

The University of Southern Mississippi  
**The Aquila Digital Community**

---

Honors Theses

Honors College

---

Spring 5-2016

## Perceptions of University Community Members Regarding Alcohol Restriction Policies

Katherine A. Meeker  
*University of Southern Mississippi*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://aquila.usm.edu/honors\\_theses](https://aquila.usm.edu/honors_theses)



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#), and the [Public Affairs, Public Policy and Public Administration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Meeker, Katherine A., "Perceptions of University Community Members Regarding Alcohol Restriction Policies" (2016). *Honors Theses*. 392.  
[https://aquila.usm.edu/honors\\_theses/392](https://aquila.usm.edu/honors_theses/392)

This Honors College Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Honors College at The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact [Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu](mailto:Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu).

The University of Southern Mississippi

Perceptions of University Community Members Regarding Alcohol Restriction Policies

by

Katherine Meeker

A Thesis  
Submitted to the Honors College of  
The University of Southern Mississippi  
in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirement for the Degree of  
Bachelor of Arts  
in the School of Criminal Justice

May 2016



Approved by

---

R. Alan Thompson, Ph.D., Thesis Adviser  
Associate Professor of Criminal Justice

---

Lisa Nored, Ph.D., Director  
School of Criminal Justice

---

Ellen Weinauer, Ph.D., Dean  
Honors College

## Abstract

There has been a growing concern regarding sexual assaults on college and university campuses. The push to decrease sexual assaults has lead researchers and universities to examine alcohol abuse as a contributing factor. Many colleges and universities have developed new policies for alcohol restriction, but they have done so without taking into consideration the views of the campus community. In the absence of collaboration between the campus community and university administration, such policies will likely be ineffective. This study explores the beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes of the campus community regarding alcohol restriction policies at The University of Southern Mississippi.

Key Words: Honors College, undergraduate research, alcohol restriction policies, thesis

## Dedication

To Ashleigh Culivan: you deserved to live a full and pain free life.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to take a moment to thank my thesis and academic advisor, Dr. Alan Thompson, for pushing me to take on this project. I would have never joined the Honors College or completed an undergraduate thesis without his encouragement. Thank you for taking time out of your schedule to help an undergraduate with her thesis. I would not be taking this next step in my life without his help. Thank you for everything. I would also like to thank the Honors College for allowing me to undertake this opportunity.

## Table of Contents

List of Tables .....	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review .....	3
Chapter 3: Methodology .....	6
Chapter 4: Results .....	8
Demographic Frequencies .....	8
Likert Scale Frequencies .....	11
Bivariate Analyses .....	15
Chapter 5: Discussion .....	39
Discussion of Analyses .....	39
Limitations .....	47
Future Research .....	48
Conclusion .....	49
References .....	50
Appendices .....	52
Appendix A: Consent Form .....	52
Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter .....	54
Appendix C: Survey Instrument .....	55



List of Tables

Table 1: Demographic Frequencies .....8

Table 2: Likert Scale Frequencies.....11

Table 3: Bivariate Analysis: Age .....16

Table 4: Bivariate Analysis: Race.....18

Table 5: Bivariate Analysis: Gender.....20

Table 6: Bivariate Analysis: Relationship with USM.....22

Table 7: Bivariate Analysis: Member of Greek Life .....24

Table 8: Bivariate Analysis: Alcohol Consumption .....25

Table 9: Bivariate Analysis: Binge Drinking.....29

Table 10: Bivariate Analysis: Familiar with USM’s alcohol restriction policy .....31

Table 11: Bivariate Analysis: Understand USM’s alcohol restriction policy.....33

Table 12: Bivariate Analysis: First offense at USM.....34

Table 13: Bivariate Analysis: Completed Alcohol.Edu.....35

Table 14: Bivariate Analysis: Able to apply Alcohol.Edu .....36

## Chapter 1: Introduction

Since at least 1997, researchers have examined the issue of alcohol abuse on college and university campuses (Cohen, 1997). In addition to Cohen's research, President Obama recently addressed the growing concern regarding sexual assaults on college and university campuses. Shortly thereafter, the White House initiated the "Not Alone" public awareness campaign as a method for assisting victims of campus sexual assault and holding universities / colleges accountable for implementing more rigorous prevention programs and reporting standards (NOT ALONE: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students from Sexual Assault, 2014). Soon after the report was published, two high-profile cases drew public attention to the issue of sexual assault on college and university campuses. One case occurred at Dartmouth College, but the alleged rapist was eventually found not guilty. The other alleged case at The University of Virginia prompted a feature story in *Rolling Stone Magazine* (November, 2014). Later, the story was widely discredited and has recently been officially retracted by the magazine. As a consequence of these events, Dartmouth College announced a prohibition against possession and consumption of all "hard" liquor at campus events and requires students to complete courses on sexual violence prevention (Hanover, 2015). Similarly, The University of Virginia enacted a prohibition against the consumption of mixed drinks at fraternity events and requires that sober "party monitors" be posted at access points leading to bedrooms during fraternity house parties (Anderson, 2015).

These two events prompted other college and university campuses to re-examine their own alcohol restriction policies. This is because illegal alcohol consumption constitutes a sizeable portion of the "dark figure of crime" that often occurs on college

and university campuses. While several studies have examined the change in alcohol restriction policies on college and university campuses, few have examined the beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes of campus community members in response to their adoption.

Ignoring the problem of excessive alcohol consumption on university campuses not only presents a significant liability issue, but also invites undesirable media attention and public scrutiny. In order for The University of Southern Mississippi (USM) to implement effective alcohol restriction policies, it is imperative to understand how members of the campus community might perceive and support such significant changes. Ignoring this vital step may cause otherwise well-intended policies and programs to fail due to a simple lack of communication. To facilitate effective policy development and avoid such failure, this research project assessed the beliefs, perceptions and attitudes of campus community members regarding the question of whether or not measures similar to those implemented at Dartmouth and UVA have the potential for successful implementation at USM.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

Starting in 2011, Dartmouth College developed the Dartmouth College Health Improvement Project aimed at reducing high blood alcohol content levels among undergraduate students. The college reports this project has been successful (“Students Learn Details of Alcohol Policy Changes”, 2015). In 2014, the Dartmouth study revealed the number of high blood alcohol content levels among undergraduate students dropped from 80% to 31% since 2011. In 2014, the president of Dartmouth College, Philip J. Hanlon, implemented the Moving Forward plan which banned hard liquor from campus. Hanlon asserted that hard alcohol sends more students to the hospital than beer and wine. Dartmouth’s new punishment for violating the alcohol restriction policies are more severe. The first offense for a student will be probation, and the second offense results in suspension. If any organization violates the alcohol restriction policy, they will also be sanctioned. The first violation for an organization results in a one-term suspension. The second violation results in a one-year suspension, and the third violation of the policy will be permanent loss of official recognition (“Students Learn Details of Alcohol Policy Changes”, 2015).

Garey, et al. (2011) surveyed students from a northeastern university who had all violated their university’s alcohol policy. They observed that gender and drinking habits influenced the responses to their questions. Male college students were less likely to support alcohol restriction policies than females. The study also found that students who had already violated the policy were more likely to agree with statements that endorsed greater individual autonomy (Garey, 2011).

However, in an interview with The Washington Post, Kevin Kruger who is the president of the Student Affairs Administration in Higher Education, identified one significant flaw in trying to combat sexual assaults on campus by controlling the consumption of alcohol. Kruger stated, “Enforcing stricter policies on alcohol consumption will be difficult because students tend to drink off-campus” (Anderson and Svrluga, 2015). In the same interview, Mark Koepsell, Executive Director and CEO of the Association of Fraternity/Sorority Advisors, voiced concern over the change in alcohol restrictions. He fears that on the outside, sororities and fraternities will have this facade of abiding by the policies of less alcohol consumption, but in truth they will just partake in alcohol secretly (Anderson and Svrluga, 2015).

According to Josh Sanburn (2014), The University of Kentucky is “relaxing” its current alcohol restriction policy. The president of The University of Kentucky, Eli Capilouto, decided to change their alcohol restriction policy from a dry campus in response to the off-campus riots that happened after basketball games and other events. Capilouto believed such events were influenced by off-campus drinking. He stated that by restricting alcohol on campus it just moved the problem off campus. Last, Jennifer Cremeens stated more and more universities are taking the harm-reduction approach to alcohol abuse. This approach allows universities to watch over their students and control the amount of alcohol they consume (Sanburn, 2014).

According to Maxwell (2010), colleges and universities should examine the impact of alcohol abuse on campus. His study concluded that students should be included in the process of developing alcohol restriction policies. He reasons that without cooperation between students and administration, the policies will be ineffective.

Maxwell's (2010) study concluded that the administration should at least include leaders from the student community because they are the representatives of the student body.

