Published in final edited form as:

Subst Abus. 2015 ; 36(3): 289–296. doi:10.1080/08897077.2014.937516.

Local Support for Alcohol Control Policies and Perceptions of Neighborhood Issues in Two College Communities

Anne M. Fairlie, Ph.D.¹, William DeJong, Ph.D.², and Mark D. Wood, Ph.D.¹

¹University of Rhode Island, Department of Psychology, Kingston, RI, USA

²Boston University School of Public Health, Boston, MA, USA

Abstract

Background—Although valuable, national opinion surveys on alcohol policy may be less informative for policy development at the local level. Using samples of adult residents in two college communities, the present study: 1) measured public support for local alcohol control policies to stem underage drinking and alcohol over-service in on-premise outlets; 2) assessed residents' opinions regarding neighborhood problems; and 3) identified factors associated with strong policy support.

Methods—We administered random-sample telephone surveys to residents ages 21 years and older in college communities located in Community 1 ($N = 501$; mean age = 57.4 years, $SD = 14.7$) and Community 2 ($N = 505$; mean age = 56.0 years, $SD = 15.2$). The response rates were typical of telephone surveys (Community 1: 33.5%; Community 2: 29.9%). We assessed support for 16 alcohol control policies and the occurrence of specific types of neighborhood incidents (e.g., witnessing intoxicated people). We used multiple regression analyses to determine factors associated with policy support.

Results—Residents in Community 1 reported significantly higher weekly alcohol use, a greater number of witnessed neighborhood incidents, and a higher level of perceived neighborhood problems than did residents in Community 2. Residents in Community 1 perceived local alcohol control policies and their enforcement to be significantly stricter. Overall, policy support was high and did not differ between the communities. In both communities, higher policy support was significantly associated with being female, being older, less weekly alcohol use, and lower perceived strictness of alcohol control policies and enforcement.

Conclusions—It is important for campus officials and community leaders to be aware of and publicize favorable public opinion when advocating for policy change, especially at the local level. Information on residents' perceptions of the neighborhood issues they face can also inform local policy and enforcement efforts.

Correspondence should be addressed to Mark D. Wood, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of Rhode Island, 10 Chafee Road, Suite 8, Kingston, RI, 02881. Mark_Wood@uri.edu.

Author Contributions: Dr. Fairlie conducted the data analysis, wrote portions of the manuscript, and edited the final draft. Dr. DeJong led the conceptualization of the manuscript, wrote portions of the manuscript, and edited. Dr. Wood led the study design and data collection and assisted in writing and editing. All authors have contributed to and approved the final manuscript.

The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIAAA, NIDA, or the National Institutes of Health. The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Keywords

Alcohol control; college students; public policy

Introduction

Surveys on public support for alcohol control policies are typically conducted at a national level.¹⁻⁴ Although valuable, these national surveys may be less informative for policy development at the local level. A closer look at residents' opinions about these policies and neighborhood issues could provide actionable information for local policy makers and college officials concerned about student drinking. The current study assessed the views of adult residents living in towns near two public universities where large numbers of students live in the community.

Recommendation reports for campus officials concerned about student drinking stressed the need for environmental changes that can reduce the availability of alcohol and its appeal to youth.⁵⁻⁶ Doing this successfully typically requires a focus on developing and enforcing stricter policies, both on and off campus.⁷

Past national surveys have shown widespread public support for most alcohol control policies. Wagenaar and colleagues⁴ conducted a survey of US adults (ages 18 years and older) in 1997, which found that 58% or more of the respondents supported 19 out of 23 policies related to alcohol sales, taxes, and alcohol advertising and marketing (see also Latimer and colleagues^{2,8}). Alcohol control policies that received particularly high support involved restrictions on alcohol use: on city streets (91.8%), on college campuses (89.1%), in public parks, beaches, and campgrounds (86.0%), and at concerts, cultural events, and sports stadiums and arenas (81.4%).

