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Abstract

American colleges are experiencing an unprecedented surge in heroin related overdoses and deaths on campuses. This paper discusses representations of heroin and its college users in the wake of heroin related overdose and death on US college campuses by analyzing twenty-one search results for college newspaper articles reporting on heroin use on their respective campuses between 2010 and 2014. Content analysis of these reports shows that papers often victimize student users by reporting good academic and social standing told through third person accounts. These accounts contradict with secondary research, which finds heroin users to be less socially and professionally successful. This might be because these articles refer to a different demographic, college students, who do not match the media’s traditional financial and racial profile of heroin users. The results of the study suggest that heroin use may not necessarily conflict with academic success in all contexts. In constructing representations of victimhood, college articles run the risk of perpetuating drug use, as the college population is not assigned a responsibility to not use heroin. At a time when heroin has been reinvented as a pill and is reportedly used by some as a cheaper substitute for drugs like Oxycontin, it is increasingly important for college newspapers to produce accurate and productive representations of heroin and its users that foster a safe drug culture on college campuses.

I. Introduction

HEROIN use on college campuses is becoming a wider concern in the American public discourse, with some news sources going so far as to label the recent resurgence of heroin use on campuses in the northeast an epidemic” (Rubin 2013). The National Institute on Drug Abuse reports heroin to be a highly addictive opioid drug, which deteriorates the brain’s white matter with long-term and frequent use, affecting the user’s decision-making abilities. The short-term effect of heroin use, whether injected, inhaled or smoked, resembles a surge of euphoria, or “rush” (National Institute on Drug Abuse). This surge of euphoria is similar to short-term effects of prescription drug abuse, thus establishing a strong causal link between the two. Young people surveyed in studies by the National Institute on Drug Abuse reported abusing prescription drugs like Oxycontin, an opioid based pain medication, before using heroin. Many users reasoned that this transition was explained by the fact that heroin is becoming more accessible and financially viable (National Institute on Drug Abuse, 2014). In response to the widespread abuse of prescription drugs, health authorities have imposed stricter regulations on medical institutions to restrict the availability of opioid medication, thus making heroin the more accessible alternative (Leinwand Leger 2013). Financially, heroin is more viable than Oxycontin: PBS estimates the lowest street price of heroin in the northeast to be $6 USD per bag (Vesey 2014), a bag being approximately 0.1 grams of powder; whereas Oxycontin, based on Walgreens’ New York price in early February 2015, costs approximately $17 USD per 0.08 grams with a prescription (GoodRx 2015). The street price of Oxycontin is about 10 times as high as Walgreens’ price according to USA Today (Leinwand Leger 2013).

This phenomenon is especially noticeable on college campuses. Approached with the question of how heroin use and its users are represented in the wake of heroin related overdose and death on US college campuses between the years of 2010 and 2014, this paper argues that college newspapers in the sample of American universities in the Northeast represent student heroin users as victims. The victimization of heroin users is cultivated through the college newspapers’ representation of users in terms of high social engagement and academic success, even though such characteristics conflict with secondary scholarship on heroin users. In the wake of heroin-related incidents of death and overdose, the representation of heroin users as victims in college newspapers does little to deter the readership from heroin use as it ascribes neither responsibility nor agency to the individuals engaging in heroin use, instead portraying heroin as the principal agent responsible for a student’s addiction and/or
death.

Of the twenty-one college newspaper articles published by predominantly Northeastern colleges, fourteen report specific students with heroin addictions, heroin overdoses or overdoses that resulted in death. Five articles address heroin use on their campuses without specifying students, and two articles report heroin possession cases of two students. University heroin use is an important subject to study because of the implications that representations of a drug and its users as either agents or victims can have on understanding drug use on US college campuses in general.

II. Literature Review

The ‘college campus’, described as an environment with “greater experimentation with other drugs than is typical in the larger society” has seen an increase in heroin-related incidents during a time when the shifting demographic of heroin users is increasingly resembling the demographics of many US colleges (Perkins 2010, 253). Alcohol and prescription drug abuse are reported to be the most pressing instances of substance abuse on US college campuses. According to Wechsler et al., the average rate of college binge drinking amongst U.S. college students in 2001 (44.4%) has persisted at similar levels as reported in previous surveys since 1993 (Wechsler 2002, 203). Many campuses, however, have seen a tremendous influx in prescription drug abuse over a period of 13 years. From 1989 to 2002, the national percentage of college-age students (18-25 year olds) reportedly abusing prescription drugs rose from 7% to 22% according to the National Survey on Drug Use and Health (Quintero 2010, 904).

