Editor's Note

This Working Paper is devoted to funding of social norms programs. It contains a paper written by Richard Rice and Michael Haines of the National Social Norms Resource Center, an analysis and critique of a recent article by Henry Wechsler and colleagues that analyzed funding patterns for alcohol and other drug prevention programs, and an overview of a "policy briefing paper" by the American Medical Association (AMA) on the alcohol industry's involvement in prevention.

As I travel around the country I have noticed that colleges and universities are relying more and more on outside funding to maintain drug prevention and violence prevention activities. This trend has placed tremendous pressure on prevention staff to write grant proposals and keep a steady stream of funding in place to maintain staff and programs. It has been dismaying to see that a number of successful programs have been downsized or eliminated after a loss of funding. With this increasing dependence on outside funding some colleges and universities have turned to the alcohol beverage industry to support alcohol and other drug prevention activities, including social norms efforts.

The use of beverage industry funding for some social norms programs has proven to be controversial and fueled criticism of the social norms approach. Critics argue that the beverage industry has a stake in funding social norms programs because they don't work and because they move the spotlight away from interventions not in the interest of the beverage industry (such as environmental management interventions to reduce the availability of alcohol). This is the position taken in the recent Wechsler study and in the AMA paper. One the other hand, it can be argued that funding of social norms programs by the beverage industry is minimal, that it is done with no strings attached, that these programs are often successful, and that it is appropriate for the beverage industry to promote responsible use of its products. This is the position taken by Rich Rice and Michael Haines in their paper.

My own opinion about beverage industry funding is ambivalent. Most importantly, I feel that the controversy serves as a distraction from more important issues. For the most part, I agree with the position in the AMA paper that the beverage industry is probably not really interested in prevention and that it is more interested in public relations. At the same time I feel that the controversy about funding of social norms programs is misplaced. The social norms approach is strong and is not dependent on beverage industry funding, and the willingness of the industry to fund some social norms programs should not be used to cast aspersions on social norms. Most of the criticism in this regard has been unfair, misleading, and misinformed in my opinion, as I will try to demonstrate in my analysis of the Wechsler and AMA papers.

Funding of social norms programs by the beverage industry provides the industry with a convenient platform to make statements about prevention that are biased and not necessarily in the interest of the field. Consider the following statements by a beverage industry executive:

"Drinking on campus has been around as long as there have been students, alcohol and college campuses," says Francine Katz, the Anheuser vice president who heads the brewer's social norms efforts… The social norms theory, Ms Katz says, accepts these facts while promoting healthy behavior. "To me, behavior is dictated by what you see as the norm in society. It can be, put your napkin on your lap, don't talk with your mouth full," she adds. "Anheuser prefers reinforcing positive behavior to imposing restrictions on moderate drinkers' access to alcohol. Pressuring college bars to stop selling cheap drinks, for example, is a hollow gesture," Ms Katz says. "Whether beer costs $1 or $4 it's about personal responsibility," she adds. (Murray & Gruley, 2000).

With these comments Anheuser-Busch presents alcohol and other drug prevention as an issue of "personal responsibility" and throws out the window decades of research demonstrating the success of environmental management strategies along with society's interest in utilizing them to achieve public health goals. The beverage industry has spent countless dollars on lobbyists and public campaigns to undermine and prevent laws that regulate the availability of alcohol and to prevent the release of recommendations by Federal panels that they feel are not in their interest. To the extent that beverage industry funding of social norms programs provides it with a platform and rationale to continue these efforts I am against it. At the same time much good has been done with this funding, including the development of successful and innovative programs on college campuses and the very good work done by the National Social Norms Resource Center. Those accepting funding from the beverage industry should not be criticized because this funding is not more readily accessible from other sources, especially when such funding contains no restrictions or pressures regarding how it is used.

At a minimum, I hope that future discussions of this issue will be fair, well-reasoned, and faithful to the results of existing research. You, the reader, can judge to what extent this has been the case so far as you read the contents of this Working Paper.