These researchers also found that most policies designed to reduce youth alcohol access also received strong support: requiring bar and restaurant owners and employees to be trained in responsible beverage service (88.5%); requiring alcohol servers in bars and restaurants to be 21 years old (79.8%); conducting compliance checks to monitor illegal sales to minors (65.5%); requiring every keg to have a registration number (61.2%); banning home delivery of alcohol (59.4%); and fining adults who provide alcohol to minors (83.2%). Two measures that would affect adults in addition to college students did not receive majority support: banning happy hours that offer drink specials (39.9%) and banning keg sales to individuals for homes or parties (31.3%).

A 2001 survey of US adults (ages 21 years and older) reported similar findings,³ with strong majority support for imposing penalties on alcohol establishments that provide alcohol to minors (84.%), restricting home delivery of alcohol (85.2%), conducting undercover operations to enforce the age 21 drinking law (72.6%), requiring keg registration (71.2%), prohibiting alcohol sales and use in public places (70.1%), and prohibiting alcohol sales and use at family-oriented community events (65.6%). The investigators found less support for policies that would restrict adults' access to alcohol, such as limiting the number of alcohol

establishments in a neighborhood (59.8%), prohibiting alcohol sales and use at all community events (54.8%), and limiting the hours or days of sale (51.2%).

Factors associated with public support for alcohol policies have included alcohol use and various demographic variables, such as sex, age, and race.^{1-2,4} These studies have generally shown that being a woman, being older, and reporting lower alcohol consumption are associated with greater support for alcohol policies (see also Greenfield and colleagues⁹). Other factors associated with greater policy support include lower socio-economic status and concern about risky behaviors among teens and underage drinking.¹⁻³ One investigation identified several factors that were *not* associated with attitudes on alcohol policy, including political orientation, marital status, parental status, and employment status.²

We conducted the present study to assess support for local alcohol control policies among adult residents of two college communities, with a focus on policy measures to prevent underage drinking and alcohol over-service in on-premise outlets. We also investigated residents' reports of neighborhood issues common to college communities. Finally, we examined associations between policy support and demographic variables, perceived strictness of policies and enforcement, and residents' neighborhood experiences. We hypothesized that most alcohol control policies would receive majority support in both communities, while policies that could potentially affect all adult drinkers, and not just underage and problem drinkers, would receive less support. We also hypothesized that being female, being older, lower alcohol use, and negative neighborhood experiences would be associated with greater policy support.

Methods

Participants

The participants were local residents in two college communities in the northeastern United States: Community 1, $N = 501$; Community 2, $N = 505$. The colleges near these communities are the largest public universities in their state and are comparable in terms of size, types of students, and location (i.e., a rural New England setting near a large city). Both colleges had ongoing issues with drinking among undergraduates both on and off campus.

An environmental management intervention began at the college in Community 1 in the fall of 2005, and program elements were added over the course of two years.¹⁰ None of the program elements were implemented at the college near Community 2. The environmental management intervention was largely based on a media campaign that targeted undergraduates on campus. The off-campus elements (e.g., responsible beverage service signage at local bars) were limited in scope such that the intervention is not expected to have been salient to the general community. Therefore, no differences between the residents in the two communities were expected in the current study on the basis of the environmental management intervention.”

Participants ranged in age from 21 to 95 years (Community 1: mean = 57.4, $SD = 14.7$; Community 2: mean = 56.0, $SD = 15.2$). At both sites, approximately half of the participants

were men. Few participants reported owning rental property in their town (Community 1: 9.8%; Community 2: 5.6%).

The majority of community residents said they were non-Hispanic Whites (Community 1: 95.6%; Community 2: 91.5%). Less than 2% living in Community 1 and less than 5% living in Community 2 said they were American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, African American or Haitian, Native Hawaiian, or Hispanic White. For both samples, only 1.2% identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino. The remainder identified their race as “other” or did not answer.

Procedure

We conducted random-sample telephone surveys in the spring and summer of 2006 with local residents living in both communities. We randomly selected participants from a sample frame of residents provided by an organization that conducts surveys for scientific investigations. Residents were eligible if they were age 21 or older. Graduate students, but not undergraduates, were eligible to participate. The interviewers made up to six telephone attempts per resident.

The interviewers telephoned participants to explain the study's purpose, obtain verbal consent, and conduct the 30-minute survey. We entered participants in a random drawing for two cash prizes worth \$200 each. For each sample, the interviewers called randomly selected residents until there were at least 500 surveys and gender quotas had been met (250 men, 250 women). By this method, we created a random sample of study participants that was evenly stratified by gender.

