eCOMMONS

Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations   Theses and Dissertations

2011

Bystander Behavior: Understanding Undergraduate Male Involvement in Dangerous Drinking Situations

Christopher Allen Waugh
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Waugh, Christopher Allen, "Bystander Behavior: Understanding Undergraduate Male Involvement in Dangerous Drinking Situations" (2011). *Dissertations*. Paper 152.
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/152

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

BYSTANDER BEHAVIOR: UNDERSTANDING

UNDERGRADUATE MALE INVOLVEMENT

IN DANGEROUS DRINKING SITUATIONS

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO

THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

PROGRAM IN HIGHER EDUCATION

BY

CHRISTOPHER A. WAUGH

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MAY 2011

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to Mom, for valuing education and doing homework with me at night, especially when I didn't want to, and thanks to Dad, who often reminded me, growing up, "Chris, you can stay on the farm, or you can get an education and do whatever you want." I'm inspired by your love, by your example, and by your hard work. To my family, all of you, for sharing your lives and for your love and support, especially to Sis, my second "Mom," and to Heather, the dearest friend a brother could have. Thanks to "Mom and Pop Morris," for accepting me as your own son and for your never-ending encouragement and email epistles.

To my friends and colleagues at Lake Forest College, especially Cory Stevens, Rita Koller, and David Levinson, who were instrumental in assisting with my research and formatting: I'm grateful. To my "dream team" committee members, Art Munin and Jennifer Haworth, for your ongoing guidance, support, and friendship; I am blessed that our paths have crossed. To Terry Williams: you have been my guide through this entire wonderful experience, and I greatly appreciate all of it. I aspire to be like you as a person and as a professional.

And finally, to Kristina, my transcriber, editor, and best friend, who provides for me a life that's far better than I deserve, but then again, so are you. Thank you for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

On November 6, 1998, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* reported on the tragic

and needless death of first-year MIT student, Scott Krueger. Krueger, a physically fit

former high school athlete, was crowded out of on-campus housing in the residence halls.

For some years, MIT had accepted a shortage in residence hall housing for first-year

students. Seeing an opportunity to boost membership and to raise funds, fraternities and

sororities offered to fill the housing shortage for the university. The fraternity system

quickly accepted and housed the overflow of new first-year students within the first few

days of school. "Four days after his arrival, Scott Krueger pledged and moved into Phi

Gamma Delta, known as 'Fiji.' Ms. Krueger (Scott's mother) says that she wanted to see

the house first, but that he told her, 'If I don't take the bed, someone else will'" (Reisberg,

1998, p. A57). The report continues,

> Nonetheless, she wasn't overly concerned. MIT had a fine
> reputation, and her son was a 'true adult' who had 'never made a
> bad decision in his life,' she says. Scott Krueger wasn't an
> experienced drinker, she says...That's why his twin sister, Katie,
> was worried when he told her during a telephone call on
> September 26, 1997, that he and 11 other pledges would have to
> drink a specific amount of alcohol at an initiation event that
> evening. (Reisberg, 1998, p. A57)

This event, billed "Animal House Night" (Watt, 2008) by the fraternity, was the

1

culmination of the pledging process and a celebration of the new members' entry into

the fraternity (Watt, 2008). On the night that Krueger died, the new members of the

fraternity were gathered together

> …in a designated room of the fraternity, to watch the movie
> *Animal House,* and collectively drink a certain prescribed amount
> of alcohol, Pamela J. Wechsler, the Assistant District Attorney
> who led the investigation, wrote in a report released when
> indictments against Phi Gamma Delta were announced in
> September. The chapter's "pledge trainer" gave the initiates beer
> and a bottle of Jack Daniels, which they consumed before each
> pledge met his 'big brother,' or mentor. Scott Krueger's big
> brother gave him a bottle of Bacardi spiced rum. (Reisberg, 1998,
> p. A57)

When Krueger began to sway and lose consciousness, his fraternity brothers

carried him downstairs to a sofa and laid him on his back with a wastebasket beside his

head to sleep it off (Watt, 2008).

The Chronicle reported that 10 minutes later, Scott Krueger was unconscious and

unable to breathe, his face covered in vomit. A fraternity member discovered him and

dialed campus police (Reisberg, 1998, p. A57). Paramedics rushed him to the hospital,

where Scott Krueger lingered in a coma for 14 hours until taken off life support and

pronounced dead the following afternoon. The autopsy reported that Krueger died from

alcohol poisoning and from suffocation (Watt, 2008). In essence, this is the story of a

student who drank himself to death while his fraternity brothers watched.

On a wider scale, problem drinking leaves a troubling wake on college campuses

throughout the United States. For example, 1,700 college students between the ages of 18

and 24 die each year from alcohol-related, unintentional injuries, including motor vehicle

crashes (Hingson, Heeren, Winter, & Wechsler, 2005). Data also reveal that 599,000

students between the ages of 18 and 24 are unintentionally injured each year under the influence of alcohol and more than 696,000 students between the ages of 18 and 24 are assaulted each year by another student who has been drinking (Hingson, et al., 2005). On a related note, more than 97,000 students between the ages of 18 and 24 are victims of alcohol-related sexual assault or date rape each year (Hingson, et al., 2005) and more than 100,000 students between the ages of 18 and 24 annually report having been too intoxicated to know if they consented to having sex (Hingson, et al., 2005).

About 11 percent of college student drinkers report that they have damaged property while under the influence of alcohol (Wechsler, Lee, Hall, Wagenaar, & Lee, 2002); and more than 25 percent of administrators from schools with relatively low drinking levels and over 50 percent from schools with high drinking levels say their campuses have a "moderate" or "major" problem with alcohol-related property damage (Wechsler, Moeykens, Davenport, Castillo, & Hansen, 1995). One might reasonably infer that a good deal of problem drinking is not done alone, but involves others, such as peers, siblings, friends, and casual passers-by. Collectively, these others are called bystanders (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005). That is where this study begins.

How did Scott Krueger spiral so fatally out of control? Why did the men who counted themselves as his very best friends not get Scott the help he needed to save his life? Why did Scott Krueger die, arguably, at the hands of these bystanders? This study explores to what extent male college student bystanders involved in dangerous drinking situations intervene and to what extent information and training in specific bystander skills improve their likelihood to be effective, engaged bystanders. This chapter

introduces the study's rationale, provides an overview of current student development and bystander theory, outlines overarching research questions, defines terms, and explains the significance of this study.

<div align="center">**Background to the Study**</div>

Alcohol Abuse on Campus

To begin a study on bystander behavior related to dangerous drinking situations on college campuses, one must first look at the role of alcohol in the lives of college students. Alcohol on college campuses has evolved over time. "Historians have noted that alcohol has been around since the first American colleges were founded, but prior to 1950 most reports of drinking on college campus were anecdotal" (Wechsler & Wuethrich, 2002, pp 26-27). Although anecdotal, an infamous confrontation with alcohol occurred when Thomas Jefferson complained about drinking at the University of Virginia in the 1820s. In defiance, and for the next 100 years, UVA students threw a campus-wide party each spring, roughly coinciding with Jefferson's birthday (Wechsler & Wuethrich, 2002).

Researchers today note a number of alarming trends in the past 50 years surrounding college student alcohol use. "First, the women have caught up with the men…Second, …the numbers of students drinking in larger amounts have gone up significantly for men, and even more so for women. Third, the reasons for drinking have changed. The percent of students who say they drink to get drunk is way up. We had very few in 1950" (Wechsler & Wuethrich, 2002, pp. 28-29). Not only have women become more engaged in dangerous drinking behavior over the past five decades, but men's use

has increased as well, and the end and the means are now identical: to drink dangerous amounts of alcohol.

Why this change in attitude towards alcohol? With much improved information about the dangers of alcohol and increased public awareness of alcoholism and the collateral damage it causes, why has college student drinking been characterized by increased consumption versus a decrease? Theories abound, with the most prominent being an already-developed heavy drinking culture in addition to mass media marketing that supports the role of binge drinking as a college rite of passage (Gately, 2008).

Many students have an established lifestyle of heavy drinking by the time they reach college campuses (Chassin, Pitts, & Prost, 2002). Wechsler et al. (1995) found that if the student binged during a typical drinking episode in the last year of high school, there was a very strong chance that student would binge drink in college (Wechsler et al., 1995). More recently, a 2008 report from the National Institute on Drug Abuse indicates, "Almost three out of every four 12th-grade students (72%) have at least tried alcohol, and nearly half (44%) are current drinkers - that is, they reported using alcohol in the 30 days prior to (taking) the survey" (Johnston, O'Malley, Bachman, & Schulenberg, 2008, p. 87). A 2002 study in the *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology* indicated that adolescent and emerging adult alcohol use was directly linked to "parental alcoholism and antisociality, peer drinking, and drug use" (Chassin, Pitts, & Prost, 2002, p. 67).

But even more alarming is use among 8th graders, where "the proportion of students who reported some alcohol use in their lifetime is nearly four tenths (39%), and a sixth (16%) are current (past 30-day) drinkers. Of greater concern than just any use of

alcohol is its use to the point of inebriation: 18% of 8th graders, 41% of 10th graders, and 55% of 12th graders said they have been drunk at least once in their lifetime. The prevalence rates of self-reported drunkenness during the 30 days immediately preceding the survey are strikingly high—6%, 18%, and 29%, respectively, for grades 8, 10, and 12 (Johnston, et al., 2008, p. 87).

In 2003, the Center for Addiction and Substance Abuse reported that, "…America has an epidemic of underage drinking that germinates in elementary and middle schools with children nine to 13-years old and erupts on college campuses where 44 percent of students binge drink and alcohol is the number one substance of abuse--implicated in date rape, sexual harassment, racial disturbances, drop outs, overdose deaths from alcohol poisoning and suicides" (Richter, 2003, p. i).

This binge culture entering college has been assisted by portrayals of drinking by Hollywood films of the era. The paragon of the genre, the aforementioned comedy, *Animal House*, "…inspired a generation of male students to try to crush newfangled aluminum beer cans against their foreheads, in imitation of the actor John Belushi" (Gately, 2008, p. 455). This trend continues into the new Millennium, with more recent films, like *Road Trip* (2000) and *Old School* (2003), continuing the portrayal of the college experience as being steeped in alcohol. Other films, such as *The Hangover* (2009), continue a romanticized notion of a binge drinking culture into adulthood.

Additionally, a proliferation of television beer advertisements has occurred, which often portray behaviors tantamount to heavy drinking, like the Coors commercial, which portrays a shirtless man, chest painted, creating a spectacle in front of his friends. This is

an example of a genre of beer advertisements that reinforce the notion of excessive

drinking being synonymous with the college experience. This notion is also reinforced

currently by popular teen television shows, like, MTV's *The Real World*, which featured

a college-age woman who passed out and had to be rushed to the hospital after a night of

binge drinking. "In many ways, college culture itself vigorously communicates and

perpetuates the myth that this type of behavior is the norm and that excessive drinking is

an integral part of every college student's life" (Lederman & Stewart, 2005, p. 5).

Unfortunately, these myth-making stories never depict real harm coming from dangerous

consumption and its related behaviors, and students rarely if ever circulate drinking

stories with negative consequences (Lederman & Stewart, 2005, p. 251).

In a 2004 editorial in *The Journal of the New England Board of Higher

Education*, the founder and CEO of *Outside the Classroom*, stated, "for too many

students, college is no longer about preparing for leadership roles and productive service

to society, business and science, but rather about taking a vacation from the real world"

(Busteed, 2004, p. 15). The editorial continues, "Legions of binge-drinking graduates are

leaving college as ill prepared citizens feeling no more responsible for their contributions

to democracy than they do for their inappropriate, excessive use of alcohol" (Busteed,

2004, p. 15). This notion is underscored in popular culture today, one example being

Asher Roth's #12 hit song on Billboard Charts from 2009, "I Love College," where Roth

sings,

> That party last night was awfully crazy.
> I wish we taped it.
> I danced my ass off and had this one girl completely naked.
> Drink my beer and smoke my weed, but my good friends is all I need.

Pass out at 3, wake up at 10, go out to eat, then do it again.
Man, I love college.

Others echo this sentiment. "It is clear from these studies that binge drinking continues to be a problem in present times and prevention efforts in the form of effective interventions is the need of the hour" (Sharma, 2008, p. 3). While dangerous drinking remains problematic, it is important to note that the majority of students either choose not to drink or do not drink at levels considered dangerous or binging (Wechsler et al., 1995). That said, there remains a substantial need for bystander education regarding alcohol abuse on college campuses and reiterate strong implications for higher education, both as a future research endeavor (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004), but also as a topic for practitioners and educators (Hudson & Bruckman, 2004).

Also important to studying college student bystander response to dangerous drinking is a foundational comprehension of human development theory relative to the behavior and thinking patterns of college students. The next section of this chapter will provide an overview of current student development theory, focusing on areas most germane to bystander behavior as it relates to undergraduates and dangerous drinking situations.

Student Development Theory

Numerous developmental theories describe the various developmental tasks faced by traditionally-aged college students. "Developmental theory provides systematic ways of making sense of individual differences among college students and their responses to educational environments" (Arnold & King, 1997, p. viii). Researchers agree these tasks are as significant as they are complicated, and theories help educators assist students in

navigating this often-difficult terrain. Further, student development theory underscores

the idea that students advance through specific life tasks as they move through their

college years. "The direction of growth is toward greater complexity, broader and more

differentiated frames of reference, more authentic interpersonal relations, greater ethical

and aesthetic awareness, and more adequate coping with ideas, life tasks, and external

demands" (Arnold & King, 1997, p. x).

A relevant example comes from Chickering's seven "Vectors" of development,

specifically, the "move through autonomy toward interdependence" (Chickering &

Reisser, 1993, p. 117). This developmental step is defined as "freedom from continual

and pressing needs for reassurance, affection, or approval from others" (Chickering &

Reisser, 1993, p. 117). Building awareness and confrontation skills in undergraduate

bystander training programs might help move a student into this developmental stage.

Such training may also hold potential relevance to student development in the

"developing integrity" vector of Chickering's theory, which involves balancing the

interests and values of others with one's own, where said values "become congruent and

authentic as self-interest is balanced by a sense of social responsibility" (Evans, Forney,

& Guido-DiBrito, 1998, p. 40).

Another relevant example of developmental theory as it relates to potential

bystander training is that of William Perry, a counselor and professor at Harvard

University. After World War II and increased socio-economic diversity on campus, Perry

began to notice increased relativity among students and observed undergraduates making

meaning through multiple frames of reference. Based on hundreds of student interviews,

Perry and colleagues devised nine developmental positions, which together illustrated a "movement away from a naive egocentrism to a differentiated awareness of the environment" (Perry, 1970, p. 204). The top five positions involve students' ability to conceptualize their surroundings relative to numerous points of view, with the final positions solidifying each individual's commitments to well-formed ideas.

Lawrence Kohlberg, a psychologist at Harvard University, developed a six-stage sequence related to moral development grouped into three levels, advancing from level one, where the individual is focused solely on self-motivated interaction with others, to level two, where the individual takes on a more broad understanding of her role, seeing herself as a part of society and accepting of its entrenched rules and expectations, to the third and final level of moral development, where the individual separates herself from the rules and expectations of society and internalizes her own set of values and moral guidelines (Kohlberg, 1981).

These are but a few developmental theories describing successive tasks occurring along a sometimes-cyclical and often-difficult path. Bystander training may be a useful means both to build upon student developmental progress as well as to help propel students forward in the development process. Specifically, by building skills in assessing emergency situations, engagement with peers, and careful intervention, student training for bystander intervention in dangerous alcohol situations might help students advance to higher stages of development.

Bystander Theory

As a foundational element for studying bystander behavior in college students, in addition to a broad understanding of student development theory, one must also be familiar with the body of research in the area of bystander behavior and bystander theory. As one explores this literature, various terms and concepts begin to emerge. Research widely indicates that bystander involvement in dangerous situations is governed by two central influences, external and internal, or more specifically, 1) group bystander dynamics and 2) the internal beliefs and attitudes of the individual bystander. This section provides a brief overview of both influences.

Bystander group dynamics. Seminal to understanding bystander behavior is the idea of "bystander effect" (Latané & Darley, 1968), which suggests that the more eyewitnesses to an emergency situation, the less likely an individual bystander will intervene. In this scenario, the bystander is lulled by the notion that one of the other bystanders will intervene. This phenomenon is further explained by "diffusion of responsibility" (Latané & Darley, 1968; 1970), which contends,

> if only one bystander is present at an emergency, he carries all of the responsibility for dealing with it; he will feel all of the guilt for not acting; he will bear all of the blame that accrues for nonintervention. If others are present, the onus of responsibility is diffused, and the finger points less directly at any one person (Latané & Darley, 1970, p. 90).

In the mind of the bystander, the mere presence of others artificially distributes responsibility among the group, making it easier for the individual bystander to attribute responsibility to intervene to others.

Similarly, "group inhibition" (Garcia, Weaver, Moskowitz, & Darley, 2002) indicates, "…the mere perception that other people are also witnessing the event will markedly decrease the likelihood that an individual will intervene in an emergency" (p. 215). In this instance, individuals were primed to imagine themselves in a group and were then prompted to respond to a charity-giving measure. Those who imagined themselves in a group pledged significantly fewer dollars on a charity-giving measure than those primed to imagine themselves alone.

A related bystander notion, "social influence," asserts, "a potential helper, confronted with a situation in which another may be in need of assistance, was posited to look to the reactions of others to help define the situation" (Cacioppo, Petty, & Losch, 1986, p.100). According to this view, a bystander would be less likely to intervene when the actions of others indicated the situation was not an emergency. In the study, individuals did not respond to an emergency when the "actors" reacted with indifference to the given situation. This phenomenon was described in an earlier study as the process of "deindividuation manipulations and self-consciousness" (Becker-Haven, & Lindskold, 1978), where bystanders were shown more likely to respond when alone than when in a room with other potential bystanders who were non-responsive.

"Audience inhibition" digs more deeply into this phenomenon, stating, "bystanders who believe that others are aware of their presence may be apprehensive regarding others' expectations and evaluations of their behavior" (Cacioppo et al., 1986, p. 101). Fear of being judged poorly created a lack of action on the part of the bystander. Schwartz, Jennings, Petrillo and Kidd, (1980) stated that because of performance anxiety,

a bystander's anonymity deterred helping when she or he believed other bystanders favored intervention because there was a perception of higher performance expectations in the mind of the bystander. Further, they found that helping was enhanced when a bystander believed other bystanders felt helping was inappropriate (i.e., when perceived expectations were removed).

Individual bystander beliefs and attitudes. While group dynamics play an important role in understanding bystander behavior, the internal values, beliefs, and attitudes of the individual dig more deeply into understanding the phenomenon. How does the individual see herself in relation to others? What values and beliefs guide individuals as they observe emergency situations? How does the individual interpret emergency situations? This section introduces main topics in the literature that help unpack individual motivations related to bystander behavior.

Perhaps most elementary part of the related work on individual bystander behavior involves the notion of the "apathetic bystander" (Clark & Word, 1974). The apathetic bystander is described as one who, after observing an emergency situation, evaluating that intervention is necessary, and weighing the potential costs versus potential benefits of intervening, chooses not to step in. This concept is directly related to the "cost-reward model" (Piliavin, Piliavin, & Rodin, 1975; Walster & Piliavin, 1972), which indicates that in order for a bystander to intervene, she must determine that the potential benefits of intervening outweigh the potential costs. Another study (Fritzsche, Finkelstein, & Penner, 2000) combined the "cost-reward model" with "policy capturing" methodology, further illustrating how bystander behavior relates to individuals' decision-

making processes. This study affirmed the earlier notion that bystander response could be captured with respondents' view of cost of helping versus reward of helping.

Piliavin, Piliavin, and Rodin (1975) describe a four step model of bystander behavior, which reduces the phenomenon to an attempt by the bystander to reduce the unpleasant arousal of the stumbled upon emergency. In the first step, an observation of an emergency must first arouse in the bystander an unpleasant internal response. In the next step, the arousal becomes more unpleasant as it continues, creating motivation from the bystander to reduce the negative arousal. The third step is dependent upon the internal personality, beliefs, and motivations of the bystander, who will either react impulsively to the emergency or impulsively flee the scene. Step four acknowledges that in either option, the bystander "will choose the response to an emergency that most rapidly and most completely reduces his arousal, incurring as few net costs (costs minus rewards) as possible in the process" (p. 430).

"Confusion of responsibility" emphasizes not "…the responsibility a potential helper feels for helping a victim, but rather…the responsibility for harm doing the potential helper believes will attribute to him or her should he or she help the victim" (Cacioppo et al., 1986, p. 101). In this instance, the potential bystander fears that, in stepping-in to provide assistance, other onlookers will presume the helping bystander was at some level the cause of the current trauma. Fear of being falsely blamed for a harmful situation overcomes the bystander's sense of responsibility to supply help.

Also potentially useful for engaging the college-age bystander is the decision-making model designed by Latané and Darley (1968), which is similar to the Piliavin,

Piliavin, and Rodin model (1975) described previously. In Latané's and Darley's

model, it is noted that before one decides to intervene in a situation, three things must

first happen: "he must first notice the event, he must then interpret it as an emergency,

and he must decide that it is his personal responsibility to act" (p.220). The authors note

that at each of these decision-making crossroads, the bystander may fail to recognize the

emergency, may fail to interpret the event as an emergency situation, or may fail to

assume responsibility to step in. In these scenarios, the authors note that the bystander's

indecision in whether or not to intervene becomes a very concrete decision – not to help.

The internal decision-making process described in Latané's and Darley's (1968)

model is a recurring concept in bystander literature and has been widely used in later

studies involving bystander motivation, where it has been tested in various experimental

settings, like decision-making when in pairs or in larger groups (Borges, & Penta, 1977;

Choi, Nisbett, & Norenzayan, 1999; Clark & Word, 1974; Darley & Teger, 1973).

Also relevant to the bystander conversation as it relates to the individual's values,

beliefs, and attitudes is "social norms theory," which "describes situations in which

individuals incorrectly perceive the attitudes and/or behaviors of peers and other

community members to be different from their own when, in fact, they are not"

(Berkowitz, 2005, p. 193). Due to this inaccurate assessment, individuals are often

influenced to make choices outside of their normal tendency. In response, campus leaders

have created "social norms campaigns," which list factual data on student drinking

patterns, drug use, and sexual activity. The goal behind this approach is to affirm healthy

attitudes and moderate behavior.

The literature seems indecisive on the efficacy of social norms campaigns. Some researchers and practitioners view the approach as effective in modifying drinking perceptions and, as a result, modifying dangerous drinking behavior (Berkowitz, 2005). Other researchers, however, indicate otherwise. One study, for example, in "a randomized control trial…studied the effects of a primary prevention social norm intervention on binge drinking, and no differences were found between intervention and control group in alcohol use and alcohol-use risk factors" (Werch, Pappas, Carlson, Diclemente, Chaly, & Sinder, 2000, p. 4). Whichever side one takes, social norms theory continues to be a pervasive topic of conversation surrounding bystander attitudes and internal motivation.

Current Bystander Intervention Strategies

Examining current bystander intervention practices in other areas is helpful in designing approaches for college students involved in dangerous drinking situations. Current practice includes bystander intervention efforts in the workplace (Scully & Rowe, 2009), bystander outreach in the areas of K-8 school children bullying (Black & Jackson, 2007; Olweus, 1999), and sexual assault prevention with specific attention to male athletes (Barone, Wolgemuth, & Linder, 2007; Lynch, 2005). These intervention strategies utilize community-based approaches to identify ways in which bystanders might impact negative or dangerous situations. Such methods highlight the complexity of the subject matter. These strategies inform my approach and direction when gathering information from students, campus staff, and faculty, and the strategies borrow themes from student development theory, bystander theory, and bystander intervention concepts

related to K-8 bullying and sexual assault prevention to address the issue of engaging

traditionally-aged undergraduate men in dangerous drinking situations.

A movement for bystander behavior research is taking place in the professional

work setting, which may prove helpful in both understanding helping in non-emergency

situations and also in methods of soliciting future help. In a study about bystanders in

sexual harassment situations in the workplace (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005),

researchers developed a "typology of observer intervention behaviors" (p. 290) that

describes how the level of involvement of a bystander impacts his or her level of

intervention, similar to the aforementioned "role of commitments" concept (Schwarz et

al., 1980). The study recommends continued research on observer intervention on

aggressive workplace behavior, including liability issues of "innocent bystanders" who

choose to do nothing about witnessed harassment.

Bystander intervention practices start with children, with a great deal of research

focusing on combating K-8 school bullying. Educators are reaching out to bystander

classmates who witness bullying, seeking to impart skills to intervene (Black & Jackson,

2007; Olweus, 1993; Smith & Brain, 2000). The universally accepted definition of

bullying in the subset of bystander research is repeated exposure of one child to

intentionally harmful actions of a single or group of youth (Olweus, 1993; Smith &

Brain, 2000). According to this definition, an imbalance of power exists. "The bully is

stronger through social status, physical prowess, age, cognitive abilities or skill" (Black

& Jackson, 2007, p. 624).

One promising bystander strategy to reduce school bullying has potential relevance to engaging college bystanders in alcohol situations. The "Olweus Bullying Prevention Program" (Olweus, 1993) "…is one of the few evidence-based bullying prevention programs for schools. The BPP starts with a needs assessment to identify prevalence, types, areas and attitudes related to bullying" (Black & Jackson, 2007, p. 624). The BPP program improves its chances for impact by involving not only the bully and the bullied, but also the entire community-at-large. As noted in other bystander program research and evaluation, engaging the broader community is crucial to building a strong bystander training program (Banyard et al., 2007). "A coordinating committee, comprised of teaching and non-teaching staff and community members, uses the needs assessment data to develop school specific implementation plans using the strategic BPP model" (Black & Jackson, 2007, p. 624).

The BPP program incorporates interventions for the entire school, each class, and individual students and core components of the program include: school rules against bullying, a bullying awareness day, training on improving student supervision, parent involvement, student input, and a system of positive and negative consequences. The needs assessment survey is repeated annually to evaluate success of the program (Black & Jackson, 2007). This approach also holds concepts that seem relevant to a college age population, especially as it relates to building campus awareness on the issue (Sokolow, 2008), ongoing training for student peers (Banyard et al., 2007), and campus social norming campaigns (Berkowitz, 2005).

In this K-8 subset of bystander research, scholars point out a negative aspect of bystander involvement in grade school bullying. "Bystanders to bullying events may contribute to the problem by providing attention and assistance to those who bully. Live observations showed bystanders involved in more than 80% of bullying episodes and generally reinforcing the aggression" (Frey, et al., 2005, p. 479). Another study noted that in playground bullying incidents "peers intervened rarely, but when they did, bullying tended to stop quickly" (Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001, p. 513), which suggests that further bystander training and empowerment might reduce grade school bullying. Further, these phenomena may be useful in understanding bystander behavior among established college-age groups, like fraternities.

Also potentially useful for bystander intervention for dangerous drinking situations, K-8 educators point to the widely-used training system of teaching peers to support bullied students and point to the key features of such training: (1) training young people to work together outside of friendship groups, (2) giving young people the opportunity to learn communication skills and to reflect on their own emotions in relationships, and (3) training young people to deal with conflict and to help peers relate to one another (Cowie & Hutson, 2005, p. 40). The steps of empathy, self-reflection, and skill-building seem relevant to broader audiences and might prove useful in designing bystander behavior in college age men as it relates to dangerous drinking situations.

Research in sexual assault prevention indicates a strong rationale for wider community involvement similar to K-8 research. Banyard et al. (2007) indicated the positive developmental impact from a community of responsibility model that teaches

both men and women (in separate, single-gender groups) how to intervene safely in situations of sexual violence. A significant flaw, however, exists in approaching men only from the perspective of potential perpetrators. It leaves out a crucial component of sexual assault situations: the non-perpetrator, the male on the sidelines of the party, the bystander. Sokolow, Lisak, and Banyard (2007) suggest, "the path to prevention…is bystander intervention. We look to their peers and community and ask them to identify those whose behaviors are high-risk. We ask them not to be bystanders to the acts of aggression and trespass of the sex offenders. We ask them to intervene" (Sokolow et al., 2007, p. 1).

A new movement among sexual assault prevention programs is focusing on the bystander as an agent of change (Banyard et al., 2004; DeKeseredy et al., 2000; Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriott, 1997). This approach involves reaching bystanders with information and building skills on how to intervene in sexual assault situations. The bystander role as it relates to sexual assault includes interrupting situations that could lead to sexual assault, speaking out against sexist language and behaviors, and being an effective ally to rape survivors. This approach is based on the notion that the larger community plays a key role in creating atmospheres that support sexual assault and is also integral to providing solutions (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000).

Barone et al. (2007) indicated the effectiveness of approaching men as potential allies, suggesting that by understanding the social context of oppression and its many intersections, male participants were able to impact their communities more widely. Another bystander intervention program that receives recurring notice throughout the

literature is the "Mentors in Violence Prevention (MVP)" program, developed for

male student leaders on the campus of the University of Northern Iowa by Jackson Katz

for the Study of Sport in Society (Lynch, 2005).

> The model was designed to educate male student-athletes and other student leaders to use their status as campus leaders to confront all forms of sexist behaviors and violence…The MVP model moves from a traditional one in which males are often viewed or labeled as potential perpetrators to one in which they are seen as empowered bystanders who can confront sexist and abusive peers. (Lynch, 2005, p. 29)

On a related note, this study will focus specifically on male undergraduates, who

are noted to be engaged "in fewer health-promoting behaviors and have less healthy

lifestyles than women," (Davies, McCrae, Frank, Dochnahl, Pickering, Harrison,

Zakrzewski, & Wilson, 2000, p. 259) and "men are less likely than women to seek

medical care" (Davies, et al., 2000, p. 259). Further, research indicates, "young men of

traditional college age (between 15 and 24 years) have distinctive health threats and are

more likely than women to engage in risk-taking behaviors" (Davies, et al., 2000, p. 259).

Research Questions

Having discussed the role of alcohol on campus, introduced relevant student

development and bystander theory, and summarized current bystander intervention

strategies in other areas, this study utilizes these elements to identify factors that support

successful bystander intervention. The following research questions address the study's

overarching purpose that seeks to identify the factors that contribute to the likelihood that

traditionally-aged, male, undergraduate bystanders involved in dangerous drinking

situations will successfully intervene:

1. How do engaged, traditionally-aged, college male bystanders describe their experiences (i.e., K-8 education, physical education classes or "recess" times, athletic teams, etc.) up to and including college attendance?

2. What factors in participant backgrounds (i.e., personality, economic status, family history, etc.), either support or challenge active engagement in bystander situations?

3. How does participant definition of "dangerous drinking" and knowledge of pertinent alcohol information impact their bystander engagement?

Definitions

Bystander. A key focus throughout this study is on college student interaction with alcohol, and specifically, those imbibers or non-imbibers who are present when others are making dangerous choices with alcohol: the bystanders. While the body of research seems to presume this definition to be widely understood, some research refers to bystanders as individuals who see dangerous behavior "…occurring but are not directly involved in the incident" (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005, p. 288).

Binge drinking. A standard definition of binge drinking is elusive and hotly debated. In the early 90's, noted research from, Henry Wechsler et al., defined binge drinking as, over a two-week period, "drinking five or more drinks in a row for men and four or more drinks in a row for women" (Wechsler, Dowdall, Davenport, & Castillo, 1995, p. 922). This definition, however, carries with it obvious flaws.

> Combined with the lack of a specified time period for the drinking session, this means that an individual can potentially be classified as a "binge drinker" without ever reaching altered states of intoxication. For example, under the current definition by Wechsler and colleagues, a man

consuming—over a course of four hours—a cocktail before dinner, three glasses of wine or beer with his meal, followed by a liqueur would be classified as a "binge" drinker just like a young woman downing four drinks in half an hour at the bar on a Saturday night. (Martinic & Measham, 2008, p. 8)

In response to criticism, Wechsler and Kuo turned to students to defend their definition, surveying 14,000 U.S. students at 119 colleges in 40 different states in a 2000 study. The results indicated, "at the median, half of the students define the term binge drinking as 6 drinks or fewer in a row for men and 5 drinks or fewer in a row for women" (Wechsler & Kuo, 2000, p. 61). The researchers suggested, however, that student definitions were directly linked to how much they themselves drink.

Abstainers, for example, defined binge drinking as 5 drinks in a row for men and 4 for women, but "frequent binge drinkers use the higher limits of 8 and 6 drinks, respectively" (p. 61). The study concluded that student definitions supported researcher definition of binge drinking. Wechsler's research continues to inspire further research (Segrist & Pettibone, 2009) related to student perceptions of binge drinking versus researchers, health educators, and university administrators (Segrist, & Pettibone, 2009). The 2009 study by Segrist and Pettibone focused on drinking in single occasions, however, and did not address the ongoing concern with Wechsler's and Kuo's (2000) specified two-week time period.

Wechsler's et al. (2003) continue to defend their rationale for specifying a two-week episodic drinking time frame by stating that, as opposed to one-time dangerous drinking, "heavy episodic drinking is associated with a number of adverse health, educational and social consequences – including physical injury, high-risk sexual

behavior, alcohol overdose, alcohol-impaired driving, psychosocial problems, anti-social behavior and academic difficulties" (Wechsler, Nelson, Lee, Seibring, Lewis, & Keeling, 2003, p. 84).

Wechsler and Nelson (2008) further nuanced their former definition by specifying the concept of "frequent binge drinking," or "binging on three or more occasions in the past 2 weeks" (p. 1). Wechsler contends, "students who drink at the five/four level and above pose a major public health problem at college" (Wechsler & Nelson, 2008, p. 1). Wechsler continued the refinement of his definition of binge drinking in the 2008 study, referring "to the consumption of five drinks in a row for males or four drinks in a row for females on a single occasion within a 2-week time period" (p. 2). This revision, which specified the "single occasion," is most germane to this study of college male bystanders involved in individual dangerous drinking situations.

