

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 174

CG 011 454

AUTHOR Dembo, Richard; And Others  
 TITLE Drug Abuse Prevention: The Awareness, Experience, and Opinions of Junior and Senior High School Students in New York State. Report No. 2 of Winter 1974/75 Survey.  
 INSTITUTION New York State Office of Drug Abuse Services, Albany.  
 PUB DATE May 76  
 NOTE 43p.; For related document, see CG 011 453  
 EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$2.06 Plus Postage.  
 DESCRIPTORS Alcoholism; \*Drinking; \*Drug Abuse; Drug Education; \*High School Students; \*Junior High School Students; Participation; \*Prevention; Research; Secondary Education; \*Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

This report represents an attempt to measure young people's awareness of and attitude toward the prevention efforts their schools have undertaken in terms of the prevalence and incidence of drug use. It also seeks to learn which prevention program topics the students desire. Further, the report addresses the issue of the credibility of various sources of information on drugs and the people who are, in the eyes of youngsters surveyed, the helpers. This information has direct pragmatic value, since it speaks to drug and alcohol use from a perspective that should yield pathways to timely and meaningful intervention. (YRJ)

\*\*\*\*\*  
 \* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished \*  
 \* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort \*  
 \* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal \*  
 \* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality \*  
 \* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available \*  
 \* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not \*  
 \* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions \*  
 \* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. \*  
 \*\*\*\*\*

BUREAU OF SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH  
and  
PROGRAM EVALUATION

**DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION:**  
**The Awareness, Experience and**  
**Opinions of Junior and Senior High**  
**School Students in New York State**  
**Report No. 2 of Winter 1974/75 Survey**

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

New York State  
OFFICE OF DRUG ABUSE SERVICES  
May 1976

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank the Office's Division of Local Services for distributing the questionnaires to the schools, assisting the schools with the administration of the survey and returning the completed questionnaires to the Bureau of Social Science Research. The faculty and staff of the selected junior and senior high schools were helpful in administering the questionnaires.

DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION: THE AWARENESS, EXPERIENCE, AND  
OPINIONS OF JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS  
IN NEW YORK STATE

Report No. 2 of Winter 1974/75 Survey

Richard Dembo, Ph.D., Associate Research Scientist

James Schmeidler, Ph.D., Associate Statistician

Douglas S. Lipton, Ph.D., Director

Dean V. Babst, Associate Research Scientist

Richard C. Stephens, Ph.D.  
Assistant Director

Sharon C. Diamond  
Research Scientist

Carol R. Spielman  
Assistant Research Scientist

Phyllis J. Bergman  
Associate Computer Programmer

Mary Koval  
Senior Research Scientist

Michael D. Miran, Ph.D.  
Principal Psychologist

New York State Office of Drug Abuse Services  
Bureau of Social Science Research  
and Program Evaluation

MAY 1976

Non-medical substance abuse dramatically increased during the 1960's and continues to increase in the 70's. This trend has occurred for a variety of reasons, only some of which are understood. As a consequence of the growth in substance abuse and by virtue of an increased public concern, many surveys have been conducted, mainly among limited populations, to gain perspective on the scope and patterns of this phenomenon. New York has conducted four such studies since 1968. Policy makers, researchers and concerned citizens have attempted to use the results of these surveys for rational planning of drug treatment and prevention programs and for allocating public resources to these efforts.

Most surveys have been concerned with assessing the prevalence and incidence of drug use. Report No. 1 in this series presented and analyzed these data.<sup>1</sup> The present report seeks to move beyond these issues. The report represents our attempt, using data from the survey which provided the basis for the first statistical report, to measure young people's awareness of and attitudes toward the prevention efforts their schools have undertaken. It also seeks to learn the prevention program topics they desire. Further, the report addresses the thorny issue of the credibility of various sources of information on drugs and the people who are, in the eyes of the youngsters surveyed, the helpers -- those to whom they would go if they needed help with a drug problem -- and those to whom they would not go. Clearly, this information has direct pragmatic value. It speaks to drug and alcohol use from a perspective that, hopefully, will yield pathways to timely and meaningful intervention.

---

1. N.Y.S. Office of Drug Abuse Services, A Survey of Substance Use Among Junior and Senior High School Students in New York State Report No. 1: Prevalence of Drug and Alcohol Use, Winter 1974/75 (Albany, N.Y.: Office of Drug Abuse Services, 1975).

We know now that neither harsh penalties, vigorous police surveillance nor millions of dollars for drug prevention deter youngsters from experimenting with substances they know to be illegal and/or dangerous. It is with a large sense of frustration that prevention efforts persist in seeking to dissuade youngsters from ever trying a substance--be it alcohol or another drug. Mass media reports of arrests, overdose deaths and abuse-ruined lives have not frightened young people from experimentation. If anything, the general thrust of the evidence is that many of these programs have titillated rather than deterred. By trying to determine directions for intervention from the students' responses to prevention-related questions, we hop to develop more effective strategies to prevent drug abuse.

This report, then, presents baseline data relating to the drug prevention experiences and opinions of the junior and senior high school students who participated in the New York statewide survey that was completed by the New York State Office of Drug Abuse Services in the winter of 1974/75. The report is divided into three parts.

In the first part, a brief discussion of the sample and the sampling methodology is presented. The second part consists of a review of the questionnaire and our efforts to ensure the adequacy of the data that were analyzed. The third and main part of the report consists of five sections: (1) Awareness - students' perception of the existence of a drug problem in their schools and their awareness of prevention resources; (2) Participation - rates of participation in various drug abuse prevention programs; (3) Opinions - participating students' opinions regarding the effectiveness of these programs;

(4) Interests - the topics about drug abuse prevention that were desired by the young people surveyed; and (5) Trust - their belief in various sources of information on drugs and from whom they would seek help if they had a drug problem.

#### SAMPLE

The design of the study is discussed in detail in the first statistical report,<sup>2</sup> which presents the results of analysis of responses to the drug use questions in the statewide survey. The reader should refer to this report for further information regarding the points covered in the following brief summary.

The study is based on the responses of a representative sample comprised of 8,553 seventh through twelfth grade students from 102 public schools in New York State, who were surveyed during the winter 1974/75. Schools participating in the research were selected by stratified, random sampling. Stratification was done on the basis of seven geographical regions, degree of urbanization and grade level. About two-thirds of the schools selected for the original sample agreed to participate in the survey. When a school refused, the same grade from another randomly chosen school in the same region was substituted. In more than 90 per cent of the schools, over 95 per cent of the students in attendance participated in the survey. From the 22,600 returned booklets, the random sample of completed questionnaires was drawn proportional to the 1973 student population in each of the 42 region-grade level combinations.

