Published in final edited form as:

Addict Behav. 2017 September ; 72: 45–50. doi:10.1016/j.addbeh.2017.03.017.

Descriptive Drinking Norms in Native American and Non-Hispanic White College Students

Kylee J. Hagler, M.S.,

University of New Mexico

Matthew R. Pearson, Ph.D.,

University of New Mexico

Kamilla L. Venner, Ph.D., and

University of New Mexico

Brenna L. Greenfield, Ph.D.

University of Minnesota, Duluth

Abstract

Objective—College students tend to overestimate how much their peers drink, which is associated with higher personal alcohol use. However, research has not yet examined if this phenomenon holds true among Native American (NA) college students. This study examined associations between descriptive norms and alcohol use/consequences in a sample of NA and non-Hispanic White (NHW) college students.

Method—NA ($n = 147$, 78.6% female) and NHW ($n = 246$, 67.8% female) undergraduates completed an online survey.

Results—NAs NHWs showed similar descriptive norms such that the “typical college student,” “typical NA student,” and “typical NHW student” were perceived to drink more than “best friends.” “Best friends” descriptive norms (i.e., estimations of how many drinks per week were consumed by participants’ best friends) were the most robust predictors of alcohol use/consequences. Effect size estimates of the associations between drinking norms and participants’ alcohol use were consistently positive and ranged from $r = .25$ to $r = .51$ across the four reference groups. Negative binomial hurdle models revealed that all descriptive norms tended to predict drinking, and “best friends” drinking norms predicted alcohol consequences. Apart from one interaction effect, likely due to familywise error rate, these associations were not qualified by interactions with racial/ethnic group.

Conclusions—We found similar patterns between NAs and NHWs both in the pattern of descriptive norms across reference groups and in the strength of associations between descriptive norms and alcohol use/consequences. Although these results suggest that descriptive norms operate similarly among NAs as other college students, additional research is needed to identify whether other norms (e.g., injunctive norms) operate similarly across NA and NHW students.

Keywords

descriptive norms; alcohol use; college students; alcohol consequences; Native American; Non-Hispanic White

1. Introduction

1.1. Native American and non-Hispanic White College Attendance

Native Americans (NAs) represent approximately 150,000 of the 20 million currently enrolled college students in the United States, as compared to 11 million non-Hispanic Whites (NHWs). NAs evidence disparity in four-year graduation rates; for a 2008 cohort, the graduation rate for NAs was only 23%, compared to 43.7% for NHWs (NCES, 2014). This finding highlights the importance of research on factors affecting NA college retention, yet empirical study is lacking. Due to low representation in research, NAs are frequently either excluded from analyses or aggregated into a heterogeneous “other” racial/ethnic category (e.g., Johnston et al., 2015).

1.2. College Student Alcohol Use and Perceived Drinking Norms

Drinking is one factor that may impact college retention rates. Although little is known about NA college student alcohol use, drinking consequences have been extensively researched among college students more generally. Acute alcohol intoxication in college samples has been associated with dangerous behaviors such as impaired driving, risky sexual behavior, increased aggression, and blackouts (e.g., Chou et al., 2006; Lewis, Rees, Logan, Kaysen, & Kilmer, 2010; Perkins, 2002).

Social norm theorists assert that social reference groups exert a significant influence on the formation of an individual's beliefs and behavior patterns (e. g. Festinger, 1954). Applied to college drinking, social norms theory posits that students' beliefs about how much their peers are drinking (i.e., drinking norms) influence students' own alcohol consumption such that students who believe that their peers who drink heavily will drink more in order to “fit in” with the status quo. Descriptive drinking norms refer to college students' estimations of how much members of their peer group drink, and are the most commonly studied type of drinking norm in college samples.

College students have been shown to systematically overestimate the amount that members of their peer groups drink (e.g., Borsari & Carey, 2003; Perkins et al., 1999). Furthermore, students who perceive that their peers drink heavily (i.e. high descriptive drinking norms) have been shown to drink more (Clapp & McDonnell, 2000; Neighbors, Lee, Lewis, Fossos, & Larimer, 2007). One limitation of the extant literature is that drinking norms research has focused mainly on NHWs. To date, no study has examined drinking norms among NA college students.