The response rates were typical of telephone surveys (Community 1: 33.5%; Community 2: 29.9%). We conservatively determined response rates by dividing the number of survey participants by the sum of the number of participants who completed the survey; were never contacted directly (e.g., answering machines were reached; Community 1: 50.3%, Community 2: 54.7%); deferred participation, but were not subsequently reached (Community 1: 4.2%, Community 2: 3.8%); and refused (Community 1: 12.0%, Community 2: 11.6%).

The Institutional Review Boards at the universities near both communities approved the study procedure.

Measures

From a larger assessment battery, we selected the following measures that we had developed for the current study, unless otherwise noted. For scales with multiple items, we calculated each participant's mean score.

Demographic and other information—Demographic variables included age, sex, race/ethnicity, and years spent living in their town. We coded sex as 1 (*male*) and 0 (*female*).

Policy support—The survey included 16 items to assess support for local alcohol control policies (items listed in Table 2). With reverse-scoring, the response options ranged from 1

(*strongly oppose*) to 5 (*strongly support*). Collectively, the items have good internal reliability (Cronbach's α ; Community 1: .88; Community 2: .87).

Weekly alcohol use—We defined a drink as one shot of liquor, 12 ounces of beer, or 4 ounces of wine.¹¹ Using open-ended items, we asked respondents to report the number of days in a typical week they consumed at least one alcoholic drink and the number of drinks they consumed on a typical drinking day. We multiplied the items together to calculate the typical number of drinks consumed per week,¹²⁻¹⁴ and then applied a log transformation to address the distribution's non-normality.

Occurrence of neighborhood incidents—We asked respondents to report how many times 11 neighborhood incidents occurred in the past year (items listed in Table 3). The response options ranged from 1 (*not at all*) to 4 (*four or more times*). This set of items also had good internal reliability (Cronbach's α = .80 for both communities).

Perceptions of neighborhood problems—Respondents reported the degree to which they perceived each of the following to be a neighborhood problem: public drunkenness, vandalism, drunk driving, and underage drinking. After reverse-scoring, the response options were 1 (*not a problem*) to 4 (*major problem*). The items had good internal reliability (Cronbach's α ; Community 1: .84; Community 2: .82).

Positive and negative student interactions: Two questions asked about the occurrence of positive and negative interactions with students in the neighborhood during the past year. We coded responses as 1 (*Yes, I have had positive/negative interactions*) or 0 (*No, I have not had positive/negative interactions*).

Perceived strictness of policies and enforcement: Two items asked about perceptions of alcohol control policies on campus and in the surrounding community, and two items assessed perceived enforcement of those policies.¹⁵⁻¹⁶ Responses ranged from 1 (*too lenient*) to 3 (*too strict*). The four items had good internal reliability (Cronbach's α ; Community 1: .82; Community 2: .81).

Results

Comparisons between the Two College Communities

Compared to residents living in Community 2, those living in Community 1 reported significantly higher levels of weekly alcohol use, neighborhood incidents, and perceived neighborhood problems (Table 1). A significantly greater percentage of residents in Community 1 reported student rental properties in their neighborhood (Community 1: 73.5%; Community 2: 48.3%). A significantly greater percentage of residents in Community 1 reported having negative neighborhood interactions with students during the past year (Community 1: 18.0%; Community 2: 10.5%), but there were no differences in reported positive interactions. Residents in Community 1 perceived local alcohol control policies and their enforcement to be significantly stricter than did residents in Community 2.

Policy Support and Neighborhood Problems

There was no significant difference between the two communities on overall policy support (Table 1). Table 2 presents community-specific information on support for each local alcohol control policy. Generally, support for the policies was high, with similar levels of support in the two communities. Policies with the least support would restrict how much alcohol could be served: requiring beer to be sold in individual glasses (Community 1: 42.3%; Community 2: 42.0%), and allowing employees to serve only one drink per request (Community 1: 50.9%; Community 2: 48.5%). Notably, only two-thirds of the respondents in both communities reported support for banning low-price bar and liquor store promotions targeted to college students, comparatively less support than for most of the other policies.