The current alcohol policy at The University of Southern Mississippi "prohibits the unlawful possession, use, or distribution of illicit drugs and alcoholic beverages by students and employees on its campus. Further, any possession or consumption of alcoholic beverages of any kind in plain view shall be considered in violation of campus policy" (Drug and Alcohol Policy, 2015). There are certain situations where some alcohol is permitted on campus, e.g. when the university becomes a "resort" during football games (Drug and Alcohol Policy, 2015). One problem confronting The University of Southern Mississippi is the lack of students who are willing to report violations. There have been instances where students are fearful to report alcohol violations due to the fear that parents might learn of the partying, drinking, or drug use.

At USM, there are mechanisms for helping students, faculty, and staff to report alcohol abuse and help prevent future abuse from happening (Campus Security Authorities and free counseling). However, are USM's current policies enough to help the alcohol problem? Without the effort of communicating with the university community, these policies could end up not being effective.

This research project will assess the beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes of The University of Southern Mississippi's campus community regarding alcohol restriction policies. This project will help assess the campus community regarding whether or not they want or need new policies and programs to combat alcohol abuse.

### Chapter 3: Methodology

The instrument used for this project was based upon a thorough review of the available literature and the adoption / adaptation of existing scales, as well as the development of originally-conceived survey items. The survey was based upon a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The instrument had a total of 32 survey items. The first portion of the survey consisted of demographic items, and the remainder consisted of questions designed to assess the particular beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes regarding the university's alcohol restriction policies. The instrument was disseminated through an online format called Qualtrics.

Participation was solicited by email as well as through class visits. Faculty and staff participation was solicited through emailing USMTalk, and Greek organizations were solicited by emailing the available presidents of each Greek Life chapter on USM's campus. Students were solicited through class visits. Data from the survey was collected by using the Qualtrics software and then transferred to SPSS for analyses. Results derived from this quantitative analysis can form the basis for a thorough written overview and discussion highlighting the implications for future practice (both at USM and other universities), as well as suggested directions for future empirical research. The results of this project can help the university better understand if the campus community is in favor of the current policies or instead favors a different set of policies.

This project used descriptive, univariate, and bivariate analyses to assess the beliefs, perceptions and attitudes of the campus community. Descriptive statistics were used to show the characteristics of the demographic variables. Univariate analyses were used to analyze the Likert scale items. Bivariate analyses were used to analyze the

relationships between the demographic variables and Likert scale items (Wagenaar, 2013).



## Chapter 4: Results

The results that follow are based upon survey responses provided by a total of 194 members of the university community (127 students, 21 faculty, and 46 staff). Table 1 below presents a descriptive overview of participant demographic characteristics.

### Demographic Frequencies

Table 1: Demographic Frequencies	
Age	Mean: 29.6 Median: 22 Mode: 21 Standard Deviation: 14.3 Variance: 203.3 Range: 50
Race	African American: 40 (20.6%) White: 141 (72.7%) Hispanic: 5 (2.6%) Asian: 2 (1%) Other: 6 (3.1%)
Gender	Male: 57 (29.5%) Female: 136 (70.5%)
Relationship with USM	Student: 127 (65.5%) Faculty: 21 (10.8%) Staff: 44 (22.7%)
Classification	Freshman: 11 (8.7%) Sophomore: 18 (14.3%) Junior: 39 (31%) Senior: 55 (43.7%) Graduate Student: 3 (2.4%)
Major	College of Arts and Letters: 18 (14.2%) College of Business: 14 (11%) College of Education and Psychology: 13 (10.2%) College of Health: 4 (3.1%) College of Nursing: 1 (0.7%) College of Science and Technology: 84 (66.1%) Other: 1 (0.7%)
Minor	College of Arts and Letters: 25 (23.3%) College of Business: 10 (9.3%) College of Education and Psychology: 19 (17.8%) College of Health: 3 (2.8%) College of Science and Technology: 37 (34.6%) Honors College: 1 (0.9%) Other: 18 (16.8%)
Member of Greek Life	Yes: 69 (54.3%)

Table 1: Demographic Frequencies	
	No: 58 (45.7%)
Alcohol Consumption	Never: 37 (19.1%) Occasional: 117 (60.3%) Often: 35 (18%) Heavy: 5 (2.6%)
Binge Drinking	Yes: 26 (13.5%) No: 167 (86.5%)
Familiar with USM's alcohol restriction policy?	Yes: 146 (75.3%) No: 48 (24.7%)
Understand USM's alcohol restriction policy?	Yes: 140 (72.2%) No: 54 (27.8%)
Does USM prohibit the sale, use, and distribution of alcohol or drugs?	Yes: 189 (98.4%) No: 3 (1.6%)
A student's first alcohol offense results in automatic suspension?	Yes: 49 (25.5%) No: 143 (74.5%)
Did you complete Alcohol.Edu?	Yes: 91 (71.7%) No: 36 (28.3%)
Are you able to apply what you have learned from Alcohol.Edu to your consumption of alcohol?	Yes: 56 (62.9%) No: 33 (37.1%)

Within this study, the age of participants was calculated into mean, median, and mode. The mean age of participants was 29.6. The median age for participants was 22, and the mode of the ages was 21. The standard deviation of the participants' ages was 14.3, and the variance between the participants' ages was 203.3. Also, the range of the participants' ages was 50. There are a greater number of females (136, 70.5%) as compared to males (57, 29.5%), and a greater number of Caucasians than any other race (141, 72.4%). Students make up almost two-thirds of the participants (127, 65.5%), as compared to faculty (21, 10.8%) and staff (44, 22.7%).

The analysis demonstrated that the largest portion of student participants who completed the survey were upperclassmen. Forty-three point seven percent of the student participants were seniors (55), and 31% (39) were juniors. Freshmen made up 8.7% (11)

of the participants, and sophomores made up 14.3% (18) of the participants. The survey inquired about the students' majors and minors and those were categorized by colleges at The University of Southern Mississippi. The largest portion of student participants had a College of Science and Technology major and minor (84, 66.1% for major and 37, 34.6 for minor). Fourteen point two percent (18) of the participants had a major from the College of Arts and Letters, 11% (14) from the College of Business, 10.2% (13) from the College of Education and Psychology, 3.1% (4) from the College of Health, 0.7% (1) from the College of Nursing, and 0.7% (1) from other. Twenty-three point three percent (25) of the participants had a minor from the College of Arts and Letters, 9.3% (10) from College of Business, 17.8% (19) from College of Education and Psychology, 2.8% (3) from College of Health, 0.9% (1) from Honors College, and 16.8% (18) from other. The sample population was asked if they were members of a Greek Life organization at USM. Of that sample population, 54.3% (69) of the students were a member of a Greek Life organization and 45.7% (58) were not a member.

The next section of the survey ascertained the participant's alcohol consumption habits, and the responses were categorized into never, occasional, often, and heavy. A large portion of participants stated they occasionally consumed alcohol (117, 60.3%), and 19.1% (37) stated they never consumed alcohol. Eighteen percent (35) stated they often consumed alcohol, and 2.6% (5) consumed alcohol heavily. Participants were also asked about binge drinking behaviors defined as consuming excessive amounts of alcohol in a short period of time. Only 13.5% (26) of the participants reported engaging in binge drinking behaviors.

The survey also explored participant knowledge regarding USM’s alcohol restriction policies. One item asked participants if they were familiar with the current policy. Three-fourths (146, 75.3%) of participants stated that they were familiar with the policy, whereas 24.7% (48) were not. Participants were also asked if they understood the current policy. Slightly less than 3 out of 4 respondents (140, 72.2%) stated that they understood the current policy, whereas 27.8% (54) did not. Two additional questions asked participants about specific aspects of the policy. For example, one question asked: “Does USM prohibit the sale, use, or distribution of alcohol or drugs?” A clear majority of participants selected, yes (189, 98.4%), and only 1.6% (3) selected no. A second question asked: “A student’s first alcohol offense results in automatic suspension.” A large portion of participants selected, no (143, 74.5%), and 25.5% (49) selected yes.

Participants were also asked about “Alcohol.Edu,” a mandatory educational program for students. Over 70 percent (91, 71.7%) of students had completed the Alcohol.Edu program. Another 28.3% (36) stated they did not complete the Alcohol.Edu program. A follow up question asked students who had completed the Alcohol.Edu program if they were able to apply what they had learned. Almost 63 percent (56, 62.9%) of the students said they were able to apply what they had learned from the program.