1.3. NA College Student Alcohol Use and NA Drinking Norms

NA youth report first consuming alcohol at a younger age than all other racial/ethnic groups in the United States and experience a higher incidence of drinking-related consequences when they drink (Chen et al., 2004). However, preliminary evidence suggests that college-attending NAs evidence similar drinking patterns to their NHW counterparts. Using data from a national survey of college students, Ward and Ridolfo (2011) found that approximately 65% of NA students consumed alcohol in the past 30 days, and 41% met

Welscher et al.'s (1995) criteria for binge drinking (i.e., 4/5 or more drinks on one occasion for women/men). Although NA students exhibit similar high rates of alcohol consumption and binge drinking as the general college population, it is not clear whether these drinking behaviors are predicted by the same factors among NAs.

Although no published research has directly examined drinking norms among adult NAs, one qualitative study examining beliefs about drinking in a reservation-based NA sample found that most participants disapproved of alcohol use. Furthermore, participants believed that NAs were incapable of moderate, social levels of drinking (Yuan et al., 2010). A recent analysis of national data found that NAs were more likely than NHWs to report past-month abstinence from alcohol use (59.9% vs. 43.1%, respectively; Cunningham, Solomon, & Muramoto, 2016). High rates of abstinence among NAs and proscriptions against alcohol use in reservation communities contrast the conception for heavy drinking as a "rite of passage" for U.S. college students (Crawford & Novak, 2006). Examination of how drinking norms function in urban NA college students, who may have grown up in communities with social disapproval for heavy drinking, will serve to elucidate the relationship between drinking norms and NA college alcohol use.

1.5. College Student Drinking Norms and Reference Group Proximity

Extensive research in general college student samples has identified several moderators of the magnitude of the drinking norms-alcohol use relationship. One such moderator is proximity of the normative reference group (i.e., the closeness of the reference group to an individual student). The most distal reference group is "the university typical student", with race, gender, age, and ethnicity unspecified. More proximal reference groups include members of a team or fraternity, with the most proximal reference groups consisting of a student's best friends. Cox and Bates (2011) found that while students' normative beliefs about their best friends drinking were significantly positively associated with their own drinking, students' normative beliefs about the average student's drinking were not associated; this finding has been consistently corroborated in other studies (e.g. Cho, 2006). Given that most drinking norms research has been conducted with NHWs, it is not clear how proximity of the normative reference group may function for NAs.

1.6. Purpose of the Present Study

The present study sought to address three gaps in the research literature concerning drinking norms and alcohol in NA and NHW college students. First, we compared NA and NHW college students in terms of their quantity of alcohol use and alcohol-related problems. Second, we compared NA and NHW college students in terms of their perceived drinking norms (i.e., descriptive norms) for four reference groups: the "typical college student," "the typical NA college student," "the typical NHW college student," and "best friends." Finally, we compared the predictive validity of descriptive norms in predicting alcohol-related outcomes between NA and NHW college students.

2. Method

2.1. Procedure

During recruitment, 12,439 NHWs and 2,096 NAs were enrolled as undergraduates at the large Southwestern University where the research was conducted. Five hundred NHWs and 1311 NAs were invited to participate in the study via email addresses obtained from the university's registrar. In addition, students enrolled in psychology classes had the option to participate through the psychology department's research website. The study was advertised in the student newspaper and in a local, free weekly newspaper. A total of 588 individuals consented to begin the online survey and 472 individuals completed it. Seventy participants identifying as other than NA or NHW, eight older than 30, and one who did not answer most survey items were removed prior to analysis. The age range of 18-30 was selected to assess more specifically the experiences of "traditional" college students, as it was hypothesized that older students might be more likely to have environmental factors impacting their drinking, such as caring for children. The resulting sample size was 393 (147 NAs and 246 NHWs). A self-report question included in the survey provided data on how participants accessed the survey. Only 24.5% of NAs ($n = 36$) accessed the survey through the psychology research website compared to 72% of NHWs ($n = 177$). Approximately 73% of NAs ($n = 107$) reported hearing about the survey via email invitation, as compared to 21% of NHWs ($n = 52$).

2.2. Participants

Comparisons between NAs and NHWs on demographic characteristics are presented in Table 1. The groups did not significantly differ with respect to age and residence location. Approximately 67% of NAs reported having ever lived on a NA reservation. The groups significantly differed with respect to gender, year in school, and first language learned. A higher percentage of NAs identified as female (77.6% vs. 67.5% for NHW). A higher percentage of NHWs were freshmen (39%), whereas NAs were evenly distributed between the four college years. Finally, a higher percentage of NHWs indicated that English was the first language they had learned (97.6% vs. 80.3% for NAs).

