Collegians Consistently Drink More

**Two-Week Prevalence: Five+ Drinks in a Row**

- **Full-Time College Students**
- **Others 1–4 Years Past HS**
- **12th Graders**

![Graph showing the trend of two-week prevalence of drinking five or more drinks in a row for different groups over the years from 1980 to 2006.](image-url)

©2010 Outside The Classroom, Inc. All rights reserved.
Gender Differences Diminishing

Two-Week Prevalence: Five+ Drinks in a Row

Year of Administration

©2010 Outside The Classroom, Inc. All rights reserved.
Implication: The campus environment is a powerful contributor to student alcohol use.
Student drinking rates nationally follow a typical pattern: alcohol use generally rises the summer before a student enters college, and then increases substantially after arriving on campus. This phenomenon, known as the “College Effect,” is represented by the conceptual graphic below.

*Drinking rate is the proportion of students who have had more than a taste or sip of alcohol in the two weeks prior to the survey.
**Negative Consequences of Alcohol Use at Berkeley**

During the past two weeks, to what degree did the following happen to you when drinking or as a result of your drinking?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performed poorly on an assignment/test</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got behind in school work</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed a class</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missed going to work</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a Hangover</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t remember what I did</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regret my actions</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injured myself</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was taken advantage of sexually</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got in trouble with authorities</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took advantage sexually</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damaged property</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today’s Discussion

I. Top Myths of College Alcohol Use

II. Elements of Effective Prevention

III. Where Berkeley Stands in its Alcohol Prevention Efforts

IV. Our Opportunities to Impact the Environment
Myth #1

To successfully address college alcohol problems, focus on the riskiest drinkers
The Prevention Paradox

20% of students are abstainers
60% of students are moderate or light drinkers
The highest number of negative consequences happen to moderate drinkers

However, 80% of resources are spent on high-risk drinkers
20% of students are high-risk drinkers

Risk of Injury

Myth #2

College students don’t support efforts to address college alcohol problems
# Secondhand Effects Drive Motivation

## Prevalence of Secondhand Effects Experienced by Abstainers and Non-Binge Drinkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>School Binge Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study/sleep interrupted</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babysit a drunken student</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulted or humiliated</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwanted sexual advance</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious argument or quarrel</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushed, hit, or assaulted</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property damaged</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gauging Student Support for Alcohol Prevention

Survey Questions
(32 institutions; N= 5,210)

To what extent do you support or oppose the following possible policies or procedures?

To what extent do you think other students at this school support or oppose the following possible policies or procedures?
# A Call for Stricter Enforcement

## Percent Student Support for Policy Enforcement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Policy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>Stricter sanctions for committing alcohol-related violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>Stricter sanctions for repeatedly violating campus alcohol policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>Stricter penalties for using fake IDs to buy alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>Undercover operations at bars and liquor outlets to increase alcohol policy compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Myth #3

College alcohol use is an intractable problem without solutions
Two Recent Successes

**University of Florida**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Students High Risk Drinkers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*18% decrease over 4 years*

**University of Missouri-Columbia**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percent Students High Risk Drinkers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*15% decrease over 5 years*

**Additional successes:** Hobart, Western Washington, University of Arizona, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, and University of Tennessee
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**What Works?**

**Principles of Effective Prevention:**

- Environmental, public-health approach to prevention
- Comprehensive efforts addressing both high-risk groups and campus-wide efforts
- Evidence-based, best-practice strategies
- Coalition-based efforts with broad support
Multiple Factors Driving Behavior

**Basic Premise to Environmental Prevention:**
People’s behavior is shaped by the physical, social, legal, and economic environment in which they live, work, and play.

---

**The Environmental Framework**

- Individual factors (students)
- Peer factors (students)
  
  **AND**

- Institutional factors
- Community factors
- Public policy

---

**Environmental Prevention**
Addressing High-Risk Collegiate Alcohol Use Through Environmental Prevention

**Environmental Factors Driving Alcohol Use**

- Long periods of unstructured free time
- Widespread belief that college alcohol and other drug abuse is normal
- Aggressive alcohol promotions targeting college students
- Abundantly available, inexpensive alcohol
- Inconsistently enforced laws and policies

**Environmental Prevention Strategies**

- Offer alcohol-free social, extracurricular, and public service options
- Create a health-promoting normative environment
- Restrict alcohol marketing and promotion on and off campus
- Limit alcohol availability
- Increase enforcement of laws and policies
Extending Prevention Beyond Student Affairs
Two Different Success Stories

University of Florida

Percent Students
High Risk Drinkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18% decrease over 4 years

University of Missouri-Columbia

Percent Students
High Risk Drinkers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15% decrease over 5 years
...With Two Different Solution Sets

University of Florida
Key Prevention Programs
- Increased enforcement
- Online alcohol education
- Social marketing campaign

University of Missouri-Columbia
Key Prevention Programs
- BASICS programming
- Social norms marketing
- Peer education
Underlying Shared Components

**University of Florida**
- A prevention mindset
- Engaged campus-community coalition
- Routine data collection and careful analysis
- Comprehensive environmental programming

**University of Missouri-Columbia**
- A prevention mindset
- Engaged campus-community coalition
- Routine data collection and careful analysis
- Comprehensive environmental programming

What These Campuses Share

All these components are also present in Berkeley’s alcohol prevention efforts
Today's Discussion

I. Top Myths of College Alcohol Use

II. Elements of Effective Prevention

III. Where Berkeley Stands in its Alcohol Prevention Efforts

IV. Our Opportunities to Impact the Environment
Decreases in Use and Consequences at Berkeley

**Underage Alcohol Consumption**
(past 30 day)

- 2003: 7%
- 2008:

**Serious Personal Problems from Drinking**

- 2003: 29%
- 2008:

**Undergrad Abstainers**
(no past year use)

- 2003: 30%
- 2008:

**Minor Personal Problems from Drinking**

- 2003: 8%
- 2008:

*Source: The Safer California Universities Project*
Reduced Alcohol Availability/Access around Berkeley

It would be easy or very easy to get alcohol without an ID at a...