Overall reports of neighborhood incidents differed significantly between the two communities, with residents in Community 1 citing more incidents (Table 1). The percentages of respondents who reported each event occurring at least once in the past year are presented for the two communities separately (Table 3). The most marked differences were that a higher percentage of residents living in Community 1 had witnessed intoxicated people (Community 1: 48.5%; Community 2: 29.5%) and reported that police had been called because of a party (Community 1: 49.7%; Community 2: 18.4%). A higher percentage of residents living in Community 2 had witnessed an automobile accident (Community 1: 27.0%; Community 2: 42.8%).

Correlations and Multiple Regressions

The two variables related to neighborhood problems—occurrence of neighborhood incidents and perceptions of neighborhood problems—were substantially correlated (Community 1: $r = .74, p < .0001$; Community 2: $r = .69, p < .0001$). Therefore, we selected only perceptions of neighborhood problems for inclusion in the multiple regression analyses.

The following seven factors were included in the multiple regression analyses: sex, age, weekly alcohol use, positive student interactions, negative student interactions, perceptions of neighborhood problems, and perceived strictness of policies and enforcement.

Correlations among these variables were generally similar across the two college communities (Table 4). The most notable exceptions involved correlations between weekly alcohol use and age (Community 1: $r = -.12, p < .01$; Community 2: $r = .01, n.s.$); weekly alcohol use and perceptions of neighborhood problems (Community 1: $r = -.07, n.s.$; Community 2: $r = -.17, p < .001$); and perceptions of neighborhood problems and positive student interactions (Community 1: $r = .17, p < .001$; Community 2: $r = .08, n.s.$).

The multiple regression analyses showed that, for both communities, higher policy support was significantly associated with being female, being older, lower weekly alcohol use, and less perceived strictness of policies and enforcement (Table 5). Policy support was not significantly associated with having positive or negative interactions with students or perceptions of neighborhood problems. For both communities, less perceived strictness of policies and enforcement had the strongest association with policy support.

Discussion

The present study assessed the level of support for local alcohol control policies among adult residents of two college communities. In general, support was high for policy measures to prevent underage drinking and alcohol over-service in on-premise retail outlets (i.e., at least 80% endorsement for 10 of 16 policies), with no significant difference in overall policy support between the two communities. Multiple regression analyses revealed that, in both communities, higher policy support was significantly associated with being female, being older, and lower weekly alcohol use, consistent with past research.^{1-2,4}

Higher policy support was also associated with less perceived strictness of local alcohol control policies and enforcement. Higher policy support was not associated with having positive or negative interactions with students or with more perceived neighborhood problems. These results are somewhat at odds with previous research that found greater policy support among respondents expressing concern about underage drinking and other risky behaviors among teens.²⁻³ Our ability to detect an association between policy support and positive or negative interactions with students in the neighborhood in the past year may have been limited by the use of binary measures. A detailed measure of the quantity and quality of interactions that residents have with students in their neighborhood and the broader community might be more strongly associated with policy support.

Many of the policies that received exceptionally high support (approximately 87% or higher) focused on restricting alcohol access to minors and intoxicated persons, including many related to responsible beverage service (RBS): training bartenders to cut off intoxicated patrons; not allowing noticeably intoxicated persons to buy alcohol; requiring door personnel and bartenders to be at least 21 years of age; conducting regular undercover checks to make sure liquor stores and bars are checking IDs; and requiring waitstaff in bars and restaurants to attend a training course about RBS practices. Other strongly endorsed policies focused on measures to reduce alcohol-impaired driving: increasing enforcement of drinking and driving laws, and increasing the availability of alternative transportation including cabs and safe rides programs.

Residents were least supportive of policies for which the restrictions would affect all drinkers and not just minors or college students: (1) requiring beer to be sold in individual glasses (Community 1: 42.3%, Community 2: 42.0%); and (2) allowing employees to serve only one drink per request (Community 1: 50.9%, Community 2: 48.5%). A measure to ban low-price bar and liquor store promotions targeted to college students received moderate support (Community 1: 67.1%, Community 2: 66.9%), perhaps because some respondents may have been concerned that such a ban would affect all drinkers, not just students. Past research has also shown less support for policies that would more broadly restrict adults' access to alcohol.^{1,3-4} Similarly, one study showed that licensees of alcohol establishments also had less support than police or the public for alcohol policies that had implications for how they operated their liquor establishment (e.g., provide free bar food to slow the effects of alcohol, increase visible police checks on licensed premises).¹⁷ The lower support associated with policies that "hit home" by imposing restrictions on the individual or entity itself (e.g., adult resident, tavern owner) may have implications in the context of

community-driven intervention efforts if the stakeholders that assist in selecting the policies to be implemented are also protecting their self-interests.

