

DRINKING BEHAVIORS AND UNDERAGE DRINKING EVASION TACTICS

By

Brock K. B. LaFave, B. S.

A thesis submitted to the Graduate Council of
Texas State University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science
with a Major in Criminal Justice
December 2017

Committee Members:

Marcus Felson, Chair

Scott Bowman

Howard Williams

COPYRIGHT

by

Brock K. B. LaFave

2017

FAIR USE AND AUTHOR'S PERMISSION STATEMENT

Fair Use

This work is protected by the Copyright Laws of the United States (Public Law 94-553, section 107). Consistent with fair use as defined in the Copyright Laws, brief quotations from this material are allowed with proper acknowledgement. Use of this material for financial gain without the author's express written permission is not allowed.

Duplication Permission

As the copyright holder of this work I, Brock K. B. LaFave, authorize duplication of this work, in whole or in part, for educational or scholarly purposes only.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents, Shannon and Norman LaFave, and my fiancé, Katie Rosko.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Marcus Felson, Dr. Scott Bowman, and Dr. Howard Williams for all of your help in my undergraduate and graduate career. You have all taught me in your classes; however, most of all, I want to thank you for the hours of discussions outside of class.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTER	
I. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM.....	1
II. INTRODUCTION	2
III. RELATING THIS RESEARCH TO THE ROUTINE ACTIVITY APPROACH	4
IV. LITERATURE REVIEW	6
Underage Evasions of Control	7
Pre-Gaming	8
Drinking environmental factors.	8
Pre-gamers vs. non-pre-gamers.	10
Motives for pre-gaming.	10
Pre-gaming and increased total drinking.	12
Tailgating – pre-gaming before sporting events.	12
Likelihood of blackouts and pre-gaming.	15
Male and female perceptions on pre-gaming.	16
Drinking games literature	17
Women and pre-gaming.....	18
Intoxication consequences of pre-gaming.	19
College Students and Obtaining Alcohol.....	19
Mobile Party Environment.....	20

Fraternity Parties	21
Heavy Drinking and Aggression.....	22
Research Opportunities Motivated by the Literature Review.....	22
V. LIMITATIONS OF THE EXISTING RESEARCH	26
VI. METHODOLOGY	27
Researcher Background	27
Observation Methodology	27
Research Integrity	33
VII. RESULTS FROM OBSERVATIONS – DRINKING OCCASIONS.....	33
Pre-gaming.....	33
Environment.....	33
Observations of Pre-gaming	34
How pre-gaming is different from other drinking contexts.	35
Party Buses.....	35
Environment.....	35
Observations of party buses	37
How party buses are different from other drinking contexts. .	39
The Local Entertainment District.....	40
Environment.....	40
Observations of Local Entertainment District.	41
Regional City Entertainment District.....	43
How the local entertainment is different from other drinking contexts.	44
Environment.....	45
Observations of Regional Entertainment District.	46
Fake ID’s usage on Regional Entertainment District.	46
How Regional Entertainment District is different from other drinking contexts.....	48
Tailgating	49
Tailgate environment	49
Observations in tailgating setting.....	51
What makes tailgates different from other settings?.....	52
Evasion techniques.....	52

Male evasion techniques	52
Female evasion techniques	54
General tactics.....	54
Police response at tailgates	55
Fraternity Parties	56
Environment.....	56
Observations of fraternity parties.....	58
How are fraternity parties different from other settings?.....	60
VIII. DISCUSSION	61
IX. CONCLUSIONS	64
Routine Activities in Bars.....	65
Routine Activities Applied to Pre-gaming, Party Buses, Tailgating, and Fraternity Parties	67
Future Research	68
APPENDIX SECTION.....	70
REFERENCES	72

ABSTRACT

This research examines the tactics used by college students to evade detection while drinking underage in various contexts near a large university in the southwestern United States. This research also looks at the drinking behaviors of college students who are of legal drinking age in these settings. The researcher conducted this research as a participant observer in six different drinking contexts: party buses, tailgate parties, pre-game parties, fraternity parties, university bars, and the entertainment district of a near-by city. Most prior research on the topic relies on student self-report surveys. The observations in the current research seek to validate those findings more directly. The routine activity approach offers a theoretical background, since the drinking environments provide no supervision, that is, no guardians to protect victims and no handlers to inhibit delinquent acts.

In all six contexts, guardianship was weak, and drinking was heavy. Yet each context has special features that influence the presence or absence of controls and the quantity of alcohol consumed. Alcohol researchers have noted the importance of “pre-gaming” contexts in a drinking sequence that can produce extreme intoxication and serious negative outcomes. This thesis pays special attention to party buses, which on some university campuses in the United States provide an extra drinking stage and can greatly enhance alcohol problems.

Significant details about how binge drinking occurs in these contexts and how problem behaviors unfold are presented. The central research purpose is to verify through

direct observation the behaviors that have been self-reported in previous research and related in previous research articles in the alcohol literature on student binge drinking (Hingson et al., 2005).

I. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Youth ages 12-20 often binge drink, consuming more than 90 percent of the alcohol that they drink by binge drinking (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016). This group drinks 11 percent of all alcohol consumed in the United States, even though it is not legally permitted to consume any alcohol (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016). College students, are especially likely to engage in binge drinking. Binge drinking occurs when women consume four or more drinks and men consume five or more drinks in one sitting. A drink “refers to half an ounce of alcohol or one 12-oz beer, one 5-oz glass of wine, or one 1.5-oz shot of distilled spirits (Sharma, Knowlden, & Nahar, 2017, p.52); however, these standard drink sizes may not reflect serving sizes at bars, restaurants, or parties as drinks consumed in these settings are often larger than a standard size. College students are more likely to binge drink than their peers who work and do not attend college, with half of all college students reporting binge drinking and 35% having binge drunk in the last two weeks (Pederson, 2017).

University students are more often involved in criminal behavior that results from binge drinking. Almost 700,000 students annually are assaulted by another student who has been drinking. (Hingson, Heeren, Winter, & Wechsler, 2005)). Twenty-five percent of college students report adverse academic consequences from drinking (Blanco, Okuda, Wright, Hasin, Grant, Liu, & Olfson, 2009) Some 150,000 students annually develop alcohol-related health problems. Nearly 2,000 college students die from alcohol related injuries. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention data indicates that alcohol is a factor in the deaths of over 4,000 people under 21 each year. These deaths result from

automobile accidents, homicides, alcohol poisoning, falls, burns, drownings, and suicides (2016). Alcohol is also a factor in emergency room visits as over 200,000 people under 21 visited emergency rooms for alcohol-related injuries (The Dawn Report, 2014).

II. INTRODUCTION

The primary goal of this research is to identify the environments where underage drinkers consume alcohol and understand the specific tactics they use to avoid detection. The second goal of this research is to understand drinking behaviors of underage drinkers and legal drinkers in these settings. More precisely, this researcher chose to study a single university in the Southwestern United States. Even though that university is increasing its size, research focus, and admission standards, the alcohol consumption of its students shows no sign of declining. Arguably, for many American universities an appreciable minority of students are not fully participating in the academic goals of the university, and are satisfied with passing. They fall short in part because of excess focus on partying and excess alcohol consumption. University health officials increasingly call attention to binge drinking and its relationship to educational performance. (Singleton, 2007).

This researcher observed underage drinkers and young adults of legal drinking age in six different settings. Special attention was given to party buses that transport underage drinkers and of age drinkers to bars and clubs in a city close to the University campus. Drinking patterns in the bars and clubs located within the university town, bars located along an entertainment street in the larger Regional city, tailgate parties at the university, and fraternity parties at the university are also discussed.

Demersa, Kairouza, Adlaf, Gliksmanb, Taylorb, and Marchanda (2002) used a multi-level approach to study the contribution of both the drinking setting and the

individual characteristics of alcohol consumption. This research was conducted in Canada through a national mail survey called the Canadian campus survey. The results show that drinking setting is as important as individual characteristics in explaining alcohol intake per occasion. The authors mention that research assessing the impact of setting as it relates to student drinking are both rare and underdeveloped; however, the results of these studies suggest that underage drinking is related to the setting. The setting was found to influence factors such as why, where, when, and with whom students consume alcohol. If drinking norms and rules, as well as beverage choice vary by the drinking setting, there is a need to extend the prior research to settings such as party buses.

Marzell, Bavarian, Paschall, Mair, and Saltz (2015) examined party characteristics across different college drinking settings, associations between party characteristics and the likelihood of drinking to intoxication, and the mediating role of the perceived prevalence of intoxicated partygoers. Students attending 14 public universities in California during the 2010 and 2011 fall semesters completed surveys on individual and party characteristics in six unique settings. This is similar to the research that is being conducted currently by expanding the literature on various drinking settings. The research was expanded by using observations in actual settings instead of surveys and included a new drinking environment, party buses.

Pre-gaming or pre-drinking refers to drinking, often heavily, before a major social event actually begins. Prior research indicates that pre-gaming can greatly enhance intoxication and alcohol-related problems (Leonard, Collins, & Quigley, 2003)]. Pre-

gaming environments are usually free from the constraints that arise at traditional drinking establishments that prevent over-serving. Researchers increasingly realize that students engage in “strategic drinking,” to some extent planning ahead to enhance individual and group intoxication levels. (de Jong, de Ricco and Schneider, 2010). Underage drinkers often use party buses to pre-game on the way to bars or clubs. In addition, students often pre-game in parties at their homes even before traveling to the party bus locations. That generates a three-step drinking process: (1) pre-gaming at home, (2) pre-gaming on the party bus, and (3) drinking at the bars or clubs in the near-by city. One of the central purposes of this research is to describe these sequences in some detail. We shall use the term “pre-gaming” generically to include any drinking occasion which precedes another drinking occasion on the same evening.

III. RELATING THIS RESEARCH TO THE ROUTINE ACTIVITY

APPROACH

Routine Activity Theory was introduced originally by Cohen and Felson. This theory has been applied to numerous scenarios including youth dominated activities, unstructured socializing, and urban drinking settings. According to this theory, crimes occur when a likely offender encounters a suitable target in the absence of a capable guardian.

Research led by Osgood has applied the routine activity approach to youth-dominated settings (Osgood, D., Wilson, J., O’Malley, P., Bachman, J. & Johnston, L. 1996) Osgood used the term “unstructured socializing” to refer to settings where youths were together with their peers, but authority figures were absent. Osgood and Anderson

(2004) extended this research on individual deviance to aggregate levels of deviance. These studies found dramatically higher rates of delinquency in settings where authority figures were absent. Party buses have been observed to be substantially less structured than traditional bar or club settings. Although Osgood's work focused on high-school ages, Sun and Longazel (2008) applied the same idea to college students. They found that unstructured socializing such as parties and getting together with friends was positively associated with binge drinking, drinking-driving, and other negative alcohol-related behaviors. In addition, Cross and Zimmerman (2009) applied unstructured socializing to alcohol consumption for students living on campus. All of these studies derive from the routine activity approach, paying close attention to the absence of supervision. All six of the drinking contexts that interest this research involve unstructured socializing, with very little supervision by outsiders. The exception is tailgate parties at which university police are so outnumbered on these occasions, and students have so many evasive tactics, that guardianship becomes quite impractical. The current research gathers the specific details for each of these drinking contexts, observes how binge drinking occurs, notes how students evade controls, and pays close attention to how the drinking process unfolds.

Fox and Sobel (2000) use routine activity and place theory to study behaviors that occur in drinking settings in urban areas. The results of this study show the importance of the element of guardianship on patron behavior. This research indicated that bars that provided the greatest level of guardianship had lower levels of both predatory sexual offending and disorder within the bar (2000). Guardianship was provided by the effective use of bouncers within the bars. Routine activities of bar patrons were also found to

contribute to disorderly conduct within the bar and in adjoining neighborhoods (2000). The authors concluded with the theoretical and policy implications of the social responsibility of bar owners. My research extends this analysis to additional underage drinking settings. In addition, by observing underage drinking and attempts to enter bars and clubs in more than one location, I have concluded that increased guardianship can be effective in denying access to underage drinkers to bars and clubs.

This research is important because excess underage drinking poses serious public health risks in the United States. Alcohol is the most abused substance by young people and their drinking poses both health and safety risks (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2016). In addition, excessive underage drinking is often a precursor for longer-term alcoholism, with well-known consequences for aggressive behavior, crime, and health (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2016). These negative consequences are enhanced when drinking situations accelerate intoxication levels. The drinking sequences described in this research helps illustrate how that acceleration occurs.

IV. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review addresses how underage drinkers evade control. Next, various aspects of pre-gaming are discussed, including pre-gaming of social events and tail-gating, or pre-gaming of sporting events. The literature review also addresses how college students obtain alcohol, the mobile party environment or party buses, fraternity parties, how heavy drinking impacts aggression, and, finally, research opportunities indicated by the research.

