THE WEB OF CARING: AN APPROACH TO ACCOUNTABILITY IN ALCOHOL POLICY*

William David Burns, Association of American Colleges and Universities
Margaret Klawunn, Brown University

Introduction

In L. Frank Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* (1969), the Cowardly Lion draws courage from a bottle (invoking one old name for alcohol, "courage").[1] The famous movie version substitutes a badge of honor for the alcohol. This glimpse at our culture permits us to look at alcohol and other drug use as the ingestion of products that promise to help ease the burdens, or enhance the pleasures, of our common lives. Complicated issues of intimacy, identity, feelings of inadequacy and worth, courage, sexual identity, and self-confidence can be relieved or enhanced with the use of alcohol. When we drink, we are both uninhibited and simultaneously provided with an explanation for any unusual behavior that our lack of inhibitions might have allowed.

Alcohol becomes just another product marketed to satisfy a consumer need. Our obsession with products suggests our addiction to the quick fix. When it comes to our very special needs, alone or together, we turn our attention to the search for magic bullets to inoculate ourselves from some disability, to secure for us some special protection from our vulnerability, or to make us the perfect people we want to be. We are focusing on alcohol use (and not just on addiction) in this report.[2] We note the extreme ambivalence of our culture regarding alcohol and the benefits and risks associated with its use. Thus, we are committed to seeing more than alcohol itself as the problem that merits our attention. From a causal standpoint, we note the *coincidence* of alcohol abuse and many disturbing occurrences. We stipulate that many of the most heinous campus incidents would probably not have occurred without alcohol. Here we are thinking of vile incidents of racism, sexism, homophobia, intolerance of difference, rape, and other assaults. But alcohol cannot be said to have caused bigotry and prejudice or caused men to objectify women and appropriate them for exploitative purposes. These attitudes precede alcohol consumption, and a focus on alcohol will not seriously attend to the underlying problems. Hence, for us, the focus on alcohol and other drugs (except in cases of addiction) is in many ways inadequate.

Equally inadequate—and also impossible to find—would be a replacement for alcohol in the form of a wonder product that would have all of the

perceived benefits of alcohol and none of the undesirable side-effects or addictive properties. That search itself is pathological. It places responsibility for problems on the products themselves instead of questioning the users and those around them.

Theories are products, too, and the reader who invests the energy and time to go through what follows may expect a product to fix the problem. At the end of this document, what the reader will find is a description of a way of thinking that urges collective action to balance our obsession with individual rights, that promotes concern and connection more than separation and rules, and that encourages care over selfishness. We emphasize a series of impulses and habits in administration that we believe will respond sympathetically to students, while according them the dignity and respect they deserve. We urge a commitment to a process, not an attachment to a product. Most of all, we envision the web of caring as a metaphor for engagement and a precondition for any desire to promote community.

Particularly when it comes to alcohol policy, college communities must reckon with the laws of our society, and those laws, like many of our policies and programs, are crude attempts to gain control over things that seem to be out of control. Society's current preoccupation with young people, while grounded rhetorically in claims of care and concern and to a small extent connected with epidemiological concerns, seems more like a projection of adult anxieties combined with a neat avoidance of the behavioral problems of "grown-ups." This is especially true in cases where laws and policy are seen as the sole prevention strategy. It seems especially unfortunate that at a time when we might seek to reward and encourage the discriminating behavior of some young people who act like "adults," and by that we mean a range of behavior that is acceptable and praiseworthy (as distinct from behavior that is dangerous, abusive, and risky), we are nonetheless confronted with a legal context that makes no discriminations or distinctions in evaluating the drinking behavior of those who are underage. What is hoped for in developmental theory, a progression toward mature independence, is thwarted by the necessary practice of Manichean dichotomies of right and wrong, legal and illegal, us and them. In working with adolescents, we should prefer instruments with a finer calibration. We can find these instruments in our thinking and communicating with students, even if they seem a bit vague, ambivalent, or self-contradicting when we compare them to the blunt tools provided by some of our law-makers or to the simplistic rhetoric of our current national "war" on ourselves.

Those of us in higher education seem to be singled out by this focus on youth in college. While we believe that education offers our best hope to change the culture, there are many dangers in education. Some education is the polite subversion of prevailing myths. Gertrude Stein (1935) once wrote that "Education is being thought about and as it is being thought about it is being done it is being done in the way that it is thought about, which is not true of almost anything" (p. 15). Several convoluted and teasing sentences

later, after telling us how much education is being done in America and particularly in New England, she shrewdly notes, "They do it so much in New England that they even do it more than it is thought about." That we are doing it so much that we are not thinking about what we are doing is precisely why, even in the face of a crisis, we should pause to think. Thus, we have tried to follow Hannah Arendt's humbling and sober advice given in the introduction to The Human Condition (1958): "What I propose therefore is simple: it is nothing more than to think what we are doing" (p. 5).

In recent years, alcohol policy on college campuses has probably received more attention than any other part of the relationship between students and administrators. Yet it is only one piece of a complex set of negotiations that includes educational, political, and social decision-making. Decisions on alcohol policies and programs reflect and sometimes conflict with basic philosophies guiding these negotiations. They also illuminate the assumptions we make about students and student life.

The best way to assess the limitations and possibilities of current approaches is to put alcohol back into its context. We need to look at a series of motivations for administrative and student actions. A lot is said these days about both the need for community and the importance of individual rights. This tension in our thinking and in our national life needs to be examined. By teasing out both strands, the collective and the individual, we can see how institutions might emphasize one part over the other. When it comes to alcohol use, an overemphasis on individual self-regulation and responsibility is particularly dangerous.

In this report we look first at the assumptions in current approaches; and, second, we examine some intentions behind drinking and explore how colleges contribute to selfish attitudes and behavior; and finally we discuss alternative conceptions of the self in relation to others and suggest an approach to accountability designed to foster a web of caring. We want to uncover ideas about students that are implicit in models of university authority. By analyzing the *in loco parentis* doctrine and the contract/consumer model, we can see how these two formulations distort the students' role—the former by infantilizing students and the latter by increasing alienation and overestimating students' freedom of choice.

We then focus on the reasons for excessive drinking among undergraduates, and we identify some limitations in prevention strategies that do not account for these motivations. Using materials gleaned from student interviews, we are able to theorize about motivation by listening to students' formulations and explanations of their own drinking behavior. What they express is radical individualism, an attitude encouraged by the liability avoidance strategies of institutions, by rules-based approaches to alcohol use, and by certain prevention messages. These strategies discourage care and connection at the same time that they promote antagonistic relationships and exaggerate the condition of selfishness. And ironically, what emerges from listening to students is how important alcohol seems to be in their efforts,

though sometimes sloppy, to achieve community and connection.

In developing an accountability model to enhance connections—our concluding sections—we discuss alternative visions of selfhood in order to determine how we might nurture a different conception of self-identity, one that would incorporate care and concern for others. Turning to feminism and Afrocentrism as examples, we look for models of ways to describe political communities. We believe that a program to eliminate alcohol abuse will be effective only when responsibility expands to include genuine concern for the welfare of others, as well as for personal well-being. Our suggestions are designed to challenge the selfish and addictive attitudes that contribute to alcohol abuse. A change in thinking is an essential precondition for a sustainable change in acting.

This report analyzes the political, psychological, and cultural frameworks that support alcohol abuse. To supplement studies that use questionnaires or statistical surveys to discover truths about students' attitudes and drinking practices, we wanted to include student voices, believing that something can be learned by listening to how students talk. For facts about incidence and prevalence of alcohol use among undergraduates, we refer the reader to the following national and international studies: Engs & Hanson, 1985; Gadaleto & Anderson, 1986; Saltz & Elandt, 1986; Temple, 1986; Gallup, 1987; Johnston et al., 1987; Anderson & Gadaleto, 1988; and Johnston et al., 1988. For prevention research, see Kessler & Albee, 1975; Caleekal-John and Goodstadt, 1983; Farquhar et al., 1985; Brennan et al., 1986; and Burns & Sloane, 1987. For a very good discussion of alcohol, we recommend *Loosening the Grip* by Jean Kinney and Gwen Leaton.

The relationship between students and universities: what do our models say about students?

> Colleges have gone from being parents to clinicians in just 30 years. No one would argue that they can or should return to the days when young women were locked in, when lights were out at 11:00 p.m., and when to be caught with a bottle of beer was to risk suspension or expulsion. But does this mean that there are no standards by which conduct can be measured—or that colleges have no obligations to students? Unclear about what standards to maintain and principles by which student life should be judged, many administrators seek to ignore rather than confront the issues (Boyer, 1987, p. 203).

Ernest Boyer, in *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America* (1987), points to the problem facing university administrators today: how to influence student behavior while respecting students' independence. What might surprise most Americans about the current situation is that out of a surveyed population of undergraduates, 50% supported a code of conduct on campus, and

many asked for more administrative control over fraternity parties (p. 203). The difference between the students of the 1960s and students in the 1980s is that today's students do not have a sense that anyone cares enough to want to regulate their behavior, or even to acknowledge their success at taking care of themselves. In the 1960s, when students demanded freedom from an *in loco parentis* doctrine that infantilized them, they were asking for independence within a system that assumed connection and membership. The inheritance for students today, in the wake of an overthrown *in loco parentis* doctrine, is a system that eschews connection in the name of student rights, on the one hand, and liability-avoidance on the other. Applying this hands-off approach to alcohol policy sends a message that the college does not want to be involved if there is a problem.

Forms of *In Loco Parentis*

The question Boyer poses is whether not having any standards can be the answer to not knowing what standards are applicable. Although everyone agrees that the old form of *in loco parentis* has met its demise, there is no consensus on a theoretical model to accurately describe the present student-university relationship. Part of the difficulty in formulating a new approach is that *in loco parentis* never worked as a theoretical basis for many types of university action to begin with, so a new model is being sought to account for all aspects of the relationship in a way that its predecessor did not.

In loco parentis provided an *ex post facto* justification for university intervention when there was a disciplinary problem with a student. Elaborated in Gott v. Berea (1913), but existing since the beginning of residential colleges, *in loco parentis* extended to college authorities the power of surrogate parent to make decisions "concerning the physical and moral welfare and mental training of the pupils." It was essentially a doctrine under which student affairs personnel promulgated rules (parietals) and provided food, shelter, discipline, and care for the sick. As a philosophy for interacting with students, it provided little or no guidance, while it clearly reserved for college authorities maximum power over students' lives. "As a rationale, *in loco parentis* contributed nothing to understanding the difference between good and bad parents. It said much about theoretical functions, but little as to why, how, or to what end" (Morrill, Hurst, & Oetting, 1980, p. 6).

In loco parentis, with its source of authority in paternalism, cannot distinguish between good and bad because its justification for action—exercising authority over persons for their own good, by persons who are assumed to know better than those whose lives are governed—can permit a variety of authoritarian means, including force and deceit, as long as the end is protection. "It is equally obvious that the intention of guarding from harm has led, both through mistake and through abuse, to great suffering. The 'protection' can suffocate, it can also exploit" (Bok, 1978, pp. 204-205).[3]

Since it never helped to formulate a comprehensive approach to student

policy, *in loco parentis* could not accommodate the very demands for autonomy that are embedded in developmental psychology, or that emerge with student-initiated negotiation for freedom. A new model, which can accommodate a more complex relationship with students, one that goes beyond parent and child, is important for several reasons: for helping to conceptualize the interaction between students and universities, as a guideline or framework for policy, and to provide new terms for the relationship. In his prologue, Ernest Boyer (1987) cites as one of the eight biggest problems facing American colleges the need to resolve the tension between institutional authority and student freedom (p. 5); examining some of the current approaches and student responses to these approaches, however, reveals that many current methods only serve to heighten this tension.

One educational phenomenon that drew much attention in the eighties was a rash of lawsuits brought by students who expected to be protected by their colleges. Court decisions made on these cases have also had a major impact on institutional policy, resulting in the substitution of waivers and party registration forms for what used to range from university supervision to organized indifference. In the early 1980s, courts began to hold colleges liable for personal injuries to students whereas they rejected such liability in the 1960s and 1970s (Szablewicz & Gibbs, 1987, p. 457). More significantly, students who are making legal claims seem to believe colleges should be the guardians of their physical well-being. They are seeking an extension of liability based on this duty to protect them from physical harm.

In a 1983 case, Mullins v. Pine Manor College, a student who was abducted from her dormitory room and raped brought a negligence claim against the college for failing to provide adequate campus security. The Massachusetts Supreme Court held the college liable, claiming that a new *in loco parentis* relationship exists:

> The fact that a college need not police the morals of its resident students, however, does not entitle it to abandon any effort to ensure their physical safety. Parents, students, and the general community still have a reasonable expectation, fostered in part by colleges themselves, that reasonable care will be exercised to protect resident students from foreseeable harm (Mullins v. Pine Manor).

Another case, this one in 1985, where a student asked the court to make the college the guardian of his own safety was Whitlock v. University of Denver. In this case, the court awarded the plaintiff damages for injuries sustained while he was jumping on a trampoline outside a fraternity house. Neither the student's intoxication, nor the fact that he was jumping in the dark, dissuaded the court from deciding that the university had a legal duty to use reasonable care in response to a foreseeable risk of injury to others. The university exercised a degree of control over the fraternity, leased the house and property to the fraternity, and knew about the presence of the trampoline. Thus there was "abundant and sufficient evidence upon which a duty could be based and upon which a jury could . . . find the defendant's

negligence to be greater than that of the parties" (Whitlock v. Univ. of Denver).[4]

Szablewicz and Gibbs (1987) interpret these cases, and others like them, as the rebirth of an *in loco parentis* doctrine that is limited to the protection of student safety.

> Thus, courts in several jurisdictions have found the student-college relationship to be a special one which either explicitly or implicitly gives rise to a college's duty to protect students from physical harm. . . . Though not yet articulated by any court, it seems clear that this is in effect a new *in loco parentis*, under which the college has no right to control students' morals and character but retains a duty to protect students' physical well-being (p. 464).

Szablewicz and Gibbs believe that these rulings are the beginning of the courts' reinstatement of a form of *in loco parentis*, which the students seem to be requesting (at least after they are injured). Their prediction for the future is that eventually colleges will, in response to these decisions, ask for more power to police student behavior in order to prevent potentially harmful situations. We regard this as an unhappy possibility because it could mean oppressively invasive and pervasive control. We are unpersuaded that sufficient resources to carry out such a program of supervision are available even if it would be desirable. Without the resources, colleges are placed in the position of avoiding liability or appearing to promise more than they can guarantee. As Ryan Thomas (1987) analyzes the situation, "the values undergirding our present behavioral codes have more to do with avoiding institutional embarrassment than with promulgating shared commitment to principles of social interaction" (p. 56).

One question that emerges from this litigation is, what kind of relationship are the students asking for? Is it, as Szablewicz and Gibbs suggest, a 1980s' renunciation of student independence in favor of a return to protection? Or is it a response to the hands-off administrative policies that have said to students that no one will take any responsibility for them?[5] Szablewicz and Gibbs point out that the University of Denver was only acting "much like any other school would regarding the fraternity and trampoline—with deference to student autonomy" (1987, p. 460). Thomas (1987) claims, "When *in loco parentis* was given up, little attention was paid to the need for a principled substitute. Instead institutions began to formulate systems designed to meet the requirements of the law" (p. 56).

Students and universities are moving in opposite directions, a trend that is only exaggerated as universities respond to the new liability exposure by trying to extricate themselves from all legal responsibility. While 40% of surveyed undergraduates report that college is, quite literally, their home away from home (Boyer, 1987, p. 196), colleges are working to ensure that home is a place where anything that happens to a student cannot be blamed on the institution. To say the least, student litigation might not be having a desirable (or even the desired) effect.

A draft manuscript of a Department of Education report to college presidents on alcohol and other drug use counsels that "If only because the legal climate is changing, colleges and universities can no longer afford to keep their heads in the sand" (Upcraft & Welty, 1989, p. 11).[6] They warn that recent court decisions have extended alcohol server liability so that institutions are responsible for "hosting or supporting [any] event at which alcohol is made available" to minors. The kind of liability-driven action on alcohol use advocated here constitutes a disconnection between colleges and students. As soon as institutional self-interest or paternalism comes into play, the idea of community begins to unravel. Engagement necessarily exposes one to risks, while thinking in terms of liability tends to negate connection. Thinking about liability—or obsessing about it—is no prophylaxis against having "one's head in the sand." On the contrary, it is possible that liability-avoidance strategies can result in serious self-delusion about the nature of student reality, especially where the strategy promises more than it can deliver, or seeks to disrupt connections that might otherwise reduce harm.

Changes in *in loco "parenting"* styles may not be so different from what goes on in the home. Part of the problem with even the new *in loco parentis* doctrine is that it assumes a universal and immutable standard of parenting—a standard even Doctor Spock cannot live up to.[7] University administrators, too, have changed their minds in trying to find the proper balance between control and laxity. Realistically, the other side of the authoritarian parent model has always been a kind of laissez-faire approach that winks at certain transgressions without interceding. Universities, like most parents who know what is happening, have a certain level of accommodation, turning their heads at some select sins. For example, most first instances of alcohol use take place in a family context, and many parents want their children to learn to drink socially, even when they are drinking illegally. Without thinking through the consequences, parents actively decide not to intervene in the same way that many universities draw their line of involvement. Moreover, how much vigilance is a parent expected to provide? How active should a parent be? The phenomenon of the latchkey child (or rather the latchkey parent) is much talked about. It suggests the extent to which parents are not available in the home to provide effective supervision of young children. To the extent that colleges seek to play surrogate parents, their deployment decreases at the time when the activity most needing parental supervision takes place. We sleep while our students are awake—and most of us sleep at home, not on campus.

The Contract or Consumer Model

Under any form of *in loco parentis*, whether it is strict or indulgent, the student is in the place of the child. Colleges seem to want to recognize students' maturity, and in trying to extricate themselves from the untenable position brought about by a wave of litigation that established certain student rights,[8] another model emerged to reflect more accurately the new relationship

between students and colleges. We can call this the contract or consumer model. Under this model, the student gains the power to contract for services, as a consumer in an educational marketplace might negotiate for the best deal. The dominant metaphor shifts from family to market, and the student/consumer keeps the market healthy and responsive by taking business where the services most suit his/her needs.[9] Getting as much as one can within the context of the contract, by knowing and acting on one's own interests, becomes the ideal behavior in this model. Substituted for the parent-child model is one that need not promise any interaction beyond formal and abstract negotiations of deals where everyone seeks to win.

The party registration form, in spite of its flaws, is one example of the contract model (as it applies to alcohol policy) that has been adopted on many college campuses. With the party registration form, it is customary for students to agree to a limited number of guests, a specific amount of alcohol, and service of alcohol only to legal drinkers. Other stipulations may include nights when parties are prohibited, a requirement that students provide door monitors to check underage drinkers, and a request for proof of age from the hosts. There is a significant educational value in making students aware of party planning. Yet once a student promises to meet all the qualifications of the contract, he or she officially assumes responsibility for whatever actually takes place. In seeking to transfer legal responsibility from college to student, the contract clarifies relationships. For students, though, the "right" to party comes at the cost of an official disconnection with the authorities at the institution. Whether wittingly or not, the contract signals the institution's desire to be disengaged from the event once the protocol of filing the form has taken place. The illusion of the contract is that the students have bargained to be able to do more or less what they want. (Of course, where the contract is thought to be too onerous, the parties go on "unofficially" or take place off campus.)

The contract/consumer model suggests that students stand on equal footing with colleges as far as bargaining power is concerned, but Victoria Dodd has shown that the claim of equality is a fallacy and the model is misleading. Dodd believes that students cannot be accurately classified as consumers since they cannot freely choose the college they will attend. She also argues that the essence of contract law, a two-sided agreement, does not exist between students and colleges because the student has no control over the contractual provisions and all the provisions favor the school. "In effect the student agrees upon matriculation to abide by and tolerate every action of the school, except those of an arbitrary and capricious nature, while that school promises almost nothing in return" (cited in Szablewicz & Gibbs, 1987, p. 462). While this model aims to provide students with some measure of equality, it only serves to obscure the more powerful role of the institution. William Kaplin (1980) notes that the debate continues over how much "implied or inherent authority" is retained by the institution (p. 228). Ultimately, when contract or consumer models misrepresent the relation-

ship, they contribute to student perceptions of institutional hypocrisy.

We have outlined two different models for the relationship between institutions and students, in loco parentis and the contract/consumer model. The *in loco parentis* doctrine is flawed because it infantilizes students, frustrating their desire to separate from parental authority. It cannot accommodate the developmental shift away from parents that most psychologists predict for adolescents. From the institution's point of view, being a parent is easier when the child is dependent and becomes more difficult as the child achieves some measure of independence. The in loco parentis doctrine is not honest about the nature of parental authority because parental authority is weakest when it comes into play with an independent child. It cannot predict or control behavior with an independent child, and the assumption of connection is false.

The contract/consumer model implies negotiation where there is little room to negotiate, especially with underage drinking. In most contract theory, there is a desire on the part of the institution to achieve distance from students because of the high risks associated with their behaviors. An antiseptic disconnection takes place where we believe a flexible connection might have more chance of achieving the desired end of collective responsibility. The contract also implies that students have some autonomy and individual power or choice when, in fact, about important aspects of student life (personal freedom and alcohol use), they have very little real bargaining power.10 With both approaches, students' relationship to authority is inaccurately represented, in part because the two models rely on rules that distort the character of students and institutions.

