

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTAL NOTIFICATION AND RECIDIVISM AND
RETENTION OF STUDENTS WHO VIOLATED THE UNIVERSITY ALCOHOL POLICY

Christie Ann Cruise

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

August 2009

Committee:

Dr. Maureen Wilson, Advisor

Dr. Sharon Subreenduth
Graduate Faculty Representative

Dr. Carolyn Palmer

Dr. Dafina Lazarus Stewart

© 2009

Christie Ann Cruise

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Dr. Maureen Wilson, Advisor

A 1998 amendment to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act was clear in permitting colleges and universities to notify parents of students under age 21 when they have been found responsible for “a disciplinary violation with respect to such use or possession” of alcohol or any controlled substance (FERPA, 20 U.S.C. § 1232g, 1998, p. 4). This study explored the recidivism of students whose parents were and were not notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy between fall 2001 and spring 2008 (seven academic years) at Bowling Green State University. During this period, 1132 students under age 21 were found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy. The independent variable was parental notification and demographic variables of gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, and residency (on- or off-campus) were also examined. The dependent variable was recidivism, although enrollment status one year after the violation was also explored.

Results indicated that whether or not parents were notified of the violation, 94% of students did not have a subsequent alcohol policy violation. Men were significantly more likely than women and on-campus residents were significantly more likely than off-campus students to have their parents notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. Regarding recidivism in the university discipline system for a subsequent alcohol policy violation, students whose parents were not notified of their first non-disruptive violation of the university alcohol policy were significantly less likely than those students

whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation of the university alcohol policy to violate the policy again. Finally, the logistic regression model showed that as grade point average increased, the likelihood of a repeat violation decreased. When the first violation was disruptive, resulting in parental notification, the likelihood of a repeat violation increased. However, the overall model fit of these two predictors (grade point average and violation) was moderate.

This research does support previous findings that indicated that men were significantly more likely than women to be found responsible for violating campus alcohol policies and that students with higher grade point averages are less likely to be found responsible for violating campus alcohol policies a second time. Implications of the findings and recommendations for future research are discussed.

This dissertation is dedicated to my ancestors who fought and died for the right to receive equal rights, including the right to equal education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

“I will bless the Lord at all times: his praise shall continually be in my mouth” (Psalm 34). I am so thankful to the Lord for the courage and strength to begin and complete this program. It is only because of His grace that I was able to complete this dissertation.

Dr. Charles Eberly and Dr. Jenny Bloom, thanks to you both. It is because of your encouragement and belief in my abilities as a student and professional that I even applied for the doctoral program. I could not have asked for two better mentors. You two are truly heaven sent. To my Higher Education (HIED) mentor Julie Snyder, thanks for always being a source of encouragement and a sounding board. I thank the Lord often for pairing the two of us together. You have been such an inspiration to me.

I will always be grateful to the HESA department for allowing me this great opportunity to study under the best faculty in the country. Specifically, I would like to thank my dissertation committee: Dr. Maureen Wilson, Dr. Sharon Subreenduth, Dr. Dafina Stewart, and Dr. Carolyn Palmer. Maureen, over the past three years you have been more than an advisor. You have served as an encourager, a motivator, and a friend. The time and energy you have put into helping me complete the program and my dissertation will never be forgotten. Sharon, I could not have asked for a better graduate representative. You were truly an advocate for me throughout the entire process. Thank you. Dafina, your knowledge and wisdom are greatly appreciated. Since I began the program you have always been a source of inspiration and motivation to me. Thank you for being you. Carolyn your wealth of knowledge is tremendous. Thank you so much for sharing it with me. Also, I would like to thank Dr. William Knight for being so willing to

meet my data requests. Your commitment to the HIED program and its students are amazing.

To the 2006 HIED cohort, you are the best. I could not have asked for a more supportive, personable, and fun group of colleagues. You all have no idea how much your friendships have meant to me over the past three years. Evelyn and Cynthia, words could never express what your sister friendship has meant to me. I can honestly say without the two of you I would have been a statistic. Thank you for the long talks, many dinners, shopping trips, and most importantly, your love.

James Harper, my loving husband, you have been my rock! Your commitment to my education has been incredible. You have supported me in more ways than I can acknowledge. Thank you for your love, patience, and selflessness. I appreciate you more than you will ever know.

To the Student Discipline staff in the Office of the Dean of Students, you are my second family. Michael Ginsburg, Deb Novak, Debbie Chamberlain, Anne Becker, David Stockton, and Jill Carr, your support has been invaluable. You all have helped me to better understand who I am as a professional, and I am so grateful to all of you for that. Thank you for thinking so highly of me. I will miss our staff meetings, lunch room talks, and out-of-office excursions. Cynthia Payne, what can I say? You are the best singing buddy ever. Thank you for making my last year at BGSU in the student discipline program so much fun. You are a blessing.

To my parents and my siblings who have been awesome throughout this entire process, you all have been so supportive and have been my biggest fans. Thank you for believing I could complete this degree even when I had lost faith in myself. Thank you

for reminding me of my blessings. Thanks to all my friends in the Urbana-Champaign area for encouraging and motivating me. I appreciate you all so much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Statement of Problem.....	4
Purpose of Study	6
Research Questions	7
Significance of Study	8
Overview of the Study	9
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW	10
College Students' Use of Alcohol.....	10
Gender.....	11
Race/Ethnicity.....	12
Class Standing.....	13
Grade Point Average.....	14
Student-Institution Relationship	15
In Loco Parentis	15
Bystander Era.....	16
Duty of Care.....	17
Campus Strategies to Combat Use and Abuse of Alcohol	19
Informational Campaigns.....	19
Policy Notification	19
Social Norms.....	22
Alcohol Abuse Interventions	24

Web-based Alcohol Intervention Courses	24
College ALC	24
Alcohol 101.....	25
AlcoholEdu	25
Face-to-Face Interventions.....	26
Classroom Interventions	27
Motivational Interviewing	27
Parental Notification	30
BGSU Alcohol and Parental Notification Policies	32
Summary	34
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY	36
Data Sources	36
Major Variables	37
Independent Variables	37
Dependent Variable	38
Research Questions	39
Data Analysis	40
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS.....	41
Population	41
Demographic Characteristics and Parental Notification.....	44
Parental Notification and Recidivism	46
Parental Notification and Retention.....	49
Recidivism Predictions	51

Summary of Significant Findings	52
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSION	53
Demographic Profile of Students under Age 21 Who Violated the Alcohol Policy .	53
Gender and Parental Notification.....	55
Residency Status and Parental Notification	56
Recidivism in the Discipline System	56
Recidivism and Parental Notification Status	58
Recidivism and Grade Point Average.....	60
Retention	61
Implications for Policy and Practice	62
Gender and Underage Drinking	62
Residency and Underage Drinking	63
Retention and Parental Notification.....	64
Academics and Parental Notification.....	66
Academics and Recidivism.....	66
Behavioral Issues and Underage Drinking	67
Limitations of Study and Recommendations for Future Research	68
Summary	68
REFERENCES	70
APPENDIX A: 2008-2009 BGSU PARENTAL NOTIFICATION POLICY	78
APPENDIX B: 2008-2009 BGSU ALCOHOL POLICY	79
APPENDIX C: SAMPLE 2008-2009 BGSU PARENTAL NOTIFICATION LETTER	83

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Demographic Characteristics of Students Under Age 21 Found Responsible for Violating the University Alcohol Policy.....	43
2	Group Differences in the Demographic Characteristics of Students Whose Parents Were and Were Not Notified of Their Violation of the University Alcohol Policy..	45
3	One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Grade Point Average of Students Whose Parents Were and Were Not Notified of Their Violation of the University Alcohol Policy.....	46
4	Group Differences in Recidivism for Students Whose Parents Were and Were Not Notified of Their First Violation of the University Alcohol Policy.....	47
5	Group Differences in Recidivism for Students Whose Parents Were Notified of Their First Disruptive or Second Violation of the University Alcohol Policy	48
6	Demographic Characteristics of Students Found Responsible for Violating the University Alcohol Policy and Who Were Repeat Violators	49
7	Group Differences in One-Year Retention for Students Whose Parents Were and Were Not Notified of Their Violation of the University Alcohol Policy	50
8	Regression Coefficients for Recidivism Predictions	52

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

A culture of drinking has been fostered on college and university campuses. Examples of this culture can be seen in everything from advertising at sporting events to the presence of bars and liquor stores on and around campus (National Institute for Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism [NIAAA], 2007) to beer and liquor bottles in student windows. With this culture as a backdrop, alcohol abuse among college students continues to be a major concern for campus administrators and parents of college students. The consequences of alcohol abuse have devastating effects not only for the individual student who engages in the activity, but also for the entire campus community. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2007) provided this “snapshot” of the consequences of high-risk college drinking:

- 1,700 college students between the ages of 18 and 24 die each year from alcohol-related unintentional injuries, including motor vehicle crashes;
- 599,000 students between the ages of 18 and 24 are unintentionally injured under the influence of alcohol;
- More than 150,000 students developed an alcohol-related health problem in the past year;
- Between 1.2% and 1.5% of students indicated that they tried to commit suicide within the past year while under the influence of alcohol or other drugs;
- 2.1 million students between the ages of 18 and 24 drove under the influence of alcohol last year; and
- 31% of college students met criteria for a diagnosis of alcohol abuse and 6% for a diagnosis of alcohol dependence in the past 12 months, according to questionnaire-based self-reports about their drinking.

Alcohol abuse and its consequences on college and university campuses are not new issues for administrators. In the 1980s, drinking and driving became such an issue that in 1984 Congress passed the National Minimum Drinking Age Act that required states to raise the drinking age from 18 to 21 or risk losing a percentage of their highway construction and maintenance funds (NIAAA, 2007). Additionally, in 1989 Congress amended the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to require all institutions of higher education that receive any federal funding to adopt and implement drug and alcohol prevention programs (Palmer & Gehring, 1992). The minimum requirement of the amendment was annual distribution, in writing, to each student and employee on the following information:

- Standards of conduct that clearly prohibit, at a minimum, the unlawful possession, use, or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol on school property or as part of any school activities;
- A description of the applicable legal sanctions under federal, state, or local law for the unlawful possession or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol;
- A description of the health risks associated with the use of illicit drugs and the abuse of alcohol;
- A description of any drug or alcohol counseling, treatment, or rehabilitation and re-entry programs that are available to employees or students; and
- A clear statement that the institution will impose disciplinary sanctions on students and employees (consistent with local, state, and federal law), and a description of those sanctions, up to and including expulsion or termination of employment and referral for prosecution, for violations of the standards of conduct (U.S. Department of Education's

Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention, n.d.)

Congress continued to take steps to reduce and prevent alcohol abuse on college campuses by amending the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) in 1998 to allow parental notification if a student under age 21 “has committed a disciplinary violation with respect to such use or possession” of alcohol or a controlled substance” (p. 4).

Although Congress has made several efforts to hold colleges and universities accountable for educating students about the dangers of alcohol abuse and providing resources for rehabilitation, there is still great concern about alcohol abuse among college students, especially those under the age of 21. According to the NIAAA’s Underage Drinking Research Initiative Report, approximately 5,000 students under the age of 21, both high school and college students, die as a result of drinking, with about 1,900 of those deaths being from motor vehicle crashes, 1,600 from homicides, 300 from suicides, and hundreds from other injuries. The NIAAA Task Force, in 2002, published several strategies for reducing alcohol abuse on college campuses. These strategies encouraged the use of combined interventions for effectively working with students who engaged in dangerous alcohol consumption, including underage drinking. The strategies were divided into four tiers. The first tier, which research showed was most effective when working with college students, included a combination of cognitive-behavioral skills training with norms clarification and motivational enhancement interventions; brief motivational enhancement interventions; and interventions challenging alcohol expectancies. Tier two, which incorporates strategies that research showed were most successful with general populations and could be applied to college settings, included implementation, increased publicity, and enforcement of laws to prevent alcohol-impaired driving; restrictions on alcohol retail outlet

density; increased prices and excise taxes on alcoholic beverages; responsible beverage service policies in social and commercial settings; and campus and community coalitions of all major stakeholders to implement these strategies effectively. The third tier, which researchers believed showed the most logical and theoretical promise, but would require more comprehensive evaluation than the other tiers, included marketing campaigns to correct student misperceptions of peer alcohol use, sometimes called social norms marketing or normative education; consistent enforcement of campus alcohol policies; provision of safe rides for students who drink too much to drive safely; regulation of happy hour promotions; information for new students and their parents about alcohol use and campus policies; other strategies to address high-risk drinking, such as offering alcohol free residence halls and social activities or scheduling classes on Fridays to reduce Thursday night parties. Lastly, tier four, which was shown to be most ineffective, was simple educational or awareness programs used alone, without any other strategies or components (NIAAA, 2002).

Statement of the Problem

The legal responsibility of university officials to students has changed many times over the past several decades. Colleges and universities have gone from having complete parental authority over students, to categorizing students as adults who are responsible for their own well being, to owing students a reasonable duty of care (Bickel & Lake, 1997). These changes in the expectations placed on higher education administrators have also altered the manner in which institutions are viewed in the eyes of the law. Institutions and their representatives have had three major roles in relationship to students in the past six decades: *in loco parentis* (in the place of the parent), bystander (college students as adults), and duty of care. Currently colleges and universities owe their students a reasonable duty of care, which includes providing information

for the reduction and prevention of alcohol abuse and its consequences. The Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Amendment of 1989 requires that disciplinary sanctions be imposed on those students and employees who violate campus alcohol policies. Palmer and Gehring (1992) believed that some in higher education viewed the imposition of sanctions on students who violated alcohol policies as a return to *in loco parentis*. However, this law further solidifies the student-institution relationship and the duty of the institution to provide reasonable care for its students.

The problem of underage drinking in many cases began before students entered into higher education. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2007) reported that by the age of 15 about half of boys and girls have had a whole drink of alcohol. In addition, binge drinking increased for girls through the age of 18, and through the age of 20 for boys. Boys and girls between the ages of 12 and 20 were found to use alcohol more frequently than tobacco or marijuana (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2007). Reisberg (2001) reported that many colleges and universities involve parents in the process of reducing and preventing heavy drinking because research has shown that parents can often be a solution to the problem. In a study conducted by Palmer, Lohman, Gehring, Carlson, and Garrett (2001) over half of the institutions surveyed indicated a slight or significant reduction in reported alcohol violations since the implementation of the parental notification policy.

