

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

5-7-2009

A study of the impact Rowan University's alcohol & other drug program has on behaviors, dispositions & attitudes among students

Jessica P. Havery
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you - share your thoughts on our feedback form.

Recommended Citation

Havery, Jessica P., "A study of the impact Rowan University's alcohol & other drug program has on behaviors, dispositions & attitudes among students" (2009). *Theses and Dissertations*. 624.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/624>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

A STUDY OF THE IMPACT ROWAN UNIVERSITY'S ALCOHOL & OTHER
DRUG PROGRAM HAS ON BEHAVIORS, DISPOSITIONS & ATTITUDES
AMONG STUDENTS

by
Jessica P. Havery

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
May 7, 2009

Approved by _____
Dr. Burton R. Sisco

Date Approved May 7, 2009

© 2009 Havery

ABSTRACT

Jessica P. Havery

A STUDY OF THE IMPACT ROWAN UNIVERSITY'S ALCOHOL & OTHER DRUG PROGRAM HAS ON BEHAVIORS, DISPOSITIONS & ATTITUDES AMONG STUDENTS

2008/09

Dr. Burton R. Sisco

Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the impact that Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug program had on the behaviors, dispositions and attitudes of students responsible for violating the institution's alcohol policy. The study focused on the changes among students that attended the new program, instituted in the Spring 2008 semester, during the 2008-2009 academic year. Data on the behaviors, dispositions and attitudes were collected using a pre and post-test instrument, which consisted of 53 questions composed in both close-ended and Likert form. Data analysis suggests that the most significant changes among students were behavioral in nature. Students reported a significant change in their decision making while intoxicated, specifically regarding their involvement in unlikely sexual encounters and participation in physical altercations. Additionally, students reported a change in dispositional factors including a decrease in their approval of drinking for the sole purpose of intoxication and their intent to knowingly violate Rowan University's alcohol policy simply because they thought they could get away with the violation. In regards to the students' intent to change their alcohol-related behavior, there appeared to be minimal statistical significance.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the support of Dr. Burton Sisco, under whose supervision and guidance I chose this topic and completed a successful study. His enthusiasm, encouragement and willingness to provide me with numerous revisions have helped me more than words can express. I would have been lost without him.

I would also like to thank Bob Logan, and the Center for Addiction Studies. Their assistance in my data collection process and many thoughtful discussions have helped develop this research into a final product.

I am most grateful to have met, and worked with, Assistant Dean of Students, Joe Mulligan. He has been a resource, mentor and friend whom I have learned a great wealth of information from. I truly value the personal and professional support he has afforded to me this academic year and can only hope that I become the respected professional that he has.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, I wish to thank my best friend and boyfriend. Their constant encouragement, thoughtful feedback and trips to Starbucks kept me grounded throughout this entire process and I am forever indebted. To Lori Troise and Joshua Burke, I dedicate this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION 1
	Statement of the Problem 1
	Purpose of the Study 2
	Significance of the Study 2
	Assumptions and Limitations 2
	Operational Definitions 3
	Research Questions 5
	Overview of the Study 6
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE 7
	Working With Millennial Students 7
	Social Norms Theory 8
	Social Learning Theory 11
	Student Attitudes 12
	Student Dispositions 13
	Are All Intervention Plans Alike? 14
	Summary of the Literature Review 20
III.	METHODOLOGY 23

	Context of the Study	23
	Population and Sample Selection	24
	Instrumentation	24
	Data Collection	26
	Data Analysis	27
IV.	FINDINGS	28
	Profile of the Sample	28
	Analysis of the Data	30
	Research Question 1	30
	Research Question 2	33
	Research Question 3	34
V.	SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	35
	Summary of the Study	35
	Discussion of the Findings	36
	Conclusions	38
	Recommendations for Practice	39
	Recommendations for Further Research	39
	REFERENCES.....	41
	APPENDIX A:Institutional Review Board Approval Letter	45
	APPENDIX B:Survey Instrument	47

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
4.1	Student Demographics	28
4.2	Drinking Patterns of Selected Students	29
4.3	Survey of Student Behavior	31
4.4	Drinking Frequency of Selected Students.....	32

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As alcohol use and abuse increases among college students, higher education administrators struggle in their search for effective intervention methods. Through a variety of educational, interactive and theory-based initiatives, these administrators continue to recreate methods that will not only show a short term decrease in alcohol use among students, but a long term change in behavior as well.

Statement of the Problem

Each year, excessive alcohol use leads to more than 1,400 unintentional deaths and 500,000 unintentional injuries on college campuses. Additional high-risk behaviors, such as drunk driving, unprotected sex and physical fighting have also been attributed to alcohol use among college students (Hingson, Heeren, Zakocs, Kopstein, & Weschler, 2002).

Due to these alarming statistics, higher education administrators across the nation are working to implement a variety of intervention programs hoping that their efforts will lead to a decrease in alcohol use among students and an improvement in decision making abilities. The following three important aspects should be taken into consideration when planning and implementing intervention programs on college campus. Understanding the traits and needs of the student population that is being targeted and discovering how this population views alcohol use are two primary questions that will be necessary in a successful program. Finally, after answering the first two questions, administrators will

need to develop a course of action that addresses these concerns in a way that will meet the goals of the institution, and the needs of its student population.

Because each institution has a unique student population and programmatic goals, numerous intervention methods have been developed throughout the years. These programs vary in frequency, theory and method, therefore producing a plethora of results.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drug program on selected students who had been disciplined for violating the institution's alcohol policy. Of specific interest was the impact that the program had on the students' attitudes, behaviors and dispositions towards alcohol and whether it would produce a change in alcohol-related behavior, therefore reducing the number of repeated alcohol violations.

Significance of the Study

This study focused on the alcohol-related attitudes, behaviors and dispositions of Rowan University students before and after attending the Alcohol and Other Drug program. The findings of this study will provide Rowan University administrators insight into whether the Alcohol and Other Drug program is meeting its goals and how the program might be improved.

Assumptions and Limitations

This study was focused on a new program at Rowan University and used a convenience sample of students who were sanctioned as a result of their involvement in an alcohol violation on campus. Only students who completed and returned the pre-test, distributed at the workshop, and the post-test, distributed approximately four weeks after

the workshop, were used for this study. A student's negative attitude towards having to attend the mandated workshop may have affected their willingness to complete the surveys, therefore limiting the number of subjects used for the study. The personal nature of the survey questions, even when confidentiality was ensured, may also have limited the level of honesty among the subjects.

Additionally, beginning during the 2008-2009 academic year, monetary fines were applied to student accounts of those found responsible for violating the alcohol policy. The combination of the monetary fine and the inconvenience of attending the Alcohol and Other Drug program may have had an impact on a student's alcohol-related behavior and further violation of Rowan's alcohol policies. This potential impact made it difficult for the researcher to determine the true extent that the program had an impact on alcohol-related behavior among students.

This study also leaves room for researcher bias. It is possible that the researcher could be biased about the effectiveness of the Alcohol and Other Drug program, thus having an affect on the researcher's ability to objectively determine its impact.

