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The problem of this study is to determine the extent to which the Texas Education Agency and selected school districts have implemented the legislative provisions of House Bill 467, enacted by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature. No hypothesis is advanced.

The purpose of the study is twofold: first, it describes the sequential development of the crime prevention and drug education program by the Texas Education Agency as mandated through House Bill 467; and second, it determines the current status of the crime prevention and drug education program in selected school districts through the use of a semi-structured personal interview with the individual assigned primary responsibility for coordination of the program in each of the nineteen school districts included in the study. It is the further purpose of this study to determine principal and teacher perceptions toward twenty-two factors.
related to drug abuse among students. This was accomplished through the use of a perception survey mailed to a random sample of 1,184 teachers and all 149 principals within the nineteen school districts participating in the study. This procedure resulted in the return of usable surveys by 804 teachers and 119 principals.

Nineteen school districts, one from each of nineteen education service center regions, were selected to participate in the study. Although the selection of school districts represented a uniform geographic distribution across the state, the selection was not a random one, thereby precluding the use of inferential statistics.

A survey of the literature revealed that House Bill 467 underwent extensive revision between the time the original bill was introduced and its final passage by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature. It was also found that no state funds were provided in support of House Bill 467 from the date of its enactment in 1969 until September, 1973.

From the investigation of the sequential development of the crime prevention and drug education program by the Texas Education Agency, it was found that one consultant is employed by each of the twenty regional education service centers. These consultants are expected to assist 1,147 school districts develop their crime prevention and drug education curricula. No state-wide curriculum guide has been developed or adopted by the Texas Education Agency for the
drug education program. Each school district is encouraged to develop its own curriculum.

From the findings of the study, it is concluded that

1. There is little difference between principals' and teachers' perceptions of drug abuse among students.

2. Adequate state funds have not been made available to implement the provisions of House Bill 467 enacted by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature.

3. It would appear that there is a need for school boards to develop official school board policies which set forth the provisions for meeting the mandate contained in House Bill 467.

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that (1) similar studies of drug education programs be conducted in other states, (2) a study be conducted to develop evaluation procedures for drug education programs, (3) a study be made to determine ways in which teacher-training institutions can develop pre-service and in-service training programs for teachers, and (4) a comprehensive state-wide study be conducted to determine the extent of drug usage among public school students.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Man has always been fascinated by drugs and other substances which in some way alter his normal state of consciousness. In ancient times, drugs found their way into religious ceremonies and rituals. In the Orient, marijuana has been well known for more than 5,000 years. Reference is made to the substance as early as 1000 B.C. in Greek literature (6, p. 2).

Drug abuse is not a new problem in Texas. Different types of drug abuse have been present within the state for many years. What is new is the alarming increase in the number of young people who are experimenting with, and in many cases becoming addicted to, the use of drugs and narcotics.

Recognizing that the improper use of drugs among youth in Texas was assuming epidemic proportions, the Sixty-First Session of the Texas Legislature enacted House Bill 467 in 1969. This act related to the teaching of a course in the public schools on the dangers of crime and narcotics; provided for the creation of The Crime and Narcotics Advisory Commission and prescribed its powers and duties; and declared an emergency (15, p. 72).
In addition to establishing The Crime and Narcotics Advisory Commission, the legislature mandated that the Central Education Agency develop curricula and teaching materials for units of study on the dangers of crime and narcotics. Also, in order to keep teachers abreast of the latest developments in the subject matter, the Central Education Agency, with the cooperation of the advisory commission, was directed to provide by regulation for annual instruction sessions for those teachers assigned to teach courses on the dangers of crime and narcotics in the public schools.

The mandate extended to the public schools of Texas through the provision that units of study be required each year for all students in grades five through twelve on the dangers of crime and narcotics. Provision was also made through the mandate that every person assigned to teach such units of study attend instruction sessions as required by regulations of the Central Education Agency.

The program is now in its third year of development. There is a need for comprehensive assessment of the progress made in the implementation of the crime prevention and drug education program in this state.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine the extent to which the Texas Education Agency and selected school
districts have implemented the legislative provisions of House Bill 467.

**Purpose of the Study**

Many questions remain unresolved with regard to the most effective ways of combating the problems of crime and drug abuse. Perhaps part of the real problem lies in the fragmented assessment of efforts made in the crime prevention and drug education program through the past three years.

The purpose of this study was twofold: first, to describe the sequential development of the crime prevention and drug education program by the Texas Education Agency as mandated by House Bill 467; and second, to determine the current status of the crime prevention and drug education program in selected school districts.

It was further proposed that this study would provide information which would assist the Texas Education Agency in providing answers to the following questions concerning the crime prevention and drug education program:

I. Has the application of House Bill 467 resulted in increased cost to the local school district?

II. Has the Texas Education Agency provided adequate leadership in developing and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program?
III. What are the problems which are of concern to administrators in developing and implementing crime prevention and drug education programs?

IV. What methods and procedures have been utilized in the planning, implementation, and assessment of teacher inservice training programs in crime prevention and drug education?

V. What factors are included in school board policy?

VI. What types of instructional materials are used?

VII. How were teachers selected?

VIII. What time structure is utilized for instruction?

IX. What evaluation procedures are used?

X. What are the perceptions of principals and their staffs toward drug misuse and abuse by students?

Background and Significance of the Study

Drug abuse among young people in Texas has become a major medical and social problem. Many agencies of the state are now engaged in efforts to combat the problems of crime and drug abuse. However, as Harris, McIsaac, and Schuster have stated,

Drug dependence surely is the most pernicious of iatrogenic diseases, but there are so many facets to the problem that the answers do not lie within the province of any one discipline (7, p. xiii).

One state agency concerned with the growing problem of crime and drug abuse is the Texas Criminal Justice Council.
Funded through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, a branch of the federal government, and utilizing funds from the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1970, this agency has been instrumental in implementing crime prevention and drug education programs across the state. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has delineated six objectives for these programs:

1) Foster development of proper attitudes concerning narcotics and drug abuse and orient pupils as to the social problems relating to the use of addictive drugs.

2) Teach that illegal narcotics traffic, drug abuse, and addiction are related to crime and delinquency; strengthen teacher training and other professional programs at the university level; and develop education programs, seminars, and workshops to provide adults with access to drug facts and information.

3) Foster and develop an understanding of laws and law enforcement relating to narcotics and dangerous drugs.

4) Develop an understanding of the dangers associated with dangerous drugs, addiction, and habituation; implement critical health education programs in every school at the earliest grade feasible; and encourage the development of neighborhood information centers, including counseling services.

5) Foster and develop community, parent, and pupil interest in helping to solve the problem.

6) Determine student involvement in drug abuse (4, p. 509).

Another agency which has become increasingly involved in efforts to combat the growing problem of crime and drug abuse among youth is the Texas Education Agency. Recognizing the important role of educators in the prevention of crime and drug abuse, the Sixty-First Texas Legislature enacted House Bill 467, which established the mandate that
instruction on the dangers of crime and narcotics be taught in the public schools. Specifically, House Bill 467 directed that the Texas Education Agency develop curricula and teaching materials for units of study on the dangers of crime and narcotics. Such units of study were to be required for all students each academic year for grades five through twelve (15, p. 71).

In interpreting the language of House Bill 467, the Texas Education Agency adopted a philosophy for the crime prevention and drug education program which was more far-reaching in scope than meeting the present crisis. This philosophy stated that the crime prevention and drug education program should not only meet the current emergency, but should project a long-range design which would serve as a vehicle for moving the entire educational program toward more relevance to human needs. It expressed the more important needs of all students as

achieving a growing understanding and acceptance of self, capacities, and goals.
developing satisfying peer and social relationships.
achieving a masculine or feminine role through understanding of self.
achieving emotional independence from parents and home and expanding awareness of widening environmental boundaries.
planning for moving toward economic independence through educational and vocational preparation.
understanding family life and home responsibility.
participating in risk-taking and thrill activities.
developing intellectual skills and concepts.
developing a valuing system as a guide to self-directed behavior.
adapting to a changing self and a changing world (14, p. 2).

Since the passage of House Bill 467, many studies and reports have been made regarding the most effective methods and means of developing and implementing crime prevention and drug education programs. In 1972 following the Drug Abuse Survey Project sponsored by the Ford Foundation, the following report was made:

The traditional goal of most parents, educators, community leaders, congressmen, and government officials has been to discourage young people from experimenting with illegal drugs at all... education efforts have tried to do this by emphasizing the horrors of addiction and lumping all drugs together as leading to the same ultimate doom. Virtually all experts now agree that such tactics have not proved effective. Indeed, in many cases, they have been counterproductive, causing disrespect, skepticism, and resistance to all advice on drugs (16, pp. 124-125).

In conclusion the report stated,

This examination of current drug education efforts indicates that additional money is not the most urgent requirement. Creative individuals are needed to act as catalysts for the growth, testing, and support of creative educational approaches. Evaluation is vital, as is a climate that encourages the translation of research findings into action... Finally, concerted efforts to clarify goals, drug knowledge, and institutional responsibilities are essential (16, p. 169).

For some educators, the answer has appeared to be in the utilization of ex-addicts as antidrug educators. Donald B. Lauria, commenting on the use of ex-addicts, has stated,

It is currently popular in this country to assume somewhat inanely that he who has used drugs a lot
is by definition in a position to educate against their use. This simply is not true. There is nothing about a professional drug abuser that will make him a predictably good professional antidrug educator (9, p. 151).

Others have advocated expansion of counseling services through the public schools. In the fifth of a series of statements regarding drug dependence, prepared by the American Medical Association's Committee on Alcoholism and Drug Dependence and the Council on Mental Health, it was stated,

Frank and forceful public discussion, focusing on the futility and inherent dangers in experimentation with drugs such as the hallucinogens and on the consequences of dependence, may deter the uninitiated from starting. Expanded counseling services in schools could provide more effective and more suitable alternatives to young people in dealing with their problems (3, p. 50).

Philosophically, each agency has expressed its concerns in terms of the root causes and potential solutions to the drug abuse problem. The Georgia Department of Education has expressed its concerns in terms of supportive efforts by agents outside of the formal classroom setting and the development of resistance to societal pressures:

The ultimate solution, if one exists, to the problem of drug abuse rests in the development of individuals who are resistant to societal pleasures or pressures promoting drug abuse. Education, in general, must be supplemented by concerted efforts by parents and institutions to develop individuals who are capable of resisting pressures toward experimenting with substances extremely harmful to their physiological processes (6, p. 1).
One of the most widely acclaimed approaches to drug education is "values clarification." Marvin R. Levy has stated,

The best deterrent to drug abuse is the individual's value system and his assessment of the consequences associated with drug involvement (10, p. 3).