The inclusion of parents in the disciplinary process can be helpful to the student in a variety of ways. For example, Baker (2005) found that when the parental notification policy was used for students who have attempted suicide, parents were helpful when additional medical information was needed for successful treatment. Also, when parents were supportive and had a good relationship with the student, contacting parents was helpful for the reinforcement of

positive feelings. These same sentiments were expressed by Senator John Warner in 1998 when he introduced the amendment to FERPA that would allow for parental notification for alcohol and drug violations for underage students. Specifically, Senator Warner stated:

As a parent, and indeed as a grandparent, I would want to know if my children were in the unfortunate position of being in violation of the law as it relates to alcohol and drugs while they were students at a college or university. I would want to step forward in a constructive way, as would other parents, to lend a hand and assistance to work with the faculty and administration of the college or university to help that student. But sometimes parents are not aware of these problems because of the provisions as construed in FERPA. Our colleges and universities should be free to notify the parents of dependent students who have violated the law relating to drugs and alcohol (Congressional Record, 1998, p. 7856).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between parental notification and recidivism at Bowling Green State University. Specifically, this study examined the relationship of parental notification to students' subsequent reported alcohol policy violations. Secondary purposes were to develop a profile of students charged with violating the university alcohol policy, compare recidivism rates based on a number of demographic characteristics, and compare persistence rates for students whose parents were and were not notified of their violations.

The focus of the study was on reduced recidivism as opposed to reduced alcohol consumption as it is more feasible to track recidivism than alcohol consumption. In order to determine a reduction in alcohol consumption there would need to be an initial measure of

alcohol consumption prior to parental notification and a follow up after parental notification.

Since there is no way of knowing which students will violate the alcohol policy it is not feasible to track reduced alcohol consumption. However, once students have been found responsible for violating the alcohol policy they are automatically entered into the student discipline database where a record is kept of any additional policy violations that may occur.

At BGSU, the parental notification policy states that the parents or guardians of a student under age 21 will be notified of violations of the alcohol policy when that student violates the policy a second time or when the first violation is deemed disruptive. A disruptive violation is defined as “an alcohol violation occurring in conjunction with behavior that is disruptive to the community, endangers the health or safety of others, or results in damage or vandalism to University property or property of members of the University community” (BGSU, 2008, p. 55) (See Appendix A).

Research Questions

To address the purpose of the study the following research questions were answered:

1. What are the demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, and residency [on-or off-campus]) of students who were under age 21 and found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy?
2. Do gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, and residency (on-or off-campus) differ significantly for the following groups:

Group 1: Parents Not Notified

Group 2: Parents Notified – First violation disruptive with no repeat violation

Group 3: Parents Notified – First violation disruptive with repeat violation

Group 4: Parents Notified – Second violation with no repeat violation

Group 5: Parents Notified – Second violation with repeat violation

- 2a. Do gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, and residency (on- or off-campus) differ significantly for Group 1 and Groups 2-5 combined?
3. Are there statistically significant differences between students whose parents were not notified (Group 1) and students whose parents were notified (Groups 2-5 combined) regarding:
 - a. recidivism in the university discipline system for a subsequent alcohol policy violation
 - b. one-year retention rate at the university
4. To what extent are gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, residency (on- or off-campus), and parental notification (Group 1 vs. Groups 2-5 combined) related to an increase in the probability of recidivism in the university discipline system for a subsequent alcohol policy violation?

Significance of the Study

The significance of the present study was that it would provide higher education administrators with information to assist them in their decision of whether or not notifying parents of underage student alcohol policy violations is a viable strategy in the reduction of recidivism rates at their institution. The NIAAA recommended a variety of strategies be used to help to reduce binge drinking and underage alcohol consumption. Some institutions have already incorporated parental notification as a strategy in their student discipline process and have found it to be useful in reducing recidivism rates. Furthermore, this study will help to develop a profile of students most at risk for violating alcohol policies and the role parental notification plays in

recidivism and retention. Also, this study serves as a foundation for additional research on the effectiveness of parental notification for various students and violations.

Overview of the Study

This study was divided into five chapters. The first chapter is an introduction to the study. Chapter two is a review of the literature related to college students' use of alcohol, the student-institution relationship, and strategies to combat use and abuse of alcohol. Chapter three includes a discussion of the methods employed to conduct the quantitative study. The results of the study are detailed in chapter four. Finally, chapter five includes a discussion of the results in relation to their implications for higher education and recommendations for further research. Limitations of the study are also discussed in chapter five.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The National Institute for Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (2002) provided four tiers of possible strategies that colleges and universities should consider when implementing programs to decrease recidivism rates by decreasing underage and binge drinking. Those strategies included informational campaigns, alcohol abuse interventions, and face-to-face interventions. One intervention strategy that has not been completely explored in the research literature or by the NIAAA is parental notification. Institutions that have implemented such policies have reported decreases in alcohol policy violations (Lowery, Palmer, & Gehring, 2002; Reisberg, 1998, 2001). This literature review explored research related to the strategies recommended by the NIAAA as well as research related to parental notification. In addition, research related to college students' use of alcohol and the student-institution relationship was explored to provide foundational information to demonstrate the importance of these strategies in higher education.

College Students' Use of Alcohol

Underage and binge drinking are widespread on college campuses in the United States (Wechsler, Lee, Nelson, & Kuo, 2002). The NIAAA defined binge drinking as a pattern of alcohol use that brings the blood alcohol concentration (BAC) to 0.08 gram-percent or above. This is equivalent to consuming five or more drinks for men or four or more drinks for women in a two hour period. In studies conducted by the Harvard School of Public Health in 1993 and 1997, a large percentage of college students were found to be binge drinkers. In 1993, 140 four-year U.S. colleges were chosen from the American Council on Education's list of accredited universities. In 1997, 130 of the original 140 colleges surveyed in 1993 were resurveyed. A random sample of approximately 215 students from each of the 140 colleges in the 1993 study

and 230 students from each of the 130 colleges in the 1997 study were surveyed. The study found that 42.7% of the college students surveyed were binge drinkers, while 20.7% were frequent binge drinkers (Wechsler & Dowdall, 1998). The statistics related to members of Greek organizations were even greater. The same studies found that 81.1% of fraternity and sorority members surveyed were binge drinkers. These students, although most in need of treatment, were least likely to receive it. According to the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions, 19% of all college students' abuse alcohol, but only 5% of them sought help for their alcohol problems (Presley & Pimentel, 2006). Fraternity and sorority members, first-year students, and athletes are among the student populations most at-risk for underage alcohol use and abuse (Century Council, n.d.). Additional demographic characteristics identifying students at-risk for underage alcohol use and abuse include gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, and grade point average.

Gender

Alcohol use and abuse rates for college students have traditionally been higher for men than women (O'Malley & Johnston, 2002). Five data sources were examined to determine estimates of alcohol use among college students in the United States: the College Alcohol Study (CAS) through the Harvard School of Public Health, the Core Institute (CORE) study through Southern Illinois University, the Monitoring the Future (MTF) study through the University of Michigan, the National College Health Risk Behavior Survey (NCHRBBS) through the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA) through Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. The results from all surveys were consistent; men participated in binge drinking more than women did. For example, the CORE study showed that 26% of men and 9% of women reported consuming 10 or

more drinks per week. Similarly, the MTF study reported that 50% of men and 34% of women participated in binge drinking at least once during the month prior to the survey (O'Malley & Johnston, 2002).

Geisner, Larimer, and Neighbors (2004) reported similar results in their study. The data were used from an ongoing longitudinal study that randomly selected 1705 students from three west coast public institutions. The three instruments used to gather data were the Daily Drinking Questionnaire (DDQ), the Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index (RAPI), and the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI). Instruments were administered in both Web and paper formats. The results showed that men not only drink more than women, but also have more alcohol-related problems than women. On average men reported consuming 5.99 drinks per week as opposed to 3.56 drinks per week for women. These results were also similar to those from the Campus Alcohol Survey (CAS) collected between 2000 and 2004 at two western universities, which showed that of the 9,073 undergraduate students surveyed 43% of males and 28% of females reported binge drinking at least once within a two week period (Taylor, Johnson, Voas, & Turrisi, 2006).

Race/Ethnicity

Persons of color, in general, have been identified as being at a greater risk for alcohol abuse than Whites. However, among college students, students of color are less at risk for alcohol abuse (Kahler, Read, Wood, & Palfai, 2003). Studies have shown that White college students are more likely than college students of color to engage in risky alcohol behaviors. O'Malley and Johnston (2002) reported that for four of the five data sources used in their study Whites were shown to be the heaviest drinkers, Hispanics second, and Blacks last. When compared on the basis of gender women in all three ethnic groups were shown to drink less than their male counterparts, with Black women less likely than White or Hispanic women to drink

heavily. These results were consistent with those in the study conducted by Taylor et al. (2006). When White and students of color were compared in terms of binge drinking White students were significantly more likely than students of color to participate in binge drinking. Studies conducted by both Kahler et al. (2003) and Meilman, Presley, and Lysterla (1994) also found students of color less likely than White students to engage in high risk drinking behaviors.

Class Standing

An alert by the NIAAA (2007) reported that approximately 30% of 12th graders engage in binge drinking. This behavior continues and generally increases in college (Wechsler & Isaac, 1991). Research has reported that binge drinking is highest for college students aged 18-24, with first-year students having the highest level of binge drinking in that population (Hingson, Heeren, Zakocs, Kopstein, & Wechsler, 2002; Taylor et al., 2006). Although the results of the study conducted by Taylor et al. (2006) showed no significant class differences in class standing in the proportions of students who reported binge drinking two weeks prior to the survey, the results did show that first-year students participated in binge drinking at higher rates on Fridays and Saturdays than students at any other class level.

Wechsler and Isaac (1991) conducted a study of 1,669 first-year students at fourteen colleges and universities across the state of Massachusetts. The survey used in the study was a combination of the Monitoring the Future (MTF) Project survey and surveys used in the past by the researchers. The results showed that all first-year students had consumed alcoholic beverages. Forty-seven percent of men and 21% of women reported binge drinking. Eighty-eight percent of the first-year students surveyed reported they drank alcoholic beverages within the past year.

Grade Point Average

Students who reported more frequent binge drinking also reported lower grades and poorer performance on academic tests (Paschall & Freisthler, 2003). Binge drinking is assumed to impact grade point average because it adversely affects students' cognitive ability which leads to a decrease in effective study time. Wolaver (2002) conducted a study to examine the effects of college drinking on study hours, grade point average, and major choice. The data used for the study were from the 1993 Harvard College Alcohol Study. The results of the study showed that binge drinking produced larger negative effects on study hours than not drinking. Binge drinking was predicted to reduce study hours on average 78 minutes per day, and to reduce the probability of having an "A" average by 12%-18%. The results also showed that drinking lowers the grade point average more for underage students than for students 21 years of age and older. These results were similar to those reported by Taylor et al. (2006) showing that students who reported higher rates of binge drinking had grade point averages lower than 2.00 while students with lower rates of binge drinking were more likely to report grade point averages of 3.50 and higher.

Research related to college students drinking behaviors as well as information contained in the NIAAA's Underage Drinking Initiative have confirmed that college students' participation in risky and underage drinking is cause for concern and colleges and universities have taken a variety of steps to reduce these behaviors. Many students often question why colleges and universities are concerned with their drinking behaviors since they are considered adults once they are enrolled in college. In addition, some college educators believe alcohol use is a rite of passage and that "experimenting with alcohol, overindulging, and eventually learning how to drink responsibly is an important part of growing up" (DeJong, 1998, p. 14). Wechsler and Dowdall (1998) found that two out of five college students reported participating in binge

drinking and Hingson et al. (2002) listed consequences of excessive drinking that include death, injury, and violence. Such excessive drinking is often viewed as a rite of passage that college and university presidents hope to circumvent through the reduction of alcohol accessibility to young adults and the elimination of irresponsible alcohol sales and marketing practices by local establishments (DeJong, 1998). Colleges and universities have a mandated obligation to ensure students' knowledge of alcohol policies and laws related to underage drinking, and to protect students from foreseeable danger.

Student-Institution Relationship

The student-institution relationship has changed several times since the development of colleges and universities in the United States. Colleges and universities have gone from having complete disciplinary control over their students, to treating them as adults responsible for their own behaviors and actions, to owing them a reasonable duty of care. These relationships set standards for the accountability of colleges and universities to their students. Bickel and Lake (1997) discussed the transitional role of higher education institutions as they moved from a custodial relationship with students to bystanders, and now as facilitators with authority and control over students, but at the same time recognizing their rights and responsibilities. As facilitators, higher education institutions promote many aspects of campus life which has placed them in a position to provide their students with a reasonable duty of care.

In Loco Parentis

In loco parentis, "in the place of parents," was the relationship that existed between students and institutions during the colonial period. Based in English law, the doctrine was adopted by U.S. colleges and universities as a means to govern student behavior (Bowden, 2007). Blackstone, an English law scholar, believed that parents could delegate a portion of their

parental authority to the institution for the purposes of correcting student behavior. In 1837 the court ruled in *State v. Pendergrass* that it was the right of a teacher to discipline a child (Henning, 2007). College students during that time were not viewed as adults, as they were often young teenagers, and were therefore under the authority of college and university officials who had taken the role of parents while students were in their care (Bowden, 2007). Seventy-six years later, the Kentucky court of appeals ruled in the case of *Gott v. Berea* that the college was *in loco parentis* when it came to the physical and moral development of its students. These two cases were the impetus for the *in loco parentis* doctrine that survived at colleges and universities until the 1960s.

As students became more involved in social and political activism during the twentieth century, colleges utilized the *in loco parentis* doctrine to expel and suspend students whose behavior was outside of the mission of the institution. This practice changed in 1961 with the *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* case. Four African American Alabama State College students were expelled because of their involvement in lunch counter sit-ins during the Civil Rights Movement. The students sued the college and on appeal were allowed to re-enroll. The appeals court found that the college had violated the students' due process rights by expelling them without notice and without a hearing. It was this case that ended the doctrine of *in loco parentis* in American colleges and universities (Kaplin & Lee, 2007).