Source: The Safer California Universities Project
An Overview of Alcohol Use Among Berkeley First Year Students

When measured midway through the fall semester (Survey 3), 19% of Berkeley students had been drinking in a high risk way in the previous two weeks.
Losing Ground Among Incoming Students

Drinking rates, measured midway through fall semester, have fluctuated over the past three years. It is important to consider the multiple factors that influence drinking rates and how these factors may vary from year to year on your campus.

Typical factors impacting college students’ drinking rates from year to year:
- Alcohol policy changes
- Changes in enforcement of alcohol policy
- Shifts in composition of first year class
- Consistency in the timing of data collection

Data represents student responses collected in Survey 3, 30-45 days after completing AlcoholEdu for College.
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Berkeley students are most commonly drinking in a fraternity/sorority house or in an off-campus residence. Every effort should be made to target these particular locations with increased prevention and enforcement initiatives.

Source: AlcoholEdu for College
Perception of Enforcement Measures is Uneven

It is somewhat to very likely that...

- Police would come to parties: 82% in 2005, 86% in 2007, 80% in 2009
- Police would break up parties: 76% in 2005, 74% in 2007, 72% in 2009
- Underage student would be carded: 89% in 2005, 88% in 2007, 90% in 2009
- Drunk drivers would be stopped: 77% in 2005, 79% in 2007, 80% in 2009

Source: The Safer California Universities Project
Perceptions of Party Problem Concerns is Down

The following are very/extremely concerned about preventing alcohol-related problems at off-campus parties:

Source: The Safer California Universities Project
## Guidance for Interpreting the Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Optimal Implementation</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Context Matters</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>No Silver Bullets</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Values Not Static</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases and studies were discounted where:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly some approaches work best on certain kinds of campuses</td>
<td></td>
<td>Individual approaches not as effective as complementary ones</td>
<td></td>
<td>The literature and field continues to evolve</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- They lacked fidelity</td>
<td>- Literature and cases provide an “average” impact across campuses</td>
<td></td>
<td>- The goal was more clarity around approaches, not necessarily their combined synergy</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Partner input is encouraged</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Your Role with the Environmental Prevention Approach

- You can help to shape the physical, social, legal, and economic environment in which our students live, work, and play.
- Be part of the critical mass of active and effective bystanders for prevention and intervention.

- **Ask students** about their alcohol consumption and if they have experienced any of the negative consequences associated with drinking alcohol.
- Communicate **individual and campus concerns** when you interact with students.
- Challenge **inaccurate perceptions** about drinking and share the social norms.
- **Share resources** with students.

- Invite us to meet and talk in greater depth so you can determine your department’s unique contribution/strategy.
- Ask us questions about how this work is going. Hold us accountable.
The “Raw Data” of the Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Impact Score</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Percentage of Students Impacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breathalyzer Feedback</td>
<td>-22.0</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invited Speakers</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAC Cards</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatal Vision Goggles</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Amnesty</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Infusion</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Rides</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>$104,654</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA Training</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>$1,348</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Birthday Cards</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>$5,045</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fake ID Policies</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limiting Drink Specials</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Notification</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS Training</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>$1,225</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Engagement</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>$9,473</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance-Free Housing</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday Classes</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Marketing</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>$21,288</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol-Free Options</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>$27,570</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol Price and Taxation</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms Marketing</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>$14,614</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BASICS</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>$19,535</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Education</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>$8,690</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpreting Placement of the Strategies

- Do No Harm
- The Prevention “Sweet Spot”
- Requires an Argument
- Justify and Evaluate
- Consider and Execute with Care
Berkeley’s Alcohol Prevention Efforts

- Breathalyzer Feedback
- Social Marketing
- Social Norms Marketing
- Peer Engagement
- Online Education
- BASICS
- Substance-Free Housing
- Fake ID Policies
- Curriculum Infusion
- RBS Training
- Invited Speakers
- RA Training
- Friday Classes
- Fatal Vision Goggles
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Guiding Principles for Success

1. **Programming with a Purpose**: Be intentional with efforts and gather data on whether they succeed.

2. **The “Comprehensive” Myth**: Don’t try to do it all—a few targeted interventions can be very effective.

3. **An Emerging Picture**: Stay attuned to new research to inform your efforts.

4. **Knowing How to Spend**: Implement programs strategically to mitigate costs.

5. **Beyond the Research**: Test your messages and strategies against the research base, behavior theory, and your instincts.

6. **The Value of Synergy**: Prevention efforts must complement each other.

7. **Data-driven Success**: The best strategy is grounded in data.

8. **Campus Fit**: Make decisions based upon your culture, allies, and resources.
Accurate social norms perceptions about drinking, associated harm, and community acceptance

Clear, well-known alcohol policies and campus concern,

Critical mass of active and effective bystanders for prevention and intervention

Consistent, swift procedures for enforcement and accountability

Standard practice of responsible hospitality/responsible beverage service in both commercial and social settings