Further support for the inclusion of "values clarification" as a basic component of the comprehensive drug education program is given by Raths, Harmin, and Simon:

The development of values is a personal and life-long process. . . . It is this process that we believe needs to be carried on in the classrooms, and it is at least partly through this process that we think children will learn about themselves and about how to make some sense out of the buzzing confusion of the society around them (12, p. 37).

The current emphasis on drug abuse prevention programs through the public schools comes as a result of the recognition that the expenditure of millions of dollars on treatment and rehabilitation programs were for the most part wasted (2, p. 372).

Although many and varied approaches to drug education have been advocated, the most effective method is yet to be determined. Regardless of which method(s) is used, it is most important that those responsible for the development of programs in drug abuse prevention recognize the danger that

While the "mechanistics" of learning have moved forward, the "humanistics"--the personalized, caring, feeling elements of learning--have failed to make equal progress and at times seem to have become almost extinct (2, p. 372).
In the report of the National Education Association's task force on drug education, the definition of drug education is expressed as

A learning process that influences an individual emotionally, intellectually, psychologically, and socially, and that may result in the modification of attitudes that influence behavior. It not only involves the formal mechanism of presenting information but also includes a series of experiences and influences that help shape the learning environment—the atmosphere of the school, the life-style present at home, the attitude of parents, the pressures within a peer group, the popular culture, the personal experiences with or without drugs, and the availability of alternative mechanisms employed to carry out certain kinds of behavior (11, p. 5).

Likewise, this definition can be expanded to include crime prevention. That is, factors which influence behavior are of primary concern in a crime prevention program as well as a drug education program. Jecker has stated,

Unlawful behavior, like any other, is seen by the behaving organism as a path to a goal. The threat of punishment does nothing to alter this view of unlawful behavior except to establish the belief that it is also a path to punishment (8, p. 29).

Ford has defined crime prevention as "a planned educational effort to enhance awareness, understanding and interpretation of the individual's rights and responsibilities for himself and others as he moves toward fulfilling effective citizenship" (5). This definition enhances the "Goals for Public School Education in Texas," which states,

The public schools should help each student to develop his personal knowledge, skills, and
competence to the maximum of his capacity, and to learn behavior patterns which will make him a responsible member of society (13).

The "Goals for Public School Education in Texas" have been divided into three components. Section I addresses itself to student development. That is, in terms of their individual ability, all students should achieve intellectual discipline, economic and occupational competence, citizenship and political understanding and competence, physical and environmental health and ecological balance, appreciation of cultural and aesthetic values, and competence in personal and social relations. The latter of these goals, competence in personal and social relations, is closely related to the crime prevention and drug education program. Included as outcomes of this goal are

1) Knowledge about basic psychological and sociological factors affecting human behavior.
2) Skill in interpersonal and group relations, and in formation of ethical and moral standards of behavior.
3) Competence for adjusting to changes in personal status and social patterns (13).

Section II relates to the organizational efficiency of the public school. This section stresses the importance of organizing the public school system in such a manner that faculty and students will accept and support its objectives and processes (13).

Section III of the "Goals for Public School Education in Texas" addresses the issue of accountability. This section states,
A program of continuing evaluation should be established for measuring the performance of the public school system in terms of the competence of its products and the efficiency of its structure and processes (13).

It is this goal, which when extended to the accountability of program development, gives significance to the present proposed study.

Limitations

This study was limited to House Bill 467 and its implementation by the Texas Education Agency and selected school districts (15, p. 71). No attempt was made to compare this legislation or its implementation with that in other states.

Basic Assumptions

It was assumed that the public schools have made a sincere effort to provide an instructional program for all students in grades five through twelve. It was also assumed that an adequate period of time had elapsed since the enactment of House Bill 467 for the public schools to have gained sufficient experience to provide an objective assessment of the progress and present status of their program.

Finally, it was assumed that adequate and reliable data for the study could be obtained through the use of a perception survey instrument and personal interviews, and that those responding would do so in a cooperative and honest manner.
Definition of Terms

In order to provide a clearer understanding of the terms used in the study, the following definitions were formulated:

**Crime prevention:** Crime prevention covers a wide span of activities ranging from eliminating social conditions closely associated with crime to improving the ability of the criminal justice system to detect, apprehend, judge, and reintegrate those who commit crimes. For the purpose and use of this study, crime prevention education was defined as a planned educational effort to enhance awareness, understanding, and interpretation of the individual's rights and responsibilities to himself and others as he moves toward fulfilling effective citizenship.

**Drug education:** As used in this study, drug education refers to an educational approach that seeks to help students develop a framework of knowledge and values enabling them to make sound responsible decisions with respect to drug usage.

**Affective:** As used in this study, affective refers to the development of skills in interpersonal relationships, value clarification, and decision-making.

**Cognitive:** When used in this study, cognitive refers to the recall or recognition of information and the development of intellectual abilities.
Drug misuse: As used in this study, drug misuse refers to the use of drugs above normal, medically supervised doses.

Drug abuse: The most general concept which defines drug abuse is dependence. Dependence means addiction, habituation, or both. Addiction is physical dependence on a drug. Habituation is a psychological desire to repeat the use of a drug intermittently or continuously because of emotional reasons. Generally, abuse is the use of a drug for non-medical or non-scientific purposes with the potentiality of harm to the user or to society.

Formulation of the Survey Instrument

The survey instruments were developed to provide information which would be of assistance in answering the questions posed in the statement of purpose of the study.

Two instruments were designed to gather information related to the study. The first instrument was designed to assimilate information on organization and procedures used in implementing crime prevention and drug education programs. The second instrument utilized a Likert-type scale to determine principals' and teachers' perceptions of drug misuse and abuse.

The items which were developed to assess principals' and teachers' perceptions of drug misuse and abuse were adopted, in part, from Gerald Bailey's study, "Perceptions and Attitudes of Administrative and Counseling Staffs..."
Toward Drug Use and Abuse in Nebraska Junior Colleges" (2). An advisory panel composed of three regional education service center crime prevention and drug education coordinators, three coordinators of crime prevention and drug education programs in local school districts, and three members of the Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education at the Texas Education Agency assisted in the selection of appropriate items for the survey (see Appendix, p. 255). The function of the advisory panel was to review the proposed items developed for the survey with regard to clarity and appropriateness. They were to then make recommendations for improvements, addition or deletion of questions, or other refinements which they deemed appropriate.

Following the revisions recommended by the advisory panel, the questionnaire was submitted to a jury composed of three members of the Texas Education Agency Continuing Committee for Crime Prevention and Drug Education, two public school superintendents, two members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Crime Prevention and Drug Education, and two regional education service center crime prevention and drug education coordinators (see Appendix, p. 256). Members of the jury were requested to evaluate each item on the questionnaire to determine clarity and appropriateness for gathering information needed for the study (see Appendix, p. 257). These individuals were knowledgeable in the area of curriculum development and crime prevention and drug education. Their
knowledge and experience served to establish the validity of the instruments used in the study.

In order to establish the reliability of the survey questionnaire which was developed to determine the perceptions of principals and teachers toward drug misuse and abuse, the questionnaire was administered twice to a group of fifty-six principals and teachers. The time lapse between the two administrations of the test consisted of a three-week period. A minimum acceptable correlation coefficient of .60 was established prior to the administration of the survey instrument. The Pearson product-moment correlation between the two sets of scores was utilized in defining the reliability between the pre- and posttest scores.

Procedures for Collection of Data

The procedures used in collecting data for the study included a review of the literature related to crime prevention and drug education, a survey questionnaire, and personal interviews.

The review of the literature included a survey of published and unpublished reports related to crime prevention and drug abuse education. Materials reviewed included, but were not restricted to, publications from the U.S. Office of Health, Education, and Welfare, the President's Drug Abuse Council, Texas Education Agency, and independent studies.
The perception survey questionnaire was designed to ascertain the perceptions of principals and their staffs toward drug misuse and abuse by students. The questionnaire was distributed to principals and their staffs in nineteen school districts within the state of Texas. One school district was selected from each of nineteen education service center regions within the state.

A questionnaire was sent to each principal and a random sample of staff members who participated in the project, with the request that they complete and return the questionnaire by mail. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided with each questionnaire. A return of at least two-thirds of the questionnaires was considered sufficient to support the stated objective of this phase of the study; that is, to ascertain the perceptions of principals and their staffs toward drug misuse and abuse by students.

The third procedure used in the collection of data was a personal interview conducted with the superintendent or the individual to whom he had delegated the responsibility of developing and implementing the crime prevention and drug education component of the curriculum.

The personal interview was selected as a means of gathering information related to the development, implementation, and operation of instructional programs in crime prevention and drug education because of its advantages over the mailed survey or questionnaire. The interview provides
more flexibility; that is, it enables the interviewer to probe for additional information and clarification of responses. Since one of the purposes of the study is to ascertain the perceptions of staff members toward drug misuse and abuse, it afforded the interviewer an opportunity to observe not only what the respondent said, but the way in which he said it. Finally, the personal interview allowed the researcher to establish a closer, more personal and non-threatening relationship with the respondents. This was considered a desirable condition for gathering detailed data on questions concerning the adequacy of leadership provided by the Texas Education Agency and regional education service centers in developing and implementing crime prevention and drug education programs.

The data collected through the personal interview with superintendents and those assigned the responsibility for program planning and implementation were related to the appropriate questions posed in the statement of the purpose of the study. Such data were related primarily to considerations of program implementation, organization, evaluation, and perception of the effectiveness of leadership provided by the Texas Education Agency and regional education service centers.

The school districts participating in the study were stratified on the basis of average daily attendance into five categories (see Appendix, p. 259). School districts
were stratified into those having an average daily attendance of less than 1,000 students, 1,001 to 2,000, 2,001 to 5,000, 5,001 to 15,000, and those having an average daily attendance of over 15,000 students.

Procedures for the Analysis of Data

The data collected from school district personnel participating in the study were compiled, tabulated, and reported. The data collected through the use of the questionnaire and interview instruments are presented in tables in the form of frequency and percentage of responses to each item presented in the two instruments.

Comparisons were made between principals' and teachers' responses to items on the instrument designed to determine principal and teacher perception of drug misuse and abuse. Comparisons were also made between strata on the basis of frequency and percentage of responses.

The data collected from a review of the literature, the perception survey questionnaire, and personal interviews provided information concerning the implementation of the provisions contained in House Bill 467. This information was utilized in drawing conclusions with regard to the present status of the crime prevention and drug education program in the nineteen school districts studied. These data were also used to draw educational implications and make recommendations regarding future research.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

Introduction

Much emphasis has been placed on study of the pharmaco-
logical, social, and psychological effects of drug abuse
during the past quarter century. This emphasis, however,
has been expanded to include preventative programs, which
may, presumably, reduce the incidence of drug abuse among
the American people. One such program is the Texas Education
Agency's Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program, which
was authorized by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature in 1969
(13).