Operational Definitions

1. Administrators: Staff and faculty members employed at Rowan University during the 2008 – 2009 academic year. More specifically, those that are involved with the development, implementation and assessment of the Alcohol and Other Drug program.
2. Alcohol Policy: At Rowan University, alcohol is not permitted within the residence halls and no one, regardless of age, is permitted to possess, consume or be in the presence of alcohol in these areas. The policy for on-campus apartment living allows

- alcohol consumption if its occupants are of legal age; however students under the age of 21 are not permitted to be in the presence of alcohol in these living units. For this study, the subjects being surveyed have violated Rowan University's alcohol policy and have been sanctioned to the Alcohol and Other Drug program being researched.
3. Attitudes: Students' attitudes towards alcohol and their relationship with alcohol. In this study, the attitudinal factors measured through a pre and post-test instrument include their motivation to drink, their approval of drinking, and intent to change their alcohol-related behavior.
 4. Behavior: Students' alcohol-related behavior, including the frequency and amount of alcohol consumption and repeated violations of Rowan University's alcohol policy. After attending the Alcohol and Other Drug program, subjects' will be tracked through the Office of Judicial Affairs to record further alcohol violations. Further violations will be used to measure the impact that the program has on alcohol-related behavior.
 5. Binge Drinking: The consumption of five or more drinks in one sitting by males, four or more by females (Chapman, 2007b).
 6. Disposition: A student's tendencies or habits that make up their personality and contribute to their relationship with alcohol. In this study, the dispositional factors measured include stressors, relaxation techniques, other perceived bad habits and other addictive behaviors the subjects participate in. These factors will be measured through a pre and post-test instrument.
 7. Educational Sanctions: The Office of Judicial Affairs uses two educational sanctions when a student is found responsible for violating the institution's alcohol policy. In

addition to attending the Alcohol and Other Drug program, students are also required to complete e-CHUG (Electronic Check Up and Go) an online alcohol self-assessment.

8. **Millennial Students:** Students born between 1982-2002, who are now the most common students enrolled at higher education institutions. The subjects surveyed in this study are millennial students attending Rowan University during the 2008-2009 academic year.
9. **Monetary Fines:** Beginning during the 2008-2009 academic year, students found responsible for violating Rowan University's alcohol policy received a monetary fine, in addition to their educational sanctions. The monetary fines range from \$100 to \$400, depending on how many prior alcohol violations the student has accumulated.
10. **Sanctioned Students:** Students who have violated a campus policy and receive a punishment as the result of their behavior. All subjects in this study have been sanctioned to attend the Alcohol and Other Drug program.

Research Questions

This study addressed the following research questions:

1. What is the impact of Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drug program on the behavior of selected students?
2. What is the impact of Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug program on the disposition of students?
3. What is the impact of Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug program on the attitude of students?

Overview of the Study

Chapter two provides a review of scholarly literature relevant to this study. This section includes background information on the millennial students who are being served through the Alcohol and Other Drug program, the theories used in similar programs, and the success rates of similar intervention programs used at other higher education institutions.

Chapter three describes the methods and procedures used in the study. The areas covered in this chapter include: the context of the study, a description of the convenience sample used, a description of the data collection instruments, a description of the procedures used in gathering the data, and how the data were analyzed.

Chapter four presents the findings and results of the study, focusing on the research questions posed in the introduction of the study. This section also includes a narrative explanation and discussion of the findings presented.

Chapter five discusses the major findings of the study, in addition to offering conclusions and recommendations for further practice and research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Working With Millennial Students

Elam (2007) defines Millennial students, those born between 1982-2002, as hardworking students whose parents have socialized them to be successful in life. Having been influenced by historical events such as the Desert Storm and school shootings at Columbine High School in Colorado, the students entering colleges today grew up with increased security and protective parents that felt the need to nurture their children's personal and academic lives at a high level (Elam, 2007).

Growing up in the Millennial generation, has engrained many positive traits into today's college students. Some of these traits include greater educational goals, the ability to multitask, being team oriented and having exceedingly close relationships with their parents (Coomes & DeBard, 2004; Howe & Strauss, 2000; Murray, 1997).

While there are many positive traits in Millennial students, some researchers have also noted some drawbacks that could affect this new collegiate generation. One underlying concern is that students of this generation may not be as sensitive to issues related to diversity, racism, and discrimination. This trait has been connected to the fact that one in five Millennial students have recently had at least one parent immigrate to the United States (Howe & Strauss, 2000; O'Reilly & Vella-Zarb, 2000). Other researchers find that, due to the recent boom in technology, Millennial students may lack skills that allow them to become critical thinkers and demonstrate self-reflection (Murray, 1997).

A trait that many administrators find in Millennial students is their lack of respect for authority. Newton (2000) stated that students are aware of campus and community regulations, but are determined to find a way around them. Millennial students hide their inappropriate behavior and policy violations by creating a respectful appearance, but live by their own internal rule of “it’s OK as long as I don’t get caught.”

One freshmen student at La Salle University, supported this assertion by saying in an anonymous survey that, “...no matter how dry the campus was supposed to be, or what the alcohol policy was, there were ways that alcohol could be brought in. It’s always been a factor of campus life” (Chapman, 2007b, p. 41).

Social Norms Theory

Social norms theory is the belief that a college student’s own relationship with alcohol is based on the idea of what other college student’s drinking habits are. Researchers have found that students consistently overestimate both the amount of alcohol other students consume and the percentage of heavy drinkers on campus, and that this misconception may lead to heavier consumption of alcohol and instances of problematic behavior (Hagman, Clifford, & Noel, 2007).

A study at The Richard Stockton College of New Jersey surveyed 306 students in order to test the social norms theory. Researchers (Frank & Miley, 2006) found that students who drank more than five drinks in one setting believed that other college students drank more than themselves. More specifically, on-campus residents, sorority members and male college students believed, at a higher rate than other subjects, that they drank less than others in their age bracket (Frank & Miley).

The theory, as found in Wolburg's (2001) research, also suggests that students tend to drink more because they view alcohol use as an integral part of the college experience. Students surveyed in a study at La Salle University reported that the largest factor in determining which college to attend was the social life and community atmosphere (Chapman, 2007b). "When you think of college, you just think of a house full of people with beer everywhere, and I definitely figured drinking would be on a lot bigger scale," said a 20-year-old, junior, male (Chapman, 2007b, p. 39).

In an attempt to correct student misconception, and decrease the level of alcohol use on campus, Perkins and Berkowitz (1986) suggest that administrators giving students accurate information about campus drinking practices may cause an increase in healthy behaviors. This research has been implemented on many college campuses through social norms interventions in hopes that, through education, there will be a change in student behavior over time.

Essentially, the social norms-based approach that many institutions have found successful is an "evidence-based, data-driven process, and a very cost-effective method of achieving large-scale positive results" (Rice & Haines, 2007, p. 160). By first identifying what students perceive to be "normal alcohol use," and then surveying a target group to determine the "actual alcohol use," administrators have a baseline to begin the intervention.

In March 2006, 538 Rowan University students were surveyed about their alcohol use and their perceptions of other students' alcohol use. Among the male students surveyed, the perceived frequency of alcohol use among their peers was three times a

week. The actual reported use was only one time a week. Among female students surveyed, the perceived frequency of alcohol use among peers was one time per week, while the actual reported use was a total of two times per month. When questioned about the amount of alcohol consumed in each sitting, Rowan students reported drinking an average of 4.09 alcoholic drinks and perceived that other students typically consumed 5.67 drinks (Rowan University Center for Addiction Studies, 2007).

