

Rowan University

## Rowan Digital Works

---

Theses and Dissertations

---

2-26-2015

### Is Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy effective at deterring students from possessing or using drugs and drug paraphernalia?

Amy LoSacco

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Criminology and Criminal Justice Commons](#)

---

#### Recommended Citation

LoSacco, Amy, "Is Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy effective at deterring students from possessing or using drugs and drug paraphernalia?" (2015). *Theses and Dissertations*. 260.  
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/260>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact [graduateresearch@rowan.edu](mailto:graduateresearch@rowan.edu).

**IS ROWAN UNIVERSITY'S ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS POLICY  
EFFECTIVE AT DETERRING STUDENTS FROM POSSESSING OR USING  
DRUGS AND DRUG PARAPHERNALIA?**

An Evaluation Study

By

Amy N. LoSacco

A Thesis

Submitted to the  
Department of Criminal Justice  
College of Humanities and Social Sciences  
In partial fulfillment of the requirement  
For the degree of  
Master of Arts  
at  
Rowan University  
February 24, 2015

Thesis Chair: Joseph Johnson, Ph.D.

© 2015 Amy N. LoSacco

## **Dedication**

*I would like to dedicate this manuscript to my family, especially Jeff.*

## Acknowledgements

This would not have been possible without my thesis advisor, Joe Johnson, pushing me to find the perfect topic and seeing it through to the end. I would also like to thank all of the committee members who took time out of their days to make my thesis work worthwhile. I am heartily thankful for Joe Mulligan who has helped me from developing a topic, finalizing my study, and everywhere else in between. Lastly, I offer my sincere appreciation to all of those who have helped and supported me in the completion of this project, including my parents who seem to think that any topic I choose is the best one.

## **Abstract**

Amy LoSacco

IS ROWAN UNIVERISTY'S ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUGS POLICY EFFECTIVE  
AT DETERRING STUDENTS FROM POSSESSING OR USING DRUGS AND DRUG  
PARAPHERNALIA?

2015

Joseph Johnson, Ph.D.

Master of Arts in Criminal Justice

The purpose of this thesis is to evaluate Rowan University's current Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy. Two surveys were distributed; one via email to all current Rowan University students and the other via email to all students found in violation of the drug policy between 2005 and 2011. Three hypotheses were examined. The first was that students generally do not know about the policy and its possible sanctions. The second hypothesis was that the potential sanctions of the drug policy do not deter the general student population. The third hypothesis was that the imposed sanctions help to prevent recidivism among offenders. Results showed that the first hypothesis was false; the general student body is aware of Rowan's drug policy and its possible sanctions. The second hypothesis was not necessarily true or false; it was undetermined if the potential sanctions of the drug policy deterred the general student population. After surveying drug policy violators, the third hypothesis was also found to be false; the imposed sanctions of Rowan's drug policy did not help to prevent recidivism among offenders. Recommendations for policy change and future research were given.

## Table of Contents

Abstract	v
List of Tables	x
<b>Chapter I: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
Statement of the Problem	1
Significance of the Problem	5
Purpose of the Study	7
Research Questions	9
Organization of the Study	10
<b>Chapter II: Review of the Literature</b>	<b>12</b>
The Thought Behind Student Misconduct	12
The History of Student Conduct	13
Drug Free Schools and Communities Act	14
Deterrence Theory	16
Restorative Justice Practices	20
Rowan University Policies vs. Other Schools' Policies	24
Distribution of Policies: Rowan vs. Binghamton University	29
CAS Assessment Tool	31
Summary of the Literature Review	33

## Table of Contents (Continued)

<b>Chapter III: Methodology</b>	35
Introduction	35
Context of the Study	35
Sampling	36
Instrumentation	38
Operational Definitions	41
Operationalizing Deterrence and Recidivism	42
Variables- Survey 1	44
Variables- Survey 2	52
Open-Ended Questions- Surveys 1 & 2	68
Data Analysis	69
Preliminary Data Analysis: Cross Tabulations	69
Zero-Order Correlations	70
Mann-Whitney U Tests	72
Content Analysis	75
<b>Chapter IV: Findings</b>	78
Introduction	78
Descriptive Statistics: Cross Tabulations	78
Research Question 1	84



## Table of Contents (Continued)

Zero Order Correlation	85
Mann-Whitney U Test	90
Research Question 2	94
Zero Order Correlation	95
Qualitative Content Analysis	102
Research Question 3	107
Qualitative Content Analysis	109
Other Findings	114
<b>Chapter V: Summary, Discussion, Conclusions, and Recommendations</b>	115
Summary of the Study	115
Discussion of the Findings	115
Recommendations for Practice	118
Recommendations for Further Research	123
Conclusions	125
List of References	126
Appendix A: General Student Population Survey	134
Appendix B: Student Drug Policy Violators Survey	142
Appendix C: Student Code of Conduct	154
Appendix D: Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy Guide	179

## Table of Contents (Continued)

Appendix E: Correlations Table for All Variables

205

## List of Tables

Table	Page
Table 1 Marijuana Related Charges at Binghamton University	26
Table 1.1 Illegal Prescription Drug Charges at Binghamton University	27
Table 1.2 Other Drug Charges at Binghamton University	27
Table 2 Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- General Student Pop. (N = 98)	45
Table 3 Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- Drug Policy Violators (N = 18)	53
Table 4 Open-Ended Questions Utilized in Surveys 1 & 2	68
Table 5 Cross Tabulation for SCC Read and Gender- General Student Pop. (N = 98)	79
Table 6 Cross Tabulation for SCC Read and Class standing- General Student Pop. (N = 98)	79
Table 7 Cross Tabulation for Chance of caught and Gender- General Student Pop. (N = 98)	80
Table 8 Cross Tabulation for Chance of caught and Class Standing- General Student Pop. (N = 98)	81
Table 9 Aware of Policy and Gender- General Student Pop. (N = 98)	82
Table 10 Aware of Policy and Class standing- General Student Pop. (N = 98)	82
Table 11 Deterrence and Gender- General Student Pop. (N = 98)	83
Table 12 Deterrence and Class standing- General Student Pop. (N = 98)	84
Table 13 Correlation Coefficients Between Aware of Policy and Independent Variables	86
Table 14 Mann-Whitney U Test for Drug Policy Awareness	93
Table 15 Correlation Coefficients Between Deterrence and Independent Variables	96

## List of Tables (Continued)

Table	Page
Table 16 Additional Comments in Survey 2 (N = 18)	112

## **Chapter 1**

### **Introduction**

Drug use in the United States has been an epidemic for several decades (Musto, 1991; McNamara, 2011). As a result of the war on drugs for the past 100 years, many laws have been enacted to prevent the distribution and use of both drugs and drug paraphernalia; this is mostly due to their potential overuse and harmful effects (McNamara, 2011). The contemporary war on drugs, which began in 1971 with a declaration from President Nixon and which is still continuing today, has focused a lot on marijuana use, more specifically, marijuana use among college youth. Due to the ongoing war on drugs, colleges and universities have built policies to prohibit the possession and use of both drugs and drug paraphernalia. While there are plenty of helpful studies out there, Rowan University's policies have not been empirically evaluated fully (CAS, 2009a; CAS, 2009b; Johnston et al., 2008). In the subsections to come, I will state the problem, talk about the significance of the problem, discuss the purpose of the study and state the three research questions for this study.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Medical historian Dr. David Musto claims that the war on drugs started roughly 100 years ago (McNamara, 2011). Cocaine became one of the most popular drugs in the United States between 1905 and 1930 (Musto, 1991). During the 1920's, smoking marijuana became a great pastime for Americans and heroin became exceedingly popular in the 1950s (Musto, 1991). There was a surge in all kinds of drug use during the 1960s before marijuana became popular again in the 1970s (Musto, 1991). As a result of the

rise and fall in drug trends, many harsh policies against drug use have been enacted (Musto, 1991; McNamara, 2011).

The war on drugs has consistently included or involved college students (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011; Skiba, 2000; McNamara, 2011; Musto, 1991). Although “club drugs” (stimulants and hallucinogens such as ecstasy, methamphetamine, and ketamine) were popular in the past, marijuana and alcohol have been at the forefront for at least the last fifteen years (Simons, Gaher, Correia, and Bush, 2005). More recently, the National Survey on Drug Use and Health found that in 2010, the rate of substance abuse among 18 to 25 year-olds is almost three times higher than that of adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17, and adults over the age of 26 (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011). Many harsh drug policies have been created as a result of the drug use among college students.

In particular, Rowan University, located in Glassboro New Jersey, enacted a policy that some students believe to be very severe (Simmons, 2010). The Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy (2007) states that possession, use, manufacture, distribution or sale of illegal drugs and drug paraphernalia is prohibited (see Appendix D).<sup>1</sup> In addition, according to Rowan University’s drug policy, being under the influence of any illegal drug is prohibited. If a student violates Rowan’s drug policy guidelines, they must face judicial sanctioning. Some students consider the sanctions associated with Rowan’s current drug policy too harsh.

In response to harsh drug policies and sanctions, grassroots movements have

---

<sup>1</sup> The policy is formally entitled Rowan’s “Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy” but will be referred to here as Rowan’s “drug policy.”

formed against specific laws and college/university policies. In 2011, a group of Rowan University students, led by Eric Naroden, officially joined the national organization “Students for Sensible Drug Policy (SSDP)” (Students for Sensible Drug Policy, 2013). SSDP started in 1998 because students disagreed with the “counterproductive Drug War policies, particularly those that directly harm students and youth” (Students for Sensible Drug Policy, 2013).

On the *Facebook* Fan Page associated with the Rowan University SSDP chapter, they describe themselves as a “grassroots, student-led organization comprised of thousands of students on hundreds of high school and college campuses across the United States and internationally” (Simmons, 2010). One of the mission statements for the club reads:

We recognize that the very real harms of drug abuse are not adequately addressed by current policies... we also believe that individuals must ultimately be allowed to make decisions for themselves as long as their actions do not infringe upon anyone else’s freedoms or safety.

The SSDP strives to make Rowan's current policy and its sanctions less punitive and more educational. One of the reasons why students are upset with Rowan’s current drug policy, and why they started an SSDP chapter at Rowan, is because a student can lose housing on their first illicit drug offense (Mulligan, 2011).

As per the Student Code of Conduct (see Appendix C), a student can get their housing suspended if caught with any type of illegal drug or drug paraphernalia. More specifically, the policy states that for a first violation of the drug policy, as it pertains to the use or possession of illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia, the recommended sanction is a \$400 fine, completion of substance screening, community restitution hours, disciplinary

probation, suspension of campus housing privileges, and parent/guardian notification (Mulligan, 2011).

On October 11, 2011 the Students for Sensible Drug Policy (SSDP) erected a “Box City,” where students slept in cardboard boxes from 6pm-6am outside of the Student Center (a central location on Rowan’s campus). The goal of the protest, however unsuccessful, was to put an end to residence hall evictions due to students’ use of illegal drugs on campus. The Students for Sensible Drug Policy at Rowan University also believe that the policy should be changed so that it no longer allows equal punishment for students using illegal drugs, possessing illegal drugs, and possessing drug paraphernalia (Simmons, 2010). It is clear from testimonials that some students do not agree with the current policy, however, there is little empirical research that examines student satisfaction of Rowan’s drug policy (Simmons, 2010).

Some schools have in fact begun to shy away from harsh, punitive sanctions and have integrated restorative and therapeutic justice practices into their judicial processes. Newbery, McCambridge, and Strang (2007) conducted a study at a London college in which students participated in motivational interviewing (MI). MI is a counseling style that encourages participants to evaluate actual or potential behavior in accordance with their own values and beliefs within a constructive atmosphere (Newbery, et al., 2007). “Let’s Talk About Drugs” was the title chosen for the on-going meetings, which used MI to focus mainly on alcohol, cigarette, and marijuana use (Newbery, et al., 2007). At the end of the study, qualitative feedback was collected from both the students and the Dean of Students; feedback was positive (Newbery, et al., 2007). Students connected most with the special events that were put on, however, they also enjoyed the in-class activities



and appreciated the drug education posters put up in the school (Newbery, et al., 2007).

In 2001, California Proposition 36 similarly implemented drug prevention techniques while simultaneously focusing on therapeutic jurisprudence (Wittman, 2001). Many other states, and specifically colleges and universities, have implemented restorative justice techniques and lessened the sanctions for drug violations (Karp, 2013). Rowan University has not yet done this and, therefore, it is beneficial to determine if Rowan's drug policy is currently effective in preventing recidivism or if other techniques should be incorporated into the judicial hearing and sanctioning process. Surveying students about their satisfaction with the current drug policy, whether or not they believe the currently policy is effective, and if they think other techniques should be brought in to take the place of the current policy, will help to gain insight on the student satisfaction of Rowan's current drug policy. Up to this date, little research has been done on Rowan University's judicial process.

### **Significance of the Problem**

The Students for Sensible Drug Policy club at Rowan has provided anecdotal information on student dissatisfaction, however, in addition to collecting student perception research, the effectiveness of such policies needs further examination (Simmons, 2010). As the literature suggests, policies and programs should be evaluated for effectiveness (Musto, 1991). Yet, the evaluative aspect of students' satisfaction with college or university-wide policies and their sanctions, in addition to the policies and sanctions effectiveness, seem to be very minimal.

The Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy Guide (see Appendix D) states that Rowan

will review the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy and educational programs every two years for effectiveness, to guarantee that the disciplinary sanctions are enforced consistently, and to implement changes if needed (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011). This will be done via a committee of faculty, staff, and students in conjunction with Student Life and the Office of Human Resources (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011). However, these reviews are not made publically available online and when asked if Rowan University studied the drug policy for effectiveness, these reviews were not mentioned. Rowan did, however, recently conduct a onetime, cross-sectional evaluation of its drug policy in terms of recidivism rates. This was done solely by looking at the number of students who have been found responsible, by Rowan, for violating the drug policy more than once; that research has historically omitted the students who have continued to violate the policy without being caught (Mulligan, 2011). This lack of full research does not only apply to Rowan University. In fact, when asked via email in January of 2012, many college/university administrators working in student conduct replied that they were not aware of their policies ever being evaluated from the student conduct perspective.<sup>2</sup>

Further assessment of the drug policies at colleges and universities is much needed. Dannells (1997: 2) discusses the importance of evaluating student conduct policies, “First, institutional research should be done on existing disciplinary programs to determine their present effectiveness. Like any other student development program, these efforts should be periodically and systematically evaluated to ensure they are meeting

---

<sup>2</sup> These schools included The College of New Jersey, Stockton University, Rider University, La Salle University, Arcadia University, Temple University, Drexel University, West Chester University, Kutztown University, and Pennsylvania State University.

their goals.” If Rowan’s drug policy does not meet their goals by having a deterrent effect on its students, it should be reorganized in order to increase effectiveness and improve the wellbeing of the students it seeks to serve. Also, the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2009a: 5) states, “Not every program is right for each campus, but through intentional programming and thorough assessment, ineffective programs can be discarded, effective ones retained, and new programs added.” Without proper assessment, the University will be unaware of if they need to change the policy or maintain it. This evaluation is necessary in finding out student awareness of the drug policy at Rowan University, their opinions of the policy, and the effectiveness of its current punishments, in regards to the true recidivism rate.

### **Purpose of the Study**

According to the most recent National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH, 2011: 22), “In 2010, the current use of illicit drugs was 22.0 percent among full-time college students aged 18 to 22.” Presumably, some college students only partake in recreational drug use; however, many students aged 18-22 are classified as drug abusers (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011). The NSDUH reports that in 2010, the rate of substance abuse among 18 to 25 year-olds (19.8%) is almost three times higher than that of adolescents between the ages of 12 and 17 (7.3%) and that of adults over the age of 26 (7%) (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011).

*College Prowler (2012)* shows that the perception of Rowan University is not much different. *College Prowler* is a website that offers information that is written for students by students regarding different colleges and universities’ drug prevalence. One

of the features of this website is a letter grade that is given to colleges regarding their level of “drug safety.” This grade is mostly based on the students’ perceptions of the prevalence and importance of illicit drug use and underage drinking on campus, in addition to the amount of peer pressure that is in existence regarding alcohol and other drugs (College Prowler, 2012). Paid student authors obtain the information by distributing surveys to their college peers (College Prowler, 2012). Additionally, students who can verify that they are from a specific college can answer open-ended questions about their school on the *College Prowler* website. The letter grade given by the website also incorporates statistical data from the U.S. Department of Education and schools’ own websites (College Prowler, 2012).

Rowan received a drug safety score of C, which is lower than most New Jersey schools including Montclair State University, The College of New Jersey, and Rutgers University (College Prowler, 2012). Out of the eleven different drugs listed, the most popular drugs at Rowan University are shown to be alcohol and marijuana (College Prowler, 2012). According to the student survey poll on *College Prowler* (2012), marijuana is just as prevalent on Rowan’s campus as alcohol.

While *College Prowler* shows that alcohol and marijuana are the most popular drugs on Rowan’s campus, it is important to also look at the Clery numbers. The “Crime Awareness and Campus Security Act,” which was later renamed to “Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act,” mandates that college and universities publically report data for all on-campus crime. Clery numbers for Rowan University show similar data to that of *College Prowler*; the arrests for alcohol related offenses and other drug related offenses have been extremely close in number for

2009, 2010, and 2011 (Rowan University Police, 2012). Yet, the number of referrals for alcohol was exceedingly higher than the number of referrals for other drugs in those same years (Rowan University Police, 2012). Unfortunately, the number of illicit drug offenses in 2011 was much higher than the previous two years. The number of illicit drug arrests occurring on-campus or on an adjacent public property went from 38 in 2009, to 36 in 2010, and 47 in 2011 (Rowan University Police, 2012).

The war on drugs, which has always included college students, has been prevalent at Rowan University. Although college and university drug policies have been created as a result of the current war on drugs, it seems that Rowan's current drug policy may not be limiting the number of illegal drug incidents that are occurring on Rowan's campus. The purpose of this study is to examine Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy because many college and university policies have not been fully evaluated (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011; Skiba, 2000; McNamara, 2011; Musto, 1991). More specifically, this study will evaluate the students' awareness of Rowan University's drug policy, their satisfaction with the current drug policy, and if it is effective, in regards to the recidivism rate, or if other techniques should be explored.

### **Research Questions**

Throughout this study, three research questions guided the analysis:

1. Do students know about Rowan University's drug policy and its possible sanctions?
2. Do the potential sanctions of Rowan's drug policy deter the general student population?

3. Do the imposed sanctions help to prevent recidivism among offenders of Rowan's drug policy?

### **Organization of the Study**

Chapter II contains the structural framework of the study. Within the literature review, discussion begins on the background of college and university policies. The literature review also explains the variance among college and university drug policies in addition to the potential importance of how such policies are distributed. Deterrence theory is thoroughly examined, as well as, the link between level of punishment, e.g. getting evicted from on-campus housing, and perception of punishment as they pertain to deterrence. Finally, literature on the effects of deterrence-based policies shows that there may be a need for more restorative justice-based policies.

Chapter III describes the methodology of the study. This chapter begins by offering context in describing the setting of the study, the study design, such as the use of two surveys, and the sampling techniques that were used. The data analysis is described in this chapter and shows the procedures used to operationalize recidivism and deterrence, in order to get more accurate results. Finally, the hypotheses were thoroughly explained.

Chapter IV provides the findings of the study. The profiles of respondents are separated by each of the surveys. There is then discussion of the evidence found to either support or contradict each of the three hypotheses. Chapter IV also displays some of the open-ended answers from the respondents and shows other findings from the research.

Chapter V completes the study by providing concluding information based on the

results found. Practical recommendations are stated in order to better assist the current practices of Rowan University. Research recommendations are also provided should there be interest in continuing the study.

## Chapter 2

### Review of the Literature

#### The Thought Behind Student Misconduct

Researchers Karp and Allena (2004) find that student misconduct is embedded in five different but interconnected dimensions. First, college consists of a fast and radical loss of supervision before freshmen have developed strong internal controls that help to regularize their behavior (Karp & Allena, 2004). Second, freshmen are generally anxious to make friends and connections so they may feel pressured to drink underage or try illegal drugs in order to fit in (Karp & Allena, 2004). Third, student culture differs from the law in regards to illegal drug use and underage alcohol consumption (Karp & Allena, 2004). Fourth, since there is a lack of internal controls among college students, colleges and universities are forced to increase surveillance and punitive sanctions in order to gain compliance with school policies (Karp & Allena, 2004). “Fifth, because a quarter of the student body is new each year, disciplinary approaches must be educational and ongoing (Karp & Allena, 2004: 6).” Due in part to the loss of supervision and the need to fit in, college students have been engaging in alcohol and illegal drug use for many years. As the research states, student conduct must be constantly changing and focusing on teaching the student (Karp & Allena, 2004). This idea, however, was not always the case. In the subsections to come, I will discuss the history of student conduct, the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act, deterrence theory, restorative justice practices, how Rowan compares to other schools, and introducing the CAS assessment tool.



## The History of Student Conduct

The approach to regulating student conduct at colleges and universities has grown and changed over the years. The process really began with colonial colleges in which the school acted *in loco parentis* (in the place of the parent) and focused on the personal and intellectual development of the student (Karp & Allena, 2004). The punishments for breaking a school policy were typically very violent, such as whippings or “cuffings,” where a student would get hit on both of their ears, and occurred in front of other classmates (Karp & Allena, 2004). Harsh and violent punishments continued until the nineteenth century when less harsh and more educational sanctions began (Karp & Allena, 2004). The nineteenth century also marked the beginning of the formal discipline process within higher education as the student started to gain a little bit more respect from the administration (Karp & Allena, 2004). This meant that there were now student conduct offices instead of the job of disciplinarian falling onto faculty members or deans (CAS, 2009b). The German university system began after the Civil War and continued with mild punishments and fair discipline practices as the school focused more on research and intellectual growth than student behavior (Karp & Allena, 2004).

Following World War II, schools had a high number of older and more mature students due to the GI Bill and other federally funded programs, which resulted in the administration giving the students more respect (Karp & Allena, 2004). Schools became more diverse after the civil rights movement, during this time, and a students’ rights movement then followed (Karp & Allena, 2004). In the 1960s, federal law mandated a fair and consistent judicial process for students, of which put an end to *in loco parentis* and once again required more punitive, as opposed to educational, punishments (Karp &

Allena, 2004; CAS, 2009b). The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2009b: 3) states, “In the early 1970s, the American College Personnel Association established Commission XV, Campus Judicial Affairs and Legal Issues, to meet the needs of this emerging [student conduct] profession.” Since then, there have been many emerging standards and laws regarding student conduct such as the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act.

### **Drug Free Schools and Communities Act**

Many schools have similar drug policies to Rowan University; this similarity is due to the State of New Jersey regulations and the fact that Rowan’s policies are built around policies at other institutions. The Associate Dean for Civic Involvement and Assistant Dean of Students Joe Mulligan created the current Alcohol and Other Drug Policy (2008) for Rowan University when Richard Jones became the Interim Associate Vice President and Dean of Students in 2008 (Mulligan, 2011). Working within the NJ state system, he looked at drug policies at other state institutions and tailored them to fit the needs of Rowan (Mulligan, 2011). There are also mandatory policy disclosures that are required under the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act that he included in the policy (Mulligan, 2011).

Due to the illegality of drugs and underage drinking, along with their known side effects, the Drug Free Schools and Communities Act began in 1989 and is still in effect today (Higher Education Center, n.d.). Part 86 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (Higher Education Center, n.d.) is the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Regulations, which says:

As a condition of receiving funds or any other form of financial assistance under any federal program, an institution of higher education must certify that it has adopted and implemented a program to prevent the unlawful possession, use, or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol by students and employees.

In order to properly follow the regulations, an institution of higher education must implement a drug prevention program that prohibits the unlawful possession, use, or distribution of illicit drugs and alcohol by all students and staff while on campus and participating in of any school activity (Higher Education Center, n.d.). According to the Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Regulations (Higher Education Center, n.d.), the school's drug prevention program must:

1. Annually notify each employee and student, in writing, of standards of conduct; a description of appropriate sanctions for violation of federal, state, and local law and campus policy; a description of health risks associated with AOD use; and a description of available treatment programs.
2. Develop a sound method for distributing annual notification information to every student and staff member each year.
3. Conduct a biennial review on the effectiveness of its AOD programs and the consistency of sanction enforcement.
4. Maintain its biennial review material on file, so that, if requested to do so by the U.S. Department of Education, the campus can submit it.

Rowan University accomplishes these tasks by creating the Student Handbook, which includes relevant resources within the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy Guide. As previously stated, the Student Handbook is available both online and as part of an agenda book which is handed out to every student. Additionally, the Associate Dean for Civic Involvement/Assistant Dean of Students sends out an email once a semester to all students, which discusses the Student Handbook in detail and how to access it. Even with mandatory rules and regulations, colleges and universities are able to create their

own policies that can vary greatly between schools. Most policies are either based on deterrence theory or the use of restorative justice practices.

### **Deterrence Theory**

Many college and university policies, such as that of Rowan University, are based on deterrence theory. Deterrence theory says that individuals are deterred from crime if they believe that punishment is swift (i.e. given quickly), certain (i.e. assurance that you will receive a punishment for committing a crime), and severe (i.e. harsh) (Beccaria, 1764/1963). According to deterrence theory, swift, certain, and severe punishments will deter behavior both specifically and generally.

Specific deterrence refers to the criminal refraining from committing another crime because of the fear of additional punishment. This study looked at specific deterrence via survey two, which was a survey given out to drug policy violators, for illegal use and/or possession of drugs or drug paraphernalia, at Rowan University (see Appendix B). The violators were asked if they were deterred by the policy after being caught and sanctioned for their violation. On the other hand, general deterrence refers to others refraining from crime due to fear of receiving the same harsh punishment as the previous offender. Specific deterrence involves an offender being deterred by their own experience while general deterrence involves an offender's experiences deterring others. This study looked at general deterrence via survey one which was a survey that was given out to current Rowan University students (see Appendix A). Survey one asked students if they knew of anyone who had violated the drug policy before and then asked if they were deterred by it. This helped to gain insight on the policy's general deterrence. This study

looked at specific deterrence via survey two which was a survey that was given out to drug policy violators from 2005-2011 (see Appendix B). Survey two asked students if they were deterred by the policy and the sanctions that were imposed on them. In theory, Rowan's drug policy affects both specific and general deterrence.

There is not one deterrence theory that is universally accepted as complete (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). Since the early 1970s researchers have found that severity of sanctions has little to do with a person's involvement in criminal activity and that certainty is the most important component of deterrence (Saltzman, Paternoster, Waldo, & Chiricos, 1982). Researchers Williams & Hawkins (1986: 549) explain their findings, "While the magnitude of the association varied across studies, investigators consistently found a negative association between perceived certainty and self-reported involvement in crime." That is, if there is a high-perceived certainty of someone getting caught and punished for their actions then that person is less likely to commit the crime. Researchers have since been editing deterrence theory to omit certain characteristics, such as severity, and add others, such as perception.

Researchers of perceptual deterrence think that deterrence stems from the threat and fear of punishment as opposed to the punishment itself (Williams & Hawkins, 1986; Saltzman, et al., 1982; Jensen, Erickson & Gibbs, 1978). This means that deterrence is a subjective occurrence, as opposed to a calculation that can objectively be applied to every reasonable person. Kirk Williams and Richard Hawkins (1986: 547) explain that this is "a theory about the behavioral implications of subjective beliefs." In order for the perception of punishment to be close to the reality of punishment, making it a little bit more objective, information regarding sanctions must be accurate and easily accessible to

everyone (Kleck, et al., 2005). If this does not hold true, and someone's perception of punishment is low, then that person's level of deterrence will not increase with just an increase in potential punishments (Kleck, et al., 2005).

Researchers used the Bureau of Justice Statistics' National Judicial Reporting Program (NJRP) to find the number of convictions among adults, the number of convicted adults who received prison sentences, the average maximum sentence imposed, and the average number of days between arrest and sentencing, in order to estimate actual levels of certainty, severity, and swiftness of punishments in a given county (Kleck, et al., 2005). Perception levels were measured by interviews with 1,500 adults spread between each county represented in the NJRP. The study found that there was generally no association between perceived and actual punishments, in regards to swiftness, certainty, and severity, which muddles deterrence effects (Kleck, et al., 2005). This means that increasing punishment may not increase deterrence and decreasing punishment may not decrease deterrence, unless the perception of punishment increases or decreases as well (Kleck, et al., 2005). This study tests perceptual deterrence among both the general student population at Rowan and the drug policy violators by asking what they think their chances are of getting caught/caught again for a drug policy violation and if they are deterred by the drug policy. If a person believes that there is a high certainty of getting caught and punished for their deviant behavior, then they will likely be deterred from the behavior.

When looking at severe sanctioning, arrest or other serious punishments have three main deterring components: stigmatization, attachment costs, and commitment costs. Stigmatization is when a person is deterred from committing a criminal act

because they anticipate very negative reactions from others for committing the crime (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). Conversely, peers may not react negatively to the crime itself but will react negatively toward the perceived sanctions, which will deter the individual from committing the crime (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). For instance, college peers may think that smoking marijuana is okay but will react negatively toward a person if they are arrested for it. The survey in this study, given to Rowan's general student population, included several questions regarding potential stigmatizations. For instance, the survey asked respondents if having their parents find out would deter them from violating the policy; a separate question asked about having their peers find out. However, in order to get a real sense of stigmatization, we would need to know how their parents and/or peers felt about the behavior. Attachment costs refers to the perception of losing attachments (i.e. personal relationships) due to the punishment (legal controls) or the criminal act itself (extralegal controls) (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). The survey questions mentioned previously also refers to potential attachment costs. Commitment costs refers to the perception of losing past accomplishments or jeopardizing future ones (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). Commitment costs are especially prevalent in the population of this study, college students, because graduation is an end goal for everyone in the population and having too many policy violations could jeopardize that goal. In this study, the survey given to Rowan's general student population includes many questions regarding various commitments, in order to get a better understanding of deterrence. The survey asked students if they are a member of a club, a member of a Greek organization, a member of an athletic team, and if they have a part-time or full-time job. These are all potential commitments costs if a student violations policy. If any

of these three deterring components, stigmatization, attachment costs, and commitment costs, are perceived to be very high by an individual, than that person may be deterred from committing a criminal act, even if their perception of certainty of getting caught and/or punished is low (Williams & Hawkins, 1986).

Rowan University has based their drug policy off of deterrence theory; the punishments are swift and severe and the students are perceived to have a high level of certainty of getting caught. Rowan's policy is considered severe because students lose their on-campus housing after their first drug offense involving illicit drugs; however, studies have found that this may not be the best practice (APA, 2008). Past research has found that removing delinquent students from school, or housing, labels students as criminals, which could actually increase their violations (APA, 2008). Labeling theory was originally extracted from Emile Durkheim's book entitled *Suicide* written in 1951 but made well known by Howard Becker in 1963 (Davis, 1972). This theory states that once people are labeled as offenders, they are likely to continue offending (Davis, 1972). In schools, people who are labeled as the "bad students" tend to lash out more than others, due to the title alone (Davis, 1972). In order to not label students as offenders and to offer a more educational experience for them, many schools base their policies off of restorative justice practices.

### **Restorative Justice Practices**

Many laws regarding student conduct at the collegiate level were recently instated. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act was established in 1974, in 1988 the Association for Student Judicial Affairs was founded (now known as the



Association for Student Conduct Administration), and there were many Higher Education Amendments, such as that of the Student Right-to-Know and Campus Security Act (CAS, 2009b). After the establishment of Commission XV, and the laws listed above, there has been a trend of making the sanctions educational again and focusing on less legalistic practices and more educational practices such as restorative and therapeutic justice (Karp & Allena, 2004; CAS 2009b). However, not all schools have followed this recent trend and continue to have harsher sanctions.

One of the relatively new approaches to sanctioning is utilizing restorative justice practices in the college setting. Restorative justice involves viewing a specific crime as harm done to a person or a community (Zehr, 1997). Sanctioning is a collaborative effort between the victim/community and the offender; thus, the offender is held accountable for his/her actions and the victim/community's needs are met (Zehr, 1997). For instance, there are some schools who believe that mandatory minimum fines are a deterrent to students and others who do not think that this will decrease violations, so they utilize educational sanctions such as community service, mandated educational courses, and various other sanctions (Grasgreen, 2012). Restorative justice has become increasingly popular among student conduct within colleges and universities (Karp, 2013).

Restorative justice practices aim to have the offender take responsibility for their actions, repair the harm done to the victim/community, and reduce the risk of re-offending by building community ties (Karp, 2013). Again, this is done with collaboration between the victim/community, the offender, and a trained facilitator (Zehr, 1997; Karp, 2013).