---

2. Ibid.

## CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT SAMPLE THAT ARE EXAMINED IN THIS REPORT

Due to the complexity of the issues that are addressed in this report and the wish to provide feedback to the schools, it was decided to focus attention on the following student characteristics: (1) grade level, grouped as seventh-eighth grade, ninth-tenth grade and eleventh-twelfth grade; (2) lifetime substance use, categorized as none or alcohol only, marijuana use, and use of substances other than alcohol and marijuana; and (3) area of the state in which a student attended school, classified as New York City, suburban New York City and upstate. The omission of the factors of sex and socio-economic status (as measured by father's and mother's educational level and occupation) from this report is deliberate. Analysis of the data showed few relationships to exist between any of these characteristics and students' responses to the prevention questions.

A few points with regard to the grade level and lifetime substance use factors are in order. Combining two grades in each grade level category obscures any differences that may exist between pairs of school grades in responses to the prevention questions. Accordingly, the reported grade level results should be regarded as general statements. The lifetime substance use measure indicates an increasing involvement with drugs as we go from the "none" or "alcohol only," through the "marijuana," to the "other substances" categories. In all but a small proportion of cases, a student in the "marijuana" category also used alcohol; and youngsters who used other substances took marijuana and alcohol as well. Overall, 7,751 of 8,553 (91 per cent) of the students could be placed in one of the three substance use categories: 65 per cent having never taken any substance or used alcohol only; 19 per cent marijuana and 16 per cent other substances. Analysis of the drug use data shows



lifetime substance use behavior to be related associated to similar patterns of drug use during the six months prior to the survey.

#### THE QUESTIONNAIRE

A 10-page questionnaire, entitled "Statewide Periodic Assessment of Actions and Attitudes Among Young People," was used in the survey. The instrument was developed by a team of New York State Office of Drug Abuse Services researchers, including a statistician, epidemiologists and prevention program personnel. Our main interest in constructing the questionnaire was to obtain baseline information on youths' drug use, social and family relationships and their awareness of and reactions to their exposure to drug prevention programs. A more thorough review of the research instrument and discussion of the problems that were encountered in its administration is given in the first statistical report.

Considerable effort beyond the quality control procedures discussed in the first statistical report was expended to ensure the adequacy of the data that are presented in this report. In fact, this work consumed more time than the main analysis. This work was necessary for two reasons. First, not all students answered each of the prevention questions. We wanted to be sure that there were no drug use or demographic differences between youngsters completing the prevention questions and those who did not answer them. Second, we wanted to be sure that the students were taking the questions seriously and not frivolously or indiscriminately marking the various response choices.

Non-response rates for students attending schools in the New York City area were about 10 per cent higher than for pupils in suburban New York City or upstate schools. The lower New York City completion rates could well be due to difficulties in comprehension on the part of Spanish-speaking students. However, because questions on

ethnicity and race were excluded from the questionnaire to comply with New York City Board of Education guidelines for research in the public schools, this issue remains an open question. Importantly, however, the results of our analysis show that there are no strong drug use or demographic differences, for the state as a whole and within the three areas, between youngsters answering or not responding to the various prevention questions. Completion rates for the prevention questions ranged from 89 per cent to 95 per cent by item. From 75 per cent to 90 per cent of the students answered all the items for each set.

A second quality control analysis examined the degree to which students' responses to the prevention questions appeared to be thoughtful or indiscriminate in nature. This analysis involved learning the proportion of youths who, for example, marked one frequency category (e.g. "always" or "never") for any set of questions. Again, the results suggested that the vast majority of the youngsters took the questions seriously. The findings from these analyses gave us confidence in the data and provided a statistical rationale for their further study.

#### AWARENESS

##### FINDINGS: Perceptions of a Drug Problem in the School

The top section of Table 1 shows the distribution of responses to a question asking students whether they felt there was a drug problem in their school. Also, it presents the youths' replies to a question probing whether they thought their teachers and school officials were of the opinion there was a school drug problem. As the results in the left hand column of Table 1 indicate, 40 per cent of the students surveyed throughout the state believe there is a drug problem in their school. Even more, 52 per cent of the youths, feel their teachers and school officials believe there is a school

drug problem.

The overall perceptions of a drug problem results are refined when the students' grade level is included in the tabulation. Table 1 shows that the higher the grade level, the larger the per cent of students who feel their school has a drug problem. The figures range from 30 per cent of the seventh and eighth grade pupils in suburban New York City schools to 54 per cent of the upstate eleventh and twelfth graders. The same grade level relationship is found for pupil perceptions of teachers' and school officials' beliefs of a school drug problem.

There were interesting regional differences in student assessments of a school drug problem. New York City youths are less inclined to feel there is a drug problem in their school than are suburban New York City and upstate pupils. Similarly, New York City youngsters are less inclined than students in other areas to believe their teachers and school officials think their schools have a drug problem.

The top two rows of figures in Table 1 suggest that students are more prone to feel teachers and school officials think there is a school drug problem than they are themselves. This pattern of results occurs in every grade level and area of the state combination.

#### FINDINGS: Awareness of Community Drug Treatment and Prevention Resources

Overall, as the middle section of Table 1 shows, a large majority of students do not know of local drug treatment or prevention resources. One in three of the respondents knows of a drug treatment or prevention program in his or her community. Thirty-seven per cent of the youths know of a drug hotline. However, only 17 per cent of the students note they have heard of a Narcotic Guidance Council (NGC), a voluntary local group providing drug

TABLE 1

STUDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF A DRUG PROBLEM IN THEIR SCHOOL AND AWARENESS OF DRUG TREATMENT/PREVENTION RESOURCES  
IN THEIR COMMUNITY BY AREA AND GRADE - IN PER CENT

| Perception Of Drug Problem<br>and Prevention   | N.Y. State |       |      |       | N.Y. City |       |      |       | N.Y.C. Suburbs* |       |      |       | Upstate |       |      |       |
|--|------------|-------|------|-------|-----------|-------|------|-------|-----------------|-------|------|-------|---------|-------|------|-------|
|  | TOTAL      | Grade |      |       | TOTAL     | Grade |      |       | TOTAL           | Grade |      |       | TOTAL   | Grade |      |       |
|  |            | 7/8   | 9/10 | 11/12 |           | 7/8   | 9/10 | 11/12 |                 | 7/8   | 9/10 | 11/12 |         | 7/8   | 9/10 | 11/12 |
| <b>PERCEPTION OF A DRUG PROBLEM IN SCHOOL</b>  |            |       |      |       |           |       |      |       |                 |       |      |       |         |       |      |       |
| Per cent who feel there is a drug problem in their school                            | 40         | 34    | 39   | 47    | 33        | 34    | 31   | 36    | 41              | 30    | 43   | 50    | 44      | 36    | 41   | 54    |
| Per cent who think their teachers and school officials think there is a drug problem | 52         | 40    | 51   | 64    | 47        | 44    | 45   | 50    | 55              | 39    | 55   | 71    | 54      | 39    | 54   | 69    |
| <b>AWARENESS OF COMMUNITY TREATMENT/PREVENTION RESOURCES</b>                         |            |       |      |       |           |       |      |       |                 |       |      |       |         |       |      |       |
| Per cent who know of a drug treatment/prevention program in their community          | 33         | 26    | 33   | 40    | 33        | 27    | 35   | 36    | 35              | 32    | 30   | 43    | 31      | 20    | 33   | 40    |
| Per cent who have heard of a narcotic guidance council                               | 17         | 20    | 17   | 15    | 19        | 25    | 19   | 15    | 15              | 19    | 16   | 14    | 16      | 17    | 16   | 16    |
| Per cent who know of a Hotline   | 37         | 30    | 38   | 44    | 32        | 23    | 37   | 34    | 40              | 33    | 40   | 47    | 39      | 32    | 38   | 48    |
| <b>Total Number of Students In Each Area/Grade Category</b>                          | 8553       | 2770  | 3166 | 2617  | 2616      | 783   | 1118 | 765   | 2524            | 862   | 888  | 774   | 3413    | 1175  | 1160 | 1078  |
| <b>Minimum Per cent of Student Answering Any Question</b>                            | 88         | 85    | 89   | 90    | 82        | 72    | 87   | 84    | 87              | 87    | 86   | 87    | 91      | 90    | 90   | 91    |

