responses to multiple choice questions and Likert scales. However, a limitation in this area may be associated with participants feeling there are continued judicial consequences from filling in the survey. Of all possible methods, an online survey has the potential to reach the largest number of participants.

Design of the Study

The design of the present study is both qualitative and quantitative. The data was accumulated via online survey tool created on Zoomerang. The survey tool asks multiple choice questions, open ended questions, and compare and contrast scales addressing the amount of alcohol participants drank pre-CRAWL participation and the amount they drank post-CRAWL participation. The open ended questions were qualitative while the compare and contrast questions allowed quantitative comparisons. The Zoomerang tool allowed the researcher to compare and cross analyze any number of particular questions. For example, if the researcher wanted to compare how participants answered questions one and five, the tool could be manipulated to do so. Zoomerang allowed the researcher great ease and freedom to compare any selected items of data.

Participants

Participation in this survey was limited to one select group of students who completed the initial year of the CRAWL program between August 2005 and May 2006. Students were referred to CRAWL if they had been documented breaking Eastern Illinois University alcohol policy (Appendix A) for the first time in their EIU career. The following are the policies set in place and enforced at Eastern Illinois University.

Once students were documented, they met with a Residence Hall Director, Associate Residence Hall Director, Complex Director, or Judicial Affairs officer. In that meeting they discussed the documented situation, alcohol policy at Eastern Illinois University, and the consequences of their behavior. The staff in the meeting then briefly explained the CRAWL program. Students were to read a page long description of the

program and its requirements (Appendix E). The student then signed off on the paper stating that they understood the material. At such point, students were dismissed and were to attend the CRAWL program on the date decided in the meeting. Staff filled out paperwork detailing the situation and then forwarded the paperwork to Judicial Affairs and the Counseling Center (Appendix F).

In order to obtain the names of all students who participated in the survey, the research contacted the Director of Judicial Affairs. The Director had records of all students referred to the CRAWL program. With IRB approval the researcher obtained the list of CRAWL participants for the 2005-2006 year. The researcher used the Eastern Illinois University website directory to find the EIU email address for each participant. Through this process some participant names were no longer registered as Eastern students and thus removed from the potential participant pool. Once all available emails were collected they were entered in Microsoft Excel which allowed them to be placed into an email invitation to the online survey. 292 participants were emailed. Of the 292, 175 were men and 117 were women.

Site

The survey was distributed via email at Eastern Illinois University. Eastern is a mid-size, public institution located in central Illinois. Undergraduate student enrollment at Eastern Illinois University is approximately comprised of 12,000 students. The CRAWL program is held in an academic building, in a large auditorium. The building in which CRAWL is facilitated has been located across the street from a residence hall and local drinking establishment as well as a classroom building in the center of campus.

Those participants who responded in this study participated in CRAWL when it was held in a classroom.

Instrument

The instrument used in this research project was created by the principal investigator to assess the effectiveness of the CRAWL program as it was administered between August 2005 and May 2006. This instrument had not been previously tested for reliability or validity. Its initial administration was for the purpose of this research study.

The researcher utilized the online survey tool called Zoomerang. Zoomerang can be purchased for different lengths of time for the purpose of creating and administering online surveys. Zoomerang allows the researcher great freedom to create a personalized tool suited to his or her needs. Zoomerang allows the researcher to design questions as multiple choice, rank order, open ended, and multiple answer options. The researcher is able to choose the method in which they administer the survey. It can be sent via email through Zoomerang or a link can be placed in an email and sent to participants, which was the method of choice for this study. Along with the design logistics includes the ability to set the visual appearance of the tool. The researcher selected a calm green color for this particular survey.

The CRAWL Assessment (Appendix G) begins with a brief introduction to the survey. "The CRAWL Assessment is a survey intended to collect data about the effectiveness of the CRAWL program. Your honest feedback is encouraged! Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey." The 21 survey questions follow the introduction and the survey ends with a thank you and a message encouraging

participants to contact the university counseling center if they felt the need to discuss their drinking habits as follows: "Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. You will be linked to the EIU Counseling Center site at the completion of this survey where counseling staff can address any questions you may have about your drinking habits." Once participants read that statement they hit an arrow button, titled "submit", and were linked to the EIU Counseling Center webpage.

Question 1: Think back to the incident that brought you to the CRAWL program. How many people were immediately affected by your drinking?

As the facilitator of CRAWL explained to the principal investigator, the intent of CRAWL was to help students realize the effects of their drug and alcohol related behavior on all students, staff, and other individuals who surround them (M. Tozer, personal communication, August 2006). Q1 specifically addressed participants' perception of their own behavior and how many people it impacted.

Question 2: Of those people affected by your drinking, how many have you entered into discussion with and about what?

Following Q1, this item was intended to gauge whether or not participants had been encouraged to follow up about their alcohol induced behavior with the people it may have impacted.

Questions 3: Define yourself as a drinker.

This question allowed participants to self identify whether they were a binge drinker, weekend drinker, social drinker, or non-drinker. This item allowed the researcher to cross reference answers to this question with answers to follow up items. For example, the researcher was able to select all participants who identified as a binge drinker and compare whether or not those students had decreased their drinking since their participation in the CRAWL program.

Questions 4-6 and 8-10 were created as direct comparisons from participant drinking behavior pre-CRAWL and post-CRAWL program participation. Specifically, questions 4 and 8 were direct comparisons, questions 5 and 9 were direct comparisons, and questions 6 and 10 were direct comparisons.

Question 4: How many drinks did you drink on an average day before participating in the CRAWL program?

Question 5: How many days within an average week did you drink before participating in the CRAWL program?

Question 6: How many drinks did you drink during an average weekend (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday) before participating in the CRAWL program?

Question 7: Has participation in CRAWL helped to decrease the amount you drink?

Question 8: How many drinks do you drink on an average day now that you participated in the CRAWL program?

Question 9: How many days within an average week do you drink now that you participated in the CRAWL program?

Question 10: How many drinks do you drink during an average weekend now that you participated in the CRAWL program?

Questions 11-13 were placed in the survey to gauge participants' readiness to change. Research shows this item to be crucial to effective brief interventions.

Question 11: How important do you feel it is to change your drinking behaviors?

Participants were able to select from the following responses: I haven't considered changing, not at all important, fairly important, and extremely important.

Question 12: Since participating in CRAWL, which of the following statements accurately describes your readiness to change your drinking behaviors?

This question includes the following responses: I have thoughts of changing, I need to consider changing someday, I think I should change, but I am not quite ready, I am thinking about how to change my drinking, and I am taking action to change.

