

SPRING 2004

Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drugs

Prevention File

Alcohol and Other Drug
Prevention

Alcohol Industry

Binge drinker

Alcohol Users

Drug Store

Know when to say when

Moderation

Alcohol-related

Drunk-driving deaths

Illegal Drug

What's in a Name?
Let Me Count the Ways

Who's Watching the Hen House?

Selling Alcohol: Making a
Risky Business Manageable

Bar Warning for Women

It turns out that barrooms can be dangerous places for women, depending on the environmental characteristics of the bar and how women behave in them, according to a recent study (*Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, December 2003).

Heavy drinking, going to and leaving a bar with individuals not well-known to the women and talking to a

greater number of individuals while in the bar environment are social behaviors associated with bar-related aggression. In addition, competitive activities like playing pool and illegal activities involving drug sales or prostitution in a bar also increase the risk of severe physical aggression, according to the study.

Study coauthor Amy M. Buddie, PhD, of the University at Buffalo's Research Institute on Addictions, said, "Women are not to blame for their victimization." Nevertheless, the study found that "women who tend to frequent certain kinds of bars and engage in certain kinds of behavior while at these bars are more likely to experience bar-related aggression."

Coauthor Kathleen A. Parks, PhD, also from RIA, said that the study is consistent with previous research that found certain bar characteristics to be associated with aggression. The results, she added, "hopefully will aid in the development of future education and prevention efforts."

Putting the Lid on Isla Vista Drinking

The city of Isla Vista, Ca., is home to many students from the University of California, Santa Barbara, and has long had a reputation for raucous parties that sometimes get out of control and result in violence and property damage. For this college town of 20,000 people, beer distributors estimate that they sell more than 9,000 kegs a year.

Santa Barbara County Sheriff's Department Lt. Tom McKinney and other community leaders say that keeping track of those kegs might help them put a lid on the mayhem. The kegs carry registration tags that track who bought the beer, but the tags are stickers that can be removed once the keg leaves the store. Isla Vista officials want to devise a more accurate way to track the beer so that they can find out who is throwing the big parties.

"It's one thing to have a Super Bowl party with 30 of your friends," said Mark Chaconas, an assistant to the area's county supervisor. "It's another thing to have a rager with 300 of your 'closest friends.' When we do have parties that rise to the attention of law enforcement, we want to be able to go in there and find out who bought 15 kegs."

When Jerry Jolly, acting director of California's Department of Alcoholic Beverage Control, took a stroll through Isla Vista in January, he said he was shocked by the number of people attending house parties and milling around the streets. In most campus communities, he said, drinking is concentrated around bars and clubs, making it easier to regulate.

In December 2003 ABC awarded \$50,000 each to the sheriff's department and five other police agencies as part of an effort to battle binge and underage drinking near college campuses. In Isla Vista, the money mostly is being used to assign more officers to enforce laws against drinking.

Here's a Novel Idea

How to "Party Without Police" is the focus of doorhangers that a coalition of Cornell University, Ithaca College and Tompkins Cortland Community College staff and students, plus law enforcement, bar owners, landlords and neighbors is distributing in campus-area neighborhoods in Ithaca, NY. The hangers contain information on city, county and state laws tied to house parties, open containers and noise violations.

Snowboarding and Grappa—A Bad Mix

According to a *BBC News* report (March 8, 2004), Commander Alvaro de Palma, who heads the police's alpine training center at Moena in the north of Italy, is concerned about the growing trend of snowboarders downing a shot of the strong spirit grappa after every run.

"One shot of grappa or whiskey after lunch is one thing, but when you have lots of grappa you lose control," he says. "It's just as dangerous as being on the road when drunk."

He says that there should be safety campaigns aimed at making drinking-snowboarding as socially unacceptable as drinking-driving.

An Effective Approach

Research indicates that brief intervention methods relying on mail or computers are both appealing and effective among the hard-to-reach population of young people who engage in hazardous drinking (*Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, February 2004).

Among college students, hazardous drinkers respond well to electronic assessment and feedback about their alcohol consumption, as opposed to a discussion about their drinking with a doctor or other health professional.

"Our research suggests that young people who are not seeking treatment for an alcohol problem would be disinclined to discuss their drinking with a health practitioner through fear of being judged," said Kypros Kypri, research fellow at the University of Otago in New Zealand. "Young people are nonetheless curious about how risky their drinking is and how it compares with that of their peers. Computerized approaches capitalize on this curiosity while reducing the potential that young people will be put off by the prospect of having to discuss their drinking and its consequences with a health practitioner."

The use of motivational feedback among college students is most effective when private—for

Prevention File is a publication of The Silver Gate Group
(Federal Tax ID: 33-0714724)

Opinions expressed herein are those of the authors or other sources cited and do not necessarily reflect the beliefs of The Silver Gate Group, its editorial advisors, its officers or its personnel.

Publisher: Tom Colthurst
Editor: Barbara E. Ryan
Editor Emeritus: Robert Zimmerman
Orange County Editor: Shauna Antley
Ventura County Editor: Kathleen Staples
Contributing Editors: Bruce Bradley, Barbara Fitzsimmons,
Sandra Hazeltine, Heather Lilly, Jean Seager
Design/Illustrations: John Lane
Production: J. Lane Designs
Printer: Precision Litho

Copyright 2003 by The Silver Gate Group. Permission to reprint articles is granted for noncommercial use and with acknowledgment. We would appreciate receipt of any publication carrying a reprinted *Prevention File* article.

Prepaid domestic subscription rate: \$25/one year, \$40/two years, \$55/three years. Bulk-order discount prices available upon request. Canada: \$29 USD/one year, Beyond: \$39 USD/one year. Address: *Prevention File*, P.O. Box 420878, San Diego, CA 92142-0878
ISSN 1065-3961 (National edition)
ISSN 1065-3953 (Orange County edition)
ISSN 1534-4495 (Ventura County edition)

Comments and suggestions are welcome.
Address letters to *Prevention File*, Silver Gate Group
P.O. Box 420878, San Diego, CA 92142-0878
Internet: prevfile@silvergategroup.com
<http://silvergategroup.com>

Scientific and Policy Advisory Board

Linda C. Degutis, DrPH
Yale University School of Medicine
New Haven, CT

Thomas K. Greenfield, PhD
Alcohol Research Group
Berkeley, CA

George F. Koob, PhD
National Alcohol Research Center of Scripps Research Institute
La Jolla, CA

Rey C. Martinez, PhD
New Mexico Highlands University School of Social Work
Las Vegas, NM

John Pierce, PhD
Cancer Center
University of California, San Diego

Robert I. Reynolds
Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
Rockville, MD

Christopher Ringwalt, PhD
Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation
Research Triangle Park, NC

Robin Room, PhD
Centre for Social Research on Alcohol and Drugs
Stockholm University

Traci Toomey, PhD
School of Public Health
University of Minnesota

Friedner D. Wittman, PhD, MArch
Institute for the Study of Social Change
University of California, Berkeley

PREVENTION FILE Contents

Spring 2004 • Volume 19, Number 2



COVER
"ALCOSPEAK"
by J. Lane Designs

2 What's in a Name? Let Me Count the Ways by William DeJong
The terminology of prevention sparks discussion.

6 Gaining Presidential Support for Alcohol- and Other Drug-Abuse Prevention Initiatives
Laurence Mazzeno, the president of Alvernia College, speaks out.

11 Better Safe than Sorry
Alternative transportation for students.

13 Butts Out—Extinguishing Tobacco on Campus
Smoking by college students on the rise.

15 Selling Alcohol: Making A Risky Business Manageable
Strategies for responsible retailing.

18 Who's Watching the Henhouse?
Regulating alcohol advertisements.

Prevention Updates Inside front and back covers



What's in a Name? Let Me Count the Ways

By William DeJong

WHAT'S IN A NAME? That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.

