DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 882 RC 005 490

AUTHOR Londergan, Susan; And Others
TITLE Patterns of Drug Use Among Adolescents in a Rural Community and in a Suburban Community.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at 1971 Rural Sociological Society Meeting, Denver, Colorado

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Drug Abuse, *High Schools, Rural Schools, *Rural Youth, Secondary School Students, Student Attitudes, Suburban Schools, *Suburban Youth, *Surveys, Tables (Data)

ABSTRACT

Objectives were to determine prevalence of drug abuse in rural and suburban areas and to delineate some of the demographic and sociopsychological correlates of drug abuse. Data on adolescent drug abuse were collected in a survey, grades 7 through 12, in a rural and in a suburban school district of a small mid-Atlantic state (rural and suburban classifications according to the Bureau of Census). The 35-item questionnaire was used to obtain 5 basic types of information: prevalance of use of particular drugs, demography, attitudes, participation in social activities, and peer-group relationships. In general, findings showed that prevalence of drug use in rural areas is lower than in suburban areas; absence of the father may not be an underlying factor affecting drug use; there is an absence of association between drug use and such factors as race, religion, and sex; for sources of information, students will listen to those who have used drugs and those who are experts in the health-information field; participation or lack of participation in organizations does not appear to be strongly related to drug use in either the rural or suburban area; frequent drug use by friends increases predictability of drug use by 22.5% for rural and 38% for suburban students; and drug education programs, in order to have impact, must precede grade 10. (JB)

PATTERNS OF DRUG USE AMONG ADOLESCENTS IN A RURAL COMMUNITY AND IN A SUBURBAN COMMUNITY

by

Susan Londergan
Robert A. Wilson
John H. McGrath
University of Delaware

Presented at 1971
Rural Sociological Society Meeting
Denver, Colorado

Introduction.

In recent years, adolescents in many areas of the country have dramatically increased their use of illegal drugs. At times this phenomenon has been referred to as a "drug epidemic." The increase in drug use has also been accompanied by changing patterns of abuse: whereas many former studies had found drug abuse to be concentrated in "deprived urban areas,"[1] recent studies state that drugs are used by youth from all strata of society,[2] with widely differing reasons for drug use, types of drugs abused, and resultant behavior patterns.

Timely, indepth research of drug abuse in all strata of society is necessary in order to create a balanced empirical base for the development of sociological theory on drug abuse. In addition, any new findings should specifically aid drug education and prevention groups in their efforts to develop more effective programs for all segments of the population. Finally, findings from studies done in a variety of rural and urban settings will benefit students by providing a broader view of the extent of drug use, and differences or consequences in the attitudes and behavior patterns associated with abuse of different drugs.

Although the traditional focus of drug studies has been on metropolitan areas, the present study examines patterns of youthful drug abuse in rural and suburban areas. Current theories on drug abuse are examined with respect to these settings. Theories which interrelate alienation, economic

deprivation, and delinquency with drug abuse are evaluated. The relative strength of factors such as peer group pressures and family background as correlates of drug use are explored.

Specifically, the objectives of this study are two: (1) to determine prevalence of drug abuse in rural and suburban areas; and (2) to delineate some of the demographic and social-psychological correlates of drug abuse.

Methodology.

Data on adolescent drug abuse were collected in a survey of all students, grades 7 through 12, in a rural school district and in a suburban district of a small mid-Atlantic state. These data were part of a statewide survey of over 30,000 students.

To select schools for the state survey, districts were grouped into rural-suburban-urban groups according to Bureau of Census classifications, as an indicator of degree of urbanization. Fifty percent of the districts throughout the state were randomly selected from each of the three groups. Six rural school districts and five suburban districts participated in the survey. A single rural district and a single suburban district are employed in this study.

The Rural District.

The rural district comprises an inland area of largely agricultural land with one small town (2,497 inhabitants) where the combined junior high school-senior high school is located. The area is relatively isolated from contact with external influences, since it is crossed by only one highway and has no river or coastal point and no railroad. The area does not attract tourists, who exert a considerable influence on some of the

neighboring rural areas. The economy also evidences a rural character. The local area has little industrial development with no large industry and only a few small businesses. A state planning report on the area notes a "negative attitude on the part of the citizens toward industrial growth."[3] Twenty percent of the labor force is employed in agriculture, and employment is subject to seasonal variations. The area has a low tax base and a low tax rate. Sociological characteristics evidence rural aspects. Educational attainment is low. Like many rural areas, the community is losing population, especially among the young adults (ages 16-35).

The Suburban District.

The second district, in contrast, is located in the predominantly middle class suburbs of a city of 85,000. Located in a standard metropolitan statistical area of over 300,000 population, the total population of the school district is approximately 42,000. A large proportion of the labor force of the area is employed in technical and managerial occupations within the chemical industry. Educationally, adults residing within this school district reveal the highest educational level of any district in the state. Reflecting both its wealth and its typical upper middle class concern with precollege education, the school district is considered to be one of the best in the state.

The Survey.