Using a multimedia approach across campus, statistics on actual alcohol use among students are highly advertised in the hopes that, by seeing the true statistics, students will reconsider their own decisions about alcohol use (Rice & Haines, 2007).

Northern Illinois University (NIU) implemented a social norms-based approach in 1989 using fliers, advertisements and posters to report that NIU students typically drank five or fewer drinks when they attend parties. In the course of six years, NIU saw a 35% reduction in binge drinking, a 31% reduction in alcohol related injuries to oneself and a 54% reduction in injuries to other individuals (Haines, 1997).

In addition to using an approach similar to NIU, Rowan University offers many activities and giveaways in order to promote the social norms effort. In one activity, "Roll the Dice," students able to correctly answer questions regarding social norms statistics win prizes such as Philadelphia 76ers tickets. Typical questions included the average number of drinks Rowan students consume at a party, and the number of days a week Rowan students drink (Perkins & LaMastro, 2006).

Social Learning Theory

Social Learning Theory, created by Albert Bandura, proposes that experience constitutes an important source of expectations and predicts that consistent and positive peer involvement may have an impact on alcohol and drug education. Social Learning Theory, as described by Bandura is that “an individual’s behavior is uniquely determined by interactions of personal factors (including cognition) and environmental influences” (as cited in Ramos & Perkins, 2006, p. 2).

According to one aspect of the theory, the self-efficacy paradigm, change in behavior is a function of one’s expectations of personal behavior. The expectation that a given behavior will lead to a specific outcome are called “outcome expectations,” and the belief in a person’s ability to perform the behavior to the desired outcomes are called “efficacy expectations.”

Prevention techniques using the Social Learning Theory place emphasis on the development of specific social and personal skills to resist the pro-drug environment and pressure found on campuses. Some intervention programs incorporate Social Norms Theory and Social Learning Theory. By first educating students on alcohol misconception and then reinforcing the intervention with instruction on social skills and peer refusal, administrators are putting the power of healthy behavior into the hands of the students (Gonzalez, 1997). Psychosocial approaches to intervention methods are programs that look out for social influences that promote substance use and training designed to improve personal and social competence (Gonzalez, 1997).

The *Second Triennial Report* to the U.S. Congress from the Secretary of Health and Human Services reported that more than a dozen studies resulted in reductions in cigarette smoking among high school students. The intervention programs were experimental and looked at psychosocial factors believed to have an influence in substance-abuse initiation.

Student Attitudes

The concept of attitude has led researchers and psychologists to assign a variety of definitions to the term. For some, it is assumed that an individual has several categories of attitude towards an object or idea, such as verbal attitudes and action attitudes, which do not necessarily have to correspond. Others believe there is a direct correlation between attitude and behavior, using the term to describe a pattern of consistent behavior. And, still, another assumption is that attitude is a subconscious concept which, when combined with other factors, determines an individual's behavior, statements, beliefs and feelings toward an object or idea (Cook & Selltiz, 1964).

With the several subjective ways in which researchers and psychologists view attitude, there must also be several ways to measure such a broad concept. The five methods of measurement include: self-reporting of beliefs, feelings, behavior etc. toward an object or idea; observed behavior towards an object or idea; reactions to structured material related to the object or idea; performance on a task where the outcome may be influenced by the object or idea; and physiological responses to the object or idea (Cook & Selltiz, 1964).

Given the different nature of each measurement technique, researchers have discovered that each technique will result in different findings and there is no complete correlation between all measurement methods. Additionally, researchers have indicated that an individual's attitude toward an object or idea may affect his or her responses during measurement if the measurement technique directly addresses that object or idea (Cook & Selltiz, 1964).

Student Dispositions

The role a student's individual personality plays in his or her behavioral decisions is especially significant during transitional periods, such as the first year of college. While in this transitional period, a student has less knowledge of how to adapt and behave appropriately. This drastic change causes a student's disposition to take a larger role in his or her perceptions, responses and behavior (Cyders & Smith, 2008).

When analyzing correlations between student disposition and risky behavior, researchers refer to five constructs of disposition. Two emotion-based dispositions, positive and negative urgency, describe a student's tendency to act rashly when experiencing an unusually positive or negative experience. Two others are related to a student's level of conscientiousness, as lack of planning includes the failure to plan ahead and lack of ability to stay on task. The last is a sensation-seeking disposition in which students seek out risky or thrilling experiences. A combination of these dispositions tend to affect the frequency of risky behavior, including alcohol consumption (Cyders & Smith, 2008).

Are All Intervention Plans Alike?

While most higher education administrators recognize that alcohol is a problem on their campuses, many of them utilize a variety of intervention methods. Some, such as the social norms intervention previously described, use a strictly educational method. Other methods include long-term intensive workshops, one-time assessments, and sessions rooted in multiple theories.

Cummings (1997) states that in order to be successful, a program must be strongly rooted in theory. "A strong theory, will give the substance abuse prevention field in institutions of higher education coherence, direction and focus" (Cummings, 1997, p.47). One theory-based intervention that Cummings sees as positive change in the field is the empowerment model. The reputation of empowerment began to grow when Julian Rappaport presented on this theory for the American Psychological Association in 1981. Since then, empowerment has been used in multiple ways, including the public school system and organizations such as Alcoholics Anonymous (Cummings, 1997). "Rappaport asserted that, if prevention is the goal of most programs, then empowerment is the process for achieving that end" (Cummings, 1997, p.47).

Empowerment is seen as an integral part of the intervention process because it assists subjects in taking control over their own lives, and involves them in the intervention (Rappaport, Swift, & Hess, 1984). By involving affected students from the very beginning, even minimally in the creation of the intervention method, administrators would be putting the problem and solution development in the hands of those who

understand it best. Students experiencing problems with alcohol will be more likely to learn and benefit from an intervention method designed by those who take a personal interest in the matter, rather than a set of administrators simply attempting to reduce alcohol use (Cummings, 1997).

Cummings (1997) also states that empowerment works because it is a process that takes place over time, and that the results are not expected to present themselves at the end of a one-time session. When staff have a long-range vision, and understand how complex an issue alcohol abuse can be, they may be able to better understand that working with large, impersonal groups of students is rarely proven effective. Through a five-year Alcohol Education Demonstration project, Kraft (1984) came to the conclusion that interventions where students participated in small sessions over a longer period of time was the only method that resulted in a change of drinking behavior.

The BASICS program, developed at the University of Washington, specifically targets students who have already developed an alcohol-related problem and are generally frequent drinkers. The subjects participating in the program met the DSM-IV criteria for alcohol abuse, but not necessarily alcohol dependence (Parks, 2007).