Developmental theories, disobedient dependency, and the limitations of rules

In order to understand students' sometimes complicated reactions to institutional authority, it helps to look at some elements of prevailing developmental theory. Robert Arnstein (1974) describes the tasks of eighteen to twenty-two year olds as separating from parents, forming an identity or egosynthesis, and then developing a capacity for commitment in a relationship. Arthur Chickering (1969) describes a similar process of becoming autonomous that includes a rejection of connection during the college years. Individuals often deny the need for relationships because to admit that need frustrates their ability to see themselves as autonomous. It is only after they are able to achieve some independence that they are able to recognize interdependence (Chickering, pp. 57-61). The capstone of autonomy, according to Chickering, is the recognition and acceptance of interdependencies, as Arnstein also suggests. Thus, students are expected to separate from parental and other past connections, then to move through "tasks" that ultimately lead to autonomy and then to reconnection. Yet during the college years, students

may be somewhere between the complete rejection of others and the mature acceptance of connection. To move from dependency or rebellious independence toward relationships of mutual respect, Chickering argues, students need the encouragement of the proper university structure.

> The development of autonomy may not be fully completed in many college settings . . . because there is limited chance to develop, to demonstrate to oneself, the ability to cope with significant tasks alone—in short, because of limited opportunities for developing instrumental independence (p. 57).

It is important for administrators to recognize that while fulfilling their task of becoming independent, college students are negotiating their need for connection. (This negotiation has both a political and personal significance.) They may not have found a balance yet between dependency, autonomy, and a mature relationship of interdependency.[11]

In order to help students resolve this negotiation, universities need to provide an environment that encourages connection and simultaneously stimulates individual development. One answer, which developmental theorists and educational theorists seem to agree on, is for colleges to adopt clear and consistent standards. These standards, which represent value commitments, become a guiding philosophy for the institution to follow in all policy decisions. The volume *Administration and Leadership in Student Affairs* counsels that "student affairs staff members can probably have a much greater impact on students' ethical development by modeling a concern for and adherence to a set of publicly owned standards than they ever could when prescribing rigid rules for students" (Miller, Winston, & Mendenhall, 1983, p. 185). Chickering (1969) also finds that clear objectives, which encourage examination and debate, provide an effective structure for guiding student growth, while excessive regulation encourages bickering over implementation and enforcement (pp. 171-173). The key is not to be rigid and dogmatic in making objectives, because doing so seals learning off from conscious control and modification, causing students to rebel. Although students seem to want some kind of connected relationship to their institutions, rigid rules only serve to alienate students from those who seek to make and enforce the rules. Rules also tempt the ingenious to find ways around them. One student said it even better: "rules inspire genius."

As students struggle with conflicting desires for autonomy and dependence, especially within a context of rigid rules, they are apt to fall into a relationship with authority that Richard Sennett (1981) calls "disobedient dependence" (p. 26). He defines this bond to authority as based on "compulsive focusing of attention: what would they [the people in authority] want? Once their will is known, a person can proceed to act—against them." No genuine independence is achieved by this behavior because the authority figure is the central character: it is rebelling *within* authority rather than *against* it. As Sennett describes it, "the defiance creates a barrier which allows the depen-

dent person to enjoy the pleasure of dependence." If we are trying to help students achieve a measure of independence, then the very act of rule-making, as opposed to standard setting, impedes that goal by promoting dependence.

In response to the question, "Can you think of a situation where the rules said one thing and because you cared for someone you wanted to do something else?," a nineteen-year-old female Rutgers student illustrates this disobedient dependence bond to authority:

> The only thing I can think of is if someone had alcohol in the residence hall I wouldn't tell on them because I figure if they are doing their best not to get caught I'm not going to tell on them. Because I wouldn't want anyone telling on me if I did something that was illegal.

Instead of emphasizing the desirability of some "illegal" actions, in this case, drinking, she emphasizes the satisfaction of strategizing to evade authority. A twenty-year-old male student sounds a similar note in his answer to the same question:

> How about to protect a friend? This happened recently, he was too drunk, and you could have notified the proper people, which is what you're supposed to do, or you could just take care of it yourself, and hopefully everything should go all right and nobody should get into any problems.

This student, even though he is describing his own actions, frames his response using the second-person pronoun "you," as if he is considering a hypothetical situation. The distancing of the pronoun "you" serves to absolve him of the disobedience, at the same time that it places the hypothetical "you" in the same dependent relationship to authority that he feels he is in himself.

Another male student describes a process of bending the rules whereby "you do as much as you can so you don't get in trouble." He defines bending the rules as, "you would not change the rules but would ignore certain parts of them." Fulfilling Sennett's definition of disobedient dependence, this twenty year old sees himself as powerless to change the rules, but he enjoys the rebellious feeling of sneaking around them. A twenty-year-old female admits that her friends who do not attend Rutgers would be "surprised at how much drinking does go on considering the rules that are going on—the strict rules that have been enforced lately, so they are pretty surprised at that." All these students brought up drinking as their rules-breaking example without any prompting or suggestion from the interviewer (it was the first question), and alcohol or alcohol policy had not been mentioned at all in connection to the interviews.[12]

Obviously drinking is one area where students act out a disobedient dependence relationship to institutional authority. It is also an area where they identify the university's approach as centered on *rules*—rules that they can bend, ignore, or openly defy by illicit drinking since they see the letter of

the law as the only part of the policy that really concerns the university and themselves. All the other prevention and rehabilitation programs available on alcohol are subordinated to a focus on the one element that students feel invades their lives, the rules.

The reason each of these students gives for not reporting an infraction of alcohol policy is to avoid "getting someone into trouble." Although they express awareness of the dangers of drinking too much, those potential health hazards are *secondary* troubles or problems, as compared to the *primary* problem of fearing or facing disciplinary action for not following the rules. One female student, who is entering her senior year, recently attended a seminar on how to be a good preceptor or group leader because she is planning to be a group leader (peer advisor on academics) next year. She gave this answer when asked about a situation where the rules conflicted with caring for someone:

> If I was in that position [a friend got sick from drinking at a party in her room] I would feel more comfortable, if they were really sick I would take them to the Hurtado Health Center [the student health center], but if they're just a case of really drunk, I'd just stick them in their room. But the rules are that you are supposed to take any drunk person to Hurtado, but then it gets reported, and then you have to report to your preceptor, and then you get written up, and then you can get suspended for breaking the rules of alcohol policy or something like that. If I was responsible I would make darn sure they were all right in their room, but my last option would be Hurtado, but I would do it if they were really ill. But if they were just wasted I'd put them to bed.[13]

This student's negotiation with the rules, even after attending the training seminar, reveals that her first priority is to keep herself out of trouble, and then to consider the best care for her friend. This example, especially since it involves a student who has been through formal training on the alcohol policy, illustrates the limitations of a rules-based approach: the aim of the rules—to provide better care for students—gets lost in the obsession with the rules themselves and with their disciplinary consequences.

We realize that some student drinking might have nothing to do with authority figures, but the kinds of speculation about getting in trouble represented here suggest that a response is frequently expected. Students seem to think about drinking politically, some in terms of resisting what is controlling them, others in terms of "achieving autonomy." The "trouble" that is of most concern is the trouble they or their friends might get into for having broken the rules, not the trouble that the person who may be seriously at risk from drinking is in. This is probably even more likely in cases of chronic abuse than in individual episodes of alcohol overdosing into drunkenness.

Prevailing theories of development are focused on self and individuation. While they advocate separation as the developmental task of adolescence, they also acknowledge that mature interdependence is a late stage of development, one that may or may not occur in college. Thus, the negotiations

that students undergo with authority may place them in a situation best described as disobedient dependence. The rules seem to function as something to be gotten around. In some cases, rules may actually interfere with students' ability to act to reduce harm or to provide care for other students who are drinking in disobedience. Theories that count on self-regulation seem subject to an obvious criticism: the "self" that is supposed to be doing the regulating may not be reliable. All of the rhetoric about rules and the self fails to consider that the self is less reliable when alcohol begins to work its effects. Rules-based approaches also forget that students may have reasons for drinking.

Why do students drink alcohol?

To reconcile students' understanding of the risks involved in alcohol abuse with their blatant subversion of all the rules governing its use, the function of alcohol itself must be considered. What role does it play in the disobedient dependence behavior of undergraduates? Is alcohol a sign of rebellion or sophistication? How does it fit into undergraduate socializing?

Even though students know all the rules and the risks, they still drink illicitly and often to the point of intoxication.[14] The assumption in rule-setting is that a behavior must be modified: students have not learned how to tell when they have had enough to drink, so they need some reasonable guidelines. Since they are using the same substance that adults use, adults assume that students are misusing the substance, that they have not learned "adult" use, not that they are consciously using alcohol to get the pharmacologic effect they know it provides. If getting drunk is a conscious behavior with some kind of motive behind it, then it needs to be treated differently, and setting rules will not be effective.

Anna Freud (1974) describes a condition in adolescents that she calls the "transitory spontaneous recovery from the condition of asceticism" (p. 156). This phenomenon could explain the contradictory behavior of students who say they know the rules, seem to accept them, can argue for them, and then act against them even when they might be endangering themselves or others:

> [W]e find almost invariably a swing-over from asceticism to instinctual excess, the adolescent suddenly indulging in everything which he had previously held to be prohibited and disregarding any sort of external restrictions. On account of their anti-social character these adolescent excesses are in themselves unwelcome manifestations; nevertheless, from the analytic standpoint they represent transitory spontaneous recovery from the condition of asceticism (p. 156).

For college students living much of their lives in conformity with administrative and parental expectations, drinking provides a release from the restrictions, even if they support those regulations in principle. John Dewey (1966) labels this behavior "capricious activity"—when one does not care

what happens and disconnects the consequences of an act from the act itself (p. 77). Dewey places the blame on schools that dictate rules without leading students to see the connection between the end and the means. Thus, it would not be unusual for a student who attends a "mocktail" party or demonstration (alcohol-free cocktail party)[15] at six p.m. to decide to get drunk at a different party at midnight when she or he has grown restless with behaving. One notorious drinker, F. Scott Fitzgerald, in talking about his own college days, once exclaimed. "Why, I can go up to New York on a terrible party and then come back and go in to church and *pray*—and mean every word of it, too!" (cited in Wilson, 1967, p. 106). What Anna Freud terms the "antisocial character" of this type of rebellion and recovery might also be called the countercultural aspect of student drinking behavior.

Theodore Roszak (1969) defines a counter culture as a "culture so radically disaffiliated from the mainstream assumptions of our society that it scarcely looks to many as a culture at all, but takes on the alarming appearance of a barbarian intrusion" (p. 42). The key characteristics of a countercultural action are that it is anti-intellectual and disaffiliated. While drinking among today's college students might not necessarily be anti-intellectual, it is not intellectual either, and it is deceptively disaffiliated. When Roszak first defined "counter culture" in the sixties, he was talking about a population of young people who looked different from their parents, used different drugs, and had different goals; today's students look much the same as their parents, share many goals, and the same drug of choice, but their use of it at this stage of their lives is very different—they drink in party settings often to the point of drunkenness. They reject one of the messages of adult culture: learning control or at least learning a myth of control. In an odd way, when they drink they admit their powerlessness over alcohol because intoxication is just that state they seek to be in.[16] When sober, however, they claim total control over alcohol.

The countercultural dimension of their drinking is its radical rejection of decorum. While students look like and behave like adults and have adult aspirations, what they do while drinking is a rejection of everything they would claim they were while sober. Consider vomiting as a symbol of rejection. The prominence of vomiting on campus (and even the rhetoric associated with it, e.g., "I drove the big white bus last night") is more than just the gastrointestinal response triggered by drinking large quantities of alcohol. Vomiting is actually cultivated behavior in some instances.[17] A recent story from a prominent Southern university seems to be a good example of this "counter cultural" rejection: A noted fraternity sponsored a keg-race in its basement where participants drank in order to vomit, and then the vomit was "collected" in a garbage pail. Once enough was collected, the pail was overturned in the middle of the floor, soap suds were added and the brothers took turns sliding—some on their chests—through the vomit. In every other respect, this fraternity would seem to have embraced the dominant culture. Vomit is a good symbol of rejection, however, and thus sliding in it would seem to

qualify as a counter cultural act.

To talk about student drinking in these terms, as transitory spontaneous recovery or countercultural behavior, is to take it seriously as a behavior with a plausible objective—instead of students getting drunk because they do not know how to handle alcohol, they are drinking for its effect, and on a political level, in relation to an authority figure.

Boredom as Motivation

Students say that they are bored. Recognizing the possibility of boredom as one intent behind student drinking, and taking it seriously, is essential for developing an effective campaign to stop alcohol abuse. One frequently attempted approach, which does not accurately assess the motivation of student drinking, is the programming of activities designed to distract students from drinking and getting drunk. The rationale for this approach is that students often cite a lack of other options as their reason for drinking. While colleges themselves express amazement about this claim (recalling the many lectures, concerts, club meetings, recreational sports, and films that seem to be scheduled at any given time), they nonetheless respond. As a tactical response, programming aims to reduce drinking and promote alcohol awareness by convincing students that alcohol-free activities can be fun, and that the possibilities for such activities are endless. Of course it makes sense to provide a wide range of programs for those who do not drink or whose drinking is non-problematic. It is less sensible to suppose that alternative activities will satisfy those who use alcohol for the effects they believe it will provide.

Just one example of this strategy is a handbook for residence hall staff entitled *How to Program without Alcohol: 3000+ Residence Hall Programs* by Dr. Floyd Hoelting.[18] Hoelting alphabetically lists alcohol-free activities for dorms. He suggests programs that include a Bugs Bunny breakfast or lunch program with carrots and green vegetables and students dressed in rabbit costumes, a frog catching contest with a frog leg barbecue, a soap box derby, a bulimia rap session, etc.

As discussed earlier, any program that seeks to modify behavior must have a "sense" of the person whose behavior is to be changed. What is that sense as evidenced in these suggestions? Hoelting's suggestions offer a very confused answer to the question—one that, to a great extent, fails to take college students seriously, even less their reasons for drinking.

To think that students would forget about drinking to catch frogs does not take into account the nature of boredom, nor what students mean when they say they are bored. Frequently boredom is a mood having nothing to do with the number of available activities, as this sophomore male explains:

> You can get in a mood where you're just blah and you could even know you have a party to go to but still be bored. I've been to parties even though everyone was having a good time I just wasn't in the mood to have a good time so I left. There's

times when you can still be bored and still have options to do something.

Another sophomore stated, "even when you're bored, there's still tons of things you can do."

An awareness of boredom as a personal feeling divorced from the environment was expressed by a majority of the students interviewed, which means the plan of providing more activities cannot eliminate the excuse of boredom as a reason to drink. Adam Phillips (1986), a child-psychoanalyst, believes that boredom is actually a developmental state necessary for reconnecting with one's desires:

> What the bored child perceives himself as losing is "something to do" at the moment when nothing is inviting. . . . In a sense, the bored child is absorbed by his lack of absorption, and yet he is also preparing for something of which he is unaware, something that will eventually occasion an easy transition or a mild surprise of interest (p. 104).

The idea that boredom helps the child to "return to the possibility of his own desire" (Phillips, 1986, p. 101) might be a key to the link between alcohol use and boredom in college students.

Certainly this twenty year old's description of why he drinks when he is bored seems to fit Phillips' theory:

> Alcohol just loosens you up. It's a depressant so it just makes you like less inhibited to think "All right let's do that." Just maybe [it] helps to get other people involved in what you want to do. Like say you think of something that's kind of unusual to do, and you want to do it, and people are drunk enough, they'll do it. Otherwise they say they have a paper due next Tuesday "I can't do that, we should just hang around here and go to bed early." But if you've been drinking, you're like "oh yea, I'll do that." It helps to get you going because once you start drinking there is just no going back really unless you just drink one or two beers and hang around and just let it wear off, but if you just start drinking you know once you get going, you might as well just have fun. Kind of like a line, you just kind of cross it.

This student betrays an awareness of the facts about alcohol—"it's a depressant"—and in an interesting way his knowledge about the drug leads to his desire for it: he can anticipate the effect. In fact, his own misuse of alcohol education reveals the limitation of teaching the facts as a method for preventing abuse because, for him, the uninhibiting effect of a depressant provides the release he needs and activates his desire.[19]

Boredom has not received enough attention by alcohol researchers, although several studies focusing specifically on the connection between drinking and types of boredom have helped to identify some of the variables in the relationship. A study done at Florida State University by James Orcutt (1984) tested drinking habits in relation to two different types of boredom: existential boredom and interpersonal boredom. Existential boredom, which

was positively related to drinking among college-aged students, was defined as arising from the feeling that one's life has no clear direction and purpose. In contrast, interpersonal boredom, boredom with small talk and social interaction, is negatively related to alcohol use because drinking so often occurs in a social setting. None of the interviewed students expressed interpersonal boredom, in keeping with Orcutt's findings, but many of them expressed existential boredom. Clearly, the type of boredom related to drinking, questioning one's life purpose, cannot be ameliorated through participation in bubble blowing contests or peanut week (nor can one predict with any certainty when it might be appropriate to plan a "life purpose" workshop). Actually, existential boredom might be accelerated by infantilizing options that make drinking seem to be the only sophisticated alternative. Another study (Schwarz, Burkhardt, & Green, 1982), based on the theory that drinking provides a culturally sanctioned time-out from social controls, tested sensation-seeking as a factor in the drinking of college-aged males. This study, performed at Auburn University, found that general sensation-seeking and alcohol are significantly related. In testing alcohol as a sanctioned time-out, these researchers provide another explanation for why non-alcohol activities alone will not succeed in preventing excessive drinking. The activities that Hoelting and others suggest may provide the ice-breaking function of alcohol but they lack the excuse for misbehavior. (They are, in the words of one alumnus, "like a scotch and soda without the scotch.") Students who want the release from social controls that they think alcohol provides will not be satisfied by alcohol-free activities—especially when those activities represent the very effort to achieve social control.

Countercultural Drinking to Create Communities

When students describe their drinking habits and parties, getting drunk is an assumed part of undergraduate life and, in fact, has been for many years. Edmund Wilson (1967) complained of a famous classmate that "he had never really been to Princeton, that he had always been drunk or deluded, and had lived in a personal fantasy. He made little attempt to learn anything, as far as his courses were concerned, and he had no idea whatsoever as to how the University worked" (p. 180). Wilson then had to admit, somewhat sheepishly, that the same was true of his own college days. Today's students seem to be continuing in this well-worn tradition of collegiate life, and it is inaccurate to think that the problem of student drinking is new just because it is now receiving a lot of attention. Michael Moffatt (1989) discovered during his anthropological journey into college residence hails that: "Liquor and near-drunkenness were central to partying for white, mainstream American students . . . " (p. 129).

Asked to describe a typical Rutgers party, a woman in the class of 1990 said,

> A lot of drinking but I guess that's the same everywhere from what I've heard. A lot of drinking, sometimes I've been at a party where there's been a lot of fights. . . . I guess I would think of a fraternity party that's what I've been to mostly. I'm

> too young for bars so I don't see that. People dancing, drinking—definitely—that's what I would say, there's a lot of drinking.

This student, who admits that she is under age for drinking at bars, completely unselfconsciously tells about attending numerous parties with "lots" of alcohol. She presents this scenario as the norm for undergraduate socializing at all the schools she has heard about. It is her idea of a "norm." Elaborating on her description, she explains: "People won't dance usually unless they are drunk. . . . So by the end [of the party] everyone is dancing and everyone is just screaming." Her description is not atypical. A twenty-one-year old senior claims, "Frat parties can be wild with drinking. People all over the floor, spilling beer on you, bumping into you. . . . They [fraternities] have gotten stricter with alcohol, but they're still the wildest."

Parties may differ in character, but the emphasis on drinking seems to be universal. One sophomore gave his version of the various kinds of parties:

> You have dorm parties but they have cut down on those and they are basically small gatherings. Pretty mellow and pretty quiet. You have fraternity parties I really don't like. There are a lot of people, you can get served but it's a big hassle to do it. Usually there's a lot of dancing depending on which ones you go to. You have off campus parties which are usually fairly large. I usually like going to off-campus parties because there are usually people you know, whereas in fraternity parties you usually only know who you go with. . . . I like going to off-campus parties because basically there are fifty to one hundred people in this one apartment and you know half of them. You feel comfortable with them and there's usually a lot of drinking and dancing. They can be pretty mellow but basically you're more friendly with the people.

A female in the junior class adds some details about the typical partying environment,

> Just drinking. It's just drinking. I can't see it because I can't even breathe in a place like that because it's so hot and stuffy and filled with smoke. . . . It's just so hot in there I can't stand it and I have to move around. . . . And I can't understand why people want to do that. I guess it's just for the drinking.

The idea that these parties are organized just for the drinking is something several students mention explicitly. "If someone is planning a party, the first thing they plan is who is going to buy the keg, or the other choice . . . ," as one student puts it. The definition one woman gave for a good party was "enough alcohol for everyone there. Enough would probably be enough to get everyone intoxicated, although I doubt a typical Rutgers student would say they wanted to."