There are four common restorative justice practices among student conduct within colleges and universities: Restorative Justice Conferences, Restorative Justice Circles,

Restorative Justice Boards, and Restorative Justice Administrative Hearings (Karp, 2013). A Restorative Justice Conference is when a trained facilitator guides a discussion between the offender and the victim to come up with sanctions on their own (Karp, 2013). A Restorative Justice Circle is the same as the conference; however, this will involve holding an object to determine who can speak at that time (Karp, 2013). A Restorative Justice Board is when there is a board of students, faculty, and staff members who determine the sanctions with the offender; the victim is invited but does not need to be present (Karp, 2013). Finally, a Restorative Justice Administrative Hearing consists of incorporating restorative justice practices into administrative hearings; the offender and the hearing officer will determine the harm done and how the offender can repair the harm (Karp, 2013). Over 30 colleges and universities have begun using restorative justice practices, and while there has not been much completed evaluative research on this topic yet, the results are expected to be very positive (Lofton, 2010). Schools that focus more on educational rather than punitive sanctions include but are not limited to; Dartmouth College in New Hampshire, Southern Technical College in Florida, which does not allow alcohol on their campus, Cabrini College in Pennsylvania, Eastern Mennonite University in Virginia, Rutgers University in New Jersey, and Skidmore College in New York (Trustees of Dartmouth College, 2012; Southern Technical Institute, 2012; Cabrini College, 2012; Lofton, 2010; Karp, 2013).

When discussing the implementation of drug policies, Munro and Midford (2001) surmise that policies that include less drug education and more punitive sanctions, do not actually affect drug use among students. It seems that Rowan students feel the same way; the tagline for the Students for Sensible Drug Policy club at Rowan University is

“Educating and creating change to reduce drug use” (Simmons, 2010). The club continues to push for drug education for their fellow students by sponsoring multiple drug education workshops (Simmons, 2010). One of the studies that tested the effect of more educational programs, although not at a college or university, is an evaluation of the National Drug Strategic Plan in Australia from 1993-1997 (Single & Rohl, 1997). The National Drug Strategic Plan was created in 1993 with three goals: 1. To minimize the level of illness, disease, and injury associated with alcohol and illegal drug use, 2. To minimize the level and impact of criminal drug offenses, drug related crime, violence, and antisocial behavior within the community, 3. To minimize the level of personal and social disruption, quality of life, loss of productivity, and economic costs associated with inappropriate alcohol and illegal drug use (Single & Rohl, 1997). These goals are to be accomplished by focusing on both prevention and rehabilitation techniques (Single & Rohl, 1997). Some of the activities/programs that were implemented include the development of a national statement on marijuana, public education and awareness campaigns, the National Initiatives in Drug Education Program, new treatment services, and more (Single & Rohl, 1997). These initiatives were tested by the distribution of household surveys throughout the five years of 1993-1997; the results, however, were mixed (Single & Rohl, 1997). There were decreases in tobacco use, increases in responsible drinking, and no significant trend in relation to illicit drug use, except however, marijuana use which slightly increased (Single & Rohl, 1997). Even with the current research, there is a clear need for more evaluative studies of efforts to curb drug use, especially college and university policies.

Some institutions try to make sanctioning an educational experience while other

schools are more focused on punitive punishments. There is a strong need for empirical research as to which approach is more effective. David Lewis, M.D. (2001) believes that most harsh punishments do not deter students from using drugs; they simply push the crime off-campus, which is known as crime displacement. He states that school policies that completely prohibited underage drinking and illegal drug use may not have created a safer environment for students, or the surrounding area, because students then take their illegal activity off-campus (Lewis, 2001). In fact, student drug use could actually increase off-campus. This is especially true if they do not think the Student Code of Conduct applies to students living off-campus. Illegal drug use could also increase because off-campus students do not fear being evicted from on-campus housing, which is the sanction that upsets the most drug policy violators who live on-campus. In terms of sanctioning, Lewis (2001) believes that schools should focus more on disallowing negative behavior associated with drug use (such as assault, sexual misconduct, vandalism, etc.) and less about the drug use itself.

### **Rowan University Policies vs. Other Schools' Policies**

Even though many colleges and universities have a similar drug policy to Rowan University, some students believe Rowan's policy to be very severe (Simmons, 2010). According to the Student Handbook (2011: 49), the recommended sanction for a first violation of the drug policy, as it pertains to illegal use and/or possession of drugs or drug paraphernalia, is a "\$400 fine, completion of substance screening, community restitution hours, disciplinary probation, suspension of campus housing privileges, and parent/guardian notification." The recommended sanction for a second violation is "a

\$500 fine, completion of substance screening, disciplinary probation (remainder of academic career), University suspension and parent/guardian notification” (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011: 50). The recommended sanction for the third violation is “University suspension or expulsion and parent/guardian notification” (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011: 50). The recommended sanctions are different for alcohol-related violations. The recommended sanctions for the first violation of an alcohol-related incident, as it pertains to underage possession or use, is “\$150 fine, completion of Alcohol and Other Drugs education program, community restitution hours, disciplinary probation, and notification of parent/guardian” (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011: 173). As seen, the difference between a first violation of the illegal drug use and/or possession policy and a first violation of the underage alcohol use and/or possession policy is a \$250 fine increase and the loss of campus housing privileges, which does not come until the third violation of the underage alcohol use and/or possession policy. This study specifically focused on the illegal drug aspect of Rowan University’s drug policy. While many schools have similar policies to Rowan University, there are other college and universities with differing drug policies.

Binghamton University for example, a public university in New York, takes a different approach to punishment. Binghamton separates their drug policy sanctions by three different drug types: marijuana related charges, illegal prescription drug charges, and other drug charges (Office of Student Conduct, 2010b). Table 1 represents the recommended sanctions for “possession/personal use of marijuana, possession of drug paraphernalia with marijuana residue, and purchasing or attempting to purchase a small amount of marijuana” at Binghamton University (Office of Student Conduct, 2010b).

Table 1

*Marijuana Related Charges at Binghamton University*

Recommended Sanctions	
1 <sup>st</sup> violation	1 year disciplinary probation (may include, but is not limited to, educational sanctions, community service, and removal from housing and/or loss of privileges) and Marijuana 101 (an online drug education course that takes about two hours and costs \$50 to complete)
2 <sup>nd</sup> violation	Disciplinary probation until graduation, relocation if appropriate, loss of visitation to appropriate area, educational sanction x 3 (Educational sanctions “consist of writing an essay, attending and/or presenting a workshop to a group of students, etc., with specific instructions to be included in the sanction letter”), and parental notification if relocated
3 <sup>rd</sup> violation	Final probation until graduation, removal from all university housing, loss of visitation to all residential areas, and parental notification

Educational sanctions “consist of writing an essay, attending and/or presenting a workshop to a group of students, etc., with specific instructions to be included in the sanction letter” (Office of Student Conduct, 2010b). Also, disciplinary probation may include, but is not limited to, educational sanctions, community service, and removal from housing and/or loss of privileges (Office of Student Conduct, 2010b). According to Binghamton University's Sanction Guidelines, removal of campus housing occurs after a student's third drug offense (Office of Student Conduct, 2010c). Table 1.1 shows the recommended sanctions for possession, use, purchasing, or attempting to purchase prescription drugs prescribed to another (Office of Student Conduct, 2010b).

Table 1.1

*Illegal Prescription Drug Charges at Binghamton University*

Recommended Sanctions	
1 <sup>st</sup> violation	2 years disciplinary probation and educational sanction x 2
2 <sup>nd</sup> violation	Disciplinary probation until graduation, relocation if appropriate, loss of visitation to appropriate area, educational sanction x 3, and parental notification if relocated
3 <sup>rd</sup> violation	Final probation until graduation, removal from all university housing, loss of visitation to all residential areas, and parental notification

Table 1.2 shows the recommended sanctions for “possession/personal use of other drugs, possession of drug paraphernalia with residue other than marijuana, and purchasing or attempting to purchase other drugs” at Binghamton University (Office of Student Conduct, 2010b).

Table 1.2

*Other Drug Charges at Binghamton University*

Recommended Sanctions	
1 <sup>st</sup> violation	Disciplinary probation until graduation, educational sanction x 3, and parental notification
2 <sup>nd</sup> violation	1 year suspension and parental notification
3 <sup>rd</sup> violation	Required reflective paper and interview, final probation until graduation, removal from all University housing, and loss of visitation to all residential areas

Binghamton University's policy may be different than Rowan's due to the fact that marijuana has been decriminalized in New York. By 1979, eleven states within America decriminalized possession of small amounts of marijuana, including New York (Earleywine, 2002). Although this may be the reason for the less strict drug policy at Binghamton, some schools in states in which marijuana is illegal have similar policies. The University of San Francisco Division of University Life completed a program review in 2008 for their Office of Student Conduct, Rights, and Responsibilities (USF, 2008). Part of the program review involved collecting data from other institutions. The institution compiled a list of sanctioning for first and second illicit drug offenses for seven different religiously affiliated, private institutions that compare to the University of San Francisco (USF, 2008). The seven schools that were compared to the University of San Francisco are: Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington, Loyola Marymount University in Los Angeles, California, Santa Clara University in Santa Clara, California, Boston College in Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, Seattle University, in Seattle, Washington, Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., and Loyola University of Chicago in Chicago, Illinois (USF, 2008).

When looking at the sanctioning for all eight institutions, Boston College and Loyola University of Chicago are the only schools that require housing suspension for a first time illicit drug offense; even still, University of Chicago does not require housing suspension for possessing drug paraphernalia or being in the presence of a controlled substance (USF, 2008). For all of the other institutions, the first illicit drug offense results in housing probation and removal from on-campus housing occurs after the second drug offense (USF, 2008). Other sanctions for a first time illicit drug offense



include fines of up to \$250 but averaging at \$50, parental notification with the students writing a letter to their parents and the office of student conduct also sending a letter home, drug testing (only at Loyola Marymount University), and educational sanctions (USF, 2008). The educational sanctions include behavior assessment, counseling, ethics workshop, educational research project, enrollment in a weekly Drugs and Alcohol seminar group, community service hours, e-toke (marijuana-specific assessment and feedback tool), Brief Motivation Information meeting, and drug abuse assessment program (USF, 2008). Clearly, some schools take a more educational approach to sanctioning.

### **Distribution of Policies: Rowan vs. Binghamton University**

In addition to the policies and sanctions, the way college and universities distribute their policies can affect a possible deterrent effect. For example, distributing policies through email may be an extremely effective method or not at all, depending on if students regularly check their email or not at that institution. Without evaluating student awareness of policies, there will be a lack of insight on whether or not distribution methods are the most effective. Gaining data on student awareness, along with student perception, of such policies will be very beneficial as it is a piece of information that is currently missing.

The school's policies and the judicial process must be easily accessible to students (Karp & Allena, 2004). Students should understand the policies and the judicial process; the judicial process should also remain fair and consistent (Karp & Allena, 2004). The way policy information is distributed differs among schools. Rowan University utilizes

many different ways to communicate the current policies. First, the Student Handbook (containing both the Student Code of Conduct and the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy) is located online as a part of the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services' website. Second, all students and parents are told about Rowan's policies during the new student orientations in the summer months leading up to the start of the fall semester. Third, the Student Handbook is put in an agenda book that is given to every current student. Fourth, Resident Assistants have floor meetings with all of their residents (students living on-campus) and go over the policies with them. Finally, the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services sends an email once a semester to all faculty, staff and students explaining the Student Handbook and giving a link to its location on their website. Essentially, if a student does not go to freshmen orientation or the first floor meeting held by their RA and does not read the Student Handbook (either online or in paper form), then they will not know the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy at Rowan. This is how Rowan informs their students; other schools take different approaches.

Binghamton University informs their students of policies in a different way than that of Rowan University. In addition to distributing information through pamphlets, orientation materials, and by Resident Assistants, Binghamton University also has a student-run club that helps to distribute information about policies and sanctions for policy violations (Office of Student Conduct, 2010a). The Student Conduct Outreach Team (SCOT) promotes awareness of campus policies, discusses the philosophy of the Student Conduct Office, talks about the judicial procedures, and encourages responsible decision-making (Office of Student Conduct, 2010a). According to Binghamton's Office

of Student Conduct website (2010a), “You can find SCOT performing door-to-door residential educational initiatives... educating campus constituents at various campus events, partnering with other student organizations, and hosting conduct themed parties.”

While there are different tactics that can be used to disseminate information to a large group of people, such tactics have also not been fully examined. The purpose of this study was to empirically evaluate the policy’s effectiveness in terms of recidivism; however, student awareness was also an important feature to better understanding the policy’s possible deterrent effect and to ensure that the information was being given to the appropriate people.

### **CAS Assessment Tool**

One valuable assessment tool comes from the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). This council created self-assessment guides for forty-three different departments/services within a college or university. The two self-assessment guides of the most importance to this study are for Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Programs and Student Conduct Programs. All of the CAS guides are comprised of fourteen parts for assessment: Mission, Program, Leadership, Human Resources, Ethics, Legal Responsibilities, Equity and Access, Diversity, Organization and Management, Campus and External Relations, Financial Resources, Technology, Facilities and Equipment, and Assessment and Evaluation (CAS, 2009a; CAS, 2009b). The assessments are to be completed by a task force made up of faculty members, full-time staff members, and students (USF, 2008). Completing a CAS self-assessment can offer very beneficial information about a school’s department or program.

Stephen F. Austin State University (SFA), a public institution in Nacogdoches, Texas, completed the CAS self-assessment for Alcohol, Tobacco, and Other Drug Program in 2009. One specific question on the assessment states, “What evidence is available to confirm achievement of program goals? (2009: 4)” and SFA concluded, “Currently little evidence is available based on our assessments” (SFA, 2009: 4). Results of the self-assessment also showed SFA that there is not a strong effort to educate students on the consequences of violating the school’s policies, along with a lack of educating students on the dangers of unsafe drinking and drug use (SFA, 2009).

University of San Francisco (USF), a private institution in San Francisco, California, completed a CAS self-assessment on their Office of Student Conduct, Rights, and Responsibilities in November of 2008. While USF (2008) found a multitude of strength areas, there were also areas that needed to be improved. Some of the items to maintain or improve upon include continuing to “evaluate the effectiveness of educational sanctions” (p. 3), increasing the quantity and quality of student learning outcome evaluations, expanding on programming, re-evaluating the use of conduct boards, and providing more follow-up with students and the community (USF, 2008). Clearly, the CAS self-assessments provide helpful information that will only improve a department or program; however, the assessments still lack crucial information.

While it would be extremely constructive for Rowan to complete a CAS self-assessment for its Community Standards Office, there are still missing components to that particular evaluation. For instance, it asks if “the campus community is informed of the judicial programs” (part 1 section 2.11) but it does not ask how that information is being distributed and if their efforts of distributing information is effective (USF, 2008). In

addition, sanctions are not discussed and recidivism rates are not calculated (USF, 2008). The self-assessment generally focuses on if the department or program is upholding the institution's mission statement, if they are meeting all of the requirements, if the students are learning and growing, and if the department or program needs more resources to be able to function better (USF, 2008). The assessment does not focus on if specific sanctions are effective, if students are knowledgeable of the policies, and what students' perceptions of the policies are, all of which are very important aspects of evaluative student conduct studies (USF, 2008). There is a strong need for a more in-depth evaluation of institutions' student conduct departments, especially that of Rowan University's Community Standards Office.

### **Summary of the Literature Review**

Karp and Allena (2004) find that student misconduct, such as alcohol and illegal drug use, is embedded in five different dimensions: 1. There is a lack of supervision before students have developed controls, 2. Students feel pressured to drink alcohol underage or do illegal drugs in order to fit in, 3. Student culture is at odds with mainstream society, 4. Colleges and universities are forced to increase surveillance and punitive sanctions, 5. Disciplinary approaches must be educational and ongoing. According to various studies, drug use among college students is still very prevalent today (CAS, 2009; Johnston et al., 2008).

The history of college and university policies shows that they have gone from violent and harsh to more educational (Karp & Allena, 2004; CAS, 2009b). Today, there are regulations to such policies to ensure effectiveness. One of these regulations is the

Drug Free Schools and Communities Act (Higher Education Center, n.d.). In order to receive federal funding, the school must: 1. Notify each employee and student of standards of conduct, description of sanctions, and the health risks associated with alcohol and illegal drug use including available treatment programs, 2. Develop a method of distributing information to every student and staff member, 3. Conduct a biennial review on the effectiveness of its programs and the consistency of sanction enforcement, and 4. Keep all of that information on file. While there are some regulations for college and university policies, each school can have very different drug policies. The policies are usually deterrence based or based on the use of restorative justice practices.

This literature review discussed the differences between deterrence-based policies and restorative justice-based policies. Deterrence theory says that individuals are deterred from crime if they believe that punishment is swift, certain, and severe (Beccaria, 1764/1963). Restorative justice, on the other hand, involves viewing a specific crime as harm done to a person or a community and focuses on more educational punishments (Zehr, 1997). Rowan University's drug policy is deterrence-based, while schools like Binghamton University have restorative justice-based policies. Up until this point, there is a lack of research on which type of policies are more effective. While there have been great evaluative measures created, such as the CAS assessment tool, there is still a need for further research. This study researched Rowan's drug policy in order to determine its effectiveness, along with student awareness and satisfaction of the policy.

## **Chapter 3**

### **Methodology**

#### **Introduction**

The purpose of this study was to begin to evaluate Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy. Evaluative research is intended to determine if a policy is accomplishing what it aims to, which in this case was deterrence (Kleck, et al., 2005). This study, amongst other things, attempted to answer whether or not students were aware of the policy and if they were deterred by it. A mixed method approach was used to gain the most amount of information from the two surveyed populations. In the subsections to come, I will describe the context of the study, sampling procedures, instrumentation, operational definitions, how I operationalized deterrence and recidivism, the variables used, and how the data was analyzed.

#### **Context of the Study**

This study took place at Rowan University. Rowan is a four-year, public, suburban, coed, college located primarily in Glassboro, New Jersey (NJ) with a smaller satellite campus in Camden, NJ (Rowan University Media and Public Relations, 2012). According to the Rowan Fast Facts 2012-2013 website (2012), the University is considered medium-sized with 12,183 enrolled students (10,750 undergraduate students and 1,383 graduate students). Since Rowan University currently has a faculty of 1,049, the class sizes can typically be kept at an average of twenty students (Rowan University Media and Public Relations, 2012). Rowan awards fifteen degrees within the colleges of "Business, Biomedical Sciences, Communication & Creative Arts, Education,

Engineering, Graduate and Continuing Education, Humanities & Social Sciences, Medicine, Performing Arts and Science & Mathematics (Rowan University Media and Public Relations, 2012). The current price tag for tuition, fees, room and board, as of August 14 2012, is \$23,352 per year for in-state students and \$31,158 per year for out-of-state students, however, 7,883 students received financial assistance in the 2010-2011 academic year (Rowan University Media and Public Relations, 2012).

### **Sampling**

Since this policy had already been in effect, I conducted a cross-sectional study where I surveyed students in order to examine the potential effectiveness, awareness and satisfaction of Rowan's alcohol and drug policy, at one given time (Creswell, 2008; Ruane, 2005); there was no attempt to follow up with the same respondents. Awareness and effectiveness of the policy was based on two different populations: the general student population and those students who have been found in violation of Rowan's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy for possession and/or use of illicit drugs or drug paraphernalia between 2005 and 2011.

Our target population for the first survey (See Appendix A) was all of Rowan University's current students and I was able to send the first survey to that entire population, although not everyone responded. First, I sent the survey to June Ragone, Research Analyst for Rowan University's Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning Department. She then created a SurveyMonkey link to which the survey could be accessed online. We were able to send our survey to that entire population, about 12,183 students, via the "Rowan Announcer." The Rowan Announcer is a daily email



that is sent to all current students' Rowan email addresses. In order to post to the Rowan Announcer, one must be affiliated with a club or organization at Rowan University, therefore, I partnered with Students for Sensible Drug Policy and they posted the survey on the Rowan Announcer. The survey was sent out via the Rowan Announcer on specific days: January 29<sup>th</sup>, February 5<sup>th</sup>, February 12<sup>th</sup> and February 17<sup>th</sup>; however, the survey remained open from January 29, 2013 until February 28, 2013. The only certain thing that all of the participants in this first survey had in common was their enrollment in Spring 2013 courses at Rowan University. Although we were able to send the first survey to the entire Rowan student population, the response rate was not very high. We had 98 respondents and while some completed the entire survey, many did not answer all of the questions. June Ragone explained that Rowan students had received a lot of surveys in their email at that time and perhaps they were over-surveyed.

For the second survey (See Appendix B), a purposive sampling technique was employed in order to reach all of the students found responsible for violating Rowan's drug policy for possession and/or use of illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia between the years of 2005 and 2011, which consisted of 349 students but only 224 with listed email addresses. In order to reach out to these students, Joe Mulligan, the Associate Dean for Civic Involvement and Assistant Dean of Students, gave me a list of Rowan email addresses for everyone who had violated Rowan's drug policy from 2005-2011. Mr. Mulligan heads the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services at Rowan University, which is the office that processes all of the student conduct cases. I created a second survey, again using SurveyMonkey, and sent it out electronically using an email address that I specifically made for distributing this survey. Some of the people in this

population may have been attending classes at Rowan at the time of the survey and some were not, however, all were students at Rowan University at one time between 2005 and 2011. While the entire second population was sent the survey, there was still not a high response rate. There were 18 respondents to the second survey and, again, many chose not to answer every question. This lack of response could be due to many reasons; such as, people no longer checking their Rowan email after graduating/leaving Rowan or perhaps not wanting to bring up past incidents.

### **Instrumentation**

Research shows that self-reporting can be extremely helpful in gaining information on delinquency and criminal activity (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). There should be multiple question types used in self-reports including frequency response sets and open-ended questions (Thornberry & Krohn, 2000). For this study I employed a mixed methodological approach. The surveys were broken down into four main response types: yes/no, Likert scale (coded as Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree and Strongly Disagree), demographic questions and open-ended questions, which allowed for more opinion-based student input. The questions focused primarily on students' awareness of the policy and deterrence effects; however, the surveys also included perception questions, opinion questions, and more. The questions used in both surveys were adapted from the 2011 National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA): Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, Assessment & Knowledge Consortium, along with The Effects of Sanctioning on Underage and Excessive Drinking on College Campuses (NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in

Higher Education, 2011; Gehring, Lower & Palmer, 2012).

NASPA is a national organization made up of student affairs administrators in higher education. This organization has an Assessment and Knowledge Consortium which is a grouping of surveys that a college or university could purchase and use to assess their different student affairs departments and compare their results to those of other colleges and universities. One of the Consortium studies, the Student Conduct Benchmark, was used to help shape the surveys used for this study. This Student Conduct Benchmark was written by NASPA in conjunction with another national organization entitled the Association for Student Conduct Administration (ASCA). It is a survey designed to collect data on student “awareness of student conduct policies, outcomes of participating in the judicial affairs process and perceptions of institutional rules, policies and procedures” for those colleges and universities that sign up to use it (NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2011). I looked at all of the questions from the NASPA survey and, for those that applied to student awareness and/or deterrence, I specifically tailored the questions to fit Rowan University’s drug policy. For instance, survey one included a grouping of yes/no questions regarding student knowledge of the different steps of the judicial process at Rowan and about Rowan’s drug policy, which was adapted from NASPA’s survey (NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2011). Additionally, the next grouping of questions asked about the students’ perception of Rowan’s policies and procedures and specifically whether or not they perceived them to be appropriate, fair and educational (NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2011). There was also a ranking question regarding Rowan’s drug policy that was adapted from NASPA’s survey and questions regarding the

students' own admission of violating Rowan's alcohol and other drug policy and the sanctioning that followed (NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2011). In addition to NASPA's survey, Gehring, Lower & Palmer (2012) created a national survey that was also utilized in the creation of the two surveys used in this study.

ASCA, in conjunction with The Century Council and The National Judicial College, created a survey to gain insight into students' views of effective alcohol sanctions on college campuses (Gehring, et al., 2012). After reading the results of the national study, I reached out to the authors to attain a copy of the actual survey used. The survey's questions focus on students' views of sanctioning for alcohol violations, which I tailored to fit illegal drug violations at Rowan University. For instance, a grouping of deterrence-based questions, touching on attachment costs and perception of punishment, was adapted from this survey (Gehring, et al., 2012). Since survey two was given to people who were already found responsible of violating Rowan's drug policy, additional questions regarding beliefs before violating the policy, details of the policy violation, beliefs after violating the policy, and details of the sanctioning were included (Gehring, et al., 2012). The questions were made up of multiple levels of measurement and were all adapted from Gehring, Lower & Palmer's survey (2012). There were also open-ended questions regarding sanctioning and deterrence that were adapted from this national survey (Gehring, et al., 2012).

It is important to note that the Institutional Review Board approved both of these surveys. Each survey should have taken students roughly 10-15 minutes to complete. All of the people surveyed were made aware that the survey was both optional to them and anonymous to the researcher.

## Operational Definitions

1. “Standard Sanctions for Substance Abuse-Related Violations-- Use or possession of illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia. First violation: \$400 fine, Completion of Substance Screening, Community Restitution Hours, Disciplinary Probation, Suspension of Campus Housing Privileges, Notification of Parent/Guardian (Dependent student) (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011: 169).”
2. “Drug paraphernalia-- All equipment, products, and materials of any kind which are used or intended to use in planting, propagating, cultivating, growing, harvesting, manufacturing, compounding, converting, producing, processing, preparing, testing, analyzing, packaging, repackaging, storing, containing, concealing, ingesting, inhaling, or otherwise introducing into the human body a controlled dangerous substance... including... roach clips... bongs... pipes (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011: 198).”
3. “Disciplinary Probation-- A defined period of time (minimum of one semester) indicating that a student is no longer in good social standing with the university. Any subsequent violation, while in this status, will likely result in suspension or expulsion from the university (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011: 165).”
4. “Suspension of Residence Privileges-- The student’s privilege to live in University-owned housing, and to visit the residence areas of the campus, is suspended on a temporary or permanent basis. The student is not entitled to any refund of campus housing and/or meal plan fees (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011: 165).”

## **Operationalizing Deterrence and Recidivism**

One major criticism of cross-sectional deterrence studies is that the temporal order is usually reversed (Saltzman, Paternoster, Waldo, & Chiricos, 1982; Williams & Hawkins, 1986). In fact, most studies are actually measuring experiential effects and not deterrence effects (Saltzman, et al., 1982). In order to measure a true deterrent effect, a person's perceptions must influence their behavior; in most cases, however, past behavior has influenced perception (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). For example, if you have committed a crime and did not get caught, your perception of certainty will greatly decrease (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). In order to get a true deterrent effect two different techniques were used. The first asked respondents about their perceptions before they violated policy and the second asked respondents about future behavior. Although, Williams & Hawkins (1986) stated that these techniques may not be completely accurate. Researchers Williams & Hawkins (1986) point out that people may not be able to accurately remember their perception of punishment prior to their criminal activity, moreover, there could be a disconnect between what people say they will do and what they actually do.

I recognize that there could be other factors deterring Rowan students from possessing and/or using illegal drugs and/or drug paraphernalia that were not accounted for in this study, but this was a cross-sectional preliminary analysis/evaluation. In addition to Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy, there were many other factors that were analyzed to see if they in fact helped to deter students from breaking Rowan's drug policies. These factors included moral commitments, the greater federal

laws, and the perception and degree of parental (or family) disapproval. In this specific case of marijuana use among college students, peers may not disapprove of the behavior but may disapprove of some of the sanctions imposed if caught (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). Past researchers agree that if a student refrains from smoking marijuana because they feel that they may be caught and arrested, which their friends would not approve of, then this would be an example of general deterrence with legal sanctions as the source (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). Both surveys included general and specific deterrence.

In the past, recidivism has been examined by looking at which students were found in violation of the drug policy, as it pertains to illegal drugs, for the second (or more) time (Mulligan, 2011). This number will never be completely accurate because it does not include students who have continued to commit a crime but have not been caught by the university. This study looked at recidivism by factoring in students who have violated the policy again but have not been caught or found responsible. In other words, recidivism was examined through the responses from the students who have previously been found responsible for violating the drug policy at Rowan University. It was determined from the question, "I have possessed drug paraphernalia, drugs, or used drugs, after being caught," with the possible answers being "yes, multiple times, yes, once, or no." As long as the students were honest in answering these surveys, the descriptive statistics of recidivism became more accurate. It should be noted, however, that the low response rate could have affected the results.

Studies show that people are in fact honest when answering surveys (Farrington, 1999; Jolliffe, Farrington, Hawkins, Catalano, Hill, & Kosterman, 2003; Williams & Hawkins, 1986; Walsh, 1968). David Farrington (1999: 293) tests the value of all

measuring instruments on “traditional psychometric criteria such as questionnaire content, administration procedures, norms for various populations, internal consistency, retest stability, and concurrent and predictive validity;” he found that self-reported data held up in all of those criteria. Research was also conducted on the validity of self-reports according to different races; the conclusion was that all races had very high levels of validity in self-reports with the only exception being Asian females (Jolliffe, et al., 2003). Many researchers have proven the validity of self-reports and self-reports are extremely widely used, especially in delinquency research (Williams & Hawkins, 1986; Walsh, 1968).

### **Variables- Survey 1**

The variables for survey one included a set of demographic and contextual variables with the purpose of better understanding student awareness, satisfaction and the deterrent effect of Rowan’s drug policy. Table 2 provides the independent and dependent variables and frequency distributions for the general student population (N = 98). The inclusion of these variables was based off of theory and prior research (Kleck, et al., 2005; NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2011; Davis, 1972; Gehring, Lower & Palmer, 2012).



Table 2

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
<b>Demographics</b>			
Gender	Male	66	67
	Female	32	33
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0
	Black/African American	4	5
	Latino(a)/Hispanic	6	6
	Middle Eastern	0	0
	Native American	0	0
	White/Caucasian	82	83
	Multiracial	6	6
	Religion	Atheist	27
	Wiccan, or some other Celtic, nature-based, Pagan religion	1	1
	Hindu	0	0
	Buddhist	0	0
	Jewish	6	6
	Shinto	0	0
	Islam	0	0
	Agnostic	13	13
	Catholic	23	23
	Protestant Christian	5	5
	None	18	19
	Other	5	5
Strong religion	Yes	65	66
	No	33	34
Class standing	Freshman	23	23
	Sophomore	30	31
	Junior	12	12
	Senior	29	31
	Graduate student	3	3
Living situation	On-campus housing	51	52
	Off-campus within 5 miles of Rowan	28	28
	Commuting more than 5 miles from Rowan	19	20

Table 2 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
Member of club	Yes	68	69
	No	30	31
Athlete	Yes	14	14
	No	84	86
Member of Greek	Yes	15	15
	No	83	85
Work (full or part time)	Yes	62	63
	No	36	37
International student	Yes	3	4
	No	95	96
Transfer	Yes	23	24
	No	75	76
GPA	Below 2.0	1	1
	2.0-2.4	5	5
	2.5-2.9	10	10
	3.0-3.4	41	42
	3.5-4.0	41	42
<b>Other Independent Variables</b>			
SCC on-campus <sup>a</sup>	Yes	97	99
	No	1	1
SCC off-campus	Yes	83	85
	No	15	15
Find SCC	Yes	55	56
	No	43	44
Read SCC	Yes	35	36
	No	63	64
Notifying guardians	Yes	78	80
	No	20	20
Peer student hearing	Yes	49	50
	No	49	50
Judiciary panel hearing	Yes	85	87
	No	13	13
Not a serious problem	Strongly Agree	33	34
	Agree	28	29
	Disagree	12	12
	Strongly Disagree	25	25

a. SCC stands for "Student Code of Conduct"

Table 2 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
Policies are appropriate	Strongly Agree	22	22
	Agree	16	16
	Disagree	27	28
	Strongly Disagree	33	34
Process is fair	Strongly Agree	11	11
	Agree	9	9
	Disagree	43	44
Process is educational	Strongly Disagree	35	36
	Strongly Agree	20	20
	Agree	17	17
Disagree	Disagree	23	24
	Strongly Disagree	38	39
	Strongly Agree	23	24
Understand the process	Agree	21	21
	Disagree	31	31
	Strongly Disagree	23	24
Chance of caught	I don't violate Rowan's drug policy	28	29
	Very unlikely	53	54
	Somewhat unlikely	10	10
	Fairly likely	2	2
	Very likely	5	5
Possessed drug paraphernalia	Yes, multiple times	42	43
	Yes, once	8	8
	No	48	49
Possessed drugs	Yes, multiple times	45	46
	Yes, once	8	8
	No	45	46
Used drugs	Yes, multiple times	50	51
	Yes, once	6	6
	No	42	43
Been caught	Yes, multiple times	3	3
	Yes, once	9	9
	No	45	46
Broke policy after caught	I have never violated any drug laws	41	42
	Yes, multiple times	12	100
	Yes, once	0	0
	No	0	0

Table 2 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
Aware of negative effects	Not at all aware	1	1
	Not very aware	0	0
	Somewhat aware	6	6
	Very aware	46	47
	Extremely aware	45	46
More cautious	Yes	80	82
	No	18	18
Parents knowing	Yes	36	37
	No	62	63
Police involvement	Yes	81	82
	No	17	18
Morals	Yes	26	26
	No	72	74
Know violated	Yes and they were caught by Rowan	12	13
	Yes and they were not caught by Rowan	17	17
	Yes, some people were caught by Rowan and others were not	61	62
Dependent Variables Aware of policy	Strongly Agree	48	48
	Agree	46	47
	Disagree	4	5
	Strongly Disagree	0	0
Deterrence	Yes	49	50
	No	49	50

Survey one asked thirteen demographic questions. As can be viewed in Table 2, the majority of the respondents were male (67%) while the rest were female (33%). Also, the majority of respondents identified as white/Caucasian (83%) while the remaining were Latino(a)/Hispanic (6%), multiracial (6%) and black/African American (5%). Most respondents were Atheist (28%), followed by Catholic (23%), 19% did not identify with any religion, 13% were Agnostic, 6% were Jewish, 5% were Protestant Christian and 1%

were Wiccan or some other Celtic, nature-based, Pagan religion. We did not have any respondents who identified as Hindu, Buddhist, Shinto, or Islam. The majority (66%) felt strongly in their religion while the rest did not feel strongly (34%). Sophomores were the main respondents (31%) followed by seniors (30%), freshmen (23%), juniors (13%), and then graduate students (3%). About half (52%) lived in on-campus housing, while 28% lived off-campus within 5 miles of Rowan and 20% lived off-campus and commuted more than 5 miles to Rowan. The majority of the respondents (69%) were a member of at least one club or organization, 14% were on an athletic team, 15% were a member of a Greek fraternity/sorority and 63% worked either full or part-time. Only 4% of the students were international students. Only about a quarter of the respondents (24%) had transferred to Rowan. As can be seen in Table 2, there was a mix of GPAs ranging from 3.5-4.0 (42%), 3.0-3.4 (42%), 2.5-2.9 (10%), 2.0-2.4 (5%) and below 2.0 (1%).