2.3. Measures

2.3.1. Alcohol use—Alcohol use in the past seven days was assessed via a modified (i.e., number of hours spent drinking per day was not queried) version of the Daily Drinking Questionnaire (DDQ; Collins et al., 1985). Using a one-week grid, individuals reported the standard number of drinks consumed on each day of a typical drinking week. These responses were summed to obtain a total number of drinks consumed during a typical drinking week (i.e., drinks per week, DPW).

2.3.2. Descriptive norms—Descriptive drinking norms were assessed with a modified (i.e., more reference groups were assessed in addition to the typical student) version of the Drinking Norms Rating Form (DNRF; Baer et al., 1991). Drinking norms were assessed for four reference groups: typical same-sex student, typical same-sex NA student, typical same-sex NHW student, and best friends. For each reference group, participants estimated how many drinks a typical member of that group consumed on each night of the week.

Estimations for each night of the week were summed to obtain a single, separate DPW estimate for each of the four reference groups. The DNRF is widely used to generate descriptive drinking norms for a variety of peer reference groups (e.g., Grossbard et al., 2016).

2.3.3. Alcohol-related consequences—Alcohol-related consequences were assessed using the 23-item Rutgers Alcohol Problem Index (RAPI; White & Labouvie, 1989). Scores were dichotomized and summed to create a total score reflective of the number of alcohol-related consequences experienced in the past year, which has been validated in college student samples (e.g., Martens et al., 2007).

2.3.4. Hazardous drinking—The 10-item Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) was used to assess alcohol use behavior (Saunders et al., 1993). The first three questions address quantity and frequency of alcohol use. The remaining seven questions ask participants to provide information regarding the frequency with which they experience a range of alcohol-related consequences. The AUDIT has been validated for use in college student populations across many studies (e. g. Allen et al., 1997; Kokotailo et al., 2004; Saunders et al., 1993).

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive Statistics

For the total sample, participants consumed an average of 3.40 ($SD = 4.88$) drinks per week (DPW); the mean AUDIT score was 4.78 ($SD = 4.76$) and the mean RAPI score was 4.01 ($SD = 6.44$). A majority of participants scored below an “8” on the AUDIT (77.4%; $n = 304$). We conducted a series of independent-samples *t*-tests to examine mean level differences between NAs and NHWs on alcohol-related outcomes and descriptive drinking norms across the four reference groups (see Table 1.) NAs reported significantly lower DPW than NHWs, but did not significantly differ on AUDIT or RAPI scores. We conducted chi-square tests of independence to determine if NAs and NHWs differed on the likelihood of scoring a zero on these variables. NAs and NHWs reported similar levels of past month abstinence based on DPW (50.3% vs. 43.5%; $\chi^2 = 1.74, p = .19$), similar levels of scoring 0 on the AUDIT (25.2% vs. 20.3%; $\chi^2 = 1.25, p = .26$), and similar levels of experiencing no alcohol consequences (44.9% vs. 38.2%; $\chi^2 = 1.70, p = .19$). Compared to NHWs, NAs reported lower descriptive drinking norms for both the typical college student and the typical NHW student, but did not differ in reports of the typical NA student or best friends drinking norms.

We conducted a 2 (ethnic group: NA, NHW) X 4 (reference group: typical student, typical NA student, typical NHW student, best friends) split-plot ANOVA to examine whether ethnic groups differed in the pattern of differences among drinking norms across reference groups. A main effect of ethnic group emerged as NAs reported lower drinking norms overall than NHWs, $F(3, 389) = 18.402, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .124$. A main effect of reference group emerged as participants reported that best friends drink at lower rates than all other reference groups, $F(3, 1173) = 33.768, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .079$. However, there was not a significant interaction, $F(3, 1173) = 1.483, p = .217, \eta_p^2 = .004$. Thus, both NAs and NHWs

demonstrated a similar pattern of reporting higher descriptive drinking norms for the typical student, typical NHW student, and typical NA student compared to their best friends (see Table 1).

3.2. Bivariate Correlations

As shown in Table 2, all descriptive norms were moderately to strongly correlated with each other ($.40 < r_s < .85$) and all alcohol variables were strongly positively correlated with each other ($.59 < r_s < .77$). All descriptive norms had small-to-moderate positive associations with alcohol-related outcomes, with the strongest associations being between best friends descriptive norms and alcohol-related outcomes ($.34 < r_s < .51$).