The review of the literature and related research was
undertaken to establish a better understanding of the sequen-
tial development and final enactment of House Bill 467 (13)
by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature. Through a review of
the original bill, introduced February 24, 1969, and study
of the additional attachments and riders to it, it became
evident that the final document carried much more understand-
ing and meaning after much thought and investigation were
given to it. This is the purpose of its detailed presenta-
tion in this chapter.
In order to better understand the extent of the drug problem among school-age youth, the review of related research provides data concerning the incidence of drug abuse in two metropolitan school districts (5, 8). Two additional studies are included in the review of related research on drug abuse prevention: the Borgers (2) study and the Brazill (3) study.

Finally, in order to better understand the inter-relationship among the various federal and state agencies who share responsibilities for drug abuse prevention services, a brief review of the services provided by these agencies is included. The number of federal and state agencies is extensive, therefore, not all agencies are included in the review.

The sections included in the review of literature and related research are as follows: (1) legislative background, (2) school district surveys in Texas, and (3) related federal and state programs.

Legislative Background

Recognizing the need for an educational program in the public schools which would aid in combating the increasing incidence of crime and drug abuse, Representative Joe Golman of Dallas introduced House Bill 467 (7) in the Sixty-First Session of the Texas Legislature.
This action, taken February 24, 1969, initiated legislative action which ultimately resulted in a mandate to the public schools, requiring units of study on the dangers of crime and narcotics for all students in grades five through twelve (18, pp. 322-323).

The original bill was presented in the following form:

A BILL TO BE ENTITLED: AN ACT relating to the teaching of a course on the evils of crime and narcotics in grades 6 through 12 in the public schools; and declaring an emergency.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF TEXAS:

Section 1. The Central Education Agency shall develop curricula and teaching materials for a course on the evils of crime and narcotics to be taught at least two hours a week in grades 6 through 12 in all public schools. The course shall be required for all students.

Sec. 2. (a) In order to keep the teachers abreast of the latest developments in the subject matter, the Central Education Agency by regulation shall provide for a series of semi-annual instruction sessions, to be taught by the Department of Public Safety or by local law enforcement agencies.

(b) Every person assigned to teach the course in the public schools shall attend the instruction sessions as required by regulation of the Central Education Agency.

Sec. 3. The importance of this legislation and the crowded condition of the calendars in both houses create an emergency and an imperative public necessity that the Constitutional Rule requiring bills to be read on three several days in each house be suspended, and that this Act take effect and be in force from and after its passage, and it is so enacted.

The bill received its first of the required three readings on February 24, 1969. Following the initial reading of the bill to the House of Representatives, the bill was referred to the Public Education Committee of the House (10).
On March 11, 1969, the bill was presented to the Public Education Committee by Representative Golman. The following procedures were conducted on that date:

The Chair laid H.B. No. 467 before the Committee and recognized Mr. Golman to explain his bill. The following witnesses spoke for H.B. 467:
- Barbara Ann Kazen, an Austin attorney, representing herself.
- Dr. James A. Turman, Director of the Texas Youth Council, representing himself.
- Frank I. Cornwall, Dallas Police Department, representing Narcotic Section of the Dallas Police Department.
- Mr. C. J. Doerr, San Antonio police officer, representing himself.
- Mr. Bill Hardin, Narcotic Agent of the Fort Worth Police Department, representing the Fort Worth Police Department.
- Mr. Douglas Mulder, Assistant District Attorney of Dallas County, representing his office.
- Mr. R. E. Pinekard, Investigator, representing the District Attorney's office of Fort Worth.
- Mr. Joe C. Spurlock, Assistant District Attorney of Fort Worth, representing his office.

Under the automatic subcommittee rule, H.B. 467 was sent to the following subcommittee: Cummings, Chairman, Golman, Holmes, Burgess, Sanchez (11).

On April 29, 1969, the subcommittee reported its recommendations to the Public Education Committee. The text of the report was as follows:

The Chair recognized Mr. Cummings for a subcommittee report on H.B. 467.
Mr. Cummings moved the adoption of the subcommittee's recommendation, sending H.B. 467 back to the House with the recommendation that it pass as amended, and be printed.
A voice vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously.
Mr. Cummings then moved H.B. 467 be referred back to the floor with the recommendation that it do pass, as amended, and be printed.
A voice vote was taken, and the motion passed unanimously (12).
House Bill 467 received its second reading before the House of Representatives on May 21, 1969 (10). At that time, Representative Golman moved that all necessary rules be suspended in order to take up and consider H.B. 467. The motion prevailed without objection. The proceedings of that reading were reported as follows:

The Speaker laid before the House on its second reading and passage to engrossment, H.B. No. 467, a bill to be entitled An Act relating to the teaching of a course on the evils of crime and narcotics in grades 6 through 12 in the public schools; and declaring an emergency.

The bill was read second time.

Mr. Golman offered the following committee amendment to the bill:

Committee Amendment No. 1
Amend H.B. No. 467 by striking all below the enacting clause and substituting the following:

Section 1. The Central Education Agency shall develop curricula and teaching materials for units of study on the dangers of crime and narcotics and the excessive use of alcohol and tobacco. The units of study shall be required for all students each academic year for grades five through 12.

Sec. 2. (a) The Crime and Narcotics Advisory Commission is created. The advisory commission is composed of nine members, who shall serve for terms of two years expiring January 31 of odd-numbered years.

(b) The Governor shall appoint three members of the commission, with the following representation:

(1) a licensed physician;
(2) an official of the Department of Public Safety; and
(3) a narcotics official from the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

(c) The Lieutenant Governor shall appoint three members of the commission, with the following representation:

(1) an official of a local-level law enforcement agency;
(2) a group social worker; and
(3) an educator.
(d) The Speaker of the House of Representa-
tives shall appoint three members of the
commission, with the following representation:
(1) a businessman;
(2) a college student who is either a
senior or a graduate student; and
(3) a juvenile judge who serves in a city
with a population of over 200,000, according to
the last preceding federal census.
(e) The advisory commission shall meet when
the chairman deems necessary. The commission
shall elect its chairman, vice-chairman, and any
other officers it deems necessary. The commission
shall adopt rules to govern the conduct of its
business.
(f) Members of the commission shall serve
without compensation, but each member is entitled
to reimbursement for actual and necessary ex-
penses incurred in performing his duties, as pro-
vided by legislative appropriation.
Sec. 3. (a) The advisory commission shall:
(1) advise and assist the Central Education
Agency in developing curricula and teaching
materials for a course on the dangers of crime
and narcotics, and the excessive use of alcohol
and tobacco;
(2) designate in cooperation with the
Central Education Agency the number of hours
that the course shall be taught; and
(3) assist local citizens' groups formed
to combat unlawful use of and traffic in drugs
and narcotics.
(b) The commission shall develop a research
program designed to measure the effectiveness of
the commission's activities and shall prepare a
research report annually to facilitate planning
and development.
Sec. 4. (a) In order to keep the teachers
abreast of the latest developments in the subject
matter, the Central Education Agency with the
cooperation of the advisory commission shall
provide by regulation for annual instruction
sessions.
(b) Every person assigned to teach the
course in the public schools shall attend the
instruction sessions as required by regulation
of the Central Education Agency.
Sec. 5. The importance of this legislation
and the crowded condition of the calendars in
both Houses create an emergency and an imperative public necessity that the Constitutional Rule requiring bills to be read on three several days in each House be suspended, and this Rule is hereby suspended, and that this Act take effect and be in force from and after its passage, and it is so enacted.

Mr. Hinson offered the following amendment to Committee Amendment No. 1:

Amendment No. 1
Amend Committee Amendment No. 1 to H.B. No. 467 as follows:
(1) Delete "designate in cooperation with" on line 52, page 1, and substitute "advise and assist."
(2) Insert "in designating" between "Agency" and "the" on line 53, page 1.

The above amendment to Committee Amendment No. 1 was adopted without objection.

Mr. Hinson offered the following amendment to Committee Amendment No. 1:

Amendment No. 2
Amend Committee Amendment No. 1 to H.B. No. 467 by deleting "an educator" on line 30, page 1, and substituting "a public school superintendent in a city with a population of over 200,000, according to the last preceding federal census."

The above amendment to Committee Amendment No. 1 was adopted without objection.

Mr. Hinson offered the following amendment to Committee Amendment No. 1:

Amendment No. 3
Amend Committee Amendment No. 1 to House Bill No. 467 by renumbering Section 5 as Section 6 and adding a new Section 5 to read as follows:
Sec. 5. This Act takes effect September 1, 1970.

The above amendment to Committee Amendment No. 1 was adopted without objection.

Mr. Truan offered the following amendment to Committee Amendment No. 1:

Amend Section 1, lines 14 and 15: "Such course of instruction shall be elective and not required."

Mr. Golman moved to table the above amendment offered by Mr. Truan.

A record vote was requested on the motion to table.

The vote of the House was taken on the motion to table the amendment offered by Mr. Truan to
Committee Amendment No. 1 and the vote was announced Yeas 68, Nays 67.
A verification was requested and was granted.
The roll of those voting Yea was again called.
By unanimous consent, the House dispensed with the verification of those voting Nay.
The Speaker stated that the motion to table the amendment offered by Mr. Truan to Committee Amendment No. 1 prevailed by the above vote.
Committee Amendment No. 1, as amended, was adopted.
Mr. Golman offered the following committee amendment to the bill:
Committee Amendment No. 2
Amend H.B. No. 467 by striking all above the enacting clause and substituting the following:
"A bill to be entitled An Act relating to the teaching of a course in the public schools on the dangers of crime and narcotics and the excessive use of alcohol and tobacco; and declaring an emergency."
Committee Amendment No. 2 was adopted without objection.
H.B. No. 467, as amended, was passed to engrossment.
Mr. Golman moved that the constitutional rule requiring bills to be read on three several days be suspended and that House Bill No. 467 be placed on its third reading and final passage.
The Speaker then laid House Bill No. 467 before the House on third reading and final passage.
The bill was read third time and was passed.
Mr. Golman moved to reconsider the vote by which H.B. No. 467 was passed and to table the motion to reconsider.
The motion to table prevailed (10).

Following passage of H.B. 467 by the House of Representatives, the bill was sent to the Senate for their review and action (10). The bill was sponsored by Senator Ralph Hall in the Senate. It received its first reading in the Senate on May 22, 1969. It was then referred to the Public
Education Committee of the Senate for their review and recommendation (13).