\*Includes Nassau, Suffolk, Rockland and Westchester counties.

prevention services to its respective community. Because NGCs usually pursue their work indirectly through collaboration with various community agencies, such as the schools, it could be expected that many youngsters may not have heard of the councils.

Introducing grade level into the tabulations produces some interesting trends. Students in the higher grades are more likely to claim knowledge of a drug treatment or prevention program, than are pupils in the lower grades. A similar trend appears for knowledge of a drug hotline. Here, the positive association with grade level and awareness of a hotline occurs within each area of the state. On the other hand, grade level is negatively related to knowledge of a Narcotic Guidance Council: the higher the grade level the lower the proportion of students claiming they have heard of an NGC.

Table 1 also shows some area of the state differences in awareness of drug abuse prevention resources. New York City students are, relatively, more aware of the existence of a Narcotic Guidance Council. Conversely, these youths less often claim to know of a hotline than suburban and upstate pupils. The knowledge of a drug hotline difference between New York City and suburban and upstate youths could reflect a variation in the actual numbers of hotlines in these areas. Unfortunately, we have no data bearing on this matter that could permit a more definitive statement with regard to this difference in knowledge finding.

#### PARTICIPATION

##### FINDINGS: Participation in Drug Prevention Programs

Table 2 shows the per cent of students in the three grade levels, statewide and by area, who claimed to have attended various prevention programs during the year prior to the survey.

TABLE 2

STUDENTS ATTENDING DRUG PREVENTION PROGRAMS IN LAST YEAR BY SETTING

AND TECHNIQUE USED BY GRADE AND AREA OF N.Y. STATE\*

IN PER CENT

| Prevention Program<br>Setting/Technique<br>Used                     | N.Y. State |       |      |       | N.Y. City |       |      |       | N.Y.C. Suburbs** |       |      |       | Upstate |       |      |       |  |
|---|------------|-------|------|-------|-----------|-------|------|-------|------------------|-------|------|-------|---------|-------|------|-------|--|
|   | TOTAL      | Grade |      |       | TOTAL     | Grade |      |       | TOTAL            | Grade |      |       | TOTAL   | Grade |      |       |  |
|   |            | 7/8   | 9/10 | 11/12 |           | 7/8   | 9/10 | 11/12 |                  | 7/8   | 9/10 | 11/12 |         | 7/8   | 9/10 | 11/12 |  |
| <b>SETTING</b>  |            |       |      |       |           |       |      |       |                  |       |      |       |         |       |      |       |  |
| Classroom Instruction   | 55         | 63    | 53   | 50    | 51        | 63    | 47   | 45    | 61               | 67    | 59   | 57    | 54      | 60    | 53   | 47    |  |
| School Assembly Program   | 46         | 53    | 44   | 40    | 43        | 45    | 45   | 37    | 44               | 52    | 42   | 38    | 49      | 59    | 45   | 44    |  |
| Church Program  | 22         | 27    | 24   | 16    | 21        | 26    | 20   | 13    | 22               | 26    | 25   | 12    | 24      | 28    | 26   | 19    |  |
| After-school Center   | 15         | 20    | 14   | 10    | 25        | 37    | 23   | 17    | 13               | 20    | 12   | 8     | 8       | 9     | 7    | 7     |  |
| <b>TECHNIQUE USED</b>   |            |       |      |       |           |       |      |       |                  |       |      |       |         |       |      |       |  |
| Film on Drugs   | 67         | 79    | 63   | 59    | 61        | 78    | 55   | 52    | 73               | 81    | 71   | 66    | 67      | 79    | 63   | 57    |  |
| Rap Session Groups  | 25         | 29    | 23   | 23    | 31        | 40    | 27   | 30    | 26               | 34    | 24   | 21    | 19      | 18    | 18   | 21    |  |
| Talks By Ex-addicts   | 22         | 23    | 20   | 23    | 26        | 34    | 22   | 23    | 21               | 16    | 23   | 24    | 20      | 21    | 16   | 22    |  |
| Police Program  | 15         | 23    | 13   | 11    | 14        | 22    | 13   | 8     | 16               | 27    | 11   | 10    | 16      | 20    | 15   | 12    |  |
| Individual/Group/Family Counseling                                  | 14         | 18    | 15   | 11    | 15        | 18    | 14   | 13    | 14               | 16    | 14   | 10    | 14      | 18    | 16   | 10    |  |
| Encounter/Sensitivity Training                                      | 4          | 5     | 4    | 4     | 5         | 6     | 4    | 5     | 5                | 5     | 4    | 6     | 4       | 5     | 4    | 3     |  |
| <b>Number of Students In Each<br/>Area/Grade Category</b>           | 8553       | 2770  | 3166 | 2617  | 2616      | 733   | 1118 | 765   | 2524             | 862   | 888  | 774   | 3413    | 1175  | 1160 | 1078  |  |
| <b>Minimum Per cent of Students<br/>Answering For Any Setting</b>   | 91         | 89    | 93   | 91    | 86        | 83    | 89   | 83    | 92               | 92    | 93   | 92    | 94      | 91    | 94   | 96    |  |
| <b>Minimum Per cent of Students<br/>Answering for Any Technique</b> | 90         | 88    | 91   | 90    | 84        | 81    | 89   | 81    | 92               | 91    | 92   | 92    | 93      | 91    | 93   | 95    |  |

\*Attendance figure based on students' reporting attendance vs. non-attendance.

\*\*Includes Nassau, Suffolk, Rockland and Westchester counties.

The table presents rates of participation in programs in four different settings and experience with six prevention techniques.

#### Program Settings

Overall, from 15 per cent to 55 per cent of the students indicated they attended a prevention program in each setting. As might be expected, the two school-based settings, the classroom and assembly, were the sites for prevention program participation for more students than church or after-school centers. The results in Table 2 also note that fewer youths in the higher grade levels attended drug abuse prevention programs in each of the settings, than did pupils in the lower grades. This trend hold statewide and within the New York City, suburban New York City and upstate New York areas.

