

# **Alcohol and Other Drug Use at UMass Amherst: Results from 2012 Campus-wide Student Survey**

**Division of Student Affairs and Campus Life  
Center for Alcohol and other Drug Abuse  
Prevention**

*Prepared by Sally Linowski, Ph.D, Assistant Dean of Students, Kate Ward,  
MPH candidate and Serena Houghton, Biostatistics Consulting Center,  
SPHHS*

## ***Executive Summary***

Since 2005, University of Massachusetts Amherst undergraduate students have taken part in an annual online survey of alcohol and other drug use and related consequences.\* In March 2012, the Center for Alcohol and other Drug Abuse Prevention distributed the survey to a random sample of 2,500 full-time undergraduates aged 18-24 years. The response rate was 27%, a figure consistent with other campus online surveys.

### **Key Findings:**

#### **Trends in Alcohol and Drug Use**

**Massachusetts Statewide Snapshot:** State estimates of youth and adult current and binge drinking from 1993 to 2005 were significantly correlated when pooled across years (SAMHSA, 2012). Massachusetts has ranked among the top ten states with the highest rates of past month alcohol use for adults 26 and older; past month illicit drug use among 12-17 and 18-25 age groups; past month marijuana use among 12+, 12-17 and 18-25 year olds; and least perception of risk associated with having five or more drinks once or twice a week among residents 12+, 12-17, and 26+ age groups. (NSDUH, 2006). In 2009, the adult binge drinking rate in Massachusetts was 17%, categorizing the state as a high binge drinking state. Because youth drinking is correlated with adult drinking practices, policies that primarily affect adult drinkers (pricing and taxation, hours of sale, and happy hour and drink promotions etc) may also affect underage drinking.

**Alcohol** is the most commonly used substance of abuse among UMass Amherst students with 76% reporting drinking in the past month; significantly fewer students used marijuana (32%) or tobacco (16%) within the past month. Twelve percent are lifetime non-drinkers and another 12% drink infrequently. The age of first use and first time getting drunk among our students averages 17 years of age. Past month alcohol use rates have remained stable for legal age students, but have dropped significantly among underage students since 2005. In 2012, 86% of legal age and 69% of underage students reported past month alcohol use. Among current drinkers (past month use), 71% report drinking an average of two days per week or less.

**Heavy episodic drinking (HED)**, often called 'binge drinking', is the most common drinking pattern among underage youth and college students. High blood alcohol concentrations and impairment levels associated with HED place binge drinkers and those around them at substantially higher risk for negative consequences; thus reducing binge drinking has become a public health priority. No common terminology has been established to describe different drinking patterns, making comparison across studies and campuses difficult. We have adhered to binge drinking definition used in the Harvard College Alcohol Study other federally-funded research studies we have participated in since the mid 1990's. Binge drinking or HED is defined for males as having five or more drinks in about two hours; for females, the threshold is four or more drinks in the same time frame.

- Survey results indicate a **20% reduction in the campus binge drinking** rate from 2005 to 2012; a drop from 58% to 47% over seven years. Nationally, 37% of college students report drinking five or more drinks on occasion (Monitoring the Future, 2011b); a rate that exceeds that of their non-college age peers and has shown little decline since 1993. UMass rates are declining toward national rates for the first time since the 1980's.

- Survey results indicate a **27% decrease in underage binge drinking**. Underage HED dropped from 63% to 47% between 2005 and 2012. These reductions are statistically significant.
- Nationally, males are more likely to engage in binge drinking than females, at 44% vs. 32% (2010 Monitoring the Future Study); however female rates are converging with male rates. In 2012, a **slight increase in UMass females HED rates at 47% vs. 46% of males** was not significant, but is consistent with growing national concerns.
- The **binge rate for legal age students decreased** from 59% in 2009 to 47% in 2012.
- **Underage drinkers are significantly less likely to binge** than legal age drinkers.

**Frequent Heavy Episodic Drinking** increases the risk of consequences tenfold for students who drink in this manner. These individuals often cause the most problems on and off-campus and can serve as the “culture custodians” of campus drinking—meaning that they create the heavy drinking scene that others participate in, and perpetuate the image of a party culture at the University.

- **Frequent HED – bingeing three or more times in the past two weeks – has decreased 56%** (from 34% in 2005 to 14% in 2012).
- **Frequent Underage HED has decreased 57%** between 2005 and 2012 (from 35% to 15%).
- For all years except 2012, males were more likely to engage in frequent binge drinking than females. In 2012, 15% of females and 14% of males met this definition- not statistically significant difference. **Over 24 % of underage female who drank in the past month were frequent bingers, compared to 20% of underage males.**

### ***Positive indicators***

The proportion of non drinkers is increasing, and students are drinking fewer when they do consume alcohol.

- 24% of students have not consumed alcohol in the past month (up from 20% in 2005)
- **14% of students are non-drinkers** and 1% are in recovery from alcoholism.
- The average number of **drinks consumed per week was 8.8** drinks in 2012 vs. 14.3 in 2010.
- Among students who reported drinking within the past 30 days, the typical number of drinks when partying is 4 drinks (4 for women, 5 for men). In 2005, the typical number of drinks was 6 (5 for women, 8 for men). This represents a **33% reduction in typical drinking patterns**.
- Typical BAC when partying is estimated at **.064**, which is below the legal limit for legal age students.
- **All binge measures have decreased since 2005**, indicating reduced harm at the individual and population level.

A greater number of students have read the campus alcohol and drug policy, and fewer believe that the social atmosphere at UMass promotes excessive alcohol use.

- **64% of first years and sophomores reported reading the alcohol and drug policy**, up from 50% in 2005.
- **Only 36% of students think the social atmosphere on campus promotes EXCESSIVE alcohol use**, down from an average of 52% from 2005 to 2010 and a high of 86% in 2003.
- Students take preventative steps to reduce the harm associated with drinking. The top five **protective strategies** reported were: used a sober driver (59% up from 38% in 2010); walked home with a friend to get home safely (30% up from 5% in 2010); refused a ride with a driver under the influence of alcohol or drugs (48%); kept track of number of drinks (29%); ate while/before drinking (40%) at least once in the past three months.

### ***Negative indicators***

Pregaming (drinking before going to an event that involves more drinking) is quite prevalent but varies by group.

- **In 2012, 72% of past month drinkers reported pre-gaming.**
- The average estimated BAC after pre-gaming was calculated to be .061, not high enough to be considered drunk. **Males have one more drink while pre-gaming than females** (3.7 drinks vs. 2.6 drinks).
- **Legal age drinkers have significantly fewer pregame drinks than underage drinkers.** This is equally true for males and females.

Students drink at on and off campus parties, and when they go off campus, they increasingly bring their own alcohol.

- **30% of students attended a residence hall party** in the past month. Average consumption was 2 drinks before the event, and 3.5 at the party.
- **75% attended an off campus house/apartment party** in the past month. Average consumption was 3 drinks before and 3 drinks at the party.
- **2/3 of students bring their own alcohol to off-campus parties**; up from 50% in 2011. This has implications for open container arrests, minors transporting alcohol, and decreased ability of party hosts to control alcohol consumption
- Twice as many students reported **paying one price to drink at an off-campus party** in 2012 than in 2011 (31% vs. 18%).

### **Alcohol-related Personal Consequences**

UMass Amherst students reported experiencing a wide range of negative alcohol-related consequences since the beginning of the school year. Asked in 2011, the more common include:

- hangover (64%, down from 70% in 2010);
- having said or done something embarrassing (68%, up from 66% in 2010);
- driving after drinking (19%, down from 24% in 2010).

The **harmful effects also extend to the classroom**, with 18% (unchanged from 2010) of students reporting they missed a class because of drinking; 6% (down from 10% in 2010) felt the quality of their work was compromised by drinking.

- 43% of drinkers scored **8 or higher on the AUDIT**, a screening tool for high risk drinking. Although a drop from 57% in 2010, this is still a cause for concern.

