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This study investigated the perceived effect of increased community enforcement of the legal minimum alcohol drinking age on the attitudes and behavior of university students as reported by the community. The results indicated increased local alcohol enforcement efforts, changed student drinking behavior, which in turn created a positive change in community attitude toward enforcement efforts. Increased enforcement efforts between the years 1993 and 1995 targeted underage drinking and alcohol related crime as demonstrated by university students. Enforcement efforts were initiated by community officials in the form of a beer keg registration ordinance, minimum age bar compliance checks, raising the bar entry age from 19 to 21, and proactive support by the local judicial system. Survey results showed a positive community attitudinal change toward alcohol enforcement between the years 1993 and 1995. The community reported less alcohol-related foot and vehicle traffic, noise, vandalism, littering and violence. The community also reported a decrease in student alcohol activity within the city, while the university reported a significant increase regarding student alcohol disciplinary action taken on
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A shift in student drinking patterns from community to campus sites was observed as one result of increased community alcohol enforcement.
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Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Problem

Although the legal drinking age is now 21 and federal law requires that every institution receiving federal aid have a substance abuse policy, alcohol continues to be the major substance abuse problem on college campuses (Gulland, 1994). Since 1987, the power of states to regulate their own minimum age laws was restricted by a mandate of the federal government (Coate & Grossman, 1988; Engs & Hanson, 1988). Most states have granted some authority for regulating the availability of alcohol to cities (Moskowitz, 1989). In the state of Illinois, there is no state-regulated entry age restriction that prevents persons under the age of 21 from frequenting bars or entering liquor establishments. Individual Illinois cities may elect to prohibit entry to
liquor establishments by those under the age of 21 through a city ordinance (Ordinance 94-0-3).

In 1993, 348 students from Eastern Illinois University were administered the Core Drug and Alcohol Survey (University Consulting and Counseling Services/Office of Measurement Services, 1993). The Core Drug and Alcohol Survey (CDAS) was developed to measure attitudes and usage among college students at two and four year educational institutions. The CDAS self reporting survey samples information regarding students' attitudes, opinions and self usage of alcohol and drugs. The 1993 CDAS survey results showed 89 percent of students at Eastern Illinois University under the age of 21 illegally consumed alcohol. Seventy percent of surveyed students reported "binge" drinking of five or more drinks at a sitting. Sixty nine percent of those surveyed reported some form of alcohol related public misconduct (arrests, fighting, vandalism, DWI/DUI, taking sexual advantage) at least once that year. Fifty three percent of the students reported being victimized or experiencing serious personal problems (attempted suicide/ideation, injury, taken advantage of sexually, poor grades), within the previous year because of personal alcohol consumption (UCCS/Office of Measurement Services,
1993). Controversy surrounding the effect of underage drinking in Charleston, Illinois, has been the focus of much community debate. When underage drinking debates were forced to the forefront by community residents, the call to raise the bar entry age from 19 to 21-years was generally sounded. Previously, the liquor code adopted by the City of Charleston permitted underage patrons 19-years old to frequent the bars, although they were not at the legal minimum age of 21 to purchase alcohol (McElwee, 1989). On 9 June 1994, the City of Charleston enacted a city ordinance raising the Charleston bar entry age to 21 (Ordinance 94-0-13, 1994).

Support for public policies increasing the minimum drinking age is founded on the belief that there will be a decrease in alcohol consumption and alcohol-related problems among college students because of these laws (Engs & Hanson, 1986). Contrary to this view are concerns that raising the bar entry age will only result in students drinking in unsupervised settings (Hayes-Sugarman, 1988; Roberts & Nowak, 1986).

**Purpose of the Study**

This study determined the perceived effect of increased enforcement of the legal minimum drinking age on the
attitudes and behavior of Eastern Illinois University students as reported by the residential community. The study assessed the community residents' perceptions regarding usage of alcohol by Eastern students. This study investigated what percentage of community residents experienced direct problems resulting from alcohol induced behavior by university students, if they supported the increased enforcement of the 21-year bar entry age, and if, in their opinion, enforcement influenced the drinking practices/behavior of students. This survey served as a post indicator measurement of a similar study involving Charleston residents in 1990/1991 (Harvey, 1992) prior to initiation of intensive enforcement efforts that included raising the minimum bar entry age.

The second purpose of the study was to interview a cross-section of key community members who influenced alcohol related decisions in the Charleston community. All were asked the same questions which were extracted from the alcohol survey instrument for comparison purposes. This provided candid, anecdotal data from local public opinion leaders to clarify and augment the citizen survey results.

Finally, the 1993-1994 and 1994-1995 University
Judicial Affairs Office Disciplinary Referrals Report was analyzed to determine indicators, changes, and trends in student drinking behavior. The resultant judicial findings were merged with the collected survey results and community leader responses in forming findings and recommendations.

**Need for the Study**

Both city and university members need to understand the positive or negative community attitude regarding the effect of recent increased local enforcement of underage drinking laws. By securing current public opinion information, both community leaders and university administrators can make informed adjustments in alcohol related policies. This knowledge will assist positive progress toward managing underage drinking trends and student alcohol abuse.

This research also provides a foundation for further research addressing similar alcohol related problems.

**Hypotheses to be Tested**

The following Null Hypothesis assumes that strict enforcement of the underage drinking laws will have no impact on the drinking patterns and behavior of Eastern Illinois University students.
H1. There is no difference in community attitudes toward Eastern student drinking behavior between Spring 1993 and Spring 1995 based upon increased local alcohol enforcement efforts.

H2. There has been no change between June 1994 and June 1995 in reported university student conduct related to alcohol-based crime since raising the bar entry age from 19 to 21.
Chapter Two

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Scope of the Problem

Student consumption of alcohol dates back to the 18th and 19th centuries when students rebelled against the punitive, joyless environment imposed on them (Horowitz, 1987). Some of this behavior has become institutionalized (e.g., ritualistic consumption, drinking songs/games), particularly in certain groups such as fraternities (Leemon, 1972). The availability of alcohol is a symbol of privilege in many collegiate settings, not only among students but also between faculty and alumni. The use of alcohol on campuses has from a times past presented problems to college and university administrators (Straus & Bacon 1953). However, problems associated with both alcohol and other drug uses have escalated in recent years. B. Angelo, reporter for Time Magazine, 1990, April 23, questioned University of Wisconsin Chancellor Donna Shalala to describe the biggest problem affecting her campus. The answer was "alcohol" abuse by students. Shalala also cited the increasing costs of higher education, sexism, racism,
and anti-Semitism as problems. The destruction of lives and
careers of many hundred students through the usage of
non-alcoholic drugs was also a real problem. Yet,
Wisconsin's most critical problem according to Dr. Shalala
was alcohol (Angelo, 1990).

Dr. Shalala's attitude regarding student alcohol use is
not singular. In a Carnegie Foundation survey (1990),
college presidents classified alcohol abuse as the single
greatest threat to the quality of campus life (Carnegie
Foundation, 1990). Cheating, alcohol abuse, and violence on
campus diminish learning of all kinds. Yet, many colleges
accept these phenomena as facts of existence rather than as
a call for reform. Coordinated high-profile systemic efforts
-- from the college president to the residence assistants,
from enforcement to education -- are rare (Blimling &
Alschuler, 1996).

Locally, Eastern Illinois University (EIU) President
David Jorns has acknowledged that there is disharmony
between Charleston residents and Eastern students because of
alcohol-related incidents involving Eastern students leaving
Charleston bars (Dahill, 1994).

According to the Carnegie Foundation, nearly 500,000
students on 800 American universities have completed the
Core Alcohol and Drug Survey (CADS). The survey covers demographics, GPA, perceptions of campus substance abuse policies, numbers of drinks per week, frequency of binge drinking episodes, age of first onset, perceptions, locations of use, and consequences of use (Presley, Meilman, Lyerla, 1994).

In 1994 there was a dramatic increase, compared to prior years, in the frequency and intensity of binge drinking (consuming more than five drinks in one sitting) on American college and university campuses (Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1994). Binge drinking is now considered the number one substance abuse problem in American college life. Anecdotal evidence gained from the CADS shows that many students drink more, drink more frequently, and drink with the express purpose of getting drunk.

Forty-two percent of all college students participating in the CADS survey reported that they had engaged in binge drinking in the previous two weeks. Data on specific groups, such as college women or students living in fraternities and sororities, painted an even grimmer picture (Carnegie Corporation of New York, 1994). The problem of alcohol abuse also has a profound ripple effect on the entire campus
community. Alcohol abuse can lead to unplanned pregnancies, Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), injuries, suicide attempts, vandalism, assault, rape, and poor academic performance.

It is important to note where colleges and universities stand regarding the legal aspects of student behavior involving drug abuse and alcohol consumption. Leading legal cases hold that colleges and universities have no inherent duty, nor any realistic ability, to control students who are acting in their personal capacities. The courts have recognized (Crow v. State 271 Cal. Rptr. 349, 359 222 Cal. App. 3d 192, 208-09, Cal. App. 3 Dist. 1990) that a university has neither the authority nor the duty toward a college-age student that a parent has toward a child. Even though primary and secondary schools may stand in loco parentis (taking the place of a parent), that doctrine has been discredited with regard to universities and colleges (American Council on Education, 1992).

Although the university as a proprietor (property owner) is not an insurer of the safety of those who come onto the campus, the university may be liable if it fails to remedy a foreseeable dangerous state of affairs of which it is, or should be aware. Where experience teaches us that
certain circumstances, such as recurring rowdiness at football games or parties, the school may breach its duty of care if it fails to provide adequate security to prevent mishap (American Council on Education, 1992).

Even though the courts have consistently precluded the universities from legal liability for adverse student alcohol behavior, federal administrative requirements are in effect which require colleges and universities to adopt a substance abuse program. National concern over student alcohol and drug abuse prompted the federal Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act Amendments of 1989 which requires each college and university that receives federal funds in any form to certify to the Department of Education that it has implemented a program designed to prevent the illegal use of drugs and alcohol. Schools who do not comply with this act may be disqualified from receiving federal funds or participating in student loan programs (Gulland, 1994). The minimum requirements of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act demand: (1) prohibiting the unlawful possession, use or distribution of drugs or alcohol on college property or as a part of a college activity; (2) distribution annually to all students (and employees) a document describing the health risks of using illicit drugs
and alcohol; available counseling programs; local, state and federal legal sanctions; and the college's own sanctions; and (3) establish sanctions up to and including expulsion and referral for prosecution student/faculty/staff offenders. Additionally, the act requires the school to ensure consistent enforcement of its sanctions; provide upon request a copy of the program to the Secretary of Education; and formally review the program at least every two years (Gulland, 1994). The American Council on Education recommends that colleges when developing an alcohol policy (1) adopt only rules and sanctions that the school is willing to enforce; (2) enforce the policy consistently; (3) be familiar with all laws relating to the sale of alcoholic beverages and liability of "social hosts" who serve beverages; (3) emphasize education; and focus on circumstances that present the greatest danger and risk of liability (Gulland, 1994). The general focus of legal recommendations from the American Council on Education to college administrators responsible for developing an alcohol policy is to lean toward the minimum requirements of the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act versus imposing additional enforcement so as to limit the potential risk of a lawsuit. According to Gulland, it is important that
colleges understand what the Act does not require, as well as what it demands. Schools must adopt rules prohibiting student conduct that violates the law; they need not impose additional standards of conduct for lawful drug and alcohol-related activity. Colleges are not required to assume new obligations to protect students from their own use of illicit drugs or abuse of alcohol (Gulland, 1994).

The idea of adults modeling appropriate drinking behavior to students as a learning technique is a dangerous concept when it is balanced against existing laws. College administrators feel paralyzed in teaching students to drink in moderation, as nearly three-quarters of their populations are legally underage (Carnegie Foundation, 1994). Furthermore, educators are not allowed to legally model appropriate behavior, as consuming alcohol with underage students is in itself illegal.

**Bar Entry Age Debate**

The debate between Charleston students and community residents regarding raising the bar entry age from 19 to 21-years was carried on for years. Charleston had allowed 19-year-old students to enter bars since the 1960's (Bushong, Dyer, Jenson, Nelson, Scott & Wolff, 1993). In 1989,
Charleston Mayor Wayne Lanman announced that the police would raid Charleston bars to ensure compliance with the 21-year purchase age law (McElwee, 1989). In March 1990, Mayor Lanman directed the police in conducting two separate undercover operations for controlling underage drinking. The first operation investigated 14 Charleston bars that resulted in the arrest of 12 bartenders for serving minors (McElwee, 1990b). The next operation was a raid that resulted in the arrest of 54 eighteen-year-olds, 13 seventeen-year-olds, and one sixteen-year-old for frequenting an alcohol serving premise ("63 under age," 1990). The discrepancy between the entry age and the purchase age raised many questions about whether it was possible to enforce the 21-year-old drinking age law in Charleston (McElwee, 1990a).

On 1 July 1993, under the direction of Mayor Roscoe Cougill, Charleston formed an Alcohol Task Force to evaluate the extent of Charleston's' alcohol problems as well as to raise public awareness. After many task force meetings and three open public forums, the task force recommended that the city raise the bar entry age to twenty-one (Wulff, 1994a). The bar entry debate culminated on June 9, 1994, when the Charleston city government implemented an ordinance
prohibiting bar entry to anyone under the age of 21-years (Ordinance 94-0-13, 1994; Kirk, 1994).

Division lines were clear on the bar entry age debate. Simply speaking, most of the students wanted access to the bars before the age of 21. Just as sincerely, the city government did not want students in the bars until they were 21-years-old (Ordinance 94-0-13, 1994). The voicing of this disparity sounded during the Alcohol Task Force Open Forums, held 17, 21, and 28 February 1994 (Wulff, 1994b). During these open forums, most community members present endorsed the enforcement of the 21-year-old drinking law. This endorsement recommended prohibiting those under 21-years-old from entering community bars.

Most of the students in attendance warned that the underage drinking would continue. Students believed that bars offered a controlled environment for underage drinking. They suggested that underage students would relocate to uncontrolled environments, such as private house parties. Underage students generally considered bars as a social outlet. They challenged the task force and city government to provide alternatives to compensate for the projected loss of bar entry (Wulff, 1994b). The student-community split in opinion was evident when the 1993-94 Alcohol Task Force
voted to recommend raising the entry age to 21. By a 7-3 vote, the board approved the measure. The three dissenting votes were cast by the three Eastern students appointed to the board. The dissenting task force students said that raising the entry age would simply shift the problems to house parties, and the change in the law would not address the issue of alcohol abuse (Allee, 1994). There was a strong suggestion coming from the Eastern student body representatives that illegal underage drinking would continue despite the increased bar entry age. Many students advocated a responsible drinking concept be adopted by illegal underage drinkers at local bars, versus the behavior anticipated in uncontrolled house party drinking environments.
Dominant Theoretical Models

Sociocultural Model of Prevention and Distribution-of Consumption.

Gonzalez (1989) reviewed all available literature regarding alcohol prevention programs on college campuses since the mid-1970's. Gonzalez determined that alcohol and other drug education programs in colleges were not developed in a theoretical manner. Drug and alcohol programs were based on educational judgments that showed no relationship to the research literature (Braucht, & Braucht, 1984; Bukoski, 1986; Schaps, DiBartolo, Moskowitz J., Palley, & Churgin, 1980). Failure to base program development on proven theory was especially characteristic of alcohol and drug education programs on college campuses (Gonzalez, 1988; Saltz, & Elandt, 1986), where such programs have proliferated rapidly in recent years (Gadaleto & Anderson 1986). Although several theoretical models relevant to alcohol and drug education have been proposed (Amatetti, 1987), few prevention and education programs on campus have been developed based on these models. Most campus programs are based on the Sociocultural Model of Prevention. The Sociocultural Model assumes that a change in knowledge will
lead to a change in social norms. When applied to alcohol education, this model suggests that social norms about drinking must be changed to reduce alcohol problems. In this case, prevention comes from establishing new social norms that will promote safe, responsible drinking (Nirenberg & Miller, 1984). According to Nirenberg & Miller (1984, p. 10), this would be achieved by (1) clearly distinguishing between responsible drinking and alcohol abuse, (2) establishing a "safe" drinking level in terms of quantity and frequency, (3) reducing the social importance and mystique of drinking, and (4) emphasizing the use of alcohol in a social-recreational context rather than solitary drinking for the purpose of intoxication. In summing the Sociocultural Model, it is assumed that if people are given information about alcohol, their knowledge will increase, which will lead to positive attitude changes, followed by less substance abuse. The Sociocultural Model has dominated the thinking of college prevention practitioners since the mid-1960's (Goodstadt, 1978).

Gonzalez (1989) noted that in all alcohol prevention programs, the concept of responsible drinking was an accepted part of each program. Gonzalez found that while the responsible drinking concept was widely accepted as a
deterrent to alcohol abuse, there never was any meaningful body of research underlying its use in prevention programs. Neither was there any significant research to assess the efficacy of its use in campus prevention programs (Gonzalez, 1989). The "responsible drinking" concept has been criticized in the research literature as too general to prevent alcohol-related problems (Cellucci, 1984). More negative criticism of the responsible drinking concept based on the Sociocultural Model comes from the fact that no one has been able to demonstrate the effectiveness of this prevention technique experimentally (Gonzalez, 1989).

In 1984, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism changed their emphasis from promoting responsible drinking to reducing overall per capita consumption of alcohol (NIAAA, 1984). The Sociocultural Model of Prevention was abandoned in favor of a Distribution-of-Consumption Model (Holder & Stoil, 1988). This model suggests a direct relationship exists between the amount of alcohol consumed and alcohol problems in a population (Bruun, Edwards, Lumio, Makela, Pan, Popham, Room, Schmidt, Skog, Sulkunen, & Ostenberg, 1975). Supporters of this model seek to reduce the availability of alcohol by increasing its price, reducing the number of hours during which it is sold, and
limiting the age at which it can be purchased (Gonzalez, 1989). Gonzalez points out that supporters of Distribution-of-Consumption are interested in using public policy to help prevent alcohol and other drug abuse.

**Solution Indicators**

The University of California School of Public Health conducted research evaluating the effects of programs and policies in reducing the incidence of alcohol problems (Moskowitz, 1989). Four types of preventive interventions were examined: (1) policies affecting the physical, economic, and social availability of alcohol (e.g., minimum legal drinking age, price, and advertising of alcohol); (2) formal social controls on alcohol related behavior (e.g., drinking-driving laws); (3) primary prevention programs (e.g., school-based alcohol education); and (4) environmental safety measures (e.g., automobile air bags). Moskowitz concluded that research supports the efficacy of three alcohol-specific policies: (1) raising/maintaining the minimum legal drinking age of 21, (2) increasing alcohol taxes, and (3) increasing the enforcement of drinking driving laws (Moskowitz, 1989).

Hill (1991) suggested that alcohol education on campuses should support the entire college community,
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including faculty and staff. An initial step in alcohol education is to establish a task force or committee that will assess the needs of the target population and explore areas such as funding sources, staffing, and goals. An institutional policy on alcohol use is an important first step. Once campus needs have been determined, the scope of the program can be set. The program's leadership will assume responsibility for initial and ongoing program development and quality control. Peer education is strongly recommended in leadership programs and careful recruitment and education of these peer leaders is crucial. A well-planned comprehensive and enduring alcohol education program holds the potential to reduce alcohol-related problems on an individual as well as an institutional basis (Hill, 1991).