—Juliet, in William Shakespeare's *Romeo and Juliet* (Act II, Scene II)

My dearest Juliet:

I've read what you've said, over and over again. I want to agree with you, but I am too embittered by experience to do so. No, my love, matters of language are not quite that simple—at least when it comes to the language of alcohol and other drug prevention.

See? Already I find myself in a thicket. Let's examine that phrase, "alcohol and other drug prevention."

Prevention experts use this expression to remind people that alcohol is a drug—which it is. In the United States, the Federal Food, and Cosmetic Act [§ 201(g)(1)] defines

drugs as "articles (other than food) intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals." Alcohol meets this legal definition.

Prevention experts find the alcohol industry's use of the term "moderation" problematic because it is not precisely defined.

The alcohol industry abhors "alcohol and other drug prevention," seeing the phrase as an undisguised effort to demonize a legal product. In modern usage, "drug" has become shorthand for "illegal drug" or "street drug." People still go to the "drug store," but they go there to buy "medication," not drugs.

The industry view is that alcohol should not be thrown into the same category as illegal drugs. Consumed in moderation, the industry emphasizes, alcohol

can benefit its users, which is not the case with illegal drugs. (Okay, medicinal use of marijuana might be an exception, but let's put that debate aside.)

Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention

Alcohol Industry

The alcohol industry raises a valid point. But consider this: prescription medications, when used as intended, can also benefit consumers; yet when they are abused, people commonly refer to them as “drugs.” Along the same line, when alcohol is abused, should people then be encouraged to call it a “drug”?

If you’ve been reading carefully, Juliet, you’ve probably noticed that I slipped in several other terms that generate disagreement.

Prevention experts find the alcohol industry’s use of the term “moderation” problematic because it is not precisely defined. Anheuser-Busch tells beer drinkers to “know when to say when,” but when exactly is that? The brewer never says. As a result, even the most extreme drinkers usually think of their drinking as “moderate.”

I also referred to “alcohol users,” a term the alcohol industry dislikes because it brings to mind “drug users.” The industry would prefer that we refer instead to “alcohol consumers.” After all, we refer to “donut consumers,” not “donut users.” Similarly, some industry representatives dislike the term “alcohol abuse” because of its association with “drug abuse.” But what’s the alternative?

And what exactly is the “alcohol industry”? By applying this phrase, prevention experts are trying to tap into the public’s general suspicion

of profit-making big business. Harking back to the trust-busting days of the early 1900s, some advocates have even started throwing around the epithet “Big Alcohol.”

What’s the downside? First, using these catchall terms obscures important differences between producers, distributors, and vendors. It also masks differences between beer and distilled spirits producers, who are frequently at odds over industry-related public policy.

Second, these terms delegitimize efforts to find common ground between prevention advocates and certain elements of the industry, especially local vendors. Such collaboration is not inherently evil. Indeed, it can often be very productive—witness responsible beverage service programs and voluntary pacts to eliminate low-price alcohol promotions.

No, Juliet, matters of language are not that simple. I began by using the phrase “alcohol and other drug prevention,” and look where it took me! And now I should tell you: I skipped over the fact that this phrase includes another term that invites controversy in some quarters—“prevention.” But I’ll get to that later.

Big Stakes

Debates over prevention terminology can make your head spin. Finding a term that all parties will agree upon is very difficult—and

often impossible. Even when a term is widely accepted, its meaning can shift over time, eventually rendering it unsuitable. In other cases, there can be a growing recognition that a term has unintended connotations and should be avoided.

Many times I have heard exasperated colleagues cry out for relief: “What difference does it make what we call it? We know what we mean!” But that’s just it—we don’t always know what we mean. Know what I mean, Juliet?

The stakes go well beyond a need for clarity and shared meaning. The fact is that language affects our understanding of a problem and subtly shapes the solutions we consider. Winning a battle over language can mean winning the war.

I learned this lesson 15 years ago from my volunteer work with Mothers Against Drunk Driving. Before MADD, we talked about “drunk-driving accidents.” Now we refer to “alcohol-related traffic crashes.”

What difference does it make? MADD’s initial goal was to ensure that drunk drivers are held responsible for the deaths and injuries they cause. The word “accident” serves to minimize the severity of an incident, while also creating the idea that it was an unpredictable or chance event that was not only unintended but also beyond anyone’s control and unpreventable. In contrast, the word “crash” is an objective description of what happened, while also having the advantage of being onomatopoeic.

The adjectival phrase “alcohol-related” is also important. Using this descriptor reminds

us that alcohol impairment begins at a blood alcohol concentration (BAC) well below the standard per se limit of .08 percent. From a safety standpoint, the problem is not simply “drunkenness” but any drinking before driving.

The “B-Word”

Why is our search for suitable terminology so difficult? A key reason is that our words must serve conflicting missions. For scientific discourse, we need terminology that is precise, but for communicating with the public, we need terminology that is simple to understand and motivates their concern.

Go back to the term “alcohol-related.” The U.S. federal government classifies traffic crashes as “alcohol-related” when a driver or pedestrian has a BAC as low as .01 percent, a level not associated with meaningful impairment. The term’s scientific meaning is clear, but will the public understand it? News editors think not. Government statistics on “alcohol-related traffic deaths” are instead reported in the news as “drunk-driving deaths.” This creates public confusion—a politically useful confusion, perhaps, but confusion nonetheless.

Now consider the controversial term “binge drinking”—the “B-word” disapproved of by so many campus-based prevention advocates.

Research reports on “binge drinking” use the term in a precise way. For men, binge drinking means having five or more drinks in a row at least once in the past two weeks; for women, it means four or more drinks in a row. Researchers have used this or similar drinking measures for years, but only in the last ten years

has this level of drinking been popularized as “binge drinking.”

There are two reasons for the change in terminology. First, the term “binge drinking” is convenient shorthand, far more mellifluous than the clumsier “heavy, episodic drinking,” the term still preferred by the *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. Second, use of the term “binge drinking” leads to dramatic headlines (“44 Percent of College Students Are Binge Drinkers”), which can bring attention to the issue.

But on the downside, this term creates an exaggerated view of the problem, due largely to the fact that most laypeople think “binge drinking” refers to a level of alcohol consumption well above the research definition. Compounding this problem is that the research measure fails to account for a drinking episode’s length. A large man—think Falstaff—who has five drinks over a five-hour period is unwise, but his behavior hardly matches the sensationalistic label “binge drinking.”

Another problem: the term “binge drinking” has its complement, “non-binge drinking,” which the public might interpret as a safe level of drinking. Using any level of drinking as a cutoff point that separates “healthy” from “unhealthy” drinking is scientifically questionable at best, and dangerous at worst.

This problematic term also puts the focus on drinking rather than on what should be of real concern: the consequences of alcohol consumption, including addiction. Aye, there’s the rub, as your friend Hamlet would say. The key is not

If we are to choose our words well—that is, if we are to have both scientific precision and public understanding—then we need to test out what our words have come to mean in practice.

how much people drink but the impact it has on their lives.

What Words Mean

Language shapes the content of our thoughts. A physical thing that we do not name can become invisible to us, outside the realm of our conscious awareness, while lending a name to an abstract concept brings that idea to life, often making it as real for us as anything we can touch.

The power of language is exactly why so many debates about terminology become spirited, even heated. The political stakes are enormous. What is curious about these debates, however, is how void they are of any hard information about what people actually think our words mean.

I noted how MADD fought to banish the word “accident” from our lexicon, thinking that the term perpetuates the mistaken idea that drunk-driving crashes cannot be prevented. As it turns out, their concerns were somewhat misplaced. In 1999, a survey by researcher Deborah Girasek showed that 83 percent of U.S. adults associated the concept of “preventability” with the word “accident,” while only 26 percent thought that accidents are controlled by fate.