#### Prevention Techniques

In reviewing the prevention techniques results it is important that the reader bear in mind the difficulties students may have had in understanding what a given technique label meant. For example, a pupil may have participated in meetings with his peers during which the problems they were facing in their lives, and their feelings on these matters, were aired. However, he may not have associated the term "rap session group" with this experience. Further, the content of a particular technique may vary considerably in different schools and areas. Given these cautions in making inferences from the results given in Table 2, the technique figures suggest some interesting trends.

Films on drugs is the prevention technique with which most of the students (67 per cent) claim to have experience. Rap session groups, talks by ex-addicts, police programs and individual/group/family counseling were attended by 14 per cent to 25 per cent of the pupils. Few youngsters claim any experience with encounter/



sensitivity training.

The "technique" data in Table 2 indicate that students in the lower grades have had more experience in the past year with films on drugs, police programs and counseling than pupils in the upper grade levels. This pattern holds statewide and for each of the three areas. Some interesting area differences are also revealed in Table 2. A higher percentage of New York City students claim attendance in rap session groups and talks by ex-addicts than suburban youths. Suburban New York City youngsters, in turn, note more exposure to these two techniques than upstate pupils.

"Report No. 1" on junior and senior high school student drug use found that, except for solvents, students in the upper grades were more involved with substances than lower graders. In light of these results, it is interesting to learn that more lower grade youths have had recent experience with various prevention programs than older students. It is appreciated that school drug curricula could affect students' involvement in school-based prevention activities. However, the trends in our results are not predictable from current drug education guidelines of the New York State Education Department.<sup>3</sup> These regulations specify that health education, which includes instruction in regard to drug use and abuse, be given in a one-half-year course in junior and, again, in senior high school. The grade scheduling of these courses,

---

3. See: Rules of the Board of Regents and Regulations of the Commissioner of Education, Chapter II, Commissioner's Regulations, Subchapter G, Part 135, Section 135.3; and Chapter 674, Laws of New York, 1970.



and to some degree their content, appear to be left to the discretion of each school system.

#### OPINIONS

##### FINDING: Opinions of Prevention Programs by Their Participants

Table 3 presents student assessments of four settings in which drug prevention programs are given: a church, classroom, after-school center and school assembly. The data are for New York State as a whole. Also included is a tabulation of the relationship between the youths' lifetime substance use and their opinions with regard to the impact of programs held in these sites on drug use.

Overall, church programs were felt to be the most helpful in turning young people away from drugs. Classroom instruction and after-school centers were rated as effective by about one-third of their participants. Less than one-quarter of the youngsters who had been to school assembly programs felt they had any deterrent effect on drug taking. From 26 per cent to 36 per cent of the students were of the opinion that drug programs held in the four settings had no impact on drug use. Twenty-seven to 38 per cent of the pupils claimed they did not know the effect of these programs. Importantly, few youths felt any of the four locations encouraged drug use.

Interesting results were obtained in terms of the relationship between lifetime substance use and student ratings of the various prevention program settings. As the data in Table 3 show, the greater the drug involvement of the youngsters:

- (1) the less inclined they are to feel prevention programs in the four settings are effective in turning young people away from drugs;

TABLE 3

OPINIONS OF DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAMS IN VARIOUS SETTINGS BY PARTICIPANTS WITH  
DIFFERENT SUBSTANCE USE BEHAVIOR IN N.Y. STATE (N=3553) - IN PER CENT

| Setting<br>For Drug<br>Program | Substances<br>Ever<br>Used | Participating Students' Opinions  |  |  |   | % of Partici-<br>pating Students<br>Responding. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
|                                |                            | % Who Feel Pro-<br>gram Has Helped<br>Turn Young People<br>Away From Drugs. | % Who Feel<br>Program Has<br>Had No<br>Effect. | % Who Feel<br>Program Has<br>Encouraged<br>Drug Use. | % Who Don't<br>Know Effect<br>of Program. |   |
|                                | TOTAL                      | 45  | 26   | 2  | 27  | 87  |
| Church Program                 | None or Alcohol only       | 47  | 22   | 2  | 29  |   |
|                                | Marijuana*                 | 45  | 31   | 2  | 22  |   |
|                                | Other Substances**         | 34  | 38   | 4  | 24  |   |
|                                | TOTAL                      | 34  | 31   | 3  | 32  | 89  |
| Classroom<br>Instruction       | None or Alcohol only       | 40  | 24   | 2  | 34  |   |
|                                | Marijuana*                 | 26  | 41   | 3  | 30  |   |
|                                | Other Substances**         | 20  | 48   | 5  | 28  |   |
|                                | TOTAL                      | 34  | 30   | 9  | 27  | 78  |
| After-school<br>Center         | None or Alcohol only       | 33  | 29   | 6  | 32  |   |
|                                | Marijuana*                 | 35  | 34   | 10   | 21  |   |
|                                | Other Substances**         | 35  | 29   | 16   | 20  |   |
|                                | TOTAL                      | 24  | 36   | 2  | 38  | 89  |
| School<br>Assembly<br>Program  | None or Alcohol only       | 28  | 30   | 1  | 41  |   |
|                                | Marijuana*                 | 15  | 47   | 2  | 36  |   |
|                                | Other Substances**         | 12  | 55   | 3  | 29  |   |

\*Includes marijuana and hashish users only, most of whom have used alcohol.

\*\*Includes anyone who used drugs besides marijuana. Most of these students also used marijuana and alcohol.

- (2) the more likely they are to believe that a given prevention program setting would have no effect on drug use; and
- (3) the less frequently they indicate they "don't know" the effect of programs held at these settings.

The apparent trend between increasing drug involvement and student opinions that drug programs at the four sites encouraged drug use is based on too few cases to be accepted with confidence.

Table 4 gives the judgments of the effectiveness of six drug abuse prevention techniques by the students who were exposed to them. Talks by ex-addicts was the technique that was most highly rated by the youths. Almost two-thirds of the respondents, regardless of their own use of drugs, felt these discussions would deter drug taking. Rap session groups, police programs, individual/group/family counseling and films on drugs were rated as effective by about one-half of their participants. Encounter/sensitivity training fared less well, being rated favorably by just over one-third of the pupils. Talks by ex-addicts were least often felt to have had no effect on drug use; only 12 per cent of the youths having experience with this technique held this opinion. Films on drugs, on the other hand, were felt to be ineffective by almost one-quarter of those exposed to them. Opinions of "no effect" for rap session groups, police programs, counseling and encounter/sensitivity training ranged from 18 per cent to 22 per cent. Except for the 46 per cent "don't know" responses for ratings of the impact of encounter/sensitivity training, from 20 to 30 per cent of the youngsters claimed uncertainty over the effect of the prevention techniques on substance taking.