BASICS consists of a two-session brief intervention based on the principals of the [institution's] Alcohol Skills Training Program delivered in using motivational enhancement strategies shown to be effective in a variety of brief interventions designed for adolescents and young adults. (Miller & Rollnick, 2002, p. 328)

The first 50-minute, one-on-one session is meant to assess a student's drinking pattern, alcohol related attitude and motivation to change his or her drinking behavior. At

the end of the first session, the therapist instructs the student to monitor his or her daily drinking habits from the close of the session until the time they meet again. The student is given wallet-sized monitoring cards for daily entries and are asked to log information such as if they drank, what they drank, where they were, whom they were with, and how they felt while drinking. A second session is then scheduled for approximately two weeks later, so that monitoring can include weekend activity when alcohol use is normally heaviest (Parks, 2007).

The second session provides the student with information about risk factors related to the information gathered in the first meeting and advice on how to make better decisions regarding alcohol (Parks, 2007).

In comparison to a control group of students who completed annual assessments only, students receiving the Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students (BASICS) reported statistically significant reductions in alcohol use, reported significantly fewer alcohol-related negative consequences, and showed clinically significant improvement as indicated by the results of a four-year follow-up study. (Baer, Kivlahan, Blume, McKnight, & Marlatt, 2001, p. 1312)

In an assessment of the BASICS program, researchers discovered that the program had a significant impact on the level of alcohol consumption among students who attended. Prior to the study, students reported drinking an average of 15 drinks per week and an estimated blood alcohol level of .13%. Following the study, students who attended the program reported drinking an average of 6.6 drinks per week and a peak blood alcohol level of .09%. Students who did not attend the program reported an

increase in their alcohol consumption, drinking 16.8 drinks per week with a blood alcohol level of .11% (Dimeff, Baer, Kivlahan, & Marlatt, 1999).

The Pennsylvania State University's Alcohol Intervention Program Level 2 is required for university students who have violated an alcohol policy. The students complete three sessions over a three to four-week period. The program is comprised of a variety of assessments intended to change the decision-making processes, alcohol use and attitudes of university students. Researchers found that the program is based on multiple theories, including the Social Norms Theory, Social Learning Theory, and the Transtheoretical Model of Change (Ramos & Perkins, 2006).

Program facilitators use the social norms theory in the second session of the program to compare the participant's drinking patterns to the university norms. Through discussion, the facilitator attempts to correct misconceptions that contribute to the participant's level of drinking.

The use of the Social Learning Theory plays a heavier role in the program's progression. The theory is found in many elements of the program, such as identifying environmental and personal factors, correcting misconceptions and discussing healthy social norms, modeling positive outcomes of healthy behaviors and providing opportunities for self-monitoring, goal setting, problem solving and self rewards. For example, participants will discuss their alcohol misperceptions and identify factors that may contribute to high-risk behaviors (Ramos & Perkins, 2006).

The Transtheoretical Model of Change incorporates a number of psychotherapy and behavior change theories (Freud's Traditional Conscious Raising Theory, Skinner's

Contingency Management Theory, and Roger's Helping Relationships) into stages of change for the participants. Behavioral change evolves through five stages: pre-contemplation, contemplation, preparation, action and maintenance. By assessing stages of change at the participant's intake is to provide the facilitator a guide for the most appropriate approaches based on individual needs.

While the researchers discovered that the program was meeting its goals, by educating students on alcohol use and decision-making, they also had suggestions to strengthen the program and the theories used. Specifically, the researchers believe that the use of Social Norms Theory could be done in a more effective way. Rather than having a conversation about norms and misconceptions, the researchers suggested that "an activity-based intervention ... would strengthen the social norms theory. For example, participants could write a short essay describing their reasons for drinking. By reading these answers, the peer interventionist is able to recognize decision-making indicators and better understand the participant's rationale for drinking" (Ramos & Perkins, 2006, p. 59).

With the increase in technological use among millennial students, many institutions have opted to use an online alcohol prevention program. Outside the Classroom provides AlcoholEdu, in addition to many other population-level prevention plans. More than 500 higher education institutions require that all incoming students take, and pass, the AlcoholEdu program. Each student receives an email from a campus administrator with information about the program. The program consists of a pre-survey about their alcohol attitudes and behaviors. Following the survey, students complete a

pre-course introduction, five online learning chapters, a journal, two knowledge tests and a post-survey, immediately upon completion. Four to six weeks after completing the course, students are sent a follow-up survey of their alcohol-related attitudes and behaviors (Wall, 2007).

Creators of the AlcoholEdu program believe that, by using the theory of Bloom's taxonomy of learning, students will retain and gain the most of the prevention program. By organizing the learning chapters in an order that begins with memorization of general facts and progresses to analysis, assessment and self-reflection, students are expected to ease their way into the more difficult aspects of the course. As students progress through the chapters and interactive portions of the program are tailored to their previous answers, such as their gender, consumption level and risky behaviors (Wall, 2007).

A 2005 study comparing two groups, a control group of students who participated in the program and a group who had never heard of the program, was done using students enrolled at 112 public and private institutions across the country. After completing the entire program and the 4-week follow up survey, students in the control group reported fewer positive expectations of alcohol consumption. The group also reported 50% fewer incidents of negative academic consequences, hangover/mental impact and intentional risky behavior. The percentage of students who consumed five or more drinks in a row, whom initially did not see a need to change their behavior, also dropped by nearly 30% (Wall, 2007).

In addition to promoting changes in alcohol-related behavior, students of the AlcoholEdu program also reported significant changes in alcohol-related knowledge,

self-reflection and awareness. Seventy percent reported that they would recommend the program to other students and 62% said that the program had encouraged them to discuss drinking patterns, behaviors and effects with their friends.

When used as a judicial sanction for students who violate an institution's alcohol policy, the impact is less significant but studies show that there has been a positive influence on attitudes and behaviors. Researchers suggest that using small group motivational interventions produces greater impact and has a better chance of penetrating the students' likely disposition towards being mandated to participate in the program (Wall, 2007).

Regardless of which intervention method institutions use, it is important to recognize that change is not something that occurs without a long-term outlook and the patience to see the benefits of the program to take effect. Implementing a cultural change on a college campus takes significant planning, assessment and evolution on behalf of the staff, faculty and students (Chapman, 2007a).

Summary of the Literature Review

Higher education administrators across the nation recognize the importance of alcohol use on college campuses and the impact alcohol has on the student population. While there is no denying that alcohol use is a problem, administrators have many different perspectives on *how* to resolve the issue.

With alcohol and drug centers popping up on college campuses, the aspect of knowing the student population that institutions are targeting has become an important factor in program success. Currently enrolled students born into the millennial generation

have different needs and interests than those of past generations. Recognizing that millennial students generally have higher levels of expectations and independence, administrators have attempted to integrate those characteristics into intervention programs.

Higher education administrators are implementing a wide range of tactics to improve student misconceptions and misuse of alcohol. One popular approach, based upon the social norms theory, has been widely successful in educating students on actual campus alcohol use statistics. More hands-on intervention methods, such as workshops, assessments, and one-on-one counseling sessions have been implemented to appropriately meet the needs of independent-seeking millennial students.

Studies show that, while institutions utilize a variety of programs, intervention methods on college campus have been widely successful in correcting student misconceptions and reducing alcohol misuse. Research shows that, in order for continued success, intervention methods need constant assessment and adjustment to meet the needs of both the students and the administration. Though many schools appear to have exceptional goals and expectations for intervention methods, there is often a gap between implementing the program and reinventing the program as the needs of the campus evolve.

