clear that we have not been very successful in our efforts to help the minority students get along. Those students still leave at very high rates. I hope in the next 10 to 15 years there will be a change of attitude. We will stop noticing that student are black, or Hispanic. They will just be students and we will talk to them as individuals with an individual set of problems that could be just like the next person's. In order to do that, we have to do more listening and less reading about generalizations. The generalizations seem to have done more harm than good. We should help them as individuals.

Do you have any research that you're working on right now?

One of the most interesting things about my job is reading and generating ideas. I'm interested in student development theory and the trouble practitioners have using it. Students in my classes want to know how to connect theory and practice. The connection is always problematic. It's problematic in counseling, psychology, business, or in any field. It's easy to study business theory but, when you're managing a store, how do you apply Maslow's hierarchy of needs? Lately, I've become interested in that connection. Students in my classes will hear me talking about process models.

One of the gaps in student development theory literature is the lack of theory on minority students. It will be an area of focus for me in the next couple of years. Most of the theory has been developed based on mainstream people. The Perry theory is developed using males at Harvard. It will be interesting to see, and maybe be a part of, the expansion of those theories and their application.

There are a lot of highly quantitative studies about why students leave cóllege, why students change majors and how we predict satisfaction or G.P.A. Separate from that literature are studies about who students are and how they develop. People who study outcomes don't pay much attention to who students are and how they develop. People who study who students are and how they develop don't pay much attention to the supposed positive outcomes we all want to help students attain. I'm interested in filling that gap with my research.

### ALCOHOL - THE PERENNIAL TOPIC One Dean's View

Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association

James W. Lyons

The subject of alcohol use and abuse is a topic that is almost always discussed when student affairs deans gather. A quick perusal of NASPA national and regional meetings over the past four decades will convince one that alcohol or related topics are a constant part of our professional dialogue. For many deans, a substantial amount of time is spent on alcohol issues on their respective campuses; crafting and enforcing policies and rules; and designing treatment and educational programs. During the past three decades, however, the topic has broadened. We now talk about substance abuse; alcohol is but one of many substances that are abused.

Are these matters that are often given short shift in professional training programs? It may be so, and if it is, it may be because, as a profession, we have always been a bit reluctant to fess up to our "control" functions. We talk more about our educational roles, and about individual development. Shaping and especially enforcing campus policies doesn't have nearly the same glamour. But like it or not, these roles are part of the work of our profession. If we approach them with skill, there can be strong connections made with our educational roles.

### SOME COMMON "SLIPS" WHEN DISCUSSING SUBSTANCE ABUSE

Talking about substance use and abuse can be tricky because the language is imprecise. Words and phrases often mean different things to different people,

When we refer to drug abuse, do we mean the simple use of illegal drugs? Is just using marijuana wrong? Or is it wrong only when someone uses too much of it? Or in the wrong place at the wrong time? How about "crack" and other forms of cocaine?

Where does alcohol fit in discussions about substance abuse? Are alcoholics drug abusers? Are people who are under 21 and drink too much abusers? Any more or less so than those over 21? Are under age drinkers who drink in moderation drug abusers?

In short, "drug or substance abuse" sometimes means unlawful drug use, or unhealthy drug use, or drug related activities that imperil others such as drunk driving. Sometimes it refers to unfair drug use (like gaining a competitive advantage over others in sports and exams).

As is so often the case when crafting or discussing policies, it is often wise to spend some time with the question, "What's the problem?" Clarify things

J.J. Thorp received a bachelor of science degree in electrical engineering from the University of Vermont in 1987. This past year, he served as the Assistant Coordinator of Read Center. He hopes to pursue a position in residence life upon receipt of a M.S. in Higher Education and Student Affairs in May, 1989.

before getting very far into a discussion, especially before reaching to solutions.

Against this background I would like to offer my personal view of the state of "substance abuse" these days, and some of the new and interesting policy implications we face. Then I want then to turn to some of the collegiate responses that are being made to substance abuse. While I will offer no programs I would like to offer seven assumptions, that if used, will almost surely guarantee flawed programs or policies.

# CAN RATIONAL THOUGHT PENETRATE OUR NATIONAL HYSTERIA?

Our national mood these days is being shaped by vigorous reactions to real and perceived increases in drug abuse. That mood is fueled by political posturing, a near hysteria over cocaine, a genuine public concern that illegal drugs are too prevalent, and public debate about how best to curb drug abuse. That debate reaches clearly to our foreign policy when we see the Secretary of Education call for the use of the military to intervene in countries that manufacture drugs and export them to the United States, and to our national security policies that often call for our country to overlook drug production and trafficking by Latin American and Asian countries in the interest of "national security."