Question 13: How many times have you attempted to change your drinking behavior?

Responses available were 0, 2, 3, and 4+.

Question 14: How has participation in CRAWL affected your awareness of drinking?

Responses available were: I am more aware of how my drinking behavior affects other people, I was aware of how my behavior affected others, I want to learn more about dealing with my habits, and I am more aware and able to recognize markers of unhealthy

drinking behavior. This item addresses participants' perception of the effect CRAWL participation had on their awareness of their unhealthy drinking habits.

Question 15: How confident are you that you can change?

Response options included not at all confident, fairly confident, and very confident. This item further addresses students' willingness and preparedness to make a change if they see it necessary.

Question 16: What is the most beneficial information you learned through the CRAWL program?

This open ended question allows participants to share what might have helped them at all during the program.

Question 17: Rank order CRAWL activities from the most beneficial (1) to the least beneficial (4).

This item listed all the activities that take place throughout the CRAWL program and allowed participants to rate which they found most beneficial to least.

Question 18: How helpful was the CRAWL program?

Response options included it made no difference, fairly helpful, helpful, or extremely helpful. This allowed the full gambit of possible responses so the researcher might share suggestions for future administration of the CRAWL program.

Question 19: Please select all of the options that apply to you.

Responses included I know how to refuse a drink, I know how to intervene if a friend is drinking too much, I am likely to acknowledge unhealthy drinking habits a friend exhibits, and I am likely to intervene when a friend is exhibiting unhealthy drinking habits. This item gauges participants' personal knowledge of healthy drinking behaviors. This item was designed to identify areas in which participants believed they needed more education.

Question 20: Please provide any feedback or suggestions you have for future CRAWL programs.

Question 21: Please type your name, understanding that it is legally equivalent to your signature and constitutes your certification that your responses and assessments are accurate and fair to the best of your knowledge.

This item served as the online consent verification indicating participants understood and agreed to the terms of the survey. This consent verification procedure was explained in their first and second emails which introduced the CRAWL survey to the participants.

Data Collection and Treatment

As participants responded to each survey item, answers were sent to the Zoomerang data base. This data base is accessible only to members of the Zoomerang account who need a password to enter. Once inside the database, information can be

sorted as the researcher pleases. Options include transferring all the data to an Excel spreadsheet, comparing all answers to each individual question, cross referencing questions, and creating tables, charts and graphs.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results of this study showed that of the 292 students in the sample, 49 visited the website, and 21 chose to participate in the online survey. Thus, 201 chose not to visit the site or participate in the research study. The information presented in this chapter is based on the feedback of the 21 participants.

High Risk Drinking

Survey questions 3 and 14 addressed participants' self reported drinking behavior. The responses to those questions identified weekends to be the time when most high risk drinking occurs. The survey asked participants to identify how they classify their drinking behavior. 17% of participants self identified as binge drinkers, those who drink 4 or more drinks per sitting. 78% of participants self identified as drinking only on the weekends and only drinking socially when others were around. Only one participant selected the option of "non drinker". These statistics support the idea that the CRAWL program is successfully reaching a larger population of drinkers versus non drinkers.

Effects of Alcohol Related Behavior

The CRAWL facilitator cited that the goal of CRAWL was to educate students on their behavior and not to persuade them to abstain from alcohol use or consumption. Survey questions 1 and 2 asked participants about their interactions with others during the event which resulted in their CRAWL program participation. Similarly, question 14 was designed to gauge participants' awareness of unhealthy behaviors and how the CRAWL program educated them on awareness. The results of the survey showed that

22% of participants were more aware and able to recognize markers of unhealthy drinking behavior as a result of the CRAWL program. Another 22% of participants were more aware of how their drinking behavior affected other people. While a majority of respondents cited that they were already aware of their behavior and how it affected others, 6% wanted to learn more.

Participants were asked to share conversations they had with people who were affected by the drinking experience that qualified them for participation in CRAWL. Varied responses to the question, "Of those people affected by your drinking, how many have you entered into discussion with and about what?", are as follows:

"I talk to them all. Plus, many more people about the whole situation and because they were my friends, they understood that it [drinking and being documented] doesn't happen to me."

"None from the incident but I have had to apologize to several people for being rude or mean to them because I was drunk."

"I do not think that it was a big deal. I was an inexperienced drinker and went too far."

"Yes, we discussed that night and what happened to us. We also discussed what consequences we had."

From the overall responses to this question, the results demonstrate that most participants realized that drinking may have played a role in their behaviors and how it affected

people in close proximity. Whether due to early identity developmental stages or lack of education, responses demonstrate that there was still need to engage in intentional conversations with participants concerning the effect alcohol has on other people.

Perceptions of CRAWL

Questions 16-20 were designed to collect feedback on all topic areas addressed during the CRAWL program and the participants' overall satisfaction with the program. The majority (71%) shared that CRAWL was not a helpful program as it related to their personal drinking behavior. Many, 9%, cited they were well aware of their drinking habits, its effects on others, and were not interested in changing their behavior. However, several participants (24%) shared that they gained information from their participation in the CRAWL program and 5% (one participant) realized a need to change. Several respondents were not pleased with the cost of participation in the CRAWL program and perceived the fine and referral to the program to be prolonged punishment of their violation of the university's alcohol policies. Specific feedback on this section can be found in Appendix H. Responses for questions 16 and 20 were not included due to the nature of their personal responses.

Change in Habits

While many participants grossly exaggerated their initial habits, a select number (19) appeared to have maintained a healthy level of drinking or achieved a decrease in the amount of time spent drinking and the amount of alcohol consumed during those times.

Questions 4-10 solicited self reports of levels and frequency of alcohol consumption before and after CRAWL program participation.

Readiness to Change

Questions 11-13 and 15 asked participants about their ability and readiness to change their drinking behaviors. 95% shared they felt “very” or “fairly confident” they would be able to change their drinking behaviors if they saw fit. This encouraging number may indicate a population of risky drinkers who are not dependent on alcohol. It may be crucial to implement an aggressive educational component on campus to encourage students to learn the actual number of non-drinkers or healthy drinkers on campus. The general perception among this group of participants was that risky drinking is the norm and they view their behavior as wrong because they were caught. One participant affirms that he/she needed “to be more careful when drinking and who I am with and how I am doing it”.

Overall, students viewed pieces of CRAWL to be beneficial. Many of their shared responses show that the group setting in the auditorium does not best address everyone’s individual needs as they see fit.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The present study was designed to explore the effectiveness of the Choosing Responsibly And Within Limits (CRAWL) alcohol intervention program. Researcher designed surveys were distributed to 292 students and 21 responded. The following results and statistics were based on the responses of this small respondent population. This chapter is a comparison of the information found in the literature with the responses of the 21 participants.