Sincerely,

Alan D. Berkowitz

Editor, *The Report on Social Norms*

Social Norms: A Publicly Funded, Cost-Effective Approach

by Richard Rice, MA and Michael P. Haines, MS

One issue of recent interest in the field of health promotion is the support provided by segments of the alcohol beverage industry to a small number of universities' social norms campaigns. While this support has been welcomed by these schools for its invaluable assistance, it does not reflect the funding experience of the vast majority of institutions. In point of fact, "industry" support for social norms is very recent and, relatively speaking, minor. That is, the overwhelming majority of schools employing the social norms approach to address alcohol-related issues have been either self-funded or obtained supplemental funding from federal and/or state agencies.

This document is intended to put this issue into perspective, and covers the following topics: The Historical Record: Growing Federal and State Support for Social Norms, How Many Schools Are Using Social Norms, and How Are They Doing So?, The Level and Impact of Industry Funding, and Social Norms: Beyond Alcohol.

The Historical Record: Growing Federal and State Support for Social Norms

Beginning in the late 1980s and continuing through the 1990s, all of the funding in support of social norms interventions came from the federal government. Specifically, financial support for the social norms approach was provided by the Department of Education (DOE), which awarded generous grants through its Fund for the Improvement of Post-Secondary Education (FIPSE). When the drug prevention component of the FIPSE program was discontinued, subsequent DOE support for social norms came through grants from its Safe and Drug Free Schools Program. Early and important federal support was also provided by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP).

Two of the earliest recipients of federal funding in support of social norms were Northern Illinois University (NIU) and the University of Arizona (UA), and the grant experience of these two institutions reflect the historical record described above.

In 1988, NIU received the first of two grants from FIPSE. These grants enabled NIU to spearhead the development, implementation, and dissemination of the approach now widely known as *social norms marketing* (Haines, 1996). Subsequent to this, in 1994, the University of Arizona received funds from the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention's (CSAP) High-Risk Youth Demonstration Grant Program for a five-year project to implement and test strategies to prevent heavy drinking on its campus. The university also received two-year institutional and research grants from FIPSE and two additional two-year grants from the Department of Education (Johannessen et al, 1999).

As the number of social norm interventions with positive outcome data has increased over the years, more and more federal and state agencies have begun to fund proposals implementing this approach. Clearly, what makes social norms appealing to this growing list of federal and state agencies is the fact that it is a cost-effective, evidence-based approach with a history of proven results. One recent example of this can be found in Minnesota. There, in 1998, a collaborative of seven private and public colleges were awarded $130,000 by that state's Department of Public Safety for a three-year initiative to reduce impaired driving using a social norms marketing campaign. With funding of approximately *$6,000 per school, per year* significant reductions (13%) were achieved in the number of students reporting impaired driving (Bacchus/Gamma, 2002).

A sidebar lists some of the federal and state agencies that have provided—and, in most cases, continue to provide—supportive grants for projects using the social norms approach. This list also includes a small number of private foundations that have awarded grants in support of social norms projects.

Sources of Funding for Social Norms Efforts

Federal Agencies
- Center for Substance Abuse Prevention
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
- Department of Education
- Department of Justice
- Department of Health and Human Services
- National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
- National Institute on Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse
- National Science Foundation

State Agencies Funding Individual Programs or Regional Consortia
- California State University System
- Illinois Department of Human Services
- Iowa Department of Human Rights Division of Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning
- Iowa Governor's Traffic Safety Bureau
- Massachusetts Governor's Highway Safety Bureau
- Minnesota Department of Public Safety, Office of Traffic Safety
- Montana Department of Transportation
- New Jersey Department of Health and Senior Services
- New York Department of Health (OASAS)
- North Carolina's Governor's Highway Safety Program
- Pennsylvania Alcohol Beverage Control
- Virginia Alcohol Beverage Control Board and Department of Health
- Wisconsin Tobacco Control Board

Private Foundations
- Chicago Community Trust
- Kansas Health Foundation
- National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)