We need not look much beyond our own campuses to see evidence of the hysteria. Solutions and programs are often quickly designed and hastily put in place. Only later do the troublesome consequences that could have been seen earlier show up to plague our institutions. Students have already been affected by recent waves of public and institutional interventions, and there's more to come. The National Collegiate Athletic Association has crafted and implemented policies mandating drug testing of athletes that have affected hundreds of students across the country. Some schools have implemented their own drug testing programs that are quite separate from the NCAA program, and which reach to even more athletes. Students are required (some say coerced) to sign statements agreeing to be tested by the NCAA should they or their teams enter post-season competition. If they do not agree, they are denied the chance to be on varsity teams.

These programs have been implemented despite an embarrassing lack of information about the effects that some drugs have on athletic performance, about the efficacy of the tests themselves, and the theories that were used to build the list. Why, for example, are street drugs on the list if they have little or nothing to do with enhancing performance? Are they there to avoid embarrassing coaches, teams, or schools? What drugs might product false positives? For example, will drinking a cup of tea fifteen minutes prior to a test cause the outcome to be positive? Are educators really comfortable with knowing that the best tests give false negative results about 5% of the time? While these and other questions were not a part of campus discussions, they are now, as the

implications of drug testing begin to sink in.

Other students, however, are not free from the drug testing craze. Nearly a third of the firms that recruit at universities these days require drug tests as a condition of employment. Many students seeking government jobs (and internships?) will face drug testing requirements. Students in ROTC will be required to undergo testing for the presence of the AIDS virus antibodies. The same is true for other students seeking careers in the military. Drug testing is also a part of the repertoire of the military and intelligence services.

The federal government funds much of the research in both colleges and universities. How soon will it be before universities encounter strings attached to their research contracts that seek to ensure that the research team must be drug free? Colleges are already being asked to certify that they have comprehensive drug education programs as a condition for their students to receive financial aid. Such testing and enforcement practices inevitably generate concerns about erosion of civil liberties, especially the right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure and the right to due process. Some see troublesome relationships between drug testing and AIDS testing. Others fear the zeal of the federal ideologues who seek to impose their "solutions" on to higher education community.

What is interesting is that the recent federal programs to foster a "Drug Free America" barely mention alcohol as an abused drug. It is downplayed as a matter of policy. Why?

#### ALCOHOL IS, BY FAR, THE MOST ABUSED DRUG

The substance that is most often abused on campuses (as in society generally) is alcohol. The abuse is a widespread problem. Too many students are using too much alcohol too frequently. Few campuses can claim that they have no alcoholics on their faculty, in their administration, or among their staff.

Student affairs deans regularly report that most conduct problems are related to drinking. Each incoming class will include a few students who are alcoholics: they are dependent on alcohol, cannot control their use of it, and organize their lives around its use. All deans have seen cases where a student has become socially and intellectually deficient because of alcohol use. Each year college health services and nearby hospital emergency rooms treat cases of drug overdose. A few students die; more almost die. Alcohol is far and away the drug most overdosed. Two of my professional and personal friends, both graduate school classmates, died of complications arising out of their dependence on alcohol.

As is the case with most of society, there is little relationship between drinking laws and drinking behavior. Consequently, enforcement agencies find it difficult, if not impossible to enforce the laws. In any event, enforcement is minimal and spotty. It should not be surprising that many public officials and

law enforcement agencies want (and even expect) universities to enforce the public law, even though that's not our job.

Alcohol USE, on the other hand, is firmly embedded in the culture of most campuses; it is a part of the social and ceremonial rituals on most campuses; the tailgaiters, the "sherry hour," cocktails before dinner, the keg parties, wine tasting events, and toasting a celebrant. Some athletic departments even join with brewers to advertise (and thus culturally connect) sports and beer. Distillers and brewers spend much money advertising in campus newspapers and some alumni magazines. Official university events are often incomplete without wine or some alcoholic beverage. Kegs are often the hearthstone of student parties. So use is, or at least seems to be, accepted. Alcohol ABUSE, however is not an acceptable part of the campus culture. Yet, it is with us and it seems more pronounced than in earlier years. Even though alcohol abuse is not accepted, it does not generate the concern it deserves, especially in relationship to illicit drugs. Consequently elsewhere, it is one of the most difficult problems to address effectively.

So alcohol continues to be a fixture on our campuses, just as it is in American society. Many people use it reasonably, as an occasional beverage with a meal or in some recreational or social situations. Some people, however, have trouble with alcohol. They use it to excess, which in turn diminishes the quality of their lives and the lives of those around them. Therefore, I believe that the aim of our collegiate educational and medical programs and policies should be to have those who choose to use alcohol avoid becoming abusers. Except for the very rare campus, it is futile to pretend that college students can be denied the choice about whether or not to use alcohol. When will we ever learn that prohibition won't work?