If we are to choose our words well—that is, if we are to have both scientific precision and public understanding—then we need to test out what our words have come to mean in practice. We cannot presume to know, based on either logical analysis or anecdotal experience.

I mentioned before there might be problems with the word “prevention.” Campus officials

working to reduce sexual assault have found that some victims dislike the term, as it implies that they could have taken steps to avoid being raped, an idea that they reject on both personal and political grounds. Should the term be abandoned? Or might it be possible to educate these victims that “prevention” encompasses areas not only of personal responsibility, but also societal responsibility? Research should be our guide.

As for you, dear Juliet, I suggest that you stick to your true calling: horticulture. The world of prevention will take its toll on your romantic soul, and I love you too much to see that happen.

Very truly yours,
Bill

William DeJong, PhD, is a professor in the Department of Social and Behavioral Sciences at the Boston University School of Public Health and acting director of the Center for College Health and Safety at Education Development Center, Inc., in Newton, MA.

Gaining Presidential Support for Alcohol and Other



By Laurence Mazzeno

LAURENCE W. MAZZENO, PHD, HAS BEEN THE PRESIDENT OF ALVERNIA COLLEGE SINCE 1997. Mazzeno is the author of six books and over 300 articles and reviews on literature, history, military arts, business, and general interest; he has edited a scholarly journal and served as consulting editor for the 1996 revised edition of Masterplots, a 12-volume collection of essays on 1,800 classics of world literature. He spoke on the role that college and university presidents can play in preventing alcohol and other drug problems at the National Forum for Senior Administrators, which is a one-day event within the U.S. Department of Education's Annual National Meeting on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention in Higher Education. The 2003 Forum, cosponsored with The Network: Addressing Collegiate Alcohol and Other Drug Issues, took place in October in Austin, Texas. The following is an excerpt from his remarks.

For years alcohol and other drug professionals in higher education have known that involving college presidents is key to their success. Therefore, getting on the president's radar screen is vital. For many professionals, though, this is easier said than done. Presidents are busy people, for whom fund raising, faculty matters, alumni relations, and long-range planning sometimes seem to be of much higher priority than programs aimed at curbing alcohol and drug use.

I can't speak for all presidents, but I would like to offer some observations about how you can get my attention and understand the problem from where I sit. Begin by studying your president's habits and priorities. Does your president think reducing alcohol and drug use is important? What evidence leads you to that conclusion? What might lead you to think otherwise? If alcohol and other drug prevention doesn't seem to be a priority, what are her or his priorities? How can you link efforts at prevention to those priorities?

Presidents fall into one of several categories. You may work for that rare president who is aware of what's happening locally and nationally, ready to give you time and resources, and willing to participate in every campus and community event you schedule. Even if this isn't likely, you may still be fortunate enough to have a president who keeps up on alcohol- and drug-prevention issues, is willing to work with prevention professionals and community leaders whenever possible, and tries to provide sufficient resources for your programs. If your president fits this description, forget your small disappointments and get to work with your president on the problem. Occasionally, you will run across an uninformed but interested president. Working with her or him can also provide great satisfaction. This president knows he or she needs to get involved but doesn't know how; give her or him information and a plan.

Drug Abuse Prevention Initiatives

■

Unfortunately, some presidents are uninformed, and a few are not even aware there's a problem. Your president may be in denial or may just assume you are taking care of everything at your level and don't need help.

Unfortunately, some presidents are uninformed, and a few are not even aware there's a problem. Your president may be in denial or may just assume you are taking care of everything at your level and don't need help. Such presidents need to be handled with the same approach as their interested counterparts—but you'll need to provide more information about the problem, not simply about solutions. The president who is aware but simply not interested is even harder to deal with. Often this president will simply direct that staff take care of these matters, not wanting to be bothered with details and unwilling to become personally involved in effecting solutions. With this president, you'll really have your work cut out for you.

These are, of course, generalizations. Some president may fit none of these stereotypes. Nevertheless, once you "know" your president, how do you go about getting her or his attention? Here are some suggestions and some caveats:

- Have clear, measurable goals. Having a way to measure progress in reducing drug and alcohol use and abuse on your campus will help your president sell your program both on campus and in the community.
- Do your president's homework. Most presidents are aware of the need for drug- and alcohol-reduction campaigns, but most don't know about programs that work to minimize the problem; providing information will build your president's expertise in these matters.

- Provide written summaries of information and action plans. Presidents are busy people, but most read voraciously; having a two-page summary of an issue or an action plan will allow your president to digest the essentials and leave details to you and other professionals.
- Use real-world examples of success stories. Showing your president how others have achieved success will build his or her comfort level with what may at first appear to be a risky endeavor; presidents don't like to adopt programs that have no chance of succeeding. If you use statistics, localize them.
- Enlist allies on campus. Unless you work directly for the president, having a vice president or senior staff member speak on your behalf is essential. You should also seek allies among faculty, staff, and students, and enlist the support of the college or university attorney.
- Enlist allies off campus, including other presidents who may be able to "get the ear" of your president. The local community is likely to think that it has no role in solving the college's problems with drug and alcohol abuse. Building awareness and support among groups such as the local police department, local drug and alcohol treatment centers, or other interested community groups will demonstrate to your president that he or she is not alone in dealing with these issues. Other presidents can help yours

Don't promise more than you can deliver. No one is going to wipe out drug and alcohol abuse overnight.

realize that the rewards of a strong prevention and education program outweigh the risks of doing nothing.

- Ask your president to take on appropriate tasks. Presidents should be asked to speak or write on the issue, to establish or endorse a campus-wide plan—not to be directly involved in every meeting of a community coalition or on-campus workshop. If you can get the president to set the right tone, a majority on campus is likely to follow her or his lead.
- Prepare your president to deal with anticipated opposition. Students and alumni will not all embrace your ideas willingly; presidents will take the heat when the university begins to crack down on unauthorized use of drugs and alcohol. Give your president the answers needed to address the concerns of those who oppose your programs.
- If you plan to use the environmental approach, explain both its benefits and potential pitfalls. Engaging the community in the college's efforts to curb drug and alcohol use can be risky. Many of the issues that might otherwise be limited to campus reports will leak out and may appear in the media. Be realistic in presenting plans for activities such as community coalitions so your president is ready for the bad news that is likely to precede any good news emerging from your efforts.
- Determine the level of interest among trustees or elected officials, and build your campaign to satisfy these constituencies. There is

growing awareness among those entrusted with governing or funding colleges and universities that the problems associated with drug and alcohol use must be addressed. Make these individuals aware of the problem and your plan for addressing it. Help your president marshal their support—and resources.

- Offer a balance between education and enforcement. Although all of us would like to achieve 100 percent reduction through education alone, it is usually more prudent to suggest appropriate measures that will penalize those who violate campus standards regarding use of drugs and alcohol. Build a plan that uses these tools in a complementary fashion.
- Don't bring problems without suggested solutions. The president will rely on your expertise for advice in dealing with drug and alcohol abuse; don't simply whine about the problem, but be prepared to suggest ways the campus community can work collaboratively to deal with issues you face on your own campus.
- Don't oversell your approach. Presidents tend to be skeptical of zealots. Be realistic in what you propose, and don't spend time demanding that you be given special treatment. If you have a good plan that will make the campus climate better, you will be given priority.
- Don't promise more than you can deliver. No one is going to wipe out drug and alcohol abuse overnight. Offer realistic suggestions

NATIONAL FORUM FOR SENIOR ADMINISTRATORS

A National Forum for Senior Administrators is convened as a one-day event within the U.S. Department of Education's Annual National Meeting on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention in Higher Education. The 2003 Forum, cosponsored with The Network: Addressing Collegiate Alcohol and Other Drug Issues, took place in October in Austin, Texas, and attracted 40 college presidents and other high-ranking campus administrators.