A Critique of "Colleges Respond to Student Binge Drinking: Reducing Student Demand or Limiting Access"

by Alan Berkowitz, PhD

In "Colleges Respond to Student Binge Drinking: Reducing Student Demand or Limiting Access" (Wechsler, Seibring, Liu and Ahl, 2004) the authors present data on the funding of AOD prevention programs in higher education, with an emphasis on the sources of the funding and the philosophy of the programs being funded. They conducted a national survey of administrators at 4-year colleges in 2002 and found that 35% of the 760 schools responding received funding for alcohol abuse prevention efforts from public sources, 12% from private sources, and 21% from the beverage industry. Schools funded by the beverage industry were more likely to adopt targeted alcohol education directed at high-risk groups and social norms programs, and were less likely to restrict alcohol at campus or college events. The authors claim that while there is no evidence for the effectiveness of social norms, there is empirical support for the effectiveness of restricting alcohol availability, leading them to conclude that colleges may "want to examine the extent to which funding is the driving force shaping the direction of their alcohol initiatives" to ensure that they are not being unduly influenced by funding sources with agendas that support unproven practices.

This study, along with many others published using data from the College Alcohol Study (CAS), significantly expands our knowledge of scope and nature of drinking in higher education, the practices, policies and procedures employed, and their correlation with each other. While this epidemiological information is important, the study is rife with flaws characteristic of previous CAS studies, including faulty assumptions, sloppy citations of the research, false dichotomies, and unfair comparisons. Problems in each of these areas are noted below.

Faulty Assumptions. The authors assume that funding sources may influence what grantees do and imply that funding decisions may be biased. Not mentioned is the fact that almost all decisions to fund drug prevention programs are made competitively using experts to evaluate applications on the basis of best practices and proven effectiveness.

A careful analysis suggests that many of the study's findings may be spurious. For example, the fact that "wet" campuses are less likely to restrict access to alcohol as a prevention strategy does not necessarily mean that funding sources exert an influence against restricting use as the authors imply. It is just as likely that certain types of campuses (religious institutions, those that are "dry", or those which severely restrict alcohol use) are not likely to apply for beverage industry funding and/or utilize social norms to begin with. Thus, the correlation noted in the data between certain types of programs and certain funders may be due to pre-selection into certain funding sources and not a product of funders' influence.

As noted, the authors repeatedly state their assumption that federal and beverage industry funding sources may exert a strong influence on an institution's overall AOD prevention philosophy and that the purported lack of success of programs funded through these grants is evidence of their failure. Yet among the schools listed as receiving beverage industry funding, 63% were part of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) "Choices" program funded by Anheuser-Busch. Choices grants are relatively limited in nature, are targeted only at athletes, and are for amounts averaging $10,000/year for one-three years. As a result they are unlikely to influence aggregate use patterns on a campus. In addition, they are derived from an endowment created by a one-time donation from Anheuser-Busch and are administered by the NCAA. The preponderance of Choices grantees in the industry funded sample also suggests why the authors found that industry funded programs were more likely to utilize strategies targeted at particular groups, since

NCAA by definition funds programs for athletes.

If Choices were dropped from the list of schools receiving beverage industry funding their number would drop by more than two-thirds. In addition, not all of the schools who receive this funding utilize social norms. Finally, as Rice and Haines note in this issue, the Wechsler study relies on administrators' reports of the presence of social norms activities on a campus and makes no attempt to assess their scope or their effectiveness and fidelity to the model.

Sloppy and incorrect citations of the research. In this article research is cited and used to make generalizations about the state of knowledge in the field. As with many of Wechsler's articles, the citations may be sloppy or misleading. Consider the following statement:

"we know of no published evidence that educational and motivational efforts have decreased student drinking levels, binge drinking, alcohol-related problems, or secondhand effects of alcohol use on American college campuses." (Wechsler et al, 2004, p. 159)

The citation for this statement is a 2002 article by Wechsler and colleagues titled: "Trends in College Binge Drinking During a Period of Increased Prevention Efforts: Findings from 4 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study Surveys." This article analyzes trend data from the CAS demonstrating a statistically significant increase in high-risk drinking at 5 out of 199 colleges surveyed and an overall increase of 4% in frequent high-risk drinking during a time of heightened college drug prevention efforts, leading the authors to conclude that prevention has been ineffective. Yet the very same article reports that an *equal* number of colleges reported a statistically significant *decrease* in high-risk drinking and that the overall rate of abstaining on college campuses *increased* during the same time period from 16-20%, a success that could be attributed to