Recent research[20] on expectancy theory has interesting implications for establishing the nature of student drinking. Several undergraduates who are quoted above mention that parties frequently are organized for drinking, and they recount episodes of very heavy party drinking. One explanation for

this kind of episodic drinking is that students' beliefs about the benefits of alcohol to socializing affect the quantity of alcohol they consume on any given occasion. Because parties are perceived as necessary but potentially stressful social events, students' ideas that drinking helps to reduce inhibitions and enhance sociability may influence excessive drinking, even though this type of drinking might only take place on Thursdays, Fridays and Saturdays, the typical partying nights. As one recent study found:

> As in previous studies (Mooney et al., 1987), expectancies were better predictors of quantity-related drinking variables, including usual quantity consumed per occasion and frequency of intoxication, than of frequency of drinking occasions. This finding makes sense when one notes that many of the effects of drinking are felt only after a certain number of drinks. Initiating a drinking episode might be influenced by other factors, such as convenience or timing, but on a drinking occasion an individual drinks to experience certain desired effects, expectancies may influence the amount drunk more than the frequency of those occasions (Leigh, 1989, p. 438).

This study provides an explanation for the tendency among undergraduates to drink to drunkenness when they do drink. Expectancy theory helps us to see how and why intoxication becomes the goal because it brings with it certain perceived benefits.[21]

Drinking, Socializing, and "Hooking up"

Asked to explain the reason for drinking, and particularly for getting drunk, one frequent answer students give is that it helps with socializing because it lessens inhibitions. The same woman who spoke about hating the hot, crowded rooms of most parties theorizes that the attraction of drinking for her peers is that it allows people who are normally closed to express themselves:

> It [using drinking to open up] is a very big part of drinking here at Rutgers because a lot of people talked about this, that the reason you're doing an activity is for the drinking, not for the activity. Like parties, [they think] you have a party to drink, you don't have a party to get together with your friends.

The importance of drinking to socializing—especially when, paradoxically, one's own need for release overrides any meaningful contact with others—not only characterizes the situation at most parties, but also the kind of interaction students expect to have with each other.

Even though there is an enormous amount of pressure put on meeting people, romantic or sexual partners in particular, the interactions students have with each other at parties are, for the most part, set up to be superficial. Recognizing that not all student relationships are superficial, and in fact that many students have very committed relationships, these statements are only intended to describe one kind of socializing that is linked to drinking and parties; but since this kind of social contact was mentioned by a majority of

students as typical, it merits examination in conjunction with drinking and its function in students' lives.[22]

Many of the interviewed students, when they discussed drunkenness as facilitating contact between men and women, also described a party situation constructed as an obvious set-up for sexual encounters. As they present it, drinking becomes an excuse for some students to let themselves be set up, even when they know the trap exists. This feigned innocence is described for men and women, although it has more complicated ramifications for the women. A male art history major in his junior year talks about "hooking up," a party phenomenon he participated in during his freshman and sophomore years, which he describes in terms of a social ritual. The routine begins by establishing eye contact with a woman while dancing, then he leaves his friends and she leaves her friends to "single it off." In his words:

> For this to work successfully, you are usually fairly drunk so you don't remember what you are doing.[23] It's very awkward and not a lot of fun. But then you usually say "Gosh, it's hot in here," and go outside. Then you go outside and that's when you become physical. It's not sleeping with someone. It's not even, it's basically more just making out and not anything real. . . . Freshman year is like a point of like something really stupid, a matter of showing people you're cool, or you can do it. I did it more for, I really wanted that closeness, but it really wasn't that closeness, it was more that closeness combined with what it looked like. . . . I guess some people expect relationships out of that. I certainly never did. And I don't even know anyone who got one. Who would want to meet like that? You met in a drunken stupor, naked in the backyard of some fraternity in snow. That's not any way to meet anybody, and I guess I finally realized that.

Several other men and women echoed his description of this ritualized or contrived encounter between the sexes. In each case, the essential ingredient is the alcohol, which encourages social freedom and provides an excuse if things "go wrong." A senior, who describes herself as a light drinker, when asked about the difference between being at a party when she is drinking and when she is not drinking, replied:

> Well, when you start drinking and you start feeling the alcohol take effect, you are more friendly. You take more risks. If I were a single person and I wasn't drinking, I'd say "oh, he's cute," but I wouldn't do anything. But if I were a little drunk, maybe I'd go up to him. So you have a lot of people taking risks like that and being more friendly, giving you a pat on the back more often, it's fun.

Alcohol and Predatory Sexual Behavior

Even though men and women claim that both sexes get drunk in order to socialize more freely with each other, the difference becomes harmful when women are entering a social situation set up by men, as in a fraternity house, which is designed to make it easier for men to take advantage of women sexually. One reason women may be willing to go along with the set-up is sug-

gested by Carol Cassell (1984). She argues that "The central fact—and fault—of women's sexuality is that all too often we deny responsibility for it: we wrap our desire in a cloak of romance, need 'love' in order to have sex" (pp. 24-25). Because our society is still uncomfortable with women's sexuality, women have developed "a coping mechanism, which allows them to be sexual . . . without having to pay the price of being labeled wanton or promiscuous." This coping mechanism is the demand to be "Swept Away," which as Cassell explains, is "a counterfeit emotion used to disguise erotic feelings." Drinking, as it is typically used at fraternities, could certainly help with this delusional process and would further displace responsibility, maybe more effectively than the pretense of emotion alone.

Many students blame the women for their naivete, and all of them acknowledge that the set-up is explicitly constructed to make the women vulnerable. A female sophomore believes that going to a fraternity party is a risk, and one that women should know enough not to take:

> The guys are very sexist. They just seem to want to get laid and do anything to manipulate a girl to get laid, whether they get her drunk and try to flirt with her, or stuff like that. But a girl is taking a chance by going there. They should know instinctively that's what a teenaged man wants. Especially at this age they are at the peak of their sex drive and it's kind of common sense.

Her attitude that a woman's instincts should protect her from entering into a possibly threatening situation accepts as facts predatory male sexuality and the use of alcohol as a manipulative technique.

When a junior was asked how she thinks alcohol is used at fraternity parties, she reported,

> I've talked to these friends of mine who have gone to fraternities and they have the booze there to get the women drunk, definitely. And the women drink because they think that's what they are kind of supposed to do. And they like to drink anyway, they like to drink but they don't, they are not doing it for the same reason, like they're doing it to get relaxed or because it's there.

When asked whether the men find it attractive for the women to be drunk, she answered,

> I've done a lot of talking with people about this, and they think that a drunk woman is really disgusting but she's like an easy and a quick lay. . . . So the people I know that are in fraternities that have girlfriends, they wouldn't tolerate their girlfriends being drunk that way.

In the fraternity setting, the socializing can (and often does) lead easily to acquaintance rape and sexual assault.[24]

One factor, which paradoxically increases the likelihood of acquaintance rape in fraternities, is the policy of many national sororities to prohibit the

use of chapter funds and sorority houses for the consumption of alcohol. Sorority members are not prohibited from drinking; they are simply asked not to do it at home or with their chapter's money. This policy stance contributes directly to the circumstance where college fraternities become the main focus of social activities, particularly those involving alcohol. As the handbook *Rush: A Girl's Guide to Sorority Success* naively advises sorority members, "Have fun—drink up before you dance" and "Go home from parties before you throw up or pass out" (Rose, 1985, p. 78). Ronald Roskens, the president of the University of Nebraska, notes:

> It is clearly admirable that the sororities have banned alcohol in policy and in fact from their houses. But I find no redeeming virtue in this fact since sororities continue to participate actively in fraternity or even university sponsored events where excessive drinking is the rule, rather than the exception" ("The Stuff That Dreams Are Made Of").

With regard to alcohol consumption and sexual assault, the fact that fraternities become the buyers/sources/servers of alcohol, and that women enter fraternities in order to drink it, means that the two main conditions that tend to predispose women to sexual assault are institutionalized in some greek systems. As research suggests, the conditions that predispose women to date rape are expressing interest in the man, letting him pay for the date, and entering his home.[25] Because alcohol impairs judgment and weakens defenses, it can become an agent in assisting a predator to acquire a victim. There are other more controlled situations where alcohol is also used to lessen inhibitions, but more for facilitating conversation and flirting than for sexual misconduct; however, that possibility exists even in these settings.

Drinking Games

A common method for combining drinking and socializing is playing drinking games, such as "Thumper," "Kill the Keg," and "Quarters." All the Rutgers students interviewed were familiar with Quarters (a game where players bounce a quarter off the table and into a full cup of beer in the center—anyone who is successful picks another player to drink the beer), and they could either describe their own experiences playing or what they knew about the game from watching others play. A typical explanation of why it is fun is given by this twenty-year old female:

> I like Quarters at parties because usually people . . . I like going to parties, I like meeting people, and people don't introduce themselves and I do. . . . But a lot of people aren't, they don't do that. But you play a game of quarters, you sit down with four people you don't even know and you're talking and it kind of gets a conversation going. So I see it as that.

Like many students, this senior sees drinking games as an ice-breaker—an easy way to establish contact with others, to have fun talking and drinking

while being brought into a relationship with one another by virtue of the game. A study done at the University of Nebraska—Lincoln corroborates this view of drinking games: "They provide an easy means of relating to others, even strangers. . . . Games themselves encourage drunkenness which further facilitates socializing" (Newman, Crawford, & Nellis, 1989, p. 6).

When Rutgers students were asked how they would feel if their friends decided to try to get them drunk on their birthday by playing a game of Quarters, more than half of those interviewed said it would not bother them, although several males added qualifications about not wanting to be the only one drunk. One sophomore admitted:

> I would feel a little used in a sense but they might be doing it for a reason other than just getting drunk. If they just want to see you get sick on your birthday, it might be fun for them but I would feel pretty used. Unless they would do something afterwards and just wanted to make sure you were. As long as everyone was as drunk as I was I don't think I would mind that much.

The young man quoted above added that he would not use the word "paranoid" to describe how he would feel as the only one drunk, but he would use the word "abused." The following student did use the word "paranoid" to explain how he might feel:

> I think it would depend on their motivation to get me drunk. If they were trying to get me drunk for some bizarre reason, to strip me naked and take pictures of me in the lounge, then I would be wary. But I don't think that would be the situation. I think if they were just trying to get me drunk, it wouldn't be anything I'd object to because I've been drunk with them before. . . . The only thing that bothers me about the situation is the type, because I'm so paranoid.[26]

Ironically, only male students mentioned this fear of being "more drunk" than the others during a drinking game, while almost unanimously students stated women's predicament at fraternity parties to be precisely that: women wind up more drunk than the men who are trying to take advantage of them. These two males acknowledge the potential to be singled out as something that makes them uncomfortable, and this potential is frequently realized with women at fraternity parties; yet none of the women mentioned it in connection with drinking games, and none of the men related their discomfort with this use of alcohol to what women experience at fraternity parties. The omission may be a significant indication that vulnerability is still socially accepted as a feminine plight. It may also reveal that men are more obsessed with being in control.

When students at the University of Nebraska—Lincoln were asked why they play drinking games, 96% of those interviewed "indicated that one of the reasons why 'Quarters' was played by males was to pick up females and/or to take advantage of them" (Newman, Crawford, & Nellis, 1989, p. 11). The researchers concluded that

> the activities around the Quarters cup can provide an effective, informal, unspoken matching process where signals are given and returned by the medium of an intoxicant that tends to decrease the inhibitions of those involved. Couples who have initiated relationships in this manner may find it easier to relate to each other following the game (p. 11).

By analyzing students' reasons for playing Quarters, these researchers hope to instruct health educators and administrators on the benefits students find in the games in spite of the medical risks of overconsumption. Although they consider the role of alcohol in facilitating social contact, they do not consider the possibly harmful nature of that interaction if men are expecting to be able to take advantage of the female players. Some of the male students at Rutgers recognized that alcohol in drinking games can be used to make a person vulnerable, but they were thinking about themselves when it seems, more typically, that in drinking games and at parties, the alcohol is being used to make women vulnerable. These drinking games have an intent besides getting drunk, and this intent says even more about students' alcohol use than does their willingness to ignore health threats. Student alcohol use is more characteristically a social, albeit sometimes pathological, behavior than a cavalier renunciation of personal health. However, prevention efforts more frequently focus on the health or "total wellness" aspect and exclude the social (and sometimes predatory) dimension of much student drinking.

Cultural Messages about Alcohol Use

Complicating universities' relationships to students around alcohol policy are the cultural messages students absorb about drinking and what alcohol bestows upon its users.[27] Three underlying themes contained in these messages are important for the issues in this report. The first theme is the connection of alcohol with status and privilege, the second, the association of alcohol with infantile escapism. The third theme concerns two basic "educational" messages that exaggerate the focus on the self and shift attention away from concern for others.

Alcohol and Privilege[28]

Examples of advertisements that link alcohol with privilege abound. The basic use of alcohol as a reward (something you deserve) has been discussed extensively elsewhere. Two recent advertisements that link alcohol with anxiety about privilege help us see these connections. One entitled "Social Security" shows three bottles of champagne in a refrigerator, and the other is a mobile with an upscale scotch at the center captioned "Upwardly Mobile." Obviously these advertisements are aimed at a larger audience than college students, but they have unique repercussions within the university because they affect students' sense of their relations to status, power, and authority. If college students, who believe themselves privileged by virtue of their enrollment in college, are told that alcohol is part of being privileged, and part of

a connection to successful adults, it becomes a more desired commodity, but also a symbol of status and a way to achieve that status.

College is, after all, supposed to be the path to a successful adult life. Indeed, many admissions campaigns invoke the language of privilege—often linking it with excellence—in much of what they say about student status within the institution. This value of selectivity, of advantage over others, of specialness, is not lost on students, particularly not on those who are interested enough to engage us in our rhetoric.

A lot of the drinking behavior on campuses is designed to model the sophistication students are growing into: cocktail parties, formals, receptions, the ubiquitous presence of the bar in a fraternity house. Even the "tailgate" party, as it is appropriated by students, mimics the adult return to campus.

Students are told in many ways that "Membership has its privileges."[29] Consequently, when injunctions on drinking are imposed, they are viewed as incompatible with the status of our best and brightest, and incompatible with the myth of adult freedom that colleges promise. This problem is not new. One graduate student, writing in 1969, expressed the paradox in these terms:

> The nineteen year old with an I.Q. of 90 who was unable or too lazy to earn good grades in high school and unable or unwilling to go on to college, who now works only 35 to 40 hours a week, has all the dimensions of personal freedom that our society provides. This is not the case with this young person's intellectual polar opposite. The nineteen-year-old with an I.Q. of 125 who works a total of 50 or 60 hours a week in class, in the library, at a part-time job, and at study is often told where to live and when to come and go, and can be subjected to annoying indignities, such as having his dormitory room inspected for disorder or searched for contraband liquor. If college and university administrators continue to reject demands for personal freedom made by this student and others like him, they are in a rather ludicrous position. For then they assume that members of their select community have less intelligence, capacity, or self-control than those unable or unwilling to be students (Driessel, 1969, p. 81).

Alcohol becomes a debating point within the concept of privilege: why should the most promising young people be the most restricted? Privilege and selectivity do not repose in students as some special trust—something that can be taken away easily—but rather feel like markers of status, allowing them to think they are chosen. It becomes very hard for students to cooperate with an alcohol-free strategy that seems burdensome and hostile, especially when it subjects them to what they perceive as greater restrictions than those applied to their non-college peers.

Infantile Escapism

Advertisements that appeal to the fun and playfulness of drinking, although they take the opposite tack, also create problems for university authorities who levy alcohol policy. An example of this strategy is the Miller Brewery Spring Break Guide "Beachin' Times," which was delivered to campuses nation-wide and then retracted by their top executives as a mistake. Printed

in a childish scrawl and formatted like a comic book, "Beachin' Times" offers answers to the question "Why I Are A College Student" and proffers motherly advice on how to dress for the beach. It advises starting "spring training early" and then mixes messages of health and safety with pranks, put-downs, sexism, implicit racism, and advice for constant intoxication—the final result is that the serious messages are deconstructed at the same time that the foolish ones are promoted. "Beachin' Times" makes irresponsible drinking into a requisite (and fun) part of youth culture, promoting abuse of alcohol and abuse of others as a right of the college generation. Students' rights, according to Miller Beer, are:

> The right to be. The right to be anything. The freedom to do nothing. The ability to make a statement without saying anything. The right to be truly decadent . . . or totally modular. The right to deny yourself nothing. You have the right to be.

Students who subscribe to these beliefs about drinking openly rebel or furtively sneak around alcohol regulations that they believe deprive them of an inalienable right of young adulthood.[30]

"Beachin' Times" seems to be targeted at white men, but one campaign that seems to be targeted in part at white women is the Spuds MacKenzie series. Here we find the party animal in the form of a bewildered dog, frequently being manipulated by a group of young women.[31] In his cuddliness and his derring-do, Spuds is a reassuring, and systematically misleading representation of the party animal most young women need to be concerned about. Since he is a dog, he does not have to drink beer, so his animalism, not his intoxication, may account for his lack of inhibitions. Not so with the true party animal, which is why he turns to drinking.

College women are in the very precarious position of simultaneously having to be appealing, intelligent, caring, independent, careerist, and family-oriented. They cannot be one woman—they have to be many women. Retreating from socializing is an understandable response to this stress. Trusting people who you hope will not let you down is another. The association of alcohol with the condition of exploitation is a powerfully important condition with which women must contend. Alcohol consumption might help women feel more "integrated"—at ease in social situations, for example—but it is also an element that exaggerates their vulnerability to the very party animal they are being asked to cuddle.

Industry-Supported Education

In their attempt to collaborate with alcohol education, the industry has pushed at least two slogans that merit attention: "Know your limit" and "Know when to say when." These messages find a sympathetic response from the higher education industry as well. The National Collegiate Awareness Week people sponsored their own "Know when to say when" poster campaign. Both messages purport to be helpful.

Like much alcohol prevention and education, these messages focus on

individuals, assume that students' drinking will approach dangerous levels ("say when"), and even encourage drinking "at the limit." Neither message distinguishes among drinkers (some people are at risk drinking anything at all). Neither reminds its target of any responsibility or connection with others. Ironically, the advertisements also provide a debating point for the drinker should someone else try to intervene ("What do you mean I'm drunk? I know when to say when"). Neither ad accounts for the fact that "knowing" is affected by drinking and that the most unreliable person to tell us "his limit" is the person approaching his limit. The campaign relies on the myth that the drinker maintains control. Absent from these messages is a call to collective responsibility—"Know when and how to say what and to whom."

We have looked at a variety of things people talk about when they explain why they drink, and we have also examined some of the messages that influence people's thinking about alcohol. Some of the reasons for drinking are social, to feel connected, while other reasons are more predatory. In both instances, students place the locus of control within the individual.

The dangers of radical individualism

Students' attitudes about alcohol reveal a lot about their relationships with each other, and some of that is very troubling if their ways of using alcohol are indicative. A fiercely individualistic idea about alcohol use comes up when students talk about responsibility for a drunk person. In February, 1988, James Callahan, a first year student at Rutgers and a fraternity pledge, died during a fraternity initiation ritual involving alcohol.[32] In the student consciousness, James Callahan's death became the symbol for not knowing your limit. As they saw it, because of his error they were all being unjustly punished, and the fraternities were bearing the brunt of the criticism. A class officer had this to say about it in her interview:

> Kids are going to drink no matter what and I just think . . . James Callahan, I mean, he was like stupid. Like I don't blame the Lambdas, he was dumb. He shouldn't have drank that much. I think people should really know their limit of how much they should drink. I don't think drinking should be banned. That's just like stupid. It will just drive it underground and people will abuse it more. I think there should be an alcohol education program people will take seriously. [33] Because it's just like a joke to everyone. It's almost like James Callahan died in vain, because you'd think after that people would calm down, with like chugging of alcohol. But I heard after that about people who would just down hard liquor.

Her evaluation of blame, attributing the death to personal error, completely ignores the group context of the incident. (It is thought that Callahan drank approximately twenty-four kamikazes in forty minutes as part of an initiation rite.) She denies any connection between Callahan and the others present in favor of an individualized ethic in which Callahan is somehow faulted

for not knowing enough to take care of himself. Opinions voiced by students shortly after the incident reveal that many students felt the same way: "He had drunk himself to death," "He should have known better," "He was responsible for what happened to himself," "He should have known 'when to say when...'[an echo of the industry message]."[34] As this woman reports on the legacy of Callahan's death, this kind of response has permitted students to continue their own heavy drinking worry-free.

> I still hear stories. This one fraternity, this past Christmas, the big gag is to each . . . like a little brother buys the big brother a bottle of hard liquor and then at the party they chug it. My friend told me he did it. I'm like, "You could have died. You are such an idiot." He was like, "Oh it wasn't that bad. Then people threw up." I'm like, "That's really brilliant. You drink so you can throw up? That's a lot of fun." I don't like it. They're like, "Oh, James Callahan died. He was stupid." And then they do the same thing. He died because he didn't realize how much alcohol he was ingesting at the time. He did it in such a short amount of time he didn't realize.

She claims frustration with her friend's inability to see that he could die the same way. However, because she does not let go of the idea that Callahan could have stopped if he were not confused, her reasoning allows for exactly that disconnection that her friend expresses. By denying the group's influence and the context beyond the self, they both absolve others of responsibility for what happened.[35]

Students who think this way are also asserting a powerful individuality: their sense of themselves as masters of their own fate gives them a feeling of invulnerability to external forces. The danger of this kind of thinking with alcohol is that any student who separates himself or herself from James Callahan is overestimating his or her own judgement, especially when intoxicated, and underestimating the influence of the group. In blaming Callahan for his fate, students display a strange lack of sympathy for a fellow student's death, as if sympathy would betray a connection they need to deny.