The Public Education Committee considered the bill on May 27, 1969, recommending that it be referred to the floor with the recommendation that it do pass, as amended, and printed (15).

H.B. 467 received its second reading in the Senate on May 28, 1969 (13). The text of that reading was as follows:

On motion of Senator Hall, and by unanimous consent, the regular order of business was suspended to take up for consideration at this time on its second reading and passage to third reading:

H.B. 467, A bill to be entitled "An Act relating to the teaching of a course on the evils of crime and narcotics in grades 6 through 12 in the public schools; and declaring an emergency."

The bill was read second time.

Senator Hall offered the following Committee Amendment to the bill:

Amend H.B. 467 by deleting the words "and the excessive use of alcohol and tobacco" as the same appear immediately following the word "narcotics" in Section 1 of said bill.

The Committee Amendment was read and was adopted.

Senator Hall offered the following Committee Amendment to the bill:

Amend H.B. 467 by deleting the punctuation and words ", and the excessive use of alcohol and tobacco" as the same appear immediately following the word "narcotics" in Sec. 3(a)(1) of said bill.

The Committee Amendment was read and was adopted.

Senator Hall offered the following Committee Amendment to the bill:

Amend the caption to H.B. 467 by deleting the words "and the excessive use of alcohol and tobacco" as the same appear immediately following the word "narcotics" on Line 2 of said caption.
The Committee Amendment was read and was adopted.

Senator Hall offered the following amendment to the bill:

Amend House Bill No. 467 by adding a new Subsection (c) to Section 3 to read as follows:

(c) The commission shall cooperate and coordinate their activities with any other state agency or legislative committee or commission that is investigating or studying drug and narcotics activity, availability, or use in Texas.

The amendment was read and was adopted.

On motion of Senator Hall, and by unanimous consent, the caption was amended to conform to the body of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was passed to third reading.

Senator Hall moved that the Constitutional Rule and Senate Rule 30 requiring bills to be read on three several days be suspended and that H.B. No. 467 be placed on its third reading and final passage.

The Presiding Officer then laid the bill before the Senate on its third reading and final passage.

The bill was read third time and was passed (13).

On that same date, H.B. 467 was returned to the House of Representatives by the Senate. Representative Golman presented the bill with Senate Amendments for consideration by the House membership (13).

Mr. Golman moved to suspend all necessary rules and concur in the Senate Amendments to H.B. 467. The motion prevailed (10).

Although H.B. 467 established the necessary legislative authority to require public schools of Texas to offer instruction in the dangers of crime and narcotics, it did not appropriate funds with which to develop staff and
program materials (6). It was not until the Sixty-Third Texas Legislature met in 1973, that state funds were provided in support of H.B. 467 (14).

During the Sixty-Third Session of the Texas Legislature, Senator William Bracklin, District 16, Dallas, Texas, introduced Senate Bill 506 (14). A companion bill, House Bill 1215, was introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative Robert Matoney, District 33-E, Dallas, Texas (9).

Senate Bill 506 was described as

A bill to be entitled An Act to amend Texas Education Code, to authorize and provide for the establishment and administration of a comprehensive Crime and Narcotics education program encompassing the services and efforts of regional education service centers and Texas school districts; etc.; and declaring an emergency (14).

The bill received its first of the three required readings before the Senate on March 7, 1973. The bill was referred to the Senate Education Committee on the same date (14).

The Senate Education Committee, after reviewing the bill, recommended that it be referred to the floor with the recommendation that it do pass (14). S.B. 506 was then read for the second time on May 10, 1973 (14). The second reading proceeded as follows:

Senator Aikin offered the following amendment to the bill:
Amend S.B. 506 by renumbering sections 2 and 3 as 3 and 4 and inserting a new section 2 to read as follows:
"Section 2. There is hereby appropriated to the Central Education Agency from the General Revenue Fund for the items prescribed by Section 21.118(d)(1) and (2), Texas Education Code, as added by this Act, the sum of $560,000 for the school year beginning September 1, 1973, and $560,000 for the school year beginning September 1, 1974."

The amendment was read and was adopted.

Senator Aikin offered the following amendment to the bill:

Amend S.B. 506 by inserting "making appropriations;" before "and declaring an emergency" in the title of the bill.

The amendment was read and was adopted.

The bill as amended was passed to third reading.

SENATE BILL 506 ON THIRD READING

Senator Braecklein moved that the Constitutional Rule and Senate Rule 68 requiring bills to be read on three several days be suspended and that S.B. 506 be placed on its third reading and final passage.

The motion prevailed by the following vote:

Yeas 31, Nays 0.

The President then laid the bill before the Senate on its third reading and final passage.

The bill was read third time and was passed (14).

A companion bill to S.B. 506, H.B. 1215, had been presented to the House of Representatives on an earlier date by Representative Robert Maloney of Dallas (14). After S.B. 506 received its first reading before the House on May 11, 1973, it was referred to the House Education Committee to be considered along with H.B. 1215 (9).

The House Education Committee reviewed both bills on May 22, 1973. The review proceeded as follows:

The Chair laid out H.B. No. 1215 and S.B. No. 506 and recognized Mr. Maloney to explain his bill.

No one spoke in opposition.
Mr. Foreman moved that S.B. No. 506 be reported back to the House favorably and be placed on the consent calendar. (revised fiscal)

A roll call vote was taken on the motion reflecting the following:

Ayes: Mr. Kubiak, McAlister, Adams, Allred, Barnhart, Bird, Blake, Foreman, McDonald, Madla, and Presnal.
Nayes: Mr. Baker, Clark (9).

The bill was then placed on the consent calendar. On May 25, 1973, it received its second and third readings and was passed by the legislature (14). Governor Briscoe signed the bill into law on June 18, 1973 (14).

Both H.B. 467 (6), passed by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature in 1969 and S.B. 506 (14), enacted by the Sixty-Third Texas Legislature, have been codified as sections 21.113 through 21.116 and section 21.118 (see Appendix, p. 260).

School District Surveys in Texas

The passage of H.B. 467 (18) by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature created the need for a more detailed exploration of students' and teachers' attitudes and information regarding drug misuse and abuse. An attempt to gather new data in this area was the Borgers study (2), "Information and Attitudes Possessed by Sixth and Tenth Grade Students and Teachers in a Drug Education Program." The study was funded through a contractual agreement with the Texas Education Agency, Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education.
The purpose of the study (2) was to acquire information regarding the current status of the Laredo drug education program at that time. The study considered three basic questions: (1) Do students possess accurate drug information? (2) What is student and teacher attitude toward drugs and the drug education program? (3) Are the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) responses of teachers similar to the POI responses given by self-actualizing people?

Shostrom (16) defines a self-actualizing individual as one who functions in a more fully enriched life style than does the average person. Such a person lives primarily in the present with awareness and is typically self-supportive. Borgers states, "Many of the values and attitudes of self-actualizing people are desirable for teachers of drug education" (2, p. 2).

The Borgers study was conducted in the Laredo Independent School District, Laredo, Texas. All students attending the Laredo schools were participants in the district's drug education program. The program began in all Laredo schools in September, 1970. Laredo classroom teachers wrote the sequential program for grades one through twelve. Drug education was not taught as a separate subject for credit but as part of the existing curriculum. The sample of students and teachers participating in the study consisted of approximately 300 sixth-grade and 300 tenth-grade students and 20 sixth-grade and 20 tenth-grade teachers.
The "Drug Information Test" (DIT), the "Demographic Information Form" (DIF), and the "Semantic Differential" (SD) were administered to sixth- and tenth-grade students (1). During the same week, the DIT, the SD, and the POI (16) were administered to sixth- and tenth-grade teachers.

Conclusions and recommendations were made by Borgers to the Texas Education Agency based on the findings of the study (2, pp. 36-40). These conclusions and recommendations included the following:

1. Mean scores on the "Drug Information Test" indicated that students did not possess a high percentage of accurate information about drugs. It was suggested that consideration be given to additional ways in which students might obtain more accurate information. "Drug Information Test" mean scores for teachers of sixth- and tenth-grade classes suggested that more emphasis should be placed on teacher knowledge of drug information.

2. A study of "Drug Information Test" items revealed no distinct pattern of items missed; therefore, no specific area of concentration could be suggested.

3. It was reported that since "Semantic Differential" mean scores indicated that students make little distinction between the various kinds of drugs, consideration of these distinctions might prove useful. On the "Demographic Information Form," a majority (72.7 percent) of the students
stated that alcohol was most often used by their peers. It was recommended that more consideration should be given to alcohol and its effects.

4. The "Demographic Information Form" made reference to the content of the drug education program. Thirty-six and one-tenth percent of the students stated that drug facts should be emphasized, 21.9 percent desired more information about the experiences of drug abusers, and 40.7 percent stated that the emphasis should be on discussion. Tenth-grade students especially desired more discussion. It was strongly recommended that discussion and student involvement be increased.

5. According to the "Demographic Information Form," 67.2 percent of the students indicated that they did want a school program, and 56.3 percent indicated it should be at all grade levels. This suggested that the all-level drug education program should be continued and even expanded in scope.

6. "Semantic Differential" mean scores indicated that there was a discrepancy in the attitude of teachers and students. Teacher attitude toward the occasional misuse of drugs was more negative than student attitude. Likewise, teacher attitude toward marijuana was more negative than student attitude. Conversely, teacher attitude toward school was found to be more positive than student attitude. Also, teacher attitude toward the school drug education
program and toward other teachers was found to be more positive than student attitude. Since a teacher who views school and teachers in a positive manner may have difficulty communicating with a student who views school and teachers in a less positive manner, Borgers recommended that teachers be aware of this discrepancy and attempt to decrease it.

7. According to the "Demographic Information Form," 69.5 percent of the students indicated they would ask teachers or counselors for information about drugs; however, only 10.5 percent said they would suggest a friend with a drug problem go to a teacher or counselor for help. Because of the importance of the teacher in drug education, it was recommended that teachers make an effort to increase communication with students.

8. The results of the survey also indicated that the "Semantic Differential" mean scores revealed a difference in the attitude of sixth- and tenth-grade students. Table I illustrates the difference in mean scores. The scores in this table suggest that sixth-grade students view drug laws, the school drug education program, and teachers in a more positive manner than tenth-grade students. It was also reported by Borgers that tenth-grade students frequently wrote negative comments on the "Semantic Differential" whereas sixth-graders did not. Borgers recommended that since sixth-grade students tend to have a more positive
TABLE I

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL MEAN SCORES FOR SIXTH- AND TENTH GRADE STUDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Toward:</th>
<th>Sixth Grade</th>
<th>Tenth Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug Laws</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Drug Education Program</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sherry Borgers, "Information and Attitudes Possessed by Sixth and Tenth Grade Students and Teachers in a Drug Education Program," Texas Education Agency, Austin, Texas, 1971.

attitude toward concepts such as the school drug education program, consideration should be given to emphasizing attitudinal aspects of drug education in the lower grades.