**Likert Scale Frequencies**

Table 2: Likert Scale Frequencies					
Wording of Survey Item:	SD n (valid %)	D n (valid %)	N n (valid%)	A n (valid %)	SA n (valid %)
The Office of Greek Life has implemented a new policy that requires students to swipe their student ID's when attending a fraternity party in order to confirm your age.	6 (8.7%)	10 (14.5%)	9 (13%)	31 (44.9%)	13 (18.8%)

Table 2: Likert Scale Frequencies					
This policy is in the best interest of USM's current alcohol policy for all Greek organizations.					
Greek Life policy was implemented in a manner that ensured all affected were aware of the changes	5 (7.2%)	20 (29%)	10 (14.5%)	21 (30.4%)	13 (18.8%)
By allowing the university community to consume alcohol on football game days and special events, USM sends a mixed message regarding the acceptability of alcohol consumption.	16 (8.3%)	36 (18.7%)	28 (14.5%)	68 (35.2%)	45 (23.3%)
The more knowledge one has regarding USM's alcohol restriction policy, the more likely it will positively influence drinking behavior.	18 (9.3%)	48 (24.5%)	56 (28.9%)	54 (27.8%)	18 (9.3%)
Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.	18 (9.3%)	56 (28.9%)	69 (35.6%)	40 (20.6%)	11 (5.7%)
Being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	13 (6.7%)	51 (26.3%)	52 (26.8%)	58 (29.9%)	20 (10.3%)
The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.	21 (10.8%)	46 (23.7%)	54 (27.8%)	60 (30.9%)	13 (6.7%)
Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.	15 (7.7%)	43 (22.2%)	47 (24.2%)	55 (28.4%)	34 (17.5%)
The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.	16 (8.3%)	31 (16.1%)	61 (31.6%)	66 (34.2%)	19 (9.8%)
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments	21 (10.8%)	37 (19.1%)	46 (23.7%)	66 (34%)	24 (12.4%)

Table 2: Likert Scale Frequencies					
such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption.					
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.	38 (19.6%)	53 (27.3%)	51 (26.3%)	34 (17.5%)	18 (9.3%)
Alcohol is a contributing factor to the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the offender's judgment to make rational decisions.	10 (5.2%)	18 (9.3%)	38 (19.6%)	86 (44.3%)	42 (21.6%)
Alcohol is a contributing factor to the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the victim's judgment to make rational decisions.	9 (4.7%)	13 (6.7%)	42 (21.8%)	84 (43.5%)	45 (23.3%)

The next section of survey items was based upon a five-point Likert scale. The responses were categorized into: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral/No opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree. The first two questions were for students who are a part of Greek Life at The University of Southern Mississippi. These questions dealt with the new policy for Greek Life. The first of these asked: "The Office of Greek Life has implemented a new policy that requires students to swipe their student ID's when attending a fraternity party in order to confirm your age. This policy is in the best interest of USM's current alcohol policy for all Greek organizations." Only 44.9% (31) of student respondents agreed that The Office of Greek Life had students' best interest. The next question asked: "Greek Life policy was implemented in a manner that ensured all

affected were aware of the changes.” Responses were almost equal for agree and disagree (21, 30.4% and 20, 29%).

Another question asked if the university sent a “mixed message” by prohibiting alcohol on campus, but then making exceptions for special events such as athletic games. The largest portion of participants agreed (68, 35.2%). The largest portion of the campus community were neutral (56, 28.9%) with the question that read: “The more knowledge one has regarding USM’s alcohol restriction policy, the more likely it will positively influence drinking behavior.” In addition, the community was neutral (69, 35.6%) regarding the survey item that read: “Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.” The largest portion of the university community agreed (58, 29.9%) with the survey item that read: “Being included in the evaluation and development of USM’s alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures their behavior will conform to the rules.” The next question asked: “If the alcohol restriction policy was more thoroughly defined, then there would be a less likelihood that the university would experience negative issues involving incidents/issues with alcohol consumption,” and the community agreed (60, 30.9%). The largest portion of the campus community agreed (55, 28.4%) with the survey item that stated: “Having a negative view regarding the university’s alcohol restriction policy is common among others in their peer group.” The largest portion of the community agreed (66, 34.2%) when asked the question: “The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.”

For the question: “If violations of USM’s alcohol restriction policy included punishments, such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, would it minimize

your consumption,” 34% (66) of the campus community more commonly agreed. Twenty-seven point three percent (53) of the campus community disagreed with the question: “If violations of USM’s alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.” The largest portion of the campus community agreed (84, 44.3%) about the question: “Alcohol being a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the offender’s judgment to make rational decisions.” Forty-three point five percent (84) of participants agreed with the survey item that read: “Alcohol being a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the victim’s judgment to make rational decisions.”

### **Bivariate Analyses**

In addition to descriptive analyses, a series of bivariate analyses was conducted. Of particular interest was determining if there were any statistically significant (i.e., “real”) relationships between the demographic variables and the pattern of responses for the Likert-type survey items. Recalling that the Likert-type survey items were based on a five-point continuum, the categories of “strongly disagree” and “disagree” were collapsed/combined into a new category labeled as “collectively disagree.” The response categories of “strongly agree” and “agree” were collapsed/combined into a new category labeled as “collectively agree.” No changes were applied to the “neutral/no opinion” response category. These newly created categories, in combination with the categorical nature of the demographic items, lend themselves to chi-square analysis.



In reporting the results that follow, chi-square analysis tests the null hypothesis that two categorical variables are statistically independent or unrelated to one another. To test this null hypothesis, observed and expected cell frequencies are computed. To the extent that these values differ from one another, it becomes possible to determine if the two variables are independent or, instead, statistically related to one another. Because the obtained chi-square coefficient has no direct or intuitive interpretation, all that can be said is that as values grow larger, so too does the likelihood of rejecting the null hypothesis of independence. Stated differently, the greater the difference between the observed and expected cell frequencies, the larger the resulting chi-square coefficient. A sufficiently large chi-square coefficient allows for the conclusion that the two categorical variables of interest are statistically related to one another.

Of the sixteen demographic items, twelve had statistically significant relationships between other various survey items. The pages and tables that follow report the results of the chi-square analyses.

Wording of Survey Item:	Age	Collectively Disagree $F_o(f_e)$	Undecided $F_o(f_e)$	Collectively Agree $F_o(f_e)$	Sig.
Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.	18-22	18 (30.3)	22 (26)	69 (52.7)	.000
	23-68	32 (19.7)	21 (17)	18 (34.3)	
The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.	18-22	35 (27.2)	42 (33.8)	31 (47.1)	.000
	23-68	10 (17.8)	14 (22.2)	47 (30.9)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or	18-22	45 (52.1)	23 (26.6)	41 (30.3)	.001
	23-68	41 (33.9)	21 (17.4)	9 (19.7)	

Table 3: Bivariate Analysis: Age					
permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.					
Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the offender's judgment to make rational decisions.	18-22	18 (15.1)	29 (22.4)	62 (71.5)	.009
	23-68	7 (9.9)	8 (14.6)	56 (46.5)	
Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the victim's judgment to make rational decisions.	18-22	16 (12.2)	27 (23.7)	66 (73.1)	.051
	23-68	4 (7.8)	12 (15.3)	54 (46.9)	

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “age” (recoded as “18 to 22 years of age” or “23 to 68 years of age”) and the five survey items in Table 3 above. Specifically, participants between the ages of 18 and 22 are more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.” In contrast, participants between the ages of 23 and 68 were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.” Participants between the ages of 18 and 22 were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.” Conversely, participants between the ages of 18 and 22 were more likely to collectively disagree or be undecided with the survey item that read: “Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by

impairing the offender's judgment to make rational decisions.” Participants between the ages of 23 and 68 were also more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the victim's judgment to make rational decisions.”

Table 4: Bivariate Analysis: Race					
Wording of Survey Item:	Race	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
The more knowledge one has regarding The University of Southern Mississippi's alcohol restriction policy, the more likely it will positively influence drinking behavior.	White	11 (18)	17 (15.3)	25 (19.7)	.049
	Other	55 (48)	39 (40.7)	47 (52.3)	
Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.	White	12 (20.2)	23 (18.9)	18 (13.9)	.024
	Other	62 (53.8)	46 (50.1)	33 (37.1)	
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	White	9 (17.5)	16 (14.2)	28 (21.3)	.012
	Other	55 (46.5)	36 (37.8)	50 (56.7)	
The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.	White	10 (18.3)	15 (14.8)	28 (19.9)	.008
	Other	57 (48.7)	39 (39.2)	45 (53.1)	
The university community needs more preventive/educational	White	7 (12.7)	22 (16.4)	23 (22.9)	.049
	Other	40 (34.3)	39 (44.6)	62 (62.1)	

Table 4: Bivariate Analysis: Race					
programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.					