Bystander Era

With the demise of *in loco parentis* and the ratification of the 26th Amendment to the United States Constitution, which lowered the age of majority from 21 to 18, colleges and universities took on new roles in dealing with students and became more like bystanders in relation to student conduct (Bowden, 2007). As bystanders, colleges and universities were not

liable for the actions of traditional aged college students. Once seen as children in need of discipline and moral development, there was a shift to view them as adults with the same rights as other adults not in college. The *Dixon v. Alabama State Board of Education* case made it clear that college students were considered adults with the same rights and privileges as other adults. This was solidified further in 1971 with the ratification of the 26th Amendment.

Bradshaw v. Rawlings was the determining case defining colleges as bystanders when it came to student behaviors (Kaplin & Lee, 2007). In *Bradshaw*, a student at Delaware Valley College was injured in a car accident after attending an off-campus college-sponsored picnic where beer was served to minors. The student sued the college because he believed they failed to protect him from harm because alcohol was served at the picnic. The court did not believe the institution was responsible because it did not owe adults as much protection as minors (Kaplin & Lee). Several cases followed, including *Baldwin v. Zoradi*, *Beach v. University of Utah*, and *Rabel v. Wesleyan University*, where institutions were not held liable for the injuries sustained by students who were now considered responsible adults (Henning, 2007).

Duty of Care

For a period of time colleges and universities avoided liability for student deaths and injuries based on the bystander theory. However, the *Eisel v. Board of Education of Montgomery County* case of 1991 was a seminal case in liability for schools that failed to provide students with protection from foreseeable harm. Foreseeability is defined as

a concept used in various areas of the law to limit liability of a party for the consequences of his acts to consequences that are within the scope of a foreseeable risk, i.e., risk whose consequences a person of ordinary prudence would reasonably expect might occur.

(Gifis, 2003, p. 210)

Although the *Eisel* case concerned a middle school student, it impacted how future cases concerning duty of care would be handled in all aspects of education. In this particular case, a 13-year-old girl mentioned to her classmates her intentions to commit suicide. The classmates made school counselors aware of the student's intentions, but no further action was taken by the counselors and the girl committed suicide. On appeal, the Maryland Supreme Court found the institution was liable for the young girl's suicide because of the foreseeability of the suicide (*Eisel v. Board of Education of Montgomery County*, 1991). This was the first case where a court applied tort theory to a school setting (Lake & Tribbensee, 2002).

According to Kaplin and Lee (2007), a tort is
 a civil wrong, other than a breach of contract, for which the courts will allow remedy
 [It] generally involves allegations that the institution or its agents, owed a duty to one or
 more individuals to behave according to a defined standard of care, that the duty was
 breached, and that the breach of that duty caused injury to the individual(s). (p. 87)

If the duty is breached, the institution is liable. There are two types of torts: negligence and defamation. Negligence is "failure to exercise that degree of care which a person of ordinary prudence (a reasonable man [person]) would exercise under the same circumstance" (Gifis, 2003, p. 338). Defamation is "the publication of anything injurious to the good name or reputation of another, or which tends to bring him into disrepute" (Gifis, 2003, p. 134). The most common tort faced by colleges and universities is negligence. In order for there to be a tort, the plaintiff must be able to prove to the courts that the institution had a duty, that the duty was breached, that the plaintiff was injured, and that the institution's negligence or breach of duty was the direct cause of that injury (Blanchard, 2007). When considering tort law, one must consider a duty to care

based on foreseeability and duty of care based on a special relationship. Many cases that have been litigated have been centered on a duty to care based on foreseeability.

Negligence is considered a duty to care based on foreseeability. Foreseeability implies that the institution had some knowledge that the possible injury or death could transpire (Blanchard, 2007). Negligence claims have been brought against individuals, universities, bars, and fraternities for injuries and deaths of students in which alcohol use played an integral part. In 1999, *Delta Tau Delta v. Johnson*, *Knoll v. University of Nebraska*, and *Coghlan v. Beta Theta Pi Fraternity* were cases brought before the courts concerning underage alcohol consumption and duty of care as well as negligence on the part of individuals, institutions, and fraternities (Lowery et al., 2002). In each case one or all defendants were found to have owed a duty of care to the plaintiff. The implications of these cases demonstrated the importance of providing students with information regarding alcohol abuse and its consequences. One way institutions of higher education do this is through the use of informational campaigns.

Campus Strategies to Combat Use and Abuse of Alcohol

A variety of strategies have been employed by college and university administrators to reduce recidivism rates by reducing underage and binge drinking. The strategies range from informational campaigns to alcohol abuse interventions. Some of the strategies are required and/or supported by state, federal, and local laws.

Informational Campaigns

Policy Notification

In 1989 Congress amended the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act, enacting into law one of the first steps in providing for students a duty of reasonable care. The primary goal of the act was to provide students and employees with information concerning the institution's

alcohol policy, as well as state, federal, and local laws related to alcohol consumption. Janosik (2001) reported that

the hope is that by educating students and other members of the academic community about the real risks to their personal safety, they will make wiser choices about their own behavior and thereby reduce the chance of becoming a victim of criminal activity. (p. 349)

Although this statement was made in regard to the Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act, it is relevant to the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act as well. The hope in amending the law was that students and employees would make better decisions concerning alcohol if they were aware of its potential dangers and the consequences associated with its abuse. The Drug Free Schools and Communities Act was met with mixed reactions. Some believed simply providing students with information regarding alcohol policies would not reduce risky alcohol behaviors, including underage drinking.

Rhodes, Singleton, McMillan, and Perrino (2005) conducted a study to determine whether knowledge of college drinking policies influenced student binge drinking. The study was conducted at five historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs); two were private and three were public. The researchers found that the majority of the students who participated in the study were aware of their institution's alcohol policy, but were unaware of the disciplinary process for students who violated the policy and were unaware of any counseling or treatment services available for students with alcohol problems. In addition, the researchers found that male students who were unaware of the written alcohol policy and treatment services were more likely to report that they engaged in binge drinking when compared to those male students who were aware of the policy and treatment services. This study showed that knowledge of a written

alcohol policy had a greater impact on men than women. When male students were aware of the alcohol policy, they were less likely to report that they participated in binge drinking.

In contrast, Janosik (2001) found that the dissemination of information related to particular policies played no role in changing student behaviors. Janosik examined the impact of the Campus Crime Awareness Act of 1998 on students' decisions to attend particular colleges and universities, and its impact on reduction of their safety risks. Of the students surveyed, 71% were unaware of the law. Eighty-eight percent of respondents were unaware of receiving the campus' annual federally-mandated crime report.

Palmer, Gehring, and Guthrie (1992) conducted a study to determine college students' knowledge of the 1989 amendments to the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act. The results of the study showed that most college students gained most of their knowledge regarding health risks associated with alcohol and drugs prior to entering college. In addition, students reported that the knowledge they did gain about alcohol and drug abuse while in college came from professors, classes, television and other forms of media, and friends. Knowledge regarding disciplinary sanctions imposed by their college or university for violating rules and regulations regarding the possession, use, and distribution of substances was obtained from a variety of sources including the student handbook (19.5%), friends/peers (12.7%), and residence hall staff (11.2%). Prior to entering college, 31.9% of the students reported that they were aware of their school's rules and regulations and disciplinary sanctions. The researchers speculated this may be because of prior campus visits, conversations with older siblings or friends, or information mailed to prospective students.

Overall, dissemination of information to students regarding alcohol policies and sanctions has proven to be an ineffective method for providing students with knowledge to assist them in making better alcohol choices. Simply being aware of policies does not seem to have an impact on students' alcohol consumption or behavior (Janosik, 2001; Palmer et al., 1992; Rhodes et al., 2005).

Social Norms

Similar to providing students with information concerning policies and procedures, social norms campaigns have been used as a method of reducing binge and underage drinking on college campuses. Social norming is

based upon the discovery that young people tend to overestimate the drinking norms, expectations, and actual drinking behavior of their peers, even of their closest friends.

Accordingly, if confronted with the unexaggerated actuality of peer norms, perhaps students will bring down their own expectations and consumption to conform more closely to this actuality. (Barnett, Far, Mauss & Miller, 1996, p. 40)

Social norming is based on the premise that peer relationships have a tremendous influence on college students' alcohol and other drug use (Miley & Frank, 2006). Social norms campaigns generally consist of targeting students through a variety of media, including campus and community television stations, posters, public service announcements, dining hall table tents, and bathroom stall postings, to provide them with information about the actual levels of binge drinking on campus (Polonec, Major, & Atwood, 2006). The statistics presented in the campaigns are usually based on self-reported surveys taken at their institution. The effectiveness of social norms campaigns, however, has been met with skepticism.

Many studies conducted about the effectiveness of social norms campaign have yielded less than favorable results. For example, Thombs, Dotterer, Olds, Sharp, and Raub (2004) found that social norm campaigns did not change students' perceptions of their close friends' drinking norms or alcohol intake. In addition, the authors found that most students did not believe the social norms campaign was credible. The researchers "found that most participants in the post campaign sample were skeptical about the veracity of the campaign messages" (p. 66). Similarly, Polonec et al. (2006) evaluated the believability and effectiveness of a social norms campaign and found that of the 277 students who participated in the study, only 27% believed the statistics presented in the campaign. In addition, the researchers reported the social norms campaign used in their study was ineffective, especially when attempting to target binge drinkers. This study, as well as the previous study found that when targeting binge drinkers, "group or social network norms appear to be more influential on students' own drinking behavior than are purported campus-drinking norms" (p. 32).

Overall, some believed that social norms campaigns were ineffective for several reasons. First, campus norming did not seem to have as much of an impact on reducing individual students' drinking. Research showed that social norming related to feedback about the drinking behavior of close friends had a greater impact on students' drinking behavior than did campus norming (Barnett et al., 1996; Polonec et al., 2006; Thombs et al., 2004). Second, the campaigns relied on self-reported data as the foundation for the intervention. Thombs et al. argued that college students may believe that self-reported data do not provide valid measures of drinking behaviors. Students were mainly concerned that false information about drinking behaviors was reported in the survey by fellow students. Third, it is believed that many students just did not understand the purpose of the message (Thombs et al.).

Alcohol Abuse Interventions

In addition to providing students with information related to policies and norms and using parental notification as a form of alcohol reduction, colleges and universities generally offer Web-based and/or face-to-face alcohol interventions to assist students in making better choices about alcohol use.

Web-based Alcohol Intervention Courses

Web-based alcohol interventions include strategies for working with students as prevention methods and as educational sanctions for students who have been cited at colleges and universities for underage alcohol use. Online or Web-based interventions have become the alternative to the traditional in-class sessions. These programs are interactive in nature and are based on health behavior change theories (Wall, 2007). The three most common prevention programs cited in the literature were College ALC, Alcohol 101, and AlcoholEdu.

College ALC. College ALC was developed by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism to help reduce college student drinking and prevent consequences that come along with drinking. The program is evidence-based and utilizes pre- and post-test surveys to measure student success. The course can be customized to individual institutions by using school colors, and more importantly providing information on campus policies and resources (Prevention Strategies, n.d.). Bersamin, Paschall, Fearnow-Kenney, and Wyrick (2007) conducted a pre-post study assessing the College ALC program to determine its effectiveness in reducing alcohol use and the consequences that result from use among drinkers and nondrinkers. A total of 622 students participated in the baseline survey; of those, 370 students completed the follow-up survey. The researchers found that drinkers who participated in the College ALC

program reported decreased heavy drinking behavior as well as negative-related consequences. Nondrinkers who participated in College ALC showed no effect.

Alcohol 101. Alcohol 101, implemented in 1991, was created to assist college students in making responsible and safe decisions about alcohol. The program is geared toward special groups considered at-risk for alcohol abuse, including athletes, Greeks, first-year students, and student conduct policy violators. There are several segments that explore special issues and decisions regarding alcohol use for students in each of those groups (Century Council, n.d.). Larsen and Kozar (2005) conducted a study to evaluate the Alcohol 101 program by “measuring changes in expectations and intentions not only from pre-intervention to immediate post intervention, but also after a delay of one week” (p. 72). To do so, the researchers utilized the Alcohol Expectations and Intentions to Change Worksheet (AEICW) to assess expectations of alcohol use and intentions to change. The researchers found there to be no significant difference in students’ expectations and intentions to change on the pre-intervention and first post-intervention scores on the AEICW. There was, however, a significant difference found in the scores on the AEICW on the pre-intervention and the first and second post-intervention. These results indicated that one week following the intervention, students’ expectations of alcohol use had lowered and their intentions to change were greater.

AlcoholEdu. AlcoholEdu, founded in 2000, is an online alcohol prevention program that is delivered to entire student groups with the goal of changing the campus drinking culture. The program includes four tracks suitable for both high school and college students, and is available in both prevention and intervention formats (Outside the Classroom, 2008). Wall (2007) conducted a study on the usefulness of AlcoholEdu in reducing over-consumption of alcohol in college students. The AlcoholEdu program is patterned after Alcohol 101 and College ALC, and

in addition uses the theory of behavior change as its basis. One of Wall's research questions was whether Web-based health education can change the behavior of students who have been identified as at-risk for a particular health-related issue. To answer this and his other research questions, he used a post-test only design. Specifically, three steps were followed in the creation of the design which was created through retrospective analysis of the data. In the first step, responses to intervention and comparison groups were assigned based on a clustered randomization. The second step involved assignment of responses to time blocks to initiate comparison of the two study groups at similar time points. The last step utilized pre-survey responses for the comparison group and follow-up survey responses from the intervention group as data for the post-test design. The results of his study showed that for students who had completed the alcohol intervention there were "lower incidents of negative consequences, heavy alcohol use days and incidents of intentional risky behavior than the comparison group of students who had not yet completed the curriculum at a similar time" (p. 704-705). The group who had completed the alcohol intervention also showed a decrease in positive expectations of alcohol use.

Face-to-Face Interventions

In addition to Web-based interventions, more traditional face-to-face interactions such as classroom interventions and one-on-one counseling have been used when working with students who violate alcohol policies. These interventions have been proven to be just as successful as the Web-based alcohol intervention programs. Some researchers believe the one-on-one interventions are more successful than classroom interventions when working with underage students who drink and with binge drinkers.