9. The "Demographic Information Form also indicated the difference in attitudes of sixth- and tenth-grade students. Only 17.9 percent of the sixth-graders said drug misuse was a problem in the school. Conversely, 39.5 percent of the tenth-graders considered drug misuse a problem. Only 42.6 percent of the sixth-grade students said drugs are harmful, whereas 77.3 percent of the tenth-grade students stated they are harmful. Further, it was reported that 42.3 percent of sixth-grade students believed that the problem of drug misuse is being solved; however, only 15.4 percent of the tenth-grade students believed this to be the case. As a result of these findings, Borgers recommended that attitudes such as these be considered when choosing
areas of focus. Sixth-grade students, says Borgers, need more information about the dangers of drugs; however, since tenth-grade students are aware of the dangers, the emphasis might be shifted to other areas.

Another study of drug education programs in Texas school districts was conducted by Brazill (3) as his doctoral dissertation. The purpose of Brazill's study was essentially twofold:

First, it sought to examine some of the programs for prevention and treatment of drug abuse in Texas elementary and secondary schools. Second, it utilized the best of three programs and incorporated ideas from the literature to make recommendations which could evolve into a model program which schools could follow, probably more in part than in total, in dealing with drug problems. These recommendations could result in education for prevention and treatment of those children and students using drugs to the point of abuse or addiction (3, p. 1).

In selecting the school districts to participate in the study, Brazill divided the state into four geographic areas. The areas of the state which were selected represented West Texas, Northeast Central Texas, Southeast Texas, and West Central Texas. There was a heterogeneous mixture of school districts ranging from large AAAA urban to small, class A or B rural school districts. The material for the study was gathered through the use of a structured interview with local school district personnel.

Eight school districts were visited by the researcher. In addition, an interview was conducted with a consultant from the Texas Education Agency, Division of Crime
Prevention and Drug Education. The purpose of the latter interview was to establish the program advocated by the Texas Education Agency.

After evaluation of the eight programs included in Brazill's study, he states,

When these programs were evaluated, it was found that they were not consistent with the goals of the Texas Education Agency in the area of drug education. For the most part these same drug education programs presented deficiencies which were generally found by the Task Force on Drug Education of the National Education Association throughout the nation (3, p. 113).

Brazill reached eleven conclusions as a result of his study (3, pp. 114-115). These conclusions included

1. Most programs involved in the present study reflected a limited scope in that the primary emphasis on drug facts was indicative of a lack of depth of understanding with regard to the etiology of the drug problem in relation to the individual's total life such as the value system of the individual vis-a-vis values of the society, the self-concept of the individual, and his identity, the peer group influence, and the life style of the individual.

2. Many of the goals of the programs visited were not specific, carefully determined, nor clearly understood by personnel in the respective programs.

3. Evaluation of these programs by appropriate personnel appeared to be quite subjective and was not, in many cases, undertaken on the basis of specifically stated goals and objectives.

4. Most of the drug programs visited were lacking in depth when contrasted to recommendations set out by various agencies.

5. Since the programs visited were recommended as among the best drug education/prevention programs in the state of Texas, then it might be assumed that most of the programs in Texas leave even more to be desired.
6. If the drug education/prevention programs visited were compared to the aims of the National Education Association Task Force on Drug Education, most all programs reflected weaknesses cited by the National Education Association.

7. Further, if the programs visited were analyzed in relation to the goals for Texas schools as stated by the consultant from the Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education of the Texas Education Agency, then again, with some exceptions, the majority of the programs were barely approaching these goals. Supporting this conclusion was the statement in the final report of the Drug Study Committee of the Texas Senate that "... local school district programs generally employ specific methods and techniques grossly inconsistent with the original objectives of the Texas Education Agency [Final Report Senate Interim Drug Study Committee, 1973, p. 74]."

8. Many teachers were not accomplishing the goals for drug education, but due to their lack of specialized preparation, they could not be fully blamed or held responsible.

9. No drug education program appeared to be effective unless the administration strongly supported the program.

10. Many schoolmen were reluctant to acknowledge that their school might have a drug problem or that they were just unaware of what was happening with the students in their school.

11. Involvement of parents in the drug education programs visited was virtually nonexistent (3, pp. 114-115).

Based on the aforementioned conclusions from the study, sixteen goals were recommended for a model program in drug education. Brazill recommended goals for students which would include an understanding of such concepts as

1. To understand the meaning of life and the purpose for one's existence; the development of an identity.
2. A concept of self to include cognizance of one's abilities, limitations, and interests.
3. Understanding one's human sexuality and sexual identity; appropriate sex roles and sexual behavior.
4. Understanding human behavior and motivation.
5. The place of work in human functioning, including awareness, information, exploration, and preparation for appropriate careers.
6. Ability to do productive and critical thinking, decision making, and take responsibility for one's acts. Also, understanding responsibility to society, government, and integration into society (3, pp. 117-118).

Goals for teachers should include the following:

7. Development of teacher education programs emphasizing self-concept of the potential teachers and their fellow men; awareness of self and others; communication; uniqueness of self and others; values; participation with groups; and ways of relating or dealing with students without the use of physical force. In-service education could expedite development in these areas.
8. Consideration of drug facts or information for secondary emphasis in the drug education program.
9. Development of in-service education of experienced or new teachers along the lines mentioned.
10. Accommodation of cultural and linguistic differences as they are found in Texas.
11. Aims for teachers should reflect a more thorough understanding of the total human being facing the drug problem (3, pp. 117-118).

Goals for schools should reflect an innovative approach to drug abuse through such emphases as

12. Abandonment of the striving for complete elimination of illicit drug use and drug abuse as a realistic objective. There will always be some drug experimentation.
13. The meaningful involvement of parents which transcends drug education programs, per se.
14. Development of criteria for purposes of evaluation of the drug program which are appropriate to each individual school system and are revised on a regular basis.
15. Student involvement in the drug education program from inception through implementation, to evaluation.

The Houston Independent School District, in response to the Drug Education Committee of the Board of Education, consented to the request of the committee to conduct a school-wide survey of secondary students (8). The survey was designed to gather information on the incidence of drug usage among high school students which would provide relevant data related to four areas: first, the survey would provide the baseline data necessary to detect changes in the pattern of drug abuse; second, it would help focus and modify the drug education programs which are required by statute in the state of Texas in grades five through twelve; third, it would aid public service agencies in planning programs in drug abuse; and finally, it would provide data for public education so that the general public could be aware of the extent of the problem in Houston (8, p. 20).

The method used in the survey was a questionnaire (8, pp. 40-46) which consisted of eighty-eight multiple choice questions. Demographic information regarding age, grade level, sex, and school were also obtained through the use of the survey answer sheet.

The first twenty-seven questions of the survey (8, pp. 41-42) were designed to reflect the frequency of use of nine categories of substances during three time periods. The nine categories of substance were marijuana, hallucinogens,
opiates or cocaine, tobacco, alcohol, cough syrup, solvents, barbiturates, and stimulants. The three time periods utilized in the study were "ever used," "used in the past six months," and "used in the past seven days" (8, p. 24).

The 10 percent sample of homeroom students in each grade level of fifty-five secondary schools selected for the survey was accomplished through the use of a table of random numbers. Equivalent samples were taken from each grade level with the exception of the seventh grade. Only half of this grade level was sampled. The reason for the reduction in seventh-grade classes participating in the study was the result of another study which was planned for that grade level which might have biased the sample.

Answer sheets were completed and returned by 5,912 students (8, p. 20). Of those returned, 5,908 were acceptable for use in the study. This was representative of 6 percent of the 98,583 secondary students who were enrolled in the Houston Independent School District.

The procedure used in the study was as follows:

On December 8 the parental refusal slips were distributed in the homerooms. On December 9 the students who returned the parental slips, students who were absent the previous day, and students who requested that they be exempted from answering the questionnaire followed their regular schedule. Other students were sent to a central area in the school where the survey booklets and answer sheets were distributed.

The directions on the front of the booklet were read aloud to the students, use of the separate answer sheet was explained and any
questions concerning the survey were answered. (See Appendix D.) The survey was entirely anonymous. No names of participants were obtained. The students were told not to place their names on either the answer sheet or questionnaire booklet. They were further told that separate schools would not be identified when the results were reported (8, p. 22).

As previously stated, eight-eight questions were included in the survey questionnaire. Beyond the first twenty-seven items, which were directly related to incidence of drug usage, other items were included to allow students to state whether or not they had used drugs. These questions provided comparisons among items in order to check on the reliability of the reported use of drugs. The results of the first twenty-seven drug use questions are reflected in Tables II, III, and IV.

As reflected in each of these tables, alcohol and tobacco were the most used substances by those participating in the survey. The second most widely used substance was marijuana. "If the overall figure of 22 percent of students ever having used marijuana is extrapolated to the secondary school population of Harris County, this would indicate that some 44,000 students have tried marijuana and 24,000 have used it ten or more times" (8, p. 25).

Other findings of the study reflected that drug use for males was higher for all categories of drugs with the exception of the use of cough syrup. Use of cough syrup was considerably higher for females at the junior high level. The
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulants</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cough Syrup</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvents</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbiturates</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallucinogens</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiates or Cocaine</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulants</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbiturates</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cough Syrup</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallucinogens</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvents</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiates or Cocaine</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE IV

PERCENT OF STUDENTS BY GRADE AND SEX WHO HAVE USED THE LISTED SUBSTANCES IN THE
PAST SEVEN DAYS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 8</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 10</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 11</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 12</th>
<th></th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigarettes</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marijuana</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stimulants</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbiturates</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallucinogens</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cough Syrup</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solvents</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opiates or</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cocaine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

use by females was inversely related to grade level (i.e., there was less use in the higher grades). This was the only category of drugs in which this occurred. For males there appeared to be a general increase in use as the grade level increased (8, p. 26).

The greatest increase in incidence of drug use appeared for males between grades ten and eleven. This may represent a problem with young people who are within a specific generation or it could represent a reaction to specific factors which occur at this particular age (e.g., obtaining a driver's license). The first would constitute a cohort problem which would indicate that this group of students was using more drugs and would continue as it got older, while the latter would mean that there were external factors which were causing the problem to be age specific (8, p. 26).