## Secondary Consequences

Students report a number of harms that they experience because of other students' drinking since the beginning of the school year. These reflect the community impact of high risk drinking.

- **Insulted/humiliated (37% vs. 44% in 2010)**
- Property damaged (21% 23% in 2010)
- Victim of crime on campus (2% vs/ 4% in 2010)
- Victim of crime off-campus (4% vs 2%)
- **Noise interrupts sleep/study time (55% vs. 60% in 2010)**
- **Pushed, hit or assaulted (15% vs 18% in 2010)**

## Access to Alcohol

Alcohol is readily accessible to students both on and off campus:

- 61% (up from 59% in 2010) of **underage students report having gotten alcohol from a student 21 years or older**; 32% (unchanged from in 2010) have gotten alcohol from an underage student
- 28% (down from 34% in 2010) of **legal age students have bought alcohol for an underage student at a bar, liquor store or convenience store**; 34% have given alcohol to an underage student at a social gathering (down from 40% in 2010)
- 60% of students **bring their own alcohol to off-campus parties**; 31% **paid one price to drink at an off-campus party**
- **85%** of students believe it is "easy" or "very easy" for underage students to get alcohol at off-campus parties (2011 data down from 91% in 2010)
- **88%** of students believe it is "easy" or "very easy" for underage students to get alcohol at fraternity house parties. (2011 data)
- **48%** of students believe it is "easy" or "very easy" for underage students to get alcohol at residence halls (2011 data down from 67% in 2010).

## Perceptions and policies

- **75% of respondents believe UMass sends a clear message about drinking behavior** through its policies and policy enforcement vs. only 60% in 2010.
- About 1 in 3 students (36% down from 55% in 2010) believe that the social atmosphere on campus promotes EXCESSIVE alcohol use. Of those who hold this belief, 68% believe it to be a "problem" or "major problem".
- **68% of respondents report that they understand the campus judicial process** related to alcohol. This represents an increase of 28% from 2010.
- **Awareness of campus alcohol and other drug policies appears high.** Of those surveyed 62% say they've read the alcohol policy; 2/3 of first year and sophomores have read it. Students understand the policy regardless of having read it. The vast majority of students knew about prohibitions against:
  - \* An on-campus central source of alcohol (89%);
  - \* Alcohol consumption in a residence hall room when someone under 21 is present (85%);
  - \* Drinking games (77%).

- \* Open container in public space (92%)
- **Student agreement with campus alcohol policy and its enforcement continues to increase in 2012.** 81% believe that campus alcohol policies are appropriate; 77% believe enforcement is appropriate, though 13% believe it is too lenient. In addition the majority of students in 2011 support the following:
  - \* Prohibiting kegs on campus (34%)
  - \* Stricter disciplinary sanctions for repeat alcohol policy violators (33%)
  - \* Stricter disciplinary sanctions for students who engage in alcohol-related violence (65%)
- **78 % reported playing drinking games on campus since the beginning of the school year:** This is a clear violation of the campus alcohol policy
- Perceptions of on-campus alcohol policy enforcement have greatly increased since 2009. The percentage of students reporting **likelihood of getting caught violating the following policies has increased for all measures**
  - 76% for drinking underage in residence halls (71% in 2010)
  - 76% for underage drinking at tailgating (56% in 2010)
  - 70% for drinking from a central source (51% in 2010)
  - 89% for playing drinking games (67% in 2010)
  - 96% for open container

\*Not all items asked each year. Where possible, comparison data points

## Table of Contents

<b>Alcohol and other Drug Assessment at UMass</b>	<b>9</b>
Methodology	9
Sample Size and Response Rate	9
Sample Demographics	10
<b>Social Atmosphere</b>	<b>11</b>
Impact of Alcohol on UMass Experience	12
<b>Alcohol Policies</b>	<b>13</b>
Awareness of Campus Policies	13
Likelihood of Getting Caught Violating Campus Policy	13
Incidence of Policy Violations	14
Understanding of Campus Judicial Procedures & Campus Expectations	15
<b>Attitudes toward Alcohol Policy</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Drinking Behaviors</b>	<b>16</b>
Measures of Use and Indicators of Risk	
Mean # Drinks when Partying	17
Drinks in a Typical Week	18
Binge/Frequent Binge Drinking	18
Measures of use and Indicators of Risk	
AUDIT	20
Typical and Peak Blood Alcohol Levels (BAL)	21
Pre-gaming/pre-gaming BAL	22
Days/week spent drinking	23
Campus Drinking Venues	
Who drank what, where	24
Non-drinkers at various venues	25
<b>Alcohol Related Consequences, Driving Risk and Protective Behaviors</b>	<b>26</b>
Alcohol Related Consequences	
Consequences Due to Others' Drinking	26
Alcohol Related Driving Risk	27
Protective Strategies	
Protective Strategies Used	27
<b>Access to Alcohol</b>	

Access to Alcohol	
Ease of Access for Underage Students	29
Supplying Alcohol to Minors	29
Getting Carded at Local Alcohol Outlets	30
<b>Drug use</b>	
Drug Use History	30
Marijuana Use Trends 2005-2012	31
Consequences of Marijuana Use	31

## Alcohol and other Drug Use Assessment at UMass

Since 2005, University of Massachusetts Amherst undergraduate students have taken part in an annual online survey of alcohol and other drug use and related consequences. This research is the result of our participation in several federally-funded substance abuse prevention grants. The instrument was designed in collaboration with Boston University School of Public Health in 2005 and has been modified in recent years based on emerging needs of the University in understanding the drinking climate.

### Methodology

The survey is administered electronically each spring. Once Institutional Review Board approval is gained, a random stratified sample of 2,500 full-time undergraduates aged 18 to 24 is obtained based on the most recent enrollment information. The sample is drawn with the intent to have the respondents appropriately represent the make-up of the undergraduate population as a whole.

### Sample Size and Response Rate

In March 2012, the Center for Health Promotion distributed the survey via the Biostatistics Consulting Center at the School of Public Health and Health Sciences. The response rate was 27% or 680 respondents, a figure consistent with other campus online surveys.

**Table 1: Sample response**

Aggregate	Alcohol/Drug Survey Sample
Total Invitations	2500
Respondents	680
Response Rate	27%

At UMass, response rates are a bit higher than the twenty percent return rates consistent with national averages of campus-based alcohol prevalence surveys. Research supports a random selection of 5% of the population is sufficient to provide appropriate reflections of the campus population. While a 5% sample draw may appear low, it is consistent with most national opinion polls. A typical size for Gallup is around 1,000 adults from across the country, and their results are generalized (+-4 points) to the country as a whole (over 230 million Americans). By randomly selecting students and conducting the survey with fidelity, the results obtained from the sample of 2,500 of the student population are generalizable to the student body. While the survey sample was comparable to the general student body in terms of most demographic categories, females are over-represented and thus may not represent the campus population as a whole. However, all surveys from previous years have also been similarly overrepresented by females thus changes noted over time are not likely to be skewed by gender representation.

Note that not all questions were asked of all respondents, depending on their drinking history. "Drinkers" refer to anyone who reported having had drunk within the last year. "Recent Drinkers" are those who reported having had a drink in the last month.

## Sample Demographics

Generally, the sample was representative of the general undergraduate student population on key demographic variables. One exception was over-representation of female respondents; a trend that is true of campus and national research. Briefly, the sample has the following qualities:

- 68% are female
- 65% live in on-campus residential housing
- 99% are full time students
- 6% are varsity athletes
- 80% are White
- Average age of respondents was 20.1
- 59% were below the legal drinking age of 21 years

Ethnic/racial demographics, class year and extracurricular participation are presented below. Respondents were asked to check all that apply, thus the percentages reported below do not represent mutually exclusive participation rates.