The relationships between substance use and the perceived effectiveness of the prevention techniques, shown in Table 4,

TABLE 4

OPINIONS OF DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION TECHNIQUES BY PARTICIPANTS WITH DIFFERENT SUBSTANCE USE BEHAVIOR IN N.Y. STATE (N=8553) IN PER CENT

| Techniques Used For Drug Program   | Substances Ever Used | Participating Students' Opinions                                 |                                      |   |                                     | % of Participating Students Responding. |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|
|                                    |                      | % Who Feel Program Has Helped Turn Young People Away From Drugs. | % Who Feel Program Has Had No Effect | % Who Feel Program Has Encouraged Drug Use. | % Who Don't Know Effect of Program. |   |
| Talks by Ex-Addicts                | TOTAL                | 63   | 12                                   | 5   | 20                                  | 88                                      |
|                                    | None or Alcohol Only | 65   | 10                                   | 3   | 22                                  |   |
|                                    | Marijuana*           | 65   | 13                                   | 5   | 17                                  |   |
|                                    | Other Substances**   | 55   | 18                                   | 10  | 17                                  |   |
| Rap Session Groups                 | TOTAL                | 51   | 18                                   | 5   | 26                                  | 85                                      |
|                                    | None or Alcohol Only | 52   | 15                                   | 3   | 30                                  |   |
|                                    | Marijuana*           | 57   | 17                                   | 6   | 20                                  |   |
|                                    | Other Substances**   | 44   | 25                                   | 8   | 22                                  |   |
| Police Program                     | TOTAL                | 48   | 22                                   | 4   | 26                                  | 87                                      |
|                                    | None or Alcohol Only | 53   | 18                                   | 2   | 28                                  |   |
|                                    | Marijuana*           | 42   | 30                                   | 4   | 24                                  |   |
|                                    | Other substances **  | 38   | 33                                   | 9   | 20                                  |   |
| Individual/Group/Family Counseling | TOTAL                | 48   | 18                                   | 4   | 30                                  | 86                                      |
|                                    | None or Alcohol Only | 54   | 13                                   | 4   | 30                                  |   |
|                                    | Marijuana*           | 43   | 27                                   | 2   | 28                                  |   |
|                                    | Other Substances **  | 38   | 27                                   | 5   | 30                                  |   |
| Films on Drugs                     | TOTAL                | 45   | 24                                   | 4   | 27                                  | 89                                      |
|                                    | None or Alcohol Only | 50   | 19                                   | 2   | 28                                  |   |
|                                    | Marijuana*           | 39   | 32                                   | 6   | 24                                  |   |
|                                    | Other Substances **  | 32   | 36                                   | 9   | 23                                  |   |
| Encounter/Sensitivity Training     | TOTAL                | 34   | 17                                   | 3   | 46                                  | 78                                      |
|                                    | None or Alcohol Only | 33   | 14                                   | 2   | 51                                  |   |
|                                    | Marijuana*           | 36   | 20                                   | 4   | 40                                  |   |
|                                    | Other Substances **  | 36   | 24                                   | 5   | 34                                  |   |

\*Includes marijuana and hashish users only, most of whom have used alcohol.

\*\*Includes anyone who used drugs besides marijuana. Most of these students also used marijuana and alcohol.

exhibit a pattern that is similar to the substance use-prevention program setting results (see Table 3). With the exception of encounter/sensitivity training, these results suggest that the more youths are involved with substances, the less impressed they are with the prevention techniques they have experienced.

When student ratings of the effectiveness of prevention programs in the four settings and of the six techniques are compared to the rates of program participation presented in Table 2, some substantial discrepancies are noted. The classroom and school assembly are claimed as prevention program sites by large proportions of the youths. However, they are judged to be low in effectiveness by their participants. These low ratings may be due to the fact that students are often required to attend programs in these settings. Participation in church-based prevention programs is self-selective and they were attended by only 22 per cent of the students. However, it is important to note that one-third of the most substance-involved youths who were exposed to church drug programs felt they deterred drug use. In terms of techniques, 22 per cent of the youths claimed to have been exposed to talks by ex-addicts; yet, this technique was rated as effective by 63 per cent of its participants. Police programs were attended by 15 per cent of the students, but rated as effective in discouraging drug use by nearly 50 per cent of the pupils who were involved in them. And, two-thirds of those surveyed had seen films on drugs; however, only 45 per cent of the youths claimed this technique was effective. These results suggest the need for students to be exposed to prevention efforts they feel are most effective. At the least, their evaluations of programs should be considered an important factor in deciding what drug prevention activities will take place.

TABLE 5

N.Y. STATE DRUG ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS' FEELING PROGRAM HELPED

TURN YOUNG PEOPLE AWAY FROM DRUGS BY GRADE AND SUBSTANCE USE

Per cent of Participants' Feeling Program Helped Turn Young People  
Away From Drugs  
(N=8,553)

| Prevention Program<br>Setting/and<br>Technique Used | 7th and 8th Grades   |                            |         |                 | 9th and 10th Grades  |                            |         |                 | 11th and 12th Grades |                            |         |                 |
|---|----------------------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------------|---------|-----------------|
|   | Substances Ever Used |                            |         |                 | Substances Ever Used |                            |         |                 | Substances Ever Used |                            |         |                 |
|   | Total                | None or<br>Alcohol<br>Only | Marij.* | Other<br>Sub.** | Total                | None or<br>Alcohol<br>Only | Marij.* | Other<br>Sub.** | Total                | None or<br>Alcohol<br>Only | Marij.* | Other<br>Sub.** |
| <u>SETTING</u>                                      |                      |                            |         |                 |                      |                            |         |                 |                      |                            |         |                 |
| Church Program                                      | 42                   | 43                         | 33      | 33              | 47                   | 50                         | 47      | 36              | 45                   | 49                         | 47      | 32              |
| Classroom Instruction                               | 45                   | 46                         | 40      | 29              | 29                   | 34                         | 22      | 18              | 27                   | 34                         | 26      | 18              |
| After-School Center                                 | 33                   | 33                         | 40      | 24              | 36                   | 33                         | 34      | 45              | 32                   | 34                         | 31      | 31              |
| School Assembly Program                             | 35                   | 36                         | 29      | 25              | 20                   | 23                         | 16      | 13              | 13                   | 18                         | 9       | 6               |
| <u>TECHNIQUE USED</u>                               |                      |                            |         |                 |                      |                            |         |                 |                      |                            |         |                 |
| Talks by Ex-addicts                                 | 55                   | 58                         | 59      | 38              | 68                   | 72                         | 66      | 61              | 64                   | 67                         | 66      | 57              |
| Rap Session Groups                                  | 49                   | 49                         | 61      | 40              | 54                   | 55                         | 59      | 44              | 51                   | 52                         | 54      | 46              |
| Police Program                                      | 55                   | 57                         | 48      | 45              | 45                   | 47                         | 45      | 37              | 42                   | 49                         | 37      | 30              |
| Individual/Group/<br>Family Counseling              | 49                   | 51                         | 43      | 42              | 50                   | 59                         | 44      | 31              | 44                   | 47                         | 41      | 43              |
| Films on Drugs                                      | 54                   | 56                         | 43      | 42              | 44                   | 48                         | 40      | 36              | 36                   | 41                         | 36      | 26              |
| Encounter/Sensitivity<br>Training                   | 28                   | 27                         | 44      | 27              | 38                   | 41                         | 32      | 37              | 37                   | 36                         | 37      | 39              |

\*Includes marijuana and hashish users only, most of whom have also used alcohol.