This upward trend in prescription drug abuse is paralleled by a constant increase in illicit drug use among adolescents and college-students since the mid-1990s (Mohler-Kuo 2010, 17).

Heroin use, in particular, is gaining popularity in the US, according to a TIME news report in early 2014 (Gray 2014). This popularity is unprecedented in the demographic primarily affected by the recent resurgence of heroin. Socio-economic status has been rendered practically irrelevant as an indicator for understanding patterns of heroin use, largely due to its increased availability and continual decrease in price in the United States since the introduction of Colombian-produced heroin on the East Coast in the 1990s (Rosenblum 2014, 94). Rather than being defined by socio-economic status, heroin use has been ascribed to changing racial demographics of its users as evidenced by recent scholarship evaluating data from 1993 to 2009: Unick, during his 16-year-long research, found a declined rate of heroin use among African Americans, “presumably following devastating effects of the 1960-70’s heroin epidemic on African American communities” (Unick 2013, 1). The study also found a doubling of heroin related overdoses by whites in the period up to 2009 (Unick 2013, 5). Women are identified as “the population most at risk by the recent [heroin] overdose epidemic” occurring across the US (Unick 2013, 1). Despite studies such as Unick’s suggesting changes in the traditional demographic of heroin users, the general image of heroin users remains shaped by past demographics.

This image stands in contrast to the characteristics of the college population implicated in the resurgence of heroin, hence swelling a wide moral hysteria largely reproduced and instigated through the media. Taylor argues that news media represents hard drug users as dangerous, criminal and thus a threat to the mainstream society. Racial minority groups and stereotypes dominate the media’s representation of “folk-devil” drug users (Taylor 2008, 373). Young people using drugs, like college students, can be ascribed an innocence, for example as “the innocent users [who are] preyed upon by the evil dealer” (Taylor 2008, 373). The innocent portrayal, Taylor further argues, is linked to users who are outsiders of the stereotypical social group to which the media generally ascribes drug use, the oddity of which stirs the moral hysteria in the media (Taylor 2008, 373).

Studying the differences in race and class in the media’s portrayal of crack cocaine and methamphetamine, Cobbina emphasizes the role of the media in the production of this moral hysteria, arguing that authors take active roles in “justifying] the actions of these [untypical heroin] users deserving of sympathy” (Cobbina 2008, 156). One way such justifications are made is through highlighting the similarities between the subjects and the readership, as identified by Sacco and referred to in Pollak’s study of the media’s portrayal of crime victims and offenders (Pollak 2007,63; Sacco 1995: 49).

The newly emerging socio-demographics of heroin users generally, as well as those on college campuses, provide a historical and contextual lens to this paper, which concerns the representation of heroin and its users through a content analysis of college newspapers.

III. Methodology

College newspaper articles were acquired through Access World News Database, which is provided by Newsbank Inc. and features a thorough archive of 450 college newspapers. Filtering for the use of the word “heroin” in articles from predominantly Northeastern colleges over the past four years yielded about 250 results. The final sample of twenty-one articles was selected because
the articles write about heroin in particular relation with the college campuses and their student populations. Content analysis, which is often used to study mass media, is a technique that combines multiple research practices to systematically get at the “content of communication” and is the principal form of research conducted in this study (Macnamara 2011, 1). More specifically, this paper employs a summative content analysis, defined by Hsieh and Shannon as the “counting and comparisons, usually of keywords or content, followed by the interpretation of the underlying context” (Hsieh and Shannon 2005: 1277).

Going through each individual article, the study identified (a) what knowledge about the student is available, (b) through whom this knowledge is made available and (c) in what tone the information about the student is relayed to the reader. Several patterns in the journalistic practices of the authors emerge when examining the individual articles and the information they disclose regarding the heroin users: academic standing and sociability of the heroin user, the use of the persons’ real names versus pseudonyms and a general tragic tone are embedded in almost all articles.