**Table 2: Race/Ethnicity (# and percent of respondents)**

Race/Ethnicity	#	Percent
<b>Total</b>	<b>611</b>	<b>100</b>
Alaskan Native	0	0.0
Asian	72	11.8
Black	12	2.0
Hispanic/Latino	24	3.9
Native American	8	1.3
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	3	0.5
White	487	79.7
Other	5	0.8

**Table 3: Class year (# and percent of respondents)**

Class year	#	Percent
<b>Total</b>	<b>625</b>	<b>100</b>
Freshman (1st year)	168	26.9
Sophomore (2 <sup>nd</sup> year)	149	23.8
Junior (3 <sup>rd</sup> year)	150	24.0
Senior (4 <sup>th</sup> year)	137	21.9
5 <sup>th</sup> year or beyond (undergraduate)	21	3.4

Nine percent of respondents were fraternity/sorority members; 6 % intercollegiate athletes; 22% intramural and 13% club sports participants. Over one third reported community service/volunteer work. While 22% did not participate in any activities, 44% participated in more than one and as many as seven.

**Table 4: Campus involvement (check all that apply)**

Extracurricular Activities	#	Percent
Fraternity/Sorority (n=471)	43	9.1
Resident Assistant (n=460)	24	5.2
Intercollegiate Athletics (n=463)	27	5.8
Intramural sports (n=492)	142	28.9
Club Sports (n=466)	60	12.9
Community Service/Volunteer (n=503)	196	39.0
Religious/Interfaith group (n=468)	52	11.1
Ethnic/racial Organization (n=460)	36	7.8
Student Government (n=453)	16	3.5
Other (n=516)	262	50.8

### Social Atmosphere on Campus

Research suggests that student perceptions of the drinking culture on and around their campus is influenced by a number of factors including: social norms suggesting that heavy drinking is acceptable and prevalent; high risk traditions and events associated with alcohol use; lax or inconsistent enforcement; marketing and promotion of alcohol targeting college students; availability of alcohol-free social options. The survey included a number of items to measure students' perceptions of the social atmosphere at UMass Amherst.

Respondents were asked if they felt the social climate on campus promoted excessive alcohol use. Those that reported they felt it was a problem were then asked to rate how much of a problem they thought it was. Generally, this sentiment remained constant from 2005-2010 at around 52%. However in 2011 and 2012, we found fewer students reporting concerns with the social atmosphere on campus. Over one-third reported that they felt the campus atmosphere promotes excessive alcohol use.

**Table 5: Beliefs and perceived norms about the campus atmosphere related to alcohol use**

	Yes	No
Do <b>YOU</b> think that the social atmosphere on campus promotes excessive alcohol use? (n=621)	36.1%	63.9%

Among students indicating a problematic campus climate around alcohol, over 2/3 agreed that it is a problem of some magnitude.

**Table 6: The degree to which the campus climate around alcohol is a problem.**  
(those who responded “yes”)

	Major problem	A Problem	Minor Problem	Not a problem
How much of a problem do <b>you</b> think the social atmosphere is? (n=225)	12.9%	55.1%	32.0%	0.0%

**Impact of Alcohol Use on the UMass Experience**

About two thirds of respondents *do not* believe that out of control parties make UMass a more fun place. About the same percentage also feel that alcohol-related riots have a negative impact on the value of the “UMass product”, and that police should break up parties that get out of control.

**Table 7: Own Beliefs about the Impact of Alcohol Use on the UMass Experience**

Do <b>YOU</b> agree or disagree that...?	Agree		Disagree	
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly
Out of control parties make UMass more fun (n=622)	6.3	31.4	36.8	25.6
Police should try to break up student parties if they get out of control (n=625)	28.8	53.9	13.8	3.5
Drunken riots affect the value of my degree from UMass in a negative way (n=624)	38.9	28.5	20.7	11.9

Respondents grossly underestimated the extent to which others share their views, however, as seen in the table below. Peer attitudes are more restrictive than students believe. Table 7 reveals that most students think their peers agree that out of control parties make UMass more fun, when in fact, they don't. And most students think that their peers do not want police to break up out of control parties, when in fact, 83% do want police to intervene!

**Table 8: Perceptions of Others’ Beliefs about the Impact of Alcohol Use on the UMass Experience**

How much do you think <b>Most UMass Students</b> agree or disagree that...?	Agree		Disagree	
	Strongly	Somewhat	Somewhat	Strongly
Out of control parties make UMass more fun (n=527)	20.9	49.9	21.1	8.2
Police should try to break up student parties if they get out of control (n=527)	9.9	45.2	33.2	11.8
Drunken riots affect the value of a degree from UMass in a negative way (n=526)	20.5	42.0	27.4	10.1

The belief that one's own attitudes are out of sync with one peers contributes to the silence of the healthy majority in challenging unhealthy behaviors and demonstrates a phenomenon called *pluralistic ignorance*. This pluralistic ignorance effect leads students to wrongly believe that they disagree with the majority, when the majority covertly agrees with them. Pluralistic ignorance might, for example, lead a student to engage in rioting because of the mistaken belief that most other students approve of it, while in reality most other students disapprove, but behave in the same way because they share the same mistaken (but collectively self-sustaining) belief. In a parallel example of false consensus, a student who likes binge drinking or rioting would believe that a majority also likes it, while in reality; most others dislike it and openly say so. Social norms marketing campaigns are a strategy to correct these misperceptions and reduce dangerous drinking practices.

## Alcohol Policies

The following section provides a summary of data related to alcohol policy questions including:

- Awareness of alcohol policies on campus
- Likelihood of getting caught violating alcohol policies
- Incidence of alcohol policies violations
- Understanding of campus judicial

### Campus Alcohol Policies

Over half of the respondents have read the university's alcohol policies since the beginning of the school year. Data collected in previous years indicates that most are able to accurately identify *specific alcohol policies on campus, regardless of actually having read them*. This suggests that verbal communication methods from Residential Education staff, floor meetings, as well as visible enforcement are effective informational strategies.

**Table 9: Awareness of Alcohol Policies - % "yes"**

	Yes
Has read university's alcohol policies	61.5

### Likelihood of Enforcement/Getting Caught Violating Campus Policy

The perception of enforcement has a deterrent effect on behavior. On all measures, students report a moderate to high likelihood of getting caught if violating campus alcohol policies. Open containers of alcohol in public spaces are most likely to be enforced according to students, followed by drinking games. Nearly one-third reported that it was unlikely that drinkers of legal age drinking in a residence hall room with underage students present would be discovered. These data as well as the 30% reporting unlikely enforcement of the prohibition on central source of alcohol may be important data to inform the development of strategies to reduce pre-gaming in the residence halls.

**Table 10: Likelihood of getting caught violating alcohol policies - % reporting**

How likely do you think it is that a UMass student would get caught violating ...?	Not very likely	Some what likely	Very likely

Policies prohibiting persons under 21 drinking in residence halls (n=625)	24.0	30.7	45.3
Policies prohibiting persons under 21 drinking while tailgating (n=621)	24.3	34.6	41.1
Policies prohibiting persons 21 or older from drinking in a residence hall when an underage person is present (n=621)	32.5	32.2	35.3
Policies prohibiting drinking from a central source of alcohol (n=620)	29.7	44.0	26.3
Policies prohibiting drinking games for everyone regardless of age (n=620)	20.8	31.3	47.9
Policies prohibiting possession of an open container of alcohol in a public space (n=615)	14.0	46.5	39.5

Next, we asked about their perceptions of alcohol law enforcement by local police around the Amherst community. While most students believe that police are diligent about enforcing drunk driving laws, less than half believe that police “usually” enforce laws related to underage drinking. Roughly one third said they do not know the extent to which enforcement is happening locally.

Research shows that certainty of sanctions and celerity (or swiftness) of sanctions matter more in deterring problematic behavior than the severity of those sanctions. A highly visible pro-active communication strategy is recommended to increase both the perception of certainty and swiftness of enforcement of alcohol laws off-campus.