\*\*Includes anyone who used drugs besides marijuana. Most of these students also used marijuana and alcohol.

**FINDINGS: Participants' Feeling Prevention Programs in Various Settings and Employing Different Techniques Discouraged Drug Use by Grade Level and Substance Use Combined**

Table 5 reports the results of a more detailed analysis of the data that are given in Tables 3 and 4 including the students' grade level. The findings show grade level (or age) to be an important factor in understanding the youths' opinions of the effectiveness of the four prevention program locations and the six prevention techniques in deterring drug taking. The influence of grade level is reflected in the several trends that appear in the table. First, as grade level increases there is a decline in the proportion of participants who feel that classroom instruction, school assemblies, police programs and films on drugs are effective. Conversely, ninth to twelfth grade students rate talks by ex-addicts and encounter/sensitivity training as being effective more often than do the seventh and eighth graders.

Although substance use and grade level are positively related to one another, the results in Tables 3, 4 and 5 do not always correspond. This suggests that grade level and substance use have distinctive influences on students' effectiveness ratings. Of the two factors, however, substance use is more consistently and frequently associated with the judged impact of the various prevention program settings and techniques than is grade level.

#### INTERESTS

**FINDINGS: Prevention Program Topics Desired by Seventh to Twelfth Grade Students with Different Substance Use Behavior**

One set of prevention questions in the statewide survey asked students whether they wanted, or did not want, to have programs discussing each of 10 topics. The statewide figures in the left hand column of Table 6 show that the youths desire prevention

TABLE 6

DRUG PREVENTION PROGRAM TOPICS DESIRED BY SEVENTH TO TWELFTH GRADE  
STUDENTS WITH DIFFERENT SUBSTANCE USE BEHAVIOR - IN PER CENT

| Type of Drug Program Which Explains               | TOTAL | SUBSTANCES EVER USED |            |                    |
|---|-------|----------------------|------------|--------------------|
|   |       | None or Alcohol Only | Marijuana* | Other Substances** |
| How taking drugs affects your mind.               | 81    | 83                   | 81         | 72                 |
| Dangers of drug use to physical health.           | 79    | 83                   | 76         | 65                 |
| Legal penalties for using drugs.                  | 71    | 71                   | 74         | 66                 |
| Different treatments for drug experiences.        | 71    | 70                   | 73         | 72                 |
| How using drugs can damage your family.           | 70    | 76                   | 62         | 53                 |
| How to handle bad drug experiences.               | 66    | 62                   | 72         | 75                 |
| Other things to do besides using drugs.           | 64    | 67                   | 62         | 53                 |
| Scientific information about drugs.               | 61    | 63                   | 60         | 55                 |
| Why drug use is immoral.                          | 44    | 48                   | 39         | 32                 |
| How you can live better with drugs.               | 29    | 22                   | 35         | 50                 |
| Minimum Number of Students Answering Any Question | 7394  | 4832                 | 1419       | 1140               |

\*Includes marijuana and hashish users, most of whom have also used alcohol.

\*\*Includes anyone who used drugs besides marijuana. Most of these students also used marijuana and alcohol.



program topics which explain the effects of drugs on one's mind and health. These desired program topics are followed, in a second order of emphasis, by those dealing with the legal penalties for drug use, treatment for drug experiences, the impact of drugs on one's family, how to handle bad drug experiences, alternatives to drug use and scientific information about drugs. Less than a majority of the youths want programs explaining why drug use is immoral. Only about three in 10 students are interested in learning how they can live better with drugs.

Analysis of the data found few regional or grade level differences in the prevention program topics that were desired by the youths. There was a negative association between the use of substances and interest in six of the prevention topics discussed. The more involved students are with drugs, the less inclined they are to desire programs which explain: how taking drugs affects your mind, the dangers of drug use to physical health, how drug use can damage one's family, other things to do besides use drugs, scientific information about drugs and why drug use is immoral. On the other hand, the greater the degree of student involvement with substances, the more they want prevention programs that explain how to handle bad drug experiences and how to live better with drugs. The desire for programs discussing the legal penalties for using drugs and different treatment for drug experiences was not related to drug use.

Considered as a whole, the results presented in Table 6 indicate that youngsters with different substance relationships want to hear prevention program themes discussed that fit in with their own

TABLE 7  
 PERCEIVED BELIEVABILITY OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON DRUGS BY GRADE  
 IN PER CENT  
 (Based on "mostly believable" responses)

| Information Source                                | Total | Grade Category |      |       |
|---|-------|----------------|------|-------|
|   |       | 7/8            | 9/10 | 11/12 |
| Doctor  | 66    | 67             | 65   | 67    |
| Staff member of a drug program                    | 61    | 61             | 60   | 62    |
| Former drug user                                  | 60    | 45             | 64   | 72    |
| Nurse   | 57    | 59             | 56   | 56    |
| Pamphlets   | 54    | 48             | 57   | 54    |
| Teacher/school staff                              | 50    | 58             | 47   | 45    |
| Someone in immediate family                       | 50    | 54             | 51   | 43    |
| Mental health counselor                           | 46    | 49             | 45   | 45    |
| Police officer                                    | 46    | 51             | 45   | 41    |
| A friend who uses drugs                           | 45    | 29             | 49   | 58    |
| Newspapers  | 41    | 42             | 42   | 37    |
| Magazines   | 40    | 36             | 42   | 40    |
| Television  | 38    | 37             | 39   | 36    |
| Other relative                                    | 33    | 35             | 34   | 30    |
| Radio   | 31    | 30             | 32   | 30    |
| Social worker                                     | 28    | 20             | 27   | 35    |
| A friend who does not use drugs                   | 26    | 29             | 26   | 23    |
| Clergyman   | 23    | 24             | 23   | 22    |
| Neighbor  | 18    | 20             | 19   | 16    |
| Lawyer  | 18    | 17             | 17   | 19    |
| Minimum Number of Students Answering Any Question | 7632  | 2438           | 2828 | 2352  |

drug use behavior. Students who are not involved with drugs want to be exposed to program topics that will discourage drug taking. On the other hand, drug users want to acquire information that can be useful in their substance taking. In any prevention effort that involves target audiences with diverse substance use patterns, therefore, it would be wise to include a range of topics covering the social, personal and medical aspects of drug use. In this way, it would be possible to expose youths to different views of how drugs relate to their lives. Program themes dealing with the moral problems of drug use would best be de-emphasized since they are desired by less than a majority of the students.