Classroom interventions. Walters, Gruenewald, Miller, and Bennett (2001) evaluated a three hour class used as an intervention for college students found in violation of the college alcohol policy. The course included educational, attitudinal, and skills-based activities, along with personalized feedback. The educational content included discussion of norms, effects of alcohol, and myths and facts related to alcohol use. The social skills content allowed for small group activities that focused on responsible decision making. The last section, personal feedback, included use of the Check Up to Go (CHUG) program and the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) to determine engagement in risky or abusive drinking behaviors. The results of these two assessments were mailed to students one week after completing the class in the form of a personalized information packet. The researchers found that participants in the program reported a decrease in their alcohol consumption of 11.73 drinks per month with their weekly blood alcohol content decreasing by 0.097. These results showed a significant difference in blood alcohol content post intervention.

Motivational interviewing. Motivational interviewing is a fairly new technique used on college and university campuses to assist in decreasing risky alcohol behaviors. LaBrie, Pedersen, Lamb, and Quinlan (2007) described motivational interviewing as

a non-judgmental, client-centered style of counseling founded on the basic principles of expressing empathy, developing discrepancy, rolling with resistance, and supporting efficacy. Strategies focus on helping individuals build motivation to change problem behaviors. (p. 890)

LaBrie et al. used the empathetic, non-confrontational style of motivational interviewing during their study to evaluate the effectiveness of a single-session group intervention. Group interventions were led by doctoral level facilitators and lasted between 60 and 90 minutes. There

were 10-15 first-year males assigned to each group. The three main components of motivating behavior change were normative education, alcohol expectancies, and motivation to change. The Timeline Followback (TLFB) was the assessment used to facilitate the motivating behavior process. In addition to the TLFB, normative feedback information, decisional balance to weigh the pros and cons of drinking behavior, relapse prevention, expectancy challenge information, and creation of behavior goals of the intervention were used in the process. Four variables were used to assess change among the participants: total drinks per month, drinking days per month, average drinks consumed per occasion in each month, and maximum drinks consumed at one time in each month. The results of the study revealed significant changes for all participants on all four of the variables from pre-intervention to follow-up.

A previous evaluation of motivational interviewing by Freeman (2001) reported similar results. Freeman also used group sessions of no more than six students, utilizing concepts from motivational interviewing for students who were in violation of their universities' code of student conduct. The intervention focused on lifelong goals and the role of alcohol in preventing one from achieving those goals. In addition personal values, ambitions, and personal responsibility and safety were discussed. Of the sixty-nine students who participated in the program, only 6 were referred to the judicial board again for violations of the code of conduct. Overall, the researchers found that the program reduced the number of repeat violators by 50%.

A study by Larimer, Turner, Anderson, Fader, Kilmer, Palmer et al.(2000) of motivational interviewing and its effects on the drinking of fraternity men found positive results using this intervention as well. Twelve randomly selected fraternities were used for the study. A total of 159 males were chosen to participate and completed the baseline assessment. The fraternity members were then randomly assigned to the treatment or control group. Students in

the treatment group received a 60-minute feedback session specifically tailored to the individual based on information provided from the baseline assessment and designed to provide information about skills that help promote moderate drinking. In addition, topics such as evaluation of drinking patterns, training in estimating blood alcohol concentration, and alcohol norms were discussed. The results of the study showed a significant reduction in overall drinking for those who participated in the intervention. The difference between this and prior studies discussed in this section is that the interviews were conducted on an individual basis. This was also the case in the study conducted by Borsari and Carey (2005), who found positive feedback from students who participated in motivational interviewing as an intervention.

Borsari and Carey predicted students participating in brief motivational interviewing (BMI) would report lower alcohol consumption upon completing the program than those in an alcohol education course. Brief motivational interviewing was defined as using the same techniques as motivational interviewing, but utilizing one or two 45 minute sessions. The results showed that students in both groups decreased their alcohol use upon completion of the interventions. The students who participated in the alcohol education course received as effective alcohol intervention as those who participated in the BMI. However, there were additional benefits to BMI over the alcohol education course alone. The results of the study showed that students participating in BMI reduced alcohol related problems at a higher rate than those in the alcohol education course. The researchers also found students in the BMI group showed more collaboration, engagement, and disclosure than those in the alcohol education course. This was attributed to the one-on-one nature of the BMI.

Parental Notification

Another strategy used to combat underage use and abuse of alcohol is a parental notification policy. The Buckley Amendment, or FERPA, was established to provide privacy rights to students at colleges and universities, and their parents. In 1974 Senator James Buckley (R-NY) sponsored new legislation that provided college students and their parents' access to student records, but also kept those records confidential from parties who had no reason to view them. Buckley stated that the purpose of the act was

To assure parents of students, and students themselves if they are over the age of eighteen or attending an institution of post-secondary education, access to their education records and to protect such individuals' rights to privacy by limiting the transferability [and disclosure] of their records without their consent. (Weeks, 2001)

This concern arose from issues of abuse of student records, mainly in elementary and secondary schools.

The Buckley Amendment became an addition to prior educational legislation in the summer of 1974 (Weeks, 2001). Buckley established the act for four main purposes: to provide students with the right to 1) access their educational records, 2) consent to the release of records to others, 3) challenge incorrect or inappropriate information, and 4) be notified of these rights. In addition to student rights covered under FERPA, there were several parental rights that were added to the original act only a few months after it became part of the educational legislation. Parents of dependent children have the right to access educational records as defined by Congress in sections (4) (a) (i) and (ii) of FERPA. Dependency is determined based on the student's dependent status according to the Internal Revenue Service. Also, any financial information, including income tax information, provided by parents to institutions may not be

accessed by students. In addition to these rights, FERPA provided two exceptions that allowed institutions to release information about students to their parents or guardians. In 1998 Congress amended FERPA to allow for parental notification when students under age 21 are found responsible for alcohol or drug violations. Many institutions now include parental notification as part of their student discipline processes.

Alcohol abuse has been found to be the number one problem on college campuses in the United States (Lake & Tribbensee, 2002; Lowery et al., 2002). Since the 1998 FERPA Amendment there has been a substantial increase in the number of colleges and universities that have adopted parental notification policies. Lowery et al. (2002) found that 45.8% of institutions they surveyed had some type of parental notification policy. Before the 1998 amendment, only 13.8% of institutions had parental notification policies and the majority of those institutions were private. Many institutions have adopted these policies in the hope of reducing recidivism in the campus discipline system. However, at some institutions, officials maintain that adopting such a policy under any circumstance defeats the purpose of treating college students as adults.

Reisberg (2001) reported that some college administrators believed it was important to treat college students as adults whether they behaved in that manner or not. Their position was that to contact parents about alcohol violations did not assist students in fighting battles for themselves. Although there have been mixed reactions to parental notification policies, institutions that have implemented the policy have reported decreases in reported alcohol violations. In one study, 45.8% of institutions with parental notification policies reported reductions in alcohol-related incidents (Lowery et al., 2002).

The University of Delaware is one example of a university that has seen a decrease in alcohol violations since implementing the policy. College administrators at Delaware reported that less than a quarter of students cited for alcohol violations were cited again once the parental notification policy was implemented. Similar results were reported at Virginia Tech University and Radford University, where parental notification policies were also implemented to assist in the reduction of alcohol policy violations (Reisberg, 1998).

There are a variety of methods for notifying parents. Some institutions notify parents for first alcohol violations, while others notify for second alcohol violations. Other institutions notify parents of alcohol violations depending on the seriousness of the situation related to the alcohol violation. Still others notify parents when suspension or dismissal is a possibility for the student. A combination of factors may be used to determine parental notification.

BGSU Alcohol and Parental Notification Policies

Students found in violation of campus alcohol policies face a range of possible sanctions. Some institutions warn students verbally or in writing for violating alcohol policies. Other institutions place students on disciplinary probation where they face possible fines, community service, required participation in alcohol abuse interventions, or other disciplinary actions (Wechsler et al., 2002). In addition to alcohol abuse interventions, such as Web-based alcohol intervention courses, classroom interventions, and motivational interviewing, parental notification is another strategy that is now being used by many colleges and universities as an educational sanction to address students' alcohol violations.

The present study examined the relationship between parental notification and recidivism of students who violated the alcohol policy at Bowling Green State University. The alcohol policy at BGSU states that "use, possession, or distribution of alcoholic beverages except as

expressly permitted by the law and University regulations” is prohibited (BGSU, 2008, p. 35) (Appendix B). Alcohol violations have mandatory sanctions. Students found responsible for underage use or possession for a first violation are placed on University warning for an academic year and must complete an alcohol education class or must meet with a certified chemical dependence counselor if they have already completed the required alcohol class (BGSU, 2008). Students found responsible for a second alcohol violation are placed on University disciplinary probation for an academic year and must attend alcohol screening and meetings with a certified chemical dependence counselor. In addition, their parents are notified of the violation. Third alcohol violators face suspension from the university. These sanctions are for students whose behavior is considered non-disruptive to the university community. Students who violate the alcohol policy and are behaving in a disruptive manner are placed on University disciplinary probation, are required to meet with a certified chemical dependence counselor, and have their parents notified on the first violation. The second disruptive violation results in possible suspension from the university. Disruptive behavior is considered any behavior that is “disruptive to the community, endangers the health and safety of others, or results in damage or vandalism to University property or property of members of the University community” (BGSU, 2008, p. 55).

A parental notification policy was implemented at BGSU in the fall of 1999 (Appendix A). Parents of students who violate the alcohol policy and meet certain conditions are notified by letter (Appendix C) as part of the student discipline process. Bowling Green State University’s policy states:

The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) gives colleges and universities the option to release specific types of information from a student's discipline record. University staff from the Office of the Dean of Students will notify parents/guardians when their student is found responsible for the use, sale or possession of controlled substances (illegal drugs) within the community. The Office of the Dean of Students will also notify parents or guardians when a student is found to have violated the Code of Student Conduct policies on the use and possession of alcohol when he/she is under the age of 21 and one or more of the following occurs:

1. When a student has been found to have violated the alcohol policy a second time;
2. When there is significant property damage;
3. When medical attention to any person, including the student, is required as a result of the student's alcohol-related behavior;
4. When the student demonstrates reckless disregard for his or her own personal safety or the safety of others; or
5. There is evidence that the student's alcohol-related behavior negatively impacted the learning environment. (BGSU, 2008, p. 61)

Summary

Providing students with information regarding alcohol policies and sanctions alone is an ineffective method for reducing underage and binge drinking among college students. Social norms campaigns alone have also been shown to be ineffective. According to Gintner and Choate (2003) primary education strategies such as social norms campaigns and dissemination of alcohol policy information is not effective in reducing risky behaviors related to alcohol consumption. However, when combined with secondary prevention programs such as

counseling, classes, and motivational interviewing, providing information about social norms and campus alcohol policies seem to make a difference in changing alcohol drinking behaviors which in turn lead to a reduction in recidivism rates. Parental notification is another strategy that has been shown to help in the reducing of recidivism (Lowery et al., 2002).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of the present study was to examine the relationship between parental notification and recidivism for students who violated the alcohol policy at Bowling Green State University. Specifically, this study examined the relationship of parental notification to students' subsequent reported alcohol policy violations. Secondary purposes were to develop a profile of students charged with violating the university alcohol policy, compare recidivism rates based on a number of demographic characteristics, and to compare persistence and graduation rates for students whose parents were and were not notified.

Data Sources

The data sources for this study were the student discipline program and institutional research databases. As permitted by Ohio law, the student discipline database maintains seven years of data on students who have violated the code of student conduct. It includes both university and residential discipline cases. This study examined university discipline cases.

University cases pertain to violations outside of campus housing, both on and off campus, and disruptive violations that occurred in residence halls. Residential cases are those in which non-disruptive first violations occurred in campus residence halls; these cases do not require parental notification. Students whose first violation was handled in the residential discipline system and who did not have a repeat violation were not included in this study. Students with a repeat violation in a residence hall are referred to university discipline, subject to parental notification, and included in this study.

Students are entered into the student discipline database whenever there is an allegation of a violation of the student code of conduct. Reports of possible violations are generally received by the student discipline program from the campus and city police departments, and from the office of residence life. Cases referred to the student discipline program from residence halls and Greek houses are typically second alcohol offenses, disruptive alcohol offenses, drug offenses, and other serious violations such as sexual or physical assault, burglary, or weapons possession (BGSU, 2008).

Using procedures approved by the BGSU Human Subjects Review Board, the list of students under age 21 who were found responsible for university-level violations of the campus alcohol policy between fall 2001 and spring 2008 was retrieved from the student discipline database by a full-time staff member in the dean of students office. Included in the list were student identification number, type of violation, and gender. This information was then submitted to the institutional research office to determine students' race/ethnicity, residency (on- or off-campus), class standing, grade point average for the semester of their first violation, and enrollment status one year after the violation. The merged data set, excluding student identification numbers, was then given to the researcher.

Major Variables

Independent Variables

The independent variable, also called the treatment or predictor variable, is an attribute or characteristic that influences the dependent variable. Independent variables are studied to determine their effect on the outcome, or dependent, variable and are measured independently of the dependent variable (Creswell, 2005). In the present study, parental notification was the primary independent variable. Specifically, it was the treatment variable. According to Creswell,

a treatment variable is “measured in categories (received or denied activities) to determine its effect on the outcome” (p. 123). In other words, in an experiment one group receives treatment, while another group does not to determine the treatment’s impact on the dependent variable. In the present study the independent variable, parental notification status, was examined based on student membership in one of five groups of students: no parental notification, parental notification for first disruptive alcohol violations with no repeat violation, parental notification for first disruptive alcohol violations with a repeat violation, parental notification for second alcohol violations with no repeat violation, and parental notification for second alcohol violations with a repeat violation. In addition, several minor independent variables (gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, and residency,) were used to address the demographic portion of the research.

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable, also called the outcome or criterion variable is influenced by or dependent on the independent variable. This variable can be categorical or continuous, and is generally the major interest in the study (Creswell, 2005). The primary dependent variable in the present study was recidivism. Recidivism is defined for the purpose of this study as being found responsible for violating the same alcohol policy based on the following two categories: first violation disruptive and second violation.