**Table 11: Enforcement of alcohol laws around the Amherst community**

How often do police enforce laws prohibiting the following?	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Usually	Don't know
Persons 21 and older driving with a blood alcohol level of .08 or greater (n=621)	0.5	3.4	10.6	48.2	37.4
Persons under 21 consuming alcohol (n=622)	2.1	14.3	29.4	27.8	26.4
Persons under 21 using fake ID to purchase alcohol (n=622)	0.8	6.0	18.8	40.2	34.2
Persons 21 and older supplying alcohol to persons under 21 (n=621)	3.7	15.0	21.3	27.4	32.7

### Incidence of Policy Violations

The incidence of campus alcohol policy and/or bylaw violations were estimated based on students’ responses to how often, since the beginning of the school year, they engaged in a series of behaviors. Less than 20 percent (17.6%) of students reported paying one price to drink at an off-campus party, which is a significant decrease from 69% in 2010. Illegal alcohol sales are still a problem locally but a growing number of students report BYOB to off-campus parties, increasing the likelihood of minor transporting alcohol or open container charges by local police. Playing drinking games is still a very prevalent activity both on and off campus with about one-fourth of respondents reporting they had done so at least monthly.

**Table 12: Estimate of alcohol policy violations and off campus drinking:**

Since the beginning of the school year how many times have you...?	Never	Once or Twice	Monthly	Weekly
Played drinking games (n=624)	22.4%	26.4%	26.6%	24.5%
Paid one price to drink at an off campus party (n=624)	69.4%	17.6%	9.0%	4.0%
Brought your own alcohol to an off campus party (n=624)	33.7%	19.9%	20.0%	26.4%

### Understanding Campus Judicial Procedures and Campus Expectations

Nearly 70% of respondents have a clear understanding of the campus judicial process, and about 75% believe that the campus sends a clear message about expected behavior through its alcohol policy enforcement. Both measures have significantly increased since 2010 when only 53% understood judicial process, and only 60% believed UMass sends a clear message about conduct. Additionally, since 2010, there has been a 118% increase in the proportion who believe the judicial process is timely. These data suggest that students are held accountable swiftly and possess an overall understanding of the judicial process and campus expectations regarding alcohol consumption.

## Attitudes Toward Alcohol Policy

### Student Views on Alcohol Policies

The following section presents respondents views on alcohol policies and local laws as well as their perception of others' views.

The majority of students believe that general alcohol policies/laws on and off campus are appropriate in content and enforcement. In other words, most students agree with the campus alcohol policy and its enforcement, but about one quarter believe that enforcement off campus is too strict.

**Table 13: Respondents OWN views on Alcohol Policies/laws (%responses)**

What are <i>YOUR</i> thoughts about the following?	Too lenient	About right	Too strict	Don't know
Alcohol policies on-campus (n=625)	6.7	73.8	13.0	6.6
Enforcement of alcohol policies on-campus (n=624)	13.1	63.6	16.7	6.6
Alcohol laws off-campus (n=622)	2.9	51.5	28.0	17.7
Enforcement of alcohol laws off-campus (n=624)	5.1	46.8	28.9	19.2

Table 14 shows that students grossly overestimate, by as much as 60%, the extent to which others believe that policies and enforcement are too heavy handed. Peer attitudes are more restrictive than students believe. Pluralistic ignorance might, for example, lead a student to complain about campus alcohol policy enforcement because of the mistaken belief that most other students think that it is too strictly enforced, while in reality most other students believe policy is enforced appropriately or is too lenient, but behave in the same way because they share the same mistaken (but collectively self-sustaining) belief.

The belief that one's own attitudes are out of sync with one's peers contributes to the silence of the healthy majority in challenging unhealthy behaviors, in holding peers accountable and active bystanders in dangerous or illegal drinking practices. So in essence, students who speak out against alcohol enforcement may do so against their own beliefs to try to "fit in" to the false majority.

**Table 14: Respondents perceptions of *OTHERS* views on Alcohol Policies/laws (%)**

<b>What do you think <i>MOST UMASS STUDENTS</i> think about the following?</b>	<b>Too lenient</b>	<b>About right</b>	<b>Too strict</b>	<b>Don't know</b>
Alcohol policies on-campus (n=530)	3.6	52.3	37.2	7.0
Enforcement of alcohol policies on-campus (n=530)	5.5	47.4	40.9	6.2
Alcohol laws off-campus (n=528)	2.1	45.8	41.5	10.6
Enforcement of alcohol laws off-campus (n=530)	2.6	43.2	42.8	11.3

## Drinking Behaviors

### Measures of Use and Indicators of Risk

The following section presents data on selected indicators and descriptors of high risk drinking. These include:

- Last time a drink was consumed
- Number of drinks typically consumed when partying
- Number of drinks consumed in a typical week
- Binge rates
- Frequent binge rates

Respondents reported on when they last consumed alcohol. 76% drank in the past 30 days, meaning that they are classified as current drinkers. Report of recent drinking behavior then dictated additional questions with which respondents were presented. Those who reported having drunk within the last 30 days received all questions; those who reported their last drink being more than a month ago but within the year received a smaller subset of questions, and those who have not drunk in the past year were considered non-drinkers and received the fewest questions related to drinking. Results are reported with clarification of who responded to each item; all respondents, all drinkers (including those that drank within the year), and recent drinkers only (those that have drunk within the past 30 days).

Overall, 86% of students report drinking alcohol within the past year. Only 12% have never consumed alcohol in their lifetime and 1% report being in recovery from alcoholism. Most students (76%) are current drinkers, reporting having drunk within the past 30 days. The average age of first drink, not counting a few sips, was 16.8 years, with the first time being drunk reported at age 17.

**Table 15: Last time I had a drink containing alcohol was (%): (n=626)**

	%
I have never drank (skip to Q 85) (n=77)	12.3
Not in the last year (skip to Q85) (n=12)	1.9
More than 30 days ago, but within the last year (skip to Q61) (n=61)	9.7
Within the last 30 days (continue through all questions) (n=476)	76.0
I am in recovery (n=545)	1.1

### Typical Alcohol Consumption

Those who reported that they drank within the last 30 days were asked how many drinks they typically consumed when partying. The average overall was 4.1 drinks and when combining underage and legal age respondents, males drink more than females.

**Table 16: Mean # of Drinks Consumed When Partying (recent drinkers only)**

Birth sex*	Mean#	Legal Status ^	Mean #
<b>Overall</b> (n=420)	4.1	Underage (n=220)	4.5
		21 or older (n=200)	3.7
<b>Males</b> (n=129)	5.4	Underage (n=65)	6.3
		21 or older (n=64)	4.6
<b>Females</b>	3.5	Underage (n=155)	3.7
		21 or older (n=136)	3.3

\* Significant gender effect (p<0.0001)

^ Significant legal status effect (p=0.004)

Most campuses include all drinkers when reporting typical alcohol use. This is an important distinction when comparing across sites, or building social norms messages. Data including the non-current drinkers are presented in table 17. The number of non-drinkers was relatively small, thus the number of drinks are set to zero which did not change. Mean number of drinks decreased only one drink.

**Table 17: Mean # of Drinks Consumed When Partying (all respondents, non-drinkers counted as drinking zero)**

Birth sex*	Mean#	Legal Status	Mean #
<b>Overall</b> (n=569)	3.0	Underage (n=333)	3.0
		21 or older (n=236)	3.1
<b>Males</b> (n=182)	3.9	Underage (n=105)	3.9
		21 or older (n=77)	3.8
<b>Females</b> (n=387)	2.7	Underage (n=228)	2.5
		21 or older (n=159)	2.8

\*Significant gender effect (p<0.0001)

Data comparisons from 2010 to 2012 show little variation in typical number of drinks consumed when partying, but continue to reflect higher consumption by males than females.

**Table 18: Mean # of Drinks Consumed When Partying – 2010-2012**

		2010	2011	2012
<b>Overall</b>	Recent drinkers only	4.4	4.3	4.1
	All respondents	3.0	3.2	3.0
<b>Males</b>	Recent drinkers only	5.8	5.9	5.4
	All respondents	5.1	4.5	3.9
<b>Females</b>	Recent drinkers only	3.3	3.3	3.5
	All respondents	2.5	2.4	2.6

Respondents were asked to report directly in a single question how many drinks they estimated they drank in a typical week. Analysis showed that males drank significantly more on a given week. Legal status did not have a statistically significant effect on this for either gender, though females 21 or older reported drinking about a .5 drinks less over the course of a week than underage females. For males under 21, they consumed about 2.5 more drinks than males 21 or older.