The present study demonstrated that some neighborhood problems in college communities are specific to each community, bolstering the case for collecting local survey data on these issues. A higher percentage of residents in Community 1 had witnessed people who were intoxicated and knew of police being called to the neighborhood because of a party, whereas a higher percentage of residents living in Community 2 had witnessed an automobile accident. Interestingly, despite the greater number of neighborhood issues, residents in Community 1 perceived local alcohol control policies and their enforcement to be stricter than did residents in Community 2.

Strong support for alcohol control policies can also be found among college students, with clear majority support found for such measures as stricter penalties for alcohol-related violence, repeated violations of school policy, and using a fake ID to purchase alcohol.¹⁸ Campus officials can use student survey data to bolster the case for new policy initiatives on campus and in the surrounding community.^{10,19} College campuses and the surrounding community are interconnected (e.g., students living in residential areas, students providing business to local shops, residents attending college sporting or arts events). Future efforts could examine the relations among on-campus and off-campus alcohol policies, support for these policies, and perceived on- and off-campus issues from the perspectives of the college students, community residents, and college officials. The correspondence and relative balance among these various perspectives may provide valuable insights about structuring community-based intervention efforts.

Campus and community officials can publicize favorable public opinion data when advocating for policy change at the local level. Ideally, a campus-community coalition should attempt to field a random-sample survey to gauge public opinion. Absent sufficient financial or in-kind resources, campus and community officials could conduct focus group research to discover what the public thinks about different policy options and then publicize that information.

Study Limitations

First, the low response rate in the present study limits the generalizability of the findings. However, the low response rate is largely due to being unable to make contact with participants (approximately half of the participants screened) rather than explicit refusal. Second, the results of this study cannot be generalized to other college communities, and in particular to communities with individuals from diverse ethnic or racial backgrounds. Third, residents' views of local policy support and their perceptions of neighborhood issues may have changed since the time these data were collected. Although residents' perceptions may have evolved over time, our findings do provide a useful snapshot of local policy support and perceived neighborhood problems that can inform future research on community residents' attitudes and perceptions regarding alcohol policies. Lastly, the current findings are largely descriptive in nature. However, the current findings underscore the potential for neighborhood concerns and issues surrounding alcohol-related behaviors to differ across campus communities.

Conclusions

The present study calls attention to the need to evaluate policy support and neighborhood issues at the local level. Level of policy support for specific alcohol control policies was similar across the two college towns, but notable variation was found in the neighborhood problems that were reported. The administration of a local survey has the ability to provide information that may lead to targeted improvements in public safety and local residents' quality of life. Additional research is needed to examine the process by which public support for local alcohol control policies can be increased over time and then channeled to promote new laws and regulations.

Acknowledgments

We thank our many colleagues on the Common Ground project who helped conduct the survey reported in this article.

Funding: This study was supported by grant U01-AA-014749 from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) to the University of Rhode Island. While preparing this manuscript for submission, Dr. Fairlie was also supported by Award Numbers T32 DA017629 and P50 DA010075 from the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA).

