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ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores mixed-issue campus disturbances (celebratory riots), which are defined as a public conflict between aggregates of participants (mostly students) and authorities (usually the police) that did not begin as an issue-based protest gathering. These disturbances have increased in number and intensity over the past two decades, and the severity of the problem, in danger to students and public safety personnel as well as in financial costs, has prompted a variety of untested actions by universities and communities.

In an effort to develop a comprehensive description and a conceptual framework for further research, this mixed-method study combined a qualitative examination of student and public accounts of the disturbance that occurred after the 2002 Ohio State University/University of Michigan football game with data obtained through two quantitative surveys; one of administrators representing 31 universities and one of OSU students experiences with off-campus parties.

Despite underage drinking laws that prohibit young adults from drinking until age 21, students report, “drinking is the major glue that bonds students.” Student parties (typically in student off-campus housing neighborhoods) provide a place for students to drink with friends (over 70%
reported attending an off-campus party at least once a month). Large gatherings of students at parties appear to attract “entrepreneurs,” people (many of whom are not students at the university) intent on precipitating and participating in anti-social (car tipping, arson, etc.) behavior. As police take action to break up the parties before trouble begins or to apprehend the “entrepreneurs,” they often invoke negative responses from the partiers. Bystanders inadvertently affected by large-scale police tactics against partygoers and/or entrepreneurs, often join in the confrontation with the police in response to feeling unjustly harmed.

Analysis of student comments indicates that for 18-21 year olds, an underlying issue is the minimum drinking age and police and university tactics used to enforce it. This suggests further research into police training and response to gatherings of students is needed. The prevention efforts employed by universities also require additional thought and research, as student comments suggest that most of the efforts currently in practice are likely to fail.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

From the *Columbus Dispatch*, November 25, 2002.

Instead of basking in their Big Ten title, Ohio State University administrators, OSU students and city officials spent yesterday cleaning up a vandalized campus neighborhood and making embarrassed public apologies on behalf of street partyers who overturned and torched cars.

Starting about 1 a.m., police clad in riot gear escorted firefighters through clouds of tear gas to more than 100 street fires as crowds pelted them with bottles and rocks.

At least 20 parked cars were overturned, authorities said, and many were set afire, some exploding.

No serious injuries were reported.

Police arrested or cited 48 people for disorderly conduct, rioting and other misdemeanor offenses. But police vowed to file more charges after identifying people in amateur and media video footage, which was broadcast in national news reports.

"If we see them in the videotapes, we're coming after them," Columbus Police Deputy Chief Stephen Gammill said. Even bystanders could be charged with complicity, he added.

The street melees, which continued for several hours, overshadowed news of the victory over the University of Michigan. The game capped an undefeated football season and gave the Buckeyes a national-championship berth. (p. 01A)

Two characteristics of student behavior have long been associated with university life: student unrest, sometimes leading to riot and student drinking,
frequently leading to public drunkenness. Historically, student unrest, typically taking the form of protests and demonstrations, has been provoked by academic and institutional concerns or by social and political issues. Familiar to the ancient Greeks and to administrators in the medieval and later European university, student unrest has also been a frequent aspect of academic life in the United States beginning with the colonial era (Lucas, 1994). In 1766, Harvard was the scene of the “Bad Butter Rebellion” one of the worst of several food riots on the college’s campus brought on by students protesting the food being served at the university. The more recent Vietnam War era in US history was marked by significant student activism on college campuses, epitomized by the 1970 student protests at Kent State University that resulted in the shooting deaths of four students by Ohio National Guardsmen, sparking a wave of student riots around the country.

Alcohol consumption as part of the exuberance and indiscretion of youth has been equally well established in the academic culture. Disciplinarians of the medieval university were faced with problems caused by students roaming the streets after curfew and neglecting their studies for the local brothels and taverns (Lucas, 1994). *Gaudeamus Igitur*, a musical piece in the repertoire of many a college choir and still a traditional performance at some college graduation ceremonies, is a student drinking song that dates back to the middle ages. In the early 1700s, drunkenness among colonial college students was rampant, along with violent assaults and various other
forms of debauchery (Lucas, 1994). There is nothing new about college students rioting or drinking.

What is new, however, is the combination of these two activities into a phenomenon that some college administrators call “celebratory riots.”1 Frequently, but not always associated with sporting events, these student disturbances have grown in number and intensity over the last two decades. McCarthy, Martin, McPhail, and Cress (2002) conducted a Lexis-Nexis search of US daily newspapers to identify mixed-issue campus disturbances that resulted in a public conflict between aggregates of participants (mostly students) and authorities (usually the police), but that did not begin as an issue-based protest gathering. They identified 178 such disturbances between 1985 and 2001, with 114 (64%) of those disturbances occurring in the period between 1996 and 2001 (see Figure 1). These disturbances were related to

---

1 Choosing the term to use in this dissertation required a number of considerations. The term “celebratory riot” has been used in media accounts and by college administrators and, therefore, has some common recognition. The term is misleading, however, in that not all of these disturbances have been associated with celebrations (e.g., some have occurred after losing sporting events), and the term “riot” carries considerable cultural and emotional baggage and, in the case of law and individual policies, a definitive set of criteria (Michigan State University defines “riot” as “five or more persons, acting in concert, who engage in violent conduct and thereby intentionally or recklessly cause or create a serious risk of causing public terror or alarm”). I have chosen to use the term, “mixed-issue campus disturbance,” which is the term that McPhail and McCarthy (collective action sociologists) have used in their preliminary work on documenting the frequency of the phenomenon. Clark McPhail (personal communication, March 10, 2004) notes, “that while there are clearly common denominators in how people learn about and come to assemble in a common location in space and time, there are almost always differences in why they do so.” For example, some come for the announced reason, some because others insisted they accompany them, some out of curiosity, some for professional or scholarly reasons (police, journalists, university administrators), and as McPhail explains, “no doubt that some come because it may provide an opportunity to fight, to vandalize, to loot, to set fires, or just be drunk and disorderly.” McPhail also argues that the reason or reasons that bring people together may change into the reasons they stay (e.g., the student who initially came out of curiosity may subsequently become furious in the face of an over-reaction of the police to a bottle thrown from the area in which he or she is standing.)
sporting events, holiday events (e.g., Halloween, St. Patrick’s Day), social, and Greek events. Participant alcohol use was noted in approximately 80% of the newspaper reports of the disturbances and the mean property damage estimate for these disturbances was more than $40,000. The financial costs associated with police and university prevention and intervention efforts related to these disturbances, some of which have become student “traditions” at particular universities, run into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. The costs and potential costs to students’ well-being through injuries and even deaths are significant as well. Perhaps the most serious cost is the division these disturbances create within the university community and between the university and the larger community.
Figure 1. Frequency of U.S. campus/community disturbances NOT associated with protests, 1985-2002 (McCarthy, Martin, McPhail & Cress, 2002).

Although a body of research on American student drinking and its correlates exists, studies of student disturbances are scarce, dated, and for the most part limited to descriptions of the student political protest activities of the 1960s and early 1970s. The alcohol-infused, “celebratory” student disturbances that have become more frequent and more widespread among US campuses in the last decade have yet to be subjected to academic theory and rigorous study. This research void makes it impossible to base prevention and intervention efforts on scientifically obtained information rather than on mere speculation. Despite the lack of solid information regarding the causes and effective responses to these events, the severity of the problem, both in
danger to students and to public safety personnel and in financial and cultural costs, has prompted a variety of untested actions by universities and communities. Therefore, it is easy to determine that basic research into this phenomenon should be undertaken. The more difficult determination is where or how to begin when there are no previous studies to guide the logical “next step,” nor even the research based description of these events necessary to provide a framework for inquiry. In the case of mixed-issue campus disturbances, the basic elements needed to generate researchable hypotheses have yet to be assembled.

In the absence of a body of literature specific to mixed-issue campus disturbances, research that has been conducted in areas germane to these events must be used to create the beginnings of a conceptual framework. Heavy alcohol consumption has been reported in the majority of these disturbances, and the body of research on drinking among college students is substantial, as is the body of research on the relationship between alcohol and aggressive or destructive behavior. Both are included in the subsequent literature review.

Collective behavior or collective action literature is also reviewed, as it represents another area that offers explanatory information. Although the focus of a number of theorists, collective behavior has been the subject of observational research far less often. Riots, as a subset of collective action, have been subjected even less to empirical study, due in part to the complexity and relative infrequency of these events (McPhail, 1994a). The
spontaneous and temporal nature of the phenomenon contributes to the retrospective characteristic of the research that has been conducted. Though limited, the research studies of 1960s urban riots, and the research related to how public safety personnel respond to gatherings of people do provide insight into the course of mixed-issue campus disturbances.

Finally, the body of research on the propensity for adolescents and young adults to engage in risk taking behavior may offer insight on why college students engage in heavy drinking and participate in either the actual property destruction or the onlooker activities that are a part of student disturbances. Therefore, it is also included in the review.

The purpose of this endeavor, however, is to move beyond the very general framework that can be constructed through examination of related elements to the development of a detailed, comprehensive description of mixed-issue campus disturbances and conditions associated with their occurrence. The aim is to provide a basis both for understanding the phenomenon and for the eventual identification of a set of researchable questions. As such, this study will be a peculiar kind of project with a peculiar kind of approach (in comparison to a traditional social science study), combining multiple methods of inquiry and exploration, and involving varied informants.

Specifically, this study examines the disturbance at The Ohio State University (OSU) following a football game between OSU and the University of Michigan in November 2002. OSU’s victory came at the end of an undefeated
football season and sent the team to the national championship game. This disturbance was one of a series of disturbances that had occurred in the neighborhoods east of the OSU campus, some associated with football games, and others associated with unofficial student street parties or “festivals.”

Transcripts from focus groups of students, writing prompts of first year students and students living in residence halls, and email responses to questions posed by the OSU undergraduate student government president, along with university press releases, university reports, media accounts, task force reports and reports of surveys conducted by OSU department of student affairs were analyzed using qualitative methods. The goal was to develop an understanding of student perspectives in particular and in general to develop an in-depth description of the event in the manner of a case study.

Additionally, two quantitative surveys were administered and the results are reported in this study. The first was conducted in conjunction with the work of a task force assembled by OSU administrators in the aftermath of the disturbance. Administrators at 31 universities were interviewed regarding the incidence and details of disturbances on their campuses. They were also asked about community and university characteristics that may be associated with the absence or presence of this phenomenon. The second survey was administered on the OSU campus in the early fall 2003 and asked undergraduate students about off-campus parties. Data analysis of these two surveys was limited to descriptive statistics, as their purpose in this study was to help describe mixed-issue campus disturbances.
The severity and frequency of the disturbances that have occurred at OSU are a significant problem for the community for all of the reasons outlined (property destruction, financial costs associated with police and university prevention and intervention efforts, threats to students’ and public safety officials’ well-being through injuries and death, strains in relationships between “town and gown”). Perhaps, the greater problem is the divisions the disturbances represent and amplify – between administrators and students, between students who participate and those who do not, between neighbors and the students, between the city and the university, between the students and public safety officers. Without understanding, there is little chance of finding a solution to the disturbances occurring at OSU and other campuses, and every possibility for the spiral of conflict to continue.
Definition of Terms

Binge drinking

Defined as 5+ drinks in a single setting for males; 4+ drinks in a single setting for females.

Celebratory riot

Term used by news media and some college administrators to describe mixed-issue campus disturbances.

Collective behavior/collective action

Collective behavior is a field of study within sociology and social psychology that encompasses a wide array of behaviors, processes, structures, and contexts. Collective behavior typically focuses on a particular kind of behavior (e.g., riots) rather than on a particular institution such as schools. Collective action is the term adopted by later theorists and researchers to distinguish the newer theories and research from earlier collective behavior perspectives.

Heavy episodic drinking

Term used interchangeably with binge drinking.

Mixed-issue campus disturbance

Campus disturbances that result in a public conflict between aggregates of participants (mostly students) and authorities (usually the police), but that do not begin as an issue-based protest gathering. Although frequently associated with sporting events, these occurrences
also occur in connection with holidays, festivals, and impromptu gatherings of partying students.

Nonriot schools

Those colleges or universities reporting that they have not experienced a mixed-issue campus disturbance within the last ten years.

Public order management systems

Policing strategies used with large gatherings of people. The two most widely used are the escalated force style (a show of force followed by increases in force and tactics to match resistance) and the negotiated management (employs negotiations with leaders prior to onset and then uses the minimum amount of force and restriction necessary to keep the situation safe).

Riot schools

Those colleges or universities reporting that they have experienced a mixed-issue campus disturbance within the last ten years.

Risk behavior

An action (e.g., driving after drinking) or a nonaction (e.g., not using a condom during sex) that involves a chance of loss to the actor.

Risk taking

Engaging in a risk behavior or behaviors.

Risky decision

A decision that involves a choice in which at least one of the options entails a chance of loss.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

In the absence of research literature specific to mixed-issue campus disturbances, a review of theory and research in related areas is all that is possible. In the following review, I first examine the two areas most informative to the occurrence of mixed-issue campus disturbances: alcohol consumption by college students and collective action/rioting. I also examine two other areas of research that provide a more complete picture and explanation of the potential processes involved in the young adult behavior exhibited during these disturbances: the effects of alcohol on cognitive processes and aggressive behavior and young adult risk taking.

Alcohol and College Students

Prevalence and Trends

A number of studies have established that alcohol consumption among college students is a significant problem on most college and university campuses where, on average, 80% of students report that they drink and two out of five report that they engage in heavy episodic or “binge” drinking (Johnston, O'Malley, & Bachman, 1996). As part of an ongoing study begun in 1982, Engs, Diebold, and Hanson (1996) surveyed more than 12,000 university
students attending US colleges during the 1993-1994 academic year. Participating institutions were chosen for the study based on a “quota sample,” meaning that colleges and universities were chosen to be representative of all four year institutions of higher education in terms of their financial support (public vs. private) and size (over and under 10,000 students enrolled). Engs et al. used a pre-coded anonymous instrument (Student Alcohol Questionnaire), that contained 6 items regarding the quantity and frequency of wine, spirits, and beer consumption and 19 items regarding associated negative consequences (e.g., academic/social, legal/violence, health/personal). The questionnaire also included demographic, alcohol knowledge, and attitude questions.

Engs et al. categorized males that consumed more than 21 drinks per week and females that consumed more than 14 drinks per week as “at risk” drinkers. Males and females that consumed less than the threshold amount were categorized as “low risk” drinkers. Using a quantity/frequency method, study participants were further identified as abstainers, light to moderate, and heavier drinkers. Engs et al. reported that 72% of the total sample were drinkers, 20% were heavy drinkers, and 50% of the total sample were light to moderate drinkers. The mean number of drinks consumed by those students who reported themselves as drinkers was 10.9 drinks per week. A significantly higher percentage ($\chi^2 = 55.4, p. <001$) of underage students were classified as heavy drinkers compared to students of legal age to drink. A problem score
was calculated based on the negative consequence items of the scale. Male students had a significantly higher mean drinking problem score ($t=23.4$, $p<.001$) than female students.

The Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study (CAS) (Wechsler, Davenport, Dowdall, Moeykens, & Castillo, 1994) was first conducted in 1993 among a total of 17,592 college students in the US. Wechsler and colleagues identified a national sample of 179 colleges from the American Council on Education’s list of accredited four-year colleges and universities in the United States. Probability sampling proportionate to enrollment size was used to select the sample. All undergraduate students were eligible for selection for study inclusion regardless of their university affiliation. A final sample of 140 schools (out of the originally identified 195) in 40 states agreed to participate with 215 students at each of 127 colleges, and 108 at each of 13 other colleges (28,709) receiving the 20 page survey instruments by mail. Students were questioned about their recent drinking along with problems they may have had as a consequence of their drinking. Wechsler used sex, the recency of last drink, and the number of times in the last two weeks the participant had consumed five or more drinks in a row (four for women) to assess “binge drinking.”

---

2 It is important to note that within the field of alcohol research there is some controversy over Wechsler’s definition and use of the term binge drinking. Wechsler defines binge drinking as five or more drinks in a row for men, four or more for women. He argues that this measure has been adopted by the U.S. Surgeon General, the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and further, that his research indicates that this definition is understood by college students (Wechsler, 2000). Others argue that the term binge drinking has a different and specific clinical definition within
The response rate for the survey was 69% (17,592 of 25,627). The response rate was not associated with the binge drinking rate at the college as the Pearson correlation coefficient between the two rates was .06 (p. = .46). Wechsler et al. sent a short form of the questionnaire to a segment of the sample who had not returned the original questionnaire. The rate of binging among the subset of nonresponders did not differ from that of the students who responded initially to the survey. Sixteen percent of the respondents were nondrinkers (15% of the men and 16% of the women) and 41% of the students drank but were non-bingers (35% of the men and 45% of the women). Fifty percent of the men and 39% of the women (44% of the total) were classified as binge drinkers. One-half of the binge drinking group (19% overall) were frequent binge drinkers, defined as those who binged three or more times in the past two weeks. For the most part respondents reported the same drinking behavior in high school as they did in college. Forty-seven percent had not been binge drinkers in high school and did not binge drink in college. Twenty-two percent binged in high school and in college. The same percentage (22%) binged in college but did not binge drink in high school, and approximately 10% were binge drinkers in high school but not in college.

The CAS was repeated in 1997, 1999 and 2001 (130 of the original 140 in 1997, 128 of the original 140 in 1999, 119 in 2001; in each case, obviously, the alcohol treatment field (binge drinking is defined as an extended period of time – typically at least two days – during which time a person repeatedly becomes intoxicated and gives up his or her usual activities and obligations in order to do so), and that someone consuming five drinks over the course of an evening of eating and socializing might fail to reach blood alcohol concentrations of 0.06% or higher (DeJong, 2003).
different students participated) with the results showing little change in the overall rates of binge drinking from 1993 to 2001 (44% to 44.4%) (Wechsler, Lee, Kuo, & Lee, 2000; Wechsler, Lee, Kuo et al., 2002; Wechsler, Molnar, Davenport, & Baer, 1999). Beginning with results obtained from the 1997 survey, however, the percentages of abstainers and frequent binge drinkers each showed a significant increase (from 16.4% in 1993 to 19.3% and from 19.7% to 22.8%, respectively), indicating a trend towards polarization of drinking behavior.

In addition to rates of binge drinking on college campuses, the CAS studies have yielded other important information regarding college drinking. Given that the mixed-issue campus disturbance phenomenon appears to be largely confined to the US, the study in which Kuo et al (2002) compared the results of the 1999 CAS with the 1998 Canadian Campus Survey (CCS) is of some interest. The sample for the CCS was created using a stratified two-stage cluster selection of students enrolled in full-time, undergraduate studies during the 1998-1999 school year. The stratification was designated according to five regions across the country with four universities per region selected initially with probability-proportional to size. Twenty-three universities were approached for participation, with 16 of that sample agreeing to participate. One thousand students were randomly sampled at each university (no stratification was used for year in college or field of study). Students were queried by mail (15,118) and a response was obtained from 7,800 (51%). No significant differences were found between respondents and non-respondents.
Despite some differences in postsecondary education that exist between the two countries, Canadian universities share many attributes of the publicly funded US universities (political and economic) as well as some characteristics of the large private US institutions.

Canada has a lower legal drinking age (set by each province, it ranges between 18 and 19) than the US minimum drinking age, therefore Kuo et al. recoded respondents in the two studies according to whether they were of the legal drinking age for each country (1 for over the minimal legal age, 0 for under) to account for this difference. Comparable methods were used to standardize questions used in each survey regarding prevalence and frequency of alcohol use as well.

The mean age of the US students was 20.3 and the mean age of the students at Canadian universities was 20.7. Forty-two percent of the US students were below the minimum drinking age as compared to 6% of the Canadian students. The numbers of students living off-campus with parents differed significantly also, with 52% of the Canadian students and only 15% of the US students in this living situation. Canadian students were less likely than US students to live in a university residence (17% to 43%). About 31% of the Canadians students live off-campus without parents compared to 40.4% of the US students.

3 Unlike the US system of both publicly and privately funded universities, Canada has a national university system that is publicly funded, regulated by provincial governments, and is comprised of about 50 institutions. Participation in post-secondary education is higher in the US.
Canadian students reported greater lifetime and past-year rates of alcohol consumption than US students (91.5% to 86.1% and 86.9% to 80.9%, respectively). Past-week use rates did not differ significantly between the two samples, and in both countries, the past-week use rates for male students were significantly higher than those of female students. Heavy alcohol use (binge drinking) in both past-week and past-year was significantly higher among US students than those reporting from Canada (53.9% to 42.3% and 40.6% to 34.6%, respectively). Multiple logistic regression analyses of the correlates of heavy alcohol use showed that:

- US male students were more likely to engage in heavy alcohol use than were Canadian male students
- No significant difference existed between US and Canadian female students
- Older students from both countries were less likely to participate in binge drinking
- The effect of age was more significant than the effect of legal drinking age
- Students in both the US and Canada who live in university housing and off-campus without parents were more likely to engage in heavy alcohol use than those students living off-campus with parents
In both samples, those students who reported their first drunkenness before age 16 were more likely to engage in heavy alcohol use.

The extensive research on alcohol prevalence and trends establishes the pervasive expectation and practice of heavy alcohol consumption as an important part of the American college experience. This “cultural” expectation relates to student disturbances in at least two ways, first in providing a mental reference that college social events and celebrations involve alcohol, second by the pharmacological effects of the drug on the mental processes of those intoxicated students who attend or participate in the mixed-issue campus disturbances. Most media accounts of these disturbances reference the number of alcohol impaired students involved both as perpetrators of destructive behavior and as a supportive “cheering” section for the action. Both the qualitative and quantitative elements of this study explore the role of alcohol in mixed-issue campus disturbances.

**Consequences Experienced by Drinkers**

The negative consequences of alcohol use among college students are equally well reported in the research literature. The Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (CORE) used random and representative sampling techniques and was administered at 89 institutions receiving Federal Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) grants in 1992-94 (Presley, Meilman, & Casein, 1996). A total of 45,632 students were surveyed during this initial
administration of the CORE Survey at two-year and four-year institutions. Almost 22% of the students surveyed indicated that as a result of alcohol or drug use, they had performed poorly on a test or project. More than 27% indicated that they had missed classes due to substance use, 59.6% reported having had hangovers, and approximately 47% reported nausea or vomiting. Almost 26% had experienced memory losses, close to 30% reported being involved in an argument, and almost 13% reported being hurt or injured while under the influence of alcohol or other drugs. More than a third of the respondents reported doing something that they later regretted while under the influence, and 10% of the male students reported that they had taken advantage of someone sexually.

Hingson, Heeren, Zakocs, Kopstein, and Wechsler (2002) used data from the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Centers for Disease Control (CDC), national coroner studies, Department of Education, the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA), the National College Health Risk Behavior Survey, and the CAS to assess alcohol-related deaths, injuries, and other health problems among US college students. The purpose of their study was to determine the number of alcohol-related traffic and other injury deaths that occurred among part-time and full time college students (18-24 years of age) during 1998, and to estimate the number of 18 - 24 year-old college students who engage in alcohol related behaviors that create risks to their health.
Hingson et al. used data from the US Department of Education to establish the number of college age students between the ages of 18-24 in 1997. They used Department of Commerce data to determine the total number of youth in this age range (25,470,210) and Department of Education data to determine the number of youth in that range that were enrolled as full- or part-time students in either 2- or 4-year colleges (8,000,106) or 31%. The NHSDA, which surveyed 19,438 young adults between the ages 18-24 regardless of college status, reported that college students were more likely than same age non-college respondents to report binge drinking (five or more drinks) on at least one occasion in the past month and to report driving under the influence in the last year. Based on the NHSDA results and the reasoning that college students' propensity for such behavior is at least as high as that of non-college 18-24 year-olds, Hingson et al. estimated that college students experience 31% of the traffic and unintentional injury deaths experienced in the 18-24 year old population.

NHTSA reported 3,674 alcohol-related traffic deaths among the 18-24 age population. Using the 31% figure calculated above, Hingson et al. estimated that 1,138 of those deaths were of college students within this age group. The authors used similar methods using CDC and coroner data to calculate that 307 college students died as a result of alcohol-related non-traffic unintentional injury during the one-year period.

Hingson et al. also applied the percentage of college students aged 18-24 who reported in the CDC National College Risk Behavior Survey that they
had driven after drinking in the last 30 days (28%) to the 8 million college students nationwide to estimate that 2.2 million college students take that risk each month. Using the same formula, they projected that 3.1 million college students ride with a drinking driver each month. Using percentages from the CAS study, Hingson et al. also projected that during 1998, 630,000 students were assaulted or hit, 400,000 had unprotected sex, and over 70,000 were victims of sexual assault or date rape as a result of their drinking.

None of the studies on the negative consequences of alcohol consumption by college students included those experienced as a result of participation in alcohol-related mixed-issue campus disturbances. Students who attend such events put themselves in jeopardy of being hit by thrown objects, being trampled by surging crowds, being hit by police “non-lethal” ammunition, being crushed by overturned cars, and being burnt by out-of-control fires and burning cars. At the 2001 occurrence of Norwichfest, one of OSU’s unofficial student festivals that has escalated into a disturbance, an OSU student was hit in the eye with a rubber bullet during the disturbance, causing permanent loss of sight in one eye (Morandini, 2002). Those caught by authorities face disciplinary action by their university, criminal prosecution, and increasingly, educationally focused sanctions by the state (e.g., exclusion from state universities and denial of state financial aid). As the numbers of these events grow and authorities become increasingly determined to end them through escalated enforcement and sanctions, the consequences associated with such disturbances become greater as well.
Consequences Experienced in the Community

Results of the CAS study have also generated information regarding the negative consequences of alcohol consumption for all students living on college campuses. In the initial survey conducted in 1993 and reviewed previously in this paper, analyses of the data indicated adverse effects for students living on a campus that had a high drinking level. These effects were present even for students who were not heavy drinkers (Wechsler, Moeykens, Davenport, Castillo, & Hansen, 1995). Examples of corollary effects of heavy drinking assessed in the survey included being hit or assaulted, experiencing property damage, and experiencing unwanted sexual advances. Wechsler et al. calculated the odds of experiencing at least one problem from other students' drinking to be 3.6 to 1 when nonheavy drinking students at high drinking level schools were compared to nonheavy drinking students at lower drinking level schools.

The negative effects of alcohol consumption by college students are also experienced within the larger community. In 1999, Wechsler, Lee, Hall, Wagenaar, and Lee (2002) conducted a telephone survey of adult residents in the US. The sample was stratified to include areas near high and low binge schools as identified in the 1997 CAS study. The 30 schools in the CAS study (n=116) with the lowest prevalence of binge drinking were designated low binge schools, and the high binge schools were those 30 with the highest rates of binge drinking. The adult residents interviewed were asked if they had seen or witnessed any negative consequences of others’ drinking (e.g.,
noise, vandalism, litter, people who are drunk, fighting, or assaulting others, litter, vomit, public urination, automobile accidents) one or more times in their neighborhood within the last year. The number of people in these neighborhoods who had experienced four or more of the identified secondhand effects was examined. Those interviewed were then asked to identify the incidents that they attributed primarily to college students, permitting the categorization of the secondhand effects.

Respondents were also asked about community problems, including homelessness, crime, public drunkenness, drug use, vandalism, drunk driving, underage drinking, and loitering. Finally, they were asked to estimate the distance between their home and the nearest college (excluding community colleges) and how many alcohol outlets were within one mile of their home.

Wechsler used Chi-square tests to examine the difference in socioeconomic backgrounds between the two groups of communities defined by proximity to the closest college (within and farther than 1 mile). Multiple logistic regressions were used to test if the secondhand effects of drinking that were attributed to college students were different between residents of high and low binge drinking school areas, and whether they varied by the distance from the closest college. Structural equation models were used to explore the relationship between the number of alcohol outlets and secondhand effects and the proximity to the closest college or the college binge drinking level.
Among respondents living within a mile of a college, income was significantly lower, more were African American, more were 18-24 years old, and homeowners were less prevalent. Bars and liquor stores were more often located within the one mile designation (92% of those within one mile from the closest college reported one or more alcohol outlets compared to 75% of those living more than one mile away). When income, race, urbanism, and home ownership were controlled for, those respondents who lived within one mile were significantly more likely to report the presence of alcohol outlets (adjusted odds ratio = 2.83; p<.001). Those living within one mile more often reported homelessness, crime, public drunkenness, drug use, underage drinking, and loitering than those living more one or more miles from a college. They were also significantly more likely to report noise, disturbances, vandalism, drunkenness, and vomit and urination and were significantly more likely to report four or more of these effects.

More respondents in high binge drinking college sites reported the presence of alcohol outlets within a mile of their home (adjusted OR = 2.33; p<.001) and more often reported litter and noise/disturbance by college students than those living in low binge areas did. In the low binge areas, 10% of the respondents reported at least one secondhand effect. In high binge areas, 18.6% of the respondents reported such effects.

Property damage and vandalism, which usually occur in connection with student disturbances, have also been identified among the negative effects of alcohol consumption. In the national study conducted by Engs et al.
males and females who were low risk drinkers reported significantly less property damage in the previous year than those male and females who were high-risk drinkers (6% and 2% vs. 33% and 13%). In the CAS study (Wechsler, Dowdall, Maenner, Gledhill-Hoyt, & Lee, 1998) and the CORE study (Presley et al., 1996) about 8% of the students reported damaging property or pulling a fire alarm within the last year as a result of their drinking.