Research also shows that, though intervention programs demonstrate promising goals, many fail to root their programs in theories that support the relationship between the elements of the programs and the intended goals. Few college-level intervention

programs have undergone assessments to determine the effectiveness of the program and determine long-term outcomes.

Thus, a study at Rowan University is needed to gain insight in how students view alcohol use at the collegiate level and to assess the educational and behavioral impact that the Alcohol & Other Drug program has on campus alcohol use. Continued study and assessment over time will be necessary to evaluate the program, its long-term benefits and how it meets the needs of Rowan students.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Context of the Study

The study was conducted at Rowan University, in Glassboro, NJ. The medium-sized public university is located in southern New Jersey and has more than 10,000 students. The institution has six academic colleges, which offer 58 undergraduate majors and seven teacher certification programs. Students entering as undergraduates in 2007 were ranked in the top 21% of their high school class. Nearly 70% of these students receive some form of financial aid, such as grants, loans, and scholarships from a variety of sources. In addition to the undergraduate programs offered, Rowan University offers more than 30 graduate level programs for students working towards masters degrees, certifications, an educational specialist degree, and a doctoral degree in educational leadership (Rowan University website, 2008).

US News & World Report describes Rowan University as a “top tier” public institution that has evolved into one of the most recognized and highly regarded universities in the state of New Jersey. *Kiplinger’s* named Rowan as one of the “100 Best Buys in Public Colleges and Universities,” and the *Princeton Review* listed the institution in The Best Northeastern Colleges.

Population and Sample Selection

The target population of this study was all students sanctioned to attend Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug program as a result of violating the institution's alcohol policy during the 2008-2009 academic year. A convenience sample was selected because subjects were required to attend the workshops as part of their sanction. The sample of subjects varied in age and gender.

Of the 181 students mandated to attend the workshop during the research period, 115 students attended the program. The 66 students that failed to attend were charged with failure to comply with University directives by the Office of Judicial Affairs, fined \$50 for a rescheduling fee and were rescheduled to attend at a later date.

Instrumentation

A self-designed instrument was used to assess the subjects' alcohol-related attitudes, behaviors and dispositions. The survey (Appendix B) consisted of 53 items designed to address motivational, academic and behavioral factors regarding subjects' attitudes and dispositions towards alcohol. The items were chosen from relevant research to specifically address the research questions. An identical instrument was used as the post-test in order to re-evaluate subjects' attitudes towards alcohol up to four weeks following the initial assessment.

The instrument was divided into three sections. The first section requested demographic information including age, what the subject drinks, frequency of drinking, and why the subject drinks. The second section included 12 statements in which the subject was asked to rate his or her response of "Never," "Rarely," "Often" and "Always" on a Likert scale. These statements addressed the subjects' drinking habits and practices,

and potential academic, psychological and physical consequences the subject may encounter as a result of drinking. The third section included 14 statements in which the subject was asked to rate his or her response of “Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “Neutral” and “Strongly Disagree” on a Likert scale. These statements addressed behavioral, dispositional and motivational factors. The only identifying characteristics on the instrument were the subjects’ initials, used to correlate the pre and post-test responses.

Following approval from the Institutional Review Board of Rowan University (Appendix A), the instrument was field tested on a sample of students who had been sanctioned to the same workshop as the subjects participating in the research. The 18 Rowan students, chosen from a convenience sample, completed the instrument and provided valuable feedback to help establish face and content validity. The field test demonstrated the survey adequately and logically encompassed the information necessary to measure student behavior, as well as readability. The Chronbach Alpha reliability coefficients for the last two sections, respectively, were .79 and .75, indicating a stable and consistent instrument.

The Office of Judicial Affairs also provided statistics on the number and classification of alcohol violations throughout the 2008-2009 academic year. This information included confidential information on the students who repeated alcohol violations after being sanctioned to, and attending, the Alcohol & Other Drug program since its implementation in January 2008. This information was used to measure a change in student behavior over a longer period of time.

Data Collection

After the instrument was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Rowan University, and was submitted to a pilot test, it was administered to sanctioned students attending the Alcohol & Other Drug workshop. The survey measured the subjects' attitudes, behavior and disposition towards their individual alcohol use, and was administered prior to the program and approximately four weeks following the conclusion of the program.

The pre-test was distributed by the coordinator of the Alcohol & Other Drug program prior to the start of the program. Subjects were instructed that their participation was voluntary, and that all answers would be kept confidential and would not impact their standing as a student.

Of the 115 students that attended, 89 completed the pre-test correctly and were contacted to complete a post-test for further research.

The post-test was administered through the Office of Judicial Affairs, approximately four weeks following the session. To increase the probability of response, and ensure continued confidentiality, a return envelope was included with the post-test. Subjects were given one week to complete and return the instrument.

Of the 89 students asked to complete a post-test, 72 students completed and returned the survey.

The statistics received from the Office of Judicial Affairs were confidential. No student names, or initials, were released when reporting instances where sanctioned students violated the alcohol policy after attending the Alcohol & Other Drug workshop.

Data Analysis

The independent variables in this study included gender and age. The dependent variables were the alcohol-related attitudes, dispositions and behavior. Information regarding subjects' attitudes was collected using the pre and post-test survey instrument. While 89 subjects completed the pre-test at the Alcohol & Other Drug program, only the 72 that completed both the pre and the post-test were used when calculating data.

Variations in student attitudes, behaviors and dispositions were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software. Comparisons (paired t-test) and descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, percentages, means and standard deviations) were used to analyze the data in regards to the research questions.

Information regarding student behavior and repeated alcohol violations was collected through the Office of Judicial Affairs, producing statistics to show the impact the program has on subjects' alcohol-related behavior.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Profile of the Sample

The subjects for this study were chosen from a convenience sample of Rowan University students, required to attend the Alcohol & Other Drug program, during the 2008-2009 academic year. Of the 115 potential subjects, 26 failed to complete the entire pre-test, making them ineligible for participating in the remainder of the study. Post tests were administered to the 89 eligible students, with 72 completing both tests for a response rate of 81%. Subjects were all undergraduate students of Rowan University.

Table 4.1 contains demographic data of the subjects, including their ages, genders, grade levels and residential status. Seventy-nine percent were underage alcohol offenses.

Table 4.1

Student Demographics (N=72)

Student Characteristics	Frequency	%
Age		
18	19	26.4
19	22	30.6
20	16	22.2
21	3	4.2
22	11	15.3
23	1	1.4
Gender		
Male	58	80.6
Female	14	19.4

Class Rank		
Freshman	30	41.7
Sophomore	15	20.8
Junior	12	16.7
Senior	13	18.1
Graduate Student	2	2.8
Residency/Commuter		
Resident	68	94.4
Commuter	4	5.6

Table 4.2 contains demographic data of the subjects' self-reported alcohol use including where they tend to drink and the reason(s) they consume alcohol. Of the seven statements used to identify the reason behind student alcohol consumption, the only one that was not selected by any subject was the statement indicating addiction.

Table 4.2

Drinking Patterns of Selected Students (N=72)

Student Characteristics	Frequency	%
I drink because ...		
My peers drink	18	25
I like the taste	26	36.1
I avoid negative feelings	3	4.2
It relieves stress	19	26.4
I am bored	14	19.4
It makes socializing fun	64	88.9
I drink ...		
In my Residence Hall	30	41.7
At Campus Crossings	60	83.3
At Beau Rivage	43	59.7

Analysis of the Data

Research Question 1: What is the impact of Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug program on the behavior of selected students?