References

1. Greenfield TK, Ye Y, Giesbrecht NA. Views of alcohol control policies in the 2000 national alcohol survey: What news for alcohol policy development in the US and its states? *J Subst Use*. 2007; 12:429–445.
2. Latimer WW, Harwood EM, Newcomb MD, Wagenaar AC. Sociodemographic and individual predictors of alcohol policy attitudes: Results from a US probability sample. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2001; 25:549–556. [PubMed: 11329495]
3. Richter L, Vaughan RD, Foster SE. Public attitudes about underage drinking policies: results from a national survey. *J Public Health Pol*. 2004; 25:58–77.
4. Wagenaar AC, Harwood EH, Toomey TL, Denk CE, Zander KM. Public opinion on alcohol policies in the United States: Results from a national survey. *J Public Health Pol*. 2000; 21:303–327.
5. National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. A Call to Action: Changing the Culture of Drinking at U S Colleges. Washington, DC: National Institutes of Health; 2002. Task Force of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.
6. Presidents Leadership Group. Be vocal, be visible, be visionary: Recommendations for college and university presidents on alcohol and other drug prevention. Newton, MA: Higher Education Center for Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention; 1997.
7. DeJong, W. Setting goals and choosing effective strategies. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Higher Education Center for Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Violence Prevention; 2010.
8. Latimer WW, Harwood EM, Newcomb MD, Wagenaar AC. Measuring public opinion on alcohol policy: A factor analytic study of a US probability sample. *Addict Behav*. 2003; 28:301–313. [PubMed: 12573680]
9. Greenfield TK, Johnson SP, Giesbrecht N. Public opinion on alcohol policy: A review of U.S. research. *Contemporary Drug Problems*. 2004; 31:759–790.
10. Wood MD, DeJong W, Fairlie AM, Lawson D, Lavigne AM, Cohen F. Common Ground: An investigation of environmental management alcohol prevention initiatives in a college community. *J Stud Alcohol Drugs*. 2009; 16(Supplement):96–105.
11. Wechsler H, Lee JE, Kuo M, Seibring M, Nelson TF, Lee H. Trends in college binge drinking during a period of increased prevention efforts: Findings from 4 Harvard School of Public Health College Alcohol Study surveys, 1993–2001. *J Am Coll Health*. 2002; 50:203–217. [PubMed: 11990979]

12. Leffingwell TR, Neumann C, Leedy MJ, Babitzke AC. Defensively biased responding to risk information among alcohol-using college students. *Addict Behav.* 2007; 32:158–165. [PubMed: 16626881]
13. Sher KJ, Walitzer KS, Wood PK, Brent EE. Characteristics of children of alcoholics: Putative risk factors, substance use and abuse, and psychopathology. *J Abnorm Psychol.* 1991; 100:427–448. [PubMed: 1757657]
14. Wood MD, Read J, Palfai T, Stevenson JF. Social influences and alcohol use and misuse among college students: The mediational role of alcohol outcome expectancies. *J Stud Alcohol.* 2001; 62:32–43. [PubMed: 11271962]
15. DeJong W, Schneider SK, Towvim LG, et al. A multisite randomized trial of social norms marketing campaigns to reduce college student drinking. *J Stud Alcohol.* 2006; 67:868–879. [PubMed: 17061004]
16. Fairlie AM, DeJong W, Stevenson JF, Lavigne AM, Wood MD. Fraternity and sorority leaders and members: A comparison of alcohol use, attitudes, and policy awareness. *Am J Drug Alcohol Ab.* 2010; 36:187–193.
17. Hawkins N, Sanson-Fisher R, Shakeshaft A, Webb G. Differences in licensee, police and public opinions regarding interventions to reduce alcohol-related harm associated with licensed premises. *Australian New Zealand J Public Health.* 2009; 33:160–166. [PubMed: 19413861]
18. DeJong W, Towvim LG, Schneider SK. Support for alcohol control policies and enforcement strategies among U.S. college students at 4-year institutions. *J Am Coll Health.* 2008; 56:231–236. [PubMed: 18089503]
19. Lavigne AM, Witt CF, Wood MD, Laforge R, DeJong W. Predictors of college student support for alcohol control policies and stricter enforcement strategies. *Am J Drug Alcohol Ab.* 2008; 34:749–759.