#### TRUST

FINDINGS: The Believability of Sources of Information on Drugs Overall and by Grade Level

The survey sought to learn the students' belief in various sources of information on drugs, or as we asked: "We would like to know where you get the most believable information on drugs." A list of 20 sources was provided, and the youths were requested to indicate whether each source was "mostly believable," "mostly not believable" or if they were "not sure" as to the source's credibility.

The per cent of students responding "mostly believable" to each listed source of drug information is presented in Table 7. The overall percentages in the left hand "total" column show that people who have had experience with drugs either as medical/drug treatment personnel or as former drug users tend to be regarded as more credible than any of the mass media. Pamphlets, which are a more specialized medium, were felt to be the most believable media source of drug information. They were also seen as more

credible than teacher/school staff, someone in the immediate family, mental health counselor, police officer or even a drug using friend.

Social worker, non-drug using friend, clergyman, neighbor and lawyer were perceived as less believable than the various media for information about drugs. Interpretation of these results is difficult. One-third to one-half of the students indicated they were "not sure" about the credibility of these sources. These data could reflect the fact that these five persons are not generally regarded as drug information sources among those surveyed.

Two important grade level-credibility trends are reflected in the results in Table 7. On the one hand, smaller percentages of students claim to believe in teacher/school staff, immediate family member, mental health counselor, police officer, other relative, non-drug using friend and neighbor as drug information sources as we move from the seventh-eighth to the eleventh-twelfth grade level categories. On the other hand, there is an increase in the per cent of youths who believe in a former drug user, a drug using friend and social worker as information sources as we go from the seventh-eighth to the eleventh-twelfth grade levels. These per cent changes primarily occur between the seventh-eighth and ninth-tenth grade levels. Little relationship was found to exist between the area of the state in which the students attended school and their belief in the various sources of information on drugs.

**FINDINGS: Students' Belief in Drug Information Sources by Their Substance Use**

Table 8 presents the results of the examination of the association between the youths' substance use and their belief in the 20 sources of information on drugs. Two interesting patterns of relationship

TABLE 8

PERCEIVED BELIEVABILITY OF SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON DRUGS BY 7th TO 12th GRADE,  
N.Y. STATE STUDENTS WITH DIFFERENT SUBSTANCE USE BEHAVIOR-IN PER CENT  
(Based on "mostly believable" responses)

| Information Source                                | Total | Substance Ever Used  |            |                    |
|---|-------|----------------------|------------|--------------------|
|   |       | None or Alcohol Only | Marijuana* | Other Substances** |
| Doctor  | 67    | 70                   | 64         | 61                 |
| Staff member of a drug program                    | 62    | 63                   | 62         | 57                 |
| Former drug user                                  | 62    | 55                   | 74         | 73                 |
| Nurse   | 57    | 61                   | 53         | 49                 |
| Pamphlet  | 55    | 56                   | 55         | 48                 |
| Teacher/school staff                              | 51    | 58                   | 41         | 32                 |
| Someone in immediate family                       | 50    | 52                   | 48         | 45                 |
| Mental health counselor                           | 47    | 50                   | 42         | 42                 |
| Police officer                                    | 46    | 51                   | 41         | 35                 |
| A friend who uses drugs                           | 46    | 34                   | 64         | 73                 |
| Newspapers  | 41    | 44                   | 37         | 32                 |
| Magazines   | 40    | 42                   | 39         | 33                 |
| Television  | 38    | 42                   | 33         | 27                 |
| Other relative                                    | 33    | 34                   | 31         | 31                 |
| Radio   | 31    | 33                   | 28         | 23                 |
| Social worker                                     | 28    | 27                   | 28         | 31                 |
| A friend who does not use drugs                   | 26    | 28                   | 23         | 19                 |
| Clergyman   | 23    | 26                   | 18         | 16                 |
| Neighbor  | 18    | 17                   | 19         | 21                 |
| Lawyer  | 18    | 18                   | 16         | 17                 |
| Minimum Number of Students Answering Any Question | 7051  | 4595                 | 1361       | 1091               |

\* Includes marijuana and hashish users, most of whom have also used alcohol.

\*\* Includes anyone who used drugs besides marijuana. Most of these students also used marijuana and alcohol.

are revealed in the table. The most prevalent, general trend is a negative one: the greater the degree of involvement with substances, the less believable many of the sources of information on drugs are felt to be. This is the case with all the information sources noted in Table 8, with the exception of former drug user and drug using friend and, to a slight degree, social worker and neighbor. A positive relationship was found to hold between substance involvement and belief in these four drug information sources. Two of the substance involvement-believability associations are particularly strong. Students who are more involved with drugs are substantially: (1) less likely to believe in teacher/school staff as sources of drug information and (2) more inclined to find drug using friends to be more credible information sources, than are pupils who are less drug involved. In terms of the substance use-believability results, greater differences in credibility occur in the comparisons between non-drug users or students who use alcohol only and marijuana takers, than between marijuana and other substance users.

Since there is a relationship between drug use and grade level, it is not surprising that the results reported in Tables 7 and 8 are somewhat similar. Further analysis of the data, taking into account both substance use and grade level, indicates that each factor influences the youths' belief in the drug information sources -- even when the other is controlled. Accordingly, both substance use and grade level should be considered in the development of drug information efforts.

FINDINGS: Resources to be Sought for Help with a Drug Problem--Overall and by Grade Level

Another area tapped by the statewide survey was the kinds of individuals students felt they would approach for assistance with

TABLE 9  
 RESOURCES TO BE SOUGHT FOR HELP WITH A DRUG PROBLEM BY GRADE  
 IN PER CENT

| Resource  | Total | Grade Category |      |       |
|---|-------|----------------|------|-------|
|   |       | 7/8            | 9/10 | 11/12 |
| Staff member of a drug program                    | 62    | 61             | 62   | 63    |
| Doctor  | 58    | 63             | 55   | 56    |
| Someone in immediate family                       | 50    | 61             | 47   | 40    |
| Former drug user                                  | 46    | 37             | 49   | 51    |
| A friend who does not use drugs                   | 45    | 41             | 48   | 46    |
| Nurse   | 45    | 53             | 43   | 39    |
| Mental health counselor                           | 40    | 47             | 38   | 34    |
| Other relative                                    | 30    | 37             | 28   | 25    |
| Teacher/school staff                              | 29    | 37             | 26   | 24    |
| Social worker                                     | 23    | 19             | 23   | 28    |
| A friend who uses drugs                           | 22    | 17             | 23   | 26    |
| Clergyman   | 22    | 23             | 21   | 21    |
| Police officer                                    | 20    | 30             | 18   | 12    |
| Neighbor  | 14    | 18             | 14   | 11    |
| Lawyer  | 9     | 11             | 8    | 7     |
| Minimum Number of Students Answering Any Question | 7853  | 2504           | 2938 | 2402  |

a drug problem. In order to learn the youths' orientations to various helping resources, they were asked to indicate if they "would," "would not" or were "not sure or did not know" whether they would go to each of the persons listed in Table 9.