An overall look at the responses dealing with behavior indicate that there has been a significant change in alcohol-related behavior among students who attended the Alcohol & Other Drug program. A paired samples t-test was used to analyze changes in student responses to statements regarding alcohol-related behavior. Of the seven statements addressing behavior, four produced statistically significant results.

Students reported that their tendency to make unhealthy decisions while intoxicated improved from a mean score of 2.44 ($sd = .837$) on the pretest to a mean of 2.72 ($sd = .892$) on the post test. The difference between the two means is statistically significant at the .01 level ($t = -2.914$, $df = 71$).

Of the various unhealthy decisions often associated with alcohol use among college students, involvement in unlikely sexual encounters and physical altercations are the most highly reported in nation-wide research. Students who attended the Alcohol & Other Drug program indicated that their involvement in these risky behaviors did decrease after attending the program.

Students reported that their tendency to engage in risky sexual encounters while intoxicated improved from a mean score of 3.29 ($sd = .701$) on the pretest to a mean score of 3.47 ($sd = .671$) on the post test. The difference between the two means is statistically at the .01 level ($t = -2.91$, $df = 71$), and shows a marked change in behavior

among 4.2% of students who indicated a heavy tendency to engaged in a-typical sexual behavior prior to the program.

Additionally, students reported an improvement in behavior regarding their involvement in physical altercations while intoxicated following the program. There was a significant decrease in involvement from a mean score of 3.04 ($sd = 1.144$) on the pretest to a mean of 3.38 ($sd = .863$) on the post test. The difference between the two means is statistically significant at the .05 level ($t = 2.107, df = 71$). Of the 12 students who indicated they “strongly agreed” they had been in a physical altercation while intoxicated, only two reported that they had continued that behavior, resulting in a 13.9% decrease.

Table 4.3

Survey of Student Behavior ($N = 72$)

Strongly Agree = 1, Agree = 2, Neutral = 3, Strongly Disagree = 4

Statement	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>
I have sexual encounters under the influence that I wouldn't have sober*	-2.6	71
I have made decisions, while intoxicated, that I wouldn't have sober*	-2.9	71
I have trouble remember things I do or say when intoxicated**	-2.0	71
I have been involved in a physical altercation when intoxicated**	-2.1	71

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

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

Students also reported a change regarding the amount of alcohol consumed each time they consumed alcohol, and in the number of days per week that they consumed alcohol. The amount of alcohol consumed on a nightly basis decreased from a mean score

of 5.46 ($sd = 3.488$) on the pretest to a mean of 5.17 ($sd = 2.540$) on the post test. The difference is statistically significant at the .01 level ($t = 1.179$, $df = 71$). Students also indicated the frequency in which they drink decreased since attending the program from a mean score of 2.47 ($sd = 1.610$) on the pretest to a mean of 2.36 ($sd = 1.356$) on the post test. The difference is statistically significant at the .01 level ($t = 1.07$, $df = 71$).

Table 4.4

Drinking Frequency of Selected Students (N=72)
Student Demographics (N=72)

Student Characteristics	<i>f</i>	<i>%</i>
I drink ___ drink(s) per night		
0-3	21	29.2
	18	25.0
4-6	31	43.0
	38	52.7
7-10	16	22.2
	15	20.8
12+	4	5.6
	1	1.4
I drink ___ night(s) per week		
0-1	21	29.2
	20	27.8
2	20	27.8
	23	31.9
3	20	27.8
	16	22.2
4	0	0.0
	5	6.9
5	8	11.1
	8	11.1

Research Question 2: What is the impact of Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug program on the disposition of selected students?

After calculating comparisons in a paired-samples *t*- test, data show a statistically significant improvement in student dispositions. The students' approval of consuming alcohol for the sole purpose of intoxication shifted from an "approval" rating of a mean score of 2.25 (*sd* = .801) on the pretest to a more "neutral" mean score of 2.65 (*sd* = .825) on the post test. The difference between the two means is statistically significant at the .01 level ($t = -4.278$, $df = 71$). Of the students surveyed, 11 (15.3%) indicated that they "strongly agree" that it is acceptable to drink for the sole purpose of intoxication on the pre-test however; only 2 (2.8%) held this belief when responding to the post test.

Data also show a significant improvement in students' reflection on motivational factors which lead them to limit their alcohol consumption. The students reported that the value they place on personal goals, including academics and athletics, increased from a mean score rating of 2.47 (*sd* = .804) on the pretest to a mean of 2.17 (*sd* = .888) on the post test. The difference between the two means is statistically significant at the .01 level ($t = 3.05$, $df = 71$), revealing that 58.3% of students felt personal goals were the reasons behind their self-regulation.

Statements influenced by Social Norms Theory were also included on the survey instrument and, while there was no statistically significant change in student response

after attending the program, 64 (88.9%) students indicated that they felt comfortable turning down an alcoholic beverage.

Research Question 3: What is the impact of Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug program on the attitude of selected students?

Data analysis regarding a change in attitude among selected students showed a slight change in how Rowan University students perceive the alcohol policy and how it applies to them. Students indicated that their tendency to violate the alcohol policy because they believed they could get away with it decreased from a mean score rating of 2.60 ($sd = 1.16$) on the pretest to a mean score of 3.29 ($sd = .941$) on the post test. The difference between the two means is statistically significant at the .01 level ($t = -4.79$, $df = 71$), revealing that 29.2% of students "strongly disagreed" that they would violate the policy again because they felt they would not get caught.

The survey instrument also measured whether students had changed, or intend to change, their alcohol-related behavior and level of alcohol consumption. Students reported an improvement in their alcohol related behavior from a mean score rating of 2.79 ($sd = .934$) on the pretest to a mean score rating of 2.42 ($sd = .915$). The difference between the two means is statistically significant at the .01 level ($t = 2.945$, $df = 71$), indicating that, of the 20 (27.8%) students who disagreed that they would change their alcohol behavior, only 8 (11.1%) maintained that opinion after completing the program.

Although there was no statistical significance in the students' intent to change their alcohol-related behavior in the future, the post test data showed that 31.9% of students indicated they would not change their behavior after attending the program.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

This study investigated the impact that Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug program had on the students responsible for violating the institution's alcohol policy. The study focused on the changes in behavior, attitude and disposition within students who attended the program during the 2008-2009 academic year. The subjects in this study were students, ranging in age and class, which were required to attend the program as a result of their alcohol violation.

Data were collected using a pre and post-test instrument, distributed to 115 subjects. Of those 115, 26 failed to complete the entire pre-test and were disqualified from participating in the remainder of the research. Of the remaining 89 subjects, 72 completed the post-test and were qualified for data analysis (81%). The instrument used measured student attitude, behavior and disposition, and consisted of 53 questions composed in both closed-ended and Likert form.

Variations in student responses were analyzed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer software. Comparisons (paired samples *t*-test) and descriptive statistics (frequency distribution, percentages, means and standard deviations) were used to analyze the data in regards to the research questions.