Review: "Partner or Foe? The Alcohol Industry, Youth Alcohol Problems, and Alcohol Policy Strategies"

by Alan Berkowitz, PhD

This paper, published by the American Medical Association (2002), places social norms efforts in the middle of the debate about beverage industry funding. Extensive data is presented to make the case that the beverage industry's interest in alcohol prevention is part of a larger public relations strategy and that the industry is not really interested in reducing heavy and abusive drinking because most of its revenue comes from those

> "... the assumption that social norms is suspect as an AOD prevention strategy because of beverage industry funding is flawed, as is the assumption that social norms and environmental management are incompatible."

who abuse. Much of the argument is compelling. But the assumption that social norms is suspect as an AOD prevention strategy because of beverage industry funding is flawed, as is the assumption that social norms and environmental management are incompatible. For example, the paper states that beverage industry "support for individual-level programs is designed to blunt efforts to address environmental variables." While this may in fact be the motivation underlying beverage industry support, it is inaccurate to imply that this is what social norms programs funded by them actually do. The paper also quotes the CEO of the Distilled Spirits Council as stating that their goal is to "ensure cultural acceptance of alcohol beverages by 'normalizing' them in the minds of consumers as a healthy part of a normal lifestyle." Yet

this is not necessarily the goal of social norms campaigns, which in many cases are used to reinforce and support patterns of non-use in addition to responsible use. There is in fact considerable evidence suggesting that social norms programs can be used effectively to reduce heavy and abusive drinking, and increase abstaining in a manner that is also compatible with the environmental management strategies recommended by the AMA. While it is important to discuss

> "…we know of no published evidence that educational and motivational efforts have decreased student drinking levels, binge-drinking, alcohol-related problems, or secondhand effects of alcohol use on American college campuses." (Wechsler et al, 2004).

> "Of course they value the public relations impact," Richard Keeling, the editor of the *American Journal of College Health*, said. "Brewing companies want to position themselves as contributing to effective strategies against drinking." Keeling said that brewers choose to fund campaigns that they don't think will be successful. "They are very likely to put money into things that have not been shown to make major changes in consumption patterns," he said. (Bell, 2002)

and critique beverage industry motivation and strategies, it should not be necessary to indict social norms as part of this discussion.

Alan D. Berkowitz is the Editor of The Report on Social Norms and a co-founder of the social norms approach. He can be reached at: alan@fltg.net. For copies of the AMA report, call (312) 464-4618.

Point/Counterpoint...

There is an extensive evaluation literature documenting the effectiveness of "educational and motivational efforts" that have successfully reduced the use and abuse of alcohol for individuals, groups, and communities. For individuals, the literature for motivational approaches using stages of change and normative feedback is extensive (see Dimeff, et al, 1999). For groups, there is evidence for a number of successful interventions and approaches (see Larimer & Cronce, 2002 for a review). For social norms, there are published studies supporting the efficacy of social norms marketing efforts at Northern Illinois University (Haines & Spear, 1996), the University of Arizona (Johannessen et al, 2001), and in a recent study by Matters & Neighbors (forthcoming). In addition, there are five case studies of successful campaigns in Perkins (2003). A recent published literature review on social norms campaigns noted that "six of the eight studies reported significant reductions following descriptive norm education" (Borsari & Carey, 2001). In addition, social norms efforts have been recognized with "best practice" awards by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) and have been recommended by the National Institute for Alcoholism and Alcohol Abuse.

Social Norms: A Publicly Funded, Cost-Effective Approach   *continued from page two*

How Many Schools Are Using Social Norms, and How Are They Doing So?

To date, there appears to have been no systematic national survey that has attempted to gather information about the number of institutions using the social norms approach and, more importantly, the extent and quality of their attempts to do so. Therefore, no one can say for sure at present just how many schools that report "using social norms" are doing so as part of the data-driven, integrated process generally referred to as *social norms marketing*.

One of the reasons that social norms marketing is so appealing is that, when properly conducted, it is a very cost-effective method of achieving large-scale positive results.

