

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 043 066

CG 005 856

AUTHOR Kanun, Clara; Reinertsen, David  
TITLE An Evaluation of an Experimental Program on Alcoholism and Other Drug Abuse Counseling.  
SPONS AGENCY Minnesota Univ., St. Paul.  
PUB DATE Aug 70  
NOTE 53p.  
  
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC-\$2.75  
DESCRIPTORS \*Alcohol Education, Alcoholism, \*Drug Abuse, Drug Addiction, \*Education, Educational Experiments, Educational Objectives, \*Health Education, \*Training, Training Objectives

ABSTRACT

The evaluation of this three-quarter experimental sequence of courses includes three phases: (1) the use of non-participant observation of the lectures; (2) a series of questionnaires periodically administered to class participants; and (3) a projected survey of class participants to assess the influence and consequences of the course experience. Two primary course goals are identified: (1) the training of counselors for the rehabilitation of alcohol and drug dependents; and (2) the informing of a broad sweep of professionals in social work, education, nursing and personnel work. A student profile at the beginning of the course showed 107 participants, ages 25-65, with varied educational and occupational backgrounds. At the end of the course only 73 remained. This information is broken down and discussed. The content of the courses taught all three quarters is presented. Problems encountered included: (1) ambiguity of course goals; (2) lack of continuity in the lectures; (3) diversity of the students with respect to prior education and experience; and (4) too broad a range of material to be treated in any depth. (TL)

ED043068

**AN EVALUATION OF AN EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM  
ON  
ALCOHOLISM AND OTHER DRUG ABUSE COUNSELING**

**SPONSORED BY**

**SCHOOLS OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND SOCIAL WORK**

**DEPARTMENT OF PHARMACOLOGY**

**GENERAL EXTENSION DIVISION**

**UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION  
& WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED  
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR  
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF  
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-  
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-  
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

## INTRODUCTION

A three-quarter experimental sequence of courses under the title of "Alcoholism and Other Drug Abuse Counseling" was offered in the Evening Classes, General Extension Division, University of Minnesota during 1969-70. In response to a widespread need, the program was jointly sponsored by the Schools of Public Health and Social Work and the Department of Pharmacology and offered as the core of a proposed certificate for development of para-professional counsellors in alcoholism and drug treatment settings. Although some members of the Advisory Committee had extensive experience in education and treatment in this area, provision for evaluation of this experimental series was made to provide the optimum basis for future development of the program.

The evaluation included three phases: first, the use of non-participant observation of the lecture sessions; second, a series of questionnaires periodically administered to class participants; and, third, a projected survey of class participants to assess the influence and consequences of the course experience. The report of the first two phases is contained in the following pages.

METHOD OF THE EVALUATION: Although the usual questionnaire procedures were planned for the evaluation, the use of non-participant observation was particularly dictated by this program. The series of courses were offered for the first time by a group of lecturers some of whom were new to the platform. The students were diverse in educational background and in occupational experiences as well as in many sociological characteristics, and particularly in their personal experiences with alcohol and other drug dependencies.

In addition to the unique aspects of this program, the writers recognize that structured questionnaires soliciting expressions of opinion and

judgment from students need to be mediated by the frame of reference, vested interest, and competence of the respondents. Incomplete or no response from students are an additional invalidating factor of the traditional survey techniques. The description of the selection of students and of their sociological characteristics are relevant variables by which to mediate student responses to questionnaires.

Similarly, reports of observations and judgments of observers need to be mediated by the qualifications of the observers. Both observers are sociologists, the senior observer having completed a minor at the doctoral level in clinical psychology. Although neither observer has any counseling experience, the academic grounding and interests of one observer is particularly extensive in the relevant written materials. One of the observers has had ten years of teaching experience. Neither observer claims any familiarity or competence with pharmacology or public health. Each of the observers acknowledge more than casual interest in the problems addressed by the course materials.

The writers admit to pedagogical ideals by which this series of courses had been measured: that is, the requirement that a course should have an internal consistency and coherence of subject matter, and that faculty should have a quality of pedagogical skill and experience to insure communication with students.

The observers attended class sessions, participated in many informal discussions with students during coffee breaks, and took the examinations.

In explanation of an apparent inconsistency in procedure and variation in questionnaires administered to students from quarter to quarter the following should be noted: first, there was a variation in organization of course content and appearance of faculty among the three quarters; second, the responses to some questionnaire items presented during the

Fall Quarter were so emphatic that to repeat these questions in subsequent questionnaires would have been wasteful.

In addition to the ideals listed for a course, the statements of the Advisory Committee, particularly those about the goals for the course, provide working criteria for course evaluation. The goals, as stated by Advisory Committee members in individual interviews, and their relevance to the evaluation are discussed in the next section.

GOALS OF THE COURSE: A series of personal interviews with individual members of the Advisory Committee were held. Key questions raised during the interviews dealt with the goals of the course, the plans for the internships, and the desirable and necessary qualifications for an alcohol and drug counselor. There was some diversity of opinion among committee members in each of these areas. The statements of the goals which follow are an essential backdrop against which to read the materials in this report, and are the major criteria on which the course is evaluated.

Presumably the goals defined the content of the course as well as the guidelines for selecting the students, and therefore the following statements of the Advisory Committee members are introductory to the discussion which follows.

As nearly as the notes of the interviews permit, the following statements on goals are literally given as made by the respective interviewees:

It was originally designed especially to train rehabilitation counselors to work with alcoholics and other drug abusers.

We also hoped to involve people in the course who do not deal with alcoholic or drug problems in a therapeutic situation but might have some impact on these problems in the future--such as teachers.

\* \* \*

... the course cannot train large numbers of new rehabilitation counselors now or in the future because of the scarcity of traineeship positions. Educating educators may be the most functional service the course can provide.

\* \* \*

Goals were restricted by manner in which students were selected. Course was primarily for alcoholic counselors. Immediate goal was to strengthen the background of people with low educational background so that they can perform competently as alcoholic counselors.

\* \* \*

There is a two-fold purpose: Get up to-date information to AA members so they could function as counselors; and more expanded version into different counselors. Get something going on campus for social workers; teachers, clinical psychologists; and physicians.

\* \* \*

Getting knowledge across to these people which they don't have. Dispel misconceptions resulting from personal experience. A course that goes beyond the restriction of counselors;

\* \* \*

Originally, the course was designed to meet the needs of the drug counselor. Also, the course was needed to meet the needs of others, like the public health nurse.

\* \* \*

The short range goal was to meet the needs of shortages of people qualified to counsel, like ministers, social workers, nurses in hospitals, and counselors of all types. In the long range a more orderly preparation of people with appropriate qualifications was the goal.

With varying emphasis, two goals are identified: first, the training of counselors for the rehabilitation of alcohol and drug dependents; and, second, the informing of a broad sweep of professionals in social work, education, nursing and personnel work who can profit from this information.

The Advisory Committee members who were qualified to do so were asked to comment on the characteristics desirable for the alcoholic

counselor. As the comments indicate, there seems little relevance listed between the content and organization of the course and the process of selection of students who might become potentially effective counselors.

Whether or not a person is a good therapist doesn't depend very much on personality type. More important is a desire to help others and an ability to express interest in, that is, relate to them.