None of the national alcohol studies has assessed the damage communities experience in relation to student disturbances. In addition to property damage and vandalism, these communities incur the expense of increased police and prevention activity along with less tangible damages such as categorization as a partying, destructive school/community. In a non-researched effort to reduce the likelihood of a student disturbance, universities that have experienced such a disturbance commit substantial institutional funds to alternative activities, under the assumption that when given an alternative to drinking and parties, students will choose the alternative. In the current study, both students and university officials speak about the property damage suffered in disturbances and the role that alternative activities may or may not have in preventing the large drinking parties and disturbances.

**Influences on Drinking Behavior**

The variation in drinking behavior among individual students has been the focus of a number of research studies in which biological, social, psychological factors have been studied (Baer, 2002). Social and environmental factors are the most pertinent to this study of a collective phenomenon among
college students and will be examined in detail. However, it is worth noting here that the link between heavy and frequent alcohol use and a personality style of impulsivity (Camatta & Nagoshi, 1995), disinhibition (Clapper, Martin, & Clifford, 1994), nonconformity (Havey & Dodd, 1993), and sensation seeking (Arnett, 1996), has been consistently established in multiple studies (Baer, 2002). Young adult risk taking is examined in greater detail later in this review of the literature.

The social and environmental influences on college drinking have been the subject of a number of research studies, including the large studies by Wechsler and colleagues (CAS) and those by Presley et al. (CORE) previously described in this document. These studies yielded a number of environmental correlates to binge or heavy episodic drinking among college students:

- Racial make up (rates are higher at predominately white institutions)
- Presence of a Greek system (rates are higher among members of fraternities and sororities; the CORE study found that students with the highest levels of consumption and heavy episodic drinking episodes were those living in a fraternity of sorority house)
- Athletics (rates are higher among students involved in athletics)
- Two- or four-year designation (rates are higher at four-year colleges)
- Type of residence (rates are lower for commuters, higher for men living on campus, and higher for women living independently. In general, the average number of drinks per week and the number of
binge drinking episodes are higher for on-campus residents compared to off-campus residents)

- Size and region (higher rates at smaller schools and those in the Northeast and North Central regions)

- Age of students (underage students drink less frequently, but drink more per occasion, pay less per drink than of-age students, and typically drink in private settings, i.e., off-campus, dormitory, and fraternity parties)

- Community contexts [rates are lower in schools with high levels of social capital (defined as patterns of civic engagement and measured as student volunteer time) and higher in areas with less stringent enforcement of liquor laws and easier access to alcohol, e.g., discounted pricing of alcohol and close proximity of bars and retail alcohol outlets]

Harford, Wechsler, and Sebring (2002) used data from the 1997 and 1999 administrations of the CAS to examine student attendance and alcohol use at parties and bars in college. They used multiple logistic regression models to examine the correlates of attendance in each select setting (dormitory social event or party, fraternity or sorority event or party, party at off-campus housing, and off-campus bar or club) for the sample of current drinkers. They also conducted analyses on the proportion of drinkers at each select setting among those who reported attending such an event, and the proportion of
heavy drinking among drinkers in each setting. As expected, the correlation between year in school and legal drinking age was high ($r = .85$), so these covariates were included separately and in combination in the equations.

Off-campus parties (75.2%) and off-campus bars (67.6%) attracted more students than dormitory events (37.9%). Gender, place of residence, year in school, and legal age were significantly related to attendance at select settings. Male students were more likely than female students to attend dorm and off-campus parties and were less likely to attend off-campus bars. Student who lived on-campus were more likely to attend dorm parties and Greek parties than students living off campus with parents. Students living off-campus without parents were more likely to attend Greek parties and off-campus parties. Seniors were less likely to attend dorm parties and parties off-campus than were freshmen students, and sophomores, juniors, and seniors were less likely to attend Greek parties than freshmen. Students ranked as juniors and seniors were more likely to attend off-campus bars, and current drinkers of the legal age to drink were less likely than underage drinkers to attend dormitory, Greek, and off-campus parties. These students were more likely to attend off-campus bars. High proportions of freshmen (50.9%), sophomores (57.7%), and underage students (54.3%) reported attending off-campus bars.

The percentage of students that reported drinking in select settings was highest among those attending Greek parties (84.5%) followed by off-campus parties (75.2%), and off-campus bars (67.6%). The proportion reporting
heavy drinking followed the same order, 49.0% at Greek parties, 45.5% at off-campus parties, and 37.4% at off-campus bars. Men were more likely to drink and to drink heavily at each setting. Students living in coed dorms were more likely to drink and drink heavily in all settings when compared to students living off-campus with parents, and students living off-campus without parents were more likely to drink at Greek parties and off-campus parties, and to drink heavily at Greek parties, off-campus parties, and bars. Freshmen were more likely than all other classes of students to drink heavily at off-campus parties and bars. Drinkers of legal age were less likely to drink heavily at off-campus parties.

The importance of community contexts is illustrated in particular by a study by Weitzman, Folkman, Folkman, and Wechsler (2003). Weitzman et al. used CAS data gathered from eight universities participating in a Robert Woods Johnson funded program entitled “A Matter of Degree” (designed to reduce binge drinking and related harms) to examine the relationship of alcohol outlet density to heavy and frequent drinking and drinking-related problems. Seven of the universities had full-time undergraduate enrollments greater than 10,000 and all were publicly funded universities. Among all eight of the participating universities, there were 3,421 student respondents. The student populations of all participating institutions reported high levels of heavy (27% to 41%) and frequent (19% to 32%) drinking, frequent drunkenness (20% to 46%), and drinking-related problems (18% to 32%). Across the sites, 44
to 65% of the students indicated that “to get drunk” was an important reason for their drinking.

Researchers also collected information on alcohol outlets (typically serving college students) within a 2-mile radius of a central location point on or near the eight campuses (a total of 2304 were identified; 2217 were geocoded and mapped of which 966 were located within two miles of the central location points and 470 were within a one mile radius), using that data to calculate correlations between outlet density and the various drinking factors that were measured. There was a significant correlation ($r = .82$, $p = 0.01$) for all drinkers between outlet density and heavy drinking at an off-campus party (consuming 5+ drinks). A significant correlation existed between outlet density and frequent drinking (drank on 10+ occasions in the past 30 days) as well ($r = 0.73$, $p = 0.04$). As might be imagined given the other correlations, a significant correlation also existed between drinking-related problems (reporting 5+ problems since the beginning of the school year) and outlet density ($r = 0.79$, $p = 0.02$).

The findings of a study by Nelson and Wechsler (2003) on college drinking and sports fans are particularly germane to the proposed study given the number of students disturbances that happen in conjunction with sporting events. Nelson and Wechsler again used data from the 1999 CAS study to examine the relationship between alcohol consumption and college sports fans. The CAS questionnaire contained the question, “How important is it for you to participate in the following activities.” “Attend sports events” was one
of the twelve activities listed. Nelson and Wechsler defined sports fans as those students who responded that attending sporting events was “important” or “very important” to them. The researchers also classified universities with 40% or more of their total respondents reporting themselves as sports fans or playing intercollegiate athletics as “sports schools.” Using this criteria, a total of 34 of the 119 schools (28.6%) were classified as sports schools. School binge rates were also calculated (binge drinking rates ranged from 0% to 76%), and schools whose rates of binge drinking placed them in the top one-third of all schools or lowest one-third were designated high binge and low binge schools respectively.

The researchers used Chi-square analyses to measure differences in characteristics between sports fans and nonfans and multiple logistic regression was used to compute adjusted odds ratios to measure the difference between the groups of interest on alcohol use and alcohol-related problems, utilizing the General Estimating Equation (GEE) procedure to account for school-level effects. The multiple logistic regression model analyses were also adjusted for demographic factors of age, sex, race, and membership in Greek societies (variables previously found to be related to alcohol use).

More of the sports fans were male compared to the nonfan group (43% vs. 33%; $\chi^2_1 = 107.4$, $P < .0001$), and were more like to be under the legal drinking age compared to nonfans (55% vs. 47%; $\chi^2_1 = 68.0$, $P < .0001$).
sports fans were white (81% vs. 74%; $\chi^2 = 63.3, P<.0001$) and more were first
year students (25% vs. 21%; $\chi^2 = 27.5, P<.0001$). More sports fans reported
being a member of a Greek society (19% vs. 10%; $\chi^2 = 181.7, P<.0001$) and
were less likely to have ever been married (93% vs. 88%; $\chi^2 = 74.4, P<.0001$).
Sports fans also reported that they usually engaged in binge drinking while in
high school (36% vs. 27%; $\chi^2 = 80.1, P<.0001$).

Engaging in binge drinking was more often reported by sports fans
(Adjusted odds ratio, 1.55), and among those students reporting themselves as
drinkers, more sports fans drank on 10 or more occasions (Adjusted odds ratio,
1.56), were drunk on three or more occasions in the past 30 days (Adjusted
odds ratio, 1.43), usually binged when drinking (Adjusted odds ratio, 1.52),
and reported that drinking “to get drunk” was an important reason for
drinking alcohol (Adjusted odds ratio, 1.32). Sports fans also were more likely
than nonfans to report taking advantage of discounted alcohol in the
preceding 30 days (38% vs. 24%; Odds ratio, 1.99), and more often reported
taking advantage of special promotions by beer companies (19% vs. 11%;
Odds Ratio, 1.64).

At the school-level, sports schools were more often members of NCAA
Division 1 (77% vs. 49%; $\chi^2 = 7.3, P<.01$), and had enrollments greater than
10,000 students (65% vs. 35%; $\chi^2 = 8.5, P<.01$). The differences in other
characteristics, geographic region, location (town, urban, suburban, rural), religious affiliation, admissions criteria, or source of funding (public or private) were not significant. However, a significant relationship was reported between sports school status and high rates of binge drinking. The percentage of students who engaged in binge drinking and the percentage of students who identified as sports fans were significantly correlated (r = .28; P < .01). One half of the schools (50%) with the highest binge drinking rates were sports schools, while only 18% of the schools with moderate binge drinking rates and 19% of the low binge drinking schools were sports schools. Sports schools were significantly more likely to be in the high binge school group than were nonsports schools (χ² = 12.6, P < .01).

The environmental correlates that research has shown to influence college binge drinking rates may play an important role in the etiology of a student disturbance. Therefore, a number of context-related questions are included in the survey of university personnel conducted as part of this study. The percentage (75.2%) of students that Harford et al. (2002) found attended off-campus parties is particularly interesting in relation to the study of student disturbances, which by media and college official anecdotal accounts often occur as these types of parties grow larger and out of the control of the party hosts. The students who attend these parties tend to be freshmen and sophomores and underage, the age group that research also indicates drinks more than of-age students. I include findings from an OSU survey of students.
on off-campus parties in the development of the OSU case. Additionally, the relationship that Weitzman et al. (2003) established between the density of alcohol outlets and heavy drinking at off-campus parties might extend to the likelihood of a campus disturbance and is explored in the OSU task force survey that is also included in the analysis.

The relation between sports school status and high rates of binge drinking is also pertinent to the study of student disturbances as a number of these have occurred in relationship to major college sporting events. However, a number of student disturbances have had no association with sporting events. It may also be that in our sports-oriented culture, sporting events outnumber other reasons for gathering and celebrating (e.g., holidays and festivals) and this accounts for the frequent occurrence of mixed-issue campus disturbances in conjunction with athletic events. However, there may be cultural elements at institutions with strong sports orientations that contribute to the frequency and nature of student celebrations on those campuses.

Collective Events/Rioting

Sociologists and social psychologists have done most of the theorizing and research into collective events such as celebrations, riots, demonstrations, disasters, and social events. Two perspectives have developed in response to these phenomena: collective behavior and collective action. The term collective behavior encompasses early and some current theories regarding crowds and social movements, beginning with Gustave Le Bon’s transformative theory of mass hysteria, or social contagion. Collective action is
a term that came into use in the 1980’s in response to Couch’s (1968) challenge of the typical views espoused by collective behavior theorists⁴ and the systematic observational work of Clark McPhail in the 1970’s which established that much of what had been advanced about crowds and collective behavior was inaccurate (D. Miller, 2000). The term collective action was adopted by McPhail and other later researchers to distinguish the newer theories and research from earlier collective behavior perspectives.

The mystery of how humans come to act collectively in a “crowd” has spawned a number of theories, with perhaps the earliest (applicable to the study of riots) being developed by Le Bon in the late nineteenth century. Le Bon (1995) described a dramatic transformation of the individual in the crowd. He contended that the psychological forces of anonymity, suggestibility, and contagion combine to alter the individual’s identity and conscience, subjugating them to the “collective mind.” In this altered, child-like state, the individual becomes capable of violating personal or social norms, thus participating in acts collectively that would never be performed as an individual.⁵

---

⁴Couch asserted that crowds are yet another form of sociation exhibiting structures and behaviors that are no more nor more less bizarre than other social systems and that members of the crowd are at least as rational as the authorities who are the objects of their protest (McPhail, 1997).

⁵It is important to note the context under which Le Bon developed his theory. Le Bon, the university-educated son of a bureaucrat, was frightened by the violent strikes that occurred in Paris between 1869 and 1871 and the future of France under a populist democracy. As someone who generally disapproved of any crowd behavior, his interest was in finding ways to control and govern mass societies (McPhail, 1991).
Le Bon’s theory was reworked and formally introduced to social psychology as deindividuation theory (Festinger, Pepitone, & Newcomb, 1952). Although the language used in Festinger et al.’s deindividuation theory was more scientific, the central premise was the same as Le Bon’s; the loss of individuality in the presence of the crowd. Deindividuation theory, however, abandoned the idea of the “collective mind,” instead contending that the loss of individuality resulted in the loss of individual controls, thus releasing the individual from internalized social restraints. This release was what allowed the individual to partake in antinormative and disinhibited behavior.

Other social psychologists modified deindividuation theory in an effort to address limitations that appeared in the testing of deindividuation-oriented hypotheses (Diener, 1979; Prentice-Dunn & Rogers, 1982, 1989). However, a meta-analysis of the evidence for deindividuation theory (over 60 empirical studies) by Postmes and Spears (1998) found a lack of support for the occurrence of deindividuated behaviors or for the presence of a deindividuated state. Recent studies have confirmed Postmes and Spears findings (Coleman, Paternite, & Sherman, 1999; Kugihara, 2001). Although the transformation explanation is no longer prominent in most academic circles, it is the common wisdom among laypersons (i.e., “mob mentality”) (McPhail, 1991) and many law enforcement agencies, where it is associated with the escalated force style of protest policing (Schweingruber, 2000).6

---

6Two major forms of protest policing exist in the US: escalated force and negotiated management. The escalated force style is characterized by the use of force as the standard
referenced in media accounts of mixed-issue campus disturbances and by self-proclaimed riot experts as an explanation of student behavior at these events.)

An alternative theory to the transformation explanation proposed by the deindividuation theorists is the predisposition and social strain perspectives advanced first by Allport (1924) and later by Miller and Dollard (1941) in the deprivation-frustration and aggression model (DFA). The cornerstone of the predisposition perspective is that humans possess innate and acquired predispositions to behave in certain ways and that situational stimuli will prompt a predisposed response. The application of this perspective to crowds is that people gather in a specific place and behave in a particular way (i.e., their collective behavior) because of their predispositions, whether that be their political beliefs, their economic status, their personal values or their behavioral orientation. McPhail (1991) notes several problems with the predisposition perspective:

1. As with the transformation explanations, the theory is not based on actual observations of the behaviors the theory attempts to explain.

2. Predisposition theories assume that all participants in a gathering are exclusively and continuously engaged in the same behavior at the same way of dealing with gatherings of protesters. Police confront the crowd with a dramatic show of force that is followed by progressively escalated force tactics if their instructions for limiting the actions or dispersing the crowd are not followed (e.g., the 1968 Democratic National Convention). With the negotiated management style, police focus on preventing violence and containing the crowd, rather than crowd dispersal. This form of public order policing has been used extensively in areas and cities (e.g., Washington D.C. and New York) where police have frequent experiences with public protests and large gatherings of people.
time, an assumption that is not supported by systematic observations of crowds or gatherings. Such observations confirm that:

(1) The behaviors of which crowds are composed can alternate between sequences of individual behavior and sequences of social behavior, and (2) sequences of social behavior vary in form, in content, in complexity, in duration, and in the proportion of the gathering that participates. (p.44)

3. Predisposition theories were developed to explain extraordinary and violent behavior, which current research of collective action has shown to be rare among typical human gatherings.

4. Predisposition theory in general, and Miller and Dollard's DFA model in particular, have not been able to predict the events on which they are focused. Studies of US race riots (Lieberson & Silverman, 1965), property riots (Snyder, 1979; Spilerman, 1970, 1976), collective violence (Snyder & Tilly, 1972), and civil rights demonstrations (McAdam, 1982) have shown very low correlations of these occurrences with socioeconomic and/or political deprivations.

5. Predisposition theory does not sufficiently explain sequences of individual behavior in social situations, whether those behaviors are violent or nonviolent. Studies by Berkowitz and Geen (Berkowitz, 1965a, 1965b; Berkowitz & Geen, 1967) demonstrated that frustration is not necessary sufficient for individual aggression. Additionally, experimental studies that measured personality characteristics and
other personal and social attributes were unable to distinguish between those participants who delivered the maximum or no violence to the other humans in the experiment (Elms & Milgram, 1966; Larsen, Coleman, Forbes, & Johnson, 1972; Milgram, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1974).

Elaborating on ideas about the emergence of norms between humans in situations of ambiguity that were first proposed by Sherif (1936) and researched by Sherif and Harvey (1952), Turner and Killian (1987) developed the emergent-norm perspective of collective behavior. Turner and Killian also argued that total uniformity of mood and behavior within a gathering was seldom observed, and that various motives for participation exist within the crowd. Focusing on crowds that are confronted with extraordinary situations, Turner and Killian contended that collective behavior was governed by emergent norms that redefined right and wrong in a specific situation, possibly differing from the norms that prevailed in non-crowd situations. For example, in the face of a community disaster, patterns of authority and communication may emerge that are different from those existing before the occurrence. Young people may become important messengers and heavy equipment operators may become authorities on how work should proceed and then be in the position of giving orders to city officials (D. Miller, 2000). According to Turner and Killian’s theory, this shared redefinition provides the justification and the coordination of the collective actions.

Kroon, Kreveld, and Rabbie (1991) point out that emergent norm theory has a fundamental problem in that it cannot account for the specific content of
the emerging group norms. Therefore, it cannot predict the kind of behavior a

crowd will exhibit, allowing only a post-hoc explanation of the actions during

da collective event.

In contrast to the collective behavior approach, which is premised on

the idea that crowd behavior is a unique form of sociation or interaction

between humans, the collective action approach to gatherings emphasizes the

similarities between collective action and other types of social behavior (D.

Miller, 2000). There are three major perspectives within the collective action

orientation: the social behavioral interactionist (SBI) theory advanced by

McPhail and based on perception control theory (PCT) (1991), the resource

mobilization approach to social movements advanced primarily by Zald, Ash,

and McCarthy (McCarthy & Zald, 1977; Zald & Ash, 1966; Zald & McCarthy,

2002), and the political process theory (Fireman, Gamson, Rytina, & Taylor,

1979; Lipsky, 1968) of which major contributors are Gamson and Lipsky.

McPhail has conducted extensive observational work with gatherings and

riots and has discussed perception control theory in relation to mixed-issue

campus disturbances; therefore, PCT is discussed in some detail.

McPhail’s most recent explanation of perception control theory appears

as an appendix in Miller’s text on collective behavior and collective action (D.

Miller, 2000). McPhail utilizes Powers’ (1973) perception control theory to

explain the ongoing relationships between sensory experiences, cognitive

processing, and the purposive adjustments of action in dynamic environments,

noting that current neuroscience research supports and that the early writings
of Dewey, Mead, and Tilly, among others, are compatible with this model of human behavior.

McPhail (D. Miller, 2000) states that the central premise of perception control theory is that individuals act or make adjustments to their actions so that their present or current perceptions approach a set of reference perceptions (i.e., images or pictures in the mind) that serve as the goal, target, or intended outcome of their actions or adjustments in actions. These reference perceptions are innate (e.g., adding or removing clothing to regulate body temperature) or are based in memory as the result of a lifetime of interactions between the individual and others and the individual and his or her environment. For example, the college student who sets out to host a large off-campus party has an “ideal” or an image of what a “good” college party should look like – perhaps, lots of people drinking lots of beer with lots of loud music – and will plan and organize to try and create an event that corresponds with the internal picture he or she has as a result of previous social interaction\(^7\). Discrepancies between the reference perception and the current perception of the situation, causes adjustments in actions. In our party example, if the local community has imposed a one-keg limit on the number of beer kegs a person can purchase, the party host might arrange for friends to purchase the additional kegs needed to equip the party with enough beer to reach his or her internal reference. The random disturbances (the local

\(^7\) Another example of a strong reference perception among sports fans is that of tearing down the goalposts at the end of a significant football victory. Chapter 4 reports vivid descriptions by students of how important this was at the end of the OSU/Michigan game.
discount store is out of red cups) or deliberate obstacles (the local beer
distributor complies with the beer keg limit or imposes an additional deposit)
require the individual to make continuing adjustments to achieve the desired
outcome. Because the causal relationships between the reference perception,
the purposive action, the variable environment, and the current perception are
not linear, but both continuous and recursive, PCT is considered a “closed
loop, negative feedback” model of purposive action.

A theory of collective action must account for the variability of an
individual’s behavior in a gathering. Observational research (McPhail, 1994b;
McPhail & Wohlstein, 1983) establishes that in gatherings, people alternate
between individual and collective action, and that seldom, if ever, is everyone
participating in the same action at the same time. When collective action
occurs, it is made possible among individuals through the use of symbols, or
language. Although each person has their own unique set of memories and
reference perceptions, individuals can share the symbols or names they give to
different experiences or categories of experiences and thus can communicate
about processes, actors, actions, objects and events. For two or more
individuals to participate in collective action, they must be able to adjust their
individual actions to realize comparable or congruent reference perceptions.
McPhail (D. Miller, 2000) outlines three ways that similar or related reference
perceptions can be established among multiple parties:
• Independently. Similar reference perceptions can be independently drawn upon among people who have an extensive interaction with each other. For example, those who have the same social networks, are members of the same groups, and are denizens of particular cultures will frequently have similarly named categories of experiences stored in their memory. In American culture, there is no need for a gathering of individuals to consult with one another or to be instructed to applaud at the end of a high school play or to cheer when the college football team scores a touchdown. Those reference perceptions can be drawn upon independently as the appropriate outcome for such events.

• Interdependently. When individuals are faced with a task that cannot be completed through the actions of a single individual, they must interact through words and gestures and establish what needs to be done, who will do what, when it will be done, etc. In this manner, individuals interdependently establish the comparable or congruent reference perceptions.

• Adoption from a third party. Complex problems and those requiring greater numbers of people to achieve a solution, frequently require a single source of reference perceptions that addresses the similar or different but related reference perceptions for multiple parties. An example of a third party is the coach of an athletic team, who
perceives the outcome of the individual actions, compares it to his or her reference perceptions, and then requests adjustments in the actions of others to obtain the desired collective outcome.

Additionally, these three sources of reference perceptions often operate in combination, as third party sources of reference perceptions frequently require supplemental interaction by individuals who do not hear or comprehend what is being asked of them or who are resistant to comply with the requests of the third party. As well, the implementation of the third party requests often requires the other individuals to draw independently upon their own memories to supplement what the third party has proposed.

In applying PCT to the violence that occurs in riots and other gatherings, McPhail (1994a) explains the two different paths to violence that occur, distinguishing between outcome violence and intended violence. In the path to outcome violence, individuals act, alone or together, to control the situation and therefore their perceptions in relationship to some nonviolent goal, such as “partying hard” (in the example of the college students). When these individuals encounter resistance or interference, they attempt to go around, surmount, resist, or eliminate that interference. If that interference persists along with their continued efforts to overcome it, the struggle between the interference and purposive resistance may lead to violence, even if the original intention of the individual or group was not violence, but political protest or, in the case of drinking parties turned celebratory riots, “having a good time” partying. This would typify the type of outcome violence
that results from police trying to disperse large groups of drunken partiers or
large groups of bystanders intent on observing the action.

Intended violence comes from those for whom violence is their intention
from the beginning. These individuals will act to make their perceptions of the
situation match their goal of violence, such as vandalism, looting, arson, and
assault (McPhail, 1994a). Soccer hooligans who go to games intent on beating
someone or those who participate in mixed-issue campus disturbances and
from the beginning have the objective of vandalizing and burning property are
both examples of individuals controlling their perceptions for a different goal –
that of creating destruction and violence. The differences in reference
perceptions and intended goals between these two types of riot participant
illustrate the importance of response tactics of local law enforcement agencies.

Student anecdotal accounts of the disturbances indicate that the
general objectives of the young adults in the area can be categorized as (a)
those who want to see what’s going on, (b) those who want to party hard and
consider any police actions as provocation for destructive behavior, and (c) the
very few who were intent from the beginning on creating a disturbance and
participating in destructive behavior. The large gathering of onlookers and the
crowd of partiers provide an opportunity for the third group of participants.

Perceptual control theory provides the explanation for internal
processes that govern individual and collective actions. Observations of
human action and consideration of the ecology surrounding those actions are
necessary to describe sufficiently the external aspects of student disturbances.
or riots. McPhail (1994a) notes that there are two obstacles to the study of riots: the complexity of the phenomena and the relative infrequency of these events. To address the issues of complexity, McPhail suggests breaking riots (and other collective phenomena) into three elements: assembling processes, the activities of the gathering, and dispersal processes. Again, McPhail has provided the greatest body of observational data regarding gatherings and riots, both through systematic observations in natural settings and through review of archival videotapes.

The circumstances and processes by which people come together or assemble in an area where rioting develops or is already occurring has been the focus of several researchers. McPhail (1971) conducted a secondary analysis of the data from 10 studies of five different riots that occurred during the 1960s. The initial researchers explored the relationship between a number of demographic, attitudinal, socioeconomic, experiential, and political variables and riot participation. The only attributes that yielded moderate and high associations were those of age (young), sex (male), ethnicity (African-American), and educational level (low). McPhail argues that a plausible interpretation of the data is that such persons are more available for participation because in current US society, these attributes result in a large amount of unscheduled and uncommitted time. Urban riots tend to develop at times (after working hours or on weekends) when more people are available (Snyder, 1979). The time availability factor for participation in an event is further supported by studies that have plotted the chronological patterns of
riot activities (Burbeck, Raine, & Stark, 1978) which show that riot activities begin to increase in the afternoon, peak around midnight, and then drop to the lowest frequency between 4 a.m. and 8 a.m.

The other known fundamental aspect of riot assembling processes is that of location. Urban riots in the 1960s most often began in proximity of high-density housing (social density allows for the communication networks needed for assembling communication) and or major intersections or thoroughfares (Snyder, 1979). In some cases, common reference perceptions negate the need for actual communication regarding potential gathering spots (or for that matter, expected action, e.g. there is no need to tell attendees at a university football game what to do as the “wave” rolls around the stadium). Schelling (1960) conducted an experiment (Shelling acknowledged that this was an “unscientific” study) in which 36 subjects were asked an open ended question about where they would go if they were given no other information other than to go and meet someone somewhere in New York City on a certain day. In trying to anticipate where and when other people would expect them to be, the majority of the subjects said that they would go to the information booth in Grand Central Station, and all of the subjects when asked at what time they would appear at the meeting place, said they would do so at high noon. The subjects were also asked to pick a point on a provided map to wait for another person with whom they did not have an arranged meeting place, but that they knew had the same map. Seven out of eight of the subjects chose the same spot. Haddock and Polsby (1994) note that although some people
may select a non-viable place in a riot-assembling process, others will have correctly guessed the right place. Those who have guessed wrong and who still are intent on going to the scene of the event, whether to observe, to accompany a friend or to participate in the riotous activities, can find their way through noise, media coverage, or as is frequently the case in the current phenomena of campus disturbances, by cell phone.

The point at which destructive behavior begins in an assembled group appears to be the function of two things: a critical mass and a signal or incident that forms a focal point. Marwell and Oliver (1993) have written on the idea of the critical mass in collective action, in part to address the problem of the “free rider,” an issue of rational choice often referred to by economists. The free-rider problem occurs when a benefit is not excludable, that is, the benefit cannot be limited only to those who pay for it. The idea is that rational individuals will not voluntarily contribute money or effort to the provision of a good that they can consume anyway. Marwell and Oliver argue that the problem of collective action is the conflict between an individual's own interests (thus the inclination to free-ride) and the interests of the group as a whole. They reason that belief in a group’s efficacy is a critical aspect of an individual’s decision to participate:

---

8 Mosquito abatement is a frequent economic example of the free-rider problem. The scenario offered is that an area has a severe mosquito infestation and someone decides to offer a mosquito reduction service wherein customers are asked to pay $25 for the service. Because mosquitoes are indiscriminate in whom they bite, both those willing to pay and those who are not willing to pay will receive the benefit of mosquito reduction. Thus, it is rational for an individual to choose not to contribute to the service as long as they can expect someone else to fund it.
An urbanite considering joining in a riot may assume that the risk of any one individual being arrested declines with larger numbers of rioters; an office worker may consider the possibility that her contribution to United Way will increase the social pressures on others to contribute as well; a participant in a wildcat strike may also expect his presence on the line to embolden others to participate. People join groups involved in collective pursuits not only out of perceived common interests, but also because they regard the groups or individuals organizing the action as in some sense efficacious. Belief in the efficacy of the group may be based on a record of previous successes at stated goals, on the endorsement of a friend or relative who is already involved in the group or even on lip service by authorities to the goals of the group. For most people, however, the most prominent and convincing evidence of a group’s efficacy is probably the group’s size and command over resources. (pp. 9 – 10)

An interesting question in relation to student disturbances is what size group is needed to appear efficacious to potential participants? Although the current study cannot directly answer that question, questions asked in the survey of university administrators regarding the number of people involved in campus disturbances can at least provide information on the lowest number of participants involved in a reported disturbance.