The survey employed a 35-item questionnaire, comprised mostly of "self-report" items on drug use and delinquent behavior supplemented by some of the standard sociological measures. Because the survey dealt with admissions of illegal behavior, a central concern of the researchers was

to insure its confidentiality to both students and educators. Prior to the survey, students were given a letter from the governor of the state, stressing the strict confidentiality of the results. In order that students and classrooms could not be identified, teachers were asked to leave the classroom while students completed the survey. Questionnaires were then placed in an unmarked envelope by a student representative who in turn delivered the envelopes to the researchers who removed the data from the school. In other words, students saw that school officials had no access to the data and that they could not be personally identified. Data will be publicly released by the researchers only in aggregate form (by county and statewide), so that schools and districts cannot be identified.

Pretests on a Pennsylvania Drug Survey showed that honesty and reliability of responses were higher when students administered the survey rather than teachers or administration.[4] As noted above, students were in charge of classrooms during the administration of our survey. In analyzing the data, an internal consistency check for reliability was provided by comparing responses on separate items which measure the same thing. Highly inconsistent questionnaires, detected in this manner, were not included in the final statistical analysis. Less than one percent of the questionnaires proved to be invalid, indicating a high level of cooperation from respondents. It was possible, however, for a person to give consistent invalid responses and be undetected. The researchers also suspect a slight underreporting of drug use as a result of fear of reprisals by authorities.

Questionnaires.

The questionnaire was designed to examine several specific aspects of drug use, and a wide range of factors related to drug use. Five basic types of information were examined by the survey: (1) prevalence of use of particular drugs; (2) demographic information; (3) attitudinal information; (4) participation in social activities (of both a deviant and nondeviant nature); and (5) peer group relationships.

A wide variety of drugs (including cigarettes and alcohol) were listed as check-off items. Respondents were asked to indicate the frequency which they used each drug. Another series of questions asked which drugs were available to the respondent. Demographic information included standard sociological items such as age, sex, occupational status, and family background.

The questionnaire also included: (a) attitudes of respondents toward various types of persons as sources of drug information; (b) attitudes of youth toward the legalization of drugs and (c) prevalence of attitudes and behavioral manifestations of alienation among users and nonusers. Much of the literature of drug use is predicated on the proposition that youthful drug users are "alienated" and do not trust the system or its leaders, and feel powerless to change things for the better.[5] The Srole anomia scale[6] was included as a general measure of powerlessness and despair.

Another common theory holds that as a consequence of alienation, drug users do not participate in formal and informal organizations. This theory was tested through a series of questions on participation in various types of school and extra-curricular and community activities. As mentioned earlier, a series of questions examined frequency of

participation in delinquent activities, using the Short-Nye Self-admitted Delinquency Scale[7] for the purpose of determining whether drug users participate in many delinquent activities or whether they deviate mainly in their use of illegal drugs.

The final section focused on peer group relationships and how, if at all, they are associated with drug abuse. Items indicated whether the respondent's friends talk about drugs, use drugs, or have been in trouble with the law. Theories on drug abuse often stress the relation of the peer group "subculture" with use of drugs. This study weighs the strength of this relationship in rural and suburban communities.

Findings.

Only preliminary results are at present available from the larger statewide study. The findings which are presented here fall within two major areas: prevalence of drug use and associations between drug use and a variety of demographic and attitudinal factors.

For statistical comparisons, students are classified into three categories which describe the extent to which they are involved with illegal drugs: "Users" include all students who are now using one or more illegal drugs; "Quitters" consist of all students who have used one or more illegal drugs, but who have stopped using drugs; and "Nonusers" include all students who indicate that they have never used any illegal drugs. Where there are too few respondents to permit statistical comparison in three categories, comparisons are made between two larger groupings, "users" and "nonusers." Here "users" refers to all students who indicate that they have ever used one or more illegal drugs.

Prevalence of Use of Particular Drugs. Of the entire rural district (grades 7 through 12), 2.7 percent of the students are "users," and 5.5 percent are "quitters" (Table 1). The corresponding percentages of users and quitters in the suburban district were 11.3 and 10.2 respectively. This immediately suggests that drug use among rural students is relatively low. Other studies[8] indicate rates of drug use ranging from over 50 percent to less than 1 percent, with low rates occurring principally in rural areas. In general, this suggests that rural areas tend to have comparatively low overall rates of youthful drug abuse.

It should also be noted that there are twice as many "quitters" as "users" in the rural area, but almost equal proportions in the suburban area. Apparently most students in a rural area experiment with drugs without becoming habitual users, a tendency which is not suggested in the suburban area.

Rates of use for particular types of drugs are shown (Table 1). Drugs which are or were most commonly used by rural students in rank order are (1) marijuana, (2) glue, and (3) amphetamines. In the suburban order the drugs, in order of prevalence are (1) marijuana, (2) amphetamines, and (3) other psychedelics (D.E.T., S.T.P., etc.). Although rates of use are low in the rural area it is of interest that marijuana and heroin are the drugs most frequently used by those now using drugs.