**Table 19: Mean # of Drinks in a Typical Week (recent drinkers only)**

Birth sex*	Mean #	Legal Status	Mean #
<b>Overall</b> (n=423)	8.8	Underage (n=223)	9.3
		21 or older (n=200)	8.2
<b>Males</b> (n=131)	11.5	Underage (n=67)	12.7
		21 or older (n=64)	10.3
<b>Females</b> (n=292)	7.8	Underage (n=156)	7.8
		21 or older (n=136)	7.3

\* Significant gender effect (p<0.0001)

### Binge drinking

Recent drinkers were asked to report on the frequency with which they binge drank in the past two week (5 drinks over two hours for men, 4 drinks for women). Those who did so at least once were considered to have engaged in binge drinking; those who did so more than twice in two weeks were also considered frequent binge drinkers. Recent drinkers who are considered non-bingers are included in the overall binge and frequent binge rates presented. Overall, less than 50% of students engaged in binge drinking, with male and female rates nearly identical. The sample rates are presented below.

**Table 20: Percent Binge drinkers** (includes non-drinkers as non-bingers)

Birth sex*	%	Legal Status^	%
<b>Overall</b> (n=564)	46.6	Underage (n=330)	46.7
		21 or older (n=232)	47.0
<b>Males</b> (n=181)	45.9	Underage (n=105)	46.7
		21 or older (n=76)	44.7
<b>Females</b> (n=383)	47.0	Underage (n=225)	46.7
		21 or older (n=156)	48.1

^ Significant legal status effect (p=.000)

Analysis by gender revealed that males were significantly less likely to binge than females and underage drinkers were less likely to binge than legal age drinkers. In comparison, the difference between men and women with respect to **frequent binge** drinking rates was not found to be significant.

**Table 21: Percent Frequent Binge drinkers (includes non-drinkers as non-bingers)**

Birth sex*	%	Legal Status	%
<b>Overall</b> (n=564)	14.4	Underage (n=330)	15.2
		21 or older (n=232)	13.4
<b>Males</b> (n=181)	13.8	Underage (n=105)	12.4
		21 or older (n=76)	15.8
<b>Females</b> (n=383)	14.6	Underage (n=225)	16.4
		21 or older (n=156)	12.2

The next table summarizes trends in binge and frequent binge rates over the past three years. In general, rates continue to decline from the 2005 levels. The slight changes within groups between 2011 and 2012 are not significant.

**Table 22: Percent Binge and Frequent Binge drinkers (all respondents) 2010-2012**

	2010	2011	2012
<b>Binge Drinking</b>	<b>48.5</b>	<b>44.5</b>	<b>46.6</b>
Underage	56.5	45.0	46.7
21 or older	59.4	44.2	47.0
<b>Frequent Binge Drinking</b>	<b>23.7</b>	<b>17.0</b>	<b>14.4</b>
Underage	27.2	18.3	15.2
21 or older	29.3	15.1	13.4

#### Measures of Use and Indicators of Risk

The following section presents data on selected indicators and descriptors of high risk drinking that were included in this survey. They include :

- Age at first use
- Age when first got drunk
- Total AUDIT scores
- Those who meet or exceed the AUDIT 8 Threshold
- Typical BAL
- most number of drinks consumed on a single occasion
- Peak BAL

- % engaging in Pre-gaming
- Number of drinks consumed when pre-gaming
- Pre-gaming BAL
- Days per typical week drinking takes place

### Age at first use/intoxication

All respondents answered the questions that asked how old they were when they first started drinking and when they first got drunk. For those who have ever drunk, the mean age for both was 17 years old. There was no difference between males and females and the age of first drink and first intoxication have remained relatively constant over time. Students enroll at the University with at least some drinking experience, and most have gotten drunk in high school.

**Table 23: Age at first use** (all drinkers, n=544)

	Mean
Age when first started drinking alcohol	16.8
Age when first got drunk	17.0

### AUDIT Scores

Students who drank in the last year were administered the Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test, a validated screening tool. Scores of 8 or greater are indicative of an increased chance of experiencing negative consequences as a result of drinking behaviors. The mean score for the sample was 8.1. There was not a significant gender effect, with males having a significantly higher AUDIT score than females, though only marginally so with the *average score* for males being 8.2 and for females 8.1. Legal status did not significantly predict scores for males or females

**Table 24: Mean AUDIT score**

Birth sex*	Mean #	Legal Status	Mean #
<b>Overall</b> (n=479)	8.1	Underage (n=265)	8.1
		21 or older (n=212)	8.2
<b>Males</b> (n=155)	8.2	Underage (n=87)	8.6
		21 or older (n=168)	7.8
<b>Females</b> (n=324)	8.1	Underage (n=178)	7.9
		21 or older (n=144)	8.4

Overall 43% of the sample met or exceeded the *AUDIT 8 threshold*. The results indicate there was no significant difference between male and female respondents when exceeding the *AUDIT 8 threshold*. About half of UMass students are clinically indicated for a screening and brief intervention such as the BASICS program, based on their reported use and consequences. The average AUDIT score for students mandated to BASICS for policy violations, protective custody, arrest/citation, or medical transport for alcohol overdose is 10. So while those participating in BASICS are the right population, more students could benefit from the program.

**Table 25: Percent that meet/exceed the AUDIT threshold score (all drinkers)**

Birth sex	%	Legal Status	%
<b>Overall</b> (n=479)	43.0	Underage (n=265)	42.6
		21 or older (n=212)	43.9
<b>Males</b> (n=155)	43.9	Underage (n=87)	46.0
		21 or older (n=68)	41.2
<b>Females</b> (n=324)	42.6	Underage (n=178)	41.0
		21 or older (n=144)	45.1

### Blood Alcohol Levels

Typical Blood Alcohol Levels (BALs) were also calculated using the number of drinks reported consumed when partying (reported in the section above) along with the hours spent drinking them. On average, most students typically drink to just below the legal limit of .08. Because the legal limit for underage students is .02, all under 21 year olds drink to the level of legal intoxication for driving offenses. Underage males report drinking to .085. Mean values are presented below.

**Table 26: Typical BAL (recent drinkers only)**

Birth sex	Mean	Legal Status*	Mean
<b>Overall</b> 419	0.064	Underage (n=219)	0.075
		21 or older (n=200)	0.052
<b>Males</b> 128	0.066	Underage (n=64)	0.085
		21 or older (n=64)	0.046
<b>Females</b> 291	0.063	Underage (n=155)	0.071
		21 or older (n=136)	0.055

\*Significant legal status effect (p=0.0001)

Respondents were also asked to report the number of drinks they consumed on the occasion that they drank the most in the past 30 days. From this number and the number of hours reported to have been spent drinking, Peak BAL was calculated. Males reported significantly more drinks on a peak occasion than females. Underage males and females reported significantly more drinks on their heaviest drinking night than legal age peers.

**Table 27: Max number of drinks consumed in a single occasion –last 30 days (recent drinkers only)**

Birth sex*	Mean	Legal Status**	Mean
<b>Overall</b> 415	6.6	Underage (n=216)	7.1
		21 or older (n=199)	6.1
<b>Males</b> 127	8.3	Underage (n=64)	9.1
		21 or older (n=63)	7.4
<b>Females</b> 288	5.9	Underage (n=152)	6.2
		21 or older (n=136)	5.5

\* significant gender effect (p<0.0001)

\*\*Significant legal status effect (p=0.011)

Peak BAL averaged .123, beyond the level of legal intoxication.