There was also a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “race” (recoded as “white” or “other”) and the five survey items in Table 4 above. Specifically, non-white participants were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “The more knowledge one has regarding The University of Southern Mississippi's alcohol restriction policy, the more likely it will positively influence drinking behavior.” Similarly, non-white participants were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.” White participants were more likely to collectively agree or be undecided regarding the survey item that read: “As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.” Non-white participants were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.” On the other hand, white participants were more likely to collectively agree or be undecided with the survey item that read: “The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.”

Wording of Survey Item:	Gender	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
The Office of Greek Life has implemented a new policy that requires students to swipe their student ID's when attending a fraternity party in order to confirm your age. This policy is in the best interest of USM's current alcohol policy for all Greek organizations.	Male	10 (5.1)	2 (2.9)	10 (14)	.011
	Female	6 (10.9)	7 (6.1)	34 (30)	
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	Male	26 (18.9)	16 (15.1)	15 (23)	.020
	Female	38 (45.1)	35 (35.9)	63 (55)	
Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.	Male	10 (16.8)	15 (13.9)	32 (26.3)	.054
	Female	47 (40.2)	32 (33.1)	57 (62.7)	
The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.	Male	15 (13.7)	25 (17.8)	16 (24.5)	.015
	Female	32 (33.3)	36 (43.2)	68 (59.5)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption.	Male	25 (16.8)	17 (13.6)	15 (26.6)	.001
	Female	32 (40.2)	29 (32.4)	75 (63.4)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.	Male	14 (26.6)	19 (15.1)	24 (15.4)	.000
	Female	76 (63.4)	32 (35.9)	28 (36.6)	
Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing	Male	14 (8.3)	14 (11.2)	29 (37.5)	.009

Table 5: Bivariate Analysis: Gender					
the offender's judgment to make rational decisions.	Female	14 (19.7)	24 (26.8)	98 (89.5)	

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “gender” and the seven survey items listed in Table 5 above. Specifically, male participants were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “The Office of Greek Life has implemented a new policy that requires students to swipe their student ID's when attending a fraternity party in order to confirm your age. This policy is in the best interest of USM's current alcohol policy for all Greek organizations.” Female participants were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.” Female participants were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.” Female participants were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.” In addition, female participants were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption.” On the other hand, female participants were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that stated: “If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university

without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.” Female participants were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the offender's judgment to make rational decisions.”

Table 6: Bivariate Analysis: Relationship with USM					
Wording of Survey Item:	Relationship with USM	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.	Student	26 (38)	26 (30.8)	75 (58.3)	.000
	Faculty/Staff	32 (20)	21 (16.2)	14 (30.7)	
The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.	Student	39 (30.7)	48 (39.8)	39 (55.5)	.000
	Faculty/Staff	8 (16.3)	13 (21.2)	46 (29.5)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.	Student	54 (59.6)	28 (33.4)	45 (34)	.001
	Faculty/Staff	37 (31.4)	23 (17.6)	7 (18)	
Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the offender's judgment to make rational decisions.	Student	21 (18.3)	33 (24.9)	73 (83.8)	.002
	Faculty/Staff	7 (9.7)	5 (13.1)	55 (44.2)	
Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the victim's	Student	17 (14.5)	34 (27.6)	76 (84.9)	.016
	Faculty/Staff	5 (7.5)	8 (14.4)	53 (44.1)	

Table 6: Bivariate Analysis: Relationship with USM					
judgment to make rational decisions.					

Bivariate analysis of the data also revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “relationship with USM” (recoded as “student” or “faculty/staff”) and the five survey items listed in Table 6 above. Student participants were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that stated: “Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.” Participants who identified as faculty/staff were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.” Student participants were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.” On the other hand, faculty/staff participants were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that stated: “Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the offender's judgment to make rational decisions.” They were also more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that stated: “Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the victim's judgment to make rational decisions.”



Table 7: Bivariate Analysis: Member of Greek Life					
Wording of Survey Item:	Member of Greek Life	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.	Yes	34 (24.4)	25 (27.7)	10 (16.8)	.001
	No	11 (20.6)	26 (23.3)	21 (14.2)	
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	Yes	28 (21.7)	21 (21.7)	20 (25.5)	.036
	No	12 (18.3)	19 (18.3)	27 (21.5)	
The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.	Yes	32 (25)	14 (18.5)	23 (25.5)	.027
	No	14 (21)	20 (15.5)	24 (21.5)	
Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.	Yes	10 (14.1)	9 (14.1)	50 (40.7)	.003
	No	16 (11.9)	17 (11.9)	25 (34.3)	
The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.	Yes	32 (21.4)	23 (26.3)	14 (21.4)	.000
	No	7 (17.6)	25 (21.7)	25 (17.6)	

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “Member of Greek Life” and the five survey items listed in Table 7 above. Specifically, participants who are members of Greek Life were more likely to

collectively disagree with the survey item that stated: “Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.” In addition, they were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.” Participants who were not a member of Greek Life on USM’s campus were more likely to collectively agree or be undecided with the survey item that read: “The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.” Participants who are a member of Greek Life were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.” On the other hand, they were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that stated: “The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.”

Wording of Survey Item:	Alcohol Consumption	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
The Office of Greek Life has implemented a new policy that requires students to swipe their student ID's when attending a fraternity party in order to confirm your age. This policy is in the best interest of USM's current alcohol policy for all Greek organizations.	Never	5 (2.3)	0 (1.3)	5 (6.4)	.011
	Occasional	2 (8.1)	5 (4.6)	28 (22.3)	
	Often	6 (4.4)	3 (2.5)	10 (12.1)	
	Heavy	3 (1.2)	1 (.7)	1 (3.2)	

The more knowledge one has regarding The University of Southern Mississippi's alcohol restriction policy, the more likely it will positively influence drinking behavior.	Never	10 (12.6)	8 (10.7)	19 (13.7)	.017
	Occasional	39 (39.8)	42 (33.8)	36 (43.4)	
	Often	13 (11.9)	5 (10.1)	17 (13)	
	Heavy	4 (1.7)	1 (1.4)	0 (1.9)	
Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.	Never	9 (14.1)	14 (13.2)	14 (9.7)	.022
	Occasional	42 (44.6)	41 (41.6)	34 (30.8)	
	Often	19 (13.4)	13 (12.4)	3 (9.2)	
	Heavy	4 (1.9)	1 (1.8)	0 (1.3)	
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	Never	7 (12.2)	10 (9.9)	20 (14.9)	.000
	Occasional	32 (38.6)	31 (31.4)	54 (47)	
	Often	21 (11.5)	10 (9.4)	4 (14.1)	
	Heavy	4 (1.6)	1 (1.3)	0 (2)	
Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.	Never	14 (11.1)	14 (9)	9 (17)	.005
	Occasional	39 (35)	26 (28.3)	52 (53.7)	
	Often	5 (10.5)	6 (8.5)	24 (16.1)	
	Heavy	0 (1.5)	1 (1.2)	4 (2.3)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption.	Never	5 (11.1)	15 (8.8)	17 (17.2)	.005
	Occasional	37 (35)	20 (27.7)	60 (54.3)	
	Often	12 (10.5)	10 (8.3)	13 (16.2)	
	Heavy	4 (1.5)	1 (1.2)	0 (2.3)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies	Never	14 (17.4)	16 (9.7)	7 (9.9)	.022
	Occasional	63 (54.9)	26 (30.8)	28 (31.4)	
	Often	12 (16.4)	9 (9.2)	14 (9.4)	
	Heavy	2 (2.3)	0 (1.3)	3 (1.3)	

Table 8: Bivariate Analysis: Alcohol Consumption					
related to alcoholic consumption.					
Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the offender's judgment to make rational decisions.	Never	5 (5.3)	4 (7.2)	28 (24.4)	.050
	Occasional	13 (16.9)	25 (22.9)	79 (77.2)	
	Often	9 (5.1)	6 (6.9)	20 (23.1)	
	Heavy	1 (.7)	3 (1)	1 (3.3)	