Summary of the Findings

Overall, participants shared that they did not gain a wealth of knowledge from participation in the CRAWL program. Several students noted that there was potential to learn but other participants did not take the program seriously. Those participants who took the survey seriously showed little or no difference in drinking habits and attitudes. A small population of participants showed a strong desire/need to alter their drinking habits. Few participants described how awareness of their behaviors affected other people. The findings discussed in this chapter support the need for more personalized, individual interventions to specifically address participants' needs.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. The first limitation is the number of responses. Out of 292 potential participants, 21 replied to the survey for a response rate of .07%. Thus, response rate is neither representative nor generalizable to the entire population of CRAWL participants during the 2005-2006 school year. There were 11 responses that

appeared to reflect realistic data. 10 of the surveys yielded answers that were grossly exaggerated and therefore dismissed as valuable. This population of outlying responses may be due, in part, to the fact that the participants in the CRAWL program were mandated to attend because they violated the university's alcohol policy. The data presented in the present study is not statistically significant due to the small number of responses.

The second limitation was that the survey instrument is new and created by the principal researcher. Though great thought and research went into the instrument's creation, the tool had never been tested before. The questions in the survey instrument need future testing to determine their validity and reliability.

The third limitation of this study was that the intervention program was in its first year of administration. This feedback should provide a starting point for the CRAWL facilitator to decide if future participants receive the education and awareness. Another point of consideration is the location of the program. The program is held in the auditorium of a classroom building located directly across from a popular sports bar. The proximity of the CRAWL program to this and similar establishments may provide mixed messages.

The fourth limitation of this study was the length of time between CRAWL participation and administration of the survey. The participants in the present survey participated in the CRAWL program during the 2005-2006 academic year and were administered the survey between March and April of 2007. This allowed opportunity for participants to report behavioral change. However, the time between the program and

survey may alter the accuracy of the participants' memory. Immediate administration of this survey in the future may yield more accurate responses.

Conclusions:

1. Participants felt it was important to change their drinking behavior. Forty-four percent felt that CRAWL played some role in increasing their awareness of their drinking habits.
2. The majority of participants felt their needs were not addressed in CRAWL; the majority felt they did not deserve their referral to the program.
3. Of the participants that responded to the CRAWL survey, several learned but felt the group setting was not the best method to address their needs.
4. The overall readiness to change was low. All of the participants in CRAWL were mandated to attend. This factor certainly affected their participation and mindset toward the CRAWL program. One-on-one meetings with participants may result in better assessment, treatment and educating each of them (Chiauzzi, et al., 2005).
5. The participant population was mandated to attend the CRAWL program. Their judicial standing may have affected the types of responses given. The participants often speculated and were sarcastic when responding to the open-ended questions.
6. The judicial status of the participants may have also been a factor in the low response rate for the survey. Students were mandated to attend CRAWL and not mandated to complete the survey.

7. The low response rate for the CRAWL survey led the researcher to use of less sophisticated statistics.

Recommendations:

Future CRAWL Facilitator(s)

1. Create groups based on offenses. Groups created for students who were transported to the hospital, students who were loud and disruptive, students who were violent, and students who were minor violators may better address the needs of each population. Students who were transported to the hospital are in a different set of circumstances (physical, psychological, and emotionally) than those who may have entered into a fight resulting in only minor physical injury and psychological/emotional stress. Different goals should be set and different points of education should be imparted for a grouping.
2. CRAWL participants may benefit from being separated by gender according to Hodgson and John (2004) and Mumenthaler, Taylor, O'Hara, and Yesavage (1999). Men and women may express their concerns about alcohol consumption differently given a mixed group of men and women.
3. CRAWL, at one point, was held in an auditorium located directly across the street from a popular sports bar. Smaller groups should be created that are held in a more intimate setting away from alcoholic establishments. These groups might be best facilitated by having participants sit in a circle, creating a more personal setting similar to methods utilized in group therapy. This may lead to a more intimate and supportive setting for participants' learning and communication with all members of the group.

4. Research shows personalized feedback to have a great impact on people. Creating smaller groups and utilizing data from their Personal Drinking Profiles may help participants set personal goals suited to their individual needs. Spivak, Sanchez-Craig, and Davila (1994) lend advice to successful individual treatment for college drinkers.
5. For participant accountability and future CRAWL assessment, it may be useful to develop a follow-up component. This may take the form of an online questionnaire, mailed questionnaire, or phone call. Squires and Hester (2004) address this specific issue with their Drinker's Check-up Software.

Student Affairs Practitioners

1. The participants in the present study showed little recognition of how their behavior may affect those around them. Participants were referred to CRAWL by student affairs professionals. It should become more of a practice, in referral meetings, to hold conversations with students that focus on how and why their disruptive drinking behavior is ill suited to other students that may live with or interact with the individual in question. Findings show that student affairs practitioners may need to serve as educator when referring students to CRAWL.
2. Many participants saw no harm in their excessive drinking and disruptive behavior and for this reason it is imperative to continue alcohol education on campus and within the residence halls.
3. Referrals to CRAWL need to be for those students who violated a policy. Some participants were referred yet were only in a room with alcohol but had not been drinking. These students gained very little from this program. More time should

be spent with actual offenders if the intent of the program is intervention. LaBrie, Tawalbeh, and Earleywine (2006) discuss the differences between adjudicated and nonadjudicated students in a recent article comparing adjudicated and nonadjudicated freshmen men.

Future Researcher(s)

1. It is important to ensure survey questions provide options that include all potential participant responses.
2. Provide the survey immediately after the CRAWL program and another follow-up survey several months later to create a more valid comparison of change in drinking habits.
3. Comparing similar institutions in the surrounding states may permit assessment of the effect of the campus environment on students' drinking behaviors.
4. Create questions that are more pointed and specific. It may be useful to only allow limited options to receive more valid and comparable data.
5. Integrate research about readiness to change and assess participants' readiness and preparedness to change their drinking behavior.

Summary

The goal of the CRAWL assessment was to assess the overall effectiveness of the CRAWL program based on participant feedback. The literature supports the need for alcohol education and intervention on college campuses. The CRAWL program has built a strong foundation for staff to refer students in need of addressing their drinking behavior.

Literature supports the need for students to receive personalized feedback concerning their drinking behaviors. Students who receive personalized feedback yield more successful results than those who do not (Squires & Hester, 2004). For improved CRAWL success it may be beneficial to add a component to the program that includes personalized feedback that participant can leave the program with in order to utilize at a later time.