**Table 28: Peak BAL** (recent drinkers only)

Birth sex	Mean	Legal Status*	Mean
Overall 414	0.123	Underage (n=215)	0.140
		21 or older (n=199)	0.105
Males 126	0.116	Underage (n=63)	0.138
		21 or older (n=63)	0.094
Females 288	0.126	Underage (n=152)	0.140
		21 or older (n=136)	0.110

\*Significant legal status effect (p=0.0001)

Estimated Typical and Peak BAL among *underage drinkers were significantly higher BAL levels than those who were 21 or older*. There was no difference in BAL across gender despite the fact that females drink significantly fewer drinks, suggesting that drinking behavior is driven by perceived effects of alcohol. The results also show that the average student drinks to the point of intoxication even under “typical” drinking conditions.

### Pre-Gaming

Pre-Gaming, which is drinking alcohol in private or with a small group of friends prior to going somewhere else to socialize, is quite prevalent. About 72% of recent drinkers report that they do so and legal-age males were less likely to pregame. Also, underage pre-gaming drinking rates were similar among both genders.

**Table 29: Percent of drinkers that Pre-Game** (recent drinkers only)

Birth sex	%	Legal Status^	%
Overall (n=425)	71.8	Underage (n=224)	76.3
		21 or older (n=200)	67.0
Males (n=130)	69.2	Underage (n=66)	75.8
		21 or older (n=64)	62.5
Females (n=295)	72.9	Underage (n=158)	76.6
		21 or older (n=136)	69.1

^ Significant legal status effect (p=0.033)

However, though females may be engaging in pre-gaming and frequent pre-gaming more often as they pass their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday, legal age women (and men) are drinking fewer number of drinks when they pre-game compared to underage students (see table below). Analysis of variance showed that there were significant effects for birth sex and legal status, with males drinking significantly more drinks when pre-gaming than females, and legal age drinkers drinking fewer drinks than underage drinkers. This was equally true for males and females.

**Table 30: Mean # of drinks when Pre-Gaming** (recent drinkers only)  
*Alcohol Use Survey*

Birth sex*	Mean #	Legal Status**	Mean #
Overall (n=423)	2.9	Underage (n=223)	3.3
		21 or older (n=200)	2.5
Males (n=130)	3.7	Underage (n=66)	4.6
		21 or older (n=64)	2.7
Females (n=293)	2.6	Underage (n=157)	2.8
		21 or older (n=136)	2.4

\* significant gender effect (p<0.0001)

\*\* significant legal status effect (p=0.0001)

Despite the fact that pre-gaming is, by definition, drinking behavior that takes place prior to social events that involve more drinking, students report that they drink enough within a time frame to elevate their blood alcohol levels to that of being intoxicated.

**Table 31: Pre-Game BAL** (recent drinkers only, *Alcohol Use Survey*)

Birth sex*	Mean #	Legal Status**	Mean #
Overall 422	0.061	Underage (n=222)	0.072
		21 or older (n=200)	0.049
Males 130	0.057	Underage (n=66)	0.077
		21 or older (n=64)	0.037
Females 292	0.062	Underage (n=156)	0.067
		21 or older (n=136)	0.054

\*significant legal status effect (p<0.0001)

Females 21 or older reported significantly higher Pre-gaming BALs than males, and those who were underage reported higher pre-gaming BALs than those who were 21 or older. The highest risk groups for pregaming are underage students and legal age females.

#### Days per “typical week” drinking takes place

Using answers to the DDQ, the number of days respondents drank at least one drink were added to give a weekly total of days in which the respondent drank. The sample, which included only those who were recent drinkers, reported drinking 2.1 days per week on average. This contradicts the popularly held belief that most students drink at least three nights per week, typically on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday.

**Table 32: Weekly drinking days** (recent drinkers only, *Alcohol Use Survey*)

Birth sex*	Mean #	Legal Status	Mean #
Overall 426	2.1	Underage (n=225)	2.0
		21 or older (n=200)	2.3
Males 132	2.4	Underage (n=68)	2.2
		21 or older (n=64)	2.5
Females 293	2.0	Underage (n=157)	2.0
		21 or older (n=136)	2.1

\*significant gender effect (p=0.013)

The number of days that legal age respondents reported drinking was higher by half a day compared to underage respondents. The difference between males and females approached significance at  $p=.0.013$ . While there was an increase for both males and females in the number of days per week they spent drinking comparing underage to legal age respondents, this increase was sharper for males than for females.

### “Campus” Drinking Venues

The following section presents responses from the Survey that address the places students drink and the nature of that drinking, including:

- Venues at which students drink
- How much, if any they drink prior to attending venue
- How much they drink at the venue

Respondents of the survey were asked to report if they frequented common campus related events or locations and how many drinks they drank prior to attending (pre-gaming) and while at their destination. Off campus parties were the events that the most respondents reported going to and drinking at, followed by gatherings at the Mullins Center (75% and 38% respectively). As might be expected, legal age drinkers are more likely to frequent off-campus venues to drink.

**Table 33: Local Campus Alcohol Outlets and Drinking Associated with them**  
(recent drinkers))

In the last 30 days have you attended events at the following locations?	% That went to event/location in past 30 days	Mean # of drinks pre-gamed	Mean # of drinks consumed at event
<b>Campus bar (n=423)</b>	<b>14.4</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>1.9</b>
<b>Total</b>			
Underage (n=224)	0.9	0.8	0.3
Legal age (n=198)	29.8	0.5	2.0
<b>Residence Hall</b>	<b>29.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>3.5</b>
<b>Total</b>			
Underage (n=223)	45.7	2.0	3.5
Legal age (n=199)	11.6	1.0	3.8
<b>Frat house party</b>	<b>20.3</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.5</b>
<b>Total</b>			
Underage (n=224)	29.9	3.7	2.3
Legal age (n=198)	9.6	2.2	3.1
<b>Non-house Frat party</b>	<b>5.7</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.7</b>
<b>Total</b>			
Underage (n=222)	2.7	3.5	3.0
Legal age (n=198)	9.1	1.8	2.7
<b>Tailgating at UMass home game</b>	<b>3.8</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>
<b>Total</b>			
Underage (n=222)	2.7	1.1	2.0
Legal age (n=195)	5.1	1.5	3.4
<b>Mullins center</b>	<b>37.7</b>	<b>0.8</b>	<b>0.3</b>
<b>Total</b>			
Underage (n=222)	43.7	0.9	0.3
Legal age (n=199)	30.7	0.7	0.2
<b>Off-campus house party</b>			
<b>Total</b>	<b>74.7</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>3.3</b>
<b>Total</b>			
Underage (n=223)	73.1	3.1	3.2
Legal age (n=199)	76.4	2.0	3.4

\* mean # of drinks reported above includes those who drank zero drinks at the event

Residence Halls are the venue in which legal age drinkers drink the most (3.8 drinks on average), though it is not a venue that is frequented very much by 21 and over students. Before going out, underage drinkers consume more than legal age drinkers, except when tailgating at home games. Note that the mean number of drinks presented above includes those who reported going to each event and not drinking.

The table below presents a picture of those who go to events but chose not to pre-game or drink at the event. Only three venues were associated with pre-gaming by more than 50% of those who attended: the campus bar, tailgating and the Mullins Center. Notable is the fact that Campus Sponsored Events are attended by almost as many respondents as frat parties, yet far fewer students chose to drink at them. These are also the events that students are least likely to pre-game before, which is surprising since alcohol is not served at such events. This may have implications for how such events might be further used in environmental strategies to reduce drinking overall.