Underage Evasions of Control

Underage drinkers use several tactics to evade controls and drink illegally. Nguyen, Walters, Rinker, Wyatt, and Dejong (2011) conducted research on fake ID ownership in a sample of first year college students in the United States. According to their research, fake ID ownership increased from 17.1 percent in the fall term to 21.3 percent in the spring term (Nguyen, et al., 2011). This increase can be attributed to two primary factors, students having opportunities to purchase their fake IDs and gaining information on the usefulness of possessing fake IDs. Students in possession of fake IDs were most likely to be male and non-Hispanic white. Membership in a fraternity or sorority or having the intention to join a fraternity or sorority were strongly related to fake ID ownership. Fake ID ownership was also associated with having heavy drinking episodes and having relatives with alcohol problems. College students who possess fake IDs are likely to experience alcohol-related issues that impact their academic performance and increase their likelihood of harming themselves or others (Nguyen et al., 2011). The most likely explanation is that fake ID ownership provides easier access to bars and other high-risk venues where alcohol is purchased. Possessing a fake ID may give underage drinkers a false sense of security in their ability to gain access to drinking establishments. This false sense of security may result in students' increased use of the fake IDs and the corresponding alcohol related issues (Nguyen, et al., 2011). Quality of the fake IDs and how the quality impacts their usage in bars and other drinking establishments was not addressed in the article. Fabian, Toomey, Lenk, and Erickson (2005) looked at where college students obtain alcohol. Their research was conducted using two focus group discussions at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. All

participants were 18 to 20 years old. Eight students participated in the first focus group and 11 participated in the second. Seventeen of the participants were female (Fabian et al., 2005). The small number of participants in the study as well the high number of females, make the generalizability of this study to the college student population, questionable. The results indicated that alcohol was easily available from social sources and could be obtained in a matter of hours. All participants concurred that friends and acquaintances that were older or who had fake IDs were the easiest way to obtain alcohol. Participants in the discussions reported frequent use of fake ID. The participants reported that fake IDs were obtained by either tampering with their own IDs or using IDs belonging to others. Using others' IDs was believed to work better for women than men as women are more likely to change their appearance from their pictures on a regular basis. Parties were also considered to be common sources of alcohol, although participants disagreed about whether fraternity and sorority members vs. non-members had greater access to alcohol (Fabian et al., 2005). This research was expanded upon through multiple observations. Findings were consistent in some settings and less consistent with others depending upon the level of guardianship.

Pre-Gaming

Drinking environmental factors. Clapp, Holmes, Reed, Shillington, Freisthler and Lange (2005) present field methodologies for measuring college students' alcohol consumption in natural drinking environments. They note that much of the current literature on college alcohol use and its associated problems have relied upon self-report data on individuals' past experiences. Although this self-report data can be useful, it has several important limitations. First, capturing a drinking environment through a survey

can be difficult because of the large numbers and types of elements that must be captured in the survey. Second, survey respondents must be able to recall numerous environmental characteristics of the drinking event, despite the likelihood of their level of intoxication negatively impacting their abilities to recall the event. They present their methodology from a large field study of student drinking environments (specifically, parties and bars). They detail how to carry out field surveys, and how to apply observational methods. They discuss sampling issues and how to collect breath alcohol concentration samples. These authors focus specifically on parties and bars, yet their work offers some ideas for other drinking settings, such as party buses and pre-gaming events. For example, they point out the importance of observing the types of alcohol consumed during the drinking event as participants who consume low alcohol drinks such as beer and wine may be likely to encounter fewer alcohol related issues than those who consume shots or high alcohol mixed drinks. In addition, the authors note the importance of observing how drinks are made focusing on whether excess alcohol is used in drink preparation and whether individuals consuming the drinks are aware if excess alcohol has been used. In addition, the authors note the importance of observing preventative variables which may reduce intoxication or facilitating variables that increase the risk of intoxication. These variables include the availability of food, the presence of illegal drugs, the presence of friends or intoxicated individuals, and the playing of drinking games. These authors made clear that additional drinking contexts have been under-researched.

Makela, Mustonen, and Lintonen (2016) researched the relationship between drinking context choices and self-reported alcohol-related social harm in Finland. Their study linked the main characteristics of the respondents' latest drinking occasions to self-

reported alcohol-related harm. Their research concluded that drinking situation and context are important for describing drinking patterns and for understanding drinking outcomes. The authors stated that their results need to be replicated in other drinking cultures to assess their generalizability.

Pre-gamers vs. non-pre-gamers. Ostergaard and Skov (2014), researched whether pre-drinkers consume more alcohol than non-pre-drinkers on an event-specific night out. They conducted a cross-national panel mobile survey of young adults' drinking in England and Denmark. Their research learned that young people pre-drink, usually at a private residence, to reach a level of intoxication to carry them through the main event of the evening with little additional spending on alcohol. They concluded that pre-drinkers drink far more than those who do not pre-drink. Ostergaard and Skov conducted valuable research, but did not measure young adults' alcohol consumption continuously throughout the night.

Motives for pre-gaming. Bachrach, Merrill, Bytschkow, and Read (2012) developed a scale to assess motives for pre-gaming in college students. This tool is referred to as the Pre-gaming Motives Measure (PGMM). Their study describes the development and initial validation of their scale and evaluates associations between motives and actual pre-gaming behavior. Findings of their research suggest a very important general finding: that motives for pre-gaming differ from those of general drinking. Their results indicate that pre-gaming is motivated by desires to become intoxicated quickly, in contrast to general drinking which is motivated more by desires to enhance mood, relieve stress, and obtain positive social gains.

Labhart and Kuntsche (2017) elaborated on the PGGM instrument by developing and validating a pre-gaming questionnaire for general populations of young adults. Their research focused on young adults in Switzerland. This questionnaire differed from the earlier one because the drinking age is lower in Switzerland than in the U.S. While the legal drinking age is 21 in the United States, it is at most 19 in European countries and may be as low as 16 for consumption of beer and wine. While pre-gaming in the United States, in other countries pre-gaming is related primarily to the high price of alcoholic beverages in bars and clubs. In addition, drinking contexts for young Europeans differ from those of many young Americans, given the factors unique to North American universities. One such factor is membership in fraternities, sororities, or sports teams.

This PGMM instrument indicated that pre-gaming is conducted mainly because participants want to have fun. In addition, individuals were found to pre-game because it allowed them to spend time in environments that they enjoyed, such as having the ability to listen to music of their choosing, and because it relaxed them for social encounter that they anticipated would occur later in the drinking occasion. This research did not account for the amount of alcohol consumed at the pre-game or future events in the drinking occasions. The authors suggest that future research should account for these factors.

Wells, Graham, and Purcell (2009) looked at prevention strategies aimed at the pre-gaming that occurs before individuals frequent public drinking establishments. They outline the motivations for pre-gaming: avoidance of high priced drinks, to achieve drunkenness, and to socialize with friends and enhance male bonding. They note that existing research on pre-drinking and its consequences is limited. They state that policy implications of pre-drinking need to be addressed as well as links between pre-drinking

and aggression. Young adults who pre-game are more likely to drink and drive. After pre-gaming, young adults use impaired judgment to drive to drinking establishments or to party buses. While intoxicated, these young adults may also be subject to violence and other forms of victimization.

Pre-gaming and increased total drinking. LaBrie and Pedersen (2008) focused on how pre-gaming contributes to increased total drinking, higher blood alcohol levels, and enhanced alcohol related problems. Participants reported on their most recent drinking event, including those involving and not involving pre-gaming. For each of these drinking events participants in the assessments indicated the number of drinks they consumed during the day and how many hours they drank. They also indicated the number of drinks they consumed specifically during the pre-gaming event and how many hours they drank. The assessment also gave participants the opportunity to identify any negative drinking consequences that they experienced. Results of the assessment found that women consumed more drinks and reached higher blood alcohol levels on the pre-gaming day compared to the non-pre-gaming day. Men, however, drank similar amounts and had similar blood alcohol levels regardless of whether they engaged in pre-gaming activities. Both women and men experienced increased drinking consequences on the pre-gaming days. This study was limited by using self-report data and the use of only two drinking events; however, the results suggest an association between pre-gaming, heavy drinking, and alcohol related consequences. The authors acknowledge that more research is needed to understand the implications of the pre-gaming experience.

Tailgating – pre-gaming before sporting events. Hustad, Mastroleo, Urwin, Zeman, LaSalle, and Borsari (2014) define pre-gaming as drinking before a social event

and tailgating as drinking before a sporting event. They state that a major difference between the two drinking contexts is pre-gaming is often more clandestine than tailgating because pre-gaming occurs in private locations in small groups while tailgating normally occurs outside with large crowds. Research indicates that both activities are strongly ingrained in the drinking behaviors of college students. This study looked at both the pre-gaming and tailgating activities of students who had violated their school's alcohol policy and were required to receive alcohol intervention. Students in the study who reported engaging in both pre-gaming and tailgating behaviors were found to drink more heavily, reach higher blood alcohol levels, believe their peers drank higher levels of alcohol, and had more positive feelings about alcohol use than students who participated in pre-gaming only, tailgating only, or neither pre-gaming nor tailgating. Results also indicated that the average blood alcohol levels were similar for students in both tailgating and pre-gaming drinking contexts; however, higher peak levels were higher in the pre-game context.

Oster-Aaland and Neighbors (2007) looked at the impact on student alcohol consumption of a university's change in policy to allow alcohol at tailgates. They used student self-report data to measure alcohol consumption, problems after alcohol consumption, perceptions of other student's consumption, and game attendance both before and after the policy change. Their research took place at a mid-sized public university in the Midwest. In years prior to the change, alcohol had not been allowed during tailgating because of both campus policy and city ordinance. While alcohol was not officially allowed, this policy was enforced inconsistently, and alcohol use was observed in the stadium parking lot before the football games. Beginning in fall of 2004,

the campus policy and city ordinance were changed to allow alcohol consumption in the stadium parking lot for university sponsored tailgating. The university administrators set policies to ensure that alcohol was consumed under controlled conditions and to minimize consumption by minors. These policies included limiting tailgating to a specific area with clear borders and security, requiring people who entered the area to be 21 or older or accompanied by a parent or guardian, random checking of IDs, and closing tailgating activities once the game began. When the two surveys were compared, results showed there were no changes in alcohol consumed or in problems incurred. The only significant change was in students' perceptions of peer consumption with students overestimating the quantities of alcohol consumed and the number of students who drank while tailgating.

Woodyard and Hallum (2010) used self-report survey data to investigate whether students consume more alcohol while celebratory drinking than in typical drinking on the weekends or during weekdays. Celebratory drinking occasions were defined as tailgating before football games, holidays, and the beginning and end of academic semesters. Self-report data was collected from full-time undergraduates aged 18 to 24 at a large southern university. The authors used a modified version of the Michigan State University Celebration Questionnaire for the self-report survey. The researchers expected to find students consumed greater quantities of alcohol during celebratory occasions than on typical weekend or weekday drinking; however, the self-report data indicated that students consumed the greatest amount of alcohol during typical weekend drinking. The only exception to weekend drinking being greater than celebratory drinking was New Year's Eve. Results of this research suggest that colleges and universities need to focus

on typical weekend drinking to reduce alcohol consumption by student drinkers, particularly underage drinkers.

Lawrence, Hall, and Lancey (2012) researched whether college students who participated in tailgating during homecoming were at an increased risk for binge drinking and its related negative consequences over the previous 30 days than students who did not participate in the event. Survey data from 211 tailgaters and 356 non-tailgaters was analyzed using a logistics regression model. The model predicted that students classified as tailgaters were over three times more likely than non-tailgaters to report binge drinking and significantly more likely to report individual negative consequences associated with alcohol use, within the previous 30 days. The data also indicated that the survey participants classified as tailgaters were more likely to report a greater number of consequences. The researchers note two important limitations of this data. One, the students completing the survey were selected through convenience sampling. Second, the researchers did not use data from a typical tailgating event but used a special tailgating event associated with homecoming, which is traditionally attended by more students than typical homecoming events.

Likelihood of blackouts and pre-gaming. LaBrie, Hummer, Kenney, Lac, and Pedersen (2011) looked at factors that increase the likelihood of blackouts in the pre-gaming drinking context. Blacking out is defined as the segment of a drinking occasion for which observers report conscious actions by the subject that he or she cannot remember. Blackouts can be dangerous because they often produce emotional, academic, sexual, and legal difficulties. Students have been noticed exposing themselves, groping others, or making embarrassing remarks during blackouts, yet remembering none of this

the next day. Blackouts normally arise from rapidly increased blood alcohol levels after fast-paced drinking. Pre-gamers may be at increased risk for blackouts because pre-gaming normally involves rapid drinking with the purpose of achieving intoxication.

One purpose of this research is to determine frequency of blacking out in the pre-gaming drinking context and what individual characteristics and types of beverages consumed were likely predictors of blackouts. The researchers anticipated that pre-gaming frequency, playing drinking games while pre-gaming, and drinking shots would increase the likelihood of blacking out. Results indicated that individuals who blacked out tended to pre-game more frequently, play drinking games while pre-gaming, and consume beer, shots, wine, or mixed drinks. The individuals tended to be white, male, Greek-affiliated, and have family histories of alcohol abuse. Age was not identified as a contributing factor even though previous research has indicated that many individuals pre-game because they are underage and fear they may not have access to alcohol later in the evening. This study did not determine if the blackouts occurred during the pre-gaming event or later in the drinking occasion.

Male and female perceptions on pre-gaming. Pedersen and LaBrie (2008) looked at perceptions of both male and female college students' alcohol consumption in the pre-gaming event relative to actual consumption as well as drinking games associated with the pre-gaming event. They sampled college psychology students through an online assessment. Results of the assessments indicated that both men and women overestimated the number of pre-gaming days in a month of a typical student. They also overestimated the number of drinks consumed in a typical pre-gaming event, the number of days playing drinking games, and the number of drinks consumed while playing drinking

games. The overestimation of pre-gaming and drinking game behavior may influence students' behaviors. If students believe others will already be drunk when they arrive at their destination, they may be motivated to drink more at the pre-gaming events to avoid being the only one later who is not intoxicated. The competitive nature of drinking games may also encourage men to show off their abilities to hold their liquor or to impress women with their drinking game talents. The Pederson-LaBrie study was limited by its dependence on memories of past events and on student perceptions of their peers' alcohol use. The online assessment method may have influenced results because of concerns about confidentiality and security of data. Yet it was a unique study, meriting expansion and comparison research.