3.3. Count Regression Models

To compare the predictive validity of descriptive norms in predicting alcohol outcomes in NAs and NHWs, we examined the main and interaction effects of ethnicity and drinking norms for each reference group on each of three alcohol variables (DPW, AUDIT, RAPI). To maximize statistical power and avoid issues of multi-collinearity, we examined the predictive associations between each descriptive norms variable, ethnicity, and the ethnicity X description norms interaction in four separate models for each of the three alcohol outcomes (i.e., 12 total models). Given the preponderance of zeroes (46.1% for DPW, 22.1% for AUDIT, and 40.7% for RAPI) and the count distribution of each of our outcomes, we used negative binomial hurdle models for these analyses. This approach is recommended for alcohol variables that are known to be positively skewed, bounded by zero, contain only positive integers, and have a preponderance of zeroes (Atkins, Baldwin, Zheng, Gallop, & Neighbors, 2013). The negative binomial hurdle model applies logistic regression in the prediction of being a zero (e.g., being a non-drinker or non-problematic drinker), and zero-truncated negative binomial regression in the prediction of the count outcome among individuals with non-zero scores (e.g., drinkers or problem drinkers). Thus, each of the models is able to determine whether there is an effect of descriptive norms, ethnicity, and the interaction between descriptive norms and ethnicity on drinking status, as well as the effect on amount of alcohol use among those participants who drink.

Results are presented in Table 3. Across the four models predicting DPW, higher descriptive norms for all reference groups were associated both with higher likelihood of being a drinker and with higher reported DPW among drinkers. In the logistic portion of four models predicting AUDIT scores, higher best friends descriptive norms was associated with higher likelihood of having a non-zero AUDIT score. Across the count portion of the four models predicting AUDIT scores, descriptive norms for all reference groups were associated with higher AUDIT scores among drinkers. Across the four models predicting RAPI scores, only higher best friends descriptive norms were associated with higher likelihood of having a non-zero RAPI score and predicted higher RAPI score among drinkers.

In the logistic portion of the model predicting DPW from best friends descriptive norms, there was a significant interaction between best friends descriptive norms and ethnicity. Specifically, the association between estimates of best friends' drinking and higher likelihood of being a drinker was stronger for NHW students ($b = -.146$) than for NA

students ($b = -.064$). None of the interaction terms between descriptive norms and ethnicity were significant in predicting AUDIT or RAPI scores.

4. Discussion

4.1. Summary of Findings

The well-documented negative effects of heavy alcohol use among college students illustrate the importance of understanding predictors of drinking/consequences in this population. In the present study, we first examined descriptive drinking norms and alcohol variables in a sample of NA and NHW undergraduates and tested for significant differences in these variables between racial/ethnic groups. Second, we used negative binomial hurdle models to examine the association between drinking norms and drinks per week (DPW), hazardous drinking (AUDIT), and experience of alcohol-related consequences (RAPI). Finally, we tested for interactions by ethnicity in the relationships between drinking norms and alcohol-related outcomes. In general, NAs estimated fewer drinks per week across the four normative reference groups as compared to NHWs, with significantly fewer drinks per week estimated for the typical student and the typical NHW student. Given the established relationship between drinking norms and students' own alcohol use, one possible explanation for this finding may be that NAs also reported consuming significantly fewer drinks per week than NHWs.

Our results further supported the well-established finding that college students overestimate how much their peers drink (e.g. Baer et al., 1991; Perkins et al., 1999). Compared to their own reported drinking, NHWs overestimated how much the typical NHW student drinks per week by 9.06 drinks and NAs overestimated how much the typical NA student drinks per week by 8.59 drinks. Consistent with the extant literature (e.g., Lewis & Neighbors, 2006), participants from both groups estimated the number of drinks consumed per week to be lowest for their best friends. Overall, our results support previous research demonstrating small-to-moderate positive associations between descriptive norms and alcohol outcomes. Although all types of descriptive norms were associated with alcohol use and hazardous drinking, only descriptive norms of best friends were significantly associated with alcohol-related consequences, suggesting that descriptive drinking norms are more robustly associated with alcohol use than alcohol-related consequences. Although we found one significant interaction between descriptive norms and ethnicity out of 24 tests, this finding should be interpreted with caution given that one out of 20 tests is expected to be significant based on Type I error alone (i.e., $p < .05$). Thus, our results suggest that descriptive norms are similarly associated with alcohol use/consequences in NA and NHW college students.