IV. Results

Each year, there is a clear increase in the number of articles regarding heroin use on campuses published online, and parallel to this increase in articles, college newspapers are increasingly implicated in the shaping of the representations of heroin use and users. The number of articles available for each year increased from two in 2010 to ten in 2014. The largest difference is recognized from 2013 to 2014 (four articles to ten). This observation feeds into the scholarship by the National Survey on Drug Use and Health, which found an increase in the use of heroin in recent years, particularly in the age range of 18-25 years (US Department of Health and Human services, 2013). The increase in college student heroin use within the past four years is reflected in the increase in college newspaper articles regarding heroin use and users from 2010 to 2014.

The articles are predominantly news pieces; few merge the reportage of a heroin-related incident with commentary. By nature of being news pieces, only a small fraction of the articles extend over a 500-word limit. All articles accounting for heroin overdoses, deaths and addictions of specific students report the area of study of the student and employ either collegial or professorial accounts to point out the students’ academic success. Majors include microbiology, English, law, public relations, electrical engineering, international finance, Chinese and philosophy. In “A friend and an addict” by The Temple News of Temple University published on February 24th 2014, “David” the English major “managed to ace his classes” according to the account of a friend (Ordonez 2014). A professor in The Torch of Valparaiso University describes Abdullah, an electrical engineering freshman, as a good student “he did very well in school” (Hardesty 2012). The Campus Times reports on Juliette Richard at the University of Rochester, who according to the Dean of Students and a professor “was doing well in her courses” (McAdams 2014).

Secondary sources studying heroin addicts in white-collar jobs found that heroin users’ habits do not infringe upon the users’ job performances (Caplovitz 1976, 131). This is further supported by in-depth ethnographic scholarship studying middle-class white women. The finding, based on a sample of fifteen workingwomen, suggests that heroin was used as a performance-enhancing drug in the workplace (McCoy and McGuire 2005, 833). While the subjects of this study are not white-collar workers, their occupations as students bear similarly demanding responsibilities. By relating such findings to the academic performances of heroin using students reported on by college newspapers, it might be inferred that the use of heroin does not negatively affect a student’s academic performance, unless the heroin use leads to arrest, overdose or death. The findings of the study, in tandem with the good records of the students featured in the college universities, point to the fact that heroin use is not necessarily contradictory to academic success. This might prove to be insightful not only in understanding the demographics of heroin users in universities, but also the kinds of students susceptible to heroin use. However, more important and more relevant to this paper is the fact that college newspapers outwardly express the image of heroin as a drug that does not only appeal to non-academically successful students, but also to students who are succeeding academically.

A majority of the college newspaper articles studied focus on describing positive social personalities of heroin-using students, regardless of whether the student is alive or dead. The students are described as engaged in the community and as highly sociable by friends and professors, who may possess a favorable bias toward them. Greer, in looking at murder cases in the media, finds that documenting the reactions of loved ones and sharing their emotions, pains and suffering with the media audience has become an integral part, even an expectation, in the media’s reportage and construction of victims (Greer 2007, 30). The Torch of Valparaiso University quotes a professor describing Abdullah to have been “really involved with a lot of guys.
He was more outgoing than the majority” (Hardesty 2012). Similarly the Campus Times of The University of Rochester reports through the account of a friend that “Juliette was a full and fun caring person, [...] a great, great friend and a really loyal friend that was always there for [me/friend] and always there for everybody” (McAdams 2014). Such sociability is further aided by the representation of the drug users as having highly sympathetic personalities and being socially engaged. Mentioning aspirations, hobbies and service engagements, the constructed empathic characterizations of the articles overshadow the fact that heroin was deployed and instead produce an image of the student as a victim to heroin. This is not to argue that the subjects are not actually empathetic and successful, but that such articles focus on positive traits exclusively. Pollak, studying representations of youth-related crime, argues that media strategically chooses to focus on the “victim’s positive attributes” in their representation of young people, which intensify the youth’s status as a victim with the readership (Pollak 2007, 74). The narrative transmitted through the college newspaper articles suggests the relationship between heroin user and heroin to be antagonistic, and thus constructs a binary of good and bad that fundamentally victimizes the drug using students. In regards to Richard the Campus Times reported “Richard’s friends said she spoke of going to Africa to volunteer” (McAdams 2014). The Flyer News described Corning to be “a terrific young man, bright and engaging. He tried with all his might to make his dreams come true” (Flyer News 2013). And a friend of David’s reported to The Temple News that David was “always willing to recite poetry upon request” (Ordonez 2014).