Craig (1993) has stated that college teachers ought to know how to identify the alcoholic student, and how to help such students. Her research indicated that alcohol abuse was implicated in 38% of all academic failures. The common perception among the faculty is that the alcoholic student may smell of alcohol, act in a disoriented manner, or drop out. Contrary to this impression, she discovered as many as one-third of the students surveyed exhibited no academic signs of their alcohol problem. Craig asserted that a more
reliable indicator of alcohol abuse may be social behavior. Alcoholic students tend to be loners, who avoid face-to-face contact with the teacher and act withdrawn in class. Educators should be ably trained to recognize alcohol abuse, and encouraged to refer students to local agencies familiar with alcoholism. If teachers learn to identify and cope with such students, perhaps they can also help them in their recovery (Craig, 1993).

**Literature Summary**

Drinking by college students has been institutionalized since the 18 and 19th century. Today, college presidents classify alcohol as the singular greatest threat to the quality of campus life. Recent surveys indicate a dramatic increase in the frequency and intensity of binge drinking with nearly 50 percent of surveyed students participating in the aspects of drinking to get drunk. This abuse of alcohol can lead to a variety of negative life experiences ranging from unplanned pregnancies to death.

College administrators feel paralyzed in attempts to teach drinking in moderation since nearly three quarters of their population is underage. This eliminates the ability to
model moderate drinking in the company of students which would violate the law.

After many years of debating the community bar entry age, the university town of Charleston Illinois enacted a series of administrative actions which raised the bar entry age to 21. Public opinion regarding this issue was basically split with the community desiring students to wait until age 21 to enter bars and the students requesting to enter bars prior to age 21. Students advocated enacting a “responsible drinking concept” and community residents advocated “restriction through enforcement.”

Research shows that the majority of current campus alcohol prevention programs were developed based upon “educational judgements” versus relying upon theoretical or scientific research. Current campus prevention programs are based upon the Sociocultural Model of Prevention model which assumes that a change in knowledge will lead to a change in social norms and behavior. This model suggests the more a student learns regarding the perils of alcohol abuse, the less he or she will abuse alcohol. In recent years, institutions studying the effects of alcohol abuse have shifted support from the Sociocultural Model of Prevention to the Distribution-of-Consumption model which suggests a
Effects of Enforcement
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direct relationship existing between the amount of alcohol consumed to the resultant alcohol related problems found in the population.
Chapter Three

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the sample populations and the survey instruments administered in this study. This information is presented in four parts. The first section pertains to the data collected from surveys administered to local Charleston non-students and Eastern Illinois University students. The second section pertains to information received from the comments section of the survey instrument. Thirdly, face-to-face interviews were conducted with local community leaders who can be considered "Town-Fathers." An open-ended list of questions was used to gather the leadership viewpoint of the community. The selection criterion for these leaders focused on their impact and influence on the creation of alcohol related local ordinances and laws. The final, and forth section, applies to an analysis of the Eastern Illinois University Student Disciplinary Referral Report (Judicial Affairs, 1994). This Judicial Affairs report indicates university student conduct that includes alcohol violation statistical data.
In 1995, 300 surveys were administered within the Charleston community. The surveys were administered via telephone and during a door-to-door/mail-back collection process. Of the 380 persons with whom a contact was initiated, 219 non-students and 81 students responded. The percentage of survey return on overall numbers of individuals (380) who were contacted by face-to-face interview, self-addressed mail return, and telephonic interview, to individuals who responded to the survey (300), was 79 percent.

In 1993, 247 telephone surveys were administered within the Charleston community. Of the random returns, 200 were non-students and 47 were students. In 1994, 262 telephone surveys were administered exactly the same way as in 1993. Of the random returns, 191 were non-students and 81 were students.

**Telephone Survey**

The 1995 telephone survey was drawn from the Charleston Illinois population of 20,398 (United States Bureau of the Census, 1990). The survey was conducted during the months of April-May, 1995, and distinguished between responding
students and non-students. A total of 150 Charleston residents responded to "cold-calling" requests for participation in the survey. The sample population was randomly selected from the Charleston telephone book. The individuals who conducted the telephone surveys were instructed to call no more than eight people per letter of the alphabet from the phone book starting with the first name appearing under the corresponding letter of the alphabet. Care was given to only call people within the Charleston telephone prefix numbers (345, 348), as the phone book contains residents of smaller surrounding townships. A total of 182 telephone contacts were attempted where an actual individual answered the call. Thirty-two respondents verbally declined to participate or hung up the telephone receiver. Many more telephone numbers were dialed where no one answered the telephone call. In cases where there was no response to the call, the surveyor would continue down the telephone listing until someone physically answered the call. Messages were not left on answering machines by the survey administrator. Of the 150 residents who responded, 117(78%) were non-students and 33(22%) were students. The number of individuals contacted by telephone (182) to individuals responding (150) equaled an 82 percent survey
The length of time during which the individual had lived in the community was also collected. The average time lived in the community for the non-student was 29.8 years, with a range of one to 77 years. The average time-lived in the community for the student was 6.4 years, with a range from 1 to 29 years.

The 1993 and 1994 telephone survey data were collected using similar procedures. In 1993, 247 residents responded of which 200 (81%) were non-students and 47 (19%) were students. In 1994, 262 residents responded of which 191 (73%) were non-students and 71 (27%) were students.

**Walking Survey**

The Walking (door-to-door) Survey was conducted in the April-May 1995 time-frame along the streets students typically use to travel to-and-from the campus and Charleston bars. One hundred and fifty surveys were collected using a combined face-to-face, and if not home, mail-back strategy. The walking survey questions were identical to the telephone survey instrument. The survey instrument was delivered door-to-door to residents living on
4th, 6th and 7th streets in Charleston. Three 8-10 hour days were required to interview households and deliver the surveys. Mail-back survey returns filtered back in the mail for over a month. If a resident was home when the survey was delivered, a face-to-face interview was conducted using the survey instrument as an interview prompter. If the resident was not home, a printed survey instrument with a postage paid envelope was left in the box for the individual to fill out and return. In multi occupant houses (apartments), one survey was delivered per mailbox. Out of 150 surveys left in the mail boxes, 102 mail-back surveys were returned for a 68 percent return rate. There were 48 face-to-face interviews completed during the walking survey, so a total of 198 addresses was contacted on the three streets.

The reasons those living units on 4th, 6th and 7th streets were selected for the Walking Survey were that they were on or adjacent to the:

- Main pedestrian (foot) and vehicle routes from campus to the concentration of local bars in-and-around the business district of Charleston.
- Most heavy concentration of students residing in-and-around the Charleston community residents.
Effects of Enforcement

- City streets which have a high frequency of house parties and "after-bars" gatherings. "After-bars" refer to house parties starting upon bar closure time (1:00 a.m.) and running to 4:00-5:00 in the morning.

The geographic and demographic characteristics of the walking-surveyed portion of these three streets were as follows:

- Approximately 8 blocks or 7 tenths of a mile from the North edge of campus (Lincoln Street) to the South Side of the Charleston downtown area (Van Buren Street).

- Students migrate these streets Northbound for bar openings and Southbound at bar closings.

- Bar proximity to the campus boundary (Lincoln/4th/6th Street) ranges from 100 feet to 9 tenths of a mile. Four bars concentrate across the street from campus and 7 are located downtown.

- The total number of houses on the three streets was 227. The number of houses on each street was:
  - 4th Street - 58 single dwelling and 22 multi occupant units for a total of 80 houses.
  - 6th Street - 53 single dwelling and 19 multi
Effects of Enforcement

occupant units for a total of 72 houses.

• 7th Street - 59 single dwelling and 16 multi occupant units for a total of 75 houses.

• The single dwelling houses on 4th Street are much smaller than and closer to the sidewalks than the houses on 6th and 7th Street. There are larger apartment complexes on 4th Street and these primarily serve as student apartment housing.

• Vehicle traffic flow on 4th Street is two-way, 6th Street is one-way Southbound, and 7th Street is one-way Northbound.

The period of time that the individual survey respondent had lived on the street was also collected. The non-student average for time lived on the street was 22 years with a range of one to 88 years. The student average for time lived on the street was 3.4 years with a range of 1 to 9 years.

Survey Comment Response

The 1995 Telephone and Walking Surveys provided an opportunity for residents to expand their answers with written comments. Many individuals participating in the Walking Survey provided a verbal or written justification
for answering specific questions in the manner that they had selected. The survey directions provided no instructions regarding individual question comment. Many verbal respondent comments were "written into the margin" or expanded to the back page during the Walking Survey interviews, and individually hand written by respondents on the mailbox returns. Forty five percent of the Walking Survey respondents made specific comments. Ten percent of the students interviewed returned surveys with additional comments, and 35 percent of the non-students interviewed returned surveys with personal commentary.

The Telephone Surveys achieved less success regarding comment return ratios. The surveyed individual was provided the opportunity at the end of the telephone interview to provide comments regarding what they would like to see accomplished in regard to university students' use of alcohol. There was a 24 percent return of surveys with comments. Six percent of the students commented and 18 percent of the non-students commented. The telephone comments were generally much shorter, and of singular purpose in nature than the walking survey comments.

The raw surveys were separated by student and non-student categories and counted. The separated surveys were
then sorted for those with and without comments and totaled. The surveys with comments were then individually charted regarding question specific comments and general comments. From a content analysis of this data, specific response categories and general themes were extracted.

**Town Father Face-To-Face Interviews**

Nine individuals were selected in May 1995 from the Charleston community for personal interviews regarding the effects of local enforcement of alcohol policies. Each individual was selected based upon their ability to influence and direct local alcohol policies and for the purpose of this survey labeled "Town Fathers."

The basic interview questions were extracted from the survey instrument. The individuals were requested to comment on the following four questions:

1. What is the nature of the problem at Eastern Illinois University, and within the Charleston community, regarding student use of alcohol?
2. What do you think the University Administration and local Community Government/Agencies should be doing to control University student use of alcohol?
3. How do you think the raising of the bar entry age to 21 has impacted the problems related to drinking by
university students?

4. Is there anything you would like to see done concerning the University student’s use of alcohol?

The following people were selected for an interview:

**Roscoe Cougill** - Mayor, Charleston, Illinois

**David Jorns** - President, Eastern Illinois University

**Keith Kohanzo** - Director of Judicial Affairs, Eastern Illinois University

**Jim Dunn** - City Council, Charleston/Shell Service Station Manager/Owner

**Gene Scholes** - City Council, Charleston/Director of Media Services, Eastern Illinois University

**Greg Stewart** - City Council Charleston/Charleston News Agency

**John Winnitt** - City Council, Charleston/Winnitt Plumbing and Heating

**Herb Steidinger** - Chief of Police, Charleston, Il.

**Thomas Larson** - Chief of Police, University Police, Eastern Illinois University.

A letter was sent to each individual notifying them
that they would soon be contacted for a request to be interviewed regarding the survey topic. Interview times were set up via telephone. Seven individuals agreed to permit the use of a tape recorder, while two individuals from the Charleston City Council declined face-to-face interviews in favor of a telephone interview. To develop a record of comments from the two individuals who declined a taped interview, copious notes were taken during the telephone interview by writing the verbal response to the survey questions in the margin space of the printed survey questions. Each interview took approximately 30 minutes to conduct. A tape recorder was used only with the permission of the interviewee. The collected responses were (1) transcribed, (2) grouped, and (3) analyzed to facilitate content analysis. Individual topic phrases were grouped into categories, then classified into themes reflecting the focus of the research questions (McMillan & Schumacher, 1993).

**Alcohol Violation Statistics**

Student conduct statistics were collected in report form from the Eastern Illinois University Judicial Affairs Office. The Judicial Affairs staff provided the Student Disciplinary Referrals Report (APPENDIX A) for the prior six
years of violations, including the most recent 1994-95 report. Only the 1993-1994 to 1994-1995 portions of the report were analyzed since Hypothesis 2 focuses only on change occurring during this time frame as it relates to the raising of the bar entry age. All campus student violations of university policy are reported to Judicial Affairs and were contained within this report. The report contains disciplinary referrals other than alcohol related violations, but the alcohol related violations are clearly identified within the report. Alcohol related disciplinary referrals fell within the following areas: underage possession of alcohol; possession of alcohol in a public area; possession of hard alcohol by those 21 or older; keg/bulk possession of alcohol; and total alcohol policy violations and/or alcohol related cases. There are other disciplinary referral areas that may have been aggravated by alcohol consumption, but were not specifically identified. These categories include: excessive noise; safety/false fire alarms; damage/vandalism; housing visitation policy/hours violations; group living situation/parties; fighting/assaults/threats/sexual assaults; trespass; and telephone harassment.
Analysis of Data

The Telephone and Walking Survey data for 1993, 1994, and 1995 consisted primarily of categorical data. The 1993 and 1994 Telephone Survey data were gathered by Eastern Illinois University graduate students from the Eastern Illinois University Department of Educational Psychology and Guidance under the direction of Dr. French Fraker. The 1993 and 1994-survey raw data were tabulated into tables to provide a report for historical study and reference. The 1995 survey data was collected by the author of this study.

Chi-Square, which is a general analysis technique that works well with categorical data (Peatman, 1947), was chosen for the method of analysis. The surveyed data lends itself to the Chi-Square test which analyses the hypothesis of independence. In order to use the Chi-Square test, a null hypothesis concerning the distribution of the responses of the groups must be made. The usual null hypothesis is to assume that there are no differences among the groups (Blalock, 1960). Using this assumption, a set of expected frequencies can be computed using the marginal totals of the contingency table. The Chi-Square statistic is then the measure of the difference between the observed (actual) and the expected (hypothetical) frequencies (Eberly, 1963). In
statistical terms, the null hypothesis is that the row and column variables are independent. The alternative hypothesis is that the row and column variables are dependent. To test for independence, the observed cell frequencies are compared to the cell frequencies that would be expected if the null hypothesis of independence were true (McMillan & Schumacher, 1993).

The survey data Chi-Square was run on the Statistical Analysis Software (SAS) System, release 6.09. This software system has a Copyright 1989 by SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC and is licensed to the Board of Governors Educational Computing Network, site 0013397003.

In carrying out the SAS program, there were two questions required to answer and test the hypotheses. First, were there significant differences or emergent trends concerning how individuals answered each question from year to year? Secondly, was there a significant difference between how students answered the survey questions versus how non-students answered the survey questions?

The collected survey data were originally entered into Microsoft Excel tables which were later transferred to the SAS system for Chi-Square analysis. This Chi-Square analysis incorporated four (4) degrees of freedom and significance
was assumed at the .05 level of confidence.

Tables 1 and 2 provides an exact example of the actual SAS System printout relating to question number 7 which asked survey respondents if they thought the local community government agencies were doing enough to control university student use of alcohol. Table 1 indicates a **significant** Chi-Square probability of 0.008. Table 2 indicate a Chi-Square **non significant** probability of change 0.119.

The decision was made to collapse the "no," "not-sure" and "no-answer" survey questioner categories into one category which was subsequently labeled "other." The reason for this decision was that a "yes" response on the survey item was the primary indicator of whether a respondent perceived there was a problem dealing with student alcohol abuse.

The following pages labeled Table 1 and 2 provides an exact Chi-Square printout from the Eastern Illinois SAS computer system.
### TABLE 1 OF ANSWER BY YEAR
CONTROLLING FOR STATUS=NON-STUDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Cell Chi-Square</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>99.669</td>
<td>-1.194</td>
<td>16.331</td>
<td>2.6759</td>
<td>30.23</td>
<td>42.92</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>92.194</td>
<td>-1.194</td>
<td>2.6759</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>42.92</td>
<td>109.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>109.14</td>
<td>-15.14</td>
<td>49.83</td>
<td>58.00</td>
<td>31.23</td>
<td>42.92</td>
<td>109.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100.33</td>
<td>1.1937</td>
<td>-16.33</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92.806</td>
<td>15.137</td>
<td>41.25</td>
<td>27.72</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>109.86</td>
<td>15.137</td>
<td>50.17</td>
<td>42.00</td>
<td>50.81</td>
<td>57.08</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 6

### STATISTICS FOR TABLE 1 OF ANSWER BY YEAR
CONTROLLING FOR STATUS=NON-STUDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.550</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.587</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.452</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Sample Size = 604
Frequency Missing = 6
### TABLE 2 OF ANSWER BY YEAR
CONTROLLING FOR STATUS=STUDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANSWER</th>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Expected</th>
<th>Deviation</th>
<th>Cell Chi-Square</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Row Pct</th>
<th>Col Pct</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.391</td>
<td>22.706</td>
<td>25.904</td>
<td>-5.904</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>12.18</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.6091</td>
<td>1.2944</td>
<td>-5.904</td>
<td>-4.609</td>
<td>4.762</td>
<td>1.3455</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>31.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>38.10</td>
<td>31.75</td>
<td>-3.805</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>55.096</td>
<td>30.96</td>
<td>68.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.22</td>
<td>33.80</td>
<td>24.69</td>
<td>1.3455</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>24.97</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30.609</td>
<td>48.294</td>
<td>55.096</td>
<td>1.4762</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>55.096</td>
<td>30.96</td>
<td>68.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.609</td>
<td>-1.294</td>
<td>5.9036</td>
<td>-4.609</td>
<td>-0.0347</td>
<td>0.6326</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>30.96</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.20</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>30.96</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.40</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.78</td>
<td>66.20</td>
<td>75.31</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td>23.86</td>
<td>45.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>22.84</td>
<td>36.04</td>
<td>41.12</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency Missing = 2

### STATISTICS FOR TABLE 2 OF ANSWER BY YEAR
CONTROLLING FOR STATUS=STUDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Prob</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.257</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likelihood Ratio Chi-Square</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.251</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mantel-Haenszel Chi-Square</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.233</td>
<td>0.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency Coefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramer's V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Effective Sample Size = 197
Frequency Missing = 2
Chapter Four

RESULTS

The results of this study have been reported in four sections under the following titles: (1) Survey, (2) Survey Comment Response, (3) Town Fathers Face-to-Face Interviews and (4) Alcohol Violation Statistics. Hypothesis H1 relates to titles 1, 2 and 3. Hypothesis H2 relates to title 4. The related hypothesis pertaining to each of the titled sections are provided on pages 5 and 6 of this document.

Survey

Based upon the Chi-Square analysis of survey results, Null Hypothesis No.1 stating that there was "no difference in community attitude toward Eastern student drinking behavior based upon local enforcement efforts between Spring 1993 and Spring 1995," was not accepted.

Survey Results Breakout. The survey item responses were analyzed, and logically grouped according to three categories. The three "major group categories" of survey items consisted of (1) The Problem; (2) Responsibility; and (3) Enforcement. Within the major groups there are "specific topic areas." Finally, within the topic areas there are "survey items" which were the actual data analysis results extracted from the survey questions.
Significant change in the proportion of non-student, community responses to the alcohol usage survey were identified in the following areas: did student alcohol use impact community residents (item 2); has student alcohol use caused a problem for you (item 3); did student alcohol use effect the community crime level (item 4); did the university administration do enough to control student alcohol use (item 5); did the community government do enough to control student alcohol use (item 7); how did EIU student alcohol use compare to other universities (item 8); and should college students wait until age 21 to drink alcohol in bars (item 11)

Non-significant changes from 1993-1995 in community perceptions of student alcohol use were found in the following areas: was student alcohol abuse at EIU a problem (item 1); did local law enforcement agencies do enough to control student use of alcohol (item 6); was the relationship between the university administration and community government good (item 9); is stricter underage drinking enforcement by local authorities needed (item 10); did you support raising the bar entry age from 19 to 21 (item 12); is strict local enforcement of the 21 bar entry age law needed (item 13); how has raising the bar entry age
impacted student drinking problems (item 14); and should students have input in decisions influencing drinking policy (item 15).