In conducting the research for this project it has come to my attention that an important factor to the CRAWL program's success may lay in the readiness of its participants. It may prove successful to separate CRAWL participants into groups according to their readiness and preparedness to change their drinking related behavior. Future researchers and facilitators may benefit from delving deeper into readiness to change research (Miller, 1996; Mitchell, Francis, & Tafrate, 2005).

Overall, the CRAWL program is a promising beginning for students and staff at Eastern Illinois University. The program is still in its formative stages but is beginning to address the outstanding need for students to understand the impact their drinking has on themselves and others. I hope this research allows future facilitators and practitioners a variety of research on the topic of college students and their drinking.

References

- Bailey, K., Baker, A., Webster, R., & Lewin, T. (2004). Pilot randomized controlled trial of a brief alcohol intervention group for adolescents. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 23*, 157-166.
- Benson, T., Ambrose, C., Mulfinger, A., & Correia, C. (2004). Integrating mailed personalized feedback and alcohol screening events: A feasibility study. *Journal of Drug Education, 34*(4), 327-334.
- Bryant, A., Schulenberg, J., O'Malley, P., Bachman, J., & Johnson, L. (2003). How academic achievement, attitudes, and behaviors relate to the course of substance use during adolescence: A 6-year, multiwave national longitudinal study. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 13*(3), 361-397.
- Burke, B., Arkowitz, H., & Menchola, M. (2003). The efficacy of motivational interviewing: A meta-analysis of controlled clinical trials. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*(5), 843-861.
- Chiauszi, E., Green, T., Lord, S., Thum, C., & Goldstein, M. (2005). My student body: A high-risk drinking prevention web site for college students. *Journal of American College Health, 53*(6), 263-274.

- Glindemann, K., Geller, S., & Ludwig, T. (1996). Behavioral intentions and blood alcohol concentration: A relationship for prevention intervention. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 41*, 120-134.
- Haines, M., & Spear, S. (1996). Changing the perception of the norm: A strategy to decrease binge drinking among college students. *Journal of American College Health, 45*, 134-140.
- Heather, N. (2003). Brief interventions have expanded in range but how they work is still mysterious. *Society for the Study of Addiction to Alcohol and Other Drugs, 98*, 1025-1026.
- Helmkamp, J., Hungerford, D., Williams, J., Manley, W., Furbee, P., Horn, K., & Pollock, D. (2003). Screening and brief intervention for alcohol problems among college students treated in a university hospital emergency department. *Journal of American College Health, 52(1)*.
- Hodgson, R. & John, B. (2004). Gender, gender role and brief alcohol interventions. *Society for the Study of Addiction, 99*, 3-4.
- Jarvis, T. (1992). Implications of gender for alcohol treatment research: A quantitative and qualitative review. *British Journal of Addiction, 87*, 1249-1261.

- LaBrie, J., Tawalbeh, S., & Earleywine, M. (2006). Differentiating adjudicated from nonadjudicated freshmen men: The role of alcohol expectancies, tension, and concern about health. *Journal of College Student Development, 4*(5), 521-533.
- Larimer, M., Cronce, J., Lee, C., & Kilmer, J. (2004/2005). Brief intervention in college settings. *Alcohol Research and Health, 28*(2), 94-104.
- Larimer, M., Turner, A., Anderson, B., Fader, J., Kilmer, J., Palmer, R., & Cronce, J. (2001). Evaluating a brief alcohol intervention with fraternities. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 62*(3), 370-380.
- Marquis, G. (2005). From beverage to drug: Alcohol and other drugs in 1960s and 1970s Canada. *Journal of Canadian Studies, 39*(2), 57-79.
- Miller, W. (1996). Motivational interviewing: Research, practice, and puzzles. *Addictive Behaviors, 21*(6), 835-842.
- Mitchell, D., Francis, J., & Tafrate, R. (2005). The psychometric properties of the Stages of Change Readiness and Treatment Eagerness Scale (SOCRATES) in a clinical sample of active duty military service members. *Military Medicine*. Retrieved June 6, 2007, from the Look Smart: Find Articles database.

- Mumenthaler, M., Taylor, J., O'Hara, R., & Yesavage, J. (1999). Gender differences in moderate drinking effects. *Alcohol Research and Health, 23*(1), 55-64.
- O'Hare, T., & Sherrer, M. (1999). Campus substance abuse policies in action: The role of the resident hall staff. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 45*(1), 13-31.
- Ostrander, R., & Marinho, R. (1998). Alcohol and Private Higher Education. *Journal of Research on Christian Education, 7*(2), 121-136.
- Powell, L., Williams, J., & Wechsler, H. (2004). Study habits and the level of alcohol use among college students. *Education Economics, 12*(2), 135-149.
- Sanchez-Craig, M., Leigh, G., Spivake, K., & Lei, H. (1989). Superior outcome of females over males after brief treatment for the reduction of heavy drinking. *British Journal of Addiction, 84*, 395-404.
- Sheffield, F., Karkes, J., Del Boca, F., & Goldman, M. (2005). Binge drinking and alcohol-related problems among community college students: Implications for prevention policy. *Journal of American College Health, 54*(3), 137-141.
- Spivak, K., Sanchez-Craig, M., & Davila, R. (1994). Assisting problem drinkers to change on their own: Effect of specific and non-specific advice. *Addiction, 89*, 1135-1142.

Squires, D., & Hester, R. (2004). Using technical innovations in clinical practice: The drinker's check-up software program. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 60*(2), 159-169.

Sullivan, M., & Risler, E. (2002). Understanding college alcohol abuse and academic performance: Selecting appropriate intervention strategies. *Journal of College Counseling, 5*(2), 114-123.

Walitzer, K., & Connors, G. (1999). Treating problem drinking. *Alcohol Research and Health, 23*(2), 138-143.

Walters, S. (2000). In praise of feedback: An effective intervention for college students who are heavy drinkers. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(5), 235-238.

Walters, S., & Neighbors, C. (2005). Feedback interventions for college alcohol misuse: What, why and for whom? *Addictive Behaviors, 30*, 1168-1182

Wechsler, H., & Kuo, M. (2000). College students define binge drinking and estimate its prevalence: Results of a national survey. *Journal of American College Health, 49*, 57-64.

Wechsler, H., Nelson, T., & Weitzman, E. (2000). From knowledge to action: How Harvard's college alcohol study can help your campus design a campaign against student alcohol abuse. *Change*, 32(1), 38-43.