Contrary to college newspaper articles, secondary research documents that heroin addicts are less socially active. In a study evaluating empirical evidence in 1979, Robert J. Craig concluded, that traits of heroin users include “tending to act out aggressively, poor socialization, being somewhat egocentric and having difficulty in forming warm and lasting relationships” (Craig 1979, 619). It is important to acknowledge that the population of this secondary research differs from the sample of college students in this research. More recent scholarship supports Craig’s claim by arguing that heroin addicts “show a higher level of anxiety and depressive features [...] compared to healthy controls” (Blum 2013, 602). These findings conflict with the reported active social lives of the heroin users represented in the college newspapers. The contradictory images of active and depressive social lives between the media representations and secondary research are complicated by the lack of acknowledgement in the articles as to whether the student represented is a first time or a regular heroin user.

The resurgence of drug-induced deaths, especially in college settings, makes the representations of heroin use and users all the more pressing. In searching student newspapers for articles on heroin use and users, the results overwhelmingly focus on reporting heroin addictions, overdoses and their frequent result in death; little mention is made of heroin use that does not result in death. Greer, in studying global trends in the media representations of crimes, finds that “news media portrayals of young people as victims tend to be reserved for particularly grievous incidents resulting in serious injuries or death – when they can be presented as innocent, naïve or vulnerable” (Greer 2007, 34). This pattern in reporting highlights a narrative of tragedy that underlies the representations of student heroin users. The Campus Times of the University of Rochester on April 3, 2014 reported on Juliette Richard, who “was found dead” as a result of “drug abuse, specifically a heroin overdose” (McAdams 2014). Similarly, the Huntington News of Northeastern University reports on February 17, 2011 on Jonathan G. Blaser, who “was found unresponsive and pronounced dead” in a bathroom on campus in consequence of “an overdose of heroin” (Sampson 2011). In using passive language to report on a subject’s death, the articles assign the student a passive role in their death, as though they were not the subjects of their actions. A further example is the reported overdose of a student at Hamilton College by The Cac on November 14, 2012: “[A student] was taken to the hospital due to a heroin overdose” (InTheCac 2012). The Cardinal points reports on the “destructive” addiction of Plattsburgh State University student Kevin Quigley, who is quoted saying “I woke up in jail [...] dope sick [heroin withdrawal]” (Blow 2013). The articles are constructed around the image of the “dead, fallen heroin user,” an elegiac image that becomes repetitive and deflective of the individual’s active partaking in their drug use.

The images portrayed by the college articles are complicated by the fact that it is unclear whether students overdose as a result of one-time use, either purposefully or by accident, or as a result of an addiction to heroin. All articles, excluding those that focus on an addiction without an overdose, fail to identify whether the overdose is a product of heroin addiction or one-time drug use. In upholding the ambiguity of the circumstances of overdose and by not labeling those addicted to heroin as addicts, the articles make the students less responsible for their actions. This complicates the representations produced, as observations documented regarding the sociability and academic success of a person are likely
to remain unaffected by one-time heroin use. The complications posed by one-time heroin use to the sociable and academically succeeding representation of heroin using students, is, however, not affecting the college newspapers’ insistence on the innocence of heroin using students: they are victims. The college newspapers’ representations of heroin-using students, whether resulting in death or not, are all represented as tragic, an example of which is The Torch’s article “VU Student found dead” which reports “tragedy [to have] struck Valparaiso University” (Hardesty 2012). This tragic fiction is integral to the production of sympathy in the readership toward the student heroin users and the construction of the user as a victim.

The use of real names in representing student heroin users who have experienced fatal consequences of heroin use assists in the production of sympathy in the readership while the use of pseudonyms in cases of overdoses and addiction that have not resulted in death additionally perpetuate the invisibility of heroin use on college campuses. Eleven of the students represented in the college newspapers are referred to with their real names and the majority of these eleven students died due to heroin. Juliette Richard of the University of Rochester, Matthew Corning of the University of Dayton, Alexander Angeloff of the University of Connecticut and Jonathan G. Blaser of Northeastern University, all died as a result of a heroin overdose. The remaining articles that employ real names in reporting on students using heroin in colleges can be related to the involvement of enforcement authorities, as for example in the cases of Davon Lawrence of Stony Brook University, who was caught in possession by the police or Kevin Quigley of Plattsburgh State University College who was arrested for buying heroin.