Drinking games literature. Borsari (2004) reviewed both the qualitative and quantitative research associated with drinking games and college students. Drinking games are identified as being extremely popular among college students and significant contributors to excessive drinking and alcohol related issues. The qualitative research indicates that college students participate in drinking games for intoxication, friendship, and competition. The different types of drinking games are examined, and the conclusion is that in all types of drinking games, students consume large amounts of alcohol within a short amount of time. As students consume alcohol both their cognitive and motor processes are impaired. Because of this, students begin to make mistakes and consequently consume more and more alcohol as their mistakes increase. This process has been labeled the "reversal of competence" because players become more intoxicated over time and their skills decrease. Quantitative research confirms that drinking game participants drink more than other students. Men have been found to play drinking games

more often than women, but men and women drink similar amounts when they do so. Women drink more when playing drinking games than in other drinking contexts, and younger students play more drinking games than older students. Drinking games are also associated with negative consequences, such as getting into trouble with the law, hangovers, absence from classes, property damage, and violence.

Women and pre-gaming. Bancroft (2012) studied the pre-gaming experiences of female students at the University of Edinburgh. The women had pre-gamed frequently in countries throughout northern Europe and the United Kingdom. He defined pre-gaming as intensive consumption of alcohol in a group setting in a private home before going out to bars or clubs. The purpose of pre-gaming was to achieve intoxication before continuing with other components of the drinking occasion. Intoxication was often achieved through the playing of drinking games. His research suggests that pre-gaming has become a distinct component of the drinking occasion for young adults between the ages of 18 and 25. For the female pre-gamers, the experience was highly directed and ritualized and many pre-gamers found the experience lacking in pleasure for these reasons. Pre-gaming was viewed as preparation for further rapid alcohol consumption at pubs or clubs later in the evening. Students identified pre-gaming as an important component of a successful night of drinking and fun; however, the pre-gaming experience itself was considered forced and preparation for pleasure rather than a pleasurable experience, itself. Pre-gaming was believed to serve a protective purpose for the women as bonds are believed to develop during the pre-gaming phase of the evening that help women manage the risks that occur throughout the remainder of the drinking occasion. Pre-gaming provides a known and safe place to bond and prepare oneself

before venturing out to experience the unknown risks in the pubs and clubs later in the evening.

Intoxication consequences of pre-gaming. Miller, Droste, de Groot, Palmer, Tindall, Busija, Hyder, Gilham, and Wigger (2016) discussed the fact that heavy drinking prior to going out has become a common and celebrated practice among young adults throughout the world. Pre-drinking has been linked to increased alcohol consumption and higher blood alcohol levels. They state that motivations for pre-drinking include avoiding high priced drinks at bars and clubs, becoming drunk, extending the night of partying, and socializing. They note that despite pre-gaming being a world-wide problem, only a small amount of research has been done on the issue. They state the need for increased insight into the motivations for pre-gaming as well as identifying the various harms associated with pre-gaming. Also, pre-gamers are subject to increased risk from driving or being driven while intoxicated. When young adults drink heavily during a pre-game, they spend longer hours intoxicated in public drinking establishments. They also note that no research has been done that specifically studies interventions that can address pre-drinking behavior that does not encourage higher levels of drinking overall. Party buses are an extension of pre-gaming and allow young adults to become more intoxicated than they would have become had they pre-gamed at home only.

College Students and Obtaining Alcohol

Arria, Caldeira, Moshkovich, Bugbee, Vincent, and O'Grady (2014) researched the attitudes and behaviors of young adults of legal age who provided alcohol to underage drinkers. Participants in the research were 755 recent college students who were approached at least once after turning 21 by a minor to provide alcohol. Almost 85

percent of the participants provided alcohol to minors at least once. Fraternity and sorority involvement was associated with a higher frequency of providing alcohol to minors. The risk of being caught providing alcohol to minors was less than three percent so the possibility of getting caught was not considered to be an important factor in the decision about whether to provide alcohol to minors (Arria et al., 2014) Implications of this research support targeting young adults who have recently turned 21 for prevention strategies to reduce underage drinking on college campuses (Arria, et al., 2014).

Mobile Party Environment

Fjaer, Pedersen, and Sandburg (2016) examine the mobile party environment in Norway, focusing on how mobile party spaces contribute to high levels of intoxication. This research extends research beyond the traditional nightlife of bars and clubs to the mobile party environment. Before the mobile partying begins, young adults pre-game at a home or on a parked bus. The purpose of the pre-game is for the participants to become highly intoxicated. After pre-gaming, the participants begin the mobile experience. The participants bring their own alcohol onto the buses as they do not stop once the partying begins. The participants are familiar with the alcohol content of the drinks they intend to consume and calculate how much alcohol must be consumed to achieve the desired level of intoxication. There is no level of guardianship in the buses to prevent high levels of intoxication as there are no opening and closing hours and no bouncers or club owners refusing to serve intoxicated or underage patrons. Individuals often become ill and must be taken to emergency rooms or become too intoxicated for their friends to handle and must be picked up by their parents. The participants play music and dance under bright lights.

Fraternity Parties

Glindemann, Ehrhart, Drake, and Geller (2006) analyzed the impact incentives and rewards have on alcohol consumption and intoxication at college fraternity parties. Fraternity members were chosen for the research because fraternity and sorority members are known from prior research to engage in heavier drinking, drink more alcoholic beverages per week, and suffer more negative consequences than their non-fraternity and sorority peers. Prior research had also indicated that blood alcohol levels were higher in students attending fraternity parties than those who attended other forms of private parties. Because legislation, education, and behavioral interventions have done little to change the alcohol consumption of college students, the researchers looked at incentives and rewards. Six fraternities in Blacksburg, VA were randomly assigned to an experimental group or control group. Each of the six fraternities hosted two parties. The three fraternities in the control group hosted two parties each with no incentives or rewards. The three fraternities in the experimental group each hosted a baseline party and then an intervention party. In the intervention party, students having a blood alcohol level below .05 were entered into a lottery to receive \$100 cash. The mean blood alcohol levels at the baseline parties were .098 while the mean at the intervention parties was .079. In addition, 40 percent of those attending the intervention parties had a blood alcohol level below .08 while only 30 percent of those attending the baseline parties had blood alcohol levels below .08.

Prior research has shown that college students who are members of fraternities and sororities report higher rates of binge drinking and more alcohol related problems than students who are not affiliated with a Greek organization. Little research has been

performed, however, on the impact of housing on the alcohol consumption of fraternity and sorority members. Brown-Rice and Furr (2017) studied alcohol consumption in both wet and dry fraternity and sorority houses. They administered the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption to Greek members in both wet and dry housing. They found that scores on the test were lower for sorority members who lived in dry housing than for sorority members in wet housing or fraternity members in either type of housing; however, all categories of Greek-affiliated students had drinking levels that exceeded what is safe for both male and female students. Their findings suggest that banning alcohol, particularly in fraternity houses, does not appear to have an impact on levels of drinking, however, students may benefit from alcohol free housing for other reasons.

Heavy Drinking and Aggression

Quigley, Leonard, and Collins (2003) studied the association between alcohol and violence. They found that heavy drinkers are more likely than light drinkers to be involved in assaults and that high amounts of alcohol are related to aggression. Thirteen percent of male college students and three percent of female college students indicated that they had been in a physical fight in a bar within the prior twelve months. Interviews with bartenders also suggest that an excellent predictor of bar violence is the age of the individuals that frequent the bar suggesting that violence in bars may occur because bars bring young men together in the same location.

Research Opportunities Motivated by the Literature Review

Several of the authors in the above literature review have suggested areas where their research could be extended. For example, research originally performed in Europe can be extended to the United States, additional drinking contexts can be addressed such

as party buses, and self-reporting questionnaires can be validated through observations. Several of these extensions are discussed below.

Quigley et al. (2003) reported that heavy drinking often leads to aggression. Party bus riders and other pre-gamers tend to drink more during the drinking occasion than individuals who do not pre-game. Studying pre-gaming and party buses will give additional insight into excess alcohol consumption and its relationship to aggression as party buses experience violence and aggression by highly intoxicated party bus riders, especially on return trips between Regional Entertainment District and Local City.

Nguyen et al. (2011) discussed usage of fake IDs. In this research we will observe bars and other drinking establishments to indicate whether they have become more sophisticated in identifying attempts to use fake IDs and whether the use of fake IDs has been eliminated in drinking settings where guardianship is high.

Clapp et al. (2007) make clear that their research should be undertaken in additional settings. The purpose in studying party buses and pre-gaming is to gain additional understanding about how the specific drinking contexts affect the quantity and rate at which young drink and the problems that can result.

The current research describes six quite different drinking contexts for a single university campus in a single state. It does not claim generalizability for the United States or elsewhere. However, as Makela et al. (2016) state, many drinking contexts need to be analyzed in many places in order to round out our knowledge about the impact of settings on the quantity consumed and the problems that emerge. This research also expands on the work of Ostergaard and Skov (2014) both by examining young adults continuously throughout the entire drinking occasion and by conducting the research in the United

States. My research will also extend the work of Bacharach et al. (2012) and Labhart and Kuntsche (2017) by examining how pre-gaming unfolds and how that varies from one drinking context to another.

Wells et al. (2009) outlined the motivations for pre-gaming. Studying party buses and the entire drinking occasion will provide information on student drinking patterns and violence among intoxicated bus riders. Party buses are looked at as a safer alternative to driving, because they are perceived as giving students the freedom to drink as much as they want because they do not have to drive to the bars or night clubs. This does not account for the drive to the party buses after pre-gaming or the drive home after the buses drop students off at the apartment complexes. Pre-gaming also has implications for future research. Studies estimating the amount of alcohol consumed by young people need to consider the entire drinking occasion, including pre-gaming. Studies are also needed to examine the extent and consequences of pre-gaming as well as the contribution of pre-gaming to total alcohol consumption. To assist with new prevention initiatives, further studies of the motives for pre-gaming are needed. In order to understand the entire drinking occasion, studying party buses is important because young adults after pre-gaming at a set location, continue to drink heavily (pre-game) while on board party buses where alcohol related harms can occur.

Borsari (2004) specifically states that his research on drinking games should be continued at other universities in additional states. Bancroft (2012) indicates that his research in Scotland should be extended to the pre-gaming experience of females in the United States. Miller et al. (2016) state the need for increased insight into the motivations for pre-gaming as well as identifying the various harms associated with pre-gaming.

Also, pre-gamers are subject to increased risk from driving or being driven while intoxicated. When young adults drink heavily during a pre-game, they spend longer hours intoxicated in public drinking establishments. They also note that no research has been done that specifically studies interventions that can address pre-drinking behavior that does not encourage higher levels of drinking overall. Party buses are an extension of pre-gaming and allow young adults to become more intoxicated than they would have become had pre-gamed at home only. If we are to better understand the motivators and harms, we must acknowledge additional types of pre-gaming, such as party buses and how this form of pre-gaming is part of the entire drinking occasion.

Implications of this research support targeting young adults who have recently turned 21 for prevention strategies to reduce underage drinking on college campuses (Arria, et al., 2014). This is important to settings such as pre-gaming and party-buses where young adults of legal drinking age normally purchase alcohol for underage drinkers. As the current risk of getting caught is extremely low, this suggests that guardianship should be increased in areas where young adults of legal drinking age purchase alcohol for underage drinkers.

The Norwegian mobile experience described by Fjaer et al. (2016) has similar characteristics to the party buses that I have observed. While the buses are the final drinking event in Norway, in my observations, the party buses extend the pre-gaming experience before participants exit the buses to party at bars and clubs. My research extends research on the mobile drinking experience.

Current research on fraternity parties has focused on sexual assault and harassment as well as hazing. Little research has been performed on how underage

drinkers, particularly fraternity members and women, are offered unlimited access to alcohol with no checking of IDs and no guardianship to insure safety. As a young alumnus of a large local chapter of a national fraternity, I was able to observe the underage fraternity members and their guests in the fraternity party drinking setting.

V. LIMITATIONS OF THE EXISTING RESEARCH

Our motivation for studying underage drinking in diverse drinking contexts is to uncover ways to reduce these problems. Some researchers have suggested how improved environmental design and better management of drinking settings can mitigate problems. The Center for Problem Oriented Policing (2006) reports that a large amount of both underage and binge drinking occurs at parties held at fraternity houses. Over time fraternity membership has become associated with heavy drinking. Students who become members of fraternities join with the expectation that they will have easy access to alcohol and that alcohol will be the major focus of their fraternity experience. The extreme levels of alcohol associated with fraternities impact not only the large numbers of fraternity members on college and university campuses but also their guests, particularly females, who attend their parties. Breaking up fraternity parties can be an extremely difficult task for police, particularly when the parties are held in private facilities away from the college campuses. Understanding the fraternity and fraternity party experience is critical if underage drinking is to be curtailed. Bars are also important drinking environment for older underage drinkers. An important issue associated with bars and underage drinking is the requirement for bouncers, bartenders, and wait staff to identify fake IDs, which may include out of state driver's licenses. Efforts to constrain binge drinking require us to understand the entire drinking occasion and how an evening

of drinking unfolds. My research provides new information on drinking environments such as party buses, tailgating, and fraternity parties and validates self-reporting data for alcohol consumption in the pre-gaming and bar/club environment. It also validates research performed in Europe in the United States and research from the United States to another region in the United States.

VI. METHODOLOGY

Researcher Background

When I performed the research, I was a recent graduate of the undergraduate criminal justice program at the university. While I was an undergraduate, I was a member of a large national fraternity that was active in pre-gaming, party bus usage, tailgating, and fraternity party hosting. I knew how to dress appropriately for the events where I was a participant-observer which helped me to be accepted by the participants that I did not know at the events. As a recent alumnus, I was welcome at all of the events hosted by my fraternity as well as pre-games, parties, and tailgates hosted by other fraternities, when I was invited.