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “Alcohol consumption” and the eight survey items listed in Table 8 above. For the survey question that read: “The Office of Greek Life has implemented a new policy that requires students to swipe their student ID's when attending a fraternity party in order to confirm your age. This policy is in the best interest of USM's current alcohol policy for all Greek organizations,” participants who never consumed alcohol were more likely to collectively disagree, and participants who occasionally drink were more likely to collectively agree or remain neutral. Whereas, participants who often drink were more likely to collectively disagree or be neutral, and participants who drink heavily were more likely to collectively disagree or be neutral. For the survey item that read: “The more knowledge one has regarding The University of Southern Mississippi's alcohol restriction policy, the more likely it will positively influence drinking behavior,” participants who never consume alcohol were more likely to collectively agree, and participants who occasionally drink alcohol were more likely to remain neutral. Whereas, participants who often drink were more likely to collectively disagree or agree, and participants who drink heavily were more likely to collectively disagree. For the survey item that read: “Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on

campus,” participants who never drink were more likely to collectively agree or remain neutral, and participants who occasionally drink were more likely to collectively agree. However, participants who often drink were more likely to collectively disagree or remain neutral, and participants who drink heavily were more likely to collectively disagree. For the survey item that read: “As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules,” participants who never consume alcohol were more likely to collectively agree or remain neutral, and participants who occasionally drink were more likely to collectively agree. Whereas, participants who often drink were more likely to collectively disagree or remain neutral, and participants who drink heavily were more likely to collectively disagree. For the survey item that read: “Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group,” participants who never consume alcohol were more likely to collectively disagree or remain neutral, and participants who occasionally drink were more likely to collectively disagree. However, participants who often drink were more likely to collectively agree, and participants who drink heavily were more likely to collectively agree. For the survey item that read: “If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption,” participants who never drink were more likely to remain neutral, and participants who occasionally drink were more likely to collectively disagree and agree. Whereas, participants who often drink were more likely to collectively disagree or remain neutral, and participants who drink heavily were more likely to collectively disagree. For the survey item that read: “If violations of

the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption,” participants who never drink alcohol were more likely to remain neutral, and participants who occasionally drink were more likely to collectively disagree. However, participants who often drink were more likely to collectively agree, and participants who drink heavily were more likely to collectively agree. For the survey item that read: “Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the offender's judgment to make rational decisions,” participants who never consume alcohol were more likely to collectively agree, and participants who occasionally drink were more likely to collectively agree or remain neutral. Whereas, participants who often drink were more likely to collectively disagree, and participants who drink heavily were more likely to collectively disagree or remain neutral.

Table 9: Bivariate Analysis: Binge Drinking					
Wording of Survey Item:	Binge Drinking	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.	Yes	13 (10)	12 (9.2)	1 (6.9)	.019
	No	61 (64)	56 (58.8)	50 (44.1)	
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	Yes	17 (8.6)	7 (7)	2 (10.4)	.000
	No	47 (55.4)	45 (45)	75 (66.6)	
The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative	Yes	13 (9)	9 (7.1)	4 (9.8)	.037
	No	54 (58)	44 (45.9)	69 (63.2)	

Table 9: Bivariate Analysis: Binge Drinking					
issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.					
Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.	Yes	2 (7.7)	3 (6.3)	21 (12)	.001
	No	55 (49.3)	44 (40.7)	68 (77)	
The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.	Yes	12 (6.4)	10 (8.3)	4 (11.4)	.003
	No	35 (40.6)	51 (52.7)	80 (72.6)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption.	Yes	13 (7.8)	4 (6.1)	9 (12.1)	.057*
	No	45 (50.2)	41 (38.9)	81 (77.9)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.	Yes	11 (12.3)	3 (6.7)	12 (7)	.036
	No	80 (78.7)	47 (43.3)	40 (45)	

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “Binge Drinking” and the six survey items listed in Table 9 above. Participants who binge drink when they consume alcohol were more likely to collectively disagree or be undecided with the survey item that read: “Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.” They also were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that stated: “As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy

decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.” Participants who do not binge drink were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.” On the other hand, participants who binge drink were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that stated: “Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.” Conversely, participants who binge drink were more likely to collectively disagree or be undecided with the survey item that read: “The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.” Participants who binge drink were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that stated: “If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.”

Table 10: Bivariate Analysis: Familiar with USM’s alcohol restriction policy					
Wording of Survey Item:	Familiar with USM’s alcohol restriction policy	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules	Yes	42 (48.2)	45 (39.1)	59 (58.7)	.034
	No	22 (15.8)	7 (12.9)	19 (19.3)	
The more thoroughly defined the alcohol	Yes	57 (50.4)	36 (40.6)	53 (54.9)	.053



Table 10: Bivariate Analysis: Familiar with USM’s alcohol restriction policy					
restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.	No	10 (16.6)	18 (13.4)	20 (18.1)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.	Yes	67 (68.5)	34 (38.4)	45 (39.1)	.058*
	No	24 (22.5)	17 (12.6)	7 (12.9)	

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “Familiar with USM’s alcohol restriction policy” and the three survey items listed in Table 10 above. Participants who were not familiar with USM’s alcohol restriction policy were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.” Participants who were familiar with USM’s alcohol restriction policy were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.” Participants who were familiar with USM’s alcohol restriction policy were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension

or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.”

Table 11: Bivariate Analysis: Understand USM’s alcohol restriction policy					
Wording of Survey Item:	Understand USM’s alcohol restriction policy	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM’s alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	Yes	39 (46.2)	43 (37.5)	58 (56.3)	.029
	No	25 (17.8)	9 (14.5)	20 (21.7)	
The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.	Yes	36 (34.1)	50 (44.2)	54 (61.7)	.037
	No	11 (12.9)	11 (16.8)	31 (23.3)	

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “Understand USM’s alcohol restriction policy” and two survey items listed in Table 11 above. Participants who did not understand USM’s alcohol restriction policy were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM’s alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.” Participants who did not understand USM’s alcohol restriction policy were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.”

Table 12: Bivariate Analysis: First offense at USM					
Wording of Survey Item:	First Offense at USM	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
By allowing the university community to consume alcohol on football game days and other special events, The University of Southern Mississippi sends a mixed message regarding the acceptability of alcohol consumption.	Yes	19 (13.3)	10 (7.2)	20 (28.5)	.017
	No	33 (38.7)	18 (20.8)	91 (82.5)	
Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.	Yes	13 (18.9)	17 (17.1)	19 (13)	.046
	No	61 (55.1)	50 (49.9)	32 (38)	
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	Yes	8 (16.1)	17 (13)	24 (19.9)	.016
	No	55 (46.9)	34 (38)	54 (58.1)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption.	Yes	7 (14.5)	15 (11.5)	27 (23)	.022
	No	50 (42.5)	30 (33.5)	63 (67)	

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “First offense at USM” and five survey items listed in Table 12 above. Participants who selected no to “A student's first alcohol offense results in automatic suspension?” were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “By allowing the university community to consume alcohol on football game days and other special events, The University of Southern Mississippi sends a mixed message regarding the acceptability of alcohol consumption.” Participants who selected yes to “A

student's first alcohol offense results in automatic suspension?" were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: "Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus." Participants who select no to "A student's first alcohol offense results in automatic suspension?" were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: "As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules." Participants who selected no to "A student's first alcohol offense results in automatic suspension?" were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: "If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption."

Table 13: Bivariate Analysis: Completed Alcohol.Edu					
Wording of Survey Item:	Completed Alcohol.Edu	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.	Yes	37 (33)	17 (24.4)	37 (33.7)	.005
	No	9 (13)	17 (9.6)	10 (13.3)	
The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.	Yes	34 (27.9)	31 (34.3)	25 (27.9)	.032
	No	5 (11.1)	17 (13.7)	14 (11.1)	

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable "Completed Alcohol.Edu" and the two survey items listed in Table 13 above. Participants who did not complete the Alcohol.Edu program were more likely

to be undecided or neutral to the survey item that read: “The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.” Participants who did complete the Alcohol.Edu program were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.”

Table 14: Bivariate Analysis: Able to apply Alcohol.Edu					
Wording of Survey Item:	Able to Apply Alcohol.Edu	Collectively Disagree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Undecided F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Collectively Agree F <sub>o</sub> (f <sub>e</sub> )	Sig.
The more knowledge one has regarding The University of Southern Mississippi's alcohol restriction policy, the more likely it will positively influence drinking behavior.	Yes	15 (21.4)	15 (14.5)	26 (20.1)	.007
	No	19 (12.6)	8 (8.5)	6 (11.9)	
Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.	Yes	15 (21.4)	20 (19.5)	21 (15.1)	.003
	No	19 (12.6)	11 (11.5)	3 (8.9)	
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	Yes	14 (19.5)	17 (16.4)	25 (20.1)	.024
	No	17 (11.5)	9 (9.6)	7 (11.9)	
The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.	Yes	18 (22.7)	8 (10.7)	30 (22.7)	.004
	No	18 (13.3)	9 (6.3)	6 (13.3)	
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments	Yes	12 (17)	11 (12)	33 (27.1)	.022
	No	15 (10)	8 (7)	10 (15.9)	

Table 14: Bivariate Analysis: Able to apply Alcohol.Edu					
such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption.					

Chi-square analysis revealed a statistically significant relationship between the demographic variable “Able to apply Alcohol.Edu” and five survey items listed in Table 14 above. Participants who were not able to apply Alcohol.Edu to their alcohol consumption were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “The more knowledge one has regarding The University of Southern Mississippi’s alcohol restriction policy, the more likely it will positively influence drinking behavior.” Also, participants who were not able to apply Alcohol.Edu to their alcohol consumption were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.” Participants who were not able to apply Alcohol.Edu to their alcohol consumption were more likely to collectively disagree with the survey item that read: “As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM’s alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.” Participants who were able to apply Alcohol.Edu to their alcohol consumption were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.” Also, participants who were able to apply Alcohol.Edu to their alcohol consumption were more likely to collectively agree with the survey item that read: “If violations of the university’s alcohol restriction policy included punishments

such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption.”

## Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this research study was to assess the beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes of USM's campus community members regarding current and future alcohol restriction policies. The information collected from this research study can be used to understand various perspectives within the campus community and perhaps help further develop alcohol restriction policies.

### **Discussion of Analyses**

The univariate analyses show that respondents were more likely to agree with the Likert scale items. The respondents agreed with ten out of the thirteen items. The respondents were more likely to select the positively worded response to the survey items. Respondents only disagreed with one survey item which was regarding whether there was a common negative view among peers regarding USM's alcohol restriction policy. Members of Greek Life were more likely to agree with the two questions regarding The Office of Greek Life's new alcohol policy. For the items regarding increased punishments for violating USM's alcohol restriction policy, respondents were more likely to agree that increased punishments would minimize their alcohol behavior, and they were more likely to disagree that increased punishments would influence them to attend another university with less strict alcohol policies. For the items regarding alcohol as a contributing factor of sexual assaults by impairing the offender's and victim's judgment, the respondents were more likely to agree with both items.

The bivariate analyses applied to the data from this study revealed statistically significant relationships between twelve of the sixteen demographic variables and all



thirteen of the survey items. The specific nature of the relationships of these variables and survey items are listed in the chapter above. As stated earlier, the Likert scale items were recoded into collectively disagree and agree with neutral remaining the same.

Further examination of the study revealed interesting findings for the demographic variable of “age.” The age demographic variable had a significant relationship with five survey items. The pattern of response from the participants shows that participants from the age range of 18 to 22 were more likely to collectively agree with negatively worded Likert scale items. Whereas, participants from the age range of 23 to 68 were more likely to collectively agree with the positively worded Likert scale items. Participants between the ages of 18 and 22 assert there is a negative stigma associated with alcohol restriction policies, and if punishments increase for violating USM’s alcohol restriction policy, they would consider attending another university. Assuming participants from the age range of 18 to 22 are students, it is understandable that students would have a stigma towards alcohol restriction policies. In addition, understandably students would consider another university with less strict policies if punishments increased for violating USM’s alcohol restriction policy. The findings are not unexpected because according to Maxwell’s (2010) study, students are affected the most by alcohol restriction policies. A portion of students live on campus. Faculty and staff, who live off campus, have the ability to consume alcohol off campus. Participants between the ages of 23 and 68 claim that USM needs more preventive programs because alcohol is a contributing factor in sexual assaults. These participants are more likely to be graduate students, professors, or staff members and are more likely to work for the university. They have a vested relationship with USM. Understandably, faculty and staff

would want more preventive or educational programs because they improve USM's profile; therefore, more students would attend the university. Also, by having more preventive programs for alcohol abuse, the campus community will develop a greater relationship with the administration which is what Maxwell (2010) suggests in his study.

The demographic variable "race" (recoded as "white" and "other") also revealed significant relationships with five survey items. Going into this study, it was reasoned that the minority community of USM would disagree more with the survey items due to the demographic make-up of the university. The results show this assumption to be true. The university could help alleviate this disconnect between the minority and majority communities by implementing a better way to communicate with the minority community. The participants who were non-white were more likely to collectively disagree with all of the survey items. Non-white participants' perception of alcohol restriction policies is that increasing steps to spread and clarify information regarding these policies will not be effective at USM. This could be due to non-white participants asserting that policy is already an ineffective tool when combating alcohol abuse; therefore, other steps that include clarifying policy will also be ineffective.

The demographic variable "gender" showed significant relationships with seven of the survey items. Male participants were more likely to collectively agree with the negatively worded survey items. Male participants' attitude toward alcohol restriction policies is that there is a stigma associated with these policies, and if punishments increase for violating the alcohol restriction policies, they might consider attending another university. According to Garey, et al. (2011), gender and drinking habits influence student responses regarding alcohol restriction policies. Their study showed

male participants were less likely to support alcohol restriction policies, and their study concludes this might be due to the two gender's drinking habits. In this study, female participants' attitude towards alcohol restriction policies is to incorporate more aspects similar to preventive programs and community involvement into the campus community. Understandably, female participants would like to have more preventive or educational programs regarding alcohol consumption due to the increased attention of alcohol abuse and sexual assaults across the nation. In addition, USM students are becoming more active in the campaign of stopping the bystander effect; therefore, having more preventive programs can help alleviate some of the aspects of this effect.

There is a significant relationship with the demographic variable "relationship with USM" (recoded as "students" and "faculty/staff") and five of the survey items. Students were more likely to collectively agree with the negatively worded items. Whereas, faculty and staff were more likely to collectively agree with the positively worded survey items. Student participants' perception of alcohol restriction policies is that there is a stigma associated with those policies, and if punishments increase for violating the alcohol restriction policies, they might consider attending another university. Faculty and staff participants' perception is that USM needs more preventive programs because alcohol is a contributing factor in impairing the offender and victim's judgment. The results from this demographic variable are similar to the results from the age demographic variable. It is safe to assume the same findings of Maxwell's (2010) study where students are the most affected by alcohol restriction policies, and faculty and staff have a vested relationship with USM because they would like to improve USM's profile.

There is a significant relationship with the demographic variable “member of Greek Life” and five of the survey items. Participants who are a member of Greek Life were more likely to collectively disagree with the positively worded survey items. Participants who are members of Greek Life claim that having more preventive programs and ways to clarify and/or spread information about the policy will not be effective at USM. These results are unexpected because Greek Life members have been in the spotlight for other types of prevention and educational programs. However, these findings could be due to the fact that most Greek Life organizations have their own alcohol restriction policies.

The demographic variable “alcohol consumption” had significant relationships with eight of thirteen survey items. In this study, participants who often or heavily drink were more likely to select the negatively worded response to the survey items. Whereas, participants who occasionally or never consume alcohol were more likely to select the positively worded response. Participants who never or occasionally drink alcohol assert that policy is an effective tool in combating alcohol abuse and that there is not a stigma associated with alcohol restriction policies. Participants who drink often or heavily claim there is a stigma associated with alcohol restriction policies and that implementing more ways to clarify those policies will not work for USM. Understandably, participants who consume alcohol often or heavily would more likely have a common negative view of alcohol restriction policies because of their drinking behaviors. They are the group that would be affected the most by alcohol restriction policies because they have a higher risk of getting caught due to consuming alcohol more often.

The demographic variable “binge drinking” had significant relationships with seven of the survey items. Participants who binge drink were more likely to select the negatively worded response to the survey items. Whereas, participants who do not binge drink were more likely to select the positively worded response. Binge drinkers’ attitude towards alcohol restriction policies is that implementing more ways to spread and clarify the policies will not be effective because these policies are not an effective tool for combating alcohol abuse. In addition, binge drinkers assert there is a negative view regarding alcohol restriction policies. Participants who binge drink when consuming alcohol will more likely be affected in the same way as participants who consume more alcohol because alcohol restriction policies target people who tend to consume alcohol more than normal.

The demographic variable “Familiar with USM’s alcohol restriction policy” had a significant relationship with three of the survey items. The demographic variable “Understand USM’s alcohol restriction policy” had a significant relationship with two of the survey items. There did not seem to be a pattern of response for both of these demographic variables. The participants who are and are not familiar with and understand USM’s alcohol restriction policy vary in their responses for these two questions. Participants who are familiar with USM’s policy claim being included in the evaluation and development of policy decisions will conform their behavior to the rules, but they also claim having a better defined alcohol restriction policy will not help USM with alcohol consumption issues. Participants who understand USM’s policy assert their behavior will conform to the rules if they are included in the evaluation and development of policy decisions, but they also assert USM does not need any preventive programs.

Understandably, participants who are familiar with and understand USM's policy collectively agree that their behavior will conform to the rules if included in policy decisions because according to Maxwell (2010) having a relationship between students and administration will help the policy to be effective. Unexpectedly, participants who are familiar with and understand USM's policy do not believe more preventive programs or having a more defined policy will be effective. However, those steps to clarify alcohol restriction policy do not include a relationship between the students and administration, like Maxwell (2010) suggests in his study.