Adding to the ongoing debate, Martinic and Measham (2008) indicate that developing a comprehensive definition for "extreme drinking" (p. 3) is complex and needs to include the following key factors: *intoxication* must be present, *motivation* for extreme drinking must be considered, the process by which the individual drinks to the extreme, and the outcome of such drinking. Martinic and Measham (2008) state that glossing over these important factors, researchers run the risk of misleading data and as a result, ineffective intervention programs (2008, pp. 10-11). Others (Murgraff, Parrott, & Bennett, 1999) suggest the term, "risky single-occasion drinking" as a more accurate terminology than "binge drinking," but fail to identify a specific satisfactory definition (p. 10).

The National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism takes a more technical approach, defining binge drinking as a pattern of drinking alcohol that brings blood alcohol concentration (BAC) to 0.08-gram percent and above. For the typical adult, this pattern corresponds to consuming 5 or more drinks (male), or 4 or more drinks (female) in about 2 hours. A drink refers to half an ounce of alcohol, (e.g., one 12 ounce beer, one 5 ounce glass of wine, or 1.5 ounce shot of distilled spirits) (National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, 2008).

While similar to Wechsler, et al. (1995, 2000), this definition removes the two-week period from the equation, focusing more directly on the specific drinking encounter. The main difference between the two definitions is that the Wechsler, et al. (1995, 2000) definition seeks to identify sustained binging behavior, identifying the binge drinker as one who regularly drinks dangerously, while the National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism study posits its definition in the context of individual episodes of binging behavior.

For this study, the reader is asked to accept that no standard definition for "binge" or "dangerous" or "extreme" drinking currently exists. Further, the debate over the two-week time period does not hold relevance to this study, as this study is focused on bystander behavior of individual incidents of binge drinking. Therefore, when using the term "binge drinking" within this study, the following working definition by MedicineNet.com will be utilized: "The dangerous practice of consuming large quantities of alcoholic beverages in a single session. Binge drinking carries a serious risk of harm, including alcohol poisoning" (MedicineNet, 1999). Given that the parameters of this

study do not involve examination of long-term drinking behavior, but is focused on single-occasion drinking incidents, the definition provided by "MedicineNet" seems most germane.

<div align="center">**Significance of the Study**</div>

Bystander behavior is attracting significant attention on the national scene. American Broadcasting Company (ABC) Television featured a news special in spring 2009 titled, "What Would You Do?" (Quinones, 2009). In the recurring series, actors stage various scenarios in public areas where bystander observation is inevitable. Constructed scenarios have included child abuse, theft, and college student hazing. Bystander reaction is filmed and those who either choose to act or who do nothing are interviewed to explain the thought process behind their decision. In one scenario where college-aged women were depicted in a hazing scenario, one 16 year-old woman actually joined in the hazing activity, helping to tie a woman to a street lamp. When questioned about her choice to participate, the 16 year-old indicated that she thought it was "fun" and didn't regret her choice (Quinones, 2009).

In 2009, the Illinois Liquor Commission created a statewide movement, "Don't Be Sorry" that distributes free alcohol awareness and education to junior high, high school, and college educators. The publications target the message to the under 21 student population. Along with materials that warn of legal implications of underage drinking, the materials educate young people on the physical effects of alcohol and briefly suggest the role of bystander.

While research points out that "a fifth of American undergraduates binged three or more times in the same 2-week period" (Wechsler et al., 1995, p. 925), this study and others (Haines, 1996; Walters, 2000) also identify significant good news: more American undergraduates did not binge drink in this same time period, representing the vast majority of students. Regardless of one's opinion regarding the definition of binge drinking, these studies point to a concept central to my study: the majority of college students on a given night do not, in fact, drink dangerously. This leads to the question, what is being observed and written about this vast majority of non-binging students who may be bystanders to dangerous drinking? How can educators tap this important subset of college students to support safer alcohol use?

With these questions in mind, the relevance of this research is clear. This study provides a baseline examination of contributing factors that impact bystander engagement, or lack thereof, in emergency situations. Further, this study seeks to utilize student development theory, bystander research, and current bystander intervention practices to identify factors that support successful bystander intervention of undergraduate men involved in dangerous drinking situations. A greater understanding of how undergraduates engage or not as bystanders in dangerous drinking situations can be invaluable to educators and campus administrators who support students in residence halls, campus activities, or fraternities as they create developmental and preventative alcohol intervention strategies.

This study makes two contributions to the current literature. First, it utilizes and expands current scholarship regarding bystander behavior. Second, since there seems to

be a dearth of current research regarding bystander behavior as it relates to dangerous

drinking situations, this study will fill a void. By investigating bystander behavior using a

combination of theory and practice involving both existing theory and contemporary

bystander intervention programming, this study will develop and assess a model for

promoting active and responsible undergraduate bystanders.

The next chapter will review past and current research on the topic of bystander

behavior in undergraduate men involved in dangerous drinking situations, including a

history of alcohol use and abuse in the United States and an overview of laws

surrounding drinking and how current laws came into being. The review will then explore

baseline bystander theory, based on groundbreaking research that began in 1969 and

continues currently. Finally, the review will examine current programs aimed at

bystanders in areas of bullying and sexual assault prevention.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature reviewed in this study explores numerous facets surrounding the phenomenon of bystander behavior of traditionally aged undergraduate college men involved in dangerous drinking situations. This review of current literature (1) will explore the history of alcohol use and abuse in America, highlighting events specifically related to higher education, (2) will examine the current status of alcohol on college campuses, (3) will survey baseline theory of bystander behavior, and (4) will provide an overview of current practices regarding bystander intervention training. Finally, I will draw together conclusions from the literature review to discuss a current void in the literature: reaching the college male bystander involved in dangerous drinking situations.

Alcohol Use, Abuse, and Policy in the United States

To begin a review of literature surrounding bystander behavior as it relates to dangerous drinking situations, one must first understand the social and political history surrounding alcohol use and abuse in the United States. In North America, alcohol is an important aspect of culture and daily society (Gately, 2008). While widely used and accepted, alcohol is also,

> the most controversial part of our diet, simultaneously nourishing and intoxicating the human frame. This equivocal influence over civilization can be equated to the polar characters of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. At times its philanthropic side has appeared to be in the ascendant, at others

the psychopath has been at large. Throughout history, the place of alcohol in our meals, medicines, and leisure activities has been a matter of fierce debate. (Gately, 2008, p. 1)

Prohibition to Vietnam

The United States has a long history of indecision regarding how to handle this fermented mix of water, barley, and hops. The age of legal consumption in the United States rose and declined through the decades following ratification of the 21st Amendment, which repealed Prohibition (Government Archives, 2008). In fact, laws varied by state, with approximately 40 states identifying 21 as the age of legal alcohol purchase and consumption from 1933 to 1971 (U.S. History of Alcohol Minimum Purchase Age by State, 2008).

But social activism of the late-1960's and early-1970's, the Vietnam War, and the National Draft, influenced "…the federal government, in 1971, to lower the voting age to eighteen…ultimately twenty-nine states followed suit in regard to the drinking age" (Mittelman, 2007, p. 173). "From 1970 through 1975 nearly all states lowered their legal ages of adulthood, thirty [states] including their legal drinking ages, usually from 21 to 18" (Males, 1996, p.194).

This created a patchwork of states with varied drinking laws, which led to what became known as "blood borders" (Why 21, 2008). "They were called blood borders, because teens would drive across state lines, drink, and then drive back home across state lines, killing and injuring themselves and others" (Why 21, 2008, para. 4). The rise in border-related DUI arrests and fatalities was dramatic. "One such border ran between Wisconsin and Illinois…Within a year, alcohol-related crashes in Badger State border

communities involving nineteen-year-olds from Illinois rose from just under a third to

nearly one half" (Gately, 2008, p. 455).

National Minimum Drinking Age Act

The fickle American perspective on alcohol took a 180-degree turn a decade later

when rising drinking and driving fatalities, coupled with the ground-breaking work of

Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), set the stage for Ronald Regan signing the

National Minimum Driving Age Act (NMDA) on July 17, 1984. The actual bill requires

"…that states prohibit persons under 21 years of age from purchasing or publicly

possessing alcoholic beverages as a condition of receiving state highway funds" (Alcohol

Policy Information System, 2008). While not mandating that States comply, the Act

essentially guaranteed all States would follow suit, and they did.

The National Minimum Drinking Age Act has had a significant impact in the

United States, but the degree of said influence is greatly contested. Another constantly

debated topic surrounding the NMDA is its impact on college campuses for the past 24

years. College educators are confronted daily with how to address this important social

and health issue as it plays out daily on and off campus. In a 2008 Op-Ed piece in the *The*

Chronicle of Higher Education, William Durden, President of Dickinson College, stated,

"Current law limits college and university presidents to preaching abstinence and

enforcing the law - Herculean tasks. Clearly those approaches are ineffective" (Durden,

2008, para. 3). Ironically, the role of college faculty and administration seems to have

progressed through history from the philosophy of "in loco parentis" (Melear, 2003, p.

125) in the past to a law enforcement framework in the present.

Durden continues, "On its own terms, the law is not working. The abstinence

message does not persuade [students to stop drinking dangerously]. And the more

successful we are in enforcing the law, the more successful we are in pushing drinking

beyond our oversight and campus jurisdiction, and into more-dangerous behaviors"

(Durden, 2008, para. 3). This points to a third historical impact of the NMDA: as

institutions cracked down on underage drinking, students elected to take drinking

underground. This approach to drinking has been referred to by students as "pre-gaming,"

or pre-partying.

"Pre-partying is the consumption of alcohol prior to attending an event or activity

(e.g., party, bar, concert) at which more alcohol may be consumed" (Pedersen & LaBrie,

2007, p. 238). In their study, Pederson and LaBrie (2007) found that, "pre-partying

appears to be a fairly common practice among college student drinkers, with 75% of

drinkers in our study engaging in this behavior at least once in the past month" (p. 241).

One might argue that the NMDA helped to create an atmosphere of behind-the-scenes

alcohol abuse in the 1980s that thrives today.

Perhaps more significantly, although it was meant to curb alcohol abuse, the

NMDA has not been effective in doing so. In 2000, Wechsler, et al., reviewed national

survey results of representative samples of college students at 119 colleges in 39 states in

1993, 1997, and 1999. They found that the data,

> yielded remarkably similar rates of binge drinking over the past 6 years.
> Two of five college students were classified as binge drinkers in each of
> the three surveys…From 1993 to 1999, the proportion of binge drinkers
> remained very similar for almost all subgroups of students and in all types
> of colleges. The same types of students who had the highest rates of binge

drinking in 1993 and 1997 continued to have those high rates in 1999. (Wechsler, 2000, p. 204)

Amethyst Initiative

Reflective of 24 years of the NMDA, a current national conversation regarding the "Amethyst Initiative" was signed by 129 college presidents and launched in July 2008. The name for this initiative is drawn from Greek mythology, where amethyst stones were said to protect their owners from drunkenness. The initiative is a movement of college presidents calling for a national conversation on laws surrounding the drinking age in the United States (Amethyst Initiative, 2008). The basic position of the initiative is to support "informed and unimpeded debate on the 21 year-old drinking age" (Amethyst Initiative, 2008).

The initiative calls upon civic leaders and government officials to weigh all the consequences of current alcohol policies and to invite new ideas on how best to prepare emerging adults to make responsible decisions about alcohol use. Other voices have also emerged in the current conversation, including the *National Youth Rights Association*, which claims that the NMDA is a violation of the civil rights of adults who are between 18 – 20 years of age, citing, "the drinking age makes clear that no matter how hard you work, no matter how successful you are, you are still a second-class citizen unfit for association with adults until you reach an arbitrary age" (National Youth Rights Association, n.d.).

No sooner had the Amethyst Initiative been announced, it then became highly publicized and widely controversial. This initiative, combined with the current and ongoing U.S. military conflicts, a resurgence of political interest in young people, and

new youth-driven movements advocating for the civil rights of the young all but

ensure the drinking age debate will continue well into the 21st Century.

The next part of this literature review looks at alcohol abuse on college campuses,

including the ongoing increase of dangerous drinking by college students over the past

twenty five years, increased liability issues for colleges and universities, and potential

benefits and positive implications of engaging peer bystanders in prevention and

intervention.

Alcohol Abuse on College Campuses

Binge Drinking

Alcohol use and abuse in the United States and on college campuses are widely

documented. Recent studies indicate that alcohol abuse continues to be a problem on

college campuses, even post NMDA (Wechsler, et al., 2000, p. 200). Beyond established

contextual factors for alcohol abuse, (i.e., depression, alcoholism, emotional trauma,

etc.), research points to college-specific factors such as distance from family influence

(Gfroerer, et al., 1997, p. 62), close association with peers (Perkins, et al., 1999, para. 2),

on-campus residence, association with fraternities and sororities, social events, and

athletics (Leichliter, 1998, para. 4) as exacerbating binge drinking by college students.

As described in Chapter I, along with its prominence in the culture widely, alcohol

use and abuse on North American college campuses continue to be predominant, and

binge or problem drinking creates a damaging ripple effect with significant implications

for bystander intervention. "National studies have found that binge drinking is common

at many colleges and universities, and that such behavior is closely linked to rape, other

violent crime, the spread of sexually-transmitted diseases, declining academic performance, and growing alcoholism among college youth" (Gulland, 1994, p. 4).

Others echo this sentiment. "It is clear from these studies that binge drinking continues to be a problem in present times and prevention effort in the form of effective interventions is the need of the hour" (Sharma, 2008, p. 3). These statements underscore the need for bystander education on college campuses and reiterate strong implications for higher education, both as a future research endeavor (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004), and also as a topic for practitioners and educators (Hudson & Bruckman, 2004).

Positive Potential of College Student Bystanders

Chapter I points to research that identifies significant good news on this important topic: the vast majority of students, four-fifths of American undergraduates, do not binge drink (Wechsler, Dowdall, Davenport, & Castillo, 1995). However, what is being observed and written about the four-fifths of students who are non-binging, bystanders to dangerous drinking? A better understanding of college student bystanders has significant implications for higher education on a number of fronts, including sexual assault prevention, where researchers are studying bystander theory to evaluate the likelihood of bystander intervention and to develop training programs for male and female potential bystanders to future sexual assault attempts (Abbey & McAuslan, 2004; Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004). Additionally, a focus on the college bystander can involve business and community bystanders enlisted in town-gown conversations about how to "limit access / availability, control cheap prices, and maximize substance free environments and associations" (Weitzman, Nelson, & Wechsler, 2003, p. 34).

Further, studies on gun violence and campus shootings implicate bystanders, who are listed as a primary part of the equation before, during, and after shooting incidents (Miller, Hemenway, & Wechsler, 2002, p. 64). Studies surrounding fraternity and sorority hazing are rife with bystander intervention opportunity, including even, "faculty and staff members," who, "need to confront hazers, and to report them to campus authorities or police" (Nuwer, 1999, p. 211).

Other relevant bystander themes related to higher education include bystanders and alcohol abuse on and off campus (Seaman, 2005; Wechsler & Wuethrich, 2002), the potential impact of bystanders on reduction of campus crime (Schwarz, Jennings, Petrillo, & Kidd, 1980), how bystander intervention reduces the death rate of college students (Hingson, Heeren, Winter, & Wechsler, 2005), and student involvement in developing best practices and improved campus policies (Gulland, 1994; Mitchell, Toomey, & Erickson, 2005; Wechsler, Lee, Nelson, & Kuo, 2002).

So what is higher education currently doing to reach student peers, the vast majority of whom are not drinking dangerously? What is the institution's responsibility for educating students and what is at stake? Brett Sokolow, J.D., Founder and President of the National Center for Higher Education Risk Management (NCHERM), indicates that many could argue the institutions are not obligated to teach responsible interaction with alcohol. In fact, Sokolow indicates that one might even argue that in doing so, institutions take on additional legal risks (Sokolow, 2008).

Yet, it is also argued that colleges are, indeed, under significant obligation to teach responsible use of alcohol, because the problems of abuse are landing firmly on

academy doorsteps. Further, abuse problems on college campuses are also landing on

courthouse steps as well, where colleges are being held accountable for the abuses of

their students (Hefler, 2006). Their high-risk behaviors are damaging our recruiting

efforts, our retention strategies, our fiscal soundness, our insurance premiums, our

reputations, and our subsequent ability to build endowments through major gifts

(Sokolow, 2008, p.2).

National and local news sources send constant messages of warning to colleges

and universities about the need to reach out to student bystanders. *The Philadelphia

Inquirer* reported on the death of John Fiocco, Jr., a first-year student at the College of

New Jersey, who died of alcohol poisoning. An attorney involved in the case said the

college did not provide "'adequate training to personnel at Wolfe Hall on how to handle

visibly intoxicated students'" (Hefler, 2006, para. 17). This story illustrates how the

courts are starting to pursue institutions to cover damages incurred by alcohol-related

deaths.

Specifically pointing to the idea of reaching student bystanders for risk

prevention, Paul Tran, a third-year medical student at the University of Missouri-Kansas

City and president of the Intrafraternity Council stated, "I think what (college)

administrators are doing now is about all they can do…Students are not going to be very

receptive unless the message comes from other students rather than administrators or

even from speakers on campus" (Williams, 2007, para. 24). Tran's statement suggests

that training student bystanders to intervene may have a powerful impact on campus

drinking culture.

Further illustrating the potential benefits of such an approach, *USA Today's* Mary Beth Marklein asked four students, representing varying campus perspectives, to shed light on how colleges might approach the problem (of dangerous drinking). Among their suggestions: "Involve students in the decision-making" (Marklein, 2004, p. 7d). One student interviewed for Marklein's story, Joey Natoli, third-year economics major at Stanford University, stated, "the only way dangerous drinking can be curbed is by friends telling other friends when they have had enough. A university administrator or some other authority figure can never have that kind of influence" (Marklein, 2004, p. 7d).

In the book, *Leaving College: Rethinking The Causes And Cures Of Student Attrition* (1993), Professor Vincent Tinto reiterates the importance of training student bystanders, stating, "information of this sort can only be obtained from other students who have already been successful in navigating the institution. It cannot be gained easily, if at all, from either faculty or staff, however sympathetic or competent" (p. 165). Tinto continues, "the more frequent and rewarding interactions are between students and other members of the institution, the more likely are individuals to stay (in college)" (p.166). Tinto goes into significant detail in his book about the importance of how peer mentors impact student success in college.

The book, *Wrongs of Passage: Fraternities, Sororities, Hazing, and Binge Drinking* (1999), goes into significant detail offering suggestions for preventing alcohol-related hazing deaths, and there is virtually no mention of peer bystander training or intervention, other than a brief recommendation to "get students to come up with their

own innovative programs and connect them with creative faculty and staff who genuinely care about students" (Nuwer, 1999, p. 214).

Recent literature also points to the potential of bystander intervention on reducing institutional liability. One study points to the recent increase in unfavorable legal outcomes regarding issues related to alcohol for colleges and universities, noting how the trend "may reflect a potential shift away from institutional immunity as a matter of law" (Elkins, Helms, & Pierson, 2003, p. 76). Training bystanders to intervene may also have significant risk management implications for institutions (Paschall & Saltz, 2007) as well as impacting secondhand effects of college student alcohol use as related to town-gown relationships (Wechsler, Lee, Hall, Wagenaar, & Lee, 2002).

The next part of this literature reviews historic and current bystander behavior research, including foundational theory involving bystander's individual beliefs and motivations as well as bystander response relative to group settings and peer pressure. This section will also review current bystander theory in the areas of grade school bullying, harassment in the workplace, and social norms campaigns.

Bystander Behavior Research

Bystander behavior is not only a current topic of interest in many fields of academic study, but it also confronts us regularly in the daily news. A *San Francisco Chronicle* story from July 4, 2007 reported a stabbing victim, LaShanda Calloway, lay dying on the floor of a convenience store and several shoppers, one who even stopped to take a picture with her cell phone, just stepped over her and continued with their shopping (Hegeman, 2007). A strong understanding of bystander behavior not only helps

such crime and law enforcement efforts, but bystander studies show relevance in other

settings, like in the workplace (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005), in the field of

psychology (Levine & Crowther, 2008) and in the field of education (Sokolow, Lisak, &

Banyard, 2007).

 To that end, much has been written on bystander behavior as a general

phenomenon and deservedly so. So relevant the subject, in fact, that several subtopics

have evolved within the overall body of literature, including child abuse prevention and

intervention (Mudde, Hoefnagels, Van Wijnen, & Kremers, 2007), prevention of grade

school bullying (Black & Jackson, 2007; Frey, Hirschstein, Snell, Van Schoiack Edstrom,

MacKenzie, & Broderick, 2005), crime prevention and reporting (Gottlieb & Schwartz,

1976), social norms, (Berkowitz, 2003), group dynamics (Levine & Crowther, 2008),

emergency response (Latané & Darley, 1968), and sexual assault prevention (Banyard,

Moynihan, & Plante, 2007).

 As indicated in Chapter I, research specific to bystander behavior widely indicates

that bystander involvement in dangerous situations is dominated by two primary

influences: external, or group bystander dynamics, and internal factors, which relate to

the individual beliefs and attitudes of the bystander. This part of the literature review will

examine in-depth the foundational base of theory related to bystander behavior research,

indicating how various theoretical approaches might inform and promote helping

behavior of college age bystanders involved in dangerous drinking situations.

Bystander Dynamics Related to a Group Context

As one explores the literature, various bystander terms and theories begin to emerge. At the core of bystander research is the "bystander effect" (Latané & Darley, 1968), which suggests that the more eyewitnesses to an emergency situation, the less likely the chance an individual bystander will intervene. All research related to bystander behavior begins with this seminal idea, and the work that followed in its wake either builds upon or further unpacks that initial concept.

One attempt to further understand the "bystander effect" is the idea of "social influence," which asserts, "a potential helper, confronted with a situation in which another may be in need of assistance, was posited to look to the reactions of others to help define the situation" (Cacioppo, Petty, & Losch, 1986, p.100). According to this view, the "bystander effect" is simply a function of bystander perception. If, for example, the bystander perceived others to respond as if the situation was an emergency, the bystander would respond correspondingly.

Likewise, in a study describing the process of "deindividuation manipulations and self-consciousness" (Becker-Haven & Lindskold, 1978), bystanders were tested using a control group of actors, who were instructed to be unresponsive to the emergency scenario. Bystanders in this study demonstrated a stronger likelihood to respond when alone than when in a room with these other non-responsive potential bystanders.

Related to this, "audience inhibition" argues, similarly, "bystanders who believe that others are aware of their presence may be apprehensive regarding others' expectations and evaluations of their behavior" (Cacioppo et al., 1986, p. 101). In other

words, a bystander demonstrates hesitance to engage in helping behavior due to fear of how she will be perceived by onlookers. Schwartz and Gottlieb (1980) also cited that because of performance anxiety, a bystander was less likely to help when he believed other bystanders favored intervention. Conversely, helping behavior from bystanders was enhanced when the bystander believed others felt helping was inappropriate, effectively removing any perceived performance expectations.

"Diffusion of responsibility" (Latané & Darley, 1970; 1968), which extrapolates the "bystander effect" hypothesis, contends that helping behavior is impeded by the presence of others, because the bystander feels less personal burden for providing assistance. As noted in Chapter 1, this theory posits that if only one bystander is present in a situation, he or she feels more obligated to respond, but if others are present, the individual responsibility to help is diffused among the other bystanders (Latané & Darley, 1970).

This study supports their earlier notion as well as the related concept of "social influence," which also reveals that the presence of others similarly inhibits bystander engagement. In like manner, "group inhibition" suggests, "…the mere perception that other people are also witnessing the event will markedly decrease the likelihood that an individual will intervene in an emergency" (Garcia, Weaver, Moskowitz, & Darley, 2002, p. 215).

A great deal of research germane to bystander study focuses attention on combating K-8 school bullying (Black & Jackson, 2007; Olweus, 1993; Smith & Brain, 2000). The universally accepted definition of bullying among children is repeated

exposure of one child to intentionally harmful actions of a single or group of youth (Olweus, 1993; Smith & Brain, 2000). According to this definition, an imbalance of power exists. "The bully is stronger through social status, physical prowess, age, cognitive abilities or skill" (Black, & Jackson, 2007, p. 624).

Researchers point to the widely-used training system of teaching bystanders to support bullied students and point to the key features of such training: (1) training young people to work together outside of friendship groups, (2) giving young people the opportunity to learn communication skills and to reflect on their own emotions in relationships, and (3) training young people to deal with conflict and to help peers relate to one another (Cowie & Hutson, 2005, p. 40). The steps of empathy, self-reflection, and skill-building seem relevant to broader audiences and might prove useful in designing bystander behavior in college age men as it relates to dangerous drinking situations.

In this relevant subset of bystander research, scholars point to the negative aspect of bystander intervention in grade school bullying. As noted in Chapter 1, bystanders to bullying occurrences often contribute to the problem by reinforcing the aggressive behavior (Frey et al., 2005). Others studies found that when peers intervened, the bullying stopped more quickly (Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001), which suggests that further bystander training and empowerment might reduce grade school bullying. Further, these phenomena may be useful in understanding bystander behavior among established college-age groups, like fraternities and athletic teams.

There is also a movement for bystander behavior research in the workplace, which may prove helpful in both understanding helping in non-emergency situations as

well as in identifying methods of soliciting future help. In a study about bystanders in

sexual harassment situations in the workplace (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005),

researchers developed a "typology of observer intervention behaviors" (p. 290) that

describes how the level of involvement of a bystander impacts his or her level of

intervention, similar to the aforementioned "role of commitments" concept (Schwarz et

al., 1980). For example, if the bystander is a close co-worker or holds a position of

authority within the organization, then he or she is more likely to intervene. The study

recommends continued research on observer intervention on aggressive workplace

behavior, including liability issues of "innocent bystanders" who choose to do nothing

about witnessed harassment.

Another related avenue of research that features bystanders as the catalyst for

positive influence is "social norms" theory. "Social norms theory describes situations in

which individuals incorrectly perceive the attitudes and/or behaviors of peers and other

community members to be different from their own when, in fact, they are not"

(Berkowitz, 2005, p. 193). Social Norms marketing might be used to passively challenge

attitudes that support binge drinking and might also be used to encourage engaged

involvement from bystanders. The impact of social norms theory on bystander

engagement, however, seems to be under significant debate.

Some researchers and practitioners, for example, view the approach as effective in

modifying drinking perceptions and, as a result, modifying dangerous drinking behavior

(Berkowitz, 2005). Other researchers, however, indicate otherwise. One study used a

randomized control trial, studying "the effects of a primary prevention social norm

intervention on binge drinking, and no differences were found between intervention

and control group in alcohol use and alcohol-use risk factors" (Werch et al., 2000, p. 4).

Taken together, the body of literature indicates that more research is needed to assess the

efficacy of the Social Norms approach to boost bystander engagement.

Bystander Dynamics Related to Individual Beliefs and Attitudes

Research points to a series of individual bystander characteristics related to

internal beliefs and attitudes that shed light on helping behavior. Particularly applicable is

the decision-making model designed by Latané and Darley (1968). In this model, the

authors posit that before one decides to intervene in an emergency situation, three things

must first happen: "he must first notice the event, he must then interpret it as an

emergency, and he must decide that it is his personal responsibility to act" (p. 220). The

authors note that at each of these decision-making crossroads, the bystander may fail to

recognize the emergency, may fail to interpret the event as an emergency situation, or

may fail to assume responsibility to step in.

In these scenarios, the bystander's indecision in whether or not to intervene

becomes a very concrete decision – not to help. Like their "bystander effect" idea, the

internal decision-making process described in Latané's and Darley's (1968) model has

been widely used in later studies involving bystander motivation, where it has been tested

in various experimental settings, like decision-making when in pairs or in larger groups

(Borges, & Penta, 1977; Choi, Nisbett, & Norenzayan, 1999; Clark & Word, 1974;

Darley & Teger, 1973).

"Confusion of responsibility" emphasizes not "…the responsibility a potential helper feels for helping a victim, but rather…the responsibility for harm doing the potential helper believes will attribute to him or her should he or she help the victim" (Cacioppo et al., 1986, p. 101). This study points to a different facet to bystander psychology: not performance anxiety, but a deeper notion of a bystander's self-image and desire to maintain a positive image with virtual strangers. The literature also describes a four-step model of bystander behavior, in which the bystander's actions are less altruistic than a self-serving attempt to reduce the unpleasant arousal of the stumbled upon emergency (Piliavin, Piliavin, & Rodin, 1975).

Scholars have actively explored the bystander phenomenon and related theories for the past 40 years, adding nuances such as "self-categorization" (Levine, Cassidy, Brazier, & Reicher, 2002), which suggests "…that intervention is determined not only by how many others are present, but by who those others are believed to be" (p. 1453). As a result, "the way in which bystanders categorize not only fellow bystanders but also victims of violence seems to determine their response to a violent incident" (p. 1459). So in essence, if bystanders interpret a victim as deserving of the negative experience, they are less likely to intervene.

Conversely, a recent study combined several of these ideas into one, using bystander theory and combining it with identity theory, social category theory, and helping after natural disasters (Levine & Thompson, 2004). This study found that helping behavior had more to do with respondents' *emotional* response to an emergency versus her social category, nationality, or geographic location.

A similar subtopic of bystander research includes the "role of commitments" (Schwarz, Jennings, Petrillo, & Kidd, 1980), where bystanders were tested on level of commitment to the victim in a situation where some bystanders were asked to watch the victim's belongings while they were away momentarily and others were not asked. The study found that those who were asked to assist in advance were more likely to intervene during an attempted theft of the calculator. Another nuance to this strain of bystander research is the "attenuating influence of gaze" (Valentine, 1980), which demonstrated that a gaze from the victim to the bystander increased helping behavior, versus situations when no victim-to-bystander eye contact was made.

The "apathetic bystander" (Clark & Word, 1974) is one who, after weighing the potential costs versus potential benefits of intervening, chooses not to step in. This concept is directly related to the "cost-reward model" (Piliavin, Piliavin, & Rodin, 1975; Walster & Piliavin, 1972), where helping behavior is dependent upon the bystander's perception of "what's in it for me?" A corresponding study combined the "cost-reward model" with "policy capturing" methodology, further illustrating how bystander behavior relates to individuals' decision-making processes (Fritzsche, Finkelstein, & Penner, 2000). This study affirmed the earlier notion that bystander response could be captured with respondents' view of cost of helping versus reward of helping.

Another recent study from European scholars (Fischer, Greitemeyer, Pollozek, & Frey, 2006) reexamined Latané's and Darley's (1968) original notion of bystander response in emergency situations, demonstrating evidence contrary to the 1968 study. Fischer et al. (2006) found that, when faced with dangerous and/or violent emergencies,

bystanders do, indeed, intervene. Further, the study asserted that in Latané's and Darley's 1968 study, the emergency tested (smoke flowing into a room) did not substantiate a "dangerous" or "violent emergency," and therefore elicited a like response in the bystanders involved. The study posits that had bystanders translated smoke flowing into the room as an actual emergency, they would have behaved differently.

Muddle et al. (2007) use a social-cognitive approach to identify ways to encourage non-mandated bystander helping behavior, using the "attitude-social influence-self efficacy (ASE) model" (p.129). This study "implies that bystanders do not simply change their helping behavior overnight, but go through different stages to achieve sustained behavioral change" (p. 129). This reiterates to educators that being an engaged bystander, for many, is a journey. These findings further suggest that one-time training sessions or workshops may not be sufficient to create the desired community-wide culture of active and responsible bystanders.

The review of literature related to specific bystander theory demonstrates that ideas abound and the topic is rife with information relevant to future research and for practitioners who wish to build programs to engage bystanders, college-age and otherwise. Taken together, various bystander theories provide a foundation on which to build intervention training. The next part of this literature review looks at such programs, and how they are informed by current bystander theory, further pointing to how such a theory base might inform research specific to college students involved in dangerous drinking situations.

Bystander Intervention: Current Practices

While there seems to be little to no current research or program development surrounding bystander behavior as it relates to alcohol intervention on college campuses, there is a good deal of work being done with bystander intervention in two areas: sexual assault (Banyard, Plante, & Moynihan, 2004; DeKeseredy, Schwartz, & Alvi, 2000; Foubert, 2005; Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriott, 1997; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987; Lisak & Miller, 2002) and bullying prevention (Cowie & Hutson, 2005; Frey et al., 2005). The next section of the literature review explores these areas of bystander research and intervention practices.

Sexual Assault on College Campuses

Research indicates that between 2% and 3% of female college students experience rape or sexual aggression during an academic year (Abbey, Ross, & McDuffie, 1996; Fisher, Cullen, & Turner, 2000). Reports further indicate, approximately 50% of college women experience some form of unwanted sexual activity (Abbey et al., 1996). Mohler-Kuo, Dowdall, Koss, and Wechsler (2004) reported "1 in 20 college women experienced rape since the beginning of the school year. Moreover, 72% of these rapes occurred when victims were so intoxicated that they were unable to consent" (p. 42).

A recent U.S. Department of Justice study estimated that a college woman has between a one-in-four and one-in-five chance of being raped during her college years (as cited in Fisher et al., 2000). Sexual assault on college campuses is a community phenomenon, and research suggests that campus climate plays a significant part in establishing and reinforcing rape-friendly cultures (Lynch, & Fleming, 2005).