Prevalence of drug use in each grade (Table 2) shows that drug use increases unevenly in junior high school, then progressively with each grade after the ninth grade. The use of glue decreases markedly after the 10th grade. (N.B.: "Frequency" in table 2 indicates all those who have ever tried a drug. It is not an indication of present use of drugs.)

In the rural area drug use increases from 4 percent of the students in 7th grade to 19 percent in the senior year of high school. An even greater increase is found in the suburban area, with drug use increasing from 6 percent to 42 percent during the same grade span. Hence, drug use may be one part of the role contingent upon entering the "sophisticated world" of high school. These results imply that an effective drug education program must precede the 10th grade and attempt to forestall attitudes and expectations which lead to deviant role adaptation.

Although a minority of the student population uses drugs, over two-thirds of the suburban students, as compared to less than one-fifth of the rural students, "know where to get" one or more illegal drugs (Table 3, A-D). It is of interest that a significant segment of the population has the opportunity to use drugs but chooses not to. The Tau-B's, which specify the percentage increase in prediction of drug use through knowledge of the independent variable (knowing where to get drugs), average 6 percent for the rural area and 12 percent for the suburban area, for the 4 kinds of drugs.

Use of "socially acceptable" drugs--cigarettes and alcohol--is highly correlated with adolescent use of illegal drugs (Tables 4 and 5). This may indicate that overcoming one inhibition or proscription eases the move to trying other types of proscribed behavior. For the high school student both alcohol and narcotics are illegal: The difference in degree of illegality may have little influence on his decision to use either. Another relevant factor with respect to cigarette smoking may be the difficulty nonsmokers have in commencing to smoke marijuana, as inhaling smoke requires uncomfortable learning behavior. The association of both smoking and drinking is more highly associated with drug use in the suburban area than in the rural area.

Demographic Information. Two items on parent's occupation were of interest in relation to use of drugs in the two areas (Tables 6 and 7). The first item specifies who earns the most money in the family. The use of drugs shows a slight association with "mother" as the wage earner in the suburban area, although not in the rural area, indicating that absence of the father alone may not be an underlying factor affecting drug use. This independence from family ties, suggested by the relationship between drug use and a family with a female wage earner in the suburban area, may lead to increased dependence on the peer group to define values and behavior patterns. The use of drugs is a behavior pattern which is often opposed and restrained by family authority, yet accepted by peer groups. That fact that this relationship between the sex of the family's main wage earner and drug use is not found in the rural area, may indicate that presence of more supportive relationships within the broader community.

Occupational status of the wage earner was measured on a seven-point scale using the Hollingshead two-factor index of social position[9] (Table 7). While the relationship between parent's occupational status and drug use does not reach the level of statistical significance, it is of interest that drug users in the rural area are concentrated in the highest occupational level while users in the suburban area are more evenly distributed throughout the strata. These findings contrast with the traditional image of drug users as largely from lower class backgrounds. Since "quitters" show a slight correlation with lower occupational levels, it might be concluded that only the well-off students can afford to continue use of drugs. Using the entire range of the Hollingshead scale in an analysis of covariance, two results are prominant: (1) Interaction between type of district (rural or suburban) and the relationship between

occupational level and drug use is present, and (2) There is a slight negative slope between occupation and drug use in the rural area, although a negligible slope is found in the rural area. Interpretation of this data will have to await analysis of statewide results.

Of particular interest among the demographic information is the absence of association between drug use and such factors as race, religion, and sex of the respondent.

Attitudinal Information. For the effective planning of drug education programs it is important to know what types of persons the students respect as a source of information about drugs. Respondents were asked to rate a variety of persons as sources of drug information from above average to below average. "Nonusers," in general, indicate higher respect overall for drug information (Table 8). Note that several persons are rated below average: "school counselor," "social worker," and "best friend." On the other hand, "users" and "quitters" appear to reject drug information from many sources. Those persons who command the respect of all three groups, "nonuser," "quitter," and "user" are:

1. "A professor from Johns Hopkins Medical School;"
2. "A doctor from tne Department of Public Health;"
3. "Your personal physician;" and
4. "Someone who has used drugs."

The respect for expert medical and health information on drug use is underlined by the high rating given to the first three persons. It is significant that users and nonusers alike have high respect for someone who has used drugs. Respect for the "best friend" among users confirms the importance of the peer group in shaping attitudes on drug use.

Only one person was consistently ranked below average by all groups: social worker. Present and former users also rated the following persons as below average:

1. "A teacher giving a health lecture at your school;"
2. "A policeman;" and
3. "A school counselor."

Since the vast majority of drug education programs are conducted by those persons who gain the least respect from young people, drug users and nonusers alike, some review of these programs is recommended. More effective programs might center around more highly respected persons.

Attitudes of youth toward the legalization of drugs are strongly related to the use of drugs (Table 9). Students who had experience with drugs favored a weakening of the laws against drug use; while, in contrast, "nonusers" favored strengthening them. The knowledge of attitudes toward drug laws increases predictability of drug use by 10 percent for rural students and 22 percent for suburban. It should be noted, however, that a large group of the "users" support the laws "as they are now" or favor <u>stricter</u> laws.