The first four contextual variables stood for those general student population members who knew that there was a Student Code of Conduct that applies to students living on-campus (99%), who knew that it applied to students living off-campus (83%), who knew where to find the Student Code of Conduct (55%) and those who actually read it (35%). Students were then asked if they knew about specific procedures that Rowan follows during the hearing process. The majority of the students (80%) knew that Rowan would notify parents/guardians of drug charges. Only half (50%) of the students knew that there is the possibility of a peer student hearing while many more students (87%) knew of the possibility of a judiciary panel hearing. As stated previously, *College Prowler* gave Rowan University a C grade for drug safety on its campus (College Prowler, 2012). Survey one asked the students to agree or disagree to the statement, “The

use or possession of drugs is NOT a serious problem at Rowan University.” The majority of students agreed that drugs are not a serious problem at Rowan (63%) and the rest felt that it is a serious problem (37%).

As seen in Table 2, the next set of variables was created to gain information on student’s perceptions of Rowan’s policies and procedures. The first was if students feel that Rowan’s policies are appropriate; 38% of students agreed and 62% disagreed. The second question was if the process is fair; 20% of students agreed and 80% disagreed. The third question was if the process is educational; 37% of students agreed and 63% disagreed. The fourth question was if students actually understood the process; 45% agreed that they understood the process and 55% disagreed. Students were then asked how likely they believe they are to get caught for violating Rowan’s drug policy. While 28.6% indicated that they do not violate policy, 20.4% felt that it was very unlikely that they would be caught, 10.2% felt that it was somewhat unlikely, 7.1% felt neutral, 2% felt that it was fairly likely that they would be caught for violating policy and 5.1% felt that it was very likely.

The next set of variables were regarding each person’s own admittance of violating Rowan’s drug policy. Rowan’s drug policy is made up of three components, possessing drug paraphernalia, possessing drugs and using drugs. As seen in Table 2, about half of the student population violated the policy at least once by possessing drug paraphernalia (51%), possessing drugs (54%) and using drugs (57%). While it seems that about half of the population violates Rowan’s drug policy, only 12% of the student population had been caught for violating it. Out of the 12% who were caught for violating policy, out of the possible 98 students, all of them recidivated (i.e. violated the

policy after being caught). Survey one also asked how aware the students were of the negative effects that drugs could have on their behavior, health and safety. One student was not aware at all, 6% were somewhat aware and the vast majority of students (93%) were either very or extremely aware of the negative effects drugs could have. The students were then asked if they believe that Rowan's disciplinary sanctions simply made the students more cautious when violating the policy the next time so that they do not get caught; 82% felt that this was true.

As shown in Table 2, the next variables were based directly around deterrence theory. Deterrence researchers say that people calculate attachment costs before committing a crime (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). In the case of violating Rowan's drug policy, attachment costs to a student could be disappointing their parents, having the police involved and therefore losing a potential job in the future or losing peer connections and going against their morals or values (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). Table 2 shows that 37% students self-described as being deterred by the possibility of their parents knowing of the incident and/or disciplinary sanctions. In addition, 82% of students were deterred by the possibility of police involvement and/or breaking a federal law. Also, 26% were deterred by their morals and values. Perception of punishment plays a very important role in deterrence theory (Kleck, et al., 2005). If there is a low perception of punishment then the person is less likely to be deterred (Kleck, et al., 2005). Many times, perception of punishment comes from someone knowing another person who has violated a policy or law and has not been punished for it. The next question asked if students knew someone who violated Rowan's drug policy in the past; 13% of students knew someone who violated the policy and they were caught by Rowan,

17% of students knew someone who violated the policy and they were not caught by Rowan and 62% of students knew people who violated the policy and some were caught while others were not. Only 8% had not known anyone who violated Rowan's drug policy.

The two dependent variables for this study were "aware of policy" and "deterrence." The first dependent variable, aware of policy, referred to the question, "I am aware of the policies related to drug paraphernalia, possession and/or use." Table 2 shows that policy awareness, or aware of policy, was measured on a Likert scale using strongly agree (48%), agree (47%), disagree (5%) and strongly disagree, which no one selected (again, neutral has been recoded). The second dependent variable, deterrence, referred to the question, "Does the possibility of getting disciplinary sanction from Rowan University deter you from violating the drug policy?" Table 2 shows that while 50% of the respondents said they were deterred, 50% said they were not.

### **Variables- Survey 2**

Table 3 provides the variables and frequency distributions for Rowan's drug policy violators, as it pertains to illegal drugs, from 2005-2011 (N = 18). The inclusion of the variables was based off of theory and prior research (Kleck, et al., 2005; NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education, 2011; Davis, 1972; Gehring, Lower & Palmer, 2012). Although survey two was evaluated qualitatively, descriptive statistics were still important in helping to understand the population. I felt it necessary to note all of the missing data for in order to get a better understanding of the population.



Table 3

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- Drug Policy Violators (N = 18)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent	
<b>Demographics</b>				
Gender	Male	12	66	
	Female	0	0	
	Transgender	0	0	
	<i>Did not answer</i>	6	34	
Race	Asian/Pacific Islander	0	0	
	Black/African American	0	0	
	Latino(a)/Hispanic	0	0	
	Middle Eastern	0	0	
	Native American	0	0	
	White/Caucasian	11	61	
	Multiracial	2	12	
	<i>Did not answer</i>	5	27	
	Religion	Atheist	3	16
		Wiccan, or some other Celtic, nature-based, Pagan religion	1	6
Hindu		0	0	
Buddhist		1	6	
Jewish		1	6	
Shinto		0	0	
Islam		0	0	
Agnostic		1	6	
Catholic		3	16	
Protestant Christian		1	6	
None		2	12	
Other		1	6	
<i>Did not answer</i>		5	25	
Strong religion		Yes	7	38
		No	4	24
		<i>Did not answer</i>	7	38
Class standing		Freshman	0	0
	Sophomore	1	6	
	Junior	6	34	
	Senior	3	16	
	Graduate student	0	0	
	Not a current student	3	16	
	Other	0	0	
	<i>Did not answer</i>	5	28	

Table 3 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- Drug Policy Violators (N = 18)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
Member of club	Yes	7	38
	No	6	34
	<i>Did not answer</i>	5	28
Athlete	Yes	2	12
	No	10	54
	<i>Did not answer</i>	6	34
Member of Greek	Yes	1	6
	No	12	66
	<i>Did not answer</i>	5	28
Work	Yes	5	28
	No	8	44
	<i>Did not answer</i>	5	28
International student	Yes	0	0
	No	13	73
	<i>Did not answer</i>	5	27
Transfer	Yes		12
	No	10	56
	<i>Did not answer</i>	6	32
GPA	Below 2.0	0	0
	2.0-2.4	1	6
	2.5-2.9	3	16
	3.0-3.4	6	32
	3.5-4.0	2	12
	I don't have one	1	6
	<i>Did not answer</i>	5	27
Other Independent Variables			
SCC on-campus	Yes	17	94
	No	0	0
	I don't know	1	6
SCC off-campus	Yes	15	83
	No	2	11
	I don't know	1	6
Find SCC	Yes	11	61
	No	7	39
Read SCC	Yes	10	56
	No	8	44

Table 3 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- Drug Policy Violators (N = 18)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
Notifying guardians	Yes	15	83
	No	1	6
	I don't know	2	11
Peer student hearing	Yes	8	44
	No	9	50
	I don't know	1	6
Judiciary panel hearing	Yes	13	72
	No	4	22
	I don't know	1	6
Not a serious problem	Strongly Agree	5	28
	Agree	8	44
	Neutral	1	6
	Disagree	1	6
	Strongly Disagree	3	16
Policies are appropriate	Strongly Agree	0	0
	Agree	0	0
	Neutral	0	0
	Disagree	7	39
	Strongly Disagree	11	61
Process is fair	Strongly Agree	1	6
	Agree	0	0
	Neutral	4	22
	Disagree	4	22
	Strongly Disagree	9	50
Process is educational	Strongly Agree	0	0
	Agree	1	6
	Neutral	4	22
	Disagree	3	16
Understand the process	Strongly Disagree	10	56
	Strongly Agree	6	34
	Agree	4	22
	Neutral	4	22
	Disagree	3	16
	Strongly Disagree	1	6

Table 3 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- Drug Policy Violators (N = 18)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
Possessed drug paraphernalia	Yes, multiple times	11	61
	Yes, once	0	0
	No	6	34
	<i>Did not answer</i>	1	6
Possessed drugs	Yes, multiple times	12	67
	Yes, once	2	11
	No	3	16
	<i>Did not answer</i>	1	6
Used drugs	Yes, multiple times	13	72
	Yes, once	1	6
	No	3	16
	<i>Did not answer</i>	1	6
Incident location	On-campus	9	50
	Off-campus	4	22
	<i>Did not answer</i>	5	28
Living during incident	On-campus	11	61
	Off-campus within 5 miles of Rowan	1	6
	Commuting more than 5 miles from Rowan	0	0
	<i>Did not answer</i>	6	34
Responsible for (Select all that apply)	Possession of drug paraphernalia	8	44
	Possession of marijuana	8	44
	Possession of illicit prescription drug	0	0
	Possession of drugs not listed above	0	0
	Use of marijuana	3	16
	Use of illicit prescription drugs	0	0
	Use of drugs not listed above	0	0
	Other	2	11
	<i>Did not answer</i>	6	34
Have violated	Yes	9	50
	No	3	16
	<i>Did not answer</i>	6	34

Table 3 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- Drug Policy Violators (N = 18)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
Knowledge of policy	I did not think Rowan had a drug policy	0	0
	I thought Rowan had a drug policy but didn't know what it was	5	27
	I somewhat knew Rowan's drug policy	7	39
	I knew Rowan's drug policy extremely well	0	0
	<i>Did not answer</i>	6	34
Knowledge of behavior	Not at all knowledgeable	0	0
	Not very knowledgeable	3	16
	Somewhat knowledgeable	3	16
	Very knowledgeable	3	16
	Extremely knowledgeable	2	12
	<i>Did not answer</i>	7	40
Negative effects	Not at all aware	3	16
	Not very aware	0	0
	Somewhat aware	1	6
	Very aware	4	22
	Extremely aware	4	22
	<i>Did not answer</i>	6	34
Punishments issued (Select all that apply)	Fine	8	44
	One meeting with a counselor	7	39
	Multiple meetings with a counselor	3	16
	Disciplinary probation	7	39
	Participation in a drug education program	7	39
	Community service	0	0
	Eviction from on-campus housing	8	44
	Suspension from Rowan for up to one year	0	0
	Suspension from Rowan for at least one year	0	0
	Participation in a drug treatment program	1	6
	Other	2	12
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44

Table 3 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- Drug Policy Violators  
(N = 18)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
Effective punish	Not at all effective	9	50
	Somewhat effective	1	6
	Extremely effective	0	0
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Punish deter	Yes	0	0
	No	11	61
	<i>Did not answer</i>	7	39
Other punish	Yes	4	22
	No	6	34
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Parents knowing	Yes	2	12
	No	8	44
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Morals	Yes	1	6
	No	9	50
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Police notified	Yes	9	50
	No	1	6
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Arrested	Yes	8	44
	No	2	12
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Court	Yes	8	44
	No	2	12
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Jail	Yes	0	0
	No	10	56
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Involvement deter	Yes	0	0
	No	10	56
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Police involvement	Yes	2	12
	No	9	50
	<i>Did not answer</i>	7	38
Broke policy after caught	Yes, multiple times	10	56
	Yes, once	0	0
	No	0	0
	I was never caught by the police	1	6
	<i>Did not answer</i>	7	38

Table 3 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- Drug Policy Violators (N = 18)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent
Current status	Expelled from Rowan	0	0
	Withdrew from Rowan temporarily	0	0
	Withdrew from Rowan permanently	0	0
	Transferred to another College/University	1	6
	Student at Rowan	10	56
	Graduated from Rowan	2	12
	<i>Did not answer</i>	5	26
Labeled	Strongly Agree	4	22
	Agree	1	6
	Neutral	3	16
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	2	12
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Negatively impacted	Strongly Agree	2	12
	Agree	5	26
	Neutral	1	6
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	2	12
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Stopped classes	Strongly Agree	1	6
	Agree	0	0
	Neutral	1	6
	Disagree	0	0
	Strongly Disagree	8	44
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44
Prevent job	Strongly Agree	0	0
	Agree	1	6
	Neutral	5	28
	Disagree	1	6
	Strongly Disagree	3	16
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44

Table 3 -- CONT.

*Frequency Distributions for the Independent and Dependent Variables- Drug Policy Violators (N = 18)*

Variable	Value	N	Percent	
Sanctions unfair	Strongly Agree	6	34	
	Agree	2	12	
	Neutral	1	6	
	Disagree	1	6	
	Strongly Disagree	0	0	
	<i>Did not answer</i>	8	44	
Drug treatment	Yes, it was required by Rowan	6	34	
	Yes, but not required by Rowan	1	6	
	No	4	22	
	<i>Did not answer</i>	7	38	
Treatment effective (of those who went)	Not at all effective	7	100	
	Somewhat effective	0	0	
	Extremely effective	0	0	
Treatment more aware (of those who went)	Yes	1	14	
	No	3	43	
	<i>Did not answer</i>	3	43	
Incident more aware	Yes	2	12	
	No	9	50	
	<i>Did not answer</i>	7	38	
Awareness deter (of those who became more aware)	Yes	0	0	
	No	2	100	
Chance of getting caught	I don't violate Rowan's drug policy anymore	1	6	
	Very unlikely	7	38	
	Unlikely			
	Somewhat unlikely	1	6	
	Neutral	1	6	
	Fairly likely	0	0	
	Very likely	1	6	
	<i>Did not answer</i>	7	38	
	Chance of caught again	I don't violate Rowan's policy anymore	1	6
		Very unlikely	7	38
Somewhat unlikely		1	6	
Neutral		1	6	
Fairly likely		0	0	
Very likely		1	6	
<i>Did not answer</i>		7	38	



Survey two asked thirteen demographic questions in order to gain insight on the population that was surveyed. As can be viewed in Table 3, all of the people who responded were male (66%) but many chose not to answer the question (44%). Also, the majority of respondents identified as white/Caucasian (61%) while the remaining were multiracial (12%), or chose not to answer (27%). Most respondents were Atheist (16%) or Catholic (16%), followed by not identifying with any religion (12%) and then Buddhist, Jewish, Agnostic, Protestant Christian, Wiccan, or some other Celtic, nature-based, Pagan religion, or other (6%) and some chose not to answer (25%). We did not have any respondents who identified as Hindu, Shinto, or Islam. Many felt strongly in their religion (38%) while many, again, chose not to answer (38%). Juniors were the main respondents (34%) followed by seniors (16%), not being a current student (16%), sophomores (6%) and there were no graduate students or freshmen. In addition, 38% were a member of at least one club or organization, however, 28% did not answer. Also, 12% were on an athletic team but 34% did not answer. Additionally, 6% were a member of a Greek fraternity/sorority but 28% did not answer. Some respondents worked either full or part-time (28%) but, again, there was missing data (28%). Most respondents said that they were not an international student (73%) and the rest did not answer the question (27%). Only 12% had transferred to Rowan but 32% did not answer. As can be seen in Table 3, there was a mix of GPAs ranging from 3.0-3.4 (32%), 2.5-2.9 (16%), 3.5-4.0 (12%), 2.0-2.4 (6%) and I don't have one (6%); 27% chose not to answer.

The next set of variables stood for those who knew that there was a Student Code of Conduct that applies to students living on-campus (94%), those who knew that it applied to students living off-campus (83%), those who knew where to find the Student

Code of Conduct (61%), and those who had read the Student Code of Conduct (56%).

The drug policy violators were then asked if they knew about specific procedures that Rowan follows during the hearing process. The majority (83%) knew that Rowan would notify parents/guardians of drug charges. Less than half (44%) of the respondents knew that there was the possibility of a peer student hearing while many more respondents (72%) knew of the possibility of a judiciary panel hearing. Survey two asked the students to agree or disagree to the statement, “The use or possession of drugs is NOT a serious problem at Rowan University.” The majority of students (72%) thought that drugs were not a serious problem at Rowan, while much fewer (22%) felt that it was a serious problem, and one person (6%) felt neutral about the topic.

The next four questions were related to Rowan’s policies and procedures. The first was if respondents felt that Rowan’s policies were appropriate and 100% disagreed. The second question was if the process was fair; 6% of respondents agreed, 72% disagreed and 22% were neutral. The third question was if the process was educational; 6% of respondents agreed, 72% disagreed and 22% were neutral. The fourth question was if they understood the process; 56% agreed that they understood the process, 22% disagreed and 22% were neutral.

The next grouping of questions were regarding the respondent’s own admittance of violating Rowan’s drug policy. It is at this point in the survey that many people stopped answering all of the questions; this could have been due to the sensitive nature of the questions. Rowan’s drug policy is made up of three components, possessing drug paraphernalia, possessing drugs and using drugs. Over half of the respondents violated the policy multiple times by possessing drug paraphernalia (61%), some have never

possessed drug paraphernalia (34%) and one person did not answer (6%). Over half of the respondents possessed drugs multiple times (67%), some had only possessed drugs once (11%), some have never possessed drugs (16%) and one person did not answer (6%). Many of the respondents used drugs multiple times (72%), one person had only used drugs once (6%), some have never used drugs (16%) and one person did not answer (6%). Survey two then asked the location of the drug policy violation. Half of the respondents violated Rowan's drug policy on-campus (50%), while 22% violated Rowan's drug policy off-campus and 28% chose not to answer the question. The following question asked where they were living at the time of the incident. The majority of those surveyed were living on-campus (61%), one was living off-campus within five miles of Rowan (6%) and the rest did not answer the question (34%). Next, the drug violators were asked to "check all that apply" for which part of Rowan's drug policy they were found responsible for violating. Although Rowan's policy is only made up for possessing drug paraphernalia, possessing drugs and using drugs, research shows that other schools more specifically define their drug policy by breaking it down even further (Office of Student Conduct, 2010b). This question on survey two asked about specific drug use to better match what other institutions are looking for (Office of Student Conduct, 2010b). Possession of drug paraphernalia and possession of marijuana are the most common violations (44%), followed by use of marijuana (16%) and other charges not listed (11%). The written responses for "other charges not listed" were "failure to give up CDS" and "being in the same car as marijuana." No one was found in violation of possession of illicit prescription drug, possession of other drugs not listed, use of illicit prescription drug and use of drugs not listed above, however, 34% chose not to answer

this question. Survey two then asked the respondents if they felt their behavior did in fact violate Rowan's drug policy, 50% felt that it did violate Rowan's drug policy, 16% felt that it did not and 34% chose not to answer.

Williams & Hawkins (1986) say that a person's past behavior could influence their beliefs and perceptions. Therefore, you must account for this by asking a person's beliefs and perceptions prior to their behavior (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). The next three questions were regarding a person's thoughts before they violated policy. First, the drug policy violators were asked about their knowledge of Rowan's drug policy prior to being found responsible for violating it. The respondents were almost split between somewhat knowing the policy (39%) and knowing that Rowan had a policy but not knowing what it was (27%). No one said that they didn't think Rowan had a policy but no one said that they knew it extremely well either; 34% did not answer the question. Second, the drug policy violators were asked how knowledgeable they were that their behavior violated Rowan's drug policy. There was an exact three-way divide between being not very knowledgeable, somewhat knowledgeable and very knowledgeable (16%), some felt extremely knowledgeable (12%), and many chose not answer (40%). No one answered that they were not at all knowledgeable. Third, the drug policy violators were asked how aware they were of the negative effects drugs could have on their behavior, health and safety, before the incident occurred. Again, there was a split between being very aware and extremely aware (22%), some were not at all aware (16%), one person was somewhat aware (6%), many people chose not to answer (34%), and no one was not very aware.

Table 3 shows that there were four questions asked regarding the punishments that

were issued to the drug policy violators. The most common punishments issued were fine (44%), eviction from on-campus housing (44%), one meeting with a counselor (39%), disciplinary probation (39%), participation in a drug education program (39%), multiple meetings with a counselor (16%), other (12%) and participation in a drug treatment program (6%). No one received community service, suspension from Rowan for up to one year, suspension from Rowan for at least one year, but 44% failed to answer the question. The “other” responses consisted of one person saying that he had to stay on someone else’s couch for two months, which could mean that his housing was suspended for that period of time and another person who said that they had a “400 fine for being in proximity of drug.” The respondents were then asked if their punishments were effective in deterring them from violating policy again; half said that they were not at all effective (50%), one person found the punishment(s) to be somewhat effective (6%) and many chose not to answer (44%). The respondents were also asked if they think that punishments issued by Rowan deter students from violating the drug policy. Everyone who answered the question said no (61%) but many chose not to answer (39%). The drug policy violators were then asked if they thought there were other punishments that may be more effective in deterring them from violating the drug policy again; 34% said no, 22% said yes and 44% chose not to answer. There were three comments provided; one person said “on campus counseling,” another person said “counseling and disciplinary probation as opposed to being kicked off campus,” and the third person did not feel that anyone should be punished for smoking marijuana.

Survey two then asked how many students were deterred by the possibility of their parents knowing of the incident and/or disciplinary sanctions; 44% said no, 12%

said yes and 44% did not answer. The survey also asked if students were deterred by their morals and values; 50% said no, 6% said yes, 44% did not answer. The next five questions were regarding police involvement. The responses showed that the police were notified of the incident half of the time (50%), arrests and having the case go to court occurred frequently (44%), no one had to spend time in jail and no one was deterred from repeating the behavior by the police involvement they had. There were 44% missing responses for each of those questions. However, some were deterred by the possibility of police involvement in the future and/or the idea of breaking a federal law (12%). There were 38% missing responses for that question. Respondents were then asked if they broke policy after being caught by the police (i.e. recidivated). The majority continued to violate Rowan's drug policy multiple times (56%), one person could not answer because the police did not catch him/her, (6%) and many failed to respond to the question (38%).

The respondents were asked their current status and a majority were current students at Rowan (56%), followed by graduates of Rowan (12%) and one who transferred to another College/University (6%); some chose not to answer (26%). Then the next five questions were based on their beliefs of Rowan after being found responsible for violating the drug policy. First, 28% felt that Rowan labeled them as a criminal, 12% disagreed, 16% were neutral and 44% did not answer. Second, 38% felt that the sanctions imposed negatively impact their future, 12% disagreed, 6% were neutral and 44% did not answer. Third, 6% stopped attending classes after being found responsible for violating Rowan's drug policy, 44% did not, 6% felt neutral and 44% did not answer. Fourth, 6% felt that the sanctions imposed prevented them from getting a job, 22% disagreed, 28% were neutral and 44% did not answer. Fifth, 46% felt that the

sanctions imposed on them were unfair, 6% disagreed, 6% were neutral and 44% did not answer.

The next three variables, as shown in Table 3, were regarding drug treatment programs. First, the respondents were asked if they went to a drug treatment program; 34% went because it was required by Rowan, 22% did not go at all, 6% went but it was not required by Rowan, and 38% chose not to answer the question. Those who went to a treatment program were asked if they found it to be effective in deterring them from repeating the behavior; everyone who went said that it was not at all effective in deterring them. Those who went to a treatment program were also asked if the program made them more aware of the negative effects that drugs can have on their behavior, health and safety; 43% did not feel that the treatment program made them more aware, 14% felt that it did and 43% chose not to answer. The respondents were then asked if the incident made them more aware of the negative effects; 50% said no, 12% said yes and 38% did not answer. The 12% who said yes were then asked if that awareness deterred them from violating the drug policy again and all said no.

In order to gain more information on the perception of punishment, all of the respondents were asked what they thought the chance of getting caught again was. Most felt that it was very unlikely (38%), some felt that it was somewhat unlikely, neutral, or very likely (6%), one respondent said that they do not violate Rowan's drug policy anymore, (6%) and the rest did not answer (38%).

## Open-Ended Questions- Surveys 1 & 2

Qualitative data was used to examine research question three. The third research question revolved around whether or not Rowan's drug policy, as it pertains to illegal drugs, helped to prevent recidivism among offenders. The open-ended questions in both surveys are shown in Table 4. In addition to the questions shown in Table 4, each survey also included a space for additional comments, which were analyzed qualitatively.

Table 4

### *Open-Ended Questions Utilized in Surveys 1 & 2*

Question	Utilized in Survey 1	Utilized in Survey 2
Why are you not deterred by Rowan's disciplinary sanctions?	Yes	Yes
What disciplinary sanctions do you believe would be most effective in deterring students from violating Rowan's drug policy?	Yes	Yes
In your opinion, what programs, policies, or actions could Rowan have in place to deter drug policy violations?	Yes	Yes
What, if any, follow-up has Rowan had with you after you completed the disciplinary sanction regarding your drug violation?	No	Yes
Are there other punishments that you believe may be more effective in deterring you from repeating the behavior in the future?	No	Yes



## **Data Analysis**

This study examined three hypotheses in addition to collecting other helpful information. The hypotheses were: 1. Students generally do not know about Rowan's drug policy and its possible sanctions, 2. The potential sanctions of the drug policy do not deter the general student population and 3. The imposed sanctions for violating Rowan's drug policy helped to prevent recidivism among offenders. In order to examine the three hypotheses, two separate surveys were utilized and the data were analyzed with a statistical package entitled SPSS. The first survey was given to the general student population at Rowan (N = 98) and the second survey was given to people who violated Rowan's drug policy for possession and/or use of illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia from 2005 to 2011 (N = 18). In the following subsections I will describe my analysis procedures, including an examination of Cross Tabulations, Zero-Order Correlations, Mann-Whitney U Tests, and Content Analysis, which consisted of analyzing responses from open-ended questions within each of the surveys.

**Preliminary Data Analysis: Cross Tabulations.** I began preliminary data analysis with Cross Tabulations using the responses from survey one respondents. Cross Tabulations were used to show categorical data in a matrix format in order to find potential relationships or associations between the study variables. Relationships among variables cannot be statistically confirmed with just Cross Tabulations (Grover & Vriens, 2006; Hellevik, 1988; Zeisel, 1957). Bivariate Cross Tabulations, which uses only two variables, are the simplest form of associative data analysis and one of the most widely

used techniques (Grover & Vriens, 2006). It is widely used because it displays data in a way that is very easy to read and interpret (Grover & Vriens, 2006). It was important to use Bivariate Cross Tabulations for the present study in order to help summarize the data in a clear way and really convey what each population looked like. Cross Tabulations are used as the start of many cause and effect analyses; however, they do not definitively show a relationship between two or more variables (Hellevik, 1988; Zeisel, 1957). While it may look as if two variables are associated with each other after looking at the Cross Tabulations, this must be tested using another statistical measure (Hellevik, 1988; Zeisel, 1957). For this reason, the preliminary analysis of Zero-Order correlations was used after Cross Tabulations were explored.

**Zero-Order Correlations.** Zero-Order correlations are a measure of association between two or more variables without any controls/constants (Explorable, 2010). Zero-Order correlations show if there are any preliminary relationships or associations between two or more variables, the direction of the relationship, and whether these associations are statistically significant. The value of the correlation can range from -1 to 1 (Kim, 2002). A correlation value of -1 is a perfect negative relationship while a value of 1 is a perfect positive relationship; this means that as one variable increases, the other variable either increases or decreases at the same rate (Kim, 2002). Zero-Order correlations however do not justify a cause and effect relationship; this technique tells us simply whether a preliminary association exists between two variables (Elliott & Woodward, 2007). While a Zero-Order correlation is a basic statistical procedure, the Spearman's rho correlation fits the present data well, based on the assumptions.

For this study I chose to use Spearman's rho correlations as opposed to Pearson's correlations for a few reasons. First, outliers easily influence Pearson's correlation while Spearman's rho minimizes the effects of outliers; therefore it gives a clearer measure of association when outliers are involved (Elliott & Woodward, 2007). Second, the data in survey one contains variables that are measured on a continuous scale and also an ordinal scale. Spearman's rho can accommodate both types of variables (Elliott & Woodward, 2007). Finally, when there is a small sample size, such as in this study ( $N = 98$  and  $N = 18$ ), Spearman's rho is more appropriate to use (Elliott & Woodward, 2007). There are two assumptions for Spearman's rho. First, as previously stated, the variables must be measured on an ordinal, interval, or ratio scale, which these variables meet. Second, the relationship between the two variables is monotonic, meaning that the variables increase and decrease together; this needs to be proven before the Zero-Order correlation could be run via a scatterplot (Explorable, 2010). Therefore, I made sure to check the scatterplots for each variable to ensure that the data was monotonic, which they were.

Spearman's correlation was first utilized to examine the possible association between the dependent variable "I am aware of the policies related to drug paraphernalia, possession and/or drug use" and all independent variables (See Appendix E for full table). This is important in determining which variables have some form of a preliminary association for potential policy purposes. Spearman's correlation was also used to gain more insight into the possible association of the dependent variable "Does the possibility of getting disciplinary sanctions from Rowan University deter you from violating the drug policy" and all of the independent variables (See Appendix E for full table). In knowing which independent variables have at least a preliminary association with

deterrence, Rowan University could get a better understanding of their drug policy's deterrent effect.

While Spearman's correlation shows if there is a preliminary association between the independent and dependent variables, Mann-Whitney U Tests were also used to determine whether or not there are any statistically significant differences between groups and the dependent variable. This offered more insight into students' awareness of Rowan's drug policy.

**Mann-Whitney U Tests.** The Mann-Whitney U Test is one of the most commonly used nonparametric tests for two independent samples (Bachman and Paternoster, 1997). The Mann-Whitney U Test compares the means of two independent samples but, unlike other tests, does not assume any specific shape or distribution of the means (Black, 2011 & Bayens and Roberson, 2010). There are two assumptions that must be met before carrying out the Mann-Whitney U Test (Black, 2011). First, the two samples must be independent from one another (Black, 2011). Second, the dependent variable must be at least ordinal (Black, 2011). There is no requirement for distribution, which means that the number of students (in this case) in both of the groups can be unequal. Once the assumptions are met, the two different groups should be distinct and well defined. The data from both of the groups will then be combined and ranked from highest to lowest (Bayens and Roberson, 2010). The rankings from each group are then totaled and compared to see if there are any differences between the two separate groups (Bayens and Roberson, 2010).

In this study, Mann-Whitney U Tests determined whether or not there were

differences in students' awareness of Rowan's drug policy between two separate groups. All of the data was taken from survey one, which was Rowan's general student population. The Mann-Whitney U Test was first used to determine whether awareness of the drug policy (measured at an ordinal level) differed among students who read the Student Code of Conduct and those students who did not read the Student Code of Conduct. This was a particularly important independent variable because Rowan's drug policy was listed in the Student Code of Conduct. This test determined if there was a difference in awareness among the two groups or, in other words, whether or not reading the Student Code of Conduct makes that group of students understand the drug policy more than the other group of students who did not read it.

Next, the Mann-Whitney U Test was used to determine whether awareness of the drug policy differed among class standing. The data was, again, taken from the general Rowan student population and, since there needs to be two distinct groups, the independent variable of class standing was coded as "freshmen" and "non-freshmen." The distinction of the two groups was made this way because all freshmen learn about Rowan's drug policy during a mandatory freshman orientation (Mulligan, 2010). This data tells us if there were any potential differences in awareness of the policy between those students who most recently went through freshman orientation (i.e. freshmen) and those who have not gone through orientation in at least the past year (i.e. sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students).