Alcohol plays a pivotal role in creating and maintaining rape-friendly cultures on college campuses (Abbey, 2002; Abbey & McAuslan, 2004). Studies show that alcohol use is related to 50% or more of sexual assaults on the campus (Abbey, 2002; Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Mohler-Kuo et al., (2004) reported that "among those who experienced rape since the beginning of the school year, 72% experienced rape while intoxicated" (p. 40), and "certain women are at increased risk of being raped while intoxicated, particularly those who attend colleges with higher levels of heavy episodic drinking and who belong to or live in sororities" (p. 42). Related research indicates a variety of post-sexual assault mental health issues, including depression and post-traumatic stress disorder (Banyard, Williams, & Siegel, 2001).

Bystander Strategies to Prevent Sexual Assault

So who is responsible for sexual assault prevention? Historically the task of sexual assault prevention has been relegated to the most-likely victims: women. Banyard et al. (2004) state, "…women are victims far more often than men" (p. 62). The U.S. Department of Justice (2003) reported that nine out of ten reported rape victims in 2002 were female. Specifically, one out of every six American women have been the victims of attempted or completed rape, nine out of every ten rape victims were female in 2003, and 17.7 million American women have been victims of attempted or completed rape (RAINN, 2008).

Conventional prevention programs, however, focus on teaching women how to reduce their chances for being raped and how to escape or fight back during attempted, "stranger-from-behind-the-bush" assaults, largely ignoring men as potential allies

(Berkowitz, 2005). These measures, however, were generally ineffective in addressing acquaintance rape, which is the most common form of sexual assault (Schewe & O'Donohue, 1993). Further, these programs approached men only from the perspective of potential perpetrators. It leaves out a crucial component of male involvement in sexual assault situations: the non-perpetrating male on the sidelines of the party: the bystander.

Sokolow, Lisak, and Banyard (2007) suggest, "the path to prevention…is bystander intervention. We look to their peers and community and ask them to identify those whose behaviors are high-risk. We ask them not to be bystanders to the acts of aggression and trespass of the sex offenders. We ask them to intervene" (Sokolow et al., 2007, p. 1). In fact, such sexual assault prevention strategies have been shifting towards the male bystander for the past two decades.

"When Ms. Magazine published an article on acquaintance rape in October 1985, the editors received phone calls from men on campuses across the country who wanted to start rape-awareness programs" (Warsaw, 1994, pp. 165-166). More recently, a movement among sexual assault prevention programs is focusing on the bystander as an agent of change (Banyard et al., 2004; DeKeseredy et al., 2000; Foubert, 2000; Foubert & Marriott, 1997). This approach involves reaching bystanders with information and building skills on how to intervene in sexual assault situations.

Barone, Wolgemuth, and Linder (2007) identify the progress currently being made through training men as active bystanders in the fight against sexual assault: "male…students trained to recognize and intervene in rape-supportive environments will assist in reducing the incidence of sexual violence against all types of people on our

campuses. As men challenge their peers, the environment that allows sexual violence to thrive will change, though the process may be slower than desired" (p. 593).

One of the great strengths of a bystander approach is that it responds to the earlier-mentioned critique of the woman-centric model of rape prevention: this model gives all community members, women *and* men, a specific role they can adopt in preventing sexual assault. Training bystanders to intervene takes the logical next step beyond preparing potential victims and warning potential perpetrators and expands engagement to the broader community. The bystander role as it relates to sexual assault includes interrupting situations that could lead to sexual assault, speaking out against sexist language and behaviors, and being an effective ally to rape survivors. This approach is based on the notion that the larger community plays a key role in creating atmospheres that support sexual assault and is also integral to providing solutions (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2000).

Further results of engaging bystanders in sexual assault prevention include personal growth of participants in subject areas beyond just sexual assault.

> Results show that when men had a support group, they readily challenged their sexist environment and employed effective bystander intervention strategies. This research demonstrates that participants intervened by reclaiming 'cool' as non-hegemonic behaviors, articulating a counter-story to socialized traditional violent masculinity. Results also show that the participants understood the intersections of oppression, and intervened in situations where racial and homophobic slurs were used. (Barone et al., 2007, p. 593)

Barone et al. (2007) indicate the effectiveness of approaching men as potential allies, suggesting that by understanding the social context of oppression and its many intersections, male participants were able to impact their communities more widely.

Other potential bystander training themes are addressed in the sexual assault prevention literature, including: exposing false rape mythology (Fonow et al., 1992), creating interactive participation for intervention workshops (Gilbert et al., 1991), providing sex education through a feminist orientation (Foubert, 1997), and building empathy for assault victims (Lynch & Fleming, 2005).

Bystander Strategies to Prevent Bullying

Another example of ongoing work related to bystander engagement is in the area of bullying prevention. Bullying is an ongoing challenge in the world of K-8 education and has come into international prominence in recent years post-school shootings in Paducah, Kentucky in 1997 and Littleton, Colorado in 1999. Bullying is defined as being

> characterized by at least three criteria: (a) there is a social interaction between a child or a group of children (named bullies) who intentionally cause hurt to another child (named the victim); (b) this relationship is based on an imbalance of power (of a physical, psychological, social type) so that the bully is stronger than the victim or is perceived to be stronger; and (c) this aggressive and imbalanced relationship must occur repeatedly and overtime. (Farrington, 1993; Olweus, 1999; Smith & Brain, 2000)

Strategies to prevent or intervene in bullying situations have significant implications for influencing bystander behavior broadly. One promising bystander strategy used to reduce school bullying has potential relevance for engaging college bystanders in alcohol situations. The "Olweus Bullying Prevention Program" (Olweus, 1999; 1993) "…is one of the few evidence-based bullying prevention programs for schools. The BPP starts with a needs assessment to identify prevalence, types, areas and attitudes related to bullying" (Black & Jackson, 2007, p. 624).

As noted in other bystander program research and evaluation, engaging the broader community is crucial to building a strong bystander training program (Banyard et al., 2007). The BPP program utilizes this principle by involving not only the bully and the bullied, but also the entire community-at-large. "A coordinating committee, comprised of teaching and non-teaching staff and community members, uses the needs assessment data to develop school-specific implementation plans using the strategic BPP model" (Black, & Jackson, 2007, p. 624).

The school-specific BPP programs incorporate interventions for the entire institution, including each class and individual students. Core components of the program include: school rules against bullying, a bullying awareness day, training on improving student supervision, parent involvement, student input, and a system of positive and negative consequences. The needs assessment survey is repeated annually to evaluate success of the program (Black, & Jackson, 2007). This approach also holds concepts that seem relevant to a college age population, especially as it relates to building campus awareness on the issue of dangerous drinking (Sokolow, 2008), ongoing training for student peers (Banyard et al., 2007), and campus social norming campaigns (Berkowitz, 2005).

The final part of this literature review will examine current research directed specifically at dangerous drinking and undergraduate students, pointing to a current deficit in such research. This section will highlight the inadequacy of current research surrounding undergraduates in dangerous drinking situations, specifically noting that

current college alcohol education strategies focus primarily on the binge drinker and not those bystanders who might provide assistance and life-saving support.

Research and Practice Related to Bystanders and Dangerous Drinking

There are few studies currently available that connect ongoing bystander research to college-age dangerous drinking situations. In fact, current bystander research "…focuses much more on explaining and describing bystander behavior than on developing effective interventions to promote it" (Banyard et al., 2004, p. 69). Current practice in higher education reflects this void, as campus educational programming on dangerous drinking widely neglects the potential role of bystanders (Sokolow, 2008; Banyard et al., 2004). For example, in a *Campus Safety & Student Development* article from Winter 2007-2008, the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse only briefly mentioned educating student bystanders in one bullet point under the recommendations section: "engage students in reducing substance use and abuse among their peers through evidence-based peer education strategies" (National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse, 2008, p. 34).

The lack of current bystander training programs surrounding dangerous drinking situations presents both a problem and an opportunity. For educators, there is great promise in using the body of bystander literature to craft effective programming and training workshops to reduce dangerous drinking and related collateral damage (Banyard et al., 2004; Sokolow, 2008). This section summarizes current practice in higher education regarding responding to dangerous drinking patterns and reiterates the need for research in this area.

Current Practices Related to Dangerous Drinking on College Campuses

Since the NMDA in 1984, a traditional approach taken by college-level educators was to employ scare tactics to frighten undergraduates from using alcohol. This is evidenced in a textbook for first-year college introductory courses, *Your College Experience: Strategies For Success* (Gardner & Jewler, 1997). "College 101" courses have become widely-used for the past 20 years due to a demonstrated track record of helping with increased retention of first-to-second year students, improving graduation rates for participating students, and serving as a guide through the first year of college (Shanley & Witten, 1990).

The *Your College Experience* text devotes an entire chapter to informing students of the dangers of alcohol consumption, including such distressful factors as: the risk of becoming alcoholic, the loss of muscle coordination, the decrease of physical strength, and an increase in fatigue (targeted at athletes), the danger of drunk driving fatalities, and the impairment of memory. Given an understanding that students are less likely to receive such messages from faculty and administration (Tinto, 1993) and that binge-drinking trends continue to increase (Wechsler & Wuethrich, 2002), one can reasonably conclude that a more compelling, student-centered approach is necessary.

On a related front, colleges and universities are spending a great deal of resources enforcing current alcohol law (Durden, 2008). As a result, virtually every college campus has some form of alcohol abuse prevention strategy, with programs starting even before students arrive to campus.

> Colleges have become enforcers of policy and statute, to the extent that some suffer thousands of alcohol violations every year. Entire

bureaucracies have been created to address the most frequent campus conduct violation - alcohol. Entire bureaucracies have sprung up to study campus alcohol abuse. Cottage industries of programmers, videos, study guides and online education cater to
the crisis. (Sokolow, 2008, p. 1)

Loyola University Chicago, for example, hosts a program called "Binge Nation," which states in its mission, "…we are here to pull it [binge drinking] out of hiding and examine it under the cold, hard light of reason" (McManus, 2008, para. 4). The program offers web-based articles exposing the "binge culture" (McManus, 2008, para. 2) currently thriving on many college campuses, links students to alcohol-related resources, and provides ongoing campus programming that highlights education and support for students. Being relatively new, there is currently no available assessment material on the efficacy of Binge Nation, but it seems to hold significant promise related to peer-to-peer alcohol education and support.

Another program gaining momentum nationally, "Alcohol.Edu," is a multi-hour online program administered to students in a variety of contexts. The online alcohol education program takes several hours to complete, and most students work through the program in about two or three separate sessions. Topics span a variety of areas of alcohol use and abuse, and the program ensures that students pass a qualifying examination before being listed as completed. Many colleges mandate successful completion by first-year students before arrival to campus in the fall semester and some use the program as a mandatory sanction for alcohol-related conduct violations (*Outside The Classroom*, n.d.). Further, research hints towards evidence that this interactive web tool contributes to preventing high-risk student health behavior on college campuses (Wall, 2007, p. 692).

Potential Benefits of Bystander Training

Bystander training, while currently under-utilized, has wider implications for higher education beyond impacting dangerous drinking situations. Benefits also include positive potential for building campus-wide community. Relative to bystander research, there seems to be significant disagreement about the nature of community responsibility in the new Millennium. On one hand, researchers indicate that college campuses today face a crisis of community.

In the 2004 book, *College of the Overwhelmed: The Campus Mental Health Crisis and What To Do About It* (2004), authors Kadison and DiGeronimo point out the sense of competition rife among college students today (p. 36). They indicate that due to heavy peer competition, students are driven to placing overly-high expectations on themselves and are experiencing a mental and physical health crisis as a result. If Kadison and DiGeronimo are accurate in their assessment, then the development of bystander-specific, peer-to-peer support networks on college campuses seems crucial to the establishment of stronger, more supportive campus communities.

On the contrary, other researchers describe today's college students as "hard at work on a grassroots reconstruction of community, teamwork, and a civic spirit" (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p. 214). Howe and Strauss (2000) coined the generational term, "Millennials," to describe college students born immediately after "Generation X." The authors contend, "a new Millennial service ethic is emerging, built around notions of collegial (rather than individual) action, support for (rather than resistance against) civic institutions, and the tangible doing of good deeds" (p. 216). If Howe and Strauss are

correct, today's college students may already see themselves as engaged citizens, well-suited for training as bystanders who care about their peers and who would be willing to step-in when needed. Either way, both views indicate the significant potential of creating strong and engaged bystander support networks.

As indicated in Chapter 1, one might further surmise that men are a vital population for this area of study, as they are engaged in more high risk behaviors than women and are less likely to seek out help (Davies, McCrae, Frank, Dochnahl, Pickering, Harrison, Zakrzewski, & Wilson, 2000) and are less likely to seek medical care (Davies, et al., 2000). In relation to these factors, Michael Kimmel (2008) noted that college age men often live by the "Guy Code," defining the code as an environment where "…you can express no doubts, no fears, no vulnerabilities. No questions even. As they might say in Las Vegas: What happens in Guyland stays in Guyland" (p. 62). Kimmel uses the phenomenon of the "Guy Code" to illustrate the high risk of behavior in emerging-adult males, making undergraduate men an ideal population for this study.

Conclusion

The problem seems clear: college campuses are in serious need of a new approach to reducing dangerous drinking, and the bystander approach has been proven effective when utilized in other related areas, such as sexual assault prevention (Barone, Wolgemuth, & Linder, 2007). Ultimately, while there is a great deal in the literature on both dangerous drinking on college campuses and on bystander behavior, writ large, there seems to be nothing specifically on bystander behavior as it relates to dangerous drinking on college campuses. This holds great potential as a future topic of study and would

contribute greatly to the field of higher education and a stronger understanding of how

to better contribute to the success of college students.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Dangerous drinking continues to be problematic on college campuses today

(Gately, 2008), fueled also by a growing lifestyle of heavy drinking that begins in high

school (Chassin, et al., 2002). Research demonstrates that, for many students, college is

less about preparing for future leadership roles than it is about taking an extended

vacation from the rigors and responsibilities of adult life (Busteed, 2004, p. 15). Further,

researchers point to the growing necessity of effective intervention strategies (Sharma,

2008).

To this end, there is significant research in the area of bystander behavior (Garcia,

et al., 2002; Latané & Darley, 1968; 1970), which seeks to identify the motivations of

individuals who see dangerous behavior "…occurring but are not directly involved in the

incident" (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005, p. 288). Further, there is growing

evidence in related fields of the importance and potential positive impact of engaging

peer bystanders in prevention of bullying (Black & Jackson, 2007; Olweus, 1993) and

sexual assault (Banyard, Moynihan, & Crossman, 2009), among others, and this study

seeks to build upon this baseline bystander research to seek applications in the area of

bystander response of college men involved in dangerous drinking situations.

This chapter describes the research methodology used for this study, including a

discussion of the researcher and approach, a rationale for use of qualitative methodology, ethical considerations, and initial results of a pilot study. Further, this chapter describes the specific design of the study, including site selection and process of gaining access to study participants, interview protocols, and discussions on using the narrative data analysis method and the validity and limitations of this approach.

The Nature of Truth

Creswell (1994) indicates "Qualitative research is interpretative research. As such, biases, values, and judgment of the researcher become stated explicitly in the research report" (p. 147). Like Creswell, I view information as subjective in nature, and I believe that an individual's background, experiences, education, and beliefs work together to form a grid through which new information is filtered and interpreted. Due to this personal imprint on all information, two people can observe the same phenomenon and provide either similar or completely opposite interpretations. These interpretations are supported or challenged by one's continued experiences, community, and additional information, adding further nuance to the melting pot of ideas. I believe, therefore, that established principles of "Truth" are derived by patterns of agreement in perspectives over time and may change as people, ideas, and new information develop. In other words, conventional wisdom is often temporal and adapts to greater contexts, as people do.

My background includes a degree in literature, the study of which creates new interpretations by the close examination and analysis of setting, events, and character in the context of their literary environment. Additionally, a Master's degree in Counseling, with two years of supervised clinical training, has provided me a significant amount of

experience with identifying themes and assisting clients with interpreting experiences from family history, personal background, and various events in their lives.

Strauss and Corbin (1990) indicate that theoretic sensitivity develops from a number of places, including literature on the topic, professional experience, and personal experience. Further, the authors indicate that such sensitivity is derived from the pursuit of the analytic process itself. In other words, "Insight and understanding about a phenomenon increase as you interact with your data" (p.43). My personal and professional background, therefore, served as a strong foundation for my efforts to interview, record, and examine data that was derived through the study of bystander behavior.

Researcher Positionality

Strauss and Corbin (1990) point to the importance of discussing the researcher's background and personal experience involving the setting, population, and subject matter of bystander behavior in dangerous drinking situations. As an undergraduate at a large, Midwestern state university, I had numerous first-hand experiences as a bystander of dangerous drinking situations. My first bystander experiences occurred as a rank-and-file student, participating in various fraternity house and apartment parties where binge drinking was regularly taking place. In those instances, I did not step in to assist peers who over-imbibed. Instead, I remained behind the scenes, presuming that peers were "just drunk" and "knew what they were doing." Ignorant of the real dangers of alcohol abuse, I was complacent in allowing peers to "have their fun." While occasionally

imbibing myself, I never engaged in behavior that fits the various definitions of dangerous, extreme, or binge drinking.

Two years into my career at the university, I was employed as a Resident Assistant and held the position through the remainder of my undergraduate experience. After receiving my Bachelor's degree, I was offered a position as a Graduate Hall Director at the same institution while I pursued my Master's degree, and I was eventually promoted to a full-time Residence Hall Director a few years later. In these official helping roles, I participated in hundreds of hours of staff training and professional development, covering alcohol-related topics such as the physiological effects of alcohol and the collateral dangers of binge drinking, such as physical injury, sexual assault, and even death.

The training helped me understand the seriousness of dangerous drinking and the potential negative impact for those involved. In the course of regular work responsibilities, I experienced countless occasions of stepping-in on situations involving students and dangerous drinking. The professional staff training educated me on the necessity of intervention and furnished opportunities to practice confrontation skills. As a result, I became more comfortable with my role as an active bystander and became engaged during dangerous drinking situations beyond a professional sense of duty or only in work-related settings.

Currently, I oversee several campus operations at a small, private, liberal arts college that involve students participating in events with alcohol, including Greek-letter organizations, a student center pub, and off-campus dances hosted by various student

organizations. Further, I actively collaborate with the Office of Residence Life and the Health & Wellness Center to co-sponsor a number of annual alcohol education programs for the campus community. I believe the past 20 years of personal and professional experience surrounding this topic, from various viewpoints, have placed me in a unique situation to observe and explore the research question surrounding bystander behavior of undergraduate men involved in dangerous drinking situations.

It is important to note that I have a significant professional interest in this study. As a practitioner in the student services profession, I have first-hand experience with the direct damage and collateral fallout of dangerous drinking by college students on and off campus. I have developed numerous workshops and training sessions for students, staff, and faculty on the topic of campus alcohol abuse and have served as an expert in the field on various educational conversations surrounding the topic.

This fared well for the study at hand, as Strauss and Corbin (1990) indicate that, in order for discoveries to occur, "the researcher has to be thinking about the data – preferably be steeped in them, know a lot about the area under study. At the same time, he or she has to be puzzled or disturbed about some feature of those data or about their interpretations, so that questions and answers will be raised and sought" (p. 29).

Strauss and Corbin (1990) further indicate that, "…someone may come across a problem in his or her profession or workplace for which there is no known answer" (p. 35). In the course of ongoing work with undergraduate students, I am regularly confronted with myriad student responses to dangerous drinking, ranging from peer indifference to outright defiance of policy and safety. A significant understanding of how

students respond to dangerous drinking situations is seemingly unavailable. Nowhere in the hundreds of training sessions or in the related literature do researchers provide insight into the variables that motivate those involved in dangerous drinking situations to either involve themselves in the well being of others, or to idly stand by. This information seems crucial to building effective training and programming surrounding the topic.

At the outset of the study, it was my goal to meet, interview, and analyze both the engaged *and* the disengaged, undergraduate, male bystanders, comparing and contrasting the two types, cataloguing and describing their differences in the hopes of beginning a conversation about bystander attitudes within this population and how educators might use these baseline descriptions to identify desired skill-sets to be developed in first- and second-year men. What the study provided, however, was something different and surprising, yet possibly much more useful, overall, than my original plan.

Quite unpredictably, I met not one, engaged, male, undergraduate bystander throughout the interviews. I met seven college men, who, to varying degrees, displayed a detached attitude towards providing assistance to peers in dangerous drinking situations. This unforeseen circumstance in the study afforded me, instead, the opportunity to examine, deeply, the minds and hearts of college men, who remove themselves from responsibility in binge drinking situations. This appraisal uncovered numerous, interconnected themes related to disconnected, bystander behavior and offered a glimpse at three, typical disengaged bystanders, which will be described thoroughly in chapters four and five.

Qualitative Methodology

The Approach

In the book, *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques,* the authors list skills required for doing qualitative research: "to step back and critically analyze situations, to recognize and avoid bias, to obtain valid and reliable data, and to think abstractly" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 18). The qualitative researcher must have, therefore, "…the ability to maintain analytical distance while at the same time drawing upon past experience and theoretical knowledge to interpret what is seen, astute powers of observation, and good interactional skills" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 18). My background in the residence halls and counselor training proved extremely useful in allowing me to accurately interpret data gleaned from interviews.

A qualitative approach was used in this study for a number of compelling reasons. Creswell (1998) indicates that one selects a qualitative design first, because of the nature of the research question, which "…often starts with a how or a what so that initial forays into the topic describe what is going on" (Creswell, 1998, p. 17). This fit well with my initial questions surrounding motivations of college-aged male bystanders. Secondly, the author indicates that a qualitative approach is necessary when "variables cannot be easily identified, theories are not available to explain behavior of participants or their population of study, and theories need to be developed" (Creswell, 1998, p. 17). Since little is known about why undergraduate men respond or not to dangerous drinking by their peers, it would have been difficult-to-impossible to create a valid quantitative instrument or methodological design to explore this question.

Due to the nature of the topic, that is, exploring the individual experience of college students in various social settings, the research approach for this study is qualitative in nature. Specifically, the study uses a phenomenological approach in pursuit of establishing a baseline understanding of bystander behavior in undergraduate men involved in dangerous drinking situations. While the literature contains a good deal of research on bystander behavior widely, there seems to be a void on the specific topic of this study, traditionally-aged undergraduate male bystanders involved in dangerous drinking situations. As a result, there is no current theory or preconceived notion of what the data will likely suggest. Although detractors may suggest that data never be analyzed, but simply reported and allowed to speak for themselves, one might argue that qualitative research does just that (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 21).

As in grounded theory, "One does not begin with a theory, then prove it. Rather, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 23). This study, likewise, does not endeavor to prove or disprove any current theory. This qualitative phenomenological study represents an effort to utilize qualitative methods to uncover evidence on this topic. Creswell (1998, p. 15) defines qualitative research as,

> …an inquiry process of understanding based on distinct methodological traditions of inquiry that explore a social or human problem. The researcher builds a complex, holistic picture, analyzes words, reports detailed views of informants, and conducts the study in a natural setting.

The topic of bystander behavior in dangerous drinking situations, a social problem, lends itself to a qualitative investigation. Seeking out the narratives behind the

actions of bystanders sheds light on this important topic. Further, a phenomenological study "describes the meaning of the lived experiences for several individuals about a concept or the phenomenon" (Creswell, 1998, p. 51). A qualitative phenomenological investigator seeks to "set aside her preconceptions to best understand the phenomenon as experienced by the participants" (Creswell, 1998, p. 31). Setting aside preconceived ideas of the topic and staying out of the way of the interviewees' narratives are crucial in allowing the evidence to present itself. A qualitative approach, in the form of semi-structured interviews, is germane, therefore, to investigating the phenomenon of bystander behavior in this population and setting.

Other reasons for selecting a qualitative approach for exploring this topic include my background in English literature, which brings with it a certain skill level and interest in writing in a prose style. Further, and perhaps more significantly, this relational style of inquiry is relevant to the participants of the study, undergraduate men, and its intended audience, higher education professionals. Finally, this study was my first, significant research project, and the qualitative phenomenological approach emphasized my role as a developing and engaged learner, rather than unfeeling expert (Creswell, 1998, p. 18).

Pilot Study

Authorities in the field of qualitative study suggest that practice is essential in developing a skill set needed to undertake a serious research project. Seidman (2006) urges "all interviewing researchers to build into their proposal a pilot venture in which they try out their interviewing design with a small number of participants" (p. 39). As a result of such practice, Strauss (1990) suggests, "in time, almost anyone who so desires

should be able to reach sufficient level of skill and ease to do effective and useful research" (p. 25).

I began formulating this study in fall 2007. At the time, the broad idea involved bystanders to dangerous drinking incidents on campus. In seeking ways to narrow and refine the topic, Richards and Morse (2007) recommend doing an "armchair walkthrough," where the researcher selects a particular methodology and spends time "mentally going through the process" (p. 37) of such an approach. To that end, I conducted a pilot of a study on bystander behavior on college campuses under the close supervision of the professor in my Qualitative Methods course I was taking at Loyola University Chicago.

In building a foundation for research, the pilot study assisted in the development of the design, research questions, and analysis of themes emerging from the pilot. The study also helped me become familiar with the basics of conducting interviews, including timing, location, and even navigating the technical recording equipment during the interview and later in transcribing. Further, the pilot helped me to become familiar with the Institutional Review Board / Human Subjects process, including informed consent consideration and procedures (Appendix A, B, and D). Finally, the pilot study familiarized me with qualitative research methods, helping me gain confidence in my ability to initiate and complete a study of this magnitude.

The study allowed me to narrow the basic research question by allowing initial themes to emerge from the two interviews, including issues related to group-think, alcohol education, fitting-in / self-image, confrontation skills, and ideas of masculinity

and femininity. Further, the pilot study helped me to examine inherent limitations to this study, including the challenge of including other important variables, such as race, age, gender and sexual identity. Further, by interviewing students from my own campus, where I held a visible position in the administration, including oversight of various student life areas, I learned that interview subjects were less-than forthcoming in their answers, sometimes backing away from initial responses and over-thinking their accounts of binge drinking on campus.

Design of the Study

Site Selection

As I learned in the pilot study from fall 2007, I need to select an institution outside of my own to conduct this research in order to preserve the trustworthiness of the data collected in the interviews. I conducted interviews with students at a large, Midwestern institution with which I have no affiliation, formal or informal. In order to ensure the active social environment relevant to the subject matter, I selected an institution large enough to include a critical mass of full-time, traditionally aged college students, an active "Greek Life" program, as well as substantial athletics and residence hall programs.

Participants

Purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling occurs when "the investigator selects participants because of their characteristics" (Richards & Morse, 2007, p. 195). Further, "Good informants are those who know the information required, are willing to reflect on the phenomena of interest, have the time, and are willing to participate" (p. 195). Given

the specific nature of the topic of this study, I utilized purposeful sampling in selecting

interview participants. The institution itself was not the unit of measure in this study, but

rather the individual student and his experience as an engaged or disengaged bystander.

For these reasons, I selected a large (10,000-plus), private institution in the Midwest,

which has been in operation for over 100 years. In keeping with ethical research practice,

this research proposal was first presented to the Institutional Review Board of Loyola

University Chicago and then to the participating institution for review, which did not

require from me formal, documented approval for this research.

Criteria. Five core criteria guided the direction of this study, which sought to

learn from: a.) male undergraduate students, specifically, b.) first- or second-year men, c.)

in non-helping roles, d.) who were participants in a residence hall community, Greek-

letter organization, or athletic team. Further, I wished, also, to identify how diversity

impacts bystander behavior, and to this end, I sought e.) men from different racial and

ethnic backgrounds to participate in this study.

As noted in Chapter 1, data show us that men are engaged in riskier behaviors and

practice less healthy habits than women, (Davies, McCrae, Frank, Dochnahl, Pickering,

Harrison, Zakrzewski, & Wilson, 2000) and are less likely to seek medical care (Davies,

et al., 2000). Similarly, and as indicated in Chapter 2, Michael Kimmel (2008) noted that

college age men often live by the "Guy Code," defining the code as an environment

where emerging-adult males do not have the freedom to express doubts, fears, and

vulnerabilities. Kimmel uses the phenomenon of the "Guy Code" to illustrate the

isolation of college age males and underscores the power that male peers have over one

another. Given these factors, this study focused on the male, undergraduate bystander. Further, due to the specific bystander experience defined in this research, I solicited students who identified themselves as actually having witnessed situations where dangerous drinking was taking place.

My first assumption going into the study was related to the status of "upper-class" and graduate students. By virtue of their age and experience, these students are in "helping roles" by default, and will, therefore, be excluded from participation. To this point, I initially interviewed first- and second-year students only, as older students, juniors and seniors, I presumed, were likely to find themselves in mentoring or "helping roles" by virtue of their time and experience at the institution.

Further, one might reasonably assume that students in formal and informal helping roles may be more effective and engaged bystanders. Specifically, I assumed that students in a specific helping role may have access to special training on related topics and would, therefore, be better positioned to be engaged bystanders than their rank-and-file peers. Therefore, I was only interested in talking with students in non-helping roles at the outset of the study. By non-helping roles, I refer to those who do not serve in formal or informal positions where they are responsible for supporting or guiding peers. This would, therefore, necessarily exclude any students who are Resident Assistants, Peer Teachers, or those involved in "Ally" programs, where they are trained to provide support to marginalized peers.

A diverse population of students from all walks of life and backgrounds populates large college campuses. Size of institution, therefore, was an important factor in this

sample, as I was interested in utilizing a campus population with a critical mass of

student backgrounds and experiences, including a substantive residence hall system,

Greek-letter network, and Athletics Program. Further related to a diverse population, I

was specifically interested in examining how ethnic and racial identities might play a role

in bystander behavior.

Related to this, when seeking sources of data, "qualitative researchers maximize

access to the phenomenon they are studying and select cases in which it is most evident"

(Richards & Morse, 2007, p. 231). It is important, here, to identify another researcher

assumption involving students of marginalized populations, such as racial or ethnic

minorities and GLBTQ students. As one considers engaged bystanders, one might

reasonably assume, by virtue of their "minority" status, such students may have had more

opportunities to "prove," to defend, or to otherwise stand up for themselves, thus making

these students more likely to be more engaged bystanders. Keeping this in mind, this

study will not exclude such students, but will mindfully seek to examine these potential

key factors within the collected data.

Identifying and contacting participants. Rubin and Rubin (1995) list four key

themes surrounding participant recruitment, including "initially finding a knowledgeable

informant, getting a range of view, testing emerging themes with new interviewees, and

choosing interviewees to extend results" (Rapley, 2007, p. 17). Further, Marshall and

Rossman (1989) indicate the design "proposal should contain plans for appropriate entry

through formal and informal gatekeepers in an organization, whether the organization is

an urban gang or an Ivy League university" (pp. 63-64). I identified, therefore, an appropriate gatekeeper for this study.

At this institution, I identified a professional staff member in the Dean of Students Office who serves as the Director of Student Life. This person is connected to the aspects of student life that are most pertinent to the study (i.e., students in residence halls, Greek-letter organizations, and athletes) and proved a most suitable liaison between the various constituents of the institution and myself. This gatekeeper also served as my initial liaison with the institution, serving to assist me in identifying potential participants for this study.

I began by approaching this contact person in a face-to-face meeting, where I shared the synopsis of my study (Appendix C) and the criteria for which I was seeking. In this meeting, I specified that all potential participants needed to be at least 18 years of age. After securing the involvement of my selected liaison, I worked closely with this person to contact participants who met the criteria for inclusion in the study. This administrative liaison at the selected institution identified several pools of potential first- or second-year, undergraduate interviewees, including student athletes, students residing in the residence halls, students in minority-based clubs, and students involved in Greek-letter organizations.

The liaison sent the potential participants my letter of invitation and the response form via email. So I did not know the identity of these initial contacts, I was not copied or blind copied on these emails. As a token of appreciation for participant time, I offered a $15.00 gift certificate to the institution bookstore for participating students, and I

delivered the certificate to the participants at the outset of the interviews. In order to

ensure a variety of bystander experiences, I anticipated that I would need to interview

approximately 9 first- or second-year students from a wide-range of backgrounds. To

generate this number of participants, I utilized my liaison to invite (Appendix A and B)

10 students residing in the campus residence halls, 10 students involved in Greek-letter

organizations, and 10 student athletes.

Given my knowledge of this population, I believed it reasonable to assume that I

would not get a large response rate to the initial emails, and this assumption proved to be

correct. The Institutional Review Board at Loyola University Chicago approved my study

in early February 2010, and my liaison began contacting potential participants

immediately. Though the liaison's efforts were substantial over the next six months,

actual participants were slow-in-coming, trickling-in at an average of one participant per

month, starting in February. Several attempts were made over six months to increase the

sample size, including working with my liaison to recruit other professional staff

members within the Dean of Students division, including staff in Athletics, Greek-life,

and staff working with minority student organizations. I was also invited to attend a

leadership meeting for the Inter-fraternity Council to share information about my study

and to request assistance from student leaders.

Further, after each interview, I provided interview participants with a card with

my contact information (email and telephone numbers) to share with other potential

participants, who fit the desired demographic of the study. In order to maintain

confidentiality of potential participants, I described the characteristics of students I

sought to interview, and asked interviewees to consider sharing my contact information with peers they know who might be interested in being interviewed. I did not know whom participants chose to invite, but asked that invited students use the contact cards to contact me, directly and anonymously.

These additional efforts yielded few additional participants. In the few cases where this approach delivered further interviews, I utilized my extensive background in working with undergraduate students to screen for characteristics that match the objectives of my study, being careful not to "stack the deck" with any one predominant student type. That said, as participant response was sparse, I made two exceptions to my original criteria, interviewing an African-American junior, because he offered a key element of diversity and interviewing one senior, who agreed to discuss only his first- and second-year experiences in observing dangerous drinking.