Former alcoholics may be better able to maintain a consistent, long-term relationship with alcoholics than those who have not had alcoholic problems. Also, over the short run, alcoholics might trust former alcoholics more and as a result the former alcoholic would be a better counselor.

\* \* \*

Therapeutic personalities shouldn't have personality characteristics that turn people off. Often values have to be imposed; value neutrality isn't possible for effective counselors. Young, bright-appearing alcoholics don't make good counselors. Established personality patterns are important.

\* \* \*

Course will not produce counselors. People become what they have done. Credentials aren't important. Skills are hard to get and hard to train.

Non-alcoholics are potentially good counselors (with alcoholics). Internship makes the big difference.

Three members of the Advisory Committee made comments about the internship program, and the differences of opinion reflect the incompleteness of plans for this aspect of the program.

In other words, the course cannot train large numbers of new rehabilitation counselors now or in the future because of the scarcity of traineeship positions.  
(Repeated from statements about goals).

\* \* \*

Assume that 96% of students (in course) wouldn't make good interns. State counselors should get certified recognition and status through the course.

\* \* \*

Internship program is designed for lay counselors in treatment situations.

From the reading of these comments on goals for course, plans for internships and qualifications for counselors it would appear that there are some ambiguities between the conception of the course and the short run fulfillment of purposes.

Additional ambiguities unique to this course are the wide range of formal educational background of the student body which is more varied than usual, and approximately half of the students were incumbent in a professional role for which the course was designed to be the educational training background. For these reasons, some of the focal questions to which the evaluation is relevant are: to what extent does relevant occupational, formal educational, and personal experience with drug dependency make a difference in the formal learning setting?



STUDENT PROFILE -- BEGINNING AND END OF COURSE

Students for the 1969-70 series of the "Alcoholism and Other Drug Abuse Counseling Program" were selected from 247 applicants. Although the optimum number of students had been set at 100, 114 were selected, 7 dropped before the Fall Quarter opened, and 107 began the course.

Selection was guided by a set of criteria giving preference to applicants whose current occupation was counseling in alcohol or other drug dependent treatment settings or whose potential contribution in a counseling role in the future was most promising. As observed in the selection procedures approximately half the selected students were personally known to one selection committee member. This was confirmed in a subsequent interview.

The selected 107 participants represented a very diverse group with respect to such variables as age, education, current occupation, and personal alcohol and drug use patterns.

The age range among the students was very wide, from under 25 years to over 65 years. The proportion of men and women was approximately the same as in the Evening Class population generally: approximately two-thirds male; one-third female.

At the time of the application, 60 students indicated more than one-half of their time was spent working with alcohol and other drug dependent people. This includes some of the nurses and social workers and clergymen in addition to the counselors on alcoholism. The occupational categorization of the students included incumbent counselors in alcohol and drug dependent treatment settings as the largest group, social workers, nurses, law enforcement personnel, and some clergymen.

Comparison of number of students in the respective occupational categories at the beginning and end of the course reflects varied persistence patterns among the groups as shown in the following listing:

	<u>Fall Quarter</u> <u>107 students</u>	<u>End of Spring Quarter</u> <u>73 students</u>
Counselor on Alcoholism/Drugs	48	32
Nurse	20	16
Social Worker	12	11
Law Enforcement, Probation or Parole Officer	8	0
Educator	6	4
Clergyman	3	2
Other	5	5
Unknown	5	3

There were 107 students who started the course; 73 completed, or a drop-out number of 34. Sixteen or one-third of the counselors dropped the course. Four or one-fifth of the nurses dropped; all law enforcement officers dropped.

Educational background of students covered the widest possible range, from less than high school through the Ph.D. Specifically relevant was the additional experience in instruction in alcoholism problems indicated by some of the students. The educational background details are shown in Table 1. This table lists the number of students in the respective educational classifications at the beginning of the course, Fall Quarter, and at the end of the course in Spring Quarter.

(See Table 1, next page)

**TABLE 1**  
**EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, ALCOHOLISM INSTRUCTION AND STUDENT PERSISTENCE**

Education Completed	Fall Quarter N = 107		End of Spring Quarter N = 73	
	No Alcoholism Instruction	Alcoholism Instruction	No Alcoholism Instruction	Alcoholism Instruction
Some High School	3	-	2	-
High School or High School Equivalency	10	4	7	2
Two Years or less of College	9	1	8	1
More than Two Years of College	10	3	7	1
Three Year Nursing Program	6	1	4	1
Bachelor's Degree	29	2	21	2
Some Graduate Work	10	-	5	-
Master's Degree	14	-	9	-
Some Work toward Ph.D.	1	-	-	-
Professional Degree	2	-	2	-
Professional and Master's Degree	1	-	1	-
Ph.D.	1	-	-	-

Among the 107 Fall Quarter students, 60 held a bachelor's degree. Among these are some who had some graduate work or a graduate degree. One-third or 20 of these dropped the course by Spring Quarter. However, the 40 college graduates left in Spring Quarter out of 73 were more than half of the Spring Quarter students.

Students were asked to characterize themselves on the patterns of drug or alcohol<sup>1</sup> usage at the beginning of the course, and from their responses the following classification of students at the beginning and end of the course is shown:

	<u>Fall Quarter</u> <u>107 students</u>	<u>End of Spring Quarter</u> <u>73 students</u>
Recovered Alcoholic	36	30
Recovered Drug Dependent	3	1
Recovered Alcoholic and Drug Dependent	8	6
Social Drinker	40	29
Rarely or never uses alcohol or drugs	6	1
Drug usage patterns unknown	14	6

The relationship of educational background and alcohol and other drug dependency is shown in Table II. For economy, the educational background details have been reduced to three categories: high school or less; some college; bachelor's degree or more as shown in Table II in the column headings.

(See Table II, next page)

---

1 The questionnaire was prepared before the writers had learned that alcohol is a drug and for complete accuracy questionnaire form should not have requested this distinction.

TABLE II

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND RELATED TO ALCOHOL/DRUG DEPENDENCY AND STUDENT PERSISTENCE

	Fall Quarter N = 107				End-of Spring Quarter N = 73			
	High School or less	Some College	B.A. or more	Totals	High School or less	Some College	B.A. or more	Totals
Recovered Alcoholic	10	15	11	36	8	12	10	30
Recovered Drug	1	2	-	3	1	-	-	1
Recovered Alcoholic and Drug	2	2	4	8	2	2	2	6
Social Drinker	1	5	34	40	-	5	24	29
Rarely or Never	1	3	2	6	-	-	1	1
Drug Patterns Unknown	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>
Totals	17	30	60		11	22	40	

The categories of alcohol or other drug usage status are shown as row headings in the left column.

The majority of the students indicated plans to complete all three courses; more than one-fourth also intended to complete an internship; some were uncertain. These commitments were made in the responses to specific questions on the application form. In detail, 106 students responded as follows:

- 59 - All three courses
- 5 - All three courses but uncertain about internship
- 30 - All three courses plus internship
- 12 - Uncertain

In view of the commitments of students to complete the course, characteristics of drop-outs and the reasons they give are relevant factors. Student persistence in the course by educational level and drug usage can be read from Table 11. Combining the frequencies in the alcohol and other drug dependency statuses, 47 students began the course and 37 were still registered during Spring Quarter. Among the ten who dropped, 2 had high school or less in educational background; 5 had some college; and 3 were college graduates. In Fall Quarter 46 students classified themselves as social or infrequent drinkers; 30 of these completed the course or a total of 16 in this group dropped Spring Quarter. Eight of the students unclassified on dependency status dropped by Spring Quarter. Noting the drop-outs on the educational background as shown in Table 11, 6 of the 17 students with "High school or less," 8 of the 30 with "Some College," and 20 of the 60 college graduate dropped the course.