Werch, C. (2001). Preventive alcohol interventions based on a stages of acquisition model. *American Journal of Health Behaviors*, 25(3), 206-217.

Werch, C., Pappas, D., Carlson, J., DiClemente, C., Chally, P., & Sinder J. (2000). Results of a social norm intervention to prevent binge drinking among first-year residential college students. *Journal of American College Health*, 49(2), 85-92.

Williams, D., Thomas, A., Buboltz, W., & McKinney, M. (2002). Changing the attitudes that predict underage drinking in college students: A program evaluation. *Journal of College Counseling*, 5, 39-49.

Why do some people drink too much? The role of genetic and psychosocial influences. (2000). *Alcohol research and Health*, 24(1), 17-26.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Eastern Illinois University Alcohol Policy

APPENDIX A

ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES - UNIVERSITY HOUSING

The possession and consumption of beer and wine by students of legal age is permitted only in private living areas, student rooms and apartments in University owned or controlled housing.

Beer and wine may be possessed or consumed, but not sold, only in student rooms or apartments in University owned or controlled housing by those residents and their invited guests who are twenty-one years of age or older.

Students who are twenty-one years of age or older may transport such beverages to and from their room or apartment, provided the beverage is sealed with the manufacturer's original seal. No open containers of alcoholic beverages are permitted in public areas, corridors, bathrooms, or dining areas.

Bulk containers of alcoholic beverages are not permitted. Examples include servings larger than quart bottles of beer and quantities of wine larger than gallon jugs. Kegs, pony kegs, barrels, half barrels, etc., are not permitted.

Conference guests and resident's guests are also subject to this policy.

The use of beer or wine by students of legal age, in University housing, is a privilege, the use of which is consistent with standards expected of the student body. Abuse of the privilege is reason for appropriate disciplinary action."

Approved:

President

July 5, 2000

Monitor: Vice President for Student Affairs

Appendix B
Substance Use Self-Assessment

Substance Use Self-Assessment

Please indicate whether you have experienced the following due to drinking or drug use during the past 60 days. Place a check mark next to your response for each situation listed. Thank you.

1. Had a hangover

Yes _____

No _____

2. Performed poorly on a test or important project

Yes _____

No _____

3. Been in trouble with the police, residence hall, or other college authorities

Yes _____

No _____

4. Damaged property, pulled fire alarm, etc

Yes _____

No _____

5. Got into an argument or a fight

Yes _____

No _____

6. Got nauseated or vomited

Yes _____

No _____

7. Driven a car under the influence

Yes _____

No _____

8. Missed a class

Yes _____

No _____

9. Been criticized by someone I know

Yes _____

No _____

10. Had a memory loss

Yes _____

No _____

11. Done something I later regretted

Yes _____

No _____

12. Been arrested for DWI/DUI

Yes _____

No _____

13. Have been taken advantage of sexually

Yes _____

No _____

14. Have taken advantage of another sexually

Yes _____

No _____

15. Tried unsuccessfully to stop using

Yes _____

No _____

16. Seriously thought about suicide

Yes _____

No _____

17. Seriously tried to commit suicide

Yes _____

No _____

18. Been hurt or injured

Yes _____

No _____

Appendix C
Personal Drinking Profile

Health Education Resource Center
5011-5023 Student Services Building
600 Lincoln Ave. Charleston, IL 61920
(217) 581-7786

Personal Drinking Profile

Section One: Personal Information

Name: _____

Date: _____

Local Address: _____

Permanent Address: _____

Local Phone: _____

Alternate Phone: _____

E-Mail: _____

* account that is most often checked

Year in School (check one)

Fr So Jr Sr Grad

Section Two: Standard Drinking Habits

A standard drink is defined as the following: 12 ounces of regular beer/wine cooler; 4 ounces of wine; 1 shot of liquor

* Please describe a typical drinking week. For each day, fill in the type, number, and size of drinks that you consumed. In the bottom box, please list the number of hours you spent drinking these drinks. Refer to example.

Example	Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
3 12 oz. Beers							
1 1 oz. Shot *							
3 Hours							

Health Education Resource Center
 5011-5023 Student Services Building
 600 Lincoln Ave. Charleston, IL 61920
 (217) 581-7786

Section Two: Standard Drinking Habits Cont'd.

* This time, please describe your typical drinking habits for the past four weeks. Start at the bottom row of the calendar and place today's date in the box that corresponds to what day of the week it is today. Working backwards, place the appropriate dates in each remaining calendar boxes. Then place the number of standard drinks consumed for each date. If you do not know exactly, place your best approximation. Refer to example.

Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
12 5 drinks example						

Section Three: What's your Blood Alcohol Concentration (BAC) Level

* Think of two occasions during the past month where you drank the most. For those two occasions list the type, number, and size of drinks consumed, hours spent drinking these, and your estimated BAC level.

Example	Situation One	Situation Two
2 12oz. cans of beer 1 1oz. shot of whiskey		
4 hours		
.03		

Section Four: Amount Spent on Alcohol

How much would you estimate that you spend on average for alcoholic beverages per week? \$ _____

How much spending money do you have for the year? \$ _____



Health Education Resource Center
 5011-5023 Student Services Building
 600 Lincoln Ave. Charleston, IL 61920
 (217) 581-7786

Section Five: Alcohol and Your Academics

Previous semester's G.P.A. _____

How many classes did you miss last semester? _____

How many of these absences were due to alcohol (hospitalized, hung-over, too tired from the night before, etc.)? _____

How many homework assignments, quizzes, tests, etc. have you performed poorly on or not completed due to alcohol? _____

Section Six: Familial Alcohol Connections

* Please think about and provide the number of your blood relatives who are now, or have been in the past, problem drinkers or alcoholics.

	<u>Yes/No</u>		<u>Number</u>
Any Parents.....	_____If Yes, how many?	_____
Siblings	_____If Yes, how many?	_____
Grandparents	_____If Yes, how many?	_____
Uncles/Aunts	_____If Yes, how many?	_____
First Cousins	_____If Yes, how many?	_____

Section Seven: Consequences of Drinking

Has the following happened to you while you were drinking alcohol or because of your alcohol use during the past 6 months? Please circle yes or no.