Articles that do not report real names of the heroin users either abstain from mentioning names and instead refer to the subjects by their genders or create pseudonyms and indicate the alternation of names to be a means to concealing the person’s identity. This is unlike the way in which other illegal activity is reported on, where the perpetrator’s identifying information is made publicly available. The Temple News reports on “David, whose real name is being concealed to protect his identity” and Duke University’s The Chronicle reports on a friend that it refers to as “we’ll call her Sam,” neither of which have experienced fatal consequences of their heroin use (Ordonez 2014, Sawicki 2014). Even though these students are engaged in illegal activity, they are not perceived of as criminals. This contrasts reporting in cases of illegal activity where criminals have their names reported to the public. What drives the reportage of college newspapers and our society to distinguish amongst illegal activities and depict some subjects as victims as opposed to criminals? Granting the heroin user privacy and protection through the anonymity of a pseudonym suggests their powerlessness as a victim. The pseudonym thus directly ascribes the heroin user with the label of a victim. Yet, this journalistic strategy is complicated by the simultaneous vulnerability of the general readership to heroin use, which Galea et al. found to be particularly likely through social networks (Galea et al. 2004, 40).

The one circumstance in which real names are consistently reported for heroin users is in the context of sports. In direct contrast to the representations of heroin users as victims, collegiate articles that address heroin use within the context of sports, represent athlete users as primarily responsible for their heroin use and its consequences. Both presented with their real names, Abe Cahan’s rugby coach is quoted in The Towerlight saying in response to Abe’s death of heroin intoxication: “these guys think they’re indestructible. [...] I think Abe’s a cautionary tale [...] and something I warn my boys about to try to use as a lesson” (Slavin 2010). In response to football running back Davon Lawrence’s arrest for heroin possession, the football program is quoted in The Statesman saying: “This does not represent the core values of our program. [...] The student has been removed from the team effective immediately [and] we fully support [...] the judicial process” (Szkolar 2013). Neither social nor academic lives are described for either of the two men, and instead of an underlying tragic and sympathetic language, the tone of both articles is disapproving. Rather than victims of villainous heroin as it is represented by other collegiate articles, the two athletes are represented as the sole responsible agents in their heroin use. The framework of sports situates the two heroin users in a narrative that is particularly stigmatizing of drug use. Collegiate newspapers, which produce patronizing representations of the heroin user, reiterate the condescendence toward drug use in sports. In line with this portrayal, secondary research finds college athletes to be at lower risk for illicit drug use than non-athletes. As a result of such statistically supported lower risk, the image of college sport as “a protective factor against illicit drug use” is produced, which could be the foundation for the stigma held against those athletes that do engage in illicit drug use (Ford 2008, 216). Two reasons are listed for Ford’s findings, the social control theory and an athlete’s consciousness of their health. Of special interest to this study is the social control theory, which states that athletic participation establishes a “strong bond to significant others,” which further “creates a stake in conformity that inhibits deviant behaviour” (Ford 2008,
This is manifested in the way that the athletes’ coaches portray Abe and Davon in the sample of college newspapers.

V. DISCUSSION

The production and provocation of sympathy through the narrative of tragedy is problematic in that it overshadows the adversity of heroin use. In juxtaposing the academic and social success of the student with the student’s agentless engagement with heroin, newspapers create a sympathetic image of the heroin user through the language of tragedy. In doing so, the news pieces engage the readership in a process of victimizing the student, a process that is lead by the authors who attempt to “justify the actions of these [untypical] users deserving of sympathy” (Cobbina 2008, 156). The heroin users’ sympathetic representation suppresses the negativity and stigma associated with heroin use, and is not proactive in deterring student readership from pursuing heroin use. Secondary scholarship on the psychology of victimhood supports such findings, and argues that the label of “victim” predisposes a person to be “always morally right, neither responsible nor accountable, and forever entitled to sympathy” (Zur 1995). The victimized representation of the heroin-using student does not deter the predominant student readership from heroin use, but merely antagonizes heroin as a power that exploits the vulnerabilities of college students. Hence the heroin-using student is not held responsible for their use of heroin, which could mean that the readership is not held to any responsibility to abstain from heroin use; instead all responsibility is ascribed to the perpetrating powers of heroin. As supported in Zur, the representation of the heroin-using student as a victim, whether related to addiction, overdose or consequential death, is “disowning any responsibility for [their] behaviour and its outcome” and ascribes no negativity to the use of heroin in itself (Zur 1995).