Established in 1987 by the U.S. Department of Education, The Network is a voluntary organization whose member institutions agree to support a set of standards aimed at reducing alcohol and other drug abuse and resulting problems at colleges and universities. The Network has a membership of over 1,400 campuses representing all types of postsecondary education. Through 21 regional groups, The Network develops collaborative alcohol- and other drug-prevention efforts among colleges and universities through consultative services, electronic information exchange, printed materials and sponsorship of national, regional and state activities and conferences.

The Network's Council of Advisors—current and emeritus faculty and top administrators—share their expertise in the forum and through regular interaction with The Network's executive committee and regional coordinators.

The 2003 Forum participants considered strategies for student retention, risk management, contending with incoming student attitudes and values, legal liabilities and application of the recommendations from a 2003 National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism panel report on college alcohol problems. Collegial dialogue and an exchange of experiences are annual forum hallmarks.

As an example of forum sessions, one of the 2003 presenters, Anastasia Urtz, JD, dean of students at Syracuse University, described how her campus responded to a regrettable alcohol-fueled incident. An annual off-campus student block party resulted in major disturbances in a neighborhood adjacent to campus. Leaders from the university and community used the situation to develop new policies for achieving a healthier and safer environment for students and neighbors.

The partnership has addressed quality-of-life concerns such as code enforcement, waste management, noise abatement and parking. It established a neighborhood safety patrol for increased monitoring and enforcement. New policies provide for substantial sanctions against those who supply alcohol to minors, parental notification, and extension of the university's code of conduct to off-campus violators. Sanctions are progressive in nature and begin with disciplinary probation and community service for those who supply alcohol to minors. Repeat offenses are likely to result in a student's suspension and compliance by publicizing these new policies, 100 volunteers went door-to-door to enlist understanding and compliance by speaking with students, distributing packets of information concerning university policies and local laws, and inviting students to participate in a social gathering to meet their student and nonstudent neighbors.

There are other long-standing barriers to success as well. Many law enforcement agencies don't have time to enforce the laws regarding illegal alcohol and drug use. They are simply too busy with what they perceive to be more important crimes. Add to that the tendency of colleges to see themselves as "places for learning and experimentation" within a controlled environment, and we sometimes realize too late that we've been too lenient.

that will allow the president to point to measurable results in a moderate time frame. Real success will be achieved gradually; anyone who thinks otherwise is simply out of touch with the realities of the culture of today's youth.

Even if you employ these tips, you may find significant barriers arising due to your campus culture. For example, on many college campuses there is a belief that since we no longer serve in loco parentis, we have no special role in dealing with undergraduates. Even though we are allowed by law to communicate with parents of students under 21 about problems they may have as a result of illegal alcohol use, some presidents believe we should simply treat all our students equally. Let me assure you, most students who enter college—and many throughout their college days—still require some adult supervision and mentorship. While we may not be able to do as much as we did when we had a legal duty to serve in place of their parents, I think it is still our ethical duty to form their character while we develop their intellect. You may find resistance to this approach—perhaps from your president, but more likely from professionals on

the faculty or in student life. Anyone who spends any time dealing directly with students knows that what sounds fine in theory is dangerous in practice, both for individual students and for the community of which they are a member.

Recently there has emerged what some perceive as a new barrier: the challenge to the value of social norming campaigns. Henry Wechsler's study critical of social norming was summarized in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* in fall 2003. Therefore, your president is likely to know about the issue, even if she or he isn't familiar with the specifics of any social norming campaign. What's more, your president is likely to be predisposed to discount social norming because the study of this approach came out of Harvard; we are a class-conscious industry, and Harvard stands atop the "pecking order" among our institutions. You will have to demonstrate that social norming is working by providing data that will stand up to scientific scrutiny.

Professionals may find, though, that they have new allies in combating alcohol and drug use and abuse. Trustees are now waking up to the idea that the cost of dealing with these issues is eating into the "capital" we have to provide high-quality education. In a recent issue of *Trusteeship* magazine (December 2002), a publication for trustees of colleges and universities, Brandon Busted, former Duke University trustee and former campus leader

in the fight against drug and alcohol abuse, sketches out a set of indicators for boards to measure progress in curbing excessive drinking. You can be a hero by collecting and reporting statistics to your president, who will then have demonstrable evidence that abatement and cessation programs are working. Busted makes a strong point, however, that the time for task forces and study groups is over; we must establish measurable objectives and start holding people, especially presidents, accountable for meeting those objectives. You could find yourself having to explain why the data you collect don't support the rhetoric you espouse regarding the effectiveness of your programs.

Finally, I believe there is a key ingredient to success for presidents and campus AOD prevention professionals: courage. You can have all the tools in the world, but if you're not willing to take the heat from a constituency that's not convinced you're right, you will fail. You can start developing courage by first becoming honest with yourself about the limits of education and awareness campaigns. Admit to yourself, and tell your president, that there's no magic bullet that will solve the problem. There is a propensity for those within and outside the

college community to look for simple solutions. I believe it was H.L. Mencken who once observed wryly that "for every problem there is a solution that is readily apparent, remarkably simple, financially feasible—and probably wrong."

Nevertheless, if we work hand-in-hand, presidents and professionals working on AOD prevention programs can make a difference. I believe we must accept the challenge to tackle the problem head-on. I have set for myself two simple goals:

- A demonstrated reduction in underage drinking—measurable, not anecdotal; and
- A change in campus climate in which faculty and staff work to discourage underage drinking and excessive use of alcohol and to eliminate illegal drugs. Even if we don't reach the zero level, we can at least help people realize they are committing a socially and legally unacceptable act.

These are my goals when it comes to dealing with the problems of AOD use and abuse on campus. I suspect other presidents would share them. If you can help us meet them, we will be forever grateful. Even more importantly, though, you will earn the gratitude of students and parents who have entrusted themselves or their sons and daughters to our care. □

To learn more about The Network, including which campuses are members, visit its Website at www.thenetwork.us. Among resources are the searchable Network directory and information on how to join. Membership involves a written statement from the campus chief executive agreeing to adhere to The Network's standards and acceptance by the U.S. Department of Education.

SAVE THE DATE

The U.S. Department of Education's 18th Annual National Meeting on Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse and Violence Prevention in Higher Education

Saturday–Tuesday, October 16–19, 2004

National Forum for Senior Administrators

Monday, October 18, 2004

Crystal Gateway Marriott Hotel

National Capital Area

Arlington, Virginia

www.edc.org/hec/natl/2004

BETTER SAFE THAN SORRY

DESPITE DECADES OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS, legislative measures and increased enforcement aimed at reducing drinking and driving, college students still get behind the wheel at an alarming rate after drinking. In 2001 an estimated 2.1 million students between the ages of 18 and 24 drove under the influence of alcohol. And, according to the Harvard College Alcohol Study, almost 30 percent of college students report that they drove after drinking. What's a campus to do?

Some campuses have decided that one way to reduce the risks associated with driving after drinking—arrest, property damage, injury or even death—for drivers,

passengers and others on the road is to provide their students with alternative transportation options. Often called safe rides programs, they range from subsidized cab rides and vans from popular entertainment venues to on-call transportation provided by volunteers.

In Southern California, where the definition of a carpool is “everyone drives their own,” three universities have implemented their own versions of safe rides programs for students. At the University of California, San Diego, the safe rides program is not just for students who have been drinking. Students who find themselves in any uncomfortable or unsafe situation can call the Triton Taxi to get a ride home from 11 p.m. to 3 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights during the academic year.

Students were the driving force behind Triton Taxi, which started six years ago as a service of UCSD Associated Students. According to Lupe Samaniego-Kraus, health educator and alcohol, tobacco and other drug prevention coordinator, students cared so much about coming up with a safer alternative that they took the risk of supporting the program from AS fees alone rather than seeking funds from the university.