For six of the nine categories of drugs, use during the past six months peaked for females at grade ten. These drugs were as follows in order of their incidence: marijuana, 21.2 percent; stimulants, 15.4 percent; barbiturates, 11.4 percent; hallucinogens, 9.6 percent; opiates or cocaine, 4.9 percent; and solvents, 4.7 percent. The reason for females having used peaking at grade ten was probably due to several factors. The use curve may appear to peak and then drop off. However, if these data were obtained on all females (both in and out of school) in the secondary school age range, the curve might appear the same as the curves for
males (i.e., general linear increases). A female student who became drug involved may have found it easier to drop out of school than her male peer who was drug involved (8, p. 26). It is easier for the female to obtain employment, get married, and thus there is not as much pressure to remain in school for females as for males.

Generalizing across the nine categories of substances, the largest increase in use tended to occur between grades ten and eleven for males. Use of drugs by males generally increased as the grade level increased. For five of the nine categories the highest incidence of use during the past six months was at grade twelve for males. These substances were as follows listed in order of incidence (8, p. 26): alcohol, 81.1 percent; cigarettes, 51.6 percent; marijuana, 44.6 percent; stimulants, 22.3 percent; and barbiturates, 17.9 percent. For four of the substances peak use appeared at grade eleven for males. These substances were as follows, listed in order of incidence (8, p. 26): hallucinogens, 17.3 percent; cough syrup, 14.0 percent; solvents, 9.0 percent; and opiates, 8.3 percent. While peak use occurred at grade eleven for males for these substances, the percentages did not drop significantly at grade twelve. Apparently these were asymptotic functions and the percentage use at grade eleven represents both the maximal use and the predicted use level for older age groups. This was in
marked contrast to the use of females, who showed a marked decrease from grades ten to twelve (8, p. 27).

The use of the substances included was quite different for males and females. The implication was that educational programs, if they were of any depth, should take into account the differing patterns of use by males and females. Different aspects of drug use should be presented to the sexes. This does not mean that separate educational programs should be developed (8, pp. 26-27).

The following observations were presented as being of special interest to educators (8, pp. 29-31):

Reported use of drugs is significantly related to the overall grade average for the past semester. Of students who report a grade average last semester of A, only 13 percent reported past drug use who might use the drug again or are continuing to use it. Among students who had an overall F average for the last semester 59.8 percent reported past drug use who will continue using the drugs or might use them again. As the overall grade average increases, the student use of drugs is lower. Whether or not this is a cause and effect relationship remains unproven. However, this finding is consistent with the findings of studies in other areas. The same relationship is evident between estimated grade average for the current semester as for past grades. The lower the student believes his grade average to be the more likely he is to continue using drugs or report that he might continue using drugs.

The number of non-school related activities in which the student was involved is significantly related to use of drugs. The highest category of reported drug use occurred among students who had no activities (21.3 percent) and students who had four or more non-school related activities (23.2 percent). Since this question did not define "non-school activity" or specify the type of activity in which the student was involved no statement can be made regarding whether these activities were sanctioned by parents.
Those who are drug involved tend to be less future oriented than students who are not. Of those who plan to get a job after leaving school, 24.2 percent report drug use; of those who plan to enter the armed forces, 25.6 percent report drug use; of those who plan on college, 15.5 percent report drug use. Of those without plans after leaving school, however, 31 percent report drug use. This tends to confirm the hypothesis that drug abuse is a symptom of lack of direction in the life of an individual. If there is a purpose in someone's life there is no void. Any void, such as lack of goals or personal plans for the future, may be filled by the use of drugs.

Among drug users there is a marked increase in college plans at the ninth grade level which may reflect the success of the eighth grade spring program to develop a "four year plan" of studies toward college entrance or other occupation. Perhaps non-users were already goal oriented because of family influence and users were less so.

Regarding the most effective drug program all categories of students rated live panels of professionals and former users as the most effective. The second effective drug education program would be films or movies for all students except those who had used drugs and would continue using them. This last group ranked "none of these" second. The least effective drug education program was seen as books or reading material.

The source of most information about drugs for the students who are drug involved is from friends and from the communications media. These sources are ranked first and second for drug-involved students. The primary source of information for abstainers is the media. The school is ranked as the third source of information about drugs for every category of students with the exception of the abstainers. The abstainers rank schools as the second source of most information about drugs. The family as a source of most information about drugs was ranked fourth by all. All students ranked the church as the source of the least information about drugs. While this reflects a lack of interest in church activities by some students, it may also reflect a lack of interest in drug prevention work by
many churches or a lack of time or knowledge on the part of churches in providing information about drugs.

The most reliable source of information regarding drugs for the drug users is their friends or their personal experience. This is also true of those students who have used drugs but who have discontinued their use and is true for those students who have not used drugs but might use them in the future. The most reliable source of information for students who are abstainers is professional individuals. This would reflect a difference in attitude between abstainers and those who might consider drug use or have used drugs in the past. Students who have used drugs and students who are contemplating the use of drugs would see their friends as being the most reliable source of information because their peers are the ones that are using the drugs. For a drug-naive individual—one who has not used drugs—a professional would provide the most reliable information. This has implications for preventive programs in the school system. A grade level breakdown of this item reveals more specific findings for school curricula and program planners.

When the students were asked if they were well informed about drugs, in every category most students indicated that they were well informed. Seventy-five percent of those students who are presently using drugs considered themselves to be well informed while 52 percent of confirmed abstainers thought they were well informed. This is consistent with the idea that students whose friends are using drugs and who are themselves using drugs feel that they have much more reliable information than those students who are not drug involved and whose friends are not drug involved. The percentage who said they were well informed increases from the seventh to ninth grade and decreases from ninth to twelfth grade. The percentage of those who said they were not well informed steadily increases with advancing grade level. The percentage of those who said they did not know whether they were well informed decreases with advancing grade level.

Of the students surveyed 37 percent indicated that current use of drugs in their school was higher than last year. Forty-six percent
of the students said either they didn't know or they were not in this school last year. Students who are drug involved tend to see drug use as not increasing, while students who categorized themselves in the abstainer class see current drug use as considerably higher compared with last year (8, pp. 29-31).

The Dallas Independent School District has also conducted a large-scale survey of drug usage as reported by Dallas public school students (5). The survey was conducted during the 1972-73 school year. The major purpose of the survey was to gather data concerning the extent of drug usage among students in the Dallas Independent School District. The data were tabulated by grade, sex, ethnic group, geographic area, and academic performance as reported by the survey respondents (5, p. 1).

The students who were surveyed were selected through a stratified cluster sampling procedure. This procedure was utilized in order to insure sufficient representation of each area of the city and of each grade level from five through twelve. A 10 percent random sample of classes was drawn from within each of the forty strata (eight grade levels across five geographic areas) included in the survey. The "Drug Survey Questionnaire" (DSQ) was administered to all students present in the selected classes and homerooms. The total number of students surveyed through this sampling procedure included 8,179 students (5, p. 1).

The following instrumentation procedures were described:
The instrument used to capture the data which are summarized in this report was the Drug Survey Questionnaire (DSQ). Of the 78 DSQ items, 48 dealt with the respondent's present or past use of various drugs; the remaining items were included in order to obtain a variety of demographic and attitudinal data. The drug usage section of the DSQ contained items relating to the use of alcohol, tobacco, marijuana, hashish, LSD, mescaline, heroin, and a variety of other substances, including inhalants, stimulants, tranquilizers, narcotics, and hallucinogens. For each of 24 drug categories, the students responded to two items, one dealing with total usage, the other limited to use within the week preceding the survey. The wording of the items was such that medicinal use was excluded; the respondent was asked how many times he had used the drug "to get high."

Following is a sample item pair from the DSQ.

How many total times have you used cocaine to get high? (snow, coke)
1. Never
2. One time
3. Two to ten times
4. More than ten times
This past week, how many times have you used cocaine to get high? (snow, coke)
1. Never
2. One time
3. Two or three times
4. Four or more times

Several precautions were taken in order to enhance the accuracy of the data. Foremost among these was insistence upon anonymity of the respondents. In addition, synonyms (street names) were provided for most of the drugs included in the survey. Finally, the DSQ items were read to the students (5, p. 3).

Many comparisons were made across data gathered through the survey; however, the results were summarized as follows:

It seems clear that there is extensive drug usage among DISD students. Whether it is within the schools' power to deal with the situation, however, has not been a topic for investigation in this study. The District does, in fact, support a Drug Abuse Education Program and that effort is being evaluated in another study.
Recommendations for action by District administration fall more appropriately within the domain of that evaluation, and therefore none will be stated here. The present discussion will, at this point, be limited to a brief review of the results of the system-wide drug survey. On the basis of the survey data the following observations seem well supported.

1. Reported drug usage increased generally in grades nine through twelve since the 1972 drug survey. Trends were mixed, however, in grade eleven and in the South Dallas-Kleberg-Seagoville area.

2. In grades five through eight the change, although less pronounced, was generally in the direction of a decrease. Some increases, however, were observed, particularly in North Dallas and Southwest Oak Cliff.

3. Relative to other drugs, the data on marijuana reflect the largest increases.

4. Reported usage in North Dallas and, to a lesser extent, Southwest Oak Cliff was higher than in other areas.

5. There was little evidence of a relationship between reported drug usage and ethnicity, except for the relatively high percentage of Negro respondents classified as users in grades eleven and twelve.

6. Males showed much more inclination to use drugs than did females.

7. The use of drugs is strongly and inversely correlated with academic performance (5, p. 14).

Related Federal and State Programs

Many existing programs related to criminal and regulatory law, treatment and rehabilitation of drug abusers, crime prevention and drug education, and drug research have been modified or new programs established since the early 1960's (17). These programs have been established at all levels of governmental function. They may be established by federal or state legislative mandate or they may be established
through regional or local community organizations who are concerned about the social and economic betterment of their community (17).

The program which has the widest jurisdiction in the area of law enforcement and to some extent crime prevention and drug education is the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs (4, pp. 4-5). The Bureau was organized and established in 1968. Its establishment was the result of a presidential reorganization plan which resulted in the merger of the Treasury Department's Bureau of Narcotics and the Food and Drug Administration's Bureau of Drug Abuse Control. The purpose of the merger was to establish some effective controls over narcotic and dangerous drug abuse through enforcement and prevention. In order to carry out this mission, the Bureau cooperates with other federal agencies, foreign as well as state and local governments, private industry, and other organizations.

The relationship of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to the area of crime prevention and drug education lies in its responsibility to promote programs in drug abuse prevention. As part of its program to make citizens aware of the hazards of narcotics and dangerous drugs, the agency provides factual information through literature, speakers, films, and displays to a variety of organizations, and to the general public. It also works closely with educators, as well as with local, state, and
national government agencies, associations, law enforcement officials, and organizations in planning and conducting drug abuse prevention programs.