The traditional theory that drug use is related to degrees of alienation is <u>not</u> evidenced by our preliminary examination of the data. Although analysis using the Srole anomia scale has not been completed, the data on the individual scale items evidence strong attitudes of alienation in all students, but no difference in anomia between users and nonusers.

<u>Participation in Social and Deviant Activities</u>. The participation of students in various types of organizations is examined in relation to drug use (Table 10). Participation or lack of participation in any of

these social activities does not appear to be strongly related to drug use in either the rural or suburban area.

There is a slight tendency of drug "users" to be more involved than "nonusers" in political activities. These findings contradict the theory that drug users are nonparticipants in formal or informal organizations. Rural drug users appear to be involved in all types of activities.

Participation in delinquent acts other than drug use (Table 11) is strongly and directly correlated with rural drug use and suburban drug use. A high proportion of drug users engage in or have engaged in other forms of delinquent activity. This suggests that drug use is not an isolated deviant action, but is part of an overall pattern of deviance. Drug abuse may indicate participation in an overall pattern of active rejection of social norms through violation of laws and standards: a rebelliousness or "defiant subculture" which is in sharp contrast with the traditional drug stereotype of alienation and apathy. Moreover, drugs may be taken <u>because</u> they <u>are</u> illegal, as a sign of rejection of societal norms. This would complement Cohen's notion as to why some adolescents deviate.[10]

<u>Peer Group Relationships</u>. Peer group relations are strongly related to use of drugs. The extent friends talk about drugs (Table 12) is positively associated with drug use. One may note, however, that over 30 percent of the drug users do <u>not</u> often talk with their friends about drugs. The frequency with which friends use drugs is also strongly and positively correlated with the respondent's use of drugs (Table 13). Tau-b measures indicate that knowledge of the frequency friends use drugs increases predictability of drug use by 22.5 percent for rural students

and 38 percent for suburban students. It is evident that a student's peer group has a strong relation to his behavior in use or nonuse of drugs. (Again, it is interesting to note that nearly half of the drug users in the rural state that their friends never use drugs, although this is true for only 17 percent in the suburban area.) Drug users are also more likely to have friends who have been in trouble with the law (Table 14.

Peer group relationships thus appear to be strongly correlated with patterns of youthful drug abuse in both rural and suburban areas. It appears that drug use is not characterized by isolation and retreatism, but rather by rebelliousness and defiance, as evidenced by the strong correlations with numerous other deviant acts. Drug use may be either a result of peer relationships, or a person's decision to use drugs may lead him to choose friends who also use drugs. It emerges as but one manifestation of a general deviant youth subculture--a pattern which parallels that of deviant youth cultures found by other researchers.

In conclusion, it is strongly indicated that drug education programs, in order to have impact, must precede the 10th grade, as attitudes and expectations which lead to deviant role adaptation appear to be formed in junior high school or before. Wherever possible, programs should be conducted by persons whom the students trust as sources of information on drugs.

FOOTNOTES

1. O'Donnell, John A. and John C. Ball, ed. Narcotic Addiction. New York, Harper and Row, 1966. p. 145.

2. Larimer, George S. and Alvin H. Tucker. "Drugs and Youth," Pennsylvania's Health. Volume 31, number 4, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, 1970. p. 9.

3. Mighton, Alex C. Factors Governing Community Development and Economic Profiles of Selected Delaware Communities, Division of Urban Affairs, University of Delaware, 1968. p. 86.

4. Larimer and Tucker, Op.cit., p. 6.

5. O'Donnell and Ball. Op.cit., p. 134.

6. Srole, Leo. "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," American Sociological Review, 21 December. pp. 709-716.

7. Nye, F. Iran and James Short. Family Relationships and Delinquent Behavior. New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc. 1958.

8. Bogg, Richard H. Drugs and Michigan High School Students. Michigan Department of Public Health, 1968. p. 20.

9. Hollingshead, August B. and Frederick Redlich. Social Class and Mental Illness. New York, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

10. Cohen, Albert K. and James F. Short, Jr. "Research in Delinquent Subcultures," Journal of Social Issues, Volume XIV, 1958.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS WHO ARE NOW USING OR HAVE QUIT USING SPECIFIED TYPES OF DRUGS

Pattern of Drug Use	Percentage of Total Respondents	Marijuana[a]	LSD	Heroin	Amphetamines	Barbituates	Other Psychedelics	Other Narcotics	Glue	Other
Users										
Rural	2.7	2.2	0.8	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.8	0.6	0.8
	(22)	(17)	(6)	(7)	(6)	(6)	(5)	(6)	(5)	(6)
Suburban	11.3	10.6	1.4	0.4	2.9	1.5	2.2	1.0	0.7	0.7
	(566)	(532)	(70)	(20)	(146)	(75)	(109)	(47)	(34)	(36)
Quitters										
Rural	5.5	3.2	0.5	-	2.2	1.7	0.5	0.4	3.0	0.6
	(44)	(25)	(4)	(0)	(17)	(13)	(4)	(3)	(23)	(5)
Suburban	10.2	8.2	3.2	0.9	6.0	2.9	2.6	2.2	4.2	2.3
	(515)	(409)	(160)	(42)	(339)	(168)	(200)	(123)	(181)	(114)
TOTAL N[b] (Including Nonusers)	(5,004)	(4,929)	(4,881)	(4,974)	(4,891)	(4,871)	(4,886)	(4,864)	(4,875)	(4,875)

[a] Columns involve cross-listing: A respondent is listed once in each column to indicate use or nonuse of the specified drug.