Nevertheless, due to severe limitations of staff and funding on many if not most campuses, schools are frequently forced to limit their use of the social norms approach. For example, many schools now routinely incorporate positive norm messages—regarding a variety of issues—into student orientation programs, health education sessions, and the like, and it is both important and appropriate that they do so. However, "using social norms" in this limited way is qualitatively different than conducting a comprehensive *social norm marketing* campaign. The latter necessarily requires a larger commitment of institutional resources. Both are valid, of course, and reflect the fact that each institution can only operate within the context of what it deems possible. Still, the fact remains that these important qualitative differences will be masked when a school simply reports that it is "using social norms." Consider, for example, the following comment:

"As the approach has grown in popularity, we see intervention projects create new techniques to communicate social norms, incorporate social norms material within more traditional programs, and even rename traditional prevention activities as social norms approaches. This has all led to the emergence of studies under the rubric of social norms work that range dramatically in the degree of effect they achieve. As more prevention programs and research projects construct initiatives that ostensibly use this approach, this expansion is likely to exacerbate the problem of maintaining the fidelity of the model. It has already begun to create such questions and challenges as why the approach might appear to be ineffective in some instances." (Perkins, 2002, p. 280)

That said, there have been several attempts to survey at least a portion of the more than 4,070 accredited, degree-granting institutions of higher learning in the United States regarding their use of social norms.

In March 2000, the Harvard School of Public Health's College Alcohol Study (CAS) reported the results of a questionnaire that it had mailed to a select list of college presidents in February 1999. "The 734 schools in the sample," the CAS stated, "represented a cross-section of US institutions of higher education located in 50 states and 2 US territories." (Wechsler, et al, 2000). Fifty-five percent of the respondents indicated that they "regularly measured the extent of the campus drinking problem through some type of survey mechanism," and twenty percent of these institutions "incorporated those findings into social norming campaigns." Thus, approximately 81 of the responding institutions were using social norms in some way. It should be noted, however, that there appears to have been no attempt made in this study to examine the extent and quality of these reported social norms interventions. Still, if these findings are in fact generalizeable, they suggest that at least several hundred institutions nationwide may have been using social norms in some way at this time.

Subsequent to this, in late 2001 the National Social Norms Resource Center issued a query on the Student Health Service (SHS) Listserv indicating that it was "attempting to compile a current list of schools (and other organizations) that are using social norms to address alcohol, tobacco, sexual health, violence, social justice, academic performance, and/or retention issues." Approximately 117 institutions responded that that they were using social norms to address alcohol-related issues in some way. Again, no attempt was made in this brief survey to examine either the extent or quality of these self-reported social norms interventions.

Lastly, in 2001 the BACCHUS and GAMMA Peer Education Network indicated that "44% of its affiliates report that their institution is using social norms as a prevention strategy." This figure increased slightly in 2002, when 52% of its 907 affiliates reported doing so. Thus, approximately 471 institutions reported using social norms in some way. Of course, not all of these reported interventions are designed solely to address alcohol-related issues. And it should again be noted that no attempt was made in the BACCHUS and GAMMA survey to examine either the extent or quality of these interventions.

Whatever the precise figure, it is safe to say that the number of institutions that report using the social norms approach is quite large and appears to be growing.

The Level and Impact of Industry Funding

The industry support that is provided to just over a handful of universities conducting social norms campaigns is a very recent occurrence and—when compared with federal, state, and other private foundation support—relatively minor. This becomes increasingly clear when one considers both the historical record described above and the current funding situation. Furthermore, all of this industry support comes in the form of unrestricted grants that in no way affect either the design or the operation of these social norms programs. Thus, the goal of these programs is in all respects the same as those that are funded in other ways: to reduce the incidence of heavy-episodic alcohol consumption and its related harm.

Social Norms: A Publicly Funded, Cost-Effective Approach   *continued from page five*

The Level of Industry Funding. The data provided here strongly suggest that there are probably hundreds of universities currently using the social norms approach in some way to address alcohol-related issues on their campuses. Of these, most do so as part of their ongoing and self-funded programmatic efforts. Nevertheless, some receive supplemental funding from federal and/or state agencies, or private foundations.