Observation Methodology

The current research method was ethnographic research and the approach was observational field research. Observations were made using routine activities theory and looking at likely offenders, suitable targets, and guardians. The main technique was to spend substantial amounts of time observing the subjects and taking systematic field notes on their behavior. When I made observations, I spent four to five hours in the field each time I performed an observation. Some ethnographic researchers prefer to avoid theoretical hypotheses or preconceptions. This research takes an intermediate position,

grounding the observations in the routine activity approach, yet allowing modifications and variations as the observations were carried out.

Pre-gaming, party bus, tailgating, fraternity party, and bar/club research was conducted in Local City and Regional City, Texas. While conducting this research, I rode party buses between Local City and Regional City, and frequented bars and clubs at the Local Entertainment District in Local City and on Regional Entertainment District in Regional City. The negative consequences of binge drinking are enhanced when drinking situations accelerate intoxication levels. The drinking sequences that are described in this paper help illustrate how that acceleration occurs.

All the observations occurred in public places with no reasonable expectation of privacy except for the pre-gaming setting which occurred in private apartments or houses. When conducting the research, I was a participant-observer and the population being studied was unaware that they were being observed. As I am close in age to the underage drinkers and an alumnus of a large fraternity, I was invited to all of the pre-games. I have friends in other fraternities, sororities and friends that are not in fraternity/sorority life who invited me to pre-games, as well, so I was able to observe a variety of groups in the pre-game setting. I was able to participate in these activities alongside the underage drinkers without drawing undue attention to myself. I typed all of my observations in the notes section of my phone but I appeared as though I was simply texting so no one noticed that I was taking notes. I looked and dressed the part of a fraternity member and college student by wearing cowboy boots with wrangler jeans and a button-down shirt. My style of dress was consistent in each setting. I did carry a cup in my hand similar to

other participants, but I did not consume alcohol. My presence had little to no effect on the situation or the behaviors of those participating.

At these social gatherings, students socialize and drink very heavily with the intention of achieving drunkenness. The pre-games started between 9:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. This was consistent among the different groups. As a participant-observer, I participated in drinking games, such as beer pong and flip cup, and socialized normally with the students. After the pre-games, I drove to the party bus pick up locations at several student housing apartment complexes. I drove because I was sober and did not want to ride with anyone who had been drinking. While waiting for the buses to show up and start the boarding process, young adults continued drinking alcohol in the parking lot. If students had not purchase their wrist bands earlier in the day themselves or from a friend who, they bought the wristbands directly from the bus companies at the pick-up locations. The wristbands are first come first serve so many students purchase their wristbands early to ensure their spots on the buses. While onboard the party buses, I continued to socialize and observe students' drinking. I took note of any illegal and dangerous behaviors that I observed. These behaviors were consistent among different groups of students. After a thirty to forty-minute ride, the students and I were dropped off at the Regional Entertainment District. Generally, the buses arrived at the large Regional Entertainment District around 11:00 p.m. After being dropped off, the students spent the next three hours moving from different bars and night clubs while continuing to drink and party.

To avoid suspicion, while inside each bar, I made sure to have a drink in my hand even though I did not consume the alcohol. I observed how the students' behavior

changed throughout the night as they became increasingly intoxicated. While observing I made notes on which bar settings had the most problems (over crowdedness, rudeness, fights/disputes, etc.) until 2:00 am when the bars closed. I also took notes on how barroom management and design affected guardianship and victimization. While I took notes on my phone, I appeared to be texting. While the students and I travelled from bar to bar I observed the environment on the street. For example, I observed when the street becomes crowded with people moving between bars and the prevalence of the homeless, and the mentally ill. The buses picked us up at 2:00 am for the return trip. After the three hours of socializing at Regional Entertainment District, I rode back to the apartment complex pick up points. Between 2:30 am and 2:45 am the students and I exited the party buses and returned home in our cars that were parked at the apartment complexes. My research did not stop once we exited the bus. I continued to observe students' behaviors in the parking lots, taking note of how students entered their cars to drive home while they were extremely intoxicated and how students rode with others who had been drinking with no concern for safety.

I observed the football tailgate drinking setting at the local University on several occasions. For two weekends I arrived at the tailgates at 7 a.m. so that I could observe the organizations set up process. The football games normally start at 6 p.m. so for the remaining tailgates I arrived between 1 p.m. and 2 p.m., at the same time as the majority of the students. When I arrived, I walked around looking for people I knew so that I could enter the fraternity tailgates. As an alumnus I was allowed into my fraternity tailgates but needed to be invited to other fraternities' tailgates. Once I found my friends, I went to the bar in the tents to obtain a beer. I carried a beer so I would not look suspicious. Once

at the fraternity tents I observed how underage drinkers evaded detection from police. I also observed how the students' behaviors changed throughout the day as they became more intoxicated and the tailgates became more crowded. As tailgates became more crowded and students became more intoxicated, I paid specific attention to how it impacted underage drinkers trying to avoid detection and how the lack of guardianship affected this and the behaviors of all students in attendance. I also looked for problems that arose such as fights and disputes. I took all notes on my phone to appear as though I was texting. I spent the majority of my time in the tailgate tent area of my fraternity, but I also walked around to observe students at other tailgate tents and students walking around with no specific tailgate to attend. I was invited to other tailgate tents because I had friends in other fraternities and organizations. I wanted to see if the behaviors and evasion tactics varied among different organizations, especially the fraternities. Tailgate started to shut down thirty minutes prior to game time, so organizations had time to clean up their tailgate space and go to the game or go home.

The last setting that I observed was fraternity parties. I began my observations at the pre-games that occurred prior to the parties. The pre-games began between 9:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. Due to the large number of people attending themed fraternity parties there were usually multiple people hosting pre-games. I went to the pre-games already dressed in costumes to fit the themes of the parties just like everyone else in attendance. I socialized with students while observing drinking games (beer pong & flip cup) and taking notes on my phone. While observing I noticed that the pre-game behaviors and traditions were consistent no matter what setting the students were pre-gaming. Between 11:00 p.m. and 11:30 p.m., I drove to the fraternity parties (I did not drink) at the time

other people were leaving the pre-games. Once at the party I walked around greeting everyone I knew, making observations of how intoxicated everyone was. I went to the bar to obtain a drink to hold. The room with the bar was is where students socialized, played drinking games, and drank large quantities. After approximately thirty minutes of observing in that area, I moved to the area where the dance floor is located. Once in that area I continued making observations of what I saw for approximately thirty minutes, including how students were behaving and dancing while they were drunk. Then I went to the designated space outside the party where there is no music and students go to socialize and smoke cigarettes. I spent thirty minutes in this area observing while I socialized with the students. Once I was done observing outside it was approximately 1:30 a.m. and the parties end at 2:00 a.m. With thirty minutes remaining I went back inside and moved between the room where the bar and drinking games were held and the room where the dance floor was located. While I continued making observations, I took into account how much more intoxicated almost everyone was compared to earlier in the evening. At 2:00 a.m. I went outside to observe the students getting in their cars and leaving the fraternity houses. At this time my observations ended.

After I completed my observations and note taking in the above settings, to gain additional validity, I conducted member checks. Because I was unable to conduct direct member checks, I selected students with similar backgrounds and familiarity with the various settings. I presented my observations to five different college-aged groups. After I presented my observations to these groups of college students, I asked the students if my observations were accurate; all of the students answered yes.

Research Integrity

To conduct accurate research on underage drinking in various settings such as tailgating, party buses, and bars, I acted as a participant-observer and avoided drawing attention to my outsider role. Anyone in attendance at the settings could have obtained this information because of the public nature of the settings. I conducted this research by going to each of these settings multiple times to ensure validity in the research and to be sure that participants were behaving as they normally would in this context. Pre-gaming research was conducted in the same manner. I was invited to the pre-games and was a participant-observer. There is no direct mention of any person, maintaining their confidentiality.

VII. RESULTS FROM OBSERVATIONS – DRINKING OCCASIONS

The following sub-sections offer results for the six drinking settings, pre-gaming, party-buses, the Local Entertainment District, the Regional Entertainment District, tailgating, and fraternity parties.

Pre-gaming

Environment. Most pre-games occur in apartment complexes or small houses. Ten to thirty people will normally attend a pre-game. Both men and women in attendance usually bring their own alcohol; however, men often purchase the alcohol for the women. Sometimes the host of the pre-game will provide alcohol, but this is not the norm. Men usually drink beer or whiskey while pre-gaming and women usually make mixed drinks made with liquor and juice. During a pre-game people will socialize and drink while either sitting or standing in groups with other pre-gamers. Many people play drinking games. The most popular drinking games are beer pong or flip cup. Drinking games

create fun social interactions and encourage getting drunk. Many people also drink shot glasses of liquor to achieve drunkenness more quickly. Group shot taking and drinking games help bring the group together and elevate the pre-gamers to a partying mood.

Observations of Pre-gaming. Issues occur in the pre-game setting that stem from the fact that the participants drink with the goal of becoming highly intoxicated. The purpose of a pre-game in the college setting is reaching high levels of intoxication quickly. By becoming intoxicated at the pre-game, underage drinkers insure that they become intoxicated even if they are not served alcohol later in the evening at other drinking occasions. Becoming highly intoxicated in the pre-game setting leads to problems into the following drinking context such as becoming sick, blacking outs, and becoming a victim. One problem with the pre-game setting is there is no portion control of the alcohol. This means that young adults can make themselves large drinks with large quantities of alcohol. Consuming these drink with large amounts of alcohol leads to quick intoxication. In addition, pre-games are generally held in apartments where there is limited space causing pre-games to be often over crowded. Most of the time pre-games have an open-door policy. This means that attendees are welcome to bring other friends to drink and socialize. This can cause a problem because the residents do not know everyone in their home. Because the apartments are over-crowded, it harder for residents to keep track of all activity going on at the parties, making it easy for people to get away with theft at pre-games. Another activity that occurs at pre-games is drug use. In many cases, the pre-game hosts do not even know that people are doing drugs in their home. Pre-gamers who do drugs usually do it where they cannot be seen by going into a bathroom or bedroom. At some pre-games, however, drugs are welcome including

marijuana and sometimes hard drugs such as cocaine and ecstasy. When these participants leave the pre-game, they can be both highly intoxicated as well as high on various drugs.

How pre-gaming is different from other drinking contexts. In most drinking settings, there is usually a standard portion size where one drink equals one shot of alcohol. At a pre-game, however, young adults make their drinks themselves and often make their drinks much stronger and larger than the standard portion. At a bar, the bar tenders make the drinks and are trained to make the drinks with the right portions of alcohol. Young adults at a pre-game are not trained in to make drinks, resulting in many underage drinkers preparing oversized drinks. Other underage drinkers prepare drinks with large amounts of alcohol to become intoxicated quickly. Another reason for the large drink is the cups in a home are generally much larger than are the glasses bar staff use to make mixed drinks. Young adults also generally drink faster in a pre-game setting than in other settings because they begin the pre-game completely sober but with the idea of getting drunk as fast as possible. Also, with the exception of the pre-game hosts there is no guardianship at a pre-game and the guardianship present at a pre-game is to protect the apartments' furnishings not monitor alcohol consumption. Unlike a bar or club where responsible bar tenders will not serve intoxicated drinkers, young adults in a pre-game setting have no one to monitor their alcohol intake or set rules prohibiting excess consumption.

Party Buses

Environment. Party buses are normally old school buses that have been painted and refurbished to support a party setting. Many young adults use party buses as a pre-

game for bars and clubs and other parties; however, many young adults, especially underage drinkers, pre-game the party buses at apartments and houses. Seating on a party bus is normally one large couch that runs along the outside walls of the bus. This seating arrangement leaves room in the middle of the bus for dancing. There are poles throughout the bus that women often hold on to while dancing. Multi-colored flashing party lights are installed on the bus with a sound system. In the back of the bus is an auxiliary cord so young adults can plug in their phones and play their own music. The bus is almost always at full capacity and overcrowded with people dancing and socializing while drinking. Party bus riders often sit on the tops of the couches instead of on the seats. The bus driver is exposed to the party bus riders because there is no barrier between the bus driver and the people riding in the back of the bus. Males often wear wrangler jeans, boots, and a button-down shirt. Females wear revealing clothing such as a short dress or jeans with a top.

Party buses are a popular means for students to travel between their residences near Local City, Texas and Regional Entertainment District in Regional City, Texas. Party buses pick students up at large apartment complexes in Local City at 10 p.m. every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday night when school is in session at the University. These buses pick up the students and drive them directly to Regional Entertainment District. At 2:00 a.m., students are picked up from Regional Entertainment District and returned to the apartment complexes. Party buses have operated for several years and have expanded the number of apartment complexes where they pick up and deliver. Throughout the years, the number of companies operating party buses has increased as well as the number of nights of operation.

Observations of party buses. Party buses are extremely popular with university students for several reasons, but primarily because students are allowed to bring their own alcohol onto the busses. Students also are able to travel back and forth between the apartment complexes and Regional City without having to worry about drinking and driving. Other than a policy of no glass on the party buses, there are few restrictions. Students are allowed to bring unlimited amounts of alcohol onto the party buses. Party buses are particularly popular with underage students as they are permitted to drink without challenge or check of IDs. Once the students arrive at Regional Entertainment District they are able to continue drinking using fake IDs or other methods discussed below.