The Mann-Whitney U Test was also used to determine whether awareness of the drug policy differed based on the student's living situation. The data was, again, taken from the general Rowan student population and the independent variable of living

situation was coded as “living on-campus” and “living off-campus,” in order to create two distinct groups. This distinction was due to the fact that students who live on-campus have Resident Assistants (RAs) who are required to hold regular floor meetings, which give additional information on Rowan’s policies (Mulligan, 2010). Students who live off-campus, whether it is with a family member, roommate, or by themselves, do not have RAs to give them additional information. This test offers data on whether or not there was a difference between the two groups in regards to awareness of Rowan’s drug policy.

Next, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine whether awareness of the drug policy differed based on gender. This told us if there was a difference in awareness of Rowan’s drug policy between males and females. The Mann-Whitney U Test was also used in a series of tests to determine whether or not drug policy awareness differed among varying degrees of student involvement. The dependent variable remained drug policy awareness (measured at an ordinal level) while the independent variables were member of a club vs. non-member of a club, athlete vs. non-athlete, member of Greek life vs. non-member of Greek life, and work (either part or full-time) vs. don’t work.

Next, the Mann-Whitney U Test was used to determine whether or not drug policy awareness differed among international students and domestic students. Finally, it was used to determine whether or not drug policy awareness differed among transfer students and non-transfer students. Both international students and transfers go through a slightly different orientation process to the university than their counterparts. This test was one small step (this test alone will not give a definitive answer) to help determine if their orientation processes were just as effective in making students aware of the policies.

In addition to knowing the potential associations between our data and understanding the possible differences between a variety of groups, I felt that there was a need to delve deeper into understanding the two separate populations that were surveyed; the general student population at Rowan and the past drug policy violators. In order to gain more insight into these populations, including their opinions of policy and procedure, content analysis was performed using qualitative data from both surveys but specifically focusing on survey two.

**Content Analysis.** Some of the questions in both surveys were more sensitive in nature as they encompassed information on past violations and sanctions. Research has provided mixed results on whether or not open-ended questions are more beneficial than closed-ended questions, when dealing with sensitive information (Ivis, Bondy, & Adlaf, 1997). Past research has shown that open-ended questions are preferable for sensitive topics; however, it has also shown that closed-ended questions are easier for the respondent to answer in that it does not make them feel as pressured to give exact information in their own words (Ivis, Bondy, & Adlaf, 1997). Due to this reason, qualitative data was utilized in both surveys and were analyzed in order to gain a better insight on the quantitative results that were found.

Content analysis using qualitative data involves identifying and interpreting common themes among the data (Burke, 1969; Loftland & Loftland, 1995). There are two different techniques for qualitative data analysis; confirmatory which is hypothesis-driven and exploratory which is content-driven (Guest, MacQueen, & Namey, 2012). The confirmatory technique consists of the researcher predetermining themes or codes

that they will look for when reviewing their qualitative data (Guest, et al., 2012). The codes are predetermined based off of the hypotheses and past research (Guest, et al., 2012). This technique is less common and typically uses already existing data, as opposed to original research (Guest, et al., 2012). The more common approach is exploratory (Guest, et al., 2012). The exploratory technique consists of the researcher reading over the qualitative data and determining themes or codes based on that data (Guest, et al., 2012). In other words, the codes are not predetermined. I used an exploratory approach to my content analysis. I followed the proper protocol by using original research from a purposive sample and created themes based on that data (Guest, et al., 2012).

As seen previously in Table 4, there were three open-ended questions asked in survey one and five open-ended questions asked in survey two. These open-ended questions were used to gain more information in answering research questions two and three. The following open-ended questions were used to help answer research question two and were given to both populations via the two surveys.

Both populations were asked if they were deterred by Rowan's disciplinary sanctions. If they answered no, they were then asked an open-ended question of why they were not deterred by Rowan's disciplinary sanctions. Both populations were also asked what disciplinary sanctions they believed would be most effective in deterring students from violating Rowan's drug policy. This specific question used a mixed-method approach as they were given 15 different choices and the opportunity to select "Other" and write in their own response. The "Other" responses were analyzed qualitatively. Additionally, both populations were asked what programs, policies, or



actions Rowan could have in place to deter students from violating the drug policy. I analyzed the open-ended answers of both surveys in order to find common themes among the data collected and to get a deeper understanding of hypothesis two.

There were two additional open-ended questions that were asked of the drug policy violators in survey two, in order to gain information for research question three. The drug policy violators were asked what, if any, follow-up Rowan had with them after they completed the disciplinary sanctions regarding their drug violation. Additionally, the drug policy violators were asked if there were other punishments that they believed might be more effective in deterring them from repeating the behavior in the future. I analyzed these responses by finding common themes and using them to help answer research question three. Once the survey results were calculated for each of the three hypotheses, the findings were used to offer recommendations for the future.

## Chapter 4

### Findings

#### Introduction

This is an evaluation study of the drug policy at Rowan University, a medium-sized institution in South Jersey. The drug policy at Rowan University applies to all students, including graduate students and students who live off-campus or commute. For this reason, survey one was distributed to all current students (12,183 enrolled at Rowan University at the time of distribution) via an emailed online survey link. The survey was live from January 29, 2013 until February 28, 2013 and during that time a total of 98 students responded. In order to get a different perspective, a second survey was distributed via an emailed online survey link to all students (224 in total) who have been found responsible for violating Rowan's drug policy for possessing and/or using illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia between 2005 and 2011. From January 3<sup>rd</sup> until January 29<sup>th</sup>, 18 people completed the second survey. In the subsections to come, I will show how I used the data to begin answering the three research questions in this study. I also looked at the descriptive statistics for both surveys and more closely examined the variables using Spearman's correlations, Mann Whitney U test, and qualitative information.

#### Descriptive Statistics: Cross Tabulations

As seen previously in Table 2, the first four contextual variables in survey one represents those general student population members who knew that there was a Student Code of Conduct that applies to students living on-campus (99%), who knew that it applied to students living off-campus (83%), who knew where to find the Student Code

of Conduct (55%) and those who actually read it (35%). In order to get more information on who actually read the Student Code of Conduct, bivariate cross tabulations were examined. Table 5 shows that the majority of males (58%) and the majority of females (76%) did not read the Student Code of Conduct. According to this sample, more males read Rowan's Student Code of Conduct than females.

Table 5

*Cross Tabulation for SCC Read and Gender- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

	Read SCC	Did not Read SCC	Total
Male	42%	58%	100%
Female	24%	76%	100%

Additionally, Table 6 provides the reader with a bivariate cross tabulation of class standing and reading the Student Code of Conduct. Table 6 shows that the majority of freshmen (70%), sophomores (77%), juniors (79%), and seniors (79%) did not read the Student Code of Conduct but that all graduate students did read it.

Table 6

*Cross Tabulation for SCC Read and Class standing- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

	Read SCC	Did not Read SCC	Total
Freshman	30%	70%	100%
Sophomore	23%	77%	100%
Junior	21%	79%	100%
Senior	21%	79%	100%
Graduate Student	100%	0%	100%

Survey one asked students how likely they thought that they would get caught for violating Rowan’s drug policy. Previously, Table 2 showed that while 28.6% indicated that they do not violate policy, 20.4% felt that it was very unlikely that they would be caught, 10.2% felt that it was somewhat unlikely, 7.1% felt neutral, 2% felt that it was fairly likely that they would be caught for violating policy and 5.1% felt that it was very likely. Table 7 shows that males most commonly believed that there was a very unlikely chance that they would get caught for violating the policy (25%) while females more commonly do not violate the policy at all (54%). If males believed that there was a very unlikely chance of them getting caught then that could lower the deterrence effect of the policy (Beccaria, 1764/1963; Kleck, et al., 2005).

Table 7

*Cross Tabulation for Chance of caught and Gender- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

	I don't violate Rowan's drug policy	Very unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Fairly likely	Very likely	<b>Total</b>
Male	20%	25%	14%	4%	9%	<b>100%</b>
Female	54%	26%	10%	0%	0%	<b>100%</b>

When looking at class standing in Table 8, freshmen most commonly did not violate Rowan’s drug policy at all (45%) but if they did, they thought that it was very unlikely that they would be caught (32%). Sophomores (52%), juniors (49%) and seniors (60%) also most commonly believed that it was very unlikely that they would be caught. All of the graduate students surveyed did not violate Rowan’s drug policy. The belief

that these students (freshmen through seniors) wouldn't get caught for violating Rowan's drug policy could, again, affect deterrence (Beccaria, 1764/1963; Kleck, et al., 2005).

Table 8

*Cross Tabulation for Chance of caught and Class Standing- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

	I don't violate Rowan's drug policy	Very unlikely	Somewhat unlikely	Fairly likely	Very likely	<b>Total</b>
Freshman	45%	32%	6%	0%	17%	<b>100%</b>
Sophomore	30%	52%	12%	6%	0%	<b>100%</b>
Junior	17%	49%	17%	0%	17%	<b>100%</b>
Senior	28%	60%	11%	0%	0%	<b>100%</b>
Graduate Student	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	<b>100%</b>

The two dependent variables for this study were “aware of policy” and “deterrence.” The first dependent variable, aware of policy, refers to the question, “I am aware of the policies related to drug paraphernalia, possession, and/or use.” Table 2 shows that policy awareness, or aware of policy, was measured on a Likert scale using strongly agree (48%), agree (47%), disagree (5%) and strongly disagree, which no one selected. In regards to gender, Table 9 shows that females tended to either strongly agree (53%) or agree (47%) that they were aware of the policies while males mostly strongly agreed (46%) or agreed (48%) with a small portion that disagreed (6%). This means that both genders most commonly believed that they were very aware of Rowan's drug policy.

Table 9

*Aware of Policy and Gender- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Male	46%	48%	6%	0%	<b>100%</b>
Female	53%	47%	0%	0%	<b>100%</b>

In regards to class standing, Table 10 shows that all of the classes either completely strongly agreed or agreed that they were aware of the policy, except for sophomores, where a small portion (5%) disagreed.

Table 10

*Aware of Policy and Class standing- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Total
Freshman	50%	50%	0%	0%	<b>100%</b>
Sophomore	60%	40%	0%	0%	<b>100%</b>
Junior	50%	45%	5%	0%	<b>100%</b>
Senior	31%	69%	0%	0%	<b>100%</b>
Graduate Student	55%	45%	0%	0%	<b>100%</b>

The second dependent variable, deterrence, referred to the question, “Does the possibility of getting disciplinary sanction from Rowan University deter you from violating the drug policy?” Table 2 shows that while 50% of the respondents said they were deterred, 50% said they were not. Table 11 shows that in regards to gender, females were more commonly deterred by the possibility of getting sanctions (66%) from Rowan while males more commonly did not feel deterred (56%). As stated previously, this could

be due to the fact that males had a lower perception of getting caught than females did (Beccaria, 1764/1963; Kleck, et al., 2005).

Table 11

*Deterrence and Gender- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

	Yes	No	Total
Male	44%	56%	<b>100%</b>
Female	66%	34%	<b>100%</b>

Deterrence was then examined in regards to class standing. Table 12 shows that freshmen (70%), seniors (69%) and graduate students (100%) were more commonly deterred while, on the contrary, most sophomores (73%) and juniors (67%) were not. Sophomores and juniors had a low perception of getting caught, which could affect deterrence (Beccaria, 1764/1963; Kleck, et al., 2005). However, seniors also had a low perception of getting caught and they still seemed to be deterred by the drug policy. This could be because their attachment costs were higher as they were getting ready to finish their degree (Williams & Hawkins, 1986).

Table 12

*Deterrence and Class standing- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

	Yes	No	Total
Freshman	70%	30%	100%
Sophomore	27%	73%	100%
Junior	33%	67%	100%
Senior	69%	31%	100%
Graduate Student	100%	0%	100%

### Research Question 1

The first research question examined was, “Do students know about Rowan University’s drug policy and its possible sanctions?” Several questions were asked to the general student population (N = 98) in order to help begin to answer this research question. Descriptively speaking, Table 2 shows that the general student population seems to understand that Rowan’s Student Code of Conduct encompasses both students who were living on and off-campus; however, not all students actually read the Student Code of Conduct. For instance, as seen in Table 5, males read the Student Code of Conduct more than females. Table 6 also shows that graduate students read the Student Code of Conduct much less than every other year in school. The data also shows that most of the general student population at Rowan was aware of the drug policy. Tables 9 and 10 show that the majority of both genders and all class standings said they were aware of the policy. It was expected, however, that there could have been a difference in policy awareness based on factors such as if they had read the Student Code of Conduct, if they lived on-campus or not, etc. Zero-Order correlations were run in order to get more information regarding any preliminary associations between these variables.



**Zero-Order Correlations.** The purpose of Zero-Order correlations in this study were to examine the data for any preliminary relationships or associations between two or more variables, the direction of the relationship, and whether those associations were statistically significant. First, a Spearman's correlation was run with the dependent variable, aware of policy (see Appendix E for full table). As seen in Table 13, there were associations between being aware of Rowan's drug policy and seven independent variables.

Table 13

*Correlation Coefficients Between Aware of Policy and Independent Variables*

Variables	$R_s$	$P$	Strength
Aware of Policy and SCC on-campus	-0.057	---	-----
Aware of Policy and SCC off-campus	0.255*	0.05	Relatively weak
Aware of Policy and Find SCC	0.357**	0.01	Relatively weak
Aware of Policy and Read SCC	0.398**	0.01	Relatively weak
Aware of Policy and Possessed drug paraphernalia	-0.124	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Possessed drugs	-0.109	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Used drugs	-0.102	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Know violated	-0.026	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Member of club	-0.009	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Athlete	-0.090	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Member of Greek	-0.087	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Work	0.041	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Class standing	0.028	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Gender	-0.017	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Religion	-0.183	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Strong religion	-0.086	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Living situation	0.139	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Race	-0.180	---	-----
Aware of Policy and International student	-0.111	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Transfer	-0.041	---	-----
Aware of Policy and GPA	-0.110	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Not a serious problem	-0.188	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Policies are appropriate	0.065	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Process is fair	0.176	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Process is educational	0.004	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Understand the steps	0.418**	0.01	Somewhat weak
Aware of Policy and Been caught	-0.169	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Chance of caught	0.103	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Notifying guardians	0.281**	0.01	Relatively weak

$R_s$  = Correlation coefficient

$P$  = Significance

\* $p \leq .05$

\*\*  $p \leq .01$

Table 13 -- CONT.

*Correlation Coefficients Between Aware of Policy and Independent Variables*

Variables	$R_s$	$P$	Strength
Aware of Policy and Peer student hearing	0.201*	0.05	Relatively weak
Aware of Policy and Judiciary panel hearing	0.140	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Negative effects	-0.419**	0.01	Somewhat weak
Aware of Policy and Deterrence	-0.016	---	-----
Aware of Policy and More cautious	0.034	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Parents knowing	-0.145	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Police involvement	0.049	---	-----
Aware of Policy and Morals	-0.048	---	-----

$R_s$  = Correlation coefficient

$P$  = Significance

\* $p \leq .05$

\*\*  $p \leq .01$

Table 13 shows that there was not a significant association between knowing that the Student Code of Conduct applies to students living on-campus and being aware of Rowan's drug policy ( $r_s = -0.057$ ). However, there was a significant association between knowing that the Student Code of Conduct applies to students living off-campus and being aware of Rowan's drug policy ( $r_s = 0.255, p \leq 0.05$ ). This indicates that the more someone knew that the Student Code of Conduct applies to students living off-campus the more aware they were of Rowan's policies. As seen in Table 2, more students knew that the Student Code of Conduct applies to students living on-campus than off-campus. In the same regard, if students were more aware of the policies then they would better understand that the policies apply to all students.

Also, as shown in Table 13, Spearman's rho for aware of policy and find SCC ( $r_s = 0.357, p \leq 0.01$ ) indicates that there is a statistically significant relationship. This

means that those students who knew where to find the Student Code of Conduct appear to be more likely to be aware of Rowan's drug policy. Similarly, Spearman's rho for aware of policy and read SCC ( $r_s = 0.398, p \leq 0.01$ ) shows a statistically significant relationship which indicates that if a student reads the Student Code of Conduct they are more aware of Rowan's drug policy. Again, Table 5 shows that males read the Student Code of Conduct more than females, which means males were aware of the policy more than females; although, Table 9 shows that both genders feel they are aware of the policy. I could also draw the conclusion that the Student Code of Conduct was at least somewhat easy to understand since policy awareness was positively correlated with reading the Student Code of Conduct.

Table 13 shows that based on Spearman's correlation, aware of Rowan's drug policy was not statistically significant association between the variables: possessed drug paraphernalia ( $r_s = -0.124$ ), possessed drugs ( $r_s = -0.109$ ), used drugs ( $r_s = -0.102$ ), know violated ( $r_s = -0.026$ ), member of club ( $r_s = -0.009$ ), athlete ( $r_s = -0.090$ ), member of Greek ( $r_s = -0.087$ ), work ( $r_s = 0.041$ ), class standing ( $r_s = 0.028$ ), gender ( $r_s = -0.017$ ), religion ( $r_s = -0.183$ ), strong religion ( $r_s = -0.086$ ), living situation ( $r_s = 0.139$ ), race ( $r_s = -0.180$ ), international student ( $r_s = -0.111$ ), transfer ( $r_s = -0.041$ ), GPA ( $r_s = -0.110$ ), not a serious problem ( $r_s = -0.188$ ), policies are appropriate ( $r_s = 0.065$ ), process is fair ( $r_s = 0.176$ ) and process is educational ( $r_s = 0.004$ ). However, Spearman's rho for aware of policy and understand the steps of the judicial process ( $r_s = 0.418, p \leq 0.01$ ) shows a statistically significant relationship, which indicates that the more students were aware of the policy the more they understood the steps of the judicial process. Rowan wants to make sure that students understand the judicial process, which is listed in the Student

Code of Conduct. There was not a statistically significant association between aware of policy and been caught ( $r_s = -0.169$ ) and aware of policy and chance of caught ( $r_s = 0.013$ ). However, Spearman's rho between aware of policy and notifying guardians ( $r_s = 0.281, p \leq 0.01$ ) shows a statistically significant relationship, which indicates that the more a student knew that Rowan's drug policy required notifying parents of any violation the more they were aware of the policy. Likewise, Spearman's rho between aware of policy and peer student hearing ( $r_s = 0.201, p \leq 0.05$ ) similarly indicates a statistically significant association. This means that the more a student knew that Rowan's drug policy could include a peer student hearing the more they were aware of the policy. Interestingly, the association between aware of policy and judiciary panel hearing was not found to be statistically significant ( $r_s = 0.140$ ).

As seen in Table 13, the last significant association was between aware of policy and negative effects of drugs. Spearman's rho between aware of policy and the negative effects of drugs ( $r_s = -0.419, p \leq 0.01$ ) provides a statistically significant relationship, indicating that the more a student was aware of the policy the less a student was aware of the negative effects of drugs. Conversely, the more a student understood the negative effects of drugs the less they were aware of the policy. This could mean that the policy did not offer enough information about the negative effects that drugs could have on your health or that the students who were aware of the negative effects of drugs did not know Rowan's drug policy because they did not need to know, i.e. they did not want to violate the policy. Policy awareness was not statistically significant with any of the remaining independent variables; deterrence ( $r_s = -0.016$ ), more cautious ( $r_s = 0.034$ ), parents knowing ( $r_s = -0.145$ ), police involvement ( $r_s = 0.049$ ), and morals ( $r_s = -0.048$ ).

**Mann-Whitney U Tests.** The purpose of the Mann-Whitney U Test was to examine the data for any statistically significant differences between two groups on the dependent variable of policy awareness, for the purpose of testing hypothesis one. A Mann-Whitney U test was first run to determine if there were differences in policy awareness between students who read the Student Code of Conduct (SCC) and those students who did not read it. As seen in Table 14, there was a statistically significant difference in policy awareness between students who read the SCC ( $M = 1.00$ ) and those who did not read it ( $M = 2.00$ ,  $U = 605.5$ ,  $p \leq .05$ ). That is that students who read the Student Code of Conduct had much more awareness of the drug policy than those who did not read it. This is concurrent with the data in Table 13 and suggests that the Student Code of Conduct is easy to read and understand. When looking at class standing, Table 6 shows that many people in all class standings have read the Student Code of Conduct, with the exception of graduate students. The conclusion could then be drawn that graduate students do not have as high of a level of policy awareness as the other class standings have. Perhaps this could be due to fact that graduate students do not get the same orientation that undergraduate students do. The undergraduate orientations, including the transfer orientations, focus on the policies of the university, including where to read the policies, while graduate students do not have an orientation of that nature.

There were then many tests run using data from the demographic questions. First, a Mann-Whitney U test was run to determine if there were differences in policy awareness between students who are freshmen and students who are non-freshmen (i.e. sophomores, juniors, seniors, and graduate students). As seen in Table 14, there was no

statistically significant difference in policy awareness between freshmen ( $M = 1.66$ ) and non-freshmen ( $M = 1.66$ ),  $U = 812.5$ ,  $p > .05$ . This means that both groups had roughly the same amount of drug policy awareness, which was concurrent with the data in Table 10. As seen in Table 14, there was also no statistically significant difference in drug policy awareness between students living on-campus ( $M = 1.60$ ) and students living off-campus ( $M = 1.66$ ),  $U = 982.5$ ,  $p > .05$ .

A Mann-Whitney U test was then run to determine if there were differences in policy awareness between males and females. As seen in Table 14, there was no statistically significant difference in policy awareness between males ( $M = 1.66$ ) and females ( $M = 1.30$ ),  $U = 999.5$ ,  $p > .05$ . This aligns with the data in Table 9 that shows that males and females feel that they are both aware of the policy. There was also no statistically significant difference in policy awareness between students who are members of a club ( $M = 1.66$ ) and the students who are non-members ( $M = 1.80$ ),  $U = 1016.5$ ,  $p > .05$ .

I then wanted to determine if there were differences in policy awareness between students who are athletes and students who are non-athletes. As seen in Table 14, there was no statistically significant difference in policy awareness between students who are athletes ( $M = 2.00$ ) and the students who are non-athletes ( $M = 1.66$ ),  $U = 507$ ,  $p > .05$ . There was also no statistically significant difference in drug policy awareness between students who are members of a Greek organization ( $M = 1.66$ ) and the students who are non-members ( $M = 1.66$ ),  $U = 608$ ,  $p > .05$ .

A Mann-Whitney U test was also run to determine if there were differences in policy awareness between students who work (either full or part time) and students who

do not work at all. As seen in Table 14, there was no statistically significant difference in policy awareness between students who work ( $M = 1.66$ ) and students who don't work at all ( $M = 1.66$ ),  $U = 1072.5$ ,  $p > .05$ . Additionally, there was no statistically significant difference in policy awareness between international students ( $M = 1.00$ ) and domestic students ( $M = 1.66$ ),  $U = 52.5$ ,  $p = .062$  (exact significance).

Finally, a Mann-Whitney U test was run to determine if there were differences in policy awareness between transfer students and non-transfer students. As seen in Table 14, there was no statistically significant difference in policy awareness between transfer students ( $M = 1.00$ ) and non-transfer students ( $M = 1.66$ ),  $U = 742$ ,  $p > .05$ .



Table 14

*Mann-Whitney U Test for Drug Policy Awareness*

Group	N	Median	U
Read SCC	35	1.00	605.5*
Didn't read SCC	65	2.00	
Freshman	23	1.66	812.5
Non-freshman	75	1.66	
Living on-campus	51	1.60	982.5
Living off-campus	47	1.66	
Male	66	1.66	999.5
Female	32	1.30	
Member of a club	68	1.66	1016.5
Non-member of a club	30	1.80	
Athlete	14	2.00	507
Non-athlete	84	1.66	
Member of Greek life	15	1.66	608
Non-member of Greek life	83	1.66	
Work	62	1.66	1072.5
Don't work	36	1.66	
International student	3	1.00	52.5
Domestic student	95	1.66	
Transfer	23	1.00	742
Non-transfer	75	1.66	

\*p ≤ .05

In sum, Table 2, along with the Cross Tabulations, show that students generally feel that they are aware of Rowan's drug policy and have a good understanding of the different nuances of the drug policy. The Zero-Order correlations show that their level of awareness has at least preliminary associations with other factors. Additionally, the Mann-Whitney U Tests show that out of the independent variables tested, one variable had a statistically significant difference in drug policy awareness between its two groups, meaning that students who read the Student Code of Conduct had more awareness of the drug policy than those who did not read the Student Code of Conduct.

## Research Question 2

The second research question was, “Do the potential sanctions of Rowan’s drug policy deter the general student population?” In order to help begin to answer this question, students were asked if they have ever “possessed drug paraphernalia,” “possessed drugs,” or “used drugs” while enrolled at Rowan University. As seen previously in Table 2, about half of the general student population had broken the drug policy in each of those three ways. All students were then asked outright if the possibility of getting disciplinary sanctions from Rowan deterred them from violating the drug policy. Also seen in Table 2, there was an exact split between the amount of students who were deterred by the possibility of getting sanctions from Rowan and those students who were not deterred. In regards to gender, Table 11 shows that females were generally more deterred by the possibility of getting sanctions than males were. This could be true for a multitude of reasons including that females feel that they have more to lose, that females have a lower perception of punishment than males do, etc. In order to get more information, gender and deterrence were later explored more. When looking at class standing, Table 12 shows that freshmen, seniors, and graduate students were more commonly deterred while sophomores and juniors were not. This was also a variable that was later explored more.

The first follow-up question was what students thought the chances were of them getting caught for violating the drug policy. Table 2 previously showed that while many respondents do not violate Rowan’s drug policy, that majority of students felt that it was very unlikely that they would be caught. More specifically, Table 7 shows that males

believe there was an unlikely chance that they will get caught while females more commonly just did not violate the policy at all. Table 8 shows that in regards to class standing, freshmen thought that it was unlikely that they would get caught, sophomores, juniors, and seniors all believed that they would get caught and none of the graduate students violated the drug policy. The data shows that perception of punishment is low for two reasons. First, many respondents are violating policy and not getting in caught. Second, many students see others violate the drug policy and not get caught.

**Zero-Order Correlations.** Correlations examine the data for any preliminary associations between two variables. Spearman's correlations were run with the dependent variable deterrence (see Appendix E for full table). As seen in Table 15, there were associations between deterrence and sixteen independent variables.

Table 15  
Correlation Coefficients Between Deterrence and Independent Variables

Variables	$R_s$	$P$	Strength
Deterrence and SCC on-campus	0.091	---	-----
Deterrence and SCC off-campus	0.239*	.05	Relatively weak
Deterrence and Notifying guardians	-0.051	---	-----
Deterrence and Peer student hearing	0.180	---	-----
Deterrence and Judiciary panel hearing	0.102	---	-----
Deterrence and Find SCC	0.072	---	-----
Deterrence and Read SCC	0.075	---	-----
Deterrence and Aware of policy	-0.016	---	-----
Deterrence and Not a serious problem	-0.350**	.01	Relatively weak
Deterrence and Policies are appropriate	0.553**	.01	Somewhat weak
Deterrence and Process is fair	0.507**	.01	Somewhat weak
Deterrence and Process is educational	0.432**	.01	Somewhat weak
Deterrence and Understand the steps	0.074	---	-----
Deterrence and Possessed drug paraphernalia	-0.496**	.01	Somewhat weak
Deterrence and Possessed drugs	-0.479**	.01	Somewhat weak
Deterrence and Used drugs	-0.471**	.01	Somewhat weak
Deterrence and Been caught	-0.279**	.01	Relatively weak
Deterrence and Negative effects	0.098	---	-----
Deterrence and More cautious	-0.275**	.01	Relatively weak
Deterrence and Parents knowing	0.422**	.01	Somewhat weak
Deterrence and Police involvement	0.403**	.01	Somewhat weak
Deterrence and Morals	0.431**	.01	Somewhat weak
Deterrence and Chance of caught	0.250*	.05	Relatively weak
Deterrence and Know violated	-0.033	---	-----
Deterrence and Member of club	-0.137	---	-----
Deterrence and Athlete	-0.125	---	-----
Deterrence and Member of Greek	-0.230*	.05	Relatively weak
Deterrence and Work	0.059	---	-----
Deterrence and Class standing	-0.095	---	-----
Deterrence and Gender	-0.254*	.05	Relatively weak
Deterrence and Religion	-0.294**	.01	Relatively weak
Deterrence and Strong religion	-0.081	---	-----
Deterrence and Living situation	-0.148	---	-----
Deterrence and Race	-0.006	---	-----
Deterrence and International student	0.058	---	-----
Deterrence and Transfer	0.100	---	-----
Deterrence and GPA	-0.189	---	-----

$R_s$  = Correlation coefficient \* $p \leq .05$

$P$  = Significance \*\* $p \leq .01$

Table 15 shows that there was not a significant association between knowing that the Student Code of Conduct applies to students living on-campus and deterrence ( $r_s = 0.091$ ). However, there was a significant association between knowing that the Student Code of Conduct applies to students living off-campus and deterrence ( $r_s = 0.239$ ,  $p \leq 0.05$ ). This indicates that the more someone knew that the Student Code of Conduct applied to students living off-campus the more they were deterred by Rowan's policies. Deterrence did not have statistically significant associations with the next set of variables: notifying guardians ( $r_s = -0.051$ ), peer student hearing ( $r_s = 0.180$ ), judiciary panel hearing ( $r_s = 0.102$ ), find SCC ( $r_s = 0.072$ ), read SCC ( $r_s = 0.075$ ) and aware of policy ( $r_s = -0.016$ ). However, the following four variables were significantly associated with deterrence. Spearman's rho for deterrence and not a serious problem ( $r_s = -0.350$ ,  $p \leq 0.01$ ) indicates that the students who did not think that drugs were a serious problem on Rowan's campus were generally less likely to be deterred by Rowan's drug policy. On the other hand, the more a student believed that drugs were a serious problem on Rowan's campus, the more they were deterred by the policy. It would seem that they had a better grasp on the seriousness of the policy violation and did not want to violate the policy.

Next, Spearman's rho between deterrence and policies are appropriate ( $r_s = 0.553$ ,  $p \leq 0.01$ ) indicates that the more a student believed Rowan's drug policy was appropriate the more they were deterred by it. Similarly, Spearman's rho between deterrence and process is fair ( $r_s = 0.507$ ,  $p \leq 0.01$ ) indicates that the more a student believed Rowan's judicial process for violating the drug policy was fair the more they were deterred by it. Also, Spearman's rho between deterrence and process is educational

( $r_s = 0.432, p \leq 0.01$ ) indicated that the more a student believed that the judicial process at Rowan was educational the more they were deterred by the drug policy. These all mean that the more a student believed that Rowan's drug policies were appropriate, and Rowan's process was fair and educational, the more they were deterred by the possibility of getting sanctions. This could be due to understanding the seriousness of the policy and process. It also means that Rowan should work to increase knowledge of the policy and the process as a whole. This will hopefully mean that students would then be more deterred by the possibility of getting sanctions. Interestingly, the association between deterrence and understand the steps was not statistically significant. However, statistically significant associations were found between deterrence and violating the drug policy in all three different ways.

As seen in Table 15, Spearman's rho between deterrence and possessed drug paraphernalia ( $r_s = -0.496, p \leq 0.01$ ), possessed drugs ( $r_s = -0.479, p \leq 0.01$ ) and used drugs ( $r_s = -0.471, p \leq 0.01$ ) all indicate that if a student violated Rowan's drug policy at all (possessed drug paraphernalia, possessed drugs, or used drugs) then they were less likely to be deterred by the possibility of sanctions. This could be because students do not think that they will get caught for violating the policy or because the students who filled out this survey are not deterred by the drug policy whether they choose to violate it or not.

Spearman's rho between deterrence and been caught ( $r_s = -0.279, p \leq 0.01$ ) directly relates to deterrence theory as specific deterrence. It seems that specific deterrence is lacking in this population. This negative correlation could be because students do not think that they will get caught again or that maybe they already were

caught for violating the policy and the sanctions were not bad so they wouldn't mind getting them again, or perhaps they were only concerned about one sanction, like losing on-campus housing, and since they already received it, it didn't matter if they were caught again.

Table 15 shows that there was not a statistically significant association between deterrence and negative effects ( $r_s = 0.098$ ). It also shows that Spearman's rho between deterrence and more cautious ( $r_s = -0.275, p \leq 0.01$ ) indicates that the more a student felt that disciplinary sanctions from Rowan simply make students more cautious so they don't get caught in the future, the less they were deterred by Rowan's drug policy. This could be because students do not take the drug policy seriously at Rowan and therefore are not deterred by the potential sanctions.

The next three variables in Table 15 are directly related with deterrence theory (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). First, Spearman's rho between deterrence and parents knowing ( $r_s = 0.422, p \leq 0.01$ ) indicates that the more a student was deterred by their parents knowing of their drug policy violation the more they were deterred by Rowan's drug policy. Second, Spearman's rho between deterrence and police involvement ( $r_s = 0.403, p \leq 0.01$ ) indicates that the more a student was deterred by the possibility of police involvement the more they were deterred by Rowan's drug policy. Third, Spearman's rho between deterrence and morals ( $r_s = 0.431, p \leq 0.01$ ) indicates that the stronger a student's morals and values were the more they were deterred by Rowan's drug policy. The possibility of parents knowing, the possibility of police involvement, having strong morals were all positively correlated with being deterred by the possible sanctions. This directly aligns with deterrence theory. Deterrence theory says that a person takes

into account attachment costs before deciding to commit a crime (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). Attachment costs refer to the perception of losing attachments such as personal relationships due to the punishment or the crime itself (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). If their parents found out that they violated a policy it could hinder their relationship and they could lose an attachment. Likewise, a student's relationship with their parents or peers could change if the police had to get involved and they got a judicial record because of the policy violation. Also, if a student has strong morals then they likely will not want to go against their moral compass by violating a policy.