- Not been able to do your homework or study for a test?Yes No
- Got into fights, behaved poorly or did mean things to others?.....Yes No
- Missed out on other things because you spent too much money on alcohol?.....Yes No
- Went to school or work drunk?.....Yes No
- Caused shame or embarrassment to someone?.....Yes No
- Caused shame or embarrassment to yourself?.....Yes No
- Neglected responsibilities such as homework, organizational duties, etc.?.....Yes No
- Been avoided by relatives, friends, or roommates?.....Yes No
- Felt that you needed more alcohol than you used in the past to get the same effects?.....Yes No



Health Education Resource Center
 5011-5023 Student Services Building
 600 Lincoln Ave. Charleston, IL 61920
 (217) 581-7786

Section Seven: Consequences of Drinking Cont'd.

Has the following happened to you while you were drinking alcohol or because of your alcohol use during the past 6 months? Please circle yes or no.

- Felt sick because you have tried to stop or cut down your drinking?.....Yes No
- Noticed a change in your personality?.....Yes No
- Felt that you had a problem with alcohol?.....Yes No
- Missed a day (or part day) of school or work?.....Yes No
- Tried to cut down on your drinking?.....Yes No
- Got into trouble with authorities (i.e. residence hall staff, Judicial Affairs, etc.).....Yes No
- Suddenly found yourself in a place you could not remember getting to?.....Yes No
- Passed out or suddenly fainted?.....Yes No
- Had a fight, argument, or bad feelings with a roommate, family member, boy/girlfriend, or friend?.....Yes No
- Kept drinking when you promised yourself you would not?.....Yes No
- Had a bad time?.....Yes No
- Were asked/told by someone else to stop or cut down on your drinking?.....Yes No
- Drove shortly after having two or more drinks?.....Yes No
- Drove shortly after having been asked not to drive by someone else because you were too intoxicated?...Yes No
- Experienced nausea or vomiting?.....Yes No
- Had a hangover?.....Yes No
- Did not remember acting or behaving in a manner that others say you were?.....Yes No

Section Eight: Social Norms

For each of the following, please estimate what percentage of EIU Students:

Drinks fewer drinks per week than you: _____%

Drink one day or less per week:: _____%

Drink fewer days per week than you: _____%

Appendix D
CRAWL Evaluation

Evaluation

1. Has this group changed your mind about whether or not you will continue to drink?
Yes _____ No _____
2. Has this group made you more aware of your drinking habits?
Yes _____ No _____
3. Are you likely to make different decisions about your drinking after this group?
Yes _____ No _____
4. Did this group teach you something new about drinking that you didn't know before?
Yes _____ No _____
5. Would you say this group was helpful in anyway?
Yes _____ No _____

Evaluation

1. Are you more likely or less likely to stop drinking altogether after attending this group?

More likely _____ Less Likely _____

2. Has this group made you more aware of your drinking habits?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what are you more aware of?

3. Are you likely to make different decisions about your drinking after this group?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, what decisions will you make now?

4. Did this group teach you something new about drinking that you didn't know before?

Yes _____ No _____

6. What was the most helpful part of this group?

7. What was the least helpful part of this group?

8. If you continue to drink in the manner you did before this group who would be impacted and what are some possible consequences?

Appendix E
Informed Consent for participation in the CRAWL Group

Informed Consent for participation in the CRAWL Group**What is CRAWL?**

CRAWL stands for Choosing Responsibly and Within Limits. It is a group meeting designed to help students who have committed, usually for the first time, an alcohol or marijuana-related violation of the Student Conduct Code. The group will meet for one three-hour session on an assigned Thursday night from 7 to 10 pm. There is a required fee of \$35, which is to be paid at the beginning of the group by cash, check, or money order payable to "Eastern Illinois University".

What is the CRAWL group like?

The Thursday evening group is experiential in nature and requires active participation by all members. During the group the leader will ask you questions about your violation and the circumstances that led to it. For everyone in the group to benefit, it is necessary that each member be willing to talk openly about their violation, and your signature at the bottom of this page acknowledges this expectation.

If you are unwilling to discuss your violation with the group, an alternative educational group utilizing a six-hour, non-self-disclosing format, will be held on an assigned Saturday.

Everyone who attends either group is expected to remain free from alcohol and drug use prior to the group, and random on-site testing will be performed before entering the group room. If you attend the group under the influence of substances you will be asked to leave, your fee will be forfeited, and you will be required to pay an additional \$35 fee to attend the next scheduled group.

Scheduling Policy

Your assignment to a scheduled group is at the sole discretion of the staff member who made the referral, and the group leader. Your group will most likely occur within two weeks of your violation. It is your personal responsibility to resolve class or job conflicts to permit attendance in the group. If you are unable to miss a Thursday evening scheduled academic class, inform the referring staff member now, and you will be assigned to a Saturday group. If you miss your assigned group for any reason, the \$35 fee will be forfeited, and you will be required to pay an additional \$35 fee to attend the next scheduled group.

Release of Information

Your signature below (1) indicates that you have read and understood the above information and have received a copy of it, and (2) authorizes the disclosure and exchange of information otherwise confidential between the Counseling Center, the Judicial Affairs (Student Conduct) Office, and/or the other University department which made this referral. Information will be exchanged solely to facilitate effective service delivery and to determine the outcome in completing any sanctions that were required to complete. You have the right to be made aware of any information exchanged, and you may revoke this authorization at any time in writing. This authorization will remain valid until your case is closed at the Judicial Affairs office or the Counseling Center.

Your assigned CRAWL group will meet:

Day _____ Date _____ Time _____ Location _____

In addition to your fee you must bring your driver's license *or* your Panther Card.

Original – Student

Copy – Counseling Center

Student's Signature

Date

Appendix F
Worksheet for CRAWL Referral

With (name) _____ held by (initials) _____ Length of meeting _____

Checked with JC: ___ Student's first alcohol or drug related conduct referral ___ Second alcohol or drug-related ___ More than two

Covered in meeting ___ Determined to be simple possession or use, no aggravating circumstances

___ Aggravating circumstances:

___ Intoxication ___ Incapacitation/injury ___ Noise ___ Providing to others ___ Verbal abuse
___ Uncooperative/false info ___ Damage ___ Threats/Fighting ___ Other _____

___ Discussed: ___ alcohol use & University policy towards ___ academics, personal ___ Explained sanctions & hearing option if complaint contested

___ If under 21: Cautioned about parental notification for 2nd alc or drug (including ordinance violations)

___ If parents are to be notified, the student raised objection due to _____

___ Student called home from office

Sanction(s) imposed:

Probationary status:

___ Placed on Housing Probation, term & conditions specified on hearing waiver

___ Student is first year resident, under 21 & dependent. ___ Explained that parents will be notified.

Objections? _____

___ Placed on University Disciplinary Probation (consult Judicial Affairs first), term & conditions specified on hearing waiver