#### CRAFTING GOOD POLICIES AND PROGRAMS

Just because drug and alcohol abuse problems have been with us for many generations does not mean that they will not yield to effective policies and programs. As we look ahead, we need to keep two thoughts in mind. Like so many problems of humankind, alcohol abuse will never go away; we'll not fix it once and for all. So get ready for the long haul and recognize that we can bring about some changes, and that even small changes can improve the quality of life and lives on our campuses. Secondly, we should recognize that many swell looking and glamorous programs have not worked. Yet their glamour tempts us to try versions of them again and again - never recognizing that some of the premises on which they rest are seriously flawed. Before we break even more of our picks, let's examine some of those flawed assumptions. I offer a few of the more common.

1) The use and abuse of illicit drugs are more of a problem than alcohol abuse on our campuses.

Study after study shows us that this is not so. Sure, illicit drugs are a problem on nearly all campuses. But, the incidence of use and problematic consequences pale by comparison with alcohol abuse and its consequences. Yet, we test athletes for most drugs other than alcohol. Recruiting employers show little interest in alcohol use by potential employees, yet they experience significant employee absenteeism and performance problems due to alcohol abuse.

Somehow, our campuses do not focus as much on alcohol abuse as we do on the abuse of other drugs. Yet, we decry the role that alcohol abuse plays in overdose emergencies, in hazing, in academic deficiencies, in death and injury, in violent behavior, in date rape, and in shaping qualities of our environment that detract from good learning and scholarship.

## 2) Knowledge determines behavior; "if they only knew they wouldn't!"

How many of our respective drug and alcohol education programs rest on the assumption that the provision of information about drugs (usually information about associated dangers) will deter the use of those drugs? Too many. Our literature is full of studies that show that those who are most informed about drugs are those who use them the most.

Student affairs deans and their colleagues base many of their programs and services on the premise that feelings affect thinking, learning, and behavior. While their intellect is celebrated, students are whole persons who are also developing their psychological, social, sexual, ethical, physical and spiritual selves. It seems to me that these are the contexts that are most often associated with drug abuse. If so, these are powerful enough to override the intellect when it comes to deciding about situations involving the use (and perhaps abuse) of drugs and alcohol. Why cannot more of our collegiate programs take the more complicated road and approach substance abuse with the sure knowledge that students feel as well as think and that their feelings can and do significantly affect their behavior?

### 3) Behavior can be significantly shaped by regulation.

There is some truth in this assumption, but not enough to rest comfortably with a policy or program that leans heavily on it. Regulation or passing laws work best when there is a clear consensus about the "common good," and when a law relates clearly to that common good. But we have a long history of unenforced rules, and rules that were effectively discarded long before someone got around to legislating them away.

The second best example of this is to be found in the annuals of the Prohibition Era - the grand legislative assault that didn't work. The best example, however, remains the common public law that forbids drinking by citizens under 19 or 21. Has that law significantly shaped the drinking behavior of the under-aged? Of course not.

#### 4) Colleges should enforce public laws.

Wrong! Colleges should abide by laws. And they should help their members do the same be setting expectations of lawfulness and by informing members of the collegiate community of relevant laws. But where is it written that colleges and their officers are law enforcers or enforcement agencies? Our role is that of educators. That role would be severely crippled and compromised were we also to serve as enforcers of the public law.

## 5) Colleges are, can, or should be sanctuaries from the enforcement of public laws.

There was a time in American higher education when this was a true and common assumption. It was a companion piece to "en loco parentis" which anchored, among other things, the assumption that schools should assume parent-like relationships to their students. In many ways, the family home still is something of a sanctuary for minors. If a minor gets in trouble police still call the family - the implication being that the parents should take responsibility and intervene and "handle" the matter. That was the common approach for college students in earlier days. A student who got into trouble (say, drunk in public) would not be put in the drunk tank along with grown-up drunks. Rather, the police would call the dean to come and retrieve the student and "take care" of him or her. And that is what happened. Colleges assumed that the student was their responsibility. So did the police and local judges.

But students are no longer minors; the age of majority moved from 21 to 18 during the 1960's. Students have no fewer nor more rights than other citizens. And colleges are not inclined to "take care of their own" when it comes to enforcing public laws. The days when the campus was a sanctuary are long past. Those times will not return, even though there are currently some pressures for colleges to return to some of those earlier practices; pressures from enforcement agencies and occasionally from parents who would just as soon have their son or daughter protected from the harshness of real live law enforcement.

### 6) College rules should mimic public laws.

Wrong again! It is generally accepted that college policies exist for educational reasons. Those educational reasons are likely to result in college laws that protect and enhance an academic community. More often than not, they differ from the public law. The most obvious reason is that the school need not mimic the public law. It is already on the books and should be subject to enforcement neither more nor less than anywhere else. The campus isn't a sanctuary; public laws apply there.