Additionally, Table 15 shows that Spearman's rho between deterrence and chance of caught ( $r_s = 0.250, p \leq 0.05$ ) indicates that the more a person believed that they have a high chance of getting caught the more they were deterred by the possibility of getting sanctions. This is the basis of perceptual deterrence as part of deterrence theory. A punishment must be perceived as "swift, certain, and severe" in order to have general deterrence effects (Beccaria, 1764/1963; Kleck, et al., 2005). Having a punishment that is "certain" means that if a person believes that there is a high certainty of getting caught and punished for their deviant behavior, then they will likely be deterred from the behavior (Beccaria, 1764/1963; Kleck, et al., 2005).

The next variable in Table 15, know violated, was not significantly associated with deterrence ( $r_s = -0.033$ ). The last group of variables is from the demographic questions and there were statistically significant associations found. Being a member of a club or being an athlete was not significantly associated with deterrence ( $r_s = -0.125$ ) but being a member of a Greek organization was statistically significant ( $r_s = -0.230, p \leq 0.05$ ). Spearman's rho between deterrence and member of Greek indicates that if



someone was a part of a Greek organization then they were less likely to be deterred by the possibility of sanctioning. This could be true for a multitude of reasons. Members of a Greek organization tend to know a lot of students because the organizations are fairly large and close-knit. Perhaps students know many people who violated Rowan's drug policy and didn't get caught so their perception of punishment is very low. In another vein, maybe drug paraphernalia and drug possession or use is more accepted within their Greek organization. If violating the policy is more accepted then their attachment cost for peers is low.

Table 15 shows that there was not a statistically significant association found between deterrence and work ( $r_s = 0.059$ ). There was also not a statistically significant relationship between deterrence and class standing ( $r_s = -0.095$ ), even though Table 12 found that freshmen, seniors, and graduate students were more commonly deterred than sophomores and juniors. However, Spearman's rho between deterrence and gender ( $r_s = -0.254, p \leq 0.05$ ) indicates that males were correlated with deterrence more than females. These results were different from the survey results by Rowan students. Meaning, Table 11 shows that females feel more deterred by the possible sanctions than males. However, perhaps males are deterred by the policy for different reasons than just the possible sanctions. There are a number of reasons why males may actually be more deterred by the policy than females. Males could have more attachment costs than females in college. For example, maybe there are more males who are involved on campus (in organizations, athletic teams, larger friend groups) so they have a higher attachment to peers. They could also have a higher attachment to a job, family, church, etc. than females do. In another regard, females may know more people who violate the

policy and do not get caught while males know more people who got caught, making their perception of punishment very different. Also, males may be more aware of the policy, process and sanctions so are therefore more deterred by them than females.

As seen in Table 15, Spearman's rho between deterrence and religion ( $r_s = -0.295$ ,  $p \leq 0.01$ ) was significant. This could be true because different religions have more or less strict "rules" in regards to drug use. Drug use is a part of ceremonies in some religions while other religions are very against it. Religion could also be an attachment for some people and/or could influence a person's morals, which we know are also correlated with deterrence. Deterrence did not have any statistically significant associations with the rest of the variables: strong religion ( $r_s = -0.081$ ), living situation ( $r_s = -0.148$ ), race ( $r_s = -0.006$ ), international student ( $r_s = 0.058$ ), transfer ( $r_s = 0.100$ ), and GPA ( $r_s = -0.189$ ).

In sum, the descriptive statistics show that about half of the general student population was deterred by Rowan's drug policy and the other half was not. Correlations show that deterrence has preliminary associations with many different factors. I examined the qualitative data in order to get more information on the deterrence level of the general student population at Rowan.

**Qualitative Content Analysis.** For this evaluation study, I used the exploratory technique for analyzing qualitative data, which requires determining themes or codes based on the data (Guest, et al., 2012). For research question two, I was specifically looking for why students are deterred or not determined by Rowan's drug policy. There were several themes that I discovered after reviewing all of the qualitative data in survey

one.

All of the students were asked an open-ended question of why Rowan's possible sanctions did not deter them from violating the drug policy. Some students chose to answer that question and gave a more detailed response as to why they are not deterred by Rowan's policies and sanctions (34%). One common response was that students do not violate the drug policy anyway so the possible sanctions do not deter them at all (10%). Another common theme found in the responses was that they do not agree with the drug policy and chose not to follow laws that they do not believe in (55%). Students see this as choosing to stand up for what they believe in, even if that means violating certain laws or policies. Many students stated that they did not agree with how smoking marijuana is treated. For instance, some think that there should be different levels of the drug policy with possessing and/or smoking marijuana being the lowest level (14%). In fact, some students wrote that they do not agree with Rowan punishing students for smoking marijuana at all, especially if they smoke off-campus (17%). This student talks about standing up for what they believe in and what they think Rowan's policy should generally look like:

Students will smoke pot. Our generation faces exponentially more stress (loans, weak economy, crumbling state of the world) and find it relaxing and insightful to smoke. It doesn't carry the health implications that cigarettes, alcohol, or prescription pills have. Our generation has a strong tendency to do what we believe is right and just, regardless of the opinions of others. I believe rowan should provide a safe and educational setting for students to behave as they will, without fear that some cop will creep up and enforce policy, stripping students of their housing, scholarships, and burying them in debt with no means of completing their degree. Rowans drug policy needs to be progressive, as the majority of the country begins to realize that drug users are not criminals to be categorized with murderers and rapists, but ordinary people.

The student quoted above talks about how Rowan’s drug policy should be progressive and changing with the greater federal and state laws. While marijuana is still illegal in New Jersey, many states have decriminalized it. He/she also mentions that Rowan is an educational setting and should not enforce policy by evicting students from on-campus housing, taking away scholarships and giving students large fines. As stated previously, there are some colleges and universities that take a more educational approach to sanctioning (Binghamton, 2010; USF, 2008). More research is needed on which policies and processes are more effective.

The data also showed a pattern that students do not think that they will be caught for violating Rowan’s drug policy (35%); some because they live off-campus and believe it is less likely that they will be caught. Many of the responses were very similar to that of this student’s:

I’m not deterred because the drug I’ve mainly used at Rowan University is marijuana. I believe with occasional marijuana use I can still be a functioning member of the Rowan community, and I believe making Dean’s List for three straight semesters helps reflect that. During the time I lived on campus, I occasionally, and very carefully possessed marijuana. I was not deterred because a) I did not feel like I was committing a serious offense and b) I felt confident in my ability not to get caught.

This student’s reasoning aligns with deterrence theory in a couple of ways. First, deterrence theory says that people calculate their attachment costs before committing a crime (Williams & Hawkins, 1986). If students do not feel that they are committing a serious crime then they are not afraid of losing attachments such as personal relationships, a job, education, etc. Second, punishment for a crime needs to be “swift, certain and severe” in order to deter someone from committing it (Beccaria, 1764/1963).

Based on the open-ended responses and previous data from Table 12, students do not feel that punishment is certain for violating Rowan's drug policy because there is a low perception of people actually getting caught. One student also said in survey one that "they [administrators at Rowan University] don't seem to take it as seriously as they say they do," perhaps implying that students are not easily found responsible for violating the drug policy or that the sanctions are not as severe as they explain.

Instead of just focusing on their own level of deterrence, or lack thereof, the students were also asked about what could change in the future to increase deterrence for others. For example, the survey asked an open-ended question of what disciplinary sanctions did they believe would be most effective in deterring students from violating Rowan's drug policy and offered an "other" response to which some students chose to write in their own responses (8%). Another open-ended question asked was what policies or programs could be put in place in order to deter students from violating the policy. Many students chose to answer this open-ended question (42%) and the results were fairly similar among respondents. There were many common themes that I found after reviewing all of the qualitative data.

Some of the more common responses were giving violators fines (16%), community service hours (6%) and drug education (16%) (i.e. "truthful data on substance use and substance abuse"). Some students also felt that notifying parents and/or the police could deter others from violating Rowan's drug policy (10%). Counseling (4%) and probation (6%) were also mentioned on more than one occasion. Additionally, there were some students who felt that the sanctions should change based on the number of times you have broken policy in addition to the nature of the policy violation (14%).

Below is an example of a student who offered the idea of changing the sanctions based on the number of offenses:

I think the university should offer classes on drug safety and a probationary period rather than immediately escalating to evicting their students in the instance of drug policy violations. Fines should be distributed after the second offense along with community service. The third offense should result in eviction or suspension from the university.

It seems that this student is saying that a student will be deterred by a policy that incorporates tiered educational punishments rather than just the same punitive sanctions.

Another student agreed by saying that a student's educational success should also be considered. This particularly student also thought it would be a good idea if the sanctions could get more or less harsh depending on how a student is doing academically.

Interestingly, there was a mixed opinion on whether or not students should be evicted from on-campus housing for an illegal drug policy violation. While more students wrote comments about eviction being unfair for certain illegal drug violations (10%), there were some students who felt that it would at least deter students from violating the policy and help keep the residence halls and apartments safe and comfortable for everyone (6%). Some students also believed that eviction of on-campus housing was a good deterrent but that it should only occur after multiple violations (6%).

To summarize, Table 2 shows that when looking at the research question of whether or not the general student body is deterred by Rowan's drug policy and its possible sanctions, half of the students were deterred and the other half were not. In addition to looking at the correlations in Table 15, the data from the open-ended responses and the data in Table 2 offer the possibility of students not being deterred

because they do not agree with the policy, or do not agree with the fact that marijuana is illegal in New Jersey, and choose to break the policy. In addition, the data in Table 2 shows that students generally do not think that there is a high likelihood of getting caught for violating Rowan's drug policy. Table 15 shows that the perception of getting caught has a preliminary association with deterrence. Likewise, the open-ended responses also showed a common theme in that students are not deterred by Rowan's drug policy because they do not think that they will get caught anyway.

### **Research Question 3**

The third research question is, "Do the imposed sanctions help to prevent recidivism among offenders of Rowan's drug policy?" The second survey, given to Rowan's drug policy violators (N = 18), aimed to answer the third research question of whether or not Rowan's drug policy reduces students' recidivism rates by way of basic quantitative close-ended and more in depth open-ended questioning.

Survey two asked drug policy violators if they continued to break policy after they were found responsible for violating the policy by Rowan University. Table 3 previously showed that half of the students who answered this question felt that the punishments they received from Rowan were not at all effective in deterring them from repeating the behavior that violated the University's drug policy. Part of the reasoning behind students not feeling that their sanctions were effective could be that Rowan did not offer any type of follow-up with the student after they completed their sanctions. All of the drug policy violators were asked an open-ended question of what type of follow-up Rowan had with them after they completed their sanctions and all respondents said that Rowan did not

make any attempt to follow-up with them. Following up with the student afterward could make sanctioning a more educational experience rather than just being punitive.

The drug policy violators were then asked if they believe that there are more effective sanctions that Rowan could use in order to deter students from violating the drug policy. As shown previously, Table 3 shows that 34% of the responders felt that there were not more effective punishments while the rest (22%) felt that there were better options. As a follow up question, the responders were asked which disciplinary sanctions they believe would be the most effective in deterring other students from violating Rowan University's drug policy. There were a total of 15 different choices and then the option to select "Other" and write in their own response. Out of the 13 people who responded, the most selected choices were a warning not to repeat the behavior and community service, followed by participation in a drug education program, disciplinary probation, fines, writing a research paper, creating a bulletin board or program, participation in a drug treatment program, notification of parents and suspension from Rowan University. One person felt that notification of the police and eviction of on-campus housing would be effective. It should be noted that while some people felt that participation in a drug treatment program would be effective, an earlier question asked if respondents had participated in a drug treatment program and those who answered "yes" were asked how effective that program was in deterring them from repeating the behavior in the future. All of the respondents answered with "Not at all effective."

As seen in Table 3, every respondent who was caught by the police violated the drug policy multiple times after that, meaning that there was 100% of self-reported recidivism (keeping in mind that the response rate was very low). Beccaria (1764/1963)



say that a punishment must be “swift, certain, and severe” in order to have a deterrent effect. However, researchers now believe that severity of sanctions has little to do with a person's involvement in crime (Saltzman, Paternoster, Waldo, & Chiricos, 1982). The low perception of punishment could be hindering the deterrent effect. As seen previously in Table 3, respondents were asked what they thought the chances were of them getting caught again for violating Rowan’s drug policy. The most selected response was “very unlikely” and only one person felt that it was likely that they would get caught again.

**Qualitative Content Analysis.** This survey employed a qualitative component by asking drug policy violators open-ended questions regarding disciplinary sanctions. I again analyzed the qualitative data by reviewing the responses to the open-ended questions and looking for common themes. One of the open-ended questions asked, “Are there other punishments that you believe may be more effective in deterring you from repeating the behavior in the future?” Only three people responded, however, the more common theme for this question was mandating counseling. The first response stated, “Counseling and disciplinary probation as opposed to being kick off campus.” The second response stated, “On campus counseling.” The third response has been omitted due to irrelevant content.

Another one of the open-ended question states, “Which disciplinary sanctions do you believe would be the most effective in deterring other students from violating Rowan University’s drug policy?” Again, three people chose to write in an open-ended response to this question and two out of the three focused on Rowan’s changing its policies/procedures to better match other colleges/universities. The first response, while

incorrectly implying that Rowan has a three strikes policy for alcohol violations, suggests that Rowan University should look into what other colleges and universities are doing.

The way your university handles possession of marijuana is LAUGHABLE. Especially when compared to other universities in the state, and across the nation. You have a no-tolerance policy for simple marijuana possession, but if kids are found black-out drunk in a pool of their own vomit they get three strikes? What is more detrimental to a student's health? Are we as students and graduates of an institute of higher learning supposed to completely dismiss logic, reasoning, and scientific evidence when it comes to marijuana?

The second response stated, "You need to differentiate between alcohol, marijuana, prescription drugs, and harder drugs such as cocaine and heroin to start." This idea is in fact true of other institutions. While Rowan only differentiates between alcohol and drugs, Binghamton University, for example, had marijuana related charges, illegal prescription drug charges and other drug charges (Office of Student Conduct, 2010b). There are now other institutions that distinguish between drugs, as well.

The third response is similar to the responses that were seen among the general student population at Rowan. This person suggests that they personally do not agree with New Jersey state laws regarding marijuana and therefore do not agree with how Rowan University handles such incidents.

The real issue is that it is not entirely possible to just stop somebody from using drugs by imposing mandated disciplinary sanctions. A drug user, unless easily scared straight, does not always want to just stop using. For me, it was marijuana, and I believe it should be legal to use marijuana as long as the person is above a certain age. For that reason, I am not really deterred from using unless it is MY personal sanction to stop using. I don't like the fact of anybody controlling me or stopping me from using a "drug" that I truly do not find to fit that label. Other drugs (which are truly addictive and can cause extremely detrimental problems to a user's health) I believe should have more serious consequences, but again, I don't believe a user will stop using unless they personally want to.

The idea that a student does not follow a policy because they do not agree with it has been a common theme throughout both surveys one and two.

Survey two also asked the drug policy violators, "...what programs, policies, or actions could Rowan have in place to deter drug policy violations (such as the one you were cited for) before they happen?" Six people chose to write in responses for this question. One person suggested having more police on campus as a deterrent. Another person said that it might be beneficial to bring in a drug abuser to speak at freshman orientation. The common theme found in all responses, which was also brought up in a previous question, was that Rowan should look into changing their policies/procedures and that nothing would deter students from violating the drug policy as it is now. This is because, according to the responses, students see violating the drug policy as a personal choice that the university should not interfere with. They also commonly think that the sanctions should not be as harsh as they are now.

The survey concluded with an opportunity to write in additional comments before asking demographic questions. There were seven people who chose to write in additional comments and their responses are listed in Table 16.

Table 16

*Additional Comments in Survey 2 (N = 18)*

---

Responses

---

1. Students are going to abuse intoxicants. If they don't feel safe using it on campus, they won't do it. The way Rowan dealt with my violation was unprofessional. They called my parents with out my consent (and before I could talk to them), kicked me out of my housing with no place to go, and labeled me a criminal.

2. I think my other comments pretty much sum it up. Your University and its drug policy is a JOKE. Especially when it comes to marijuana. How on earth can you have the same punishments in place for someone caught cooking meth compared to someone caught with a couple grams of marijuana? Its nonsensical. Get off your moral high horses and stop treating your students like dirt. Of all the people I've told about how I was treated by Rowan University for marijuana possession, not one of them could actually believe it. Nor had any of them experienced anything even REMOTELY relatable to being thrown out of campus housing in the middle of a semester with no previous warnings or offenses for possession of one gram of marijuana. There are places in this country where possession of marijuana is now completely LEGAL. Yet, you continue to treat your marijuana smoking student body like crack head criminals? ...Your politics are reactionary and absurd.

3. I was only in the same car as weed and the perpetrator left rowan the next day never to return but the other 3 of us I the car who had no drug were fined 400 each and kick out of housing just for involvement

4. Rowan University has an incredibly unfair drug policy that is counter-productive to the school's stated goal of furthering the educational of its members. It puts a financial strain on students already struggling from economic hardship, it evicts them from their homes with no concern with how they could possibly continue their educational without so much as a place to live, and uses inexcusable scare tactics and misinformation about the effects of benign substances such as marijuana in order to attempt to bully a population seeking to further their education and enhance their future. Rowan University's drug policy is quite simply ineffective and even harmful, potentially ruining otherwise promising lives and careers in the process.

5. Legalize it

6. The incident I previously described as my first incident was during my first week at Rowan as a freshman. I was naïve and unintelligent since I was arrested for smoking marijuana in between Beau Apartments where bike cops are abundant. I haven't had another issue with Rowan's Drug Police since then despite continually using.

---

Table 16 -- CONT.

*Additional Comments in Survey 2 (N = 18)*

---

Responses

---

7. This survey, I'm sorry to say, is awful and biased. You can't just lump every single drug into one group. Alcohol kills yet is only a fine for Rowan students, yet marijuana can't and you can get kicked out of school on the first offence.

---

Table 16 shows further proof of the common themes that were previously identified. These themes include changing the drug policy so that it is separated by drug type and making the judicial process more educational. Responses 2, 3 and 7 show that students would like the drug policy to be tiered either by type of drug, type of violation, or number of violations. Responses 1 and 4 show that people believe that there is a fault of some kind with Rowan's judicial procedures and that they would like for it to be more educational. Table 16 also reinforces the fact that there is a low perception of getting caught. Response 6 shows a student perspective where they do not believe that they will be caught again for continuously violating Rowan's drug policy, therefore lowering any deterrence effect. All of the responses in Table 16 have fit into common themes throughout the study.

To summarize, coding for the responses from the open-ended questions on both surveys found that the majority of the student population at Rowan and the drug policy violators believe that the sanctions for violating Rowan's drug policy do not need to be harsher in order to have a better deterrent effect. In fact, the majority believes that the severity should be lessened. Many respondents, as shown in the open-ended responses in

both surveys including those in Table 16, believe that Rowan should look into changing their drug policy to better match those of other institutions and to make the sanctioning more educational. For example, one common theme is the opinion that Rowan should separate its policy by types of illegal drugs (e.g. “marijuana and all other drugs” or such as how Binghamton University separates marijuana, prescription drugs and all other illicit drugs). Descriptive statistics also show that students and drug policy violators do not think that they have a high chance of getting caught for violating Rowan’s drug policy. I believe it is due to this lack of certainty that the deterrent effect is low and, in some cases, nonexistent. This reinforces the idea that severity may not be a priority (since it may not affect deterrence) and brings up the idea again that perhaps the drug policy sanctions for violators could be less punitive and more educational.

### **Other Findings**

The data from survey two were also used to gain insight on other information as well. As mentioned in Chapter 2, labeling theory is the idea that once people are labeled as offenders, they are likely to continue offending (Davis, 1972). This theory was tested with Rowan’s drug policy violators. It was intended to add a quantitative component by using a Chi-Square Test for Independence in order to find out if there is a correlation between people who felt labeled by Rowan University and whether or not they violated Rowan’s drug policy after being caught (i.e. recidivated). However, all respondents recidivated so the test could not be run.

## Chapter 5

### Summary, Discussion, Recommendations and Conclusions

#### Summary of the Study

This study looked at Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy. It focused on student perception of the policy and additionally included information on whether or not students knew of the policy, agreed with the policy or were deterred by the policy. Very helpful information was found and can be used for any future research that is found necessary. In the subsections to come, I will discuss the findings, give recommendations for practice, give recommendations for future research and conclude the study.

#### Discussion of the Findings

Three hypotheses were tested. The first was that students generally did not know of the policy and its possible sanctions. This hypothesis was formed because if a student does not go to freshman orientation, does not attend the first floor meeting held by their RA (if they live on-campus) and does not read the Student Handbook, then they will not know the drug policy at Rowan. This hypothesis was proved wrong; results showed that the general student body was aware of Rowan's drug policy and its possible sanctions. This is most likely due to their knowledge of the Student Code of Conduct, which houses the drug policy. It seems that the Student Code of Conduct is easy for students to understand because finding and reading that document and being aware of the policies was positively correlated. A Mann-Whitney U Test also showed that there was a statistically significant difference in drug policy awareness between students who read

the Student Code of Conduct and those who did not read it. It was also found, via Spearman's correlations, that the more a student is aware of the policy, the more they know that it applies to students living off-campus, that their parents/guardians will be notified for all policy violations, that there could be a judiciary panel hearing for policy violations and the more they understand the steps of the judicial process. These all mean that the Rowan Student Code of Conduct offers a lot of good information regarding Rowan's policies and procedures. On the other hand, correlations helped to discover that the more a student is aware of the policy the less a student is aware of the negative effects of drugs. In order to combat this, Rowan should offer more information regarding the negative effects of drugs, and statistics on drug use should be more widely spread among Rowan students, perhaps even starting to include this in the Student Code of Conduct.

The second hypothesis was that the potential sanctions of the drug policy did not deter the general student population. This hypothesis was not necessarily true or false. In fact, there was an exact split between students who were deterred by the policy and students who were not deterred by the policy at all. As stated previously, there were many variables that had a preliminary association with deterrence. For instance, there were three demographic variables that were correlated with deterrence: being a member of a Greek organization, gender and religion. While these variables seem to affect deterrence for different reasons, this emphasizes the importance of educating all types of students about the drug policy, the negative effects of drugs, etc.

Also, the more a student knows that the Student Code of Conduct applies to students living off-campus the more they are deterred by the policy. By understanding the drug policy applies to all students, not just those living on-campus, students perhaps



find it more serious or at least take it more seriously. Also, the more a student believes that the policies and procedures are appropriate, fair and educational the more they are deterred by them. This reinforces the idea that sanctions for violating Rowan's drug policy could be less punitive and more educational.

Deterrence theory was also very present within students' qualitative comments. First, the more a student knows of the possibility of their parents knowing of the incident or the possibility of police involvement, the more they are deterred. In addition, the stronger a student's morals and values are the more they are deterred by Rowan's drug policy. Finally, the higher the chance of getting caught, from the student's perspective, the more they will be deterred. However, if a student has actually been caught they are less likely to be deterred. This could be because they do not think that they will be caught again, since correlations also showed that violating the drug policy on any level made students less deterred by the policy. In the same regard, the more a student thinks that the drug policy just makes students more careful not to get caught, the less they are deterred by the policy, implying that they do not take it seriously.

The original belief used to form this hypothesis was that if students had a low level of perception of punishment, then it would not allow for any major deterrence from the policy. After reviewing both the quantitative and qualitative data, it seems as though this reasoning is true. The chance of getting caught is positively correlated with deterrence. In addition, if someone has been caught for the violating the policy in the past they are less likely to be deterred by the possibility of sanctions. I surmise that this is because the perception of being caught and punished another time is very low. The open-ended responses for survey one clearly stated that numerous students did not

believe that there was a high chance of getting caught for violating Rowan's drug policy, as it pertains to possession and/or use of illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia. With a low level of perception of punishment the deterrent effect is not as strong, if present at all. It should also be stated that the open-ended responses showed a pattern of students choosing not to follow Rowan's drug policy because they did not agree with it. Many students felt that the policy should separate marijuana from other illegal drugs because of their perceptions of the low dangers of the drug.

The third hypothesis was that the imposed sanctions help to prevent recidivism among offenders. After surveying drug policy violators, this was also found to be false. Respondents felt that Rowan's sanctions did not deter them from repeating the behavior. In addition, everyone who responded that the police caught them for violating Rowan's drug policy for possessing and/or using illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia said that they have repeated the behavior multiple times since being caught. An analysis of qualitative data showed that the drug policy violators were not deterred by Rowan's drug policy and its sanctions for the same reasons that the general student population was not deterred. These reasons were because they did not feel that there was a likely chance of them being caught again and because they disagreed with New Jersey drug laws and/or Rowan's drug policy and procedures and, therefore, chose to engage in the illegal behavior anyway.

### **Recommendations for Practice**

There is an incredibly low level of perception of punishment for violating the drug policy. In order to combat this way of thinking, perhaps Rowan could be more proactive with explaining what will happen if the students are caught using illegal drugs or display

the numbers of illegal drug violations (on fliers, emails, etc.) around campus. One of the students in an open-ended response suggested that an educational and proactive component could be added by having a student who violated Rowan's drug policy in the past, speak to the current students. This could potentially increase both the awareness of the policy, awareness of the negative effects of drugs and increase deterrence among the students who attend the event.

Due to the fact that a lot of students are not deterred from violating Rowan's drug policy because they do not agree with New Jersey state laws, it may be a good idea for Rowan to advertise information on the statewide laws. For instance, information could be better distributed on the New Jersey laws regarding illicit drugs, the federal laws regarding illicit drugs, and the negative effects of illegal substances. This would be especially helpful because Munro and Midford (2001) argue that policies that focus on punitive sanctions instead of drug education are ineffective. This information could be distributed via email, posters hung up around campus, or an outreach team such as that of Binghamton University (Office of Student Conduct, 2010a). This outreach team of students, or administrators, could speak of the statewide laws, the negative effects of illicit drug use and discuss Rowan's policy and possible sanctions. This will ensure that every student knows the policy and sanctions, understands the laws and is aware of the negative effects of illicit drug use. This may subsequently increase students' certainty of being caught.

Based on the data from drug policy violators, there is a need for a change in the judicial process. According to the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (2009b: 4), "The primary role of student conduct administrators is that of an

educator.” Yet, Table 13 shows that 72% of respondents to the survey given to drug policy violators said that they did not feel that the process was educational. Also, all of the respondents said that they did not receive any form of follow-up from Rowan after completing their required disciplinary sanctions. Following up with students post-sanctioning will offer them guidance and may help them feel less like they were labeled by the university, treated unfairly, or not given any helpful information (all of which were concerns of the drug policy violators). This follow up could be as simple as sending an email out to all students found in violation of the drug policy to let them know of different resources that may be helpful; such as the contact information for the counseling center, off-campus apartments nearby Rowan (if the student was evicted from on-campus housing), and any other information deemed helpful. If Rowan had an outreach team made up of students, such as SCOT at Binghamton University, then the follow up could be done peer to peer instead of via email. A member out of the outreach team could follow up with the student found in violation of the drug policy to see if they needed any additional resources from the University. Another idea would be to have the counseling center follow up with that student. In fact, the qualitative data from the drug policy violators show that they think mandatory counseling is a good idea. Dannells (1997: 2) states, “...today's codes of conduct tend to be heavy on process and light on real guidance for the student. It is time for colleges and universities to rethink their purposes for engaging in student discipline and fashion rules and processes that follow logically.” If the purpose of engaging in student discipline is to repair the harm done, punish the offender and reduce recidivism, then Rowan should look into offering restorative justice practices, such as Restorative Justice Administrative Hearings instead of conduct boards

and following up with students after sanctioning.

In addition, students may feel more positively about the judicial process with different sanctions. For instance, qualitative data shows that both students and drug policy violators feel that community service hours would help to deter students from repeating the behavior, however, none of the respondents were actually sanctioned with community service. Supporters of restorative justice techniques in a college setting believe that sanctioning should focus on restoring harm and suggest that communal harm could be repaid through community service (Karp & Allena, 2004).

The sanction of on-campus eviction after the first violation of the drug policy for possessing and/or using illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia should be further examined. Some students surveyed were evicted from their on-campus housing after being found responsible for violating Rowan's drug policy, however, Colleges and Universities today are trying to shy away from suspending a student from on-campus housing on their first illegal drug offense because it is not advantageous to the student's learning and due to the fact that other punitive sanctions can be given in replacement (USF, 2008). The qualitative data from both the general student population and the drug policy violators show that most do not agree with evicting students from on-campus housing based solely on one illegal drug charge. Implementing educational sanctions or following up with students post sanctioning could potentially alleviate this problem.

More educational sanctions could replace removal from on-campus housing. "Sanctions should be guided by the objectives of restoration and reintegration so that harm is repaired and offenders can become productive community members" (Karp & Allena, 2004: 8). Instead of losing on-campus housing, more appropriate sanctions

would focus on the entire student, such as requiring academic advising or counseling (Karp & Allena, 2004). In fact, Karp and Allena (2004) argue that students should only be evicted from their on-campus housing if a student poses a threat to the community or fails to attend judicial hearings and/or complete judicial sanctions. Otherwise, the goal of sanctioning should be to reintegrate the student through personal development, including accepting responsibility for their crime (Karp & Allena, 2004). Second, by having a staff member follow up with students after their sanctions are complete, which according to the drug policy violators is not currently happening, the students could be encouraged to remain enrolled in classes, told how they could move forward from the policy violation and be given any other beneficial advice that they may need. By implementing different sanctions, the judicial process could potentially be both punitive and educational.

Based on this study, Rowan is doing very well at distributing policy information, but may need to distribute more educational information (i.e. the negative harms of illicit drug use, what NJ law states, the seriousness of violating the drug policy, etc.). In order to make the sanctioning process more educational, Rowan should also reconsider the sanctions associated with the drug policy. Most importantly, Rowan University should continue to assess the Office of Community Standards, the student conduct policies and the effectiveness of the implementation of such policies. It would be extremely helpful for Rowan to complete a CAS self-assessment guide for the Office of Community Standards and the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy. This will offer another layer of assessment that is needed.

## **Recommendations for Future Research**

There is the opportunity for many follow-up assessments if Rowan University implements any recommended changes. These changes could include but are not limited to, distributing policy information differently, changing the policy so that marijuana and other illegal drugs are separated, gaining more educational sanctions, etc. If Rowan makes any of these changes, another study would be beneficial to gain additional information on whether or not students' attitudes have changed regarding the policy or if they are more or less deterred by the policy.

This study also used a very general term of "drugs" when asking questions regarding possession or use. The reason for the use of this general term is because Rowan University groups all drugs together in their policy. For more helpful information, however, the questions could separate that category into alcohol, marijuana, and all other illegal drugs. Data showed that Rowan students do not agree with the current drug policy and sanctions and therefore choose not to follow it. However, agreeing or disagreeing with the policy and/or sanctions could actually depend on which drugs were involved in the incident. For instance, students may be against eviction from on-campus housing for the first violation of smoking marijuana but agree with eviction from on-campus housing for the first violation of using heroin. Separating the drug policy by alcohol, marijuana, and other illegal drugs would be very helpful in analyzing student opinions.

Additionally, it would be beneficial to add a question asking if students agreed or disagreed with New Jersey drug laws. Again, many students said that they do not agree with the policy and therefore choose not to follow it. It would be very helpful to know if

they disagree with Rowan's specific policy or if the students disagree with the federal and/or state laws in general. For example, perhaps students will never agree with sanctioning a student for smoking marijuana because they believe that it should be decriminalized.

Finally, future research should make a stronger effort to gain a higher response rate and there should be an emphasis placed on completing each question. A substantial limitation of this study is the potential selection bias with such small sample sizes. Selection bias refers to not properly representing an entire population. For instance, the general Rowan students who chose to answer my survey may have been the "more responsible" students who do not violate the drug policy often, already understand the processes and protocols, etc. On the other hand, the drug policy violators who chose to answer my survey may have been the more opinionated people out of that group. Perhaps drug policy violators do not generally feel negatively toward Rowan's drug policy and sanctions but all of the respondents of this survey did. Due to the potential selection bias, the results of this study are not generalizable to the entire populations (the general student population at Rowan and the drug policy violators). One way of potentially gaining more responses in future research is to combine different surveying methods. If a student population does not check their email regularly then perhaps the surveys could be distributed by hand. More responses can only further solidify the findings of this study and future studies.



## Conclusions

Research shows us that the war on drugs is continuing and consistently pertains to college students (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2011; Skiba, 2000; McNamara, 2011; Musto, 1991). The current Rowan University college student population does not seem to agree with the current drug laws, in particular, the New Jersey drug laws pertaining to marijuana, which affects deterrence. However, there are still ways to increase deterrence among the Rowan student population. Rowan University should look into different ways of distributing more educational information and incorporating more educational sanctions.