Table 1
Comparisons Between the Two College Communities

Item or Scale	Mean (SD) or Percentage		t-test or chi-square	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	Community 1	Community 2		
Age	57.4 (14.7)	56.0 (15.2)	$t(1004) = -1.43$	0.09
Percent men	48.5%	48.1%	$\chi^2(1, N = 1006) = 0.01$	--
Percent who reported that their neighborhood included student rental properties	73.5%	48.3%	$\chi^2(1, N = 984) = 66.03^{***}$	--
Number of years lived in town	18.2 (14.2)	21.2 (17.2)	$t(1003) = 2.94^{**}$	0.19
Weekly alcohol use (log transformation)	1.1 (1.0)	0.9 (0.9)	$t(993) = -3.46^{***}$	0.22
Occurrences of witnessing neighborhood incidents	1.7 (0.5)	1.6 (0.5)	$t(1004) = -4.64^{***}$	0.29
Perceived neighborhood problems	1.9 (0.8)	1.6 (0.7)	$t(1003) = -4.87^{***}$	0.31
Percent who reported positive interactions with students in the neighborhood	33.1%	33.4%	$\chi^2(1, N = 1002) = 0.01$	--
Percent who reported negative interactions with students in the neighborhood	18.0%	10.5%	$\chi^2(1, N = 1005) = 11.42^{***}$	--
Perceived strictness of policies/enforcement	1.8 (0.5)	1.7 (0.4)	$t(968) = -2.62^{**}$	0.17
Policy support	4.3 (0.6)	4.2 (0.6)	$t(1004) = -1.18$	0.07

Note. Means, standard deviations, t-tests, and Cohen's *d* are reported for continuous scales, and percentages and chi-square tests are reported for categorical scales.

*
 $p < .05$.

**
 $p < .01$.

 $p < .001$.

Table 2
Means, SDs, and Percentages Endorsing “Support” or “Strongly Support” for each of the Alcohol Policies by Campus Community

Alcohol Policy Item	Community 1		Community 2	
	Mean (SD)	Percentage	Mean (SD)	Percentage
Noticeably intoxicated persons should not be allowed to buy alcohol at a liquor store or bar.	4.8 (0.6)	98.0%	4.7 (0.7)	94.7%
Bartenders should be trained to cut off intoxicated patrons.	4.7 (0.6)	97.8%	4.6 (0.6)	95.1%
Requiring door personnel and bartenders to be at least 21 years of age.	4.6 (0.7)	92.6%	4.6 (0.7)	93.9%
Police officers should conduct regular undercover checks to make sure liquor stores and bars are checking IDs.	4.5 (0.9)	91.6%	4.5 (0.8)	89.5%
Employees who serve alcoholic beverages in bars and restaurants should be required to attend a training course that teaches how to deal with underage and excessive drinking.	4.6 (0.8)	91.6%	4.4 (0.9)	86.9%
Increasing police enforcement of ordinances, such as parking, noise, and vandalism.	4.5 (0.8)	89.6%	4.4 (0.8)	87.7%
Increasing the availability of alternative transportation in your community including cabs and safe ride programs.	4.5 (0.8)	89.4%	4.4 (0.8)	88.9%
Increasing enforcement of drinking and driving laws	4.5 (0.8)	89.2%	4.5 (0.7)	91.9%
Applying stricter penalties for the use of false ID's	4.5 (0.8)	87.0%	4.5 (0.8)	85.9%
Party hosts should be held responsible for problems arising from alcohol use.	4.3 (1.0)	83.4%	4.2 (1.1)	80.8%
All persons under the age of 30 should be checked for age identification.	4.1 (1.1)	75.5%	4.1 (1.1)	76.8%
Restricting advertising that promotes excessive alcohol consumption at the bars	4.1 (1.1)	74.9%	4.2 (1.0)	76.2%
Tavern owners should be held responsible for the actions of noticeably intoxicated persons.	4.0 (1.2)	71.5%	3.9 (1.2)	69.5%
Banning low-price bar and liquor store promotions targeted to college students	3.9 (1.2)	67.1%	3.9 (1.2)	66.9%
Restaurants and tavern employees should serve only one drink per request.	3.5 (1.3)	50.9%	3.5 (1.2)	48.5%
Beer should be required to be sold in individual glasses rather than pitchers or large containers.	3.3 (1.3)	42.3%	3.2 (1.3)	42.0%

Note. Response options ranged from 1 (*strongly oppose*) to 5 (*strongly support*). Items are sorted in descending order according to the percentages of endorsement among residents in Community 1.