The percentage of NAs reporting past month alcohol consumption in the present study was somewhat lower than found in one previous study (49.7% in our sample vs. 65% in Ward and Ridolfo (2011)). One reason for this may be heterogeneity in drinking practices between tribes from different geographical regions (e.g., Spicer et al., 1991). Despite less alcohol consumption overall, the mean total AUDIT score for all students in this sample who reported consuming at least one DPW ($M = 7.25$) was comparable to previous research that reported a mean AUDIT score of 7.61 in a previous sample (Zamboanga et al., 2010). Approximately 39.2% of drinkers in our sample reported at least one instance of past-month

binge drinking, comparable to 40% in Johnston et al.'s (2009) sample. This evidence suggests that NA and NHW college students who choose to drink engage in similarly hazardous drinking practices compared both to each other and to other college student samples. This finding is especially important in the consideration of stereotypical beliefs regarding NA drinking, as it provides empirical evidence that NA students are not drinking with greater frequency or intensity as compared to NHW students. Both NA and NHW college students in our sample reported higher rates of abstinence than had been previously reported in such samples.

4.2. Limitations

One limitation to the present study was that data were collected at a single time-point, precluding conclusions as to the temporal order of the relationship between variables. It is likely that the relationship between drinking norms and students' own drinking is complex, with the student's own drinking potentially influencing the development of normative beliefs. NA and NHW males were also underrepresented in the present sample; 21.4% of NA participants were male, compared to 37.5% of NA undergraduate students. Approximately 30% of NHWs were male, compared to 45.6% of NHW undergraduate students. One possible reason for this is the relative overrepresentation of female students in psychology courses, a main source of recruitment. Tribal heterogeneity also precludes generalization of results to NA college students in other geographic regions.

Finally, the collection of drinking data may represent a sensitive topic for some individuals, particularly for NAs, given stigma pertaining to NA drinking (e.g., Gonzales & Skewes, 2016). For this reason, our sample may have been biased to including only those individuals who were willing to answer questions about alcohol use, or those who had a lower rate of alcohol consumption. However, students in our sample reported a similar amount per week, on average, as students from the same university completing a campus-wide survey about substance use (3.4 drinks per week vs. 3.1 drinks per week; UNM Student Lifestyles Survey, 2013), suggesting that our sample was representative of the larger student body.

4.3. Implications and Future Directions

Although the present study found only small-to-moderate effect sizes for the associations between descriptive drinking norms, normative feedback interventions are currently one of the most commonly used approaches for treating alcohol problems among college students (Carey, Scott-Sheldon, Carey, & DeMartini, 2007). Due to the relative low cost and ease of implementation, normative feedback interventions are likely to remain widely used. As has been proposed in previous research (e.g., LaBrie et al., 2010), results from the present study support tailoring normative feedback interventions. Given that estimated DPW of the participants' best friends was the most robust predictor of drinking outcomes, future research should test the efficacy of incorporating specific descriptions of the drinking behavior of proximal reference groups into normative feedback interventions.

Offering ethnicity-specific normative feedback may be of particular benefit to NA college students. Though findings are mixed (Hawkins et al., 2004 for review), some studies have shown that cultural identification is protective against substance use problems among NA

youth (e.g. Thurman & Green, 1997). This finding suggests that providing ethnicity-specific normative feedback could have the benefit of fostering a sense of ethnic pride and help to correct erroneous stereotypical beliefs regarding NA drinking.

Descriptive drinking norms are useful in the prediction of college student drinking and alcohol consequences. A significant strength of the present study was that it was the first examination of normative beliefs about drinking among NA college students. Given that we found similar low rates of alcohol use between NHWs and NAs in the present study, further research with similar samples could contribute to a strengths-based approach to the prevention of heavy drinking among college students.