[b] Total N's in each column will not be equal as No Information was given by respondents on frequency of use for the specified drug.

TABLE 2

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY GRADE (7 THROUGH 12) WHO HAVE USED SPECIFIED TYPES OF DRUGS

	Grades											
	Seventh		Eighth		Ninth		Tenth		Eleventh		Twelfth	
Drug Used	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Drug Users As Percentage of Total Students	3.7 (5)	6.4 (58)	3.4 (6)	12.5 (107)	5.8 (7)	17.5 (149)	8.9 (11)	25.2 (206)	13.5 (15)	31.2 (247)	19.4 (19)	41.8 (314)
Marijuana	3.0 (4)	3.7 (34)	0.6 (1)	8.6 (74)	3.3 (4)	14.4 (123)	7.3 (9)	23.1 (189)	9.9 (11)	28.8 (228)	13.3 (13)	40.2 (302)
LSD	1.5 (2)	0.2 (2)	- (0)	0.8 (7)	- (0)	3.3 (28)	2.4 (3)	5.3 (43)	0.9 (1)	6.2 (49)	4.1 (4)	13.3 (100)
Heroin	1.5 (2)	0.1 (1)	- (0)	0.7 (6)	- (0)	1.2 (10)	0.8 (1)	1.0 (8)	- (0)	1.6 (13)	3.1 (3)	3.9 (29)
Amphetamines	1.5 (2)	2.5 (23)	1.1 (2)	4.4 (38)	0.8 (1)	6.3 (54)	4.0 (5)	11.5 (94)	6.3 (7)	7.8 (62)	6.1 (6)	10.6 (80)
Barbituates	1.5 (2)	1.0 (9)	0.6 (1)	1.9 (16)	- (0)	3.0 (26)	3.2 (4)	5.4 (44)	6.3 (7)	6.6 (52)	5.1 (5)	8.9 (67)
Other Psychedelics	1.5 (2)	0.4 (4)	- (0)	1.7 (15)	- (0)	2.9 (25)	2.4 (3)	5.8 (47)	0.9 (1)	6.7 (53)	3.1 (3)	13.8 (104)
Other Narcotics	1.5 (2)	0.4 (4)	- (0)	1.5 (13)	- (0)	2.0 (17)	0.8 (1)	4.2 (34)	0.9 (1)	4.5 (36)	4.1 (4)	7.0 (53)
Glue	2.2 (3)	3.0 (27)	1.7 (3)	4.7 (40)	2.5 (3)	5.6 (48)	7.3 (9)	4.4 (36)	3.6 (4)	6.6 (52)	5.1 (5)	5.2 (39)
Other	1.5 (2)	1.5 (14)	- (0)	2.4 (21)	- (0)	4.7 (40)	1.6 (2)	3.1 (25)	1.8 (2)	4.0 (32)	3.1 (3)	2.7 (20)

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, QUITTERS AND NONUSERS WHO "KNOW WHERE TO GET" SPECIFIED DRUGS

A. Marijuana (Pot)

	Know Where to Get It		Do Not Know Where to Get It	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	7.5 (13)	23.3 (251)	1.4 (9)	0.0 (2)
Quitters	16.1 (28)	23.7 (255)	2.6 (16)	0.1 (10)
Nonusers	76.3 (132)	53.0 (571)	95.8 (579)	99.9 (629)
TOTAL	99.9 (173)	100.0 (1,077)	99.8 (604)	100.0 (641)

Rural, Tau_B = .067

Suburban, Tau_B = .153

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, QUITTERS AND NONUSERS WHO "KNOW WHERE TO GET" SPECIFIED DRUGS

B. Heroin or Opium

	Know Where to Get It		Do Not Know Where to Get It	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	14.7 (9)	24.2 (150)	1.8 (13)	9.3 (103)
Quitters	24.5 (15)	27.8 (172)	4.0 (29)	8.5 (93)
Nonusers	60.6 (37)	47.9 (296)	94.1 (674)	82.2 (904)
TOTAL	99.8 (61)	99.9 (618)	99.9 (716)	100.0 (1,100)