Haddock and Polsby (1994) argue that the high-profile event or “starting signal” does not tell someone what to do, but is rather a signal that tells a
person what other people will probably do. They use the example in an urban riot of the sound of a breaking window as a signal that others may begin looting. Anecdotal accounts of student disturbances often note the lighting of a fire as a signal that the dynamic has changed (this is also a point at which public safety personnel change tactics as well). McPhail (1997) notes that an elementary form of collective action that occurs in a variety of gatherings are arcs and rings of people which form around a focal point, such as speakers, arguments, fights, and arrests. Video footage of student disturbances exhibit dense arcs and rings around fires and those attacking automobiles. McPhail's many observations of gatherings indicate that the appearance of these arcs and rings of people frequently represent a touchstone in the milling process, as individuals and clusters of people converge around those proposing or engaged in a specific course of action.

Another critical factor in the ultimate course of a collective event is the behavior of social control agents (e.g., police, national guardsmen) as they interact with members of a gathering. Stott and Reicher (1998) note that early crowd psychology (Le Bon and Allport) viewed crowd conflict as a derivative of the pathology of the crowd itself and that this view has been used by government and police leaders to consistently advocate for more and heavier policing. Stott and Reicher interviewed 26 Public Order trained police in the United Kingdom. These officers were questioned about their perspectives of
crowds in general and of the 1990 Poll Tax riot in particular. Although officers acknowledged that the crowd was heterogeneous and included law-abiding citizens, they perceived a homogeneous crowd threat, believing in an anti-social minority that was capable of exploiting the mindlessness of the majority of ordinary people in the crowd. As a result, officers perceived all crowds as potentially dangerous, and in situations of actual conflict, all members of the crowd as equally dangerous. Further, the officers reported that given the nature of their tactical interventions, that it was impossible to distinguish crowd members or subgroups of crowd members from each other either behaviorally or physically. Stott and Reicher argue that this perspective and the resultant actions of the police often play a key role in initiating and/or escalating conflict in collective action contexts.

In an examination of the roots and subsequent diffusion of escalated force tactics, Schweingruber (2000) examined various US police documents that discussed the policing of crowds, demonstrations, and riots. Schweingruber identified Raymond Momboisse, a California deputy attorney general in the 1960s, as one of the key disseminators of what Schweingruber terms “mob sociology,” or an attempt to explain how a law-abiding crowd becomes a law-breaking mob (via Blumer’s modified version of Le Bon’s transformation theory of the crowd). Momboisse, who wrote multiple books on

---

9 The Poll Tax Riot arose out of a large national demonstration against an unpopular “Poll Tax,” a flat rate local tax. The riot began after police intervened with a sit-down protest outside of Downing Street and grew into one of the largest instances of public disorder London had experienced in more than 20 years.
crowd control along with writing and producing a training film for the police, was a member of the Riot Advisory Committee of the President’s Commission on Law Enforcement in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Schweingruber reports that Momboisse borrowed heavily from the work of Joseph Lohman, who held a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago and became the chair of the Illinois Division of Correction. Momboisse promoted the idea that the individual is absorbed into the crowd and is controlled by the “crowd mind,” a pervasive condition that leads to violent behavior. He also maintained that any show of weakness by the police encouraged mob violence, and he developed and used scientific sounding taxonomies (without supportive data) of crowd types, members, and psychological attributes to lend weight to his arguments.

The escalated force style of public order management resulted in a number of violent and deadly clashes between police and demonstrators during the 1960s and 1970s, the result of which was the Kerner Presidential Commission of the Causes and Prevention of Violence and the Eisenhower Presidential Commission of the Causes and Prevention of Violence (McCarthy, McPhail, & Crist, 1999). These reports recommended a principle of minimum necessary force and helped precipitate a redesign of the US civil disturbance orientation course (SEADOC). The new orientation was on “confrontation management” which encouraged police contact, interaction, and negotiation with protesters before, during, and after protest events. The negotiated management form of public order policing has been diffused across a number of police systems within the US, with departments that routinely deal with
civil protest (e.g. New York, San Francisco, and Washington D.C.) being the most experienced with this strategy. Schweingruber (2000) reports, however, that mob sociology is the only social science theory of the crowd to appear in the current police literature and that research is nonexistent on how well negotiated management has been diffused throughout other cities and smaller communities. As long as the outdated and disproven theory is perpetuated in police literature and training while contemporary theory and empirical research is absent, the potential for repressive police tactics and self-fulfilling ideas about the violent capacity of the crowd is substantial.

The widespread occurrence of binge drinking and the thousands of large gatherings of students and others that occur weekly if not daily on US campuses, most without incident, suggest that the overall approach and specific responses exhibited by public safety personnel are a potential factor in the course of a student gathering. It is easy to imagine as well, that many of the community police agents that respond to brewing disturbances have not been trained on the more advanced methods of crowd control and, given the results of Schweingruber’s research, have been exposed to theories that support more aggressive responses to crowds of people (particularly drunken, young people). The survey of administrators used in this study asks about policing style and if violence and/or destruction escalated or deescalated when law enforcement arrived at the scene of the disturbance. The student accounts of the OSU disturbance provide their perceptions of police actions and the role it played in the disturbance.
Little research has been conducted to illustrate the prevalence and patterns of alcohol-related aggression among college students. However, a number of theories and research on the relationship between acute alcohol consumption and aggression can be found in the literature. The research studies support a strong relationship between acute alcohol consumption and aggressive behavior, while denying the assumption that alcohol directly causes aggression (Giancola, 2002). One difficulty in applying this research to mixed-issue campus disturbances, however, is the definition of aggression used in most theoretical and research literature (typically behavior directed at persons) and the variability of “aggressive behavior” displayed by some participants in student disturbances, that is, much is directed only at property.

Berkowitz (1993) devotes a chapter to the question “what is aggression?” in an effort to develop a clearly understood definition. He defines it as “any form of behavior that is intended to injure someone physically or psychologically” (p. 276), a definition that he finds congruent with that generally used in research-oriented texts. The specification that aggression is the intent to injure a person makes it less applicable to the indiscriminate property damage and vandalism that frequently accompanies student disturbances, and in fact, the experimental research studies regarding aggression and alcohol often employ methods wherein the subject’s aggression is measured by the intensity and frequency of “shocks” he or she administered to a human partner. Drawing a parallel from aggression
exhibited towards another person in a laboratory to an intoxicated student’s willingness to set his old couch on fire in the middle of the street is questionable. Aggression towards people, however, can and does manifest itself during mixed-issue campus disturbances, typically at public safety personnel who are attempting to intervene in the property destruction and/or to disperse the crowd. Therefore, the research in this area may be informative regarding aggression towards others, but is far from definitive in explaining behavior directed at property destruction.

Giancola prepared an extensive review of the existing research on alcohol and aggression (2002) with a focus on college students. In his article, he outlined two general theories of aggressive behavior that rely on broad constructs and processes for explanation and that provide the framework for more specific models related to alcohol and aggression. The first is proposed by Geen (1990), who theorized that aggressive behavior is elicited based on two factors: background (which includes genetics, physiology, temperament, socio-cultural expectancy, etc.) and provocative environmental stimuli that produce stress, arousal, and anger. Under this theory, how the stimuli are interpreted determines whether aggression is expressed.

The second is theory is one put forth by Berkowitz (1993), who proposed that aggression was the result of experiencing negative affect (unpleasant feelings brought on by frustration, insults, attacks, noise, etc.). Berkowitz postulated that it was not the direct effect of these factors that produce aggression, but the psychological damage or negative affect that they produce
and the resultant activation of aggression- or fear-related cognitions, feelings, expressive-motor and physiological reactions related to basic fight and flight tendencies. This theory does not appear to be as relevant to the study of aggressive behavior during mixed-issue campus disturbances as a negative affect is not evident in those participating in the drinking, couch burning, and car rolling.

Several models specific to the study of alcohol and aggression have also been offered (Giancola, 2002). The expectancy model is based on the assumption that aggression is not due to the pharmacological effects of alcohol, but to the a priori belief that one has consumed alcohol, that is, the belief that alcohol causes aggression. However, results of studies constructed to measure the effect of belief on aggression have not been definitive. Some have shown full (Lang, Goeckner, Adesso, & Marlatt, 1975) placebo effects on aggression, but a number of others have not found aggressive behavior to be influenced by the belief that alcohol has been consumed (Chermack & Taylor, 1995; Giancola & Zeichner, 1995; Zeichner & Pihl, 1979).

Most experimental studies of alcohol-related aggression in college students have used the Taylor Aggression Paradigm (TAP) to measure aggression (Taylor, 1967). Students are told that they are participating in an experiment of reaction times, and then are asked to compete against a fictitious opponent. Prior to each reaction time trial, the subjects are asked to select a shock intensity ranging from 1 to 10 that they will administer to the opponent. If the subject “wins” the trial, the “opponent” is delivered a shock.
The subject receives a shock of varying intensity (to manipulate the level of provocation) if they “lose” the trial. In many of these studies, the experimental design has been to divide students into three groups: alcohol, no alcohol, and placebo. The placebo is used to control for the possibility that aggression is simply the result of the belief that one has consumed alcohol (expectancy model). As noted before, the results from these studies have been mixed. The contradictions in results may be the result of the inability of placebo manipulations to account for individual differences in beliefs that alcohol will increase aggression (i.e., placebo manipulations may be effective in increasing aggression but only in those subjects who hold beliefs that alcohol will increase aggression). Studies based on the expectancy model that take into account individual differences in alcohol expectancies for aggression have reported support that expectancies interact with alcohol to increase aggression (Chermack & Taylor, 1995; Leonard & Senchak, 1993).

The premise of the disinhibition model (Graham, 1980), considered to be a very general explanation, is that alcohol has a direct effect on aggression by pharmacologically disinhibiting brain functions that are important in providing inhibitory control over behavior. The unrefined version of this model has limited empirical support, as aggression is not displayed by every person when consuming alcohol. A refinement of this model, known as the indirect cause model, postulates that alcohol affects particular psychological and/or physiological processes that in turn result in aggressive behavior. The indirect
cause model is the basis for more than seven working hypotheses of alcohol-related aggression that focus on cognitive processes.

Operating under a cognitive model, Steele and Josephs (1990) noted that alcohol’s effects on human social behaviors and emotions differ greatly and are highly irregular; some people may become aggressive when intoxicated, others more altruistic. Further, the effects of alcohol vary within specific drinkers, that is, the same amount of alcohol consumed by the same person at different times may evoke a different set of behaviors. In trying to solve the puzzle this reality poses, Steele and Josephs have focused on alcohol’s general impairment of perception and thought. They propose that alcohol intoxication affects social behavior and emotion primarily through an interaction of the shortsighted information processing that is a part of alcohol intoxication – “myopia” – and the nature of the cues the intoxicated person experiences in a given setting. If we think of this in conjunction with perceptual control theory, alcohol will affect an individual’s ability to draw on reference perceptions, to make accurate comparisons between the reference and current perceptions, and to adjust behavior accordingly.

The work of Steele and colleagues focused on three categories of socially significant alcohol effects: drunken excess, drunken self-inflation, and drunken relief. Drunken excess refers to alcohol’s tendency to make peoples’ social actions more extreme or excessive (e.g., more aggressive, more talkative, more socially assertive, more amorous, etc.) than they would be if they were sober. This is the quality of the drug that is both prized and
dangerous. Alcohol research indicates that the mechanism by which this transformation occurs is through impairment of perception and thought (Birnbaum, Hartley, Johnson, & Taylor, 1980; Moskowitz & Depry, 1968; Tarter, Jones, Simpson, & Vega, 1971). Steele and Josephs (1990) assert that:

1. Alcohol intoxication consistently restricts the range of cues that we can perceive in a situation. When we are drunk, we simply attend to and encode fewer available cues, internal as well as external.

2. Alcohol intoxication reduces our ability to process and extract meaning from the cues and information we do perceive. When we are drunk, we are less able to elaborate incoming information, to relate it to existing knowledge, and thereby to extract meaning from it (p. 923).

Steele and associates (Steele, Critchlow, & Liu, 1985; Steele & Southwick, 1985) also identified under what conditions alcohol myopia would lead to excess. Their hypothesis was that this would occur in situations wherein the person, if they were sober, would experience a certain response conflict, an inhibition conflict. These situations are ones in which a response that is provoked by salient, strong cues is also inhibited by other strong cues that require additional processing to grasp. For example, Zeichner and Phil (1979) conducted a pain-perception/reaction-time experiment with seventy-two 18-35 year-old male social drinkers, who were randomly assigned to one of six groups. One third of the study participants received alcoholic beverages,
one third received placebo drinks, and another third received no beverages. Each subject received a noxious tone that he or she was told was delivered by a (bogus) partner. The subjects were told that the tone could be stopped by giving the partner an electric shock as fast as possible. Aggression was assessed by the intensity and duration of shocks each subject administered. One-half of the subjects in each of the three beverage groups were exposed to aversive contingencies correlated with their aggressive responses (i.e., an “eye-for-an-eye” response), and the other half received random aversive contingencies. The intoxicated subjects were significantly more aggressive than the sober subjects under both contingency conditions, whereas the sober participants exhibited a response pattern that differentiated between the contingency types. Thus, when the intoxicated subjects received the provoking tone, it was more salient to the subject than the thought that his aggression would be retaliated against, a concept that required additional processing. When sober and confronted with the provoking cue, one can respond to that cue or can seek out, become aware of, and understand other cues that might inhibit the response. In situations without this type of conflict, alcohol intoxication does not generally lead to excess, as the alcohol myopia does not change the balance of pressures bearing on the response. Further studies (Steele et al., 1985) confirmed, as might be imagined, that greater blood alcohol levels in conjunction with strong inhibition conflict resulted in more extreme excess.
Alcohol myopia creates a similar type of conflict in terms of self-evaluation, leading to what Steele and Josephs termed drunken self-inflation, an aspect that may be central to alcohol addiction in its reinforcing quality. Steele and Joseph's thinking is based on the fact that people have a powerful need to think positively of themselves, especially on qualities that are particularly salient to them (Steele, 1988; Tesser, 1988). However, when sober, it is much easier to be aware of information that contradicts the desired self-images, creating a self-evaluative conflict. Alcohol induced myopia impairs access to this inhibiting information, again especially when the conflict is greatest (Banaji & Steele, 1989). (Karaoke night at a bar offers numerous examples of this myopic effect.)

Alcohol myopia also accounts for what Steele and Josephs term drunken relief, or the ability for alcohol to divert a person's attention from their worries. The central aspect of the myopia is that it restricts attention to the salient, immediate aspects of an experience and it reduces processing capacity so that a larger proportion of the capacity must be used to meet the demands of the immediate, on-going activity. The example given by Steele and Josephs is that when intoxicated, one does not have the processing capacity to watch television and engage in worry about one's troubles at the same time. Experimental studies conducted by Steele and colleagues (Josephs & Steele, 1990; Steele & Josephs, 1988; Steele, Southwick, & Pagano, 1986) support this hypothesis. They concluded that, “Even modest accompanying distraction transforms alcohol intoxication from a sometime reducer of
psychological stress into a strong, reliable one that consistently reduces this stress even at moderate doses for all drinkers” (p. 931). Without activity, however, alcohol intensified psychological stress.

Similar to the work of Steele and associates, Peterson, Rothfleisch, Zelazo, and Phil (1990) also found that alcohol consumption impaired the selection of alternative responses and the functions necessary to consider future or long-term consequences of one’s action. In their study, they investigated whether a similar neuropsychological deficit pattern underlies alcohol intoxication and prefrontal lobe syndrome, a disorder affecting the prefrontal areas of the frontal lobe that diminishes judgment and sustained application and organization of one’s life. Peterson et al. also explored whether alcohol expectancy detrimentally affected neuropsychological performance. Participants in the study (72 male university students) were administered a battery of neuropsychological tests, including the Porteus Maze Test and the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test, after they had been administered one of three different doses of alcohol. Planning, verbal fluency, memory, and complex motor control, functions associated with prefrontal and temporal lobes were detrimentally affected by higher doses of alcohol. They did not find that expectancy played a significant role in determining this effect.

Giancola (2000) argued that the different cognitive models employ singular aspects of the more general construct of executive functioning, defined as the higher order cognitive process involved in the planning, initiation, and regulation of goal-directed behavior. In articulating his new
Giancola contended that:

(1) executive functioning mediates the alcohol-aggression relation in that acute alcohol intoxication disrupts the executive functioning, which then heightens the probability of aggression and (2) executive functioning moderates the alcohol-aggression relation in that acute alcohol consumption is more likely to facilitate aggressive behavior in persons with medium to low, rather than high, executive functioning.

(p. 133)

The only study to examine the relationship between executive functioning, acute alcohol consumption, and aggression was conducted by Lau, Pihl, and Peterson (1995) with 48 men (24 with scores in the upper performance quartile and 24 with scores in the lower performance quartile) assigned to alcohol and non-alcohol conditions. Data analysis indicated that alcohol and low executive functioning had independent effects on aggression \([F (1.44) = 4.04, p < .05 \text{ and } F (7,308) = 21.20, p.0001, \text{ respectively}]\), but in contrast to Giancola’s theory, no interaction was observed between executive functioning and alcohol. However, the statistical power was too low to detect a significant Executive Functioning x Alcohol interaction and only two measures, a spatial conditional associative-learning task and a self-ordered pointing task, were used to assess executive functioning.

Alcohol’s substantial negative effects on cognitive processes – the ability to perceive multiple cues, the ability to process and extract meaning
from the cues that are perceived, and the ability to select alternative responses and to consider future consequences of one’s action – have direct bearing on the behavior that is exhibited prior to and during a student disturbance. Students who have been drinking probably will not even hear bullhorned messages to disperse, and if they do hear them, they many not perceive that the messages are directed at them, or if they do understand the directives, they may not be able to consider the consequences of not complying with the requests. These same aspects of alcohol impairment that make large groups of drunken students difficult to control – in a sense, the effect of forcing one to “be in the moment” – are the aspects that young people (and others) perceive as a social benefit. Alcohol’s myopic effect both draws the crowds together and increases the potential for socially detrimental behavior.

Adolescent/Young Adult Risk Taking

The propensity among adolescents and young adults to engage in various forms of risk taking behavior is well established in the research literature. Beth-Marom and Fischhoff (1997) defined risk as a chance of loss and risk behavior as:

an action (e.g., driving after drinking) or a nonaction (e.g., not using a condom during sex) that entails a chance of loss to the actor. Engaging in a risk behavior is risk taking. A risky decision involves a choice in which at least one of the options entails a chance of loss. (p. 111)
In a definition more directed at health risk behaviors, Irwin (1993) defined risk taking as “those volitional behaviors in which the outcomes remain uncertain with the possibility of an identifiable negative health outcome” (p. 11) and he then focused on sexual behavior, substance use, and motor recreational vehicle use as major areas of adolescent and young adult risk taking. Irwin notes that these behaviors are initiated during early adolescence with a marked increase in frequency from early to late adolescence. He reports that when accounting for sexual activity status in age-specific rates, those in late adolescence, have the highest sexually transmitted disease rates of any age specific cohort in the US. The propensity to take risks while driving accounts for the fact that young drivers between the ages of 16 and 25 are at greater risk of being involved in a casualty accident than older drivers, even when differences in the quantity and quality of road travel and driving experience are controlled for (Jonah, 1986). The National Survey on Drug Use and Health (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, 2003) reported that in 2002, current drinkers aged 12 to 17 and young adults aged 18 to 25 drank more drinks per day on the days they consumed alcohol than adults aged 26 and over (4.8 and 4.6 respectively, compared to 2.7), and current drinkers aged 18-25 were more likely to drive under the influence of alcohol in the past year than drinkers aged 26 or older (27% to 14%). Illicit drug use is also more prevalent among the young. Drug use among youth aged 12 to 13 was 4.2 % and increased with age among young persons, peaking among 18 to 20 year olds (22.5 %) and declining steadily after
that point with increasing age. Those under the age of 25 accounted for 45% of all arrests made in 1999, 54.6% of all index arrests (murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson), and 58.4% of all property crime arrests (US Department of Justice: Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2000).

This brief review of some of the indicators of the risk taking inclinations of adolescents and young adults supports the graphic illustration (Figure 2) by Gottfredson and Hirshi (1994) of their hypothetical age distribution of deviant behavior as it is demonstrated across the lifespan. The graphic depicts two important aspects of deviant behavior as it relates to celebratory riots. First, risk taking and deviancy peak during the young adult years – those years when many young adults are newly independent and at college campuses. Second, the prevalence of risk taking follows the same pattern for adolescents with low rates of deviancy as is does for those adolescents with high rates.
Although the data documenting adolescents’ propensity for risk taking is well developed, theories regarding adolescent risk-taking and the empirical studies to support those theories are not so well developed. Lavery, Siegel, Cousins, and Rubovits (1993) point out that not only do we not fully understand the adolescent’s perspective on risk taking behaviors, but that the study of adolescent risk taking is complicated by the number of different adult perspectives on the phenomenon. These perspectives include, among a number of others, the “problem”-behavior perspective, risk-taking as normal and adaptive, the adolescent egocentrism perspective, and the rational decision making perspective.

*Figure 2. Hypothetical age distributions for deviancy in high rate and low rate groups (Adapted from Gottfredson and Hirshi, 1994).*
The problem-behavior perspective on risk-taking takes a clinical perspective and is based on the idea that problem behaviors are socially defined and those adolescents who engage in such behaviors are unconventional in their values and represent some form of social maladjustment or personality disorder (Donovan, Jessor, & Costa, 1991). This perspective is countered by those who have advanced the idea that risk taking is a means of coping with normal developmental tasks and is essential to developing autonomy and identity (Baumrind, 1987). Under this view, normal and developmentally appropriate behaviors are exploratory, whereas pathological and problem behaviors are habitual.

Spear (2003) notes that across a variety of species, adolescence is marked by an increase in behaviors classified as risk-taking or sensation/novelty seeking and a change in the focus of social interactions with peers becoming the primary concentration. Evolutionary theories regarding adolescent-typical behavior speculate that these behaviors may have evolved in part to help the adolescent transition to maturity. New skills and social support grow out of the peer-directed interactions. Risk taking among many species (including humans) serves both the purpose of increasing the reproductive success of males and in providing the impetus to explore new and broader areas away from home and genetically related individuals.

Spear also reports that although it has long been assumed that adolescent behaviors are largely the result of "raging hormones," that there is almost no empirical evidence to confirm the link between gonadal steroids and
adrenal androgens and adolescent behavior. Research that is more recent has implicated adolescence-associated increases in stress hormones or sensitivity to stressors and the dramatic adolescent-associated changes in the brain, which rival that of newborns in the magnitude of developmental transformations.

Spear (2002) drew on Larson's work (Larson & Asmussen, 1991; Larson & Richards, 1994) on adolescents and negative emotions in explaining that adolescents exhibit age-related alterations in the way they respond to motivational stimuli, and that they exhibit an increase in negative affect and depressed mood relative to younger and older age groups. Adolescents also appear to experience positive situations as less pleasurable than younger or older individuals do, thus showing a degree of anhedonia, or less ability to attain positive impact from stimuli with low to moderate incentive value. Spear speculates that a consequence of this state of anhedonia is that adolescents are predisposed “to pursue new appetitive reinforcers through increases in risk-taking and novelty-seeking behaviors, including alcohol and drug use.” (pg. 72)

Elkind (1967; 1978) advanced the idea that adolescents are egocentric in how they view themselves and that this egocentrism is responsible for a “personal fable” that leads the adolescent to believe that they are special and invulnerable to harm and that this sense of invulnerability gives rise to risk taking behavior. This adolescent sense of invulnerability is the view that the average Joe on the street is most likely to express. However, there is little or
no empirical evidence for this concept (Melton, 1988). Research indicates that adults and adolescents both have a fundamental tendency to overestimate the probability that good things will happen to them and to underestimate their own vulnerability to negative events, in other words an “optimistic bias” (Weinstein, 1980; Weinstein & Klein, 1996; Weinstein & Lyon, 1999). Further, in a study asking adults and adolescents to make risk judgments on a range of natural hazards and behavior-linked outcomes, Millstein and Halpern-Felsher (2002a) found that a significantly greater proportion of adults reported perceptions of absolute invulnerability (34%) than did adolescents (14%), with significance remaining even after controlling for experience with the behavior and the negative outcomes. However, the “adults” in this study were students between the ages of 20 and 30 that had been recruited from universities in the San Francisco Bay Area (mean age was 25 years). They were unmarried and without children. This leaves the question of how the risk judgments of young adults compare with those of older adults.

A number of discussions are focused on the adolescent decision-making process. Steinberg and Scott (2003) argue that adolescents’ decision-making ability regarding risk is affected by their cognitive and psychosocial immaturity. They contend that although laboratory studies indicate that by mid-adolescence teens are approximately equivalent to adults in the cognitive abilities needed for decision-making that in stressful and unstructured settings (real life) where decisions are made under emotional arousal and/or in groups and under conditions which require the advantages of personal
experience, knowledge, and intuition, their decision-making capacity is not equivalent to that of adults. They argue further, that even if the cognitive abilities of adolescents are equivalent with that of adults, that psychosocial immaturity affects their decisions. Steinberg and Scott contend that these psychosocial factors affect decision-making outcomes because they influence adolescent and young adult values and preferences as it relates to the cost-benefit calculus used in making choices. Although Steinberg and Scott offer an interesting and plausible argument, they offer less than adequate support for their thinking, often citing articles in support as if they were empirical evidence, when in reality, the articles were often the speculation of others or empirical studies that were flawed or with less than rigorous designs.

Some of the psychosocial factors identified by Steinberg and Scott (2003) and others as most relevant to understanding the differences between adolescents/young adults and adults in judgment and decision-making are susceptibility to peer influence, attitudes toward and perception of risk, and future orientation. In American society, the influence of the peer group begins in earnest when children enter school where “peer pressure” is overt, and deviance from group norms is subject to group sanctions, including ridicule and rejection (Harris, 1995). By adolescence, and certainly college age, conformity to group norms is not typically the result of overt pressure on the part of the group, but is the result of a person's desire to participate in experiences that are salient to group identity (Lightfoot, 1992).
Leary, Nezlec, Downs, Radford-Davenport et al. (1994) conducted a study in which 179 undergraduates kept diaries of all social interactions over 10 minutes in length that they had over a seven day period. Participants recorded data on who their cointeractants were, the kinds of impressions that the participants wanted to make on their other people (likable, competent, ethical, and attractive), the level of concern they held about other’s impressions, how much thought they had about how they were being perceived or evaluated, and how nervous or tense they had felt during each encounter. Using separate multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA), Leary et al. found that self-presentational concerns increased when the young people were interacting with unfamiliar people and with people of the opposite sex regardless of familiarity. Their analysis also indicated that the young people were more likely to engage in dangerous behaviors in the presence of acquaintances rather than close friends. Perhaps this is because the need to establish and maintain a social identity is greater within the larger peer group.

Millstein and Halper-Felsher (2002b) point out that in assessing how well adolescents perceive risk, one must first acknowledge the size of the risks that adolescents face. They note that although some threats to adolescent well-being pose sizable risks, that in many situations, the actual chance of a negative outcome is relatively small. They cite Fischhoff et al.’s (2000) research on teen expectations for significant life events that the actual probability of a female adolescent getting pregnant within one year to be less than 6% and
that the probability of a male adolescent getting someone pregnant in the next year is less than 3%; the probability of being a victim of violent crime is less than 10%; of dying from any cause in the next year, .08%; and of dying by age 20, .04%. If we go back to Hingson et al.’s (2002) calculations of college students’ alcohol-related mortality and morbidity and calculate a college student’s risk of dying as a result of driving while intoxicated or riding with someone who is intoxicated (Hingson and colleagues report that 5.3 million took this chance each month in 1997 and that 1,138 died in alcohol-related traffic accidents that year), we find that any given student who engaged in this risk behavior that year had a .00179% chance of dying as a result. In the case of OSU’s last mixed-issue campus disturbance, officials estimated the crowd to be around 6,000. Ten OSU students were arrested. Students participating in the disturbance had a .16% chance of being arrested by the police. Using this perspective, the risk assessments that young adults make seem as reasonable as those made by many older adults.

Beyth-Marom et al. (1993) asked 199 parents and their adolescents (199) to list possible outcomes of accepting or declining opportunities to engage in various potentially risky behaviors such as riding in a car with a driver that has been drinking, smoking marijuana at a party, driving a car without a license, having sex, going to a beer party, and cutting school to go to a mall. The response patterns of the adults and adolescents were very similar. However, the adolescents’ perceptions of their own personal risk were significantly lower than what their parents perceived for them. In Cohn,
Macfarlane, Yanez, and Imai's (1995) study of differences between adult and adolescent risk perception, 31% of the adolescents believed that there was little or no harm in getting drunk one or two times, but only 9% of the parents responded in the same way. These measurements comparing adults' perceptions of adolescents' risks with the adolescents' perceptions of their own risk, however, is complicated by the basic human tendency to judge another's risk higher than one's own personal risk (optimistic bias) and nonindependence in the two samples.