Survey response results that exhibited significant deviations from the expected are reported in Table 3. Table 4 displays non significant results. All question responses were presented regardless of exhibiting significant change or variation. Significance was assumed at the .05 level of confidence. Tables 3 and 4 are contained on following pages.
### Table 3

**Chi-Square Analysis of Perception of Alcohol Issues by Students and Non-Students: 1993-1995; (Significant)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>Yes Response</th>
<th>All Other Responses</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you think the students use of alcohol at Eastern Illinois University affects the residents of the community?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20(10)</td>
<td>135(22)</td>
<td>27(14)</td>
<td>65(11)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>35(18)</td>
<td>136(22)</td>
<td>36(18)</td>
<td>55(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>55(28)</td>
<td>186(30)</td>
<td>26(13)</td>
<td>33(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>110(55)</td>
<td>457(75)</td>
<td>89(45)</td>
<td>153(25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has alcohol use by Eastern Illinois University students ever caused a problem for you?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>7(4)</td>
<td>77(13)</td>
<td>40(20)</td>
<td>123(20)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>13(7)</td>
<td>50(8)</td>
<td>58(29)</td>
<td>141(23)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>29(15)</td>
<td>124(20)</td>
<td>52(26)</td>
<td>95(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>49(25)</td>
<td>251(41)</td>
<td>150(75)</td>
<td>359(59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you think the alcohol use of Eastern Illinois University students effects the crime level in the community?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>12(6)</td>
<td>111(18)</td>
<td>35(18)</td>
<td>89(15)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>34(17)</td>
<td>100(16)</td>
<td>35(18)</td>
<td>91(80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>49(25)</td>
<td>145(24)</td>
<td>32(16)</td>
<td>74(12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>95(48)</td>
<td>356(58)</td>
<td>102(52)</td>
<td>254(42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
### Table 3

**Chi-Square Analysis of Perception of Alcohol Issues by Students and Non-Students: 1993-1995; (Significant)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student Yes</th>
<th>Non-Student Yes</th>
<th>Student All Other</th>
<th>Non-Student All Other</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>X2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you think the University administration is doing enough to control the university students' use of alcohol?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>17(9)</td>
<td>54(9)</td>
<td>30(15)</td>
<td>146(24)</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>44(22)</td>
<td>67(11)</td>
<td>27(14)</td>
<td>124(20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>54(27)</td>
<td>39(6)</td>
<td>26(13)</td>
<td>180(30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>115(58)</td>
<td>160(26)</td>
<td>83(42)</td>
<td>450(74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you think the local law enforcement agencies are doing enough to control university students' use of alcohol?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>32(16)</td>
<td>94(16)</td>
<td>15(8)</td>
<td>106(18)</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.173*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>49(25)</td>
<td>101(17)</td>
<td>22(11)</td>
<td>86(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>68(34)</td>
<td>121(20)</td>
<td>13(7)</td>
<td>96(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>149(75)</td>
<td>316(52)</td>
<td>50(25)</td>
<td>288(48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you think the local community government is doing enough to control university students' use of alcohol?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>26(13)</td>
<td>84(14)</td>
<td>19(10)</td>
<td>116(19)</td>
<td>0.119*</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>47(24)</td>
<td>94(16)</td>
<td>24(12)</td>
<td>91(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>61(31)</td>
<td>125(21)</td>
<td>20(10)</td>
<td>94(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>134(60)</td>
<td>303(50)</td>
<td>63(32)</td>
<td>301(50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
Table 3

Chi-Square Analysis of Perception of Alcohol Issues by Students and Non-Students: 1993-1995; (Significant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. How do you think the level of alcohol use by EIU students compares to that of students at other state universities?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>9(5)</td>
<td>60(12)</td>
<td>36(19)</td>
<td>104(21)</td>
<td>0.006 0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4(2)</td>
<td>27(5)</td>
<td>61(33)</td>
<td>120(24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>27(5)</td>
<td>74(40)</td>
<td>157(32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>16(9)</td>
<td>114(23)</td>
<td>171(91)</td>
<td>381(77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Do you think the relationship between the university administration and community government is good?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>14(7)</td>
<td>84(14)</td>
<td>33(17)</td>
<td>108(18)</td>
<td>0.012 0.075*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>23(12)</td>
<td>104(17)</td>
<td>46(23)</td>
<td>87(15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>11(6)</td>
<td>96(16)</td>
<td>70(36)</td>
<td>116(37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>48(24)</td>
<td>284(48)</td>
<td>149(76)</td>
<td>311(52)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Do you think that college students should have to wait until they are 21 to drink in campus bars?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>17(9)</td>
<td>135(22)</td>
<td>30(15)</td>
<td>65(11)</td>
<td>0.008 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>40(20)</td>
<td>154(25)</td>
<td>31(16)</td>
<td>37(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>52(26)</td>
<td>180(30)</td>
<td>29(15)</td>
<td>39(6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>109(55)</td>
<td>469(77)</td>
<td>90(45)</td>
<td>141(23)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages of raw scores are in parentheses. *p<.05.
### Table 4

**Chi-Square Analysis of Perception of Alcohol Issues by Students and Non-Students: 1993-1995; (Non Significant)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( \text{Student} )</th>
<th>( \text{Non-Student} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you think there is a problem at Eastern Illinois University regarding the students' use of alcohol?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>21(11)</td>
<td>142(23)</td>
<td>26(13)</td>
<td>58(10)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>30(15)</td>
<td>123(20)</td>
<td>41(21)</td>
<td>68(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>21(11)</td>
<td>161(26)</td>
<td>58(29)</td>
<td>57(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>72(37)</td>
<td>426(70)</td>
<td>125(63)</td>
<td>183(30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are local law enforcement agencies doing enough to control the university students' use of alcohol?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>32(16)</td>
<td>94(16)</td>
<td>15(8)</td>
<td>106(18)</td>
<td>0.050**</td>
<td>0.173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>49(25)</td>
<td>101(17)</td>
<td>22(11)</td>
<td>86(14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>68(34)</td>
<td>121(20)</td>
<td>13(7)</td>
<td>96(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>149(75)</td>
<td>316(52)</td>
<td>50(25)</td>
<td>288(48)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is the local government doing enough to control the university students' use of alcohol?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>26(13)</td>
<td>84(14)</td>
<td>19(10)</td>
<td>116(19)</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.008**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>47(24)</td>
<td>94(16)</td>
<td>24(12)</td>
<td>91(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>61(31)</td>
<td>125(21)</td>
<td>20(10)</td>
<td>94(16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>134(68)</td>
<td>303(50)</td>
<td>63(32)</td>
<td>301(50)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(table continues)*
### Table 4

**Chi-Square Analysis of Perception of Alcohol Issues by Students and Non-Students: 1993-1995; (Non Significant)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>x2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.  Do you think the relationship between the university administration and the community government is good</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>14(7)</td>
<td>84(14)</td>
<td>33(17)</td>
<td>108(18)</td>
<td>0.012**</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>23(12)</td>
<td>104(17)</td>
<td>46(23)</td>
<td>87(15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>11(6)</td>
<td>96(16)</td>
<td>70(36)</td>
<td>116(20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>48(24)</td>
<td>284(48)</td>
<td>149(76)</td>
<td>311(52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Do you support stricter enforcement by the local law enforcement authorities of the underage drinking laws?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>24(12)</td>
<td>160(26)</td>
<td>23(12)</td>
<td>40(7)</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>27(14)</td>
<td>147(24)</td>
<td>44(22)</td>
<td>44(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>35(18)</td>
<td>180(30)</td>
<td>46(23)</td>
<td>39(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>86(43)</td>
<td>487(80)</td>
<td>113(57)</td>
<td>123(20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Did you support the age for entering a campus bar being raised from 19 to 21?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>20(10)</td>
<td>142(24)</td>
<td>27(14)</td>
<td>58(10)</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>18(9)</td>
<td>134(22)</td>
<td>53(38)</td>
<td>53(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>20(10)</td>
<td>162(27)</td>
<td>61(31)</td>
<td>55(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>58(29)</td>
<td>438(73)</td>
<td>141(71)</td>
<td>166(27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Table continues)*
### Table 4

**Chi-Square Analysis of Perception of Alcohol Issues by Students and Non-Students: 1993-1995; (Non Significant)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Non-Student</th>
<th>x²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. Do you support enforcement of the law restricting students from entering bars before the age of 21?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>27(14)</td>
<td>160(26)</td>
<td>20(10)</td>
<td>40(7)</td>
<td>0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>37(19)</td>
<td>145(24)</td>
<td>34(17)</td>
<td>42(7)</td>
<td>0.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>44(22)</td>
<td>179(30)</td>
<td>37(19)</td>
<td>40(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>108(54)</td>
<td>484(80)</td>
<td>91(19)</td>
<td>122(20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Do you think raising the bar entry age has increased the problems related to drinking by university students?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>21(11)</td>
<td>54(9)</td>
<td>26(13)</td>
<td>146(24)</td>
<td>0.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>40(20)</td>
<td>54(9)</td>
<td>31(16)</td>
<td>137(23)</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995G</td>
<td>43(22)</td>
<td>59(10)</td>
<td>38(19)</td>
<td>158(26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>104(52)</td>
<td>167(27)</td>
<td>95(48)</td>
<td>441(73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Do you think university students should have input in the decisions influencing drinking policy?</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>38(19)</td>
<td>108(18)</td>
<td>9(5)</td>
<td>92(15)</td>
<td>0.434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>61(31)</td>
<td>101(31)</td>
<td>10(5)</td>
<td>90(15)</td>
<td>0.786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>63(32)</td>
<td>122(37)</td>
<td>18(9)</td>
<td>95(34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group</td>
<td>162(81)</td>
<td>331(54)</td>
<td>37(19)</td>
<td>277(46)**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Percentages of raw scores are in parentheses. **p>.05.
I. THE PROBLEM.

A. Is There a Problem (item 1, Table 4)?

Over a three-year period, an average of 70 percent of the residential community members (non-students) believed there was a problem with students use of alcohol, verses 37 percent of the students believing so. Regarding perception, approximately two thirds of the community members believe there were problems, whereas approximately two thirds of the students did not believe there were problems regarding student drinking. Student and non-student responses did not show a significant probability of variation across time at the 0.05 level. The student data did show a variance probability of 0.057, which was very close to being significant. The noted variation appeared between 1994 and 1995 when 16 percent fewer students answered "yes" to this question. The student category area of "no" showed an approximate annual increase of 10 percent during each of the three surveyed years.

B. Does the Problem Effect the Community (item 2, Table 3)?

When the survey respondents were asked if "student use of alcohol affected the residents of the community," the response showed significant probability of a variance in
both the student and non-student category. That is, the overall proportion of people responding "yes" to the item were dependent on the year in which the question was asked. A three-year average of response for this item showed 75 percent of the non-students and 55 percent of the students agreeing that student alcohol use affected the residents of the community. There was a significant one year increase in the "yes" category between 1994 and 1995 in both the student and non-student categories. Between 1994 and 1995, the student's "yes" selection increased 19 percent to 68 percent and the non-student's selection of "yes" jumped 14 percent to 85 percent.

C. Has Student Drinking Caused Problems for You (item 3, Table 3)?

When asked if "student use of alcohol has ever caused a problem for you," the three-year survey average showed 41 percent of the non-students and 25 percent of the students having directly experienced problems personally. There was a significant increase in both the student and non-student reporting of the "yes" answer between 1994 and 1995 on this item. Between 1994 and 1995, non-students reported a 31 percent increase in the "yes" choice for a 1995 non-student group total of 57 percent. These data revealed that between
1994 and 1995, over half of the non-student community and a third of the student population reported personally and adversely being effected by students under the influence of alcohol.

D. Does Student Drinking Effect Crime (item 4, Table 3)?

A three-year survey average of respondents show that 58 percent of the community members, and 48 percent of the students think that student alcohol use effects the community crime level. There was a significant increase in both the student and non-student report of the "yes" response between 1994 and 1995. From 1994 to 1995, non-students reported a 14 percent increase in the "yes" choice, for a group total of 66 percent agreeing that student drinking effects crime rates. During the same time frame, the students reported an 11 percent increase of the "yes" response and a group total of 60 percent.

E. Are University/Community Relations Good (item 9, Table 4)?

The survey responses revealed a significant probability of variance in the student category about whether "the relationship between the university administration and the community government was good." A three-year average showed only 48 percent of the non-students and 24 percent of
the students—felt the relationship between the university and the community was good. A significant 19 percent drop, to a group total of 14 percent, occurred in the student "yes" response between 1994 and 1995. There was also a drop of 9 percent for the non-student group "yes" response during the same time frame.

F. How Does Eastern Compare to Other State Universities (item 8, Table 3)?

When asked "how alcohol use by Eastern Illinois University students compared to that of students at other state universities," the majority of the community and students selected "same/not sure." Over a three-year period, 91 percent of the students and 77 percent of the non-students thought the student alcohol usage was the same or were uncertain about how it compared to student alcohol use at other state universities. Both student and non-student groups showed a significant variance. A three-year average revealed that 23 percent of the non-students and 9 percent of the students felt that Eastern student's level of alcohol consumption was "more" or greater than that of other state universities. In 1993 the non-student category results showed 37 percent believing student alcohol consumption was greater than other universities. Between 1993 and 1994, the
non-student perception of “more” changed from 37 percent to 18 percent, indicating a 19 percent shift to a choice “other” than “yes.” The students showed a 14 percent increase between 1993(80%) and 1994(94%) in the “other category.”

II. RESPONSIBILITY.

A. University Administration Doing Enough (item 5 Table 3)?

When the survey asked if the “university is doing enough to control student drinking,” the students said “yes” and the community said “no.” This question response showed significant probability of a variance in both the student and non-student categories. A three-year average of the respondents showed that 58 percent of the students and 26 percent of the non-students feel “the university administration is doing enough to control the students’ use of alcohol.” The student response to this question produced a year-to-year annual gain during the three surveyed years in the “yes” answer choice. The total student gain from 1993 to 1995 showed 31 percent for a 1995 group total of 68 percent. Contrary to the student increase, the non-students recorded a drop between 1994 and 1995 in the “yes” answer choice of 17 percent to a 1995 group total of 18 percent.

B. Community Government Doing Enough (item 7, Table 3).
When asked, "Do you think the local community government [was] doing enough to control university student use of alcohol," the students said "yes" and the community respondents split 50/50. The non-student population displayed significant three year increases of 15 percent in the "yes" approval rate to this question. Variances occurred between 1993 and 1994 when the non-student's perception shifted from a negative (not enough) to positive (enough) viewpoint regarding their local government's efforts in student alcohol consumption control.

C. Local Law Enforcement Doing Enough (item 6, Table 3).

When asked if "the local law enforcement agencies [were] doing enough to control university student use of alcohol," both the students and non-students agreed that they indeed were doing so. This question showed significant probability of a variance in the student portion across time. The non-student response was dependent on the year in which non-students were surveyed. A three-year average of the respondents showed 75 percent of the students and 52 percent of the non-students thought that local law enforcement agencies were doing enough to control university student use of alcohol. A 15 percent increase was observed among students in the "yes" category between 1994 and 1995,
which increased the 1995 student group total to 84 percent. The non-students showed a “yes” increase of 9 percent spanning three years. This increase produced a 1995 group total of 56 percent in reported community support for the efforts of local law enforcement agencies.

D. Student Input (item 15, Table 4)?

When asked if students should be able to provide input to “decisions influencing drinking policy,” the student and community respondents said “yes.” The question did not reveal any probability of a variance in either the student or non-student groups. A three-year average of the “yes” answer responses showed that 81 percent of the students, and 54 percent of the non-students, thought that students should have input in decisions regarding drinking policy. The student “yes” response decreased 8 percent between 1994 and 1995 from 86 percent to 78 percent. The non-students response spanning three years remained stable within 2 percentage points of 54 percent.

III. ENFORCEMENT.

A. Stricter Enforcement of Underage Drinking Laws (item 10, Table 4)?

When asked if the survey respondents supported “stricter enforcement by local authorities of the underage
drinking laws," the community respondents said "yes" and the student respondents said "no." Responses to this question did not reveal a dependence upon the year surveyed in either the student or non-student categories. A three-year average of "yes" responses revealed that 80 percent of the non-students and 43 percent of the students favored stricter enforcement of the underage drinking laws.

B. Should Students Wait Until Age 21 (item 11, Table 3)?

When asked if college students should have to "wait until age 21 to publicly consume alcohol," both the university student and community respondents said "yes." The survey question responses revealed significant probability of a variance in both the student and non-student categories. A three-year average of the "yes" responses showed that 77 percent of the non-students and 55 percent of the students agreed that students should have to wait until age 21 to publicly consume alcohol. There was a 28 percent increase in student "yes" responses from 36 percent in 1993, to 64 percent in 1995. The non-student "yes" responses revealed a one-year increase of 13 percent between 1993 and 1994.

C. Support Raising of the Bar Entry Age (item 12, Table 4)?

When the survey asked the respondents if they supported
the bar entry age being raised from 19 to 21, the community in general said "yes" and the students said "no." This question did not reveal significant probability of a variance in either the student or non-student categories. A three-year average of the "yes" responses revealed 73 percent of the non-students and 29 percent of the students supported the bar entry age being raised to 21. The student "yes" response showed an 18 percent decrease in support of "yes" between 1993 and 1995. The non-students remained stable and only increased in support of this issue by 4 percent over the three-year period.

D. Support Enforcement of the 21 Bar Entry Age (item 13, Table 4)?

Both student and non-student respondents affirmatively supported strict enforcement by local authorities "of the law restricting students from entering bars before the age of 21". Survey responses revealed no pattern of variation in either student or non-student groups. A three-year average showed 80 percent of the non-students and 54 percent of the students supported strict enforcement of restricting entry of underage students into the bars.

E. Has the Bar Entry Age Increased or Decreased Problems (item 13, Table 4)?
Asked "if raising the bar entry age to 21 has increased or decreased the problems related to student drinking," students said "yes" and non-students said "no." Observed frequencies did not differ from the expected, so the result was non-significant. A three-year average of the "yes" responses showed 52 percent of the students and 27 percent of the non-students thought that raising the bar entry age had increased student-related drinking problems.

Half of the students polled in 1995 thought that problems have increased. This opinion comes a full year after the enactment of the 21-year-old entry age ordinance. The 1995 "yes" response of 53 percent was 3 percent below the 1994 figure of 56 percent.

**Survey Comment Response**

The following information was voluntarily provided by 102 self-selected student and non-student survey respondents (34 percent of the 1995 group, N= 300) in addition to answering the standard 15 survey questions. It is not suggested, or to be assumed, that the majority of people who completed the survey in 1995 without comment did so without opinions in these areas.

Of the 300 people surveyed, 219 were from the non-
student group. Seventy-eight of the 219 non-students, or 36 percent of the non-student sample, provided a total of 117 individual comments to survey items. Many of the non-students provided two to three comments per survey instrument.

Students made up 81 of the total 300 surveyed respondents. Twenty-four students, or 30 percent of all students surveyed, provided a total of 37 comments. Most students responding to the survey provided one comment per survey instrument.