The ability to survey an entire population is unique and this study was able to survey two different populations (the current Rowan University student body and everyone who violated Rowan's drug policy for possessing and/or using illegal drugs or drug paraphernalia from 2005-2011) in their entirety. However, there was a limitation in that not everyone in the populations responded. While the data from this study is not generalizable to either population, it still offers a lot of helpful and insightful information. In future research, different methods of surveying should be considered.

In sum, this study shows that Rowan University succeeded at making students aware of the policies and their possible sanctions but was not as effective at deterring them from violating such policies. Additional research on Rowan's judicial process and sanctions will help to gain information on how to properly deter students from violating policies while lowering the recidivism rate. With ongoing research and an opportunity for change, Rowan University can continue to increase the effectiveness of Student Conduct on its campus.

## References

- American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force (APA). (2008). Are Zero-Tolerance Policies Effective in Schools?: An evidentiary review and recommendations. *The American Psychologist*, 63(9), 852-862.
- Arcadia University. (2011). *Student Handbook*. Retrieved from <http://gargoyle.arcadia.edu/handbook/regpro/cc-code-conduct.htm>
- Bachman, R. & Paternoster, R. (1997). *Statistical Methods for Criminology and Criminal Justice*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bayens, G. & Roberson, C. (1997). *Criminal Justice Research Methods: Theory and Practice, Second Edition*. Florida: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Beccaria, C. (1963). *On Crimes and Punishments*. (H. Paolucci, Trans.). Michigan: Bobbs-Merrill. (Original work published 1764)
- Black, K. (2011). *Business Statistics: For Contemporary Decision Making*. USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Blischke, W. R., Rezaul Karim, M., & Prabhakar Murthy, D. N. (2011). *Warranty Data Collection and Analysis*. London, England: Springer.
- Burke, K. (1969). *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley, California: University of California Press.
- Cabrini College. (2012). *Student Handbook and Code of Conduct*. Retrieved from <http://www.cabrini.edu/Student-Life/Student-Resources-and-Services/Student-Handbook-and-Code-of-Conduct/>
- College Prowler. (2012). *Drug Safety*. Retrieved from <http://collegeprowler.com/rowan-university/drug-safety/>

- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). (2009a). *CAS self-assessment guide for alcohol, tobacco, and other drug programs*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). (2009b). *CAS self-assessment guide for student conduct programs*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). (2013). *Welcome to the CAS Online Store*. Retrieved from <https://store.cas.edu/catalog/index.cfm>
- Creswell, J. (2008). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. California: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Dannells, M. (1997). From Discipline to Development: Rethinking Student Conduct in Higher Education. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report*, 25(2).
- Davis, N. (1972). Labeling Theory in Deviance Research: A Critique and Reconsideration. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 13(4), 447-474.
- Division of Student Affairs at La Salle University. (2012). *Student Guide to Resources, Rights, and Responsibilities*. Retrieved from [http://www.lasalle.edu/students/dean/divpub/manuals/sgrrr/index.php?accordion\\_num=2&vn2\\_accordion\\_num=2&content=comm&anchorID=rule](http://www.lasalle.edu/students/dean/divpub/manuals/sgrrr/index.php?accordion_num=2&vn2_accordion_num=2&content=comm&anchorID=rule)
- Drexel University. (2012). *Student Handbook*. Retrieved from [http://drexel.edu/studentlife/community\\_standards/studentHandbook/](http://drexel.edu/studentlife/community_standards/studentHandbook/)
- Earleywine, M. (2002). *Understanding Marijuana: A New Look At The Scientific Evidence*. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Elliott, A. & Woodward, W. (2007). *Statistical Analysis Quick Reference Guide: With SPSS examples*. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Explorable. (2010). *Partial Correlation Analysis*. Retrieved from <https://explorable.com/partial-correlation-analysis>
- Farrington, D. P. (1999). Editorial: Validity of self-reported delinquency. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health: CBMH*, 9(4), 293-293.
- Gehring, D., Lowery, J., & Palmer, C. (2012). *The Effects of Sanctioning on Underage and Excessive Drinking on College Campuses* [Survey]. Retrieved via e-mail.
- Grasgreen, A. (2012). *Conduct Gets Costly*. Retrieved from <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/02/24/university-student-codes-conduct-include-fines-violations>
- Grossman, M., Chaloupka, F., & Shim, K. (2002). Illegal Drug Use and Public Policy. *Health Aff*, 21(2), 134-145.
- Grover, R., & Vriens, M. (2006). *The Handbook of Marketing Research: Uses, Misuses, and Future Advances*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Productions, Inc.
- Guest, G., MacQueen, K., & Namey, E. (2012). *Applied Thematic Analysis*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE Productions, Inc.
- Higher Education Center. (n.d.). *Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSCA) and Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention Regulations*. Retrieved from <http://www.higheredcenter.org/mandates/dfsca>
- Hellevik, O. (1988). *Introduction to Casual Analysis: Exploring Survey Data by Cross-Tabulation*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Ivis, F., Bondy, S., & Adlaf, E. (1997) The Effect of Question Structure on Self-Reports of Heavy Drinking: Closed-Ended versus Open-Ended Questions, *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 622-624.

- Jensen, G., Erickson, M., & Gibbs, J. (1978). Perceived risk of punishment and self-reported delinquency. *Social Forces*, 57, 57-78.
- Johnston, L., O'Malley, P., Bachman, J., & Schulenberg, J. (2011). Monitoring The Future: National Results in Adolescent Drug Use. *Sponsored by The National Institute on Drug Abuse National Institutes of Health*. Retrieved from <http://www.monitoringthefuture.org/pubs/monographs/mtf-overview2011.pdf>
- Jolliffe, D., Farrington, D. P., Hawkins, J., Catalano, R. F., Hill, K. G., & Kosterman, R. (2003). Predictive, concurrent, prospective and retrospective validity of self-reported delinquency. *Criminal Behaviour & Mental Health*, 13(3), 179-197.
- Karp, D. & Allena, T. (2004). *Restorative Justice on the College Campus: Promoting Student Growth and Responsibility, and Reawakening the Spirit of Campus Community*. Springfield, IL: Charles C Thomas Publisher, Ltd.
- Karp, D. (2013). *Restorative Justice @ Colleges & Universities*. Retrieved from <http://www.skidmore.edu/campusrj/index.php>
- Kim, S. (2002). *Correlate, Correlation- Zero Order*. Retrieved from [http://sociologyindex.com/correlation\\_zero\\_order.htm](http://sociologyindex.com/correlation_zero_order.htm)
- Kleck, G., Wever, B., Li, S., & Gertz, M. (2005). The missing link in general deterrence research. *Criminology*, 43, 623–660.
- Kraut, R. (1976). Deterrent and Definitional Influences on Shoplifting. *Social Problems*, 23, 358-368.
- Kutztown University. (2009). *Student Code of Conduct*. Retrieved from <http://thekey.kutztown.edu/codeOfConduct.aspx>
- Lewis, D. C. (2001). Urging college alcohol and drug policies that target adverse behavior, not use. *Journal Of American College Health*, 50(1), 39-41.

- Lofland, J. & Lofland, L. H. (1995). *Analyzing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Lofton, B. (2010). *Use of Restorative Justice Improves Campus Behavior*. Retrieved from <http://emu.edu/now/news/2010/04/use-of-restorative-justice-improves-campus-behavior/>
- McNamara, J. D. (2011). The hidden costs of Americas war on drugs. *Journal of Private Enterprise*, 26(2), 97-115.
- Mulligan, J. (2011). *Student Handbook and Planner*. Retrieved from [http://www.rowan.edu/studentaffairs/main\\_office/publications/documents/Addendum%20Spring%202011.pdf](http://www.rowan.edu/studentaffairs/main_office/publications/documents/Addendum%20Spring%202011.pdf)
- Munro, G., & Midford, R. (2001). 'Zero tolerance' and Drug Education in Australian Schools. *Drug & Alcohol Review*, 20(1), 105-109.
- Musto, D. (1991). Drug use in history. *OAH Magazine of History*, 6(2), 12-15.
- NASPA Student Affairs Administrators in Higher Education. (2011). [Survey for the Assessment & Knowledge Consortium 2011]. *The Student Conduct Benchmark*. Retrieved from <http://www.studentvoice.com/p/Project.aspx?q=4c42ff19a8b40be440c3e1272b1acaeb92e1edbf9235cd5a425b838ae325132f7d8a10ea056dccc0385a9b79d17655fc&r=51d8f56b-b89c-4be2-98a5-61cc3205c7e0>
- National Survey on Drug Use and Health (NSDUH). (2011). *Summary of National Findings*. Retrieved from <http://www.samhsa.gov/data/nsduh/2k11results/nsduhresults2011.htm>
- Newbery, N., McCambridge, J., & Strang, J. (2007). "Let's Talk About Drugs": Pilot study of a community-level drug prevention intervention based on motivational interviewing principles, *Health Education*, 107(3), 276-289.

Office of Student Conduct. (2010a). About the student conduct outreach team (SCOT). Retrieved from <http://www2.binghamton.edu/student-conduct/scot/>

Office of Student Conduct. (2010b). Student Conduct Sanctions. Retrieved from <http://www2.binghamton.edu/student-conduct/sanctions.html#q3>

Office of Student Conduct. (2010c). Sanctioning Guidelines. Retrieved from [http://www2.binghamton.edu/student-conduct/pdfs/sanction\\_guidelines.pdf/](http://www2.binghamton.edu/student-conduct/pdfs/sanction_guidelines.pdf/)

Pennsylvania State University. (2012). *Code of Conduct*. Retrieved from <http://studentaffairs.psu.edu/conduct/codeofconduct/>

Provost at Temple University. (2009). *Student Code of Conduct*. Retrieved from [http://policies.temple.edu/getdoc.asp?policy\\_no=03.70.12](http://policies.temple.edu/getdoc.asp?policy_no=03.70.12)

Richard Stockton College. (2012). *Office of Rights and Responsibilities*. Retrieved from <http://intraweb.stockton.edu/eyos/page.cfm?siteID=225&pageID=26>

Rider University. (2011). *Student Handbook- The Source*. Retrieved from <http://www.rider.edu/offices/more-services/handbooks-policies>

Rowan University Media and Public Relations. (2012). *Rowan Fast Facts 2012-2013*. Retrieved from <http://www.rowan.edu/open/fastfacts/>

Rowan Student Handbook. (2011). *Rowan University 2012-2013 Student Handbook*. Retrieved from <http://www.rowan.edu/studentaffairs/communitystandards/handbook.html>

Rowan University Police. (2012). *Clery Offenses*. Retrieved from [http://www.rowan.edu/safety/crime/Clery\\_Offenses\\_2008\\_2010.pdf](http://www.rowan.edu/safety/crime/Clery_Offenses_2008_2010.pdf)

Ruane, J. (2005). *Essentials of Research Methods: A Guide to Social Science Research*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing.

- Saltzman, L., Paternoster, R., Waldo, G. & Chiricos, T. (1982). Deterrent and Experiential Effects: the Problem of Causal Order in Perceptual Deterrence Research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 19(2), 172-189.
- Skiba, R. (2000). Zero Tolerance, Zero Evidence: An analysis of school disciplinary practice. Retrieved from <http://www.indiana.edu/~safeschl/ztze.pdf>
- Simons, J., Gaher, R., Correia, C., & Bush, J. (2005). Club Drug Use among College Students. *Addictive Behaviors*, 30, 1619-1624.
- Simmons, P. (2010). Rowan Students for Sensible Drug Policy. *Facebook* [Fan Page]. Retrieved from <http://www.facebook.com/RowanSSDP?sk=wall#!/RowanSSDP?sk=info>
- Single, E., & Rohl, T. (1997). *The National Drug Strategy: Mapping the future. An evaluation of the National Drug Strategy 1993-1997*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- Southern Technical Institute. (2012). *STC's Drug and Alcohol Abuse Policy*. Retrieved from <http://southernstech.edu/consumer-info.php>
- Stephen F. Austin State University (SFA). (2009). *Alcohol, tobacco, and other drug programs*. Nacogdoches, TX: Author.
- Students for Sensible Drug Policy. (2013). *Students For Sensible Drug Policy*. Retrieved from <http://ssdp.org/>
- The College of New Jersey. (n.d.). *Student Conduct Code*. Retrieved from <http://conduct.pages.tcnj.edu/files/2011/08/Student-Conduct-Code-FINAL-APPROVED-07.12.2011.pdf>
- Thornberry, T. P., & Krohn, M. D. (2000). The self-report method for measuring delinquency and crime. *Criminal justice*, 4(1), 33-83.



- Trustees of Dartmouth College. (2012). *Student Handbook*. Retrieved from <http://www.dartmouth.edu/~deancoll/student-handbook/>
- University of San Francisco Division of University Life (USF). (2008). *Program review materials*. San Francisco, CA: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2008). College Academic Performance and Alcohol and Other Drug Use. [http://www.higheredcenter.org/files/product/fact\\_sheet2.pdf](http://www.higheredcenter.org/files/product/fact_sheet2.pdf)
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2011). Results from the 2010 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Summary of National Findings. <http://www.samhsa.gov/data/NSDUH/2k10Results/Web/PDFW/2k10Results.pdf>
- Walsh, W. (1968). Validity of Self Report: Another Look. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 15(2), 180-186.
- West Chester University. (n.d.). *Student Code of Conduct*. Retrieved from [http://wcupa.edu/\\_services/stu.lif/ramseyreview/policies/conduct\\_code.asp](http://wcupa.edu/_services/stu.lif/ramseyreview/policies/conduct_code.asp)
- Williams, K. & Hawkins, R. (1986). Perceptual Research on General Deterrence: A Critical Review. *Law and Society Review*, 20(4), 545-572.
- Wittman, F. (2001). Prevention, Community Services, and Proposition 36. *J Psychoactive Drugs*, 33(4), 343-352.
- Zehr, H. (1997). Restorative Justice: The Concept. *Corrections Today*, 59(7), 68-70.
- Zeisel, H. (1957). *Say it with Figures*. Harper Collins Div.

## Appendix A: General Student Population Survey

### Student Conduct Policies at Rowan University

I am conducting a study on Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy to complete my master's thesis. If you wish to participate in this study, please complete the survey that appears below. You must be at least 18 years old to complete this survey. It should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Please do not put your name on this form since all responses will be kept anonymous. We cannot trace your email address back to your identity. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not respond to any question or to not participate in the study as a whole with no penalty to you. If you have any questions my name, along with my advisor's contact information, appear below:

Amy LoSacco (Student) LoSacc86@students.rowan.edu

Joseph Johnson (Advisor) johnsonjo@rowan.edu

### Do you believe that Rowan University has any of the following?

	Yes	No	I don't know
Student Code of Conduct that is applied to students living ON-campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student Code of Conduct that is applied to students living OFF-campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy for notifying parents/guardians of policy violations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Peer student hearing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Judiciary panel hearing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### I know where to find a copy of Rowan's Student Code of Conduct.

- Yes  
 No

### I have read Rowan's Student Code of Conduct.

- Yes  
 No

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I am aware of the policies related to drug paraphernalia, possession, and/or use.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The use or possession of drugs is NOT a serious problem at Rowan University.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The policies related to student conduct are appropriate for students attending Rowan University.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that the process for addressing potential student misconduct at Rowan University is fair.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that the process for addressing potential student misconduct serves an educational purpose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I understand the steps in the hearing/student conduct process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**I have possessed drug paraphernalia while enrolled at Rowan University.**

- Yes, multiple times  
 Yes, once  
 No

**I have possessed drugs while enrolled at Rowan University.**

- Yes, multiple times  
 Yes, once  
 No

**I have used drugs while enrolled at Rowan University.**

- Yes, multiple times
- Yes, once
- No

**I have been CAUGHT (by the police) for possession of drug paraphernalia, possession of drugs, or drug use, while enrolled at Rowan University.**

- Yes, multiple times
- Yes, once
- No
- I have never violated any drug laws

**I have possessed drug paraphernalia, drugs, or used drugs, AFTER being caught (by the police).**

- Yes, multiple times
- Yes, once
- No

**The possible sanctions related to Rowan's drug policy have deterred me from:** (select all that apply)

- Possessing drug paraphernalia
- Possessing drugs
- Using drugs
- They have NOT deterred me at all

**How aware are you of the negative effects drugs could have on your behaviors, health, and safety?**

- Not at all aware
- Not very aware
- Somewhat aware
- Very aware
- Extremely aware

**Does the possibility of getting disciplinary sanctions from Rowan University deter you from violating the drug policy?**

- Yes  
 No

**Why are you not deterred by Rowan's disciplinary sanctions?**

**Do you believe disciplinary sanctions from Rowan simply make students more cautious so they don't get caught in the future?**

- Yes  
 No

**What disciplinary sanctions do you believe would be most effective in deterring students from violating Rowan's drug policy? (select all that apply)**

- A warning not to repeat the behavior  
 Disciplinary probation  
 Participation in a drug education program  
 Completion of a research paper pertaining to drugs  
 Creating a bulletin board display or conducting a program designed to education others about drugs  
 A fine of \$1-\$50  
 A fine of \$50-\$200  
 A fine of more than \$200  
 Community Service  
 Eviction of on-campus housing  
 Suspension from Rowan University  
 Participation in a drug treatment program  
 Notification of parents  
 Notification of police  
 None of these sanctions would be effective  
 Other (please specify)

**Does the possibility of your parents knowing about an incident and/or its disciplinary consequences deter you from violating the drug policy?**

- Yes  
 No

**Does the possibility of police involvement (arrest, jail time, etc.) and/or breaking a federal law deter you from violating the drug policy?**

- Yes  
 No

**Do your morals/beliefs deter you from violating the drug policy?**

- Yes  
 No

**What do you think the chances are of you getting caught for violating Rowan's drug policy?**

- I don't violate Rowan's drug policy  
 Very unlikely  
 Somewhat unlikely  
 Neutral  
 Fairly likely  
 Very likely

**Do you know anyone who has violated Rowan's drug policy (possessed and/or used drugs or drug paraphernalia)?**

- Yes and they were caught by Rowan  
 Yes and they were NOT caught by Rowan  
 Yes, some people were caught by Rowan and some were not  
 No I don't know anyone who violates Rowan's drug policy

**Please rank the following illegal behaviors according to seriousness; 1 being the most serious behavior and 5 being the least serious behavior.**

- Possessing drug paraphernalia
- Possessing drugs
- Using drugs
- Drinking alcohol underage
- Serving alcohol to minors

**In your opinion, what programs, policies, or actions could Rowan have in place to deter drug policy violations?**

**Please write any additional comments below.**

**Please answer the following about yourself.**

	Yes	No
Are you a member of at least one club or organization on campus, not including a Greek organization?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are you a member of at least one athletic team on campus?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are you a member of a Greek organization on campus?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do you work either full or part-time?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**What is your current class standing?**

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate Student
- Other (please specify)

**What is your age?**

**What is your current gender identity?**

- Male
- Female
- Transgender

**What is your religion?**

- Atheist
- Wiccan, or Some Other Celtic, Nature-Based, Pagan Religion
- Hindu
- Buddhist
- Jewish
- Shinto
- Islam
- Agnostic
- Catholic
- Protestant Christian
- I don't associate with any religion
- Other (please specify)



**Are you a strong believer in this said faith (or lack thereof)?**

- Yes
- No

**What is your living situation while attending Rowan University?**

- On-campus housing
- Off-campus housing, within 5 miles of Rowan
- Commuting, MORE than 5 miles away from Rowan

**With which category do you most identify with?**

- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black/African American
- Latino(a)/Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Native American
- White/Caucasian
- Multiracial

**Are you an international student?**

- Yes
- No

**Did you transfer to Rowan University?**

- Yes
- No

**What is your current Grade Point Average (GPA)?**

- Below 2.0
- 2.0-2.4
- 2.5-2.9
- 3.0-3.4
- 3.5-4.0

Thank you for completing this survey.

## Appendix B: Student Drug Policy Violators Survey

### Student Conduct Policies at Rowan University

I am conducting a study on Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy to complete my master's thesis. If you wish to participate in this study, please complete the survey that appears below. You must be at least 18 years old to complete this survey. It should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. Please do not put your name on this form since all responses will be kept anonymous. We cannot trace your email address back to your identity. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may choose not respond to any question or to not participate in the study as a whole with no penalty to you. If you have any questions my name, along with my advisor's contact information, appear below:

Amy LoSacco (Student) LoSacc86@students.rowan.edu

Joseph Johnson (Advisor) johnsonjo@rowan.edu

### Do you believe that Rowan University has any of the following?

	Yes	No	I don't know
Student Code of Conduct that is applied to students living ON-campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student Code of Conduct that is applied to students living OFF-campus	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Policy for notifying parents/guardians of policy violations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Peer student hearing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Judiciary panel hearing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### I know where to find a copy of Rowan's Student Code of Conduct.

- Yes  
 No

### I have read Rowan's Student Code of Conduct.

- Yes  
 No

Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
I am aware of the policies related to drug paraphernalia, possession, and/or use.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The use or possession of drugs is NOT a serious problem at Rowan University.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The policies related to student conduct are appropriate for students attending Rowan University.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that the process for addressing potential student misconduct at Rowan University is fair.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I believe that the process for addressing potential student misconduct serves an educational purpose.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I understand the steps in the hearing/student conduct process.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**I have possessed drug paraphernalia while enrolled at Rowan University.**

- Yes, multiple times  
 Yes, once  
 No

**I have possessed drugs while enrolled at Rowan University.**

- Yes, multiple times  
 Yes, once  
 No

**I have used drugs while enrolled at Rowan University.**

- Yes, multiple times
- Yes, once
- No

If you have been involved in multiple drug incidents while attending Rowan University, please use the FIRST incident while answering the following questions.

**Did the incident occur on or off campus?**

- On campus
- Off campus

**Were you living on or off campus after the time of the incident?**

- On campus
- Off campus, within 5 miles or less from Rowan
- Off campus, more than 5 miles from Rowan

**While of the following best describes the violation for which you were found responsible?**

- Possession of drug paraphernalia
- Possession of marijuana
- Possession of illicit prescription drugs
- Possession of drugs other than marijuana and illicit prescription drugs
- Use of marijuana
- Use of illicit prescription drugs
- Use of drugs other than marijuana and illicit prescription drugs
- Other (please specify)

**Do you believe that you in fact violated Rowan's drug policy?**

- Yes
- No

**Before you were found responsible, how knowledgeable were you with Rowan's drug policy?**

- I did not think Rowan had a drug policy
- I thought Rowan had a drug policy but didn't know what it was
- I somewhat knew Rowan's drug policy
- I knew Rowan's drug policy extremely well

**Before the incident occurred, how knowledgeable were you that your behavior violated Rowan's drug policy?**

- Not at all knowledgeable
- Not very knowledgeable
- Somewhat knowledgeable
- Very knowledgeable
- Extremely knowledgeable

**Before the incident occurred, how aware were you of the negative effects drugs could have on your behavior, health, and safety?**

- Not at all aware
- Not very aware
- Somewhat aware
- Very aware
- Extremely aware

**Which of the following punishments were issued? (Please select all that apply)**

- Fine
- One meeting with a counselor
- Multiple meetings with a counselor
- Disciplinary Probation
- Participation in a drug education program
- Community Service
- Eviction from on-campus housing
- Suspension from Rowan for up to one year
- Suspension from Rowan for at least one year
- Participation in a drug treatment program

Other (please specify)

**How effective were the punishments you received, from Rowan, in deterring you from repeating the behavior?**

- Not at all effective  
 Somewhat effective  
 Extremely effective

**Do you believe that punishments issued by Rowan University deter students from violating the drug policy?**

- Yes  
 No

**Are there punishments that you believe may be more effective in deterring you from repeating the behavior in the future?**

- Yes  
 No

If yes, please describe them briefly

**Did your parents/guardians' knowing about the incident and/or its disciplinary consequences deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?**

- Yes  
 No

**Did your morals or beliefs deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?**

- Yes  
 No

**Please answer the following questions regarding possible involvement of the criminal justice system.**

	Yes	No
Were police notified of or involved in the incident?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Were you arrested?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did your case go to court?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did you have to spend any time in jail?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Did your involvement with the criminal justice system deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Did the possibility of police involvement (arrest, jail time, etc.) and/or breaking a federal law deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?**

- Yes  
 No

**I have possessed drug paraphernalia, drugs, or used drugs, AFTER being caught (by the police).**

- Yes, multiple times  
 Yes, once  
 No

**The possible sanctions related to Rowan's drug policy have deterred me from:** (select all that apply)

- Possessing drug paraphernalia  
 Possessing drugs  
 Using drugs  
 They have NOT deterred me at all

**My current status at Rowan University is:**

- Expelled from Rowan
- Withdrew from Rowan temporarily
- Withdrew from Rowan permanently
- Transferred to another College/University
- Student at Rowan
- Graduated from Rowan

**Please rank the following illegal behaviors according to seriousness; 1 being the most serious behavior and 5 being the least serious behavior.**

- Possessing drug paraphernalia
- Possessing drugs
- Using drugs
- Drinking alcohol underage
- Serving alcohol to minors

**Please answer the following questions based on your beliefs of Rowan AFTER being found responsible of violating the drug policy.**

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Rowan University has labeled me as a criminal.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The sanctions imposed on me by Rowan have negatively impacted my future.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I have stopped attending all college classes after I was found in violation of Rowan's drug policy.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The sanctions imposed on me by Rowan have prevented me from getting a job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The sanctions imposed on me by Rowan were unfair.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



**Did you participate in a drug treatment program as a result of this incident?**

- Yes, it was required by Rowan University
- Yes, but it was not required by Rowan University
- No

**How effective was the treatment program in deterring you from repeating the behavior?**

- Not at all effective
- Somewhat effective
- Extremely effective

**Do you believe that being in a drug treatment program would make you more aware of the negative effects that drugs can have on your behavior, health, and safety?**

- Yes
- No

**As a result of the incident and its consequences, did you become more aware of the negative effects that drugs can have on your behavior, health, and safety?**

- Yes
- No

**Did that awareness deter you from repeating the behavior in the future?**

- Yes
- No

**What disciplinary sanctions do you believe would be most effective in deterring students from violating Rowan's drug policy?** (select all that apply)

- A warning not to repeat the behavior
- Disciplinary probation
- Participation in a drug education program
- Completion of a research paper pertaining to drugs
- Creating a bulletin board display or conducting a program designed to education others about drugs
- A fine of \$1-\$50
- A fine of \$50-\$200
- A fine of more than \$200
- Community Service
- Eviction of on-campus housing
- Suspension from Rowan University
- Participation in a drug treatment program
- Notification of parents
- Notification of police
- None of these sanctions would be effective
- Other (please specify)

**What, if any, follow-up has Rowan had with you after you completed the disciplinary sanction regarding your drug violation?**

**What do you think the chances are of you getting caught again for violating Rowan's drug policy?**

- I don't violate Rowan's drug policy anymore
- Very unlikely
- Somewhat unlikely
- Neutral
- Fairly likely
- Very likely

**In your opinion, what programs, policies, or actions could Rowan have in place to deter drug policy violations (such as the one you were cited for) before they happen?**

**Please write any additional comments below.**

**Please answer the following about yourself.**

	Yes	No
Are you a member of at least one club or organization on campus, not including a Greek organization?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are you a member of at least one athletic team on campus?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Are you a member of a Greek organization on campus?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Do you work either full or part-time?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**What is your current class standing?**

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Graduate Student
- Not a current student
- Other (please specify)

**What is your age?**

**What is your current gender identity?**

- Male
- Female
- Transgender

**What is your religion?**

- Atheist
- Wiccan, or Some Other Celtic, Nature-Based, Pagan Religion
- Hindu
- Buddhist
- Jewish
- Shinto
- Islam
- Agnostic
- Catholic
- Protestant Christian
- I don't associate with any religion
- Other (please specify)

**Are you a strong believer in this said faith (or lack thereof)?**

- Yes
- No

**What is your living situation while attending Rowan University?**

- On-campus housing
- Off-campus housing, within 5 miles of Rowan
- Commuting, MORE than 5 miles away from Rowan

**With which category do you most identify with?**

- Asian/Pacific Islander
- Black/African American
- Latino(a)/Hispanic
- Middle Eastern
- Native American
- White/Caucasian
- Multiracial

**Are you an international student?**

- Yes
- No

**Did you transfer to Rowan University?**

- Yes
- No

**What is your current Grade Point Average (GPA)?**

- Below 2.0
- 2.0-2.4
- 2.5-2.9
- 3.0-3.4
- 3.5-4.0
- I don't have one

Thank you for completing this survey.

## APPENDIX C: Student Code of Conduct

**\*Edited to only include information applicable to Rowan's policy regarding drugs and drug paraphernalia (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011: 144-180)**

Rowan University is an academic community and as such the University has instituted this Student Code of Conduct to set forth the standards and expectations that are consistent with its purpose as an educational institution. The University reaffirms the principle of student freedom, coupled with an acceptance of full responsibility for one's behavior and the consequences of such behavior. Rowan University recognizes the rights of its students guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States and the State of New Jersey, which include a student's rights within the institution to freedom of speech, inquiry, assembly, peaceful pursuit of an education, and reasonable use of services and facilities of the University.

While it is the goal of the disciplinary process to educate students as to the purpose and importance of abiding by the Student Code of Conduct, the University will also issue sanctions as are appropriate and necessary to ensure continued and/or future adherence to this Code, and to protect the University community from disruptive behavior. In addition to the Code, students must also recognize and comply with the standards of classroom behavior as stated in their individual course syllabi.

This document and supporting materials have been developed to guarantee procedural fairness to students when there has been an alleged failure to abide by Rowan University's policies and regulations. Procedures may vary in formality given the gravity and nature of the offense and the sanctions that may be applied. Each student is

responsible for reading and complying with the Student Code of Conduct.

**A. Definitions** -when used in this Student Code of Conduct:

1. The term “University” means Rowan University.
2. The term “student” includes all persons enrolled in courses at Rowan University, both full-time and part-time, pursuing undergraduate or graduate studies, and those who live in campus living units. Persons who are not officially enrolled for a particular term but who have a continuing relationship with the University, such as students who withdraw after allegedly violating the Code, are considered “students.”
3. The term “faculty member” means any person hired by the University to conduct classroom or teaching activities or who is otherwise considered by the University to be a member of its faculty.
4. The term “University official” includes any person employed by Rowan University, performing assigned administrative or professional responsibilities.
5. The term “member of the University community” includes any person who is a student, faculty member, University official or any other person employed by the University. A person’s status in a particular situation will be determined by the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students.
6. The term “University premises” includes all land, buildings, facilities, and other property in the possession of or owned, used, or controlled by Rowan University, including adjacent streets and sidewalks.
7. The term “University-Sponsored Event” will mean any activity on or off campus, which is initiated, aided, funded, or supervised by the University or the Student

Government Association.

8. The term “organization” means any number of persons who have complied with the formal requirements for University recognition. (Greek Letter Organizations are also subject to the disciplinary procedures outlined in the Greek Handbook.)

9. The term “Campus Hearing Board” refers to a group of persons designated by the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students to determine whether a student has violated the Student Code of Conduct and, if so, to impose sanctions.

10. The term “Administrative Hearing Officer” refers to a University official designated by the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students to hold a hearing to determine whether a student has violated the Student Code of Conduct and, if so, to impose sanctions.

11. The term “Special Interim Hearing Board” refers to a group of persons designated by the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students to determine whether a student has violated the Student Code of Conduct and, if so, to impose sanctions when a Campus Hearing Board cannot convene.

12. The term “Campus Appeals Board” refers to the persons authorized by the Vice President for Student Affairs to consider an appeal from the Campus Hearing Board’s determination that a student has violated the Student Code of Conduct or from the sanctions imposed.

13. The term “witness” refers to a person who has personal knowledge of the incident in question.

14. The term “will” is to be used in the imperative sense, not imparting a choice.



15. The term “may” is to be deemed permissive, imparting a choice.

## **C. Off-Campus Conduct**

### **1. Introduction**

Rowan University expects its students to conduct themselves as mature, responsible and law abiding members of the University Community, as well as the larger community of which students and the University are a part. As such, Rowan students shall abide by all federal, state and local laws and ordinances including, but not limited to those relating to noise, traffic, parking, illegal drugs and consumption of alcohol. As responsible members of the University Community, Rowan students are expected, by their conduct and actions, to foster an atmosphere which nurtures positive community relations between Rowan University and the surrounding community.

### **2. Policy**

Rowan University will discipline students for Student Code of Conduct violations committed off-campus, when the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee determines that the conduct has an impact on the educational mission and interests of the University and/or the safety and welfare of the University community.

### **3. Student Conduct Code Applicable to Off-Campus Activities**

Jurisdiction of the University Discipline may be imposed on students for conduct which occurs on University premises, in or out of the classroom setting, while using University technology, at off-campus instructional sites, during off-campus University affiliated events and for off-campus conduct when the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee determines that the conduct has an impact on the

educational mission or interests of the University and/or the safety and welfare of the University community.