In order to ascertain whether there was a common reason for dropping the course among the 34 individuals who did not complete all three quarters, an attempt was made to contact each one by phone. Information about 20 of the 34 was obtained either through direct contact or from secondary sources.

Very few students mentioned criticisms of the course as reasons for dropping out. The one criticism which stands out most clearly came from four individuals who work largely with drug rather than alcohol problems.

These four people either did not complete Fall Quarter or did not re-register after Fall Quarter because they felt that the course would not be worth their time due to its superficial and passing references to drugs and drug abusers.

One of these four made the strongest criticism of the course. In addition to the lack of information on drugs, he criticized the Fall Quarter final exam as irrelevant and degrading, thought the books were a waste of time, and thought the class sessions were too much like Alcoholics Anonymous meetings.

Two people besides those dealing largely with drug problems considered the course too introductory and/or not relevant enough to merit their time for a year. One of these had been working with alcoholics for 17 years and had attended the Yale Summer School of Alcohol Studies. The other was a vocational counselor and did not feel he dealt with the problems of alcoholics enough to benefit much from the course.

Two parole officers working in the same office did not reregister after Fall Quarter because they were given the impression that successful completion of the course would require a one-year internship which neither would have been able to handle. This seems to be an unfortunate case of misinformation rather than a criticism of the course as a whole.

The most common reasons for dropping the courses were non-critical and involved health problems, scheduling difficulties and family responsibilities.

These were mentioned by 8 people. Four of these eight specifically mentioned a desire to complete the course next year.

At least two additional people have moved out of the area and had to drop the course for this reason.

At least one former alcoholic had started drinking again.

Grades did not appear to be an important factor in determining who would drop the class. The additional details are given in the sections which follow.



### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary of all the materials and experiences in this program, it should be emphasized that the observers and the students learned new materials or learned a new integration of familiar materials, and found occasion to reexamine and revise attitudes towards alcohol and other drug dependencies. The weight of the following summary comments, however, is critical.

The goals of the course as varyingly identified by the members of the Advisory Committee were possibly contradictory or, at least, competitive. The goal of training counselors could not simultaneously or with equal success be attained with the goal of educating another public -- teachers, social workers, nurses, law enforcement officers and other professionals coming in contact with these problems. The ambiguity of the goals was compounded by the diversity of formal educational background, current vocational or professional status and personal experience with alcohol or other drug dependency among the students. In addition, there was a difference of opinion about the qualifications of a "good" drug dependency counselor or the best method of training one among committee members.

Although each quarter was characterized by an integrating title and the individual lecture titles seemed related to the course theme, the total effect was that of a lecture series rather than a course with internal consistency. The effect of discrete lectures was fostered by the appearance of many lecturers particularly Fall and Winter Quarters. No effort was made by lecturers to establish connections for students, and only one lecturer during Fall Quarter mentioned having listened to the tapes of preceding lectures.

The lack of supporting or supplementary reading materials, particularly

for the technical and the unfamiliar, enhanced the impression of discrete lectures. With two exceptions the assigned reading materials, specified for Winter Quarter only, were not referred to by the lecturers. This closed the possibility of student questions stimulated by outside reading being articulated and answered in class sessions.

Some consideration should be given to the consequence of the diversity of students. College graduates earned higher course grades for Fall and Winter Quarters. These grades were based on the "usual" Minnesota objective style test. Students with counseling experience earned better grades for Spring Quarter on a final consisting of treatment recommendations for case descriptions. The Fall and Winter Quarter examinations were based on lecture materials. Very little during Spring Quarter lectures provided information for the final and it is not surprising that experience outside of the course was closely related to achievement on the final.

It would seem that unless the diversity of students is exploited by some application of a specialized discussion technique, the diversity is not a totally congenial element. The largest educational group among the drop-outs were the college graduates.

Students welcomed examinations but rejected letter grades. Examinations were valued as learning-teaching tools and rejected by students as a ranking and competitive measure in a course of this kind.

Additional and more relevant and interesting reading materials were requested by students. The concentration on alcohol materials and the lack of materials on other drugs was criticized by students.

Many suggestions and requests for discussion were made by students and much expression of planning for discussion was made by faculty. In view of the number of students with personal dependency experience and with

current vocational counseling responsibility, the resources for more involvement of students were available. Nevertheless, successful class discussions are very dependent on skillful discussion leadership, and this was not demonstrated by any member of the faculty. As a matter of fact, the ineffective response to student questions was a major lack in the course.

Fall and Winter Quarters were planned to provide the theoretical and empirical information background for individual and group counseling techniques, history taking, family counseling as specifically related to drug abuse, and understanding of personality to be taught Spring Quarter.

Evaluation responses to this quarter ranged from boredom to frustration. The college graduates, not in counseling positions, were bored. The academically informed about clinical materials were frustrated at the superficiality. Students who were also counselors in treatment centers were satisfied. Careful review of the lectures, in juxtaposition to each other revealed that counseling techniques were named, sketchily reviewed, and rejected. Dynamics of personality and personality theory were very briefly touched on.

It may be that in retrospective consideration, so much was attempted in the three quarters that only a bird's-eye view of the broad scope of theory, the empirical, and the treatment resources and techniques in the field could be given. By definition, such a broad overview presented by a series of lecturers could only result in a lecture series rather than an effective training=educational experience.

EVALUATION OF FALL, WINTER, SPRING QUARTERS

THE RATIONALE AND CONTENT OF THE COURSES:

Much planning is reflected in the rationale implicit in the title and topic outlines of each quarter and in the comments made by Advisory Committee members. The course sequence was planned on an interdisciplinary basis, the first quarter included the pharmacology of alcohol and other drugs; the second quarter, the social-cultural and psychological aspects of the problems; and the third quarter, the theory and method of counseling. As summarized in the following pages, the scope of the materials might be characterized as encyclopedic. However, each of the quarters, in varying degrees, fell somewhat short of the announced purposes. In the judgment of the observers, this was a reflection of the diversity and varied pedagogical experience of the lecturers and the difficulty inherent in integrating any multi-disciplinary and multi-lecturer effort. There were incomplete procedures among the lecturers in informing themselves about other aspects of the course than their own, although each was familiar with the topical outline. The three-quarter sequence was under supervision of one over-all coordinator who retained detailed responsibility for the Fall Quarter and shared responsibility for Winter and Spring Quarters with two of the Advisory Committee members.

Although, the comments in this section may seem more critical than laudatory this is not a negation of the fact that the observers as well as the students learned new materials and developed new and more informed attitudes about alcoholism and other drug problems. There is however, some contradiction between the generally accepting and approving responses of the students which are reported in the succeeding pages and the judgment of the observers. This point will be discussed in more detail where relevant in the context of the evaluation of each quarter.

As the most effective presentation of the observers' report and the student evaluations, each quarter will be treated separately in the following sections, since there was variation among the quarters and variation in the questionnaires eliciting evaluation responses from the students for each phase of the course.