Students typically drink large amounts of alcohol before boarding the party buses, while on the trip to Regional City, and on Regional Entertainment District. Most students pre-game the party buses in their apartments or fraternity houses before boarding the party buses. Unless, they live near one of the party bus pick up points, most students also drink in cars on the way to meet the buses. After boarding the buses, students continue to drink from beer cans, water bottles, or plastic cups. When students are riding on the buses, they pass the plastic bottles and cups to their friends on the bus. After they arrive at Regional Entertainment District most students continue to drink in the bars and clubs; however, some are so drunk upon arrival that they pass out on the street. A major issue is the number of students that do not return to the buses for the trip home because they are too drunk to find the bus or because they are passed out somewhere on Regional Entertainment District and are unable to physically return to the bus. Bus drivers make no effort to count or identify bus riders so that students who ride to Regional City also

return. Students who do make the return trip on the party bus are returned to the original apartment complex. In the best case, students are able to walk to their homes; however, many students drive cars to the party bus and, therefore, drive home under much higher levels of alcohol influence than when they arrived.

The buses are usually so crowded that there is no way for the bus driver to see anything that is going on in the back half of the bus. The music on the bus is extremely loud making it difficult for the bus driver to hear any sounds from either inside or outside the bus. Because of the loud music, students cannot hear or ignore instructions from the bus driver and are usually very disrespectful. There are usually several flashing lights inside the bus. These lights reflect off the glass and mirrors and make it difficult for the bus driver to see the road. There are no seatbelts on the buses. Both the seated passengers and the standing passengers often fall whenever the bus driver brakes. Because there is no barrier between the bus driver and the students, someone falling while the bus brakes or as the result of a fight, could easily fall on the bus driver. If this were to happen, an accident could occur that would harm or kill many of the passengers on the bus. In addition, because the bus is so crowded, students also sit on the stairs by the bus door putting them in extreme danger if the door of the bus were to open.

Because of the crowded conditions on party buses, fights are common. Passengers bump into one another leading to grievances and altercations. Fights can also occur when students trash-talk to one another and the trash-talking escalates or when students trash talk one another before entering the buses at both pick up sites. Passengers routinely throw beer cans and other trash out the windows, sometimes at other vehicles on the streets and highways. Drunk students often vandalize the buses and destroy the interiors.

Drunk students often perform back flips by using the polls and rails of the bus to flip themselves over. These back flips often result in passengers falling down or being kicked. Both male and female passengers are involved in incivilities such as intentionally urinating on the bus. Women passengers sometimes urinate between seats and men urinate out the windows or in the bus trash can. There are no restrooms on the party buses so men who drink too much before leaving or on the bus will often use the trash cans on the bus as restrooms. When using these trashcans, men expose themselves to other passengers on the bus. Men who are standing will often try to dance with women who are standing. These women have difficulty evading the men because of the extreme crowding on the buses. Men are more likely to try to dance with drunk women because they are less likely to be able to evade the men. Many sexual behaviors occur onboard the buses. These behaviors are initiated by both men and women and include kissing, groping, hand-genital stimulation, and oral sex. Occasionally passengers will engage in sex; however, this is not common, possibly because of the crowded conditions. Some of the sexual behaviors are consensual but others can involve ambiguous circumstances or can clearly be defined as sexual assault or rape. Hard drugs, such as cocaine and ecstasy, are also brought onto party buses and are ingested by some students. The priority of the bus companies is to protect their businesses, not to report crimes or misbehaviors. Only on limited occasions will drivers stop the buses and call the police.

How party buses are different from other drinking contexts. Party buses are unique because students pre-game the party bus drinking context but also use party buses to pre-game other drinking occasions, such as bars, clubs, and parties. They are also unique because of the added dangers associated with the mobile drinking experience.

Because students pre-game party buses, they are often highly intoxicated when they arrive at the party bus pick-up locations. In many cases, the students have already been exposed to danger before boarding the buses because they have ridden to the pick-up location in a vehicle driven by an intoxicated driver. Once on the party buses students are exposed to the additional dangers described above such as assault and the potential for a serious accident if the driver loses control of the bus.

General opinion appears to be that party buses are safe for students because it is believed that the students are safer riding party buses than driving to the bars and clubs in the entertainment district approximately thirty miles away. Discussions with riders suggest, however, that students would not substitute driving in their personal vehicles for riding in the party buses. Instead, most have indicated that they would have partied in local bars and clubs or at house or fraternity parties.

The Local Entertainment District

Environment. The entertainment district consists of bars, restaurants, and stores in this area form a Local Entertainment District around the old courthouse. There are thirteen bars mixed in with stores and restaurants in the center of downtown. People move from bar to bar throughout the night. All of the bars on the Local Entertainment District are different in terms of size, design, and bar room management. People usually start the night in the smaller bars where the music is not as loud and there are places to sit and socialize. The smaller bars are normally extremely crowded on certain nights, especially early in the evening. Each of the smaller bars have a bar in the center of the room with stools placed around it. There is space for people to come up to the bar and order drinks around people sitting on the stools. Other seating is away from the bar and is

usually highchairs around a small table with space for four people. Most bars also have small lounge areas for people to sit and drink. The larger bars have dance floors that the smaller bars lack. Drinks are served by bartenders at bars located on the sides of the dance floor. The larger bars generally have loud music for dancing which makes communication difficult. The larger bars with dance floors also have multi-colored lights that illuminate the dance floor. The busiest nights on the Local Entertainment District are Thursday (because of discounted drinks), Tuesday (one dollar Dos and dollar tequila shot nights), Friday, and Saturday. Most bars are very crowded by the middle of the night around 12:30 a.m. and 1:00 a.m. Men tend to wear button down shirts and jeans but there are people that dress very casually as well. With women, the dress is a mixture of provocative and casual

Observations of Local Entertainment District. Most young adults arrive at the Local Entertainment District between 11:00 p.m. and 11:30 p.m. to begin socializing and drinking in this environment. The majority of patrons at the Local Entertainment District appear to be college students between the ages of 21 and 25. Patrons tend to start the night off in the smaller bars that do not have dance floors and where the music is not loud, so they can communicate more easily with their friends. In the small bars I noticed multiple groups of friends around different areas of the bar room drinking and socializing. I also observed several tables of friends ordering group shots of alcohol. This drinking of group shots encouraged both bonding and intoxication. Early in the night it is easy to identify the people in the individual groups; however, as the night goes on and the bar gets more crowded it becomes more difficult because the space between groups disappears. On busy nights, the small bars often become as crowded as the larger bars. As

the bars became increasingly crowded and the patrons became more intoxicated, I noticed people bumping into each other frequently due to lack of space. When patrons bumped into one another, I noticed that this often led to altercations between various individuals and groups.

Early in the evening I noticed that a lot of patrons were already drunk. They were drunk when they arrived at the Local Entertainment District because they had pre-gamed and had previously consumed large amounts of alcohol. Pre-gaming is common among college students and young adults in general, and from my observations is prevalent among the young adults that frequent the Local Entertainment District. The people that I interacted with indicated that they pre-game the Local Entertainment District in the same manner that they pre-game other settings by meeting at an apartment and drinking heavily with the intention of getting drunk.

The attempted use of fake ID's in order to get into bars and night clubs while underage has become extremely common. From my observations, the Local Entertainment District does an excellent job examining ID's to determine if they are fake. In general, the process of identifying whether IDs are authentic or fake is performed as follows. Bouncers first look at the way the ID card bends and check to see if the ID is holographic. Next, they do is look at the picture to see if the person with the ID is identical to the person in the picture, whether the ID has expired, whether the gender of the person is accurate, and whether the birthdate appears accurate. The last check a bouncer typically performs is shining a black light to see if the ID glows. If the ID is an out of state ID bouncers will usually be more skeptical of whether the ID is real and will examine it closely. The Local Entertainment District tends to have a rigorous process for

checking IDs which makes entering a bar in the Local Entertainment District difficult for an underage drinker. With an extremely sophisticated and expensive fake ID an underage drinker can enter bars on the Local Entertainment District; however, it has become increasingly difficult as the Local Entertainment District seems to focus their efforts on eliminating underage drinking.

High levels of intoxication often lead to aggression and violence in the crowded bars of the Local Entertainment District. One of the biggest dangers facing patrons of the bars at the Local Entertainment District is bartenders over serving individuals who are already drunk. Over serving causes people to become severely inebriated and results in unwise decisions such as drinking and driving. A big danger of over serving is “blacking out.” Blacking out occurs when individuals become so drunk that they are unable to remember events that occurred when they were drunk. This can be extremely dangerous because it is easy to take advantage of individuals who have blacked out. For example, women who black out can be sexually assaulted or raped either at the bars or when they are returning. In addition, individuals who blackout will commonly make decisions to drive while intoxicated resulting in a car accidents, injuries, or death.

Regional City Entertainment District

The Regional entertainment district 30 miles away has bars and night clubs along both sides of the street. Bars on vary in terms of size, design, and bar management. Some bars are very unique in terms of design. The Street is extremely crowded and becomes that way early in the night by 11:00 p.m. The population is mainly college students, some bachelorette parties, and locals who bar hop and walk on the street. There are also homeless people, mentally ill, and drunks that wander along the street of the

entertainment district. The environment is very noisy and chaotic but fun and exciting. The male college students mostly wear button downs, jeans, cowboy boots, and sometimes a blazer jacket. The local men wear more variety of clothing. Women dress in a provocative way but not all women do this. There are quite a few very large bars that are two stories with sometimes multiple bars inside on both floors. There are two parts of Regional Entertainment District. Dirty Sixth which is closer to East Side of Regional City which is known to be more ghetto and dangerous. Dirty Sixth also has more locals and less college students but also has more dance clubs. Then there is the other side of Regional Entertainment District which is where more college students go and where it is not supposed to be as dangerous. There is a medium sized bar which is popular because of the bar layout and mechanical bull that can be ridden for free. The louder bars are the larger bars, which tend to be more crowded. The large bars with dance floors have bars on the sides of the room by the multi-colored light up dance floor. By 12:30 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. the street outside the bar is filled with long lines of people waiting to get inside bars and people walking around. Police officers patrol Regional Entertainment District on horses and on foot, but there is not a sufficient amount of police officers to patrol the large crowds. The small number of police that patrol the entertainment district is not enough to prevent offenders from finding victims.

How the local entertainment is different from other drinking contexts. While there are issues with heavy drinking and intoxication at The Local Entertainment District, this drinking context has higher levels of guardianship than Regional Entertainment District. The bars and clubs at The Local Entertainment District put forth effort to prevent underage drinking. Underage drinkers find it much more difficult to enter the

establishments in The Local Entertainment District. The increased guardianship occurs primarily with the bouncers that control entrance to the establishments. They appear to be well trained in identifying fake IDs and the usage of fake IDs by underage drinkers. They scrutinize IDs and deny access to the establishments. They also confiscate the IDs that are fake or clearly do not belong to the underage drinker trying to use them. Bouncers at The Local Entertainment District also do not routinely let women into the bars and clubs. Instead, they require IDs from women to the same extent that they do from men.

Environment. The entertainment district is in downtown Regional City, Texas. Regional Entertainment District has bars and night clubs along both sides of the street. Bars on Regional Entertainment District vary in terms of size, design, and bar management. Some bars are unique in terms of design. Regional Entertainment District is extremely crowded by 11:00 p.m. The Regional Entertainment District patrons consist of college students, some bachelorette/bachelor parties, and locals who bar hop and walk on the street. Numerous homeless and mentally ill people also wander through the crowded entertainment district. The environment is noisy and chaotic but fun and exciting. There are several large bars that have two stories with multiple bars on both floors. The east and west areas of Regional Entertainment District have different characteristics. The area of Regional Entertainment District on the east side is believed to be more dangerous than the west side and is referred to as Dirty Sixth. The patrons of Dirty Sixth tend to be the local Regional City residents rather than the college students. Dirty Sixth has more dance clubs than the west side. The west side of Regional Entertainment District is frequented by college students and out of town partiers. This area of Regional Entertainment District is believed to be less dangerous. One of the medium sized bars on the west side is popular

because it has a mechanical bull that patrons can ride for free. The large bars on the west side are loud and crowded. These bars have dance floors lighted by multi-colored lights and bars on all sides of the room by the dance floor. Between 12:30 a.m. and 1:00 a.m. the street outside the bar is filled with long lines of people waiting to get inside bars and people walking around. Police officers patrol Regional Entertainment District on horses and on foot but there are insufficient numbers of police officers to patrol the large crowds. The busiest nights on Regional Entertainment District are Thursdays, Fridays, and Saturdays. On Friday and Saturday nights, college students and other young adults frequent Regional Entertainment District primarily because of the weekend. Thursday nights are popular with college students because many have no class on Friday, and the bars and clubs offer drink specials and promotions. The male college students mostly wear button downs, jeans, cowboy boots, and sometimes a blazer jacket. The local men wear more variety of clothing. The women generally dress provocatively.

Observations of Regional Entertainment District. College students and other young adults from the Regional City area are the major patrons of the Regional Entertainment District bars and clubs. In addition, college students from Local City, Texas frequently drive or ride party buses to Regional Entertainment District. I observed that individuals who desire to dance and drink heavily are most likely to frequent the bars and clubs of east Regional Entertainment District. Individuals who want an environment for relaxing and listening to music will be more likely to frequent the bars and clubs of west Regional Entertainment District.