Millstein and Halpern-Felsher (2002b) point out that most theories on adolescent risk behavior are based on the idea that perceptions of risk play a central role in motivating adolescents' behavior. Validating this hypothesis would require examining people's beliefs about potential risks before they began to engage in any risk behavior, and then following the subjects longitudinally to see if they engage in the specific behavior. If the hypothesis is the correct one, then those who perceived less risk and/or felt less vulnerable to negative outcomes would be those most likely to engage in the behavior. Those who perceived higher risks would be less likely. No such studies have been undertaken to date.

Millstein and Halpern-Felsher (2002b) also point out that the typical study of risk perception and behavioral experience uses a cross-sectional design wherein the risk judgments of engagers in risky behavior are compared to the risk judgments of non-engagers. In studies that employ a cross-sectional design and that ask nonconditional assessments such as, “what is your risk for
developing cancer?” those with experience in the behavior (in this example, smoking) rate their risk of an adverse outcome higher than do the non-engers (e.g., Cohn et al., 1995; and Moore and Rosenthal, 1991). In studies where participants are asked conditional questions about their personal risk if they were to engage in a risk behavior, such as “what is your risk of developing lung cancer if you smoke?”, those engaged in the behavior perceive the risks of their engagement as lower than those who do not engage (e.g. Halpern-Felsher et al., 2001; and Benthin et al., 1993). Taken together, these results suggest that individuals who are engaging in risky behavior are cognizant that these behaviors involve risk, but find these risks as less significant than those who are not engaging in the risky behaviors.

Perceived benefits, frequently neglected in studies of risk perception, are another factor that influences decisions regarding risk behavior. A study of the importance of benefits in adolescents’ decisions to drink alcohol (Goldberg, Halpern-Felsher, & Millstein, 2002) found that adolescents perceived the benefits of alcohol to be more likely and the risks to be less likely as the adolescents increased in age and experience with the behavior. The authors suggest that a better explanation of the smaller risk estimates of older respondents than a sense of “invulnerability” was that individuals adjust their perceptions as they engage in risk behaviors, experience the benefits, and fail to experience negative outcomes. Only 2% of the adults in their study said that there was nothing good that could result from drinking alcohol, as opposed to 28% of the fifth graders. Given that health concerns may not be as salient to
adolescents as social concerns, perceived and experienced benefits of specific risk behaviors may outweigh any perceived, and perhaps, unexperienced negative outcomes. As stated earlier in this review, the actual probability of experiencing a negative outcome is usually low, therefore as adolescents engage in risk behaviors because of their social benefits and do not experience negative outcomes, their perceptions of risk will decrease.

Millstein and Halpern-Felsher (2002b) conclude their review of the risk literature with the following summary:

The importance of risk perceptions – theoretically, in program development, and in defining standards of decision-making competence – warrants rigorous study. Existing literature is fraught with problems, primarily stemming from issues concerning the measurement of risk perceptions and from the lack of longitudinal studies. (p. 24)

The propensity of adolescents and particularly young adults to engage in risk-taking behaviors is well documented, and the peak of risk taking behavior for both the high and low deviancy rate groups encompasses the years that most youth are in college. As Millstein and Halpern-Felsher (2002b) point out, however, the existing research on why – the nature of this age group’s risk and benefit perceptions and decision making – is less well-developed. Both the students who attend the large parties and who rush to join the crowd once a disturbance begins to erupt are making a risk decision. Whether that decision is based on a biologically based need for novelty or a
perceived benefit in terms of social acceptance, it is clear that the decision to seek out risky situations will continue to occur. The research seems to indicate that efforts to increase perceptions of the risk associated with mixed-issue campus disturbances will most likely fail to prevent the behavior. OSU students talked about the risk assessments and decisions they made in connection with the November, 2002 disturbance as part of the focus group discussions conducted for this study, and university administrators responded to questions about the nature of the prevention efforts that were in place at the time a campus disturbance occurred. This data offers insights into how both groups view young adult decision making about risk.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Overview and Approach

Creswell and Miller (1997) identify four possible inquiry paradigms that provide the philosophical base or frame of reference for approaching research. The positivist paradigm, wherein reality is objective, singular, and apart from the researcher, has been the traditional quantitative approach to social and psychological research. The qualitative paradigm, which is also described as the interpretive or constructionist approach, assumes that reality is subjective and multiple as seen by the participants in a study. The ideological paradigm is the framework that encompasses action and social change research including feminist, critical theory, and postmodern approaches. In the pragmatic paradigm, which is concerned with “what works,” the orientation is that the problem is central to the research methodology and that researchers will combine available quantitative and qualitative methods to best address specific problems. In the tradition of Dewey, Pierce, James, and Mead (Cherryholmes, 1992), the pragmatic researcher starts with a problem that needs to be solved and uses the tools available to understand it. Creswell and Miller elaborate:
The researcher views knowledge pragmatically as based on studying ‘problems’ or ‘issues’ by using a variety of research methodologies (Creswell, Goodchild, & Turner, 1996). This means that a philosophical stance such as the location of knowledge is secondary to the larger question of the problem that needs to be solved. (p. 39)

As argued, in the case of mixed-issue campus disturbances, the problem is the absence of a detailed understanding of the phenomenon and a framework that facilitates the generation of research questions that can drive more narrow and elaborate (and expensive) research studies on etiology and effective interventions. Therefore, this project takes a pragmatic approach to gathering data about mixed-issue campus disturbances in an effort to construct a knowledgeable framework for immediate understanding as well as for further work. This project examines available raw material that is both quantitative and qualitative in nature and was gathered from multiple groups of informants.

The data used in this study were all generated by various entities at The Ohio State University (OSU) in response to a series of mixed-issue campus disturbances that occurred between 1996 and 2002, including a large-scale disturbance that occurred after a championship football game between Ohio State and the University of Michigan in November 2002. University records indicate the occurrence of at least 8 and as many as 11 disturbances during this time period, depending on the criteria used to define a disturbance [e.g., OSU student affairs officials note at least three events that included multiple
dumpster fires, bottle throwing at the police, and multiple arrests (as many as 133) but that student affairs officials did not consider “riots”\textsuperscript{10}. By the definition of mixed-issue campus disturbance used for this project (i.e., disturbances that resulted in a public conflict between aggregates of participants (mostly students) and authorities (usually the police), but that did not begin as an issue-based protest gathering), OSU has experienced at least 11 mixed-issue campus disturbances since 1996.

The decision to use data exclusively available from OSU was made for several reasons. First, after the November 2002 disturbance, OSU President Karen Holbrook established the Task Force on Preventing Celebratory Riots, the announced purpose of which was to “study the root causes of, and seek solutions to, the socially destructive, alcohol-fueled behavior that has occurred recently in off-campus neighborhoods.” As part of its work, the task force conducted structured interviews with student affairs officials and university public safety officials at 31 universities, which, despite limitations, provides the only multi-institutional data available on mixed-issue campus disturbances from the university administrator perspective, and allows for the comparison of the OSU administrators’ perceptions with those of administrators at other universities. Second, the data from those interviews indicate that OSU is a “leader” in the number of disturbances and in the variety of occasions with which these disturbances have been associated (e.g., not just with

\textsuperscript{10} It is interesting to consider this in light of the definition of riot used in Michigan State University’s (MSU) student code of conduct as “five or more persons acting in concert” (see footnote 1 for the complete definition used by MSU).
championship athletic events). The severity of the problem within the OSU community made it a pragmatic choice for developing an initial description of and contextual framework for (a) the study of the phenomenon and (b) in advancing a solution for the community. Third, the regularity, frequency, and severity of the disturbances at OSU have prompted multiple attempts (surveys, focus groups, student writing prompts, etc.) to gather information about the phenomenon and people’s perceptions of it, providing a substantial, rich, and varied body of material. Fourth, and not the least significant in an effort that is in large part a case study approach, the researcher is a member of both the larger community and the university community and has spent the last three years as an OSU graduate student and over a year as an OSU employee assigned to provide research assistance to the task force established by the OSU president. In my position at the university, I was often present at related administrative meetings, always present at meetings of the task force committees and subcommittees, present in the disturbance-prone neighborhoods on several high risk weekends in 2003 and 2004, and frequently in conversation about mixed-issue campus disturbances with students, faculty, community members, OSU administrators, and administrators from other universities who were eager to tell their “riot” story and to hear what the OSU task force was discovering. My standing at OSU allowed me to develop both a substantial level of detail and a broader contextual framework in which to place that detail. My position as a member of a community dealing with

---

11 I was a nontraditional student with college age children. My age and experience
this problem prevented it from being an abstract issue of only academic importance. Unfortunately, I was not present at the OSU/Michigan game disturbance and, therefore, could not contribute personal observations of what took place. However, not personally experiencing the event also permitted a level of detachment from the issue that facilitated hearing the experiences of others without filtering it through my own. Finally, in considering whether to focus on a single campus or multiple campuses, I had to weigh the dilution of analysis or lack of depth in any single case with what might be gained in choosing multiple cases (Creswell, 1998). The decision to study only OSU was facilitated by the ability to draw on the quantitative data generated by the multi-campus survey, thus providing the opportunity for comparison with disturbances and experiences at other universities while maintaining the depth of analysis of the OSU specific data.

Qualitative Data Collection

By its very nature, qualitative research is emergent rather than tightly prefigured and the general pattern of understanding is expected to emerge in the process that takes place from the initial coding of the data to the development of broad themes to the coalescence of a broad interpretation (Creswell, 2003). In the 1990s, a number of approaches were identified by different researchers and complete procedures were developed for distinct approaches such as ethnography, grounded theory, phenomenological
research, narrative research, and case studies (Creswell, 2003). The purpose of the data collection in the case study approach is to select sources of information that will allow the researcher to conduct an in depth exploration of a program, event, activity, process, or individual. The goal is to present a detailed description of the “case” (in this study, mixed-issue campus disturbances at OSU), to analyze themes or issues, and to develop an interpretation based on the description and analysis. The following is a description of the various qualitative data sources used for this study:

**Public Statements by OSU and Columbus Officials**

Remarks by OSU administrators (e.g., President, Vice President of Student Affairs, Task Force Chair) and city officials (e.g., mayor, police spokesperson) were gathered from ten 2002 – 2003 archived OSU official press releases, over 20 local and college newspaper reports, and local television video. These sources represent both purposeful statements of position and more spontaneous statements made in reaction to news reporters.

**Student Affairs Reports**

Documents issued by the OSU Student Affairs Department were collected and used in the description and analysis. These included the results of two random sample surveys, one on student alcohol use (conducted in the spring of 2002, 456 surveys; 48.9% response rate), the other on student opinions regarding the disturbances (304 phone interviews, 58% response rate) conducted by student affairs assessment services, police arrest reports after a disturbance in the spring of 2002, and written reports of prevention and
intervention activities undertaken by student affairs officials before the
OSU/Michigan game and the national championship game.

*OSU Video and News Accounts*

The “riot” tape was filmed to document game day behavior before,
during, and after the OSU/Michigan football game. It included local media
footage on the disturbance that occurred late Saturday night and early Sunday
morning. This video also includes statements by students and police
spokespersons that were made while the disturbance was occurring, allowing
analysis of the framework presented through the video media. Archived
articles by the OSU student newspaper, *The Lantern*, the local newspaper, *The
Columbus Dispatch*, and other Ohio news sources allowed analysis of more
than two dozen articles reported in the print media.

*Focus Group with Columbus-area Senior Guidance Counselors*

The Director of the OSU Undergraduate Admissions and First Year
Experience conducted a 2-hour focus group with 9 guidance counselors from
suburban high schools in the Columbus area early in 2003 as part of her work
on the task force. These guidance counselors had long affiliations with their
respective high schools and their responsibilities included working with high
school seniors regarding college admissions. They also served in an informal
advisory capacity to the OSU admissions department and several were
parents of OSU students and/or alumni themselves. I attended at this meeting
and had my notes in addition to those written by the Admissions Director. The
counselors provided a number of perspectives (e.g. community member, youth
worker and advisor, what comments students and parents were making about
the disturbances).

OSU Residence Hall Responses

Immediately following the November 2002 (OSU/Michigan game)
disturbance, OSU Residence Hall Advisors (RAs) were asked by the OSU
Associate Director of Housing to interact with the residents in their respective
residence halls (OSU RAs are also students) about the disturbance. The RAs
submitted to the Associate Director (in written form): the RAs perception of
student feedback (based on floor meetings and individual conversations), their
own perceptions and reactions to the disturbance as OSU students in
positions of responsibility, and students' written reports of what they did the
weekend of the disturbance. This document included 25 pages of transcript.

Student Journal Entries

In the week following the OSU/Michigan game disturbance, the OSU
College of Engineering included a quote from President Holbrook’s press
release on the disturbance (“This is a community problem, and its solution will
require collective ideas, support, and cooperation. In the days ahead, we must
all give thought to how we address this situation, both immediately and for
the long term.”) in their student journal assignment for the week of November
24. A total of 840 (94.4%) of the students enrolled in the First-Year Engineering
Program commented in response to the quote and the following prompt: “Next
quarter we will take up the issue of ethics, from a personal as well as
professional standpoint. Please provide your comments in response to Dr.
Holbrook's statement." These data provide information on how some faculty framed the issue (in how they constructed the prompt) and how students responded within that frame. The student responses created approximately 125 pages of transcript.

**Student Emails to the OSU Undergraduate Student Government President**

The Ohio State University Undergraduate Student Government (USG) President requested that OSU students email him regarding the OSU/Michigan game disturbance so that he could pass their thoughts onto the OSU administration and the OSU Task Force. This data source includes almost 500 student responses to the USG president’s request (254 pages of transcript). Because this information was not solicited by a faulty member or university administrator, it provides a student-to-student perspective on the issue.

**Focus Groups with OSU Students Living in Residence Halls and Off-campus Housing**

In early 2003 as part of the work of the task force, two teams with two facilitators each conducted a total of four focus groups with a total of 45 students. Each session lasted about 90 minutes. Transcripts of the focus group conversation totaled 106 pages. Three of the groups were recruited by email (through a random sampling) from students living in OSU residence halls (typically students from the lower ranks) and one group was recruited from students who lived in the off-campus neighborhoods where the disturbances took place. The conversations were taped and transcribed and provide both
the perspective of students who attended and/or participated in the disturbance and the perspective of students who did not participate.

Qualitative Analysis

The ultimate goal of qualitative analysis is to make sense out of the gathered text and image data and therefore, the analysis is typically less divided from the other research activities such as hypothesizing and data collection as is quantitative analysis (Creswell, 2003). In part, as the data is explored, it suggests the appropriate analysis. However, qualitative analysis primarily involves classifying persons, events and information, and the characteristics that define them. My steps of analysis were based on those outlined by Creswell:

1. The data organized and prepared for analysis.
2. The data read to obtain a general sense of the information and its meaning.
3. The data “coded,” that is topics were identified and then clustered together to form categories.
4. The coding process was used to create a description of the event and the themes for analysis.
5. The description and themes were analyzed and are conveyed in the narrative.
6. The meaning or interpretation of the data and its relationship to the data obtained from the other universities through the survey of their
student affairs and public safety officials were used to suggest new questions that need to be asked.

The data that was collected from OSU students through email surveys, writing prompts, and multiple focus groups created a large amount of textual data. Therefore, the first step in the analysis of the data obtained from the students was to choose the text that was relevant to the research concern, that of developing a better description and understanding of mixed-issue campus disturbances. Therefore, I first excluded all of the text from the students whose comments specifically indicated that they had not been present at any of the disturbances and that they did not understand how anyone could behave in such a fashion. Although these comments offered insight into how the disturbances were viewed by many nonparticipants\(^\text{12}\) as well as insights into how these students viewed the OSU administration and its handling of the disturbances, the comments could not advance our knowledge of the phenomenon itself beyond that of knowing that those who participate in and observe the disturbances represent a minority group of students on the OSU campus.

Using the remaining text, I selected passages that described what students who were present at the OSU/Michigan disturbance experienced and

\(^{12}\) Reactions of nonparticipants ranged from, “the riots are really not that big of a deal” to “the majority of the students at Ohio State University didn’t cause these despicable acts and we’re sick and tired of being blamed for them.” A number of nonparticipants also expressed concern and anger that OSU’s reputation as a riot school was hurting the value of their degree and their future ability to obtain a job. The majority attributed the problem to alcohol use, many implicated the police and the university administration, particularly Campus Partners’ removal of the bars on High Street in the University District.
what they thought and felt because of that experience. Ideas that were repeated by different student participants were grouped together. I organized those ideas into the themes that are included and described in the results narrative.

Quantitative Data Collection

Two quantitative studies are considered in this project. The first was conducted by the OSU Task Force on Preventing Celebratory Riots. This survey of university Student Affairs officials and Public Safety directors was undertaken as part of the work of the task force and provides multi-institutional information about the occurrence of mixed-issue campus disturbances. The second set of data was collected from OSU students in fall 2003 regarding alcohol consumption and off-campus parties. The basic elements of these two studies are presented in the style typically used in quantitative studies, with the purpose for this study being the generation of descriptive rather than inferential statistics.

OSU Task Force on Preventing Celebratory Riots Multi-Campus Survey Participants.

Participants were the identified vice presidents of Student Affairs and the directors of Public Safety at 31 universities in the United States. By the nature of the responsibilities associated with these positions, it was expected that the individuals holding these positions were most likely to have extensive knowledge about any occurrences of student disturbances, student body and community characteristics, prevention efforts, and response tactics.
Procedures.

Using national media reports of student disturbances, 15 universities were identified as having had a celebratory riot within the past five years. Online college information databases were used to generate a general profile for each of these universities based on:

- The size of the student body
- The type of community environment (small town, suburban, urban)
- The academic profile of the student body (average GPA and college testing scores of incoming freshman classes)
- The residency choices of undergraduates (on-campus vs. commuter)
- The scale of their athletic and extracurricular programs (NCAA classification)

Taskforce members and OSU administrators were used to generate a list of possible nonriot schools. Profiles of these institutions were checked online using college search databases. From this list, fifteen additional universities were identified that, based on media searches, did not appear to have had a disturbance and that had a similar profile to each of the universities identified as having experienced a riot. Although this sampling procedure did not specifically match “riot” schools with “nonriot” schools on an institution-by-institution basis, an attempt was made to make sure that every school identified as having experienced a riot had at least one comparator school in the control group with a similar general profile.
After completing this procedure, the Task Force administration noted that only one school on The Ohio State University's (OSU) list of NCAA Big 10 Conference and benchmark institutions was being omitted, therefore this university was added to ensure inclusion of all Big 10 Conference schools, and all of the universities identified as Ohio State benchmarks in Ohio State's current academic plan.

Letters from the office of The Ohio State University, President Karen A. Holbrook, were sent to the president, the vice president of Student Affairs, and the director of Public Safety at each university. These letters explained the work of The Ohio State University Task Force on Preventing Celebratory Riots, the purpose of the study, and the general areas that would be covered in the telephone survey. The letters also indicated that the institution's Dean of Student Affairs or Student Life and the Chief of University Police or Director of Public Safety would receive a call from the Ohio State University Center for Survey Research within several days of the receipt of the letter asking them to participate in this survey. The Dean of Student Affairs or Student Life and the Chief of University Police or Director of Public Safety were the identified respondents for each school.

During the first three weeks of March 2003, The Ohio State University College of Social and Behavioral Sciences’ Center for Survey Research contacted each of the respondents to schedule a time for the telephone interview. The Center then conducted interviews with the Student Affairs and Public Safety administrators at the identified universities. The Center used
senior interviewers that had undergone training utilizing this survey before
making contact with the respondents. Interviewers used a computer program
that included instructions and prompts. In the few instances where initial
attempts to contact officials to schedule the interviews were unsuccessful,
representatives of the OSU president’s office made follow up phone calls to the
presidents of the identified universities asking for their help in arranging an
interview time with the Student Affairs or Public Safety administrator.

The Ohio State University College of Social and Behavioral Sciences’
Center for Survey Research was able to conduct interviews with 59 of the
possible 62 respondents. Response rate by university was 100%. Response rate
for Student Affairs officials was 90%, and for directors of Public Safety, 100%.
Only 3 of the 62 individuals approached were unable to participate, citing lack
of information or time constraint. Of the schools for which a Student Affairs
official did not respond, two were reported (by the public safety official) as not
having had a disturbance. In the remaining school, the public safety official
did report the occurrence of a disturbance.

Measures.

A structured telephone interview was prepared to solicit information
regarding the occurrence of celebratory riots, the nature of the riot(s) and
university and law enforcement responses, riot and high-risk drinking
prevention efforts, demographic data on university student populations,
characteristics of student housing and university district neighborhoods,
university environmental factors, university and local policies relating to riots
and alcohol, and the policing practices of university and local law enforcement. The resulting survey included 128 items with forced choice answers (this number includes similar questions in different tracks based on location and sequence of the disturbance. Each respondent actually answered about 60 questions). It was estimated that the survey would take respondents 20 minutes to complete.

The interview was structured into three sections. Respondents were first given a description of a mixed-issue campus disturbance and asked if their institution had experienced such an event in the past 10 years. Respondents answering “yes” were asked a series of questions (approximately 22) that varied slightly in number and nature depending on whether the mixed-issue campus disturbance occurred off-campus, or on campus, whether it was a single incident or part of a reoccurring series. The questions in this section focused on the nature of the event that occurred. The second section consisted of 11 questions and gathered demographic and contextual information on all the participating universities. The third section of the survey was devoted to 27 questions about policies and policing practices. Respondents were also given the opportunity to give additional information or advice to the OSU taskforce (see the Appendix for the complete survey).
Analysis.

Descriptive statistics were generated by pooling answers from the different respondents to develop as accurate (in terms of knowledge of the school’s situation) a response set as possible. The answers by the different respondents were combined by using the response of the person most likely to be informed on a question (this was verified by consulting with a high-ranking OSU student affairs official and the OSU Director of Public Safety). For example, the Director of Public Safety was expected to be privy to information regarding the number of officers that responded to a disturbance, the Student Affairs official was more likely to know what percentage of the student activities budget is spent on late night programming, or how many undergraduates live in university residence halls. In cases where both respondents were expected to be equally well informed (e.g., how many bars are there within walking distance of the campus?), the average of the two answers was used. In the case of missing data from a particular respondent, the answers of the second source from that school was used.

Because the questionnaire offered multiple opportunities for the informants to provide qualitative data, that information was used to provide clarification or added detail to the statistical results and was incorporated into the qualitative narrative.
Participants.

This survey was conducted in conjunction with 12 other universities. Therefore, we followed the sampling protocol developed by Michigan State University (MSU), the coordinating institution. The population from which the sample of 1500 was drawn included 33,168 undergraduate, degree seeking OSU students (Columbus campus) between the ages of 18 and 25 who were registered and had paid tuition for the Fall 2003 quarter. The sample was stratified so that 70% the students in the sample were white and 30% were minority (80.7% of the population was white or unknown; 19.3% was minority), and so that 60% of the sample was male and 40% was female (population was 52% male, 48% female). Therefore, the sample was a random drawing of 630 white males, 420 white females, 270 minority males, and 180 minority females.

Of those mailed the survey instrument, 336 returned completed surveys yielding a response rate of 22.4%. Respondents were 55.5% female, 43.9% male; 72.4% white, and 28.6% minority. Almost 55% of the respondents were between the ages of 18 and 20; 45% were aged 21 years or older.

Procedures.

After receiving IRB approval for this project, the students identified for the sample were mailed (October 2003) the following items via US postal service, first class:

- A cover letter that also served as the Informed Consent Statement.
• The four page Off-Campus Party Scantron Form (the MSU generated survey).

• A single sheet (front and back) of 20 OSU-specific questions.

• A return envelope (postage paid).

• A postcard for the student to complete with his or her name, address, and phone number. The purpose of this postcard was to determine responders, so that they were not contacted for follow-up. Additionally, these postcards were used to enter the student into the incentive drawing (a $150 gift certificate to Best Buy or a merchant at a near campus shopping center).

A reminder email was sent to those students who had not yet responded 10 days after the survey was mailed.

Measures.

The survey administered consisted of two parts. The first part contained 37 questions, many of which were multi-part (e.g., How likely are you to hear about or invite people to a party with the following methods? A four point Likert scale response set was provided for each of the following answers: word of mouth, email, flyers/written invitations, walk around and look for them, phone, other) regarding how often the respondents attended parties and clubs, what were their reasons for attending, how they found out about the parties, and what they expected to be provided at the party. Respondents were also asked about how they felt about certain party behaviors (e.g. drug
use, people getting sick, damage to the location, etc.), what types of things happen at parties, and if they have ever hosted a party, how did they pay for it, clean up after it and what “services” they provided. Respondents also provided demographic information. These questions had been piloted by Michigan State University in the spring of 2003 (see Appendix B for the complete survey). However, validity and reliability data were not available from MSU.

The second part of the survey consisted of 20 questions developed by OSU student affairs and alcohol prevention personnel. These questions were inserted into the multi-campus questionnaire provided by MSU and asked students about their familiarity with various OSU policies and prevention programs and Ohio laws regarding alcohol consumption and student disturbances. Students were also asked about the likelihood of the identified policies and sanctions preventing campus disturbances and the likelihood of their participation in alcohol prevention programs. Additionally, students were asked about their level of binge drinking in the last two weeks and the average number of drinks they consumed a week. Three questions asked about problem behaviors related to alcohol consumption, and one asked about their drinking and attendance at parties during high school (see Appendix).

Analysis.

Given that the purpose of including this inquiry was to help describe the phenomenon of off-campus disturbances, the data analysis was limited to
descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and range) for the pertinent items on the questionnaire.
CHAPTER 4

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

This chapter draws on the qualitative data sources outlined in the Chapter 3 (e.g., student focus groups, student emails, student writing prompts, university press releases, administrative reports, etc.) and is divided into two major sections: context and phenomenon.

The Context

Mixed-issue campus disturbances, like any complex social phenomenon, take place in a rich environment. In fact, separating the phenomenon from the context for the sake of description creates an artificial barrier that in reality does not exist. Webster’s dictionary (Agnes, 2000) defines context as “the whole situation, background, or environment relevant to a particular event” (p. 315). Thinking persons would find fulfilling the definitional standard of a contextual description a gargantuan if not impossible task. However, some effort must be made to describe the context or setting in which mixed-issue campus disturbances take place. Therefore, those elements that appear most relevant to the OSU/Michigan game disturbance are briefly, and admittedly inadequately, described in the following section.
The Ohio State University

The Ohio State University (OSU), a Level I research, land grant institution, is located in Columbus, the largest city in Ohio. Columbus, one of the fastest growing metropolitan areas in the US, is the home to state government, many national corporations, and several colleges and universities. Primarily a service-industry community, the population of the city is around one million and the university is the largest employer in the city.

In 2003, the enrollment at the Columbus campus was 50,731. OSU moves between having either the largest or the second largest enrollment on a single campus in any given year, switching places with the University of Texas, Austin as the enrollment at each university fluctuates from year to year. The 2003 undergraduate enrollment was 37,605. OSU’s budget for the year was almost $3 billion.

OSU is also a Division I school in the Big 10 athletic conference. Although athletics in general have long held importance in the OSU and Columbus community, football is certainly the most revered. In 1999, the editorial staff at ESPN.com ranked the annual Ohio State/Michigan football game as number one on a list of the 10 greatest rivalries in sports. In a town and university already rich with football traditions and fervor, the annual OSU/Michigan game stands out in the amount of attention and emotion attached to it by the buckeye fans. The particular disturbance under investigation in this document occurred after the 2002 OSU/Michigan game.

---

13 The OSU mascot is a buckeye, the nut of a tree frequently found in Ohio.
that took place in the OSU stadium, which held a record crowd of 105,532 on that day.

**The University District**

The adjacent neighborhoods to the north, east, and south of the OSU campus are known as the University District (UD). The neighborhoods closest to the OSU campus contain dense areas of privately owned properties that are generally rented to students. High Street separates the campus proper from the off-campus area immediately to the east, and the east side of the street contains mostly commercial establishments. Outside the ring of predominantly student housing, particularly in the east and southeast quadrants of the district, are neighborhoods of extreme poverty. The density per square mile in the UD is 8,649 persons, compared to an average of 3,346 per square mile in the city of Columbus, and 1,918 per square mile in the county. More than 90% of the housing in the UD is renter-occupied, creating a transient population with a high turnover rate.

In 1995, the university, in cooperation with the city of Columbus, created Campus Partners for Community Urban Redevelopment, commonly referred to simply as Campus Partners. The purpose of the Campus Partners initiative was to develop a comprehensive revitalization plan for the urban neighborhoods around the university’s campus. Part of that plan called for a commercial redevelopment/revitalization project along the southern end of High Street in the campus area (see Figure 3). Between 1999 and 2002, Campus Partners acquired necessary property through purchase and eminent...
domain proceedings and in mid 2002 demolished the properties on the planned “Gateway Center” site. Public improvements to the site began in 2003. Actual building of the commercial property began in 2004 with the opening scheduled for fall of 2005.

The Campus Partners project did not proceed without controversy in the Columbus community, including lawsuits to block the acquisition of certain buildings. Many of the businesses that were relocated or forced out entirely were long-time student haunts. The demolition of High Street buildings that cleared the way for the Gateway Center eliminated several bars that had served the OSU student community. Although the years in which Campus Partners acquired, demolished, and made site improvements on properties did not seem lengthy to those involved in urban renewal, for students in a college setting whose tenure is typically four to five years, the project seemed to be promises without much progress.