**Comment Breakout.** The comments received were (1) categorized, (2) analyzed, and (3) grouped according to a response theme. All comments fall into four themes, which consisted of (1) The Problem; (2) Responsibility; (3) Enforcement; and (4) Solutions. Within the major theme categories there were "specific topic areas." Finally, within the topic areas there are "topic comments" which were the actual responses provided by the survey respondents. The comments are separated into the "non-student" and "student" categories. A breakout of the four themes is provided below.

**Non-Student/Community Response:**

I. THE PROBLEM. The non-student community responded strongly and very frequently that community problems have
emerged from student drinking. On the local front, there were three areas which were most frequently targeted for criticism and responsibility; the students, the local alcohol merchants, and the university officials. Nationally, the media/advertisement agencies and all citizens were identified as responsible for, and/or, providing the solution for underage drinking.

A. Is There a Problem (item 1, Table 4).

1. Locally.

   a. Community perception of surveyed citizens indicated a solidarity of concurrence that there is indeed a problem regarding student consumption of alcohol. Two sets of parents provided comment regarding their personal experience:

You probably don’t want to hear what I have to say. I am very angry. My husband and I have just come from the hospital visiting our seventeen-year-old daughter who was severely injured as a passenger in a drunk driving accident. She will never walk correctly again. The underage driver was one of the university fraternity students who live in the fraternity house next door. We tried to stop her from associating with that drunken bunch, but what can you do? When is someone going to really do something about student drinking?

I had two daughters attend Eastern. My youngest daughter’s life was practically destroyed by alcohol. She went to Charleston High School and started going to the bars when she was sixteen. One particular bar owner did not care that he was catering to underage drinkers and promoting
illegal activity. It was not hard to get served underage at most of the town bars. It was just too easy. Peer pressure was too great and she was caught up in the social atmosphere of the bar scene. Her problems with alcohol that started in the Charleston bars caused serious problems with her life and our family. Alcohol eventually caused her to drop from school.

b. Several comments were directed toward local Charleston merchants who are in business associated with alcohol. One resident stated the problem very clearly:

Some local merchants associated with alcohol distribution are unethical and do not abide by the law by knowingly serving minors, thus contributing to the delinquency of minors. It seems especially during the past five years certain people involved with alcohol sales have suddenly become the wealthiest people in Charleston. They drive Mercedes Benz cars and live in brand new $500,000 homes. These are the same people who keep getting arrested for serving minors. It makes you wonder what in the world is going on here in our town?

c. University officials were frequently singled out as a problem source related to student alcohol abuse as presented by a local businessman:

Eastern's president and his staff do not appear to want to become involved with resolving the issues surrounding university student drinking. I always say that if you are not part of the solution, then you are a part of the problem. They seem to be very sensitive to insulating themselves from the enforcement efforts of the community. It seems like they don't want to upset the students by taking a lawful stand on underage drinking. University officials seem to be more concerned with keeping the students happy, thus ensuring
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capacity enrollment, thus ensuring a steady flow of incoming dollars to the university coffers, thus ensuring their continued employment.

d. Excessive noise, vandalism, and littering were a consistent theme expressed by community members living on the main streets which the students travel to and from the bars. One long time resident expressed his concern:

I have lived on 6th Street for 15 years which is a major traffic route for the students going to and coming from the bars. At least twice a week I have to clean my yard of empty and broken beer bottles. To be wakened at 1:00 or 2:00 a.m. by drunken students heading to campus following bar closure was a rule. I am very tired of students urinating in my yard, destroying my property, disturbing my peace and littering my property. On night I even found a drunken student inside my back porch laying asleep on the freezer. Another night an intoxicated couple were preparing to have sex at my front door. Neighboring student house parties are out of control. I have started contacting the landlords and advising them of the possibility of a lawsuit for not controlling their tenants. I am to the point of prosecuting students for their inappropriate behavior. All my neighbors have had similar experiences with the students.

2. Nationally.

a. When the "who is responsible" topic of local versus national responsibility associated with problem underage drinking surfaced, five community members labeled it as a national problem. One community leader summed up this position:

Underage drinking is a rampant national problem.
We as citizens allow the media (television) to be sponsored by distributors of alcohol who target our youth for consumption of alcohol. By the time a child is old enough to sit in front of the television he or she is bombarded by attractive commercials promoting alcohol. The message being sent to our youth is it is OK for adults to consume alcohol, but you have to wait. Hence, our children are being “groomed to consume.” Until we get a handle on the public promotion of alcohol that targets our youth, society will continue to have problems with underage drinking.

b. As a nation we seem to have a tendency to “look the other way” when it comes to drinking by college students as expressed by an elderly female resident:

It is time to take a stand against the college student drinking problem. It is so easy to continue to ignore the problem as if it isn’t happening. The problem with drunk students has continued to worsen and it is not going away. The adults of America need to get involved and take a position against underage drinking. If the rest of the country takes steps to control the problem like Mayor Cougill is doing, the problem will get much better.

B. What is the Problem?

1. Are We Sending the Wrong Message?

   a. A mother of two Charleston High School students expressed concern with those in the business of alcohol sales who target youth for their profits:

      It is not right for businessmen to target young people for advertisements promoting alcohol sales. They sell T-shirts with beer logos all over town to any child with money. They have advertised
cheap drinks promoting attractive ways of getting drunk in our local newspaper. The city and university allow hundreds of students to gather in the community residence for parties where underage students openly consume from visible beer kegs. It is my constant battle in explaining why this is not a good thing for my children as they see it happening every day.

b. A local male in his late 30's also expressed his dismay directed toward advertising at the national level:

By allowing beer companies to sponsor NCAA athletic events and advertise during the games is wrong. Every major sporting event is promoted by alcohol companies. Is it any wonder why our male youth find alcohol attractive?

2. Can it be Stopped?

a. An elderly gentleman who graduated from Eastern expressed his view concerning student abstention from alcohol:

You cannot totally stop kids from drinking. Drinking on and around the college campus has been institutionalized. Students were drinking when I went to college and they will continue to drink in the future.

b. A female businessperson with an opposing viewpoint stated:

Student drinking can be brought under control if the students understand the city is serious about enforcing the drinking laws. As a community we must not conduct rhetoric without action as we
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have in the past. The city and university must back up enforcement policies with action.

   a. A male Telephone Survey respondent angrily expressed his concern regarding student responsibility:

   Students are irresponsible and need to take personal responsibility for their behavior. They want to be treated like adults, yet they act like children. It is like they are saying, “give me all the benefits of adulthood, but don’t hold me responsible for my illegal actions” because “I’m young.” You can’t have one without the other.

   b. An elderly couple who are longtime residents of 4th Street and who have seen students come and go said:

   Students are only in our city for a short period of time and do not assume ownership and pride in the community. Students feel no responsibility to our community because they know that in a few years they will be gone. They are here to have a good time. If we have a bad group of students who move next door, we also know that they will be gone in a few years and just wait them out.

4. Consequences.
   a. A few survey respondents attempted to minimized the student drinking problem:

   A few violent individuals give the perception of a campus-wide problem with student drinking. I would say that only 10 percent of the students are causing most of the problems.

   b. Three females who were in their early
twenties related their fears directed toward intoxicated students roaming the streets:

I am fearful to travel alone at night due to the threat posed by intoxicated male students. I have been harassed, groped and propositioned in the most vulgar ways by drunks who are complete strangers. This happens in the bars and right out in plain sight on the streets.

Some of my friends share the same fear of rape and assault that I do. We all know of friends who have been raped or "date raped." I will not answer my door late at night.

I wish the city or university could provide a "safe" means of transportation for people who due to work have to work late at night. I will not walk to work for fear of assault.

5. Demographics.

a. Some see the problem being related to the close proximity of the bars to campus and a town and university which provides little entertainment for the students:

Having the bars located so extremely close to campus sends a message to the students that the university supports their alcohol usage. The term "campus bars" which is used frequently by residents and students supports this notion. I have heard that students from other universities come to Charleston on the weekends for the party atmosphere. Eastern has gained the reputation as a "party school" and some individuals attend Eastern for this very purpose.

b. The bulk of Eastern's student population grew
up in and around the Chicago metro area which prompted this comment:

Students in a small university town with no city nearby, need entertainment and alcohol seems to meet that need. There is nothing for the students to do. If the university and Charleston will not provide entertainment for the students, they will find ways to entertain themselves.

II. RESPONSIBILITY.
A. Who is Responsible?
   1. The University.
      a. There was a split of opinion when deciding who was responsible for addressing the student drinking problem, the university or the city. A university employee defended the university by saying:

      It is not the universities’ responsibility to fix the student alcohol problem. We are not their parents and they are adults. Many of the problem drinkers came to the university with a drinking problem. The university is here to provide an education, not to enforce drinking laws,

      b. On the other hand the majority of community members, which include many university employees, stated comments that reflect a longtime university employees comment:

      The university is shirking its lawful obligation
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to the students, the students' parents, and the community by allow/condoning rampant alcohol abuse by the students. Eastern and the city has equal responsibility to act on the student drinking problem.

2. The Students.

   a. When analyzing the non student written comments regarding student responsibility for the drinking problem, two general items arose. Most comments insist that the students be accountable for their own actions. A few comments reflected that students should rule their own destiny. A comment received from a 6th street male resident who had attend Eastern but did not graduate stated:

      Let the students govern themselves. The police need to back off and stop harassing students. If you treat the students like adults, they will act like adults. The harder you push, the harder the students are going to push back.

   b. Conversely, many comments received from the community supported an Eastern professor’s survey comment:

      Students must take responsibility for their actions. If they break the law, they must be punished. The Student Council and the majority of students who do not cause alcohol related disturbances must band together and influence the troublemakers that their behavior is unacceptable. Peer pressure is a wonderful tool to create change within a population of this age group. Unfortunately, there seems to be no movement toward the students accepting the responsibility of policing their own student body.
III. ENFORCEMENT.

A. Are Enforcement Agencies doing Enough?

1. The University (item 5, Table 3).

a. Many survey respondents, especially from the community, have indicated that the university has a role to play in the prevention, enforcement and punishment of students who abuse alcohol. The general survey response is summed up best by a female Telephone Survey respondent:

EIU officials need to take responsibility to prevent, enforce, and punish alcohol offenders. The students look to the university administration for guidance and appear to reject efforts from the community. When the university does nothing constructive to stop the alcohol abuse, the students interpret this as the university condoning their actions.

b. Some respondents feel Eastern officials are doing enough to control the problem, although nothing was provided to indicate what it was that the respondent thought the officials were doing. In other words, little or no elaboration was provided in any of the survey responses to indicate specifically what action university officials were
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doing to control the student alcohol problem. On the other
hand, the community prevention and enforcement effort is
well publicized and documented. The survey comments received
regarding community efforts provide many details that
indicate a general understanding of the city officials’
enforcement program. An example supporting university action
is provided by one of the survey respondents:

The EIU administration is doing enough to control
the problem.

2. Has Enforcement Effected the Problem?

a. During the walking survey, many individuals
living on 4th, 6th and 7th Street were quick to provide
positive feedback regarding the city’s enforcement efforts.
One elderly 6th street widow who indicated that she was
previously at her "wit’s end" prior to enforcement provided
this survey response.

I have seen a dramatic improvement in the past six
months. The foot-traffic, noise, vandalism, and
violence have decreased in the community,
especially in our neighborhood. I am no longer
awakened from my sleep by drunk students screaming
profanity as they wandered down our street.

Another resident complemented the Charleston
Police Department:

Prior to enforcement efforts it seemed to take
forever for the police to respond to our calls of
student party disturbances. Now, the police arrive
right away and the parties disband.
b. When the specific topic of improvement due to raising the bar entry age (item 13, Table 4) was broached, fewer specific answers were received. Since the bar entry age was only a portion of the composite enforcement effort, many are taking a wait-and-see position:

I believe it is too early to tell if raising the bar entry age has impacted the student drinking problem. I do know that things are getting better, but I am not sure if the bar entry age is the source of improvement. I think we need to give it another year and then take a look.

IV. SOLUTIONS.

A. Recommendations.

1. Get Involved.

   a. There was much survey response activity regarding recommendations for the university to take a more active role in resolving the student drinking problem. A local business man who owns an establishment on the Charleston Town Square stated:

   Eastern's administration needs to prevent, enforce, and punish student alcohol offenders. You continually see and learn of inebriated students getting into all kinds of trouble, but you never hear of any of them being kicked out of the university. In some cases the trouble includes violent assault and felonies. As this occurs, the university is standing on the sidelines. This strikes of a double standard regarding how the students are disciplined on campus when compared to how the city disciplines offenders. If the
university rightfully started administratively expelling the students for flagrant abuses of the law, you would see an instant positive change in student behavior.

b. A few comments were received that suggested a unified front to combat the student drinking problem:

Everyone in the Charleston community needs to study and understand the problem with student drinking and work together to resolve this issue.

2. Teamwork.

a. Several survey responses received indicate a rift between some of the EIU administrators and Charleston city government officials. There were few specifics provided other than the university not making official statements of support regarding the enforcement effort. Comments generally leaned toward the community being too strict and the university being too lenient regarding enforcement. One common thread that consistently emerged in the survey responses regarding the working relationship between the university and the city was:

The university and the city need to start cooperating better together to resolve the student drinking problem.

b. Encouragement emerged regarding the working relationship between the university and the city police
departments. One example of cooperation was the "Unified Patrol." The "Unified Patrol" consists of the Charleston and University Police Departments combining officers from both forces in the same patrol cars and responding to student disturbances. All comments indicate that this program is successful. A local law enforcement officer stated:

We need to take a lesson from how well the Charleston Police Department and the University Police have teamed together to better handle the student party situation.


A series of short, yet specific pro-enforcement recommendations were received from the survey comments:

a. Prohibit the advertising of alcohol.
b. Eliminate all bars near campus.
c. Hold landowners responsible for the actions of their tenants.
d. Keep alcohol off campus, especially in the dorms and the Student Union.

A series of specific pro-consumption comments were also received:

a. Lower drinking age to 19.
b. Be more supportive of students.
c. Leave the students alone.
d. Reduce the amount of the community fines for alcohol violations.

4. Alternatives.

The survey instrument did not include any question
related to "Alternatives to Alcohol." Even so, "alternatives" were frequently referred to in the survey comments. Providing students alternatives to alcohol is a topic which both the university and community agree upon. Producing alternatives to alcohol was also a student battle cry emerging from the bar entry age debates during the Alcohol Task Force Open Forums. Some local parents also state that alternatives are needed for the high school students who are influenced by the university student drinking behavior. Another group targeted for "alternatives" was the general population, including the elderly. There is little doubt that the community needs and supports alternatives. Unfortunately, this is where the consensus ends. There is little evidence to indicate exactly what these alternatives should be and who will fund them. Some say the university should fund the alternative since it involves the student population. Others indicate that the city should provide the alternatives since they profit from the students' presence. Finally there are those that think that private businesses should provide the alternatives to alcohol as moneymaking ventures. There were no comments received which opposed alternatives. The alternative comments were generally very concise:
a. Provide the students alternatives to alcohol.
b. There is little for the students to do socially in Charleston without some type of alternatives to alcohol.
c. If you don’t give the students something to do, they will drink to have fun.
d. Charleston needs a community center that serves all of its residents.
e. The university students are not the only ones who need alternatives to alcohol, so do our high school students.

5. Education.

Education was frequently referenced in the survey comment responses. There was little commonality as to “what” education is and “who” should provide it. The references to education came from different perspectives:

a. Educate students about the harmful effects of alcohol.
b. EIU needs to start stressing academics, not social activities. The students are here to receive an education, not to party. Somewhere along the line we lost sight of Eastern’s academic objectives.
c. The university is in the business of education so it is natural that they assume the lead in alcohol education.
d. Parents need to teach their children about the ramifications of alcohol abuse.
e. Parents need to be educated about the effects of alcohol abuse.
f. It is important to educate the students in the area of responsible drinking.


Overwhelmingly, most comments recommended continuing with current enforcement efforts. Some
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respondents wanted more severe sanctions and a few wanted penalties reduced:

a. Continue with current enforcement programs.
b. Close all the bars in town.
c. Move all student party's on-campus so they can be controlled.
d. Stricter laws/controls are needed regarding student alcohol use.
e. The penalties directed toward student alcohol violations are too severe to the point of being "unfair."
**Student Response:**

The student responses were separated from the non-student responses. The student responses were much shorter regarding verbiage and generally defensive in nature.

I. THE PROBLEM.

A. Is There a Problem (item 1, Table 4).

1. Yes, There is a Problem.

   The students who wrote in comments or verbally espoused their positions to this question ran contrary to the survey results seen in item 1, Table 4. Those students who commented regarding whether or not there was a student alcohol problem, generally stated that there was indeed a problem. A few comments were received indicating no problems with student drinking. The survey selection results as seen in item 1, Table 4 indicate that from a student perspective, there is not a problem with student drinking. Student comments received:

   a. There is a huge problem with student alcohol abuse. You can’t go anywhere without seeing it.

   b. There is a problem with alcohol abuse and something needs to be done to control it.

   c. Some of my friends are so consumed with the party atmosphere at Eastern that they are more concerned with where the next party is rather than when is my next test.

2. No, There Isn’t a Problem With Alcohol. A few
students commented:

a. The students don’t have a problem with alcohol, the city has a problem with students.

b. The student drinking problem is blown way out of proportion. Drinking here is no worse than anywhere else.

B. What is the Problem?

1. Enforcement.

Students tended to comment that enforcement is a problem. The comments did not indicate that enforcement was causing the alcohol problem to increase, but rather the perceived problematic affect to their social lifestyle. The student comments “struck out” against resultant effect of their actions versus the perceived cause:

a. The police are unethical.

b. Fines are too high for underage drinking.

c. It is becoming harder and harder to have a good time in Charleston.

d. The mayor is trying to enforce morality.

2. Consequence.

Some comments were returned in the form of threats or predicted negative ramifications to enforcement. The mood was “if you do this, don’t be surprised when we do that.” The general lines of response included:

a. Students will rebel when you force things on them.
b. Increasing the bar entry age will increase house parties.
c. Students will stop coming to Eastern if they know that the city is out to arrest them.

3. Economics.

The threat of withdrawing student monies from the Charleston community was expressed by some students:
   a. Students' use of alcohol creates jobs and brings money into the community.
   b. Alcohol has made people in the Charleston business community very wealthy and powerful.
   c. Charleston would dry up and blow away without the university student dollars.
   d. We pay to live here just like everyone else and should be able to do what we like.

4. Rationale.

The student comments providing rationale for the student alcohol problem were defiant:
   a. There is nothing fun to do without the bars.
   b. You can't stop student drinking anyway, so why make a big deal out of it?
   c. If I am old enough to fight for my country, I am old enough to drink.

II. RESPONSIBILITY.

A. Who is responsible?

1. Students.

Comments received from some student respondents indicated that the students must themselves be responsible
Effects of Enforcement

82

for their own actions:

a. Hold students accountable for their drinking behavior.
b. If students want to be treated like adults, why don’t they start acting like adults.
c. We have some really immature students on this campus who need to grow-up, act right, and stop complaining.

2. University/City.

Some students blamed others for the student alcohol problem:

a. If the university and city gave the students something fun to do, alcohol wouldn’t be a problem.
b. The police are the ones causing all the problems.
c. There are only a few bad students causing all the problems.

III. ENFORCEMENT.

A. Are Enforcement Agencies Doing Enough?

1. University/Community (item 5, Table 3; item 7, Table 3).

The general mood received from the student survey respondents favored less enforcement:

a. Yes, there is more than enough enforcement to address the student drinking issue.
b. Increase the involvement by campus police and decrease the involvement by city police.
c. The city needs to be more lenient to students.
d. Leave us alone!
B. Has Enforcement Effected the Problem?