Research Questions

To examine the relationship between these variables, the following research questions were addressed:

1. What are the demographic characteristics (i.e., gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, and residency [on-or off-campus]) of students who were under age 21 and found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy?
2. Do gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, and residency (on-or off-campus) differ significantly for the following groups:
 - Group 1: Parents Not Notified
 - Group 2: Parents Notified – First violation disruptive with no repeat violation
 - Group 3: Parents Notified – First violation disruptive with repeat violation
 - Group 4: Parents Notified – Second violation with no repeat violation
 - Group 5: Parents Notified – Second violation with repeat violation
- 2a. Do gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, and residency (on- or off-campus) differ significantly for Group 1 and Groups 2-5 combined?
3. Are there statistically significant differences between students whose parents were not notified (Group 1) and students whose parents were notified (Groups 2-5 combined) regarding:
 - a. recidivism in the university discipline system for a subsequent alcohol policy violation
 - b. one-year retention rate at the university

4. To what extent are gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, residency (on- or off-campus), and parental notification (Group 1 vs. Groups 2-5 combined) related to an increase in the probability of recidivism in the university discipline system for a subsequent alcohol policy violation?

Data Analysis

Research question one was addressed through the use of descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The scales of measurement for both the independent and dependent variables were categorical (except grade point average), so chi-square test of proportions was used to analyze the data for research questions two and three. Chi-square analysis is used when both the independent and dependent variables are categorical and is the appropriate statistical test when the research categories are within group comparisons (Creswell, 2005). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze grade point average in question two. ANOVA is used when the “mean difference on a dependent variable (DV) between two or more treatment conditions” is evaluated and the dependent variable is continuous (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005, p. 67). The significance level for research questions two and three was set at 0.05.

Research question four used logistic regression as a means of analysis since the demographic characteristics were being used to predict group membership. Logistic regression is used “to predict values on a DV of two or more categories” (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005, p. 313). The dependent variable (DV) in logistic regression is categorical and can be dichotomous. The overall purpose of this statistical analysis is to compose a regression equation “of the sum of the products of weights and actual values on several predictor variables (IVs) in order to predict the values on the criterion variable (DV)” (Mertler & Vannatta, 2005, p. 313).

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

This chapter reports the findings of this study in the sequence of the four research questions. These questions are listed at the end of chapter three.

Population

The population examined in this study was students at Bowling Green State University who were under age 21 and had been found responsible in the university discipline system for violating the university alcohol policy between fall 2001 and spring 2008. The total number of students who met those criteria was 1139. Because matching data could not be obtained for seven of the students, only the remaining 1132 were included in the analysis. Of these, 373 (33%) students had their parents notified of their violation. The remaining 759 (67%) were students whose parents were not notified of their violation.

Demographic Characteristics of Students who Violated the Alcohol Policy

The first research question sought to determine the demographic characteristics of students included in this study. Frequencies and percentages were used to describe the population by gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, and residency. The mean and standard deviation were computed for grade point average. The data were screened for missing information and outliers using frequency distributions, histograms, and box plots. There were no reported grade point averages for 271 students who were first semester students at the time of their first violation since and had not yet earned grades; 251 were first-year students. These students were removed from any analysis concerning grade point average. The remaining data were screened for normality (skewness and kurtosis) and linearity (residuals). No unusual patterns were identified and thus no data transformations were necessary.

As shown in Table 1, the results showed that of those who violated the university alcohol policy, 90.0% were White while the other 10% were students of color. As a point of comparison, between fall 2001 and spring 2008, White students averaged 84.4% of the overall student body and students of color averaged 15.6%. Furthermore, 81.4% were male and 18.6% were female. During the period under study men averaged only 44.9% of the total student population. During this time first-year students and sophomores comprised 47.1% of the student body at BGSU. In the present study first-year students and sophomores made up 90.8% of students who violated the university alcohol policy. However, it is also likely that most first- and second-year students are under age 21.

The mean grade point average for students found responsible for violating the policy was 2.49 with a standard deviation of 0.78. Grade point averages for students who violated the university alcohol policy ranged from 0.00 to 4.00. Forty-seven percent of students found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy had a 2.50 or lower grade point average; 22% had percent had a grade point average below a 2.00. Between fall 2001 and spring 2008, 8.5% of the overall BGSU undergraduate population had grade point averages below 2.00. The mean grade point average for all BGSU undergraduates during that time period, however, was 2.59. The descriptive statistics for the grade point average excluded first-semester students who, at the time of their violation, did not yet have a reported grade point average.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Students Under Age 21 Found Responsible for Violating the University Alcohol Policy (N = 1132)

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Women	210	18.6
Men	922	81.4
Race/Ethnicity		
White	1019	90.0
Students of Color	113	10.0
Black	29	2.6
Hispanic	43	3.8
Asian	7	0.6
Native	8	0.7
Other	26	2.3
Class Standing		
First-year students	718	63.4
Sophomores	310	27.4
Juniors	71	6.3
Seniors	13	1.1
Graduate	2	0.2
Unknown	18	1.6
Residency		
On-campus	966	85.3
Off-campus	166	14.7

Demographic Characteristics and Parental Notification

The second research question sought to determine whether significant differences exist in the demographic characteristics of students in the following five groups:

Group 1: Parents Not Notified (n = 759; 67.0%)

Group 2: Parents Notified – First violation disruptive with no repeat violation (n = 306; 27.0%)

Group 3: Parents Notified – First violation disruptive with repeat violation (n = 28; 2.5%)

Group 4: Parents Notified – Second violation with no repeat violation (n = 34; 3.0%)

Group 5: Parents Notified – Second violation with repeat violation (n = 5; 0.4%)

The second part of research question two sought to determine whether significant differences existed in the demographic characteristics of students in Group 1 and Groups 2 – 5 combined. Categories within race/ethnicity and class standing were combined to compensate for the small number of cases in specific categories. The race/ethnicity data were analyzed in terms of White and students of color since several of the individual categories for students of color had a small number of cases. The number of juniors, seniors, and graduate students was also small, so those three categories were combined.

Chi-square analyses were conducted to determine whether gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, and residency differed significantly for students in Groups 1-5. The results showed a significant difference only for residency status among the five groups. Those found responsible for violations were more likely to reside on campus. When Group 1 was compared to Groups 2-5 (parents not notified versus parents notified) the results were slightly different. As shown in Table 2 the results of these chi-square analyses showed no significant differences in race/ethnicity or class standing. However, significant differences in gender ($p = .03$) and

residency ($p = < .01$) were found. Men and on-campus students were more likely than women and off-campus students to have their parents notified of their violation.

Table 2

Group Differences in the Demographic Characteristics of Students Whose Parents Were and Were Not Notified of Their Violation of the University Alcohol Policy

Characteristic/ Parental Notification	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>df</i>	χ^2	<i>p</i>
Gender	Women	Men	1	4.61	0.03*
Not Notified	154 (13.6%)	605 (53.4%)			
Notified	56 (5.0%)	317 (28.0%)			
Race/Ethnicity	White	Students of Color	1	2.33	0.13
Not Notified	676 (60.0%)	83 (7.0%)			
Notified	343 (30.0%)	30 (3.0%)			
Class Standing	First-year students	So/Jr/Sr/Grad/Unknown	1	2.66	0.10
Not Notified	469 (41.0%)	290 (26.0%)			
Notified	249 (22.0%)	124 (11.0%)			
Residency	On-campus	Off-campus	1	12.40	<.01*
Not Notified	628 (55.0%)	131 (12.0%)			
Notified	338 (30.0%)	35 (3.0%)			

Notes. Not Notified = Group 1; Notified = Groups 2-5. Percentages have been calculated based on the total sample size of 1,132.

The mean grade point average for students whose parents were notified (Groups 2-5) of their violation of the university alcohol policy was 2.45 and 2.51 for students whose parents were not notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. On average students whose parents were not notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy had higher grade point averages than those students whose parents were notified. As shown in Table 3, the results of the ANOVA, however, showed that this difference was not statistically significant.

Table 3

One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Grade Point Average of Students Whose Parents Were and Were Not Notified of Their Violation of the University Alcohol Policy

Parental Notification Status	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Not Notified	569	2.51	0.78	1	1.30	0.26
Notified	292	2.45	0.78			

Note. Not Notified = Group 1; Notified = Groups 2-5.

Parental Notification and Recidivism

Part A of the third research question sought to determine the relationship between parental notification status and recidivism in the discipline system for a subsequent alcohol policy violation. Two different analyses were run. The first compared recidivism in the campus discipline system of those whose first violation was non-disruptive and therefore not subject to parental notification (Groups 1, 4, and 5) to those whose first violation was disruptive and therefore subject to parental notification (Groups 2 and 3).

As shown in Table 4, the chi-square analysis showed a significant difference ($p = .02$) in the recidivism rates of students whose parents were not notified of their first violation ($n = 798$; 70.0%) and those whose parents were notified ($n = 334$; 30%). Of those whose parents were not notified of their first violation 759 (95.0%) did not have a repeat violation while 39 (5.0%) did. Specifically, students whose parents were not notified of their first violation of the university alcohol policy were less likely than those whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation to violate the university alcohol policy again. It should be noted that parents are notified after a first violation only if that violation was disruptive; in other words, the initial violation was more serious.

Table 4

Group Differences in Recidivism for Students Whose Parents Were and Were Not Notified of Their First Violation of the University Alcohol Policy

Recidivism	First Non-disruptive Parents Not Notified		First Disruptive Parents Notified		df	χ^2	p
	n	%	n	%			
Did Not Repeat	759	(67.0%)	306	(27.0%)	1	5.17	0.02*
Repeat	39	(3.0%)	28	(3.0%)			

Notes. Not Notified = Groups 1, 4, & 5; Notified = Groups 2 & 3. Percentages have been calculated based on the total sample size of 1,132.

The second analysis of the relationship between parental notification and recidivism examined only those students whose parents were notified of a violation ($N = 373$). It compared recidivism of those students whose parents were notified for a first violation that was disruptive to those notified of a second violation. As shown in Table 5, there was no significant difference in recidivism for students whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation (Groups 2 and 3) and those whose parents were notified of their second alcohol violation (Groups 4 and 5). Overall, just 33 students had another violation following parental notification. That represents 9% of the 373 whose parents were notified and 3% of the 1132 students in the study.

Table 5

Group Differences in Recidivism for Students Whose Parents Were Notified of Their First Disruptive or Second Violation of the University Alcohol Policy

Recidivism	First Violation Disruptive		Second Violation		df	χ^2	p
	n	%	n	%			
Did Not Repeat	306	(82.0%)	34	(9.0%)	1	0.85	0.36
Repeat	28	(8.0%)	5	(1.0%)			

Notes. First violation disruptive = Groups 2 & 3; Second violation = Groups 4 & 5. Percentages have been calculated based on the total sample size of 373.

The vast majority of students (94%) who were found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy were not found responsible for violating the policy again, regardless of whether or not their parents were notified of their violation. Table 6 provides a closer

examination of the 33 students with a repeat violation following parental notification. Of those 33 students, 30 were male, 31 were White, 26 were first-year students, and 30 resided on campus.

Table 6

Demographic Characteristics of Students Found Responsible for Violating the University Alcohol Policy and Who Were Repeat Violators

Recidivism	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Male		Female	
	30	91	3	9
Race/Ethnicity	White		Students of Color	
	31	94	2	6
Class Standing	First-year students		Soph/Jr/Sr/Grad/Unknown	
	26	84	7	16
Residency	On-campus		Off-campus	
	30	91	3	9

Parental Notification and Retention

Part B of the third research question examined the relationship between parental notification status and one-year retention at the university. Retention was coded as being enrolled, graduated, or neither. Since only seven students had graduated one-year after their violation, they were combined with those who were still enrolled. No student was found to have

been dismissed from BGSU for disciplinary reasons. If students were no longer enrolled or had not graduated, they either left on their own or were dismissed for academic reasons.

As shown in Table 7 the chi-square analysis showed no significant difference in one-year retention for students whose parents were and were not notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. In both instances of parental notification status the number of students still enrolled or who had graduated one year later was greater than those who were not enrolled or had not graduated. Seventy-one percent of all students who violated the university alcohol policy were still enrolled or had graduated one year later, while 29% were not enrolled and had not graduated.

Table 7

Group Differences in One-Year Retention for Students Whose Parents Were and Were Not Notified of Their Violation of the University Alcohol Policy

Retention	Not Notified		Notified		<i>df</i>	χ^2	<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%			
Enrolled/Graduated	533	(47.0%)	266	(24.0%)	1	0.14	0.71
Neither	226	(20.0%)	107	(9.0%)			

Note. Percentages have been calculated based on the total sample size of 1132.

Recidivism Predictions

The final research question sought to predict recidivism based on demographic characteristics and parental notification status. Logistic regression was conducted to determine which independent variables (gender, race/ethnicity, class standing, grade point average, residency, and parental notification) were predictors of recidivism (repeat violation or no repeat violation). The independent variable parental notification was modified to accurately represent a comparison between parental notification for first violations for which parents were and were not notified. The newly created variable, violation, was based on first non-disruptive violations for which parents were not notified and first disruptive violations in which parents were notified.

Wald statistics indicated that grade point average and violation significantly predicted recidivism; however, regression results indicated that the overall model fit of the two predictors (grade point average and violation) was moderate ($-2 \text{ Log Likelihood} = 243.92$, Goodness-of-fit = 393.73). The model correctly classified 97.1% of the cases, but the model summary showed that less than half of the variation in the dependent variable can be explained by the predictors. Regression coefficients are presented in Table 8. Odds ratios for these variables indicated that as the variable grade point average increased, the odds of having a repeat alcohol violation decreased, and as the variable violation changed from non-disruptive to disruptive the odds of a subsequent alcohol violation increased.

Table 8

Regression Coefficients for Recidivism Predictions

Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>Wald</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Exp(B)</i>
Grade Point Average	2.74	30.27	1	< .01*	15.41
Violation	-0.86	4.45	1	.04*	.42

Summary of Significant Findings

In summary, violators of the university alcohol policy were more likely to be men and on-campus residents than women or off-campus students. These students were also significantly more likely to have their parents notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. Regarding recidivism in the university discipline system, students whose parents were not notified of their first violation of the university alcohol policy were significantly less likely than those whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation of the university alcohol policy to violate the policy again. Finally, the *Wald* statistics indicated that two variables—grade point average and violation type (disruptive versus non-disruptive)—significantly predicted recidivism. The overall model fit of the two predictors was moderate with the independent variables accounting for 20.3% ($R^2 = .203$) of the variance in the dependent variable. Other variables not included in this study may also influence recidivism.