**Inherent Authority** In addition to the enforcement of the Student Code of Conduct as it relates to off-campus activities, the University reserves the right to take any other necessary and appropriate action to protect the safety and well-being of the University and the University community, the University's interests and community standing as well as the pursuit of the University's mission, goals and objectives.

**Violation of Law and Off-Campus Conduct** Students are separately accountable to both civil authorities and to the University for acts which constitute violations of federal, state or local law and of the Student Code of Conduct, including Off-Campus Conduct. Due to the need to efficiently, effectively and promptly protect the academic environment, proceedings for violations of the Student Code of Conduct, including Off-Campus Conduct, normally will proceed without delay and without regard to the potential or pendency of criminal proceedings or civil litigation. Proceedings under the Student Code of Conduct are not subject to challenge or revision on the grounds that criminal charges involving the same incident have been dismissed or reduced.

#### **4. Prohibited Conduct**

Conduct off-campus that is subject to disciplinary action, includes, but is not limited to violations of laws or ordinances concerning illegal drugs, alcohol consumption or distribution, public urination, public nudity, damaging property, noise, traffic, parking, loitering, littering and other disorderly conduct. Students are subject to discipline for off-campus misconduct even if the behavior was not the subject of criminal prosecution or

legal citation.

#### **D. Violation of Law and University Discipline**

Students may be accountable to both the University and to civil authorities for acts which violate the Student Code of Conduct. Disciplinary action at the University will normally proceed during the pendency of criminal proceedings. The University reserves the right to reach its own determination on violations of this Code independently of the outcome of any civil or criminal proceedings.

#### **E. Conduct Rules**

Individual students and student organizations are expected to abide by the following rules and regulations, and administrators are expected to enforce them. Additional rules and regulations may be promulgated during the year; announcements will be made upon adoption of the changes or additions. Attempting, abetting, or being an accessory to any act prohibited by the Student Code of Conduct will be considered the same as a completed violation.

Violating promulgated University rules, regulations and policies, and the laws of the State of New Jersey, and the Federal and local governments, whether on or off campus.

11. Possessing, using, manufacturing, distributing or attempting to distribute narcotics, dangerous drugs, controlled dangerous substances or drug paraphernalia that are prohibited by federal, state or local laws or University policies or knowingly being present at the time of the prohibited conduct (See also Alcohol and Other Drug Policy).

17. Engaging in off-campus actions and/or behaviors that violate laws and regulations of

federal, state and local agencies, as well as policies of the University (See also Student Code of Conduct Section C. “Off-Campus Conduct”)

20. Initiating behavior that violates the law, University policies or the Student Code of Conduct and placing evidence of that behavior on a public website or other public medium.

## **F. Disciplinary Process and Administrative Procedures**

### **1. Filing a Complaint**

Complaints against students/organizations may be made by any student, employee, or guest of the University who feels the Student Code of Conduct has been violated. A complaint must be made in writing to the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services, (Chamberlain Student Center, Suite 210) within a reasonable amount of time after the occurrence. (This will normally be construed to mean within 30 calendar days, unless unusual circumstances exist or it is an alleged crime that the University must report under the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act.) Forms on which complaints may be filed are available in the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services. The use of the form to file a complaint is not required, but is requested. The complaint should include as much detail concerning the alleged violation as possible and include the specific reference to the part of the Student Code of Conduct the complainant feels has been violated. Perceived criminal activity should be reported immediately to Public Safety, which will submit its report of a student violation to the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services. Whenever a complaint provides evidence that the continued

presence of the accused student on the campus may pose a substantial threat to herself/himself, others in the University, or to the stability and/or continuance of normal University functions the University reserves the right to impose an interim suspension from classes, residence areas, or the entire campus pending a disciplinary hearing (refer to section I for a complete description of procedures).

## **2. Adjudication of Complaints**

The Associate Dean for Civic Involvement or designee will review the complaint and determine whether it should be adjudicated by the student discipline system, and, if so, the appropriate adjudicator will be determined. For any disciplinary action for which sanctions may be imposed, the accused student/organization will have his/her case heard before one of the following adjudicators:

- *Administrative Hearing Officer* -If the alleged violation is one for which the student/organization could not be suspended or expelled from the University, the complaint will be heard by an Administrative Hearing Officer.
- *Campus Hearing Board* -If the alleged violation is one for which the student/organization could likely be suspended or expelled from the University, the complaint will be heard by the Campus Hearing Board. (refer to Sections F6 and F7 for additional information concerning the Campus Hearing Board)
- *Special Interim Hearing Board* -If the Campus Hearing Board cannot meet, a Special Interim Hearing Board will be appointed by the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services to expedite adjudication of student disciplinary cases under the following conditions

- a. An interim suspension has been issued (see section I), or
- b. The case must be adjudicated when the Campus Hearing Board cannot convene (for example, final exam week, vacation periods or summer school, etc.)

### **3. Notification**

When it is determined that a complaint will be adjudicated by the student disciplinary system, the accused student/organization will be notified of the alleged violation in writing (the “Hearing Notice”) via the Rowan email system. The Hearing notice will state what portion of the Student Code of Conduct was allegedly violated and describe the behavior believed to constitute a violation. The student will be notified of the hearing date in the Hearing Notice. Student will receive notice of a hearing at least three (3) business days prior to an Administrative Hearing and five (5) business days prior to a hearing before the Campus Hearing Board or Special Interim Hearing Board. If the accused student/organization fails to attend the hearing, except when there is a justifiable reason (serious illness or hospitalization, death of member of immediate family, serious physical emergency, arrest or incarceration or unavoidable transportation delay), the hearing will proceed and a finding will be reached based upon the available information. Failure of the accused student/organization to appear will not be considered to be an admission of responsibility. All participants will be informed of the right to select an advisor of his or her choosing, including an attorney. Advisors may have no other role in the hearing/case and are not permitted to speak on behalf of the student, ask questions or appear in lieu of the student/organization. A student who wishes to have an attorney as an advisor must inform the Office of Community Standards and Commuter

Services in writing, by telephone or electronic mail at least two business prior to a hearing. If a complainant or accused student/organization informs the University that an attorney will be present at the hearing, the University will decide if legal counsel for the University should also be present. Both the accused student/organization and the complainant will be informed of the right to bring witnesses to provide information at the hearing. Witnesses must have personal knowledge of the incident at issue and may serve no other role at the hearing/case. Character witnesses are considered irrelevant and will not be permitted to participate. A list of witnesses must be submitted to the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services 48 hours in advance of the hearing. The list should include each witness' name and a summary of the information s/he is expected to provide.

#### **4. Administrative Agreement/Hearing Waiver**

The accused student/organization and complainant will also be informed if the disciplinary complaint can be resolved by completing an Administrative Agreement/Hearing Waiver. An Administrative Agreement/Hearing Waiver would be completed only when there is acknowledgement of responsibility on the part of the accused student/organization, and agreement, by all parties including the complainant, that the sanction(s) imposed are reasonable and fair. The sanction will reflect the severity of the current charge(s) against the student/organization, as well as any previous disciplinary record. All participants will also waive the rights to have the complaint adjudicated at a disciplinary hearing and appeal. Should the accused student/organization not accept responsibility for the charges, nor accept the proposed sanction, then appearance at the disciplinary hearing is required.

## **5. Administrative Hearing Officer Procedures**

- a. A student/organization may challenge the assignment of a specific hearing officer to his/her case for good cause. This challenge must be presented in writing to the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services at least one working day prior to the scheduled date and time of the hearing. Upon reviewing the details of the challenge, the Associate Dean for Civic Involvement will either uphold the challenge and appoint an alternate hearing officer and arrange a new hearing or deny the challenge.
- b. A hearing officer will withdraw from adjudicating any case in which s/he cannot reach a fair and objective decision.
- c. The Hearing Officer will exercise control over the manner in which the hearing is conducted to avoid unnecessarily lengthy hearings and to prevent the harassment or intimidation of witnesses. This includes, but is not limited to, imposing reasonable limits on the number of factual witnesses that may be introduced. Technical legal rules of evidence, the wording of questions, hearsay and opinions will not be formally applied. Anyone who disrupts a hearing or who fails to adhere to hearing procedures may be excluded from the proceeding.
- d. The hearing officer will review all materials, hear all information pertinent to the case from the complainant, the accused student/organization and witnesses, clarify issues raised, render a decision based on the information presented and take all actions and make all determinations necessary and proper for the hearing.
- e. A hearing officer's decision will be based on all the information presented during the hearing process. If the student is found in violation of university rules, records within the



student's past disciplinary file and a written victim impact statement, if appropriate, will also be used in determining an appropriate sanction(s).

f. Following all hearings in the case, the hearing officer will provide the accused student with written notification of the decision reached, the reason for the decision and information regarding the University's appeal process.

## **6. Campus Hearing Board Structure**

The Campus Hearing Board is chaired by a non-voting Administrative Hearing Officer, who is normally an employee of the Student Life Division and most likely the Associate Dean for Civic Involvement. The Campus Hearing Board is composed of nine regular members and a pool of alternates. • Three members who are matriculated undergraduate or graduate students and in good standing with the University. Student members are selected through an annual application and selection process conducted by the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services. • Three members of the University Senate who are appointed by the University Senate President. • Three members of the professional staff who are appointed by the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students. • The Campus Hearing Board may be convened by a quorum of five members, provided that at least one student, one University Senate member and one professional staff member are present. For complaints that are adjudicated by a Special Interim Hearing Board any three members of the Campus Hearing Board must be present.

## **7. Campus Hearing Board Procedures**

a. Any student appearing before the Campus Hearing Board may challenge the assignment of any member of the Board to his/her case. Upon hearing the details of the

challenge, the Chair will either uphold or deny the challenge.

b. A Campus Hearing Board member will withdraw from adjudicating any case in which s/he cannot reach a fair and objective decision.

c. There will be an audio recording of the hearing (excluding Board deliberations and voting) for the purpose of providing assistance to the Campus Hearing Board or Appeals Board in their deliberations and to the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee, and accused student or complainant for use in filing an appeal. This recording remains the property of the University and constitutes an official record of the hearing. No other recording of the hearing is permitted.

d. The Chair will make all determinations on questions of procedure and admissibility of information presented and will not be excluded from hearings or Board deliberations except that s/he will not vote. The Chair will exercise control over the manner in which the hearing is conducted to avoid unnecessarily lengthy hearings and to prevent the harassment or intimidation of witnesses. Technical legal rules of evidence, the wording of questions, hearsay and opinions will not be formally applied. Anyone who disrupts a hearing or who fails to adhere to hearing procedures may be excluded from the proceeding at the discretion of the Chair.

e. The Board will review all materials and hear all information pertinent to the case from the complainant, the accused and all witnesses. Members of the Board, including the Chair, will be free to ask relevant questions in order to clarify information or resulting issues.

f. After hearing all the information, the Board will deliberate privately until the decision

is reached by a majority vote. A tie vote will result in a finding of “not in violation.”

g. If the student is found —in violation— the Board will determine the appropriate sanction to be imposed. The past disciplinary record of the accused student will not be supplied to the Board by the Chair prior to this point. Other information from either party to the hearing, including a written victim impact statement if appropriate, or from the Chair which is relevant to the choice of sanction(s) may also be introduced at this point, including information concerning sanctions imposed against other students for similar offenses. No information directly related to the case in question may be introduced for the first time unless the accused student has been informed and allowed to review and comment on the information.

h. Following the hearing, the Chair will provide the accused student with written notification of the decision reached, the reason for the decision and information regarding the University’s appeal process.

j. The Chair will also provide the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee with written notification of the decision reached and supporting case documents for the purpose of conducting a —Case Review. At the conclusion of the review, the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee may also file an appeal of the decision.

## **8. Rights in all Disciplinary Hearings**

The University disciplinary system is not a criminal or civil law process and the technical rules of evidence applicable in criminal and civil cases will not apply.

University disciplinary hearings will accord the following specific rights to all

students/organizations:

- a. To receive written notice of the charges.
- b. To have reasonable access to the case file prior to and during any hearing, provided that all reviews, prior to the hearing, must take place in the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services.
- c. To have access to advice by an individual of his or her choosing, including an attorney.
- d. The burden of proof rests upon the complainant, who must establish that the accused student/organization is responsible for the conduct violation “more likely than not” based on the weight of the credible information presented.
- e. The accused student/organization and the complainant will be given the opportunity to participate in the hearing, present information on their own behalf, call witnesses and question those who provide information at their hearing. This does not include the right to ask questions directly.
- f. Disciplinary hearings will be closed to all members of the campus and outside community except those directly involved with the case.
- g. The accused student/organization will receive written notification of the decision reached after all hearings, connected to the complaint, are conducted. The notification will also include a list of any sanctions imposed and appeal information.
- h. The accused student/organization will have the right to waive any of these rights.
- i. Victims may submit written statements to the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services detailing the effect the violation has had upon them and their ability

to function as students. This statement will be considered when determining an appropriate sanction and only if the accused student is found “in violation.”

## **G. Sanctions**

A Hearing Officer, Campus Hearing Board or Special Interim Hearing Board may impose a single or multiple sanctions for violations of the Student Code of Conduct. Factors to be considered in deciding sanctions will include present demeanor and past disciplinary record of the student, penalties resulting from a corresponding court case, the nature of the violation, and severity of any damage, injury, or harm resulting from it as perceived by the victim and/or appropriate University officials. There will be no refund of tuition/fees if withdrawal from courses and/or University housing is affected because of violations of the Student Code of Conduct. Sanctions which may be imposed upon any student found to have violated the Student Code of Conduct include the following:

*Official Warning:* A written statement indicating a violation of the Student Code of Conduct has occurred and warning that a subsequent violation will likely be treated more severely.

*Campus Service Hours or Educational Task:* Completion of hours/task(s) which benefit the individual, campus, or community.

*Monetary Fine:* The student is required to pay a fine that has been placed onto their student account.

*Suspension of Activity Privileges:* The student cannot be a member of a recognized student organization, participate in organizations’ regularly scheduled activities, serve as a representative of the University, or participate in intramural, club, or intercollegiate

sports. Notification of this sanction/status will be sent to appropriate University officials so they will know who may not participate in activities sponsored by their offices.

*Disciplinary Probation:* A defined period of time (minimum of one semester) indicating that a student is no longer in good social standing with the university. Any subsequent violation, while in this status, will likely result in suspension or expulsion from the university.

*Suspension of Residence Privileges:* The student's privilege to live in University-owned housing, and visit the residence areas of the campus, is suspended on a temporary or permanent basis. The student is not entitled to any refund of campus housing and/or meal plan fees.

*Suspension:* Beginning on the date the suspension takes effect, the student may no longer be a registered student, may not attend classes, nor receive grades for a specified period of time. In addition, while in this status, the student may not be present on the campus nor at a University-sponsored event for any reason whatsoever. The suspension will be noted on the student's academic transcript. The student is not entitled to any refund of any tuition/fees.

*Expulsion:* Beginning on the date the expulsion takes effect, the student may never again be a registered student, may never attend classes, nor receive grades. In addition, the student may never be present on the campus nor at a University-sponsored event for any reason whatsoever. The expulsion will be noted on the student's academic transcript. The student is not entitled to any refund of any tuition/fees.

*Other sanctions:* Other sanctions maybe imposed in addition to, or instead of, those

described in #1 through #8 above. For example, costs associated with educational programs or damage repair fees may be charged or students may have use of University facilities, campus driving or parking privileges limited or revoked. Students who are found responsible for Student Code of Conduct violations which involve alcohol/drug (ab)use, may be required to attend educational programs intended to inform them about alcohol/drug use and abuse.

- The Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services may notify parents/guardians of students under 21 years of age when a student is found responsible for a violation of the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy.
- Rowan Public Safety may notify parents/legal guardians when citations have been issued by law enforcement officials, without waiting for a hearing or any other due process since citations given by the law enforcement unit of a university are not covered by FERPA.
- Any sanction may be put on hold or “stayed” (i.e. not put into effect) for a predetermined period of time by the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or his/her designee. The original sanction(s) may be re-imposed immediately upon a further finding responsibility in a subsequent campus disciplinary hearing at any level.
- A student who fails to complete the terms of a campus disciplinary sanction by the given deadline will have an administrative “Hold” placed on their account and may have his/her re-registration for a subsequent semester postponed or terminated until all terms of the sanction have been completed.
- Students should be aware that conviction in criminal court for certain controlled substance offenses including drug possession and/or sale may have them declared

ineligible for Federal financial aid for a period of time. See the Financial Aid Office for details.

### **Application of Standard Sanctions**

Standard sanctions have been adopted by Rowan University to respond to substance abuse-related violations, off-campus conduct violations, as well as weapon and violence violations of the Student Code of Conduct. Rowan University is deeply concerned about the extent to which some students engage in underage consumption of alcohol, unlawful use of drugs, and/or consumption of alcohol or other drugs to a degree that renders them in need of emergency medical intervention or other extraordinary assistance. In addition, Rowan University seeks to deter students from engaging in conduct that poses risks to the safety and well-being of the individual student and/or the University and Glassboro community as a whole. Standard sanctions are intended to alert students and other members of the University community to the seriousness of alcohol-related and drug-related behaviors, violence, and safety violations; provide meaningful consequences for violations of the Student Code of Conduct; and, ensure that students are provided opportunities to access education, counseling, and support. Standard sanctions apply only to those offenses described below. Standard sanctions listed below apply to misconduct that occurs both on-campus and off-campus, at the discretion of the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee. Incidents falling within the Student Code of Conduct but not described below will be handled on a case-by-case basis in light of all the circumstances.

**Please Note:** Students found responsible for multiple violations will receive the



cumulative sanctions associated with each violation. (Example -A student who is found responsible in a single incident for the first violations of maintaining a disorderly house, supplying alcohol to underage persons and selling alcohol should expect to receive a sanction which includes a fine of \$800, Completion of Alcohol and Other Drugs Education Program, Mandatory participation in the Community Responsibility Workshop, Disciplinary Probation and Notification of Parent/Guardian).

## **H. Appeals**

1. Upon receiving notification of the outcome of a case, the accused student, victim (in cases of “sex offenses” or “crimes of violence”) or the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee (in Campus Hearing Board cases) may file an appeal for the following reasons:

- a. The specified procedural error(s) or error(s) in the interpretation of University regulations is so substantial as to effectively deny the participant a fair hearing.
- b. New and significant information has become available which could not have been discovered by a properly diligent person before or during the hearing.
- c. The sanction is substantially disproportionate to the violation.
- d. The facts of the case were insufficient to establish that a violation occurred.

2. All appeals must be made within five (5) business days of the date on the letter informing the parties of the decision. Appeals must be submitted in writing to the Associate Dean for Civic Involvement and should explain in detail the basis of the request, including any supporting documentation.

3. Upon receipt of the written appeal, the Associate Dean for Civic Involvement will

defer the imposition of the sanction(s) pending the decision on the appeal. Note: Interim Suspension restrictions will remain in effect during the appeal process.

4. Cases adjudicated by the Campus Hearing Board will be forwarded to the Campus Appeals Board. All other cases will be forwarded to the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee.

5. An appeal will be responded to in a timely manner and a final decision will be issued in writing either accepting or denying the appeal and giving the reasons for this decision.

6. The Campus Appeals Board:

a. The Associate Dean for Civic Involvement convenes the Campus Appeals Board. The Board is comprised of a member of the University's Administration (appointed by the Office of the President), President of the University Senate, and the President of the Student Government Association. Designees may be used in any of the positions. Each member must be in attendance for a quorum.

b. The Board will review the written appeal and all documentation contained in the case file in a closed meeting. The Board by a simple majority vote will deny or uphold the appeal. If an appeal is upheld based on procedural error or new information (reasons a or b above), the case will be remanded to the Campus Hearing Board for re-opening of the hearing. If an appeal is upheld based on disproportionate sanction or lack of sufficient information (reasons c or d above), the Board will render the appropriate determination and/or sanction.

c. Normally, all Campus Appeals Board decisions are final and will be forwarded to the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services for immediate implementation.

For cases involving an expulsion of a student or permanent loss of recognition for a student organization, the accused student or organization, the victim (in cases of —sex offenses or —crimes of violence) or the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee may request the President of the University to review the decision of the Appeals Board.

d. A request for review by the President must be made within two (2) business days of the date on the letter informing the parties of the Campus Appeals Board decision. The request must be submitted in writing to the Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services and must include clear and convincing reasons to change the decision of the Campus Appeals Board. The President may or may not elect to review a decision. The request for review will be responded to in a timely manner by the Office of the President.

7. When it is not possible for the University Appeals Board to meet in a timely fashion (for example, final exam week, vacation periods, summer school, etc.), an appeal from the Campus Hearing Board may be reviewed by the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students for final disposition.

8. The appeals process described will be the final step in the discipline process.

#### **I. Procedures for Interim Suspension from Campus or Residence Areas**

1. A student may be suspended from the campus as a whole or from residence areas for an interim period pending a disciplinary hearing; the interim suspension is effective immediately without prior notice whenever there is evidence that the continued presence of the student on the campus may pose a substantial threat to herself/ himself, others in

the University, or to the stability and/or continuance of normal University functions.

2. The Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee is generally authorized to impose Interim Suspensions.

3. If a student wishes to return to classes and/or residence on campus, he or she is required to make an appointment to appear personally before the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee within five (5) business days from the effective date of suspension. The purpose of this Interim Suspension appointment is to determine the following:

a. The reliability of the information concerning the student's conduct, including the matter of his/her identity.

b. Whether the conduct and surrounding circumstances reasonably indicate that the continued presence of the student on the campus likely poses a substantial threat to herself/himself, to others, or to the stability and/or continuance of normal University functions.

4. A disciplinary hearing will be scheduled at another time to hear the substantive issues involved. This follows the Interim Suspension appointment with the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee and employs the procedures outlined earlier. An Interim Suspension, in and of itself, does not become part of a student's permanent disciplinary record.

#### **J. Conduct Code Violations' Effect upon Graduation**

A student found responsible for violations of the Code, which could have led to expulsion or suspension had s/he remained a registered student at the University and who

has otherwise satisfied the University's published requirements for graduation, may have the awarding of his/her degree postponed to a future date or permanently withheld. A student whose graduation is postponed or permanently withheld may also be refused a copy of his/ her official transcript and cannot have it sent to others during the period of his/her sanction. In cases where graduation is delayed due to pending charges, cases normally will be adjudicated within as short a period of time as is practicable.

#### **K. Release of Disciplinary Record Information**

In accordance with current guidelines established in the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and implemented by Rowan University, the record of most disciplinary proceeding's findings is not open to the public without the consent of the individual student. The Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act, and the N.J. Sexual Assault Victim's Bill of Rights, and/or 34 CFR 668.47(a)(12) (vi) does permit the disclosure of campus discipline system findings to victims of —sex offenses‡ (including non-forcible ones) or —crimes of violence.‡ In addition, FERPA permits, once all appeals are exhausted, the final results of campus disciplinary hearings for crimes of violence and forcible and non-forcible sex offenses to be publicly disclosed, including the name of the accused held responsible and the nature of the offense. Parents or guardians may be notified for cases involving crimes of violence and forcible and non-forcible sex offenses and in certain cases involving violations of campus drug or alcohol regulations, when the student is a dependent (as defined in Section 152 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986) or when the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee deems the matter to have been a health or safety emergency. Complainants in other kinds of cases will be notified about case

adjudication and sanctions imposed if, in the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students' or designee's opinion, such disclosure is necessary to protect the safety of the complainant or of other members of the University community. If FERPA or other pertinent regulations change, the complainant and the accused student will be notified before a hearing is held. The Office of the Registrar's **Notice to Students Regarding Provisions of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974** can be accessed at "<http://www.rowan.edu/provost/registrar/ferpa.html>"

#### **L. Record Keeping**

The Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services will maintain student disciplinary files, which contain all necessary and appropriate correspondence, Hearing Officer, Campus Hearing Board and appeal decisions as well as other documentation pertinent to any cases for which a student was found responsible for a violation of the Student Code of Conduct. Records of cases that are designated as "pending" will also be maintained. Student disciplinary files will be maintained as follows: Disciplinary records will be maintained for a period of seven years after the last year of the student's attendance at the University. The University reserves the right to retain any disciplinary records for longer periods.

#### **M. Interpretation and Revision**

Any question of interpretation regarding the Student Code of Conduct will be referred to the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students or designee for final determination. The Code may be periodically reviewed and amended as necessary under the direction of the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students, or designee.

## **Appendix D: Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy Guide**

**\*Edited to only include information applicable to Rowan's policy regarding drugs and drug paraphernalia (Rowan Student Handbook, 2011: 181-216)**

Rowan University is committed to the pursuit of a quality education by providing an environment which promotes respect, safety and optimal health and well being to all members of the campus community. This includes students, faculty, staff, administration, alumni, and Rowan University guests. Alcohol and illicit drug use can pose many safety and health risks. Such use may result in impaired judgment and coordination, physical and psychological dependence, damage to vital organs, inability to learn and retain information, psychosis and severe anxiety, unwanted or unprotected sex, injury and death. In light of this, the Rowan University Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy prohibits all use of illegal drugs and only permits the consumption of alcoholic beverages in a manner that is responsible and adheres to restrictions imposed by law and University standards of conduct. Rowan University does not accept misuse of illicit drugs or alcoholic beverages as an excuse for violations of any University policies. Emphasis is placed on responsible and legal use of alcohol. Responsible drinking is the use of alcohol in ways that do not have negative effects on either the individual or the community and do not violate the law. The preparation, sale, service, and consumption of alcoholic beverages must comply with the limitations established by University policies, local ordinances, state laws, and federal laws. Behavior at off-campus events, which are not sponsored or funded by Rowan University or a University recognized organization, will be subject to the University discipline system if the conduct violates local, state, or

federal law or when the University determines that the conduct has a direct impact on the educational mission and interests of the University and/or the safety and welfare of the University community.

This statement serves as notice that violations may result in disciplinary sanctions as specified below under sections I.e. “Consequences for NonCompliance” and I.f. “Parental Notification for Student Violations of the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy.”

### **I. Rowan University Regulations**

In compliance with the Drug Free Schools and Campuses Act and the Drug-free Workplace Act, Rowan University prohibits the unlawful possession, use, or distribution of alcohol and illicit drugs on campus or as part of any of its sponsored events.

In addition to the legal requirements from the New Jersey Statute, Title 2C, the following University regulations must be observed whenever alcoholic beverages are served, sold, or consumed in approved facilities on campus, in University-owned or operated residential facilities, or at university sponsored events.

The Office of the Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students has been charged with overall responsibility to administer, support, and enforce the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy. This office also reserves the right to suspend alcohol privileges temporarily when it is in the best interest of the University community. Additional personnel involved in the administration, support, and/or enforcement of the policy include, but are not limited to, Greek Affairs, Community Standards and Commuter Services, Athletics, Student Life, Residential Learning and University Housing, Public Safety, Dining Services, Faculty, Staff, Human Resources, and Counseling and



Psychological Services. The Vice President for Student Life/Dean of Students may convene an ad hoc board to review policy details of process and educational approach.

#### **A. Illegal Drugs**

Possession, use, manufacture, distribution or sale of illegal drugs is prohibited.

Possession, use, manufacture, distribution or sale of drug paraphernalia (e.g. pipes, bong, etc.) is prohibited.

Being under the influence of any illegal drug is prohibited (see section b.3 for behavioral symptoms associated with intoxication). Knowingly being in the company of anyone who is using illegal drugs is prohibited.

#### **D. Off-Campus Events**

University-affiliated events are covered by this policy, even though they may take place off campus. A University affiliated event is defined as an off-campus gathering of members of the Rowan University community (and/or their guests) which is sponsored or funded in whole or in part by Rowan University. Private off-campus events which are not sponsored or funded by Rowan University will also be subject to the University discipline system if the conduct violates local, state, or federal law or when the University determines that the conduct has a direct impact on the educational mission and interests of the University and/or the safety and welfare of the University community.

Sponsors, coaches, and/or organization advisers are expected to ensure that their respective student organizations/groups take reasonable precautions in their activities in order that policies and laws governing alcohol/illegal drugs are not violated and that the welfare of their members is not endangered.

The University expects that the existing state, local, or premises regulations which prohibit illegal drugs or regulate the service, sale, possession, or consumption of alcohol will be supported and enforced at University-sponsored events.

#### **E. Consequences for Non-Compliance**

The University is concerned that individuals make responsible decisions regarding the use of legal and illegal substances. All members of the campus community found in violation of the Rowan University Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy will be subject to disciplinary action.

A student found violating the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy will be considered to have violated the Student Code of Conduct and be subject to sanctions commensurate with the offense consistent with local, State, and Federal law, up to and including expulsion from the university and referral for prosecution, as well as the possibility of revocation of the privilege to consume alcohol on campus and/or to attend University affiliated events at which alcohol will be served or consumed. Referrals to educational programs sponsored by the Counseling & Psychological Services Center may be required.

Organizational sanctions for violations of the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy by campus groups may include written reprimand, restriction or loss of privileges, and loss of official recognition. In addition, the campus group may be mandated to participate in educational programs. Individual members of the group may also be individually sanctioned for their involvement in the violations pursuant to this section.

Violations of the University Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy by a University

employee will be referred to the individual's supervisor for the appropriate administrative action consistent with the state regulations and applicable agreements between the state and employee bargaining units. An employee may be disciplined for violation of this policy consistent with local, State and Federal law up to and including termination of employment and referral for prosecution.

Violations of the University Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy by persons who are not members of the University community may result in their being banned from the Rowan University campus or from specific facilities and/or subject to arrest for trespass. Contractors are subject to all University rules and regulations.

Any violation which occurs while an event is in progress may subject the violator to immediate removal from the area.

When violations or other circumstances occur at events which, in the judgment of University officials, constitute a threat to life or property or which create a substantial risk thereof, the event may be terminated. It is expected that such authority will be exercised only in extraordinary and/or emergency circumstances.

This policy does not supplant or supersede statutory or administrative law at the federal, state, county, or municipal level. Strict compliance with such laws will be the responsibility of all organizations and individuals. Violators of the law may be subject to penalties imposed by a court or other empowered board, agency, or commission, in addition to any action taken by Rowan University.

## **F. Parental Notification for Student Violations of the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy**

Rowan University's Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy outlines the University's position regarding the unauthorized possession, use, or distribution of alcohol and controlled substances on campus. A 1998 amendment to The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 authorizes higher education institutions to inform a parent or guardian of any student under age 21, who has been found in violation of any federal, state, or local law or any rule or policy of the institution governing the use or possession of alcohol or controlled substances. The Office of Community Standards and Commuter Services may notify parents/guardians of students under 21 years of age when a student is found responsible for a violation of the Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy. Please note: Citations given by the law enforcement unit of a university are not covered by FERPA. Therefore, Rowan Public Safety may notify parents/legal guardians when citations have been issued by law enforcement officials, without waiting for a hearing or any other due process.

## **III . Summary of Applicable State and Federal Laws Regarding Drug Offenses and Penalties**

2C:35-3, Leader of Narcotics Trafficking Network, provides penalties for a person found to have acted as an organizer, supervisor, manager or financier of a scheme distributing any Schedule I or II drug.

2C:35-4, Maintaining or Operating a Controlled Dangerous Substance (CDS) Production Facility, provides that such conduct is a first degree crime punishable by imprisonment

and fines. N.J.S.A. 2C:35-5, Manufacturing, Distributing, or Dispensing, provides that such conduct results in imprisonment and fines.

2C:35-6, Using a Juvenile in a Drug Distribution Scheme, provides that such conduct is a second degree crime punishable by imprisonment and fines.

2C:35-7, Drug-Free School Zones, provides that any person who distributes, dispenses, or possesses with intent to distribute a controlled dangerous substance within 1,000 feet of school property is guilty of a crime of the third degree. N.J.S.A. 2C:35-8, Distribution to Persons Under Eighteen or Pregnant Females, provides that such conduct carries a penalty of imprisonment and fines.

2C:35-9, Strict Liability for Drug-Induced Death, provides that such a situation is a first degree crime, same as murder, but no intent need be shown, only that death resulted as a result of the use of a drug supplied by the defendant.

2C:35-10, Possession, Use, Being Under the Influence, or Failure to Make Lawful Disposition, provides that such conduct carries penalties of imprisonment and fines.

Possession of anabolic steroids is a third degree crime. N.J.S.A. 2C:35-11, Imitation Controlled Dangerous Substance (CDS), provides that dispensing or distributing a substance falsely purported to be a CDS is a third degree crime, and can carry a fine up to \$200,000. Drug paraphernalia is defined —...all equipment, products, and materials of any kind which are used or intended for use in planting, propagating, cultivating, growing, harvesting, manufacturing, compounding, converting, producing, processing, preparing, testing, analyzing, packaging, repackaging, storing, containing, concealing, ingesting, inhaling, or otherwise introducing into the human body a controlled dangerous

substance... including... roach clips... bongs... pipes...

2C:36-2, Use or Possession with Intent to Use, Narcotic Paraphernalia, provides that such conduct carries a disorderly persons offense.

2C:36-3, Distribute, Dispense, Possess with Intent to, Narcotics Paraphernalia, provides that such conduct is a fourth degree crime.