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs identifies both long and short range problems which are encountered in the development of drug education programs (4, p. 14). Short range, crash programs to educate pre-teens and teens now in school have met with limited success because of already developed attitudes in these youth. The example of adults, using and abusing legal and prescribed drugs such as tobacco, alcohol, barbiturates, amphetamines, tranquilizers, and over-the-counter remedies of many kinds, has made it difficult to achieve credibility with the teen and pre-teen group.

The long range problem identified by the Bureau is that children in kindergarten through the elementary grades need, but are only slowly being provided with, information and experiences that develop attitudes and values which can influence them to reject the easy, counterfeit routes to a satisfying way of living. The Bureau believes much more needs to be done, both in long and short range programs.

Several educational approaches are examined by the Bureau of Dangerous Drugs and Narcotics (4, pp. 15-16). Preaching and exhortation is an old and frequently used approach. This may work when the speaker is highly respected, but may not be generally accepted by today's
students. Scare tactics will sometimes work if young people can see the real possibility that they can be personally affected, but generally this approach is ineffective when used with persons who have no idea of the real nature of drug effects, or when it is used in a dishonest or exaggerated way.

Another approach, which is examined by the Bureau, is the use of authorities such as physicians, or ex-addicts, to discuss the problem. "This," says the Bureau, "is useful when there is little peer group pressure to use drugs" (4). High school students rate physicians highly, but think law enforcement officials, ministers, and counselors are least convincing. For elementary school children, law enforcement and other institutional authorities rate higher. The use of police in the very early grades, as community members, has been found effective in creating an accepting attitude toward the law.

Traditional courses of study in the schools are another widely used approach. This is best done when the drug information is included naturally within a science or health curriculum in a long-range program, in the total kindergarten to grade twelve program. "Attitudes and values," states the Bureau, "must be part of the program from the earliest grades" (4, p. 15).

The Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs works with schools in teacher-training programs, and provides films,
materials, and consultative assistance through its regional offices. It also conducts special programs for community action on a pilot basis, to develop local action committees for drug abuse prevention.

Many state agencies have direct responsibilities for combating drug abuse. The state agency which has responsibility for coordination of all state agency efforts in drug abuse prevention and treatment is the State Program on Drug Abuse, a division of the State Department of Community Affairs (17). In order that a state planning process might be established in the area of drug abuse prevention and treatment, the governor and leaders of the Texas Legislature formed the State Program on Drug Abuse in 1970 (17, p. 10). The primary responsibility of the newly-formed agency of the State Department of Community Affairs was to develop a coordinated plan for dealing with all aspects of the drug abuse problem (17, p. 10).

In November, 1971, Governor Preston Smith signed the first of two gubernatorial executive orders which would clarify the position of the state program in relation to other state agencies. Although the Smith order died with the installation of Dolph Briscoe as governor in January, 1973, the new state chief executive also signed an order on February 12, 1973, designating the state program through its parent agency, the Texas Department of Community Affairs, as "the single state agency responsible for coordinating all
drug abuse prevention functions," including drug abuse rehabilitation, treatment, education, research and prevention activities (17, pp. 112-113).

Governor Briscoe further requested the Interagency Health and Human Resources Council (a fifteen-member body chaired by the governor and organized to advise in the handling of state agencies and to further interagency coordination of planning and program cooperation for health and human resources) to assist the executive director of the Texas Department of Community Affairs in carrying out the mandate given by the governor to the state program at the time of the newest executive order. Included in this charge were (1) provisions for conducting a detailed survey of state and local problems and needs for prevention and treatment of drug abuse, (2) identification of all funds, programs, and resources available in the state and from the federal government, (3) development of objective devices for the evaluation of all drug abuse prevention functions in the state, and (4) establishment of a central clearinghouse for centralized drug abuse data collection and dissemination systems (17, p. 114). Governor Briscoe also appointed a thirty-member lay and professional group known as the State Drug Abuse Advisory Council to assist the governor in drug abuse prevention (17, p. 113).

In order to carry out this responsibility, seven major task forces were organized within the next year. These task
forces were composed of staff of various state agencies and other experienced and knowledgeable persons who compiled reports on functional areas of research, education and prevention, treatment, rehabilitation, detection and apprehension, regulation and sales, and corrections (17, p. 10).

An Interagency Council on Drug Abuse was created in 1970 (17, p. 10). This council was composed of the executives of eighteen state agencies which were involved programmatically, or in other ways, with activities related to drug abuse problems.

Teams, which were composed of staff members of different state agencies, were developed to offer assistance to local communities (17, pp. 10-11). These teams made visits to numerous cities and towns throughout the state to assist local communities in organizing and coordinating community efforts to combat drug abuse.

After gathering all reports from task forces, community assistance teams, and other professional and governmental organizations, the State Program on Drug Abuse outlined a preliminary plan which was presented to the Interagency Council (17, p. 11). The comments and suggestions of the Council were used to rework the plan into a second draft. The portion of this second draft which dealt with drug centrals was mailed to potential organizations. Two statewide meetings were convened in Austin to elicit comments and
recommendations. The third draft incorporated the above suggested revisions; an updated description of the problem utilizing newly published data from the Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation, the Department of Health, the Department of Corrections, the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity, the Uniform Crime Report, and various grant applications; and state drug abuse prevention plans of the Texas Rehabilitation Commission and the Texas Education Agency. This draft was reviewed by the Governor's Drug Abuse Advisory Council, the governor's planning staff, and was available for public review in advance of submission to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

For the next plan year, local input into the revision of plans was the major emphasis and the state program's function was the facilitation of a decentralized planning process (17, p. 11).

The purpose of the state plan developed by the State Program on Drug Abuse was elaborated upon as follows:

The purpose of the Plan is to facilitate the development and maintenance of an effective, well-coordinated system of programs and services to reduce and prevent the negative aspects of drug use. The purpose is not to "prevent drug abuse" because that wording implies that the sole cause of the problem lies within the abuser and that he must somehow be prevented from obtaining and using drugs. Part of the problem does originate within the individual and the Plan must address the needs for personal development. But any overall strategy should also address the environmental conditions (social, economic, legal) that bring about major
negative consequences such as imprisonment of youth, health hazards, poverty and alienation, organized crime involvement, etc.

The purpose of the plan is not to prevent the use of drugs. The appropriate use of drugs is immeasurably beneficial to man. Drugs cure disease, save lives, and otherwise enable many people to function who otherwise would be incapacitated by the pressures of our competitive society. The recreational use of drugs is widely practiced as a means of relaxing and as a lubricant for social interaction. The self-damaging use of drugs is a matter of choice in a free society although every effort should be made to provide the individual with factual knowledge and rational arguments to influence his choices. If the individual is very young or for other reasons lacks the capacity to make a rational and free choice, control measures may be appropriate, the degree of control to be directly related to the abuse potential of the drug.

Reduction and prevention of the negative consequences of the drug use is largely an effort to alleviate the symptoms but also includes a responsibility to deal with the root causes of maladaptive drug usage when possible. Insofar as patterns of drug abuse are perceived to derive from social, economic, health, and other conditions in the total make-up of the drug abuser's environment, the responsibility assumed in the Plan is to point out these causes and needs. It is necessary to inform the public and the decision-makers that drug abuse, alcoholism, crime, mental illness, suicide, and other such symptoms are not going to be curbed by isolated efforts which do not have the financial support nor the authority to deal realistically with their common underlying causes (19, pp. 213-214).

There are many state governmental agencies which directly or indirectly contribute to the fight against drug abuse (17, pp. 312-320). These agencies include the following.
Texas Commission on Alcoholism

The Texas Commission on Alcoholism conducts educational programs on alcohol abuse and alcoholism and coordinates the state's efforts in the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics. The commission members are willing to serve as consultants to committees who are planning and implementing drug abuse programs. Regional coordinators are in Amarillo, Austin, Corpus Christi, El Paso, Fort Worth, and Houston.

The commission supplies curriculum guides, literature, films, and other audio-visual aids on request. Some of these materials are appropriate to drug abuse.

The commission provides funds to employ alcoholism counselors in the state mental and tuberculosis hospitals and in prison units operated by the Texas Commission on Alcoholism. The commission cooperates in training Texas Rehabilitation Commission counselors and operates a wide range of industrial programs. Since many people suffer a dual addiction, much of this treatment and rehabilitation work benefits drug abusers (17, p. 312).

Texas College and University System Coordinating Board

Throughout the college and university system research and education in drug abuse abound. The Coordinating Board collects information on these activities through a Management Information System for Higher Education which is being developed. Such retrieval will facilitate the State Program on Drug Abuse survey of existing programs and resources.
Community Service and Continuing Education Projects under Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 are funded through the Coordinating Board. A priority in their plan for fiscal 1973 was programs on drug abuse which would educate local and state government officials (17, pp. 312-313).

Governor's Office of Comprehensive Health Planning

Coordination of health planning and service to the regional planning areas are the responsibilities of this office. It supports the planning of the state program as the Texas approach to the health problems of drug abuse. It will give technical assistance as requested to regional planning bodies in implementing this plan (17, p. 113).

Texas Department of Corrections

This agency sponsors an educational program called "Operation Kick-It." Two panels of young, first offenders travel throughout the state talking to groups of teenagers about the events in their lives that led to drug usage and eventually to prison. Multiple prints of a 16mm color-sound film of the program are available without charge when personal appearances are not possible. The Texas Department of Corrections has a program of treatment and rehabilitation for inmates who have been addicts. The department's research division is studying the changing patterns in social and criminal histories of drug offenders (17, p. 113).
Texas Criminal Justice Council

The Texas Criminal Justice Council administers Law Enforcement Assistance Administration funds through planning, action, and discretionary grants to drug abuse programs that are directly related to the criminal justice system. Programs receiving grants for 1972 included the Travis County Juvenile Court, Texas Education Agency, Lancaster "Project Eradicate," Dallas County "Help is Possible," Department of Corrections "Operation Kick-It," Austin Drug Central, and comprehensive drug treatment programs in the following Mental Health and Mental Retardation Centers: Austin-Travis County, Bexar County, Harris-Galveston County, Harris County, Hidalgo County, Plainview, and Waco-McLennan County.

In 1973 the Council did not fund treatment programs. The Council made approximately ten small grants to the development of new educational approaches that acquaint the public with the dangers of drug abuse, crime prevention and related programs (17, pp. 313-314).

Texas Employment Commission

The Texas Employment Commission gives specialized service to rehabilitated drug abusers through intensive counseling, job development, and placements. The Commission also counsels prospective employers. A fiscal 1973 priority was an increase in available employers (17, p. 315).
Texas State Department of Health

The Public Health Education Division of the Texas State Department of Health distributes literature free to the public on request. The division operates the largest library of drug abuse films in the state. The division also prepares and distributes public service announcements for television and radio.

