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**Choices about Alcohol Demographics and Information**

- **Number of students referred:** 624 students (29.8% decrease from 2014-15)
- **Number of participants completing program:** 634 (including prior year referrals)
- **Number of groups held:** 93 (7 students per group average)
- **Number of participants completing pre- and post-assessments:** 625

**Sex:** 30.0% female, 70.0% male

**Race/ethnicity:**
- 87.52% White
- 2.24% Latin@
- 5.60% Asian
- 0.16% American Indian
- 0.96% Black
- 1.76% Multiracial

**Average age:** 18.88 years old

**Year in school:**
- 66.3% first year
- 22.1% sophomores
- 10.0% juniors
- 1.6% senior

---

### Drinker Profile and Readiness to Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choices</th>
<th># of students</th>
<th>Typical Drinking Week</th>
<th>Heaviest Drinking Week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drinks per sitting</td>
<td>Drinks per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low risk drinkers</td>
<td>153 (24.3%)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate risk drinkers</td>
<td>132 (20.9%)</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk drinkers</td>
<td>269 (42.7%)</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem drinkers</td>
<td>76 (12.1%)</td>
<td>9.68</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High risk drinkers, including problem drinkers</td>
<td>345 (54.8%)</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Definitions:**
- **Low risk drinkers:** 4 or fewer per sitting in 30 days prior to first BASICS session
- **Moderate risk drinkers:** Typically low risk drinkers who averaged between 4 and 8 during their heaviest drinking week in 30 days prior to first session
- **High risk drinkers:** Typically 5 or more, but fewer than 8; or 4 or fewer typically and 8+ per sitting in heaviest week
- **Problem drinkers:** Typically consuming 8 or more per sitting in 30 days prior to first session

---

277 students began the program precontemplative and were unchanged. Each of the subscales for this group had changes of small magnitudes, though Action was in the negative direction. Their pre-assessment attitudes were more polar than all other students (representing more firmly entrenched attitudes resistant to change or contemplation). The precontemplators who changed were less polar and had larger increases on each scale. It is evident that the participant most likely to be resistant to change can be identified by the magnitude of their resistance at pre-assessment.
61.1% of participants begin the program with little consideration for changing their drinking (precontemplation). Investigating officers can reduce this rate through MI and brief intervention during the misconduct process.

Only 46.5% of participants complete the program contemplative or in action. The outcomes are very polar with only 9.3% of participants contemplative about changing at post-assessment.

Across all drinking styles, 70% to 80% of students who were contemplating changes or taking action at the time of preassessment were still doing so at the postassessment. Contrasted with the outcomes for precontemplators at the end of the program (above), it is evident that students who are ready to consider changes, at a minimum, are likely to have a better outcome from Choices about Alcohol.

43% of high risk drinkers remained precontemplative. 51% of problem drinkers remained precontemplative. In contrast, students who began the program contemplative or in action, tended to remain in one of those stages of change. 75% of high risk drinkers and 100% of problem drinkers who were contemplative stayed contemplative or moved to action. 84% of high risk drinkers and 76% of problem drinkers who began the program in action remained in action or contemplative about changes.
11 Items Measured
N=616 for total
Average pre-assessment knowledge of 6.11 correct items.
Knowledge gains of 3.34 items correct, statistically significant at p < .001 for a post-assessment knowledge average of 9.39.
90.9% of students improved their total score. 21 students scored lower on post assessment than on pre assessment. 35 stayed the same including three who got 11 correct on both the pre and post assessments.

Post assessment knowledge scores concentrate at 11 correct answers. 53.4% score above the average. This is in contrast to the pre-assessment distribution, which more closely resembles a slightly shifted normal curve.
Choices about Alcohol Change in Attitudes

### Readiness to Change

- **My drinking is okay as it is.**
  - Pre: 1.32
  - Post: 2.5
  - Change: 1.18

- *I am trying to drink less than I used to.*
  - Pre: 1.56
  - Post: 2.09
  - Change: 0.53

- **I enjoy drinking but sometimes I drink too much.**
  - Pre: 1.63
  - Post: 2.5
  - Change: 0.87

- **It is a waste of time thinking about my drinking.**
  - Pre: 1.48
  - Post: 2.5
  - Change: 1.02

- *I am at the stage where I should think about drinking less.*
  - Pre: 2.59
  - Post: 3.11
  - Change: 0.52

- **My life would be the same even if I drank less.**
  - Pre: 3
  - Post: 3.03
  - Change: 0.03

Scores range from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

### Attitudes Regarding Risky Drinking

- **Know to help a passed out friend, and would do it.**
  - Pre: 3.6
  - Post: 3.42
  - Change: -0.18

- *Important to have a plan before going out.*
  - Pre: 3.09
  - Post: 3.03
  - Change: -0.06

- *I dislike when I drink to get drunk.*
  - Pre: 2.29
  - Post: 2.34
  - Change: 0.05

- **Drinking a lot of alcohol quickly is risky.**
  - Pre: 3.32
  - Post: 3.45
  - Change: 0.13

- *It’s important to know how much alcohol I’m consuming.*
  - Pre: 3.26
  - Post: 3.31
  - Change: 0.05

Scores range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (strongly agree).

- N=609 or greater
- All of significant changes in direction anticipated.

While the individual items above did not see much movement, they do indicate a greater contemplation of change and the problems associated with the participants’ alcohol use. The subscales for precontemplation and contemplation also saw statistically significant changes that indicate greater ambivalence and uncertainty about the participants’ current drinking practices.
Student evaluations reflect a general agreement that the Choices program would help them reduce risk, but there is greater ambivalence about using the information to change their behavior. What is unclear is which behaviors they may change, whether to avoid detection or lower other negative personal consequences. It remains consistent that while the program is viewed favorably overall, fewer students would recommend it definitively, and are disinclined to take a firm position on how it might lead to changes.