**Table 34: Percent of those who DID NOT drink at local events**

	<b>Of those who went - % that did NOT pre-game</b>	<b>Of those who went - % that did NOT drink</b>
<b>Campus bar (n=87) Total</b>	<b>77.8</b>	<b>11.3</b>
Underage (n=68)	75.0	75.0
Legal age (n=19)	78.0	6.9
<b>Residence Hall Total</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>6.5</b>
Underage (n=68)	36.4	7.1
Legal age (n=19)	52.2	4.4
<b>Frat house party Total</b>	<b>23.3</b>	<b>18.4</b>
Underage (n=68)	19.4	20.6
Legal age (n=19)	36.8	10.5
<b>Non-house Frat party Total</b>	<b>30.8</b>	<b>23.1</b>
Underage (n=68)	25.0	50.0
Legal age (n=19)	33.3	11.1
<b>Tailgating at UMass home game Total</b>	<b>55.6</b>	<b>17.7</b>
Underage (n=68)	62.5	28.6
Legal age (n=19)	50.0	10.0
<b>Mullins center Total</b>	<b>73.3</b>	<b>88.2</b>
Underage (n=68)	73.7	89.9
Legal age (n=19)	72.1	85.3
<b>Off-campus house party Total</b>	<b>24.4</b>	<b>9.2</b>
Underage (n=68)	17.9	11.7
Legal age (n=19)	30.9	6.9

## Alcohol Related Consequences, Driving Risk and Protective Behaviors

### Alcohol Related Consequences

Respondents were asked a series of questions about alcohol related consequences they experienced due to their own drinking as well as the drinking of others. Questions include those relating to the following:

- Personal consequences of others' alcohol use (secondary harms)
- Alcohol-related driving behaviors

### Consequences due to Others' Drinking

All respondents were asked to report how much they have been impacted by the drinking of other students on campus since the beginning of the school year. The top five secondary harms were: babysitting a drunk student (63%); disrupted sleep or study time (55%); vomit in residence halls (55%); insult or humiliation by a drunk person (37%); and witnessing a threat of physical violence (33%). These are major quality of life issues for all students regardless of their own drinking habits and are similar to the complaints from neighbors abutting campus.

**Table 35: Percent Experiencing Consequences of Others' drinking**  
(All Respondents, %, )

Because of other students drinking I have...	Not at all	One time	2-3 times	4 or more times
Had to "baby sit" another student who drank too much (n=540)	37.2	25.4	26.3	11.1
Had my sleep or studying interrupted (n=539)	44.7	15.0	19.5	20.8
Found vomit in the halls or bathroom of my residence (n=540)	44.8	10.7	23.9	20.6
Been insulted or humiliated (n=539)	62.9	19.7	13.7	3.7
Had a serious argument or quarrel (n=540)	68.7	16.1	10.9	4.3
Witnessed threat of physical violence (n=540)	66.9	14.1	14.3	4.8
Experienced an unwanted sexual advance (n=537)	76.9	13.0	7.6	2.4
Witnessed actual acts of physical violence (n=538)	69.7	17.5	10.8	2.0
Had to get help for an intoxicated friend (n=538)	77.7	13.4	6.5	2.4
Had my property damaged (n=537)	79.0	14.7	5.0	1.3
Witnessed acts of sexual harassment (n=538)	82.9	8.7	6.3	2.0
Been pushed, hit, or assaulted (n=539)	84.8	10.4	3.5	1.3
Witnessed acts of ethnic/racial harassment (n=540)	87.8	7.2	3.5	1.5
Changed my living situation (n=538)	94.8	4.7	0.2	0.4
Been a victim of a sexual assault (n=537)	96.3	3.3	0.2	0.2
Been the victim of a crime on campus (n=539)	97.8	1.7	0.6	0.0

Responses that included anything greater than “once” were collapsed into “twice or more” for clarity, however there were three notable consequences that had a significant number of responses in the “four or more” category. They are:

- 11.1% of respondents reported that they had to babysit another student four or more times;
- 20.6% found vomit four or more times;
- 20.8% had their sleep/studying interrupted four or more times.

### Alcohol Related Driving Risk

Respondent who reported drinking within the past 30 days (recent drinkers) were asked a series of questions about alcohol related driving risk behaviors.

Over a quarter (29%) of respondents report driving after drinking and one in ten (10%) have ridden with an impaired driver at least once in the past 30 days. Nearly 1 in 5 has (17.3 %) have served as a designated driver. Legal age respondents were more likely to engage in both positive and negative drinking and driving behaviors. Legal age respondents were most likely to serve as a designated driver with 5.3% reporting that they had done so twice or more in the past 30 days. They were also more likely to drive after drinking and somewhat more likely to do so after having drunk five or more drinks.

**Table 36: Percent who Engaged in Alcohol Related Driving Behaviors in past 30 days**  
(recent drinkers only, %, *Alcohol Use Survey*)

In the past 30 days how many times have you...?		Underage (n=255)	21 or older (n=215)	All (n=470)
I have been a rider with a driver that was high or drunk (n=621)	<i>Not at all</i>	79.6	71.2	<b>81.0</b>
	<i>Once</i>	11.8	14.0	<b>10.0</b>
	<i>Twice or more</i>	8.6	14.9	<b>9.0</b>
I have served as designated driver* (n=619)	<i>Not at all</i>	62.5	33.6	<b>57.7</b>
	<i>Once</i>	19.1	22.9	<b>17.3</b>
	<i>Twice or more</i>	18.4	43.5	<b>25.0</b>
Driven after drinking alcohol (n=426) **	<i>Not at all</i>	91.6	62.8	<b>78.2</b>
	<i>Once</i>	6.2	20.6	<b>12.9</b>
	<i>Twice or more</i>	2.2	16.6	<b>8.9</b>

\* significant legal status effect (p<0.0001)

\*\* significant legal status effect (p<0.0001)

### Protective Strategies

The following section details the use and presumed use of protective strategies aimed at minimizing the negative consequences associated with alcohol use:

- 15 items from the Protective Behavioral Strategies Survey plus three additional items.

Table 37 below presents an overview of the protective strategies that respondents to the survey report using, intentionally or otherwise (respondents were not asked if they engage in these behaviors for the purpose of reducing the risk of experiencing alcohol

related consequences). Most students report using at least some harms reduction strategies when drinking. The most common actions were: using a sober driver (59%); refusing to ride with someone who has been drinking (48%); eating before/while drinking (40%); limiting spending on alcohol (31%); walking home with a friend to make sure they got home safely (30%); keeping track/counting drinks (29%).

**Table 37: Protective Strategies used in the past 3 months (%)**  
(All drinkers, *Alcohol Use Survey*)

	<b>Not Applicable</b>	<b>Never</b>	<b>Rarely</b>	<b>Some times</b>	<b>Often</b>	<b>Always</b>
Determined not to exceed a set number of drinks (n=466)	5.6	19.7	17.6	18.7	24.3	14.2
Alternated alcohol an non-alcoholic drinks (n=465)	5.2	13.1	15.5	30.1	19.8	16.3
Had a friend let me know when I had enough to drink (n=465)	5.6	34.0	23.4	19.6	11.4	6.0
Stopped drinking at a predetermined time (n=466)	5.6	27.9	19.3	25.3	15.0	6.9
Avoided drinking games (n=465)	5.6	31.8	22.6	23.0	10.5	6.5
Avoided drinking shots of liquor (n=466)	5.4	24.0	15.9	29.2	17.8	7.7
Avoided mixing different types of alcohol (n=466)	5.8	21.0	12.2	25.8	24.5	10.7
Drank slowly rather than chugged (n=464)	5.0	7.3	8.2	31.5	31.9	16.2
Avoided trying to “keep up with” or out-drink others (n=465)	5.4	11.2	8.6	18.5	29.5	26.9
Used a sober driver (n=465)	7.1	3.4	3.0	9.0	18.5	58.9
Ate before/while drinking (n=463)	5.0	1.3	2.4	13.0	38.0	40.4
Kept track of how many drinks I had (n=462)	5.0	4.1	7.4	23.8	31.2	28.6
Refused an offer of alcohol (n=464)	5.0	4.5	13.2	47.2	25.9	4.3
Limited the amount of money I spent on alcohol (n=465)	5.4	6.5	3.7	21.9	31.4	31.2
Went home to avoid the campus drinking scene (n=463)	7.1	37.8	18.4	20.5	11.0	5.2
Refused a ride with someone who had been drinking or was high (n=464)	9.1	7.8	5.2	9.7	20.5	47.8
Walked home with a friend to make sure we got home safely (n=465)	7.5	10.1	5.6	20.4	26.7	29.7

^ additional items added to PBSS

## Access to Alcohol

### Access to Alcohol

The following section presents findings related to the access to alcohol, including:

- Alcohol access by underage students
- Campus outlets for alcohol and their use
- Use of off-campus outlets for obtaining alcohol

### Ease of Access for Underage Students

Respondents to the survey were asked how easy they thought it was for underage students to get alcohol at various venues. Excluding residence halls and tailgating, campus locations are not seen as easy outlets for underage students getting alcohol.