Students responded equally regarding enforcement' effect on the problem in the categories of "no consequence," "increased problems," and "decreased problems."

1. No Consequence:
   a. Students are going to drink regardless of the laws and enforcement.
   b. The students don't drink any less. They just don't drink in the bars as much.
   c. If we can't drink in the bars, we will just go where we can drink.
   d. You can't stop us from drinking.

2. Increased the Problem:
   a. I have noticed many more house parties in my neighborhood since raising the bar entry age.
   b. Students are now going to the University of Illinois to drink and it is putting drunk drivers on the highways. This is a much larger problem than we had before.

3. Decreased the Problem:
   a. Students are staying in their rooms more and studying more.
   b. I have noticed a lot less parties or people are being much quieter when they drink.

IV. SOLUTION.

A. Recommendations.

1. Pro-Enforcement.

A few pro-enforcement comments were received from
the students:

a. Continue the enforcement efforts.
b. Raising the bar entry age was a good start.
c. Now we need to address liquor in the residence halls.
d. Students should worry more about academics and less about drinking.

2. Con-Enforcement.

Overwhelmingly, the student comment response was to decrease enforcement efforts with multiple responses received relating to the raising of the bar entry age:

a. Return the bar entry age to 19 and 21 to drink.
b. Treat students as adults.
c. Leave the house parties alone.
d. Students need to drink in a controlled environment like bars.
e. Surely the police have something better to do than to harass the students.

B. Lessons Learned.

1. Recommendations.

The two commonly repeated answers that the students presented for lessons learned are:

a. If you treat students like adults, they will act like adults.
b. The more you try to force things on students, the more they will rebel.
Town Fathers' Face-To-Face Interviews

The following information was collected through taped and transcribed interviews with nine community leaders ("Town Fathers") who influence or decide community alcohol related decisions. Some of the responses received from the Town Fathers duplicate responses received from the Survey Comment Response section.

Comment Breakout. The comments received were (1) categorized, (2) analyzed, and (3) grouped according to a response theme. All comments fall into four themes, which consisted of (1) The Problem; (2) Responsibility; (3) Enforcement; and (4) Solutions. Within the major theme categories there were "topic comments" that were the actual responses provided by the interviewed respondents. A breakout of the four themes is provided below.

I. THE PROBLEM.

A. Is There a Problem (item 1, Table 4)?

1. Locally.

All of the Town Fathers, with the exception of one, indicated that there is a student drinking problem. The Town Father who said that there was no student drinking problem would later stipulate that the problem was "no
greater or no worse" than other like localities. This individual appeared to be more concerned with how the general Charleston population was being "penalized" with the enactment of enforcement laws because of student behavior.

Responses collected stated:

a. Yes, there is a problem at Eastern Illinois University.
b. Statistically over the past few years, Eastern has been worse in terms of its students surveyed use/abuse of alcohol.
c. Eastern's statistics of alcohol use and binge drinking is higher than the national average.
d. The alcohol problems on campus are not as big as in the community and are limited to the residence halls which can be more easily controlled.
e. There is no problem with kegs and the keg ordinance needs to be abandoned.

2. Nationally:

The national response provided a split opinion:

a. Yes, there is a serious national problem.
b. All citizens need to get involved to address the nations "love affair" with alcohol.
c. No worse than other comparable universities.
d. Not any worse than anyplace else, college or not.

B. What is the Problem?

1. Not the Use So Much as the Abuse.

The growing abuse of alcohol caused much discussion to emerge from the Town Fathers. Binge drinking
(drinking huge quantities of alcohol quickly with the express purpose of getting intoxicated) seemed to provide the greatest concern. Freshmen were labeled as the primary abusers of alcohol:

a. It is not so much the students use of alcohol, but the uncontrolled abuse that causes problems.

b. many Eastern students who use alcohol to excess and are defined as “binge drinkers.”

c. Binge drinking is a problem and appears to be a phenomenon of Freshmen.

d. Increasing numbers of underage students are being caught drinking in the residence halls.

2. Sending the Wrong Message.

The majority of the Town Fathers presented somewhat emotional comments explaining perceived conflicting messages being sent to our youth regarding alcohol consumption:

a. The university administration’s attitude regarding the community enforcement effort is less than admirable. Non-support equals non-compliance and the students are watching.

b. Society presents a building dilemma to our youth. We profess to our children that alcohol is bad and “you can’t have it.” Yet, they are “groomed to consume” alcohol through alluring television advertisements as soon as they are old enough to comprehend what is seen and heard.

c. More time, effort, and emphasis are being placed upon social activities versus academics.

d. There are too much politics involved with
alcohol.

e. Advertising sponsors of collegiate sporting
events whose product is alcohol is wrong.
f. The previous 18-year-old bar entry age
essentially condoned underage drinking.
g. Too many of Charlestons' businesses cater to
alcohol activity. Unfortunately, certain
unethical individuals are selling their
virtue for illegal alcohol profits without
regard to the long-term effects on our youth.

3. Education.

Two very different philosophies emerge regarding
the educational aspects of student drinking. Comments by
educators tend to allow the students freedom to experiment
and learn from life experiences as to what is right and
wrong regarding alcohol consumption. On the other hand,
community officials state it is societies' responsibility to
establish clearly defined limits regarding youthful alcohol
consumption and enforce those limits. Here are two very
distinct but different comments:

a. Education is very important. Note the general
understanding and realization that these are
young people. We need to understand what they
are going through as they reach into one part
of their lives and going on to the next. This
is a very volatile age group. They come as
teensagers and by the time they leave they are
young adults. They are "testing their wings" a
little bit and so you have to anticipate they
will perhaps overindulge on occasion.
b. As parents and adults we need to educate the
students to the boundaries regarding alcohol
consumption. Once the boundaries are
established, we must remain firm and enforce
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those boundaries against challenges. It is natural for our youth to challenge established rules and it is up to us as adults to enforce the standards.

4. Enforcement.

The differences of comments between university personnel and city personnel were also evident regarding enforcement. Town Fathers associated with the university and Town Fathers associated with the community provided comments which generally fell into "party lines" with few exceptions. The educator's comments primarily indicate that the community is too strict in its enforcement efforts. On the other hand, the community members related positive results emerging from the enforcement efforts and want to continue the current enforcement policy. The majority of community Town Fathers are concerned with the lack of participation and involvement shown by the university administration. Two university and one community viewpoint are provided:

a. Some would argue that the penalties are so severe in the city that they border on being unfair. The fines levied on students create a severe financial burden.

b. Primarily what we would do at the university is not so much to enforce things, but to provide alternatives, and we continue to do that.

b. Enforcement efforts are producing positive results and must continue. The students are hearing our message very clear, "if you
choose to drink and create conflict in our community, you will pay the price.” The next logical target for enforcement is the university student residence halls.

5. Can it be Stopped?

All agree that stopping student alcohol abuse will be a difficult task:

a. Since student drinking is a longtime trend, it will be a difficult thing to stop.

b. Underage drinking is going to happen, you can’t stop it, you can only hope to control it.

c. I doubt if there is anything that can be done to control student drinking entirely, but certainly with more resources the university would do more.

6. Avoiding the Issue.

Several Town Fathers commented on the sensitivity of addressing the alcohol issue. Somewhat stern accusations emerged regarding the avoidance of the student alcohol problem. The university administrators feel that they are involved with the enforcement effort according to their responses. Contrary to this perception, many outside the administration feel the university is not involved and is allowing the community to shoulder the entire burden of correcting the student drinking problem. This perception becomes clear with received comments:
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a. The university is allowing rampant underage drinking in the dormitories by not enforcing the issue. Penalties are insignificant.

b. In the past, the underage drinking problem was basically ignored or "cold shouldered" by University administrators and the community.

c. The university officials have shown only passive approval as they remain officially silent since enforcement efforts have increased by the community.

d. It is time for the University to "get off the sidelines" and join the community enforcement effort.

7. Consequences.

The resultant consequence of the liberal drinking atmosphere which enveloped the Charleston university environment has caused great concern as reported by the community leaders. The community Town Father members' responses regarding "consequence" focuses on the cumulative damage encountered by the student population and disruption of the community social well-being. Some university Town Father's comments regarding consequence of alcohol use is not directed toward the resultant damage to the student population as reported by the community leaders. Rather, the potential negative consequence of the university becoming involved in enforcement efforts is stated in more parochial terms. These differences are easily singled out:

a. The unlawful public serving of alcohol to
Charleston's youth over the years has unfortunately ruined many lives. There are currently a lot of fine young peoples' lives being destroyed by being caught up in the social atmosphere of alcohol abuse.

b. Public drunkenness by students involves activities and actions that show total disregard and disrespect to the Charleston community. This turns the community against the university.

c. The attrition rate of Freshmen due to alcohol related problems are astronomical.

d. Parents in Charleston cannot properly raise a child in this community without the lawful support from the community regarding alcohol violations.

e. If the university declared that anyone caught drinking in the residence halls would be suspended or expelled, we wouldn't catch students drinking at all. Students wouldn't be turned-in. This approach is unenforceable because undergraduate student hires (Resident Assistants) are used to monitor and enforce student behavior in the residence halls.

f. I don't believe we do enough at the university to control the student's use of alcohol, but we do as much as we can based on the revenue and resources and dollars that we have.

8. Demographics.

The high student per capita ratio to community members in Charleston creates a higher concentration of visible negative student actions as reported by members in the local law enforcement community. Where universities are housed in a large metropolitan area, the overwhelming concentration of community members absorbs the negative
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student actions. In the metropolitan case, the student illegal activities become less visible when included with the illegal activities of the entire metro community.

a. The city of Charleston has a hard time absorbing and integrating a like-sized student population. There are about 11 thousand students and about that many community members.

b. Charleston doesn’t have many more problems than other university towns, but the high concentration of students makes these problems very visible.

9. Rationale.

The Town Fathers provided a variety of insights as to why drinking is a problem with the student population. One noticeable common link relates to the lack of maturity of university students when dealing with consumption of alcohol:

a. Kids get into trouble with too much time on their hands.

b. Students come out of high school into the community and want to “test the waters” regarding boundaries. Consumption of alcohol has established boundaries which are constantly challenged by the students.

c. Students lack maturity and experience with alcohol.

d. College students are at a very volatile age group and want to “test their wings.”

e. Eastern must rely upon undergraduate staff members and student employees to control and enforce university policy in the residence halls.

f. When you give students “a free reign”
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regarding alcohol for so many years and then "clamp down," the students automatically think they are being "picked upon."

G. Between ages 19-21 is a prime time in peoples' lives to experiment with alcohol and/or drugs.

H. Freshmen seem to have no sense of what the consequences of abusive drinking will hold for them.

I. Students' use of alcohol in our culture is a historical fact.

II. RESPONSIBILITY.

A. Who is Responsible?

1. University/City.

   Each Town Father who provided comments did not indicate that they or their organizations were immune to the obligation of resolving the student drinking problem. Some thought that others were not doing as much as they should be doing. Others felt that more than enough was being done to control the problem. Comments received from the aspect of who is responsible resolving the problem and those responsible individuals who should take credit for the success achieved are provided:

   a. The city and university are regulated by state and federal statutes that require responsibility to control and maintain temperance in the public consumption of alcohol.

   b. The spike of improvement occurred when the new city council was elected and this university administration was changed.
c. The new city and university administrations provided a whole new way of looking at enforcement and compliance of alcohol laws which produced the desired results.

2. The University.

When focusing directly on the universities responsibility toward resolving the student drinking problem, some town fathers projected stern criticism:

a. Colleges have tended to foster an abusive alcohol environment.

b. This university has allowed students to binge drink.

c. Eastern appears to have "wiped its hands" of the alcohol problem of its students as if to say this is a "townie problem."

3. The City/Community.

Town Father comments directed toward the City of Charleston were more specific in description and some provided warning. More positive and constructive statements regarding community action were indicated by the Town Fathers when commenting on community responsibility:

a. The community owes it to itself to teach responsibility to its citizens and insist upon it.

b. If the community is not careful in enforcing the alcohol laws, we will unnecessarily lose some of our young people to alcohol related deaths and injuries.

c. Judge Cini (Associate Judge, 5th Judicial Circuit Court), has taken the responsibility to establish and send the message to the
3. The Students.

Assessing the Town Father comments regarding student responsibility, produces an interesting profile:

Students are responsible individuals who will meet established and enforced standards, and those who need the most attention are the 10 percent of troublemakers who are made up primarily of Freshmen and students living off-campus:

a. Students are responsible people who will act responsible once they understand the limits of their boundaries.
b. The student responsible for sponsoring the party will be held accountable for the actions of their guests.
c. Freshmen provide the university with the most problems regarding alcohol abuse.
d. Only ten percent of the students are causing the alcohol related problems.
e. The students who live off-campus must learn the community standards and abide by the rules.

5. Society.

When addressing the area of social responsibility
for youth drinking, the following comments were provided:

a. Society is ultimately responsible for the actions of its citizens.
b. Society must stop yielding to the political power of the alcohol industry that targets our youth as consumers.

III. ENFORCEMENT.

A. Are Enforcement Agencies doing Enough?

1. University/Community (item 5, Table 3; item 7, Table 3).

When comments were received that combined the enforcement efforts of both the university and community, the reviews were mixed:

a. The university and community are not doing enough to control student drinking.
b. It is presumptuous to say that all of us are doing everything we can to improve the problem, but we are doing a much better job over the past few years.
c. During the past few years the city government, city council, and university administration have worked closely together to resolve a wide array of problems.

2. The University (item 5, Table 3).

When the university was singled out regarding its responsibility and subsequent actions toward controlling the student drinking problem, negative feedback was offered by the community Town Fathers to university officials. The
message provided by university Town Fathers indicate that more could be done to resolve the problem but enforcement was not the answer. The fundamental difference between university and city philosophy regarding enforcement becomes clear from the statements:

a. The university doesn't do enough to control the problem, but does as much as it can based upon revenue and resources.

b. When we (university), receive notification of a student being arrested for a house party, we don't impose severe disciplinary action in addition to what happens to them downtown. The penalties downtown by themselves are very severe.

c. The Judicial Board has not revised the Student Conduct Code or increased penalties or sanctions regarding alcohol violations based upon the recent community underage drinking enforcement efforts.

d. The university is not taking their share of the responsibility for the student alcohol problem.

e. The university is very relaxed and not serious about controlling alcohol in the residence halls.

f. The university needs to "tighten their belts" just like the community has and not allow alcohol in the dormitories.

g. The university should have provided more positive statements to the community in support of the decision to raise the bar entry age.

h. A silent showing of support by university officials at best equals passive approval.

i. The university should have published an official statement of support and media publicity regarding Judicial Board changes or increased campus sanctions as it relates to enforcement of underage alcohol abuse.
3. The City Government (item 7, Table 3).

The majority of Town Father comments received were generally favorable toward enforcement efforts by the city government with a few exceptions:

a. The current mayor has spent more time and effort than the previous five mayors put together regarding alcohol related issues.

b. The Charleston City Council, acting on the recommendations of the Charleston Alcohol Task Force and community members, analyzed and approved a comprehensive and workable enforcement package addressing underage and abusive student drinking.

c. The Mayors morals are a little higher than the average citizen when it comes to alcohol. He has a picture in his mind how things ought to be and "ramrods" his position down our throat. He ran for office on an agenda which promised the students that he wouldn't raise the bar entry age and changed his mind after coming into office. That's not right.

d. We have made a good start to control student drinking and need to continue the course we have established.

4. Local Law Enforcement Agencies (item 6, Table 3).

The local law enforcement agencies receive positive feedback from the Town Fathers:

a. The local police are doing what they can to enforce the new ordinances without appearing too abusive.

b. A little known fact is that the Charleston Police are not necessarily "hammering" the student and many times give drunk students, who are wandering the city, safe rides home to the dorms.
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B. How has Enforcement Effected the Problem?

1. Positive Effect.

All Town Fathers, including a few who were initially opposed to enforcement efforts, had many favorable results emerging from enforcement effort to report:

a. The student drinking problem is much better.
b. Since enforcement, there has been a reduction of the number of times the police are called back to a house party through complaint.
c. The students now take responsibility for their party guests and understand that they can't keep their neighbors awake all night.
d. The students are getting a clear message regarding responsible and underage drinking.
e. Less foot and vehicle traffic at bar closure.
f. Noise, vandalism and littering have greatly reduced.
g. Since raising the bar entry age and putting in more alternatives to alcohol, the problem has improved significantly over the last year.
h. The university no longer has as many arrests, bar fights and general bad publicity.
I. The students are not going downtown and disrupting the public as much.
j. The access to the alcohol has been controlled, so it is not as easy for students to drink.
k. The keg registration ordinance has done away with students selling cups for profit.
l. Even the fraternities have been cited for noise violations at their organized parties.
m. Community members are becoming increasingly intolerant of student drinking.
n. Enforcement has made the public more aware of the problem.
o. Enforcement efforts produce an improvement, not a final resolution to the problem.
p. Raising the bar entry age had an immediate positive impact on 6th Street residents.
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q. Students are now somehow controlling the violence at the house parties.

r. Prior to enforcement, public drunkenness was obvious and the rule, not so now.

s. Police are no longer being confronted by students in a hostile manner as they were before enforcement.

t. City police no longer dread coming to work on certain nights designated as student "party nights."

u. The "midnight shift" of the University Police say that there is a drastic change in the numbers of students who are out wandering campus after bar closure.

v. Vandalism has decreased dramatically on campus.

w. University Police have received only one third of the "party calls" this Spring for the same time last year.

x. The university no longer sees the large numbers of out-of-town university students coming into Charleston and on-campus to drink illegally underage.

y. The serious troublemakers, who were not from Charleston, are choosing other locations to drink illegally and cause their particular type of trouble.

z. The community has gained in community order in the last two years what it lost over the past 15 years.

2. Negative Effect.

The negative comments received by the town fathers regarding enforcement indicate symptoms of a changing student drinking pattern:

a. Disruptions have increased in the residence halls.

b. There has been an increase this academic year in the numbers of students who have been confronted on campus for the use of alcohol.
c. Some local bar owners have gone out of business.
d. Some local businesses have lost late night business.
e. There are some indications that house parties may have increased.

3. Shift in Location.

Town Father comments indicate that students are migrating from the Charleston bars to "safer" havens to consume alcohol:

a. Previously there was no incentive at all to drink on campus. Now there is.
b. Increasing numbers of students are being caught drinking in the residence halls.
c. Some students are leaving Charleston to drink illegally in other communities, but there is nothing to substantiate this fact.
d. There is a drastic decrease in the numbers of students who wander campus after bar closure. Before there were hundreds, now you have to look hard to find anyone.
e. The large numbers of underage people who came to Charleston previously to drink illegally are going elsewhere.
f. The serious out-of-town troublemakers are no longer frequenting Charleston and have selected other locations.