In the wake of heroin-related incidents of overdose and death on college campuses, newspaper coverage may dissuade its student readership from using heroin. By describing the drug users through measures characteristic of many college students’ academic and social pursuits, the articles imply similarities between the reader and drug user. Pollak et al. describes the random nature of victimization as a means for news media to amplify the dramatic value of a story (Pollak 2007, 63). Furthermore, the portrayal of the heroin-using student as normal and common, suggests that heroin use could “happen” to anyone, thus inherently placing heroin in a more powerful position over the student.

The content of the reports and the victimizing representations of heroin use and users that such articles produce fail to deter the readership by virtue of the essence of victimhood that ascribes no responsibility to those that use heroin. There is an inherent lack of responsibility within the concept of a victim. A victim is defined as a victim because he or she was not responsible for his or her own action and an unfortunate event befell him or her. In his analysis of the larger media context, Taylor discusses the lack of reportage and the failure to further ‘educate’ the public around the wider issues of drugs (Taylor 2008). In a passive manner, the representation of heroin users as victims could be perpetuating the wake of heroin induced overdoses and deaths on college campuses. The diminished agency of students in relation to the use of heroin suggests that one has no active control over heroin use and the perpetuation of inertness with regards to heroin use may predispose students to become “victims” of the drug.

Ultimately, this paper raises questions regarding the efficacy of college newspaper reports in deterring heroin use on campus. In the wake of rising numbers of heroin overdoses and deaths on college campuses in the Northeast US, the representations that are constructed in college newspapers are increasingly important in shaping both the drug culture of a college and the moral hysteria surrounding it. When constructing representations of victimhood, college articles run the risk of perpetuating drug use, as no responsibility is ascribed to the college population not to use heroin. In contrast, villainous representations of heroin users may deter drug use, yet run the risk of alienating addicts from seeking help through university resources.
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VI. Appendix

Table 1: Overview of college articles published between 2010-14 mentioning keyword ‘heroin’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>#</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>University, State</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Addict hits rock bottom”</td>
<td>Oakland University, MI</td>
<td>Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Heroin overdoses cause of student death”</td>
<td>Towson University, MD</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Updated: Man overdoses in Shillman”</td>
<td>Northeastern University, MA</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“The Hill’s Addictions”</td>
<td>Cornell University, NY</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“VU student found dead, suspected heroin overdose”</td>
<td>Valparaiso University, IN</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Authorities mistreat Bongiovi overdose”</td>
<td>Rutgers University, NJ</td>
<td>Overdose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Hamilton College Heroin Bust”</td>
<td>Hamilton College, NY</td>
<td>Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“Journey from addiction tough”</td>
<td>Plattsburgh State University</td>
<td>Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>College, NY</td>
<td>University of Dayton, OH</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Third-Year Law student found dead, heroin present”</td>
<td>Cornell University, NY</td>
<td>Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“Released from prison after $50K Heroin Bust, Former Cornell Student Gets Clean, Writes Book”</td>
<td></td>
<td>Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“Football running back removed from roster after arrest”</td>
<td>Stony Brook University, NY</td>
<td>Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>“In Bard’s open drug culture, heroin remains vice of secrecy, solitude”</td>
<td>Bard College, NY</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>“Breaking: UConn student arrested in on-campus drug bust”</td>
<td>The University of Connecticut, CT</td>
<td>Possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>“The Local Epidemic”</td>
<td>Bard College, NY</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“University mourns the loss of Juliette Richard”</td>
<td>University of Rochester, NY</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“Rutgers recovery houses give students support system”</td>
<td>Rutgers University, NJ</td>
<td>Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“Rutgers responds to N.J. heroin problem”</td>
<td>Rutgers University, NJ</td>
<td>Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>“A friend and an addict”</td>
<td>Temple University, PA</td>
<td>Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“But let’s reconsider rehab”</td>
<td>Bard College, NY</td>
<td>Addiction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>“Seligman addresses heroin allegations”</td>
<td>University of Rochester, NY</td>
<td>Death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>“Let’s talk about drugs baby”</td>
<td>Duke University, NC</td>
<td>Commentary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>