The overall results, in the left hand column of the table, show that only two of the persons listed would be approached for help by more than one-half of the students: staff member of a drug program and a physician. Immediate family member, former drug user, non-drug using friend, nurse and mental health counselor were selected, in descending order, by 50-40 per cent of the youths. The remainder of the individuals listed in Table 9 were mentioned by three in 10 or less of the students.

Two important trends are found in the table. The higher the grade level, the smaller the proportion of students noting they would seek out someone in their immediate family, a nurse, mental health counselor, other relative, teacher/school staff, police officer, neighbor and, to some degree, a clergyman for help with a drug problem. A reverse trend is seen for former drug user, social worker and drug using friend. Here, the higher the school grade, the greater the per cent of students claiming these resources would be approached for assistance. The percentage differences are larger in the seventh-eighth and ninth-tenth grade level comparisons, than for the ninth-tenth and eleventh-twelfth grade data.

Additional analysis found some area of the state differences in claimed willingness to use the various drug help resources. New York City youths were slightly more likely to go to the individuals listed in Table 9 for assistance with a drug problem than were suburban New York City or upstate students.



TABLE 10  
 RESOURCES TO BE SOUGHT FOR HELP WITH A DRUG PROBLEM BY 7th TO 12th GRADE  
 N.Y. STATE STUDENTS WITH DIFFERENT SUBSTANCE USE BEHAVIOR-IN PER CENT

| Resource  | Total | Substances Ever Used |            |                    |
|---|-------|----------------------|------------|--------------------|
|   |       | None or Alcohol Only | Marijuana* | Other Substances** |
| Staff member of a drug program                    | 63    | 64                   | 62         | 57                 |
| Doctor  | 58    | 63                   | 51         | 45                 |
| Someone in immediate family                       | 49    | 55                   | 40         | 37                 |
| Former drug user                                  | 47    | 41                   | 56         | 61                 |
| A friend who does not use drugs                   | 46    | 46                   | 49         | 40                 |
| Nurse   | 44    | 50                   | 37         | 32                 |
| Mental health counselor                           | 40    | 42                   | 36         | 34                 |
| Other relative                                    | 30    | 32                   | 26         | 25                 |
| Teacher/school staff                              | 29    | 33                   | 23         | 19                 |
| Social worker                                     | 24    | 22                   | 27         | 25                 |
| A friend who uses drugs                           | 22    | 14                   | 27         | 47                 |
| Clergyman,  | 22    | 25                   | 17         | 15                 |
| Police officer                                    | 20    | 24                   | 12         | 11                 |
| Neighbor  | 14    | 14                   | 11         | 14                 |
| Lawyer  | 8     | 9                    | 6          | 7                  |
| Minimum Number of Students Answering Any Question | 7260  | 4720                 | 1416       | 1124               |

\* Includes marijuana and hashish users, most of whom have also used alcohol.

\*\* Includes anyone who used drugs besides marijuana. Most of these students also used marijuana and alcohol.

FINDINGS: Resources Students Would go to for Help with a Drug Problem by Substance Use

Table 10 presents data relating to the association between substance use and the resources that students would go to for help with a drug problem. Eleven moderate to strong relationships are reflected in the table. In nine instances, the greater the degree of involvement with drugs, the less inclined the youths indicate they would be to approach the following help resources: staff member of a drug program, doctor, someone in the immediate family, nurse, mental health counselor, other relative, teacher/school staff, clergyman and police officer. On the other hand, students who are more involved with substances are more likely to seek out a former drug user and a drug using friend for assistance with a drug problem. These patterns of relationship suggest a movement away from professional individuals and a greater reliance on persons with experience in drug use (particularly friends) as students become more involved with substances. With regard to these results, greater differences occur in the comparisons between non-drug users or students who use alcohol only and marijuana takers, than between marijuana users and the users of other substances.

Further analysis of the data was undertaken to learn the relative importance of substance use and grade level in the resources to be sought for help results. The findings show both substance use and grade level to separately relate to the youths' willingness to seek out the various persons for assistance with a drug problem.

The resources to be sought for help with a drug problem findings parallel those obtained in the analyses of the believability of drug information source data (see Tables 7 and 8). Taken together,

the drug resource and believability results suggest a movement away from family and institutional help resources and information sources as youths grow older or more involved with drugs. Conversely, there is an increasing tendency for older or more substance involved youths to rely on drug using peers and former drug users as helping persons and drug information sources.

## CONCLUSIONS

The following is a summary of highlights of this report. These highlights are presented in the order in which their relevant topic areas are covered in the text:

### AWARENESS

1. A considerable proportion of the students surveyed feel there is a drug problem in their schools. However, more youngsters feel their teachers and school officials think there is a school drug problem than they themselves do. Variations in these perceptions were found by grade level and the area of the state in which the students attend school.
2. Most students are not aware of any drug treatment or prevention resources in their communities. Less than four in 10 know of a drug hotline, a treatment/prevention program or a Narcotic Guidance Council. Level of resource awareness vary by grade.

### PARTICIPATION

3. There are considerable overall, grade level and area of the state differences in attendance in drug programs in various settings and exposure to prevention techniques. Lower grade youths, who are less involved with drugs, claim more recent experience with prevention programs than pupils in the upper grades (who tend to use drugs more).

### OPINIONS

4. Ratings of the effectiveness of drug programs given in various settings and of a number of prevention techniques are more favorable for youths who are not very involved with drugs. Drug using youngsters do not seem to be impressed with their prevention program experiences.
5. Differences are found in the ratings of the effectiveness of drug programs held in four settings and for six prevention techniques by students in different grade level. Youngsters in the higher grades are less positive about classroom instruction, school assemblies, police programs and films on drugs, than are pupils in the lower grades. On the other hand, upper grade youths are more favorable about talks by ex-addicts and encounter/sensitivity training than seventh-eighth graders.

## INTEREST

6. Students desire prevention program topics that fit in with their drug use behavior. Youths who are not into drugs want to hear program themes that discourage drug use. Conversely, substance involved pupils want to obtain information that can be useful to their substance taking. The implications of these findings for prevention activities are discussed.

## TRUST

7. A doctor, staff member of a drug program and former drug user are highly regarded by the students as sources of drug information.
8. Pamphlets are the only mass media rated as credible sources of information on drugs by a majority of the youths. Newspapers, magazines, television and the radio are rated relatively low in terms of their believability.
9. Important differences in drug information source credibility are found for youths in different grades and degrees of involvement with drugs. In general, the higher the students' grade level or the greater their involvement with drugs, the more believable they regard a former drug user and a drug using friend.
10. Only a staff member of a drug program and a physician, among 15 resources, are selected as persons to be approached for assistance with a drug problem by more than one-half of the youths surveyed.
11. Differences in drug resource person use are found among students in various grade levels and degrees of involvement with drugs. Students who are older or more involved with drugs tend to rely less on family and institutional helping resources and more on drug using peers and former users.

new york state  
**Office of Drug Abuse Services**  
box 8200 · albany, n.y. 12203