#### THE FALL QUARTER:

The title of the Fall Quarter course was "Fundamental Aspects of Drug Abuse and Dependency." Eleven class sessions were scheduled. One hour during the seventh session was used for a mid-quarter examination, and the last or eleventh session was used for the final examination and discussion of the quarter's work. Seven lecturers shared the responsibility for the ten lecture sessions.

The first class session was devoted to an introduction to the course emphasizing the congeniality towards the increased consumption of drugs in our society which mirrors the widespread, increased use of new medications in the legitimate practice of medicine.

For the observers, the five class sessions of pharmacology materials were pedagogically most professional in organization and presentation. Although there was some variation in receptivity and generally an ineffective response to student questions, student interest and involvement remained at a high level. A measure of this was the continued high attendance of the registrants. Clearly, these materials as presented were unfamiliar to most students.

Outlines for the pharmacology lectures were distributed, but in spite of the fact that this series of lectures seemed coherent and efficiently presented, it was difficult to record notes on the lectures in the prepared outline spaces. It seemed there was a difference between

the lectures and the outlines. For the chemistry novice (including the observers), the detailed and illustrated portions of the lectures on chemical tables were not meaningful and probably, therefore, not relevant to a course of this kind. The pharmacological names were unfamiliar to most students and of questionable relevancy to the para-professional counseling responsibilities currently carried or anticipated by the students. Nevertheless, there was strong evidence that the half of the class with personal experience with alcohol or drug dependent people and in current counseling positions possessed an amount of experience complementary to an understanding of these materials which was superior to that of the uninitiated. Similarly, the nurses in the course had some helpful background not held by the majority of students. This understanding varied positively with personal and vocational experience and seemed unrelated to the level of formal education.

None of the assigned reading material was referred to in the pharmacology lectures. One text on the reading list, Marijuana by E. R. Bloomquist, M.D. was relevant, but no reference was made to it. No supplementary processed or printed form of materials on drugs was distributed or assigned, although some material was available in the field and would probably have been helpful.

Although two of the pharmacology lecturers were academically trained as clinical psychologists, the emphasis was consistently placed on the pharmacological aspects of drugs rather than on the behavioral correlates or consequences of drug use. (This observation was particularly called to our attention by the coordinator for Fall Quarter.)

Some rejecting and challenging discussion was stimulated by the permissive approach of the lecturer on the use of hallucinogens during

the fifth session on pharmacology.

Although planned as a full two-hour lecture, the seventh session lecturer was limited to one hour because of an unexpected scheduling of a midquarter. The title for this lecture was "Psychosocial Alterations in the Drug Dependent." The portion of the lecture which was presented covered the role of motivation, learning and the psychosocial conditions for behavior change, particularly the problem of achieving freedom from alcohol and other drug dependency. The lecturer was highly sophisticated in organization of material and in presentation. Terminology was substantially different from that of preceding lecturers and tempo of presentation was faster. At best, and spread over a two-hour period, this lecture would have been less familiar to the majority of the students than some of the pharmacology materials. No reading materials had been assigned to prepare students for the lectures, and the unfortunate crowding into one-hour of a two-hour preparation truncated the possibilities of student comprehension. This one hour lecture illustrated a problem arising repeatedly and one most common to a multi-disciplinary course in which a number of lecturers participate. The problem arises from the tendency of each lecturer to telescope large segments of a field (in this instance the psychology of learning) into a single lecture.

Lectures eight and nine were the responsibility of the coordinator who had given the first lecture. As coordinator of the Fall Quarter, he had been present at all preceding lectures. He knew by name approximately half of the students in the class. The titles of the lectures were, respectively, "Nature of Drug Dependency" and "Psychological Complications of Drug Abuse." The materials presented might be characterized as an integration of much material which must have been familiar to the members

of the class who knew the lecturer. Whether this was actually the case, the slowed tempo and very permissive and non-directive response to questions and comments constituted a relaxed change of pace from the preceding class meetings. In the judgment of the observers and from a pedagogical standpoint, non-directive response to specific questions may not be the most effective teaching method.

The final and tenth lecture was "Process of Drug Dependency." This lecturer, like the preceding one, was known to and knew many of the students, although this was his first appearance in the course. Socio-cultural factors related to processes of drug dependency were described and discussed. This lecture was well organized and effectively presented. Basically, it would seem that this lecture like the introductory lecture served the function of back-drop or scenery and was not as central to the students as the pharmacology lectures.

#### EVALUATION OF FALL QUARTER PHARMACOLOGY LECTURES:

The five lectures included in the pharmacology facet of the Fall Quarter lectures constituted a unit by definition of a specific subject matter. It seemed feasible, therefore, to elicit student evaluation of this portion of the course; particularly since none of the lecturers were scheduled in subsequent quarters. This section should be read (like all evaluation materials) with the qualification that these are not objective ratings in an absolute sense, but the responses of a group of students who may be responding to the person and personality of the lecturer and generalizing to their rating of the content, or conversely from the subjectively experienced obscurity of the content to the rating of the personality of the lecturer. More than eighty (81.3%) percent of Fall Quarter students responded to the questions summarized in Tables III,

IV, and V.



Students were given the opportunity to comment on the amount of learning and the familiarity and technicality of the material as shown in Table III. In addition, the contradiction of previous impressions could be indicated. Student responses are shown in the several categories of opinions for each of the five lectures as shown in Table III. Lectures One and Three were given by the same lecturer but evaluated differently by the students.

(See Table III, page 24)

Table III should be read horizontally for evaluation of one lecturer on each item and vertically in each column for comparisons among lecturers. For example, reading horizontally, 35% said they "Learned a great deal;" 26% found the "Material generally familiar; picked up some information." Only 1% indicated, "Material mostly review; already familiar with most of lecture;" but 36% found the first "Lecture too technical and didn't learn much." Students were given the opportunity to respond to "Previous impressions contradicted" in combination with any one of the previous ratings and 5% rated the first lecture as contradictory of earlier impressions. One (1%) percent did not rate the first lecture.

The rating for each of the lectures can be read from Table III similarly.

Lecture Two received the highest rating from 68% of the students on "Learned a great deal," although one-fourth of the students indicated that the material had been mostly familiar. None of the students criticized this lecture as too technical and 4% found previous impressions had been contradicted. Six percent did not rate the second lecture which may reflect the absentee rate rather than lack of response to the lecture.

TABLE III  
 STUDENT RATING OF HOW MUCH THEY LEARNED FROM PHARMACOLOGY LECTURES  
 (In Percentages)

Lectures in order of presentation	Learned a great deal	Material generally familiar; picked up some information	Material mostly review; already familiar with most of lecture	Lecture too technical; didn't learn very much	Previous impressions contradicted	No response	Total*
One	35	26	1	36	5	1	104
Two	68	25	1	0	4	6	104
Three	47	32	3	12	12	5	101
Four	55	34	5	2	7	2	105
Five	59	28	3	0	35	3	128

\* Percentages add to more than 100% because students could answer "Previous Impression Contradicted" in conjunction with other responses.

Lecture One and Three were given by the same lecturer, however, Lecture Three was received more favorably by the students. From the observers' viewpoint this was more a function of the change in the manner of presentation and receptivity to questions rather than a difference in lecture material. Forty-seven (47%) percent "Learned a great deal." Almost one-third (32%) found the lecture generally familiar and 12% found it too technical, and indicated that "Previous impressions were contradicted."