By comparison, eight universities have either received in the past or presently receive supplemental funding from a beverage industry source to conduct social norms marketing campaigns. These eight universities are (in alphabetical order): California State University-Fresno, Florida State University, Georgetown University, Michigan State University, University of Missouri-Columbia, University of Virginia, University of Wyoming, and Virginia Commonwealth University

Details regarding the funding provided to two of these schools, as reported in a November 2000 edition of the *Wall Street Journal,* are as follows: Miller Brewing Company reportedly gave $25,000 to Georgetown University to help in the development of its social norms campaign, and the Adolph Coors Company made a similarly intended donation of $8,000 to the University of Wyoming (Murray & Gruley, 2000).

Currently, seven of the eight universities listed above receive funding from Anheuser-Busch and the Anheuser-Busch Foundation to support their social norms marketing campaigns. They are: California State University-Fresno, Florida State University, Georgetown University, Michigan State University, University of Missouri-Columbia, University of Virginia, and Virginia Commonwealth University.

The University of Virginia (UV) was the first of these schools to receive such funding. Nevertheless, in its development stage, UV's social norms campaign—like those of most other schools—was totally supported with funds from its Student Health budget, including all salary, benefit, and facility costs. Only subsequent to the project's inception was supplemental funding secured from Anheuser-Busch. Out of this unrestricted gift, 40% of the total programmatic costs of the social norms campaign were initially covered; this has since increased to 60% of the total programmatic costs (Bauerle, et al. 2002). Programmatic costs include items such as graphic arts, printing, advertising, etc. The fulltime staff support systems – including faculty and secretarial support – continue to be covered entirely by the UV's Student Health budget.

Three other schools in this list (Florida State University, Georgetown University, and Virginia Commonwealth University) each received a four-year unrestricted grant for their social norms campaigns from the Anheuser-Busch Foundation in January 2002. The remaining three schools (California State University-Fresno, Michigan State University, and the University of Missouri-Columbia) received three-year unrestricted grants from the Anheuser-Busch Foundation commencing in January 2003.

Finally, the National Social Norms Resource Center is funded in three ways: a donation from the Anheuser-Busch Foundation, a grant from the BACCHUS & GAMMA Peer Education Network, and income from consultation provided to a small number of colleges, as well as state and private agencies.

The Impact of Industry Funding. As noted previously, the financial support provided by industry sources to a small number of universities comes in the form of unrestricted grants. Because they are unrestricted, these grants in no way affect either the design or operation of these social norms programs. As a result, the goal of these programs is identical to those that are principally funded by other means: To increase the percentage of students who correctly perceive the moderate campus norm, and to achieve significant consequent decreases in heavy-episodic alcohol consumption and related harm. Were it not for this unrestricted funding, these universities might not be able to conduct these social norms campaigns.

Social Norms: Beyond Alcohol

An unfortunate consequence of the focus on industry support is that it diverts attention from the fact that the social norms approach is being used to address issues other than alcohol. For example, dozens of schools are now using the social norms approach to address tobacco use on their campuses; a number of high schools and communities are doing so as well. Among the first of these was the DCP/SAFE project, which has achieved a significant reduction in cigarette use among students in two community high schools. Another example is the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh's Comprehensive Tobacco Plan, which includes an innovative social norms campaign component, and which has reported a 33% reduction in smoking rates. Similarly, the Montana Most of Us Are Tobacco Free campaign reported a significantly lower proportion of teens who initiated smoking in the seven-county campaign area compared with the rest of the state.

Some of the other applications now in development in college and university settings include using the social norms approach to address safer sex, intimate partner violence, and academic performance and retention.

As knowledge of the social norms approach continues to grow, so do its

Social Norms: A Publicly Funded, Cost-Effective Approach

applications. Among the most interesting to date is the research of Dr. Michael Wenzel in Australia, who has studied the extent to which normative feedback can correct taxpayers' perceptions of relevant norms and thereby increase their level of tax compliance (Wenzel, 2001).

To summarize:

■ The number of institutions that report using the social norms approach in some way appears to be quite large and continues to grow.