Where did this ethic of individualism come from and how does the university foster it? We have pointed to both contract/market theories, developmental theories that prize autonomy above connection, and cultural messages that focus on self ("knowing when to say when") as evidence of the special appeal to individualism that exaggerates the already profound "individualism" of American culture. The political side of individualism is a rights-based conception of relations to authority and the rule-making that goes with it.

Educational analysts from many different political orientations agree that there is a selfish individualism among today's college students that universities have somehow encouraged and now need to correct. In a 1986 speech at Harvard University, then Secretary of Education William Bennett took colleges to task for remaining silent on morality, and he entreated faculty and staff to accept morality as a basic responsibility. His example of laxity was a

college president who shrugs his shoulders about drugs on campus instead of doing something to stop the problem. Ernest Boyer (1987) blames the tension between individualism and community on the narrow vocationalism of many schools, which emphasizes personal success more than citizenship. He implores, "We need individualism but, at the same time, we must be mindful of the consequences of selfishness." Educational institutions, he argues, "must help students" understand the dilemmas and paradoxes of an individualistic culture" (p. 68). Allan Bloom, author of *The Closing of the American Mind* (1987), attributes students' egocentric individualism to too much freedom:[36]

> But a young person today, to exaggerate only a little, actually begins *de novo*, without the givens or imperatives he would have had only yesterday. His country demands little of him and provides well for him, his religion is a matter of absolutely free choice and—this is what is really fresh—so are his sexual involvements. He can now choose, but he finds he no longer has a sufficient motive for choice that is more than whim, that is binding (p. 109).

Each analyst of higher education has a different theory about what caused their claim of a lack of community among students in the 1980s, but each one lays at least part of the blame on the colleges and universities themselves. Consequently, educators are asked to question the behavior they are modeling and the policies that are eliciting this response.

We wanted to find out in the interviews how students felt about the connections they have with faculty and administrators, and whether they felt encouraged to initiate contact or not. We were interested in seeing if students believe their individualism reflects the treatment they receive from other members of the university community. Our question—Do you feel that the faculty and administrators with whom you have had contact are interested in you and your welfare?—met with this response from one senior:

> A few professors have. When you go up to them after class, they will take the time to talk to you, answer your questions, will come to office hours with you. Some say no, they don't have time and you will have to come when they have their office hours. They won't make the extra effort.

A woman in the junior class speculates, "If we were younger I think that they would take more time, but I think they feel we're in college and you know what you have to do." She also relates an incident where her department failed to notify her about an important certification test:

> One of my teachers just mentioned to us that she hoped we got our application for the teachers' certificate test. They didn't even send us anything. Now we don't know what we're going to do. The school is supposedly working on it but we don't know. . . . It's just too big I think. Maybe if you took advantage of it, I can't speak on that part because I never have. If you went down there yourself, but it's not like they're going out of their way, even in your own department.

The only student who mentioned any contact with administrators, a female class officer, wondered about the sincerity of the response she had received in some cases:

> Some. I deal with a lot of deans because I'm involved in a lot of activities. I think some deans, I'm actually like friends with, and they really do care, however, as you get up there, on the surface they seem like they care but then you find out things like they refuse to meet with certain people. Or they constantly give you the same prepared speech. They don't genuinely care about the students, maybe they are sick of dealing with it. Too many kids.

Several students mentioned that professors responded once they made an effort, yet other students who did not initiate contact also might not have had any interaction with the professor. In one male student's experience:

> I mean you have some professors that have huge lecture halls, and they really can't get to know each and every person, but if you go to their office hours even once or twice they'll usually go out of their way to help you. . . . I think to get some interaction you have to get involved with them.

What emerges from these interviews is that whether the experience was good or bad, little sense of connection exists. The students do not assume that contact with teachers or administrators is possible, although some take a chance, and teachers may or may not take the time to interact with students. It is necessary to raise the expectations so that personal contact is not the exception but the norm, so that students, teachers, and administrators encourage and initiate contact regularly.

We realize that connection cannot stop the kinds of destructive behavior that much student drinking represents. Connection does, however, provide a basis for influencing behavior that does not exist with separated models of authority. For example, a professor or dean who has some personal contact with students can probe, during a conversation about performance, to find out whether there are some underlying problems. This kind of personal contact is a precondition to political caring, which we are defining as caring that is directed at an individual but that also benefits the community. Political caring is based on the premise that the group benefits from the activities of individuals who act, through their connections with others, for the general welfare of the community. The effect of political caring is to improve the conditions of the group, and in that way it is not as immediately reciprocal as intimate caring. Adrienne Rich (1979) clarifies this distinction in her definition of the desire for relation: "The 'need for love' is not the same thing as a desire for relation; the desire for relation implies a degree of wholeness, which needs a fellow-being not for completion of the self but for extension and challenge of the self" (p. 114).

The relationships between authority figures and students are not the

only opportunity for political caring. Students can also care for each other. Unfortunately, the connections between students are often discouraged by factors inherent in the reward systems of most colleges. Competition very directly affects student-to-student relations. Most grading systems do not encourage collaborative work, and in the absence of required cooperation, students vie for the approval of the professor. In the student-professor relationship, the power distribution is clear and limit-setting is disproportionately fixed; but between students, there is the potential for a more equitable exchange, which is often lost because the model for achievement is so individually oriented. When we are wrapped in the language of egosynthesis, separation, autonomy, and individuation, the only visible model of self is one of disconnection.

Some alternative visions of self

Robert Bellah (1985) identifies as one of the crises in America today the fact the we do not have "any collective context in which one might act as a participant to change the institutional structures that frustrate and limit" (p. 127).[37] The challenge is to conceptualize a self in a collective context and to develop a program to increase interaction and participation. Although there is a lot of emphasis on individual rights, health, and pleasure, college is also a social place, and alcohol seems to be part of a search for connection, even if the interactions are not always mutually satisfying. Alcohol is often used to allay fears about the risks of connection, but what we need to do is to examine the roots of those fears.

American society privileges the model of the autonomous individual. In this section, we look at several alterative visions of the self from feminism, Afrocentrism, and Alcoholics Anonymous. We believe that ideologies of the self are political, and by privileging one model—of the autonomous individual—society devalues connection and excludes the possibility of a strong self developed in relation to others. The autonomous model is also not effective for developing theories of alcohol policy because it breaks down when it is applied to a substance that impairs individual judgment and functioning. We find these other models imaginatively suggestive because they give us ways to think about the self in relationships.

Feminist theorists have done much work on the ways our society represses or undervalues connection because of its association with the feminine. These theorists believe that connection is a natural human state, which has only been militated against to reinforce artificially the supremacy of male identity as "not female." They argue for revaluing connection as part of identity formation.[38] The work of Carol Gilligan (1989, 1987) on women's ethical decision-making posits a model for development that opens up our traditional notions of self and community.[39] Afrocentric theorists suggest a further step, the conceptualization of a social world that would value connections.

They argue that only Eurocentrism prizes individuality so highly, in contrast with African philosophy. The African sense of community, where individual survival is dependent on the strength of the group, is similar to the model of community used by Alcoholics Anonymous. The archetype of twelve step self-help groups, Alcoholics Anonymous, teaches that common welfare needs to come before the self.

Feminist Models

Researching women's moral development, Carol Gilligan discovers that feminine morality views the world as a network of relationships where the connections between people give rise to a recognition of responsibility. She uses Nancy Chodorow's (1978) psychoanalytic theory to explain why men and women have different conceptions of self and morality. Following Chodorow, Gilligan (1982) attributes the difference in identity to the fact that early child care is largely and universally carried out by women, so that female children experience themselves as like their caretaker, while male children define themselves in contrast to their caretaker.[40] "From very early, then, because they are parented by a person of the same gender . . . girls come to experience themselves as less differentiated than boys, as more continuous with and related to their external object-world, and as differently oriented to their inner object-world as well" (p. 8). Gilligan's aim is to redress the sexist bias favoring individuation in developmental models, as in Kohlberg's stages of moral development, and to expand our definition of mature behavior to incorporate interdependency as well as separation.

Other feminist theorists also find women's experiences of selfhood ignored or repressed within a male-dominated culture, and, like Gilligan, they believe that female models of connection have the potential to transform society. Jane Flax (1985) argues that our "inability to achieve true reciprocity and cooperative relations with others, and the translation of difference into inferiority and superiority can be traced in part to this individual and collective act of repression and denial" of the early infantile experiences of mothering (p. 26). She believes that by repressing, on a social and an individual level, the period in our lives when women are powerful, we deny the most fundamental proof of human bonding, sociability, and interdependence.

Jessica Benjamin (1985) theorizes that preserving the boundary between the male posture, which overemphasizes self boundaries, and the female posture, which relinquishes the self, leads to domination and violence in our political and erotic lives. She argues that the male stance of overdifferentiation, which protects and establishes individuality, "dovetails with the dualistic, objective postures of Western rationality" (p. 46). This way of thinking prohibits any understanding of interdependence, of simultaneous difference and sameness, and relegates others to object status. To overcome the opposition of self and other, we need to establish a form of communal life that can transcend the boundaries between "male" and "female" postures and

between the recognition (of another's similarity) and differentiation (p. 43).

Dorothy Dinnerstein (1976) and Nancy Chodorow (1978) argue persuasively that women's mothering is a central and defining feature of the social organization of gender and is implicated in the construction and reproduction of male dominance itself. With the present division of labor, nurturing and caretaking are devalued skills, but if child-rearing were to become the responsibility of both genders, then those abilities would no longer be belittled. By analogy, if taking care of others were more valued, then there would be less inclination to focus on one's own drinking as the only marker of control and regulation.

The individualistic conception of self that patriarchy supports is reinforced through our language systems. Julia Kristeva (1980), the French psychoanalyst, also believes that society imposes overdifferentiation, but her non-biological model locates the loss of connection in the acquisition of language.[41] She believes that our language systems indoctrinate children into patriarchal societies. She identifies a period in early infancy, which she terms the "semiotic," during which the child communicates nonverbally with the mother. Once the child learns language, he or she takes on "The Name of The Father," and simultaneously learns to devalue the mother and repress his or her own connection to the mother. Kristeva theorizes that disrupting patriarchal language systems with semiotic play can unsettle the ideology of male domination.

Afrocentrism

Afrocentric theorists posit an alternative model of selfhood and, in opposition to Eurocentric models, these conceptions of identity are also helpful for exposing the self-limiting individualism of the dominant culture. These models suggest the extent to which racial identification affects personal development, as well as public interaction, even though it is an often neglected factor in the work of Euro-American social scientists, political theorists, and writers. Thinking in societal and cultural terms changes the meaning of self in relation to the world, and these analysts argue that racial identity must be included as another term in definitions of selfhood.

The whole notion of self-conception is more culturally determined than is generally recognized. Wade Nobles (1976) points out the differences between a European definition of self and an African one. The core of European self-identity is separateness, whereas the African world-view emphasizes cooperation, interdependence, and collective responsibility (p. 19). Nobles states that Black self-concept cannot be accurately analyzed through a European model that uses individuation as a measure of self-development.

Recognizing the need to question cultural frameworks, Ariola Irele (1965) explains that Negritude, an intellectual movement of Black writers, is different from other attempts to represent African identity precisely because it rejects western standards.

> Negritude may be distinguished from other efforts to rehabilitate Africa by what can be termed its "ethnological" aspect, which attempted to redefine its terms, and to re-evaluate Africa within a non-western framework (p. 514).

Negritude aims to establish the "validity of African cultural forms in their own right." Its literature is characterized by a collective or group consciousness that the Black writer is a member of a minority group that has been subordinated within the political and social order. This movement redresses the oppression of Black culture and affirms its value, and thus its participants are able to reconstitute their own identities. For these writers, personal identity is understood collectively, and finding free self-expression has political implications.

In the social sciences, Na'im Akbar (1989) likewise argues that dominant models of development cannot account for the experiences of minorities. Akbar affirms that African/Black identity is the core context of the Black "real self," and working against Eric Erikson's developmental theory, he demonstrates how according to Erikson's scheme Blacks would not have achieved "concretized identity" (p. 259). Akbar points out that, for Erikson, "identity is core and essential to personality functioning despite the fact that social conditions may enhance or impede the emergence of that integrated entity." By omitting social conditions, Erikson disallows for variations in the process of identity formation.

The research done by these theorists of "Africanity" and by others expands our awareness and respect for difference, at the same time that it reminds us that self-identity does not exclude connections with others. These conceptions of the self in relation prove that we can rethink our notions of identification so that collective rather than individual action is our primary concern. They also tell us, implicitly at least, that programs that fail to take into account the cultural assumptions of those they seek to influence will not resonate in such a way that they can sustain their intended effect.

The Model of Alcoholics Anonymous

Alcoholics Anonymous is a good example of a non-professional, nontherapeutic community organized around sobriety. In the A.A. tradition, each member proclaims him or herself "but a small part of a great whole," which is the initial commitment to the group's welfare (1976, p. 565). At the twelfth step in the recovery process, every member is pledged to help other alcoholics: the primary purpose of the A.A. group is to carry its message to the alcoholic who still suffers. Despite some differences in goals, Alcoholic's Anonymous gives us a glimpse of what the "self in relationship" might look like. A.A.'s sponsorship program, which gives each member an always available support person, recognizes that an addict tends to be radically, indeed pathologically, individualistic in his/her thinking. A trusting relationship with a sponsor mitigates the solipsistic pathology of addictive thinking.

Anne Wilson Schaef (1987) argues that we live in an addictive system where alcoholism is only one of the diseases; others are sexism, depression,

exploitation, and selfishness. Reflecting on Alcoholics Anonymous, Schaef believes that the twelve-step model of recovery contains some insights into addiction from which we could all benefit.[42] Usually we treat little pieces of the problem instead of admitting that the whole system is addictive, or as she puts it, our society (identified as White Male dominated) has a "nonliving orientation" to which we contribute. Schaef believes that the way out of this addictive system is an emerging female system that breaks the cycle of co-dependency by renouncing the illusion of control. Borrowing from Alcoholics Anonymous, Schaef supports a realization of powerlessness as the first step in recovery.

One application of her work to college drinking is that the illusion of control is something most institutions participate in, and one way around students' rebellion against authority might be for colleges to acknowledge that complete control is impossible. Then they could begin with the areas of student alcohol use where they can have some impact. Schaef helps us to see alcohol abuse as part of a system that fosters it, so we can begin to rethink our strategies with attention to the environmental factors. She goes too far, however, in attributing co-dependency to most of the population; she cites a study that includes 96% of the population under a broad definition of co-dependency (1989, p. 15). There is a difference between being in a relationship and being co-dependent: when Carol Gilligan (1982) talks about women being "mired in relationships," connection is a non-pathological move against abstraction (p. 155). One probably unintended consequence of Schaef's analysis is her "blaming" pathology on the culture. In finding the problem everywhere, she could be absolving us all of any personal responsibility to change things.

Caring and the self

The central preoccupation of the care perspective is responsiveness to others. As defined by the editors of Women and Moral Theory, it entails "providing care, preventing harm, and maintaining relationships" (Gilligan, 1987, p. 3). The justice perspective is individualistic: "the rights it recognizes morally equip people to take care of themselves while morally shielding them both from the demands of others and from the invasiveness of the state" (p. 5).

For Carol Gilligan (1982), female and male conceptions of identity define complementary moral philosophies. The male model of identity as separation is justified by an ethic of rights, while the female model of attachment is supported by an ethic of care.

> This conception of morality as concerned with the activity of care centers moral development around the understanding of responsibility and relationships, just as the conception of morality as fairness (separate individual) ties moral development to the understanding of rights and rules (p. 19).

The female ethic of responsibility relies on the concept of equity, the recognition of differences in need. In Gilligan's interviews of women talking about abortion, she locates a distinct moral language of selfishness and responsibility; this language contains a definition of the moral problem as one of obligation to exercise care and avoid hurt. Within this moral framework, the expression of care is seen as the fulfillment of moral responsibility, and the inflicting of hurt, in its reflection of unconcern, is considered selfish and immoral. The male morality of rights is predicated on equality, balancing the claims of other and self, and centered on the understanding of fairness. Gilligan's conclusion is to advocate a dialogue between fairness and care, believing that each approach provides a healthy corrective for the other: "In the development of a postconventional ethical understanding, women come to see the violence inherent in inequality, while men come to see the limitations of a conception of justice blinded to the differences in human life" (p. 100).

Current models for the university-student relationship (*in loco parentis* and consumer/contract) and approaches to student drinking (laissez-faire, liability avoidance, party regulations) are all based mostly on an ethic of rights—the rights of the university or the rights of the students. Allan Bloom (1987) passionately declaims the limitations of rights:

> It can be called a right and converted into a term of political relevance when a man is fully conscious of what he needs most, recognizes that he is threatened by others and that they are threatened by him. The spring that makes the social calculation that, if he agrees to respect the life, liberty, and property of others (for which he has no natural respect), they can be induced to reciprocate. This is the foundation of rights, a new kind of morality solidly grounded in self-interest (p. 166).

Although he is clearly pointing out only the worst in an ethic of rights, Bloom is accurately identifying the problem with the rights-based interaction between students and universities: there is no motivation for action besides self-interest, and there is little evidence that self-interest will be enlightened.

In contrast, when Gilligan (1982) explains the ethic of care, a central part of it is the "recurring recognition that just as the incidence of violence is in the end destructive to all, so the activity of care enhances both others and self" (p. 74). The idea of care as both self-enhancing and other-enhancing means that self and other are seen as interdependent, an insight into human relationships that is missing in the ethic of rights. According to Richard Sennett (1981), "liberty finally exists when the recognition I give you does not subtract something from myself" (p. 130). Incorporating an ethic of care into administrative policy can enable universities and their students to secure for themselves this kind of liberty.

Intimate Caring and Students' Negotiations of Self and Others

As Carol Gilligan demonstrates, speaking of care admits the tie between relationships and responsibility and acknowledges the ongoing process of attach-

ment that creates and sustains the human community. Eighteen- to twenty-two-year-olds, whom developmental theorists place at a stage between autonomy and interdependency, may be negotiating the demands of self and other[43] (Chickering, 1969; Arnstein, 1974). When students talk about the relationships they have with friends, teachers, and family, they talk about caring in terms of balancing their own interests with concern for others. A twenty-year-old student defined caring as, "Keeping in mind someone else's interests and needs, not necessarily ahead of your own, but sometimes ahead of your own needs or wants at that particular moment." Another student defined care as a "decision-making process, what do I need to do for myself, you know looking at the world and saying where am I at, do I have something to give?" When asked what gets in the way of caring, one twenty-year old responded, "Age—selfish stages you go through and you might not want to help somebody even though it might not be that much to ask. I was like that last year. I went through that."

Asked to define "caring," students locate it in intimate relationships, between parents and children or boyfriends and girlfriends. Some responses to the question—What does caring mean? Can you give an example? —follow:

> —Something that happens between two people. When you trust somebody and have enough feeling for them to care about their well-being, making sure they are okay. I guess one example is between a boyfriend and girlfriend (Female, class of 1990).

> —It has a connotation of parenthood, the ultimate caring situation (Female, class of 1990).

> —Taking an interest in someone, being a friend to someone, caring about what happens to them, always being interested in what they have to say (Male, class of 1991).

> —My family. I have a very close family. We're there to help each other even if we're having difficulties. . . . If something comes up, forget everything else, we're right there (Female, class of 1990).

> —You have a certain attachment for that person when you care for them. . . . But there's very few people in this world that if I never saw them forever from right now, I really wouldn't care, even some of my friends. . . . There are very few people that you actually care about (Male, class of 1991).

Although most of the students interviewed think of caring in terms of very intimate relationships, several students mentioned experiences where the concept had been abused, and some betrayed the influence of a materi-

alistic culture even in their emotional attachments. A sophomore, in considering her reaction to the word "caring," added: "I think when it comes to dealing with administrators and students, 'Oh, do they care about you?' then it is a little overused because it's so superficial because you are dealing in such generalizations." Another female student objected to the political use of the word:

> Like when you read an editorial in The Targum. . . . They want to force an intimate relationship onto you with the cause, whereas you're looking at care as something you do with people you have known all your life, or you've grown to know, and I think that's overused or used the wrong way in politics because of course I care about dead whales or toxic waste but there's just a limit that I can't do anything about. . . . I just think care is a word that people use to lure you into, playing on your basic instincts and morality, to get you involved in something. That stuff is overused.

Defining care as "going out of your way to do something for somebody," a 20-year old male gives the example of buying "a greeting card for really no reason." Another male student had a very cynical response to "caring" because it has been so exploited:

> I think of a Hallmark card, or of something sweet out of a card store. I think it gets a little bit of overuse by some people, like sororities probably use it too much. But I think that people connotate the same meaning with a different word. I use concern a lot or something like that because I think that it has more thought behind it. Whereas care is something without as much thought behind it, a little more superficial.

Missing from all of these responses is an idea of sincere caring as anything other than personal relationships and intimacy. As soon as caring is moved outside of personal relationships, students express distrust, partly because they have never seen any public models of caring that were sincere. As the female student who objected to editorials on care (extract above) expressed it, "Like Bush says he wants a caring nation and a kinder, gentler nation . . . but he's using that to appeal to an emotional voter instead of, how can you care when there is a red button right next to your desk and you can push it any time?" The ethic of rights seems to have deprived the political situation of care.