On the "generally familiar" rating, Lecture Four got the highest proportion of students, 34%. Fifty-five (55%) percent said they "Learned a great deal."

The Fifth Lecture elicited the most animated and challenging response from the students, and this is reflected by the 35% who said their "Previous impressions were contradicted." This lecture dealt with hallucinogens, and the lecturer presented a very permissive approach to the user and minimized the negative consequences. No one found this lecture too technical, and 59% said they "Learned a great deal."

From informal conversations between observers and students, those who were in the health professions (nurses) and counselors in alcohol and drug dependency centers were generally familiar with these materials. As can be seen from Table III few students considered these materials merely review.

Students were given an opportunity to rate the usefulness of the pharmacology lectures, and the responses are shown in Table IV.

(See Table IV, next page)

TABLE IV  
STUDENT RATING OF THE USEFULNESS OF THE PHARMACOLOGY LECTURES  
(In Percentages)

Lectures in order presentation	Very helpful	Somewhat helpful	Probably will not be much help	Not certain	No response	Total*
One	25	43	20	11	1	100
Two	53	39	2	19	4	99
Three	47	39	3	7	4	100
Four	54	38	2	3	2	100
Five	51	34	3	10	2	99

\* May differ from actual row total owing to rounding error.

Students overwhelmingly endorsed these lectures as "Very Helpful" or "Somewhat helpful." If these responses are pooled for each of the lectures, 25% and 43% (78%) indicated Lecture One "Very helpful" and "Somewhat helpful." Lectures Two and Four were similarly endorsed by a total of 92% of the students and Lectures Three and Five by 85%.

Twenty (20%) percent said that Lecture One would "Probably not be much help" and 19% were "Not certain" about the helpfulness of Lecture Two.

To some extent, the ratings of familiarity and helpfulness of materials shown in Tables III and IV reflect student ratings of the manner and method of the lecturers shown in Table V.

(See Table V, page 28)

The total of 146% responses of ratings of Lecturer A reflect the relatively low (33%) response of "Generally very satisfied" and the judgment that Lecturer A was too technical given by 39% of the students. The same lecturer gave the third pharmacology lecture and satisfied more of the students, 52%, than in his first appearance.

Compared to the other lecturers, A was considered too technical by some students in each appearance, 32% on the first and 24% on the second. Similarly, Lecturer A was rated as unwilling to answer questions by 32% on his first appearance and by 11% in his second lecture. Lecturer D was rated as unwilling to answer questions by 8% of the students.

Students most frequently commented that Lecturer C was not consistent with his outline. Relatively few students said that the outlines were too brief, but in the experience of the observers, the outlines were frequently no more than word topical lists.

TABLE V  
STUDENTS RATING OF MANNER AND METHOD  
IN WHICH THE PARAMACOLOGY LECTURES WERE PRESENTED  
(In Percentages)

Lecturers in order of appearance	Generally very satisfied	Too much material; not enough time for questions	Material too dis- organized	Lecture didn't follow outline	Outline too brief spent too much time tak- ing notes	Lecture too technical	Lecturer seemed unwilling to answer questions	No Response	Total*
A	33	20	10	1	9	39	32	2	146*
B	92	4	0	1	4	1	0	6	118*
A	52	17	8	2	6	24	11	7	127*
C	75	3	3	23	8	2	3	3	120*
D	77	4	4	3	4	1	8	4	101*

\* Percentages add to more than 100% because more than one response to each lecture was possible.

GENERAL EVALUATION OF FALL QUARTER:

In questionnaires administered after the mid-quarter and at the end of Fall Quarter, students were given the opportunity to evaluate the first quarter of the series as a whole and in response to many detailed questions. The following summary is based on 87 responses to the questions at mid-quarter time and 83 responses at the end of the quarter.

More than half of the students said they would like more information about drugs and more than 25 were listed by trade name. Requests were also made for additional information on the effects of glue and paint thinner.

When they were asked to select from a number of methods by which they might increase their knowledge about the various drugs, most students indicated they would like more reading material. (76% said they would like detailed outlines or summaries of the pharmacology lectures; 65% said they would like government or pharmaceutical house pamphlets on the various drugs).

The use of outlines during each lecture is a question which finds almost all class members in agreement. At the end of fall quarter 92% of the students responding said they would like each lecture to "be accompanied by an outline" and 87% said the outlines should be "as detailed as possible in order to free people from writing and thereby provide more opportunity to think about the material being presented and more time for asking questions."

About half the students felt that time should have been provided for discussion, particularly in small groups.

Because there had been a great deal of discussion about the examination at mid-quarter, students were given the opportunity to respond to a variety of statements based on suggestions made to the observers in informal discussions. The summary of responses in percentages of respondents is shown on the next page.

(See Table VII, next page)

Inspection of the responses indicate that approximately 60% of the students accepted examinations as a learning opportunity, although the specific examinations were not highly rated as measuring their learning in this course. At least half of the students indicated that letter grades were not desirable, and almost 70% thought that examinations should support self-evaluation of learning for the students rather than instruments of "objective" evaluation. The possibility of keeping the examinations was approved by 87%.



TABLE VII

A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS' REACTIONS TO THE MID-QUARTER AND FINAL EXAMINATIONS FOR FALL QUARTER, 1969 (In Percentages)

NOTE: The mid-quarter had 87 respondents  
the final had 83 respondents

	AGREE		UNCERTAIN		DISAGREE	
	MID-QTR	FINAL	MID-QTR	FINAL	MID-QTR	FINAL
The exam effectively tested what I have learned from the fall quarter lectures.	46	30	32	33	22	37
Having this exam motivated me to learn material that I might otherwise have neglected.	59	60	10	15	31	25
I didn't have to study much for the exam since I had been reviewing my notes regularly.	11	15	14	18	75	67
Many of the questions asked in the exam were about things which I didn't consider very important.	17	41	25	33	58	26
The exam would have been better if the questions had been essay questions rather than multiple choice and fill in the blanks	14	16	10	15	76	69
I don't see much sense in having exams at all in this type of course.	15	24	25	18	60	58
I think the exams should be graded as "satisfactory" or "unsatisfactory" rather than A-F.	58	50	18	20	24	30
It's more important to design exams which will assist us individually in determining what we know and don't know rather than enabling someone else to evaluate us.	68	68	24	24	8	8
Doing well on the exams is very important to me.	41	45	35	29	24	26
I feel I am at a disadvantage in being examined on the same basis as recent college graduates and people with advanced degrees.	17	20	24	16	59	64
I would like to be able to keep each exam after it has been graded	-	87	-	8	-	5

THE WINTER QUARTER:

Three of the seven lecturers appearing during Winter Quarter had also lectured during Fall Quarter. The Winter Quarter course title was "The Disease Process and Social Implications of Drug Dependency." The basic questions of individual responsibility for the drug dependency and consequences for society as well as the problems of interference with the individual's right to freedom of choice were implicit in the title for the quarter. Similarly, each lecture title and content were chosen with these questions in mind.