■ The vast majority of schools using social norms to address alcohol-related issues have been either self-funded or obtained supplemental funding from federal and/or state agencies.

■ To date, eight (8) colleges or universities have received supplemental funding for their social norms campaigns from a segment of the alcohol beverage industry. This support has been provided in the form of unrestricted grants that in no way affect either the design or the operation of these social norms programs.

■ Social norms has been and continues to be funded for the most part by a wide variety of federal, state, and local agencies. This will no doubt continue to be the case as this cost-effective, evidence-based approach is used to address issues other than alcohol related harm, such as tobacco use, safer sex, intimate partner violence, and academic performance and retention.

Michael Haines is the Director and Richard Rice is the Coordinator of Information and Education of the National Social Norms Resource Center. They can be contacted at: rrice@niu.edu or mhaines@niu.edu. This paper was originally written in January 2003 and was posted on the Center's website.

A Critique

drug prevention efforts. This "good news" is not referenced in the citation nor was it mentioned in any of the publicity for this study. Because the study cited was not a literature review it did not mention the many published studies in the literature reporting positive effects for "educational and motivational efforts." Just because Wechsler and his colleagues do not "know of" these studies does not mean that they don't exist.

Finally, Wechsler fails to mention or cite anywhere a published study by Ziemelis et al (2002) that compared high-risk drinking rates at a sample of FIPSE grantees with schools in the randomly selected CAS sample during the period 1992-1995. Ziemelis found that a greater percentage of schools in the FIPSE sample reported decreases in high-risk drinking and had statistically significant lower high-risk drinking rates than did schools in the CAS sample, suggesting that alcohol and other drug prevention programs do make a difference.

In another citation, three sources are provided to support the statement that "The alcohol industry is a significant funder of alcohol education programs on college campuses." Yet none of the three references provide national statistics for beverage industry funding. Instead they mention that Anheuser-Busch has funded "social norms marketing programs on seven campuses" (AMA, 2002; Murray & Gruley, 2000). This evidence is clearly not sufficient to support the claim that the beverage industry is a *"significant"* funder of drug prevention programs.

The authors claim that "there is evidence that restricting access to alcohol may support abstention and reduce heavy drinking and its associated effects." Eleven citations are provided for this claim. Wechsler has a propensity for biasing his citations heavily in the direction of his own research, as was the case here, with five of the eleven citations having him as an author. Yet all eleven studies refer either to correlational data based on national studies, or to successful community and governmental based interventions. None of them refer to actual programmatic interventions implemented on a college or university campus. Thus,

while the authors are correct in arguing that supply reduction efforts have been proven to be effective, the citation is misleading because supply reduction strategies have not yet been documented as effective when implemented as part of a comprehensive campus-based alcohol abuse prevention program. The lack of research on environmental interventions for college campuses is one of the reasons why the NIAAA designated environmental management as a "Tier II" strategy in their comprehensive report. Interestingly, the only drug prevention strategy identified by the NIAAA as "Tier I" (i.e., supported by research) are one-one interventions for abusers that utilize normative feedback.

There are also errors in the article. None of the tables indicate that the data contained in them is reported in percentages. And one has half of the data missing.

False Dichotomies. As the title of the study suggests, reducing demand and limiting access are presented as polar opposite strategies. The data is analyzed to convey this impression even though many prevention programs—including social norms—use both. In fact, some of the most well-documented and successful drug prevention interventions have combined social norms with other environmental interventions. Thus, it is misleading and detrimental to the field to present these two strategies as either/or approaches. The key to successfully combining them is to do so in a way that is synergistic and mutually reinforcing and to promote supply restriction quietly while emphasizing the healthy behavior of the majority.

In summary, this study demonstrates that many colleges and universities rely on outside funding for their drug prevention programs, and that they employ a variety of strategies. While the conclusions may be criticized and some of the implications seem unfair, it is nonetheless useful to have national data on the nature and extent of funding sources for drug prevention programs in higher education.

Alan D. Berkowitz is the Editor of The Report on Social Norms and a co-founder of the social norms approach. He can be reached at: alan@fltg.net

References

Ameican Medical Association (2002). *Policy Briefing Paper: Partner or Foe? The Alcohol Industry, Youth Alcohol Problems, and Alcohol Policy Strategies*. Chicago: AMA Office of Alcohol and Other Drug Abuse.