References

- Allen JP, Litten RZ, Fertig JB, Babor T. A review of research on the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT). *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 1997; 21(4):613–619.
- Baer JS, Stacy A, Larimer M. Biases in the perception of drinking norms among college students. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 1991; 52(6):580–586. [PubMed: 1758185]
- Carey KB, Scott-Sheldon LAJ, Carey MP, DeMartini KS. Individual-level interventions to reduce college student drinking: A meta-analytic review. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2007; 32:2469–2494. [PubMed: 17590277]
- Chen CM, Dufour MC, Yi H. Alcohol consumption among young adults ages 18-24 in the United States: Results from the 2001-2002 NESARC survey. *Alcohol Research & Health*. 2004; 28(4):269–280.
- Chou SP, Dawson DA, Stinson FS, Huang B, Pickering RP, Zhou Y, Grant BF. The prevalence of drinking in the United States, 2001-2002: Results from the national epidemiological survey on alcohol and related conditions. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2006; 83(2):137–146. [PubMed: 16364565]
- Clapp JD, McDonnell AL. The relationship of perceptions of alcohol promotion and peer drinking norms to alcohol problems reported by college students. *Journal of College Student Development*. 2000; 41(1):19–26.
- Crawford LA, Novak KB. Alcohol abuse as a rite of passage: The effect of beliefs about alcohol and the college experience on undergraduates' drinking behaviors. *Journal of Drug Education*. 2006; 36(3):193–212. [PubMed: 17345914]
- Cunningham JK, Solomon TA, Muramoto ML. Alcohol use among Native Americans compared to whites: Examining the veracity of the 'Native American elevate alcohol consumption' belief. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*. 2016 In press.
- DeBerard MS, Spielmans GI, Julka DL. Predictors of academic achievement and retention among college freshmen: A longitudinal study. *College Student Journal*. 2004; 38(1):66.
- Festinger L. A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*. 1954; 7:117–140.
- Freeman C, Fox MA. Status and trends in the education of American Indians and Alaska Natives. Washington, DC: US Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics; 2005.
- Gonzalez VM, Skewes MC. Association of the Firewater Myth with drinking behavior among American Indian and Alaska Native college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2016. Advance online publication.
- Grossbard JR, Mastroleo NR, Geisner IM, Atkins D, Ray AE, Kilmer JR, Turrissi R. Drinking norms, readiness to change, and gender as moderators of a combined alcohol intervention for first-year college students. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2016; 52:75–82. [PubMed: 26363307]
- Hawkins EH, Cummins LH, Marlatt GA. Preventing substance abuse in American Indian and Alaska Native youth: Promising strategies for healthier communities. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2004; 130(2):304–323. [PubMed: 14979774]

- Johnston LD, O'Malley PM, Bachman JG, Schulenberg JE, Miech RA. Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use 1975-2014: Volume 2, College students and adults ages 19-55. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan; 2015.
- Johnston LD, O' Malley PM, Bachman JG, Schulenberg JE. Monitoring the Future national survey results on drug use, 1975-2008: Volume II, College students and adults ages 19-50. Bethesda, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse; 2009. NIH Publication No. 09-7403
- Kokotailo PK, Egan J, Gangnon R, Brown D, Mundt M, Fleming M. Validity of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test in college students. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2004; 28(6):914–920.
- LaBrie JW, Hummer JF, Neighbors C, Larimer ME. Whose opinion matters? The relationship between injunctive norms and alcohol consequences in college students. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2010; 35(4): 343–349. [PubMed: 20045262]
- Lewis MA, Rees M, Logan DE, Kaysen DL, Kilmer JR. Use of drinking protective behavioral strategies in association to sex-related alcohol negative consequences: The mediating role of alcohol consumption. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*. 2010; 24(2):229–238. [PubMed: 20565149]
- May Philip A. The Epidemiology of Alcohol Abuse among American Indians: The Mythical and Real Properties. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*. 1994; 18(2):121–143.
- Neighbors C, Larimer ME, Lewis MA. Targeting misperceptions of descriptive drinking norms: efficacy of a computer-delivered personalized normative feedback intervention. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*. 2004; 72(3):434. [PubMed: 15279527]
- Neighbors C, Lee CM, Lewis MA, Fossos N, Larimer ME. Are social norms the best predictor of outcomes among heavy-drinking college students? *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2007; 68:556–565. [PubMed: 17568961]
- Neighbors C, Lewis MA, Atkins DC, Jensen MM, Walter T, Fossos N, Larimer ME. Efficacy of web-based personalized normative feedback: a two-year randomized controlled trial. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*. 2010; 78(6):898. [PubMed: 20873892]
- Perkins HW. Surveying the damage: A review of research on consequences of alcohol misuse in college populations. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, S. 2002; 14:91–100.
- Perkins HW, Meilman PW, Leichliter JS, Cashin JR, Presley CA. Misperceptions of the norms for the frequency of alcohol and other drug use on college campuses. *Journal of American College Health*. 1999; 47(6):253–258. [PubMed: 10368559]
- Pritchard ME, Wilson GS. Using emotional and social factors to predict student success. *Journal of College Student Development*. 2003; 44(1):18–28.
- Saunders JB, Aasland OG, Babor TF, De La Puente JR, Grant M. Development of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): WHO collaborative project on early detection of persons with harmful alcohol consumption. II. *Addiction*. 1993; 88:791–804. [PubMed: 8329970]
- Spicer P, Beals J, Croy CD, Mitchell CM, Novins DK, Moore L, AI-SUPERPF Team. The prevalence of DSM-III-R alcohol dependence in two American Indian populations. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*. 2003; 27(11):1785–1797.
- Thurman PJ, Green VA. American Indian inhalant use. *American Indian and Alaska Native Mental Health Research*. 1997; 8:24–40. [PubMed: 9458543]
- University of New Mexico Student Lifestyles Survey. 2013. Accessed on 28 Dec. 2016 from <http://cosap.unm.edu/campus-resources/Student%20Lifestyle%20Survey.html>
- Ward BW, Ridolfo H. Alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drug use among Native American college students: An exploratory quantitative analysis. *Substance Use & Misuse*. 2011; 46(11):1410–1419. [PubMed: 21810075]
- White HR, Labouvie EW. Towards the assessment of adolescent problem drinking. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*. 1989; 50:30–37. [PubMed: 2927120]
- Yuan NP, Eaves ER, Koss MP, Polacca M, Bletzer K, Goldman D. “Alcohol is something that been with us like a common cold”: Community perceptions of American Indian drinking. *Substance Use & Misuse*. 2010; 45(12):1909–1929. [PubMed: 20380555]