Overlays

- **OSU campus**
- **Area of disturbances**
- **Student residence halls**
- **Campus Partners Gateway site**
Background and History of Campus Disturbances at OSU

The disturbance after the 2002 OSU/Michigan game was certainly not the first disturbance to occur at OSU. OSU professor, Christopher Zacher, and OSU student affairs administrator, Richard Hollingsworth, compiled a history of student unrest at OSU for inclusion in the task force report. Their compilation served as the basis for this section.

In the 1880s, OSU students protested against, among other things, compulsory chapel, compulsory military drill, and the firing of the university president in 1883. Students rioted several times in the 1950’s during May week, setting fires in the streets and invoking police intervention with clubs and tear gas, with the first use of tear gas on campus occurring in conjunction with a panty raid in May 1950.\(^{14}\)

During the 1960s and early 1970s, OSU students protested and rioted over racial relations, administrative policies, and the war in Southeast Asia. These disturbances included building takeovers and, in the case of the 1970 disturbance, violent confrontations with the police, the presence of the National Guard, and the closing of the campus from May 6 to 15.

Student disturbances related to football games began in the 1950s, and beginning in 1954, the OSU/Michigan game frequently spawned a disturbance in response to either a victory or defeat. In 1970, a police officer shot a student during a post OSU/Michigan game disturbance. The current “run” of disturbances appears to have started around 1996, and depending on the

\(^{14}\) Must have been some panties.
criteria used to define a disturbance, they number between 9 and 18, with about two-thirds of them being associated with football games. The rest of the disturbances grew out of the unofficial spring parties held by students in the off-campus neighborhoods each year. During the 1996 to 2002 timeframe, large-scale disturbances developed after the OSU/Michigan game in 2000 and 2002 (The OSU/Michigan game alternates each year between being held at OSU and Michigan. The game was held in Columbus in 2000 and 2002).

The OSU/Michigan Game Disturbance 2002

News accounts of the disturbance after the OSU/Michigan game reported “Ohio State fans set more than 100 street fires while celebrating after a 14-9 win Saturday over Michigan that completed an unbeaten regular season and clinched a spot in the national championship game.” (Wagner & Smyth, 2002), Twenty cars were reported to be damaged by fire or overturning, and a young man kicked in the glass doors of a bookstore on High Street. At about one o’clock a.m., police in riot gear using tear gas and pepper spray attempted to clear the streets so that firefighters could extinguish the fires. Police reported that they deployed around 250 officers who were pelted with bottles and rocks. Despite the level of confrontation between the partiers and the police, the police reported no serious injuries. The disturbance was brought under control around four a.m.

The Phenomenon

I have arranged the themes that emerged from the qualitative data in a framework that was suggested by the data itself and supported by concepts in
the literature review. I begin with the reference perceptions that student participants brought to the disturbance, what images they had in their minds and the experiences that helped develop those mental images that shaped their expectations and behavior. The second section explores the descriptions of what went on during the evening of the disturbance, including the detailed personal accounts students gave of why they were there and what they did, offering an alternative to the broadly used description of “senseless mob behavior.” The final section focuses on students’ descriptions of their experiences with the police, a critical factor in the course of the event by both student account and riot research.

The Reference Perception: In the Mind’s Eye

The reference perceptions (non-innate) that perception control theory posits as the benchmark visions guiding the actions of individuals, are based on the cumulative interactions between the individual and others and the individual and his or her environment. Consequently, each person has different reference perceptions. As well, those who have the same social networks, are members of the same groups, and are part of particular cultures will often have similarly named categories of experiences stored in their memory. Thus, each young person, each administrator, and each police officer comes with his or her own personal reference perception and, typically, the ability to reference the shared perceptions of their group. Examination of the qualitative data from students and other sources in this study begins to reveal what those reference perceptions were for students who were present during the OSU/Michigan
game disturbance and what the reference perceptions may be for students involved in other mixed-issue campus disturbances. The data permitted some idea of the “group” perception of university administrators and the police. However, further research will be necessary to develop the same depth in description from individual administrators and police officers.

“Alcohol is Part of the College Experience and This Will Not Change”

OSU’s 2002 administration of the CORE survey (OSU Student Affairs Assessment, 2003) with a random sample of 934 undergraduate students (456 or 48.9% of the students responded) confirms that alcohol use is widespread among OSU students. Over 91% of the respondents reported having used alcohol at least once in their life, 81.3% reported using alcohol in the last month, and 52.8% reported binge drinking behaviors. Almost 78% of those under 21 reported having used alcohol in past 30 days and over 50% of first year students reported that they engaged in binge drinking. Students present at the OSU/Michigan disturbance reinforced in their focus group and email responses that underage drinking in college is the norm, not the exception.

I mean everyone on campus drinks underage, like, pretty much and you can’t stop it; why try?

I mean, every college across the nation…every college has their fair share of underage drinking.

The students’ perceptions of the significance of alcohol to student social life were evident both in the OSU CORE survey results and in their discussions about the disturbances. Approximately 80% of the students responding to the CORE survey agreed that alcohol breaks the ice and that it enhances social
activity. More than 93% of the students believed that alcohol is a central part of
the social life for male students and fraternity members; 83.0% believed that it
is a central part of the social life for female students, 87.9% for sorority
members, and 74.6% believed that it was a central part of the social life for
athletes. Over 45% of the students who responded perceived that alcohol was
a central part of the social life for alumni as well. As one student put it:

Ohio State is huge, very intimidating, and drinking is the major glue
that bonds students.

The students explained that because underage students cannot drink in
commercial establishments, the parties in the off-campus neighborhood
provide a place for them to gather with their friends and drink. Over 70% of the
OSU undergraduate students who responded to the Off-Campus Parties Study
(OCPS) indicated that they attended an off-campus party between one to four
times in any month, almost 30% indicated that they attended an off-campus
party more than four times in any month. More than half of the student
respondents also reported that they attend off-campus parties at other schools
at least once a month. This is an important point to remember during the later
discussion of who was in the neighborhoods the night of the disturbance.

We are all underage...I mean, like, I am not going to be able to go there
(a bar) and drink, but I can go to my friend’s and have a keg...and, I can
drink as much as I want and it is free, too, for me.

But like you can go to a party for free. Also, freshmen aren’t 21 and
they’re not going to stop partying.

Students recognized that house parties provide an uncontrolled setting
for young adults to engage in drinking and that this increases the potential for
things to get “out of control.” Many noted and endorsed the limits that naturally occur in a bar setting, for example, bartenders who “cut you off when you’ve had too much” and bouncers who eject “troublemakers.” Students repeatedly cited the elimination of a number of bars along High Street (see figure 3) as a contributing factor to both the growth of off-campus parties and the students’ antagonism towards what might be called the establishment (i.e., OSU administration and its extension into the campus community, Campus Partners). The extended presence of a large vacant lot that once held bars seemed to take on a symbolic significance to the students. The fact that underage students would not be able to drink in these establishments and the fact that disturbances occurred in the neighborhoods before Campus Partners purchased and demolished the bars did not diminish the importance of the missing bars to the many students, most of whom noted their absence as a problem and an example of the university’s disregard for them.

It definitely wouldn’t hurt to have a few more bars on campus. I mean Jesus Christ, Miami University, less than half our size and in Oxford Ohio of all hick towns, has way more bars then (sic.) we could even imagine having, and they don’t riot….

One of the cops that I was talking to… thinks it was the worse idea in the world to tear those down and he actually said that the big empty space, they should just put up a beer tent and a lot of port-a-potties and just shove everyone in there.

Kids are going to go out and get drunk somewhere… I can’t believe they even tore down all of the bars without even knowing what they are going to build…I mean it is just ridiculous that it is just sitting there. It makes the University look horrible. I mean, having a dirt bar there looks better than having, like, dirt.
A number of students made references to family and friends that were alumni of OSU and the stories the alumni told of how young students used to drink in the bars. Many current students are related to or know people who attended OSU in the past, both recent and ancient, and thus are imbued with a strong “institutional memory” that permits a contrast of the current state of bars and drinking-related social activities with past practices.

Other students commented that the off-campus parties offered a better deal for students than the bars.

Student: One of my friends went to a bar, like, that night (OSU/Michigan game) and she said it was completely empty...like, completely empty. There was no one there, and it is a popular bar and there was no one around.

Interviewer: Why was that...because everyone was out on the street?

Student: Because everyone was having house parties and it was cheaper.

Students who were at the parties and disturbances (and many of those students who were not) expressed disagreement with the under-age drinking laws. They indicated that enforcing the under-age laws escalated the problems with the police.

But when it comes to alcohol, it suddenly takes on this imaginary value simply because it’s forbidden. Knowing that you’re doing something that is forbidden and getting away with it is a thrilling experience. Limiting people’s ability to drink only when they’re over 21 is a bad law and should’ve never been enacted in the first place.

Well, I would just say don’t arrest kids for alcohol. I mean you can arrest kids for being stupid, but not like alcohol.

15 My personal experience with these stories is that people tell them as fond memories.
But, like, you just can’t arrest a kid for being underage, like, underage drinking that weekend. It just escalates so much.

Let’s face this is what kids want to do, and now they have no outlet for this. So they party in uncontrolled apartment parties that can and do get out of hand. This will never change because politicians find it politically incorrect to think about actually letting adults have an adult beverage in an adult place. Instead they spend time enforcing underage drinking and keg rules while just making the students more angry at the establishment.

Clearly in the minds and the experiences of the majority of students drinking and parties that include drinking are and will continue to be an important part of their social life in college, representing a strong reference perception that influences their decisions and actions.

Perceptions of Expectations (or It’s Beginning to Look a Lot Like Riots)

Students who were in the university district neighborhoods the night of the disturbance identified different sources that contributed to the idea or expectation of a riot16 among students. In talking about riot expectations, students repeatedly referred to the communications and actions of the university administration, the attention of the media, and the activities of the police. To a lesser degree, they cited the talk of other students and alumni as a contributor to the expectations or idea of a riot.

---

16 Although I have used the term mixed-issue campus disturbances for the academic discussions in this paper, students and others refer to the disturbances simply as riots. Because the purpose of this chapter is to convey the experiences of those in the university and Columbus community, I will use the term “riot” both for ease of reading and to be consistent with the language of the speakers.
*Messages from the OSU administration.*

The OSU administration published a news release about behavior expectations on November 20, 2002 at the beginning of “Beat Michigan” week. Ohio State football fans were “challenged” to “show the nation that they celebrate with respect and class.” The university recorded and distributed a public service announcement that featured Archie Griffin, Associate Athletic Director at the time. Griffin, a former OSU football player and the nation’s only two time Heisman Trophy winner, was chosen because of perceptions that Griffin had widespread respect and appeal among OSU football fans.

The news release expressed confidence that OSU fans would “act appropriately regardless of the outcome of the game.” The senior vice-president for student affairs was quoted as to his “trust and hope” that the fans would celebrate “like real champions.” Although the references made were to OSU football fans, the initiatives the university listed as their efforts to promote appropriate behavior were almost entirely targeted at students. The first two initiatives on the list were a free concert on “Saturday night after the game” and the distribution of free food on campus “Saturday after the game,” two strategies that the OSU student affairs office instituted with the idea of diverting students from drinking at off-campus parties and/or diminishing the effects of alcohol with food. The news release, along with broadcast emails and letters that various entities in the administration sent to all students, communicated the university’s expectations for appropriate fan behavior, but
the missives also communicated expectations of trouble in the students’ post
game celebrations. In the students’ words:

The more the university played up such activities, it just invited more students to consider it.

It’s almost like when we get emails and stuff like that, although we don’t think about it at the time, in the back of your mind, it puts something there and then when people are drunk then it’s like little things like that that will trigger something…it’s hard to explain…

Some students also indicated that the repeated admonitions of the administration were irritating and “egged” people on:

Before the riots were what were meant to be helpful public announcements by President Holbrook and others, saying stay under control…you know, celebrate responsibly…that, that actually was not received well by the students17.

I didn’t enjoy opening up my email and getting four or five things saying don’t riot this week …

Messages from the media.

Local television outlets, one of which during the week before the OSU/Michigan game has a segment on the nightly news devoted to “Buckeye Fever,” relayed the university’s message along with speculations about whether the students would riot after the game. Print media both off and on campus devoted space to discussion of the potential for disturbances after the OSU/Michigan game. A local paper noted that the police planned on a strong presence in the university area and would have riot gear ready (Thomas,

---

17 As a student, I also received the emails and announcements to which the undergraduate students refer. My reaction was similar despite being 25 years older than most of them. I was irritated and felt mildly rebellious towards what seemed to me to be paternalistic and patronizing messages.
Students saw the media attention as an effort to increase viewers and to promote the opportunity (as in encouraging a riot) for more media coverage.

The local media had made such a huge production to increase viewers in the weeks prior to the game that it creates an atmosphere of expectance and draws on the students to come looking to act out against everyone telling them to behave.

During the week before the Michigan game, everyday there was at least one article in the Columbus Dispatch, The Lantern, and a segment on the evening and daily news, wondering if the student’s would riot. We received e-mails from Karen Holbrook and other faculty members urging everyone to be sensible. Did anyone stop and think, maybe this encouraged people to riot? All the publicity and the hype of wondering, would the students riot, maybe this added something to the situation? Camera crews consistently asking students, will there be a riot?

The news and other sources were talking about them (riots) before the Michigan game and while it’s not acceptable behavior, it is expected behavior...

*Messages from the police.*

Students also noted that the preparations of the police telegraphed riot expectations and that the show of police force was undesirable.

I think the vibe....like, they cleared off what, Chittenden to 13th? I remember walking up to my friend’s house in the morning, thinking, like, riots tonight, because they were clearing the streets...

I think it is like the self fulfilling prophesy, you know, the more cops that show up to deal with it, it’s like, “Yea, it’s happening! We’re doing it!”

(I) was dismayed to see police parked in the middle of high street with their lights flashing (they made a mess of traffic) and TV crews by the law school. These people were WAITING for something to happen (should I say hoping in the case of the news crews?) I have to believe that this promotes problems – I’m sure the police would deny it... I don’t like feeling that I live in a police state.

What’s sets people on edge (including myself) is the overwhelming presence of the police, as if they are daring us to do something out of
line. It’s like making a suggestion that hasn’t even occurred to most of us: the cops are here and ready for action.

Messages from other students.

Students also stated that there was a good deal of talk and speculation among their friends and other students about whether the OSU/Michigan game would precipitate a riot.

I heard a lot of kids talking about riot, like from the get go and, I mean, people were practically taking bets on if the riots would be worse if we won or if we lost.

Some indicated that the ideas of a riot emerged from conversations held before the game about the possibility of it occurring. When the game was over and they had consumed enough alcohol, they acted out the idea.

Because by that time everyone was so hammered...that it seemed like a really good idea... before the game even happened...everyone was talking like...you know, things are going to happen, we are so excited...like, I know a lot of people were, like, I really want to riot...it is going to be crazy....all of my friends were like that and so then when they got drunk enough, then it seemed like, like, let’s just do it now.

Others indicated that although there was extensive talk before the riot, the disturbance was not preplanned.

Nobody was prepping to, like, riot. I never heard, like, riot once up until it actually started happening. People were yelling like, wanting to drink, wanting to have a good time party, and beat Michigan but I never ever heard like, riot or, like let’s do this if this if we win or let’s do this if we lose.

They talk about, you know, waiting to see what happened. No one said, you know, I’m going into this weekend with, like, specific goals on what to destroy or how to destroy it...but, just more of I want to be there if it happens.
Messages from the alumni.

As with expectations about bars and drinking on the OSU campus, students also talked about how family and friends who were alumni contributed to their riot expectations. They stated that OSU alumni relayed stories about campus disturbances that occurred while they were students.

My boyfriend was like, yea they're going to riot...I know they are going to because his mom went to Ohio State and like, he knows about all the riots and everything.

I mean, you have a feeling riots are going to happen. My whole family came from Ohio State, so, I mean, I've kind of been brought up around the whole atmosphere here and stuff.

Again, the communication and interactions students had with alumni, with fellow students, with media messages, with administration admonitions, and with observations of police behavior all contributed to the development of their reference perception for the weekend’s activities that included at least the possibility of trouble in the neighborhoods. Obviously, by the messages being sent by the other entities – administrators, police, the media, etc. – they too, had expectations of trouble, despite hope their expectations would not be met.

The Experience

Just as each person and each group of people with similar backgrounds bring unique reference perceptions to social interactions, each person and group have different experiences during an interaction or event. All experience variable levels of success and failure in having their experience match their
initial reference perception, and all attribute the reasons for their behavior and the behavior of others based on that experience.

**Media, Spokespeople, and OSU Administration**

The local news media had extensive footage of the OSU/Michigan game disturbance that occurred between 1:00 and 4:00 a.m. on November 24, 2002. The comments of the Columbus Police Department spokesperson, who was quoted on the news video tape of the riot, provided a framework that was echoed by the OSU administration in the days immediately after the disturbance:

This is a great accomplishment that Ohio State did today, and all these kids just took everything away.

In her initial post disturbance statement on November 24, 2002, the OSU university president also contrasted the “great” accomplishment of the football team with the “appalling” and “destructive” behavior of the students who participated in the disturbance. She stated that “most of those responsible appear to be our students.” She then apologized on behalf of the university for the actions of the previous night, saying, “I express apologies to our city, to those who suffered property damage, and to those fans and supporters who did celebrate in an appropriate manner.”

**Participants and Observers**

On November 25, the vice-president of student affairs updated the media on the university’s actions and efforts to identify students involved in the disturbance. At that time, nine of the 48 people arrested were OSU
students. Six of the 48 were students at other universities. The remaining 33 (69%) were not students. OSU officials issued interim letters of suspension to the OSU students while the investigations were being conducted.

On November 26, the administration issued another update that noted that 15 of the 64 cited or arrested at that point were OSU students. Students were arrested or cited for underage drinking, disorderly conduct, public indecency, setting off fireworks, open burning, criminal damaging, rioting, and resisting arrest. Only 10 of the 15 students were cited with violations significant enough to warrant interim suspension from the university.

On December 6, the OSU administration issued a news release that 16 of the 69 (23%) cited or arrested in connection with the disturbance were OSU students. Again, only 10 of the 16 were cited with violations severe enough to precipitate interim suspensions. Ultimately, after the student judicial process was completed, OSU expelled eight students (11% of those arrested and cited) from the university because of their involvement with the disturbance.

The small ratio of OSU students to non-students among those cited or arrested by the police was supported by the numerous statements on this topic by students who were in the neighborhoods the night of the disturbance. Students explained that many people who were not OSU students were in the campus area, staying in the dorms and in the neighborhoods the evening of the OSU/Michigan game.

Even before game day, people I know from other schools were talking about coming because they wanted to see a riot. The riot was instigated by people from other schools.
These are people who are, like, from different campuses, people who are visiting and I’m like, “Why are you here?” and they’re like, “Oh, well there is going to be big riots and lots of parties.”

The night of the Michigan game, everyone I met was from another school, and as far as I’m concerned there were also far too many kids that were still in high school.

My brother… said there were a lot of people staying at their house that weekend, and most of them were running around during the chaos.

I mean, I had three guests come down from Toledo and stay with me… they slept on the floor (dorm) …

Students explained, sometimes from their previous experiences as an out-of-town party guest, why the people who were not students were more likely to engage in the extreme behaviors.

That day I was talking to people and I’m like, “Are you going to the game?” and they’re like, “No, I don’t have tickets.” I’m like, “Well, why are you here?” and they’re like, “Well, there’s going to be big riots tonight.” I’m like, “Why are you here?” and they’re, like “Well, if we do anything we won’t get caught. They don’t know who we are.” I mean I heard a lot of that.

When you go to another college, you definitely get crazier. It’s their house. They are going to have to clean it up the next morning…you know, you don’t have to worry about it. So, I mean, it’s, like…that, like, includes like your city too. It’s his city, he can deal with that…like, “It’s his city, not mine…I’m going back up to Columbus.”

I heard a lot of, “Well, I’m in the navy and even if I do get caught they can’t do anything to me.” Like, I heard a lot of that.

I feel I have more insight to this problem than most people. I had the riotous party on 13. I witnessed the commotion first hand … First, many of the people involved in the riots were people who do not attend the university and therefore, have no respect for university property.

Most of them came for the sole purpose to partake in the riots. They wanted to see it happen so they made it happen. About 10 of my high school buddies, who were all male mind you, came here to party (female
outsiders). None of them were OSU students and they couldn’t wait to riot. They were so pumped up about it, it worried me.

Outsiders were not exclusively responsible for all the destructive behavior, however. Some students admitted that they or friends of theirs were involved in property destruction.

We ran into some guys from our floor and they literally...not to be, like, crude; but, their exact words were, “This is boring. Let’s start some shit up.” So, they go and they flip a car. Like, it’s almost just like everyone expects so much more than just the regular party but their mindset is we need to make it fun and we need to, you know, have a good time.

I had buddies that were just walking around and they didn’t even know riots were going and like, they were like, “Hey, let’s flip a car.” So, they just flipped a car randomly and went home.

I saw one guy who was like, “Flip this car over, it’s mine. I want some insurance money.”

When we get down to Chittenden, we walk up and there is so many people just crowded around the fire and people up on their roofs and just throwing anything they can in the fire, like signs and taking doors off their houses and just going out and throwing them in the fire...anything they could just to make the fire bigger and, like, the more people cheered, the more stuff got thrown on it and the people would cheer when stuff got thrown on...and, you could kind of see cops in the background but they weren’t really doing anything and then all of a sudden somebody...like there was a noise and someone screamed and everybody took off, waves of people just running down Chittenden.

There appears to be an interesting disconnect among some students who attributed the majority of the “entrepreneurial” (as opposed to reactive) destructive behavior to “outsiders “(by arrest reports their attribution is accurate) and in the same conversation acknowledge housing outsiders in their apartments or dormitory rooms. Do students house friends, acquaintances, or friends of friends with the hope that they will behave? With
the hope that they will misbehave? Do students agree to someone crashing at their home or room because it is unacceptable among young adults to refuse to do so? Understanding this aspect of young adult and college student social networks might also provide additional insights into the off-campus party and student disturbance phenomena.

*Reasons for Being There*

Many administrators, members of the Task Force, community leaders, and some student leaders expressed belief that the bystanders are a significant part of the campus disturbance problem. The belief was widespread enough to carry a bill through the Ohio legislature in 2003 that made failure to disperse a fourth-degree misdemeanor. The change allows police officers to arrest noncompliant individuals rather than fining them. The law also punishes college students by taking away their financial aid for two years. If convicted, a student will also be expelled for one year and barred from admittance at other state universities. Students, however, offered a number of alternative reasons for why they were in the area at the time of the disturbance and why blaming the bystander was unfair.

I wanted to go home, I wanted to go back to my dorm, but, one of my best friends was with me and he wanted to stay and I wasn’t going to leave him alone because I was scared to see what was going to happen to him, so I wouldn’t leave without him…

I was just walking back from a concert. We were going to go to a friend’s house and we just kind of stumbled around and there was a big group of people in the street, kind of like a party is going on….
We were over at the Union getting free stuff and everything and we started walking back to 11th and we passed by Chittenden and we were like holy crap… there was just a line of cops

But there was a lot of innocent people that were just partying, you know, and they might have not even been drinking…they were just partying, celebrating the victory, going home…

I mean there are tons of drunk people that did not participate or blow up cars or have anything to do with the riots.

It just so happens that I live on Chittenden on the basement floor, and the tear gas from outside got so bad that we couldn’t even stay in my apartment, so we had no choice but to go out the back door so we could breathe. Then of course, a friend I was with got pepper sprayed right in the face, no questions asked.

I went out to go and get pizza from Catfish Biffs and on the way back to Stradley, still on campus, about 30 or 40 Columbus police officers came and shot tear gas all over the place and people hadn’t really done anything but just standing outside the dorm smoking a cigarette or just hanging out.

A number of students explained that they became trapped in the neighborhoods once the police started executing a riot response.

We couldn’t get through on High and we’re like, what the heck, there must be an accident…and the people were just like doing 3 point turnarounds and going back, and we’re like alright we’ll just walk…and then like in just a matter of seconds, like…

They got caught on Chittenden…but, they couldn’t get back and they kept…everywhere they turned, the police were there, shooting tear gas and stuff…

We tried to go back to the dorms and at that point we couldn’t because there was tear gas everywhere and we were just trying to avoid and they said we couldn’t go back to campus because they were shooting all the rubber bullets and stuff and we were basically trapped out there for awhile.

Once we got down to a certain point…about 15th, the cops wouldn’t even let us go back toward the dorms at all or even back across the
other side of High Street. They made us actually walk back towards the riots, towards Indianola, back and around …

I'm not talking about rioters. I'm talking about people who were walking back to the dorms…

See, I didn't even know, like, that any of that was going on and I was coming from north campus, trying to go to somebody’s house on Chittenden and we ended getting caught up in all of it…like, as the police were…like, walking down the street. They were just pepper spraying anybody who was in the street…and, we were just trying to get to somebody else’s house…we weren’t rioting.

Yea, I know a friend of mine…like, we were, like, chilling in our room…like he ordered something from Apollo's and wanted to go up there and get it 'cause it would be quicker to walk up there and get it instead of having them deliver it to him…and, he got caught up in the mess and he got pepper sprayed by the police and came back without the food and everything….he was, you know…eyes were all red and teary-eyed…you know…and he wasn’t expecting none of that to happen.

Students also offered insight into why it was so tempting to become a bystander and watch what was going on.

A riot, especially of this size, like, I know people who have not seen a riot before, like, in their whole entire life and that might be the last riot that I ever see. It’s, I don’t know, it’s just like you are curious and so… It’s hard to explain because I’m going to be completely honest. It was absolutely amazing to see that many people, like, just going crazy… It’s just…like, even though it was so bad, it was something…like, you can tell stories about.

I think it’s intriguing, you know. If you see an ambulance, you always wonder where it is going. That’s human nature to be drawn to something just to see what the outcome is going to be.

Just because we're standing around (yes I was there, I saw EVERYTHING) and watching, does NOT mean we accept or agree with what’s going on. We didn’t. A lot of people were there shaking their heads and WATCHING. That’s all. It’s like the scene of an accident. You can’t do much about it but you can’t help but watch.
You want to know why people don't do anything and watch. Because: Have you ever seen a street full of burning cars? – it is by far an amazing sight.

Personally, it was the sight of a lifetime, yes I was there watching it all. Yet, never once did I feel as if I wanted to join in.

Yea, like I just wanted to see what was going on. It is not everyday you see a car flipped over.

I don't know, it was just kind of like...I was just in awe.

You don’t want to miss out on it, you know.

Very few spectators were encouraging further behavior with their ohhhs and uhhhs. It was comparable to a high school fight. Although shunned by high school principles, school fights do happen, and many gather to watch. Do not get me wrong, being a spectator may not be the best thing to do in this situation, but it is going to happen.

Spokespeople and officials tended to portray those in the neighborhood the night of the disturbance as irrational, senseless, and determined to cause societal damage. When the OSU president Holbrook and Mayor Coleman of Columbus announced the formation of a Task Force to study the issue, Holbrook referred to “senseless mob behavior. “ Mayor Coleman focused on the excessive use of alcohol as the reason for “far too much senseless destruction in our neighborhoods near campus.” In contrast, most students' descriptions of the reasons they were out that evening and the actions they took were banal, rational, and frequently focused on supporting friends and others. A number of students indicated that they and others tried to discourage students from engaging in destructive and confrontational behaviors.
I know that when I came back to Baker West...like, I live in Baker West, and there were a lot of people who came that were maced and I figured...I mean, it wouldn’t be a bad idea to get my washcloth and rinse it out in water and give it to them and so I did that but that was about it because I was scared...

I kept one of my friends from running into it...like, she was just so drunk, that she just wanted to do something...

Well, I was just on the way back from a party...um, I had a couple of friends with me and there had been drinking at the party and I was kind of like the designated walker, I guess...if you want to call it that...so, we were all walking back and the guys that were with me, they were like come on let’s go check it out, there is a burning car over there...we have to go look at it...and I’m just like come on guys we have to get back before it starts really getting bad, but they just started walking over there, you know, stumbling and trying get over to this burning car but I finally got them away...

There were people there who weren’t...I was sober. I was saying, “No, don’t do this.”

But, at that point it was like..."I don’t agree with what you are doing. I don’t think it is cool.” We heard that from people everywhere.

As the police sprayed tear gas and pepper spray and advanced onto campus in an effort to break up the crowd, students around and in the dorms who had not been partying in the neighborhoods became part of the event.

We were told to go outside (resident advisers) and get residents to come in or whatever and the police were trying to tear gas us and do all sorts of things...and, so there was like a lot of tension and I was like really scared.

My cell phone started ringing off the hook with like different residents calling me to ask me (resident adviser) how do you get home and you know, we’re stuck out here, is there anything we should do...like, do you know anybody who lives on this street so we can just get in a house and stuff...and so, it was just crazy.

There were cops in our courtyards and there was like tear gas in our, like, the first floor and stuff. And, like, a couple of people we were with got maced by some of the cops for not doing anything.
I mean, like, we had cops outside our building and there were people who were outside on the steps, you know, who were smoking cigarettes who got maced for being out…just for being there…and that wasn’t even where there were fires.