The less obvious reasons for differing policies are associated with the special characteristics of an academic community. Take intellectual dishonesty, for example. That is hardly a serious issue in the public sector. We have all learned to hold advertising suspect. We ask, "Can this or that claim be believed?" We really do not hold our public officials to stern tests of truthfulness. Rather, we

have come to accept a stance of disbelief; we not only question the judgements of public officials but we also question the veracity of the information they claim to have used to support the judgements. We even see public officials lauded because their public dishonesty and deceit was honorably motivated - as in the case of the Iran/Contra scandal. Honesty in the academy, however, is taken much more seriously. That's understandable because scholarship and research depend on the integrity of the preceding work of others, and the special relationship between teacher and student must be marked by trust. If that trust is betrayed by an act of academic dishonesty, the relationship is virtually destroyed. Hence, colleges regard dishonesty much more seriously than most other social institutions. They don't give medals for lying, cheating, and plagarizing. They don't look the other way. They give walking papers and suspensions. It is also often the case that educational institutions will give different weight to transgressions than would the public judicial systems

Policies regarding alcohol and drug use can also be different from the public laws. For example, under-age drinking is not really an issue with many institutions. Alcohol abuse is. Why should educators by any less concerned about a 25-year old student alcoholic than a 19-year old student alcoholic? Neither can function as well as they should. So most college policies (or practices) ignore the 21-year old drinking age. That is in the public law. But if, by policy, there are interventions in cases of drug and alcohol abuse, most of those interventions take little account of the student's age.

Colleges, then, need not simply replicate public laws. When they do, it should be for purely educational reasons.

### 7) Colleges should be neutral on matters of drug abuse.

There are those who hold that drug abuse is private behavior and, as such, is not the proper business of the college or university. Others manage somehow to misapply notions of academic freedom. Just as students must be free to savor the free market place of ideas, so too, should they be free to experiment with chemical alteration of their moods.

Educational institutions should not be neutral about such matters. We do care, and for good reason. The recreational abuse, and sometimes the simple use of psychoactive drugs is antithetical to education. Taking drugs to take one's mind out of circulation is stupid behavior. So is using street drugs of unknown dosage and purity. There are many public laws that prohibit such use and students are subject to those laws like everyone else. Why take the unnecessary risks of arrest and public judicial hassles that will surely have an adverse affect on one's ability to be a productive student?

Finally, we know that virtually all students have the choice to use and abuse drugs. Why pretend that students don't have those choices when we know that they do? Isn't it better to gear our approaches to helping students make good choices? And doesn't that happen better when colleges are clear about why they

1988 Edition

are concerned about the abuse of drugs? If so, that suggests something quite different from a neutral stance on such matters.

#### FOR FUTURE DISCUSSIONS

Student affairs professionals need to root out some of the weak premises on which so many apparently good, but unsuccessful programs and policies have been based. Can better assumptions be advanced? In doing so, can we approach these tasks as educators and not legislators or public law enforcers? Can we create a campus climate marked by support and caring for the welfare of individuals in the academic community? Can we keep the educational purposes of our institutions in better view? Can we apply what is known about the factors that are most significant in shaping and altering behavior? Can we avoid phony neutrality and create "climates of disapproval" of personal and educationally destructive behaviors? When students leave our institutions, will we have helped them make good choices about the use of one of society's oldest drugs - alcohol?

The cost of production for the Journal of the Indiana University Student Personnel Association is underwritten by annual contributions from School of Education Alumni to the School of Education Fund for Excellence. Your contributions help make our publication possible. Please use the reply card below to make your gift to the Indiana University School of Education.

Thank you.

Yes! I want to support the School of Education!
INDIANA UNIVERSITY ANNUAL FUND
Use my gift of ()\$500 ()\$100 ()\$50 ()
For ( ) the Fund for Excellence (202) ( ) other
Name
Address
City State Zip
Phone
Sol. Cd. <u>CR</u>
Send me: ( ) The list of companies that make matching gifts. ( ) More information about the tax advantages of giving to education. ( ) More information about giving through estate planning.
To the extent allowed by state and federal laws, gifts may be eligible for tax deductions and credits.
Make your check payable to the appropriate Fund/IU Foundation.  Mail to: IU Foundation, P.O. Box 2298, Bloomington, IN 47402.

Thank You!

New name or address? Please make corrections.

James Lyons is Dean of Student Affairs at Stanford University. He did his undergraduate studies at Allegheny College and his graduate studies at the Indiana University School of Education where he received his M.S. in 1956 and Ed.D in 1963. In 1985, he received the Elizabeth A. Greenleaf Distinguished Alumus Award from the Department of College Student Personnel.