Zamboanga BL, Schwartz SJ, Ham LS, Borsari B, Van Tyne K. Alcohol expectancies, pregaming, drinking games, and hazardous alcohol use in a multiethnic sample of college students. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*. 2010; 34(2):124–133.

Table 1
Participant Alcohol-Related Outcomes and Descriptive Drinking Norms by Ethnicity

	Racial/Ethnic Group			
	NA (<i>n</i> = 147)	NHW (<i>n</i> = 246)	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Participant Alcohol-Related Outcomes, <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)				
Drinks per Week	2.61 (3.97)	3.87 (5.30)	2.67	.008**
AUDIT	4.55 (4.92)	5.09 (5.08)	1.02	.309
RAPI	3.48 (4.89)	3.38 (4.61)	-.21	.831
Descriptive Drinking Norms by Reference Group, <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)				
Typical Student	10.19 (8.23)	12.37 (8.68)	2.42	.016*
Typical NA Student	11.20 (10.88)	13.23 (10.46)	1.83	.068
Typical NHW Student	10.73 (9.37)	12.93 (9.45)	2.24	.026*
Best Friends	7.87 (10.17)	8.46 (9.39)	.59	.558

*
p < .05,

**
p < .01

Table 2
Negative binomial hurdle models predicting three alcohol-related outcomes from desc

DPW									
	Logistic					Count			
	B	p	OR	B	p	RR	p	RR	
Typical Student DN	-0.038	0.018	0.963	0.039	0.000	1.040			
Ethnicity	0.363	0.309	1.438	-0.261	0.287	0.770			
Interaction	-0.017	0.540	0.983	0.002	0.912	1.002			
NA DN	-0.031	0.020	0.969	0.022	0.002	1.022			
Ethnicity	0.080	0.802	1.083	-0.219	0.324	0.803			
Interaction	0.013	0.540	1.013	-0.002	0.881	0.998			
NHW DN	-0.028	0.057	0.972	0.032	0.000	1.033			
Ethnicity	0.389	0.259	1.476	-0.417	0.082	0.659			
Interaction	-0.016	0.504	0.984	0.011	0.468	1.011			
Best Friends DN	-0.140	0.000	0.869	0.044	0.000	1.045			
Ethnicity	-0.311	0.297	0.733	0.035	0.885	1.036			
Interaction	0.086	0.006	1.090	-0.005	0.723	0.995			
AUDIT									
	B	p	OR	B	p	RR			
Typical Student DN	-0.030	0.153	0.970	0.022	0.003	1.022			
Ethnicity	0.622	0.142	1.863	0.059	0.745	1.061			
Interaction	-0.051	0.180	0.950	-0.007	0.591	0.993			
NA DN	-0.034	0.061	0.967	0.013	0.018	1.013			
Ethnicity	-0.133	0.727	0.875	0.041	0.805	1.042			
Interaction	0.032	0.220	1.033	-0.005	0.646	0.995			
NHW DN	-0.031	0.114	0.969	0.013	0.043	1.013			
Ethnicity	0.488	0.236	1.629	-0.092	0.610	0.912			
Interaction	-0.034	0.321	0.967	0.004	0.701	1.004			
Best Friends DN	-0.155	0.000	0.856	0.037	0.000	1.038			