4. Pressure on Bar Owners.

With enforcement efforts bar owners and bar managers came under increased community pressure to control underage drinking in their establishments. The pressure emerged in the form of frequent compliance checks for
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underage patrons, fines/suspensions/closures, and negative press. Even with advanced warnings of pending compliance checks, the several bar owners were unable to control underage entry and underage consumption in their establishments. The message provided to the local bars by the Town Father's comments indicated their resolve to eliminate illegal consumption of alcohol by minors in public establishments:

a. The bars have also received the message "loud and clear" that the community will no longer tolerate underage drinking in their establishments and will hold the bar owners personally responsible if they violate the law.

b. The community is now closely monitoring the local bars to evaluate their compliance to the laws.

c. Some bar owners who were allowing underage drinking have gone out of business and rightfully so. This indicates that the profits they were reaping were at the expense of our youth and the community at large.

d. Bar owners are no longer targeting students with advertising promoting exotic inexpensive drinks and conducting events to promote "quick drunks."

e. There has been a dramatic decrease in the frequency and viciousness of bar fights involving students.

f. Bar management is now more proactive in stopping fights before they escalate to injury and hospitalization.
IV. SOLUTION.

A. Recommendations.

1. Get Involved.

The most consistently criticized segment of leadership for non-involvement in the enforcement effort voiced by the Town Fathers was the university:

   a. Universities need to get involved and take responsibility in stopping the abuse of alcohol by the students they control.
   b. The university needs to get "off the sideline" and provide official statements of support.
   c. The university must publicize changes to the Student Code of Conduct, Judicial Board changes, and actions it is willing to take in support of the overall community effort to control underage drinking.
   d. Everyone must become familiar with the issues of underage drinking and have the courage to take the necessary steps to prevent it.

2. Teamwork.

Some Town Fathers comments indicate a desire for the university and city administrations to resolve any conflict between the organizations which prevents a cooperative working relationship in controlling the student drinking problem:

   a. The college and the city must equally share the responsibility in solving the problem.
   b. The city and university must work together from the exploration of the student alcohol problem, to deciding a course of action, to implementing and enforcing a plan.
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c. The Unified Patrol, which combines the patrolling of the University Police and the Charleston Police in the same squad car, is a very effective method of resolving student party complaints.

3. Set Standards.

Several Town Fathers comments introduce anticipated targets for future investigation/enforcement consideration. The establishment of clear standards appears to be the objective:

a. Action must be taken in the residence halls to stop underage drinking such as higher fines and suspensions.

b. The university and community must institute preventive measures versus reactive measures to solve this type of problem.

c. If having fun involves moderate consumption of alcohol by legal adults, it will be allowed.

e. We need to get out of this “national love affair” with alcohol.

f. Students need to be allowed to drink with adults to model moderate drinking behavior.

g. We must now address the False Identification problem as a logical next step.

4. Alternatives.

Although the Town Father comments regarding alternatives to alcohol were somewhat vague, most feel some form of alternative is needed to support the university and community:

a. If the university had more resources, we would not so much enforce, but rather provide
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alternatives (especially in the Winter months).

b. Alternatives must provide the students with non alcohol and non alcohol related entertainment.

c. This community needs a community center that serves all of our citizens as an alternative to alcohol.

5. Education.

Education appears to be a key prevention element in the view of the Town Fathers:

a. Eastern is an educational institution, and as such, it should be within the scope to develop an educational program that teaches responsible drinking to its students.

b. The university needs to establish additional educational referral resources for students involved with alcohol. We have very limited resources available to refer students who have developed serious problems with alcohol.

c. The community and university must be a part of the student’s maturing process and teach responsibility.

d. The community must teach responsibility to all of its citizens.

6. Enforce.

Community Town Fathers are resolved in their belief to continue enforcement efforts directed at curbing underage and abusive student drinking:

a. Law enforcement has the responsibility to respond, and will respond to citizen complaints involving alcohol.

b. The community needs to continue to enforce the new standards as established.
Effects of Enforcement

107

c. The university must also prevent and enforce underage drinking on campus as the public has in the community.

B. Lessons Learned.

1. Set Standards.

There were many lessons to be gained from Charleston’s comprehensive enforcement effort. Depending upon ones position and perspective within the community some lessons learned may not necessarily apply to all. The courage to "stand up" for ones values appear to be a constant theme. One certain consistency projected by the Town Fathers is that in addressing an issue of this magnitude, standards must be established:

a. Society cannot constantly look the other way from problems like alcohol abuse without the fear of destroying itself.

b. There are certain standards previous generations have set that can be changed without upsetting the community balance. However, there are certain longtime established standards and norms which cannot and should not be negotiated by new generations. Underage drinking is one of the nonnegotiable standards.

c. If alcohol related behavior is left unchecked, eventually you reach a point where deterrents are needed to change the resultant behavior.

d. Controlled behavior is just a matter of learning responsibility.

e. Students are responsible individuals who will conform to community standards once boundaries are established and enforced.
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f. The long-term positive result of student behavior learned through enforcement far outweighed the short term negative effects of its implementation.
g. A balance must be established between attempting to prohibit alcohol use completely and imposing draconian penalties which are not practical.
h. The community must teach responsibility to its citizens.
I. The university, city and judicial system must send the consolidated educational messages that there are new goals, and a new set of standards, and students need to wake up and take note of this fact.
j. Students appear to respond favorably to alcohol laws if they feel their education is at risk when they violate public law.

2. Preparing for Enforcement.

The Charleston public became knowledgeable regarding the issues surrounding the student drinking problems and the proposed enforcement effort prior to enforcement. Public forums and newspaper articles acted as a means to educate the public to the issues and provided an opportunity for response. The Town Fathers recognize this as a valuable lesson learned:

a. The establishment of an Alcohol Task Force to investigate the need and develop recommendations is a critical first step to enforcement.
b. Preparing the community for enforcement by holding public debates eased the incorporation of the ordinances once they were voted in.
3. Recommendations to other Communities.

The Town Fathers stressed that it was no single effort that favorably changed the student drinking trend. Rather, it was a combination of enforcement strategies and key organizations working together that created change. Other college communities may be experiencing similar alcohol-related problems by their youth. These Town father comments were presented in the hopes that other communities will benefit from Charleston's efforts:

a. We created a "package deal" which means that the university, city and judicial systems all worked in harmony with common goals to address the alcohol problems.

b. Other state universities who are planning to go to a 21-bar entry age need to explore what Charleston has successfully accomplished prior to their start.

c. The Keg Ordinance paved the way for the Bar Entry Age Ordinance.

d. When dealing with intoxicated students, the University Police seem to have an advantage over the City Police. The students confronted by University Police sense the treat and
association of their education being caught in the balance and do not cause additional trouble which would risk expulsion.

e. You absolutely cannot allow underage university students into the bars because it is impossible to enforce underage consumption once they gain entry to the bars.
Alcohol Violation Statistics

Based upon a statistical analysis of the survey results, Null Hypothesis No.2 stating that there was "no change between June 1994 and June 1995 in reported university student conduct related to alcohol crime since raising the bar entry age to 21", was not accepted. Hypothesis 2 states that there has been no change between June 1994 and June 1995 in reported university student conduct related to alcohol crime statistics since raising the bar entry age from 19 to 21. Based upon the hypothesis, only the 1994-95 and 1993-94 portions of the report were analyzed to determine effect.

There has been significant positive change with few exceptions regarding reported university student conduct related to alcohol crime since raising the bar entry age to 21.

The Eastern Illinois University Judicial Affairs Office is responsible for processing and acting upon Student Conduct Code violations that are brought to their attention. In essence, this office monitors and enforces the good order and discipline of the university students. Judicial Affairs publishes an annual report titled the Student Disciplinary Referrals Report (APPENDIX A).
This report was analyzed to determine emerging trends regarding student usage of alcohol and effects of local alcohol enforcement. The report contained seven years of disciplinary referral data.

The Eastern Illinois University Student Disciplinary Referrals Report is broken out in eight portions. Each portion of the report was analyzed and major points of interest were extracted and reported upon.

**Statistical Review**

**Section 1.** Section one of the Student Disciplinary Referrals Report lists the annual total of disciplinary referrals and breaks these totals out by class groupings.

There were 1072 disciplinary referrals reported during 1994-95. There was 217 more total group referrals, or a 25 percent increase, over the 855 referrals reported in 1993-94. Freshmen were responsible for 579 referrals in 1994-95, or 54 percent of the total group referrals. The Freshmen disciplinary referrals jumped by 145 reports in 1994-95, or an increase of 33 percent over 1993-94. All grade levels,
Freshmen through Senior, showed some substantial increases in reported referrals between schools years 1993-94 and 1994-95.

Section 2. Section two of the Student Disciplinary Referrals Report lists the number of times students have been individually referred for discipline. The range is from first referral to seventh referral.

The number of individual students having multiple referrals to Judicial Affairs for discipline has increased substantially from first time referrals through sixth time referral. This portion indicates that other than first time referrals, the same individual can be, and is being referred to the Judicial Board for discipline up to seven different times. These multiple referrals can be for the same or different offenses.

The following table depicts the (1) number of times students have been referred and multi referred for discipline, (2) number of 1993-94 referrals, (3) number of 1994-95 referrals, and (4) the percentage of change (+, -) from 1993-1994 to 1994-1995.
Table 5

Individual Disciplinary Referrals - First to Seven Time Offenders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>+110</td>
<td>+18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>+ 59</td>
<td>+34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>+ 26</td>
<td>+55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>+ 16</td>
<td>+94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>+ 5</td>
<td>+500%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>+ 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3. Section three of the Student Disciplinary Referrals Report indicates from what source the disciplinary referrals originated.

Disciplinary referral complaints initiated by the housing staff, which is made up predominately by student hired Residential Assistants (RA’s), rose significantly between 1993-94 and 1994-95. Housing reported 617 complaints.
in 1993-94 and 873 complaints in 1994-95 for an increase of 256 (+41%). The 873 housing generated complaints in 1994-95 are 81 percent of all student disciplinary referrals received by Judicial Affairs.

Complaints issued by the University Police Department decreased measurably between 1993-94 and 1994-95. The police reported 205 complaints in 1993-94 and 165 complaints in 1994-95 for a decrease of 40 (-20%). Complaints initiated from the faculty, other administrative offices and the Judicial Affairs Office were relatively few and indicated only marginal change.

**Section 4.** Section four of the Student Disciplinary Referrals Report indicates the university entity where the final resolutions of the disciplinary referrals were adjudicated.

The most noticeable element of this section is that 73 percent of the student disciplinary referrals are being adjudicated by the university housing staff, which is predominantly made up of graduate students. In the 1994-95 school year a combined total of 6 percent, or 56 of 1072 cases, of student disciplinary referrals were formally adjudicated by the University/Student Judicial
The following table depicts: (1) departments that resolved/enforced the student discipline report, (2) number of discipline reports handled by that department in 1993-94, (3) number of discipline reports handled by that department in 1994-95, (4) the difference between years in raw numbers and percentage of change, and (5) the 1994-95 department percentage of the total discipline reports (1072) received by the university over the two year period.

**Table 6**

**University Department/Board that Magistrate Disciplinary Referrals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>Change/%</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Staff</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>787</td>
<td>+214 (37%)</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Affairs</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>+29 (29%)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Police</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-21 (21%)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>+2 (9%)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Judicial Bd.</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-7 (16%)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stud. Judicial Bd.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 5. Section five of the Student Disciplinary Referrals Report outlines the results of appeals. There were no data relevant to be gained from this portion as it relates to this study.

Section 6. Section six of the Student Disciplinary Referrals Report outlines academic misconduct. There were no relevant data to be gained from this portion as it relates to this study.

Section 7. Section seven outlines the categories of judicial misconduct and the number of offenses per year per category. Multiple offense listings may occur as a result of a single arrest/report, i.e., theft while trespassing.

The results of this section of the report showed significant campus increases in all direct alcohol related misconduct with the exception of possession of alcohol in a public area.

The following table depicts (1) the category of alcohol policy/alcohol related offense, (2) 1993-94 number of violations, (3) 1994-95 number of violations, and (4) the difference between years in raw numbers and percentage of change.
Table 7

University Alcohol Policy Violations and/or Alcohol Related Cases.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>Change/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total alcohol policy violations</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>+148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underage possession of alcohol</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>+ 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of alcohol in public</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>- 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive noise</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>+125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/false alarms/elevators</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>+ 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage/Vandalism</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>+ 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of hard alcohol (21+)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>+ 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting/assaults/threats</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity/use of ID cards</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+ 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kegs/bulk possession of alcohol</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>+ 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 8. Section eight of the Student Disciplinary Referrals Report displays sanctions imposed for Student Conduct Code violations.

The student reprimands increased 73 percent between 1993-94 and 1994-95. Fines, which have a $50.00 maximum,
increased by 40 percent. Averaging the number of fines by the dollar amount collected, individual fines averaged approximately $23.00. Public service assignments increased by 106 percent with an individual average time assignment of approximately 21 hours. Formal apologies mandated dropped 71 percent between 1993-94 and 1994-95. Individuals suspended from the university dropped 37 percent between 1993-94 and 1994-95.

The following table depicts (1) type of sanction, (2) 1993-94 amounts, (3) 1994-95 amounts, and (4) the difference between years in raw numbers and percentage of change.
### Table 8

**University Judicial Sanctions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanction Type</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>94-95</th>
<th>Change/%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reprimands</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>+285 (73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>+207 (40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>+ 35 (106%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage Restitution</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>- 21 (34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Apologies</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>- 15 (71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Papers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>- 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refer to Counseling Center</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>- 7 (64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Probation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>+ 32 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imposed Housing Reassignment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>+ 7 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expelled from Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+ 3 (300%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary Probation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+ 1 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Suspension</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>- 2 (67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>- 6 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expulsion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results Summary

This chapter has presented the results of a four prong effort to collect and analyze: (1) survey data, (2)
survey comments, (3) leadership viewpoints and (4) university discipline statistics related to the "Effects of Local Enforcement of the Minimum Drinking Age on the Students of Eastern Illinois University." Validity was incorporated into the categorical data review by conducting Chi Square analyses to determine variance from the proposed null hypotheses. By analyzing the hypotheses from four different, yet similar aspects, a cross-reference of validity and multiple interpretation was acquired.
Chapter Five

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter presents an overview and interpretation of the research reported. Observations, conclusions and recommendations were drawn from the interpretation of the survey results, survey comments, interviews, and university disciplinary data. Suggestions for further associated research is provided.

Purpose and Procedure

The purpose of this study was to determine the effects of recent local community enforcement efforts directed toward the drinking behavior of university students at Eastern Illinois University as reported by the local community. The evaluation of enforcement efforts of the legal minimum drinking age was of primary concern. The study was designed to report the opinions of local community members regarding their attitude toward the student drinking problem and evaluation of the enforcement effort. Students were also offered the opportunity to respond to the survey
and provide comment input. The resultant student data was utilized for comparison aspects.

The sample of survey respondents were randomly selected through telephone interviews and walking door-to-door along heavily traveled streets used as routes to-and-from the campus and Charleston local bars. The Walking survey comments were written on the survey instrument by the survey respondents or annotated on the survey form by the Telephone survey interviewer. The collected comments were transcribed, grouped, and analyzed to facilitate the content analysis. Personal interviews were conducted with nine individuals from the Charleston community and university setting who were deemed leaders who influenced alcohol related laws. These leaders were asked questions extracted from the survey instrument and their comments were recorded. The individual topic phrases were grouped into categories, then classified into themes reflecting the focus of the research questions.
**Consolidated Survey Observations**

All survey/interview/comments analysis fell into three major themes which consisted of (1) The Problem; (2) Responsibility; and (3) Enforcement. Within the major themes were "specific topic categories." Within the topic categories there were "survey items" which were extracted from the survey data. A breakout of the three themes is provided below:

I. THE PROBLEM.

A. Is There a Problem (item 1, Table 4)?

Seventy percent of the surveyed residential community thought that there was a problem at Eastern Illinois University regarding the students' use of alcohol. Thirty-seven percent of the surveyed students indicated there was a problem.

When comparing the ever-increasing underage drinking enforcement efforts between 1993 and 1995, to the students' annual decreasing perception that there is a problem with student drinking, an interesting phenomenon occurs. As enforcement efforts increase, the student's reporting perception of "there being a problem" decreases. The dynamics of the survey interaction response indicated that when the person (student) was confronted with the problem
where he or she was associated with the problem’s source, there was a general trend to minimize the problem. The non-student’s reaction to increased enforcement remained relatively stable with a slight increase in the “yes” category.

B. Does the Problem Effect the Community (item 2, Table 3)?

Yes, both students and community respondents agreed that alcohol use by university students affects the residents of the community. During the three-year period, a “yes” survey selection realized averaged rates of 75 percent for community and 55 percent agreement for students.

When asked if the students’ use of alcohol affects the residents of the community (item 2, Table 3) both the student and non-student populations answered “yes.” The rationale for this affirmative answer may reside in the reaction to increased community enforcement, education, and residual media attention. Numerous news reports regarding student use of alcohol, and community enforcement efforts were published in the Charleston Times Courier and Daily Eastern News between 1994 and 1995. The underlying educational message of this media coverage was that the Charleston community would no longer tolerate underage
drinking and the residual negative behavior of intoxicated students. The students and uninformed community members received the information regarding these enforcement messages and this attention to the issue in the local press may have influenced an attitudinal change which was reflected in the answer selection.

When comparing the student perception of question number one (is there a problem?), and question number two (does it effect the community?), there appears to be a conflicting thought process. One can surmise that when students answered question 1, they indicated that "alcohol is not a problem for me," without taking into consideration community impact. Question number 2 forced the student to consider community impact, which created an entirely different perception. Between 1994 and 1995 there was a 15 percent increase (to 73%) of the students who believed that there was not a problem with the student's use of alcohol. Contrary to this perception, and during the same time frame of 1994 to 1995, the same students agreed at a rate of 68 percent that student's use of alcohol effects the residents of the community. The 1995 rate of 68 percent was a 19 percent increase over the 1994 rate.

It is also possible that many students may have
answered question number one in "party line" fashion, meaning that solidarity and peer pressure played a role in their answer. Question number two forced the students to answer more specifically and to be accountable.

C. Is Community Crime Effected by Student Drinking?

The Charleston community crime level was increased by student drinking. The alcohol related crime rate was ever-increasing prior to the incorporation of enforcement efforts. The dramatic drop-off in illegal alcohol-related activity since enforcement efforts increased is an indicator that student drinking effects the crime levels of the community. A visible and direct relationship to the quantity of alcohol consumed and the frequency and intensity of criminal student activity exist. Since the underage students are no longer allowed to frequent and drink in the local bars, there exists a direct relationship between where the students drink, and frequency of criminal activity. Essentially, alcohol-related crime in the streets has radically diminished since the enforcement ordinances have been enacted. During this same period, there has been corresponding increases in campus-related alcohol offenses.

There was a marked increase in the student and community response agreeing that alcohol use by university
students effects the crime level in the community between 1994 and 1995. A proposed cause of the 1994/95 marked increases of respondents agreeing that crime is affected by student use of alcohol is information exposure. The community, university officials and local media widely reported the criminal events and statistics related to student alcohol use. This reporting of alcohol crime facts normally appeared in newspaper headlines from both the community and student newspaper. This abundance of information exposure may have educated the respondents to the problem or they may have been personally adversely effected by student alcohol use.

Over a three-year period, 76 percent of the students and 67 percent of the non-students reported that student alcohol usage was the same or were uncertain how Eastern compared to other universities. The high percentages of perception that Eastern is no better or no worse than all others indicates latent acceptance, apathy, and possible subconscious approval of the problem. By the majority strongly defending the university as “not being any worse than the others” seem to send the message that “we’re OK” since we’re “no worse” than others like us. A metaphor to this type of logic would portray the people of Los Angeles
saying "sure we have an air pollution problem that kills our citizens," but it is no worse than any other like-sized metropolitan community. If the problem is no better or no worse, is it any less of a problem? The facts may be true, but the assimilation logic is unsound.