Despite the lower-than-hoped-for participant numbers, I was encouraged by the substantive information shared by those who did provide an interview. The dearth of participants unexpectedly afforded me ample time to review and analyze interview content between each meeting, and as the interviews progressed through the spring and into the summer months, I began to see a clear and obvious repetition of themes surrounding bystander behavior of undergraduate men involved in dangerous drinking situations.

As the months progressed and data analysis continued, I was able to find substantive data surrounding themes related to bystander behavior in dangerous drinking situations. From these data, based on quotations from interview transcripts, emergent

themes began to appear. At this point, I began to reflect upon the notion of data saturation

and the necessity of further samples. As Jones, Torres, & Arminio (2006) indicate, the

> …concept related to maximizing data and sample size is called *saturation*. When themes or categories are saturated, then the decision to stop sampling is justified. Saturation occurs when the researcher begins to hear (or observe, or read) the same or similar kinds of information related to the categories of analysis. (p. 71)

This led me to suspect, after the fifth, sixth, and seventh interviews with no, new

concepts, that I may have reached sufficient sample size or a saturation of themes.

Further, Lincoln and Guba (1985) refer to this phenomenon as sampling to the point of

redundancy,

> In purposeful sampling, the size of the sample is determined by informational considerations. If the purpose is to maximize information, the sampling is terminated when no new information is forthcoming from new sampled units; thus redundancy is the primary criterion. (p. 202)

At this point, I reached out to the members of my dissertation committee for their input

and recommendations regarding sample size. Based on the evidence of theoretical and

thematic saturation, the committee agreed that seven interviews, indeed, seemed a

sufficient sample size for this study. Members of the committee provided guidance as to

the importance of thorough explanation of smaller-than-anticipated sample size and

granted permission to end the sample size at seven participants.

Data Collection

Interviews

Interviewing seeks the stories of others for the sake of a deeper understanding of

their experience. "Simply put, stories are ways of knowing" (Seidman, 2006, p. 7). The

foundation of in-depth, research-focused interviewing is the pursuit of identifying the meaning that lies beneath the individual's actions and behavior. Seidman (2006) provides a significant exploration of interview protocols, and I designed a semi-structured interview protocol based on his work.

Specifically, I developed a three-pronged interview (Appendix E) based on Seidman's guidelines (2006). The first part of the interview established the background of the participant, including family, social, and educational history, putting his experience into direct context of the topic. The second part of the interview allowed participants to recount specifics about their bystander experiences and reconstruct details of those experiences. The third and final part of the interview gave participants the opportunity to reflect on the meaning of their bystander experiences.

In order to navigate any potential interruptions or distractions surrounding the interview (Rapley, 2007, p. 18), I conducted the meetings in a private, quiet area familiar to the participant (Seidman, 2006, p. 49). Every interview was conducted in the university student union. With permission of participants, I used audio recording equipment, explaining to participants that recording interviews allowed me to be more actively engaged during the interview and not constantly jotting down notes. In order to avoid interruption or distraction, I turned off my cell phone and asked each participant to do the same through the duration of the interview.

At the outset of the interview, I reviewed the purpose and goals of the research, including the list of interview questions, providing ample time for participant inquiry and clarification (Ryen, 2007). Next, I asked the participant to review the informed consent

form (Appendix D), giving ample time for review and possible questions. I also shared with the participant that the interview will be transcribed and that the transcriber will sign a statement of confidentiality (Appendix F). Finally, I asked the participant to sign the informed consent form, reminding him that he is free to end the interview at any time. Upon the interviewee signing the form, I then began the recorded interview.

I informed the participant that the interview would last for approximately 60 minutes, and I kept careful watch to ensure that the interview stayed within the allocated time frame. On the few occasions when the conversation ran longer than the agreed upon time, I stopped at the 60 minute time frame and asked the participant for permission to continue the interview. In every instance, the participant was able to continue at that time and appreciated my respect of his time and busy schedule.

Narrative Data Analysis

Creswell (1994) indicates that there is no one-way to analyze data, calling the process "eclectic" (p. 153). As Creswell suggests, I analyzed data as they were collected, simultaneously collecting information, sorting data into categories, synthesizing the categories into an emerging narrative, and drafting the initial summary report (Creswell, 1994, p. 153). The process of analyzing, synthesizing, and interpreting the data as I moved forward informed and impacted successive interviews as I met with student bystanders, better informing and guiding each, successive interview relative to the research topic.

In discussing how qualitative research fits into scientific inquiry, Strauss and Corbin (1990) list the essentials of "good" science: "significance, theory-observation

compatibility, generalizability, reproducibility, precision, rigor, and verification" (p. 31). The authors further note the importance of creativity and connecting to the research personally, which "enables the researcher to ask pertinent questions of the data and make comparisons that elicit from the data new insights into phenomenon and novel theoretical formulations" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 31). My backgrounds in both the study of English literature and student services assisted me with creativity and connectedness to this topic.

As in the pilot study, I had the interviews transcribed. My field notes, which were completed immediately following each interview, made careful record of relevant environmental issues as well as important non-verbal cues from the participant. I then created a table to document notes, questions, observations, and emerging themes. After completing this task for several informants, I used first open coding, "where the researcher forms initial categories of information about the phenomenon being studied by segmenting information" (Creswell, 1998, p. 57). Within discovered categories, the researcher identifies common threads of ideas or themes, which illuminate the various possibilities within the category (Creswell, 1998, p. 57).

Next, I used axial coding, in which "the investigator assembles the data in new ways after open coding" (Creswell, 1998, p. 57). In this phase of data analysis, the researcher identifies a "central phenomenon" (Creswell, 1998), taking into consideration causal conditions that influence the central phenomenon, specific actions / interactions that result from the central phenomenon (including intervening conditions), and consequences for the central phenomenon (Creswell, 1998).

Through this process, I created a list of emerging topics and themes, organizing these into three categories: major / meta-themes, unique themes, and outliers. The interviews were designed to uncover a meta-theme common to the whole sample set, for example, related to participant likelihood to engage as a college bystander. A meta-theme in this example might be the participants' past experiences as a target of bullying in grade school or possibly a pattern related to the interviewees' family history. Next, I reviewed this list with new and previous data found in the interview transcripts, making note of trends, testing established themes to identify new topics as they emerged.

Unique themes (Creswell, 1998) are topics uncommon to the whole set, but are more specific to a subgroup. An example of this might be the race or sexual orientation of the interviewee as it relates to his willingness to be an active bystander. Finally, outliers are factors that seem inconsistent with the overall thrust of the data. Examples of outliers in this study might include unusual or random experiences of participants that render their response unusual or uncommon to peers, like childhood illness or a disability. Concluding this process, I grouped topics in related, meta-categories and unique themes, pointing to relationships among themes and making note of outliers, providing possible explanations when possible (Creswell, 1994, p. 155).

Ethical Considerations

Informed consent. Research participants have the right to know that they are participating in research and the right to be informed about the nature of the research. Further, participants have the right to discontinue involvement at any time (Ryen, 2007, p. 219). "This means providing them with information about the purpose of the

study…how the data will be used, and what participation will require of them" (Lewis, 2003, pp. 66-67). To demonstrate my commitment to informed consent in this study, I first reiterated to the institutional liaison that informed consent is crucial for this research, sharing with them the consent form (Appendix D). As indicated previously, the institutional liaison then worked with related staff at the institution to identify possible candidates for participation in the study. I supplied my liaison with a participant letter of invitation to participate in the study and a response form (Appendix A & B), and the liaison will email the letter to the identified students.

Confidentiality. Researchers are "obliged to protect the participants' identity, places, and the location of the research" (Ryen, 2007, p.221). To this end and as indicated earlier, I had no information on who received an invitation to participate in the study. Further, as I conducted the interviews, I used non-identifiable descriptors in my written report, including field notes, transcriptions, and the final report. I further ensured confidentiality by keeping participant details non-descript whenever possible and using pseudonyms for each interviewee and for his undergraduate institution. Additionally, I used a confidential transcriber to assist me with transcription of the interviews. Further, the transcriber signed a confidentiality agreement (Appendix F).

Trust. Establishing and maintaining trust is a crucial step in the qualitative research process in order to ensure the most accurate data possible (Ryen, 2007, p. 222). To create and foster a trusting environment with the participants, I began by using my institutional liaison and established faculty and staff contacts at the institution to recruit participants where the research was being conducted. The faculty and staff credibility

assisted in establishing a pattern of trust between the subjects and the researcher. Next, as it was relevant to do so, I was transparent with participants about my current professional role at a small, private college and clearly explained my ongoing professional interest in this topic. Finally, I carefully followed the consent and confidentiality steps as described above, being mindful of the needs of the participant during and after our interview was complete.

For example, when the interview is complete and transcribed, I employed member checking (Creswell & Miller, 2000) to maintain trust, where I emailed a two-page summary of themes found in the data, asking for participant clarification and verification of accuracy. It is important to note, here, that due to the nature of this topic as it relates to alcohol consumption by minors, I was prepared, during the interview process, to help ensure the safety of a study participant if the interview revealed immediate dangerous behavior from a participant. Though this didn't happen over the course of interviews, I was prepared to link the participant to the confidential counseling and health services at their institution (Appendix G).

Trustworthiness

"The fruits of an inquiry are also judged in large part by the soundness of the process by which they were generated" (Simmons & McCall, 1985, p. 91). Trustworthiness of completed research is directly linked to the methods involved in gathering and analyzing data. As with other qualitative research, validity and trustworthiness will focus less on generalizeability (Creswell, 1994) than on internal (Creswell, 1994; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 138) and supplemental (Strauss & Corbin,

1990, p. 52) validity, using both the data and the literature itself and various pieces of literature that fortify the veracity of the findings in the study. This section next describes methods that will be used to ensure trustworthiness of the study based on these standards.

Specifically, Strauss and Corbin (1990) state the importance of internal validation when identifying emergent themes, indicating, "these relationships can be compared against the data, both to verify the statement and to support the differences between the contexts at the dimensional level" (p. 138). For qualitative studies, the researcher focuses on implementation of the study as a means to achieve trustworthiness: "Was the study well conceived and conducted? Are decisions clear? Was sufficient evidence gathered and presented? Was the researcher rigorous in searching for alternative explanations for what was learned? Are differing interpretations put forward and assessed?" (Rossman & Rallis, 2003, p. 67).

To this end, I utilized triangulation as a means of applying necessary rigor to this study. "Triangulation involves the use of different methods and sources to check the integrity of, or extend, inferences drawn from the data" (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003, p. 43). Along with being used by researchers to validate data, triangulation is commonly used as a means for qualitative researchers to investigate consistency and conclusions drawn from data (Ritchie & Lewis, 2003). I triangulated data in this study, first, by the aforementioned practice of member checking the interviews (Creswell & Miller, 2000), which involves providing a two-page, theme synopsis to participants, asking for feedback and clarification to ensure truthfulness (Creswell, 1998).

Further, I triangulated data by comparing content with findings and observations from my extensive field notes, which were recorded in the research log. In this log, I recorded environmental issues and observations, including relevant, non-identifiable physical characteristics of participants, including interviewee non-verbal communication. I organized these field notes in a 3-ring binder, which have been kept in a locked cabinet in my home. Further, I have held onto my transcripts and audio disks in a secure, locked file cabinet in my home and will do so for two years following my study, after which all data will be destroyed.

In their book, *Naturalistic Inquiry*, Lincoln and Guba (1985) offer an outline for establishing baseline trustworthiness for a research study. The publication outlines four criteria for trustworthiness: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability. These criteria are described as they relate to this study.

Credibility. Creswell (1998, pp. 201-202) indicates the triangulation strategies of prolonged engagement and peer review as primary to assessing credibility in a study. Prolonged engagement refers to the practice of "building trust with participants, learning the culture, and checking for misinformation that stems from distortions introduced by the researcher or informants" (Creswell, 1998, p. 201). It is further noted, "working with people, day in and day out, for long periods of time, is what gives ethnographic research its validity and vitality" (Fetterman, 1989, p. 46). To this point, my current background as a practitioner in the field of higher education regularly places me amongst undergraduates on a college campus. Similarly, my 17 years of post-graduate professional experience have given me tremendous knowledge and understanding of this population.

Peer review "is the review of the data and research process by someone who is familiar with the research or the phenomenon being explored" (Creswell & Miller, p. 126, 2000). A carefully selected panel of peer reviewers provides support, challenges researcher assumptions, and asks relevant questions about the population, methodology, and conclusions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To ensure confidentiality, the peer reviewers did not receive any identifying factors of the participants, nor were they informed of the institution from where the interviews originated.

I used the practice of peer review or "peer debriefing" (Creswell & Miller, 2000) to confidentially share initial findings of the study with peers in the field. I utilized peer educators at a small, private, liberal arts institution: including teaching faculty and practitioners in the field of student affairs. The peer review consisted of sixteen professional staff members: twelve, from various offices within Student Affairs, including Residence Life, Judicial Affairs, Health & Wellness, Counseling, Campus Activities, and the Dean of Students, and four peers participated from the teaching faculty, including the Departments of Education, Communication, and Philosophy.

Dependability. Dependability involves "…researcher attempts to account for changing conditions in the phenomenon chosen for study as well as changes in the design created by increasingly refined understanding of the setting" (Marshall& Rossman, 1989, pp. 146-147). In essence, while the qualitative researcher may presume that "truth" is changing and occurs contextually, she or he also understands the importance of dependability in the research context. To assure dependability of this study, I employed

the aforementioned triangulation strategies of prolonged engagement, peer review, and member checks.

Transferability. In discussing the criteria for trustworthiness outlined by Lincoln and Guba (1985), Marshall and Rossman (1989) indicate that the burden of transferability "rests more with the investigator who would make that transfer than with the original investigator" (p. 145). This study utilized a representative sample of undergraduate men involved as bystanders in dangerous drinking situations. The descriptions of the interviews and the concepts that emerge have been described in rich and thick detail in the dissertation to provide the reader with sufficient information to which to apply the results of other studies of similar themes and populations. As noted earlier, the topic of bystander behavior has further implications in other unrelated fields, such as bullying and sexual assault prevention.

Confirmability. "Confirmability captures the traditional concept of objectivity…by stressing whether the finding of the study could be confirmed by another" (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p. 147). In other words, the confirmability of a study relies on whether or not the researcher was able to maintain impartiality and whether or not data are consistent with other related studies. Relating my findings to the current literature in related fields along with thoughtful collection and rendering of data support the confirmability of this research, particularly through careful recording and transcription of interviews, member checking, checking data relative to my extensive field notes, and through observations of campus areas where dangerous drinking occurs.

Limitations

"Another parameter for a research study establishes the boundaries, exceptions, reservations, and qualifications inherent in every study" (Creswell, 1994, p. 110). In other words, it is important to highlight the potential limitations of a study. First and foremost, as with all qualitative studies, researcher subjectivity and bias hold potential limitations. Creswell and Miller (2000) describe the role of the individual "lens" (p. 125) used by the researcher: her or his own perspective. To account for possible bias, Creswell and Miller (2000) indicate the importance of using a "second lens to establish the validity of their account: the participants in the study" (p. 125).

This was especially relevant to keep in mind both in the interview process, as I did not intend to be overly leading with interview participants, and this was also important to keep in mind when interpreting the data. Strauss and Corbin (1990) discuss the importance of "theoretical sensitivity" (p. 41) when making meaning out of data.

> Theoretical sensitivity refers to the attribute of having insight, the ability to give meaning to data, the capacity to understand, and the capability to separate the pertinent from that which isn't. All this is done in conceptual rather than concrete terms. It is theoretical sensitivity that allows one to develop a theory that is grounded, conceptually dense, and well integrated- and to do this more quickly than if this sensitivity were lacking. (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 42)

To this end, I carefully employed theoretical sensitivity, my personal and professional lens, as gleaned through my extensive professional experience to add strength to this study.

Another potential limitation involved the planned method for selecting participants, which involved utilizing an institutional informant to make initial contacts

and then networking from these contacts. This process confirmed the suspected possibility, first, of not yielding enough initial responses to glean a critical mass of data. Further, the aforementioned method of "snowballing" initial respondents to identify additional interviewees limited responses to established social circles, possibly impacting the data negatively. I sufficiently overcame this potential limitation by selecting from three separate and unique pools of undergraduates, including residence hall students, athletes, and Greek-letter organization members. Further, I used my background in working with this population to filter obvious redundancies.

Conclusion

This study adds to the literature on bystander behavior, sexual assault prevention, and crime intervention. Continuing bystander-related work in these fields, this study sheds light on a new subset in the study of the bystander phenomenon: undergraduate men involved in dangerous drinking situations. The methods for conducting this research and developing its design are based in well-established qualitative research principles. Further, the processes of identifying and selecting participants, of conducting the interviews, and of data analysis were carefully planned and ensured the ethics of the research and the trustworthiness of the results. As the investigator, it was my goal for this study to impart relevant information and insights to the field of higher education as well as to educators involved in educating young people in both alcohol awareness and the promotion of engaged citizenship. Further, the study identifies innovative approaches and interventions for educators across the spectrum who are interested in creating a more engaged and social justice-oriented campus community.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Researchers point to the growing necessity of effective intervention strategies in response to dangerous drinking among students on college campuses (Gately, 2008; Sharma, 2008). To this end, significant inquiry in the area of bystander behavior has occurred (Garcia, et al., 2002; Latané & Darley, 1968; 1970), which seeks to identify the motivations of individuals who see dangerous behavior "…occurring, but are not directly involved in the incident" (Bowes-Sperry & O'Leary-Kelly, 2005, p. 288). Further, growing interest exists on college campuses for stronger bystander engagement and response, both proactive and reactive, to the perennial issue of college student binge drinking ("Outside The Classroom," *Annual Research Summit*, 2010).

This study seeks to build upon baseline findings in the field to seek further applications in the area of bystander response of college men involved in dangerous drinking situations. This chapter begins with an overview of the participant demographics for this study and introduces each participant to the reader. Key findings are then described and discussed in the context of the research questions being explored, making comparisons with the reviewed literature and current practices surrounding bystander engagement. In this discussion, four emergent themes are discussed, (1) high school drinking behavior, (2) self-centered, male-centric perceptions of dangers related to alcohol, (3) alcohol misinformation and the perpetuation of "urban legends" among

college-age men, and (4) commonly-shared roadblocks to effective bystander

intervention. The chapter ends with a summary and discussion of a peer review and

member checking process.

Participant Demographics

Given the specific nature of the topic of this study, I utilized "purposeful

sampling," specifically selecting interview participants based upon their characteristics as

germane to the research (Richards & Morse, 2007, p. 195). For reasons outlined in earlier

chapters, the study focused on the individual, undergraduate, male bystander. The student

and his experience as an engaged or disengaged bystander was the unit of measure for the

study, and I selected a large (10,000-plus), private institution in the Midwest, which has

been in operation for over 100 years from which to draw my sample. To make contacts

with potential participants, I utilized an on-campus liaison within the Dean of Students

office. Four core criteria helped to guide the selection of participants, including, (a) male

undergraduate students, (b) ideally, in their first- or second-year, (c) in non-helping roles,

and (d) who are participants in a residence hall community, Greek-letter organization, or

athletic team. Further, to help discern how diversity impacts bystander behavior, I also

sought to interview men from different racial and ethnic backgrounds for this study.

I interviewed seven of ten students who initially expressed an interest in

participating. Three potential participants opted-out, with two not showing up to our

scheduled appointments, and one who mistakenly thought the study was an online survey

and stopped communicating with me upon clarification that the data were collected

through a face-to-face interview. I began reaching out to potential participants through

the university liaison in late January, 2010, holding my first interview in mid March. The

remaining interviews trickled-in at a sluggish pace through the remainder of the spring and summer months. By the end of July, I had seven completed interviews, with each interview lasting an average of 50 minutes.

The participant backgrounds in this study, as designated by individual participant, varied from "lower-middle class" to "middle class," to "upper middle class." Participants were primarily Caucasian, but within this population were first-generation American students, Christian/Catholic students, one African-American student, and one Jewish student. All students identified themselves as heterosexuals, and all but one of the participants had parents who were married. I allocated 60 minutes for each meeting, and the interviews took place in the student center of the university in a location selected by the student, usually a private corner of a lobby, where participants were able to speak freely.

The students with whom I spoke, whose names have been changed in this study in order mask their identities, were genuinely interested in this topic and had a great deal to share. I was caught off guard by the depth of personal detail the men were willing to reveal and how their lives seemed like "open books." In almost every interview, in fact, I needed to caution the student when he began providing names, locations, and specific, identifying information of people, groups, and organizations. As a result of their candor and enthusiasm, I am particularly confident in the integrity of the information they provided.

Table 1 summarizes the demographic characteristics of the participants in my sample. Seven male undergraduates participated in the study, and the majority were

second-year students with an average age of 20. There was a wide diversity of

academic interests among the participants with no, specific trend towards one area of

study.

Table 1. Self-Reported Participant Demographic Information (N=7)

Ethnicity	Caucasian – 6 African American – 1
Average Age Age Range	20 19 – 22
Sexual Orientation	Heterosexual – 7
Religious Beliefs	Jewish – 1 Roman Catholic – 3 Evangelical Christian – 1 Baptist – 1 Non-religious – 1
Socio-economic Background	Lower Middle Class – 3 Middle Class – 2 Upper Middle Class – 2
Academic Majors / Minors	Undecided Business Pre-Law Political Science / Psychology Secondary Education / History and Psychology Economics / Geographic Information Systems Journalism / Art Media and Video Game Design
Campus Involvement Areas	Campus Activities Board – 1 Fraternity – 5 Black Student Union – 1 Other Involvement: Intramurals and Music
Year In College	1st year – 0 2nd year – 5 3rd year – 1 4th year – 1

Participant Biographies

Michael is a Caucasian, heterosexual, Roman Catholic, 20 year-old second-year student with an undecided major from a suburban community. He describes his socio-economic background as "lower-middle class," his parents are married, he is the youngest of four siblings, and his parents have lived in the same suburb and home for their entire marriage. Michael describes himself as "dorky, but social," and a self-professed "smartass." Michael currently resides in a private apartment near campus. His co-curricular involvement consists of participating on the student programming / activities board.

Robert is a Caucasian, heterosexual, non-religious, 19 year-old second-year student with a Business major from the a suburban community. He indicates that his socio-economic status, growing up, was "middle class." His parents are married, he is the oldest sibling with a younger sister, and his family has lived in the same suburb and home for his entire life. Robert describes himself as "quiet and studious," but he also enjoys attending athletics and social events on campus. He currently commutes from home, and his co-curricular involvement consists of participating in his social fraternity.

Kurtis is a Caucasian, heterosexual, Roman Catholic, 20 year-old second-year student, who is planning to attend law school after graduation. He is from Houston, Texas and describes his socio-economic background as "upper-middle class." His parents are married, he is the middle of three siblings, and his family has lived in various locations, including overseas, during his lifetime. Kurtis describes himself as "studious and athletic" and currently resides in a single apartment near campus with his pet dog. His co-

curricular involvement consists of working out, intramural sports, and involvement with his fraternity.

Henry is a Caucasian, heterosexual, Roman Catholic, 20 year-old second-year student with a Political Science major from a suburban community. He describes his socio-economic background as "lower-middle class." Henry's parents are married, he is the youngest of triplets, and his parents have lived in the same suburb and home for their entire marriage. Henry describes himself as the "typical, suburban kid." He currently resides with other fraternity members in private apartments near campus. His co-curricular involvement consists of his fraternity and playing in a rock band.

Patrick is a Caucasian, heterosexual, Evangelical Christian, 21 year-old fourth-year student with a major in Secondary Education. He is from a suburban community and describes his socio-economic background as "middle class." Patrick's parents are married, he has one younger sister, and his family has lived in the same suburb and home for his entire life. Patrick describes himself as "nerdy and religious, but socially nimble," connecting easily with many different types of people. He currently resides in a private apartment near campus with other members of his fraternity. His co-curricular involvement consists of his fraternity and playing in a band.

William is a Caucasian, heterosexual, Jewish, 20 year-old second-year student with an Economics major from Denver, Colorado. He describes his socio-economic background as "upper-middle class." His parents were recently divorced, he has one younger sister, and until last year, his family lived in the same suburb and home for his entire life. William describes himself as an "athletic hippie" who gets along with a variety of people. He currently resides in an apartment above a bar near campus. His co-

curricular involvement consists of participating in his fraternity, but he is not exclusive to that social group.

Greg is African American, heterosexual, Christian / Baptist, 22 year-old third-year student with a Journalism major from a suburban community. He describes his socio-economic background as "lower-middle class," his parents are married, he has one sister and four step-brothers, and his family has lived in a number of suburbs throughout his life. Michael describes himself as "nerdy," and has a social circle of friends who are interested in computer games. He currently commutes from home. His co-curricular involvement consists of student organizations, Black Student Union and "Men of Color."

Table 2 summarizes demographic information specific to each participant, including details of background and interests of each student. While all interviewees were involved in more than one co-curricular activity, participants trended towards activity in social and fraternal organizations and social programs (i.e., attending campus programs and performances, participating in intramurals, playing in a rock band, etc.). Further, it's important to note that a significant degree of stated, demographic information is self-reported by the participants of the study and is, therefore, subject to their specific points of view (i.e., socio-economic status, etc.).

The data collection method for this study involved personal interviews that were guided by three major research questions, which addressed the following themes: (1) high school and college bystander experiences, (2) student background and personal history, and (3) definitions of dangerous drinking, including participant understanding of accurate alcohol information. The following discussion summarizes participant experiences

related to the research questions and draws comparisons with current literature and

"best practices" in the fields of student development and alcohol education.

Table 2. Specific Participant Demographic Information

Participant #	Sexual Orientation Race	Religion Major	Year-in-college Age	Involvement Soc-econ
Michael	Heterosexual Caucasian	Catholic Undecided	Sophomore 20	Prog. Board L. Mid Class
Robert	Heterosexual Caucasian	N/A Business	Sophomore 19	Fraternity Middle Class
Kurtis	Heterosexual Caucasian	Catholic Pre-Law	Sophomore 20	Frat./ I.M.s U.Mid Class
Henry	Heterosexual Caucasian	Catholic Poli. Sci.	Sophomore 20	Frat./Music L. Mid Class
Patrick	Heterosexual Caucasian	Evangelical Education	Senior 21	Frat./ Music Middle Class
William	Heterosexual Caucasian	Jewish Economics	Sophomore 20	Fraternity U.Mid Class
Mark	Heterosexual African American	Baptist Journalism	Junior 22	B.S.U. L.Mid Class

Data Analysis

The first step in the data analysis process was to use open coding (Creswell, 1998,

p. 57) to allow germane themes to identify themselves, naturally and without bias,

through the interview process. I accomplished this step by first taking notes at each interview, recording apparent issues and ideas "in the moment." Next, the interviews were transcribed, and I read through the transcripts while listening to the interviews again, which continued and refined the process of identifying themes as they arose. I next made a list of themes as they emerged, noting occurrences across the span of interview participants, in some cases noting solitary appearances, and in others, occurrences in all seven interviews.

After this, I identified the most commonly mentioned themes, linking them together into four themes, which are discussed, in detail and with participant quotations, in this chapter. These four themes are: (1) high school drinking behavior / parental involvement, (2) self-centered, male-centric perceptions of dangers related to alcohol, (3) alcohol misinformation and the perpetuation of "urban legends" among college-age men, and (4) commonly-shared roadblocks to effective bystander intervention.

The final step in data analysis, axial coding (Creswell, 1998, p. 57), allowed me to reassemble the data in a new, more informed way, by interrelating common themes, identifying central phenomena and taking into consideration the causal conditions that influence the central phenomena, the intervening conditions caused by unplanned events that may promote or interrupt the established momentum of development, and the contextual conditions, which consist of a culmination of circumstances, time, and place as they impact a person's growth and development. This step will be described in detail later in the chapter.

Data analysis began immediately after each interview, using open coding, which required me to create a list of initial emerging topics and themes (see Table 3). Table 3

provides an exhaustive list of bystander themes that surfaced from the student

interviews. The table lists the themes first by category and description and then lists the

rate of occurrence for each.

Table 3. Open Coding: Bystander Behavior Themes, by Theme and Occurrence Rate

Theme	Description	Number of Occurrences
Bystander inhibitors	Poor / lack of alcohol information	7
	Bystander assistance not always requisite, but situational (i.e., gender, friends, etc.)	7
	Everyone should be responsible for themselves	7
	College men aren't focused on learning how to be "helpful" or on long-term choices, but on the present / partying / having fun	7
	College men are focused on physical results of dangerous behavior (i.e., fighting, vandalism, physical injury), not health and safety (i.e., alcohol poisoning)	7
	Sufficient to "get that guy out of here" / away from party = success	5
	Fear of being "that guy," or the "buzz kill." Social pariah.	5
	Fear of "crying wolf"	5
	Competitive nature of men is exacerbated with alcohol	5
	"We're not doctors." It's not my role	1

Table 3. Open Coding: (Continued)

Theme	Description	Number of Occurrences
Potential dangers	Drunk driving	6
	Fighting	5
	Falling / injury	4
	Alcohol poisoning / stomach pump / lungs / organs stop / death / choking on vomit	3
	Sexual assault of a woman	2
	Embarrassment	1
	Alcoholism	1
	Health-related issues (disrupted sleeping, shaking, etc.)	1
	Trouble with the law	1
Gender differences	Men feel more responsibility to help a woman	7
	Male bystander is less inclined to help another man	7
	Exception: if a woman brags about her drinking behavior, bystander is less inclined to help	1
Myths	Unconscious victim will be okay if he lies down and is checked-on a few times	7
	Put an unconscious person on his stomach, and he will be "okay"	5
	After a victim vomits, he is "safe"	5

Table 3. Open Coding: (Continued)

Theme	Description	Number of Occurrences
Parental expectations	Parents play an active part in student choices in high school	7
	Absent parents create opportunities for dangerous drinking in high school	5
Teasing	Dangerous drinking is an opportunity to tease / mock other men	7
Bragging Rights	Amount of alcohol consumed is an opportunity for bragging / status	5
Residence Halls	Residence hall staffing structures / policies inhibit dangerous behavior	4
Accurate information	Incoherent = hospital	1
Moment of clarity / responsibility	Student engages in sensible response to dangerous drinking	1

Table 4 provides an integrated list of exhaustive bystander themes, organized into three categories: major / meta-themes, unique themes, and outliers. Meta-themes (Creswell, 1998) are concepts common to the whole sample set. For this study, themes were identified by commonality among the participants and direct relevance to the topic, writ-large. Unique themes (Creswell, 1998) are topics uncommon to the whole set, but are more specific to a subgroup or phenomenon. For this study, unique themes were identified by not only number of occurrence in the transcripts, but also related to participant context. For example, in this study, every participant discussed "gender differences" in describing theirs' and others' bystander behaviors, but responses were nuanced by situation and context.

Outliers are factors that, while not consistent with the overall thrust of the dataset, seem relevant to the conversation and assist with understanding of the overall topic. In this study, for example, an outlier included uncharacteristic moments of responsive bystander behavior from one of the participants, Henry. This outlier, while not common to the entire set, assisted in understanding the topic as a whole. As I moved through each, successive interview, I reviewed the list, comparing new and previous data, making careful note of trends and testing "established" themes, and observing new topics as they emerged.

This step in the data analysis process helped to identify the four, main sets of key findings for this study. Further, it helped me to better understand unique themes related to how gender identity / gender roles may impact bystander attitudes and resulting behavior, as well as identify related outliers, which seem important to note, but less obviously relevant to the direction of the identified themes of the study.

As I continued the process of integrating the data, the four themes emerged (see Table 5), each possessing unique and related sub-themes. All emergent themes are richly described in this chapter, using documented content from the student interviews, being careful to establish the trustworthiness of the study through triangulation methods (i.e., relating the findings to current literature, peer review of findings, and inviting participants to review a summary of the research findings).

Table 4. List of Bystander Themes: Meta-Themes, Unique Themes, & Outliers

Category	Related Theme
Meta-Themes	• Parental Involvement / High School • Potential Dangers of Binge Drinking • Myths and Misinformation • Bystander Inhibitors / Roadblocks
Unique Themes	• Teasing / Heckling Male Peers • Gender Differences
Outliers	• Bragging Rights / "High Tolerance" • Moments of Clarity / Responsibility

Table 5 provides a summary of coding results, stemming from the open coding process, which include alcohol use in high school and parental involvement in underage drinking, student perceptions of dangers related to binge drinking, widely-held misinformation about alcohol safety, and shared roadblocks to effective, peer-to-peer bystander intervention.

Significant Findings Addressing Study Research Questions

The interview protocol was based on three research questions that guided this study: (1) How do engaged, traditionally-aged, college male bystanders describe their bystander experiences up to and including college attendance (i.e., K-8 education, physical education classes or "recess" times, athletic teams, etc.)? (2) What factors in participant backgrounds (i.e., personality, economic status, family history, etc.), either support or challenge active engagement in bystander situations? (3) How does participant definition of "dangerous drinking" and knowledge of pertinent alcohol information impact their bystander engagement? My analysis identified four sets of key findings over

the course of the seven interviews. The next four sections describe the emergent

themes related to each research question and to undergraduate, male response to

dangerous drinking situations.