It is kind of hard to miss tear gas coming in. I mean I was asleep by that time. It was like 2 a.m. so, I was asleep by that time and tear gas was just…bam…it was hitting like all parts of the building and it was like what is going on here…is it hailing outside…and, then you go out into the hallway and, like, I have really bad asthma…so, it was like all the tear gas went like…whoosh…up into like the elevators and stuff and got on everybody’s floors and stuff and everybody was coughing and hacking and throwing up and everything was just really bad, and everybody on our floor was just like, oh my God, we have so many people in this hall that do not belong in here; that are in people’s rooms passed out drunk because they were running from High Street and couldn’t get…

We (resident advisers) were supposed to find out where they lived … we were instructed to take them through the buildings and get them to the nearest exit to where they can get to their dorms easily. It was a mess. If we couldn’t get them to their dorms or if they lived off campus and they couldn’t get to their house, then some of us…we just took them to our rooms and just let our roommates handle them.

At one point during the disturbance, a dorm director instructed the resident advisers to secure the doors in the halls. At the same time, police were demanding that people go inside the dorms regardless of whether they lived there or not.

When we were standing outside the police said go inside and like everybody was saying we don’t live here and they were firing tear gas and pellets at people and saying, go inside and people were saying we don’t live here and then they started pepper spraying people and then people learned their lesson and went inside…

They were overrunning the dorms and they were headed towards ours, so they wanted us to make sure our doors were… I actually got a call from the person at the desk, that said to come down and make sure the doors were secured so that they could stay behind and on the phones.
Administrative and police accounts tended to portray the actions of the students in the neighborhoods as somewhat scripted (senseless, but scripted). Student accounts portray a random and confusing set of interactions with police and often with each other. This contradiction again illustrates the effect that reference perception has on perspective.

**Police**

As the previous section foreshadows, extensive comments about the police dominated the students’ discourse about the OSU/Michigan disturbance. For some students the interactions with the police during the disturbance were an extension of existing negative relationships between students and the Columbus Police Department. For some, the experiences during the disturbance precipitated feelings of hostility.

**Harm to the Innocent**

Given that 15,000 students live in the neighborhoods east of the campus and an additional 4,823 live in the south campus dormitories immediately adjacent to the scene of the disturbance, it could be expected that a number of students would be traveling in the area in the course of leaving and returning to their homes, in addition to those who were out in the streets as active observers of the criminal behavior. This normal traffic coupled with the presence of bystanders who moved into the area to see what was going on and those who were drawn into the mix in because of the police actions (e.g., leaving a house to escape tear gas) created the potential for a number of “innocent” people to be engaged with or affected by the police. Some students
offered understanding of the difficult job of the police, but they also expressed disappointment and criticism for the police treatment of the innocents.

Like, I was so disappointed… with how like the cops handled the whole thing… I like live in Park and all I want to do is go back to my dorm… I was completely sober and I walked out the door and got like reamed… like I just thought it was really stupid… it was like so unorganized and like I know… how can you tell an innocent person from a guilty person… like how do you decide who you are going to tear gas… but like I don’t think that is any excuse because I’m sure there is like more than one person that got tear gassed that didn’t do anything…

My 100 lb. female friend who was trying to escort her blind friend home in the middle of this mess got maced by a cop who was panicking/out of control.

Many VERY OBVIOUSLY peaceful and innocent students were harmed by the use of pepper spray and non-lethal projectiles designed to stop the miscreants.

Police officers deliberately aim their knee knocker guns at people or shoot tear gas into people’s homes or fire at innocent observers who stand alone on the porch of their house.

I don’t think the police handled the situation very well either. A lot of people I know got hit in the face with pepper spray just for being in the wrong place at the wrong time or trying to get to their homes.

Many students expressed anger at the treatment of people they deemed innocent of any wrongdoing and felt the mistreatment contributed to antagonism towards the police the night of the disturbance. Some predicted that it would increase the likelihood of riots in the future.

It wasn’t at all fun to watch from my window, police beating and gassing kids getting AWAY from the riots… such infringement should inspire further riots if nothing else.

I know three people that got hit by rubber bullets and like a couple of the guys there were like tear gassed and they were fuming and they told their friend and like literally if there wasn’t an RA in like every door,
they probably would have gone out and tried to be aggressive towards
the cops...like, they were walking home and trying to get back...you
know to try to get away from everything and this is what happened.

They (police) started to not take any chances and they started to do
things that they shouldn't have done and I mean they could have
handled it a lot safer way...and they got off to campus and started tear
gassing all of south campus and some people who wanted to get into
their dorms couldn't get in and stuff like that...so, I know that some of
the people I knew were at Baker that got really angry and made them
even want to go back.

I think the police, like, were really ridiculous that night in the use of the
rubber bullets and stuff. They hurt a lot of people with those. It
happened to so many people and so many people got their eyes
seriously hurt by the pepper spray when they weren't doing anything..., I
think, like, that was too much and that they took it too far and hurt
people who didn't even deserve it...and that was part of the problem. It
just made people madder and madder.

I was appalled by the pleasure they were getting from throwing gas on
people that were VERY CLEARLY taking no part in the rioting.

If she (President Holbrook) could have seen the abuse of power the
police officers were doing to innocent students just walking across the
street... I witnessed countless sprayings in student's eyes just because
they walked across the street to get away from other cops. Then the
cops screaming, “Hey I love this, I get paid time and a half to spray kids
down.” She knows one side of what happened and that's all she's going
on.

_Confrontation at the Goalposts_

Some students felt that an altercation that occurred between fans and
the police immediately after the game as people rushed the field and tried to
reach the goalpost also increased the negative energy in the neighborhoods.

For administrators, rushing the field after the game presented safety issues
that they wanted to avoid. To students, rushing onto the field after a major
victory was an important tradition. Both the intensity of the moment of victory and the theme of innocence was evident in their comments.

I was in Block-O during and after the game. I had a clear view of what happened. As a diehard Ohio State fan, this is something I’ve dreamed about since I was born. It was a beautiful moment watching everybody celebrate on the field. The real problem there started with the POLICE. This whole thing started when one of the students stumbled and lost his balance. That’s when the pepper spray started. This guy was defenseless and heading the opposite direction of the goal posts, yet they still sprayed him. Nobody was really thinking about the goal post yet. After they sprayed the guy a couple of times, the mass of people started running away. This caused a lot more trouble than there was before. I for one saw a couple of people getting trampled in this group. One guy could not stand up, due to what was probably a broken leg. That’s when the cops went after him. It was the most disgraceful thing I have ever seen. He was not causing any trouble, yet he was pepper sprayed while he was down. A couple of his friends came to his aid and tried to lift him up, but the cops, mad with power, sprayed them as well, leaving the poor guy defenseless. I do not know who this guy was or how he is doing, but I hope justice is being served and he is taking them to court.

I suggest that the CPD/OSHP thoughtfully re-examines the tactics and strategies they use, and re-evaluate what has/has not worked. I specifically point to the pepper-spraying incident after the MI game, a vain and ill attempt to prevent the destruction of an INDESTRUCTABLE goal post…. In which the handful of surrounded Troopers attempted to fend off roughly 15,000 students in a contained area, in something that must have resembled the waning moments of Custer. …. I could plainly see that they accomplished nothing more than pissing off an overwhelmingly large fan body.

The administration was both stupid and ruthless in its attempts to keep students off the field. I have lost nearly all respect for the police officers of this area as I feel that the way they treated students on the field was atrocious. They were attacking (tackling, kicking, hitting) students at the north end of the stadium who were simply on the field to celebrate. This was totally uncalled for and the police need to apologize for their actions, just as much as the students who rioted do. The police did nothing but exacerbate an already heated situation.

I know a lot of people were kind of upset that they got maced at the game…and after that, they were like, “We were just having a good time
tearing down the goalposts. I mean it is tradition man,"...and then some innocent people got maced.

Too Much, Too Little, Too Early, Too Late – Critiques of Police Tactics

Other students attributed the development of a disturbance to the early presence of the police in the neighborhoods, and what they perceived to be the aggressive nature of their actions.

The reasons for the riots are pretty obvious. For starters, don’t send the police dressed in riot gear into student neighborhoods at 1 am the night that the football team completes a perfect season.

It seems that every time there is a riot, the police were there prior instigating negative responses from the intoxicated crowds. One of the things they do is arrest people drinking on the sidewalks, or break up huge parties for underage drinking. Granted, the students are breaking the laws, but the police fails to see the bigger picture. That is, hundreds of angry, drunk students willing to do stupid things.

I’m sort of in a unique position with this whole thing because my father is actually a police officer... if you start having raids at parties and arresting people, you are going to start getting drunks angry...and when you get a group of drunks angry, the rioting is going to start quicker than what it would have if they would have just sat back and let the students handle it on their own.

Other students felt that the police contributed the problem by initially ignoring criminal behavior among students. These students felt the police needed to take action on these types of activities earlier rather than later.

Like they were like flipping it (a car) and it was like in the middle of the street and the cops were coming and we’re like...oh, crap let’s push it to the side...and, like he goes by like real slow and then they keeping doing it and beating the crap out of it...like the cops went by like three times....and they didn’t do anything

They threw the chair in the middle of the street and caught it on fire...like the police passed a couple of times and like nothing happened...like, the chair went out its own...I thought that they were going to get out and they just drove on.
The police also play a vital role in the riot by allowing it to escalate to a level of complete chaos. They group together and wait for a certain time to react, by this time it is too late. They should react earlier and not allow things to escalate.

**Student and Police Relations**

Many students expressed the belief that the riots were an outgrowth of bad relations between students and the police, relations that had developed through previous negative interactions between the two groups. Some students specifically noted confrontations that took place during Chittfest, the unofficial student block party that occurs in the spring.

I have lived on Chittenden for over a year and a half now not to mention the corresponding accounts from friends and acquaintances who attended parties I did not, I can truthfully and sincerely say that the Columbus police not only provoked the riots, but in effect caused them. There is no shred of doubt in my mind that had the police never arrived to the party on 13th street almost 4 years ago now, there never would have been a riot.

Why do people honestly think that cars were destroyed to celebrate the victory? They were destroyed to avenge the police. When hundreds of people were chanting, “flip that car” they really mean “f**k the cops.”

Every fall, certain students are anxious to start trouble while the police (are) unprepared, leading to annual riots in the fall. At the other end of the school year in the spring, students are just wanting to gather at large parties not wanting to cause trouble, but the police seem to bring in four times as many police for the spring than the fall. Shouldn’t the police catch on a little quicker.

Students complained that the Columbus police regularly treat them disrespectfully. They believe this contributes to the bad relations between students and police.

I don’t drink, so I was completely sober at the Michigan game, but I was very angry with the police. For someone who was drunk, I can totally
understand why a riot would break out. I don’t feel sorry for the cops, if they abuse students, the students will strike back.

I also feel that the Columbus Police handled the situation very poorly. Other campuses have much more drinking, and many more students being rowdy, yet other police departments handle the situation in such a manner that students respect their authority. There is no such respect on this campus. Most of the students I know can’t stand the police, because the police do not show the students any respect. I feel that in order for the police to gain respect, they must give respect.

Last year while walking at night with my friend, we saw a police car drive by. She drove beside us for over 3 blocks, until we finally took a short cut to avoid her. We were not causing any trouble. We were simply taking a walk, yet she felt the need to harass us and coerce us into “unruly” behavior. This is the strongest reason for the riots. Most of the students are just tired of such harassment. As for me, I have very little respect for the Columbus police department. This is not an anti-authority reason. I know many great police officers in my part of the state. However, I have yet to see any good ones at Columbus.

Students contrasted police efforts on issues important to the students living in the university district – rape, burglary, theft – and police efforts to control student parties, expressing their frustration that the enforcement of underage drinking and controlling parties received more attention than effective policing for what students saw as more serious crimes. These perceptions also emerged when the OSU Undergraduate Student Senate members along with members of the OSU faculty conducted a door-to-door conversation campaign in the university district in the spring of 2003.

One of the main reasons for the rioting is hostility towards the Police Department. Every weekend nearly a dozen students are arrested for underage consumption either at bars, on the sidewalks, or by undercover officers at parties. Meanwhile the university district is plagued by break ins, rape, and theft. Why is there no special task force to halt these crimes? Why has arresting underage drinkers become the priority of Franklin County? When safety of students should be the main priority. There needs to be more open communication between students
and the police department, and strict enforcement of alcohol laws needs to cease. Alcohol is part of the college experience and this will not change.

Students did not appear to have a universal disregard for police authority. Their criticism was directed specifically at the Columbus police department, which has jurisdiction over the off-campus neighborhoods.

Students contrasted the behavior they experienced in interactions with the Columbus police with their police experiences elsewhere. Some suggested that better training for the police would help resolve some of the issues.

In most communities, the police force is seen as an ally; they are people who protect them from harm. However, in the campus area, many students view the police as enemies. The interactions that most people have with the police involves getting busted for underage drinking. It seems as though the police are much more determined to keep a 20 year old from drinking a beer than they are to catch the serial rapist, who terrorized women in the area for many months before the attacks were even made public.

At the same time maybe there could be something done to build a better relation between the police and the students. Most of those police are assholes. As you know, I am no angel and had frequented the FCCC (Franklin County Correctional Center). However, I never damaged or destroyed property and never retaliated against the police, so I know both ends of the spectrum here. The police are sometimes a bit ruthless and it incited the kids to retaliate with force. ...

Columbus police can’t deal with this and need some training or something on how to better deal with it so things don’t get out of control. ...

The situation may also be helped with better training for police in the Columbus area to deal with potential rioters. I am from the Washington DC area and almost every month there is some activity in the city that warrants the presence of protestors and troublemakers. The reason there is never national news coverage of riots constantly occurring in DC is because the police there have had the proper training to deal with potential rioters. Police training could help to combat the problem of rioting.
Although superficial reading of the students’ comments might lead one to believe that students offer contradictory views of what tactics police should employ with students, that is, at times students charge that the police precipitate disturbances by an early show of force, at other times they are critical of the police not intervening early. However, when the details of what students are suggesting are taken in consideration, another interpretation can be made. Students’ criticisms about early actions reflect a disagreement with how the police are deployed and the manner in which they interact with the students. Police cruising in patrol cars, assembling in large masses, appearing early in riot or SWAT gear, even police on bikes, appear to increase the barriers between the students and the police. Students seem to be asking for the “beat cop” approach to interaction.

If you could just maybe even get like a police officer..., except there were like some rule or guideline that you could dictate that, like, the people wouldn’t get in trouble for any alcohol violation and no one would get arrested for any alcohol violations...like, that might even do it, you know. If you just have a cop there and kids could just talk to him.

The police need to take a different approach to the way they conduct themselves during these situations. If they took the time to just walk to the place where the party is being held and discussed solutions to maintaining a controlled environment in a subtle manner, it would drastically affect the way these riots occur. Instead they take 3 hours to group together and take action at the most intense part of the party, in most cases results in a war between the kids and the police.

Yea, they need to be there. Like they don’t have to be camped out.

Police riot tactics are based on intimidation and persuasion of a hostile crowd. They stand shoulder to shoulder, beating on their shields, and giving verbal commands to disperse the crowd. The second step is to slow march forwards, possibly using gas, pushing the crowd out of the
controlled area. The final measure is to use non-lethal weapons to disperse the crowd and persuade the mob to break up and retreat. This is also based upon the PRESUMPTION that the mob is relatively sensible, reactive, perceptive, and most important, logical. Adding alcohol to the mix effectively removes “persuasion’s” effect. I assume that we both can agree that a drunken mob on Chittenden displays none of the above. Therefore, it makes sense that those tactics will not work either. ….

Several students singled out police on bikes as being particularly ineffective\footnote{My observation on Chittenden during Chittfest in the spring immediately following the OSU/Michigan disturbance (Spring 2003) was that the police on foot were far more engaged and effective with the partying students. I had noted (this was before hearing the student’s comments on the police) that the bike police stayed in a group either riding or standing together with their bikes; they appeared neither approachable nor intimidating.}.  

Student A: Bike police don’t intimidate anybody. They should have them out there on horses… a guy on a bike doesn’t bother me too much but a guy on a horse…

Student B: When they’re wearing those tights especially, it is just not intimidating at all.

Student 1: A bike cop came up and arrested one kid, like, for underage (at a party on Chittenden a year before)…like out of like a thousand people he just comes out and picks up one kid, and then people started throwing bottles at this cop on a bike…which a cop on a bike is a ridiculous sight anyway…

Student 2: Especially in the summer, when they have shorts on.

What clearly emerges from the student discourse about the police is that students perceive the local police as outsiders to their community. While outsider status enhanced the ability of the “entrepreneurs” to exploit the party conditions of the neighborhood to achieve their goals, the outsider status of the police hindered their ability to maintain or restore control. Some aspects of
the students’ accounts evoke images of the classic triangular relationship, with the neighborhood student populace (and their friends from the nearby dormitories), the police, and the entrepreneurs as the three sides to the triangle. Students are drawn into conflicts between the police and the entrepreneurs, and the tense relationships between the police and the students give power to the entrepreneurs.

The statements students made reveal their reference perceptions and some of the ways they developed these perceptions. Their statements also described some of the actions that they took so that their current or in-the-moment perceptions approached the reference perceptions they held. For some, the reference perception was property destruction and their actions were organized to achieve that target. For many more, their reference perception was to party and celebrate in the manner they felt was consistent with their age and their environment.

Through the lens of perception control theory, the “riot” was the result of the former group finding little impediment in matching current perception with their reference perception and the latter group encountering forces that they had to overcome to reach a match.

Student A: I mean, we’re all…hopefully everyone who was there was at least 18. We’re all in college now. We should act our age. I mean that is what they’re (police) thinking. They’re thinking that it is not our job to baby-sit them.

Student B: Well, when there are thousands and thousands of drunk college students, no one is going to act their age.

Student C: We are acting our age.
OSU Task Force on Preventing Celebratory Riots Multi-Campus Survey

Although the majority of the questions asked in this survey are helpful in developing both an understanding of different universities’ experiences of mixed-issue campus disturbances and developing potential areas of research into university and community risk factors, some of the questions asked in this survey are not pertinent to the focus of this paper. Therefore, not all of the variables explored in the survey are included in this discussion.

The Student Affairs officials at 18 of the universities surveyed said that they had experienced a celebratory riot at some time during the last 10 years (the student affairs officials at three schools did not respond to the survey); the remaining 10 indicated that they had not experienced a riot. Public safety officials at 20 of the schools indicated that they had experienced a riot in the last 10 years, 10 indicated that they had not, and 1 referred the interviewer to the Student Affairs official for the answer to the question (that person had answered yes). The officials at 2 of the schools gave conflicting answers to the question. However, the official responding positively to the question was able
to provide dates and details for the event. Therefore, when the answers from each school were combined as outlined in the methods section, those 2 schools were included in the group of schools that had experienced a celebratory riot/mixed issue campus disturbance (the riot schools), resulting in 21 schools that had experienced riots (67.74%) and 10 that had not (32.26%).

**The Riots**

Of the 21 universities that reported having had a riot in the past 10 years, 4 universities reported a single riot incident. For three of those universities, their only riot occurred off-campus. The remaining institution reporting a single riot was also the only university indicating that they had only experienced a riot on campus. Ten of the riot schools reported that they had only experienced riots off-campus and 10 reported that they had experienced riots both on and off campus. The total number of on campus riots reported by the 10 universities reporting this as a riot site was 33, with a mean of 6 and a standard deviation of 2.439. The total number of off campus riots reported by the 20 schools reporting this as a riot site was 71, with a mean of 6, and a standard deviation of 2.49. The total number of riots reported both on and off-campus was 104.

When respondents were asked about whether the disturbance occurred in connection with a university-related event or activity such as a sports game or if it occurred in connection with an unofficial event such as a party, 5 of those reporting a single riot indicated that the disturbance occurred in connection with a university sponsored event (e.g., a final four basketball
game, a football game, a hockey playoff, the hockey national championship, and an apple cup football game), and 1 indicated that it occurred with an unofficial event (the weekend before finals). When those reporting multiple riots the worst of which was on campus were asked if any of the riots occurred in connection with university related events, 14 answered yes, 3 answered no. When those reporting multiple riots the worst of which was off campus were asked if any of the riots occurred in connection with unofficial events, 12 answered yes, 6 answered no. Those reporting multiple riots indicated that the riots took place in connection with various athletic events such as football and basketball games, specific rivalries and national championship basketball finals (wins and losses) were noted. Those reporting multiple riots also outlined a number of non-athletic events, such as a protest to eliminate a field for a party, a spring weekend, a gathering in a parking lot after an annual concert, a dance associated with hosting a black student leadership conference, and an arts festival.

Of the riots reported on in detail (the single riot or the worst riot) by the respondents, more riots were reported in the spring months of March, April, and May (9, 7, and 4 respectively) than in the fall months (see Table 1).
Table 1. Number of riots reported by month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Riots Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of riots reported by year. Note: The numbers of riots reported in the two tables disagree because some respondents could report a year, but not the month in which a riot occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Riots Reported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total number of people involved in the riots as reported by the different universities ranged from 300 to 10,000 with a mean of 3,104 and a standard deviation of 2880.20. The respondents' estimates of the number of students involved in those riots ranged from 110 to 8,000 with the mean of 142
2,334 and a standard deviation of 2099.89. Respondents were also asked to estimate the amount of property damaged caused by the riot. Estimates ranged from $1,000 to $500,000, the average was $83,231 and the standard deviation, $123,193.

Out of the 21 schools reporting riots, 17 indicated that they had prevention efforts in place before the riot, 4 reported no prevention efforts in place. Respondents were asked to describe those prevention efforts. Many of the prevention efforts revolved around police preparation:

This party was not on our campus. We were in assist mode with local police. Our efforts are letting student know that they need certain permits for functions on or off campus. But they don't call a lot because these are not on campus, because they could not get permits because they could not drink. We have told them behavior will not be tolerated.

Security on the field. Normal riot equipment and tear gas.

Brought in extra officers stationed at the entrances to university campus. Contacted police to have officers on the streets surrounding the University.

Tried to stop people from taking down the goal post, security officers and police, radio system was down leading to communication break down from command center, for police and security, leading to injury of officers.

Not university but the city, patrol cars, choppers, called university police for back up, riot gear used.

Increased staffing for campus police, collaborate with local police and lots of publicity in student newspaper to make students aware of repercussions of bad actions.

Local and University Law enforcement and state patrol.

Part of a tactical team that had crowd control training.
Enforcement and crowd control related. Traditional gathering space on campus that students have gone to for sport celebration. Removed dolphins from fountain so they couldn't be taken. Arranged with police (city & university) to monitor traffic. Everyone was on duty. Building lock down. Student affairs coordination to monitor flow of crowd as residents go to bars, etc. City police coordination.

(Town) police task force gets together on a monthly basis that does a lot of coordination and planning of what to do how to do it. Speakers come in that talk about all kinds of info that comes down in terms of registration of parties and events. A lot of information that goes out informing students what can happen to them if things get out of hand and such. Basic prevention education.

Strategies we've used to prevent disturbances at large gatherings have included active policing in the early stages of a gathering. The police arrest students as early as possible that clearly identify theirselves as troublemakers. Engage student leadership in advance to clarify expectations. Communication directly with students

Some prevention efforts were focused on educational efforts and appeals to students.

Tried to send out messages to students through student leaders. Did a button with a message to "act with class." Message campaign basically. Conversations with the student leaders to prepare.

Flyers, panels, discussions, mailings, handbook notices, newspaper ads.

Crowd control, announcements over the PA system.

Number of tactical plans. Wanted to prevent violence. Tried to curtail alcohol abuse. Tried to explain reason for elimination of field for party.

Non stop meetings all year. Door to door. Letter to community police chief. Student affairs meeting with different groups.

Some of the respondents noted an investment in alternative activities that they felt would attract students away from any riotous parties.

On campus activities with reduced and only legal alcohol service. Also arranged entertainment.
Scheduled our alternative venues to watch the game. Alcohol free in the
arena. Worked with our student leadership to try and encourage
students to come and participate. Bands that played, and watch the
game collectively in the arena. Coordinated a group of student leaders
and student affairs staff on duty for the evening to address or react to
things that may happen in coordination with the dept of public safety.

Alternate events to be healthy. Alternative to prevent it from
happening, since the student body doesn't consider it a riot.

Non alcoholic social events.

One respondent, in the well-established tradition of doing the same
thing but expecting different results, said that their prevention efforts for the
riot they were reporting on were “the same as earlier riot.”

Interviewers asked the administrators if high volume alcohol
consumption was a factor in the reported riot. Twenty (95%) responded yes; 1
school responded no. Respondents were also asked if television news crews
taped the riot as it happened. Again, 20 responded yes, 1 school (the same
school responding no to alcohol involvement) responded no.

The student affairs officials and public safety officials were asked about
which law enforcement agencies responded, how many officers responded,
whether the arrival of the police escalated or diminished the disturbance, the
number of arrests made, and how many of those arrested were students. All
21 of the schools indicated that university police responded to the disturbance
and all but 1 university indicated that the community police also responded to

---

19 The riot this school designated as their worst was in response to the loss of a
women’s NCAA away basketball game that cost the school a chance at the national
championship.
the disturbance (the school without community police response was the school that had only experienced one disturbance and it was on campus). Almost half (10 of 21) indicated that state forces (this could be state police or national guard) also responded to the disturbance. In responding to the question regarding the escalation or diminishment in response to the police arriving, 35% responded that the disturbance escalated, 20% responded that the disturbance subsided, 12.5% responded that the level of the disturbance stayed about the same, and 7.5% responded that they did not know.

The number of officers reported responding ranged from 3 to 450 (mean 132; SD, 125.25). The number of arrests made ranged from 10 to 200 (mean 47; SD, 58.75) and the number of students arrested ranged from 6 to 100 (mean 27; SD, 29.29). Respondents were also asked about how many students were disciplined by the university. The number ranged from 1 to 55 (mean 13; SD 12.85). The administrators described the disciplinary actions that ranged from reprimands to suspensions and expulsions from the university.

The final questions regarding the riots were focused on changes in university and community policies that were made in response to the disturbance. The university policy changes reported by the administrators included changes in student conduct codes and judicial procedures.

Anti riot policy. Makes a statement: no student participates in riot and if they do they’ll be subject to judiciary procedures. Defines riot and how it would get them into the judicial system if involved.

Change in riotous events extends to off campus.
Change in judicial to off campus violations. Conviction for any offense associated with rioting faced expulsion.

Extended code of conduct to off campus. Expulsion.

Suspension references changed, expulsion meant being removed permanently. Changed wording from suspension to expulsion (for every temporary suspension, temporary expulsion).

New university off campus misconduct policy.

Student code of conduct: Continue to stay in riot area would be suspended.

Policy surrounding the fire regulations was stiffened. Automatic expulsions from school if you were even standing around the fire within 20 feet or so within fire to stop those standing around.

Athletic department gave guidelines out to the players.

Some universities began or continued to make appeals to students, investments in education on the issue, and efforts at culture change.

Just heavy publication of this conduct not being tolerated and facts on binge drinking.

More emphasis on binge drinking prevention.

Do more in terms of a sense of community/neighbor with students.

Other universities cancelled events, made changes in alcohol policies, and investigated alternative activities.

There could not be events scheduled where alcohol was present or planned.

Did away with homecoming event that sparked the riot.

Allows people on the field, therefore time delay of 15 minutes after the game to let people on the field, band to play during that time. Three task forces also working on alternative celebratory events for students.
We modified the stadium seating. Took out three rows of student section near the field.

For some, investments related to police, police equipment, and police tactics were the noted as outcomes of the disturbance.

Equipment issuance now has riot gear. Additional training part of standard training for officers.

Walking, talking, different types of patrols in the area.

Changed the goal posts; added additional police on field.

Because of few happenings before this, we have made a concentrated effort on riot gear for campus (because of 911 incident).

In terms of notice to students, probably a higher level of cooperation with external law enforcement agencies.

Worked in terms with police...

Others created task forces, review groups, and a willingness to engage in action sooner. Some noted little change or action.

Created Task Force and reexamining code of student conduct.

Led to routine review of off campus behavior.

We take action on events like this if they are in close proximity to the university if we would have previously taken action when they were on campus.

Nothing at this time. A lot of informal policy in terms of how we respond.

The changes made by the city or community fell roughly into the same types of efforts. Some were focused on policing issues.

Pushed community policing.

We have more of a professional relationship with city police.
Law enforcement decided to flood areas with law enforcement at future football games.

Community policing, neighborhood livability study, joint task force (university/city).

Relationships between (city) PD and (university) PD on how to work together.

Discussion about camera in the area, additional lighting, riot training, use of state police for night games, afternoon games and art festival, mounted police. Coordinated efforts with police with different jurisdiction, new riot gear for police, minor violations off campus like DUI etc. are looked at by the university and the community when reviewing misconduct of people involved.

Others focused on educational efforts and efforts to build a sense of community among the students.

Just reinforcing that these types of gatherings would not be permitted.

Three task forces to look at working with bars downtown, working with community and city to celebrating in the city. Late night games - evening games - are worse but due to TV contract has to stick for two years. Therefore, making night games start at 6 instead of 8.

More proactive approach to block parties and early response and contact with the residents.

Some eliminated events, tightened enforcement of existing laws and policies, and some discussed the issue.

Went to strict policy of alcohol use and open container policy.

Went beyond zero tolerance.

Couch ban...prohibited couches from being on outdoor porches.


In discussion.
University and Community Characteristics of Interest

Statistical calculations were made for each of the variables using the complete sample of 31 universities. To permit comparisons that might facilitate areas of future inquiry, calculations were also made with the data split into those schools that had reported a riot and those that reported no riots. Mean scores for the “riot” group were compared with mean scores for the “nonriot” group when variables were coded as continuous data. Variables with categorical responses were explored using cross-tabs, although the small sample size of 31 frequently yielded cells with too low a count for a valid calculation. T-tests and chi-square analyses were used to identify variables for which there were emerging differences between schools. However, as universities and individuals have speculated on causal relationships between many characteristics and campus disturbances, the lack of difference between the groups on many factors is also helpful in shaping the description of the phenomenon and potential areas for further research.