Fake ID's usage on Regional Entertainment District. The majority of bars and clubs on Regional Entertainment District are for individuals who are 21 or over; however,

I observed that underage drinkers are easily able to enter the establishments on Regional Entertainment District. The use of fake IDs is extremely common on Regional Entertainment District. The bouncers on Regional Entertainment District are lenient when checking IDs. In many cases the bouncers simply hold the IDs and return them to the patrons without looking. The bouncers rarely examine the IDs to determine if they are fake or if they belong to the individuals using the IDs. Underage women have little difficulty entering the Regional Entertainment District establishments because the bar owners and managers want attractive young women in their bars and clubs in order to entice young men to follow. While the bouncers on Regional Entertainment District allow both underage men and women to enter illegally, underage women rarely are turned away. Underage drinkers can also easily enter the Regional Entertainment District establishments if they or their friends know the bouncers. It is common for large groups of underage drinkers to make advance arrangements with bouncers to enter the establishments illegally.

Over serving is a significant issue on Regional Entertainment District. I observed individuals being served additional drinks when they were severely intoxicated. In addition, less intoxicated friends will continue to purchase alcohol for their intoxicated friends. Being over served can be dangerous on Regional Entertainment District, particularly the east side. Individuals also use ecstasy and cocaine in the Regional Entertainment District establishments. Many of the bars and clubs have photo booths near the dance floor. Individuals desiring to use drugs in these establishments will bring the drugs into the photo booths and use them in the privacy of the booths. People carry guns on Regional Entertainment District so that they can rob drunken individuals of their

money and phones. Several of the robbers on Regional Entertainment District deceive the drunken young adults because they are dressed the same as the college students themselves. They offer to help the drunken young adults find their friends, their cars or bus and then point a gun at the individuals and demand wallets and cell phones. Sexual assaults and violence occur frequently on Regional Entertainment District. Party bus riders are especially vulnerable to assaults, thefts, and other violence as they often are too drunk upon arrival to walk around Regional Entertainment District and may pass out on a side street, sidewalk, or bench. Others are too drunk to find their way back to the bus at 2:00 a.m. and have no way to return home until they are able to contact someone to pick them up and take them home. Students who miss the bus increase their risk of being robbed, arrested for public intoxication, or becoming victim of sexual assault. Fights are common on Regional Entertainment District because it is crowded throughout the night. After the bars close individuals must also be careful of drunk drivers as many intoxicated drivers leave the area around 2:00 a.m.

How Regional Entertainment District is different from other drinking

contexts. Unlike the other drinking contexts, Regional Entertainment District is located in a major city. Unlike, the Local Entertainment District, Regional Entertainment District is frequented by many individuals who are not college students. In addition to patrons of the drinking establishments, Regional Entertainment District is frequented by many dangerous homeless individuals as well as individuals who frequent Regional Entertainment District to prey on intoxicated students. Intoxicated students are often robbed on Regional Entertainment District and those who pass out from intoxication are often victims of sexual assault.

Tailgating

Tailgate environment. At the university there are two parking lots that are designated for tailgating before football games. Both lots are adjacent to the football stadium. The smaller of the two lots is set up for tailgating by alumni and non-students such as faculty and members of the community. The larger lot is set up for student tailgating and is the focus of this discussion. Although the student tailgating lot is available to all students for tailgating, the large tailgates are run primarily by members of the university Greek (fraternity and sorority) community. For special occasions such as homecoming and alumni weekend, sororities may set up their own tailgates. Sororities also may co-host a tailgate with a fraternity. In general, however, the large tailgates are hosted by university fraternities.

Organizations' tailgates are set up either next to the tailgate of another organization or are separated by a 20 to 25-foot walkway that is used for movement throughout the entire tailgating parking lot. Most organizations have tents covering their tailgating space and all large tailgates have distinctive barriers surrounding the perimeter. Perimeter barriers are made up of several different materials including construction netting, tables, couches, chairs, and picnic tables. Fraternities begin setting up their tailgates several hours before the football game begins. Each tailgate is its own party. Fraternities serve large amounts of alcohol and cook food on their grills. Loud music is played in the tailgate areas and many fraternities hire live bands.

Fraternity members generally expect their pledges to set up the tailgating areas and to transport the beer to the parking lot. Large fraternities may consume as many as 50 cases of beer at a tailgate so the set up can be a time-consuming experience. Most

fraternity pledges are minors, so the set-up process can be risky for both the pledges and the fraternities. If the minor pledges are caught by the police when bringing the beer to the tailgate area, police instruct the fraternity members to open all of the alcohol containers and dispose of it. Further disciplinary action is also possible if the pledges are caught. Fraternities and other tailgating organizations tend to ignore legal drinking age requirements at their tailgates. Each organization creates its own policies for controlling access to alcohol by minors at their tailgates. A small space inside the designated tailgating space is set up as a bar. Pledges work the bar and hand out beer to older members of the fraternity and women. IDs are not checked prior to handing out beer. Wristbands are no longer being issued at tailgates because fraternities in the past routinely provided them to underage drinkers. In the past, members issuing the wristbands, the fraternities and those individuals serving the alcohol, were guilty if minors were served. The only tailgates that use wristbands are commercial establishments, such as the Bud Light Tent. In the Bud Light Tent, IDs are checked and wristbands are provided to those 21 or older.

Fraternity members and pledges are always welcome at their fraternity's tailgate, as are alumni. Except for alumni weekend, the only alumni that are likely to attend tailgates are those that have graduated within the past three years. Fraternity members who have dropped out of college are allowed to attend and consume the free beer, although very few actually do attend the tailgates. Men who drop out of the fraternity, however, are not allowed to attend the tailgates under any circumstances. Non-fraternity men are not tolerated at tailgates unless they have been invited. Invitations for friends happen occasionally, but this is not a common practice. It is even more unlikely for

fraternity men to receive invitations to another fraternity's tailgate. When this does occur, the men are allowed to drink the free beer, but it is generally an uncomfortable and contentious situation for the men involved. Women are always welcome at tailgates. Women are not required to be a member of a sorority in order to be invited into the tailgate and receive free alcohol if they are interested in drinking beer. Women are allowed to walk in and out of tailgates as they please and often will attend the tailgates of several different fraternities. Because all women are allowed to attend and drink free beer, there are usually more women than men in attendance at tailgates.

Both men and women at the tailgates have a standard style of dress. Fraternity men wear their fraternity t-shirts or a maroon university t-shirt or polo shirt. Pledges usually wear their fraternity pledge shirts. Men wear Wranglers with western boots or golf shorts with top siders. Women attending tailgates usually wear brown western boots. The boots are often worn with maroon t-shirt dresses or sundresses. When women chose not to wear dresses, they usually wear a university t-shirt with denim shorts. The fraternity men usually have similar haircuts. Most women have long hair that is worn in a ponytail at the hot weather tailgates.

Observations in tailgating setting. There are four main issues at tailgates: underage drinking, drunk and disorderly conduct, theft, and assault. Large crowds and drunk and disorderly conduct are serious issues at tailgates. Violence/fights often occur as the participants become intoxicated. Fights are most likely to occur between males. A fight may occur for several reasons. One of the primary reasons for fights occurs when an uninvited male enters a tailgate that he was not invited to, drinks the group's beer, and talks/flirts with the women attending that group's tailgate. Groups like fraternities do not

want men they do not know drinking their beer for free. They also do not want men they do not know in their tailgate to flirt with the women that are attending. Fights may occur when men outside the fraternity are drunk and harass the women who are tailgating with fraternity members. Fights may also occur over something as simple as a bump. When there are large crowds of intoxicated students, bumps occur frequently and may result in violence or verbal abuse. Some fights occur because some people become angry/aggressive when they drink. Fights were observed occurring between friends and fraternity brothers because of anger and aggression.

What makes tailgates different from other settings? One characteristic that makes tailgates different from most drinking settings is they are held during the day and outside. Because they are held outside in hot temperatures, the sun dehydrates people and they become drunk rapidly. Another characteristic that makes tailgates unique is all the alcohol is purchased beforehand in large amounts to prevent running out. Tailgates also put all students and organization in one area. Organizations and students reserve spaces on the parking lot for their organization or group and make barriers to keep them separate; however, fights often break out because the tailgaters fail to respect the boundaries when they become intoxicated.

Evasion techniques. While the goal of underage drinkers is to evade detection in all public drinking environments, evasion is especially important in the tailgating environment. When tailgating, underage drinkers are outside in the daylight in full view of campus police who are patrolling the area.

Male evasion techniques. One of the most common means for underage drinkers to evade detection is warnings from their fraternity brothers who are of legal drinking age.

Older members want the pledges and younger members to be able to drink at tailgates just as they themselves did when they were younger. This method is most successful early in the tailgating day when the older members have just begun drinking and are sober. Older members keep watch and warn their younger members when police are near by telling them to quickly put their beers down or to hand their beers to older members. Some males wear camelBaks to the tailgates. A camelBak looks like a very small backpack with a long tube that is used as a straw and connects to a reservoir inside of the camelBak. CamelBaks are normally filled with water when individuals are hiking or biking, so people can remain hydrated. Instead of filling a camelBak with water, students fill the reservoir with alcohol and wear it to tailgates, allowing them to drink inconspicuously. Male students often participate at their tent in a group “shot gun” chugging beer race. Minors prefer this method of drinking because they can finish their beer in under ten seconds. This rapid drinking makes it harder for police to catch the minors and allows them to get drunk more quickly. When a group shotgun occurs, students gather with their beers in a small circle inside their organization’s tailgate space. The students then pass a set of keys around, and poke a small hole on the side towards the bottom their beers. Once the hole is made, students hold their beers sideways with the hole facing the sky so the beer does not spill out. Then one student will do a verbal count down from 3 and say go. At this time the students pop the tab at the top of the beer and drink from the hole they made, racing to see who can finish their beer first. A group shot gun will happen multiple times throughout the day during a tailgate. Males will also fill up a flask with liquor and hide the flask in their boots or pockets. This makes evasion easy because all that is required is for students to go into a crowded area or simply check

to make sure no one is looking, pull the flask out and take a quick drink, then slide the flask back into their boot or pocket. Students also pour liquor from a flask into a half empty soda can to make a mixed drink which appears as nothing more than a soda to campus police.

Female evasion techniques. Because women often do not like beer, they are able to avoid detection by police at tailgates by mixing liquor with soft drinks. A popular means of disguising alcohol from police is purchasing soft drinks in Styrofoam cups from fast food restaurants such as Sonic. Women also avoid detection by making mixed drinks at home and then bringing the drinks into the tailgate inside tumbler cups (reusable plastic cups with a lid and a straw). These cups are popular among women because they find them fashionable, and they come in many different designs. Other cups, such as mason jars, are used as well. Another tactic women use to avoid detection is pouring a clear liquor such as vodka or gin into a water bottle to appear as water to police. Older women who are of legal drinking age buy their younger friends alcohol before the tailgate. The younger women will often give older woman money to purchase alcohol for them. Also, sorority women will give their little sisters alcohol as gifts. Another way women obtain alcohol is during a pre-game. Men will give women free alcohol and their female friends will also give them alcohol. They provide alcohol to underage women because, just like the men, the older women want their younger friends to be able to drink at the tailgates as they did.

General tactics. The denser the crowd, the easier evasion is; however, larger crowds will often encourage police to leave their carts and enter the tailgates. Because of this, it is difficult to say which situation is preferable for underage drinking. Most students that

are underage try to remain in the center of their tailgate space so they can use the crowd to conceal their drinking. Underage drinkers in the center of the tailgate have more time to see police approaching the tailgate and more time to discard their alcohol. Also, because many tailgaters dress in a similar manner, it is extremely difficult for university police to go into a crowd and identify which student they saw drinking. Pledge shirts are the exception to this statement about homogeneous dress. When minors see police exit their cars and enter the tailgate space that they are in, they quickly put down their alcohol, or quickly exit the tailgate area that police are entering. Some students hide liquor bottles in their cars and take “pulls” (drink) straight from the bottle. This can happen multiple times throughout the tailgate either inside or near the vehicle to hide from police. Students also “pre-game” heavily and then drive intoxicated to the tailgate. Students also drink in their cars on the way to the tailgate and throw the empty cans out the window. Another strategy used is pouring out half of a can of Coca-Cola or any other soft drink and filling the can with liquor for a mixed drink. This makes it easy to evade police because the drink appears to be only soda. Brown liquor can also be disguised from police inside of ice tea bottles. Beer sleeves are becoming increasingly more popular among college students. Beer sleeves are made from soda cans in five easy steps. Step one: Remove the top and bottom of a can using a can opener. Step two: Trim the top metal ring off of the can with scissors. Step three: Find a spot on the can away from the logos and cut a line from the top to the bottom with scissors. Step four: Roll the sleeve up and rubber band it. Step five: Wrap it around the beer can.

Police response at tailgates. University police primarily patrol the student tailgate lot. Each tailgating day there are four teams of two police officers for patrol, one team of

two for transport, and one individual for the Bud Light Tent. University police have confirmed that they focus their attention on the large student tailgates with sorority and fraternity members and their guests because fraternity and sorority tailgates are extremely large while other student tailgates tend to be small. Police begin patrol with one team at 7:00 a.m. This first team patrols for at least 15 hours. The second team arrives at 9:00 a.m., the third at 10:00 a.m., the fourth at 1:00 p.m., and transport at 2:00 p.m. Minor in possession and public intoxication are the primary violations that university police encounter. The number of violations vary dramatically by the particular game because of the number of tailgaters. More people tailgate at games with well-known opponents or homecoming. University police say they identify underage drinkers primarily by the way they behave, how young they look, and by their attire. Pledge shirts are the most important way that university police identify underage drinkers. The university police recognize fraternity pledge shirts and know that pledges are usually underage members of fraternities. The police patrol around the perimeter of the parking lot but will enter tailgates when they suspect specific cases of underage drinking. Police will also undertake random ID checks.