Table 5. Overview of Open Coding Results

Theme One: Parental involvement / high school alcohol use	- Binge drinking began in high school - Parents as co-conspirators in underage drinking - Taboo nature of drinking may encourage misuse
Theme Two: Self-centered, male-centric descriptions of related dangers	- Drunk driving - Injury and fighting - Alcohol poisoning - Vandalism - Sexual assault widely ignored
Theme Three: Alcohol misinformation / "urban legends"	- Just leave victim on his stomach, and he'll be fine - Just walk away; he'll sleep it off - Every man for himself / opportunity to ridicule
Theme Four: Roadblocks to effective bystander engagement	"Bystander effect" and themes found in the literature - Disconnect between information and action - Youth culture saturated with binge drinking - Fear of "crying wolf" - Lack of empathy for the victim - General ignorance of accurate information about alcohol safety - Inadequate assessment of alcohol poisoning

Question One: High School Drinking / Parental Involvement

High school age binge drinking. One recurring theme in the interviews, related to the first research question, which asked how engaged, traditionally-aged, college male bystanders describe their bystander experiences up to and including college attendance, involved conversations about when participants first began drinking, which, for all seven participants, started in high school. Six out of the seven interviewees described situations where they were given access to alcohol, either by their own parents, or by parents of friends. In these instances, almost all underage drinking was unsupervised and led to detrimental results. As Robert shared,

> I've seen college drinking, but it's pretty contained, in regards to what people do, as opposed to high school students. It just seems like high school (students) go, like, wilder. They have nothing to fear, or nothing to worry about. Where, here in college, what you do may impact your life.

Parents as co-participants in underage drinking. When asked if any parents knew about drinking at the house parties in high school, Michael indicated, "(A friend's) mom did, but a lot of times, she would know it was going on, but she wouldn't be there; she would be out somewhere." Another participant, Kurtis, indicated,

> Drinking was completely acceptable. Parents were fine with it. We were drinking beer or wine in the house. Generally, the rule was, "when you walk in, give me your keys, whether you have one glass or ten, you don't leave my house until I deem you okay to drive in the morning."

In essence, parents in these situations assisted their underage children and their children's friends to "drink responsibly," or, put more bluntly, when providing alcohol to underage friends of their children, to break the law "responsibly." Kurtis continues,

> Parents were fine with it, because many had the mindset that they prefer us to learn how to drink responsibly in a somewhat controlled environment

that they can ensure that they can end it as quickly as they allow it to happen. They made sure nobody goes overboard.

In defense of this point, study participants who drank in high school indicated that this early, semi-supervised experience with alcohol helped them not to over-drink in college, stating that, by imbibing in high school, the phenomenon of drinking was "demystified" for them. Kurtis indicated that his high school experience with parent-condoned drinking prevented him from going too far in college when he was on his own, stating,

> They (parents) were fine with it, which was surprising, but also (the reason) I don't go out every night, now, and get completely hammered. I never really hit that stage (in high school) where it was taboo, and "Dad will take the belt to you if you get caught drinking." I think it definitely had an impact (on me).

These interviews underscore findings in recent studies (Abar, Abar, & Turrisi, 2009) demonstrating the efficacy of parental involvement in controlling or escalating underage, high school drinking, as indicated by one student, William, who stated that he had little high school drinking experience, due largely to parental influence: "Well, my mom doesn't drink, ever. I mean, she doesn't touch alcohol." William further described how, later in college, his lack of knowledge and experience with alcohol led him down a dangerous path,

> The first time I ever really got drunk, like, that was dangerous, because I didn't know there was a limit to how much alcohol you can drink, and it was, like, "Oh, sure, I'll do, like, ten shots in half an hour, that sounds like a good idea." I mean, that taught me pretty well.

William's experience substantiates a popular notion from alcohol educators that a lack of alcohol education from parents, when students are still living at home, may create a

naivety regarding alcohol use and abuse, when their children reach college age (Richter, 2003).

Self-identified socio-economic status of participants' families pointed to another trend regarding parental involvement in underage drinking. In situations where parents were identified as "lower-middle class," parental involvement followed accordingly: the parents were only peripherally aware of the underage drinking, acquiescing to the activity, but physically absent during drinking occasions. Usually, underage participants in this context would gather at the home of a family with only one parent. In these situations, the one parent was at his/her place of employment. Further, in these scenarios, unsupervised, underage drinking almost always involved both beer and hard liquor, as Michael indicated, "whatever you could scrounge up," and almost always led to intoxication and destructive or dangerous behavior (i.e., vandalism and/or toxic drinking).

In situations where parents were identified as "upper-middle class," parental involvement in drinking behavior was more active. In these occurrences, parents were present at the drinking occasions, coordinating the drinking experiences in advance by communicating with other parents about the drinking behavior and securing verbal permission. In the latter context, supervised, underage drinking did not lead to destructive or dangerous behavior, and underage participants were limited in the amounts of alcohol consumed. Conversely, none of these scenarios involved consumption of hard liquor by underage participants.

Early in the interview process, the second participant seemed to show significant promise regarding effective bystander response when asked to give an example of an effective bystander response to over-drinking. This participant, Robert, shared his

perspective of an ideal bystander, describing his idea of how one might effectively

intervene in a binge-drinking situation,

> …someone comes up and calmly says, you know, you're – "it's getting
> out of hand, and you've got to stop drinking. Drink this water, sit down,
> and stay relaxed," like, "don't drink for a little bit," or something like that.
> If people watched out for each other and just, like, slowed down the
> pace…

Conversely, throughout the remainder of the interview, Robert indicated that he had

never, in fact, engaged in this level of responsive behavior in dangerous situations, opting

instead, to stand back and watch what others do. As I moved through the interviews, it

became apparent that, among the seven participants, there was not one, single student in

the group who could be classified as an "engaged" bystander. In fact, only one student,

Henry, articulated an experience at a party where he was involved in getting a college-

age woman help. He described,

> She was drinking more, more, and more, and it eventually developed into
> where she was incoherent and stuff…once we noticed it, we stopped her
> from drinking, obviously, and then we were trying to see if she's okay,
> whatever. Then she obviously wasn't, so we are going to bring her to the
> hospital; we aren't going to leave her there, so someone took her to the
> hospital. I guess they pumped her stomach, or something, and that's the
> last I heard of that.

> In this instance, however, Henry wasn't acting as an "engaged bystander," but

was simply complying with guidelines as prescribed by the "Risk Management Chair,"

another student in the fraternity, who received specific training from the staff of his

national fraternity. Henry described the chain-of-command, demonstrating significant

trepidation for contacting the upper levels of leadership in the fraternity,

> We have a (student) Risk Management Chair, we have a (student)
> President, and we have a (adult, alumni) Chapter Advisor. You are
> supposed to (in the case of an emergency) notify this person, first (Risk

Management Chair), then this person (Chapter President), then this person (Chapter Advisor), and this person (Chapter Advisor) is the *last* person you want to notify!

Henry indicated that the response, in this example, was predicated not by his instincts, but by strict fraternity policy and extensive training. This suggests that, while perhaps not the cultural norm for this population, traditionally-aged college men are, indeed, capable of responsible thinking around this topic and may only need additional prompting to put these ideas into action. Henry's fraternity-trained, automatic response also seems to bode well for the notion that training programs may also be helpful in developing even rote skill-sets for undergraduate men in the area of bystander response to emergencies.

Question Two: Self-Centered Perceptions Of Binge Drinking Dangers

This study's second research question explored how factors in participant backgrounds, including personality, economic status, and family history, either supported or challenged engagement in dangerous situations. While the research sample, described earlier in the chapter, represented some diversity in terms of participant backgrounds, the interviews revealed an overall consistency regarding a lack of engaged, bystander response. While one might, arguably, presume that a student's background would factor significantly in his level of bystander engagement, the data did not provide a clear pattern demonstrating such a connection.

This might indicate that specific, student background has little impact on a college-age male's sense of engagement when confronted as a bystander in an emergency drinking situation. That said, an absence of observed pattern does not, necessarily, indicate the lack of connection between participant background and ensuing bystander activity. Important findings related to the second research question involve noteworthy

examples drawn significantly from participant backgrounds and experiences, which are described in detail below.

Featured prominently in this study was a self-centered perspective of each participant as it related to the notion of responsible, bystander engagement. As demonstrated across the interviews, participants shared an overall lack of empathic response to male peers, as well as a self-focused, socially-based concern for how they might be perceived by other bystanders. This supports the current research on bystander behavior, widely, which labels this performance-based anxiety, "audience inhibition" (Cacioppo, et al., 1986, p. 101), where the bystander fails to respond effectively, because he fears he may not "perform" to the approval of the bystander audience.

As part of the interview protocol, each participant was asked to list his view of all potential dangers related to dangerous drinking. As indicated earlier, their responses were largely drawn from their backgrounds and experiences that respond to the second research question. Of the seven students interviewed, significant congruence was found among them about the most significant dangers, ranging from minor fights and trouble with the law to long-term injury and death. With little exception, however, the men listed dangers from a male perspective, taking little account of potential harm related to women. The most commonly listed dangers of binge drinking are listed below, in rank order, with most-cited, listed first.

Drunk driving. The most often noted danger related to binge drinking by participants was drunk driving; six of the seven students interviewed listed it first in their lists. This response seems to bode well for the efforts of "Mothers Against Drunk Driving" (MADD) and similar community organizations, which have provided

significant education and public service announcements over the past 30 years

(Mittelman, 2007). Interestingly, while the majority of participants listed drunk driving as

the top danger related to over-drinking, they also noted that it was rare. Michael stated,

"Drunk driving…I don't really see it. We (college students) all have U-passes…(but) it's

a big thing in the suburbs; I can tell you that much."

Injury and fighting. The next, most-mentioned dangers related to binge drinking

were injury and fighting. Kurtis indicated that drinking games bring out a competitive

response in men and adds alcohol to the mix, creating a situation rife for peer-to-peer

violence, stating, "I've seen things happen and come way too close, like, friends getting

physically aggressive with each other as a result of a stupid beer pong game or flippie cup

game" (two popular drinking games among college students). William mentioned both

drunk driving and injury in his list, recalling a story of a friend from high school,

> Him and his friends were really drunk, and he decided to drive, which he
> did a lot…he drove off the road, the car flipped, and his friend, who was in
> the passenger seat, wasn't wearing a seat belt and got ejected from the car,
> and it rolled over his legs, so now he is in a wheel chair.

This example was an anomaly among the interviews, as most examples of injury shared

by participants, similar to those depicted in popular movies and culture, were of little-to-

no permanent consequence, like the example shared by Kurtis, who recalled an example

of an injury from an unknown source,

> A few weeks ago, another kid I know (had) …a huge golf ball size bump
> on his face and cuts. I'm pretty sure he just ate it somewhere and doesn't
> remember. Same kid passed out and fell asleep on a car. It was three in the
> morning, and he was just so tired, wanting to go to bed.

Most participants referenced the tendency for men to become more physically aggressive

after over-drinking, indicating that this phenomenon often sets the stage for fights.

Speaking from the perspective of the victim of such an attack, Kurtis reported, "I feel like there are so many different possibilities for bodily harm (due to drunk fighting), or just emotional damages that come as a result from being attacked."

Alcohol poisoning. Only three of the seven students interviewed listed alcohol poisoning as a potential danger related to binge drinking. The participants gave a variety of names to alcohol poisoning, including, getting one's stomach pumped, choking on one's own vomit, having one's organs stop, and even death. Michael indicated,

> I've heard about that story, the University of Colorado kid who, like, drank too much, and they threw him on the couch in the frat, and they couldn't call the ambulance, because their whole party would have been busted for underage drinking, but he ended up drinking so much that his lungs just stopped.

The few men who listed alcohol poisoning as a potential danger to binge drinking shared a common disconnect between knowledge of the danger and sense of appropriate response. Sometimes, they indicated a serious lack of understanding of the telltale signs of poisoning, indicating "danger" only if a victim is having a seizure or some other extreme symptom, but did not include vomiting and/or lethargy as symptomatic of alcohol poisoning. Robert stated,

> Um, like, if they start showing signs of alcohol poisoning. So, like, if they were having a seizure or something like that, definitely…if someone is (merely) lethargic, we would give them water, like, a lot of water.

This commonly-held disconnect between symptoms that indicate danger, and appropriate emergency response, demonstrates a serious and potentially dangerous problem in peer reaction to binge drinking situations.

Vandalism. Another identified danger related to binge drinking was vandalism of property, which included automobiles, apartments / homes, and personal property. Kurtis described one situation,

> I went over to a friend's house, and when I was coming back, it was late at night, and he was belligerent and thought busting holes in his walls with a golf club was a funny idea…he completely destroyed their living room, and a couple grand worth of "sheetrocking" (needed) to get redone.

In the interviews, participants often cited examples of vandalism as humorous or harmless, going into significant detail about the damage done and how the bystanders, especially the men, cheered-on the behavior, essentially exalting the perpetrators to hero status. More than one student described such escapades in larger-than-life terms, as if these will be highlights of their time in college or simply examples of what men are expected to do in college.

Sexual assault. Only two of the seven participants listed sexual assault as a possible danger of binge drinking. When asked about dangers, Michael quickly shared male-centric examples, like fighting and vandalism, and he thought for a full minute, finally stating, "Ummmm…unless it's, like, falling and hitting your head, I don't really see anything else." Another interviewee, Robert, when pressed to list another potential danger beyond violence or driving while intoxicated, thought for several moments and replied, "I can't think of others."

In another instance, Michael described his "intervening" in a dangerous drinking situation with the following,

> We had this whole party, and, like, I don't know, this girl had drank way too much. She was out on this deck, getting into everyone's faces, you know, all this stuff. So my intervening consisted of me tapping her on the shoulder, telling her she had a spill on her shirt, and then when she looked

down, I went, 'Boo!' and hit her in the nose. I felt like that would be a way to calm her down, you know, whatever.

This participant seemed completely unaware of the concept that a male stranger approaching a woman, uninvited, and touching (or as Michael indicated, "hitting") her nose might not be perceived as aggressive, threatening behavior. The woman in this scenario responded in what appears to be a fearful manner, Michael continued,

> …to which point she responded, hit me back, and I was, like, "No," and then at that point, it was, like, my cousin and a couple of my friends from back home…we told her…friend…we were, like, "You two need to leave. You need to get her out of here."

The participant went on to indicate that he wasn't sure if that counted as an effective intervention to dangerous drinking, but defended his behavior by indicating, "Everyone should be responsible for their own actions."

One of the students who did list sexual assault as a danger related to binge drinking, Mark, identified that alcohol can lower one's response time and resistance to dangerous situations, indicating,

> I think sex would be the biggest danger (of over drinking), really, because I know that, like, when people are drunk and under the influence, they let certain inhibitions go when they are drinking.

In this instance, the participant indicated that the person drinking is solely responsible for the effects of alcohol and letting their inhibitions go. Similarly, when discussing sexual assault as a danger of binge drinking, Kurtis, recalled,

> I mean, you get (a woman saying)… 'I woke up with a text from somebody saying I got in a cab with some random guy last night'…the biggest issue I see for women is they get too drunk, and they end up going home with guys they don't know. They put themselves in dangerous situations that can easily be avoided.

Another common thread in the interviews, as demonstrated in this example, is that

the few participants who even listed sexual assault as a potential danger of binge

drinking, tended to place the sole responsibility of preventing assault on the over-

drinker. In every example from this study, this was a woman.

Question Three: Participant Definitions of "Dangerous Drinking"

The final research question of this study, regarding participant definitions of

"dangerous drinking," seemed to yield the most direct connection to student response in

binge drinking situations and eventually led to two additional key findings for this study,

"Popular Alcohol Misinformation / 'Urban Legends'" and "Roadblocks To Effective

Bystander Engagement." Student definitions of dangerous drinking played so

prominently a role in congealing the data, they seem to warrant specific discussion as an

introduction to the final two findings. While no agreed-upon definition of binge drinking

exists, in 2009, the Illinois Liquor Control Commission published seven, physical

symptoms of dangerous drinking / alcohol poisoning, which included:

1. Unconsciousness or semi-consciousness.
2. Slow breathing – 8 breaths or less a minute, or breathing that stops for more than 8 seconds at a time.
3. Cold, clammy, pale, or bluish skin.
4. Does not respond to being talked to, or even shouted at.
5. Does not respond to being pinched, prodded, or poked.
6. Cannot stand up.
7. Rapid pulse rate.

While participants in this study recalled a number of these danger signs in their accounts,

their ideas of what constitutes "dangerous drinking," were, ultimately, as wide and varied

as the definition proves nebulous. Their descriptions included both physical symptoms of

over-drinking, as listed in the Commission's listing, above, as well as signs of impaired mental capacity. Michael defined dangerous drinking as imbibing,

> …to the point of puking. That's dangerous. Whatever it takes to make you puke is dangerous, because obviously what your body is telling you, that NO, this shouldn't be in me.

Similarly, Henry defined dangerous drinking as it relates to physical responses to alcohol, "If they are not responding, even if they look like they are sick…different color skin, or something…breathing irregularly, throwing up a lot." Both definitions share a common theme: a dependence upon one's ability to recognize and interpret physical signs of dangerous drinking, not construing the symptoms as merely a mundane, benign occurrence at a college party, which, based on participant interviews is, how the symptoms are more often perceived.

A few students included both physical and non-physical symptoms in their definitions, including mental and behavioral signals of excessive drinking. Patrick indicated,

> …binge drinking would be like drinking to the point where you get sick, you vomit, to the point where you make really stupid choices…it's drinking to the point of puking, is kind of, generally to me, is binge drinking.

Other students focused more on behavioral symptoms of over-drinking, Robert stated "I think of someone that drinks so much, they have no common sense, no judgment, they would go out and do really stupid things and even drive." Kurtis echoed behavioral symptoms in his definition,

> …(when) you've had so much in which you are not able to be coherent and actually understand your surroundings and make smart judgments on what you are supposed to be doing, where you are supposed to be going, and how you are supposed to be acting.

Similarly, but more extreme, Mark's definition of over-drinking was linked to severe, behavioral signs, indicating that binge drinking has occurred "…if a violent act occurs when a person is under the influence." He continued,

> I would consider that to be dangerous drinking: if someone were to be under the influence and would want to assault somebody, both physically and sexually, then I would consider that to be dangerous drinking.

When pressed if violent behavior was the only symptom of dangerous drinking, Mark responded with another severe example,

> I mean, also…not only if a violent act would occur, but also if, when the person is drinking, if their well-being is being threatened. Like, if they become really sick, or if they pass out, and when you go to check their pulse, you won't be able to feel their pulse or their heartbeat.

William defined dangerous drinking as, "…drink(ing) to get drunk. Like, drink to that point where I was so inebriated, that I couldn't function, like, in any capacity." These conceptualizations of reaching this level of danger share a dependence upon successful bystander observation and interpretation of described, erratic behavior, made more difficult when other participants may also be drinking to various levels of inebriation.

One could contend, however, that student definitions like these lack efficacy in actually preventing significant numbers of alcohol related trauma or death, because they recognize symptoms too late. According to the Illinois Liquor Control Commission (2009), a person may be in danger of long-term physical injury related to alcohol poisoning even after they stop drinking, stating, "…even after you stop drinking, your body is still pumping the last few drinks into your bloodstream. So your blood alcohol level won't stop rising for a while" (Illinois Liquor Control Commission, 2009).

Taken together, participant definitions provide helpful insight as to what an undergraduate, college male considers "the point of no return," as it relates to dangerous drinking. The men seem able, on one level, to accurately identify a number of telltale physical signs of alcohol poisoning to various stages, from obvious signals (i.e., vomiting, loss of consciousness, etc.) to more subtle signs of danger (i.e., skin discoloration, erratic breathing, etc.).

Some researchers (Wechsler & Kuo, 2000, p. 61) might argue, however, that these student definitions collectively fail, because of their dependence upon external and often acute evidence of over-drinking, which in many cases, may find the victim already passed the point when his vital systems are shutting down (Illinois Liquor Control Commission, 2009). Further, the men interviewed in this study collectively seemed to lack awareness of this key concept, as well as a demonstrated track record in responding appropriately to this level of intoxication. This finding might cause one to defend Wechsler's et al. (1995) controversial definition of binge drinking, because it focuses not on symptomatic expression of danger, but on amount of alcohol consumed, a key factor these student definitions, collectively, fail to consider.

The next two themes, "Popular Alcohol Misinformation / 'Urban Legends'" and "Roadblocks To Effective Bystander Engagement" are discussed below and also directly relate to the third research question regarding student definitions of dangerous drinking, including participant understanding of accurate alcohol information.

Popular alcohol misinformation / "urban legends." The Illinois Liquor Control Commission (2009) lists three steps to take if one thinks another person has alcohol poisoning. At the top of the list is to get professional, medical

assistance immediately, by calling "911." The second and third steps on the

Commission list are to turn the person on her/his side to prevent vomit from

getting caught in the airway and staying with the person until professional,

medical help arrives. The Commission (2009) identifies common "myths"

surrounding safe response to over-drinking, including, "cold showers," "black

coffee," or "fresh air."

Through the course of interviews, I observed a series of similar, commonly held

beliefs about effective alcohol safety that were, either completely false, or only partially

true. In every case, these beliefs, or "urban legends," about alcohol use and safety, passed

down from one generation of college student to the next, might prove extremely

dangerous, should they prevent students from more thorough and responsible action.

They are listed, here, in order of frequency of appearance throughout the interviews.

Place unconscious victim on his stomach, and he will be fine. The first, and

most commonly instituted, myth about responding to an over-drinker was described by

Michael, who indicated that rolling one on his stomach is the best known and utilized

safety measure.

> Whenever people drink too much, and they are laying down or
> something…like, I can tell you this, like, 99 percent of the time, there is
> always going to be someone there, who is, like, "put them on their
> stomach…don't want to end up like Jimi Hendrix."

This response is perpetuated by stories surrounding the 1970 death of musician, Jimi

Hendrix, who allegedly asphyxiated on his own vomit (*Rolling Stone Encyclopedia*,

2001, p. 429) after a drug and alcohol overdose. While the Illinois Liquor Control

Commission (2009) does indicate the important safety measure of placing an overly

intoxicated person on his or her side, it does not, necessarily, guarantee the overall

safety of the victim. Michael continued in his description of this oft-held notion of a

"safe" response to over-drinking, detailing the steps of laying the person, facedown on

the floor or on a bed, with a glass of water and a bucket to collect vomit, stating,

> Occasionally, everyone would just check-in, you know, every 5 or 10
> minutes…just be, like, alright, see lungs moving, you know, make sure
> there is, like, a bucket or bag (to catch vomit). So every once in awhile
> change the (glass of) water…make sure it's full. Whatever.

Another student, William, described his bystander response when a guest over-drank,

recalling,

> He was passed out on my living room floor, and then, he was going to
> puke, so we kind of lifted him into the bathroom…so (after he vomited)
> we kind of got him out of the bathroom. He was, like, "I don't want to
> move," like, "I'm alright here; that's all I'm doing," so we gave him a
> pillow, and he just sat on the floor. While he was half asleep / half passed
> out on the floor, he started puking on my floor…then, like, we gave him a
> blanket, we gave him a little bowl (to catch vomit), and we left him
> there…

In defending his response to overdrinking, William echoed Michael' poor understanding

of a safe and reliable response to this dangerous situation, stating,

> …you give him or her, I guess, you know, like, you find them a place
> where they can either sleep it off, or a waste bin, if they are puking, or a
> few times you force people to drink water, just because they clearly went
> at it too fast; it's just not healthy.

The surprising aspect of these accounts is the apparent disconnect in the described

responses. On one hand, the bystander effectively identifies a dangerous drinking

situation, but his response demonstrates a clear inability to grasp the appropriate level of

emergency response: to get the victim immediate, medical attention (Illinois Liquor

Control Commission, 2009). When asked to describe an effective response to toxic

drinking, Michael further illustrates this finding, listing the popular undergraduate

process of responding to over-drinking: putting the victim on his stomach with a vomit

pail and glass of water, to which he then pointed out,

> Yeah, but you'll never know if it (the bystander intervention) was effective until the next day, you know? Um, I would hate to be someone who lived in that frat house in Colorado and found out (their friend was dead), but at the same time…we're not doctors.

Just walk away / "he'll sleep it off." Another recurring sub-theme in the

interviews involved participants observing dangerous behavior and abdicating themselves

from any responsibility by simply walking away. One participant, Kurtis, described his

response to his roommate's dangerous drinking, with the following,

> I came home to my dorm room last year, and my roommate completely trashed the entire room and messed up all my stuff, because he was just drunk and pissed off about something…He was passed out; I just went and slept somewhere else, because I was not in the mood to deal with it.

Kurtis further elaborated on the condition of his room and his roommate,

> in his bed…it was a bit of a shock when I walked in, and I saw everything. Bunk beds moved probably a good three feet out of the way, papers all over the place, sheets thrown off the bed. It looked like a bomb went off. He was passed out and completely oblivious to anything…halfway in his bed and halfway on the floor. He didn't plan on going to sleep like that. I closed the door and just walked right out.

In this example, Kurtis was witness to an acute case of over-drinking, and his response

seemed to take into account only his own perceptions and needs (i.e., being

understandably frustrated at the state of his room and angry at his roommate's destructive

behavior). In this situation, the bystander ignored the obvious, potential physical dangers

of his roommate's toxic drinking, not even checking to see if his roommate was

breathing; he simply walked away.

Opportunity to ridicule friends. Every man interviewed for this study shared a common experience and attitude that over-drinking is an opportunity to ridicule their male friends, sometimes in a manner meant to be good-natured and "harmless," and at other times, in a fashion meant to embarrass and insult. When recalling an example of a response to a male peer who drank to toxic levels, one participant, Mark, described how he and a friend provided a running commentary for the crowd as this man, an acquaintance, was doubled-over and vomiting in a wastebasket. He remembered,

> This one guy and I were talking about it (intentionally in earshot of a man who was vomiting from cocaine use and over-drinking at a party), and we were saying, like, how not smart it is to do drugs and then drink alcohol. We were also talking about how, like, people don't know how to drink now a day. Both of us were, like, "why would you snort cocaine and then come here and drink alcohol? It makes no sense."

When asked what other bystanders were doing at the time, Mark responded, "I guess they were doing the same thing, too."

In some instances, the "good-natured" teasing seemed anything but friendly. When asked what would have been his response to a good friend over-drinking, Michael shared a response that both denigrated women and perpetuated a binge drinking college culture, stating,

> We probably would have given him shit. We probably would have, like, "Oh, what's the matter?" You know? …just, like, tell him things, just like, "What's the matter? You can't hold your liquor? You a woman?" …or something like that…treating him like shit.

In response to the aforementioned, overly intoxicated peer, who was clubbing holes into an apartment wall with a golf club, Kurtis, shared,

> …the guys who were already there were just sitting there and laughing. It was one of those laughs where there was nothing else you could really do, but laugh, because they knew he was going to end up paying for it.

Another common example of response to male, peer over-drinking is an action that is sometimes used with "friendly" intent and at other times, as an act of malice towards the victim, as William put it, "…the classic, like, marker stuff, there was a lot of, 'you mess with the kid'." In William's example, "marker stuff," includes writing on a victim's face in permanent, black marker. In most cases, bystanders write sexually suggestive phrases and/or homophobic-oriented jabs on the person's forehead or around his mouth. Photographs are then taken and shared among friends and acquaintances, and in some instances, posted on "facebook."

When referring to a time when a peer was drinking excessively and slurring his words, William indicated that making fun of the drunk person became part of the "fun" of the party, "…there was definitely a culture about it, like, perpetuating it, absolutely." In this example, William pointed to the social phenomenon of identifying the "clown" of the party, oftentimes known for his over-drinking and status as the "life of the party." William added, conversely, that men often respond differently when the victim is a woman, indicating,

> It's much different between the sexes in that, if you see a guy passed out, and it's funny, and you see a girl passed out, and people are trying to wake her up to find out who she is: "Can I get you a cab?" "Can we do something to get you home safe?"

Roadblocks to effective bystander engagement. The final theme in the study, "Roadblocks To Effective Bystander Engagement," seemed to respond to all of the research questions for this study, as it touched upon not only previous bystander experiences, participant background and history, and also student definition and understanding of dangerous drinking, but it also illuminated and

supported a good deal of the literature and research surrounding bystander

behavior.

"Bystander effect" and related themes from literature. One theme from the

literature review looms large in the interviews: the notion of "bystander effect" (Latané &

Darley, 1968), the theory that suggests that bystander intervention is hampered in

anonymous situations, when the number of eyewitnesses is greater. One participant,

William, recounted the response to an inebriated, male peer at a large, apartment party,

describing the aforementioned practice of taunting the intoxicated male peer,

> …you mess with the kid. I would say that was mostly for bigger parties. I
> would say with the smaller parties, you take care of the guy, and chances
> are, you know him.

William later relayed,

> It's times when someone, who, either I wasn't close with, or there were
> people who were closer to them there, or I absolutely did not know them.
> You go to a party and see somebody passed out on the couch; you've
> never even seen the person before. They are just laying there, and I'm not
> going to, you know (reach out to help the person), I mean, it's a bad
> culture, I guess, but it's just, like, I mean, I guess that's just what you do.

Another participant, Mark, when recounting a situation where he was a bystander and

opted not to help, explained his behavior similarly, with,

> I didn't know who they were; that's the main thing (reason why he didn't
> help)…If I'm around people I don't know well, I'm not that comfortable
> around them. Like, I have to be around a person more and more to really
> establish that comfort level with them, because usually when I meet
> somebody for the first time, I don't get comfortable with them just like
> that.

This description perfectly reveals, in a real world example, the previously

mentioned "bystander effect," as well as the related concept of "social influence"

(Cacioppo, Petty, & Losch, 1986), where the potential helper looks first to the reactions

of others to define the parameters of helping, and in this case, the zeitgeist of the

crowd was to interpret the potential emergency as an opportunity for teasing.

Another concept from the literature review that mirrors the interviews is

"diffusion of responsibility" (Latané & Darley, 1968, 1970) and "group inhibition"

(Garcia, Weaver, Moskowitz, & Darley, 2002), which both suggest that the mere

perception of other witnesses will cause a significant decrease in responsive, helping

behavior. One participant, Patrick, illustrated this notion accordingly,

> I mean, generally, if it's, like, somebody we don't know at a party, it's
> just, like, 'get them out of here.' A lot of times, we feel it's not really our
> problem; we'll get them in a cab and, like, get them home, just because
> it's a liability on our part, and you know, we don't know this guy, so that's
> kind of how it is when we don't know him.

This description also brings into focus the "role of commitments" (Schwarz,

Jennings, Petrillo, & Kidd, 1980), where bystander engagement is determined by the

level of commitment to the victim in a given situation. Patrick continues, "If it's someone

we know, generally, we, like, try and get him home or send somebody," which perfectly

describes a stronger commitment, and thus stronger helping response to friends, versus

strangers.

Disconnect between information and action. Students interviewed in this study

demonstrated a consistent disconnect between their knowledge of effective, bystander

action and a demonstration of such informed behavior. William, in describing what it

would take for him to actually intervene, shared,

> I think it would take a lot for me to really call an ambulance, to be honest.
> I feel like that's a whole other step that I don't know if I would ever… I
> mean, I'm sure, like, if someone is bleeding or something, but I really
> don't know where the line would be for me, if I see someone standing up
> and then they are on the ground (unconscious). That would be a red flag

for me, but I'm not quite sure what it would be, what it would need to look like, that I would call the ambulance for someone.

Anonymity equals disengaged response. Related to these themes is the idea that anonymity seemed to exacerbate low response rate described across the interviews. In describing a situation where he did not step in to assist a peer who was overly intoxicated, as indicated earlier, Mark succinctly replied, "I didn't know who they were; that's the main thing," going on to explain that he does not feel comfortable assisting people he does not know well. Similarly, William indicated,

> I think drinking is much safer when you know everyone there. I know, myself and my friends, I mean, we aren't the hot-headed types, but at big parties, you see so many fights. There is, like, a "keg stand" thing (which is a drinking activity where a person is held by both feet, upside-down, while they drink as much beer as possible while the spectators perform a mass-countdown, cheering on the drinker to consume for as long as possible from the keg spout) and there is, you know, I mean, like, we will play drinking games, whatever, but, like, I mean, there is just, like, a whole other level of things that my group of friends don't go to, but you see it at the larger parties.

Consistent across the interviews and as mentioned earlier, when the victim was unknown to the male, undergraduate bystander, he never intervened. William continued discussing times when, upon reflection, he realized he should have stepped-in, but didn't, because he didn't know the person who had over-imbibed.

> I'm really trying to think about times when I should have stepped in, but I feel like it's, like, it's times when someone who, either… I wasn't close with, or there were people, who were closer to them (at the party), or I absolutely did not know them…

Participants in this study consistently reiterated the earlier noted bystander theory, "bystander effect" (Latané & Darley, 1968), demonstrating by their experiences how anonymity increases the potential for lack of engaged bystander behavior.

Lack of empathy and perceived responsibility. Midway through the

series of interviews, another theme began to emerge involving a low-level of empathy of

undergraduate men towards their peers. As Kurtis described,

> So many of my peers don't necessarily look at the ramifications of their
> actions or think of what they want to do in ten to fifteen years. They don't
> necessarily care, "oh well, I really should look out for a friend,
> hammered." A lot of them don't necessarily think in those terms, which I
> think makes your job (as an educator working to assist undergraduates
> become engaged, responsible bystanders) much more difficult…to
> actually get them to listen.

As mentioned earlier, Mark, shared the experience he had where, instead of empathizing

with a peer who was demonstrating signs of alcohol poisoning as well as potential

overdose of illegal drugs, he and a friend chose to idly sit back, watching the peer

vomiting and providing amused commentary.

Related to an overall lack of empathy for their peers who over-drink, student

participants consistently demonstrated a detachment from sensing a need to intervene in

dangerous situations. In one instance, Michael seems to express a sense of obligation, or

at least awareness that one should help, but indicated that it is, ultimately, "every man for

himself," as it relates to primary responsibility, stating,

> I kind of feel, like, everyone should be responsible for their own actions.
> Obviously, you want to help when you can, if you want to help, obviously.
> It's not an obligation to help, is it really that much out of your day to help?
> No. It's not, like, your life is totally ruined by checking-in on other people,
> or something like that, you know? I don't know. It all depends on how
> selfish and unselfish you are.