Rural, Tau_B = .007

Suburban, Tau_B = .086

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, QUITTERS AND NONUSERS WHO "KNOW WHERE TO GET" SPECIFIED DRUGS

C. LSD

	Know Where to Get It		Do Not Know Where to Get It	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	15.8 (10)	27.6 (178)	1.6 (12)	6.9 (75)
Quitters	26.9 (17)	24.5 (158)	3.7 (27)	9.9 (107)
Nonusers	57.1 (36)	47.9 (309)	94.5 (675)	83.0 (891)
TOTAL	99.8 (63)	100.0 (645)	99.8 (714)	99.8 (1,073)

Rural, Tau_B = .10

Suburban, Tau_B = .094

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, QUITTERS AND NONUSERS WHO "KNOW WHERE TO GET" SPECIFIED DRUGS

D. Goof Balls or Pep Pills

	Know Where to Get It		Do Not Know Where to Get It	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	7.8 (10)	28.4 (191)	1.8 (12)	5.9 (62)
Quitters	14.9 (19)	25.1 (169)	3.8 (25)	9.1 (96)
Nonusers	77.1 (98)	46.4 (312)	94.3 (613)	84.9 (888)
TOTAL	99.8 (127)	99.9 (672)	99.9 (650)	99.9 (1,046)

Rural Tau_B = .038

Suburban Tau_B = .114

TABLE 4

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, QUITTERS AND NONUSERS WHO SMOKE CIGARETTES

	Smokers		Nonsmokers	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	7.7 (15)	29.2 (170)	1.2 (7)	6.0 (89)
Quitters	12.8 (25)	28.1 (164)	3.3 (19)	7.6 (112)
Nonusers	79.6 (156)	42.7 (249)	95.5 (549)	86.4 (1,281)
TOTAL	100.1 (196)	100.0 (583)	100.0 (575)	100.0 (1,482)

Rural Tau_B = .046 Suburban Tau_B = .139

TABLE 5

RESPONSE OF USERS AND NONUSERS TO THE STATEMENT:
"HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU BOUGHT OR DRUNK BEER, WINE OR LIQUOR IN THE LAST FIVE YEARS?"

	Never		Once or Twice		Three or Four Times		Five or More Times	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users[a]	2.1	6.8	8.6	19.3	14.3	33.9	30.3	53.3
	(10)	(59)	(11)	(70)	(6)	(65)	(36)	(335)
Nonusers	97.9	93.2	91.4	80.7	85.7	66.1	69.8	46.7
	(459)	(812)	(117)	(292)	(36)	(127)	(83)	(293)
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1	100.0
	(469)	(871)	(128)	(362)	(42)	(192)	(119)	(628)

Rural Tau_B = .133 Suburban Tau_B = .209

[a]"Users" here sums all respondents who have ever used illegal drugs.

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE OF USERS AND NONUSERS BY PRINCIPAL WAGE EARNER IN FAMILY

	Father		Mother		Other	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	9.1 (58)	25.2 (496)	3.0 (3)	45.6 (36)	20.0 (4)	30.8 (4)
Nonusers	90.9 (577)	74.8 (1,470)	97.0 (96)	54.4 (43)	80.0 (16)	69.2 (9)
TOTAL	100.0 (635)	100.0 (1,966)	100.0 (99)	100.0 (79)	100.0 (20)	100.0 (13)

Rural Tau_B = .010 Suburban Tau_B = .008

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, NONUSERS AND QUITTERS
BY PARENTS' OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

	High[a]		Medium		Low	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	4.7 (5)	12.5 (140)	3.1 (8)	12.1 (73)	1.0 (2)	12.5 (13)
Quitters	8.5 (9)	12.7 (142)	4.6 (12)	13.9 (84)	7.8 (15)	19.2 (20)
Nonusers	86.6 (91)	74.8 (836)	92.1 (236)	74.0 (448)	91.0 (173)	68.3 (71)
TOTAL	99.8 (105)	100.0 (1,118)	99.8 (256)	100.0 (605)	99.8 (190)	100.0 (104)

[a]Parent's Occupational Status was measured on a seven point scale using Hollingshead's Index of Occupational and Education Status. The seven categories were grouped for statistical purposes. Category I and II = High, Category III, IV. and V = Medium and Category VI and VII = Low.

Analysis of Variance test for interaction: F ratio = 15.9, p = .0001

Rural, b = .01727 Suburban, b = -.17136

Tau_B = .005 Tau_B = .001

TABLE 8

RELATIVE VALUE USERS, QUITTERS AND NONUSERS
HAVE FOR DRUG INFORMATION GIVEN BY SPECIFIED PERSONS[a]

	Users		Quitters		Nonusers	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Professor from Johns Hopkins Medical School	2.33	3.37	2.46	2.47	2.60	2.59
Doctor from the Department of Public Health	2.16	2.26	2.61	2.35	2.60	2.60
Your Personal Physician	2.20	2.48	2.43	2.57	2.64	2.69
Teacher Giving a Health Lecture at Your School	1.52	1.53	1.69	1.83	2.21	2.12
Your School Counselor	1.61	1.50	1.98	1.65	2.21	1.93
Social Worker	1.63	1.79	1.86	1.86	1.99	1.96
Policeman	1.67	1.63	1.88	1.90	2.39	2.09
Your Minister, Priest or Rabbi	1.95	1.72	2.37	1.92	2.41	2.14
Someone Who Has Used Drugs	2.50	2.60	2.51	2.52	2.33	2.36
Your Best Friend	2.18	2.25	2.17	2.18	2.06	1.97
Your Father or Mother	1.79	1.64	2.14	1.87	2.43	2.23

[a]Number indicates the mean score 3 = above average, 1 = below average.