Fraternity Parties

Environment. A fraternity party is a large social gathering hosted by a fraternity. Fraternity parties are usually held at the fraternity house. Some fraternities rent venues for their parties if they do not have a big enough house. Fraternity parties have music, dancing, drinking games, and are thought to be extremely fun. Similar to other drinking settings, there is always a pre-game to achieve drunkenness before going to the party. Because of the pre-games, students tend to be heavily intoxicated when they drive from

the pre-games to the fraternity houses. The fraternities host planned parties that usually have a theme, for example, workout bros & yoga hoes, Halloween, tacky sweater Christmas, or toga themed. Themed parties tend to have much larger attendance because they are usually held during rush (recruitment), the first few weeks of the fall and spring semesters. Men who are not members of the fraternity are not allowed to be in attendance, but all women are welcome, making fraternity parties a semipublic setting. Fraternity men do not want men who are not part of their fraternity flirting with the women at the party. Women generally enjoy themed parties because they dress up in a costume and look cute.

The main purpose of themed parties to invite rushees (potential new members) so that members can get to know them and make the rushees want to become members of the fraternity. There are also casual house parties where men and women wear every day clothes. These parties are usually not planned in advance. Because they are impromptu, attendance tends to be lower and less alcohol is purchased. Fraternities normally purchase cheap beer such as Bud Lite or Keystone. Women often do not like beer, so fraternities also make punch of soda and juice mixed with a strong liquor such as ever clear or vodka. The punch usually has a very high alcohol content. Everyone at the party can go back for as many drinks as they desire, including taking multiple drinks at one time. No IDs are checked are checked at fraternity parties and many of the people there are drinking illegally. During rush, active members and JI's (just initiated members) take shifts being behind the bar serving beer and punch. After rush is over, themed and casual parties are run by the pledges, who work behind the bar and at the front gate to make sure only women and people that were invited gain entrance into the party. Fraternities

sometimes hire security guards, give out wristbands, or put X's on individuals' hands who are underage to make it look as if they are checking IDs. This strategy is to deceive police as the fraternities serve alcohol to everyone in attendance. Fraternity parties usually begin around 11:00 p.m. after a pre-game and end at 2:00 a.m.

The environment can be described as a large, noisy, exciting party where everyone is extremely intoxicated. Students dress in costumes to go with the theme of the party as described earlier. Women dress very provocatively in their costumes to make themselves more desirable to fraternity men who are also dressed in costumes. These parties become extremely crowded due to the number of participants. Almost everyone in the fraternity attends, and all women at the university are invited as stated earlier. Inside the party there is either a separate room or a designated space for students to play drinking games (beer pong and flip cup) and socialize. There is also a room or space used for dancing. Either a DJ is booked to work the party or one of the fraternity members DJ's. The music is loud and can be heard throughout the entire party. It is very dark inside these parties with the only lighting being multi-colored flashing lights. Inside the party the fraternity pledges set up large bars and are required to serve beer and punch to fraternity members and women. Pledges are required to wear a certain costume to distinguish themselves as pledges. Fraternity parties also have a designated space outside the party where students like to smoke cigarettes and talk.

Observations of fraternity parties. As described earlier, students pre-game this setting and are already drunk before they even arrive at the party. In most cases the students drove drunk to get to the party. Once there, students have the freedom to drink as much as they want and do so at a fast rate. Males will often carry around two beers at

once. This is called double fisting and is done so as soon as one beer is finished, another is ready. This setting encourages some of the highest levels of intoxication where people end up “blacking out” and will not remember much about what happened the next day. Women who black out are often taken advantage of by men because they see the women as easy to have sex with. This also happens occasionally in reverse where the female takes advantage of the male. Men often prey on drunk women who are dancing and attempt to dance with them. The dancing at these parties is extremely sexual, as women Twerk (dancing where girls shake their butt) and grind on males’ private areas. This sexual dancing often leads to kissing and groping. Girls often become so intoxicated that they end up dancing and having unexpected sex. Women also may be raped and often do not realize the sex was rape. Fraternity males take girls to their rooms in the fraternity house and have sex with them. Fraternity members who not live in the house take the women back to their homes or the women’s homes and usually drunk while driving. The prime time for victimization is when the party is nearing its end. This is because it is the last chance before the night is over for fraternity men to prey on women who appear the most intoxicated. Students often have sex in strange places such as the truck beds, cars, and outside in sheds or coops. Routine activities theory (a likely offender finds a target with the absence of a capable guardian meeting in time and space) can explain the majority of issues with fraternity parties. The lack of guardianship at these parties makes it easy for offenders to target victims. There are designated members who are supposed to watch the party and make sure it goes smoothly, but these designated members impose no restrictions on their fraternity brothers. In addition, the members who are supposed to remain sober, usually become as intoxicated as the members they are supposed to be

watching. Although fraternity parties are for members and women only, non-member males will often show up and try to join the party. These men are rejected at the entrance to the party which can lead to altercations. Non-member males also arrive with multiple girls as a bribe to get into the party, but this strategy is unsuccessful most of the time. Members tell the man, “The girls can stay, but you have to leave.” Fraternity members often have their pledges drive people home who are too drunk to drive, but the pledges are often drunk themselves, so this serves little purpose. Many fraternity members use drugs such as cocaine and molly (Ecstasy) and invite girls to use the drugs with them. They do this at the pre-game in private and also in their cars or bedrooms at the fraternity house during the party. The cocaine is powder, so they snort it up their noses, and the molly is snorted or swallowed depending if it is in pill or powder form. The high levels of intoxication at these parties lead to black outs, vomiting, alcohol poisoning, and car accidents because many of people drive home from the party intoxicated and often do not even remember driving.

How are fraternity parties different from other settings? Unlike most settings the drinks at fraternity parties are unlimited and free. At a bar or club, if a student appears too drunk, the student is usually cut off or not allowed inside. At a fraternity party there is no one to cut students off or tell them they have had too much to drink. Getting wasted (the most drunk one can get) is encouraged at fraternity parties. At a public bar, students have to worry about getting arrested for being too drunk, but at a fraternity party there are no police or security around. All males at the party are members of the same fraternity so they know each other. This is unique from other settings where everyone is mostly strangers outside of the primary drinking group.

VIII. DISCUSSION

Much of the previous research on underage drinking was performed through the use of self-reporting questionnaires. One of the limitations of self-reporting questionnaires for binge drinkers is the possibility that participants' memories have been compromised by excess alcohol consumption and blackouts. My observations validated much of the prior research in traditional drinking environments and explored underage drinking in new settings, such as party buses. I had a unique opportunity to perform participant-observation research in various college drinking environments because of my age and membership in a large national fraternity. I was invited and accepted into the drinking environments because I was demographically similar to the other participants. An older observer or one without ties to the Greek community would have been unable to observe underage drinkers behaving naturally in the various drinking settings.

Having recently attended college and belonging to a fraternity gave me a unique perspective on the underage drinkers. For example, while Glindemann, Ehrhart, Drake, and Geller (2006) determined that incentives such as the opportunity to win \$100 in a drawing reduced alcohol consumption at a fraternity party, my experience with binge drinkers suggests following up that research with a question of what the winners of the drawing would do with the \$100. For example, while those who participated drank less at the fraternity party, the follow up questions should be how did the winners spend the \$100, and how likely were the winners to spend the money on additional alcohol?

Opportunities exist to reduce both underage drinking and binge drinking; however, in order for underage and binge drinking to be reduced, one must understand the real rather than the perceived college drinking environments and what types of

actions will reduce alcohol consumption. For example, many college students have limited budgets to spend on alcohol. Raising prices on alcohol should, therefore, reduce the amount of alcohol that college students are able to purchase. Limiting the hours that alcohol is sold should also be effective at reducing alcohol consumption. Once initial alcohol purchases were consumed, underage and binge drinkers would be unable to purchase additional quantities of alcohol in the late hours of the evening. Eliminating or reducing the number of drink specials in bars and clubs would reduce binge drinking. Many bars in both the Local Entertainment District and Regional Entertainment District offer drink specials to attract young adults into their establishments during the week. Drink specials in these environments typically offer deeply discounted drinks. In both settings, young adults tend to drink large quantities of the drink specials and become highly intoxicated. On Tuesdays in the Local Entertainment District, many bars sell tall Dos Equis and tequila shots for the discounted price of a dollar. Another example of drink specials are the \$2 wells offered on most week nights. Well liquor is the cheapest liquor on the shelf, but young adults happily consume large quantities of discounted wells because they are permitted to.

Fraternities and sororities are important in the study of underage and binge drinking as research has shown that individuals in the Greek system are more likely than non-Greek students to engage in heavy drinking. Another policy change to reduce binge drinking is to eliminate fraternities and sororities from college campuses. The Greek organizations host parties, tailgates, and organize trips to entertainment districts on party buses. If the fraternities and sororities are banned from college campuses, most of the

large drinking events will no longer be held and underage and binge drinking will be reduced significantly.

Fraternities have been in the national news for several drinking related incidents, recently. In the first case, both party buses and fraternities were involved in the incident. In 2016, the Sheriff's office was called to a location near a major state university in the southwestern United States, where the body of a 20-year-old female, freshman was found dead under the rear axle of a party bus. The student rode the party bus to a fraternity party that night, after which she was run over by the party bus. She was dragged 500 feet, and her body was found the next morning by a mechanic. The bus company has been involved in two crashes and has had five safety violations in the prior year. The company earns its living by providing underage binge drinkers a bus to party on and transportation to their next drinking location.

As the result of an incident in 2016, at a large, northeastern university, fourteen members of a disbanded fraternity will stand trial in the alcohol related hazing death of a pledge. On the night before his death, the pledge and his pledge brothers were forced to travel through a gauntlet of drinking stations at a party, where they quickly consumed large quantities of vodka and beer. Later that night the pledge fell down the basement stairs. After falling down the stairs, the pledge fell repeatedly while trying to stand and hit his head on multiple occasions. The next morning, he was found unconscious and cold to the touch; however, the fraternity members waited more than 40 minutes before calling 911. He was brought to the hospital by paramedics and died the following morning from a ruptured spleen and fractured skull.

In September of 2017, at a large southern university, a fraternity pledge died after a suspected alcohol related hazing incident. Ten fraternity members have been charged with hazing after pledges were forced to drink to excess when answering questions wrong during a pledge activity. Sometime after midnight, the pledge was laid on a couch. No one checked on the pledge until the next morning when he was discovered with a weak pulse. The pledge was pronounced dead later that day at the hospital.

Increased guardianship should also reduce both total consumption and underage drinking. For example, in the tailgating environment there are too few guardians to identify and prevent the majority of underage drinkers from consuming alcohol. In addition, when bars and clubs have increased guardianship, fewer underage drinkers are able to enter the establishments and intoxicated drinkers inside the establishments are less likely to be served.

IX. CONCLUSIONS

Youth ages 12 to 20 often binge drink, consuming more than 90 percent of the alcohol that they drink by binge drinking (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016). This group drinks 11 percent of all alcohol consumed in the United States, even though it is not legally permitted to consume any alcohol (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016). In order to reduce the numbers of underage and binge drinkers, the various drinking environments must be understood. One of the most important of these drinking environments is the pre-gaming environment. Underage and binge drinkers normally use pre-gaming before drinking in other settings or the environments, themselves are a form of pre-gaming. Before attending bars, clubs, and fraternity parties, young drinkers engage in pre-gaming. This pre-gaming can be at houses or apartments,

but it can also be in the form of tailgating or party buses. Students use tailgating to pre-game an athletic event or the tailgate, itself is the primary drinking event. Party buses are interesting because they can be used to pre-game another event, yet party buses are also pre-gamed at houses or apartments. Regardless of the setting, participants use pre-gaming to drink large quantities of alcohol with the goal of becoming highly intoxicated.

Each of the drinking environments can be studied with the routine activities theory. While the motivated offender and suitable target are important elements of routine activities theory, the lack of guardianship may be the most important factor in understanding the various drinking environments. All of the drinking environments share a lack of guardianship as an important element in both binge and underage drinking.

Routine Activities in Bars

Drinking settings can become crime generators (places where large numbers of people are attracted for reasons unrelated to criminal motivation that provide large numbers of opportunities for offenders and targets to come together in time and place to produce crime or disorder). An example of this would be a large crowded bar where there is little room to move around and bar staff over serve and continue to serve already drunk individuals. Crowded settings like this create opportunities for crime because when people drink heavily their good judgment level is lowered and the risk of crimes such as fights, sexual assaults, and thefts increases. An example of a sexual assault in a crowded setting such as this would be a drunk male (offender) walking behind a girl (target) and then groping her from behind as he walks by. Because of the crowds, the girl cannot tell who it was that groped her. Another example of how a crowded bar can become a crime generator would be one male accidentally bumps into another male because it is crowded,

and the other male punches the male who bumped him because he was highly intoxicated and aggressive. An example of how opportunity for theft can occur is a crowded poorly managed bar. A man at the front of the line at the bar may already be drunk, and, after he pays, he may forget his wallet on the bar. Another person in line can easily take the wallet instead of returning it to the owner. Bar design and how well the bar is managed can reduce these problems significantly. Smaller bars that are significantly less crowded and have places to sit and lower noise levels, have fewer problems because the opportunities for crime are much lower. In smaller bars, the staff has a much easier time detecting problems such as fights before they escalate. In smaller bars it is easier for bartenders to monitor how much they serve, and it is easier for bouncers to identify someone that is too drunk to be there. Large bars/clubs with dance floors also have their own issues that smaller bars without a dance floor do not have. An example would be a woman dancing, and a man trying to dance with her. Her boyfriend could then show up and want to fight. Another example would be a woman on the dance floor dancing while highly intoxicated. A man can take advantage of her sexually because she is too drunk to protest. Another negative aspect of crowded bars is the lengthy lines to purchase drinks. People can become impatient and aggressive or rude to bar staff if the wait to purchase drinks is too long, especially if the people in line are already intoxicated. Another example of a potential risk with long lines would be impatient people that attempt to cut in line, and then fights break out as a result. These are just a few examples of how bar settings and management relate to crime opportunities. To understand how people drink, we have to observe and study additional settings and see how crime opportunities vary.