Fear of "crying wolf." Social status proved to be commonly important among

the participants in this study. These undergraduate men were perpetually sizing up

situations in terms of their ability to help or to harm their social standing among others.

When pressed about erring on the side of caution when responding to dangerous

drinking, Michael was concerned about potential, negative impact on his social reputation

if he over-reacted, stating,

> …we can't be expected to know these things and at the same time, we
> can't be expected to, like…we don't want to be the boy who cried, "This
> person drank too much," because what if it's, like, "Oh, this person is just
> really drunk"…you know?

Another student, Patrick, shared this concern, indicating a significant amount of fear

involved with being perceived as the party-killer, "You are not really going to stop it, per

se, because that's, like, if they are fine, then it's, like, you are the jerk, and you are just a

'buzz kill'." He continued,

> …they just don't feel like it's their place to do it, you know, like, I really
> wouldn't want anyone doing that to me (calling an ambulance
> prematurely, without necessity). Then you earn the reputation of being a
> 'buzz kill,' too. You've kind of got the social aspect (of being perceived as
> "not cool" by peers) of it, too.

In this example, the student cared more about his perceived social standing and reputation

among his peers than in providing potentially life-saving, bystander support.

Youth culture saturated with glorified binge drinking. Regularly throughout

the interviews, participants shared numerous stories of a youth culture steeped in binge

drinking, which points to concepts related to the second research question, about

participant background and history. Kurtis indicated,

> You've got bars with drinking games going on, and you can do any of that
> sort of…I mean, most guys I know are naturally competitive, and when
> that mixes with some sort of drinking game, it turns into aggressive
> behavior – the more and more they drink.

Birthdays and youth rituals surrounding celebrating birthdays also loom large,

relative to dangerous drinking in college. William pointed out that these occasions are,

essentially, tantamount to binging, stating,

> It's basically, like, it's your birthday, you are *supposed* to be drinking,
> like, it's your birthday, and you are *supposed* to be drunk. I mean, it takes
> many forms, like, some kids refuse to end the night, until they've had as
> many shots or beers as years as they are old, or, like, I mean, yeah, that's
> kind of just the gist of it, like, "it's my birthday, and I have to be drunk."
> It's like a mentality a lot of people get into.

Another aspect of the binge culture in college is the practice of bragging about

one's drinking abilities. Not wanting to be referred to as a "light weight," when it comes

to amount of alcohol one can consume, students actively work to build a high tolerance.

Michael illustrated by laughingly quoting, "Dave Chappelle says it's 'a White thing' to

just have White people rattle off their inventory of what they just drank." The popular

comedian's depiction and parody of Caucasian drinking culture resonated with Michael,

who seemed amused by what he perceived to be the accuracy of Chappelle's observation.

Axial Coding

While this study does not entail the development of a grounded theory on

bystander behavior as it relates to undergraduate men involved in dangerous drinking

situations, I have included the axial coding process (Creswell, 1998) in my data analysis

for two reasons: 1) to provide additional depth in understanding the data derived from the

interviews and 2) to help ensure the analysis in this qualitative study is as objective as

possible. Axial coding allowed me to reassemble the data in a new, more informed way,

by interrelating common themes, identifying central phenomena and taking into

consideration various conditions that influence the central phenomena, as

described earlier in the chapter. An overview of the axial coding results is presented in

Table 6.

Table 6. Overview of Axial Coding Results

Causal Conditions	- Drinking normalized in high school - Youth culture saturated with examples of glorified binge drinking / focused on fun - Maturity / developmental stage: lack of empathy and sense of responsibility
Intervening Condition	Personal encounters with binge-related tragedy
Contextual Condition	Misinformation / "urban legends" about alcohol dangers

Three causal conditions presented themselves through the axial coding process

and were most cogent in this study. First, the common theme of how drinking patterns

were primarily established and normalized in high school, through both "underground"

drinking, where participants and their friends would, as Michael indicated, "scrounge up

any alcohol" they could find, pillaging parents' refrigerators and liquor cabinets, and also

drinking in full view of parents, who justified allowing underage drinking in their homes

by insisting it "safer" and more "responsible" than drinking elsewhere. High school age

drinking was common among all participants.

The second causal condition common among the participants was a common

experience with a North American youth culture, steeped in examples of glorified and

sanitized binge drinking. With an overarching focus on fun stemming from movies,

comedians, and celebrities to peer-perpetuated myths about alcohol safety, all study participants described a youth culture which encouraged alcohol consumption as a sport, as an opportunity to brag about amounts consumed and to ridicule "weak," male peers who couldn't consume at high levels.

The third causal condition revolved around the common theme of student psychosocial development and level of maturity in the population of undergraduate men. Two sub-themes emerged from this condition: 1) a consistent lack of empathy among male, peer interactions (Whittaker, Brown, Beckett, & Gerhold, 2006), with all participants describing dangerous drinking as an opportunity to ridicule male friends, and 2) a consistent absence of a sense of responsibility towards others by undergraduate men (Kimmel, 2008) interviewed for this study, all of whom felt that men should be responsible for their own choices, or as William discussed helping a male peer who over drank, "If it's a guy, it doesn't matter."

The second aspect of axial coding I pursued was to explore intervening conditions, which are specific, unplanned actions or events that disrupt or adjust the path or trajectory of the phenomenon. In analyzing the data, I found one intervening condition: participants' personal experiences with tragedy related to dangerous drinking. One might anticipate these first-hand, tragic experiences may have caused a shift in participant's bystander engagement, or may have inspired a stronger awareness of helping others in need. While a number of participants shared such tragic encounters, it did not seem to heighten their sensitivity towards more engaged behavior, which on one hand, seems surprising, but perhaps makes sense when considered with the causal factor of low levels of empathy and responsibility in this stage of their development.

Contextual conditions, the third aspect of axial coding, are factors culminating from circumstances related to time and place as they impact a person's growth and development. One common contextual condition was the shared, peer-perpetuated mythology surrounding drinking and the very often misinformed responses to dangerous behavior that were perceived as "best practices," like letting a victim "sleep it off," or once a victim vomits, he is "safe" from danger.

The axial coding process is often utilized in creating grounded theory, and while it was not necessary in reaching my goals for this study, it provided an objective method for reviewing the observed themes. This additional process in analyzing the data assisted me with interrelating wider themes into a rational whole, organizing these smaller themes into the larger, meta-themes discussed in the next chapter.

Peer Review

Another important step in establishing the credibility and dependability of the findings of this study is through the practice of "peer debriefing" (Creswell & Miller, 2000), or peer review. The peer review for this study involved 16 professional staff members from my current institution: 12 from various offices within Student Affairs, including Residence Life, Judicial Affairs, Health & Wellness, Counseling, Campus Activities, and the Dean of Students, and four peers from the teaching faculty, including the Departments of Education, Communication, and Philosophy. The peer review lasted for one hour and fifteen minutes, with the first thirty minutes consisting of an overview of the findings of this study, and the remainder of the time utilized for answering questions and discussing the reliability of the findings, based on the multiple perspectives represented within the group.

Questions from the group ranged from specific, methodology questions, like, "how many students participated in the study?" and "how did you recruit participants?" to process-driven questions, "did you consider student development theory in your study?" and questions about the literature review. One reviewer asked if participants interviewed seemed to learn from experiences and occurrences of dangerous situations, becoming better bystanders with each successive situation, and I answered that they did not seem to learn, but I suspected this is largely due to lack of effective, bystander training, which helps to make meaning of their experiences.

One reviewer in Student Affairs challenged my exclusion of undergraduate men in helping roles (i.e., RAs, "Allies," etc.), expressing that it would be interesting to learn what motivated these helpers to seek out these formal roles. Before I could explain my rationale, two other reviewers defended the decision, answering for me that they felt it more important to hear from a "natural" perspective, verses students who were trained and "practiced" at providing assistance, which perfectly explained my initial rationale, although I do not doubt that the question is worthy of continued study.

All present indicated that the analysis seemed to "ring true" for them, considering their various perspectives in higher education. One reviewer, a counselor at the institution, indicated that the themes that floated in the interviews seemed most germane to her daily work in the counseling center, especially the themes of males not wanting to "cry wolf," or to get their friends in trouble. This counselor also reinforced the theme of permissive parental attitudes towards drinking and students passing down misinformation about alcohol, from one generation to the next.

One of the teaching faculty, from the Education department, supported the findings of the study, noting that she often encounters a sense of "invulnerability" in undergraduate men, also supporting the finding that undergraduate men, who are inexperienced with alcohol, seem to approach the party culture with "wide-eyed wonderment." This faculty member also expressed particular interest in parent involvement in high school drinking, indicating that a number of her neighbors permit alcohol use by their high school-aged children and expressed frustration with this attitude, pointing to a need to provide education for "more responsible parenting."

Another faculty member, from Philosophy, indicated that the results of the study seemed consistent with her experience, indicating that she felt it particularly telling that I only encountered "disengaged bystanders," suggesting that this may imply the majority of male, undergraduates might fall into this category. This professor also indicated that the parental involvement with high school age drinking resonated with her experience with not only students, but also with neighbors and friends with teenage children.

As the session wrapped-up, one faculty member expressed an interest in expanding this study to include women, whose drinking rates are catching up with those of men (Wechsler & Wuethrich, 2002, pp. 28-29) and to include other cultures, to which I readily agreed. Similarly, another counselor in the peer review expressed an interest in applying the findings of this study to other populations. One teaching faculty member, from Communication, was intrigued that all the participants cited "drunk driving" as their most-listed "danger" of binge drinking, while none of them actually engaged in that behavior. Being a Communication professor, he pointed to the powerful impact of

marketing programs, like "MADD" and how they may be doing "too well," in their marketing strategy, and in the process, overshadowing other, key alcohol risks.

Member Checking

As discussed in chapter 3, when the interviews were completed and transcribed, and when the data were analyzed, I employed the practice of "member checking" (Creswell, 1998; Creswell & Miller, 2000), where I emailed a two-page summary (Appendix H) of themes found in the data, asking for participant clarification and verification of accuracy. I was specifically interested in hearing participant feedback on the emergent themes and the descriptions of disengaged, male bystanders.

I successfully contacted six of the seven participants, with one student's email "bouncing back" to me, indicating his address "no longer valid." Of the six participants contacted, I heard back from one, Henry, who, not surprisingly, was the student who demonstrated a heightened bystander response as a result of substantive, risk management training from his fraternity.

> Most of what you wrote seems to be true with my experiences of others, but as far as my immediate group and myself goes, like I mentioned, we are much more responsible and attentive to any dangerous situation arising; especially if it occurs at one of our own (fraternity) parties.

Henry felt the summary was valid, overall, but suggested that his demonstration of a better-informed response to dangerous behavior is more common among his fraternity. I anticipate that this may, indeed, be accurate, but based on the span of interviews, I would posit this to be true primarily of men who participated in the fraternity risk management training.

Henry's other comment seemed to touch on a number of issues: party hosting / training in how to safely respond to dangerous drinking, and his opinion of what he perceives to be an "abstinence only" message surrounding alcohol use in high school and college. He indicated,

> I didn't see anything about reactions by hosts of parties. I just wanted to add that a big cause, to me, for the lack of knowledge about how to handle a dangerous drinking situation is due to the lack of information provided to students in high school and college about how to handle such a situation because it is treated as a taboo and with an "abstinence only" policy.

While not covered, specifically, in the two-page, participant summary, the implications of bystander training and concerns about the "taboo" nature of underage drinking were addressed in the study. I sent Henry a summary reply, covering those issues and thanked him for his thoughtful response.

Conclusion

This chapter supplies an overview of the findings of this study and includes participant demographics and a general description of how the research progressed, moving through the seven student interviews. Through the three, primary research questions and a process of axial coding, emergent themes were identified and described as they came forth in the data, including attitudes, beliefs, and culture surrounding dangerous drinking by male college students.

Drinking started, for all of the participants, in high school, with parental knowledge, consent, and at times, with parental encouragement. Participant definitions for dangerous drinking were varied, but shared a common thread of dependence on a bystander's ability to effectively observe, identify, and appropriately respond. The participants cited similar ideas about the dangers of binge drinking, describing the

concepts from a male-centric perspective, with only two listing sexual assault as a potential danger for women.

As a clear, associated danger, participants also shared a cache of commonly held and potentially dangerous misperceptions of alcohol abuse, including a tendency to use over-drinking as an opportunity for peer ridicule. Finally, the interviews supported contemporary and enduring research surrounding bystander behavior, and participants pointed out current attitudes, which reflected long-held concepts of bystander engagement, including fear of a negative perception of onlookers and lack of victim empathy, among others.

The final chapter will further discuss these findings and will provide a snapshot of today's disengaged, undergraduate male bystander. Chapter 5 will also describe three prototypes of the disengaged bystander, as gleaned from the participant interviews, offering suggestions for future research and implications for educators in helping this important student population to develop informed, responsible, and empathic, undergraduate bystanders.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Today's male college student is bright, articulate, and optimistic about his future. Research about today's generation of college students, also referred to as "Millennials," indicates this group to be "more upbeat about the world in which they're growing up. Nine in ten describe themselves as 'happy,' 'confident,' and 'positive'" (Howe & Strauss, 2000, p. 7). Similarly, male college students today inhabit a caring, educational, campus environment, which features programs and support services that focus on academic and personal success (Whitt et al., 2008).

Conversely, today's undergraduate male student is also faced with an unstable, economic environment and an even less hopeful job market (Greenhouse, 2010, para. 1) as well as an ever-growing alcohol and drug culture on campus (Wechsler & Wuethrich, 2002) as described by one study participant, Robert,

> Yeah, well, (stumbling, intoxicated students) you can see any day, really, even on the street…so there, you spend, probably, a Friday or Saturday night around the campus, and on the street, you'll see, like, some people…at least, like, three within, like, an hour, walking by and stumbling a little bit, so it's really, like, everywhere.

Keeping in mind these current environmental contexts, on- and off-campus, and building on relevant literature, the present study examines a specific aspect of daily life for undergraduate men: bystander behavior. Further, this study incorporates student interviews, student development theory, bystander research, and current bystander

intervention practices to identify factors that support successful bystander intervention of undergraduate men involved in dangerous drinking situations.

Summary of Research Study

Current research on alcohol use on college campuses reveals that four-fifths of American undergraduates did not binge drink in the same 2-week period (Wechsler et al., 1995, p. 925), which confirms other studies (Haines, 1996; Walters, 2000), pointing to similar conclusions: the majority of college students on a given night do not, in fact, drink dangerously. This study examines the behavior and attitudes of this vast majority of non-binging students who may be bystanders to dangerous drinking.

To critically examine undergraduate male bystander behavior, I conducted a qualitative study, interviewing seven undergraduate men to learn of their experiences and to elicit their perspectives on bystander behavior in the campus setting, exploring the following research questions: (1) How do engaged, traditionally aged, college male bystanders describe their bystander experiences up to and including college attendance (i.e., K-8 education, physical education classes or "recess" times, athletic teams, etc.)? (2) What factors in participant backgrounds (i.e., personality, economic status, family history, etc.), either support or challenge active engagement in bystander situations? (3) How does participant definition of "dangerous drinking" and knowledge of pertinent alcohol information impact their bystander engagement?

As Creswell (1994, p. 153) suggests, qualitative data analysis is "eclectic," and there is no one, correct method of inquiry. Further, Strauss and Corbin (1990) note the importance of creativity and the researcher connecting personally to the study, which

"enables the researcher to ask pertinent questions of the data and make comparisons that elicit from the data new insights into phenomenon and novel theoretical formulations" (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 31). My background in both the study of English literature and over 17 years working in the higher education field assisted me with both creativity and connectedness to this topic.

Further, Creswell describes "meta-themes" (1998) as concepts common to the whole sample set, which emerged from the central themes discussed in Chapter 4. These meta-themes serve as the major conclusions of this study and include: 1.) While the majority of the undergraduate, college men interviewed were able to clearly articulate an understanding of their academic interests / majors and career paths, all exhibited a significant focus and priority on social life and recreation, 2.) While bright and well intentioned, these undergraduate, college men demonstrated a significant lack of empathy for male peers, indicating a penchant for the, "every man for himself," philosophy, and 3.) These undergraduate, college men displayed a similar lack of responsibility towards their male peers, while female peers fared significantly better with these men.

Finally, from the study emerged 4.) A description of the disengaged, undergraduate male bystander, suggesting three archetypes of the disengaged bystander, which will be discussed further in this chapter. This chapter also reveals the story of today's disengaged, undergraduate, male bystander and concludes with recommendations for the field of higher education, limitations in the current study, and future research opportunities as well as possible methods for reducing the impact of dangerous drinking on college campuses.

Conclusions

Priority on Social Life Versus Academics

Linked directly to the first two emergent themes from Chapter 4 that relate to high school drinking and self-centered perspectives of the dangers of binge drinking, the undergraduate participants in this study demonstrated a significant emphasis on the social aspects of college life, versus intellectual or career-related goals. This conclusion also responds to the first two research questions that relate to previous bystander experience, including high school drinking, and factors stemming from student backgrounds, including a self-centered focus. Further, this conclusion reiterates findings from related research on the social development of college age men.

In college age men, social status is a strong and primary focus of student time and attention (Simona & Caravita, 2009; Kimmel, 2008). Thus, factors related to social life, including parties, sports, and as noted earlier, social status of male participants, are a key finding for this study, as they may be critical in preventing undergraduate men from consistently involving themselves as responders in dangerous drinking situations. In my conversation with Kurtis, for example, he shared his perception of the overarching social focus on himself and his male peers, stating,

> I feel like…in order for (undergraduate, college men) to actually listen and take something out of (alcohol education), they have to *want* to learn. So many of my peers don't necessarily look at the ramifications of their actions, or think of what they want to do in 10-to-15 years. They don't necessarily care. "Oh well, I really should look out for a friend (who is) hammered." A lot of them don't necessarily think in those terms, which I think makes your job much more difficult - to actually get them to listen.

This quote perfectly captures the zeitgeist of the data set. All seven participants, while extremely bright and articulate when discussing their academic majors, internships, and career plans, display a lack of focus on these areas, instead targeting the more frivolous, leisurely aspects of college life.

Similarly, when participants discussed potential, career-related co-curricular activities (i.e., student organization leadership, presenting or attending campus programs, etc.), they referred not to the probable, intellectual or job-related skills inherent to such enterprises, but solely on the social aspects, specifically, how these experiences provide opportunities to meet new peers. Further, when discussing how they spent their time outside of the classroom, participants highlighted only part-time jobs, hobbies (i.e., playing in a band), recreation (i.e., intramural sports, video games, etc.), and social life (i.e., attending athletic events with friends, going to bars and apartment parties, etc.), with little-to-no mention of classes, study groups, or professional affiliations.

Correspondingly, and as noted earlier, Kurtis elaborated on the shared emphasis among his peers as it relates to the balance of academic and social life, stating,

> For most of my friends, Wednesday through Saturday is considered "the weekend," and at about 5:30pm, pre-gaming starts: people start drinking and playing pong, whatever ("beer pong," which is a drinking game played with plastic cups and ping-pong balls, where one seeks to land a ping-pong ball into an opponent's full cup of beer, which the opponent, then, must "chug" in its entirety).

While one may, arguably, presume an adequate amount of time is likely spent on academic activity, not one student accentuated such pursuits, which stands as a key finding in the study.

Lack of Empathy for Male Peers

The first two research questions, focusing on bystander experience and personal background, elicited responses that demonstrate a consistent and significant lack of peer empathy by the participants. Further, this conclusion is linked most closely to the final three emergent themes from Chapter 4 that relate to self-centered perspectives of binge drinking dangers, alcohol misinformation / "urban legends," and roadblocks for effective bystander engagement. This stands out as a crucial finding for this study and is consistent with related areas of research and current events.

Studies indicate that empathy levels are directly linked to helpful and/or delinquent behavior (Robinson, Roberts, & Strayer, 2007). Further demonstrative of empathy concerns on college campuses is the recent suicide of college student, Tyler Clementi, a first-year student at Rutgers University, which was a result of his roommate and another student using a web camera to secretly transmit images of sexual activity involving Clementi (Teicher Khadaroo, 2010, n.p.). The actions of Tyler Clementi's roommate seem to demonstrate an absence of basic empathy: a vital human quality. Lack of empathy is a dark attribute, for "it provides one the ability to watch others get hurt without feeling guilt, remorse, or responsibility" (Spiegel, 2010, n.p.). And the phenomenon seems to be on the rise.

> One recent University of Michigan study found that college students'
> empathy declined by about 40 percent between 1979 and 2009, with the
> biggest drop-off occurring after 2000. (Evans, 2010, n.p.)

This trend seems reflective of the participants in this study, who underscored a recurring lack of empathy for their male peers. Robert highlighted this pattern as he

recounted a party where a male peer, who, after over-drinking, stumbled to the edge of an

apartment balcony and vomited over the side. He recalled the disinterest of the

bystanders,

> …it was, like, a handful of people that were on the balcony, smoking
> cigarettes, and he basically ran…to the edge of the balcony (to
> vomit)…there were just people watching him with their cigarettes.

In most cases, not only did the undergraduate men indicate a lack of empathy for

their male peers, but in fact viewed the vulnerable situation of dangerous drinking as an

opportunity to mock and ridicule classmates. As Michael described,

> I could tell you about a buddy of mine (who) passed out, and I, we tied his
> shoelaces together. Then he woke up and said, "Oh, real funny, you tied
> my shoelaces together," and then he ripped them off. So, we did stuff like
> that…when people weren't responsive, we would usually draw on them
> (on the face with permanent, black marker), I guess that was pretty
> common.

While studies indicate that women tend to have a more developed sense of

empathy, overall, than their male counterparts (Chng, & Burke, 1999, p. 573; Ruf &

Radosevich, 2009, p. 207), evidence from this study may suggest differently. As William

indicated when describing a situation where a male peer had over imbibed and was

abandoned by his female friend,

> I mean, really then, like, we gave him a blanket, we gave him a little bowl
> (for vomit), we left him there (on the floor)… eventually, after, like, 45
> minutes later, I turned off the music, and everyone was, like, "Ohhhh,"
> and then they all left. The girl he came with even left.

Similarly, Kurtis recollected a situation where a woman demonstrated an angry lack of

trust in her friend, which became physically aggressive,

> …a girl who was friends with myself and other people, was at a bar and
> was belligerent. One of her friends picked up her purse in the bathroom,

because she left it in there, and the girl accused her of stealing it, and that turned into a physical altercation. The girl ended up dropping out of (the institution) and moving away, because she was so embarrassed of the entire dorm finding out about her attacking this girl that was trying to help her…it was a brawl, pretty much.

A number of bystander researchers (Cacioppo, Petty, & Losch, 1986; Latané & Darley, 1968) might argue that empathy levels of college-age women are impacted by their surroundings (i.e., "bystander effect," etc.), suggesting that when acting on their own, women might behave differently than when influenced by peer response to emergency situations. In essence, a question remains concerning the reaction of undergraduate bystanders with a more enhanced sense of empathy: is their reaction dulled by the lack of response by peers around them?

Lack of Sense of Responsibility for Self and Others

Also linked most closely to the final emergent themes from Chapter 4, including self-centered perspectives of binge drinking dangers, alcohol misinformation / "urban legends," and roadblocks for effective bystander engagement, the undergraduate participants in this study lacked a demonstrated sense of responsibility towards their peers.

When responding to the first research question, about bystander experience continuing from high school into the college years, participants described behavior and attitudes that reflected a low level of maturity and an overall lack of personal responsibility for others. Michael, who stated, "I kind of feel like everyone should be responsible for their own actions. Obviously you want to help when you can…it's not an obligation to help," encapsulated the overriding attitude of the study participants.

Similarly, when describing his peer group in high school, Michael recounted a

trend of anti-social, irresponsible behavior,

> We were, kind of, like, a bunch of malcontents. I was kind of a bully,
> basically. I was a huge bully…I was pretty much a huge jerk to
> everyone…looking for mischief… We did "ding-dong ditching" people:
> run up to their doorbell, ring it, and then run away. Then that got boring
> after awhile, so then we got laser pointers, so when they answered the
> door, we would shine the laser in their faces (to make the person at the
> door believe a weapon may be aimed at her face). It just kept escalating,
> because we were so bored. Nothing we ever did was, like, criminal.

As one might expect, irresponsible behavior was often tantamount with dangerous

drinking. Michael shared instances when, after over-drinking, he and his peers would

engage in destructive behavior with little-to-no sense of remorse or personal

responsibility for the situation,

> …like, we used to set up hookahs as well, so there were, like, coal
> burnings on the counter and on the floor (of the host parent's house). One
> friend punched a hole in the wall in anger. Another friend punched a hole
> in the door in anger. They would get in fights...one friend started puking,
> and he was, like, "Alright, help me clean it up," and I was, like, "No! I'm
> not going to help, it's fucking gross, I'm not going to touch that!" So, he
> just got so angry that no one helped him, he just punched a hole in the wall
> (laughs).

Another participant, Kurtis, described a similar situation where an intoxicated

peer was beating holes into a drywall with a golf club. In this situation, both the

inebriated male and his bystander friends demonstrate no sense of responsibility towards

the behavior, displaying equally indifferent bystander response.

> He had done quite a bit of damage. The guys that were already there were
> just sitting there and laughing. It was one of those laughs where there was
> nothing else you could really do, but laugh, because they knew he was
> going to end up paying for it…When I asked why they didn't stop him,
> they said, "Well, he was swinging a golf club."

Similarly, students interviewed demonstrated a common disinterest in assisting a

male peer who exhibited dangerous behavior. Kurtis described a student who was

demonstrating reckless, drunken behavior and he and his friend's half-hearted bystander

response,

> I was outside talking with a couple of my friends, while they were having
> a cigarette, and we were just talking, and he (a fellow resident in his
> residence hall) came out and initially, we didn't realize he was belligerent
> and drunk or anything like that. After a short time of trying to talk to him,
> because he wasn't very coherent, it was obvious he was completely
> inebriated and completely drunk. At that point, somebody made a joke
> (about the inebriated man, making fun of him and cajoling him), and he
> became extremely aggressive, shouted at somebody, and at that point,
> that's when he bolted. He completely face-planted…We didn't' really
> realize there was an issue, until we saw the result of it (bruises and cuts on
> his face) the next morning. A couple of us ran after him to see if he was
> alright, but when we started coming, he just got up and ran. We were, like,
> "screw it."

A lack of responsibility regarding breaking the law was another common thread.

Kurtis described a common practice among first-year men on college campuses,

> If you go on the incoming freshmen class "facebook" group, or whatever,
> you'll see (a first-year student post the question), "where can I get a fake
> ID?" or whatever. I never had a fake ID, until I moved to Chicago. I never
> had a need for one, but now, it's really no big deal. It's, like, a felony, but
> most people are, like, "whatever."

Patrick provided, perhaps, the most elemental summary of undergraduate, male

attitudes towards responsibility for others, stating, "a lot of times, we feel it's not really

our part, and you know, we don't know this guy, so that's kind of how it is…" He

continued, describing his perception of peer responsibility to step-in during a dangerous

situation,

> I really wouldn't want anyone doing that to me (unduly calling the
> ambulance). Then you earn the reputation of being a "buzz kill," too.

> You've kind of got the social aspect (fear of being socially ostracized for getting someone "in trouble") of it, too. But mainly, it's just not really your place, most of the time.

A notable trend related to the notion of personal responsibility was a consistent undercurrent of dishonesty in their drinking behavior. Clearly, underage drinking, necessarily, involves dishonesty, due to the illegal nature of the activity. This dishonest behavior, however, seems to spill into other avenues of participants' day-to-day lives. Robert, who is a member of a men's social fraternity, described his decision to join and his parents' response,

> Really, when I came to college, I had no intention to join a fraternity, but I read about the fraternity and who were notable alumni and the scholarships offered. In theory, this may benefit me, in regards to networking for the future, as well as helping me pay for college. At first, no (my parents were not in favor of his joining a fraternity), but (I) told them the benefits about the networking and how I met certain alumni from the school that way. My parents don't know I have dues, though (or they wouldn't have allowed him to join), so I pay for those on my own.

In this instance, Robert describes being dishonest with his parents in order to join a social fraternity. This type of subterfuge, paired with earlier examples of illegal behavior and false identification cards, be it regarding illegal use of alcohol, or regarding other areas of their lives on and off campus, was a common occurrence throughout the interviews.

Participant responses correspond directly with recent research related to the need for personal and social responsibility education and how few higher education institutions focus on responsibility development as part of their core curriculum,

> The relative lack of institutional investment in students' personal and social responsibility reflects the widespread assumption that academic content knowledge and the intellectual skill of analytic or critical thinking, quite divorced from either action or responsibility, are the overriding aims of higher education and that the development of personal and social

responsibility is only distantly connected with those aims (Colby & Sullivan, 2009, p.22).

Participant behaviors involving personal irresponsibility and dishonest behavior directly link to the second research question, regarding participant background and personal characteristics. This delinquent behavior from participants stands in direct opposition to their significant displays of candor throughout the interviews as well as vivid descriptions of their strong-held personal values, including family, career aspirations, and religious beliefs.

The Disengaged Male Bystander: A Typology

Through the course of conversations with seven male, undergraduate students using Siedman's (1998) interview model and a process of axial coding, four common themes emerged. The first theme, responding to the first research question about previous bystander experience, pointed to patterns in experiences with high school drinking behavior, which ranged from occasional drinking at family events, to almost nightly drinking among peers with the knowledge of one or more parents. The second theme, stemming from the second and third research questions about personal characteristics and background and student definitions of dangerous drinking, involved the participants' decidedly self-centered and male-centric perspectives on dangers associated with over-drinking, where the participants were seemingly unaware of gender-related dangers.

The third theme identified participant use of widely held and incorrect, or misleading, "facts" involving alcohol use, safety, and effective response to dangerous behavior, which responded to the third research question about student definitions of dangerous drinking. The fourth theme pointed out roadblocks to engagement in bystander

situations and supported current research on bystander theory, corroborating long-standing premises surrounding bystander inhibitions largely due to inaccurate student definitions of dangerous drinking.

One well-known student development theory indicates that a college student moves through a series of developmental stages, or "vectors" (Arnold & King, 1997, p. 44), which present ongoing challenges and moments of progress as they move along early, rudimentary, self-focused plateaus onto more challenging, nuanced, and others-centered skills (Arnold & King, 1997). Added to personal characteristics of the participants and factors in their backgrounds is the difficult developmental task of the undergraduate male to move beyond self-focused pursuits, further complicated by the abundance of false or misleading "facts" and "urban legends" surrounding alcohol use and safety. This cannon of misinformation fuels the disengaged bystander phenomenon described in current literature, which identifies powerful psychological roadblocks to responsible bystander behavior in today's college man.

These emergent themes point to a description of today's disengaged, undergraduate, male bystander, who begins his drinking journey at home, with peers and/or with parents, who are very often keenly aware of the underage drinking taking place in their homes and at times encourage a "responsible" approach to parental-guided drinking, deeming it "safer" than drinking with friends outside the home. Fueled by popular youth culture, which glorifies binge-drinking behavior that sanitizes or glosses-over any real, negative consequences, today's undergraduate men arrive on college campuses across the United States primed and ready to "party" (Chassin, Pitts, & Prost,

2002). Building upon the emergent themes from participant interviews, I now describe

three types of disengaged male bystanders on college campuses today:

The naïve male bystander. As learned from the first two research questions

regarding previous bystander experience and personal characteristics, this male bystander

comes to college with little background and experience with alcohol and is often, himself,

a novice to the drinking scene, like William, who described his first drinking experience

as "dangerous," because he "…didn't know there was a limit to how much alcohol you

can drink." William went on to reveal his lack of understanding regarding what

constitutes dangerous drinking, indicating,

> I mean, to be honest, I'm not a hundred percent sure what that is. Um, I
> mean, I know, I do know people, who have gone to the hospital, because
> they felt so sick when they were intoxicated, or the next day, they felt so
> sick they went to the hospital and they got, like, an I.V. run, just to get
> fluids in their body.

The naïve bystander is generally unenlightened to dangers surrounding alcohol abuse

and, therefore, has limited or no measure by which to assess the danger of a drinking

situation. This bystander observes binge drinking without noticing the clear and apparent

danger to his peers, or the potential liability implications for himself and others.

For example, while one participant, Kurtis, began drinking in high school, he

described a typical response to a dangerous situation during his first year in college,

where his roommate was unconscious on the floor, stating, "I just went and slept

somewhere else, because I was not in the mood to deal with it." His lack of an engaged

response in this situation demonstrates a dangerous and commonly held level of

ignorance surrounding the perils of alcohol abuse and the necessary level of support to

victims. Another student, Patrick, described his lack of knowledge about the alcohol

content of a commonly known and popular beverage,

> This one time, I was seeing a friend's band. It was, like, $7.50 Long
> Islands (Long Island Iced Teas, made with vodka, gin, tequila, and rum),
> and so we did a little pre-game…so we were just watching the show, and I
> had a couple of them (Long Islands). I guess I got really hammered,
> because I didn't realize how much liquor is in those things.

The ineffective male bystander. The second category of disengaged bystander is

the well meaning, but ineffective male bystander. When discussing the first research

question about previous bystander experiences, this male bystander possesses a

significant background familiarity with drinking culture and means no harm in his

lackluster response, but generally provides insufficient assistance in dangerous situations.

Regarding the second research question about student background, this bystander is

active and socially engaged with his peers.