Underage respondents were also asked to report how they actually obtained alcohol within the last 30 days. Few reported getting alcohol themselves without being carded or by using fake ID. The most frequently cited source was from others who are 21 year of age or older at 61%.

**Table 38: Underage alcohol access** (underage recent drinkers)

In the past 30 days have you gotten alcohol in the following ways?	Yes
Got alcohol myself without being carded (n=364)	3.3%
Got alcohol from a student or other person under 21 (n=367)	31.9%
Got alcohol using my own fake ID (n=365)	3.6%
Got alcohol from a student or other person 21 or older (n=367)	61.3%
Got alcohol from parents/relatives (n=367)	14.2%

Legal age respondents were asked if they provided alcohol to minors. About 35% of respondents report giving alcohol to underage individuals.

**Table 39: Supplying alcohol to minors** (legal age respondents)

Since the beginning of the school year have you...?	Yes
Purchased alcohol for an underage person at a bar, liquor store or convenience store (n=254)	27.6%
Given alcohol to a person under 21 years at a social gathering or party? (n=250)	34.4%

Respondents to the survey were asked about their experience getting alcohol in the Amherst area; where they go and if they were carded. The good news is that liquor stores, convenience stores and bars are the preferred outlets for purchasing alcohol and that they have higher rates of ID checking than restaurants that also serve alcohol. The bad news is that only an average of 45% to 59% students report always being carded when they attempt to purchase alcohol.

**Table 40: Getting Carded at local alcohol outlets**  
(recent drinkers, %)

In the past thirty days ...	Never	Occasionally	Most of the Time	Always
Local bar (n=452)	29.0	4.9	13.1	53.1
Local liquor store (n=447)	28.4	2.9	10.1	58.6
Restaurant (n=448)	28.8	6.5	20.1	44.6
Convenience store (n=444)	31.8	3.4	11.7	53.2

## Drug use

### Drug Use

The following section presents summaries of responses related to drug use:

- Drug use history
- Number of days of use in the past 30 days
- Consequences associated with marijuana use

Respondents were asked how often, if ever, they used a variety of illegal drugs. We asked about lifetime use with four categories from “never used” to “used within the past 30 days” and number of days used within the past thirty days. The figures below show the percentages that have never used the drug and current drug users (last 30 days). The top five drugs of choice are marijuana (32%); ADHD meds (7%); Ecstasy (5%); LSD, mushrooms, salvia (3%); and cocaine (3%). Although not an illegal drug, tobacco ranked second in terms of 30-day use at 16%.

**Table 41: Drug used within the past 30 days** (All respondents, n=537)

	Never Used* (%)	Used Within past 30 days** (%)
Tobacco	63.9	15.7
Marijuana	44.4	32.0
Cocaine	92.2	2.6
Hallucinogens (LSD, mushrooms, salvia)	86.2	2.8
Heroin	99.6	0.2
Ecstasy	88.4	5.2
ADHD Meds	80.5	6.9
Sedative/Tranquilizer	94.6	1.3
Painkiller	89.2	1.1
Steroids	99.6	0

Table 42 below presents the average number of days of reported drug use. Days of use of steroids and heroin were not reported because there were zero and one respondent, respectively who reported any use, making the “mean” meaningless.

**Table 42: Mean number of Days Drug used within the past 30 days**  
(Those who reported use within past 30 days- *Alcohol Use Survey*)

	<b>Mean # Days Used</b>
Tobacco (n=84)	<b>12.1</b>
Marijuana (n=170)	<b>11.1</b>
Cocaine (n=14)	<b>2.3</b>
Hallucinogens (LSD, mushrooms, salvia) (n=15)	<b>1.8</b>
Ecstasy (n=28)	<b>1.9</b>
ADHD Meds (37)	<b>4.9</b>
Sedative/tranquilizers (n=7)	<b>1.9</b>
Painkillers (n=6)	<b>3.0</b>

Based on this year's survey, marijuana is the most highly used drug on campus, surpassing tobacco in terms of the percent of users, and doubling it in monthly rate of use. Marijuana use on campus has shown some fluctuations across years, starting with data collected in 2005, as shown in the table below. However these differences from year to year are likely more related to differences in sample sizes rather than differences in population behavior over time.

**Table 43: Marijuana use within the past 30 days 2005-2012**

	<b>Never Used (%)</b>	<b>Used Within past 30 days (%)</b>
2005 (n=437)	<b>38.9</b>	<b>30.2</b>
2006 (n=882)	<b>35.8</b>	<b>33.1</b>
2007 (n=517)	<b>48.0</b>	<b>24.8</b>
2008 (n=806)	<b>44.9</b>	<b>26.4</b>
2009 (n=1129)	<b>43.7</b>	<b>29.6</b>
2010 (n=N/A)	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>
2011 (n=621)	<b>42.4</b>	<b>28.2</b>
2012 (n=537)	<b>44.4</b>	<b>32.0</b>

While there is a statistically significant increase in the proportion of respondents reporting that they have never used marijuana from 2006 (when this was the lowest) to 2009, the change in 30 day use was not statistically significant. This suggests that though fewer students are beginning to use pot, those who have are doing so fairly consistently.

### **Consequences of Marijuana Use**

Respondents who reported marijuana use in the past 30 days were asked to report on the consequences they experienced over the past three months as a result of their use. The three most frequently reported consequences were "Unhealthy Eating" with almost 60% of respondents reporting that this happened at least once in the past 3 months, "Feeling tired/unmotivated" with about half of respondents experiencing this at least once in the same time frame, and "driving while under the influence" with over 30% of respondents reporting that they did so at least once, over a fifth doing so 6 or more times in three months. Almost 10% have experienced financial problems as a result of their marijuana use.

The average amount of **money spent weekly on marijuana by users was almost \$10 per week**. This is slightly more than **money spent on alcohol weekly** by those who are recent drinkers (about \$13).

**Table 44: Consequences experienced in the past 3 months as a result of using Marijuana (Marijuana users, %)**

	<b>Never</b>	<b>1-2 times</b>	<b>3-5 times</b>	<b>6-9 times</b>	<b>10 +</b>
Unhealthy eating (n=222)	40.5	36.0	13.1	4.5	5.9
Feeling tired, groggy or unmotivated (n=221)	51.6	29.4	11.3	3.2	4.5
Driving a car while under the influence (n=221)	69.7	16.7	5.4	3.2	5.0
Difficulty remembering things (n=221)	64.3	20.8	7.7	2.3	5.0
Coughing or breathing problems (n=221)	62.0	29.4	4.5	1.8	2.3
Using more marijuana than you had planned (n=222)	69.8	18.0	6.8	1.8	3.6
Going to class under the influence (n=222)	81.1	8.6	5.4	1.8	3.2
Missing class (n=222)	91.4	5.0	1.8	0.5	1.4
Feeling bad about yourself (n=222)	83.8	10.8	4.5	0.5	0.5
Going to work under the influence (n=222)	91.4	2.7	1.8	0.9	3.2
Difficulty sleeping when not using (n=222)	83.3	8.6	4.1	1.4	2.7
Financial difficulties because of your use (n=221)	89.1	5.9	3.2	0.5	1.4
Doing poorly on a test or school project (n=220)	90.0	5.9	1.8	0.9	1.4
Doing something you later regretted (n=222)	92.3	6.3	0.5	0.5	0.5
Someone else suggesting you cut down or quit (n=222)	91.4	5.4	1.8	0.5	0.9
Problems between you and your girl friend/boyfriend, friends or family (n=222)	91.4	5.9	1.8	--	0.9
Missing work (n=222)	96.9	1.0	1.0	0.5	1.0
Getting in trouble with the police or college authorities (n=220)	95.9	4.1	--	--	--