Political Caring: the Need for Connection

Lacking a positive ideal for life together, we do not know how to conceptualize caring on a large political scale. Says Parker Palmer (1981), "We have lost the ability to act in public creatively" (p. 35). Palmer asserts that public life cannot function on the norm of intimacy since we must be able to understand relations that are not warm.[44] He argues that the familial model of interaction is inadequate because it excludes vital elements of human expe-

rience. Although Palmer advocates a spiritual solution, some of his observations about the lack of communal life in America are helpful for looking at models of community for universities. His explanation of the need for a philosophy of community to proceed a set of rules is particularly useful for analyzing the limitations of the rules-based approach as compared to the necessity for an ethic of care.

> At its most basic level, the public life involves strangers, encountering each other with no political agenda at all. In fact, the public life is "pre-political." It is more basic than politics; it existed long before political institutions were developed and refined; and a healthy political process (at least, the process we call democracy) depends on the preexistence of a healthy public life. As important as it is to attempt to influence the government, it is even more important to renew the life of the public. Without a public which knows it shares a common life, which is capable of feeling, thinking, debating, and deciding, politics becomes a theater of illusion, with everyone watching the drama on stage, hoping to play some part, while the real action goes on backstage in the form of raw and unrestrained power. Without a public life, government becomes a sham, a show, an elaboration of techniques for manipulating the populace—and movements aimed at altering the government tend to become the same. Public life creates the community which both establishes legitimate government and holds it accountable to what the people want (p. 23).[45]

An ethic of care, with its web of relations, would work the same way as the public life Palmer describes—it could create a connection as well as the demand for an interactive form of decision-making. Palmer's idea that rules without a guiding philosophy are only an attempt to manipulate describes exactly the kind of breakdown of rules that occurs with student drinking. Students resent both the attempt to manipulate and the lack of interaction between themselves and the powers that be.

In asking for a public vision, we want to distinguish at this point between a community of *manners* and a community of *morals*. A community of manners is a nonpolitical vision, one without the conflict and tension of opposing viewpoints. It has the appearance of cooperation, just as some theme parks look like communities. In the political vision, there will be conflict and people with different opinions will have to work together to find solutions. A consensus is reached through compromise and a deeper solution emerges from the perspectives at variance.

With rules there is no provision for effective dissension. Conflicts are acted out or driven underground. The whole idea of university rules to regulate drinking proceeds from the fact that, for most undergraduate resident students in most states, drinking is illegal; although the rules stem from that fact, student behavior suggests great disobedience and misbehavior. Increasing the rules, however, risks increasing alienation. When one Rutgers student was asked about the effect of stricter drinking rules she perceived to have been adopted, she replied:

> In some ways they are better like maybe there's a deemphasis on fraternity, but at the same time if you want to go and have a good time, it's just like impossible. In the beginning of the year, we went to this one fraternity where one of my friends is, and every five minutes we would be shoved in a room because Board of Control was there, or the Dean of Students was there, and it was like so annoying, and I was like this is so horrible, it was just horrible. So in that case it is bad.

Exemplifying an alienated response to rules, this student feels no connection to the reasons for regulating drinking, nor to the administration that has some responsibility for carrying out state law. She recounts an episode of misbehavior without questioning her own actions or the actions of the fraternity; instead she focuses on the intrusion of the administration into her good time.

Attempting to control students' use of alcohol without fostering any interaction, like the empty rules Palmer describes, will not have the desired effect. If anything, such a strategy seems to push the drinking underground into more unregulated situations, decreasing the chance to influence and intervene, and away from even the watchful gaze of the administration. Robert O'Neil (1970) analyzes the bind universities get caught in:

> A system of rules is only as effective as the means for its enforcement. Some systems can rely chiefly upon persuasion. Not so university codes of student conduct, the enforcement of which must be ultimately coercive. . . . Thus the university is caught between moral suasion that does not work in serious cases, and criminal penalties which seem barbaric in this context (p. 139).

Rules seem to create more problems than they solve because instead of representing a careful reading of the situation, they represent a projection of adult anxiety—a need to feel in control of student behavior when uniform enforcement is almost impossible and the necessary policing only causes rebellion. Rules may serve to retrospectively determine blame, but they are not effective in prospectively predicting behavior. Moreover, the rules acknowledge no distinction within behavior: the student who is drinking as one might hope reasonable adults might drink is just as disobedient as the most abusive drinker.

The student quoted above objects to strict rules on the grounds that they are invasive. Michael Moffatt (1989) found in his experience in a college dorm that

> students definitely did not agree with the new laws; or, more precisely, some of them did agree that many of their peers drank too much, but very few of them felt it was fair or just to abridge their own freedom to drink. Drinking, of course, was not the only issue. Drinking was really about partying, and partying was really about sexuality (p. 124).

Even though student rights guarantee protection of many freedoms, students are not shielded from the invasiveness of the state when it comes to

alcohol because they are not legal drinkers. They face a limitation of their liberties with a substance they use, and that substance exposes them to demands and intrusions. They see their rights as citizens compromised whether they behave responsibly or irresponsibly. Political caring necessitates promoting connections within political communities, going beyond the small bonds of intimates.

Planning connectedness: the web of caring

In choosing the image of a web to describe what we propose as an approach to accountability in alcohol policy, we were inspired by the title of Janet Emig's book, *The Web of Meaning* (1983). Emig reports that she borrowed the title from Vygotsky's famous observation that writing is "elaborating the web of meaning" (Preface). The image of the web is a powerful one for us because it suggests a complex series of connections, issues, motivations, and circumstances. It helps suggest that the particular behavior (consuming alcoholic beverages) that we discuss is bound up with many other issues. A web also offers many opportunities to shift position and to evade any particular attempt to sort out one or a few strands of a problem. The web suggests the many pathways and connections that need to be explored in order to begin to understand and act. The web is an organic metaphor; it varies and changes. It is not a mechanistic image, nor one that locates power in simple linear relationships to those who attempt to control behavior, predict reactions, or inspire change in others. Suggesting connections that are sometimes obscure and nonlinear, the web confirms the interconnectedness of much of what we have to do.[46]

This report is political and contains as its essential feature a belief in democracy and in the kinds of political arrangements that give people opportunities to create their own lives. When opportunities for freedom (even freedom to make mistakes) are not provided, people find ways to act outside the reach of the rules that seem to restrict freedom. Students create their own culture. This is evident in many ways. One simple example is residence hall security. Unless there is some collective belief that enhanced security arrangements make sense, students will find ways to prop open doors, let people enter through windows, and otherwise circumvent what they find to be serious impediments to their own movement and freedom (even though these restrictions are designed to keep them safe). This example serves another purpose, however, and that is to illustrate just how precarious simple gestures toward collective security can be. They are easily abrogated by a few people who act on their own private, individualistic impulse to be free from the onerousness of rules.

Culture and context are part of the web we describe. In college, at least,

most of the drinking still occurs in group settings. It is well established that people tend to drink like the people around them. (This is not the usual argument about peer influence, although that argument is worth keeping in mind because it explains how people sometimes choose peers who exhibit attitudes and kinds of behaviors that will allow the chooser's behavior to seem normal.) Thus, if one wishes to drink, one chooses a drinking crowd to be in as a reference group. For the most part, however, even the nonproblematic student drinking seems to be party or group drinking. Yet, as we have suggested, the vast majority of our prevention activities and rules have focused on individuals and individual behavior.

One element shared by the "Just say no" and "responsible drinking" campaigns is that the focus of the message is on the individual. It is obvious that action occurs on the individual level, but the group context in which the action takes place seems to us to be the most important factor to consider in elaborating an overall prevention strategy. This is implicit in the understanding of alcohol and drug prevention that FIPSE takes because FIPSE emphasizes a comprehensive, across-the-board approach. Unfortunately, many prevention programs, except for some environmental strategies, seem rooted in a concept of wellness or obedience, both of which are individually focused. The wellness metaphor or approach places obligation on the individual to take care of him or herself. What it also does, as many critics have pointed out, is blind the individual to structural and other large questions. It relies, to a huge extent, on either narcissism or ego strength to carry out the message.[47]

Obedience, similarly, hardly seems possible in a cultural setting that emphasizes privilege, in a setting where laws seem to have lost their authority, and where society maintains an unofficial but very discernable ambivalence toward drinking. The other theme that seems to run through understandings of alcohol use is that the individual is somehow defective; some people are simply morally, or in some other way, reprehensible and should be avoided.

Thus, in both of these strategies, in order to consider whether one has a problem with drinking, it seems necessary to consider the possibility that one is somehow personally responsible or morally defective. Neither of these conditions need be present in a person suffering from either chronic or acute alcohol abuse. Nevertheless, programs that seek to single out individuals run that risk. Since a good deal of discussion about alcohol focuses on individual behavior, there seems to be an exaggeration in the elaboration of distinctions about behavior that again leads away from group or collective consequences of actions. Individual behavior can always be dismissed as something that needs to be controlled: "So what that he was found passed out in his car! He just needs to learn to get himself home. He doesn't drink everyday, and he's kept his job." In this kind of formulation, a fixed set of criteria for individual behavior is the focus, and the effect on the group or on another individual

(friend/family/lover) goes unexamined.

Even the concept of "responsible drinking" gets reformulated in the minds of students as a kind of *ex post facto* method of determining whether someone obeyed a rule or not. Responsible drinking—or responsible decision-making about drinking—becomes less and less reliable as drinking progresses, so that while one may have a very responsible notion of how one is going to drink prior to drinking, as the drinking proceeds, depending on an individual to modify behavior in accordance with some preordained or predetermined notion of responsibility is exceedingly unreliable.

Our efforts have not sought to abandon individuals and individuals' obedience to rules. Instead, we seek to supplement these strategies with a much more comprehensive look at the web of relations and the web of possibilities. We seek to shift the focus from the individual and to change the issue from an individual matter to one of collective understanding, responsibility, and intervention. We have described some of the ways in which, among other factors, developmental theory, institutional organization, and industry-sponsored messages about prevention contribute to the exaggerated focus on individual control. They also encourage disconnection at the same time that they permit a radically selfish approach to the use of alcohol. But we have also suggested that alcohol, in the pharmacological sense, is being used by students for both narcissistic purposes and for reaching out to create some kind of community. It is, in the old phrase, a kind of social lubricant, particularly as it is used in a group context.

Our aim in this part of the text is to describe an approach to accountability that would help inform administrators and students alike of opportunities they may have to strengthen the web of caring. We hope that a web of connection can allow for the natural creation of a student culture that would be less pathological than the one that is currently created. We believe that, to a very great extent, some of the pathologies in current student/institutional arrangements are direct consequences of the strategies that institutions have used to deal with the problem of alcohol abuse or to avoid dealing with the problem. And so it is our belief that choosing a set of strategies that modify, to some extent, the dominant ones may enhance what we have called "political caring." We seek to go beyond the individual taking care of him or herself (and all the autonomy/rights talk that engenders) to individuals having an interest in others and using that interest in a way that improves the common conditions of those around them.

In looking for some kind of cultural, or other deep basis, for a web of caring, we found at least three strands that are suggested by three different parts of our culture. They provide a theoretical basis for why we might take this approach and suggest what doing so might entail. The first strand is an *ethic of care*, which is elaborated in the work of Carol Gilligan but which also seems to us to have roots in certain religions and moral philosophies, Afrocentrism, feminism, and the self-help movement.[48] The second strand is the continuum of care, a concept that seeks to allocate and describe caring obligations

and opportunities across a broad spectrum of participation. This concept is drawn from nursing theory.[49] The third strand is a duty of care drawn from legal theory. It is a description of certain obligations that people, because of their relationships, have to one another.[50] We are not intending for an emphasis on these sorts of things to eclipse individualism, personal freedom, or autonomy. What we hoped to do in this text, however, is to provide an alternative to paternalism and selfish individualism. Paternalism and individualism, when combined with alcohol, produce results that damage much more fundamental values held by most institutions of higher education, and, more importantly, they damage human beings.

We are interested in a political and democratic approach because we want to avoid an approach that exaggerates power distribution or that deemphasizes connection by being essentially professional and therapeutic. Students should be educated in democracy and citizenship, and those values should be modeled. Concern for the welfare of others does not have to be solely the responsibility of certain designated professionals. This is surely not an argument against professional intervention; instead we seek to locate in citizens certain obligations that arise from "membership" in the political community. Professional interventions would be used only in those cases where ordinary people lack abilities, opportunity, and authority to act.

We propose ways to enhance connection so as to aid in the education of the people we are responsible for and to promote in them a sense of responsibility for others that will serve for the future. We suggest approaches that enhance accountability and remind us that we should be able to justify our behavior toward others. Making rules and walking away is not acting responsibly toward the people for whom the rules were made. We do not want to emphasize a selfish inclination that might already exist in our students. If Anna Freud (1974) is right when she tells us that "Adolescents are excessively egoistic, regarding themselves as the center of the universe and the sole object of interest, and yet at no time in later life are they capable of so much self-sacrifice and devotion" (p. 137), then we must want to make sure that we emphasize their democratic impulse, which asks for a relationship between the rulemakers and the ruled.

Formulating a model of authority that could work with alcohol policy necessitates some creativity because the authority must be flexible, in that it must foster connection between administrators, faculty, and students, as well as participation of all members of the university community, and it must encourage caring behavior without being rigidly manipulative. Caring and connection—as standards—rather than the alienation of rules are essential even in the treatment of those who are addicted. "An empathic approach is one common element in a variety of interventions that have been shown to yield favorable long-term outcomes with problem drinkers"(*Handbook of Alcoholism Treatment Approaches,* p. 73). [51]

We are advocating something like what William Ouchi (1981) calls

"Theory Z," a model developed from Japanese management techniques. Ouchi warns us that Americans tend to think too narrowly, not realizing that "productivity [for us, in terms of reaching goals] may be dependent upon trust, subtlety, and intimacy" (p. 9). His suggestions for implementing Theory Z take a holistic approach and avoid formal bureaucratic procedures. One of the initial steps is to "audit" the institutional philosophy, as Ouchi puts it, to show that the philosophy should come out of what the institution is and not what it should be (p. 87). The philosophy needs to be implemented by creating structures and incentives to support it: formal reporting relationships and divisions of people and tasks ensure that everyone works together, even though Ouchi's model of the optimal organization is one with no formal structure, like an experienced basketball team that responds effectively to changes in play (p. 90). Developing interpersonal skills is another step in the Z process because everyone must be able to work cooperatively (p. 91). An important interpersonal skill is being able to recognize patterns of interaction so that if a meeting gets stalled because of conflicts, a leader can reorganize and get back to the important issues. (This skill is especially useful in discussions about alcohol use policy, which often become occluded by side questions: what is a public place versus a private space? Or, what authority does an institution have over a fraternity or sorority? While these are interesting and important questions, the shift of focus from alcohol to these topics is a kind of denial.) Theory Z helps with productivity because it clarifies shared goals and encourages cooperative efforts as the best way to meet those goals. We are interested in Theory Z's emphasis on interpersonal interaction and trust, rather than formal hierarchical structures, as a method for getting people to work together to find solutions to communal problems.

Rules would not be jettisoned with a web of caring approach, but they would be subordinated to a guiding philosophy or standard of care—the kind of clear standard that Boyer (1987), Chickering (1969), Ouchi (1981), and others advocate as the best method for promoting community. Rules should be inferred from experience, deduced from differences in need, and flexible because they would respond to changing needs. Richard Sennett (1981) explains how open discourse about nurturance keeps authority from becoming rigid:

> All the ambivalence we feel about authority is contained in these impersonal or indirect ploys for nurturance. To declare openly that we need someone else, that we have a right to another's strength, seems to make us most vulnerable, and to give the other absolute power over us. This is why an open negotiation about nurturance face-to-face at each echelon of the hierarchy seems to me the most disruptive experience which can occur in a modern chain of command. Making the first fact of nurturance a face-to-face encounter seems a reasonable way to lose the shame of dependency (pp. 186-187).

Because true nurturance acknowledges that one's care makes another stronger, the power of authority seems diminished when its purpose is care-

taking. Open acknowledgement of caring also removes the motivation for disobedient dependence behavior (as described earlier, a possible motivation for student drinking) because without the shame of dependence, there is no reason to rebel against or within it. Sennett describes this kind of diffusing of power as keeping it *en abyme*, or constantly in question; the structure of power is not allowed to become rigid since methods for shaking it up are built into it (p. 178). An example of authority *en abyme* takes up one of Sennett's suggestions, which is open discourse about categories, to show how students can participate in the application of a regulation. The regulation that all underage students are illegal drinkers and should be disciplined for breaking the law is a good test case. What should we do about students who take an intoxicated friend to the health center for medical attention? In an open discourse, students might propose to administrators that there should be some provision for immunity to encourage students to take intoxicated friends for treatment. An inflexible categorization of "illegal drinker" prevents students from helping each other to get proper medical care and confuses the issue of caring for others. Questioning the category would also, in this case, initiate a discussion of how to provide the best nurturance, or to help prevent the need for medical attention in the first place.

Some suggestions for creating the web of caring

In proposing to shift the focus of policy and programming from individuals, rights, and rules to care and connection, we have made several assumptions. They are:

—that institutions are prepared to take a comprehensive approach which embraces policy, prevention education, staff development, intervention, and rehabilitation services or referral for services, and at least modest self-evaluation and research;

—that institutions are interested in the issue of alcohol and drug use by their members (including students, faculty, staff, alumni and visitors) and are prepared to engage with that use when it is sanctioned, just as when it is not (thus institutions will be interested in policies and practices governing when alcohol is used/served, just as they are in determining when it may not be served);

—that institutions are concerned about the problems of those members of institutional communities whose lives are affected by the substance use of other people (thus, even though they may not drink themselves, the loved ones—children, relatives, and others—of alcoholics have an "alcohol problem"); and

—that institutions have forms of decision making that can involve participation by those who will be subject to the policies and programs that are developed.

We will not be providing details on policies and programs—these are products of a process, and could, at best serve only a provocative or suggestive purpose. Rather, what follows will be a set of suggestions that might shape and assess policy and program development, moving the process in the direction of a model of care and concern. The result would support, metaphorically, the web of caring that we have advocated. Many good sources on practical ideas for policy and programming exist. *Alcohol and Other Substance Abuse: Resources for Institutional Action*, published by the American Council on Education, contains our suggestions for the elements of policies and programs and suggestions for how to institutionalize them.

In each of the sections that follow, we offer a brief discussion and an example or two of how the suggestion might advance an ethic of care, how it might get implemented along a continuum of care and/or how it might help fulfill a duty of care.

Here, then, are ten suggestions designed to encourage care and connection:

1. Engage in Serious Self-Evaluation

We recommend institution-wide self-analysis in order to foster an engaged relationship between students and those in authority. We want to replace the idea that administrators have to be separated from students with the idea that all can be willing to take the risks of involvement. Instead of crude liability-avoidance and the distancing of "professional" responses, self-analysis encourages an introspective look at the values we project and the mission we embrace. Since members of our institutional communities are relatively transient—especially students—self-evaluation will need to be repeated periodically or institutionalized to afford continuity.

Approach

We should be very conscious of our collective mission in higher education and the particular mission and ideology of our own institution. Our policies and programs, the way we do what we do, the degree to which we take our students seriously, all of these facets of our beliefs about ourselves will contribute to the communication of our values. To know our ideology, we must talk about it more, think about its implications for our theories of student development, and determine what it suggests about how rules and standards are to be created.

How successfully we reach students will have a great deal to do with how well we know them. If we do not pay attention to them, we can easily make the mistake of thinking or assuming that what goes on in their minds is what we think we remember went on in our minds when we were students. Instead, we need to take advantage of the opportunities to know our students, collectively and individually. Michael Moffatt (1989) suggests one method: on-site

anthropological research. It is, however, a project to which few of us could devote our full energies. But there may be opportunities short of Moffatt's pioneering work, like finding ways to listen to students, engaging in interviews and carefully observing student culture, which we can fruitfully pursue. Even though it may be difficult to get to know students, particularly because of their sometimes loaded reactions to authority figures, knowing them is essential if we are to be effective. They, too, must have a corollary opportunity to come to know us. One of our goals should be to find out systematically what we can about the people for whom we have a responsibility.

Whatever we say we believe in, we teach by example, and we project values both implicitly and explicitly in what we do. Faculty members are not the only teachers; in the way we perform our jobs we are all teachers. Yet we cannot simultaneously embrace the idea that our purpose is to educate free, autonomous, and independent persons and not expect to have our authority challenged. We should not confuse quiescence on campus with virtue. Education in all that we do entails being prepared to give explanations that we think are good explanations, doing our work in ways that communicate our standards for how our work should be done, and being honest and candid with students. Such high standards are connected to what, in other contexts, we claim we seek to uphold. Excellence, if it is our standard, makes no sense in a vacuum.

Accountability

Testing what we do against the standard of an ethic of care implies that we cannot practice a strategy that seeks to separate ourselves from students or students from one another, especially if that separation is designed simply to avoid having to take some responsibility for what happens. Being engaged creates risks, but so does membership in any community.

Self-evaluation is a good place to begin establishing a sense of the continuum of care, for it affords an opportunity to examine the self in relation to others, in relation to the roles we each play and in relation to institutional mission. Looking at one's own responsibility within the institutional context and in relationship to others can suggest each person's role in a comprehensive strategy to create a web of caring. Behavior should be a central focus of institutional concern and that implies the development of thoughtful, consistent strategies designed to prevent misuse of alcohol by "adults," just as much as it suggests a need to concentrate on those who are underage. Self-evaluation should enable institutions to determine how much their policies contribute to disconnection and alienation. It can also help suggest compensatory strategies to address that problem.