Specifically, this bystander under responds to dangerous behavior of strangers,

either because he is swept-up in the "fun" of the party, because he does not feel it is his

role to assist and presumes that "someone else" will step-in, or because he underestimates

the potential danger of binge drinking. A typical well-intentioned, but ineffective,

response was recalled by Patrick,

> We were drinking wine (pre-gaming), and then we went to the party. My
> roommate was drinking out of a handle of really cheap vodka. It was, like,
> in a plastic (container), and he got really drunk. I guess he left the party; I
> didn't even know he left the party (Patrick wasn't keeping track of his
> friend in this instance). He called my friend's phone, like, screaming. We
> thought he was in a fight or something, but I guess he was just locked out
> of the apartment, and he was just screaming. He got back into the
> apartment and was screaming at his girlfriend for no reason. We got him
> inside, put him to bed (instead of seeking medical assistance), and then he
> ended up puking in his bed.

The "well-meaning" bystander also under-responds to the dangerous behavior of

his friends, due to a significant amount of misinformation about alcohol safety, including

"urban legends" and magical thinking, often perpetuated in popular culture, where

dangerous drinking is portrayed as "fun," "normal," and having no permanent or fatal

consequences. This phenomenon is directly related to this bystander's definition of

"dangerous drinking" and knowledge of pertinent alcohol information, from the third

research question. As Patrick described the drinking culture among his friends, "We give

each other a lot of shit, but it's natural; it's really fun."

The malicious male bystander. This male bystander *intends* to cause his peer to

become, to some extent, overly intoxicated. While not interested, necessarily, in causing

long-term harm, the malicious bystander sorely underestimates the dangers related to

over-drinking and often instigates, supports, and encourages the dangerous behavior,

usually in the context of a specific occasion (i.e., birthday party, initiation to an

organization or athletic team, etc.). William describes a student in his social circle, who is

known for his reputation for getting peers overly-intoxicated. He recounted,

> So, last spring, about halfway through the quarter, I went to a friend's
> place, and we were just going to pre-game there, and then I was going to
> go to another party with my girlfriend. I was, like, "Alright, I only have 45
> minutes," so we kind of sat around for about 20 minutes (and the
> "malicious bystander" said), "Oh, man, I just realized you are leaving
> soon, and I have to make you a drink." So I was, like, "Okay," but you
> aren't supposed to drink his drinks. His drink…you are just not supposed
> to drink it (because he is well-known, among his peers, for mixing drinks
> with dangerously-high alcohol content), and I didn't know that.

William indicated that he became overly intoxicated after drinking his peer's concoction.

The "malicious bystander" is usually the leader, or "alpha male," of a group of peers. One

of the participants, Michael, could be described as such a bystander. In illustrating how

friends would describe him, he indicated,

> …an asshole, but, like, a *nice* asshole. That's pretty much what it is. I
> always give my friends shit all the time about everything and anything…I
> also think they would tell you I am smart, because, one, I hold that as a
> high value of mine. Two, I pretty much remind them all the time how
> much smarter I am than them.

Ironically, the "malicious bystander" can also turn his efforts inward, pushing

even himself to over-drink in certain situations. For example, all of the study participants

described situations where a group of students at a party would participate in drinking

games. In drinking games, all involved students push each other and themselves to binge

drink, as Robert recounted,

> Otherwise, there are, like, events, where they would play (drinking)
> games. So I'm not sure if you are familiar with a game called, "Zoomy-
> Zoomy?" Basically, everyone is assigned a number, and…basically, then
> someone starts off by calling a number, and then another person has to
> (call a number), and whoever's number was called, has to say their
> number twice, and then another person's number twice…and whoever
> messes up would have to drink.

Insidiously, the phenomenon of drinking games creates a scenario where all participants

concurrently become the malicious bystanders and at the same time, victims of over-

drinking. While all three research questions helped to identify the malicious bystander,

the third research question, regarding student definition of dangerous drinking seems

most relevant, as the vindictive bystander's lack of sound alcohol information lulls him

into a false sense of safety during his risky behavior.

Better understanding undergraduate, male, bystander behavior is the principal

focus of this study, and the above identified archetypes of disengaged bystanders may

hold promise for helping parents, educators, and administrators provide bystander support and training for high school and college age men. In the next section I describe recommendations for the field of higher education.

Recommendations for Higher Education

Dangerous drinking remains a significant problem on college campuses today (Wechsler, et al., 2000, p. 200), and leaders in the field of higher education must continue to commit themselves to addressing this serious, student health issue. This study examines male bystander behavior as a factor in tackling dangerous drinking by undergraduates. Specifically, this research has found that deficient knowledge among students of the dangers of binge drinking, a lack of empathy, and a dearth of perceived, personal responsibility in dangerous situations leads to lethargic attitudes towards alcohol and less engaged bystander behavior.

The data from this study seem to suggest that, widely speaking, a 19 year-old college male is not equipped to make consistently healthy and responsible decisions involving alcohol and, therefore, benefits greatly from both stronger restriction of personal latitude and more stringent policy enforcement by campus officials. To this point, the following section outlines specific suggestions for higher education practice in supporting student health and safety.

Policy Enforcement. A key factor that seemed to positively impact bystander behavior was found within the campus environment. Specifically, supervised residence hall environments resulted in less dangerous drinking situations than more independent, apartment-living environments. One of the participants, Robert, described numerous

situations of dangerous drinking by underage students, but all of his examples took place

in private, student apartments or at bars,

> …not in the residence halls, because in the residence halls, they are very,
> very strict. Where, even one bottle found could get a college student
> kicked out of the residence hall, so I haven't seen anything in the
> residence hall.

Similarly, another participant, Henry, reiterated that residence hall staff,

specifically, undergraduate resident assistants, were key in preventing dangerous

drinking. He describes a situation in the residence halls without resident assistants,

> My dorm wasn't, like, a traditional, like, I don't know what you call it,
> like, a bunch of single rooms, like, together. It was more like apartments,
> and then there was a courtyard and townhomes. We had RAs in our
> apartment-style dorms and the townhomes didn't have RAs…well, they
> did, but they…weren't anywhere near there. So we had a lot of parties
> right off the back of the townhomes, really big, and there were no RAs to
> watch it. The first week here was when I started drinking a lot.

In this situation, Resident Assistants were not readily available to support healthy

behavior and to confront dangerous drinking. As a result, Henry and his friends over-

imbibed. This recommendation is related and leads to the next regarding adult and/or

staff supervision in student living spaces.

Adult/Staff Presence and Supervision in Student Living Spaces. Participants

for this study were largely fraternity men, who

> …use significantly more alcohol than their non-Greek peers and suffer
> more negative consequences from drinking, including the negative
> secondhand effects caused by others' alcohol use. (Outside The
> Classroom, 2010, n.p.)

To this point, and similar to it is strongly recommended that fraternity chapter houses

adopt standard residence hall staffing models (Foubert, 2007) to include full-time, live-in,

professional and student support staff to guide the living community. Eastern Illinois University, for example, currently features live-in, graduate student staff, who provide ongoing policy enforcement and educational programming in their Greek-affiliated residence halls.

These Student Affairs professionals provide the essential, daily support and guidance for young men in fraternal organizations, and national fraternal organizations would be wise to enlist these models in off-campus, chapter-owned properties. On a related note, private apartment owners would also do well to adopt similar, live-in staffing patterns, affording apartment dwelling students similar oversight and, ideally, education programming and support opportunities.

Reduce Access to Alcohol. Similarly, participants described situations, both in high school and college, where alcohol was made available to them, either via parents in their homes, from other college students, or even bars, through acquiring false identification or by ineffective bartending. As Kurtis indicated, "It was very surprising when I came up here (from Houston to Chicago) and bartenders just turned a blind eye."

These situations reflect Weitzman's et al. (2003) research findings regarding the positive impact of reducing underage access to alcohol. Simply put, an effective and inexpensive approach to preventing dangerous drinking is to eliminate or reduce underage access to alcohol. To this goal, institutions must focus on proactive approaches to alcohol safety, beyond the residence halls and other campus facilities, partnering with national Greek-letter organization leaders, area liquor store owners, bar managers, law

enforcement officials, and off-campus apartment supervisors to limit alcohol access to

underage students (Weitzman, et al., 2003, p. 34).

Increased Bystander Education. One student participant in this study, Henry,

indicated limited understanding of the importance of engaged bystander behavior in

dangerous drinking situations. In describing his idea of an effective bystander

intervention, he indicated,

> You (would) talk to them and get them away from their focus on drinking,
> so, take their drink away. Maybe get in the cab with them, take them back
> to their place, get them in bed, and then go back (to the party).

He continued,

> I mean, if I was at a party and didn't really know anyone, I would get
> someone that knew (the person) and say, "Hey, (you) should take care of
> that person," like, "Does anyone know her or him?" I would just do that. I
> wouldn't just walk away completely.

As indicated earlier, however, in the course of the interview, I learned that Henry's ideas

for bystander involvement were based, not on his own ideas, but on training he received

through his fraternity risk-management training program. This, along with decades of

higher education practice of training undergraduate RAs to intervene in dangerous

drinking situations and peer training programs, like "BACCHUS Network," the "Red

Watch Band" program, and myriad peer educator efforts at institutions across the United

States, demonstrates alcohol education and peer response training to be effective

strategies in reducing dangers related to binge drinking (Mastroleo, Mallett, Ray, &

Turrisi, 2008).

Similarly, campus-wide, alcohol education campaigns, which inform students of

legal and financial implications of dangerous behavior, such as driving under the

influence, seem to hold promise in helping students understand the potential

consequences of dangerous behavior, as demonstrated by Michael quoting the alcohol-

awareness poster campaign at his university, which lists probable outcomes to a DUI

arrest,

> …what I will tell you is that, like, DUI is definitely something we, me and my friends, do not tolerate. Like, we were all at Joe's house, we were always able to crash there, whatever, but if someone were, like, piss-ass drunk, trying to get home, we are going to be, like, "NO. Crash here, go call your parents, tell them you are sleeping here," you know? It's not worth the $5,000.00 fine, plus lawyer fees, plus a year suspension of your license, and plus, it's on your record. It's not worth it.

Responsibility and Empathy Development. As indicated earlier in this chapter,

factors related to social life, including parties, sports, and social status of male

participants, may lie at the nucleus of this study, as it may be the one key factor that

might, consistently, stand in the way of undergraduate men involving themselves as

responders in dangerous drinking situations. In his book, "Guyland," Kimmel (2008)

describes a male, youth culture where peers hold significant influence over one another,

yet experience a void of basic empathy beyond their small circle of friends.

Correspondingly, studies in other areas indicate similar findings. Findings from a

study exploring adolescent, male sexual molesters indicate that offenders "have less

sexual knowledge and less victim *empathy skills* than non-offending adolescents"

(Whittaker, Brown, Beckett, & Gerhold, 2006, p. 143). Training programs, such as

Resident Assistant training curricula (Foubert, 2007) and Ally development programs

(Finkel, Storaasli, Bandele, & Schaefer, 2003), hold significant promise in helping

undergraduate students develop vital empathy skills. Other potential programs holding

promise for empathy development include diversity training and experiential education programs, including service-learning opportunities (Myers-Lipton, 1998) and low-ropes, peer team-building courses (Haras, Bunting, & Witt, 2005), often offered through First-Year Experience and new student orientation programs.

To this point, a potentially beneficial campus response in addressing the current dearth in empathy among college age men is the growing emphasis and development of "emotional intelligence" and empathy education (Camfield, 2009; Goleman, 1995), which challenges students to think intentionally about understanding another from her or his perspective, which holds significant promise for bystander situations. In the book, *Emotionally Intelligent Leadership: A Guide For College Students*, the authors suggest, "perceiving the emotions of others enables us to build healthier relationships, manage difficult situations, and develop trust more effectively" (Shankman & Allen, 2008, p. 77).

Similarly, peer-to-peer training programs offer opportunities for students to engage with other students, influencing students on a variety of topics (i.e., substance use, sexual behavior, etc.) where desirable changes in behaviors tend to adjust to the perspective of the dominant peer group (Astin, 1993). Further, peer-to-peer training provides intentional, faculty-staff led conversations to help students make meaning of peer experiences. Participant interviews seemed to underscore this idea, as demonstrated by Henry's apparent ability to comprehend and respond effectively in a dangerous situation, due to his fraternity risk-management training program.

Further studies point to the importance of the development of empathy even earlier than high school, during childhood development (Kristja'nsson, 2004; Swick,

2005), including a bullying-response, elementary school program called, "Roots Of Empathy," which brings a "…parent and a baby to classrooms to help children learn to understand the perspective of others" (Szalavitz, 2010, n.p.). When a baby cries in the classroom, an instructor "…helps students consider what might be bothering her…By trying to figure out how to help, they learn to see the world through the infant's eyes and understand what it is like to have needs, but no ability to express them clearly" (Szalavitz, 2010, n.p.). The goal of this training program is to help instill empathy in school children at a young age, allowing them to develop this "skill" as they move through adolescence and young adulthood.

Similarly, another growing trend in empathy education in high school and college that is experiencing significant success is use of "immersion trips" to facilitate empathy development (Plante, Lackey, & Hwang, 2009). This approach involves taking groups of students to various settings where students encounter "Otherness" and discuss the worldview from the various perspectives of multiple communities. This activity shows significant promise for helping students develop awareness of different perspectives, cultures, and socio-economic factors that make up a community (Plante, Lackey, & Hwang, 2009).

Approach Men as Allies, Not Violators. In my member checking process for this study, Henry, in describing his perception of himself and his peers, indicated, "we are much more responsible and attentive to any dangerous situation…especially if it occurs at one of our own parties." In this instance and in spite of his described behavior, Henry *perceives* himself and his peers to be responsible and attentive in situations where they

are more directly involved or implicated. Educators would do well to tap into this

perceived goodwill and design intervention programs that appeal to the college male's

willingness to partner in alcohol safety. Henry went on to respond to my initial findings,

> I just wanted to add that a big cause, to me, for the lack of knowledge about how to handle a dangerous drinking situation is due to the lack of information provided to students…about how to handle such a situation, because it is treated as a "taboo" and with an "abstinence only" policy.

Here, Henry suggests approaching college men as allies, using educational

programs and interventions that place them in the role of engaged, responsible bystander,

versus a program designed to scare them from drinking with "horror stories" of alcohol

trauma or with potential trouble with law enforcement, would be an effective approach

for enlisting peer support and leadership in alcohol education.

Leverage Men's Focus on Social Standing to Shift Cultural Norms. Findings

from this study reiterated the importance of social status among peers for college age men

(Simona & Caravita, 2009). Just as this characteristic lends itself to dangerous behavior,

it might be well leveraged to increase safe behaviors through social norms campaigns in

high risk drinking communities (Berkowitz, 2003) and by utilizing peer leaders in small

group intervention programs, where student leaders receive specialized training and

instruction on alcohol safety measures and are awarded academic credit for completing

such a program.

To further appeal to social standing, institutions can offer highly visible rewards

and recognition opportunities for student leadership in alcohol safety, including financial

compensation or scholarships for alcohol education conferences. On a related note,

institutions could leverage student desire for heightened social status by creating broadly

visible recognition for peer leaders, including presence on the institution's website or on a brochure or poster campaign on alcohol safety, featuring peer leaders.

Suggestions For Future Research

In describing disengaged, undergraduate, male student bystander attitudes and behaviors surrounding dangerous drinking, this study found three trends among the undergraduate men interviewed for this study: (a) a focus on social activities, versus academic or long-term goals, (b) a lack of empathy for their male peers, and (c) a lackluster sense of responsibility for self and others in dangerous drinking situations. The next section identifies potential areas for further research and program development, in regards to assisting undergraduate men in becoming better, more engaged bystanders in dangerous drinking situations.

Examining The Disengaged, Undergraduate Male Bystander Typology

This study identified a typology of the disengaged, undergraduate male bystander: the "naïve male bystander," the "ineffective male bystander," and the "malicious male bystander." A potential next study could be to conduct a large scale, online survey of college male bystander behavior to examine the viability of the typology and/or to refine each "type" further. Identifying the bystander "type" for specific groups of undergraduate men could guide educators in developing relevant training and educational programs related to alcohol safety.

The Engaged, Undergraduate, Male Bystander

The participants of this study represented a specific segment of college students today, primarily men in fraternal organizations. While it was a goal of this research, at the

outset, to identify and explore attitudes and beliefs of the engaged, college-age, male bystander in dangerous drinking situations, my recruitment methods reached primarily disengaged men. While this unexpected turn of events provided rich data about an important population of undergraduate men, I still believe much can be gleaned from reaching out to engaged, male bystanders in college.

One might identify engaged student bystanders through recruiting men in campus helping roles, like Resident Assistants, student organization leaders, campus religious organization members, peer mentors and allies, and even older students with a track record of alcohol use, who have demonstrated marked improvements in attitudes and behaviors surrounding alcohol use. Identifying and investigating the motivations of engaged, male, college-age bystanders and why they respond more sensibly in dangerous drinking situations would, no doubt, provide significant insight to campus health educators, residence hall staffs, and student affairs professionals and would provide a worthwhile sequel to this initial study.

Bystander Behavior of Other Student Populations

One of the purposes of this study was to begin a discussion about the undergraduate, male bystander. While a critical topic for conversation and worthy of ongoing study, other campus populations also hold significant relevance in better understanding college student drinking behavior and effective response to dangerous situations. Research that focuses on the bystander behavior of women would be critical in this important conversation. Further, examining bystander behavior among other campus populations, such as LGBT, or African American, Hispanic and Latino/Latina, Asian, and

other ethnic communities as well as students in helping roles, such as Resident Assistants or "Allies," could significantly contribute to an understanding of effective bystander approaches and how bystander engagement may vary across cultures and campus roles.

I suspect a study identical to my own, using a larger sample, would yield rich data for comparative analysis. Further, pursuing the research questions using an online survey and a larger sample across multiple institutions would be highly recommended to obtain a stronger diversity of student background, and very likely, a more nuanced set of conclusions.

Experimental Design Approach

Early in the research process, I considered a research approach that included an experimental design with a training program as the intervention, using a pre- and post-test to assess the efficacy of the intervention. The researcher would then test participants immediately after the intervention and then six months to a year beyond the training. This is still an approach that holds significant interest to me and would likely incorporate a number of the social norms and status-based approaches, as mentioned above.

Bystander Perspectives of Student Affairs Professionals

Finally, I believe a substantial amount of key perspectives for increasing engaged bystander behavior could be gathered by interviewing Student Affairs professionals, who work with undergraduate men on a daily basis. Specifically gathering observations from Athletic Directors, Coaches, Greek-letter Organization Advisors, Counseling staff, Public Safety Officers, and Residence Hall Directors, who work "in the trenches" with students,

would be a useful source of rich narrative that would most certainly strengthen baseline understanding of undergraduate bystander behavior.

Limitations

With any research study, one must be forthcoming about potential limitations, making allowances and adjusting, where possible, to minimize probable deficiencies. The first limitation of this study is in the number of participants included. My original goal was to interview nine undergraduate men, but over the course of seven months, I was only able to secure seven interviews. While I do not anticipate a significant change in themes with the inclusion of two more interviews, had I been able to successfully recruit two additional participants, I would have preferred to include them to affirm that I had reached saturation (Jones, Torres, & Arminio, 2006, p. 71).

The second limitation for this study involves a lack of diversity related to race, religion, and sexual orientation. Of the seven interviewed for this study, all but one, African-American male were Caucasian. Additionally, all men interviewed identified themselves as heterosexual and primarily Christian, in terms of religious beliefs, with one participant indicating that he was Jewish and another indicating non-religious. A larger and more diverse pool of participants may have revealed a wider variety of themes as it relates to bystander attitudes and experiences.

Next, my identified method for recruiting and selecting students may have had a limiting impact on the pool of participants. I used a campus liaison within the Dean of Students Office, who worked primarily with student organizations and leadership programming. This may have inadvertently led to a potential over-representation of

Greek-letter organization members (five of seven students interviewed). This gave the

study a unique perspective, perhaps, on bystander behavior as it relates, specifically, to

fraternal organizations, but may reflect less accurately on other facets of undergraduate

life, since Greek-letter organization culture tends to lend itself to riskier behavior

(Davies, et al., 2000, p. 259).

Further, I anticipate that my aforementioned method for recruiting and selecting

student participants, which yielded a significant emphasis on fraternity participants, may

have impacted the data, accordingly. As has been documented previously to significant

extent (Weitzman, et al., 2003), undergraduate, fraternity culture lends itself to heavier

drinking habits than among non-fraternity students, possibly influencing findings towards

a community of under-responders in this niche community.

The fourth limitation, as in any qualitative study (Creswell & Miller, 2000, p.

125), is related to the subjectivity of the researcher, which always plays a factor in this

manner of research. While my extensive background and professional experience in

higher education informed my study, there may have been unrecognized assumptions,

biases, or preconceived notions at play throughout the research process. Further, while I

employed established methods for identifying and analyzing data, including open and

axial coding, the conclusions are still filtered through my personal and professional

experiences and are, therefore, a product of these.

Finally, another limitation for this study is the absence of the empathic,

responsible, and engaged, undergraduate male bystander. I know he's out there, because

I've interacted with him and numerous college men, in fact, who are tremendously

thoughtful, well-informed, and active in their respective campus communities. It is the absence of such a participant in this study that stands as a limitation, as an unabridged study of male, undergraduate bystander behavior would, necessarily, include him.

Conclusion

This research project has reviewed current literature and established theories surrounding bystander behavior in areas such as sexual assault and crime prevention. From the literature, relevant theory has been identified related to the topic of underage, male bystander behavior in dangerous drinking situations and has critically evaluated these theories as they relate to this phenomenon. Undergraduate men in my study reflect similar attitudes and behaviors discussed in the literature.

Further, the study identified a lack of personal development in this population in regards to empathy and possessing a sense of personal responsibility for one's own actions and for supporting peers in dangerous situations. Limiting access to alcohol and enforcing policy surrounding underage drinking seem to play a strong role in combating dangerous drinking. Finally, in establishing a community of engaged, undergraduate, male bystanders, there seems to be great promise in future research and programming surrounding the development of empathy and personal responsibility for this population.

I am indebted to the seven, undergraduate, male participants who took part in this study. I am grateful for their candor and willingness to share not only their experiences as bystanders to dangerous drinking situations, but also to reveal their ideas and attitudes behind their choices to stand along the sidelines in these situations. Their honesty and openness have allowed me not only to better understand and describe their disconnection,

but also to suggest possible approaches to fortify undergraduate bystander attitudes and to possibly assist in supporting and protecting this population at risk.

At the outset of this study, I sought to understand the behavior of the engaged, male college student bystander when confronted with a situation involving dangerous drinking. The study unexpectedly gave me something different: a description of dangerous drinking from the perspective of the disengaged bystander. Upon reflection, I suspect this to have been a worthwhile plan at the outset, as understanding this significant population, perhaps the majority of college age men, is crucial to creating mentoring and educational programs to help the disengaged become more thoughtful and responsible citizens of the campus community.

APPENDIX A

STUDENT INVITATION TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDY

Date

Dear (Name of Student):

I write to invite you to participate in a research study focused on undergraduate men who observe dangerous drinking situations among their peers at college that I am conducting for my doctoral dissertation at Loyola University Chicago. This qualitative study seeks to gain a better understanding of factors inherent in college age bystander behavior that might assist educators in the development of ongoing prevention efforts targeted at the important undergraduate, male bystander population.

My intention is to gain insight into this topic by interviewing 9 – 12 first and second-year undergraduate men who witness dangerous drinking situations. If you are willing to participate and are selected for this study, your participation would involve a personal interview of approximately 60 minutes. Our confidential conversation will be audio taped and later transcribed for analysis. In cases where clarification is desired, I may contact you for an optional, face-to-face, follow-up interview, where you would have an opportunity to review the interview transcript and provide clarification. Later in the process, I will invite you to review a one-page summary of findings for your potential feedback.

The information gathered in the interview will only be used for the purpose of my research study. Your identity, that of your institution, and the identities of others you might mention in the interview will not be revealed. Further, your status at your institution will not be impacted by your participation in this study. The enclosed Synopsis of the Research Study will provide you with more detailed information. In exchange and appreciation of your time, you will receive a $15.00 gift certificate to the bookstore at your institution at the outset of the interview.

Thank you for considering my invitation to participate in this research project. If you are interested in participating, please telephone me at the number below. I will ask you to share with me the information held in the confidential response form (attached). I look forward to hearing from you soon, but not later than (date). If you have any questions, feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Christopher A. Waugh
331 Washington Road
Lake Forest, IL 60045
Email: cwaugh@luc.edu
Telephone: 847-970-0713

APPENDIX B

STUDENT RESPONSE FORM

Student Response Form

<u>Confidential Response Form</u>

Name: _____

Year at institution (i.e., first-year or second-year): _____

Age (in years): _____

Race / ethnic background: _____

Have you observed what you believe may be considered dangerous drinking among your peers (yes/no)? _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

****

Please use this form as a reference when you telephone me (at the number below) to set up an interview date and time; I will ask you to share with me the above information. As with all data collected in this study, the information you provide on this form will be kept confidential and will not be used in a manner that will enable you to be identified by either name or institution.

Thank you.

Christopher A. Waugh
331 Washington Road
Lake Forest, IL 60045
Email: cwaugh@luc.edu
Telephone: 847-970-0713

APPENDIX C

SYNOPSIS OF STUDY

Synopsis of Study

Bystander Behavior:
Understanding Undergraduate Male Involvement
In Dangerous Drinking Situations

Researcher Background

My name is Christopher A. Waugh, and I am a Ph.D. candidate in the Program in Higher Education at the School of Education at Loyola University Chicago. I received a master's degree in Counseling from Northern Illinois University.

Research Purposes

Dangerous drinking among students continues to be problematic on college campuses. Statistics show that 1,600 students are killed annually due to alcohol-related deaths, and thousands more are injured or negatively impacted due to the collateral damage of dangerous or binge drinking (i.e., physical injury, sexual abuse or assault, and failed academic goals, etc.). Currently, prevention programs to curb dangerous drinking are targeted mainly at those who binge drink. Prevention methods are often limited to scare tactics and mandated alcohol education about the negative impact of alcohol on the body, highlighting problems stemming from alcohol abuse.

That said, recent research indicates that only a fifth of American college students binged three or more times in the same two-week period. A review of the related literature demonstrates little to no attention to this vast majority of college students who do not drink dangerously, many of whom are witness to the dangerous drinking: the bystander. Current literature related to bystander research focuses on baseline bystander theory, sexual assault prevention, and K-8 school bullying. Further, there is growing evidence in these related fields of the importance and potential positive impact of engaging peer bystanders in prevention efforts.

This study seeks to explore and to build upon this baseline research, applying relevant bystander concepts to the response of college men with their peers who are involved in dangerous drinking situations. Specifically, this study will explore possible factors inherent in college age bystander behavior that might assist educators in the development of ongoing prevention efforts targeted at the important undergraduate, male bystander population

APPENDIX D

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Consent to Participate in Research

Project Title: Bystander Behavior: Understanding Undergraduate Male Involvement in Dangerous Drinking Situations

Researcher: Christopher A. Waugh

Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Terry E. Williams, Ph.D.

Introduction:

You are being asked to take part in a research study being conducted by Chris Waugh for a dissertation under the supervision of Dr. Terry Williams in the Program of Higher Education at Loyola University Chicago.

You are being asked to participate because you are a college student who has observed situations involving dangerous drinking.

Please read this form carefully and ask any questions you may have before deciding whether to participate in the study.

Purpose:

The purpose of this study is to investigate the experiences of students who witness dangerous drinking situations, especially regarding actions taken or not taken as a result of dangerous drinking by peers.

Procedures:

If you agree to be in the study, your participation will include the following:

- An interview on the topic of your experiences as a bystander in dangerous drinking situations on and off campus. The interview will be audio recorded and take approximately 60 minutes.
- In cases where clarification is desired, you may be contacted (by telephone or email) and invited for an optional, follow-up meeting, face-to-face, to review, clarify, and/or to add to information from the initial interview transcript. This additional interview is entirely optional, and you are under no obligation to participate.
- You will be contacted later (by telephone or email) for an invitation to review a one-page synopsis of data themes that emerge from the study. You will be asked to indicate if the suggested findings of this study are consistent with your own

experiences. This participation is entirely optional, and you are under no obligation to participate.

Interviews will take place in a private meeting or conference room on campus. A digital audio recording will be made and transcribed by a transcriber, who will sign a confidentiality agreement. As indicated earlier, participants will have an opportunity to read through the interview transcription to ensure accuracy. Finally, participants will be provided a one-page summary of themes at the conclusion of data analysis for review and feedback.

Risks/Benefits:

College students can benefit from reflecting upon their learning experiences and considering which behaviors and experiences have supported their studies; thus, your participation in an interview which asks you to engage in this kind of reflection should be beneficial.

In addition, your participation may be beneficial to others. The objective of the research is to provide insights which might help guide educators in their decision making, intervention, and programming involving bystanders to dangerous drinking situations.

Finally, I have no formal relationship with DePaul University, and your status at your institution will not be impacted by participation in this study.

Compensation:

At the conclusion of the interview, you will receive a $15.00 bookstore gift certificate as a token of appreciation for your time.

Confidentiality:

To protect your privacy, data from the interview (that is, the recording or a transcript of it) will be available only to the researcher, to his dissertation advisors, the Loyola University Chicago IRB and its representatives and to professional colleagues directly involved in this dissertation project. Only the researcher will know names of participants, which will remain confidential at all times. Interview recordings and transcripts will be coded to preserve confidentiality. Further, interview recordings and transcripts will be stored either under lock and key or by password protection. No names will appear on interview notes. Paper-based data will be shredded and electronic data will be destroyed within two years after completion of the study. Participant contact information and consent forms will be stored in a separate, locked, and secure location at the home of Chris Waugh.

If any data (recordings and transcriptions) are kept for possible future research purposes, any information that can identify individuals (i.e., names and other identifying details) will be deleted.

Voluntary Participation:

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you do not want to be in this study, you do not have to participate. Even if you decide to participate, you are free to not answer any questions or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.

The researcher is not an employee of your institution, and your participation in this interview, or your refusal to participate, will have no affect on your status at your university.

Contacts and Questions:

If you have questions about this research study, please feel free to contact the researcher, Chris Waugh, at cwaugh@luc.edu or 847-735-5211; or faculty sponsor, Terry Williams, at twillia@luc.edu or 312-915-7002.

If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Assistant Director for Research Compliance in Loyola's Office of Research Services at 773- 508-2689.

Statement of Consent:

Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above, have had an opportunity to ask questions, and agree to participate in this research study. You will be given a copy of this form to keep for your records.

_____   _____

Participant's Signature   **Date**

_____   _____

Researcher's Signature   **Date**

APPENDIX E

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Interview Protocol

This guide is not meant as a script, but as a resource to jog the interviewer's memory regarding the topical areas that can be explored. The interviewer's task is to get participants first to offer their perspectives on the topics in whatever way they wish to respond, but then-if the participate does not move in this direction of his/her own accord-the interviewer should attempt to move them toward exploring how each topic area relates specifically to his experience as a bystander in dangerous drinking situations. Paradoxically, questions are intended to provide focus while at the same time remaining as open-ended as possible, to urge participants toward extending their responses in whatever direction they find meaningful.

BACKGROUND

Overarching research question:

What factors contribute to the likelihood that traditionally aged male undergraduate bystanders involved in dangerous drinking situations will successfully intervene on behalf of their peers?

Research questions:

4. How do engaged, traditionally aged, college male bystanders describe their experiences up to and including college attendance?
5. What factors in participant backgrounds (i.e., personality, background, family history, etc.) either support or challenge active engagement in bystander situations?
6. How does participant definition of "dangerous drinking" and knowledge of pertinent alcohol information impact their bystander engagement?

SETTLING IN

Prior to the start of the interview itself, the researcher will review the Informed Consent form with the participant and will ensure understanding. In addition to the issues mentioned on the form, the researcher will also explain that he may later contact the participant only in the instance where clarification is desired. The interviewee would be asked for an optional, follow-up meeting, face-to-face, to review, clarify, and/or to add to information from the initial interview transcript. The interviewee will be informed that he is under no obligation to participate in this additional interview.

Further, the interviewee will be informed that he will be contacted later (by telephone or email) for an invitation to review a one-page synopsis of data themes that emerge from the study. The participant will be asked to indicate if the suggested findings of this study

are consistent with his own experiences. Finally, the interviewee will also be asked to only use pseudonyms and not to mention any real names during the interview.

In the interest of establishing rapport and helping the participant locate himself in a larger context, the researcher may then mention his own experience as a first-year university student, explaining that this was part of his reason for choosing this topic of inquiry.

OPENING QUESTIONS

Interview questions are based on Seidman's (2006) ideas surrounding qualitative interview three-part methods and are intended to begin the interview focused on the individual's background:

I. CONTEXT AND PERSONAL HISTORY:

- To better understand you and your thoughts, I'm interested in learning a bit more about your background. Would you tell me about where you grew up, your family, and the kinds of social events that were important to your family?

- What words would your childhood friends use to describe you growing up (involved, isolated, outgoing, "popular," etc.)?

- What words best describe your neighborhood or living environment while growing up?

- Where do you live now? On- or off-campus? What words or descriptors would paint a picture for someone new to campus culture about where you live?

- Please describe your peer group today. How would your peers describe you today?

II. RECOUNT / RECONSTRUCT EVENT WITHIN PERSONAL CONTEXT:

- There are many terms used today to describe alcohol and how people use it. I'd like to hear how you would define what some label as "dangerous drinking." What does this term mean to you?

- What potential dangers do you associate with dangerous drinking?