“Safe Rides was promoted by students as a health and safety program that is a risk-reduction strategy. It's a piece of the prevention puzzle,” said Samaniego-Kraus.


The program is free for undergraduate students, but they must sign up for it and get a sticker to place on their ID in order to use the service. Triton Taxi uses Cloud 9 Shuttle, a San

SAFE LANES ON CAMPUS: A GUIDE FOR PREVENTING IMPAIRED DRIVING AND UNDERAGE DRINKING

The recent publication *Safe Lanes on Campus: A Guide for Preventing Impaired Driving and Underage Drinking* reviews the scope of the problem of driving under the influence and underage drinking and describes an environmental management approach to campus and community interventions.

It also includes descriptions of policies and programs currently being used throughout the United States, with contact information for 22 programs, an overview of campus and community coalitions, an outline of the basic elements of strategic planning and evaluation that campus and community coalitions should follow and a list of resource publications and organizations.

Safe Lanes was developed by the Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention on behalf of the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, and the U.S. Department of Transportation, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. It is available online at www.edc.org/hec or by calling 800/676-1730.





“not to complain but rather to thank us for making the service available to students.”

USD also arranges to have cabs available at large student events held at

big hotels to ensure that students who need

a safe ride home get it. Volunteers from Campus Connections are on hand at such events to assist students who need help with safe transportation by directing them to waiting cabs.

The Safe Ride Home program was formed to prevent San Diego State University students from drinking and driving and to offer students a way out of any uncomfortable situation. Until this year the program operated much in the same manner as Triton Taxi, with Associated Students of SDSU contracting with Cloud 9 Shuttle to provide a free, one-way ride home for students who need it. The service now uses Yellow Cab and is available Thursday, Friday and Saturday from 11:00 p.m. to 2:30 a.m. Students must preregister to receive a safe-ride card, which the taxi driver uses for payment for the free one-way ride. There are geographical limits on the rides. Students may use it only once per night. However, since switching to the taxi-based system and increasing student awareness campaigns, student utilization has increased so much that cost concerns are threatening the program.

The Greek systems at SDSU and USD also use the Designated Drivers Association of San Diego, founded in July 2001 by Raymond Gross. Its purpose is to keep drunk drivers off the road by taking them and their cars home free of charge. Since the program started, more than 4,500 people and 2,100 automobiles have been taken home. DDASD operates through the use of volunteers. The volunteers work in teams of two, where one drives the intoxicated person home in his or her vehicle and the other volunteer follows in the chase car—the volunteer's vehicle.

“The No. 1 reason people don't use a safe rides program is that they don't want to leave their vehicles stranded somewhere,” says Raymond Gross, director of DDAOC. “We eliminate that problem by getting their vehicles home too.”

SDSU has a project funded by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism to evaluate the Safe Ride Home program and the use of designated drivers when students cross the border into Mexico to take advantage of the lower drinking age and Tijuana nightspots that cater to young people.

Researcher James Lange, PhD, says that students do not have a high use rate for Safe Ride Home program. Some of the reasons are procedural.

“Students have to be preregistered to use the service. And, of course, they have to remember to use it. We have done a breath test survey of students who have used the service and found that they have been drinking heavily,” says Lange.

At the border Lange's project randomly assigns groups into designated drivers and controls. Project staff hand the designated driver a card with a message on the benefits having a designated driver. Drivers are asked to read it aloud so that all those in the vehicle hear the message. The researchers conduct breath tests of drivers in both groups when they cross back into California to determine whether the designated-driver groups are more likely to have sober drivers. It turns out that involvement in the designated-driver groups reduces drinking by the driver by 80 percent.

According to Lange, being in the designated-driver group also reduces drinking by passengers.

“It turns out that merely asking people who is the designated driver on the way into Mexico has an impact on the drinking behavior of everyone in the vehicle. The group gets involved in making safer choices,” says Lange.

Editor's note: *For more information on the Designated Drivers Association of San Diego, go to www.ddasd.org or call 866/373-SAFE.* □


Diego-based taxi, shuttle and limousine service. Cloud 9 provides enough shuttles so that students do not have to wait more than 40 minutes from the time they request a ride to when they are picked up. Triton Taxi provides rides from popular neighborhoods where students gather to socialize.

The University of San Diego, a private Catholic institution with about 7,000 students, has operated its College Cab program since 1989. When USD undergraduate students are confronted with any unsafe situation—not just alcohol-related—they can call the Orange Cab Company and identify themselves as USD students. The driver will then return students safely to their homes 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Although there is a limit that each individual student can only use the service three times a semester, in all the years this program has been in operation no student has ever been turned away for abusing this program. Each cab ride requires only one USD student to show their USD ID card no matter how many people are with them in the cab.

Unlike UCSD's program, USD students bear part of the cost for College Cab. Within two weeks of using the service they must pay one-half of the fare. Associated Students pays the rest. However, if a student fails to pay his or her share of the fare, the full amount goes on their student account.

“Several times parents have called about the charge,” said Julie Barnett, director of education in Alcohol and Drug Education Services,

Butts Out Extinguishing Tobacco on Campus



■ IN 1965 OVER 40 PERCENT OF ADULTS IN THE UNITED STATES WERE SMOKERS. By 2001 smoking rates had declined by almost half, down to 22.8. It is one of the country's great public health successes. But the last decade has witnessed a steady rise in tobacco use by college and university students. At current rates, an estimated one out of nine of today's college students will die of tobacco-related illness.

Many start to smoke in college, and almost 40 percent of college students either began smoking or became regular smokers after starting college, according to researchers Abigail Halperin, MD, and Ted Eytan, MD, both at the University of Washington, Seattle.

"Freshmen represent the youngest and most vulnerable population to start smoking at college. Freshmen are away from parental control and making health decisions independently for the first time. Residence hall students in smoking-optional halls are at high risk because of hanging out with new friends who may smoke. Students who rarely smoked before college may rapidly escalate to addicted use," says Linda Hancock, PhD, assistant director of health promotion at Virginia Commonwealth University, who created the www.smokefreecampus.org Website for her campus.

"Fraternity and sorority members are highly social and may combine smoking with their party behavior. VCU and University of Maryland unpublished data found approxi-

mately 60 percent of sorority women smoke," said Hancock. Women now account for 39 percent of all smoking-related deaths each year in the United States, a proportion that has more than doubled since 1965, according to a 2001 report on women and smoking released by then U.S. Surgeon General David Satcher, MD.

Other students who may be a greater risk include male baseball team members and other athletes (chewing tobacco), as well as those studying arts and theater, according to Hancock.

Costs to Colleges

In addition to adverse health consequence, tobacco use increases costs for colleges and universities. For example, according to the National Fire Protection Agency, in 1998 smoking was the third leading cause of the estimated 1,380 structure fires in school, college and university residence halls and fraternity and sorority housing. These fires resulted in 87 injuries and \$5.9 million in direct property damage.

Smoking also adds to the campus maintenance bill. Carpets, draperies and furniture require extra cleaning and repair due to smoke damage and burns. Cigarette butts are a significant share of the campus litter that must be collected and discarded.

TEST YOUR TOBACCO KNOWLEDGE
Students can learn more about tobacco by taking Cig Quiz on Tobacco Free U., the BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Website on collegiate tobacco control at www.tobaccofreeu.org/.

FIVE STRATEGIES FOR COMPREHENSIVE CAMPUS TOBACCO PREVENTION

1. Create a tobacco-free normative environment
2. Restrict tobacco sales, advertising and promotion
3. Increase and enforce sound tobacco-related rules and policies
4. Educate students about tobacco prevention
5. Offer tobacco cessation programs designed for college students

Source: College Tobacco Prevention Resource Website at www.ttac.org/college/model/approach.html.