Routine Activities Applied to Pre-gaming, Party Buses, Tailgating, and Fraternity Parties

This research extends the observations and studies to pre-gaming, party buses, tailgating, and fraternity parties. The atmosphere of these drinking settings with high amounts of drinking creates suitable targets, such as women who are too intoxicated to give consent and with no capable guardian around, women have a high risk of being victimized. Also, a packed party bus where intoxicated young adult men and women bump into each other creates altercations such as fights where a person(s) may get hurt and become a victim due to a lack of guardianship. There is also a potential for multiple victims because there is no barrier between the bus driver and the packed bus, so if a fight breaks out in the front of the bus and someone falls on the driver and the bus crashes, it could result in many injuries and deaths. The threat of victimization continues when the young adults are dropped off at the entertainment district. Young adults enter bars and drink more even though they are already extremely intoxicated when they arrive because of the pre-gaming. After drinking in the entertainment district, young adults often become so intoxicated that they do not make it back on the bus. They then may fall asleep in the entertainment district, making them an easy target for a likely offender. Intoxicated students who miss the bus can end up staying with someone they do not know. This person may see the student(s) as suitable targets because they are almost always highly intoxicated and alone with no capable guardian. The young adults' risk of being victimized does not end if they make it on to the bus. Young men often try to find a woman to take home on the bus ride back from the entertainment district. Men and women who are on the bus are almost always too intoxicated to give legal consent to sex.

This does not stop male and female offenders from finding suitable target to engage in sex with. Fraternity parties have many of the same characteristics as party buses. Men and women have unlimited access to alcohol at fraternity parties. They arrive at the parties highly intoxicated from pre-gaming and continue to drink, often to the point of backing out or passing out. With no guardians limiting access to alcohol consumption, both men and women continue drinking large quantities of alcohol throughout the night. Because they are intoxicated, women become suitable targets for sexual encounters with motivated offenders, the fraternity men. The primary issue with tailgating is lack of guardianship. Although campus police patrol the tailgates, their numbers are insufficient to identify either underage drinkers or heavily intoxicated students. Because of this lack of guardianship, intoxicated males often engage in fights with other fraternity males or unaffiliated students and become both motivated offenders and suitable targets because of their intoxication.

Future Research

An important aspect of guardianship is being able to identify which drinkers are of legal age and which are underage. Underage drinkers often possess fake IDs which they use to purchase alcohol and gain admittance to bars and clubs. Nguyen et al. (2011) administered a survey on fake ID usage at a large Midwestern University. Since 2011, progress has been made on making drivers' licenses and other forms of official identification more difficult to duplicate; but at the same time, producers have become more skilled at manufacturing fake IDs. The research of Nguyen et al. should be duplicated in another region of the country and updated to reflect new technologies in the production of both real and fake IDs.

The Las Vegas Strip and Bourbon Street have become popular locations for college age students, particularly for students on spring break and for events such as fraternity and sorority formal events. When fraternities and sororities schedule events at these locations, they assume that underage members will have access to alcohol for both formal parties and informal activities. Observations on the Las Vegas Strip and Bourbon Street would add to the knowledge gained from the observations of the Local and Regional Entertainment Districts, particularly the use of guardianship and its impact on underage drinkers.

Research on party buses from the perspective of the Local and Regional police departments should be conducted. Preliminary discussions with police on this subject indicate that party buses are considered to be safer alternatives to large numbers of students driving between cities and to and from fraternity and sorority events. However, students who frequent party buses have indicated that they would not travel to Regional City if party bus options were not available. Projected changes in usage of party buses relative to individual transportation as well as restricting alcohol on the buses or limiting access to underage or intoxicated students would be interesting future research that could impact the safety.

APPENDIX SECTION

GLOSSARY

Blacking Out – when a person reaches such a high level of intoxication that he/she will not remember what happened the next day

Buzz Kill – a person at a party not drinking who also has a negative attitude towards the evening and is bringing the mood down

Chugging – to drink as fast as you can without stopping

Group chugging – a race between drinkers to chug a drink without stopping

Group shots – taking shots with others to celebrate events such as a birthday or the end of final exams

Shot gunning – poking a hole in side of a bear can, near the bottom, then popping the can and chugging from the hole to the mouth. This allows drinking faster and getting drunker

Taking a pull – drinking straight from a bottle of liquor, or passing the bottle around for quick pulls

Taking a shot – pouring the liquor into a small glass and drinks it all in one gulp

Toast – a short celebration speech given before a group takes a “shot”

Wasted – when a person is very intoxicated, and the intoxication is apparent.

EXAMPLES OF DRINKING GAMES

Drinking games encourage group bonding and getting drunk. There are many kinds of drinking games, but the focus here is on two specific drinking games because they were observed as the most popular when observations were made. The two most popular drinking games are Beer Pong and Flip Cup. Beer Pong is a two versus two team game which is played with a large rectangular table. Ten cups are set up at the end of each side of the table, formed into a triangle, and filled with beer. The objective of the game is to throw ping pong balls into the opposing team's cups and when a ball lands in a cup a player on that team has to chug (drink fast) whatever amount of beer is in the cup. Whichever team loses all the cups first loses the game. The losing team also has to drink the beer in the winning team's cups as well. The losing team can become intoxicated extremely quickly in this game.

Flip cup is another team drinking game that requires larger teams of five to eight lined up along both sides of the table. Each player has a cup filled half way with beer. The game is a race that starts at one end of the table. The first step of the game is for the first player on each team to drink the beer as fast as possible. The second step is for the first player to set his cup on the table with the bottom of the cup hanging off the table a bit so the player can flick the cup with his fingers trying to make the cup land on the table face down. The next player cannot begin until the first player successfully makes the cup land face down. The team that finishes first wins the game. Males will often ask girls to be on their team as a way to socialize and flirt. Drinking games are fun and allow for social interaction and group bonding.

REFERENCES

- Arria, A., Caldeira, K., Moshkovich, O., Bugbee, B., Vincent, K., & O'Grady, K. (2014). Providing alcohol to underage youth: the view from young adulthood. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 38*(6), 1790-1798.
- Bachrach, R., Merrill, J., Byschkow, K., & Read, J. (2012). Development and initial Validation of a measure of motives for pre-gaming in college students. *Addictive Behaviors, 39*(9), 1038-1045.
- Bancroft, A. (2012). Drinking with and without fun: Female students' accounts of pre-drinking and club-drinking. *Sociological Research Online, 17* (4).
- Blanco, C., Okuda, M., Wright, C., Hasin, D., Grant, B., Liu, S., & Olfson, M. (2008). Mental health of college students and their non-college-attending peers: results from the national epidemiologic study on alcohol and related conditions. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 65*(12), 1429-1437.
- Blobaum, E. & Anderson, J. (2006). The impact of exposure and perceived disapproval of underage drinking. *Criminal Justice Studies, 19*(2), 171-192.
- Borsari, B. (2004). Drinking games in the college environment: A review. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 48*(2), 29-53.
- Brown-Rice, K., & Furr, S. (2017). Differences in college Greek members' binge drinking Behaviors: a dry/wet house comparison. *The Professional Counselor, 5*(3), 354-364.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016). Fact sheets – underage drinking.
- Clapp, J., Holmes, M., Reed, M., Shillington, A., Freisthler, B., & Lange, J. (2007). Measuring College students' alcohol consumption, in natural drinking environments: Field methodologies for bars and parties. *Evaluation Review, 31*(5).
- Cohen, L. & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: a routine activity Approach. *American Sociological Review, 44*, 588-608.
- DeJong, W., DeRicco, B., & Schneider, S. K. (2010). Pre-gaming: An exploratory study of strategic drinking by college students in Pennsylvania. *Journal of American College Health, 58*(4), 307-316.
- Demers, A., Kairouz, S., Adlaf, E., Gliksman, L., Newton-Taylor, B., & Marchand, Alain. (2002) Multilevel analysis of situational drinking among Canadian undergraduates. *Social Science & Medicine, 55*(3), 415-424.

- Fabian, L., Toomey, T., Lenk, K., & Erickson, D. (2008). Where do underage college students get alcohol? *Journal of Drug Education* 38(1), 15-26.
- Fjaer, E., Pedersen, W., & Sandberg, S. (2016). Party on wheels: mobile party spaces in the Norwegian High school graduation experience. *The British Journal of Sociology* 67(2), 328-347.
- Fox, J. & Sobol, J. (2000). Drinking patterns, social interaction, and barroom behavior: a routine activities approach. *Deviant Behavior*, 21, 429-450.
- Glindemann, K., Ehrhart, I., Drake, E., & Geller, S. (2007). Reducing excessive alcohol Consumption at university fraternity parties: a cost-effective incentive/reward intervention, *Addictive Behaviors* 32(1), 39-48.
- Hingson, R., Heeren, T., Winter, M., & Wechsler, H. (2005). Magnitude of alcohol-related mortality and morbidity among US college students ages 18–24: Changes from 1998 to 2001. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 26, 259-279.
- Hood, M. (1996). Underage drinking, peer influence, and escalation. *Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 16(5/6), 73-87.
- Hustad, J., Mastroleo, N., Urwin, R., Zeman, S., LaSalle, L., & Borsari, B. (2014). Tailgating and pre-gaming by college students with alcohol offenses: Patterns of alcohol use and beliefs. *Substance Use & Misuse*, 49, 1928-1933.
- Labhart, F., & Kuntsche, E. (2017). Development and validation of the predrinking motives questionnaire. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 47(3), 136-147.
- LaBrie, J., Hummer, J., Kenney, S., Lac, A., & Pedersen, E. (2011). Identifying factors that increase the likelihood for alcohol-induced blackouts in the prepartying context. *Substance Use and Misuse* 46, 992 – 1002.
- LaBrie, J., & Pedersen, E., (2008). Prepartying promotes heightened risk in the college environment: An event level report. *Addictive Behaviors*, 33(7), 955-959.
- Lawrence, S., Hall, T., & Lancey, P. (2012). The relationship among alcohol consumption, tailgating, and negative consequences. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 21, 227-237.
- Leonard, K., Collins, R., & Quigley, B. (2003). Alcohol consumption and the occurrence and severity of aggression: an event-based analysis of male to male barroom violence. *Aggressive Behavior* 29(4), 346-365.
- Makela, P., Mustonen, H., & Lintonen, T. (2016). Connection between drinking context choices and self-reported alcohol-related social harm: Results from the Finnish Drinking Habit Survey 2008. *Drug and Alcohol Review* 35(2), 187-195.

- Martinez, J. & Sher, K. (2010). Methods of “fake” ID obtainment. *Addictive Behaviors*, 35, 738-740.
- Marzell, M., Bavarian, N., Paschall, M., Mair., & Saltz, R. (2015). Party characteristics, drinking settings, and college students’ risk of intoxication: A multi-campus study. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, 36(4), 247-248.
- Miller, P., Droste, N., de Groot, F., Palmer, D., Tindall, J., Busija, L., Hyder, S., Gilham, K., & Wigger, J. (2016). Correlates and motives of pre-drinking with intoxication and harm around licensed venues in two cities. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 35, 177-186.
- National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (2016). *Underage drinking*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nguyen, N., Walters, S., Rinker, D., Wyatt, T., & Dejong, W. (2011). Fake ID ownership in a US sample of incoming first-year college students. *Addictive Behaviors*, 36, 759-761.
- Osgood, D., Wilson, J., O’Malley, P., Bachman, J. & Johnston, L. (1996). Routine activities and individual deviant behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 61(4), 635-655.
- Osgood, D. & Anderson, A. (2004). Unstructured socializing and rates of delinquency. *Criminology*, 42(3), 519 - 549.
- Oster-Aalund, L. & Neighbors, C. (2007). The impact of a tailgating policy on students’ drinking behavior and perceptions. *Journal of American College Health*, 56(3), 281-284.
- Ostergaard, J., & Skov, P. (2014). Do pre-drinkers consume more alcohol than non-pre-drinkers on an event-specific night out? A cross-national panel mobile survey of young people’s drinking in England and Denmark. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 33(4), 376-384.
- Pedersen, D. (2017). Which stressors increase the odds of college binge drinking? *College Student Journal*, 51(1), 129-141.
- Pedersen, E., and LaBrie, J. (2007). Normative misperceptions of drinking among college students: A look at the specific contexts of prepartying and drinking games *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 69(3), 406-411.
- Sharma, M., Knowlden, A., & Nahar, V. (2017). Applying a new theory to alter binge drinking behavior in college students. *Family & Community Health*, 40(1), 52-55.

- Singleton, R. A. (2007). Collegiate alcohol consumption and academic performance. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 68(4), 548-555.
- Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. (2014). Alcohol and drug combinations are more likely to have a serious outcome than alcohol alone in emergency department visits involving underage drinking. *The DAWN Report*.
- Sun, I. & Longazel, J. (2008). College students' alcohol-related problems: a test of competing theories. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 36(6), 554-562.
- Vander Ven, T. (2005). The community construction of the underage drinker. *Deviant Behavior*, 26, 63-83.
- Wells, S., Graham, K., & Purcell, J. (2009). Policy implications of the widespread practice of 'pre-drinking' or 'pre-gaming' before going to public drinking establishments – are current prevention strategies backfiring? *Addiction*, 104(1), 4-9.
- Woodyard, C. & Hallam, J. (2010). Differences in college student typical drinking and celebration drinking. *Journal of American College Health*, 58(6), 533-538.