Table 3 contains the minimum and maximum values, means, and standard deviations for the continuously coded variables in the demographic section of the survey. There was a notable difference between the two groups for two of these variables. Although there was no significant difference in the undergraduate enrollment at the two groups of universities, the number of undergraduates reported as living in residence halls was significantly different (t=-2.153; p<.04), with schools that reported riots having a larger number of students living in residence halls than institutions reporting having no riots.
This would be congruent with the research on the 1960s urban riots that found that the riots most often began in proximity of high-density housing, where the social density created the communication networks needed for disseminating assembling communication and provided a readily available group of people who could be mobilized.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Undergraduate enrollment</th>
<th>Undergraduates in university housing</th>
<th>Bars within walking distance of campus</th>
<th>Package stores within walking distance of campus</th>
<th>Budget for non-sports entertainment activities</th>
<th>Percentage spent on midnight or later activities</th>
<th>Underage drinking citations per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td>23974.58</td>
<td>6980.81</td>
<td>16.63</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>279285.86</td>
<td>44.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td>9853.38</td>
<td>3157.19</td>
<td>14.33</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>376949.11</td>
<td>42.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td></td>
<td>6500.00</td>
<td>1000.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td></td>
<td>47000.00</td>
<td>16000.00</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>23.00</td>
<td>150000.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No Riot | Valid | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 8 |
|         | Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| Mean |                          | 25274.00                            | 5310.00                                | 19.85                                         | 11.66                                         | 278571.86                                  | 15.80                              |
| SD  |                          | 11139.20                             | 1954.17                                | 12.55                                         | 7.83                                          | 545517.19                                  | 19.96                              |
| Minimum |                        | 7500.00                             | 1000.00                                | 4.00                                          | .00                                           | 0                                          | 0                            |
| Maximum |                        | 47000.00                            | 8000.00                                | 47.00                                         | 23.00                                         | 150000.00                                 | 50.00                              |

| Riot | Valid | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 14 | 15 | 19 |
|      | Missing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 2 |
| Mean |                          | 23355.81                            | 7776.43                                | 15.10                                         | 7.26                                          | 279642.86                                  | 54.53                              |
| SD  |                          | 9410.12                             | 3342.58                                | 15.16                                         | 5.77                                          | 285046.99                                  | 44.34                              |
| Minimum |                        | 6500.00                             | 1705.00                                | 3.00                                          | .50                                           | 5000.00                                    | 0                      |
| Maximum |                        | 45000.00                            | 16000.00                               | 75.00                                         | 20.00                                         | 1000000.00                                | 100.00                            |

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for continuously coded variables.
Analysis also revealed a significant difference in the percentage of the total evening and weekend student activities budget that the two groups of universities spent on late night “alternative activities without alcohol.” The schools that reported having riots were spending significantly more (t = -2.668; p < .017) on late night activities than were schools reporting no riots. Further, the mean per student no-alcohol late night activity expenditure (total budget x percent spent on late night activities ÷ undergraduate enrollment) for schools reporting riots was $5.32 compared to only $.76 for schools without riots. The most likely explanation for this difference is that schools that have had disturbances have implemented or increased alternative activities in an effort to prevent further disturbances. Depending on the sequence (i.e., activity, then disturbance or disturbance, activity, no further disturbances), this data may tell us that alternative activities are ineffective in reducing the occurrence of mixed-issue campus disturbances.

Officials were asked to describe some of the evening and weekend activities their university had implemented. The activities instituted at non-riot schools did not appear to differ qualitatively from those described by the schools reporting a riot. Examples of comments from the non-riot schools include:

Movies, intramural sporting events, parties, midnight breakfasts in three dining halls.

Nighthawk activities and sports events at night. Weekend events for the most part.
Face paint, outdoor activity movies, late night eatery open, comedy shows, special bands, console game tournaments.

Residence hall activities, groovin on the grounds spring time activity, wellness fair (students on target. Comedy skits from the union.

Athletic events. Dances. Concerts.

Movies during the weekend (free). Different student associations have different events throughout the year. Before these events security meets with the groups.

G night is most unique. Trying to draw kids away from the bars. Program of movies on the lawn, games in the game room, bowling, free drinks, popcorn, aimed at under 21 crowd.

Concerts, small concerts not big ones, mock trail events, social events, dances where alcohol is not served, comedians.

Very close dollar theater, late night movies at the student unions, comedians, magician, concert, pool tournament.

Resident halls will have sports teams, but we don't patrol this. They will have basketball competitions.

The comments and examples given by respondents from the riot schools include:

Large planned dances, entertainment programs. Campus parties on Friday and Saturday night.

Athletic events. Cultural events. Concerts.

Concerts, poetry readings, coffee hours, dances.

Recreation center stays open late. Late night activity on weekends. Mix between different kinds of music, activities, refreshments, games, crafts.

Movies, dances, group performance, student union stays open for breakfast.

Dancing, bingo, casino nights, swing dancing, and non alcoholic kind of programs.
Alternative alcohol events, movies, dances, marathon dances, mardi gra night, cultural events, concerts

Concerts. Movies at midnight. Union all nighters. Late night 2 - 4 a.m. bowling.

Fun events, films, assortment of artists.

Huge late night program. Movies, dances, magicians, speakers, musicians, poetry, theater.

When the OSU student focus group participants’ statements that they were not interested in the “alternative” programming OSU had been offering are considered in conjunction with the OSU student affairs officials catalog of the many alternative activities they implemented in advance of the OSU/Michigan game disturbance, one might speculate that alternative activities are ineffective in reducing the occurrence of mixed-issue campus disturbances. Certainly, the effectiveness of late night programming in preventing mixed-issue campus disturbances, at least as currently configured by major universities, appears to be an area requiring further research and analysis.

Three questions (Table 4) focused on where students lived off campus and whether predominantly student neighborhoods had been the site of large parties that had attracted the attention of police or university officials. The data suggests that both riot and non-riot universities are experiencing the off-campus party phenomenon that sets the stage for many, if not all of these disturbances.
Do most students who are not living in university housing live fairly close to campus or do they need to commute to campus by car or bus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Close</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even Split</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Riot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Close</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even Split</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Close</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commute</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even Split</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are there any residential areas in the local community or close to campus in which 90% or more of the residents are students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>90.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Descriptive statistics for neighborhood variables.*

(continued)
Table 4 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Riot</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riot</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have any of these areas been the site of large student parties that have attracted the attention of law enforcement or the university administration?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Riot</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riot</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 contains the frequencies for two questions related to alcohol policy. The answers of the student affairs officials were used to calculate the statistics for the question regarding whether students of legal age were permitted to consume alcohol on campus, although the officials who reviewed the survey indicated that they expected that both the student affairs and the public safety official would know the answer to the question. Interestingly, particularly given the centrality of the issue to a school’s alcohol policy, there was disagreement between the answers of the student affairs official and the public safety official in almost 40% of the schools with two respondents, representing far more disagreement between partner respondents than with any other question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are Students Of Legal Age Allowed To Consume Alcohol On University Property?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Riot</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. Descriptive statistics for alcohol policy variables.

(continued)
Table 5 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Riot</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Is Alcohol Sold To Legal Aged Students On University Property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Riot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents were also asked about the levels of enforcement of underage and open container laws in the university and the community (1 = very strictly; 4 = very loosely). No significant differences between the two groups were evident (Table 6). A mistake in the computer prompt used during the structured interview, limited the number of respondents who were asked if there were university events for which open container laws were less likely to be enforced. However, of the 18 schools that were asked this question, 12 (67%) responded yes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How strictly are open container laws enforced in the local community?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How strictly are open container laws enforced on university property</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How strictly are underage drinking laws enforced in the local community?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How strictly are underage drinking laws enforced on university property?</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.599</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Means and standard deviations for alcohol enforcement variables.

University administrators were also asked where students were student most likely to consume alcohol. Their answers seem to indicate that students are more likely to consume alcohol in the off-campus student neighborhoods at
the schools that have experienced a disturbance. Figure 4 presents a graphical representation of the trends in the data, which are supported by the OSU students’ comments about off-campus parties and disturbances.

![Graphical representation of university riot experience as a function of where students drink.]

*Figure 4. University riot experience as a function of where students drink.*

Interactions with and perceptions of the police dominated students' comments about the OSU disturbance. Therefore, the questions about the policing related to the universities in the study are of particular interest. Figure 5 illustrates the ways in which policy agencies and jurisdictions are distributed among the universities surveyed. Just as importantly, given the number of disturbances reported in the areas immediately off-campus, respondents were asked whether university police had jurisdiction off of
university property. Over 87% (90% of the non-riot and 85.7% of the riot schools) indicated that the university police did have jurisdiction over areas off university property.

\[ \text{Figure 5. Police agencies with jurisdiction over university property in relation to riot status.} \]

Respondents were asked about the nature of the working relationship between the different policing agencies (for this question, the responses of the directors of public safety were used). The assessment of the working relationship between the different agencies was significantly different between the non-riot and riot groups ($t = -2.335; p < .03$) with the non-riot groups reporting better working relationships. Although the difference is far from definitive, positive working relationships between university and
community policing agencies may affect how community police respond in situations involving students. I have had conversations with several university police administrators who feel that university police use a much different approach with young people (less confrontational) because of training and daily experience with this population. Positive relationships between university police and community police may mean that the orientation of the community police is similar to that of the university police, or that a close, positive working relationship between the two safety organizations allows for more problem solving and proactive responses to town/gown policing issues.

OSU Off-Campus Parties Survey

Many of the questions on the off-campus parties survey were designed to develop a deeper understanding of that phenomenon in general. The variables that are reported on here are those that are most pertinent to the understanding of the parties in relation to campus disturbances. As noted earlier in this paper, the data from the off-campus parties supports students’ anecdotal descriptions of the role of alcohol consumption and off-campus parties in student social life. Over 70% of the undergraduate sample responded that they attend an off-campus party at least once per month. (Table 7).
In a month, how often do you go to an off-campus party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 times</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>42.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 times</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 times</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-20 times</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+ times</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7. Frequency statistics off-campus party attendance.*

Student responses to where they party in a given month (Table 8) favored houses (66.57%) and apartments (55.2%), with Greek houses (23.38%) and tailgating sites (21.19%) a distant second. Seventy of the respondents (29.5%) indicated that they had been a host of an off-campus party.
In a month, in which of the following locations do you party off-campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>66.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>55.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Houses</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailgate</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoors</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 8. Frequency statistics on off-campus party locations.*

The OSU students’ comments about the number of non-students who are in the neighborhoods and at the parties are supported by the students’ answers to a question about how often they attend parties at other schools (Table 9) and a question about who usually attends off-campus parties (Table 10). Almost half of the students attend parties at other schools at least once per semester. Although more than 60% of the respondents reported that fellow students attend off-campus parties, over 40% said that students from other
local schools attended and over 30% reported the attendance of students from schools that were out of the area.

In a semester, how often do you go to parties at other schools?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>52.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 per semester</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>39.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 per semester</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every other week</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every other week</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 9* Frequency statistics on party attendance at other schools.
Who usually attends off-campus parties?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman/Sophomores</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>66.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors/Seniors</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>60.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from other local schools</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>41.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from other schools out of the area</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>32.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school students</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Student locals</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger siblings</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>16.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young alumni</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. Frequency statistics on who attends off-campus parties.

The survey contained a question regarding what students expected to be provided at a party if they were a guest or what they expected to provide as a host. The response scale ranged from 1 = not very likely to 4 = very likely. Among the items listed (e.g., soft drinks, chips/snack foods, dancing area, etc.), the top three items and the only items with a mean score of more than 3.0 were music (3.59 for students who answered as having been a party guest, 3.8 for students answering that they had hosted a party), beer in kegs (3.31 for
guests, 3.41 for hosts), and beer in can/bottles (3.15 for guests, 3.32 for hosts).

What the off-campus party provides – friends, music, beer, and more beer – makes it clear that universities and communities will be hard pressed to find “alternative” activities that have a chance at competing with that powerful combination.

Students were asked how familiar they were with the new Ohio law that requires public universities, colleges, and trade schools to dismiss immediately students who are convicted of or plead guilty to disturbance related behavior (e.g., failing to disperse, rioting, disorderly conduct, or misconduct). Only 40% responded that they were somewhat or very familiar with the law. More importantly, almost 60% responded that it was not likely or not very likely that the sanction would prevent the off-campus disturbances. Less students were familiar (29.5%) with the part of the law that required the loss of state financial aid for conviction of disturbance related behavior, but again, 59% responded that this sanction was unlikely to prevent off-campus disturbances. A few more students were familiar with the university policy of suspending students who host a party that gets out of control (35.9%), but 60% responded that is was unlikely to be effective in reducing out of control parties, and 60% said that they did not believe that the lowered legal blood alcohol levels (.10 to .08) would reduce drinking and driving. Finally, over 70% said that they were unlikely to attend any of OSUs late night activities (the survey question did not note this, but these are alcohol free activities), and almost 70% reported that during their last two years of high school they had
attend parties where they drank alcohol (36% reported attending more than 10 times).
As stated in the introduction, college students have consumed alcohol in excess for centuries. Biological theories of risk-taking suggest that adolescents and young adults take risks and drink alcohol as a result of their diminished ability to experience pleasure at the same levels they did at younger ages and will again experience as they mature. Evolutionary theories speculate that the adolescent-typical behaviors of novelty-seeking and focusing on social interactions with peers may have evolved, in part, to help the adolescent transition to maturity, providing new skills, social support, and increased reproductive success. Some prevention experts see the widespread use of alcohol in our society as bad social norming – a culture that celebrates in unhealthy ways. All these perspectives probably hold some truth, but the pharmacological effects of alcohol, the “myopia” that Steele and Josephs (1990) describe, which eases social interaction (at least initially) and in the presence of activity, mediates psychological distress, may be the most powerful explanation. The alcohol survey results and the comments of the OSU students underscore the centrality of alcohol in the college experience, its role as the “the major glue that bonds students.” Given the importance of social
acceptance in the peer group and the level of stress that comes with navigating the path to independence, it seems the question should be “why don’t all college students drink?” rather than “why do college students drink?”

Current societal concerns about the drinking patterns of young people and the disadvantages associated with them, particularly drunk driving, have led to greater efforts to limit and control young people’s drinking. Since the federal law was passed that raised the minimum drinking age to 21, increasingly stringent enforcement efforts have made underage drinking in commercial establishments more difficult – fake ids are far less useful today than they were 20 years ago. These efforts, however, given the usage statistics, the comments of the OSU students, and their responses regarding the effectiveness of new sanctions towards reducing drinking, have not changed students’ beliefs in the social benefits of drinking, their beliefs in their right to drink, and ultimately, in their consumption. What does appear to have changed is where students aged 18 to 21 consume alcohol. Both the quantitative and qualitative data analyzed in this study indicate that the vast majority of students are drinking in off-campus parties. This is line with findings from the CAS data that over 75% of surveyed college students are drinking in off-campus parties and that freshman, who are typically underage,

20 Of course, with over 80% of undergraduate students reporting alcohol consumption in the last month, almost all college students are drinking.
are more likely to drink in private settings than older students (Harford et al., 2002).

The minimum drinking age was raised to 21 in 1984 and efforts to enforce the law in drinking establishments and in sales to underage youth has increased since that time. The relationship may very well be spurious, but the phenomenon of mixed-issue campus disturbances appears to have started around 1985 (see Figure 1) and has increased dramatically in the last 20 years. It seems reasonable to speculate that private parties and “underground” drinking have grown as underage students have lost access to alcohol in controlled settings such as bars, and that mixed-issue campus disturbances, in part, are a by-product of this shift in where students drink. As the one student put it, “Lets face this is what kids want to do, and now they have no outlet for this. So they party in uncontrolled apartment parties that can and do get out of hand.”

Warm weather, festivals, holidays, and sporting events all provide occasions for large gatherings and celebrations and the typical college student reference perception is that these celebrations and parties will involve alcohol consumption (alcohol consumption at celebrations is not an atypical reference perception for many adults as well). Frequently, these types of events are also accompanied by societal signals that the typical rules do not apply (this is the Mardi Gras example, where outrageous dress, flashing, and other nontypical behavior is tolerated, and to a large degree, expected), as evidenced by the university responses to a question about whether there were events in the
community or at the university where open container laws were less likely to be enforced; two-thirds of the universities responding said “yes.” Sporting events are highly associated with mixed-issue campus disturbances, probably for two reasons. First, in American society, sporting events occur frequently and are ascribed a great deal of societal energy, and second, sporting events have had a long and strong connection with alcohol. In fact, the lineage of many of our modern team sports can be traced back to contests created by tavern owners to entertain and attract patrons (Collins & Vamplew, 2002). CAS data indicate that binge drinking rates tend to be higher at “sports” schools, which are often NCAA Division I universities. Thus, the prototypical mixed-issue disturbance is an outgrowth of the sporting event only in that sporting events provide a backdrop for gathering and drinking, and are frequently accompanied by lower enforcement of existing alcohol laws, and therefore, lower controls over drinking.

The accounts of the OSU students and the number of non-students in the arrest statistics support the conclusion that large gatherings of drinking students also attract some individuals who are much higher on the deviancy scale. For these “entrepreneurs” the large gathering provides an opportunity to precipitate situations of greater risk – burning couches, overturning cars, setting cars on fire, and potentially, engaging with the police in a situation where the large numbers provide them some advantage. As events such as celebrated athletic games, big festivals, and parties such as a “Chittfest,” receive media and word of mouth notoriety for the size of their celebrations,
the number of entrepreneurs in the mix increases. The potential for a spectacle at these events also become an attraction to students who are less inclined to take large risks, but who still have the young adult need for novelty and to be part of a peer community. These students swell the size of the crowd.

By student account, there appears to be at least two paths to the escalation from party to disturbance. Once the escalation begins, the progression of the disturbance is similar. In one path, risk prone entrepreneurs precipitate a focal event (e.g., fire, car flipping). As partiers and others converge on the scene (frequently aided in finding the location by the widespread use of cell phones) to see what is happening and to experience the event along with their peers, the police change tactics (typically shifting to the escalated force model) as they try to disperse the crowd. In the other path, police move in early to break up large and boisterous parties and are met with an angry response. In both cases, as the police engage “the crowd” as opposed to smaller groups of individuals, the “outcome” violence described by McPhail (1994a) occurs. That is, individuals who were out to party and have a good time (as opposed to the entrepreneurs who intended to engage in antisocial activities) see the police action as an obstacle to meeting their original goal. The effects of the alcohol on these individuals’ executive functioning further diminishes their ability to process the, by now, many cues in the environment, to draw meaning from them, and to make reasonable decisions based on consequences beyond the moment. As noted in the comments of many students, antagonism against the police often increases as
the large-scale tactics of the police affect bystanders (e.g., hit by a ricocheted wooden bullet, engulfed in tear gas, sprayed with mace or pepper spray). The final course of the disturbance and accompanying destruction depends on how many people are readily available to move to the location and the tactics and numbers of officers used by the policing agencies. As might be expected, the experiences of the different actors shape the perceptions each person and their reference group take to the next party/event. Entrepreneurs who escape detection may be emboldened. Partiers who feel unjustly persecuted and the unwitting bystander harmed in the confusion of the disturbance will resent the police, and the police will expect the worst when they next confront a group of partying young adults.

The purpose of this study was to develop description of mixed-issue campus disturbances and from that to identify of a set of researchable questions. The first part of the task has been accomplished with some limitations. First and most importantly, given their importance in determining the course of an event, this description is missing the voice of the police officers who respond to off-campus parties and their commanders who decide the tactics they will use. We can speculate from the research of Stott and colleagues (Stott & Drury, 2000; Stott & Reicher, 1998) that police in riot situations experience fear, and that in the midst of a confrontation, the crowd
becomes homogeneous, each person equally threatening \(^{21}\), but without police accounts, we are left with a diminished picture of the phenomenon.

Second, the results of the qualitative inquiry, while rich, describes the OSU experience alone. Although the information provided “fits” reasonably well with the theories and research reviewed in an earlier chapter of this paper, without similar study of other campuses, it is impossible to separate what is unique to the OSU experience from what occurs commonly across university campuses.

Third, the sample size and the respondents’ ability to answer accurately some of the questions limit the usefulness of the survey of university administrators. Although these limitations prohibit any conclusions about variables related to mixed-issue disturbances, the survey was useful in triaging a point of inquiry. For example, all the universities with predominantly student neighborhoods report large parties that attract police and university attention, yet only some report disturbances. This would suggest that research on differences/similarities of police response might be a logical and fruitful next step in the research aimed at further understanding and eventual prevention of mixed-issue campus disturbances.

Generation of thoughtful research questions was the second goal of this study. Some of the research questions this study generates, such as the one just mentioned, spring from the information obtained. Others are suggested by

\(^{21}\) One of the police officers who served on the OSU Task Force said that in a crowd situation the officer simply sees a single mass of people, like “a wall” in front of him or her.
the study limitations and the information not asked or not available from the
data sources used. A short, though certainly not comprehensive, list follows:

- What is the nature of the public order training of the police agency that
  responds to gatherings of students, specifically, are they trained in
  minimal force/negotiated management techniques? What have the
  officers been taught about crowd behavior? What are their attitudes
  towards the college student population? Are there significant
  differences between communities that report large parties, yet no
  disturbances with those that report disturbances? Do police respond
  differently in crowd management situations depending on their
  perception of the legitimacy of the gathering (i.e., protest vs. party)?

- What prevention efforts are effective at changing the volatile nature of
  off-campus parties, that is, reducing numbers of people at parties,
  reducing amount of alcohol consumed, limiting the number of
  entrepreneurs in a neighborhood of partiers?

- Does a sense of “community” beyond fellow students inhibit “parties
  gone bad” in student neighborhoods, that is, will stronger social ties
  between students and faculty, students and community members,
  students and police officers reduce the instance of disturbances on
  campuses and communities?

- Does the off-campus party phenomenon occur among college students
  in countries without or with lower drinking ages (e.g., Canada)? If the
phenomenon exists, what types of behaviors are associated with parties and do the police respond? If they respond, what tactics do they use?

- What are the physical/environmental characteristics of the places where disturbances have occurred? What is their proximity to on and off-campus housing? Do the physical features create a natural gathering place? Are there physical changes that would reduce the potential for a disturbance?

- Universities responding to the Task Force survey, reported over 64 off-campus disturbances and over 32 on-campus disturbances. Are there differences/similarities depending on where the disturbance takes place? Are on-campus disturbances associated with distinctly different precipitating events?

- Is there a relationship between a college’s binge drinking rate and the incidence of disturbances? Is there a relationship between a school’s sports status (i.e., the importance of sports among students) and the occurrence of these events?

- Is there a “tipping point” in terms of crowd size, that is, is there a relationship between the size of the crowd and the emergence of the entrepreneur?

- How many universities in the US have experienced a mixed-issue campus disturbance? How many have experienced multiple disturbances?
CHAPTER 7
CONCLUSION

This paper describes mixed-issue campus disturbances and off-campus parties in general and OSU students’ perceptions regarding both in particular. Student parties, frequently described as “out-of-control” by university administrators, media, and community officials, are seen by underage students as the available venue to drink with their friends, an activity they describe as the major glue of the college experience. Administrators, journalists, and police officials use the adjective “senseless” to describe the disturbances that many students, even if expressing disapproval of the phenomenon, describe as “the sight of a lifetime.”

Mixed-issue campus disturbances are frequently, and I believe, based on the quantitative and qualitative data, mistakenly called “sports riots,” because they occur often in conjunction with high stakes athletic events. These disturbances occur just as frequently, however, in conjunction with holiday and social events.\textsuperscript{22} The disturbances in the OSU student neighborhoods hours after athletic events were not about “fan behavior.” They were about student beliefs about the importance of alcohol to their social life,

\footnote{\textsuperscript{22} Based on raw data gathered by McPhail, McCarthy, and Martin.}
the places where students can experience alcohol and peer relationships, the
interactions between students and the antisocial behavior of entrepreneurs,
and the interactions between both groups and public safety officers.

Most prevention efforts seem to fall into one of two categories. Some
focus on providing alcohol-free activities that administrators hope will be more
attractive to students than drinking parties, a strategy that the data discussed
in this document does not appear to support. The others could be categorized
as the “get tough” approach, which has the potential to further divide the
college student from the rest of the community and in the case of police
tactics, escalate the rowdy party into an all out confrontational disturbance.
The promises to get tough combined with the increasing number of these
disturbances suggests this may be the happening.

The path to a pragmatic solution to this community issue will involve
additional thought and study, as the perceptions and experiences explored
here illustrate there will be no quick and easy fixes. As stated in the
introduction, the reference perception that alcohol consumption is a part of the
college experience has a long, long history. The social pressures to party – not
in the sense of one student talking another student into drinking, but in terms
of the community/culture in which students exist – are not minor. The
comments of students indicate that a core conflict is the important role of
alcohol in their environment in the face of a minimum drinking age of 21. OSU
surveys along with national surveys report that between 80% and 90% of
underage students are drinking and around 50% engage in binge drinking. The
off-campus party survey, like that of Harvard’s CAS, indicates that over 70% are doing so in off-campus settings.\(^\text{23}\) Obviously, the perceived social benefit of drinking outweighs the illegality of the practice.

The probability of the larger community wrestling with this issue in a way that addresses young adult concerns along with the concerns of the larger society is low. Therefore, prevention and intervention efforts will need to focus on issues where change is possible. The most promising point of intervention appears to be police training and response tactics, based on previous research in the area of police response and the research on riots in earlier decades. Prevention efforts that are effective at changing the volatile nature of off-campus parties are another possible approach. Finally, assessment of the role of “community” or a sense of connection beyond the student’s immediate cohort in reducing the divisions between students and other reference groups in the university and the larger community may lead to strategies that reduce the instance of disturbances on campuses and nearby neighborhoods without students perceiving life at the university as life in a police state.

\(^{23}\) The contrast of 70% reporting partying off-campus and 90% reporting in the 2002 student affairs survey that they’d not seen the spring disturbance that year is an interesting one.
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APPENDIX A

Celebratory Riots Survey

The Ohio State University is conducting a survey of key informants at selected universities on the issue of student riots in the recent past. The primary concern of this investigation is substantial violence and destructive behavior by very large groups of students associated with sporting events, large parties, and other types of celebrations. Universities that have had difficulty with such events, as well as a matched group of institutions that have not experienced such behavior are being surveyed.

>q1<
This study is focusing on riots that happen in connection with a gathering of a large group of students in association with some form of social event, such as a sports event, a holiday, a festival, or a party, and that eventually leads to substantial violence and property destruction that necessitates crowd dispersal. The riots may occur on or off university property. These are not riots that happen in connection with political protests. Some people have called these kinds of riots “celebratory riot” although they don’t always happen on connection with celebrations.

Thinking of this definition, to your knowledge, has your university experienced such a riot in the past 10 years?

<1> YES <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto sec2]
<2> NO [goto sec2] <8> REFUSED [goto sec2]
<9> DON’T KNOW [goto sec2]

>q2a<
In the past 10 years, how many of these riots have occurred on university property? (INSTRUCTION: WHERE DID THE RIOTS START)

<0-50> # CAMPUS RIOTS <77> SOMEONE ELSE
<88> REFUSED
<99> DON’T KNOW
Also in the past 10 years, how many riots have occurred off of university property? (INSTRUCTION: WHERE DID THE RIOTS START)

<0-50> # CAMPUS RIOTS  <77> SOMEONE ELSE  
<88> REFUSED  
<99> DON'T KNOW

[SINGLE RIOT PATH]

Did this riot happen in connection with some university-related event or activity such as a sports game or did it happen in connection with an unofficial student event such as a party?

<1> UNIVERSITY RELATED EVENTS  <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto q5a]
<2> UNOFFICIAL STUDENT EVENT  <8> REFUSED [goto q5a]
      [goto q5a]
<9> DON'T KNOW  [goto q5a]

What was the event or activity that the riot happened in connection with?

When did the riot take place? Month, year

About how many people in total were involved in the riot? (This includes students and non-students.)

About how many students were involved in that riot?

Can you give us a dollar estimate on the property damage caused by the riot?

<0-8888887> AMOUNT OF TOTAL DAMAGE
Did the university have any riot prevention efforts in place before this event?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  [goto q11a]
<2> NO    [goto q11a]  <8> REFUSED  [goto q11a]
<9> DON’T KNOW  [goto q11a]

Can you describe those prevention efforts?

<1> COMMENTS  [specify]  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW

Was a high volume of alcohol consumption a factor in this riot?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  [goto q11a]
<2> NO  [goto q11a]  <8> REFUSED  [goto q11a]
<9> DON’T KNOW  [goto q11a]

Were any television news crews taping the riot as it happened?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  [goto q11a]
<2> NO    [goto q11a]  <8> REFUSED  [goto q11a]
<9> DON’T KNOW  [goto q11a]

Which of the following law enforce agencies responded to this riot?

University police or security?  @a
Community law enforcement?  @b
State forces including the national guard?  @c

Immediately after law enforcement responded, did violence or destruction escalate or begin to de-escalate?

<1> ESCALATE (INCREASE)  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> DE-ESCALATE (DECREASE)  <8> REFUSED
<3> STAY ABOUT THE SAME (VOLUNTEERED)  <9> DON’T KNOW
>q14a<
   About how many officers or agents responded to the riot?