Campuses are also workplaces. Smoking by employees leads to decreased workforce productivity and greater use of health care services for smokers and nonsmokers alike, which have implications for the bottom line of campus financial positions.

Tobacco Marketing to College Students

The 1998 Settlement Agreement between 46 states and the five largest tobacco firms limits certain industry promotional practices. For example, billboard and transit advertising and inclusion of cartoons in ads are prohibited. However, promotional activities targeted at young adults in bars and nightclubs are not affected by the settlement. Consequently, “Tobacco promotion in bars and clubs is likely to lead to increased adult smoking prevalence,” wrote Lois Biener, PhD, and Alison Albers, PhD, both at the University of Massachusetts, Boston (*American Journal of Public Health*, February 2004). Other researchers have found similar results.

“We know [based on tobacco documents research] that the tobacco industry sponsors social events at bars, clubs and college parties in order to promote cigarettes to young adults,” said Nancy Rigotti, MD, of Harvard Medical School, at the American Public Health

Association annual conference in November 2003.

“Our conclusions are that smoking prevalence is higher among college students who have attended a tobacco industry-sponsored promotional event at a bar or club or campus party. These

events may encourage tobacco use among college students, especially the majority of students who don’t enter college as regular smokers,” Rigotti said.

Such promotions are “another reason we ought to have smoke-free bars,” she said. In addition, Rigotti found that a preponderance of students that her team surveyed supported a ban on tobacco promotions. “We looked at the support for prohibiting tobacco sponsorship of events among all students, among nonsmokers and smokers, and found a strong level of support overall.”

College Campuses—The New Front Line in Tobacco Prevention?

Campuses are deploying a range of strategies to prevent tobacco-related harm. These strategies include social norms marketing, curriculum infusion, and clean air policies for campus facilities.

“The college setting presents a prime opportunity for interventions which may prevent initiation of tobacco use, block the transition to regular

smoking, or aid students in quitting,” says University of Washington’s Halperin, in *State of the Union: Tobacco Use on College Campuses*, report for the American Legacy Foundation.

Halperin helped lead that campus to outlaw the sale of tobacco products in the campus bookstore.

While Virginia Commonwealth University’s Hancock encourages higher education to promote smoke-free environments based on a combination of health factors, she says: “College students are the future policy setters and leaders of government and industry. Beliefs and behaviors learned by students in college will have far-reaching implications for our society. If college graduates have experienced the benefits of clean indoor life and healthy environments during their college careers, they will be more likely to work to maximize similar healthy living environments for our worksites and communities.”

Other examples of what campuses are doing in the area of tobacco control as well as a number of resources for prevention can be found on the College Tobacco Prevention Resource Website at www.ttac.org/college/campus/—a service of the Center for College Health and Safety’s College Tobacco Prevention Initiative, a project of Health and Human Development Programs at Education Development Center, Inc., in Massachusetts. □



Selling Alcohol:

Making A Risky Business Manageable

IT'S A ROUTINE OCCURRENCE at convenience stores, supermarkets, bars, restaurants or any retail outlet that sells alcohol—underage customers with fake IDs, older strangers buying alcohol for kids, and even employees who just plain ignore the minimum 21-year-old purchase age. That's how many young people under the age of 21 obtain beer, wine and spirits. As a matter of course businesses, whether they are large chains or small mom-and-pop operations, face attempts by underage or already impaired customers to purchase alcohol illegally.

Faced with stepped-up federal efforts to deter underage drinking, concerned community coalitions, and more aggressive state and local regulation and enforcement of alcohol sales and service, the hospitality industry and retailing trade associations are paying more attention to how they engage in the alcohol trade. And a growing number of colleges and universities are engaging their surrounding communities to minimize alcohol-related harm. In doing so, they are becoming advocates for responsible hospitality practices.

Responsible Retailing Coalition Promotes Solutions

Taking the position that alcohol sales and service is not so much solved as managed, a new group, the Responsible Retailing Forum, is

promoting strategies that involve retail outlets, community collaboration, and policies to deter alcohol problems.

Close to 100 educators, alcohol trade association representatives, regulators, retailers and health advocates gathered in Las Vegas in March 2003 for the second annual national conference organized by the forum.

Several states, including Iowa, Missouri and New Mexico, are engaged in a field

test of the forum's comprehensive approach linking retailers with community collaborators and state policies. These states have each recruited select groups of retailers to participate in study groups, secret shopper visits and the use of self-assessment tools customized for state laws and resources.

Iowa's experience demonstrates a number of lessons learned in attempts to take a more rational approach to state policies. After certain Iowa cities enacted keg registration laws for their jurisdictions, several retailer associations lobbied the state Legislature for a statewide keg registration law, seeing that as preferable to a labyrinth of local ordinances. Iowa Alcoholic Beverages Division staff wondered if greater restrictions on keg sales, such as the registration requirement, would lead to increased sale of cases of beer in cans or bottles. But the answer to that question will have to wait



CORPORATE COMMITMENT TO REDUCING TOBACCO SALES TO KIDS

In 2002, ExxonMobil entered into an agreement with 45 states regarding tobacco sales at gas station convenience stores. The firm, the world's second largest corporation in 2003 according to *Fortune* magazine, committed to training employees at 1,000 company-operated outlets in ways to restrict underage access to tobacco products. ExxonMobil policy now requires clerks to age-check all tobacco customers who appear to be under the age of 27. The corporation ensures compliance through videotaping and engagement of an outside firm to conduct random, anonymous compliance checks (mystery shoppers). Other features of the agreement forbid self-service displays of tobacco products, the sale of nontobacco product samples. While these policies initially apply to just the 1,000 company-owned stations, ExxonMobil also agreed to extend them to nearly 16,000 franchise stations—those bearing either the Exxon or Mobil brand name but not owned by the corporation—as franchise contracts come up for renewal.

to find out, as the Iowa Legislature did not enact the kegel law in its now adjourned 2004 session.

Iowa is also wrestling with policies that would impose restrictions on price promotions, attempting to reach policy consensus among retailers and distributors. Following a round of public hearings by the state Liquor Commission, the ABD is considering regulation to outlaw price promotions at bars—for example, all you can drink for a set price; women drink free; two for the price of one—in the state's three public university cities, Ames, Cedar Falls and Iowa City. Many local bar owners support such a regulation because it would even the field of competition. However, the ABD found that local distributors were against such measure. Representatives of the nation's largest breweries in attendance at the forum said that their companies were against price promotions and that they were looking into the Iowa situation.

The Missouri Division of Alcohol and Tobacco Control is also participating in the field test. The city of Springfield, which has an existing community partnership, is one site, and community collaboration there is paying off. Springfield is a college town plus a market center for surrounding rural areas, attracting young people from miles around. Through work with com-

community retailers and law enforcement, the DATC learned that purchases by third parties for underage youths are a big problem, especially during holidays and other celebrations. In response, the Springfield community partnership stations monitors in parking lots of larger alcohol outlets at times when illegal transactions are anticipated. If monitors witness such transactions, they call local law enforcement to intercede. The third party can be an older relative or friend or a stranger approached by an underage youth in a shoulder-tap request to buy alcohol.

New Mexico's Division of Gaming and Alcohol reported on policy initiatives at the forum. The state, one of the earliest to enact mandatory server training and to issue permits to individual servers, now—ten years later—has learned that enforcement is also a necessary ingredient of a comprehensive approach for reducing underage drinking. Under state laws, clerks who sell alcohol to underage customers can receive a criminal sanction of up to a \$1,000 fine plus community service and a separate administrative citation with a fine of up to \$500. In addition, they face loss of their alcohol server permit for a period ranging from 30 days for a first offense to permanent revocation after three offenses. New Mexico has one of the highest rates of alcohol-related traffic fatalities in the country.