The demographic variable "First offense with USM" had a significant relationship with four of the survey items. Participants who were correct regarding whether or not USM's first offense for violating the alcohol restriction policy was automatic suspension from the university, with the correct answer being no, were more likely to collectively agree with negatively worded responses to the survey items. Participants who were correct regarding USM's first offense for violating the alcohol restriction policy claim USM sends mixed messages to their campus community about their policies. However, they assert policy or clarifying policy will be ineffective for USM. The findings for this demographic variable are unexpected because participants understand USM's first offense for violating the alcohol restriction policy. Some participants could be familiar with this punishment because they have violated USM's policy. According to Garey, et al. (2011), participants who have violated their university's alcohol restriction policy are more likely to agree with policies that are autonomous. Since USM is a dry campus, there is not autonomy in the current policy.

The demographic variable “Completed Alcohol.Edu” had a significant relationship with two of the survey items. Participants who did not complete the Alcohol.Edu program were more likely to remain neutral. Participants who completed Alcohol.Edu program assert that having a better defined policy or having more preventive programs will not be effective for USM. These findings are surprising because the Alcohol.Edu program is both a preventive program and helps define alcohol consumption in order to decrease issues associated with alcohol. The results could be due to the fact that these participants believe the Alcohol.Edu program is enough for combating alcohol abuse.

The demographic variable “Able to apply Alcohol.Edu” had a significant relationship with five of the survey items. Participants who were not able to apply the Alcohol.Edu program to their alcohol behaviors were more likely to select the negatively worded response to the survey items. The results from this demographic variable contradict the previous demographic variable’s results. Participants who were able to apply the Alcohol.Edu program to their alcohol behaviors assert more preventive programs and more ways to clarify USM’s current alcohol restriction policy will be effective for USM. This could be due to the Alcohol.Edu program impacting their alcohol behaviors. These participants could claim that more preventive programs will be able to reach more students and will affect their behavior in the same way. Those participants who were impacted by the Alcohol.Edu program are more likely not the ones who consume alcohol often or heavily or who binge drink when consuming alcohol. Understandably, these participants assert more programs and clearer policies will benefit USM because more likely they have conformed to USM’s alcohol restriction policy.

In Maxwell's (2010) study, he found that students wanted to be a part of the process of developing alcohol restriction policies because these policies affect the students the most. Maxwell stated that not having a relationship with the students will cause the alcohol restriction policies to become ineffective. For this study, there was a survey item that closely related to this topic of including students into the development and evaluation of alcohol restriction policies. This survey item not only included students but also USM's whole campus community. Results found that the campus community did not have a significant relationship with this survey item. However, other demographic variables like race, gender, and alcohol consumption did have a significant relationship with this survey item. This could mean other factors come into play regarding this topic.

### **Limitations**

Although this study found significant relationships between several demographic variables and survey items, there are some limitations. First, there was a low number of participants compared to the total number of people who attend and work at The University of Southern Mississippi. Second, there was a short time frame to complete this undergraduate thesis. For a more extensive look at these variables, more time should be allotted. Third, The University of Southern Mississippi has its own unique community profile, so the results of this study might not be generalizable to other colleges or universities. There were two challenges that I faced as a researcher. First, there were a few survey responses that had to be thrown out due to missing data. Some participants were not able to complete the survey, and the reason is unknown. Participants could have possibly lacked the time to finish the survey, or the participants opted to not finish the survey. Second, the method by which the survey was distributed was through Qualtrics.



A few of the campus community members were unable to use the link to the survey. In addition, one of the questions did not display for faculty and staff participants (In what month and year did you first start working for The University of Southern Mississippi?) causing the question for faculty and staff and the mirrored question for students (In what term and year did you first attend The University of Southern Mississippi?) to be thrown out.

### **Future Research**

This study was conducted to assess the beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes of campus community members at The University of Southern Mississippi regarding alcohol restriction policies. Future research can expand on this study or compare it to a similar study at another college or university. In addition, there could be further research conducted on age and the factors that influence participants from different age groups on their responses to alcohol restriction policies. In this study, participants from the age range of 18 to 22 and 23 to 68 have a specific pattern of response to alcohol restriction questions. Also, more research on the relationship between gender and alcohol restriction policies could be conducted. In this study and the study by Garey, et al. (2011), gender had a significant relationship with responses to alcohol restriction policies. Further research could also explore why there is a disconnect between the campus community and alcohol restriction policies. Even though this study had a large portion of participants who were familiar with and understood USM's alcohol restriction policy, there were still a number of participants who were not familiar with and did not understand USM's alcohol restriction policies. Research could examine if there are different routes to spread information regarding USM's alcohol restriction policies or how effective USM's current

route of spreading information is. Another important variable to study is how levels of alcohol consumption influence participants' beliefs regarding alcohol restriction policies. In this study, levels of alcohol consumption had the most significant relationships with survey items, and in the study by Garey, et al. (2011), alcohol violators had a significant relationship with policies that included more freedom.

### **Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to assess the beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes of The University of Southern Mississippi's campus community regarding alcohol restriction policies. The findings from this study can be useful for other colleges and universities, as well as other researchers studying alcohol restriction policies. As attention increases for cases involving sexual assaults and alcohol, colleges and universities need to understand their own campus community's beliefs, perceptions, and attitudes regarding alcohol restriction policies before initiating new policies; without the support of the campus community those policies might be ineffective.

## References

- Anderson, N. "New Safety Rules Announced for U-Va. Fraternity Parties." *Washington Post*. The Washington Post, 6 Jan. 2015. Web. 27 February 2015.
- Anderson, N., and S. Svrluga. "No Hard Alcohol, No Pledging: Dartmouth Plans Major Cultural Reforms." *Washington Post*. The Washington Post, 29 Jan. 2015. Web. 27 Feb. 2015.
- Cohen, F., and D. Rogers. "Effects of Alcohol Policy Change." *Journal of Alcohol & Drug Education* 42.2 (1997): 69-82. *Ebscohost*. Web. 13 June 2015.
- "Drug and Alcohol Policy." USM. University of Southern Mississippi, 2015. Web. 20 May 2015.
- Garey, L., M. Prince, and K. Carey. "Alcohol Policy Support among Mandated College Students." *Addictive Behaviors* 36.10 (2011): 1015-018. *Science Direct*. Web. 15 July 2015.
- Hanover, N. "Dartmouth Bans Hard Alcohol, Creates Program to Prevent Sexual Violence - NBC News." *NBC News*. NBC News, 29 Jan. 2015. Web. 26 Feb. 2015.
- Maxwell, R. *Students and the Administration: Examining the Relationship between University Policy and Students' Views on Alcohol*. Diss. U of Southern California, 2010. Ann Arbor: ProQuest Dissertations, 2010. Print.
- "NOT ALONE: The First Report of the White House Task Force to Protect Students From Sexual Assault." *Whitehouse*. The White House Task Force, 1 Apr. 2014. Web. 4 Mar. 2015.

Sanburn, J. "Drinking on Campus: University of Kentucky Relaxes Its Alcohol Policy."

*Time*. Time Inc., 25 Apr. 2014. Web. 13 June 2015.

"Students Learn Details of Alcohol Policy Changes." *Dartmouth Office of*

*Communications*. Dartmouth College, 4 Mar. 2015. Web. 13 June 2015.

Wagenaar, Theodore C., and Earl R. Babbie. *The Practice of Social Research, Thirteenth*

*Edition*. 13th ed. Belmont: Thomson Wadsworth, 2013. 549-560. Print.

## Appendices

### Appendix A: Consent Form

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

You are invited to participate in a study measuring attitudes regarding alcohol restriction policies at The University of Southern Mississippi. We ask that you read this information before agreeing to be in the study. The researcher conducting this study is Katherine Meeker, an undergraduate student in the School of Criminal Justice at The University of Southern Mississippi.

#### Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to measure attitudes regarding alcohol restriction policies at The University of Southern Mississippi.

#### Procedures:

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following things. Your participation will involve completing the on-line or pen-and-paper survey with several questions, including questions about your background. It is expected that it will take you approximately 10 minutes to complete the survey. This survey is best viewed and completed on a traditional desktop monitor.

#### Risks and Benefits of Participating:

The risks associated with your participation are minimal to none. For example you may become bored or fatigued when completing questions. Some students may be eligible to receive extra credit from one or more of their professors or organizations in return for completing the full survey. However, that decision is left to each individual professor or organization. If you have any questions, be sure to ask your professor(s) or organization(s) for clarification. Aside from this, another benefit you may experience is a heightened sense of personal awareness.

#### Compensation:

There will be no financial compensation for your participation in this study. Some professors/organizations may choose to offer extra credit points for completion of this survey. However, the researcher has no role in either offering or awarding extra credit points.

#### Confidentiality:

The individual results of this study will be kept strictly private. After the study has been completed, a unique number will be assigned to your information. In any report that might be published from this data, no information will be included that will make it possible to identify a single participant. Research records will be stored securely on computer devices and only the researchers involved in this study will have access to the data.