Bacchus/Gamma (2002). "Collaboration and Social Norms: The Key to Reducing Impaired Driving Among College Students in Minneapolis/St. Paul". *The Peer Educator,* 25(3):7-9.

Bauerle, J, Burwell, C & and Turner, J (2002). "Social Norms Marketing at the University of Virginia." Presented at the American College Health Association National Conference, Washington, D.C., May 23.

Bell, K (2002). "Surprising Sponsor of Social Norms: Brewing Industry." *The Dartmouth*, May 15, p.1.

Borsari, B & Carey, K. (2001). "Peer Influences on College Drinking: A Review of the Research." *Journal of Substance Abuse,* 13:391-424.

Dimeff, L, Baerk J, Kvilahan, D & Marlatt, AG. (1999). *Brief Alcohol Screening and Intervention for College Students: A Harm Reduction Approach (BASICS)*. NY: Guilford Press.

Haines, M. P. (1996). *A Social Norms Approach to Preventing Binge Drinking at Colleges and Universities*. Newton, MA: The Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention, Education Development Center, Inc.

Haines, MP & Spear, SF (1996). "Changing the Perception of the Norm: A Strategy to Decrease Binge Drinking Among College Students." *Journal of American College Health,* 45: 134-140.

Johannessen, K, Glider, P, Collins, C, Hueston, H & DeJong, W. et al (2001). "Preventing Alcohol-Related Problems at the University of Arizona's Homecoming: An Environmental Management Case Study." *American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse,* 27(3):587-597.

Johannessen, K., Collins, C., Mills-Novoa, B., & Glider, P. (1999). *A Practical Guide to Alcohol Abuse Prevention: A Campus Case Study in Implementing Social Norms and Environmental Management Approaches*. Tucson, AZ: Campus Health Service, The University of Arizona.

Larimer, ME & Cronce, JM (2002). "Identification, Prevention and Treatment: A Review of Individual-Focused Strategies to Reduce Problematic Alcohol Consumption by College Students." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol,* Supplement 14:148-163.

Mattern, J & Neighbors, C (forthcoming). "Social Norms Campaigns: Examining the Relationship Between Changes in Perceived Norms and Changes in Drinking Levels." *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*.

Murray, S Gruley, B (2000). "Uneasy Alliance: On Many Campuses Big Brewers Play a Role In New Alcohol Policies." *Wall Street Journal*, November 2, pA1.

Perkins, HW (2003), Ed. T*he Social Norms Approach to Preventing School and College Age Substance Abuse: A Handbook for Educators, Counselors, and Clinicians*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Wechsler, H, Sebring, M, Liu, I-C, & Ahl, M (2004). "Colleges Respond to Student Binge Drinking: Reducing Student Demand or Limiting Access." *Journal of American College Health*, 52(4):159-168.

Wechsler, H, Lee, JE, Kuo, M, Seibring, M, Nelson, TF & Lee, H (2002). "Trends in College Binge Drinking During a Period of Increased Prevention Efforts: Findings from 4 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Surveys: 1993-2001." *Journal of American College Health*. 50:203-217.

Wechsler, H, Kelley, K, Weitzman, ER, San Giovanni, JP & Seibring, M (2000). "What Colleges are Doing About Student Binge Drinking—A Survey of College Administrators." *Journal of American College Health*, 48 (10) 219-226.

Wenzel, Michael (June 2001A). "Misperceptions of Social Norms About Tax Compliance (1): A Prestudy." Working Paper No 7: Centre for Tax System Integrity, Research School of Social Sciences (Australian National University).

Wenzel, Michael (June 2001B). "Misperceptions of Social Norms About Tax Compliance (2): A Field Experiment." Working Paper No 8: Centre for Tax System Integrity, Research School of Social Sciences (Australian National University).

Ziemelis, A, Buckman, R & Elfessi, A (2002). "Prevention Efforts Underlying Decreases in Binge Drinking at Institutions of Higher Education." *Journal of American College Health,* 50(5):238-252.