The Responsible Retailing Forum's *Report on Best Practices for Responsible Retailing* is online at fcpr.fsu.edu/retail/reports.html.

Through work with community retailers and law enforcement, the DATC learned that purchases by third parties for underage youths are a big problem, especially during holidays and other celebrations.

Emerging Technologies

Forum participants also heard about technological and other innovations to manage the retail environment so as to avoid illegal sales, such as:

- Uniform age identification documentation. To counter the never-ending challenge of detecting faked age identification, the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators—made up of top state motor vehicle officials—is developing standards for tamperproof driver's licenses that would be much more reliable for age identification than is currently the case with the various technologies in place among the states.
- Electronic age verification (EAV) devices. Many large-chain retailers make use of EAVs, which are devices that scan age information encoded on driver's licenses. The very presence of such devices, proponents say, deters underage customers from attempting illegal purchases with fake IDs. However, this technology can be undermined if clerks fail to read the display closely. Maybe the clerk isn't paying attention, or the customer uses someone else's license and the clerk does not notice that the license photo does not match the purchaser.
- Secret shoppers. This growing retail practice provides customer service feedback, including compliance with applicable laws and store policies. Merchants typically contract with outside firms who dispatch so-called secret shoppers to document the purchase experience, gaining information that is then

shared with management and can be used to inform policy development and improve staff training.

Space for Sociability

Jim Peters, a veteran of the responsible hospitality movement for 30-plus years and director of the Responsible Hospitality Institute, told forum participants that he sees an increasing demand for space for sociability spurred by the country's expanding 18- to 30-year-old population and more leisure time for baby boomers as they enter their retirement years. The result is a heightened demand for dining and entertainment venues. Peters calls these two demographic groups "bookend generations" and says that both are attracted to what he terms a new café society.

Peters predicts that urban areas seeking to create new entertainment districts may be in for a surprise as these districts take on a split-use character, with businesses serving as dining spots through lunch and dinner and then converting later in the night to entertainment venues attracting a far different crowd. Residents of these districts, such as San Diego's Gaslamp District where RHI has worked, may be in for unanticipated quality-of-life

disruptions. Noise, litter and property damage can result in the wee hours after restaurants transform into nightclubs.

One concern frequently expressed at the Las Vegas conference of special note to college communities is that measures to reduce underage and other illegal alcohol sales at licensed establishments—especially bars and restaurants—will push problems into unlicensed settings, such as parks and private property where there is no adult supervision or controls in place. Colleges and universities experienced a similar phenomenon beginning in the 1980s when stepped-up campus enforcement of alcohol policies led, many believe, to an increase in off-campus disturbances. Peters maintains that the creation of "safe and vibrant places for young adults 18 to 20 years of age to meet and socialize with over-21-year-old friends" should be a goal of responsible retailing. Selling alcohol entails risks. Managing those risks can mitigate them, also a goal of responsible retailing. □



WHO'S WATCHING THE HEN HOUSE?



IF YOU READ THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION'S SEPTEMBER 2003 REPORT TO CONGRESS on the subject of alcohol advertising and youth, you get the impression that the alcohol industry engages in effective self-regulation of both the placement and content of its alcohol advertisements. The report *Alcohol Market and Advertising: A Federal Trade Commission Report to Congress* was issued in part to evaluate industry adherence to recommendations of the 1999 FTC report *Self-Regulation in the Alcohol Industry: A Review of Industry Efforts to Avoid Promoting Alcohol to Underage Consumers*. That report concluded, "improvement in standards and implementation were needed to reduce the likelihood that alcohol advertising would be directed to underage consumers." The 2003 report examined the industry's marketing practices since that time.

In 1999, the alcohol industry asked its members to voluntarily adhere to the standard that 50 percent of the audience for alcohol advertisements be 21 years of age or older. The FTC criticized that standard as being too lax and recommended a more stringent 70 percent standard. In its 2003 report, the FTC states, "the

industry now has committed to adhere to a 70 percent placement standard and to implement post-placement audits."

Self-regulation of the content of alcohol ads is also scrutinized in the 2003 FTC report. The report calls the area "particularly sensitive, given that minors are present in nearly every venue where ads are disseminated." Also, the report notes that advertising that targets the youngest legal consumers (those aged 21 to 24) risks appealing to minors. However, the FTC concludes, "industry members have policies prohibiting content that targets teens as well as implementation procedures designed to give meaning to these policies."

So self-regulation works, right? It is a question that requires further examination.

Laurie Leiber, media advocate at the non-profit Marin Institute, which is dedicated to preventing problems related to alcohol, suggests following the money.

According to the National Academy of Sciences' 2003 report entitled *Reducing Underage Drinking: A Collective Responsibility*, the alcohol industry realizes \$22 billion annually in sales to underage youth. In addition, there are "stronger and stronger data" that those who start to drink alcohol before the age of 15 are more likely to become problem drinkers than those who begin to drink when they are of legal age. Problem drinkers consume a large percentage of the alcoholic beverages sold—fully 75 percent of the beer industry's sales and more than half of the alcohol industry's total sales, according to



the American Medical Association. Thus, both underage youth and problem drinkers, who may begin to consume alcoholic beverages as teenagers, are some of the industry's best customers.

"We have a system that encourages them [the alcohol industry] to do ads that reach young people and appeal to them," says Leiber. "If they don't, they pay in the bottom line." The situation is exacerbated by the fierce competition for brand loyalty, particularly among beer advertisers.

George Hacker, director of the alcohol policies project at the Center for Science in the Public Interest, says that one need only look at the ads to see that they appeal to underage youth.

"There is adolescent and sophomoric humor," he says. "These ads seem to get by industry self-censorship."

Another problem with self-regulation is the lack of teeth in the system. There are no fines or penalties for those who do not adhere to the industry codes. For the FTC, this is mitigated by an industry that responds favorably to consumer complaints. However, Leiber counters that the complaint system is cumbersome and lengthy.

"By the time a complaint process is over, so is the ad campaign," she says, explaining that a typical campaign's duration is a few months. "It's positive PR for the industry with no impact on young people."

Another flaw in the self-regulation of alcohol advertising is the 70 percent standard itself.

According to the 2000 U.S. Census, persons aged 12 to 21 are 15.6 percent of the population. However, they can be as much as 30 percent of the audience for alcohol advertising. Thus, the alcohol marketers can expose young audiences to alcohol advertisements at a rate that is disproportionately higher than their representation in the population at large.

"The 70 percent standard provides a bonus to marketers. It totally ignores the fact that large numbers of underage people



can be in the audience,” says Hacker. And large numbers of underage people do view the alcohol advertisements. The Center on Alcohol Marketing and Youth says that in 2001, alcohol advertisements reached 89 percent of young people, with the average youth seeing 245 alcohol advertisements.

Whereas the alcohol industry is willing to adhere to a 70 percent standard, the Institute of Medicine (an independent advisor to the U.S. government) calls for a 75 percent standard, the American Medical Association an 85 percent standard with no advertisements before 10 p.m., and Mothers Against Drunk Driving a 90 percent standard. The organizations involved see these standards as being protective of youth.

Given the problems with self-regulation, what can be done to keep alcohol ads away from young people? One answer lies in a unique program called the Campaign for Alcohol-Free Sports TV. Launched in November 2003 by CSPI, the program targets sports television because young people are sports fans and because alcohol advertising is pervasive on televised sporting events. A 2001 study cosponsored by ESPN found that 93 percent of youth aged 8 to 17 follow sports. The Center for Alcohol Marketing and Sports reports that the alcohol industry spent

\$487.9 million on sports television advertising in 2001 and \$596.3 million in 2002.

In addition, Jay Hedlund, manager of the campaign for CSPI, identifies an “unnatural alliance” between sports, which is a wholesome activity for youth, and drinking alcohol, which is the opposite.

This unnatural alliance is particularly inappropriate in college sports.