The historical roots of the contemporary cultural attitudes to alcohol and other drugs and the ambivalences residing therein were the subjects of the first two lectures under the title "Cultural Attitudes Toward Mood Altering Drugs." A series of generalizations were made: our society carries culturally inconsistent attitudes about alcohol; our society is complex and heterogeneous; there is a high value placed on individualism; attitudes towards how alcohol should be consumed are heterogeneous; information sources about alcoholism are highly biased. No reading materials were assigned for these lectures.

The third lecture "Disease Concept of Drug Dependency" drew heavily from an assigned text by that name. The distinction between the use of the words "habituation" and "addiction" was made. Some important emphases on the problems of psychological and physiological dependency were explored. The close relevance of this lecture to assigned reading material did not produce a more animated session illustrating the problem of relating the reading list distributed Fall Quarter to discussion in subsequent quarters. Some processed material was

distributed dealing with characteristics by which, a drinking problem could be recognized which was useful, particularly to the uninitiated. Fourth lecture, the second on the disease concept, pursued the emphasis that this concept was the result of a search for some idea by which the individual would not be held responsible for his alcoholism. This lecturer had made students unhappy Fall Quarter by his highly technical and theoretical presentation of a learning theory approach to motivation. Similarly, this lecture was more theoretically complex and presupposed a familiarity with such concepts as etiology and methodological approaches to causality beyond the ken of most class members.

The fifth class meeting was divided between the lecturer on "Social Welfare Issues" and the midquarter. The lecture covered a historical sketch of social welfare in Europe and England and a comment on current social welfare developments in the United States. This lecturer was pleasant and obviously eager to please but had little pedagogical or lecturing skill. The placing of this topic at this point of the course seemed not particularly relevant as developed by the lecturer, although the role of society's assumption of responsibility for the individual would seem to be essentially relevant to the integrating theme for the quarter.

The sixth lecture, "Motivational Issues" was staged as a debate between two clinical psychologists holding different basic values, one, an empiricist; the other a mystic (or at least taking a mystical approach). The students suffered from the sophisticated methodological verbiage used in this lecture. The discussion of motivation in the context of the presentation did not clearly relate to the basic question of the individual's responsibility for his own behavior in a manner comprehensible to the members of the class.

"Familial Issues", the title of the seventh lecture were covered by a professional counselor in an alcohol and other drug dependency treatment center. appearing for the second time during this quarter. The presentation lacked vitality or interest. Had the working counselor used a "how I do it approach", he might have been more informative and possible even effective. Instead, this was again a very pallid job of playing lecturer.

The eighth lecture on "Education Issues" was delivered by a lecturer who was meeting with the class for the third time during Winter Quarter. The problem of the need for education of the public in concrete fashion and education of the professional about drug dependency problems was described and the need for education emphasized. The traditional method of education, the lecture technique, was described as ineffectve. Cultural precepts and practices are most effective in controlling and preventing dependency was a theme again reinforced during this presentation. A report on a survey of the research on educational experiments in the area of drug dependency, part of this lecture, emphasized the dearth of activity and achievement in the field.

Legislative issues were covered in the ninth lecture. Reference was made to an assigned text, the only other reference to assigned reading in the three quarter sequence. The material was specific, undoubtedly familiar to students who were also counselors of drug dependents and, as presented by the lecturer, reflected a change of pace from preceding lectures.

"Ethical and Philosophical Issues" were covered by a clinical psychologist in the ninth and final lecture of the quarter. A distinction was made between the traditional judgments or/ behavior on the criteria

of "right" and "wrong" and the necessity for defining public policy or drug use so as to minimize the problems faced by society. The policy decisions are based on the subjective, on the ethical or the values to be placed on the facts. The problems relate to a personal or individual and a societal level. At this time, values are diverse. The goal to be reached for is a synthesis of diverse values to a unified value system in which restrictions on individual's liberty serve a legitimate social end.

EVALUATION OF WINTER QUARTER LECTURES:

The procedures and questionnaire forms for student evaluations varied in Winter Quarter from Fall Quarter. The Winter Quarter lectures and integrating theme were different from Fall Quarter. Some questions raised during Fall Quarter received unambiguous responses and would have been repetitively and wastefully used again.

Eighty-three students were registered Winter Quarter; 58 or 71% responded to the end-of-the-course questionnaire. A series of questions were raised as shown by the responses in Table VIII. Lecturers are identified in order of appearance. Two of the lecturers were well-known and personally knew about half of the students. Nevertheless, the judgments of the students are varied to the questions, indicating a rating with some objectivity. Although the observers might have rated differently, it is understandable *why* the students gave the responses which are shown. It would seem that in these responses students are rating the personality and manner of the lecturer even when the question asks for a rating of content and competence.

(See Table VIII)

TABLE VIII: STUDENT REACTIONS TO WINTER QUARTER LECTURERS  
(In Percentages)

Lecturers	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Did Not Attend Any Lectures by This Person	No Response	Total*
<b>1. Made it clear how each topic fit into the course.</b>						
A	69	24	5	0	2	100
B	78	16	3	3	0	100
C	48	26	24	0	2	100
D	62	24	12	0	2	100
E	46	33	14	5	2	100
F	59	19	12	10	0	100
G	45	29	21	3	2	100
<b>2. Clearly interpreted abstract ideas and theories.</b>						
A	88	9	3	0	0	100
B	83	10	3	3	0	100
C	36	28	33	0	3	100
D	74	17	3	2	3	100
E	52	31	9	5	3	100
F	79	7	3	10	0	100
G	48	29	19	3	0	100
<b>3. Gave explanations which were clear and to the point.</b>						
A	79	16	5	0	0	100
B	67	26	3	3	0	100
C	29	31	38	0	2	100
D	72	22	3	0	2	100
E	46	36	10	5	2	100
F	74	14	2	10	0	100
G	41	31	22	3	2	100

\* May differ from actual row total owing to rounding error.

TABLE VIII (continued)

Lecturers	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Did Not Attend Any Lectures by This Person	No Response	Total*
4. Made good use of examples and illustrations.						
A	81	12	2	0	5	100
B	55	31	5	3	5	100
C	64	12	19	0	5	100
D	62	29	3	0	5	100
E	40	40	10	5	5	100
F	71	10	3	10	5	100
G	57	21	14	3	5	100
5. Supplemented required reading.						
A	60	22	12	0	5	100
B	71	17	5	3	3	100
C	48	29	17	0	5	100
D	52	38	5	0	5	100
E	26	50	14	5	5	100
F	62	17	5	10	5	100
G	36	38	17	3	5	100
6. Related text and lecture materials.						
A	46	33	14	0	7	100
B	62	22	5	3	7	100
C	26	36	29	0	9	100
D	43	36	12	0	9	100
E	19	42	24	5	9	100
F	45	28	9	10	9	100
G	19	45	24	3	9	100

\* May differ from actual row total owing to rounding error.

TABLE VIII (continued)

Lecturers	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Did Not Attend Any Lectures by This Person	No Response	Total*
7. Was well organized.						
A	81	9	5	0	5	100
B	67	22	3	3	3	100
C	59	17	21	0	3	100
D	67	19	9	0	3	100
E	53	26	12	5	3	100
F	65	12	7	10	5	100
G	38	36	19	3	3	100
8. Sensitive to students' difficulty in understanding, and changed approach.						
A	59	29	9	0	3	100
B	64	26	3	3	3	100
C	52	21	26	0	2	100
D	60	33	3	0	3	100
E	41	31	19	5	3	100
F	50	29	7	10	3	100
G	43	33	17	3	3	100
9. Welcomed questions from students.						
A	79	12	3	0	5	100
B	83	7	2	3	5	100
C	62	24	9	0	5	100
D	84	9	2	0	5	100
E	69	19	2	5	5	100
F	74	9	2	10	5	100
G	59	22	10	3	5	100

\* May differ from actual row total owing to rounding error.