___ Student is under 21 & dependent. ___ Explained that parents will be notified.

Objections? _____

Educational component(s):

___ Assigned to Counseling Center's CRAWL program

___ Forwarded: ___ signed ___ unsigned consent form to CC. Date of assigned program: _____

___ Assigned Alcohol 101 through HERC

___ Gave Alc 101 attachment for hearing waiver ___ Due within one month, or ___ date due is specified on waiver ___ Notified HERC

___ Assigned to Alcohol Response-Aibility Program

___ Gave ARP attachment with hearing waiver

___ Educational assignment, specified on hearing waiver

Retribution and/or public service component(s):

___ fine ___ reprimand ___ restitution ___ public service Other _____

Remarks: _____

DETACH & SEND TO THE COUNSELING CENTER FOR ALL C.R.A.W.L PROGRAM REFERRALS

Date _____	Student's Name _____	Student's SSN Last Four Digits _____	Student's Phone _____
Student's Local Address _____	Referred By _____	Referring Staff's phone _____	

Check one: ___ The original of the Informed Consent Form, signed by the student, is attached. Date of assigned CRAWL program: _____
___ I called the Counseling Center (581-3413) to confirm the student's assignment on the date specified.
___ The student opted not to sign the Informed Consent Form, and needs to be notified of assignment to an alternative Saturday program

Date/Time of the violation _____ Location _____

Summary of the violation _____

Appendix G
CRAWL Assessment Instrument

C.R.A.W.L. Assessment

The C.R.A.W.L. Assessment is a survey intended to collect data about the effectiveness of the C.R.A.W.L. program. Your honest feedback is encouraged! Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

1

Think back to the incident that brought you to the C.R.A.W.L. program. How many people were immediately affected by your drinking?

2

Of those people affected by your drinking, how many have you entered into discussion with and about what?

3

Define yourself as a drinker:

- Binge (when I drink, I drink 4 or more drinks)
 - Weekend (I drink several drinks only on the weekends)
 - Social (I drink when others around me are drinking)
 - Non Drinker (I never drink)
-

4

How many drinks did you drink on an average day before participating in the C.R.A.W.L. program?

5

How many days within an average week did you drink before participating in the C.R.A.W.L. program?



6 How many drinks did you drink during an average weekend (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday) before participating in the C.R.A.W.L. program?



7 Has participation in C.R.A.W.L. helped to decrease the amount you drink ?



8 How many drinks do you drink on an average day now that you participated in the C.R.A.W.L. program?



9 How many days within an average week do you drink now that you participated in the C.R.A.W.L. program?



10 How many drinks do you drink during an average weekend now that you participated in the C.R.A.W.L. program?



11 How important do you feel it is to change your drinking behaviors?

I haven't considered changing Not at all important Fairly Important Extremely Important

1

2

3

4

12

Since participating in C.R.A.W.L., which of the following statements accurately describes your readiness to change your drinking behaviors?

- I have thoughts of changing.
- I need to consider changing someday.
- I think I should change, but I am not quite ready.
- I am thinking about how to change my drinking.
- I am taking action to change.

13

How many times have you attempted to change your drinking behavior?

- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4+

14

How has participation in C.R.A.W.L. affected your awareness of drinking?

- I am more aware of how my drinking behavior affects other people.
- I was aware of how my behavior affected others.
- I want to learn more about dealing with my habits.
- I am more aware and able to recognize markers of unhealthy drinking behavior.

15

How confident are you that you can change?

Not at all confident	Fairly confident	Very confident
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

16

What is the most beneficial information you learned through the C.R.A.W.L. program?

17

Rank order C.R.A.W.L. activities from the most beneficial (1) to the least beneficial (4):

	1	2	3	4
telling your story	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
jury activity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
the virtual bar	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
filling out the personal drinking profile	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18

How helpful was the C.R.A.W.L. program?

It made no difference	Fairly helpful	Helpful	Extremely helpful
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

19

Please select ALL of the options that apply to you.

- I know how to refuse a drink.
- I know how to intervene if a friend is drinking too much.
- I am likely to acknowledge unhealthy drinking habits a friend exhibits.
- I am likely to intervene when a friend is exhibiting unhealthy drinking habits.

20

Please provide any feedback or suggestions you have for future C.R.A.W.L. programs.

21

Please type your name, understanding that it is legally equivalent to your signature and constitutes your certification that your responses and assessments are accurate and fair to the best of your knowledge.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. You will be linked to the EIU Counseling Center site at the completion of this survey where counseling staff can address any questions you may have about your drinking habits.

SUBMIT 

Appendix H
CRAWL Assessment Results

CRAWL Assessment Results Overview



Date: 5/6/2007 9:10 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

The C.R.A.W.L. Assessment is a survey intended to collect data about the effectiveness of the C.R.A.W.L. program. Your honest feedback is encouraged! Thank you for taking time to complete this survey.

3. Define yourself as a drinker:

Binge (when I drink, I drink 4 or more drinks)	██████████	3	14%
Weekend (I drink several drinks only on the weekends)	██████████████████	8	38%
Social (I drink when others around me are drinking)	██████████████████████	9	43%
Non Drinker (I never drink)	██	1	5%
Total		21	100%

7. Has participation in C.R.A.W.L. helped to decrease the amount you drink ?

Yes	██████	2	10%
No	██	19	90%
Total		21	100%

11. How important do you feel it is to change your drinking behaviors?

I haven't considered changing	██	9	43%
Not at all important	██████████████	5	24%
Fairly Important	██████████████████	6	29%
Extremely Important	██	1	5%
Total		21	100%

12. Since participating in C.R.A.W.L., which of the following statements accurately describes your readiness to change your drinking behaviors?