#### Voluntary Nature of the Study:

**Participation in this study is completely voluntary.** Your decision to participate will not affect your current or future relations with The University of Southern Mississippi or the School of Criminal Justice. If you decide to participate, **you are free to not answer any question and may withdraw at any time** without adverse effect.

#### Contacts and Questions:

The principal researcher conducting this study is **Katherine Meeker**. If you have any questions you may **contact the researcher at [katherine.meeker@eagles.usm.edu](mailto:katherine.meeker@eagles.usm.edu)** or 228-596-5726. This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

Once you have read and understand this information, you may proceed to begin and complete the survey. By doing so, it is assumed that you consent to participation. Individuals **under the age of 18 are not eligible for participation in this survey.**

I consent to the terms

I do not consent to the terms

## Appendix B: IRB Approval Letter



### **INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD**

118 College Drive #5147 | Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001

Phone: 601.266.5997 | Fax: 601.266.4377 | [www.usm.edu/research/institutional.review.board](http://www.usm.edu/research/institutional.review.board)

### **NOTICE OF COMMITTEE ACTION**

The project has been reviewed by The University of Southern Mississippi Institutional Review Board in accordance with Federal Drug Administration regulations (21 CFR 26, 111), Department of Health and Human Services (45 CFR Part 46), and university guidelines to ensure adherence to the following criteria:

- The risks to subjects are minimized.
- The risks to subjects are reasonable in relation to the anticipated benefits.
- The selection of subjects is equitable.
- Informed consent is adequate and appropriately documented.
- Where appropriate, the research plan makes adequate provisions for monitoring the data collected to ensure the safety of the subjects.
- Where appropriate, there are adequate provisions to protect the privacy of subjects and to maintain the confidentiality of all data.
- Appropriate additional safeguards have been included to protect vulnerable subjects.
- Any unanticipated, serious, or continuing problems encountered regarding risks to subjects must be reported immediately, but not later than 10 days following the event. This should be reported to the IRB Office via the "Adverse Effect Report Form".
- If approved, the maximum period of approval is limited to twelve months.  
Projects that exceed this period must submit an application for renewal or continuation.

PROTOCOL NUMBER: 15093004

PROJECT TITLE: Perceptions of University Community Members Regarding Alcohol Restriction Policies

PROJECT TYPE: New Project

RESEARCHER(S): Katherine Meeker

COLLEGE/DIVISION: College of Science and Technology

DEPARTMENT: Criminal Justice

FUNDING AGENCY/SPONSOR: N/A

IRB COMMITTEE ACTION: Expedited Review Approval

PERIOD OF APPROVAL: 10/13/2015 to 10/12/2016

**Lawrence A. Hosman, Ph.D.**

**Institutional Review Board**

## Appendix C: Survey Instrument

### Default Question Block

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

You are invited to participate in a study measuring attitudes regarding alcohol restriction policies at The University of Southern Mississippi. We ask that you read this information before agreeing to be in the study. The researcher conducting this study is Katherine Meeker, an undergraduate student in the School of Criminal Justice at The University of Southern Mississippi.

#### Background Information:

The purpose of this study is to measure attitudes regarding alcohol restriction policies at The University of Southern Mississippi.

#### Procedures:

If you agree to participate in this study, you will be asked to do the following things. Your participation will involve completing the on-line or pen-and-paper survey with several questions, including questions about your background. It is expected that it will take you approximately 10 minutes to complete the survey. This survey is best viewed and completed on a traditional desktop monitor.

#### Risks and Benefits of Participating:

The risks associated with your participation are minimal to none. For example you may become bored or fatigued when completing questions. Some students may be eligible to receive extra credit from one or more of their professors or organizations in return for completing the full survey. However, that decision is left to each individual professor or organization. If you have any questions, be sure to ask your professor(s) or organization(s) for clarification. Aside from this, another benefit you may experience is a heightened sense of personal awareness.

#### Compensation:

There will be no financial compensation for your participation in this study. Some professors/organizations may choose to offer extra credit points for completion of this survey. However, the researcher has no role in either offering or awarding extra credit points.

#### Confidentiality:

The individual results of this study will be kept strictly private. After the study has been completed, a unique number will be assigned to your information. In any report that might be published from this data, no information will be included that will make it possible to identify a single participant. Research records will be stored securely on computer devices and only the researchers involved in this study will have access to the data.

#### Voluntary Nature of the Study:

**Participation in this study is completely voluntary.** Your decision to participate will not affect your current or future relations with The University of Southern Mississippi or the School of Criminal Justice. If you decide to participate, **you are free to not answer any question and may withdraw at any time** without adverse effect.

#### Contacts and Questions:

The principal researcher conducting this study is **Katherine Meeker**. If you have any questions you may **contact the researcher at [katherine.meeker@eagles.usm.edu](mailto:katherine.meeker@eagles.usm.edu)** or 228-596-5726. This project has been reviewed by the Human Subjects Protection Review Committee, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research subject should be directed to the chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 116 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, (601) 266-6820.

Once you have read and understand this information, you may proceed to begin and complete the survey. By doing so, it is assumed that you consent to participation. **Individuals under the age of 18 are not eligible for participation in this survey.**

- I consent to the terms  
 I do not consent to the terms

This first section asks some basic questions about your background.

What is your age?

What is your race?

- African American  
 Caucasian  
 Hispanic



Asian

Other (specify)

What is your gender?

Male

Female

What is the nature of your primary relationship with The University of Southern Mississippi?

Student (Undergraduate and Graduate)

Faculty

Staff

Other

What is your classification?

Freshman

Sophomore

Junior

Senior

Graduate Student

In what term and year did you first attend The University of Southern Mississippi?

In what month and year did you first start working at The University of Southern Mississippi?

What is your major field of study?

What is your minor field of study?

Are you a member of a Greek Life organization at The University of Southern Mississippi?

Yes

No

The next section asks questions regarding your consumption of alcohol.

For purposes of this study, these are the definitions used.

Occasional: a couple of drinks a month.

Often: 3-4 standard drinks per drinking episode, no more than 9 drinks per week for women and 12-14 for men.

Heavy: consuming 5 or more drinks on the same occasion on each of 5 or more days in the past 30 days.

How often do you consume alcohol?

- Never
- Occasional
- Often
- Heavy

Binge drinking: consuming excessive amounts of alcohol in a short period of time.

Do you binge drink when you normally consume alcohol?

- Yes
- No

The next section asks questions regarding your familiarity with alcohol restriction policies at The University of Southern Mississippi.

Problem drinking/Abusive drinking: commonly defined as a female who consumes more than 7 alcoholic drinks a week and a male who consumes more than 14 alcoholic drinks a week.

	Yes	No
Are you familiar with of The University of Southern Mississippi's current alcohol restriction policy?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do you understand The University of Southern Mississippi's current alcohol policy?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Does The University of Southern Mississippi have an alcohol restriction policy that prohibits the sale, use, or distribution of alcohol or drugs?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A student's first alcohol offense results in automatic suspension?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The next section asks questions regarding the Alcohol Edu training program.

Incoming freshmen at The University of Southern Mississippi are required to take an online course called Alcohol Edu. Have you completed this course?

- Yes
- No

Have you been able to apply what you learned from Alcohol Edu to your consumption of alcohol?

- Yes
- No

The next section asks questions regarding the new Greek Life alcohol restriction policy.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
The Office of Greek Life has implemented a new policy that requires students to swipe their student ID's when attending a fraternity party in order to confirm your age. This policy is in the best interest of USM's current alcohol policy for all Greek organizations.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The new Greek Life policy was implemented in a manner that ensured all affected were aware of the changes.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

The next section asks questions regarding your perceptions of university alcohol restriction policies.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
By allowing the university community to consume alcohol on football game days and other special events, The University of Southern Mississippi sends a mixed message regarding the acceptability of alcohol consumption.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The more knowledge one has regarding The University of Southern Mississippi's alcohol restriction policy, the more likely it will positively influence drinking behavior.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy is an effective tool in combating the problem of alcohol abuse on campus.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
As a student, faculty, or staff, being included in the evaluation and development of USM's alcohol restriction policy decisions ensures that my behavior will conform to the rules.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The more thoroughly defined the alcohol restriction policy, the less likely it is that the university will experience negative issues with incidents/issues with alcohol consumption.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Having a negative view regarding the university's alcohol restriction policy is common among others in my peer group.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The university community needs more preventive/educational programs regarding the risks associated with alcohol consumption.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic suspension or permanent dismissal, it would minimize your consumption.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
If violations of the university's alcohol restriction policy included punishments such as academic	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

suspension or permanent dismissal, it would influence you to attend another university without strict policies related to alcoholic consumption.

Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the offender's judgment to make rational decisions.

Alcohol is a contributing factor in the commission of sexual assaults by impairing the victim's judgment to make rational decisions.