As self-evaluation gets underway, an institution can begin to discover duties to care that are implied by the mission expressed, the roles clarified, the practices discovered, and the expectations of performance that are developed. For example, if an institution makes a serious commitment to raising consciousness about alcohol use and abuse, it follows that it should back up

that commitment with resources and services for coping with identified problems. It might, therefore, support recovering members of its community by providing special services and facilities. It would provide training so that those in specific roles could perform them to capacity. It would act to correct identified deficiencies.

2. Avoid Hypocrisy in the Focus of Policy and Programs

Students have an uncanny ability to discern hypocrisy and condescension. To avoid setting a standard that cannot be achieved, that is inadequate, or that cannot be enforced, we need to be honest with one another, and we need to formulate realistic policies. The best method for developing policy is through negotiations among those it will affect. Policies should allow for a wide range of individual behavior, but should strive to model a standard of care and concern. By instituting a strategy of negotiation, we, as authority figures, acknowledge our need for student involvement, just as we recognize that negotiations are time consuming and involved. But in negotiating, we do not pretend to self-sufficiency or infallibility, nor do we create standards we cannot live up to ourselves. We also resist the pretension of control and avoid hypocrisy. Hannah Arendt (1972) reminds us that "if we inquire historically into the causes likely to transform *engagés* into *enragés*, it is not injustice that ranks first, but hypocrisy" (p. 162).

Approach

To avoid hypocrisy, the behavior we model should match our expectations for our students. If we want them to act with care and concern, then we need to begin by acting that way toward them. We want to set high standards for ourselves, and we want to make sure that we act to meet those standards, on an individual level as well as on an institutional level.

In looking at alcohol-related behavior, we want to be honest about abusive drinking whether the problems exist among students, administrators, staff, or faculty members. Focusing policy means being honest about the problems and doing something about them. It means balancing a standard ("dry campus") against the reality (94% of American college students drink), favoring honesty as a prophylaxis to hypocrisy.

Accountability

We should openly acknowledge the existence of addicted members of our community, and we should follow an ethic of care by seeking to create or connect with employee assistance programs, student assistance programs, and campus and community-based Twelve-Step programs in order to help where we can.

We must care enough about the quality of our prevention approaches not to participate in programs that we know to be false or that make claims about the dangers of alcohol use that are exaggerated to the point of spoiling credibility. There will be a great pressure for us to join in one or another national incantation—because if we don't we will be seen as part of the prob-

lem, not the solution. However, we do have our own standards to uphold and we should not collaborate in something we know to be false or misleading.

Everyone in the campus community—the whole continuum of care—needs to be taught to recognize the difference between remarkable drinking and non-remarkable drinking. All student alcohol use does not need to get our attention, but we need to be able to distinguish between behavior that requires intervention and behavior that does not. Once problem behavior is identified, however, we all have a part in the chain of referral, treatment, and support.

Recognizing the difference between policy, what we hope we can affect, and the realities of student life is an important start in helping us understand our duty to care. We should not pretend that implementing a party regulation, for example, changes the reality of off-campus alcohol abuse. When we focus on where drinking takes place and seek to put it out of our sight we may be helping to create greater risks, and hence a greater likelihood of tragic consequences. When we say drinking is prohibited but fail to enforce a rule we know is being broken, we may be missing our duty, which might be better understood as an obligation to educate one another about collective responses to each other's drinking.

It is important to acknowledge that either implicitly or explicitly institutions have some policy toward alcohol and other drug use:

> The policy consists of what the school really does about the issues, not necessarily what its written pronouncements say. Schools that think that they have no policy fail to realize that they actually have a policy of approaching the question in a less formal, more ad hoc manner (American Council on Education, p. 15).

3. Acknowledge Differences in People, Needs, and Approaches

Rules tend to anticipate uniform behavior—but they also assume a kind of uniformity of personality and circumstance. Lacking a mechanism for considering specific circumstances and differences, we cannot measure the appropriateness of an action for a particular situation. Inflexibility in expectation frustrates special responses to the special needs of diverse populations.

To replace one unitary strategy, we are advocating many strategies. Only by recognizing and responding to the differences among us can we find effective bases for influencing behavior. A pluralistic approach recognizes that treating everyone the same way may not be treating them equally or appropriately.

Approach

We must begin by respecting difference. Another side of racism is what for some whites is fickle color blindness, a condition that leads them to decide sometimes to recognize race and sometimes not, depending on whether it suits their immediate interests. This practice denies any history, any differ-

ence, any culture to the other person, so that race does not have to be addressed when it might need to be. Race and culture are two differences, but gender, sexual orientation, religion, medical history, and family background also affect another's world view and need to be taken into account when strategies for prevention are considered. There is a similar blindness that seems to adhere to our perceptions of alcohol use, as well. It accounts for our differential handling of situations, which to an outside observer might seem substantially identical. As applied to alcohol policy, appreciation of difference helps with the project of connecting with particular others and suggests another dimension of care and concern.

Accountability

Part of a commitment to an ethic of care entails learning something about the people who surround you. It is necessary to be able to envision the possibility of someone seeing the world and interpreting its messages in ways that are different but completely comprehensible to the interpreter. An ethic of care would seek first to understand difference, in its own terms, and to engage with it. This can be difficult, but one relatively benign place to turn to find out about other experiences is to read fiction. We can learn about how we live our lives, and a lot about the lives of others, through fiction. In Toni Morrison's *The Bluest Eye*, Gabriel Garcia Marquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude*, and Maxine Hong Kingston's *Woman Warrior*, for example, the authors metaphorically recreate their cultural legacies. The translation of their stories into images intensifies the forces of survival and domination with which each culture contends. The opportunity to feel another person's experience cannot be gained through facts. But those who seek to influence behavior will have to have a sense of feelings, if they are to succeed.

In order to be effective with interventions, it is necessary to know something about the different circumstances and needs of diverse peoples. Thus, while a continuum of care will entail many people performing many roles, within that caring there will be a web of differences that needs to be considered. For example, Dana Finnegan and Emily McNally (1987) outline "issues and problems that are specific to gay/lesbian alcoholics' experience and that can increase the difficulty of their recovery from alcoholism and other drug dependencies" (p. 32). The central issue is homophobia, which they locate externally in society's harmful and destructive attitudes and internally in self-hatred. Homophobia affects recovery from alcoholism as it contributes to feelings of depression, anxiety, and denial in the lesbian or gay male. A frequent mistake of alcohol counselors is to try to force a gay patient to stop passing as heterosexual at the same time that she or he stops trying to pass as a social drinker. Admitting alcoholism may be only the first step in a process of self-disclosure. As this example illustrates, the interaction between alcohol and personal identity is more complex than it may appear, and alcohol treatment programs must reflect the range of differences that exists. The connection to issues of bigotry is not abstract, for, like homophobia, racism and sex-

ism can undermine prevention strategies, just as they can help create high-risk drinking (drinking to cope with the stresses of discrimination and marginality).

Whenever rules are made that apply to everyone, they are probably going to injure someone. A duty to care implies an obligation to act with sensitivity to particular circumstances. Whether someone is or is not a child of an alcoholic makes a big difference in analyzing his or her habits. As a consequence of different family histories, two people with identical behavior may not share the same risk of alcoholism and should not be treated the same. Without attention to predisposing factors, effective prevention and rehabilitation cannot take place.

4. Practice and Encourage Subtlety in Seeking to Manage Others

Increasing control often means tightening rules. Rules may apply to all, but are directed at individuals and seek individual compliance. For college, the zone of influence and control fades as the student moves away from the campus. Theoretically this means that there will be less "illicit" behavior on campus because all possibilities for it have been outlawed. We know, however, that students now come to "dry" parties having already consumed alcohol before arriving, just as they sometimes stagger back—or worse, drive back—to the campus having partied elsewhere. What we have here is at best the adherence to the letter, surely not the spirit, of some rules.

By advocating "subtlety," we want to encourage the use of power that can discriminate between behavior that is harmful and behavior that is not harmful, so that control is exerted only when, where, and by whom it needs to be. We call rules that can measure degrees of behavior "finely calibrated" as opposed to the blunt instruments of blanket regulations. William Ouchi (1981) translates a lesson in subtlety from Japanese practice to American ways. He warns that "Relationships between people are always complex and changing. . . . These subtleties can never be captured explicitly, and any bureaucratic rule will do violence to them" (p. 6). The answer is to find—through consensus decision-making—flexible, subjective, implicit, and subtle solutions that acknowledge the intricacies of human behavior, and for our purposes such decision-making can focus on alcohol use, not on the limits or domain of institutional control.

Approach

By looking at the authority we appeal to when we try to get someone else to do something, we can get a good idea of how we regard the person we seek to influence. Being conscious of the source of authority we wield can help us to act appropriately. We should seek to "empower" students in proximal relationships to other students, so that subtlety can have a chance to work.

Judgments of and assumptions about other people's identity are implicit in the metaphors for relationships between authority figures and those sub-

ject to that authority. To the extent that we believe we are engaged with students who qualify as equals, we shall need techniques like subtlety to secure cooperation.

Accountability

An ethic of care requires sustained engagement and some consistency in behavior that is characterized by a concern for the needs of another person. It is nurturing, not controlling. But this attention to needs should not originate in nor degenerate into co-dependency. This issue of subtlety versus co-dependency can be tested by examining what is happening—is what both parties claim about the condition of the relationship credible or true?

The identity we claim for ourselves along the continuum of care—parent, friend, advisor, disinterested observer, "brother" or "sister," physician, police or security person, teacher—will reflect something of our sense of the other in the relationship, just as it says something about how we see ourselves and what others might expect from us. We should be accountable to others for fulfilling the role that we are in. That means resisting the tendency to go in and out of roles and identity, thereby undermining trust and creating an unreliable identity for those who are engaged with us. This is a particularly difficult matter for those who are called upon to be friends and authorities at the same time or in unpredictable succession. As discussed earlier, keeping the structure of power in a relationship *en abyme*, or constantly in question but not in doubt, may seem to invite the kind of instability that we have just decried. But thought about another way, such questioning acknowledges that adjustment and change must be achieved in subtle ways, not in brittle disputes about power, but in connection with what we can know about a problem or a person, and how we might trust other people to influence those in proximal relationship to their own power and influence.

One appropriate source of authority for those of us in colleges and universities is the authority of knowledge itself. What we know and can teach and learn could be said to inhere in our duty as an institution. Thus, if we believe that there is a need for knowledge about alcohol and other drug use and its relation to the condition of our community—something that everyone who says this is our "number one problem" would seem to believe—then prevention education, as well as a variety of other strategies, would seem to be required of us. We also need to be careful to examine how we use our power in order that we not abuse it in harmful ways. Many of us are not as conscious as we should be of just how much power we have over our students. The authority to not act, to deny or delay action, can have just as great an effect on the life of a student as an action can. Even though we think we are approachable and open, it may not look that way to a hesitant student. A stern posture may appeal to those who hope for a drug-free school, but it can also mitigate against a student's duty to seek help for a problem and, as we saw in the interview material, chill a tendency we would otherwise want to encourage, namely seeking help for people who may be in trouble because of

their drinking. It is in response to this fear of punishment that many students are trying to "handle" the problems of their fellow students by using "subtlety"—but, if they too are afraid of the consequences of seeking help, or are themselves impaired at the time they try to figure out how to help without being caught, dangerous consequences can result.

5. Pay Attention to the Context and Content of Drinking Behavior

While studies of incidence and prevalence are important contributions to the research on alcohol use and abuse, they are only one source of help for us as we try to understand problem student drinking. We believe that an understanding of the character of alcohol use and abuse can only be attained by listening to students and by looking at the conditions that are amenable to the pharmacological "benefits" alcohol provides. Thus, except for addicted students or those in recovery, alcohol should not even be the center of our attention. Rather, we need to look at the complexities of our lives and the special tensions that being in college seem to create or exaggerate. What purposes does drinking serve? What do our students and, indeed, what do we think about drinking?

It would be much easier if we could just blame the substance itself, but the need for the drug arises within a social context. We need to examine this social context if we are ever to discover what makes drinking such a priority for students.

Approach

Prevention and intervention should be targeted to specific needs that are known. The best way to find out about student needs is to listen to what students say and to observe what they actually do. It is important that we define "needs" as more than addiction or problem drinking because alcohol use may be a response to other needs.

Our theories of student development will influence what we see when we look at behavior and listen to speech. We urge a resistance to certain aspects of development theory that "reward" autonomy, emphasize individuality, or push towards "self-actualization"—because, in part, it is especially difficult to determine when "obedience" to rules is an example of dependency or fear as opposed to when it might represent some highest "stage" of development where the obedience is connected to the appreciation of some abstract principle or truth. Programs that emphasize individuals and individualism obscure the collective or group context in which most of the drinking behavior occurs. Strategies of prevention and intervention should be tailored to the group context of much of the behavior. Thus individual behavior will be of importance, but we will be able to focus on more than "will" or ego strength as we seek to modify behavior; we can focus on relationships, intimacy, the need for relief of stress, etc. Indeed, we will be able to focus on the self in relationship to others.

Accountability

In a U.S. Department of Health and Human Services publication on adolescent peer pressure and drug use, the top two recommendations for "What Youth Need Most" were (1) increased respect from adults and (2) more time and involvement from adults (1984, p. 17). We often underestimate how much college students still need the acceptance and guidance of adults. An ethic of care would suggest some "institutionalization" of a caring relationship, among students themselves and among people in authority and students. Some desire the "independence" that maturity is supposed to bring us and resist the "coddling" of more caring relationships. This seems to us to be an evasion of relationship, more than a theory of relationship—but an accountability strategy might entail examining just that issue as it plays out on campus.

Talking to or at students is not enough, however, to ensure that those along the continuum of care are doing what they should for students. An important component to advising students is *listening* to students and caring enough to find out what they think. Being informed about the facts of students lives is not enough. The research we can all conduct to improve our job performance is to let students tell us about themselves instead of operating on our own assumptions about them. (Our own almost unshakable impulse to indulge in generational comparisons of difference—"we were never like that"—seems just as much designed to reassure ourselves about ourselves as it may be to understand what differences might actually exist.) It is again in this attention to context that a focus on alcohol alone will probably be inadequate, just as in neglecting to consider alcohol use as a contributing factor to some other problem—such as poor academic performance—we might fail to see alcohol as part of the larger context of a student's life.

If we develop critical indicators so that we know when we need to intervene, then we have a duty to intervene when the indicator tells us we should. Certain conditions should signal to us that we have an obligation to provide follow-up investigation and care. For example, acquaintance rape and its connection to alcohol abuse should prompt us to pay attention to violence toward women and alcohol use. The context of the problem should help shape the content of the response to it.

6. Find Ways to Foster Connections and Alternative Conceptions of the Self

Traditional notions of development have over-emphasized individual autonomy and ego strength. Some claim that these theories are stuck in a Eurocentric white male ideology of selfhood and that they support rights-obsessed, contract-driven conceptions of the self in relation to others. In any event, these theories do not seem to be especially good descriptors or predictors of the conditions of many college students, especially women, African-

Americans, Asians, and members of marginalized communities, like Greek organizations, gays and lesbians, and others. Yet these notions are consistent with a rules-based approach to alcohol policy because they count on rights to balance the invasiveness of the rules. Ideas of selfhood do not need to exclude connections to others, however, and we believe that supporting alternative visions, which see the self in relation, may be more helpful in prevention strategies and surely more likely to help create the community that many members of the academic establishment long for. These alternative notions of the self can help us to see how we enter into each other's lives and behavior, including drinking behavior.

Approach

Our sense of obligation to one other should balance our sense of individual rights. The ethic of care suggests to us the metaphor of citizenship because as citizens we have two bases for action: private interests and public welfare. Citizenship suggests membership that both preserves the self and locates the self in a public context. We have to rediscover our connections and begin to feel comfortable with making moral claims on one another. In the metaphor of citizenship, we can recognize that what hurts one of us can hurt all of us and that communal good includes individual good.

Accountability

We would do well to think about Benjamin Barber's (1984) definition of citizenship: "Citizens are neighbors bound together neither by blood nor by contract but by their common concerns and common participation in the search for common solutions to common conflicts" (p. 219). As members of an academic community, we should see ourselves as connected in this way, and we should see that that connection binds us in relation to others.

Feminist and Afrocentric conceptions of the self stress interdependence, and this notion of interdependence is valid on the institutional level as well as on the personal level. Departments need to recognize their mutual dependence on other departments. As we are learning from changes in our country's health care systems, we can provide the best care if we all work together. Sometimes what we remember to practice as individuals we forget to practice on an institutional scale. Thus, the political relationships implied by the metaphor of citizenship preserve institutional identities but also suggest the need for integrated services along the continuum of care.

We have a duty to make sure that we use our best resources to foster connection. Practically this means making sure that every department and facility on campus publicizes its services and capabilities and then acts to carry them out according to the highest standards possible. Everyone on campus should have a list of available resources and should be familiar with some of the options. It is important that everyone be taught to make referrals when a problem lies outside his or her area of expertise, and the attitude about referrals should be that they are a valid way to help a person in need, not a sign of personal inadequacy or disinterest.

7. Recognize Complexity and Raise Expectations

While it is often tempting to tighten control or to provide a barrage of alternative activities to dissuade students from drinking, those responses do not recognize the complexities of student behavior. An array of other options will not persuade students who want to drink that they should not. Tightening control can give students more reasons for being disobedient. When they sense our distrust instead of our concern, they are inspired to disobey.

We seem to have a choice of selecting prevention strategies that tend to view students either as infantile or as adult. We recommend an approach that errs, if at all, in the direction of expecting adult and mature behavior—the mature conception of interdependency discussed earlier in connection with Arnstein and Chickering. We think that the infantilizing strategies—what we call the Parcheesi theory of student development—are irrelevant, at best, and surely not sufficient to prepare leaders for our democracy.

Approach

We want to raise our expectations of student behavior, and we want to raise their expectations for us—so that they assume we are connected, interested, and involved. A misguided, post-sixties political strategy has been to lower expectations in order to prevent dissatisfaction (one theory is that the race riots were motivated by high expectations that were not met). But the problem with this strategy is that it never leads to better conditions for anyone. Alexis de Tocqueville, who first coined the term "rising expectations" in the nineteenth century, noted that revolutionary movements generally do not occur when conditions are most hopeless, but during periods of improvement. When people begin to realize that oppression is not inevitable, they agitate for change (Keller & Light, p. 214). For us this means that we have to expect a response from students if we ask them to be involved with us. We are saying that we do not want complete obedience or cowed silence. We want participation. We have to realize that what we will get is debate and negotiation, which may produce better solutions. Raising expectations seems to be a strategy that even people from diverse ideologies agree upon. Raising expectations can help us find a standard for relating to one another—one that is based on mutuality and taking each other seriously.

Accountability

Universities need to set high standards for themselves in all arenas, and not just academically. The corollary to care is trust. We need to trust that our students, whom we otherwise tend to associate with our prestige, are really capable of the excellence we say they represent. As a community we need to expect a lot of each other and for each other. If we want an environment of care, rather than one of distrust and suspicion, we ought to be able to ask ourselves if our policies and practices really assume that standard.

The best way to provide a continuum of care, as well as to translate our trust into action, is to expect students to help each other. Within dorms,

departments, health care centers, and counseling centers, students can be resources for each other, just as we can be resources for them. We should be clear about our expectation of that care and concern, and our prevention strategies should thus seek to engage with the behavior we are interested in, not simply divert attention away from the complexity of issues like self-worth and intimacy by pretending that "we can get high on life" or be diverted from thinking about our situations by a series of childish games.

Students are sometimes experts on their drinking habits, and we will increase our effectiveness if we take advantage of their knowledge and skills in formulating our policies. We have to be flexible enough to continue to listen to students' suggestions. Infantilizing students is another symptom of low expectations. When policy incorporates dismal predictions, it seems to encourage more immature behavior. We should encourage what we want, not what we fear.

8. Resist Denial, Understand Addiction, and Plan for Rehabilitation

Institutional denial is probably the greatest single threat to coming to terms with a campus' alcohol and drug problem. This denial can be seen in the claims people make about what a problem is or would be, in their sense of what is "normal," in the projection of their own beliefs about alcohol use, and in many other ways. While we have urged that expectations be raised, we also suggest that there is a virtue in being frank about problems, and thus risking the "public relations" problem of promising more than can be assured in practice.

A rules-based approach assumes that alcohol use is a willed behavior, which can be stopped whenever a drinker decides that he or she has had enough. Strategies like "just say no," "know your limit," and "know when to say when" are based on the idea that an individual controls his or her consumption. A care-based alcohol policy recognizes context and addiction and pays attention to the impossibility of individual control over some drinking behavior, whether the person is an alcoholic or, in isolated instances, drinks too much to judge the limit.

This approach also recognizes that the desire to drink is a desire for the expected effects of alcohol and not simply for entertainment, or because there is nothing else to do. Alcohol-free activities cannot prevent students from drinking if what they want is the release they get from alcohol.

Recognizing the powerlessness of some people over alcohol brings us to the need to consider services for those who need special help. It is important to re-think the proposition that alcohol and drug use impairs academic performance and academic productivity. Surely it does, but often the impairment is not particularly discernible and a standard that assumes loss of academic productivity will under-predict problems because sometimes very accomplished people are very accomplished alcoholics. If

one waits for a college alcoholic to "bottom out," one may wait too long. We want students to get help before they bottom out, and we want recovering students to remain a part of the campus community. On-campus treatment services allow students to continue their studies and to have the help of the people at college with whom they feel comfortable.