I have thoughts of changing.	██████████████████	6	29%
I need to consider changing someday.	██████████████████████	7	33%
I think I should change, but I am not quite ready.	██████	3	14%
I am thinking about how to change my drinking.	██████	2	10%
I am taking action to change.	██████	3	14%
Total		21	100%

13. How many times have you attempted to change your drinking behavior?

0		13	62%
1		5	24%
2		3	14%
3		0	0%
4+		0	0%
Total		21	100%

14. How has participation in C.R.A.W.L. affected your awareness of drinking?

I am more aware of how my drinking behavior affects other people.		5	24%
I was aware of how my behavior affected others.		9	43%
I want to learn more about dealing with my habits.		1	5%
I am more aware and able to recognize markers of unhealthy drinking behavior.		6	29%
Total		21	100%

15. How confident are you that you can change?

Not at all confident		1	5%
Fairly confident		9	43%
Very confident		11	52%
Total		21	100%

17. Rank order C.R.A.W.L. activities from the most beneficial (1) to the least beneficial (4):

	1	2	3	4
<small>Top number is the count of respondents selecting the option. Bottom % is percent of the total respondents selecting the option.</small>				
telling your story	9 43%	3 14%	3 14%	6 29%
jury activity	3 14%	10 48%	6 29%	2 10%
the virtual bar	5 24%	3 14%	5 24%	8 38%
filling out the personal drinking profile	4 19%	5 24%	7 33%	5 24%

18. How helpful was the C.R.A.W.L. program?

It made no difference		15	71%
Fairly helpful		4	19%
Helpful		2	10%
Extremely helpful		0	0%

Total		21	100%
--------------	--	-----------	-------------

19. Please select ALL of the options that apply to you.

I know how to refuse a drink.	[REDACTED]	20	95%
I know how to intervene if a friend is drinking too much.	[REDACTED]	17	81%
I am likely to acknowledge unhealthy drinking habits a friend exhibits.	[REDACTED]	14	67%
I am likely to intervene when a friend is exhibiting unhealthy drinking habits.	[REDACTED]	14	67%

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. You will be linked to the EIU Counseling Center site at the completion of this survey where counseling staff can address any questions you may have about your drinking habits.

Copyright ©1999- 2007 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc. Trademark Notice

CRAWL Assessment Results Overview



Date: 5/6/2007 9:10 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

1. Think back to the incident that brought you to the C.R.A.W.L. program. How many people were immediately affected by your drinking?

#	Response
1	none
2	7
3	Two
4	10
5	i didn't drink and was falsly accused
6	9
7	3
8	4
9	None...I was actually sober
10	0
11	1
12	3 people
13	none
14	2
15	4
16	Just me and my roommate
17	2
18	myself
19	1
20	6
21	3

Copyright ©1999- 2007 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc: Trademark Notice

CRAWL Assessment Results Overview



Date: 5/6/2007 9:11 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

2. Of those people affected by your drinking, how many have you entered into discussion with and about what?

#	Response
1	none
2	I talked to them all plus many more people about the whole situation and because they were my friends they understood that it doesn't happen to me.
3	One, she was the reason i was sent to CRAWL.
4	3
5	everyone I meet
6	All, either about the situation itself, or just talking to in person on a daily basis. My RA's did not treat me any different.
7	2
8	ive talked to 3 of them about the nice weather we have been having
9	None from the incident but i have had to apologize to several people for being rude or mean to them because i was drunk.
10	I do not think that it was a big deal. I was an unexperienced drinker and went too far.
11	The only person affected was me! I was the only one from eastern in the room, and it wasn't my friends in my room with me. My friend Kristi went down to her room quickly, and we were caught while she was out of the room.
12	All of them.
13	No one was affected by my drinking. I only got caught because my roommate was drinking in the room, with her friends, and I was just one of the people who happened to be in the room.
14	one, we talked about what happened.
15	Yes, we discussed that night and what happened to us. we also discussed what consequences we had.
16	None
17	0
18	none
19	one just a recap of the night
20	Why it happened
21	zero

Copyright ©1999- 2007 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc. Trademark Notice

CRAWL Assessment Results Overview



Date: 5/6/2007 9:11 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

4. How many drinks did you drink on an average day before participating in the C.R.A.W.L. program?

#	Response
1	10
2	5-12
3	1
4	about 8 or 9 on weekends
5	0
6	1/day BUT usually a Fri or Sat(7 drinks)
7	the same as after
8	0
9	2
10	1
11	5
12	0-1
13	mostly on the weekends and usually 8 or so beers
14	0
15	1 or 2
16	0
17	1
18	0
19	4
20	0
21	4 on the weekends

Copyright ©1999- 2007 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc. Trademark Notice

CRAWL Assessment Results Overview



Date: 5/6/2007 9:12 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

5. How many days within an average week did you drink before participating in the C.R.A.W.L. program?

#	Response
1	4
2	1-2
3	3
4	about 2 or 3
5	1?
6	1
7	3
8	0
9	4
10	8
11	2
12	1-2
13	between 2-4
14	2
15	3
16	0
17	2
18	2
19	2
20	1
21	2

Copyright ©1999- 2007 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc. Trademark Notice

CRAWL Assessment Results Overview



Date: 5/6/2007 9:12 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

6. How many drinks did you drink during an average weekend (Friday, Saturday, and Sunday) before participating in the C.R.A.W.L. program?

#	Response
1	90
2	5-12
3	10-15
4	about 8 or 9
5	3
6	7
7	2
8	4
9	30
10	8
11	12
12	6-12
13	probably around 16 beers for two nights
14	8
15	20
16	12
17	To much
18	5 to 10 a weekend
19	12
20	1 or 2
21	4

Copyright ©1999- 2007 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc. Trademark Notice

CRAWL Assessment Results Overview



Date: 5/6/2007 9:12 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

8. How many drinks do you drink on an average day now that you participated in the C.R.A.W.L. program?

#	Response
1	15
2	5-12
3	0
4	same
5	0 not beacause of the program though
6	Two nights/month Avg 7/night
7	as many as i want
8	1-3
9	2
10	1
11	5
12	2-3
13	still around 8 beers on weekends
14	0
15	none
16	1
17	Same as before
18	0
19	4
20	0
21	4

Copyright ©1999- 2007 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc. Trademark Notice

CRAWL Assessment Results Overview



Date: 5/6/2007 9:12 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

9. How many days within an average week do you drink now that you participated in the C.R.A.W.L. program?

#	Response
1	100
2	0-1
3	1
4	same
5	0
6	Once every two weeks
7	as many as i want
8	7
9	3
10	8
11	2
12	3-4
13	2-3 days
14	2
15	1
16	1
17	Same as before
18	2
19	12
20	0
21	4

Copyright ©1999- 2007 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc. Trademark Notice

CRAWL Assessment Results Overview



Date: 5/6/2007 9:13 PM PST
Responses: Completes
Filter: No filter applied

10. How many drinks do you drink during an average weekend now that you participated in the C.R.A.W.L. program?

#	Response
1	100
2	5-12
3	5
4	same
5	0
6	7 if i drink on that weekend
7	like this question matters the program is a joke
8	10
9	30
10	8
11	12
12	6-12
13	around 16 for two nights
14	8
15	4 or 5
16	12
17	To much, crawl was a waste of my time.
18	5 to 10 in the weekend
19	12
20	1 to 3
21	5

Copyright ©1999- 2007 MarketTools, Inc. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of MarketTools, Inc. Trademark Notice