TABLE VIII (continued)

Lecturers	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Did Not Attend Any Lectures by This Person	No Response	Total*
10. Stimulated my curiosity and learning.						
A	71	16	9	0	5	100
B	60	24	9	3	3	100
C	76	9	12	0	3	100
D	48	34	12	0	5	100
E	50	24	16	5	5	100
F	62	19	3	10	5	100
G	48	22	21	3	5	100
11. Was genuinely interested in students.						
A	74	16	5	0	5	100
B	85	3	5	3	3	100
C	55	26	14	0	5	100
D	74	17	3	0	5	100
E	55	24	10	5	5	100
F	59	21	5	10	5	100
G	43	28	21	3	5	100
12. Was available for individual help.						
A	31	41	10	0	17	100
B	43	33	5	3	16	100
C	38	38	9	0	16	100
D	36	40	7	0	17	100
E	17	48	12	5	17	100
F	26	42	5	10	17	100
G	16	50	14	3	17	100

\* May differ from actual row total owing to rounding error.

THE SPRING QUARTER:

There was a basic difference in organization between Spring Quarter and the two preceding quarters. Most of the lectures on "Counseling the Alcoholic and Other Drug Dependent Persons" were given by one lecturer. This did not result in a greater feeling of unity of subject matter, however.

No readings or texts had been assigned, although some of the volume of clinical materials might have been relevant.

Techniques of counseling, descriptions of treatment centers, techniques of interviewing and of treatment, personality characteristics and defense mechanisms were some of the subjects covered in the lectures. In the time budgeted for each of these subjects, it was merely possible to name and to comment briefly on a therapeutic method or technique. Since no method was illustrated by example of application, nor presented as effective, the critical comments about each left a vacuum from the standpoint of what the counselor can do when he counsels.

There was no more discussion during this quarter than in previous quarters, although student frustrations on this matter had been extensively verbalized.

The high-light of interest and animated involvement during the quarter was reached on the evening when visiting lecturers from two new centers for emergency treatment of young drug dependents visited the class. Although there was some question and challenge to these lecturers, the stimulation of new approaches and content was palpably different from that of other class meetings.

The final examination was administered in the session preceding the last, and the last class meeting was reserved for discussion and review by the coordinator for the quarter and the coordinator for the entire course. The hour was not used effectively either for discussion of the final which had not been graded or for summary and review of the course and the quarter.

The detailed evaluation for the Spring Quarter was covered in summary questions for all three quarters and will be covered in the next and final section. No effort to rate the major lecturer was made for this quarter. He had been rated during the other quarters.

COMMENTS RELEVANT TO ENTIRE SERIES

The presentation of comments and evaluations of students in this section were elicited from 54 of the 73 Spring Quarter registrants. This is 74% of Spring Quarter students, although follow-up mailings of duplicate questionnaires were sent. In view of the attrition of registrants from Fall Quarter registrants, the materials in this section should be read with qualification when reference is made to student responses.

Comparisons are made on the basis of Education, Occupation and Drug Dependency Status.

RATING OF COURSE BY STUDENTS:

Students were given the opportunity to grade the three quarters of the course on the basis of letter grades as shown in Table IX, page 43.

Among the 5 students who grade the courses A are 2 who have high school or less education and 3 who are college graduates. Two of these students are counselors and three are non-counselors. Three were alcoholic or drug dependent and two are not.

The majority of students who responded, graded the course B. Nineteen of these were college graduates. Seven had some college and three were in the high school or less category. On the counselor -- non-counselor status, 11 were counselors, 18 were not. On the third variable, drug dependency status, of those who graded the course B, 13 were former dependents, 15 were not dependent, and 1 was of unknown status.

Nineteen of the students graded the course C as shown in Table IX and one student graded the course Incomplete.

(See Table IX, next page)

TABLE IX:  
 RATING OF COURSE BY STUDENTS  
 CLASSIFIED BY EDUCATION, OCCUPATION, DEPENDENCY STATUS

Question: If you were to give a grade to the entire 3-course sequence with respect to how much you got out of it, what grade would you give?

EDUCATION	A	B	C	D	F	I	Total
High School or Less	2	3	3	0	0	0	8
Some College	0	7	7	0	0	0	14
B.A. or More	3	19	9	0	0	1	32

---

OCCUPATION	A	B	C	D	F	I	Total
Counselor	2	11	8	0	0	0	21
Non-Counselor	3	18	11	0	0	1	33

---

DEPENDENCY STATUS	A	B	C	D	F	I	Total
Alcoholic or Drug Dependent or Both	3	13	11	0	0	1	28
Not Alcoholic or Drug Dependent	2	15	7	0	0	0	24
Drug Usage Patterns Unknown	-	1	1	-	-	-	2

UNDERSTANDING THE PURPOSES OF THE COURSE:

Most of the students said the purposes of the course were reasonably clear from the beginning or became reasonably clear as shown in Table X with students categorized on Education, Occupation and Drug Dependency Status.

Among the ten who found the purposes less clear were 7 college graduates; and one with some college. Only one of these 10 was a counselor and only one was a former drug dependent.

(See Table X, next page)

INTEREST OF STUDENTS IN ADDITIONAL COURSES:

Thirty of the 53 students responding indicated positive interest in taking additional courses in this area. In each educational group approximately half of the students indicated great interest; the other half moderate or minimal interest.

Two-thirds or 14 of the counselors were positively interested; one-third or 7 were moderately or minimally interested. Half or 16 of the non-counselors were positively interested; the other half or 16 were moderately or minimally interested. Nineteen or two-thirds of the 28 former drug dependents were positively interested; 9 were moderately or minimally interested. The 23 non-dependents were approximately equally divided on the interest in additional courses as shown in Table XI.

(See Table XI, page 46)

**TABLE X:**  
**UNDERSTANDING OF PURPOSES OF COURSE BY STUDENTS**  
**CLASSIFIED BY EDUCATION, OCCUPATION, DEPENDENCY STATUS**

Question: How well do you understand the purposes of this course?

EDUCATION	Never Made Clear	Only Indirect Reference Made To Them	Somewhat Clear	Became Reasonably Clear	Clear From Beginning	Total
High School or Less	1	1	0	4	2	8
Some College	0	0	1	7	6	14
B.A. or More	1	0	6	14	10	31

---

OCCUPATION	Never Made Clear	Only Indirect Reference Made To Them	Somewhat Clear	Became Reasonably Clear	Clear From Beginning	Total
Counselor	0	1	0	10	10	21
Non-Counselor	2	0	7	15	8	32

---

DEPENDENCY STATUS	Never Made Clear	Only Indirect Reference Made To Them	Somewhat Clear	Became Reasonably Clear	Clear From Beginning	Total
Alcoholic or Drug Dependent or Both	0	1	0	14	13	28
Not Alcoholic or Drug Dependent	2	0	6	10	5	23
Drug Usage Patterns Unknown	-	-	1	1	-	2

TABLE XI:

INTEREST OF STUDENTS IN ADDITIONAL COURSES IN THIS GENERAL AREA  
CLASSIFIED BY EDUCATION, OCCUPATION, DEPENDENCY STATUS

Question: What interest would you have in taking other courses  
in this general area of study?