Approach

We need to be honest with ourselves and openly acknowledge that members of our college communities are addicted to alcohol. Resisting denial is a very important dimension of recovery. There is a great deal of denial going on in our whole national strategy, and we do not want to perpetuate it on our college campuses. Roland Barthes (1979) warns us to beware of the "oppressive divorce of knowledge and mythology" (p. 37). We do not want the myth of individual control over alcohol use to block us from treating addictive behavior.

Accountability

To resist denial, we must stop pretending that the problem does not exist, or that drinking is just a simple matter of people choosing some option in their own lives that can just as easily not be chosen, or that because the "problem" is everywhere it has become intractable and cannot be solved. An ethic of care gets us, to use Gilligan's phrase, "mired in relationships" where we are just as susceptible to denial as we might be to effectively caring. Education to help sort out that difference should be part of a comprehensive prevention strategy.

It is critical to acknowledge openly the fact of disobedience, misuse, and abuse. We should fashion efforts designed to achieve consensus on how to deal with misbehavior, and how to distinguish misbehavior from behavior beyond an individual's control. This may include communicating with parents, who are still other participants in the continuum of care, to clarify expectations and develop strategies.

We should use our research capacity, as William Bennett (1986) suggests, to assess the extent and character of the problem on our campuses. This means committing research funds to knowing why alcohol and drug abuse happens, not just summing up statistics on incidence and prevalence. We should seek to determine what about college campuses can be changed to reduce the root causes of abuse, or at least to improve the action to reduce risk.

We have a duty to create substance-free living situations for students in recovery. College is a very hard place in which to recover from an addiction because many theoretically "dry" dorms are not in reality substance-free. Remembering that students, not dorms, are what can be substance-free, we should arrange for special facilities where students can join together and help each other through the recovery process.

9. Rethink Privilege

For many students, privilege plays a part in the justification for their drinking

behavior and in the character of that drinking. Advertisements inculcate the idea that adult success is rewarded with alcohol. People who are influenced by these cultural messages think individualistically about success and about drinking. Let us re-think the idea of privilege so that it includes the idea of membership in a community, not simply the mark of special status. Privilege as status knows few limits, but privilege as something different from a right, carries obligations. Drinking behaviors that are excessively status conscious and individualistic are more suggestive of addiction than is drinking behavior in relation to others. Making decisions that take others into account is the kind of responsibility we hope to foster in place of the dangerous belief that because of my status, the rules should not apply to me.

Approach

One approach to change individualistic thinking about alcohol is to rethink privilege. Privilege is bound up in students' sense of their status, our sense of the university as an elite community, and marketing strategies that link drinking to sophistication. Re-thought, privilege becomes something earned through responsible membership in a community. It is not just a status to be purchased with money, an SAT score, or special connections.

Accountability

To rethink privilege, we must reconnect it with membership and obligation. This conception of privilege can enhance a sense of connectedness and have the corollary effect of binding us to an improved relationship with students. Connection can be animated by care and concern, not alienation, control, or self-generated and self-validated ideas of accountability. If privilege is to be disconnected from alcohol for any of us, perhaps it should be disconnected for all of us. Let us look at our own use of alcohol and be sure that we can subject ourselves to the same standards we expect students to uphold. We can use our power to try to suppress the dimension of popular culture that links alcohol and privilege. We can also use education to expose the dangerously misleading elements of marketing strategies that seek either to obscure the risk of alcohol abuse or make false promises to users.

If we see privilege as connected to membership and obligations, our duties go beyond making rules and walking away satisfied that we have addressed the problem of alcohol abuse. Our responsibility is to work with students on methods and programs for stopping the alcohol abuse of all members of the institution. To have personally obeyed the rules does not absolve someone of responsibility for another person's problem drinking—this is a danger of both individualistic and privilege-as-status thinking.

10. Get Beyond the Individual in Designing Prevention Strategies and Keep Authority Flexible

The popular approach to health and wellness centered on the individual is hampered by its inability to change the addictive system that has produced

the problems. Effective education and prevention strategies need to be community-oriented. They should look at individuals as they fit into and are shaped by the collective circumstances of their lives.

Approach

If our strategies are going to encourage community, we need to remember to keep authority flexible. Collaborative models coming out of management theory are urging "flexible authority" as the best way to produce a good working relationship between those in authority and those who are ruled. Flexible authority is responsive to the specific needs in a situation that requires attention. This kind of authority makes use of the resources in a community: people's unique skills and their ability to work together are utilized more fully. Solutions come from those involved rather than from those higher up. William Ouchi (1981) urges us to "find those organizational innovations which can permit a balance between freedom and integration, which go beyond our current interpretation of individualism" (p. 79). We believe that flexible authority will empower students in the decisions that affect their lives, and thus can help us to do our jobs better because we will be able to find solutions that fit the problems.

Accountability

As a college community, we work together on our problems, realizing that all of them do not belong to the students and that we have much to learn from students and about them. The solutions we reach should not be structured so that they ask each of us only to take better care of ourselves, but so that they also ask us to take better care of each other. We would be making our authority flexible by adding our need to be cared *for* into our responsibility to take care *of* the college.

A substitute for the "know when to say when" approach could be to teach everyone "how to say what, when and to whom," which incorporates a relationship to others into our thinking about limits and locates us all on a continuum of engagement.

Our duty is to reduce risks by making our community, not just ourselves, strong and healthy. Individually focused approaches to risk reduction are vitally important, but they are inadequate because they overestimate individual power and underestimate our desire not to be alone, especially in relation to others we care about.

Conclusion

Having outlined an approach that urges people to take risks—one that also urges them to be involved and to care—we are left with a key and troubling question: Why should anyone take this approach?

One perceived benefit of an approach that emphasizes individuals taking care of themselves is that if someone fails to take care of himself, then his fail-

ure will be felt most by him, or so we would like to think, and that failure is his—"he packed his own chute," "he wrote his own script." Were this the case, perhaps we would not be faced with the problems we have. But it is clear that the acts of single individuals are not without a broad range of consequences for others. We certainly know that people who are killed or hurt by drunk drivers would find little solace in a program of radical individualism, and, on a much more ordinary level, so much of what we do is bound up with each other in intimate relationships and in forming friendships. It seems to us that to redress the harm that selfishness creates, we can learn something from twelve-step programs that actually ask those who are recovering to make inventories of people they have hurt, and then to make, at some later point, amends to those who have been injured. Thus, we can see that it is only a myth, propped up by recent political messages, which convinces us to be content with an assessment of progress that considers only whether we as individuals are better off than we were sometime in the past.

There is obviously, particularly in the collective context of the college, no reason to believe that the behavior of individuals fails to touch the behavior of others. Students are in an interesting stage in which they will acknowledge peer pressure, but simultaneously argue that it does not affect them. That is to say, they acknowledge that peer pressure is a factor in culture, groups are very important, but individually they ask, "how can I emerge with some sense of self and argue that I am being controlled by others, particularly other peers?" Listening to students speaking about drinking games provides an interesting insight into how much they believe they are subject to other influences. Oftentimes they will say that they could leave the game at any moment. But one begins to doubt that claim when one considers a wide range of other things the student may be negotiating at that point: the whole desire to be connected; to be different, but not so different as to be exotic; to be the same, but not so much the same so as to be unnoticeable.

When we began to think about what a web of caring might look like at an individual level, we were inspired by the image of the sponsor, someone who takes an unqualified interest in the person beginning a journey to recovery: someone who knows the rules, knows what works and what doesn't work, but also someone who is prepared to engage actively with the alcoholic so that some good might come with it. In discussing whether or how one might induce people to take that kind of interest in each other, whether there was some basis in a university for that kind of interest, one colleague of ours, a recovering alcoholic himself, a distinguished scholar, and an academic leader, thought the idea was interesting, but expressed great skepticism about whether it could actually work because of a very big difference between the situation in higher education and the situation in Alcoholics Anonymous.

In Alcoholics Anonymous, there is a distinct belief that without such a system, death will occur to the alcoholic or to someone around him. "Without each other we will all surely die. Without AA we will all surely die." This presence of an almost apocalyptic view helps strengthen a commitment to others

for those who have not reached the stage of their recovery where such a commitment is the step that they should be doing. But our colleague doubts that there is any such collective sense of either crisis or doom sufficient to motivate this kind of caring. Unfortunately he is probably right. But in the end, our sense is that to the extent that we believe that there is a need to improve our political conditions, to avoid many of the calamities that are predicted for higher education and for the culture in general, and to resist a kind of denial that leads us to believe everything will just work out all right—to the extent that we subscribe to any of the beliefs about the breakdown of community, then we believe that the exaggerations caused by selfishness qualify us as people who need to become engaged and need to support those students whose activities most model the kind of interest and connection that we believe can inoculate our community to some extent against some of the real pathologies. Therefore, care for others is something, we think, that is justified from the three strands that we have identified, but also forcefully commended to us by our sense of the urgency and importance of creating a human community and engaging in some of the reform that long-term planning would suggest to us.

In challenging assumptions and rules or rights-based approaches, we have done more than just show their shortcomings: we have developed a program to reconceptualize our connections to one another. Our approach has been similar to what Stephen Jay Gould (1981) calls "debunking" (pp. 321-322). He suggests that debunking is a mechanism for allowing a progression of ideas; rather than being wholly negative, debunking replaces ideas that are no longer useful with a more informed view of the nature of things. After assessing the limitations of current approaches to alcohol policy on campuses, we are advocating a contextual method, one that looks to political theory, psychology, and literature to expand our knowledge. We hope to start a conversation of "strong democratic talk," as Benjamin Barber (1984) calls the "talk that makes and remakes the world" (p. 177). Strong democratic talk "entails listening no less than speaking; second, it is affective as well as cognitive; and third, its intentionalism draws out of the domain of pure reflection into the world of action" (p. 174).

We hope we have suggested a variety of ways in which this approach can be tried. We are persuaded that the typical prevention activities now in place exaggerate, to some extent, the dangerous dimensions of individualism instead of strengthening individuals enough that they might act in collaborative ways with others. This is going to be a continuing struggle, and we hope that we have contributed in this report to strategies that will not be alienating and that may result in benefits that go beyond simply dealing with some of the transient dimensions of student use of alcohol.

**This paper was made possible by generous grant support from the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) of the United States Department of Education. With funds made available under its Drug Prevention Program, I was able to*

employ Margaret Klawunn, a Ph.D. Candidate in English at Rutgers to do research and aid in the project. Margaret's work made it possible for me to devote time to this project and the manuscript. Her contributions merit her designation as co-author. I am greatly indebted to her for her part in this collaboration.

My own thinking on these topics has been influenced by many people, some known to me and some unknown. To account for the unknown, one of my favorite teachers once invoked, as I do now, Blanche Dubois' line in Streetcar: "I've always relied on the kindness of strangers." My conversations with colleagues and students, the questions that have followed lectures I have given, what I have read or observed here and there, all these things seem to find ways to wander into my thinking and writing. Some debts, though, are too special to remain anonymous. Don Fisher, Ron Bucknam, and Richard Wheeler of FIPSE were unstinting in their attention, generous with deadlines, and helpful in connecting these ideas to those of others working on similar problems. To my colleagues from around the country, I am grateful for the influence that knowing them has had on my thinking—although they bear no responsibility for any mistakes I make: Jean Kinney, Bruce Donovan, Chris Cullinan, Carol Gilligan and the students in the seminar on female adolescence, Richard Keeling, Omowale Amerleru-Marshall, and Peter Claydon. Some of my Rutgers colleagues have been especially generous: Peter Nathan, James Reed, Lisa Laitman, Marvin Greenberg, Fern Goodhart, Richard Nurse, April Pagano, and Robert Bierman. Ultimately, this work concerns the inextricable link between the welfare of students and that of colleges and universities. Students were the inspiration for this thinking and I hope they—and those who seek to promote that welfare—will benefit from it as well.

I am profoundly grateful to the late Edward J. Bloustein, president of Rutgers University, for having the courage to take on hard issues and to support those of us who had the privilege of working with him in doing the same. With his encouragement and support, we stretched ourselves to find a new metaphor for the relationship of students to institutions. In his memory, I shall work to bring that metaphor to life.

—William David Burns

Notes

[1]The passage from L. Frank Baum's *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz* follows: The lion now walked to the Throne Room and knocked at the door. "Come in," said Oz. "I have come for my courage," announced the Lion, entering the room. "Very well," answered the little man; "I will get it for you." He went to a cupboard and reaching up to a high shelf took down a square green bottle, the contents of which he poured into a green-gold dish, beautifully carved. Placing this before the Cowardly Lion, who sniffed at it as if he did not like it, the Wizard said, "Drink." "What is it?" asked the Lion. "Well," answered Oz, "if it were inside of you, it would be courage. You know, of course, that courage is always inside one; so that this really cannot be called courage until you have swallowed it. Therefore I advise you to drink it as soon as possible." The Lion hesitated no longer, but drank till the dish was empty. "How do you feel now?" asked Oz. "Full of courage," replied the Lion, who went joyfully back to his friends to tell them of his good fortune (Baum 137-9). For a reference on courage as a name for liquor, see the *Dictionary of Alcohol Use and Abuse: Slang Terms and Terminology*, ed. Ernest L. Abel (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1985).

[2]We recognize that the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE) Drug Prevention Program is concerned with a wide range of drugs, including alcohol. We have chosen to concentrate on alcohol because it is the drug of choice for college students and because it is more socially accepted than other drugs. There is also a significant correlation between heavy use of alcohol and the use of other drugs, which makes the focus on alcohol a justifiable strategy in a general discussion of prevention. We believe that much of what we say in this report is relevant to drugs other than alcohol.

[3]The context for this quotation is Sissela Bok's analysis of paternalism which includes an example from public health policy: "Among the most thoroughgoing paternalistic proposals ever made were those of Johan Peter Frank, often called the Father of Public Health, in eighteenth-century Germany. In his six-volume *System for a Complete Medical Policing* he proposed ways to 'prevent evils through wise ordinances.' Laws should be passed, he argues, in every case where they might further the health of citizens. Sexual practices, marriages, and child rearing were to be regulated to the smallest detail; a law should be passed to prohibit tight clothing women wore, if it interfered with their respiration. . . . The need for some paternalistic restraints is obvious. We survive only if protected from harm as children. Even as adults, we tolerate a number of regulations designed to reduce dangers such as those of infection or accidents" (203-205).

[4]We are not attempting to analyze the legal implications of these cases, nor even, as in the case of Whitlock v. University of Denver, to follow their progress through the courts (the original decision in the Whitlock case was overturned). We simply use them to illustrate some of the powerful motivations for liability avoidance that are pressed upon colleges and universities. It has been stated that the possible damage claims arising from lawsuits account for why colleges are paying attention to alcohol at all. For a good overview of the legal issues, see *Self-Regulation Initiatives: Resource Documents for Colleges and Universities* (American Council on Education, Washington D.C., 1988).

[5]Students may not be the only ones who are litigating to get a response from their colleges. An article in the October 26, 1989 edition of *Black Issues in Higher Education* quotes Martha Bazik, president of Chicago Citywide College, on the relationship

between faculty and the administration: Many faculty members feel that "'they are not listened to, that they are not heard, and the environment often makes them feel like that.' Moreover, she said, faculty do not have to sue to maintain their campus rights, but because of the climate, they often see that as the only means'" (Wiley, 1988, p. 22).

[6]The report, Alcohol and Other Drug Use: A Guide for College Presidents and Governing Boards prepared by M. Lee Upcraft and John B. Welty, is presently in draft manuscript form and is being circulated for comment by the Dept. of Education, Office of Substance Abuse Prevention.

[7]Styles of parenting are as tied to time, place, and culture as any other social phenomenon, and a look at the revisions of Dr. Benjamin Spock's popular handbook *Baby and Child Care* proves it. When the handbook first came out in 1946, Dr. Spock urged parents to trust their instincts with their children: no more rigid schedules and emotional constraints—"Be natural and comfortable, and enjoy your baby" (spock 4). By 1956, he was worried that he had been misinterpreted by overly-permissive parents who no longer tried to have any control over their children, and he issued this corrective: "Firmness is one aspect of parental love. Firmness, by keeping children on track, keeps them lovable. And they love us for keeping them out of trouble" (Spock 48). (Lynn Z. Bloom points out this significant revision in *Dr. Spock: Biography of a Conservative Radical*.)

[8]We are referring to cases like Goss v. Lopez, Mississippi University for Women v. Hogan, Soglin v. Kauffman, Gaspar v. Bruton, Healy v. James, and Gay Lib v. University of Missouri.

[9]Even federal financial aid strategy changed to reflect this market driven, consumer approach. Institution-based aid was replaced to a great extent by "portable" aid—financial aid vouchers that consumers could use to "access" the college or program of their own choice. This shift sought to bring market forces to play to help move what colleges offered closer to what consumers want. For a thorough analysis of the contract and consumer legislation, see William Kaplin's *The Law of Higher Education*, 2nd edition. He includes an extensive bibliography on the new legal status of students.

[10]Contract theory relies upon a belief that both parties are interested in what they can get from the contract. The consequences of breaking the terms of the agreement have to be significant enough to encourage obedience. One problem with applying contract theory to alcohol policy is that the students are not as committed to the contract as the dormitory staff or the administration might be. The result is that the students do not feel compelled to comply.

[11]Much of the political and popular rhetoric in the 1980s stressed individual effort, which may have exaggerated students' sense of autonomy.

[12]The interviews, conducted on 26-27 April 1989 in a residence hall on campus, were advertised as a project on student behavior (Has Anybody Ever Paid You to Talk about Your Life for 20 Minutes?). Nothing was said about alcohol policy or the Office of Student Life Policy and Services. Thirty students volunteered. While all classes were represented and 1/4 of the volunteers were minorities, these interviews are not meant to be representative in any way. We were interested in how students formulate their thoughts about each other, about Rutgers, about their social lives, and about drinking. We are using the interviews to show how students deal with these issues. The responses are unedited to preserve the contradictions and qualifications that take place in conversation. Surveys done at Rutgers have shown that the incidence and prevalence of alcohol use among Rutgers students is equal to (or slightly below)the national norm as published in *National Trends in Drug Use and Related Factors among American High School Students and Young Adults, 1975-1988*.

[13]This perception of "trouble" may or may not be related to what would really happen were she to get the person to a health center: indeed, what is risked in seeking help is the *possibility* that the situation will get out of student "control," and the potential that someone in authority might act in a way that gets someone else in trouble.

[14]The most recent national survey suggests that 92% of high school students drink, compared with 94% of college students. More than half of the white men in college drink heavily, consuming more than five drinks on one occasion in the two weeks preceding this survey. It is clear that at least as far as alcohol use is concerned, we lack the "adherence to a publicly owned sense of standards" referred to earlier. These statistics are taken from Johnston, L.D., P.M. O'Malley, and J.G. Bachman. *National Trends in Drug Use and Related Factors among American High School Students and Young Adults, 1987-88*. Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse, 1989.

[15]A note on the "mocktail" party and other similar prevention fantasies: these are good examples of what Stanley Fish calls a "self-consuming artifact"—something that turns back on itself and self-destructs. In preserving the form of a behavior we seek to avoid while suppressing its substance, we tell people "it's not the real thing." In this sense, it is a *mock*tail (tale). For the concept, see Stanley Fish, *Self-Consuming Artifacts*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973.

[16]Hence words like "blasted," "wrecked," and "trashed" are used in passive voice constructions to describe their condition when drinking, and names like Child Abuse, B-52, and Kamikaze for the drinks.

[17]It is worth noting the connection between the "group vomiting" associated with alcohol use and the "group vomiting" associated with bulimia. For an excellent article on bulimia, see Susan Bordo's "Anorexia Nervosa: Psychopathology as the Crystallization of Culture"(*The Philosophical Forum, 17*(2): 73-103).

[18]Hoelting's strategy might effectively satisfy a desire for relief from adult responsibilities, which may be one reason for drinking, but his suggested activities do not provide an excuse for misbehavior, an end to boredom, nor "sophisticated" adult fun. Some of the activities are organized around being alcohol-free(alcohol awareness band wagon, cold turkey week, etc.), but others do not necessarily preclude alcohol use(outdoor movie night, bowling tournament, candy corn counting contest, chariot races, new wave dances) and could turn into drinking events quite easily. In fact, even the spirit of some of the alcohol-free events suggests the desirability of drinking. For example, one entry under alcohol awareness is Cold Turkey Week. "Sponsor an all campus Cold Turkey Week where students pledge not to drink for one full week. Successful participants will receive an 'I Survived Cold Turkey Week!' button." Because the emphasis is on *surviving* the week rather than enjoying it, this activity reinforces the idea that without drinking students can barely live.

[19]Perhaps we can say that it is more likely that someone would find the frog leg fry an appealing alternative to boredom *after* consuming alcohol than they would in a sober state.

[20]A study done at Northern Illinois University (Haines 1988) and another one done at Hobart and William Smith College (Perkins and Berkowitz 1987) found that students tend to overestimate how much their peers are drinking, thus placing an internal pressure on themselves to fit in. Michael Haines, program coordinator for NIU's Health Enhancement Services, discovered that less than 9% of a surveyed population of freshman and sophomore students thought a "frequent drunk" was okay, but they guessed that 42% of their peers approved of frequent drunkenness. These studies have interesting implications for student reports of drinking activity, and for

assessing motivation of heavy drinking. They also show that a care-based approach needs to examine the myths about student drinking because administrators need to be in touch with the myths, as well as the reality, in order to respond to need accurately.