“At freshman orientation events, virtually all college presidents tell students that underage drinking is not tolerated. Then on Saturday, the football team plays and there are the alcohol ads,” says Hedlund.

So the campaign began with college athletics. Bypassing the broadcasters and advertisers, CSPI wrote to athletic directors and presidents at the more than 1,000 NCAA colleges nationwide and asked them to establish a policy that prohibits advertising on locally produced sports programming, beginning with all future broadcast contracts. Within five weeks, on what Hedlund calls “turnaround mail,” approximately 95 colleges, including 24 Division I schools agreed. Hedlund sees this response as a good start. CSPI will continue to dialogue with the schools, but will also initiate a grassroots effort. Several high-profile college sports figures, including Tom Osborne,

former head football coach at the University of Nebraska and a current member of Congress, and Dean Smith, former basketball coach at the University of North Carolina, are working to make the campaign a success.

Once a critical mass of schools in a conference commits to prohibiting alcohol advertisements on local broadcasts, CSPI will work at the conference level and then at the NCAA level to expand the ban. Since the conferences and the NCAA negotiate most of the big television contracts, this is a key element in the campaign.

“We expect a long-term effort,” say Hacker. “We will go to other amateur sports and also to professional sports. We may be seeking different remedies in each area.”

If successful, the Campaign for Alcohol-Free Sports TV will reduce the number of alcohol advertisements that young people see. But there is more to be done.

“We need to ‘out’ the industry,” says Leiber. “We need to help people understand that drinking alcohol puts young people at risk. The industry puts money in the bank while public entities are scrambling to pay the cost.” For Leiber, it is a public awareness of the costs of underage drinking more than reports by the Federal Trade Commission that can put the pressure on the alcohol industry to reduce its marketing to youth. □

Editor’s note: For more information about the Campaign for Alcohol-Free Sports TV, visit the CSPI Website at cspinet.org/booze

Continued from inside front cover

example, mailed to the individual—and could reach even more students if disseminated through electronic means.

“‘Motivational feedback’ is information provided to an individual which draws attention to discrepancies between their health goals and his or her actual behavior,” explained Kypri. “It is information which draws the individual’s attention to their risk status in a nonthreatening and nonjudgmental fashion.”

The Link Between Alcohol and Rape

According to a recent study, most college rape victims are too intoxicated to consent to sex or fight their attackers. Women in college are more likely to be raped than other women are—and alcohol plays a key role. One out of 20 college students in the study experienced rape over a seven-month period.

The study also found that women at colleges where there is significant binge drinking were more likely to be raped while intoxicated than were students at other schools. Students who are active in fraternities and sororities had a higher incidence of rape.

“You could predict that ‘party schools’ have higher rates of rape,” said Mary P. Koss, a professor of public health at the University of Arizona, one of the study’s coauthors. “This study points to an urgent need for more alcohol-prevention programs on campuses, along with sexual assault education.”

The study is based on an analysis of 119 schools across the nation by researchers at the Harvard School of Public Health, the University of Arizona and St. Joseph’s University in Philadelphia. It was based on three surveys of women randomly selected by the Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study and included 8,567 women in

1997, 8,425 in 1999, and 6,988 in 2001. For more information on the study visit, www.hsph.harvard.edu/cas.

A Historic First in Virginia

Virginia, a state that has long revered tobacco and is the new home of industry giant Philip Morris USA, will no longer have the nation’s lowest cigarette tax. Virginia legislators voted in late April to raise cigarette excise taxes from 2.5 cents to 20 cents this year and to 30 cents in 2005.

According to an Associated Press dispatch, Virginia Governor Mark R. Warner had sought higher cigarette taxes and other tax increases to balance the state’s budget.

“This is a historic first step,” said Donna Reynolds, spokesperson for the American Lung Association of Virginia. “Our goal was 75 cents, which would make Virginia about average, but we’re very happy.”

The only previous change in Virginia’s cigarette tax came in 1966 when legislators, concerned that the industry could be hurt by the first surgeon general’s report on smoking released in 1964, reduced the tax from 3 cents to 2.5 cents.



Stay Current. Subscribe Now!

Subscribe to *Prevention File* today and join a growing national audience advocating for public health and safety.

Prevention File is available at both individual and bulk subscription rates. Our bulk subscribers distribute *Prevention File* in their communities as a way to stimulate informed response to alcohol, tobacco and other drug problems.

SINGLE COPY	USA	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 yr/\$25	<input type="checkbox"/> 2 yrs/\$40	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 yrs/\$55
	Canada	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 yr/\$29	Beyond Canada	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 yr/\$39

BULK QUANTITIES	(USA only) Qty. per quarter	Cost per copy (\$)	Annual price (\$)
	<input type="checkbox"/> 100	1.38	550
	<input type="checkbox"/> 250	1.25	1,250
	<input type="checkbox"/> 500	1.10	2,200
	<input type="checkbox"/> 1,000	1.00	4,000

Name _____
 Organization _____
 Address _____
 City/State/ZIP _____ E-mail _____

PAYMENT. Prepayment required on all orders under \$500. All prices include shipping and applicable sales tax. Make checks payable in U.S. dollars to:

The Silver Gate Group.

Send to: Prevention File
 Silver Gate Group
 P.O. Box 420878
 San Diego, CA 92142-0878

Federal Tax ID: 33-0714724

Web: <http://silvergategroup.com>

E-mail: prevfile@silvergategroup.com

Ten Years Ago in *Prevention File* (Vol. 9, No. 2, Spring 1994)

THE SOUNDS OF MONEY

WHEN CALIFORNIANS VOTED IN 1988 to increase cigarette taxes by 25 cents a pack, they were given assurances that part of that money would be used for tobacco education and prevention programs.

Proposition 99, the citizens' initiative that imposed the tax, mandated that 20 percent of the new income be spent on programs in communities and schools to discourage smoking.

However, this is a promise that California's legislature has failed to fulfill. Since the 1989–1990 fiscal year, spending by the state for tobacco education and prevention has averaged only 14.7 percent of expenditures of Proposition 99 revenue—fully one-fourth less than required. About \$175 million that should have been spent on education and prevention has been spent instead on medical care programs.

Why have California lawmakers shortchanged tobacco prevention and education? Researchers at the University of California, San Francisco, say that the tobacco industry's hefty political contributions are influencing the way California legislators vote on smoking issues.

“Constituent attitudes, which strongly supported tobacco control, did not seem to be reflected in legislators' behavior,” said Stanton Glantz, PhD, of the University of California, San Francisco, who studied the results of Proposition 99 (*American Journal of Public Health*, Vol. 83, No. 9, September 1993).

“This failure in representation may be the result of the tobacco industry persuading legislators not to support tobacco-control policies.”

The stakes are high for the tobacco industry, which has been a big player in California politics for over a decade, even though no tobacco is grown or tobacco products manufactured in the state.

In 1978, the tobacco industry spent \$6.3 million to defeat Proposition 5, a nonsmokers' rights initiative, and another \$2.6 million defeating a second nonsmokers' rights initiative in 1980. The industry's unsuccessful attempt to defeat Proposition 99 in 1988 cost \$21.2 million.

Other than one-time efforts to defeat specific election measures, the tobacco industry's lobbying expenditures in California had been relatively stable at \$280,000 for every biennial election since 1975–76. Then they shot up to over \$2 million in 1987–88, a tenfold increase. In 1991–92 the tobacco industry spent \$3.4 million lobbying in California.

Editor's note: *For additional information on the tobacco industry's relationship with the California legislature, see Turning the Tide: Tobacco Industry Political Influence and Tobacco Policy Making in California 1997–1999, by Sheryl Magzamen and Stanton A. Glantz of the University of California, San Francisco, at repositories.cdlib.org/ctcre/tcpmus/CA1999/.*