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship of parental notification to students' subsequent reported alcohol policy violations at Bowling Green State University and their retention one year after the violation. Secondary purposes were to develop a profile of students under age 21 who violated the alcohol policy and to examine the relationship of demographic characteristics to parental notification, recidivism, and retention.

In previous surveys administrators have reported that students whose parents were notified of their violation of campus alcohol policies were less likely to violate the alcohol policy again, although they did not provide empirical data to support that claim (Lowery et al., 2002; Palmer et al., 2001). However, no studies were found that addressed recidivism to the campus conduct system comparing students whose parents were and were not notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy.

Demographic Profile of Students under Age 21 Who Violated the Alcohol Policy

Results from the first research question revealed that students under age 21 who were found responsible for violating the alcohol policy were primarily male, White, first-year students and sophomores, and on-campus residents. Although research has not produced a demographic profile of students most likely to have their parents notified of their violation of campus alcohol policies, the findings here support Dannells' (1997) claim that those who most often face disciplinary problems "have a fairly clear and consistent profile: impulsive young men, most often freshmen and sophomores . . . who very likely were engaged in alcohol use or abuse at the time of the incident" (p. 25). He also claimed these students have not developed positive feelings

toward the institution. This may help explain the attrition rate of students whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation.

This profile is also similar to other findings regarding students most at-risk for underage drinking. First-year students were considered one of the top three populations at-risk for alcohol abuse (Century Council, n.d.). Wechsler and Isaac (1991) reported that all first-year students in their study had consumed alcoholic beverages, and 88% reported they had drunk alcoholic beverages within the past year. Although the differences were not statistically significant in this current study, a greater number of first-year students were found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy than those with sophomore status or higher. This was consistent with the results reported by Taylor et al. (2006) where there was no significant difference in class levels of students who reported binge drinking.

That 90% of the violators in this study were White is consistent with research showing that White students participated in high risk drinking at significantly higher rates than students of color (Taylor et al., 2006; Meilman et al., 1994; O'Malley & Johnston, 2002; Kahler et al., 2003). Frequency distributions showed that men (81.4%) represented a higher percentage of the violators of the university alcohol policy than women (18.6%). The literature reported overwhelmingly that men participated in high risk drinking behaviors significantly more than women (Geisner et al., 2004 & Taylor et al., 2006).

Finally, the mean grade point average of students in this study who were found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy was 2.49. Other research has shown that binge drinking had a significant impact on study hours and grade point average (Taylor et al., 2006; Paschall & Freisthler, 2003; Wolaver, 2002). Students who participated in risky drinking

behaviors often had lower grade point averages. These behaviors were predicted to reduce study hours on average of almost an hour and a half per day (Wolaver, 2002).

The second research question addressed the relationship between demographic characteristics and parental notification. The results showed no significant differences in race/ethnicity, class standing, and grade point average for students whose parents were and were not notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. However, two variables were significantly related to parental notification: gender and residency. These differences are discussed in the next two sections.

Gender and Parental Notification

More men than women were found responsible for violating the alcohol policy and men were significantly more likely than women to have their parents notified of their violation. Again, although other research has not examined gender in relation to parental notification, the preponderance of men in campus discipline processes is consistent with other findings (Dannells, 1997). It also reflects American culture and society. Underage drinking is related to social, cultural, and biological factors that account for adolescent development, environmental influences, and personal characteristics in a young person's decision to use alcohol (US Department of Health & Human Services, 2007). Harper, Harris and Mmeje (2005) developed a theoretical model to help explain why male college students are overrepresented among university discipline offenders. The model includes six variables, (1) pre-college socialization, (2) male gender role conflict, (3) social construction of masculinities, (4) development of competence and self-efficacy, (5) context-bound gendered social norms, and (6) environmental ethos and corresponding behaviors. These variables may help explain the impacts of social constructions of masculinities on how male college students define themselves as men through

behaviors like underage drinking. These gender roles may contribute to the reasons that men were more likely to be found responsible for violating the campus alcohol policy and that those violations meet the criteria for parental notification in that they are disruptive or damaging in nature.

Residency Status and Parental Notification

On-campus residents were significantly more likely than off-campus residents to have their parents notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. BGSU has a two year residency requirement requiring first-year students and sophomores to live in university housing unless they meet certain qualifications for exemption. Consequently, large numbers of underage students reside in campus housing. It is also possible that the greater number of violations reported on campus is the result of better enforcement. A group of underage students drinking in their residence hall room may be more likely to attract the attention of a resident advisor than a group in an off-campus house or apartment would be to be confronted by local police.

Recidivism in the Discipline System

The third and fourth research questions addressed the relationship of parental notification status and demographic characteristics to recidivism in the university discipline system for a subsequent alcohol policy violation. Two demographic characteristics, parental notification status and grade point average, were significantly related to recidivism.

Regarding recidivism, of the 1132 students under age 21 were found responsible for violating the campus alcohol policy, 94% did not have a subsequent reported violation, whether or not parents were notified. Most initial violations (67%) did not warrant parental notification. Of the 798 students whose parents were not notified of their initial violation, only 5% had another reported violation. In contrast, of the 373 students whose parents were notified following

their first violation, 18% were found responsible for another violation. Of the 33 students who had a repeat violation following parental notification, 85% had a first disruptive violation.

Following their experience in the campus conduct system, most students were able to align their behaviors to campus expectations or avoid detection of their violations. This could indicate that campus conduct officers were effective in engaging students and helping students make better choices and could also mean that secondary interventions such as alcohol education classes and other sanctions impacted students' choices. However, it is not known whether students actually curtailed their underage consumption or were just more effective in not getting caught. It is plausible that they continued to drink underage but engaged in less risky or disruptive behaviors that did not attract the attention of resident advisors, campus or city police, or other campus officials.

The high percentage of students who were not found responsible for violating the policy again could also be attributed to the fact that BGSU incorporates a variety of strategies to prevent binge and underage drinking. As suggested by the NIAAA, a combination of both primary and secondary strategies has been found to be most effective in reducing risky alcohol behaviors on college campuses. BGSU, in addition to disseminating information annually about the alcohol policy, participates in a social norms campaign. Also, students who were found responsible for violating the alcohol policy were either sanctioned to meet with a licensed chemical dependency counselor where motivational interviewing was used, or a face-to-face alcohol education class. These methods have been found to be most effective when working with this population of students (Larimer et al., 2000; Walters et al., 2001; Freeman, 2001).

Recidivism and Parental Notification Status

In the present study the relationship between parental notification and recidivism to the campus conduct process for a subsequent alcohol violation was examined. The parental notification policy at BGSU is enacted for students who are found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy for the first time where the violation is disruptive in nature, and for students who are found responsible for violating the policy for a second time. Students whose first violations were disruptive in nature means that in addition to violating the alcohol policy they were also found responsible for violating another policy such as disorderly conduct, theft, damage to property, or some other policy within the code of student conduct.

The results of this research showed that students whose parents were not notified of their first violation were significantly less likely to be found responsible for violating the campus policy again than those whose parents were notified of their first violation of the university alcohol policy where the violation was disruptive. The results also showed that there was no significant difference in recidivism between students whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation and their second violation. However, the logistic regression model showed that when the first violation was disruptive, resulting in parental notification, the likelihood of a repeat violation increased.

Of the cases of parental notification, 334 (90%) resulted from students' first disruptive violation and 39 (10%) from a second violation. Perkins (2002) found that the potential negative consequences of college drinking were divided into three categories: damage to self, damage to other people, and institutional costs. Damage to self included personal injuries, suicide, and impaired driving. Damage to other people included property damage, sexual violence, and fights. Institutional costs included student attrition, legal costs, and poor "town-gown" relations.

Wechsler et al. (2002) reported that about 5% of college students, as a result of drinking, are involved with the city or campus police department, and approximately 110,000 students are arrested for an alcohol-related violation each year. Approximately 11% of college students reported that while under the influence of alcohol they have damaged property. In addition to the behavioral issues, another concern is that in most of these cases, students who participated in these disruptive behaviors did not necessarily see them as a problem (Perkins, 2002). When undergraduate students were asked if disruptive behavior such as fighting or sexually aggressive behaviors after drinking were indicative of an alcohol problem, approximately half of the men in the study believed it was not a problem if the behavior happened only once a month.

In this study, students whose parents were notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy fell into two main groups: first disruptive violators and second violators. First disruptive violators represented 90% of students whose parents were notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy while second violators represented only 10% of all students whose parents were notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. Of the students whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation, 92% did not violate the policy again. In addition, of the students whose parents were notified of their second violation of the university alcohol policy 87% did not violate the policy again. Of the 798 students whose parents were not notified of their first violation, 95% did not have a subsequent violation. Parental notification as a strategy to reduce disruptive behaviors with alcohol abuse may have led to conversations between parents and students that were effective in reducing recidivism. Also, students may have been deterred by the fact that an additional violation in both cases would lead to suspension from the university.

Recidivism and Grade Point Average

The results of the logistic regression in the present study showed that grade point average, along with violation, was one of the predictors of recidivism when compared with other independent variables, accounting for 20.3% of the variance. The mean grade point average of students who were under age 21 and were found responsible for violating the alcohol policy was 2.49. The results of the logistic regression confirmed that as grade point average increased, the likelihood of a repeat violation decreased. Students whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation and who violated the policy again had a mean 2.36 grade point average. This is in comparison to students whose parents were not notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy (2.51), those whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation, but who did not violate the policy again (2.45), and those whose parents were notified of their second violation of the university alcohol policy, but who did not violate the policy again (2.54). The mediocre grade point average for students who violated the university alcohol policy could be attributed to the fact that students who engage in risky alcohol behaviors are at a greater risk for missing class and studying less due to their drinking behaviors. Wolaver (2002) reported that students who participated in risky drinking behaviors often had lower grade point averages because these behaviors were predicted to reduce study hours on average of almost an hour and a half per day. Also, risky drinking behaviors were predicted to reduce the probability of an “A” cumulative grade point average by 12%-18%. Taylor et al. (2006) reported similar results for students who participated in risky alcohol behaviors. These students reported grade point averages lower than 2.00 while students with lower rates of risky alcohol behaviors reported grade point averages of 3.50 or higher.

Retention

The third research question also addressed the relationship of parental notification status and demographic characteristics to one-year retention at the university. Although the results of the chi-square analysis showed no significant differences in the one-year retention rates of students who were found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy based on parental notification, frequency distributions showed that 67% of students whose parents were not notified of a violation were retained one year later versus just 33% of students whose parents were notified. Interestingly, of the five students whose parents were notified after their second violation who went on to have another violation, all were White men who lived on campus. Three were first-year students and two were sophomores. Four were in their first semester at the university when they had their first reported violation and so did not yet have a grade point average. The fifth student had a 1.91 GPA. Three of the five were not enrolled one year later.

A potential explanation for this is that students whose parents were not notified had less serious violations and did not have a subsequent reported violation. Students whose parents were notified had more serious initial violations or a subsequent violation, arguably demonstrating poor decision making and an inability or lack of willingness to conform to behavioral expectations. Some in this group were also in academic jeopardy. For example, the mean grade point average of students whose parents were notified of their first violation and then had another violation had an average 2.36. BGSU students whose grade point average falls below a 2.00 are placed on academic warning unless their grade point average falls in an academic probation, suspension, or dismissal range, which could be from 0.00 to 1.89 depending on class standing. The disciplinary issues of these students combined with their subpar academic performance may put them at greater risk for attrition. A variety of factors beyond the scope of this study may help

to explain this attrition. They could have transferred to another institution, been suspended academically, lost parental support due to their academic and/or discipline issues, or decided not to return for other issues.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Bowling Green State University is a residential campus housing 7,328 undergraduates of its 17,874 undergraduate and graduate students. About 8% of its student population is found in violation of the university alcohol policy annually. The implications from this study pertain not only to the work of BGSU, but may serve as recommendations for how to best meet the needs of underage students who violate campus alcohol policies at similar institutions. The ideas set forth in this section are centered on the results from this study.

Gender and Underage Drinking

It has been well documented that male college students participate in risky drinking behaviors, especially underage drinking, more often than female college students (Geisner et al., 2004; O'Malley & Johnston, 2002; Taylor et al. 2006). The results of this study were no different. Of the students who were found responsible for violating the campus alcohol policy 81.4% were male. It has been reported that the problem of underage drinking, in many cases, began before students entered higher education. According to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2007), half of all boys and girls have had a whole drink of alcohol by the age of 15. Higher education needs to be a part of K-12 efforts to decrease underage drinking, especially in boys. Since underage drinking extends beyond high school into college, higher education needs to recognize the importance middle and high school alcohol behaviors have on alcohol behaviors in college and find ways to maximize the role of higher education to be an early influence in the lives of young men and women. Adolescence is typically a time when

young people engage in risky behaviors, including experimenting with alcohol (US Department of Health and Human Services, 2007). Outreach programs related to males and drinking behaviors need to begin in eighth and ninth grade when students are just beginning to decide whether or not to experiment with drugs and alcohol. These outreach programs are also beneficial for females since they are beginning to catch up to males in terms of underage alcohol use (Young, Morales, McCabe, Boyd, & D'Arcy, 2004). The sooner prevention strategies are implemented, the better parents and students will understand the impact that early alcohol use can have on college and early adulthood alcohol use and abuse.

Residency and Underage Drinking

In the present study, of students who violated the university alcohol policy, on-campus students were more likely than off-campus students to violate the alcohol policy and significantly more likely than off-campus students to have their parents notified of this violation. The Century Council (n.d.) reported that first-year students, athletes, and members of fraternities and sororities were at a greater risk for alcohol abuse than any other college population. Higher education provides many types of programs for intervention and prevention of underage and binge drinking. However, based on the results of this study more effort needs to go into working with on-campus students regarding intervention and prevention strategies. Social norms campaigns and dissemination of information required by the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act has been shown to be insufficient in assisting students with alcohol control. There needs to be more work in the residence halls related to intervention and prevention. Programming related to consequences of underage and binge drinking needs to be incorporated in regular floor programming and floor meetings. Collaborations between campus officials and

those in the community may help address issues related to underage consumption that occur off campus as well.