- Describe a situation, if you have an example, where you ever engaged in dangerous drinking behavior.

- Describe a situation you would consider a "successful intervention" during a dangerous drinking episode.

III. REFLECT ON THE MEANING OF THE EXPERIENCE:

- How often have you been in a situation in college where you observed peers involved in dangerous drinking? Please describe some of these situations and the behaviors surrounding the drinking (i.e., the nature of the situation, number of others present (if any), the make-up and mood of the group, etc.).

- Did you involve yourself in the situation in any way?

   a. If not, why didn't you get involved? What did you do instead?

   b. If so, what was your reasoning for stepping-in and what did you do to help?

FINISHING UP

> As time nears for the interview to end, the researcher asks the participant if there is anything else he feels is important to add.

- Is there anything we didn't talk about that you think is important regarding your experiences as a bystander in dangerous drinking situations?
- If you were talking to other bystanders in similar drinking situations, what would you ask them? (Follow up: Why?)

The interview ends with the researcher ensuring that the participant has his contact information, and requesting that if the participant thinks of anything new that might be of interest, that he is asked to telephone the investigator. The researcher also reminds the participant that he might have some follow-up questions, and if so that he will try to contact that participant and would be very grateful if he could spend a few more minutes on that particular topic. The participant will be reminded that all follow-up is entirely optional. Finally, the researcher will remind the participant that he will invite him to review a one-page synopsis of the research findings so that the participant can verify its consistency with his experience.

If necessary at this point, I might ask the participant to consider assisting me in identifying potential additional participants for the study. After a review of the desired demographic, I will ask the student if he can think of others who might be interested and available to participate. If the student is aware of other potential participants, I will ask him to share my contact card with said students.

APPENDIX F

TRANSCRIBER CONFIDENTIALITY STATEMENT

This study is being undertaken by Christopher Waugh for his dissertation research at Loyola University Chicago. The purpose of the project is to examine undergraduate male bystander involvement in dangerous drinking situations. Data from this research may be used to design developmental workshops for college students and in partial completion of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. A final report on the research may be presented to the University community, and the results may be written up for publication or conference presentations.

Project Title: Bystander Behavior: Understanding Undergraduate Male Involvement In Dangerous Drinking Situations

I, _____, the *Transcriber*, agree to:

1. keep all the research information shared with me confidential by not discussing or sharing the research information in any form or format (e.g., disks, tapes, transcripts) with anyone other than the researcher.

2. keep all research information in any form or format (e.g., flash drives, digital audio, transcripts) secure while it is in my possession.

3. return all research information in any form or format (e.g., flash drives, digital audio, transcripts) to the researcher when I have completed the research tasks.

4. after consulting with the researcher, erase or destroy all research information in any form or format regarding this research project that is not returnable to the researcher (e.g., information stored on computer hard drive).

Transcriber

_____ _____ _____
(print name)   (signature)   (date)

Researcher

_____ _____ _____
(print name)   (signature)   (date)

If you have any questions or concerns about this study please contact:

Christopher A. Waugh
331 Washington Road
Lake Forest, IL 60045
Email: cwaugh@luc.edu
Telephone: 847-970-0713

APPENDIX G

HEALTH & WELLNESS INFORMATION

X University Health and Wellness Information for Students

How much does counseling at the Center cost, and how many sessions are available?
Individual or Couples Counseling: There are 20 sessions available to all X students enrolled at least half-time, who are interested in individual or couples counseling (for undergraduate students, that's 2 classes, for grad students, that's 1 class). Students interested in individual or couples counseling are charged $5 per session. The counseling center does not take medical insurance. Group counseling sessions are unlimited.

What if you desire counseling, but can't afford it?
Don't let the cost of counseling discourage you from seeking services you might need. The counseling we provide to X students is affordable, and there are professionals in the area who will provide services to students at a sliding scale, depending on ability to pay. If you have concerns about cost, you can discuss them with your counselor or give us a call at 773-325-7779 or 312-362-6923

X University Counseling Services:
http://studentaffairs.X.edu/ucs/services.html

X University Group Counseling Services:
http://studentaffairs.X.edu/ucs/groupcounsel.html

X University Information and resources on alcohol and other drugs:
http://www.X.org/vpc/

X University Health Services:
http://studentaffairs.X.edu/dos/healthservices.html

APPENDIX H

PARTICIPANT SUMMARY

Chris Waugh
Loyola University Chicago
Dissertation Research Study: "Bystander Behavior: Understanding Undergraduate, Male Involvement in Dangerous Drinking Situations"
September 17, 2010

I interviewed undergraduate men, between the months of February and July, 2010. Four themes emerged from the interviews, as summarized, below:

Theme #1: High School Drinking. All participants indicated that drinking among their peer groups started in high school. In many drinking situations, parents were aware of drinking behavior in some manner, either allowing the behavior to occur in their homes, with or without supervision, or providing "adult supervision" and securing permission of other parents, indicating they were providing a "safe" environment for their high school age children to drink with peers.

Theme #2: Perceptions of Alcohol Dangers. Students indicated the following perceptions of alcohol dangers for college students, including: drunk driving, injury and fighting, alcohol poisoning, and vandalism. Only one participant listed unwanted sexual activity or sexual assault as a potential danger of binge drinking.

Theme #3: Alcohol Misinformation / "Urban Legends" / Negligence. Participants shared a series of shared and inaccurate alcohol "facts" throughout the interviews, including: 1.) If an unconscious victim is positioned on his stomach, he is out of danger, 2.) An unconscious victim "will be ok," or will "sleep it off" if one simply walks away, or removes himself from the situation, without inquiring about the victim's health (i.e., checking his breathing, verbal response, etc.), 3.) It is fun / entertaining to ridicule an inebriated, male peer, or to "give him shit," instead of providing health support / personal assistance.

Theme #4: Roadblocks To Effective Bystander Engagement. Students reiterated themes consistent with bystander research, regarding roadblocks to effective bystander engagement, including: 1.) "bystander effect," in which a bystander is impeded from intervening, because he presumes that "someone else will or should step in," among others. Other blockades to effective bystander response mentioned by participants included: 2.) an apparent "disconnect" between moments of clarity / accurate alcohol information and logical response. In other words, some participants were aware of "responsible" support tactics in dangerous situations, but lacked the corresponding follow-through and opted to not assist their peers. 3.) Anonymous situations (i.e., bars or larger parties) create a nebulous, social atmosphere, resulting in weaker bystander responses, and 4.) an overall lack of empathy with and sense of responsibility for male peers, especially strangers. 5.) Finally, a significant roadblock stemmed from a fear of "crying wolf," or of being "that guy," who calls an ambulance, only to find his peer did

not need one. Connected to this roadblock is a significant amount of social anxiety linked to maintaining a positive image among one's peers.

Participants in the interviews described various definitions of "dangerous" or "binge" drinking, all of which depended on the bystander's ability to identify certain physical symptoms of over-drinking. Taken together, the student interviews helped paint a picture of why undergraduate men routinely choose to not intervene with peers involved in dangerous drinking situations. The conversations pointed to three types of disengaged, bystander attitudes:

1. The naïve bystander. This bystander comes to college with no background and experience with alcohol and is often, himself, a novice to the drinking scene. The naïve bystander is generally oblivious to dangers surrounding alcohol abuse. This bystander observes binge drinking without noticing the clear and apparent danger to his peers, or the potential liability implications for himself.

2. The well meaning, but inadequate bystander. This bystander means no harm in his lackluster response, but generally provides inadequate assistance in dangerous situations. Specifically, this bystander under-responds to dangerous behavior of strangers, because he does not feel it is his role to assist and presumes that "someone else" should step-in. This bystander also under-responds to the dangerous behavior of his friends, due to a significant amount of misinformation about alcohol safety, including "urban legends" and magical thinking, often perpetuated in popular culture, where dangerous drinking is portrayed as "fun," "normal," and without permanent or fatal consequences.

3. The malicious bystander. This bystander *intends* to cause his peer to become overly intoxicated. While not interested, necessarily, in causing long-term harm, the malicious bystander sorely underestimates the dangers related to over-drinking and often instigates, supports, and encourages the dangerous behavior, usually in the context of a specific occasion (i.e., birthday party, initiation of an organization or athletic team, etc.).

REFERENCE LIST

Abar, C., Abar, B., & Turrisi, R. (2009). The impact of parental modeling and permissibility on alcohol use and experienced negative drinking consequences in college. *Addictive Behaviors, 34*(6), 542-547.

Abbey, A., & McAuslan, P. (2004). A longitudinal examination of male college students' perpetration of sexual assault. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*(5), 747-756.

Abbey, A. (2002). Alcohol-related sexual assault: A common problem amount college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, Supplement, No* 14, 118-128.

Abbey, A., Ross, L. T., & McDuffie, D. (1996). Alcohol and dating risk factors for sexual assault among college women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 20*(1), 147-169.

Alcohol Policy Information System. (2008). The 1984 National Minimum Drinking Age Act. Retrieved November 21, 2008, from http://www.alcoholpolicy.niaaa.nih.gov/index.asp?SEC=%7B9937ACFC-DB3A-4159-B068-A302CEEE0EDF%7D&Type=B_BASIC

Amethyst Initiative. (2009). Retrieved May 21, 2009, from http://www.amethystinitiative.org/

Arnold, K., & King, I. C. (1997). *College student development and academic life: Psychological, intellectual, social, and moral issues*. New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.

Austin, A. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Crossman, M. T. (2009). Reducing sexual violence on campus: The role of student leaders as empowered bystanders. *Journal of College Student Development 50*(4), 446-457.

193

Banyard, V. L., Moynihan, M. M., & Plante, E. G. (2007). Sexual violence prevention through bystander education: An experimental evaluation. *Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(4), 463-481.

Banyard, V. L., Plante, E. G., & Moynihan, M. M. (2004). Bystander education: Bringing a broader community perspective to sexual violence prevention. *Journal of Community Psychology, 32*(1), 61-79.

Banyard, V. L., Williams, L. M., & Siegel, J. A. (2001). The long-term mental health consequences of child sexual abuse: An exploratory study of the impact of multiple traumas in a sample of women. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 14*(4). 697-715.

Barone, R. P., Wolgemuth, J. R., & Linder, C. (2007). Preventing sexual assault through engaging college men. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 585-565.

Becker-Haven, J. F., & Lindskold, S. (1978). Deindividuation manipulations, self-consciousness, and bystander intervention. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 105*(1), 113-121.

Berkowitz, A. (2005). An overview of the social norms approach. In L.C. Lederman & L.P. Stewart (Eds.), *Changing the culture of college drinking: A socially situated health communication campaign* (pp. 193-215). New York: Hampton Press.

Berkowitz, A. (2003). Applications of social norms theory to other health and social justice issues. In H.W. Perkins (Ed.), *The Social norms approach to preventing school and college age substance abuse: A handbook for educators, counselors and clinicians* (pp. 259-279). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

"Binge Drinking." (1999). In MedicineNet.com. Retrieved July 15, 2009 from http://www.medterms.com/script/main/art.asp?articlekey=11040

Black, S. A. & Jackson, E. (2007). Using bullying incident density to evaluate the Olweus Bullying Prevention Programme. *School Psychology International, 28*(5), 623.

Borges, M. A., & Penta, J. M. (1977). Effects of third party intercession on bystander intervention. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 103*(1), 27-32.

Bowes-Sperry, L, & O'Leary, A. M. (2005). To act or not to act: The dilemma faced by sexual harassment observers. *Academy of Management Review, 30*(2), 288-306.

Busteed, B. (2004). Campus Buzz: How Alcohol Impairs America's Judgment of Higher Education. *The Journal of the New England Board of Higher Education, 19*(1), 15-16.

Cacioppo, J. T., Petty, R. E., & Losch, M. E. (1986). Attributions of responsibility for helping and doing harm: Evidence for confusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*(1), 100-105.

Camfield, E. K. (2009). The need for (em)powerful teaching. *Liberal Education*, *95*(4), 53 – 56.

Chassin, L, Pitts, S. C., & Prost, J. (2002). Binge drinking trajectories from adolescence to emerging adulthood in a high-risk sample: Predictors and substance abuse outcomes. *The Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 70*(1), 67-78.

Chickering, A. W., & Reisser, L. (1993). *Education and identity*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chng, C. L., & Burke, S. (1999). An assessment of college students' attitudes and empathy toward rape. *College Student Journal*, 33(4), 573-583.

Choi, I., Nisbett, R. E., and Norenzayan, A. (1999). Causal attribution across cultures: Variation and Universality. *Psychological Bulletin, 125*(1), 47-63.

Clark, R. D., & Word, L. E. (1974). Where is the apathetic bystander? Situational characteristics of the emergency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29*(3), 279-287.

Colby, A. & Sullivan, W. M. (2009). Strengthening the foundations of students' excellence, integrity, and social contribution. *Liberal Education, 95*(1), 22-29.

Cowie, H., & Hutson, N. (2005). Peer support: A strategy to help bystanders challenge school bullying. *Pastoral Care in Education, 23*(2), 40-44.

Creswell, J. W. & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory Into Practice, 39*(3), 124-130.

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

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Darley, J. M., & Teger, A. I. (1973). Do groups always inhibit individuals' responses to potential emergencies? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 26*(3), 395-399.

Davies, J., McCrae, B. P., Frank, J., Dochnahl, A., Pickering, T., Harrison, B., Zakrzewski, M., & Wilson, K. (2000) Identifying male college students' perceived health needs, barriers to seeking help, and recommendations to help men adopt healthier lifestyles. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(6). 259-267.

DeKeseredy, W. S., Schwartz, M. D., & Alvi, S. (2000). The role of profeminist men in dealing with women on the Canadian college campus. *Violence Against Women, 6*(9), 918 – 935.

Durden, W. G. (2008). The Age-21 law isn't working; it's time to debate the issue of abusive drinking. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved November 26, 2008, from http://www.amethystinitiative.org/filemanager/filedownload/phplssAQr/2008-08-27%20Durden%20Chronicle%20of%20Higher%20Ed.pdf

Elkins, B., Helms, L. B., & Pierson, C. T. (2003). Greek-letter organizations, alcohol, and the courts: A risky mix? *Journal of College Student Development, 44*(1), 67-80.

Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Farrington, D. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. *Crime and justice: A review of research*, *17*, 348-458.

Fetterman, D. M. (1989). *Ethnography: Step by step*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publicaitons.

Finkel, M. J., Storaasli, R. D., Bandele, A., & Schaefer, V. (2003). Diversity training in graduate school: An exploratory evaluation of the Safe Zone project. *Professional Psychology – Research And Practice 24*(5), 555-561.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). The sexual victimization of college women. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

Fischer, P, Greitemeyer, T., Pollozek, F., & Frey, D. (2006). The unresponsive bystander: Are bystanders more responsive in dangerous emergencies? *European Journal of Social Psychology, 36*(2), 267-278.

Fonow, M. M., Richardson, L., & Wemmerus, V. A. (1992). Feminist rape
    education: Does it work? *Gender and Society, 6*(1), 108-121.

Foubert, J. D. (2007). *Lessons learned: How to avoid the biggest mistakes made by
    college resident assistants*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Foubert, J. D. (2005). *The men's program: A peer education guide to rape
    prevention*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Foubert, J. D. (2000). The longitudinal effects of a rape-prevention program on
    fraternity men's attitudes, behavioral intent, and behavior. *Journal of American
    College Health, 48*(4), 158-163.

Foubert, J. D. & Marriott, K. A. (1997). Effects of a sexual assault peer education
    program on men's belief in rape myths. *Sex Roles, 36*(3/4), 259-268.

Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., Snell, J. L., Van Schoiack Edstrom, L., MacKenzie, E. P.,
    & Broderick, C. J. (2005). Reducing playground bullying and supporting beliefs:
    An experimental trial of the Steps to Respect program. *Developmental
    Psychology, 41*(3), 479-491.

Fritzsche, B. A., Finkelstein, M. A., & Penner, L. A. (2000). To help or not to help:
    Capturing individuals' decision policies. *Social Behavior and Personality,
    28*(6), 561-578.

Garcia, S. M., Weaver, K., Moskowitz, G. B., & Darley, J. M. (2002). Crowded minds:
    The implicit bystander effect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,
    83*(4), 843-853.

Gardner, J. N., & Jewler, A. J. (1997). *Your college experience: Strategies for
    success – Expanded reader edition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing
    Company.

Gately, I. (2008). *Drink: A cultural history of alcohol*. New York: Gotham Books.

George-Warren, H., & Romanowski, P. (Eds.). (2001). *The rolling stone encyclopedia of
    rock & roll*. New York: Fireside.

Gfroerer, J. C., Greenblatt, J. C., & Wright, D. A. (1997). Substance use in the US
    college-age population: Differences according to educational status and living
    arrangement. *American Journal of Public Health, 87*(1), 62-65.

Gilbert, B. J., Heesacker, M., & Gannon, L. J. (1991). Changing men's sexual aggression-supportive attitudes: A psychoeducational intervention. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*(2), 197-203.

Gobo, G. (2007). *Qualitative research practice* (Seale, Gobo, Bubrium, & Silverman, Eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books, Inc.

Gottlieb, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (1976). *They Know I Saw It: Evaluation Apprehension and Diffusion of Responsibility in Bystander Reactions to a Violent Crime*. Paper presented at the Midwestern Psychological Association (Chicago, Illinois, May 6-8, 1976).

Government Archives. (2008). 21st amendment. Retrieved on November 23, 2008, from http://www.archives.gov/exhibits/charters/constitution_amendments_11-27.html

Greenhouse, S. (2010, May 24). Glimmers of hope for grads. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/25/business/economy/25gradjobs.html

Gulland, E. D. (1994). *Developing effective and legally sound alcohol policies*. Chevy Chase, MD: United Educators Insurance Risk Retention Group, Inc. Hawkins, D.L., Pepler, D.J., & Craig, W.M. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer intervention in bullying. *Social Development, 10*(4), 512-527.

Haines, M. P. (1996). A social norms approach to prevent binge drinking at colleges and universities. *The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention*. U.S. Department of Education.

Haras, K., Bunting, C. J., & Witt, P. A. (2005). Linking outcomes with ropes course program design and delivery. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration, 23*(2), 36-63.

Hawkins, D. L., Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer intervention in bullying. *Social Development, 10*(4), 512-527.

Hefler, J. (2006, June 6). Family to sue college over son's death: A notice said the College of New Jersey should have enforced drinking laws to protect John Fiocco Jr. of Sewell. The school defended its efforts. *Philadelphia Inquirer, The* (PA), Retrieved January 5, 2009, from Newspaper Source database.

Hegeman, R. (2007, July 4). Police: Shoppers stepped over victim. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from http://tiny.cc/kZRWa

Hingson, R., Heeren, T., Winter, M., & Wechsler, H. (2005). Magnitude of alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among U.S. college students ages 18-24: Changes from 1998 to 2001. *Annual Review of Public Health*, *26*, 259-79.

Howe, N., & Strauss, W. (2000). *Millennials rising: The next great generation*. New York, NY: Random House, Inc.

Hudson, J. M., & Bruckman, A. S. (2004). The bystander effect: A lens for understanding patterns of participation. *The Journal of the Learning Sciences, 13*(2), 165-195.

Illinois Liquor Control Commission. (2009). *Don't Be Sorry* (ILCC Publication). Chicago, IL: Koppel, I.J.

Johnston, L. D., O'Malley, P. M., Bachman, J. G., & Schulenberg, J. E. (2008). *Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975-2007. Volume I: Secondary school students* (NIH Publication No. 08-6418A). Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Jones, S. R., Torres, V., & Arminio, J. (2006). *Negotiating the complexities of qualitative research in higher education: Fundamental elements and issues*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kadison, R., & DiGeronimo, T. F. (2004). *College of the overwhelmed: The campus mental health crisis and what to do about it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kimmel, M. (2008). *Guyland: The perilous world where boys become men – Understanding the critical years between 16 and 26*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *Essays on moral development*. San Francisco, CA: Harper & Row.

Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A. & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence of sexual aggression and victimization in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Counseling & Clinical Psychology, 55*(2), 162-170.

Kristja'nsson, K. (2004). Emphathy, sympathy, justice, and the child. Journal of Moral Education, 33(3), 291-305.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Latané, B. & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10*(3), 215-221.

Lederman, L. C., & Stewart, L. P. (2005). *Changing the culture of college drinking: A socially situated health communication campaign*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Leichliter, J. S., Meailman, P. W., Presley, C. A., Cashin, J. R. (1998). Alcohol use and related consequences among students with varying levels of involvement in college athletics. Journal of American College Health. 46(6), 257-262.

Levine, M., & Crowther, S. (2008). The responsive bystander: How social group membership and group size can encourage as well as inhibit bystander intervention. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(6), 1429-1439.

Levine, M., & Thompson, K. (2004). Identity, place, and bystander intervention: Social categories and helping after natural disasters. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 144*(3), 229-245.

Levine, M., Cassidy, C., Brazier, G., & Reicher, S. (2002). Self-categorization and bystander non-intervention: Two experimental studies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*(7), 1452-1463.

Lewis, J. (2003). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (Ritchie, J. & Lewis, J., Eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lisak, D. & Miller, P. M. (2002). Repeat rape and multiple offending among undetected rapists. *Violence and Victims, 17*(1), 73-84.

Lynch, A. & Fleming, W. M. (2005). Bystander approaches: Empowering Students to Model Ethical Sexual Behavior. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 97*(3), 27-33.

Males, M. A. (1996). *The scapegoat generation: America's war on adolescents*. Monroe, ME: Common Courage Press.

Marklein, M. B. (2004, March 15). Colleges take fresh look at putting lid on drinking. *USA Today*, 07d.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing Qualitative Research*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Martinic, M. & Measham F. (2008). *Swimming with crocodiles: The culture of extreme drinking*. New York: Routledge.

Mastroleo, N. R., Mallett, K. A., Ray, A. E., Turrisi, R. (2008). The process of delivering peer-based alcohol intervention programs in college settings. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(3), 255-259.

McManus, K. (2008). *About Binge Nation*. Retrieved December 20, 2008, from: http://bingenation.com/

Melear, K. B. (2003). From in loco parentis to consumerism: A legal analysis of the contractual relationship between institution and student. *NASPA Journal, 40*(4), 124-148.

Miller, M., Hemenway, D., & Wechsler, H. (2002). Guns and gun threats at college. *Journal of American College Health, 51*(2), 57-65.

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

Mittelman, A. (2007). *Brewing Battles: The History of American Beer*, New York: Algora Publishing.

Mohler-Kuo, M., Dowdall, G. W., Koss, M. P., & Wechsler, H. (2004). Correlates of rape while intoxicated in a national sample of college women. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 65*(1), 37-45.

Mudde, A. N., Hoefnagels, C. J., Van Wijnen, L. G. C., & Kremers, S. P. J. (2007). Bystanding an Abused Child: Testing the Applicability of the Stages of Change Construct. *Health Education Research, 22*(1), 128-139.

Murgraff, V., Parrott, A., & Bennett, P. (1999). Risky single-occasion drinking amongst young people – definition, correlates, policy, and intervention: A broad overview of research findings. *Alcohol & Alcoholism, 34*(1), 3-14.

Myers-Lipton, S. J. (1998). Effect of a comprehensive service-learning program on college students' civic responsibility. *Teaching Sociology, 26*(4), 243-258.

National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse (CASA). (2008). *Wasting the best And the brightest: Substance abuse at America's colleges and universities – Introduction and executive summary 9*(2). Kingston, NJ: Campus Safety & Student Development.

National Youth Rights Organization. (2008). Retrieved November 26, 2008, from http://www.youthrights.org/legana.php

Nuwer, H. (1999). *Wrongs of passage: Fraternities, sororities, hazing, and binge drinking*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Olweus, D. (1999). *The nature of school bullying*: *A cross-national perspective*. London: Routledge.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Outside The Classroom / Alcohol.edu website: http://www.outsidetheclassroom.com/prodandserv/higher/alcoholedu_college/

Outside The Classroom. (2010). *The alcohol prevention coalition's 2010 annual research summit: Case examples of student engagement in campus alcohol prevention.*

Paschall, M. J., & Saltz, R. F. (2007). Relationships between college settings and student alcohol use before, during and after events: A multi-level study. *Drug and Alcohol Review, 26*(6), 635-644.

Pedersen, E. R. & LaBrie, J. (2007). Partying before the party: Examining prepartying behavior among college students. *Journal of American College Health*. 56 (3), 237-245.

Perkins, H. W., Meilman, P. W., Leichliter, J. S., Cashin, J. R., & Presley, C. A. (1999). Misperceptions of the norms for the frequency of alcohol and other drug use on college campuses. *Journal of American College Health, 47*(6), 253-58.

Perry, W. G., Jr. (1970). *Forms of intellectual and ethical development in the college years: A scheme*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Piliavin, I. M., Piliavin, J. A., & Rodin, J. (1975). Costs, diffusion, and the stigmatized victim. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 32*(3), 429-438.

Plante, T. G., Lackey, K., & Hwang, J. Y. (2009). The impact of immersion trips on development of compassion among college students. *Journal of Experiential Education, 32*(1), 28-43.

Quinones, J. (Producer). (2009). Public Hazing [*ABC News: "What Would You Do?"*]. New York: ABC News.

Rape Abuse & Incest National Network. (2008). Who are the victims? Breakdown by gender and age. Retrieved December 20, 2008, from http://www.rainn.org/get-information/statistics/sexual-assault-victims

Rapley, T. (2007). *Qualitative research practice* (Seale, Gobo, Bubrium, & Silverman, Eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Reisberg, L. (1998, November 6). MIT's inaction blamed for contributing to death of a freshman. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 45*(11), A57. Retrieved January 5, 2009, from Academic Search Premier database.

Richards, L. & Morse, J. M. (2007). *User's guide to qualitative methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Richter, L. (2003). *Teen Tipplers: America's Underage Drinking Epidemic*. New York: Center for Addiction and Substance Abuse.

Robinson, R., Roberts, W. L., Strayer, J. (2007). Empathy and emotional responsiveness in delinquent and non-delinquent adolescents. *Social Development, 16*(3), 555-579.

Rossman, G. B. & Rallis, S. F. (2003). *Learning in the field: An introduction to Qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Rubin H. J. & Rubin I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ruf, D. L., & Radosevich, D. M. (2009). How personality and gender may relate to individual attitudes toward caring for and about others. *Roeper Review*, 31, 207-216.

Ryan, A. (2007). *Qualitative research practice* (Seale, Gobo, Bubrium, & Silverman, Eds.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Schewe, P., & O'Donahue, W. (1993). Rape prevention: Methodological problems and new directions. *Clinical Psychology Review, 13*(7), 667-682.

Schwartz, M. D., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (2000). Aggregation bias and woman abuse: Variations by male peer support, region, language, and school type. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(6), 555-565.

Schwartz, S. H., & Gottlieb, A. (1980). Bystander anonymity and reactions to emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*(3), 418-430.

Schwarz, L., Jennings, K., Petrillo, J., & Kidd, R. F. (1980). Role of commitments in the decision to stop a theft. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 110*(2), 183-192.

Seaman, B. (2005). *Binge: What your college student won't tell you – Campus life in an age of disconnection and excess*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Segrist, D. J. & Pettibone, J. C. (2009). Where's the bar? Perceptions of heavy and problem drinking among college students. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 53*(1). 35-53.

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education and the social sciences*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Shankman, M. L. & Allen, S. J. (2008). *Emotionally intelligent leadership: A guide for college students*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shanley, M. G. & Witten, C. H. (1990). University 101 freshman seminar course: A longitudinal study of persistence, retention, and graduation rates. *NASPA Journal 27*(4), 344-352.

Sharma, M. (2008). Binge Drinking Interventions among College Students. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 52*(2), 3-8.

Simmons, J. L. & McCall, G. J. (1985). *Social research: The craft of finding out*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Simona, C. S., & Caravita, P. D. B. (2009). Unique and interactive effects of empathy and social status on involvement in bullying. *Social Development, 18*(1), 140-163.

Skully, M. & Rowe, M. (2009). Bystander training with organizations. *Journal of the International Ombudsman Association*, 2(1), 1-9.

Smith, P. K. (2003). Parent's definitions of children's bullying in a five-country comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34*(4), 417-432.

Smith, P. K., & Brain, P. (2000). Bullying in schools: Lessons from two decades of research. *Aggressive Behavior, 26*(1), 1-9.

Sokolow, B. A. (2008). Part II - We need to teach students how to drink. *NCHERM website*, retrieved on December 26, 2008 from: http://www.ncherm.org/pdfs/PART_II_DRINK.pdf

Sokolow, B. A., Lisak, D., & Banyard, V. (2007). *The state of campus bystander intervention efforts*. NCHERM Webinar, presented June 21, 2007.

Spiegel, A. (Producer) (2010, September 25). *Love is a battlefield* ["This American Life" Radio broadcast], Chicago, IL: Public Radio International.

Stanbury, S., Bruce, M. A., & Jain, S. (2009). The effects of an empathy building program on bullying behavior. *Journal of School Counseling, 7*(2), 1-27.

Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Szalavitz, M. (2010, May 24). How to deprogram bullies: Teaching kindness 101. *Time*, *175*(21), 60-62.

Swick, K. (2005). Preventing violence through empathy development in families. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 33*(1), 53-59.

Teicher Khadaroo, S. (2010, October 1). Rutgers student death: Has digital age made students callous? *The Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved from http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Society/2010/1001/Rutgers-student-death-Has-Digital-Age-made-students-callous

Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

"U.S. history of alcohol minimum purchase age by state." (2008). In *Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia*. Retrieved November 21, 2008, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/U.S._history_of_alcohol_minimum_purchase_age_by_state

Valentine, M. E. (1980). The attenuating influence of gaze upon the bystander intervention effect. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 111*(2), 197-203.

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

Walster, E. & Piliavin, J. A. (1972). Equity and the innocent bystander. *Journal of Social Issues, 28*(3), 165-189.

Walters, S. T. (2000). In praise of feedback: An effective intervention for college students who are heavy drinkers. *Journal of American College Health, 48*(6), 235-238.

Warshaw, R. (1994). *I never called it rape: The Ms. Report on recognizing, fighting and surviving date and acquaintance rape*. New York: Harper Collins.

Watt, R. (Producer), & Schuermann, P. (Director). Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity. (2008). *Tell Me Something I Don't Know* (Educational DVD). (Available from Phi Gamma Delta Fraternity, PO Box 4599, Lexington, KY, 40544-4599)

Wechsler, H., Dowdall, G. W., Davenport, A., & Castillo, S. (1995). Correlates of college student binge drinking. *American Journal of Public Health, 85(7),* 921-926.

Wechsler, H. & Kuo, M. (2000). College students define binge drinking and estimate its prevalence: Results of a national survey. *Journal of American College Health, 49*(2), 57-64.

Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Kuo, M., Lee, H. (2000). College binge drinking in the 1990s: A continuing problem - Results of the Harvard School of Public Health. *Journal of American College Health*. 48(5), 199-211.

Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Hall, J., Wagenaar, A. C., Lee, H. (2002). Secondhand effects of student alcohol use reported by neighbors of colleges: The role of alcohol outlets. *Social Science & Medicine, 55*(3), 425-435.

Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Nelson, T. F., & Kuo, M. (2002). Underage college students' drinking behavior, access to alcohol, and the influence of deterrence policies: Findings from the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study. *Journal of American College Health, 50*(5), 223-236.

Wechsler H, Moeykens B, Davenport A, Castillo S, & Hansen J. (1995). The adverse impact of heavy episodic drinkers on other college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol,* 56(6), 628-634.

Wechsler, H. & Wuethrich, B. (2002). *Dying to drink: Confronting binge drinking on college campuses*. New York: Rodale.

Wechsler, H. & Nelson, T. F. (2008). What we have learned from the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study: Focusing attention on college student alcohol consumption and the environmental conditions that promote it. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs, 69*, 1-10.

Weitzman, E. R., Nelson, T. F., & Wechsler, H. (2003). Taking up binge drinking in college: The influences of person, social group, and environment. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 32*(1), 26-35.

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

Whitt, E. J., Nesheim, B. E., Guentzel, M. J., Kellogg, A. H., McDonald, W. M., & Wells, C. A. (2008). "Principles of good practice" for academic and student affairs partnership programs. *Journal of College Student Development, 49*(3), 235-249.

Whittaker, M. K., Brown, J., Beckett, R., & Gerhold, C. (2006). Sexual knowledge and empathy: A comparison of adolescent child molesters and non-offending adolescents. *Journal of Sexual Agression*, *12*(2), 143-154.

Why 21. (2008). *Brief history of the drinking age*. Retrieved November 24, 2008, from http://why21.org/history/

Williams, R. M. (2007, March 16). Study aims at drugs, alcohol: Colleges need to take stronger steps to curb the abuse of substances on campus, report says. *Kansas City Star, The* (MO), Retrieved January 5, 2009, from Newspaper Source database.

VITA

Christopher Waugh was born and raised in Illinois. Before attending Loyola University Chicago, he attended Northern Illinois University, in DeKalb, Illinois, where he earned a Bachelor of Arts in English in 1993. From 1993 to 1996, he continued at Northern Illinois University, where he received a Master of Arts in Counseling.

At Northern Illinois University from 1996 to 2002, Chris served as a Residence Hall Director and Conference Coordinator. In 2002, he served as the Director of the Office of Leadership & Community Involvement and was promoted to the position of Assistant Dean of Students / Director of the Mohr Student Center.

While at Loyola, Chris facilitated ELPS 527: *Internship in Higher Education,* in the fall of 2010 and the spring of 2011. Currently, Chris is the Associate Dean of Students / Director of the Gates Center for Leadership & Personal Growth at Lake Forest College. He lives in Lake Forest, Illinois.