DPW									
Logistic					Count				
	B	p	OR	B	p	B	p	RR	
Ethnicity	-0.050	0.878	0.951	0.121	0.375	1.129			
Interaction	0.055	0.272	1.057	-0.012	0.191	0.988			

RAPI									
	B	p	OR	B	p	RR			
Typical Student DN	-0.202	0.210	0.817	0.017	0.140	1.017			
Ethnicity	0.478	0.183	1.613	0.283	0.324	1.327			
Interaction	-0.030	0.281	0.970	-0.009	0.649	0.991			
NA DN	-0.016	0.233	0.984	0.013	0.153	1.013			
Ethnicity	0.303	0.353	1.354	0.330	0.194	1.391			
Interaction	-0.010	0.653	0.990	-0.012	0.412	0.988			
NHW DN	-0.287	0.163	0.751	0.010	0.163	1.010			
Ethnicity	1.008	0.285	2.740	0.325	0.285	1.384			
Interaction	-0.046	0.855	0.955	-0.046	0.855	0.955			
Best Friends DN	-0.075	0.000	0.928	0.032	0.001	1.033			
Ethnicity	0.201	0.489	1.223	0.286	0.211	1.331			
Interaction	-0.002	0.950	0.998	-0.011	0.495	0.989			

Note. Significant effects ($p < .05$) are in boldtype face for emphasis.

Table 3

Negative binomial hurdle models predicting three alcohol-related outcomes from descriptive drinking norms.

DPW						
	Logistic			Count		
	B	p	OR	B	p	RR
Typical Student DN	-0.038	0.018	0.963	0.039	0.000	1.040
Ethnicity	0.363	0.309	1.438	-0.261	0.287	0.770
Interaction	-0.017	0.540	0.983	0.002	0.912	1.002
NA DN	-0.031	0.020	0.969	0.022	0.002	1.022
Ethnicity	0.080	0.802	1.083	-0.219	0.324	0.803
Interaction	0.013	0.540	1.013	-0.002	0.881	0.998
NHW DN	-0.028	0.057	0.972	0.032	0.000	1.033
Ethnicity	0.389	0.259	1.476	-0.417	0.082	0.659
Interaction	-0.016	0.504	0.984	0.011	0.468	1.011
Best Friends DN	-0.140	0.000	0.869	0.044	0.000	1.045
Ethnicity	-0.311	0.297	0.733	0.035	0.885	1.036
Interaction	0.086	0.006	1.090	-0.005	0.723	0.995
AUDIT						
	B	p	OR	B	p	RR
Typical Student DN	-0.030	0.153	0.970	0.022	0.003	1.022
Ethnicity	0.622	0.142	1.863	0.059	0.745	1.061
Interaction	-0.051	0.180	0.950	-0.007	0.591	0.993
NA DN	-0.034	0.061	0.967	0.013	0.018	1.013
Ethnicity	-0.133	0.727	0.875	0.041	0.805	1.042
Interaction	0.032	0.220	1.033	-0.005	0.646	0.995
NHW DN	-0.031	0.114	0.969	0.013	0.043	1.013
Ethnicity	0.488	0.236	1.629	-0.092	0.610	0.912
Interaction	-0.034	0.321	0.967	0.004	0.701	1.004
Best Friends DN	-0.155	0.000	0.856	0.037	0.000	1.038

DPW									
Logistic					Count				
	B	p	OR	B	p	B	p	RR	
Ethnicity	-0.050	0.878	0.951	0.121	0.375	1.129			
Interaction	0.055	0.272	1.057	-0.012	0.191	0.988			

RAPI									
	B	p	OR	B	p	B	p	RR	
Typical Student DN	-0.202	0.210	0.817	0.017	0.140	1.017			
Ethnicity	0.478	0.183	1.613	0.283	0.324	1.327			
Interaction	-0.030	0.281	0.970	-0.009	0.649	0.991			
NA DN	-0.016	0.233	0.984	0.013	0.153	1.013			
Ethnicity	0.303	0.353	1.354	0.330	0.194	1.391			
Interaction	-0.010	0.653	0.990	-0.012	0.412	0.988			
NHW DN	-0.287	0.163	0.751	0.010	0.163	1.010			
Ethnicity	1.008	0.285	2.740	0.325	0.285	1.384			
Interaction	-0.046	0.855	0.955	-0.046	0.855	0.955			
Best Friends DN	-0.075	0.000	0.928	0.032	0.001	1.033			
Ethnicity	0.201	0.489	1.223	0.286	0.211	1.331			
Interaction	-0.002	0.950	0.998	-0.011	0.495	0.989			