Retention and Parental Notification

Twenty-nine percent of students who violated the university alcohol policy were neither enrolled nor had graduated one academic year later. Three of the five students whose parents were notified of their second violation who then had a subsequent violation were not enrolled one year later. None of these students were dismissed from BGSU for disciplinary reasons, so they were either dismissed for academic reasons or chose not to re-enroll for other reasons. The data in the present study showed that students whose parents were notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy were less likely to re-enroll or have graduated one academic year later than students whose parents were not notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. It is possible, however, that these students re-enrolled at a later time or transferred to another institution.

Colleges and universities need to determine the impact parental notification for violations of the university alcohol policy have on students' decisions not to re-enroll. One of the arguments for parental notification as a strategy for decreasing college students' risky alcohol behaviors is that parents can sometimes serve as a source of positive support for students. Also, parents may be an additional source of information and support for administrators working with students who violate the university alcohol policy. However, with many colleges and universities, including BGSU, being concerned with enrollment management issues, primarily retention, having over 30% of students whose parents have been notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy departing one academic year after their violation is cause for concern.

Retention issues at BGSU have become such a concern that in 2008, a professional enrollment-management consulting firm, was brought in to create a plan to improve enrollment in the future (BGSU, n.d.). Retention reports show that BGSU is experiencing a steady decrease in enrollment. For example, from fall 2004 to spring 2007, retention rates declined each year, averaging of 91.4% for the period.

Colleges and universities that employ parental notification as a strategy to reduce risky alcohol behaviors and who are concerned with retention should work closely with parents to determine reasons why students whose parents are notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy depart in higher numbers than those whose parents are not notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. For example, the high number of students who do not re-enroll at BGSU one academic year later who had their parents notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy could be due to parents deciding not to fund education for students who violate the alcohol policy, or it could be due to more serious alcohol issues that require additional treatment not provided by the university. Colleges and universities need to work closely with the parents of students who have violated the university alcohol policy to ensure re-enrollment for students who have not been dismissed due to academic reasons, but whose reasons for not re-enrolling may be due to parental concerns. One way this could be accomplished is through the parental notification letter. In addition to addressing straightforward policy matters, the letters could provide information regarding resources available on campus for students including academic advisors and student organizations. A purpose of the letter could be to encourage strong academic and social engagement at the institution with the goal of promoting academic success and retention and discouraging continued policy violations.

Academics and Parental Notification

Student conduct/discipline offices need to collaborate with academic advisors to find successful ways of working with these students. Disciplinary sanctions for students who violate the student code of conduct at BGSU are educational in nature. A possible way of working with students with low grade point averages who violate the university alcohol policy is to assign educational sanctions that require frequent meetings with academic advisors; this method of advising is known as intrusive academic advising. Research shows that intrusive academic advising methods, which include developmental advising and frequency of meetings, are most effective when working with students on academic probation (Heisserer & Parette, 2002; Jeschke, Johnson, & Williams, 2001). Developmental academic advising incorporates interactive teaching, counseling and administrative strategies to help students reach their career, developmental, learning, and life goals (Creamer & Creamer, 1994). Garing (1993) found that student retention increased when structured intervention strategies were used in academic advising of students on academic probation.

Academics and Recidivism

Students who continue to participate in risky alcohol behaviors and who continue to violate the university alcohol policy are at greater risk for attrition. Implementation of an academic outreach program for students who violate the university alcohol policy and whose grade point averages are below 2.00 is a necessity. Although the mean grade point average for students found responsible for violating the university alcohol policy was a 2.49, academic outreach is just as important. Of the 861 students with a reported grade point average, 45% had below a 2.50. Students whose grade point average falls below a 2.00 are in danger of academic warning, probation, dismissal, or suspension. An additional 271 students had a reported violation

in their first semester at the university, something that may not bode well academically for many of them. Interventions need to extend beyond the student discipline/conduct office. Conduct professionals should collaborate with other academic and student affairs units to find ways to maximize support for these students. This outreach needs to begin following the first violation before students violate the university alcohol policy again. Students need to understand the relationship between their behaviors and their academic performance and how that puts them at high risk for attrition.

Behavioral Issues and Underage Drinking

First disruptive violators represented 90% of students whose parents were notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy, while second violators represented only 10% of all students whose parents were notified of their violation of the university alcohol policy. Students found responsible for first disruptive violations, in addition to receiving motivational interviewing from a licensed chemical dependency counselor, also need to be sanctioned to meet with a counseling center professional. Preferably a counselor, whose specialty is working with individuals who engage in violent or destructive behaviors or who have emotional management issues, should work with these students. It is evidenced from research that students do not see their disruptive behavior as a problem. A professional counselor would be able to work with these students to help them to understand the impact their behaviors have on themselves and others, as well as work with them to determine why this type of behavior is acceptable for someone who has been drinking. If there are behaviors students also engage in when they are sober, counseling center professionals would be able to work with them in this respect also.

Limitations of Study and Recommendations for Future Research

The study is limited by its single institution design; the population was from a large regional state institution. A similar study that includes multiple institutions, different institutional types, and different parental notification policies may yield different results. Because a greater percentage of students whose parents were notified of their violation were not enrolled one year later, investigation into the reasons for that attrition would shed more light on that problem and what role, if any, parental notification played in the decision to not reenroll. It helps to know if students were dismissed academically, transferred to another institution, dropped out, or stopped out.

Quantitative data provides only a glimpse into the relationship between parental notification and recidivism. Qualitative studies may help provide a better understanding of the impact parental notification has on students' future decisions regarding underage alcohol consumption and help campus officials understand whether students did curtail their drinking or continued but avoided detection. It would also help to ascertain what factors may have influenced their decisions (e.g., the disciplinary hearing, sanctions including alcohol education, and the potential of disciplinary suspension for future violations).

Summary

The National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse has suggested that in order for colleges and universities to be effective in dealing with underage alcohol use and abuse, a variety of strategies must be used. The NIAAA also suggested that some strategies such as social norming and dissemination of alcohol information are more effective when combined with others strategies such as behavioral interviewing and alcohol education courses. Parental notification is a strategy that has been implemented at many colleges and universities, but has been discussed

very little in the literature. The research that does exist about parental notification as a strategy to reduce underage alcohol has not included empirical data to support its claim that parental notification is an effective method in reducing recidivism rates for students who have violated the campus alcohol policy (Lowery et al., 2002).

The results of the present study showed that when parental notification was examined in terms of recidivism for students who violated the campus alcohol policy students whose parents were not notified of their first violation were significantly less likely than students whose parents were notified of their first disruptive violation to be found responsible for a subsequent alcohol violation. This suggests that the nature of the initial violation may be more important than parental notification. Furthermore, students whose parents were notified of their violation of the campus alcohol policy for first disruptive violations were no more likely than students who violated the campus alcohol policy for a second time to be found responsible for violating the campus alcohol policy again.

Parental notification, like most primary strategies recommended by the NIAAA, generally is not effective alone. However, when combined with secondary strategies, primary strategies are more effective. Bowling Green State University uses parental notification in conjunction with a variety of other strategies, both primary and secondary. Strategies not measured in this study may have had an impact on recidivism. Parental notification, combined with additional strategies employed by BGSU may have impacted students' decisions not to violate the alcohol policy again. Additional research on parental notification is needed before it can be eliminated as a viable strategy to reduce recidivism.

REFERENCES

- Baker, T. H. (2005). Notifying parents after a suicide attempt: Let's talk about it. *National On-Campus Report*, 34(1), 4-5.
- Barnett, L. A., Far, J. M., Mauss, A. L., & Miller, J. A. (1996). Changing perceptions of peer norms as a drinking reduction program for college students. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 41(2), 39-62.
- Bersamin, M., Paschall, M. J., Fearnow-Kenney, M., & Wyrick, D. (2006). Short-term evaluation of a Web-based college alcohol misuse and harm prevention course (College Alc). *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 50(3), 49-65.
- Bickel, R. D., & Lake, P. F. (1997). The emergence of new paradigms in student-university relations: From in loco parentis to bystander to facilitator. *Journal of College and University Law*, 23, 755-795.
- Blanchard, J. (2007). University tort liability and student suicide: Case review and implications for practice. *Journal of Law and Education*, 36, 461-477.
- Borsari, B., & Carey, K. B. (2005). Two brief alcohol interventions for mandated college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 19, 296-302.
- Bowden, R. (2007). Evolution of responsibility: From in loco parentis to ad meliora vertamur. *Education*, 127, 480-489.
- Bowling Green State University. (n.d.). *Academic affairs updates: Strategies explored for improving retention*. Retrieved May 11, 2009, from <http://www.bgsu.edu/offices/provost/news/retention.html>
- Bowling Green State University. (2008). *BGSU Student Handbook 2008-2009*. Bowling Green, OH: Author.

Century Council. (n.d.). Alcohol 101 Plus. Retrieved September 30, 2008, from

<http://www.centurycouncil.org>

Congressional Record. July 9, 1998, pp. 7827-7857.

Creamer, D. G., & Creamer, E. G. (1994). Practicing developmental advising: Theoretical contexts and functional applications. *NACADA Journal*, 14, 17-24.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle, NJ: Pearson Education.

Dannells, M. (1997). *From discipline to development: Rethinking student conduct in higher education*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report (Vol. 25, No. 2). Washington, DC: The George Washington University Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

DeJong, W. (1998). What college presidents can do about student drinking. *About Campus*, 3(3), 12-17.

Eisel v. Board of Education of Montgomery County, No. 139, 1991 Md. LEXIS 184, at (A.L.R. Md. September 2000).

Family Educational Rights & Privacy Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1232g (1998).

Freeman, M. S. (2001). Innovative alcohol education program for college and university judicial sanctions. *Journal of College Counseling*, 4, 179-185.

Garing, M. T. (1993). Intrusive academic advising. In King, M.C. (Ed). *Academic advising* (pp. 97-104). New Directions for Community Colleges, no. 82, Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Periodicals.

Geisner, I. M., Larimer, M. E., & Neighbors, C. (2004). The relationship among alcohol use, related problems, and symptoms of psychological distress: Gender as a moderator in a college sample. *Addictive Behaviors*, 29, 843-848.

- Gifis, S. H. (Ed.). (2003). *Barron's Law Dictionary* (5th ed.). Hauppauge, NY: Barron's Educational Series.
- Gintner, G. G., & Choate, L. H. (2003). Stage-matched motivational interventions for college student binge drinkers. *Journal of College Counseling*, 6, 99-113.
- Harper, S. R., Harris III, F., & Mmeje, K. C. (2005). A theoretical model to explain the overrepresentation of college men among campus judicial offenders: Implications for campus administrators. *NASPA Journal*, 42, 565-588.
- Heisserer, D. L., & Parette, P. (2002). Advising at-risk students in college and university settings. *College Student Journal*, 36(1), 69-83.
- Henning, G. (2007). Is in consortio cum parentibus the new in loco parentis? *NASPA Journal*, 44, 538-560.
- Hingson, R. W., Heeren, T., Zakocs, R.C., Kopstein, A., & Wechsler, H. (2002). Magnitude of alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among US college students ages 18-24. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 63, 136-144.
- Janosik, S. M. (2001). The impact of the Campus Crime Awareness Act of 1998 on student decision-making. *NASPA Journal*, 38, 348-360.
- Jeschke, M. P., Johnson, K. E., & Williams, J. R. (2001). A comparison of intrusive and prescriptive advising of psychology majors at an urban comprehensive university. *NACADA Journal*, 21(1,2), 46-58.
- Kahler, C. W., Read, J. P., Wood, M. D., & Palfai, T. P. (2003). Social environmental selection as a mediator of gender, ethnic, and personality effects on college student drinking, *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 17, 226-234.

- Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (2007). *The law of higher education* (4th ed., Student Version). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LaBrie, J. W., Pedersen, E. R., Lamb, T. F., & Quinlan, T. (2007). A campus-based motivational enhancement group intervention reduces problematic drinking in freshmen male college students. *Addictive Behaviors*, 32, 889-901.
- Lake, P. F., & Tribbensee, N. (2002). The emerging crisis of college student suicide: Law and policy responses to serious forms of self-inflicted injury. *Stetson Law Review*, 32, 125-157.
- Larimer, M. E., Turner, A. P., Anderson, B. K., Fader, J. S., Kilmer, J. R., Palmer, R. S., et al. (2000). Evaluating a brief alcohol intervention with fraternities. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 62, 370-380.
- Larsen, J. D., & Kozar, B. (2005). Evaluation of a computer administered alcohol education program for college students. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education*, 49(4), 69-83.
- Lowery, J. W., Palmer, C. J., & Gehring, D. D. (2002). Policies and practices of parental notification for student alcohol violations. *NASPA Journal*, 42, 415-429.
- Meilman, P. W., Presley, C. A., & Lysterla, R. (2004). Black college students and binge drinking. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 4, 70-71.
- Mertler, C. A., & Vannatta, R. A. (2005). *Advanced and multivariate statistical methods* (3rd edition). Glendale, CA: Pyrczak.
- Miley, W. M., & Frank, M. (2006). Binge and non-binge college students' perceptions of other students' drinking habits. *College Student Journal*, 40, 259-262.

- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2002). Preventing alcohol-related problems on college campuses. Retrieved on September 21, 2008, from <http://www.niaaa.nih.gov>
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. (2007). October 2007 alcohol alert. Retrieved on September 21, 2008, from <http://www.niaaa.nih.gov>
- O'Malley, P. M., & Johnston, L. D. (2002). Epidemiology of alcohol and other drug use among American college students, *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 14, 23-39.
- Outside the Classroom. (2008). Alcholedu. Retrieved on September 30, 2008, from <http://www.outsidedtheclassroom.com>
- Palmer, C. J., & Gehring, D. D. (Eds.). (1992). *A handbook for complying with the program and review requirements of the 1989 amendments to the drug-free schools and communities act*. Ashville, NC: College Administration Corporation.
- Palmer, C. J., Gehring, D. D., & Guthrie, V. L. (1992). Student knowledge of information mandated by the 1989 amendments to the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act. *NASPA Journal*, 30, 30-38.
- Palmer, C. J., Lohman, G. L., Gehring, D. D., Carlson, S., & Garrett, O. (2001). Parental notification: A new strategy to reduce alcohol abuse on campus. *NASPA Journal*, 38, 372-385.
- Paschall, M. J., & Freisthler, B. (2003). Does heavy drinking affect academic performance in college? Findings from a prospective study of high achievers, *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 64, 515-519.
- Perkins, H. W. (2002). Surveying the damage: A review of research on consequences of alcohol misuse in college populations. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 14, 91-100.