Discussion of the Findings

The computed data shows that there were some significant changes in student behavior, attitude and disposition following the Alcohol & Other Drug program; however the changes were not as significant as those reported in similar studies on intervention programs geared towards college students. The findings support previous studies conducted separately by Kraft (1984) and Parks (2007), in which a small percentage of students reported personal changes in regards to alcohol use following the one-time workshop.

While a percentage of Rowan University students did report fewer alcohol-related negative consequences, such as participation in high-risk sexual activities and physical altercations, this change in behavior is drastically less significant compared to students who took part in multiple intervention sessions held over a longer period of time. Long-term intervention sessions have a stronger impact on student behavior, as shown in previous studies (Kraft, 1984; Parks, 2007).

When assessing student attitude, 38.9% of Rowan University students indicated that they would knowingly violate the institution's alcohol policy because they felt they could get away with the violation. Additionally, 31.9% of students indicated they had no intention of changing their alcohol-related behavior after attending the program.

These data evaluating attitudes among students fully supports Newton's (2002) assertion that Millennial students hide their inappropriate behavior and live by their own internal rules, without fully understanding the potential consequences of their decisions. This mindset among college students, and the limited use of Social Norms Theory at

Rowan University, enables students to make poor choices regarding their relationship with alcohol.

In an attempt to target alcohol misperceptions and educate college students, institutions across the country have utilized Social Norms Theory as a cost-effective, efficient, intervention method. Wolburg's (2001) research indicates that students tend to drink more because they have an incorrect perception of their own alcohol use in comparison to the consumption of an average college student. Rowan University (2006) utilized Social Norms Theory in the past through passive advertising and interactive programs, finding that the perceived frequency of alcohol use among peers was two times the frequency of what students actually reported. When subjects were asked to compare their alcohol consumption to that of their peers, 40 (55.6%) students indicated that they believed their peers consumed more alcohol. The use of Social Norms Theory through campus-wide activities and advertising has decreased at Rowan University and rejuvenating this proactive technique may correct student misperceptions.

Social Learning Theory, the basis of many intervention programs, indicates that an individual's change in behavior is a function of one's expectations of personal behavior. Prevention techniques using this theory focus on placing the power of healthy behavior into the hands of the students, discussing social influences and training designed to improve personal and social awareness (Gonzalez, 1997). The self-reflection and awareness that originates from programs rooted in this theory are not addressed through Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug program. Although the data show significant change in the attitude and disposition in a percentage of students, the change would be

much more significant if the program addressed factors that required students to be more reflective of their alcohol use and decision making skills.

Conclusions

The results of this study support the findings of previous related studies. Data from this study indicate that one-time intervention programs will produce changes among students; however the data also supports studies indicating that sessions spread out over a period of time will produce more significant, longer lasting changes.

This program should be continued, as it has shown the ability to impact Rowan University students; however the program would be more successful if it adopted some techniques used in similar intervention programs.

The BASICS program is rooted in theory and addressed each student's motivations, knowledge, attitudes and relationship with alcohol. Implementing similar strategies will provide students with a program that requires personal reflection on his or her decision making skills, relationship with alcohol and knowledge of personal and University expectations. The use of these strategies will not only continue to produce a change in student behavior; they will meet the goals of the University mission by providing an educational environment and essentially assist in the creation of a self-aware student.

In addition to researching similar intervention programs, the creation of a mission and measurable outcomes for the Alcohol & Other Drug program will increase the level of success achieved as the program evolves.

Recommendations for Practice

Based on the findings and conclusions of the researcher, the following suggestions for practice are presented:

1. Administrators should develop learning outcomes and facilitate regular assessment to ensure the program is meeting the goals of the department and is appropriately aligned with the mission of Rowan University.
2. Allow more than four weeks prior to administering the post-test so that students have the opportunity to reflect on the session and implement a potential behavioral change.
3. Collaborate with Rowan University Counseling Services to create a program that is educational and encourages personal growth and development.
4. Invest more time, and resources, into the further development of this program including, but not limited to, the retention of a full-time faculty coordinator to oversee the program.
5. Facilitate a similar program for incoming students, and their parents, in an effort remain proactive when addressing alcohol violations and potential substance abuse concerns.

Recommendations for Further Research

Based on the findings and conclusions of the researcher, the following suggestions for further research are presented:

1. Administrators should research similar intervention programs, theories and practices as part of the program development.

2. Continue research with the same, or similar, instrument over a longer time period to evaluate the success of the program as it evolves.
3. Facilitate and assess a voluntary group of similar students attending the same program in order to measure the extent to which learning is inhibited by the required nature of the program.
4. Conduct interviews with a sample of students evaluated through this study to assess factors not captured by the survey instrument.
5. Create a focus group of University administrators and students to evaluate the program, its purpose, and its effectiveness.

REFERENCES

- Baer, J., Kivlahan, D., Blume, A., McKnight, P., & Marlatt, G. (2001). Brief intervention for heavy drinking college students: Four-year follow-up and natural history. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*(8), 1310-1316.
- Chapman, R. (Ed.). (2007a). *When they drink: Practitioner views on lessons learned on preventing high-risk collegiate drinking*. Glassboro, NJ: Rowan University Center for Addiction Studies.
- Chapman, R. (2007b). An ounce of prevention: Addressing contemporary collegiate drinking. In R. Chapman (Ed.), *When they drink: Practitioner views and lessons learned on preventing high-risk collegiate drinking* (pp. 11-20). Glassboro, NJ: Rowan University Center for Addiction Studies.
- Cook, S., & Selltiz, C. (1964). A multiple-indicator approach to attitude measurement. *Psychological Bulletin, 62*(1), 36-55.
- Coomes, M., & DeBard, R. (2004). Serving the millennial generation. *Journal of College Admission, 20* (5), 20-25.
- Cummings, S. (1997). An empowerment model for collegiate substance abuse prevention and education programs. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 43*, 46-62.
- Cyders, M., & Smith, G. (2008). Clarifying the role of personality dispositions in risk for increased gambling behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*(6), 503-508.
- Dimeff, L., Baer, J., Kivlahan, D., & Marlatt, G. (1999). *Brief alcohol screening and*

- intervention for college students: A harm reduction approach.* New York: The Gilford Press.
- Elam, C. (2007). Welcoming a new generation to college: The millennial students. *Journal of College Admission, 20* (5), 20-25.
- Frank, M., & Miley W. (2006). Binge and non-binge college students' perceptions of other students' drinking habits. *College Student Journal, 40* (2); 259-262.
- Gonzalez, G. (1997). An integrated theoretical framework for individual responsibility and institutional leadership in preventing alcohol and drug abuse on the college campus. *The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.* Newton, Massachusetts: U.S. Department of Education.
- Hagman, B., Clifford, P., & Noel, N. (2007). Social norms theory-based interventions: Testing the feasibility of a purported mechanism of action. *Journal of American College Health, 56* (3), 293-298.
- Haines, M.P. (1997). A social norms approach to preventing binge drinking at colleges and universities. Newton, MA: The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention.
- Hingson, R.W., Heeren, T., Zakocs, R.C., Kopstein, A., & Weschler, H. (2002). Magnitude of alcohol-related morality and morbidity among U.S. college students ages 18-24. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 63*(2), 136-144.
- Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation.* New York: Vintage Books.
- Kraft, D.P. (1991). The prevention and treatment of alcohol problems on a college campus. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 37*(1), 37-51.