There were significant changes and significant increases regarding whether alcohol use by Eastern students had ever caused a problem for the survey respondent (item 3, Table 3). The reason for the significant increase is somewhat vague. Statistically, many perceptions and attitudes have changed in both the student and non-student categories between 1994 and 1995. This appears to be due to the high visibility in the community regarding exposure and reporting of the underage drinking problem and the resulting adverse ramifications. Not only have attitudes changed, but previously concealed "silent attitudes" of students and community members are now being voiced due to perceived support of their opinions.

II. RESPONSIBILITY.
A. University.

Public perception indicated that university officials did not assume proportionate responsibility for the resolution of the student drinking problem. A university
official did participate on the Charleston Alcohol Task Force in the original debate phase and drafting of enforcement resolutions, but their activity became less visible when enforcement efforts were initiated by the community.

In February 1994, the President of Eastern Illinois University, David Jorns publicly addressed a group of Eastern students. He acknowledged the alcohol problem by encouraging the students to act more responsible when leaving Charleston bars. He told Eastern students that there is disharmony between Charleston residents because of alcohol-related incidents involving Eastern students when leaving Charleston bars.

Jorns then strayed from the community enforcement opinion by communicating to the students that:

I think the people of Charleston really treat the student body with disrespect. If it wasn’t for your ‘student’ dollars, the city of Charleston wouldn’t be doing very well. We’re not talking about the right to get smashed, but the right to a social life (DaHill, 1994).

The President’s statements, which referred to Eastern students under the age of 21, if accurately quoted by the
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reporter, are very similar to the statements received in the student comment portion of the surveys. This quotation, appears to condone underage drinking by university students if it is related to the student's "social life."

The president's statement appears to be directly contrary to the overwhelming majority of the community perspective on the same subject of underage drinking. However, the president's position is somewhat consistent with the views of other university administrators who were interviewed in this study.

This polarity between the community and university leadership certainly appears troubling when seeking a unified position of cooperation in problem solving. During the Town Father Interview process, the University Judicial Affairs Director echoed Jorns's position on enforcement and added the inference that the community's judicial fine system is "too steep" and provides a hardship on the students.

Contrary to the above, President Jorns recently indicated an association with the community enforcement effort. During the Town Father Interview, President Jorns stated that the student alcohol problem has "improved significantly, especially over the past year," since "we
have raised the drinking age (bar entry age), and put in more alternatives to drinking." The Director of Judicial Affairs, Keith Kohanzo, also stated in his Face-to-Face Interview those repeat student alcohol offenses would not be tolerated.

According to Eastern Illinois University Judicial Affairs, there were no increased sanctions or adjustments incorporated into the University Student Conduct Code regarding increased enforcement efforts directed toward the control of underage drinking. Official public statements of support for the local government enforcement efforts appear to be lacking from the university.

It is important to note that one university official did actively participate with the local community in the initial efforts to determine the scope of the problem and projected ordinances to resolve the problem (Wulff, 1994a).

B. Community.

The community officials, judicial system and local law enforcement agencies have undertaken full responsibility to resolve the student drinking problem in their community (items 6 & 7, Table 1). A very real reason for assuming this responsibility is that they were legally bound to ensure
temperance in their community regarding citizen alcohol consumption. They also bore the wrath of irate community members who were upset with illegal student activities associated with alcohol consumption. The city government took action to form committees to address the student drinking problem. Mayor Cougill formed a Liquor Advisory Committee to oversee the established liquor ordinances and adjudicate violations to the liquor policies. The mayor also formed the independent Charleston Alcohol Task Force to evaluate the student drinking problem. This committee took the responsibility to canvas the community and provide recommendations to the Charleston City Council for problem resolution. The local police department took responsibility to enforce the liquor statues in a firm and professional manner. The judicial system enforced the local, state and federal statues regarding underaged drinking by imposing substantial fines for law violations. The Charleston community at large took the responsibility to allow the community officials the latitude to enforce change regarding student drinking behavior. There was an apparent orchestration between community governing bodies to act in responsible and synchronized effort to address this problem.
Seventy-five percent of the students and 57 percent of the community reported that the community government took responsibility to control the university students' use of alcohol (item 7, Table 3). It is interesting that three quarters of the students thought this way. A probable reason for this perception is that they are much closer to the impact of the community government's effort to control their drinking patterns than were the community members.

C. Students.

The majority of the university student population did not assume responsibility for the student drinking problem. Those that drank excessively did not control their actions on a whole and many engaged in illegal activity. The university student government and student body did not take the initiative to reduce the problem. Student alcohol-induced behavior continued to "expand the envelope" of established laws and community boundaries which resulted in community disharmony.

Once the community redefined the alcohol-related boundaries through ordinances and increased enforcement, the students conformed. University students appear to be responsible individuals who will conform and adjust to community standards once they understand the limits of
acceptable behavior.

Students requested to be allowed to participate in the
development of drinking policy at a high rate of 81
percent (item 15, Table 4). The majority of students voiced
strong opinion regarding inclusion in the formulation of
policies that have direct impact on their self-proclaimed
rights.

The issue of allowing students input to underage
drinking policy presents a problem for the non-student
community. Most problem solvers realize that the best way to
address conflict is to get all parties involved and come to
a common solution. But, does this work in all cases? The
reason that the 21-year-old age limit for alcohol
consumption was established was for public safety concerns.
Youths have not proven maturity, judgement, and restraint
when consuming alcohol. The dilemma the community may
question is whether or not the students possess the rational
maturity and experience to develop accurate and non biased
choices regarding drinking policy.

Take into consideration the following factors that
show college students being at high risk regarding alcohol-
related problems (Eigen, 1991):

- College students drink more than their non college
counterparts.

- College students are particularly vulnerable to other risk factors which alcohol exacerbates, such as suicide, automobile crashes, and falls.

- Many college and university customs, norms, traditions, and mores encourage specific dangerous alcohol use practices and patterns.

- College students and university campuses are particularly heavily targeted by the advertising and promotions of the alcoholic beverage industry.

- College students tend to drink more recklessly than others and engage in "drinking games" and other dangerous drinking practices.

- College students are particularly vulnerable to peer influences and have strong needs to be accepted by their peers.

These types of examples, and personal experience with Eastern students, suggests a reason why only half of the surveyed community approved of allowing student involvement in the establishment of the community drinking policy.

III. ENFORCEMENT.

A. University and Community.

If university and community officials are asked whether
they have a good working relationship, they will both generally tell you "yes." When closely analyzing the student drinking problems, one will find there are fundamental differences between administrations regarding how to address the problem. University officials were forced to accept increased community enforcement and discipline as a solution because the student body's unlawful actions provided them no choice but to conform to enforcement policies. Throughout this research, educators appear to resist enforcement and punishment as they embrace the Sociocultural Model of Prevention (Chapter 2, pp.17) in the hopes that education/alternatives will resolve the student drinking problem. Education and alternatives take time, money, and resources to implement. This course of action was not deemed an available luxury in this case due to the severity of the adverse student behavior. The student drinking problem was out of control and it is very doubtful that education and alternatives to alcohol would have made a significant and timely impact on the direction of adverse student behavior.

Community officials, based upon this situational problem, adopted an "education through enforcement" strategy. This strategy teaches students responsibility
through establishing strict boundaries which are bolstered by restricted access to alcohol and levying heavy, monetary fines for offenders. This community policy is a very similar reflection of the Distribution-of-Consumption Model (Holder & Stoil, 1988) which was discussed in Chapter Two of this paper. Distribution-of-Consumption suggests a direct relationship exists between the amount of alcohol consumed and alcohol problems in a population (Bruun, Edwards, Lumio, Makela, Pan, Room, Schmidt, Skog, Sulkunen, & Osterberg, 1975). Community officials sought/expected the support of university officials upon enactment of this policy and the data collected in this study suggests they did not appear to receive it.

Both community members and students who were surveyed indicated a bad relationship exists between university and city officials (item 9, Table 4). A three-year average indicated that 48 percent of the community and 24 percent of the students felt that the relationship between the city and the university was good. What created the perception in the minds of students and non-students that the relationship between the university administration and community government had diminished?

From a student standpoint, the answer may lie in the
fact that the most severe sanctions/ordinances taken by the local community regarding enforcement of students underage drinking and uncontrolled alcohol abuse occurred between 1993 and 1995. Generally, these enforcement efforts centered around raising the bar entry age, controlling bulk purchases of beer (kegs), bar compliance checks, and crackdowns on false identifications used by minors in the purchase of alcohol. With this in mind, the students may have been looking for the university administration to “step-in” on their behalf and provide relief from the community enforcement effort. When this did not happen, the students may have perceived this as bad relations between the university and the community.

The non-students, on the other hand, have noticed that the community appears to be conducting the enforcement effort without the assistance of the university. The perceived inability between the community and university to create an image of teamwork in resolving a common problem was not lost on the population.

B. University.

Asked if the university was doing enough to control student drinking (item 5, Table 1), student respondents indicated that the university administration was doing
enough to control the student's use of alcohol. On the other hand, the non-student community reported exactly the opposite by indicating that the university administration was not controlling the students' use of alcohol. In 1995, the university only received an 18 percent "yes" survey return from the community indicating that the administration was doing enough to control student drinking. More than four out of five 1995 non-student survey respondents apparently wanted the university administration to take further action to control student drinking.

In determining the rationale for the students and non-student reporting that the university is not doing enough to control student drinking, two theories emerge. First, the students, and especially the underage students, may think that they are under siege by the community regarding their use and abuse of alcohol. If the students want the community pressure to subside, it would not be in their best interest to request further and increased action from the university administration in controlling their alcohol drinking behavior. Consequently, as alcohol abuse enforcement efforts have intensified over the past three years, students increasingly report that university enforcement efforts are more than sufficient to control the problem.
Secondly, the non-student community has observed aggressive and positive results from their local community government's efforts to curb underage drinking. These results are represented by less/smaller house parties, reduced disturbances of the peace, less vandalism, less littering, less fighting, and reduced late night foot and vehicle traffic. Community members have not observed the same zeal or commitment toward enforcement emerging from university officials as they experienced from their community officials. The visible indications that (1) the local community government had assumed the lead, and that (2) the university administration was observing from a safe distance, was frequently quoted in the survey comments. That is, 82 percent of the surveyed non-students reported the university administration was not doing enough to curb student use of alcohol (item 5, Table 3).

D. Community.

The community governments' efforts to control student drinking achieved a positive response from the community (item 7, Table 3). The community perception rose by 15 percent spanning three years for a 57 percent approval rating in 1995.

The probability exists that the community had a
relatively negative perception of their local government’s efforts to curb student drinking prior to 1993. For attitudes and perceptions to change, results must be realized. In 1993, significant alcohol enforcement efforts were transpiring within the community and public opinion was probably very mixed. In 1994, the community realized that the local government was serious, and their actions were backing up the verbiage regarding enforcement and long-term control efforts. The community perception of their city government efforts changed and accelerated in positive fashion between 1993 and 1995.

One rationale for the high student approval rate (68%) is that the students felt that they were receiving enough enforcement pressure without asking for more.

C. Local Law Enforcement.


Local law enforcement agencies received high marks from the community regarding their efforts to control university students’ use of alcohol (item 6, Table 3). The students also agreed with this opinion.

When the survey respondents were asked if they support stricter enforcement by the local authorities regarding underage drinking laws (item 10, Table 4), the community
said "yes" and the students said "no." A three year-average indicated that 80 percent of the community and 43 percent of the students supported stricter enforcement of underage drinking laws.

When considering that only 43 percent of the surveyed students favor strict enforcement of the underage drinking laws, it is important to note information that was revealed in the Introduction of this paper. Eighty-nine percent of the underage students at Eastern Illinois University have reported in the CORE Drug and Alcohol Survey that they illegally consumed alcohol. In this same report, 70 percent of the students engaged in binge drinking. When these statistics are taken into consideration, 57 percent of the students favoring less enforcement of underage drinking laws becomes clear. Without strict enforcement of the underage drinking laws, the underage drinkers can continue their unlawful practices without serious consequences.

2. Age 21 Consumption Law

When the survey asked if college students should have to wait until they are age 21 to drink alcohol in bars, both the students and community agreed that the students should wait (item 11, Table 3). A three-year average showed approximately 77 percent of the community agreed and only 55
percent of the students agreed.

The logical explanation for the opinion favoring an age 21 consumption law once again can be attributed to the education and exposure efforts of the community. The bar entry debates which transpired in 1993 and 1994 included much discussion regarding the 21-year-old drinking law. These debates received wide coverage in the local newspapers. The local law enforcement agencies were conducting regular bar compliance checks in 1993 and 1994 to determine if alcohol was being served to minors and if minors less than 19-years-old were being permitted entry to the bars. Subsequent student arrests for underage drinking and public fines/closures of the bars facilitating this violation were also making regular news headlines. When the students and non-students were constantly reminded and educated about underage drinking through the media, public forums, and discussion with peers, learning evolves. With this learning, it is very probable that attitude changes have transpired.

3. 21 Bar Entry Age.

When the students and community members were asked if they supported the raising of the bar entry age to 21, the
community said "yes" and the students said "no" (item 12, Table 4). The three-year survey average indicated that 73 percent of the community and 29 percent of the students approved the raising of the bar entry age. The students' "yes" response of 43 percent in 1993 dropped to 25 percent in 1994.

The reason for the students' decrease in support of raising the bar entry age to 21 resides in the social aspect that surrounds the frequenting of college bars. In 1993 the issue of raising the bar entry age from 19 to 21 was presented by the community. Most students probably did not give this issue much consideration when answering this question at the time because their knowledge of the issues was limited. Toward the end of 1993 and the start of 1994, serious proposals and debates transpired regarding raising the bar entry age to 21. These proposals and debates were covered extensively by the media. The students then realized the community was serious in their conviction to raise the bar entry age. At that point, many underage students had to take a serious look at the ramifications of their social lifestyle if in fact bar entry was to be denied them. Students who were 21 years-olds were also impacted by the raising of the entry age because many of their friends and
classmates were minors. The unified student cry heard over-and-over again indicated that the bars were their only social outlet for entertainment. In 1994, the students suddenly realized the benefit of underage bar entry (and drinking) that had been taken for granted for so many years was in jeopardy. It is little wonder that the students’ attitude toward this question changed.

The general attitude supporting the issue of enforcement of the age 21 bar entry law centers around “it is the law.” Students (54%) and non-students (80%) support enforcement of the law restricting students from entering bars before the age of 21 (item 13, Table 4). It seems that regardless of prior positions on the 21 bar entry debates, once it became law, it was to be supported. There were several respondents from both the student and non-student groups who stated verbally or in writing that once a law is passed, it should be enforced. Some of the individuals from the non-student group, who did not support or were unsure of the movement toward a 21-year-old bar entry age, now support its enforcement since legislated.

Regarding the question of whether raising the bar entry age has increased or decreased the problems related to student drinking (item 14, Table 4), the non-students were
split in their opinion, and the students stated the ordinance has increased the problems.

**Statistics Review Summary**

The Student Disciplinary Referral Report indicated student behavior regarding alcohol violations had increased on campus. Equally important are the overwhelming indicators that the majority of alcohol activity is now concentrated within the residence halls. All on-campus alcohol violation reporting areas have increased with the exception of possession of alcohol in a public area. The increases of complaints emerging from the housing officials indicated increased disturbances in the residence halls. The number of reprimands, fines, and public service obligations levied against students increased markedly between 93-94 and 94-95.

The marked increases involving alcohol related activity on campus indicated a shift in the student drinking location and pattern. Underage students consume alcohol in the residence halls because it is safer than consuming alcohol in the community. The reason that it is safer to drink in the residence halls is because of the following:
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a. The penalties/sanctions levied by the University Judicial Board for alcohol violations are far more lenient (Average $23.00 fine or verbal reprimand) than those fines levied in the Charleston community which frequently approach $500.00 for each offense.

b. Underage students who drink in the residence halls are policed/monitored by their student peers who work for the university housing office. The majority of the student workers who have the responsibility of enforcing alcohol violations in the residence halls have only just reached the legal drinking age of 21.

c. Punishments for student alcohol violations in the residence halls are adjudicated by the residence hall staff which is predominately made up of graduate students and recently graduated first-time professionals.

d. The campus-based record of alcohol abuse violations by students in the residence halls does not affect the student’s criminal/police record. This is because violations are not forwarded to the local authorities for prosecution.

When reviewing the data a few disturbing issues came to light. First, 81 percent, or 873 of the 1072 student disciplinary referrals received were generated by the
housing staff in 1994-1995. Keep in mind that the majority of the housing staff is composed of university student workers who have just attained the age of 21. Then, 73 percent, or 787 of the 1072 student disciplinary referrals, were returned to the housing staff (Hall Counselor) from Judicial Affairs for disciplinary adjudication. Allowing the referring authority (Residence Hall Staff) to become the adjudicator (Residence Hall Staff) is unsettling. It would seem that an independent authority is required to adjudicate housing violations to ensure non biased decision making in the adjudication process, especially when dealing with direct violations of the law.

During the period of time in which on-campus alcohol disciplinary reports increased, the University Judicial Board and the Student Judicial Board only heard a combined total of 56 cases, which is only 5 percent of the total student disciplinary referrals documented.

Secondly, in 94-95 there were 347 cases of individuals who were guilty of misconduct requiring multiple and separate disciplinary referrals. The 347 cases account for 32 percent of all student disciplinary referrals received. The report does not detail how multiple offenders are tracked or disciplined or whether repeat offenders are dealt
with more severely. One would wonder that with 347 cases of multiple disciplinary offenders in 1995, why only 1 student was expelled and 10 others put on suspension by the university judicial administration. The number of expulsions and suspensions appear low compared to the high number of multiple offenses. The limited use of the most severe university sanction (expulsion), and the most severe warning (suspension), during a period of serious community discord perpetrated by university students committing multiple disciplinary offenses, could be a significant indication of perceived administration apathy as frequently voiced by community survey respondents.

**Recommendations**

**A. Charleston City Administration.**

1. Continue with current enforcement/education efforts until consistent positive indicators of controlled student drinking behavior are realized. At that point, ease enforcement, enhance education, and introduce alternatives.

2. Track the reduction of student related alcohol related crime statistics and publish an annual report for university and media distribution.

3. Make a direct and concerted effort to open positive “official” communication channels with university
administrators to enhance the "teamwork" concept. Eliminate "we versus they" perceptions. This applies especially to student alcohol related issues.

4. Offer city assistance and resources to the university (Residence Halls) in a cooperative effort to resolve the shift in student drinking location and patterns.

5. Refrain from rhetoric without action related to providing alternatives to alcohol. Take action (not promises) in creating alternatives to alcohol. Work together with the university to develop solutions. Create an action committee with a healthy mix of individuals from the community, university and student population. Canvas the community via surveys and open forums to ensure the alternative solutions are what the people (youth) want/need. Provide heavy emphasis on the youth age range of 14 to 20. Budget for and fund the committees' alternative findings and recommendations. Since the city and university population is essentially equal, share the costs between the university and city budgets. Charleston appears to need alternatives to alcohol for the entire combined city/university population.

6. Examine possible discord among members of the city council as a result of the emotional decisions that were inherent to the enforcement process. During the Town Father
interviews it became clear to this author that some unresolved emotions need to be sorted out.