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE OF USERS AND NONUSERS BY ATTITUDE TOWARD LAWS AGAINST DRUG USE

	Stronger		Kept the Way They Are		Kept the Way They Are Except It Shouldn't Be Against the Law to Use Marijuana		Not So Strong		Wiped Out Altogether	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	4.2 (21)	8.4 (78)	2.9 (3)	15.7 (40)	21.6 (22)	55.1 (293)	29.7 (11)	47.8 (66)	37.5 (6)	34.2 (41)
Nonusers	95.8 (474)	91.6 (852)	97.1 (67)	84.3 (215)	78.4 (80)	44.9 (239)	70.3 (26)	52.2 (72)	62.5 (10)	65.8 (79)
TOTAL	100.0 (495)	100.0 (930)	100.0 (70)	100.0 (255)	100.0 (102)	100.0 (532)	100.0 (37)	100.0 (138)	100.0 (16)	100.0 (120)

Rural, Tau_B = .100

Suburban, Tau_B = .220

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF USERS AND NONUSERS WHO PARTICIPATE IN EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

A. School Activities

	Participants		Nonparticipants	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	8.8 (54)	22.7 (368)	7.1 (12)	37.1 (159)
Nonusers	91.1 (553)	77.3 (1,251)	92.8 (157)	62.9 (269)
TOTAL	99.9 (607)	100.0 (1,619)	99.9 (169)	100.0 (428)

Rural, Tau_B = .001

Suburban, Tau_B = .018

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF USERS AND NONUSERS WHO PARTICIPATE IN EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

B. Religious Activities

	Participants		Nonparticipants	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	6.2 (19)	22.9 (145)	9.8 (49)	27.0 (382)
Nonusers	93.8 (283)	77.1 (488)	90.2 (428)	73.0 (1,032)
TOTAL	100.0 (302)	100.0 (633)	100.0 (477)	100.0 (1,414)

Rural, Tau_B = .003

Suburban, Tau_B = .002

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF USERS AND NONUSERS WHO PARTICIPATE IN EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

C. YMCA, Boy Scout Activities

	Participants		Nonparticipants	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	6.5 (13)	21.9 (176)	9.1 (53)	28.3 (351)
Nonusers	93.5 (186)	78.1 (629)	90.9 (525)	71.7 (891)
TOTAL	100.0 (199)	100.0 (805)	100.0 (578)	100.0 (1,242)

Rural, Tau_B = .001

Suburban, Tau_B = .005

TABLE 10

PERCENTAGE OF USERS AND NONUSERS WHO PARTICIPATE IN EXTRA-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

D. Political Activities

	Participants		Nonparticipants	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	18.5	54.7	8.1	24.0
	(5)	(64)	(61)	(463)
Nonusers	81.5	45.3	91.9	76.0
	(22)	(53)	(689)	(1,467)
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
	(27)	(117)	(750)	(1,930)

Rural, Tau_B = .004

Suburban, Tau_B = .027

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, NONUSERS AND QUITTERS
WHO COMMIT SPECIFIED DELINQUENT ACTS

A. Driving Without a Drivers License or Permit

	Never		Once or More	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	2.2 (9)	8.6 (115)	3.3 (12)	20.2 (145)
Quitters	3.4 (14)	8.9 (120)	7.7 (28)	21.5 (154)
Nonusers	94.2 (378)	82.5 (1,109)	88.8 (320)	58.3 (418)
TOTAI	99.8 (401)	100.0 (1,344)	99.8 (360)	100.0 (717)

Rural Tau_B = .008

Suburban Tau_B = .049

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, NONUSERS AND QUITTERS
WHO COMMIT SPECIFIED DELINQUENT ACTS

B. Skipping School Without a Legitimate Excuse

	Never		Once or More	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	0.5 (3)	4.4 (57)	10.4 (18)	26.5 (200)
Quitters	3.6 (21)	7.6 (99)	12.7 (22)	22.9 (173)
Nonusers	95.9 (565)	88.0 (1,141)	76.8 (133)	50.6 (383)
TOTAL	100.0 (589)	100.0 (1,297)	99.9 (173)	100.0 (756)

Rural $Tau_B = .06$ Suburban $Tau_B = .118$

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, NONUSERS AND QUITTERS
WHO COMMIT SPECIFIED DELINQUENT ACTS

C. Taking Things Worth Less Than Two Dollars

	Never		Once or More	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	1.7 (10)	8.8 (95)	5.7 (11)	16.7 (165)
Quitters	3.3 (19)	9.8 (103)	11.5 (22)	17.2 (170)
Nonusers	94.8 (536)	81.4 (876)	82.7 (158)	66.1 (652)
TOTAL	99.8 (565)	99.8 (1,074)	99.9 (191)	100.0 (987)