Table 3
Percentage of Community Residents Reporting Neighborhood Problems Occurring at
Least Once in the Past Year

Neighborhood Problem	Community 1 (<i>n</i> = 501)	Community 2 (<i>n</i> = 505)
Witnessed littering, such as beer cans, cigarette packages, etc.	80.8%	80.6%
Witnessed property that was damaged or vandalized including own	50.3%	43.2%
Witnessed people who were intoxicated	48.5%	29.5%
Witnessed fighting or physical assault	16.8%	5.0%
Witnessed vomiting or urinating on public or private property	22.0%	9.1%
Witnessed an automobile accident, not including any respondent was involved in	27.0%	42.8%
Was pushed, hit, or assaulted	1.0%	0.6%
Heard noise disturbances	67.5%	57.2%
Police were called to the neighborhood because of a party	49.7%	18.4%
Contacted the mayor or town council because of problems in the community related to alcohol use	6.4%	5.7%
Contacted college or university officials because of problems in the community related to alcohol use	2.0%	5.5%

Table 4
Correlations Among The Variables Used In The Multiple Regression Analyses By College Community

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Sex (1=male, 0=female)	-	-.06	.17***	-.04	.11*	.03	.07	-.24***
2. Age	-.05	-	.01	-.14**	-.12**	-.14**	-.17***	.29***
3. Weekly alcohol use (logged)	.15***	-.12**	-	.04	-.01	-.17***	.24***	-.31***
4. Positive student interactions	.09*	-.06	-.02	-	.21***	.08	.06	-.04
5. Negative student interactions	.05	-.11*	-.04	.28***	-	.38***	-.12**	.06
6. Perceptions of neighborhood problems	.01	-.09*	-.07	.17***	.48***	-	-.26***	.16***
7. Perceived strictness of policies/enforcement	.05	-.19***	.16***	.05	-.18***	-.33***	-	-.41***
8. Policy support	-.20***	.25***	-.25***	-.01	.11*	.18***	-.43***	-

Note. Pearson correlation coefficients *below* the diagonal are for residents living in Community 1 (*n*'s range from 475 to 501) and those *above* the diagonal are for residents living in Community 2 (*n*'s range from 484 to 505).

* $p < .05$.

** $p < .01$.

*** $p < .001$.

Table 5
Multiple Regression Analyses Examining Factors Associated with Support for Local Alcohol Policies for two College Communities

Variable	df	b	SE	95% CI for b	t-value	β
Community 1 $n = 473$, $F(7, 465) = 24.52$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .26$						
Intercept	1	4.61	0.17	[4.28, 4.93]	27.77***	--
Sex (1 = male, 0 = female)	1	-0.18	0.04	[-0.26, -0.09]	-4.08***	-0.16
Age	1	0.01	0.00	[0, 0.01]	4.47***	0.19
Weekly alcohol use (logged)	1	-0.07	0.02	[-0.11, -0.02]	-2.92**	-0.12
Positive student interactions	1	0.01	0.05	[-0.08, 0.11]	0.26	0.01
Negative student interactions	1	0.06	0.06	[-0.07, 0.19]	0.96	0.04
Perceptions of neighborhood problems	1	0.05	0.03	[-0.01, 0.12]	1.61	0.08
Perceived strictness of policies/enforcement	1	-0.37	0.05	[-0.47, -0.28]	-7.52***	-0.33
Community 2 $n = 481$, $F(7, 473) = 32.00$, $p < .001$, adjusted $R^2 = .31$						
Intercept	1	4.45	0.15	[4.15, 4.76]	28.72***	--
Sex (1 = male, 0 = female)	1	-0.18	0.04	[-0.26, -0.09]	-4.22***	-0.16
Age	1	0.01	0.00	[0.01, 0.01]	6.28***	0.25
Weekly alcohol use (logged)	1	-0.13	0.02	[-0.18, -0.08]	-5.57***	-0.22
Positive student interactions	1	-0.01	0.04	[-0.1, 0.08]	-0.21	-0.01
Negative student interactions	1	0.13	0.07	[-0.02, 0.27]	1.71	0.07
Perceptions of neighborhood problems	1	0.05	0.03	[-0.02, 0.12]	1.45	0.06
Perceived strictness of policies/enforcement	1	-0.35	0.05	[-0.45, -0.25]	-7.02***	-0.29

Note.

*
p < .05.

**
p < .01.

p < .001.