>q15a<
   About how many arrests were made in total?

>q16a<
   About how many student arrests were made?

>q17a<
   Did the university take disciplinary action against any students involved?

   <1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  [goto q20a]
   <2> NO    [goto q20a]   <8> REFUSED  [goto q20a]
   <9> DON'T KNOW  [goto q20a]

>q18a<
   About how many students were disciplined?

>q19a<
   What kind of disciplinary actions were taken?

   <1> COMMENTS  [specify]  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
   <8> REFUSED
   <9> DON'T KNOW

>q20a<
   Did the riot lead to any changes in university policy?

   <1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  [goto q22a]
   <2> NO    [goto q22a]   <8> REFUSED  [goto q22a]
   <9> DON'T KNOW  [goto q22a]

>q21a<
   What kind of policy changes were made?

   <1> COMMENTS  [specify]  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
   <8> REFUSED
   <9> DON'T KNOW
>q22a<
Did the riot lead to any changes in city or community policies?

<1> YES   <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto sec2]
<2> NO [goto sec2]   <8> REFUSED [goto sec2]
<9> DON'T KNOW [goto sec2]

>q23a<
What kind of policy changes did the city or community make?

<1> COMMENTS [specify]   <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

[FOR MULTIPLE RIOTS—ON AND OFF CAMPUS PATHS]
>q3bi<
Did any of these riots happen in connection with university-related events or activities such as sports events or student festivals?

<1> YES   <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO [   <8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q3bii<
Did any of the campus riots happen in connection with unofficial student gatherings such as student parties?

<1> YES   <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO [   <8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

[ON CAMPUS PATH]
>q4b<
Now I'm going to ask you about the worst of the on campus riots.

What was the event or activity the riot happened in connection with?

>q4ba<
Was this riot one of multiple riots that happened in connection with re-occurring events or circumstances?

<1> YES   <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto q5b]
<2> NO [goto q5b]   <8> REFUSED [goto q5b]
<9> DON'T KNOW [goto q5b]
>q4bb<
Over time, about how many riots occurred in connection with those events or circumstances?

>q5b<
When did the riot take place?

month, year

>q6b<
About how many people in total were involved in that riot?
(This includes students and non-students.)

>q7b<
About how many students were involved in that riot?

>q8b<
Can you give us a dollar estimate on the property damage caused by the riot?
<0-8888887> AMOUNT OF TOTAL DAMAGE

>q9b<
Did the university have any riot prevention efforts in place before this riot?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  [goto q11b]
<2> NO  [goto q11b]  <8> REFUSED  [goto q11b]
<9> DON'T KNOW  [goto q11b]

>q10b<
Can you describe those prevention efforts?

<1> COMMENTS  [specify]  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q11b<
Was a high volume of alcohol consumption a factor in this riot?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO  [  <8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW
>q11bi<
Were any television news crews taping the riot as it happened?

<1> YES
<7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q12b<
Which of the following law enforce agencies responded to this riot?

University police or security?  @a
Community law enforcement?  @b
State forces including the national guard?  @c

>q13b<
Immediately after law enforcement responded, did violence or destruction escalate or begin to de-escalate?

<1> ESCALATE (INCREASE)
<2> DE-ESCALATE (DECREASE)
<3> STAY ABOUT THE SAME (VOLUNTEERED)
<7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q14b<
About how many officers or agents responded to the riot?

>q15b<
About how many arrests were made in total?

>q16b<
About how many student arrests were made?

>q17b<
Did the university take disciplinary action against any students involved?

<1> YES
<7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q18b<
About how many students were disciplined?
>q19b<
What kind of disciplinary actions were taken?

<1> COMMENTS [specify] <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q20b<
Did the event lead to any changes in university policy?

<1> YES <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto q22b]
<2> NO [goto q22b] <8> REFUSED [goto q22b]
<9> DON'T KNOW [goto q22b]

>q21b<
What kind of policy changes were made?

<1> COMMENTS [specify] <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q22b<
Did the event lead to any changes in city or community policies?

<1> YES <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto sec2]
<2> NO [goto sec2] <8> REFUSED [goto sec2]
<9> DON'T KNOW [goto sec2]

>q23b<
What kind of policy changes did the city or community make?

<1> COMMENTS [specify] <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

[goto sec2 UNLESS there were also off campus riots]
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[OFF CAMPUS PATH]

>q4c<
Now I’m going to ask you about the worst of the off-campus riots.

What was the event or activity the riot happened in connection with?

>q4ca<
Was this riot one of multiple riots that happened in connection with re-
occurring events or circumstances?

<1> YES [goto q5c]
<2> NO [goto q5c]
<7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto q5c]
<8> REFUSED [goto q5c]
<9> DON'T KNOW [goto q5c]

>q4cb<
Over time, about how many riots occurred in connection with those
same events or circumstances?

>q5c<
When did the riot take place?

month, year

>q6c<
About how many people in total were involved in that riot?
(This includes students and non-students.)

>q7c<
About how many students were involved in that riot?

>q8c<
Can you give us a dollar estimate on the property damage caused by
the riot?
<0-8888887> AMOUNT OF TOTAL DAMAGE

>q9c<
Did the university have any riot prevention efforts in place before this
riot?

<1> YES [goto q11c]
<2> NO [goto q11c]
<7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto q11c]
<8> REFUSED [goto q11c]
<9> DON'T KNOW [goto q11c]
>q10c<
Can you describe those prevention efforts?

<1> COMMENTS [specify] <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW

>q11c<
Was a high volume of alcohol consumption a factor in this riot?

<1> YES <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO [ <8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW

>q11ci<
Were any television news crews taping the riot as it happened?

<1> YES <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO [ <8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW

>q12c<
Which of the following law enforce agencies responded to this riot?

University police or security? @a
Community law enforcement? @b
State forces including the national guard? @c

>q13c<
Immediately after law enforcement responded, did violence or
destruction escalate or begin to de-escalate?

<1> ESCALATE (INCREASE) <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> DE-ESCALATE (DECREASE) <8> REFUSED
<3> STAY ABOUT THE SAME (VOLUNTEERED) <9> DON’T KNOW

>q14c<
About how many officers or agents responded to the riot?

>q15c<
About how many arrests were made in total?

>q16c<
About how many student arrests were made?
>q17c<
Did the university take disciplinary action against any students involved?

| 1 | YES | 7 | SOMEONE ELSE | [goto q20c] |
| 2 | NO  | 8 | REFUSED      | [goto q20c] |
| 9 | DON’T KNOW | 9 | REFUSED      | [goto q20c] |

>q18c<
About how many students were disciplined?

>q19c<
What kind of disciplinary actions were taken?

| 1 | COMMENTS [specify] | 7 | SOMEONE ELSE | [goto q22c] |
| 2 | NO [goto q22c]     | 8 | REFUSED      | [goto q22c] |
| 9 | DON’T KNOW [goto q22c] |

>q20c<
Did the event lead to any changes in university policy?

| 1 | YES | 7 | SOMEONE ELSE | [goto q22c] |
| 2 | NO  | 8 | REFUSED      | [goto q22c] |
| 9 | DON’T KNOW [goto q22c] |

>q21c<
What kind of policy changes were made?

| 1 | COMMENTS [specify] | 7 | SOMEONE ELSE | [goto sec2] |
| 2 | NO [goto sec2]     | 8 | REFUSED      | [goto sec2] |
| 9 | DON’T KNOW [goto sec2] |

>q22c<
Did the event lead to any changes in city or community policies?

| 1 | YES | 7 | SOMEONE ELSE | [goto sec2] |
| 2 | NO  | 8 | REFUSED      | [goto sec2] |
| 9 | DON’T KNOW [goto sec2] |
>q23c<

What kind of policy changes did the city or community make?

<1> COMMENTS [specify] <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

[goto sec2]

>sec2<

Now we'd like to get some information about your institution for our study.

<1> CONTINUE

>q201<

About how many undergraduates attend your university?
(INTERVIEWER: MAIN OR LARGEST CAMPUS IF MULTIPLE LOCATIONS)

<1,000-60,000> <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q202<

About how many undergraduates live in university housing?
(INTERVIEWER: MAIN OR LARGEST CAMPUS IF MULTIPLE LOCATIONS)

<1,000-60,000> <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q203<

Do most students who are not living in university housing live fairly close to campus or do they need to commute to campus by car or bus?

<1> LIVE CLOSE <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> COMMUTE <8> REFUSED
<3> EVEN SPLIT (VOLUNTEERED) <9> DON'T KNOW
>q204<
Are there any residential areas in the local community or close to
campus in which 90% or more of the residents are students?

<1> YES
<2> NO [goto ]
<7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto ]
<8> REFUSED [goto ]
<9> DON’T KNOW [goto ]

>q205<
Have any of these areas been the site of large student parties that have
attracted the attention of law enforcement or the university
administration?

<1> YES
<2> NO [ ]
<7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW

>q206<
About how many bars are there within walking distance of your
campus? (INTERVIEWER: BEST GUESS OR ESTIMATE IS FINE)

<0-300> NUMBER OF BARS
<77> SOMEONE ELSE
<88> REFUSED
<99> DON’T KNOW

>q207<
About how many stores offer package alcohol sales within walking
distance of your campus? (INTERVIEWER: BEST GUESS OR ESTIMATE
IS FINE)

<0-300> NUMBER OF LIQUOR PERMITS
<77> SOMEONE ELSE
<88> REFUSED
<99> DON’T KNOW

>q208<
Are students of legal age allowed to consume alcohol on university
property?

<1> YES
<2> NO
<7> SOMEONE ELSE
<8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW
>q209<
Is alcohol sold to legal aged students on university property?

<1> YES <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO <8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW

>q210<
Where are undergraduate students most likely to consume alcohol . . .

<1> in university residence halls, <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> in student housing off campus, <8> REFUSED
<3> in bars in the local community, or <9> DON’T KNOW
<4> somewhere else? (SPECIFY)

>q211<
Does your university have any official or unofficial student traditions that allow students to engage in risk-taking behaviors in a somewhat controlled way? This might include events that feature large bonfires or effigy burning, or intense physical activity such as bashing a car.

<1> YES [specify] <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO <8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW

>sec3<
Now I’m going to ask you about different campus policies.

<1> CONTINUE

>q301<
About how much is your university’s annual university budget for evening and weekend student entertainment activities other than sports events?

<0> NOTHING <e> SOMEONE ELSE
<1-xxxxxxxxx> BUDGET AMOUNT <r> REFUSED
<u> DON’T KNOW
>q302<
About what percent of these funds support activities scheduled for midnight or later?

<0-100> PERCENT OF BUDGET  <e> SOMEONE ELSE  
<r> REFUSED  
<u> DON'T KNOW

>q303<
What major evening and weekend activities has your university implemented?

<1> ACTIVITIES [specify]  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  
<8> REFUSED  
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q304<
Does your institution have a parental notification policy?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  
<2> NO  <8> REFUSED  
<9> DON'T KNOW

>305<
What year did this policy go into effect?

<1850-2003>  <7777> SOMEONE ELSE  
<8888> REFUSED  
<9999> DON'T KNOW

>q306<
What actions can trigger parental notification?

<1> EVENTS [specify]  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  
<8> REFUSED  
<9> DON'T KNOW
>q307<
What effect, if any, has the notification policy had on incidents of triggering behaviors? Have there been more, fewer, or about the same number of incidents since implementing the policies?

<1> MORE INCIDENTS  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> LESS INCIDENTS  <8> REFUSED
<3> ABOUT THE SAME # OF INCIDENTS  <9> DON'T KNOW
<4> DON'T HAVE DATA (VOLUNTEERED)

>q308<
Has the university been the subject of lawsuits as the result of this policy?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO  <8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q309<
How many lawsuits have been brought against the university as a result of this policy?

<1-75> ENTER NUMBER OF LAWSUITS  <77> SOMEONE ELSE
<88> REFUSED
<99> DON'T KNOW

>q310<
Do you have regularly scheduled classes on Fridays?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  [goto ]
<2> NO  [goto ]  <8> REFUSED  [goto ]
<9> DON'T KNOW  [goto ]

>q311<
Are there significantly fewer classes scheduled on Fridays than on other days of the week?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  [goto ]
<2> NO  [goto ]  <8> REFUSED  [goto ]
<9> DON'T KNOW  [goto ]
>q312<
Do you think there are generally accepted differences in the expectation of class attendance on Fridays compared to the rest of the week?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO   [  <8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW

>313<
These next questions about on and off campus policing.

Which of the following have jurisdiction over university property?

University police or security?   @a
Community law enforcement?   @b
State forces including the national guard?  @c

>q314<
Do university police have any jurisdiction off of university property?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO   [  <8> REFUSED
<9> DON’T KNOW

>q315<
In general, how would you describe the working relationship between the university police and community law enforcement agencies? Would you say . . .

<1> very positive,  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> mostly positive,  <8> REFUSED
<3> an equal mix of positive and negative,  <9> DON’T KNOW
<4> mostly negative, or
<5> very negative?

>q316<
Do local law enforcement agencies practice community policing?

<1> YES  <7> SOMEONE ELSE  [goto q318]
<2> NO  [goto q318]  <8> REFUSED  [goto q318]
<9> DON’T KNOW  [goto q318]
>q317<
And how active is this community policing? Would you say . . .

<1> very active, <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> somewhat active, <8> REFUSED
<3> not very active, or <9> DON'T KNOW
<4> not at all active?

>q318<
Are open container laws in effect in the local community?

<1> YES [goto q321] <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto q321]
<2> NO [goto q321] <8> REFUSED [goto q321]
<9> DON'T KNOW [goto q321]

>q319<
How strictly are these laws enforced in the local community?
Would you say . . .

<1> very strictly <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto q321]
<2> somewhat strictly <8> REFUSED [goto q321]
<3> somewhat loosely, or <9> DON'T KNOW [goto q321]
<4> very loosely?

>q320<
How strictly are these laws enforced on university property?
Would you say . . .

<1> very strictly <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto q321]
<2> somewhat strictly <8> REFUSED [goto q321]
<3> somewhat loosely, or <9> DON'T KNOW [goto q321]
<4> very loosely?

>q321<
Does the university have its own open container policies?

<1> YES [goto q323] <7> SOMEONE ELSE [goto q323]
<2> NO [goto q323] <8> REFUSED [goto q323]
<9> DON'T KNOW [goto q323]
>q322<
Are there particular events or activities in the community or on university property for which open container laws are less likely to be enforced?

<1> YES [specify] <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO <8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>q323<
How strictly are underage drinking laws enforced in the local community?

Would you say . . .

<1> very strictly <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> somewhat strictly <8> REFUSED
<3> somewhat loosely, or <9> DON'T KNOW
<4> very loosely?

>q324<
How strictly are underage drinking laws enforced on university property?

Would you say . . .

<1> very strictly <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> somewhat strictly <8> REFUSED
<3> somewhat loosely, or <9> DON'T KNOW
<4> very loosely?

>q325<
About how many students at your university are cited for underage drinking in a given year?

<0-10000> # of CITATIONS <77777> SOMEONE ELSE
<88888> REFUSED
<99999> DON'T KNOW
>q326<
Are there particular events or activities in the community or on university property for which underage drinking laws are less likely to be enforced?

<1> YES [specify]  <7> SOMEONE ELSE
<2> NO  <8> REFUSED
<9> DON'T KNOW

>fini<
Is there anything else you would like to tell the riot task force?
APPENDIX B

Off-campus Parties Survey
Off-Campus Parties Survey

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project about off-campus parties. By returning this completed survey, you indicate your informed consent to participate.

Please use a Black Ink Pen or #2 Pencil to complete this survey.

Section 1: General Off-Campus Party Questions

Directions: Please indicate the correct choice that most closely describes your experiences.

1. How likely are you to do the following things for fun in the evenings?
   a. Hang out with friends ................. _______ _______ _______ _______
   b. See a movie ................................ _______ _______ _______ _______
   c. Go shopping............................. _______ _______ _______ _______
   d. Participate/attend a sporting event  _______ _______ _______ _______
   e. Go dancing ................................ _______ _______ _______ _______
   f. Go to a party ................................ _______ _______ _______ _______
   g. Drink ....................................... _______ _______ _______ _______
   h. Go to a bar .................................. _______ _______ _______ _______
   i. Study/School Work ...................... _______ _______ _______ _______
   j. Work a full-time or part-time job ...... _______ _______ _______ _______
   k. Watch TV ................................... _______ _______ _______ _______
   l. Play Video Games ........................ _______ _______ _______ _______
   m. Go online/chat ............................ _______ _______ _______ _______
   n. Attend a University Sponsored cultural/intellectual event........ _______ _______ _______ _______
   o. Other ...................................... _______ _______ _______ _______

2. When you think of off-campus parties, how likely are these things to come to your mind?
   a. Too many people in one place...... _______ _______ _______ _______
   b. Lots of fun................................... _______ _______ _______ _______
   c. Good place to drink .................... _______ _______ _______ _______
   d. Police usually come ..................... _______ _______ _______ _______
   e. Good way to meet people ............. _______ _______ _______ _______
   f. Noisy ........................................ _______ _______ _______ _______
   g. Been there/Been that.................... _______ _______ _______ _______
   h. They are for those under 21.......... _______ _______ _______ _______
   i. People are out of control.............. _______ _______ _______ _______
   j. Neighbors usually complain.......... _______ _______ _______ _______
   k. I don’t go .................................... _______ _______ _______ _______
   l. Other ...................................... _______ _______ _______ _______

3. How familiar are you with the legal and financial consequences for:
   a. Minors in Possession............... _______ _______ _______ _______
   b. Fake-ID ..................................... _______ _______ _______ _______
   c. Noise ........................................ _______ _______ _______ _______
   d. Selling Alcohol without a License.. _______ _______ _______ _______
   e. Providing Alcohol to a Minor.......... _______ _______ _______ _______

4. Do you have a fake-ID?
   □ Yes □ No

5. If yes, for what have you used your fake-ID (mark all that apply)?
   □ Purchase Beer/Wine □ Get into a bar/club
   □ Purchase Liquor □ Purchase Tobacco

6. Please mark the correct answer on the scale indicated.
   a. Most of my friends have fake-IDs... □ □ □ □
   b. There is nothing wrong with using a fake-ID ................. □ □ □ □
   c. You really need a fake-ID to have an active social life......... □ □ □ □
   d. My friends discourage my use of a fake-ID........................... □ □ □ □

7. In a month, how often do you go to a bar/club?
   □ Never □ 1-4 times □ 15-20 times □ More than 21 times

8. In a month, how often do you go to an off-campus party?
   □ Never □ 10-14 times □ 15-20 times □ More than 21 times
   * If you answered Never in Question #8, please skip to Section 4 on bottom of the last page.

9. In a month, in which of the following locations do you party off-campus (mark all that apply)?
   □ House □ Tailgate □ Apartments □ Outdoors (field/woods)
   □ Hotel □ Greek Houses □ Residence Hall □ Other

10. In a semester, how often do you go to parties at other schools?
    □ Never □ 1-2 per semester □ Every other week
    □ 3-5 per semester □ Every week
11. Who usually attends off-campus parties (mark all that apply)?
- Freshmen/Sophomores
- Juniors/Seniors
- Students from other local schools
- Students from other schools not in the area
- High School Students
- Non-Student Locals
- Younger Siblings
- Young alumni
- Other ________

12. How frequently are cups charged for at a party?
- Always
- Most
- Some
- None

13. What is the average cost for a cup?
- $1-$2
- $3
- $4
- $5
- $6

Section 2: Questions for Party Guests and Hosts

Directions: As a guest of off-campus parties, please answer only the first column labeled “As a Guest”. If you have hosted an off-campus party, please complete both columns labeled “As a Guest” and “As a Host” as appropriate.

14. Have you ever given/hosted an off-campus party? ………… No (answer 1st column only) ………… Yes (answer both columns)

15. When you go to an off-campus party, what are the likely reasons?
   a. Nothing else to do
   b. To be cool/liked by others
   c. To have fun
   d. To meet new people
   e. To hook up
   f. It's cheaper than going to a bar/club
   g. To celebrate birthdays/special events
   h. To celebrate athletic events
   i. To be with friends
   j. To make money
   k. Other ________

16. How likely are you to hear about or invite people to a party with the following methods?
   a. Word of Mouth
   b. Email
   c. Flyers/Written invitations
   d. Walk around and look for them
   e. Phone
   f. Other ________

17. Please select the one answer that indicates the ideal number of people at an off-campus house party.
   - 5-15
   - 16-30
   - 31-50
   - 51-75
   - 76-100
   - 101-150
   - 151-200
   - 201-250
   - 251-300
   - 301-350
   - 351-400

18. How likely are you to expect/provide the following at a party?
   a. Soft Drinks, water, or other non-alcoholic alternative beverages
   b. Chips/Pretzels or other snack foods
   c. Heavier foods (i.e., pizza, etc.)
   d. Beer (keg)
   e. Beer (cans/bottles)
   f. Wine
   g. Liquor/hard alcohol
   h. Pot or other drugs
   i. Music
   j. Designated smoking area
   k. Specific dancing area
19. How do you feel about the following things happening at a party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As a Guest</th>
<th></th>
<th>As a Host</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Too much drinking</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Drug use</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. People passing out</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Public sex</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. People getting sick</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. People driving drunk/on drugs</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Conflict/Violence between people</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. People coming that you don’t know</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Too many people</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Neighbors calling</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Stealing items from the location</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Damage to the location</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Police coming</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Noise violation</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. As a result of those items you indicated you disliked above, how likely are you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As a Guest</th>
<th></th>
<th>As a Host</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Leave the party</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Confront the people involved</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Find friends to help</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Find the host</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Ask people involved to leave</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Call the police</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. How likely are the following things to happen at a party?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As a Guest</th>
<th></th>
<th>As a Host</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Too much drinking</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Drug use</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. People passing out</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Public sex</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. People getting sick</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. People driving drunk/on drugs</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Conflict/Violence between people</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. People coming that you don’t know</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Too many people</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Neighbors calling</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Stealing items from the location</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Damage to the location</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Police coming</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Noise Violation</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. When someone is leaving drunk, how likely are you to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>As a Guest</th>
<th></th>
<th>As a Host</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Just let them go</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Call a taxi/public transportation</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Take them home</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have someone else take them home</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Encourage them to stay at your house</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Make sure they walk home</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 3: Questions for Party Hosts Only

Directions: If you have hosted an off-campus party, please indicate the correct choice that most closely describes your experiences.

23. When you host a party, how likely are you to do the following things?
   a. Contact neighbors.......................... Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   b. Have a guest list............................. Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   c. Only invite people you know .......... Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   d. Set an ending time for the party..... Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   e. Try to reduce noise (lower windows, etc.) Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   f. Remove valuables from party area.. Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   g. Lock-up part of the house.......... Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   h. Verify fire-protection devices work Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   i. Keep smoke-detectors uncovered... Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   j. Have hosts stay sober............... Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   k. Ensure adherence to alcohol laws .. Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   l. Minors consuming alcohol.............. Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   m. Selling cups/charging admission... Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   n. Kept guests inside......................... Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   o. Call police if it gets out of control Not Likely Likely Very Likely
   p. Call EMT if you suspect someone has overdosed/consumed...... Not Likely Likely Very Likely

24. As the host, how do you pay for the party?
   (mark all that apply)
   a. You/Housemates pay
   b. Collect at the door
   c. BYOB
   d. Other
   e. Sell cups/tickets

25. As the host, in what part of the house do guests party?
   (mark all that apply)
   a. Here
   b. Front Yard
   c. Living Room/Kitchen
   d. Back Yard
   e. Bedroom/Upstairs
   f. Roof/Balcony
   g. Areas

26. As the host, who is the most likely to clean-up after the party? (mark all that apply)
   a. Self
   b. Housemates
   c. Cleaning Service
   d. Other
   e. Friends

27. As the host, when does your house get cleaned after the party? (mark all that apply)
   a. Immediately after party
   b. Next day
   c. Next morning
   d. Within a few days
   e. Other

Section 4: Demographics

Directions: Please tell us about yourself by checking the box or entering the correct information that most closely describes you.

38. When are you completing this survey?
   a. September 15-30
   b. October 1-15
   c. October 16-31

39. How old are you?
   a. 18-20 years old
   b. 21 years old or older

40. What is your gender?
   a. Female
   b. Male
   c. Transgender

41. What is your dominant race/ethnicity?
   a. African-American
   b. Native American
   c. Asian American
   d. International
   e. Caucasian
   f. Biracial
   g. Latino/a or Hispanic

42. How do you identify your sexual orientation?
   a. Straight/Heterosexual
   b. Gay/Lesbian
   c. Bisexual
   d. Unsure

43. In what class are you?
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior

44. Are you a member of a (check all that apply):
   a. Campus Student Organization
   b. Fraternity/Sorority
   c. Intercollegiate Athletic Team
   d. Theme House (scholar, religious, etc.)

45. Where do you live?
   a. On-Campus
   b. Apartment Complex
   c. House w/1-5 people
   d. House w/6+ people
   e. Greek Chapter House
   f. Co-op House
   g. Other

46. With whom do you live (check all that apply)?
   a. Friends
   b. Domestic Partner
   c. Siblings/Family
   d. Boyfriend/Girlfriend
   e. Married Spouse
   f. Other

47. In a month, how frequently do you use:
   a. Cigarettes
   b. Cigars
   c. Smokeless Tobacco
   d. Alcohol (beer, wine, liquor)
   e. Marijuana (pot, hash, hash oil)
   f. Cocaine (crack, rock, freebase)
   g. Amphetamines (diet pills, speed, meth)
   h. Intentional Use of Rohypnol (roofies), GHB, or Liquid X
   i. Other drugs

---
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Off-Campus Parties Survey – Part II

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research project about off-campus parties. By returning this completed survey, you indicate your informed consent to participate.

Directions: Please indicate the choice that most closely describes you/your experiences. Please answer all questions by completing both sides of the survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. How familiar are you with OSU alcohol policies?</th>
<th>2. How likely is it that OSU alcohol policies are enforced?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I have no idea</td>
<td>Not very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I'm not very familiar</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I'm somewhat familiar</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I'm very familiar</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3. How familiar are you with the new Ohio law that requires public universities, colleges, and trade schools to immediately dismiss students who are convicted of or plead guilty to: failing to disperse, rioting, disorderly conduct, or misconduct at an emergency?</th>
<th>4. How likely is it that this sanction will assist in preventing off-campus disturbances?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I have no idea</td>
<td>Not very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I'm not very familiar</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I'm somewhat familiar</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I'm very familiar</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5. How familiar are you with the law that a student may be ineligible to receive state-funded financial aid for two years if they are convicted of or plead guilty to any of the offenses listed in question #3?</th>
<th>6. How likely is it that this sanction will assist in preventing off-campus disturbances?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I have no idea</td>
<td>Not very likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I'm not very familiar</td>
<td>Not likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I'm somewhat familiar</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>I'm very familiar</td>
<td>Very Likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. How familiar are you with the policy that the university may suspend a student who hosts a party that gets out of control?
   - I have no idea
   - I'm not very familiar
   - I'm somewhat familiar
   - I'm very familiar

8. How likely is it that this policy will be effective in reducing out of control parties?
   - Not very likely
   - Not likely
   - Likely
   - Very Likely

9. How aware are you that the legal blood alcohol level for which you can be arrested for drinking and driving has dropped from .10 to .08?
   - I have no idea
   - I'm not very familiar
   - I'm somewhat familiar
   - I'm very familiar

10. How likely is it that this change will be effective in reducing drinking and driving?
    - Not very likely
    - Not likely
    - Likely
    - Very Likely

Please complete the questions on both the front and the back of this sheet.

**Off-Campus Parties Survey – Part II**

Directions: Please indicate the choice that most closely describes you/your experiences. Please answer all questions by completing both sides of the survey.

11. How familiar are you with the Late Night events on the OSU campus such as Late Night at the Ohio Union, FREE events in the residence halls, or Jericho Road Breakfasts?
    - I have no idea
    - I'm not very familiar
    - I'm somewhat familiar
    - I'm very familiar

12. How likely are you to attend these activities?
    - Not very likely
    - Not likely
    - Likely
    - Very Likely

13. During the last two weeks, how many times have you had five or more drinks of alcohol at one sitting?
    - None
    - Once
    - Twice
    - 3 to 5 times
    - 6 to 9 times

14. How likely are you to obey underage drinking laws (not drinking if you are underage, not giving alcohol to an underage drinker if you are 21 or older)?
    - Not very likely
    - Not likely
    - Likely
15. During the last year, how many times have you been in trouble with police, residence hall staff, or other college authorities after drinking alcohol?
   - Never
   - Once
   - Twice
   - 3 to 5 times
   - 6 to 9 times
   - 10 or more times

16. During the last year, how many times have you damaged property after drinking alcohol?
   - Never
   - Once
   - Twice
   - 3 to 5 times
   - 6 to 9 times
   - 10 or more times

17. During the last year, how many times have you gotten into an argument or a fight after drinking alcohol?
   - Never
   - Once
   - Twice
   - 3 to 5 times
   - 6 to 9 times
   - 10 or more times

18. During your last two years of high school, how many times did you attend parties where you drank alcohol?
   - Never
   - Once
   - Twice
   - 3 to 5 times
   - 6 to 9 times
   - 10 or more times

19. What is the average number of drinks you consume in a week?

20. What percentage of OSU students do you think drink once a week or less?

THANK YOU for participating in our survey. Be sure to send in both parts of your completed survey and your postcard by NOVEMBER 7, 2003 to be included in the drawing for a $150 gift certificate.