Rural Tau_B = .027

Suburban Tau_B = .022

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, NONUSERS AND QUITTERS
WHO COMMIT SPECIFIED DELINQUENT ACTS

D. Purposely Damaging or Destroying Property

	Never		Once or More	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	1.5 (10)	10.0 (149)	7.9 (11)	23.4 (110)
Quitters	3.8 (24)	10.8 (160)	13.7 (19)	2.3 (11)
Nonusers	94.5 (592)	79.2 (1,177)	78.2 (108)	74.3 (350)
TOTAL	99.8 (626)	100.0 (1,486)	99.8 (138)	100.0 (471)

Rural Tau_B = .037

Suburban Tau_B = .014

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, NONUSERS AND QUITTERS
WHO COMMIT SPECIFIED DELINQUENT ACTS

E. Taking Things Worth Less Than Fifty Dollars

	Never		Once or More	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	2.0 (15)	10.4 (192)	13.8 (5)	32.7 (68)
Quitters	4.4 (32)	12.2 (226)	25.0 (9)	22.6 (47)
Nonusers	93.4 (676)	77.3 (1,430)	61.0 (22)	44.7 (93)
TOTAL	99.8 (723)	99.9 (1,848)	99.8 (36)	100.0 (208)

Rural Tau_B = .048

Suburban Tau_B = .036

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, NONUSERS AND QUITTERS
WHO COMMIT SPECIFIED DELINQUENT ACTS

F. "Running Away" From Home

	Never		Once or More	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users[a]	6.5 (46)	22.1 (410)	25.8 (15)	58.4 (121)
Nonusers	93.4 (656)	77.8 (1,441)	74.1 (43)	41.5 (86)
TOTAL	99.9 (702)	99.9 (1,851)	99.9 (58)	99.9 (207)

Rural Tau_B = .037 Suburban Tau_B = .062

[a]"Users" here sums all respondents who have ever used illegal drugs.

TABLE 11

PERCENTAGE OF USERS, NONUSERS AND QUITTERS
WHO COMMIT SPECIFIED DELINQUENT ACTS

G. Taking Things Worth More Than Fifty Dollars

	Never		Once or More	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Users	7.2 (54)	23.4 (463)	35.0 (7)	79.0 (68)
Nonusers	92.8 (687)	76.6 (1,509)	65.0 (13)	21.0 (18)
TOTAL	100.0 (741)	100.0 (1,972)	100.0 (20)	100.0 (86)

Rural Tau_B = .024

Suburban Tau_B = .065

TABLE 12

RESPONSES OF USERS AND NONUSERS TO THE STATEMENT:
"MY FRIENDS AND I TALK A LOT ABOUT DRUGS"

	Users		Nonusers	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Strongly Agree	18.2 (12)	22.7 (123)	6.2 (44)	5.9 (91)
Agree	40.9 (27)	44.6 (242)	20.3 (144)	28.3 (436)
Disagree	21.2 (14)	26.3 (143)	46.3 (329)	47.4 (729)
Strongly Disagree	13.6 (9)	3.5 (19)	23.4 (166)	16.9 (260)
TOTAL	93.9 (62)	97.1 (527)	96.2 (683)	98.5 (1,516)

Rural, Tau_B = .048

Suburban, Tau_B = .117

TABLE 13

PERCENTAGE OF USERS AND NONUSERS BY
USE OF DRUGS BY FRIENDS

	Users		Nonusers	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Regularly	12.1 (3)	21.7 (118)	0.6 (4)	1.8 (28)
Occasionally	24.2 (16)	14.0 (76)	2.4 (17)	6.4 (99)
Once or Twice as an Experiment	12.1 (8)	44.6 (242)	1.3 (9)	9.1 (140)
Never	47.0 (31)	17.3 (94)	93.0 (661)	80.5 (1,236)
TOTAL	95.4 (63)	97.6 (530)	97.3 (691)	97.8 (1,503)

Rural, Tau_B = .225

Suburban, Tau_B = .383

TABLE 14

RESPONSES OF USERS, QUITTERS AND NONUSERS TO THE QUESTION: "HAVE YOUR CLOSE FRIENDS EVER BEEN IN TROUBLE WITH THE LAW?"

	Users		Quitters		Nonusers	
	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban	Rural	Suburban
Yes	68.2 (15)	71.8 (191)	59.1 (26)	63.5 (176)	29.7 (211)	29.8 (458)
No	22.7 (5)	25.2 (67)	35.4 (16)	34.7 (96)	68.3 (485)	68.9 (1,061)
TOTAL	90.9 (20)	97.0 (258)	94.5 (42)	98.2 (272)	98.0 (696)	98.7 (1,519)

Rural, Tau_B = .032

Suburban, Tau_B = .085