- Miller, W., & Rollnick, S. (2002). *Motivational interviewing: Preparing people to change* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Publications.
- Murray, N.D. (1997). Welcome to the future: The millennial generation. *Journal of Career Planning & Employment*, 57(3), 36-42.
- Newton, F. B. (2000). The new student. *About Campus*, 5(5), 8-15.
- O'Reilly, B., & Vella-Zarb, K. (2000). Meet the future. *Fortune*, 142(3), 144-148.
- Parks, G. (2007). Individual alcohol abuse prevention for college students: The BASICS & CHOICES modalities of the alcohol skills training program. In R. Chapman (Ed.), *When they drink: Practitioner views and lessons learned on preventing high-risk collegiate drinking* (pp. 145-159). Glassboro, NJ: Rowan University Center for Addiction Studies.
- Perkins H., & Berkowitz A. (1986). Perceiving the community norms of alcohol use among students: Some research implications for campus alcohol education programming. *Journal of Addiction*, 21,961-976.
- Perkins H., & LaMastro, V. (2006). Social norms campaigns at New Jersey state colleges and universities. Glassboro, NJ: Rowan University Center for Addiction Studies.
- Ramos, D., & Perkins, D. (2006). Goodness of fit assessment of an alcohol intervention program and the underlying theories of change. *Journal of American College Health*, 55 (1), 57-64.
- Rappaport, J., Swift, C., & Hess, R. (1984). *Studies in empowerment: Steps toward understanding and action*. New York: Haworth.
- Rice, R., & Haines, M. (2007). The social norms approach to college student drinkers:

Its history and implications for college health promotion. In R. Chapman (Ed.), *When they drink: Practitioner views and lessons learned on preventing high-risk collegiate drinking* (pp. 160-167). Glassboro, NJ: Rowan University Center for Addiction Studies.

Rowan University website. (2008). www.Rowan.edu

Rowan University Center for Addiction Studies. (2007). *Survey of students' perceptions of campus alcohol and other drug norms: Executive summary*. Glassboro, NJ: Rowan University Center for Addiction Studies.

Wall, A. (2007). Evaluating a health education web site: The case of alcoholedu. *NASPA Journal*, 44 (4), 692-714.

Wolburg, J. (2001). The "risky business" of binge drinking among college students: Using risk models for PSA and anti-drinking campaigns. *Journal of Advertising*, 30, 23-39.

APPENDIX A

Institutional Review Board Approval Letter



November 26, 2008

Jessica P. Havery
Rowan University
Box 2299
201 Mullica Hill Road
Glassboro, NJ 08028

Dear Jessica P. Havery:

In accordance with the University's IRB policies and 45 CFR 46, the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, I am pleased to inform you that the Rowan University Institutional Review Board (IRB) has approved your project:

IRB application number: 2009-035

Project Title: A Study of the Impact Rowan University's Alcohol & Other Drug Program has on Selected Students

In accordance with federal law, this approval is effective for **one calendar year** from the date of this letter. If your research project extends beyond that date or if you need to make significant modifications to your study, you must notify the IRB immediately. Please reference the above-cited IRB application number in any future communications with our office regarding this research.

Please retain copies of consent forms for this research for three years after completion of the research.

If, during your research, you encounter any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects, you must report this immediately to Dr. Harriet Hartman (hartman@rowan.edu or call 856-256-4500, ext. 3787) or contact Dr. Gautam Pillay, Associate Provost for Research (pillay@rowan.edu or call 856-256-5150).

If you have any administrative questions, please contact Karen Heiser (heiser@rowan.edu or 856-256-5150).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Harriet Hartman".

Harriet Hartman, Ph.D.
Chair, Rowan University IRB

c: Burt Sisco, Educational Leadership, Education Hall

Office of Research
Bole Hall Annex
201 Mullica Hill Road
Glassboro, NJ 08028-1701

856-256-5150
856-256-4425 fax

APPENDIX B

Survey Instrument

AOD Assessment

Alcohol & Other Drug Program
Rowan University
Glassboro, NJ 08028

Page 1 of 2

While your participation is voluntary, and you are not required to answer any of the questions herein, your cooperation and participation are important to the success of the project and greatly appreciated. If you choose to participate, please understand that all answers are strictly confidential and no personally identifiable information is being requested. Moreover, whether you agree to participate or not, your decision will have no effect on your grades, your standing in class or your judicial status. Your completion of this survey constitutes informed consent and your willingness to participate.

Student's Initials: _____ Student's Age: _____ Resident/Commuter (circle one) Male/Female (circle one) Fresh./Soph./Jr./Sr./Grad Student

How many citations have you received for violating the alcohol policy at Rowan University? _____

I drink: In my residence hall/ at my home/ at bars/ at parties/ other: _____ (circle all that apply)

I drink: beer/ hard liquor/ wine (circle all that apply) I drink _____ drinks per night I drink _____ nights per week

I drink because: My peers drink/ I like the taste of alcohol/ Stress Relief/ To avoid negative feelings/ Boredom/ Socializing More Fun/ I'm Addicted (circle all that apply)

I attend parties at: Campus Crossings/ Beau Rivage/ Greek functions/ other: _____ (circle all that apply)

	Never	Rarely	Often	Always
I miss classes as a result of my alcohol consumption	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have missed academic assignments as a result of my alcohol consumption	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I attend classes hung over as a result of my alcohol consumption	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I start drinking ("pregame") before attending a function where alcohol will be present	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I skip meals before drinking to increase the effects of alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I become physically sick as a result of drinking alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have trouble remembering things I do or say when under the influence of alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I pressure others to drink more ("catch up") at social functions where alcohol is present	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have sexual encounters when under the influence of alcohol that I wouldn't have sober	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I become increasingly emotional and/or angry when under the influence of alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I am embarrassed by something I did or said while under the influence of alcohol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have been confronted by another person about my level of alcohol consumption	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

AOD Assessment

Alcohol & Other Drug Program
Rowan University
Glassboro, NJ 08028

Page 2 of 2

	Strongly Disagree	Agree	Neutral	Strongly Disagree
I have changed my alcohol related behavior since receiving an alcohol-related sanction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have cheated on a significant other while intoxicated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have seen a decrease in academic progress as a result of alcohol use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I will violate the drinking policy because I don't think I'll ever get caught	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have made decisions that I wouldn't normally make while intoxicated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have been involved in a physical altercation while intoxicated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I feel comfortable turning down an alcoholic beverage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think my friends consume more alcohol than I do	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I think drinking a lot of alcohol in a short period of time would put me at risk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I approve of drinking to get drunk	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
My personal goals (i.e. school, athletics) keep me from drinking too much	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I believe my alcohol use could affect my future personal and professional success	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I have trouble controlling my participation in addictive behaviors (smoking, drugs, alcohol, sex etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I will continue to use alcohol in the same manner, even after receiving an alcohol-related sanction	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>A Request:</u>	Yes	No		
Would you be willing to participate in a confidential interview for a research study on alcohol use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Student's Initials: _____