EDUCATION	No Interest	Minimal Interest	Moderately Interested	Very Interested	Extremely Interested	Total
High School or Less	0	1	3	3	1	8
Some College	0	0	4	4	6	14
B.A. or More	0	2	13	8	8	31

---

OCCUPATION	No Interest	Minimal Interest	Moderately Interested	Very Interested	Extremely Interested	Total
Counselor	0	1	6	7	7	21
Non-Counselor	0	2	14	8	8	32

---

DEPENDENCY STATUS	No Interest	Minimal Interest	Moderately Interested	Very Interested	Extremely Interested	Total
Alcoholic or Drug Dependent or Both	0	1	8	9	10	28
Not Alcoholic or Drug Dependent	0	2	10	6	5	23
Drug Usage Patterns Unknown	-	-	2	-	-	2



RECOMMENDATION OF COURSE TO FRIENDS:

Approximately one-third of the responding students would recommend the course to friends with reservations or not at all. Another one-third would generally recommend the course, and one-third would recommend it highly.

When controlled on educational background, 8 of 31 college graduates would recommend the course highly; 10 would generally recommend it; and 11 would recommend with reservations. Two of the college graduates would not recommend the course.

Most of the 21 counselors, 18, would either generally or highly recommend. By contrast, 17 of the 32 non-counselors would recommend; 13 would recommend with reservations and 2 would not recommend.

On the drug dependency status, half or 14 of the 28 dependents would recommend the course highly; 7 would generally recommend, and 7 would recommend with reservations. Fewer of the non-dependent people, 5 of 23 would highly recommend; 8 would generally recommend; 8 would recommend with reservations; and 2 would not recommend.

(See Table XII, next page)

EXAMINATIONS AND GRADING:

Most students accepted the examinations as an opportunity to measure their learning but rejected the letter grades as irrelevant in a course of this kind. These expressions of opinion were elicited Fall Quarter and given in the context of a variety of detailed criticisms of the examinations.

The difficulty with examinations was a reflection of the lack of test preparation on the part of the lecturers and the lack of a clearly defined body of material which was being tested.

TABLE XII:  
RECOMMENDATION OF COURSE TO FRIENDS BY STUDENTS  
CLASSIFIED BY EDUCATION, OCCUPATION, DEPENDENCY STATUS

Question: Would you recommend this course to a good friend whose interests and background are like yours?

EDUCATION	Definitely Not	Undecided	Recommend with Reservations	Generally Recommend	Recommend Highly	Total
High School or Less	0	0	3	1	4	8
Some College	0	0	2	4	8	14
B.A. or More	2	0	11	10	8	31

---

OCCUPATION	Definitely Not	Undecided	Recommend with Reservations	Generally Recommend	Recommend Highly	Total
Counselor	0	0	3	7	11	21
Non-Counselor	2	0	13	8	9	32

---

DEPENDENCY STATUS	Definitely Not	Undecided	Recommend with Reservations	Generally Recommend	Recommend Highly	Total
Alcoholic or Drug Dependent or Both	0	0	7	7	14	28
Not Alcoholic or Drug Dependent	2	0	8	8	5	23
Drug Usage Patterns Unknown	-	-	1	-	1	2

The course grades earned by students are shown in Tables XIII for Fall Quarter, Table XIV for Winter Quarter, and Table XV for Spring Quarter. For comparisons among the three quarters, the three tables should be read in juxtaposition to each other. For comparison in any one quarter among the students classified by drug dependency status, education, and occupation each table can be read. The total number of students in each classification is shown in parentheses under the heading total. The percentage of this group receiving the respective grades are shown in each grade category.

For example, reading from Table XIII for Fall Quarter under Drug Dependency: 47 students were alcohol or drug dependent; 46 were not alcohol or drug dependent; and 13 were of unknown dependency status. Of the 47 drug dependents 19% received a grade of B, 45% received a C, 23% a D, 9% an F, and 4% an Incomplete. Among the 46 non-dependents, 15% received the grade of A, 37% received a B, 31% a C, 9% the D, 4% an F and 4% an Incomplete. Of the 13 whose dependency status is unknown, 39% received B's, 15% received C's, 23% received D's, 15% F's, and 8% Incompletes. None of the drug dependents earned A grades and a smaller proportion earned B's when compared with the non-dependent group.

Comparison on educational level confirms the expected; that in the Fall Quarter the college graduates earn higher grades than either those with some college and those with high school or less.

In the categorization of counselors and non-counselors, the latter earn higher grades in Fall Quarter.

Comparisons of grades for Winter Quarter are shown in Table XIV and for Spring Quarter in Table XV. These tables can be read in the same manner as Table XIII.

(See Tables XIII, XIV and XV, following pages)

TABLE XIII  
 GRADES EARNED BY STUDENTS IN FALL QUARTER  
 (In Percentages)

DRUG DEPENDENCY	A	B	C	D	F	I	Total
Alcoholic or drug dependent or both	0	19	45	23	9	4	(47)
Not alcoholic nor dependent	15	37	31	9	4	4	(46)
Drug usage Patterns unknown	0	39	15	23	15	8	(13)

---

EDUCATION	A	B	C	D	F	I	Total
High School or less	0	0	41	41	12	6	(17)
Some College	0	33	27	20	17	3	(30)
B.A. or More	12	36	37	8	2	5	(59)

---

OCCUPATION	A	B	C	D	F	I	Total
Counselor	0	14	36	29	14	7	(44)
Non-Counselor	11	41	34	8	3	3	(62)

**TABLE XIV**  
**GRADES EARNED BY STUDENTS IN WINTER QUARTER**  
**(In Percentages)**

<b>DRUG DEPENDENCY</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>Total</b>
Alcoholic or drug dependent or both	5	20	40	25	8	2	(40)
Not Alcoholic nor dependent	15	36	36	8	0	5	(39)
Drug usage pattern unknown	0	33	33	11	11	11	(9)

---

<b>EDUCATION</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>Total</b>
High School or less	0	19	37	19	6	19	(16)
Some College	8	17	25	42	8	0	(24)
B.A. or more	13	37	46	2	0	2	(48)

---

<b>OCCUPATION</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>F</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>Total</b>
Counselor	5	17	38	30	5	5	(37)
Non-Counselor	12	37	37	6	4	4	(51)

TABLE XV  
 GRADES EARNED BY STUDENTS IN SPRING QUARTER  
 (In Percentages)

DRUG DEPENDENCY	A	B	C	D	F	I	Total
Alcoholic or drug dependent or both	5	42	40	5	3	5	(38)
Not alcoholic nor dependent	6	32	32	18	0	12	(34)
Drug usage pattern unknown	0	14	72	14	0	0	(7)

---

EDUCATION	A	B	C	D	F	I	Total
High School or less	0	25	50	8	8	9	(12)
Some College	4	20	56	12	0	8	(25)
B.A. or more	7	48	26	12	0	7	(42)

---

OCCUPATION	A	B	C	D	F	I	Total
Counselor	6	38	41	6	3	6	(34)
Non-Counselor	4	33	38	16	0	9	(45)