- Polonec, L. D., Major, A. M., & Atwood, L. E. (2006). Evaluating the believability and effectiveness of the social norms message “Most students drink 0 to 4 drinks when they party.” *Health Communication, 20*(1), 23-34.
- Presley, C. A., & Pimentel, E. R. (2006). The introduction of the heavy and frequent drinker: A proposed classification to increase accuracy of alcohol assessments in postsecondary educational settings. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 67*, 324-331.
- Prevention Strategies. (n.d.). College ALC. Retrieved September 30, 2008, from <http://www.preventionstrategies.com>
- Reisberg, L. (1998, December 4). When a student drinks illegally, should colleges call mom and dad? [Electronic version]. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A39-A41.
- Reisberg, L. (2001, January 19). Two years after colleges started calling home, administrators say alcohol policy works [Electronic version]. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. A34-A37.
- Rhodes, W. A., Singleton, E., McMillan, T. B., & Perrino, C. S. (2005). Does knowledge of college drinking policy influence student binge drinking? *Journal of American College Health, 54*(1), 45-49.
- Taylor, D. M., Johnson, M. B., Voas, R. B., & Turrisi, R. (2006). Demographic and academic trends in drinking patterns and alcohol-related problems on dry college campuses, *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 50*(4), 35-54.
- Thombs, D. L., Dotterer, S., Olds, R.S., Sharp, K. E., & Raub, C. G. (2004). A close look at why one social norms campaign did not reduce student drinking. *Journal of American College Health, 53*(2), 61-68.

United States Department of Education's Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention. (n.d.). *Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSCA) and Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Regulations*. Retrieved October 28, 2008, from <http://www.higheredcenter.org/mandates/dfsca>

United States Department of Health and Human Services – National Institutes of Health. (2007). *National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism*. Retrieved September 20, 2008, from <http://www.niaaa.nih.gov>

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

Walters, S. T., Gruenewald, D.A., Miller, J. H., & Bennett, M. E. (2001). Early findings from a disciplinary program to reduce problem drinking by college students. *Journal of Abuse Treatment*, 20, 89-91.

Wechsler, H., & Dowdall, G. W. (1998). Changes in binge drinking and related problems among American college students between 1993 and 1997. *Journal of American College Health*, 47(2), 57-69.

Wechsler, H., & Isaac, N. (1991). *Alcohol and the college freshman: "Binge" drinking and associated problems* (Report No. HE024667). Washington, DC: AAA Foundation for Traffic Safety. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED35791)

Wechsler, H., Lee, J. E., Nelson, T. F., & Kuo, M. (2002). Underage college students' drinking behavior, access to alcohol, and the influence of deterrence policies: Findings from the Harvard School of Public Health alcohol study. *Journal of American College Health*, 50, 223-236.

- Weeks, K. M. (2001). Family-friendly FERPA policies: Affirming parental partnerships. In B. V. Daniel & B. S. Ross (Eds.), *Consumers, adversaries, and partners: Working with the families of undergraduates* (pp. 39-50). New Directions for Student Services, no. 94. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Wolaver, A. M. (2002). Effects of heavy drinking in college on study effort, grade point average, and major choice, *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 20, 415-428.
- Young, A. M., Morales, M., McCabe, S. E., Boyd, C. J., & D'Arcy, H. (2004). Drinking like a guy: Frequent binge drinking among undergraduate women. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 40, 239-265.

APPENDIX A

2008-2009 BGSU PARENTAL NOTIFICATION POLICY

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) gives colleges and universities the option to release specific types of information from a student's discipline record. University staff from the Office of the Dean of Students will notify parents/guardians when their student is found responsible for the use, sale or possession of controlled substances (illegal drugs) within the community. The Office of the Dean of Students will also notify parents or guardians when a student is found to have violated the Code of Student Conduct policies on the use and possession of alcohol when he/she is under the age of 21 and one or more of the following occurs:

1. When a student has been found to have violated the alcohol policy a second time;
2. When there is significant property damage;
3. When medical attention to any person, including the student, is required as a result of the student's alcohol-related behavior;
4. When the student demonstrates reckless disregard for his or her own personal safety or the safety of others; or
5. There is evidence that the student's alcohol-related behavior negatively impacted the learning environment.

For instances involving the health or safety of students and our campus community, the University sees occurrences in terms of personal health and public health.

1. Personal Health instances: dependant [sic] upon state law and/or federal regulations, the student's choice to notify parents/guardians or other family members will govern whether contact is made (i.e., a student being transported to the hospital for medical treatment).
2. Public Health instances: information will be distributed to the University community (i.e., a communicable disease outbreak on campus).

(BGSU, 2008, p. 61)

APPENDIX B

2008-2009 BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY ALCOHOL POLICY

Bowling Green State University recognizes that the decision to use alcoholic beverages is a personal choice; however, this choice must be made in accordance with the laws of the state of Ohio. In addition, the mature and responsible consumption of alcohol must be consistent with the mission and core values of the University and in accordance with the Bowling Green State University Code of Student Conduct. (Section 6.D. 2 prohibits the use, possession or distribution of alcoholic beverages except as expressly permitted by the law and University policy.)

A. Procedures for Events where Alcohol is Present

1. All laws of the State of Ohio, ordinances of the city of Bowling Green, regulations of the Ohio Department of Liquor Control, and policies and regulations of Bowling Green State University must be observed and enforced.
2. Alcohol consumption shall not be the sole focus of any event.
3. Alcoholic beverages may be consumed, possessed, served or sold only by persons of legal age to do so, according to the laws of the State of Ohio.
4. Alcoholic beverages must be served by designated individuals. Participants may not serve themselves or each other. Servers may not consume alcohol while working at an event with alcohol. Arrangements for the sale and/or serving of alcoholic beverages must be made through University Dining Services.
5. Individuals sponsoring the event are responsible for taking measures to ensure that alcoholic beverages are not accessible or served to persons under the legal age. This requires verifying age on entry to the event by checking identification to verify those who are of legal drinking age.
6. Non-alcoholic beverages must be present at all events at all times.
7. Sponsors will provide solid food in order to moderate the effects of alcohol consumption and will continue to have food available as long as alcohol is being served.
8. The entry or exit of persons with alcoholic beverages at events where alcohol is served is not permitted.
9. No social event shall include any form of “drinking contest” in its activities or promotion.
10. Alcohol must stop being sold at least one hour before the end of the event.
11. Publicly distributed materials, including advertisements for any University event, shall not make reference to the availability of alcoholic beverages. The Black Swamp Pub, located in the Bowen-Thompson Student Union, is exempt from this policy. The alcohol advertising guidelines for the Black Swamp Pub are available in 231 Bowen-Thompson Student Union Administrative Office.
12. The following is a list of places on main campus where alcohol can be served. These facilities have occupancy limits set by the Bowling Green Fire Department which must be followed.
 - Bowen-Thompson Student Union
 - Designated Doyt Perry Stadium locations*
 - Designated Ice Arena locations*
 - Fine Arts Building
 - Guest House

McFall Center
 Mileti Alumni Center
 Moore Musical Arts Center
 Olscamp Hall
 President's House

*Designated locations are determined by the Dean of Students.

13. Requests for exception to the locations listed in #12 must be directed to the Dean of Students.
14. Requests to have alcohol served at an event at the BGSU Firelands campus must receive prior approval from the dean of BGSU Firelands.
15. Violations of these regulations related to the use and sale of alcoholic beverages will result in immediate termination of the event and referral to the appropriate agency for disciplinary action.
16. Inspection of events where alcohol is being served will occur by an appointed designee of the Office of the Dean of Students and/or the Department of Public Safety.

B. Special Regulations for Public Events

1. A public event is an event at which beer or wine is sold.
2. There must be a minimum of two police officers present at all times, hired by the sponsoring group. The required number of officers present will be determined by the Department of Public Safety.
3. The proper permits for this event must be obtained from the Ohio Department of Liquor Control.
4. These events may not be scheduled from Sunday to Thursday and starting the weekend prior to exam week unless otherwise approved by the Dean Students.

C. Special Regulations for Private Events

1. A private event is an event at which alcohol is served but not sold where there is a defined guest list which has been submitted and approved with registration materials to the Bowen-Thompson Student Union administrative office.
2. Admittance to the event is limited to persons on the guest list.
3. The individual who registered the event assumes the responsibility for monitoring the event and the behavior of those attending the event.

D. Sanction Guidelines for Alcohol Policy Violations

1. Sanction Plan-Minimum Guidelines: When a student and/or student organization is found responsible for violating the alcohol policy and/or procedures, any and all of the following sanctions may be imposed. Students who already have Code of Student Conduct violations may receive more severe sanctions. Sanctions may also be enhanced based on the severity of the behavior and the impact on the community.
2. Non-disruptive alcohol violations in Residential Units
 - First Violation
 - Residential Disciplinary Probation for one year
 - Participation in Viewpoints Alcohol Education Class (\$75 fee)
 - Second Violation
 - Referral to the University level

- University Disciplinary Probation for one year
 - Alcohol Screening to determine whether participation will be required in Perspectives Alcohol Education Class (\$100 fee) or individual counseling with a certified Chemical Dependency Counselor (\$200 fee)
 - Parental Notification
 - Third Violation:
 - Referral to the Office of the Dean of Students
 - Suspension from residential housing with possible suspension from the University
 - If suspended:*
 - Documentation of the completion of an alcohol assessment/treatment program required for consideration of re-admission
 - University Disciplinary Probation upon return to the University
 - Monthly meetings with Associate or Assistant Dean of Students upon return
 - If not suspended:*
 - Meet and follow through with recommendations of a certified Chemical Dependency Counselor on campus
 - University Disciplinary Probation
 - Monthly meetings with Associate or Assistant Dean of Students
3. Non-disruptive alcohol violations in locations other than Residential Units
- First Violation
 - Referral to the Office of the Dean of Students
 - University Warning for one year
 - Participation in Perspectives Alcohol Education Class (\$100 fee)
 - If already attended Perspectives, must meet with a certified Chemical Dependency Counselor (\$200 fee)
 - Second Violation
 - Referral to the Office of the Dean of Students
 - University Disciplinary Probation for one year
 - Alcohol screening and meetings with certified Chemical Dependency Counselor (\$200 fee)
 - Parental Notification
 - Third Violation:
 - Referral to the Office of the Dean of Students
 - Possible suspension from the University
 - If suspended:*
 - Documentation of the completion of an alcohol assessment/treatment program is required for consideration of re-admission
 - University probation upon return to the University
 - Monthly meetings with Associate or Assistant Dean of Students upon return
 - If not suspended:*
 - Meet and follow through with recommendations of a certified Chemical Dependency Counselor
 - University Probation
 - Monthly meetings with Associate or Assistant Dean of Students

4. Disruptive Alcohol Violations in Residential Units

Disruptive is defined as an alcohol violation occurring in conjunction with behavior that is disruptive to the community, endangers the health or safety of others, or results in damage or vandalism to University property or property of members of the University community.

- First Violation
 - Referral to the University Level
 - University Disciplinary Probation for one year
 - Individual counseling with a certified Chemical Dependency Counselor (\$200 fee)
 - Parental Notification
- Second Violation
 - Referral to the Office of the Dean of Students
 - Suspension from residential housing with possible suspension from the University

If suspended:

 - Documentation of the completion of an alcohol assessment/treatment program is required for consideration of re-admission
 - University Disciplinary Probation upon return to the University
 - Monthly meetings with Associate or Assistant Dean of Students upon return

If not suspended:

 - Meet and follow through with recommendations of a certified Chemical Dependency Counselor on campus
 - University Probation
 - Monthly meetings with Associate or Assistant Dean of Students

5. Disruptive alcohol violations in locations other than Residential Units

- First Violation
 - Referral to the Office of the Dean of Students
 - University Disciplinary Probation for one year
 - Individual counseling with a certified Chemical Dependency Counselor (\$200 fee)
 - Parental Notification
- Second Violation
 - Referral to the Office of the Dean of Students
 - Possible suspension from the University

If suspended:

 - Documentation of the completion of an alcohol assessment/treatment program is required for consideration of re-admission
 - University Disciplinary Probation upon return to the University
 - Monthly meetings with Associate or Assistant Dean of Students upon return

If not suspended:

 - Meet and follow through with recommendations of a certified Chemical Dependency Counselor on campus
 - University Probation
 - Monthly meetings with Associate or Assistant Dean of Students

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE 2008-2009 BGSU PARENTAL NOTIFICATION LETTER

Date

Parent/Guardian of <Student Name>
<Address>

Dear <Parent Name>

I am writing to inform you that your <son/daughter>, <Student Name>, has been found responsible for violating the Bowling Green State University Code of Student Conduct. Specifically, <Student Name> was found responsible for violating Code of Student Conduct section 6.d.2 from an incident that occurred on <Date>. The code section violation prohibits the following behavior:

- 6 d. Offenses Disrupting Order or Disregarding Health and Safety.
 - (2) Use, possession or distribution of alcoholic beverages except as expressly permitted by law and University policies.

Given that any further alcohol violations, for which <Student Name> may be found responsible, will result in suspension from Bowling Green State University, we believe parental notification is an important part of the sanction plan for this violation. Bowling Green State University supports the concept that the student, his/her parents/guardians, and the University are engaged in a partnership in which each partner has the responsibility to promote a healthy and productive educational experience for the student.

I encourage you to discuss this matter with <Student Name> who is aware that you will receive this letter. After doing so, if you have additional questions or concerns, please feel free to contact me at 419-372-2843.

Thank you for your time and attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

<Staff Name>
<Title>

<Case#>

M. J. Ginsburg (personal communication, June 9, 2009)