[21]Barbara Critchlow Leigh refers readers of her study to two reviews of other studies on expectancy effects, Hull and Bond (1986) and Critchlow (1986).

[22]In *Escape from Intimacy*, Anne Wilson Schaef develops the concept of the "pseudo-relationship," which offers some insight into this kind of interaction. As she explains it, "The healthy part of the person or the nonaddicted true self may actually be looking for love and intimacy at the same time the addiction (or addictive process) is looking for its fix and utilizing relationships to get that fix. Neither the person nor the relationship is really important; they are only used to get the buzz. The pseudo-relationship addict can be just as ruthless as a drug addict in search of a fix" (*Escape from Intimacy* 102).

[23]This statement is particularly interesting because after the student says that "you are usually fairly drunk so you don't remember what you are doing," he proceeds to reconstruct a very particular event, right down to the snow in the backyard, as a typical example. It is as if he is telling himself that the best way to engage in this socializing is not to remember it—the voice is more imperative ("Don't remember it") than it is descriptive.

[24]For an excellent study on the incidence of gang rape at fraternity parties, see Julie Ehrhart and Bernice Sandler's "Campus Gang Rape: Party Games?," a publication of the Project on the Status and Education of Women.

[25]A study done at Texas A&M University surveyed 106 undergraduates about acceptable behavior in dating situations. Men rated intercourse against the woman's wishes as significantly more justifiable when the woman initiated the date, when the man paid, and when the couple went to the man's apartment (Mulenhard & McFall, 1981). Another survey that supports this claim found that only 34% of teenagers said that force was not acceptable under any circumstances. See "*Nobody Told Me It Was Rape": A Parent's Guide for Talking with Teenagers about Acquaintance Rape and Sexual Exploitation* (Caren Adams and Jennifer Fay, Santa Cruz: Network Publications, 1984).

[26]Present in this quotation is a kind of trust: the speaker wants, simultaneously, everybody to be drunk but believes that, even in the impaired state, they would not do anything to betray his trust even though he offers us a couple of real examples of his "paranoid" fantasies.

[27]For example, see Jean Kilbourne's video *Calling the Shots: The Advertising of Alcohol* (Cambridge Documentary Film Co.).

[28]For a more extended analysis of alcohol and privilege, see "Alcohol and Community: Rethinking Privilege" by W. David Burns (*The Educational Record*, Summer/Fall 1989).

[29]The trademark or copyright slogan of the American Express Card.

[30]Many students were outraged by this promotion, which Miller later called a "mistake." However, neither student behavior during Spring Break, nor the behavior of those who sell beer to them, seems to have changed since the appearance of "Beachin' Times."

[31]Another beer company features men and a dog: in this television advertisement, man's best friend orders a case of beer, a side of beef, and a female dog. Although he intends to enjoy these pleasures himself, the beer and the beef are conveniently turned over to his owner. This advertisement and the Spuds series deconstruct the term "party animal" and reconstruct it as something benign.

[32]This tragedy, quite significantly, is named after the victim and not after the fraternity—it is the "James Callahan incident" rather than the "Lambda incident." Students do not talk about the incident in the context of fraternity hazing: the situation is left out to focus on the victim's culpability.

[33]Regarding education programs specifically related to hazing, a Dean had arranged for the fraternity leaders to be trained in risk reduction on the Sunday preceding the Thursday on which this incident occurred. At that meeting, a representative of a national fraternity where a hazing-related alcohol death occurred addressed them on the issue of alcohol and hazing (see the case Ballou v. Sigma Nu).

[34]The most recent article in *The Daily Targum* that expresses this opinion was published on October 3, 1989. As part of a report on a seminar to end dangerous hazing, it is noted that the speaker mentioned the following hazing tragedies: "two pledges who were marched off a railroad trestle and one who fell off a cliff at night after being kidnapped by fraternity brothers. He further described a pledge who was buried in the sand on the New Jersey shore and lastly, James Callahan, the Rutgers student who drank himself to death." It is interesting that the reporter paraphrases the list of incidents in a way that makes two of the tragedies the fault of the fraternity brothers and two of them, including James Callahan, the fault of the victim. The one that most explicitly absolves others of any responsibility is the report on James Callahan, that he "drank *himself* to death." Even the student who fell off the cliff did that after being kidnapped by others. ("Seminar held to help battle hazing evils in pledging," *The Daily Targum*, 10/3/89.)

[35]Programs like Students Against Drunk Driving (SADD) have been very effective in getting students to think about helping each other instead of denying the group's influence. Unfortunately these programs are often criticized for not taking a strong enough stand "against" drinking because they give tacit approval to drinking, and/or because they are seen as examples of "enabling" behavior. We see them as collective strategies to prevent injury and harm.

[36]Bloom has a lot of justifiable complaints about American society, students, and colleges today, but his explanations exaggerate(as he puts it) the dangers of post-sixties liberalism. There is also a real naivete in his observations about the condition of students that pays little attention to the psychological complexity of their situation. While we agree with some of the list of problems he identifies, his reasoning of the causes and his solutions are different from our's. Bloom attributes many of the problems to cultural relativism, and he advocates a return to the classical values. With our approach, we hope to counter egocentric attitudes by encouraging connection and the respect of differences, not by decreasing "openness." We also suspect that some of the classical values are themselves part of the problem, not the solution

[37]Bellah and the co-editors of *Habits of the Heart* persuasively illustrate a thesis about American society, but because they are so sure about what they want to prove at the outset, they lack more objective evidence for their theory that America is a therapeutic culture mired in self-analysis. Despite a disclaimer, much of the basis for their analysis rests on Tocqueville's observations about nineteenth century America and the contemporary voices of four white Americans. Their observations about the lack of collective life and the inability to think publicly are suggestive, particularly in combination with more representative sources.

[38]We recognize that the idea of a pre-social connection is subject to criticism for its romanticization of the infant's bond with its mother, but more origination myths are romanticized and so are some social science methodologies. Many political theories, including dominant European political theories, begin with a description of man

in nature. Interestingly enough, in the case of Hobbes, the state serves as protection against man's natural depravity. In the case of feminist theorists, the state is an artificial imposition of male domination over a natural condition that did not contain hegemony.

[39]Including gender differences as a factor in moral development, Gilligan supplements and revises Lawrence Kohlberg's stages of moral development. Her work was first published as an article in the *Harvard Educational Review* ("In A Different Voice: Women's Conception of Self and Morality," *Harvard Educ Rev* 47(1982): 481-517), and then as a book, *In a Different Voice*. She elucidates and refines her ideas in "Moral Orientation and Moral Development" in *Women and Moral Theory*, a collection of essays responding to Gilligan's conception of a female morality.

[40]See Chodorow, Nancy. "Family Structure and Feminine Personality." *Women, Culture, and Society*. L.M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere, eds. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1974; and *The Reproduction of Mothering.*

[41]For an elaboration of Kristeva's theories, the collection of essays *Desire in Language* provides a good selection of her work on language and semiotics.

[42]The12-Step program for recovery, developed and used by Alcoholics Anonymous, is: 1) We admitted we were powerless over alcohol—that our lives had become unmanageable; 2) Came to believe that a Power greater than ourselves could restore us to sanity; 3) Made a decision to turn our will and our lives over to the care of God *as we understood Him;* 4) Made a searching and fearless moral inventory of ourselves; 5) Admitted to God, to ourselves, and to another human being the exact nature of our wrongs; 6) Were entirely ready to have God remove all these defects of character; 7) Humbly asked Him to remove our shortcomings; 8) Made a list of all persons we had harmed, and became willing to make amends to them all; 9) Made direct amends to such people wherever possible, except when to do so would injure them or others; 10) Continued to take personal inventory and when we were wrong promptly admitted it; 11) Sought through prayer and meditation to improve our conscious contact with God *as we understood Him*, praying only for knowledge of His will for us and the power to carry that out; 12) Having had a spiritual awakening as the result of these steps, we tried to carry this message to alcoholics, and to practice these principles in all our affairs.

[43]See Arthur Chickering, Education and Identity; Robert Arnstein, "Psychiatry and the College Student," in Vol. 5 of *American Handbook of Psychiatry*.

[44]Parker Palmer wants the church to fill the gap in our missing "public" life in America, which is much different from our secular model. We agree with him, however, that what is lacking in our society is a way to relate to others that is neither intimacy nor neglect.

[45]This is only one idea of state/society, pre-political relations. Without choosing a myth to account for the "pre-political", we choose to look at the political as something broader and more basic than institutions of governance.

[46]The web metaphor is currently used in health care theory to represent a multifactorial concept of disease. As Sylvia Tesh noted in *Hidden Politics*, the web, "more than a linear or triadic configuration, represents the reality that disease occurs in a social, physical, political, psychological, cultural, and economic *context*"(59). Tesh critiques the web metaphor, however, for its inability to accomplish in practice what it promises in theory. We believe that the web model is the most effective paradigm and its shortcomings can be remediated with a careful program for implementation.

[47]Sylvia Tesh, in *Hidden Arguments*, theorizes that "In an era where the news media continually publicize the new threats to health from polluted water, air, and soil, and

where both industrial disasters and the possibility of nuclear war pose threats completely outside the control of individual citizens, it is comforting to think that personal action can reduce one's chances of dying early. Whether lifestyle change calls for wearing a respirator at work, giving up cigarettes, or learning stress reduction techniques, it means that at least some disease is a consequence of circumstances over which individuals have control. In addition it suggest that health can be secured without major changes in industrial practices, in the economy, or in the government"(46).

[48]The ethic of care emphasizes connectedness: loving your neighbor as yourself from Judeo-Christian theology. It also shares the concerns of feminist and Afrocentric theorists as discussed earlier. With an ethic of care, the other comes into relation with the self as a "particular other"—"particular others" are the people one has a relationship with and responsibility for, as mothers do; but is also a way of thinking about the world that reduces separation(see Virgina Held's "Feminism and Moral Theory" in *Women and Moral Theory*). There is a similar concept of identity in Afrocentric theory, the "extended self," which defines identity in terms of "we" instead of "I" (see Wade Nobles's article "The Extended Self").

[49]The continuum of care requires that each member of the college recognize the connection between his/ her own activity and the community's solution to a problem (Dr. Carol Brownlow, the Director of Allied Health at Chemeketa Community College in Salem, Oregon, first suggested the application of this concept to alcohol policy). In nursing theory, continuity of care "means that total patient care includes all phases of health-illness continuum, from high level wellness to complete disability" (Beatty, 1980, p. 3). This goal is achieved by providing the following services: 1) health education; 2) prevention of potential disease; 3) detection of disease; 4) continuing care— health maintenance; 5) care of emergency, episodic, and chronic illnesses; 6) physical, social and vocational rehabilitation; 7) custodial care; 8) terminal care (Beatty, 1980, chap. 1). The continuum of care for alcohol translates into everything from preventive measures for occasional drinkers to the rehabilitation of alcoholics. Within the college community, everyone from students and faculty members, to residence hall staff and health care providers has a role in preventing, identifying, and treating alcohol abuse.

[50]According to *Black's Law Dictionary*, a "duty" is the correlative of a right: wherever there exists a right in any person, there exists a corresponding duty upon some other person or persons. Yet a duty is not a *legal* obligation in that the courts will not enforce or redress it; it is considered an imperative *moral* or *ethical* obligation that the court sanctions. This distinction is significant within the web of caring because we are talking about "caring" in terms of an ethically motivated action rather than a liability avoidance strategy. Reasonable, ordinary, or due care is "care proportioned to any given situation, its surroundings, peculiarities, and hazards" (Black, 1968, "Due Care"). For colleges that means evaluating potential dangers and determining how care can best be provided given the specific needs of community members.

[51]This connection between our political non-therapeutic strategy and the treatment strategy for addiction was suggested to us by Dr. Bruce Donovan, the Associate Dean of the College and Associate Dean on Chemical Dependency at Brown University.

References

Adams, C., & Fay, J. (1984). *"Nobody told me it was rape": A parent's guide for talking with teenagers about acquaintance rape and sexual exploitation*. Santa Cruz: Network Publications.

Akbar, N. (1989). Nigrescence and identity: Some limitations. *The Counseling Psychologist, 17*(2), 258-263.

Alcoholics Anonymous. (3rd ed.). (1976). New York: Alcoholics Anonymous World Services.

American Council on Education. (1988). *Self-regulation initiatives: Resource documents for colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Anderson, D. S., & Gadaleto, A.F. (1988). *Results of the 1988 college alcohol survey and comparative analysis with the 1979, 1982, and 1985 college alcohol surveys*. Mimeo.

Arendt, H. (1972). *Crises of the republic*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Armstein, R. (1974). *Psychiatry and the college student*. (S. Arieti, Ed.) (Vol. 5 of American Handbook of Psychiatry, 2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Barber, B. (1984). *Strong democracy: Participatory politics for a new age*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barthes, R. (1979). *The Eiffel Tower and other mythologies*. (R. Howard, Trans.). New York: Hill & Wang.

Baum, L. F. (1969). *The wonderful wizard of Oz*. San Rafael, CA: Classic Press.

Beatty, S. R. (1980). *Continuity of care: The hospital and the community*. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Bellah, R., et al. (Eds.). (1985). *Habits of the heart*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Benjamin, J. (1985). The bonds of love: Rational violence and erotic domination. In H. Eisentein & A. Jardine (Eds.), *The future of difference* (pp. 41-70). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Bennett, W. (1986, October 10). [Address]. Harvard University Graduation. Cambridge,MA.

Black, H. C. (1968). *Black's law dictionary* (4th ed.). St. Paul: West Publishing.

Bloom, A. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Bok, S. (1978). *Lying: Moral choice in public and private life*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Boyer, E. L. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, W. D., & Sloane, D. C. (Eds.) (1987). Students, alcohol, and college health: A special issue. *Journal of American College Health, 36*, 2.

Caleekal-John, A., & Goodstadt, M. S. (1983). Alcohol use and its consequences among Canadian university students. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 13* (2), 56-69.

Cassell, C. (1984). *Swept away: Why women fear their own sexuality*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Chickering, A. (1969). *Education and identity*. London: Jossey-Bass.

Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dewey, J. (1966). Education as conservative and progressive. *Democracy and Education* (pp. 69-80). New York: The Free Press.

Dictionary of alcohol use and abuse: *Slang terms and terminology*. (1985). (E. L. Abel, Ed.) Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.

Dinnerstein, D. (1976). *The mermaid and the minotaur*. New York: Harper & Row.

Driessel, D. K. (1969). A student's view of freedom in the multiversity. In L.C. Vaccaro & J. T. Covert (Eds.), *Student Freedom in Higher Education* (pp. 73-84). New York: Columbia University Press.

Emig, J. (1983). *The web of meaning.* Montclair: Boynton/Cook Publishers.

Engs, R. C., & Hanson, D. J. (1985). The drinking patterns and problems of college students. *Journal of Alcohol and Drug Education, 31*(1), 65-83.

Farquhar, J. W., Maccoby, N., & Wood, P. D. (1985). *Education and communication studies* (pp. 207-221). (W. W. Holland, R. Detels, & G. Knox, Eds.). (Vol. 3 of Oxford Textbook of Public Health). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Finnegan, D. G., & McNally, E. B. (1987). *Dual identities: Counseling chemically dependent gay men and lesbians.* Minneapolis: Hazelden.

Flax, J. (1980). Mother-daughter relationships: Psychodynamics, politics, and philosophy. In H. Eisenstein & A. Jardine (Eds.), *The future of difference* (pp. 20-40). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Freud, A. (1974). The ego and the mechanisms of defense. *The writings of Anna Freud.* (Cecil Baines, Trans.). (Vol.2). New York: International Universities Press.

Gadaleto, A. F., & Anderson, D. S. (1986, November). Continued progress: The 1979, 1982, and 1985 college alcohol surveys. *Journal of College Student Personnel,* 499-509.

Gallup Report. (1987). *Alcohol use and abuse in America.* (Report No. 265). The Gallup Report, 46-49.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: psychological theory and women's development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C. (1987). Moral orientation and moral development. In E. F. Kittay & D. T. Meyers (Eds.), *Women and moral theory* (pp. 19-33). Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield.

Goodstadt, M.S., & Caleekal-John, A. (1984). Alcohol education programs for university students: A review of their effectiveness. *The International Journal of the Addictions, 19*(7), 721-741.

Gott v. Berea College. (1913). 156 Ky. 376, 161 S.W. 204.

Gould, S. J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man.* New York: Norton.

Hester, R.K & Miller, W. R. (Eds.). (1989). *Handbook of alcoholism treatment approaches: Effective alternatives.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Hoelting, F. B. (1988). *How to Program without Alcohol: 3000+ Residence Hall Programs.* Office of Residential Life, Illinois State University.

Hunt, B. L. (1988). From a chain to a network—trends and developments in the pattern of health care. In B. H. Doan (Ed.), *The future of health and health care systems in industrialized societies.* New York: Praeger Publishers.

Irele, A. (1965) Negritude—literature and ideology. *The Journal of Modern African Studies,* 3(4), 499-526.

Johnston, L.D., O'Malley, P. M., & Bachman, J. G. (1989). *National trends in drug use and related factors among American high school students and young adults, 1975-1988.* Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Kaplin, W. A. (1980). *Law of higher education 1980.* San Francisco: Josey-Bass.

Keller, S., & Light, D. (Eds.). (1985). *Sociology* (4th ed.). New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Kessler, M., Albee, D. W. (1975). Primary prevention. *Annual Review of Psychology, 26,* 557-591.

Kinney, J., & Leaton, G. (1987). *Loosening the grip: A handbook of alcohol information* (3rd ed.). St. Louis: Times Mirror/Mosby College Publishing.

Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art.* (L. S.

Roudiez, Ed.). (T. Gora, A. Jardine, L. S. Roudiez, Trans.). New York: Columbia University Press.
Leigh, B. C. (1989). Attitudes and expectancies as predictors of drinking habits: A comparison of three scales. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol,* 50(5), 432-440.
Miller, T. K., Winston, R. B., & Mendenhall, W. R. (1983). *Administration and leadership in student affairs.* Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.
Moffatt, M. (1989). *Coming of age in New Jersey.* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
Morrill, W. H., Hurst, J. C., & Oetting, E.R. (Eds.). (1980). *Dimensions of intervention for student development.* New York: Wiley & Sons.
Mulenhard, C.L., & McFall, R. M. (1981). Dating initiatives from a woman's perspective. *Behavior Therapy, 12.*
Mullins v. Pine Manor College, (1983). 389 Mass. 47, 449 N.E.2d 331.
Newman, I. M., Crawford, J. K., & Nellis, M. J. (1989). The role and function of drinking games in a university community. Unpublished manuscript.
Nobles, W. W. (1976). Extended self: Rethinking the so-called Negro self-concept. *Journal of Black Psychology, 26*(2), 15-24.
O'Neil, R. (1970). *The Price of Dependency.* New York: E.P. Dutton.
Orcutt, J. D. (1984, Winter). Contrasting effects of two kinds of boredom on alcohol use. *Journal of Drug Issues,* 161-173.
Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z.* New York: Avon Books.
Palmer, P. (1981). *The company of strangers.* New York: Crossroad Publishing.
Phillips, A. (1986, Fall). Being bored. *Raritan,* 101-7.
Rich, A. (1979). *On lies, secrets, and silence.* New York: W.W. Norton.
Rose, M. A. (1985). *Rush: A girl's guide to sorority success.* New York: Villard Books.
Roskens, R. W. The stuff that dreams are made of. *Alpha Chi Omega Newsletter.*
Roszak, T. (1969). *Making of a counter culture.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
Saltz, R., & Elandt, D. (1986, Spring). College student drinking studies 1976-1985. *Contemporary Drug Problems,* 117-159.
Schaef, A. W. (1987). *When society becomes an addict.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.
Schaef, A. W. (1989). *Escape from intimacy.* San Francisco: Harper & Row.
Schwarz, R. M., Burkhart, B. R., & Green, S. B. (1982). Sensation-seeking and anxiety as factors in social drinking by men. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 43*(11), 1108-1114.
Sennett, R. (1981). *Authority.* New York: Vintage Books.
Spock, B. (1946). *The common sense book of baby and child care* (1st ed). New York: Duell, Sloan, & Pearce.
Spock, B. (1965). *Baby and child care* (3rd ed.). New York: Pocket Books.
Stein, G. (1935, March 16). American education and college. *New York Herald Tribune,* p.15.
Szablewicz, J. J., & Gibbs, A. (1987). Colleges increasing exposure to liability: The new *in loco parentis. Journal of Law and Education, 16*(4), 453-465.
Temple, M. (1986). Trends in collegiate drinking in California, 1979-1984. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 47*(4), 274-282.
Thomas, R. (1987, Summer). Systems for guiding college student behavior: Punishment or growth? *NASPA Journal, 25,* 54-61.
United States. Dept. of Health and Human Services. (1984). *Adolescent peer pressure: Theory, correlates, and program implications for drug abuse prevention* (3rd printing). National Institute of Drug Abuse. Washington: GPO.

Upcraft, M. L., & Welty, J. B. (1989). *Alcohol and other drugs: A guide for college presidents and governing boards.* [Draft Manuscript]. Dept. of Education. Office for Substance Abuse Prevention.

Whitlock v. University of Denver. (1985). 712 P.2d 1072. CO. App.

Wiley, III, E. (1988). National forum explores relationships between faculty and administrators. *Black Issues in Higher Education 6*(16), 22.

Wilson, E. (1967). *A prelude: Landscapes, characters, and conversations from my earlier years.* New York: Farrar, Strauss, & Giroux.