2C:36-4, Advertise to Promote Sale of Narcotics Paraphernalia, provides that such conduct is a fourth degree crime.

2C:36-5, Delivering Paraphernalia to Person Under Eighteen Years, provides that such conduct constitutes a third degree crime.

2C:36-6, Possession or Distribution of Hypodermic Syringe, provides that such conduct constitutes a disorderly persons offense.

### **Federal Drug Offenses**

The criminal offenses most commonly charged under the Federal Controlled Substances Act are the knowing, intentional and unauthorized manufacture, distribution or dispensing of any controlled substance or the possession of any controlled substance with the intent to manufacture, distribute or dispense. Federal law also prohibits the knowing, intentional and unauthorized creation, distribution, dispensing or possession with the intent to distribute or dispense a “counterfeit substance.” Simple possession without necessarily intent to distribute is also forbidden by Federal law and carries a penalty of imprisonment. Attempts and/or conspiracies to distribute or possess with intent to distribute a controlled substance are crimes under Federal law. Specific drug crimes that may carry greater penalties include the following:

• The distribution of narcotics to persons under 21; • The distribution or manufacturing of narcotics near schools and colleges; • The employment of juveniles under the age of 18 in drug trafficking operations; • The distribution of controlled substances to pregnant women. The penalties for violating Federal narcotics statutes vary. The penalties may be more severe based upon two principal factors: • The type of drug involved; and • The quantity of the drug involved. With the exception of simple possession charges which result in up to one year imprisonment, maximum penalties for narcotic violations range from 20 years to life in prison. Certain violations carry mandatory minimum prison sentences of either five years or ten years. Harsher penalties will be imposed if a firearm is used in the commission of a drug offense. If a drug offense results in death or serious bodily injury to an individual who uses the drug involved, the penalties are harsher. Anabolic steroids are controlled substances and distribution or possession with intent to distribute carries a sentence of up to five years and a \$250,000 fine.

#### **IV. Education and Prevention**

Rowan University acknowledges the importance of communicating information concerning alcohol and other drugs, and the effects and consequences of illegal use, misuse, and abuse.

1. The Counseling & Psychological Services Center provides specialized programs for students, faculty and staff, on issues related to alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use, misuse, and abuse. Aftercare and programs for recovering students are also provided on campus. The Counseling & Psychological Services Center offers books, pamphlets, videos, and other pertinent information regarding alcohol, tobacco, and other drug issues

for use by the campus community. The office also serves as a confidential referral location for drug and alcohol assessment and evaluation.

2. Human Resources offers direction to any Rowan employee who may have questions and/or concerns related to alcohol and other drug use, misuse and abuse. Counseling & Psychological Services offers help and information to directors and supervisors of departments in identifying an employee in need of assistance.

#### **V. Distribution of Alcohol and Other Drugs Policy**

A notification regarding the availability of this policy will be distributed, via the Rowan email system, annually to each employee and student who is taking one or more classes for any type of academic credit except for continuing education units, regardless of the length of the student's program of study.

#### **VI. Review of Policy and Alcohol and Drugs Education Program**

Rowan University will conduct a biennial review of this policy and Alcohol and Other Drug Education programs to determine their effectiveness and implement changes to the policy if they are needed and to ensure that the disciplinary sanctions are consistently enforced. A committee of faculty, staff and students will review the policy and programs in consultation with Student Life and the Office of Human Resources.

#### **VII. Drug-Free Workplace Act**

The Governor of the State of New Jersey issued on March 14, 1989, Executive Order 204, in compliance with federal law. This order, the Drug-Free Workplace Act, is a condition of continued employment by all public employees, including Rowan University employees. This policy prohibits the unlawful possession, use, distribution, dispensation,



sale or manufacture of controlled substances on University premises. Violation of this policy may result in the imposition of employment discipline up to and including termination as defined for specific employee categories by existing college policies, statutes, rules, regulations, employment contracts and labor agreements. In addition to campus rules, faculty and staff must obey applicable Federal, State, and local laws concerning drugs and alcohol and are subject to criminal and civil penalties. The University cooperates with municipal and other law enforcement authorities in enforcing these laws.

## **VII . Executive Order No. 204**

WHEREAS, the problem of drug abuse is adversely affecting the lives and safety of our citizens; and WHEREAS, the abuse of drugs in the workplace, among other things, reduces job efficiency, increases absenteeism and sick leave, and, most importantly, jeopardizes the lives and safety of fellow employees and citizens; and WHEREAS, the State of New Jersey has a vital interest in promoting a safe and drug-free workplace and in ensuring our citizens that public safety employees do not threaten life and limb due to the abuse of drugs; and WHEREAS, the Federal Drug-Free Workplace Act of 1988, Public Law 100-690, Title V, Subtitle D, conditions receipt of Federal grant funds upon the grantee's agreement to provide a drug free workplace; and WHEREAS, the Federal Drug-Free Workplace Act requires a grantee to prohibit the unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a controlled substance, to specify actions that may be taken against employees who violate the prohibition, to establish a drug free awareness program for employees, to require employees and employers to give notice of any conviction for a drug offense committed in the workplace; and WHEREAS, the

citizens of the State greatly benefit from the State government's participation in Federally funded programs; NOW, THEREFORE, I, THOMAS H. KEAN, Governor of the State of New Jersey, by virtue of the authority vested in me by the Constitution and by the Statutes of this State, do hereby ORDER and DIRECT:

1. The following —Policy for a Drug-Free Workplace in New Jersey State Government shall apply to all principal executive departments in New Jersey State Government, the Office of the Governor, and all agencies that are in, but not of, principal executive departments. This policy establishes minimum standards for the imposition of discipline and for participation in drug abuse treatment programs in the limited context of convictions for drug offenses committed in the workplace. Nothing in this Policy precludes the application of other more comprehensive or more stringent provisions governing drug offenses committed by State employees. In fact, the Cabinet Task Force on Drug Testing in the Workplace, which was created in Executive Order No. 191, will formulate a more comprehensive State policy regarding drug abuse and the workplace in the near future.
2. The State of New Jersey is committed to maintaining a drug-free workplace for all State employees in order to protect the health and safety of State employees and the public.
3. The unlawful manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a drug in the workplace is prohibited.
4. In addition to any other applicable civil or criminal penalty, any employee convicted of illegal manufacture, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a drug in the

workplace shall be subject to the following consequences:

a. The State Forfeiture of Public Office Statute (N.J.S.A. 2C:51-2) requires forfeiture of public office or employment upon conviction of a crime of the third degree or higher. All convictions of crimes of the third degree or higher listed in the Comprehensive Drug Enforcement Act of 1987, and all convictions for equivalent Federal and out-of-state drug offenses, require forfeiture of public office or employment.

b. The Forfeiture of Public Office Statute also requires forfeiture of public office or employment upon conviction for an offense involving dishonesty or upon conviction for an offense involving or touching upon the convicted person's public employment irrespective of the degree of the offense. Consequently, convictions for any drug offense occurring in the workplace (including fourth degree, disorderly persons, and petty disorderly persons offenses) which are determined to involve or touch upon the office or employment of an individual may result in the statutory forfeiture of public office or employment.

c. In the case of a drug conviction for an offense occurring in the workplace that does not result in statutory forfeiture of public office or employment, disciplinary action shall be taken. The extent of disciplinary action shall be determined by the appointing authority. In addition, in the case of any disciplinary action other than removal, an employee shall be required to satisfactorily participate in a program for the treatment of drug abuse approved by both the appointing authority and any Federal or State agency responsible for the approval or licensure of such programs.

d. Each department head, agency head, or their designee who receives notice of a drug

offense conviction shall, within 30 days of receipt of notice, take the administrative action necessary for removal where statutory forfeiture is required, and where statutory forfeiture is not required, take the administrative action necessary to impose discipline and require satisfactory participation in an approved program for drug abuse where appropriate.

5. An employee who is convicted of a drug offense committed in the workplace must, within five days, report the conviction to his or her supervisor.
6. Each supervisor who receives a report of a conviction for a drug offense in the workplace must immediately report the conviction, according to departmental or agency procedures, to the department head, agency head, or their designee.
7. Within 10 days of the supervisor's receipt of notice of a conviction for a drug offense, the department head, agency head, or their designee shall ensure that notification of such conviction is provided to any Federal agency providing funds for a program in which the convicted employee is employed.
8. Each department head, agency head, or their designee must develop and implement procedures to ensure that reports, which are received by supervisors concerning convictions for drug offenses in the workplace are reported promptly to the department head, agency head, or their designee.
9. Each department head, agency head, or their designee must maintain records that contain the following information on each conviction for a drug offense committed in the workplace by an employee:

- a. Date of conviction;

- b. Disciplinary action taken;
- c. Whether the employee is one whose duties involve the performance of a Federal grant;  
and
- d. Date Federal grantor was notified of the conviction, if applicable.

10. Each department head, agency head, or their designee will distribute an Employee Notice, and this Executive Order to each current employee. Each department head, agency head, or their designee shall distribute these documents to any employee who joins the work force after the initial distribution. A program entitled, —Drug-Free Awareness is being developed, and upon completion will be provided to all employees.

11. Definitions for purpose of this policy:

a. Conviction -means a finding of guilt, or a plea of guilty, before a court of competent jurisdiction, and, where applicable, a plea of nolo contendere. A conviction is deemed to occur at the time the plea is accepted or verdict returned. It does not include entry into and successful completion of a pre-trial intervention program, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2C:43-12, et seq., or a conditional discharge, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 2C:36A-1.

b. Drug -means a controlled dangerous substance, analog, or immediate precursor as listed in Schedules I through V in the New Jersey Controlled Dangerous Substances Act, N.J.S.A. 24:21-1, et seq., and as modified in any regulation issued by the Commissioner of the Department of Health. It also includes controlled substances in Schedules I through V of Section 202 of the Federal Controlled Substance Act of 21 U.S.C. 812. The term shall not include tobacco or tobacco products or distilled spirits, wine, or malt beverages as they are defined or used in N.J.S.A. 33:1-1, et seq.

c. Employee -means all employees of the Office of the Governor or a department or agency within the scope of this Policy, whether full-or part-time and whether in the career, senior executive, or unclassified service.

d. Workplace -for the purposes of this Policy only, means the physical area of operations of a department or agency including buildings, grounds, and parking facilities provided by the State. It includes any field location or site at which an employee is engaged, or authorized to engage, in work activity, and includes any travel between such sites.

12. This policy is effective March 18, 1989 and shall remain in effect until superseded by statute, regulation, or Executive Order. Thomas H. Kean GOVERNOR

## **IX . Commonly Abused Drugs**

### ***Cannabinoids***

#### **Marijuana**

- Commercial and street names include blunt, dope, ganja, grass, herb, joints, Mary Jane, pot, reefer, sinsemilla, skunk and weed.
- Schedule 1 drug
- Usually smoked or swallowed
- Intoxicating effects include euphoria, slowed thinking and reaction time, confusion, impaired balance and coordination.
- Potential health consequences include cough, frequent respiratory infections, impaired memory and learning, increased heart rate, anxiety, panic attacks, tolerance and addiction.

#### **Hashish**

- Commercial and street names include boom, chronic, gangster, hash, hash oil and hemp.
- Schedule 1 drug
- Usually smoked or swallowed
- Intoxicating effects include euphoria, slowed thinking and reaction time, confusion, impaired balance and coordination.

Potential health consequences include cough, frequent respiratory infections, impaired memory and learning, increased heart rate, anxiety, panic attacks, tolerance and addiction.

### *Depressants*

#### **Barbiturates**

- Commercial and street names include Amytal, Nembutal, Seconal, Phenobarbital, barbs, reds, red birds, phennies, tooties and yellows • Schedule 2, 3, 5 drug • Usually injected or swallowed • Intoxicating effects include reduced anxiety, feeling of well-being, lowered inhibitions, slowed pulse and breathing, lowered blood pressure, poor concentration, sedation and drowsiness. • Potential health consequences include fatigue, confusion, impaired coordination, addiction, respiratory depression and arrest, depression, fever, irritability, poor judgment, slurred speech, dizziness, life-threatening withdrawal and death.

#### **Benzodiazepines**

- Commercial and street names include Ativan, Halcion, Xanax, Librium, Valium, candy, downers, sleeping pills and tranks. • Schedule 4 drug • Usually swallowed or injected • Intoxicating effects include reduced anxiety, feeling of well-being, lowered inhibitions, slowed pulse and breathing, lowered blood pressure, poor concentration, sedation and drowsiness. • Potential health consequences include dizziness, fatigue, confusion, impaired coordination, addiction, respiratory depression and arrest and death.

#### **Flunitrazepam (Associated with Sexual Assaults)**

- Commercial and street names include Rohypnol, forget-me pill, Mexican Valium, R2, Roche, roofies, roofinol, rope and rophies. • Schedule 4 drug • Usually swallowed or

snorted • Intoxicating effects include reduced anxiety, feeling of well-being, lowered inhibitions, slowed pulse and breathing, lowered blood pressure and poor concentration.

• Potential health consequences include fatigue, confusion, impaired coordination, addiction, respiratory depression and arrest, visual and gastrointestinal disturbances, urinary retention, memory loss for the time under the drug's effects and death.

### **GHB (Associated with Sexual Assaults)**

• Commercial and street names include gamma-hydroxybutyrate, G, Georgia home boy, grievous bodily harm and liquid ecstasy. • Schedule 1 drug • Usually swallowed •

Intoxicating effects include reduced anxiety, feeling of well-being, lowered inhibitions, slowed pulse and breathing; lowered blood pressure and poor concentration. • Potential health consequences include fatigue, confusion, addiction, respiratory depression and arrest, drowsiness, nausea/vomiting, headache, loss of consciousness, loss of reflexes, seizures, coma and death.

### **Methaqualone**

• Commercial and street names include Quaalude, Sopor, Parest, ludes, mandrex, quad and quay • Schedule 1 drug • Usually injected or swallowed • Intoxicating effects include reduced anxiety, feeling of well-being, lowered inhibitions, slowed pulse and breathing, lowered blood pressure, poor concentration and euphoria. • Potential health consequences include fatigue, confusion, addiction, respiratory depression and arrest, depression, poor reflexes, slurred speech, coma and death.



## *Dissociative Anesthetics*

### **Ketamine**

- Commercial and street names include Ketalar SV, cat Valiums, K, Special K, vitamin K
- Schedule 3 drug • Usually injected, swallowed or smoked • Intoxicating effects include increased heart rate and blood pressure and impaired motor function. • Potential health consequences include memory loss, numbness, nausea/vomiting at high doses, delirium, depression, respiratory depression and arrest.

### **PCP and Analogs**

- Commercial and street names include phencyclidine, angel dust, boat, hog, love boat and peace pill • Schedule 1, 2 drug • Usually injected, swallowed or smoked • Intoxicating effects include increased heart rate and blood pressure and impaired motor function. • Potential health consequences include memory loss, numbness, nausea/vomiting possible decrease in blood pressure and heart rate, panic, aggression, violence/loss of appetite and depression.

## *Hallucinogens*

### **LSD**

- Commercial and street names include lysergic acid diethylamide, acid, blotter, boomers, cubes, microdot and yellow sunshines • Schedule 1 drug • Usually swallowed, absorbed through mouth tissues • Intoxicating effects include altered states of perception and feeling. • Potential health consequences include nausea, persistent mental disorders, persisting perception disorder (flashbacks), increased body temperature and heart rate, loss of appetite, sleeplessness, numbness, weakness and tremors.

## **Mescaline**

- Commercial and street names include buttons, cactus, mesc and peyote • Schedule 1 drug • Usually swallowed or smoked • Intoxicating effects include altered states of perception and feeling. • Potential health consequences include nausea, persisting perception disorder (flashbacks), increased body temperature and heart rate, loss of appetite, sleeplessness, numbness, weakness and tremors.

## **Psilocybin**

- Commercial and street names include magic mushroom, purple passion and shrooms • Schedule 1 drug • Usually swallowed • Intoxicating effects include altered states of perception and feeling. • Potential health consequences include nausea, persisting perception disorder (flashbacks), nervousness and paranoia.

## ***Opioids and Morphine Derivatives***

### **Codeine**

- Commercial and street names include Empirin with Codeine, Fiorinal with Codeine, Robitussin A-C, Tylenol with Codeine, Captain Cody, Cody, doors & fours, loads, pancakes and syrup • Schedule 2, 3, 4 drug • Usually injected or swallowed • Intoxicating effects include pain relief, euphoria and drowsiness. • Potential health consequences include nausea, constipation, confusion, sedation, respiratory depression and arrest, tolerance, addiction, unconsciousness, coma and death.

### **Fentanyl and Fentanyl Analogs**

- Commercial and street names include Actiq, Duragesic, Sublimaze, Apache, China girl, China white, dance fever, friend, goodfella, jackpot, murder 8, TNT, Tango and Cash •

Schedule 1, 2 drug • Usually injected, smoked or snorted • Intoxicating effects include pain relief, euphoria and drowsiness. • Potential health consequences include nausea, sedation, constipation, confusion, respiratory depression and arrest, tolerance, addiction, unconsciousness, coma and death.

### **Heroin**

• Commercial and street names include diacetylmorphine, brown sugar, dope, H, horse, junk, skag, skunk, smack and white horse • Schedule 1 drug • Usually injected, smoked or snorted • Intoxicating effects include pain relief, euphoria, drowsiness and staggering gait • Potential health consequences include nausea, sedation, constipation, confusion, respiratory depression and arrest, tolerance, addiction, unconsciousness, coma and death.

### **Morphine**

• Commercial and street names include Roxanol, Duramorph, M, Miss Emma, monkey and white stuff • Schedule 2, 3 drug • Usually injected, swallowed or smoked • Intoxicating effects include pain relief, euphoria and drowsiness • Potential health consequences include nausea, sedation, constipation, confusion, respiratory depression and arrest, tolerance, addiction, unconsciousness, coma and death.

### **Opium**

• Commercial and street names include laudanum, paregoric, big 0, black stuff, block, gum and hop • Schedule 2, 3 drug • Usually swallowed or smoked • Intoxicating effects include pain relief, euphoria and drowsiness • Potential health consequences include nausea, sedation, constipation, confusion, respiratory depression and arrest, tolerance, addiction, unconsciousness, coma and death.

### **Oxycodone HCL**

- Commercial and street names include Oxycontin, Oxy, O.C. and killer
- Schedule 2 drug
- Usually swallowed, snorted or injected
- Intoxicating effects include pain relief, euphoria and drowsiness
- Potential health consequences include nausea, constipation, confusion, sedation, respiratory depression and arrest, tolerance, addiction, unconsciousness, coma and death.

### **Hydrocodone bitartrate, Acetaminophen**

- Commercial and street names include Vicodin, vike, Watson-387
- Schedule 2 drug
- Usually swallowed
- Intoxicating effects include pain relief, euphoria and drowsiness
- Potential health consequences include nausea, constipation, confusion, sedation, respiratory depression and arrest, tolerance, addiction, unconsciousness, coma and death.

### ***Stimulants***

#### **Amphetamine**

- Commercial and street names include Biphphetamine, Dexedrine, bennies, black beauties, crosses, hearts, LA turnaround, speed, truck drivers and uppers
- Schedule 2 drug
- Usually injected, swallowed, smoked or snorted
- Intoxicating effects include increased heart rate, blood pressure, metabolism; feelings of exhilaration, increased mental alertness
- Potential health consequences include rapid or irregular heart beat; reduced appetite, weight loss, heart failure, nervousness, insomnia, rapid breathing/tremor, loss of coordination, irritability, anxiousness, restlessness, delirium, panic, paranoia, impulsive behavior, aggressiveness, tolerance, addiction and psychosis.

## **Cocaine**

• Commercial and street names include Cocaine hydrochloride, blow, bump, C, candy, Charlie, coke, crack, flake, rock, snow, toot • Schedule 2 drug • Usually injected, smoked or snorted • Intoxicating effects include increased heart rate, blood pressure, metabolism; feelings of exhilaration, increased mental alertness and increased temperature • Potential health consequences include rapid or irregular heart beat; reduced appetite, weight loss, heart failure, nervousness, insomnia, chest pain, respiratory failure, nausea, abdominal pain, strokes, seizures, headaches, malnutrition and panic attacks.

## **MDMA (methylenedioxy-methamphetamine)**

• Commercial and street names include Adam, clarity, ecstasy, Eve, lover's speed, peace, STP, X, XTC • Schedule 1 drug • Usually swallowed • Intoxicating effects include increased heart rate, blood pressure, metabolism; feelings of exhilaration, increased mental alertness mild hallucinogenic effects, increased tactile sensitivity and empathic feelings • Potential health consequences include rapid or irregular heart beat; reduced appetite, weight loss, heart failure, nervousness, insomnia, impaired memory and learning, hyperthermia, cardiac toxicity, renal failure and liver toxicity.

## **Methamphetamine**

• Commercial and street names include Desoxyn, chalk, crank, crystal, fire, glass, go fast, ice, meth and speed • Schedule 2 drug • Usually injected, swallowed, smoked, snorted • Intoxicating effects include increased heart rate, blood pressure, metabolism; feelings of exhilaration and increased mental alertness • Potential health consequences include rapid or irregular heart beat; reduced appetite, weight loss, heart failure, nervousness, insomnia,

aggression, violence, psychotic behavior/memory loss, cardiac and neurological damage, impaired memory and learning, tolerance and addiction.

### **Methylphenidate (safe and effective for treatment of ADHD)**

- Commercial and street names include Ritalin, JIF, MPH, R-ball, Skippy, the smart drug and vitamin R
- Not Scheduled
- Usually injected, swallowed, snorted
- Intoxicating effects include increased heart rate, blood pressure, metabolism; feelings of exhilaration and increased mental alertness
- Potential health consequences include rapid or irregular heart beat; reduced appetite, weight loss, heart failure, nervousness and insomnia.

### **Nicotine**

- Commercial and street names include cigarettes, cigars, smokeless tobacco, snuff, spit tobacco, bidis and chew
- Not Scheduled
- Usually smoked, snorted, taken in snuff and spit tobacco
- Intoxicating effects include increased heart rate, blood pressure, metabolism; feelings of exhilaration and increased mental alertness
- Potential health consequences include rapid or irregular heart beat; reduced appetite, weight loss, heart failure, nervousness, insomnia, adverse pregnancy outcomes, chronic lung disease, cardiovascular disease, stroke, cancer, tolerance and addiction.

### ***Other Compounds***

#### **Anabolic steroids**

- Commercial and street names include Anadrol, Oxandrin, Durabolin, Depo-Testosterone, Equipoise; roids and juice
- Schedule 3 drug
- Usually injected, swallowed, applied to skin
- No intoxication effects
- Potential health consequences include hypertension, blood clotting and cholesterol changes, liver cysts and cancer, kidney

cancer, hostility and aggression, acne; in adolescents, premature stoppage of growth; in males, prostate cancer, reduced sperm production, shrunken testicles, breast enlargement; in females, menstrual irregularities, development of beard and other masculine characteristics.

### **Inhalants**

- Commercial and street names include Solvents (paint thinners, gasoline, glues), gases (butane, propane, aerosol propellants, nitrous oxide), nitrites (isoamyl, isobutyl, cyclohexyl), laughing gas, poppers, snappers and whippets
- Not Scheduled
- Usually inhaled through nose or mouth
- Intoxicating effects include stimulation, loss of inhibition, headache, nausea or vomiting, slurred speech and loss of motor coordination
- Potential health consequences include wheezing/unconsciousness, cramps, weight loss, muscle weakness, depression, memory impairment, damage to cardiovascular and nervous systems and sudden death.

Schedule I and II drugs have a high potential for abuse. They require greater storage security and have a quota on manufacturing, among other restrictions. Schedule I drugs are available for research only and have no approved medical use; Schedule II drugs are available only by prescription (un-refillable) and require a form for ordering. Schedule III and IV drugs are available by prescription, may have five refills in 6 months, and may be ordered orally. Most Schedule V drugs are available over the counter. Taking drugs by injection can increase the risk of infection through needle contamination with staphylococci, HIV, hepatitis, and other organisms.

Source: National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA)

## **X. Important numbers**

### ***Drug and Alcohol Treatment***

#### **On-campus resources**

Counseling and Psychological Services Center: 856-256-4222

#### **Off-campus resources**

Addictions Hotline of NJ: 1-800-225-0196 or 1-800-322-5525

Camden County Council on Alcoholism and Drug Abuse, Inc.: 856-427-6553

Center for Family Services, Inc., Voorhees, NJ: 856-428-5688

Danellie Counseling and Wellness Center, Glassboro, NJ: 856-863-0006

Natl. Council on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence/SW Jersey Vineland, NJ:

856-794-1011

Seabrook House, Bridgeton, NJ: 1-800-582-5968

Sodat House, Inc. (outpatient) 124 N. Broad St., Woodbury, NJ: 856-845-6363

This is a partial list only and not intended as an endorsement of facilities. Please consult

Yellow Pages under Alcoholism or Drug Abuse and Addiction for additional resources.



## Appendix E: Correlations Table for All Variables

*Correlations Table for All Variables- General Student Pop. (N = 98)*

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)	(15)	(16)
(1) SCC on-campus	--															
(2) SCC off-campus	.241*	--														
(3) Notifying guardians	.176	.285**	--													
(4) Peer student hearing	0.000	.457**	.222*	--												
(5) Judiciary panel hearing	.256*	.129	.313**	.155	--											
(6) Find SCC	.071	.342**	.157	.233*	.320**	--										
(7) Read SCC	.207*	.224*	.287**	.107	.329**	.230*	--									
(8) Aware of the policy	-.057	.255*	.281**	.201*	.140	.357**	.398**	--								
(9) Not a serious problem	.054	-.090	.076	.057	.075	.005	.142	-.188	--							
(10) Policies are appropriate	.035	.251*	-.094	.169	-.011	.098	-.007	.065	-.395**	--						
(11) Process is fair	-.019	.163	.020	.196	.116	.141	.012	.176	-.281**	.780**	--					
(12) Process is educational	.045	.144	-.011	.099	.056	.051	-.061	.004	-.342**	.705**	.745**	--				
(13) Understand the steps	.056	.220*	.260**	.296**	.303**	.396**	.388**	.418**	-.132	.181	.336**	.170	--			
(14) Possessed drug paraphernalia	-.154	-.142	-.118	-.091	-.122	-.217*	-.098	-.124	.203*	-.431**	-.374**	-.255*	-.083	--		
(15) Possessed drugs	-.139	-.155	-.091	-.061	-.116	-.170	-.101	-.109	.238*	-.454**	-.370**	-.274**	-.112	.932**	--	
(16) Used drugs	-.131	-.125	-.106	-.069	-.075	-.180	-.073	-.102	.306**	-.456**	-.354**	-.302**	-.079	.875**	.932**	--
(17) Been caught	-.141	-.191	-.118	-.118	-.123	-.171	-.215*	-.169	.087	-.166	-.059	-.065	.002	.543**	.502**	.492**
(18) Negative effects	-.076	-.060	-.159	-.013	-.120	-.110	-.245*	-.419**	.126	.075	.035	.057	-.163	.043	.013	.009
(19) Deterrence	.091	.239*	-.051	.180	.102	.072	.075	-.016	-.350**	.553**	.507**	.432**	.074	-.496**	-.479**	-.471**
(20) More cautious	.056	-.111	-.069	-.150	-.074	.110	.075	.034	.310**	-.232*	-.244*	-.190	-.230*	.227*	.279**	.305**
(21) parents knowing	.102	.067	-.019	-.091	.084	-.075	-.091	-.145	-.207*	.345**	.340**	.303**	-.092	-.290**	-.257*	-.280**
(22) Police involvement	.265**	.152	.159	.072	.176	.167	.101	.049	-.113	.231*	.218*	.129	.029	-.317**	-.268**	-.280**
(23) Morals	.012	.133	-.086	.057	-.088	-.056	-.240*	-.048	-.299**	.559**	.381**	.440**	-.004	-.403**	-.462**	-.460**
(24) Chance of caught	.116	.235*	.067	.071	.075	.197	-.064	.103	-.249*	.223*	.075	.064	-.131	-.433**	-.444**	-.496**
(25) Know violated	-.066	-.159	-.021	.121	.100	-.011	-.088	-.026	.006	.030	.076	-.025	-.002	-.090	-.094	-.019
(26) Member of club	.016	.088	-.010	.154	.116	.007	.053	-.009	.093	-.160	-.234*	-.063	-.050	.027	.024	.008
(27) Athlete	-.174	-.151	-.112	-.067	.008	0.000	-.168	-.090	-.008	.040	.115	-.067	.136	.116	.116	.132
(28) Member of Greek	-.168	-.224*	-.104	-.135	-.078	-.146	-.199*	-.087	.020	.008	.080	.044	.047	.096	.064	.156
(29) Work	.029	.186	-.147	.054	.086	.033	.077	.041	.155	.061	.057	.159	.033	.156	.094	.097
(30) Class standing	-.006	-.176	.199*	-.092	-.097	-.031	-.013	.028	-.034	.030	.056	.049	-.125	-.114	-.071	-.083
(31) Gender	.095	-.012	.278**	.074	.112	.063	.223*	-.017	.309**	-.207*	-.279**	-.114	.073	.168	.228*	.214*
(32) Religion	-.087	-.030	.134	-.063	-.114	-.026	-.158	-.183	.181	-.186	-.159	.013	-.142	.193	.166	.162
(33) Strong religion	.077	.043	.066	-.111	-.124	-.038	-.174	-.086	.037	.103	.047	.085	-.170	-.162	-.178	-.144
(34) Living situation	-.056	-.064	.249*	.005	.065	.013	.060	.139	-.032	-.045	-.035	-.107	.060	-.059	-.007	-.024
(35) Race	-.166	-.110	-.118	-.062	-.120	-.105	-.179	-.180	.053	.124	.107	.076	.055	.000	-.054	-.029
(36) International student	-.211*	-.097	-.131	-.017	-.057	-.040	-.217*	-.111	-.046	.182	.271**	.133	.227*	.016	-.025	.022
(37) Transfer	-.167	.005	-.124	.111	.006	-.029	-.125	-.041	.062	.083	.173	.059	.184	-.046	-.113	-.102
(38) GPA	.143	-.064	.096	-.121	-.050	-.008	.149	-.110	.346**	-.398**	-.331**	-.249*	-.103	.355**	.385**	.336**

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Correlations Table for All Variables- General Student Pop. (N = 98) -- CONT.

	(17)	(18)	(19)	(20)	(23)	(24)	(25)	(26)	(27)	(28)	(29)	(30)	(31)	(32)
(17) Been caught	--													
(18) Negative effects	.125	--												
(19) Deterrence	-.279**	.098	--											
(20) More cautious	.008	-.045	-.275**	--										
(21) Parents knowing	-.246*	.005	.422**	-.154										
(22) Police involvement	-.411**	-.180	.403**	.100										
(23) Morals	-.128	.112	.431**	-.388**	--									
(24) Chance of caught	-.421**	.100	.250*	-.029	.334**	--								
(25) Know violated	.027	-.156	-.033	-.066	.030	-.103	--							
(26) Member of club	-.102	-.094	-.137	-.111	.078	-.093	.211*	--						
(27) Athlete	.429**	.204*	-.125	-.149	0.000	-.130	.234*	-.059	--					
(28) Member of Greek	.416**	.149	-.230*	-.064	-.019	-.228*	.138	-.151	.490**	--				
(29) Work	-.002	.005	.059	-.006	.022	-.152	.031	.229*	-.090	-.204*	--			
(30) Class standing	-.116	-.095	-.095	.024	.033	-.055	.132	.047	.087	.094	-.580**	--		
(31) Gender	-.070	.058	-.254*	.129	-.353**	-.341**	.067	.280**	-.061	-.085	-.070	.252*	--	
(32) Religion	.373**	.182	-.294**	.067	-.117	-.164	-.090	-.044	.111	.137	-.123	.120	.178	--
(33) Strong religion	-.125	.024	-.081	-.030	.186	.020	-.072	.166	-.165	.020	.030	.114	.106	.175
(34) Living situation	-.139	-.152	-.148	-.047	.082	.063	.078	.210*	.068	.004	-.508**	.721**	.156	-.026
(35) Race	.441**	.293**	.006	-.225*	.180	-.150	.107	-.270**	.424**	.468**	-.024	-.125	-.137	.331**
(36) International student	.455**	.260**	.058	-.329**	.216*	-.096	.143	-.344**	.549**	.589**	-.221*	.010	-.289**	.250*
(37) Transfer	.154	.237*	.100	-.229*	.177	.029	-.014	-.220*	.186	.188	.171	-.370**	-.424**	.061
(38) GPA	.142	-.004	-.189	.109	-.381**	-.197	-.049	-.053	-.025	.026	.056	.057	.244*	.105

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Correlations Table for All Variables- General Student Pop. (N = 98) -- CONT.

	(33)	(34)	(35)	(36)	(37)	(38)
(33) Strong religion	--					
(34) Living situation	.080	--				
(35) Race	-.177	-.292**	--			
(36) International student	-.234*	-.085	.721**	--		
(37) Transfer	-.176	-.198	.526**	.510**	--	
(38) GPA	-.002	.069	-.046	-.098	-.086	--

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)