7. Accept students as community members. Eliminate the perception of distance between the university and city communities. Many students do not feel that the city of Charleston cares for them. Students should, but don’t always understand that through their adverse drinking behavior, this negative “care” perception is created within the community. Explore ways to make the students feel appreciated and accepted. Functions such as a “Student Appreciation Day” may serve to enhance community-university bonding. Strive to merge the student community with the city community to create an integrated community that reflects few boundaries.

8. Build on the success that the Charleston Police and University Police have achieved with the “unified patrol” concept. Explore new cooperative ways to join law enforcement efforts to synthesize conflicting student attitudes toward law enforcement. Publish, record, and promote the results of successful cooperative efforts.

B. Eastern Illinois University Administration.

1. Provide official recognition of the alcohol enforcement effort and accept ownership for the university’s
role in this process. The students and local citizens need to understand where the university stands on the issue of student underage drinking and alcohol abuse.

2. Examine enforcement efforts directed toward underage drinking/alcohol abuse in the residence halls. Do not rely so heavily on student employees to control this problem, as it is beyond the scope of their experience and maturity. Consider employing mature adults who are educated and trained to cope with alcohol related crises as well as general housing principles while monitoring housing violations 24 hours a day. Peer pressure is a very real obstacle to justice when it comes to reporting/disciplining fellow student peers. It was suggested by a university administrator that there is a "real danger" (physical) for students working for the university in attempting to enforce alcohol abuse in the residence halls. A community problem is not resolved if it has only shifted in location. All indicators point to the student drinking problem having only shifted from the city to the campus.

3. Examine the university judicial system. Peer justice is an acceptable form of adjudication unless the balance of "punishment fitting the crime" is skewed or neglected. Determine if the university “student conduct
code" needs to be examined, updated, and/or revised accordingly. When students enter the campus boundaries (residence halls) they should not suddenly become governed by different laws of society which make the campus the preferred location for illegal consumption of alcohol. Underage consumption of alcohol is against the law whether it occurs in a local bar or a dormitory room. By minimizing the punishment levied against students for on-campus alcohol violation, simply because the "punishment is too steep" off-campus, invites the potential of escalating problems on-campus. When students receive verbal reprimands, minimal fines, and no police record for alcohol violations on-campus, this would appear to send a dangerous message to the students who may now view the campus as a "safe harbor" to illegally consume alcohol. Consistency in levying equal and appropriate punishment is a critical aspect regarding the establishment of a bonafide drug and alcohol policy. When examining the legal aspects of creating a drug and alcohol policy, do not necessarily lean toward "minimum enforcement" to ensure a safe legal environment which is free of potential lawsuit. Rather, create a balanced and enforceable policy which is fair and effective.
4. Make a direct and concerted effort to open positive "official" communication channels with city administrators to enhance the "teamwork" concept. Eliminate the "we versus they" perception. This applies especially to student alcohol related issues.

5. Strive to refrain from rhetoric concerning alternatives to alcohol unless there is a plan to follow through with the commitments. Work together with the city to develop solutions. Create an action committee with a healthy mix of individuals from the community, university and student population. Canvas the community via surveys and open forums to ensure the alternative solution(s) is what the people (youth) want. Provide heavy emphasis on the youth age range of 14 to 20. Budget for and fund the committees' findings and recommendations. Since the city and university population is essentially equal, share the costs between the university and city budgets. The university truly needs alternatives for the entire combined university/city population.

6. Develop(revise), publish, and widely disseminate a University Institutional Policy on Alcohol Use. Make this policy a portion of the Summer Freshman Orientation activity. Be aware that the theoretical Sociocultural Model
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of Prevention (Nirenberg & Miller, 1984) which assumes that "if given enough information about alcohol, knowledge will increase, positive attitudes will occur, which will be followed by less substance abuse (1984, p. 10)," is not based upon proven research and therefore is suspect. Recommend adopting the Distribution of Consumption Model (Holder & Stoil, 1988) theory which through research has proven that by reducing the availability of alcohol through price increases, number of hours which it is sold, and limiting the age at which it can be purchased (Gonzalez, 1989), results in less consumption. Perhaps a healthy mix of the two theories is the right answer for the university in developing its Institutional Policy on Alcohol Use.

C. Eastern Illinois Students.

1. Obey the law. Do not assume that by attaining a certain age or status that all rights, benefits and due respect of adulthood are automatically bestowed. Many privileges of "coming of age" are benefits, not rights. If any person abuses the laws of society, that same person will lose the privilege which that law protects. It does not matter whether one agrees with the law. If an underage person drives an automobile without a license, that person once apprehended will be punished. It is the same with
alcohol. Drinking alcohol in our society is a privilege, not a right. Once the alcohol privilege is abused at the expense of society, that same privilege will be altered or revoked through a magistrate.

2. Police your student peers. If an unlawful segment of the student population is creating problems for the majority of lawful students, take action to rectify the problem. Peer pressure is many times the ultimate rectifier. Immature youth/adults do not normally accept nor conform to advice from their elders. They do conform to the wishes of their peers, and if not, move on to another location. The Student Senate and Judicial Boards are powerful and appropriate instruments to create positive change if utilized properly.

3. Initiate personal responsibility for taking the first step in improving student/community relations. Do not assume that the Charleston community does not care for university students. The associated pride and heritage of the Eastern Illinois University and Charleston community dates back more than a hundred years and will continue into the next century. The majority of the Charleston community does respect and care for students. When a student enters a
community, he or she becomes a part of the community. If the students have a positive disposition and conduct their behavior patterns in a positive manner, the community will respond back in a positive manner. Conversely, if the students continually, "expand the envelope" of acceptable community order, the community will react in a negative fashion toward the offenders.

Gaining community respect is a challenge for students. A statement that students/administrators sometime voice relates that the "community owes a lot to the students" based upon the revenue that the students provide the community. Some community members may express some obligation or appreciation to the students due to a direct financial interface with the students, but many others probably wouldn’t. Some community member may just as easily state that the "students owe the community a lot" for being allowed to reside in their community while attaining an education. Do not assume that the community should graciously grant the students respect based upon student dollars spent in the community. This very insinuation may be offensive to some community members. The community individual will not readily profess personal obligation to an individual student for attending the university,
especially when it comes to intangible human feelings such as respect. A lesson which is very important to remember indicates that respect is earned through personal interaction and deeds, not purchased or financed.

D. Charleston Community Members.

1. Support and fund the enforcement effort as long as positive results are realized.

2. Demand that the university and city administrators work together in a cooperative and productive manner in resolving adverse social conditions such as alcohol abuse.

3. Accept students as responsible adults and provide them the full benefit of Charleston's resources.

4. Target and report disruptive students for discipline. Demand the university dismiss disruptive students who are chronic troublemakers.

5. Do not assume that your university students' drinking problems are "no better or no worse" than other universities, and that the community does not have a serious problem. Alcohol abuse is the single greatest treat to the quality of campus life (Carnegie Foundation, 1990).

6. Formally request the university and city budget funding to address this dangerous problem through
alternatives and educational programs.

**Future Studies**

**Limitations and General Comment.**

A limitation of the survey design used in this study is that the individuals surveyed during each year were not the same. In a pure sense, interviewing the same people each year would have provided optimum results. A university community is transient by nature and achieving exact sampling is next to impossible across a period of three years. However, the goal of this study was to determine the community perception toward student drinking. With this in mind, the random method of selecting community members via a telephone survey provided a practical cross-sectional sample of local citizen responses.

If the Telephone and Walking Survey instruments are used in the future, the answer choices of "not-sure" and "no-answer" should be eliminated. The survey will be easier to interpret by providing for a forced choice "yes-no" or a scaled degree choice. By changing to the forced choice method surveyed individuals will not be able to "sidestep" or avoid emotional/sensitive answers. Computer software
which runs Chi-Square analysis and other forms of analysis can sometimes have problems with answers which are vague or noncommittal.

Survey questions 10 and 11 refer to "campus bars." There are in fact no Charleston bars that are located on campus or who cater solely to university students. "Campus bars" should be changed to reflect "community bars" in future surveys.

When distributing surveys in the community, seek a proportionate percentage mix of community members to students ratio that reflects the residential population. This is especially true when the majority of students reside on-campus in student housing. These figures can be attained from the University Housing Office or Student Services at most universities.

Within the question structure of question number 14, the portion "problems related to drinking" may be vague or could be misinterpreted. The problems related to drinking could have been more clearly defined. Some students may find that raising the bar entry age to 21 has created "problems" with their social/entertainment life, and have so indicated by selecting the "yes" answer for this question.

The best way to collect a large quantity of additional
Comments to the survey is to perform the Walking Survey versus the Telephone Survey. The Walking Survey accounted for a 45 percent comment return versus 24 percent for the Telephone Surveys. Walking Survey comments were also more detailed than Telephone Survey comments. Another way to amass large quantities of comments is to conduct Face-to-Face interviews using approximately 4 to 6 “boiler plate” questions. “Boiler plate” questions are questions that consolidate many of the general ideas of the survey instrument and each question is presented/read to the survey respondent exactly the same way and in the same order. This process will account for valid uniform answers that can be structurally analyzed.

When conducting Face-to-Face interviews, use a tape recorder to ensure accuracy. Always request in advance if it is acceptable to the individual to be recorded. Be prepared to take notes if the individual refuses to be taped. By using a tape recorder, one is freed to ask clarifying questions and is also able to visually interact with the survey respondent. It is also much easier to extract quotations later from taped data.

Some of the “Town Father” face-to-face interview subjects were a little hesitant to do the interview. This is
because many had previously experienced bad media relationships by being misquoted in the student newspaper and in other public forums. To ease this, provide a cover letter with your survey intent and include a copy of the survey questions in advance to the prospective individual to be surveyed. Then let them know that you want to use a tape recorder to ensure accuracy of received information.

Make early arrangements with the university computer services personnel or other computing sources to determine if they provide Chi-Square analysis for graduate studies. Chi-Square analysis can be hand-calculated, but the process is time intensive. Most university computer services have the ability to do a Chi-Square run. The computer services may require the graduate student to input the data or even generate the data base under supervision. Keep mindful that there are certain periods during the school calendar that all university computer services are extremely busy, so plan accordingly.

Specific Studies.

1. Follow-up studies of the Eastern Illinois University students' drinking behavior, location and patterns are recommended. The follow-up study should not continue to monitor community attitudes to enforcement of the student
drinking problem. The study should focus on the following areas:

a. Determine the *extent of alcohol use/abuse* by underage university students within the residence halls. Survey the student residents, university administration officials, housing authority officers, Judicial Affairs, university student officers, and student housing workers. Perform a follow-up analysis of the Judicial Affairs Student Disciplinary Referrals Report to determine if there has been any variation of the alcohol problems being experienced on campus.

b. Perform a detailed study of the University Judicial System as it relates to alcohol enforcement. Determine if any progress has been made in documenting changes to existing student conduct codes/regulations. Analyze and report the alcohol discipline adjudication process of the university. Compare the levels/details of discipline levied against students to the county judicial magistrate. Determine where the community and university stand in comparison to federal and state statutes regarding underage drinking.

c. Analyze the Eastern Illinois University Institutional Policy on Alcohol Use. Determine the
theoretical foundation on which the university has based its student alcohol prevention program. Determine what educational resources are available to educate students on the effects of alcohol. Determine the extent of on-campus medical and counseling resources that are available to students who have developed substance abuse problems while in attendance at the university. Determine what legal, ethical, and moral responsibility the university has to its students who have become addicted as a result of the "social" atmosphere surrounding the campus lifestyle.

d. Perform a study regarding alternatives to alcohol. During the town meeting debates regarding raising the bar-entry age, creating alternatives to alcohol was a hot topic. The students said that they needed alternatives to alcohol. The university officials recognized the need for alternatives to alcohol. Community officials also recognized the need for alternatives to alcohol. Investigate what has been accomplished to provide these alternatives.

If nothing substantial has been accomplished to fulfill the alternative void, start the process. Through the survey and interview process:

(1) Determine the need (is there a problem?).
(2) Determine the alternatives (what do students want?)

(3) Determine the approval process (who approves and funds?)

(4) Determine the time-line for implementation (when is it going to happen?)

e. Conduct research to explore referral sources for students needing help with alcohol related problems. The university environment appears to foster alcohol related activities by its students. With this premise in mind, student addictions and behavioral problems will continue to surface and cause strife within the university and residential community environment. One may assume that the university and community have an inherent and ethical responsibility to their students to provide the educational, medical, and counseling support that are essential in the alcohol recovery process. This study should determine the:

(1) need for such resources,

(2) current available resources,

(3) projected needed resources and

(4) responsibility for funding the resources.
Conclusion

The results of this study indicate that organized local enforcement efforts directed at problem drinking by university students can create a profound and somewhat immediate positive impact on the perceptions of community members. This study has only "scratched the surface" of available information related to the overall effects of enforcement efforts directed at university student drinking problems and patterns.

The general study regarding the short and long-term effects of alcohol abuse within the university student population is in the infant stage of theoretical research. Studies such as this one is needed to develop a general comprehensive body of knowledge regarding university student drinking affect. From like studies, scientific parameters may be developed to test projected theories and consequently create proven models directed specifically toward university alcohol education and prevention programs.
References


Bruun, K., Edwards, G., Lumio, M., Makela, K., Pan, L.,
Effects of Enforcement


Effects of Enforcement


Engs, R.C. & Hanson, D.J. (1986). Age-specific alcohol prohibition and college students' drinking problems. *Psychological Reports, 59*(2) pt 2, 979-984.


Gonzalez, G.M. (1989). Are we too busy doing what needs to be done to know what it is that we're doing? The rationale and purpose for a national research agenda on the prevention of alcohol and other drug problems on campus. Paper presented at the Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse in Higher Education Applied Research Meeting, Washington, DC.


Gulland, E.D. (1994). Developing effective and legally sound alcohol policies: How well does your alcohol policy...
Effects of Enforcement


I want to thank Dr. Charles G. Eberly, Professor, Eastern Illinois University, for the many hours of invaluable classroom assistance and professional guidance he provided me toward the completion of this paper.

The City of Charleston Illinois and Mayor Roscoe Cougill deserve special recognition for providing in essence Graduate Assistantship support for this research. Being employed as Coordinator of the Charleston Alcohol Task Force provided a valuable learning experience and acquisition of valuable information that otherwise would have remained undiscovered or inaccessible.

I must recognize Eastern Illinois University whose various staff and departments provided valuable information toward this project. In particular, Computer Services provided valuable assistance and professional advisement in the data computation phase of this study.

Finally, I must credit my lovely wife Pamela. Without her continued encouragement and gentle nudging, I would still be working on this project.
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### Effects of Enforcement

**StUDENT DISCIPLINARY REFERRALS**  
**1994-95 ACADEMIC YEAR**  
Including summer term 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>88-89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There were 1072 disciplinary referrals during 1994-95.</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>1175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>579 Freshmen</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281 Sophomores</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 Juniors</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 Seniors</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Graduate Students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In 725 cases it was the student's only disciplinary referral  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>88-89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>232 Second referral</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73 Third referral</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Fourth referral</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Fifth referral</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Sixth referral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 Seventh referral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Complaints initiated by:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>88-89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>873 Housing staff</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165 University Police Department (Note 1)</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Instructional faculty</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Other administrative offices (Note 2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Judicial Affairs Office</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**  
Alterations to this document may have occurred during the digitization process.

**Note 1:** Student Conduct Code referrals. Criminal charges may or may not have resulted from the same incident.  

**Note 2:** The 100 cases in 92-93 were due to a crackdown on the alteration of birth dates formerly included on student ID cards.
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#### Previous academic years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>88-89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Students waived hearings and resolved allegations with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>787 Housing professional staff</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 Judicial Affairs staff</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 University Police citations (Note 3)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Instructional faculty</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal resolution through hearings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 University Judicial Board</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Student Judicial Board</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 5. There were 14 appeals of board recommendations:

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Resulted in modifications of sanctions (Note 4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Were denied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6. There were 26 admitted or determined cases of academic misconduct (Note 5)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Freshmen</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Sophomores</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Juniors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Seniors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Graduate students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Resulting in: (Note 6)

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Suspension/Expulsion/Dropped from program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 F in course</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Reduced grade on exam or assignment</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 No credit for course</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 3** - Includes only citations written for Student Conduct Code violations (possession of alcohol, misuse of ID cards, etc.), not traffic citations (campus or state), or parking tickets. The 90-91 figure also includes 56 citations for falsified parking permits, cases now handled directly by UPD. Note 4 - Eight rehearings were also mandated during 1988-89.

**Note 5** - Determined not in violation: 94/95-2 93/94-1 92/93-6 91/92-5 90/91-1 89/90-0 88/89-4.

**Note 6** - Hearings are provided to resolve only disputed allegations of academic misconduct, or to impose disciplinary sanctions other than grade penalties. The imposition of grade penalties remains with the instructor if the violation is admitted, or, through a hearing, is determined to have occurred.
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Most violations can be categorized in one or more of the following: (many incidents are included in more than one category)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Violation</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>88-89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Underage possession of alcohol</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessive noise</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of alcohol in a public area</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/False alarms/Elevators/Candles/Incense</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage/Vandalism</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing visitation policy: hours violations</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession of hard alcohol by those 21 or older</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of residence hall bathroom by opposite sex</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group living situations/Parties</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting/Assaults/Threats</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes 2 sexual assault cases</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing visitation policy: no escort</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft/Possession of stolen property/Fraud</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity/Use of ID cards</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of probation/Disciplinary sanctions</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kegs/Bulk possession of alcohol</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trespass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone harassment</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fireworks/Weapons</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occurred in residence hall dining rooms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraudulent parking permit application</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlled substances/Hard drugs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to reimburse EIU for bad checks</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total alcohol policy violations and/or alcohol related cases</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sanctions imposed included the following:
(many in combination)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanctions</th>
<th>93-94</th>
<th>92-93</th>
<th>91-92</th>
<th>90-91</th>
<th>89-90</th>
<th>88-89</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>677 Reprimands</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>723 Fines ($50 maximum) totalling $16,932</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(93-94) $10,312 (92-93) $8,031 (91-92) $9,318 (90-91) $14,018 (89-90) $9,690 (88-89) $10,952</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152 Fines assessed a $10 late fee</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 Public service assignments</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>totalling 1,413 hours</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Damage restitution totalling $4,013 (Note 7)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(93-94) $6,636 (92-93) $5,953 (91-92) $4,419 (90-91) $7,881 (89-90) $2942 (88-89) $3,072</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 Prohibited from using personal checks for Univ. obligations
1 Prohibited from parking on campus
6 Formal apologies mandated
19 Educational papers assigned
2 Referrals to alcohol/drug education programs (Note 8)
4 Referrals to the Counseling Center or Coles County MHC
8 Referrals to the Ethics Discussion Group (Note 9)
16 Residence hall visitation privileges restricted
68 Placed on Housing Probation
14 Imposed housing reassignment
3 Expelled from University housing
0 Deferred expulsion from University housing
21 Placed on University Disciplinary Probation
1 Deferred suspension from the University
10 Suspended from the University
0 Deferred expulsion from the University
1 Expelled from the University

Note 7 - Does not include all damage restitution assessed by the University.
Note 8 - Staffing for five-session alcohol and three-session marijuana violator educational programs was lost in 92-93 when FIPSE grant funding ended. Volunteers from the campus ministry and the student affairs staff have since conducted the reduced numbers of these programs.
Note 9 - Four 1½ hour ethics discussion sessions moderated by volunteers from the instructional faculty and administrators.