The division has trained twenty-four selected persons on staff with fourteen local health departments and five public health regions in drug control principles and educational methodology. Visual aids were deposited with these persons. Training for health professionals and community officials is conducted periodically through two and three-day seminars.

The Food and Drug Division licenses and regulates synthetic drug maintenance programs. This division also regulates drug and pharmaceutical wholesale and retail establishments.

Texas State Library

Either directly or through their local libraries, the Texas State Library provides materials on drugs to all Texans. Three groups are served directly by the library: state agency personnel, persons wishing information in the U.S. government documents collection, and persons who qualify for service to the blind and physically handicapped because they cannot read ordinary printed material. The
Field Services Division administers a federal Library Services and Construction Act project under which forty-four libraries are developing drug education programs.

Linked by Telex to the ten Major Resource Center libraries, which are in turn linked to other libraries by telephone, the Reference Division makes materials available through the Texas State Library Communication Network. A library patron thus has immediate access to the materials in the local collection. Materials in other libraries may be borrowed for him (17, pp. 315-316).

Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education

This commission certifies peace officers for the state. Narcotic laws are taught in the basic police course required for certification. Credit toward officer certification is given for specified seminars and workshops on narcotics; eleven such courses were scheduled in 1972.

The commission keeps abreast of materials on drug abuse and makes this information available to officers on request. The commission researches literature on drug abuse and disseminates pertinent findings to its training program instructors and also to all chiefs of police and sheriffs through the 1,500 mailings of the news bulletin which is published every other month.
A portion of the commission's manual for police-community relations is devoted to drug abuse. The staff develops drug abuse training material for their instructors.

The commission has a publication available for instructors and police departments on narcotics and dangerous drugs. This sixty-eight-page manual is suitable for the basic law enforcement training (17, p. 316).

**Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation**

Legal responsibility to provide treatment for persons mentally disordered and disabled from drug abuse lies with this department. The Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Section assists in planning and implementing treatment for drug abusers, including provision of training programs for staff treating these patients.

Eight state mental hospitals and their outreach programs, Texas Research Institute of Mental Sciences, twenty-four community mental health centers, and two mental health outpatient clinics serve drug abusers. Three state hospitals, Texas Research Institute of Mental Sciences, and twelve mental health and mental retardation centers currently have identifiable treatment programs for the drug-dependent (17, p. 317).
Texas Office of Economic Opportunity

Through Community Action Agencies, the Texas Office of Economic Opportunity institutes education and treatment in low-income neighborhoods. Three narcotic addiction programs were funded for a total of $630,828 in fiscal 1971. The Governor's Youth Secretariat coordinates all activities concerning drug abuse that involves children and youth. A direct service to youth, primarily in low-income areas, is drug education in summer workshops.

State Board of Pardons and Paroles, Division of Parole Supervision

The division provides parole supervision to approximately 3,939 parolees through 60 area parole counselors. Parolees who are drug abusers are referred to appropriate local services. The parole counselor monitors these referrals.

Statistics on the treatment status of parolees who were addicts before incarceration are available through the division.

Parolees participate in the educational aspects of a program in Dallas known as HIP, "Help is Possible," which is available to anyone having drug problems (17, pp. 317-318).

Texas Department of Public Safety

The Department of Public Safety is an assisting agency for local law enforcement officers. In drug abuse this
function is carried out by the Narcotics Section. This section employs one hundred agents whose primary responsibility is the enforcement of drug laws. These agents are trained to evaluate the drug problem in a community and to help citizens evaluate drug information. Speaking engagements to adult groups are filled when possible. Large meetings are given priority.

The Narcotics Section also trains local officers in cooperation with the Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education, and conducts an annual four-week advanced course in narcotics law enforcement for local officers assigned to narcotics. The section researches and coordinates materials on drug abuse for use by their staff and by local officers (17, p. 318).

**Texas State Board of Pharmacy**

The Board of Pharmacy examines and licenses those who have graduated from an accredited College of Pharmacy; it also licenses pharmacies, pharmaceutical manufacturers, reciprocity applicants, and peyote distributors.

In cooperation with other government agencies, the board polices all licenses. Staff members lecture on drug abuse and drug laws at police schools on a regular basis throughout the state. Other lectures are given on request.

The board maintains close communication with other state boards and with the national board. When abuse of a
particular drug is suspected, all cooperate to gather nationwide statistics. The board also has available statistics on deaths due to drugs, furnishes articles and activity reports on drug abuse and drug law violations to professional journals, and is involved in approving drug research on human subjects and licensing methadone maintenance programs (17, pp. 318-319).

Texas Department of Public Welfare

Problems surrounding drug abuse in families who are clients of the Department of Public Welfare are the concern of social and protective service workers in all Texas communities. The drug abuser is referred to a treatment agency, and social service workers help the family with attendant problems. Protective services include making recommendations about placement of the abandoned or neglected child whose life or health has been endangered by parental drug abuse.

San Antonio has a five-worker drug unit that works exclusively with drug abuse problems. The unit services 500 cases, with concentration on 20 to 30 families in which the mother is an addict. For fiscal 1973, the Department of Public Welfare's policy was to provide social services when drug abuse becomes a barrier to self-care or to self-support (17, p. 319).
Texas Rehabilitation Commission

The Texas Rehabilitation Commission has legal responsibility for the vocational rehabilitation of drug abusers in the state. Counseling and guidance are provided in federal and state institutions, Mental Health and Mental Retardation Centers, and district offices. Several transitional living facilities serve ex-drug abusers.

In 1973 the commission planned to develop more halfway houses, recruit counselors knowledgeable about drug abuse, increase the effort to inform the public and potential employers of the capabilities of ex-drug abusers, and to encourage the medical community to identify, diagnose, and code drug abusers (17, p. 320).

Texas Youth Council

Through the academic programs of its correctional schools the Council provides drug abuse education following the recommendations of the Texas Education Agency. Treatment of drug abusers in the schools through individual and group therapy is provided by the psychiatric staff. A vocational rehabilitation counselor at each school also works with abusers. Also, through juvenile parole, the council offers referral for treatment, and counseling to parolee drug abusers (17, p. 320).
Summary

Through a review of the legislative actions, which were taken upon House Bill 467 following its introduction in the House of Representatives on February 24, 1969, a historical overview of the proceedings in both the House of Representatives and Senate have been presented. As the review revealed, many amendments were added to the original bill prior to its enactment.

Four school district surveys were presented which reflected the need for drug abuse prevention programs in the public schools of Texas: (1) the Borgers study (2) reflected student and teacher attitudes toward drugs, (2) the Brazill study (3) sought to examine eight programs for prevention and treatment of drug abuse in Texas elementary and secondary schools, (3) the Houston Independent School District survey (4) was designed to gather information on the incidence of drug usage among high school students, and (4) the Dallas Independent School District survey (5) had as its major purpose the gathering of data concerning the extent of drug usage among students.

The review of literature reflecting related federal and state programs presented overviews of services which were offered by several government agencies. Not all government agencies providing services related to drug abuse were included since the number of such agencies would be extensive.
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CHAPTER III

COLLECTION OF DATA

The problem of this study was to determine the extent to which the Texas Education Agency and selected local school districts have implemented the legislative provisions of House Bill 467. The investigation included an examination of legislative records and transcripts related to the development and passage of House Bill 467 (6). This investigation was further extended to include a personal interview with Louise Dooley (2) of the Texas Education Agency Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program, under whose leadership the drug education program has been developed by the Texas Education Agency. The purpose of the interview was to establish the procedures used in developing and staffing the Texas Education Agency, Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education, in order to carry out the legislative mandate of House Bill 467 (6).

Selection of the Population to be Studied

Three major purposes were established for this study. One of these major purposes was to determine the current status of the crime prevention and drug education program in selected school districts.
In order to assure a state-wide geographic distribution of school districts participating in the study, one school district from each of nineteen education service center regions (see Appendix, p. 264) was selected. The selection of the school districts was initiated through contacting the crime prevention and drug education coordinator in each of the nineteen regions. The coordinators were asked to recommend a school district in each of their regions which had demonstrated an interest in the crime prevention and drug education program through participation in workshops and other related services offered through the regional education service center. Following these recommendations, each school district which was recommended was contacted and asked to participate in the study.

The selection of the population to be studied was not a random one, thereby precluding the use of inferential statistics. All findings were restricted to the nineteen school districts participating in the study.

A roster of teachers and principals was prepared from records maintained by the Texas Education Agency (5). Teachers in each school district participating in the study were assigned a number. A table of random numbers was then used to select a random sample of seventy-five staff members to be surveyed in each of the larger districts. In school districts with less than seventy-five teachers, all teachers were asked to complete the survey instrument developed to
measure the perception of principals and teachers toward
drug misuse and abuse. All principals in the school
districts participating in the study were asked to complete
the survey instruments.

Construction of the Initial Survey
Instruments

Two survey instruments were constructed as a means of
gathering data on the current status of the crime prevention
and drug education program in nineteen school districts.
The first instrument was designed to assimilate information
on organization practices and procedures used in implement-
ing crime prevention and drug education programs within the
nineteen school districts studied. It was designed as a
personal interview instrument to be administered to the indi-
vidual assigned primary responsibility for the development
of the crime prevention and drug education program in each
of the school districts participating in the study. Each
question which was developed for inclusion in the interview
instrument was related to one of the first nine questions to
be answered by the study, as stated in the purpose of the
study. The questions which were included in the survey
instrument were selected on the basis of their relationship
to the determination of the current status of the drug edu-
cation program in the nineteen school districts studied.

The second instrument was developed to assess the tenth
question stated in the purpose of the study. This instrument
was developed to ascertain the perceptions of principals and teachers toward drug misuse and abuse. The items contained in this instrument were adopted, in part, from Gerald Bailey's study, "Perceptions and Attitudes of Administrative and Counseling Staffs Toward Drug Use and Abuse in Nebraska Junior Colleges" (1). This instrument was developed utilizing a five-category response Likert-type scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree" with a median response of "undecided." The instrument consisted of twenty-two statements related to drug misuse or abuse. Following the initial development of the instruments, they were submitted to an advisory panel.

Selection of the Advisory Panel

In order to obtain a broad input from individuals who had extensive experience in crime prevention and drug education curriculum development, an advisory panel composed of nine members was selected.

The advisory panel was selected from three areas of responsibility for crime prevention and drug education program development. Three panel members were selected from among the twenty regional education service center crime prevention and drug education coordinators. Three school district crime prevention and drug education coordinators were requested to serve as members of the advisory panel.
The final three members of the advisory panel were consultants in the Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education, Texas Education Agency.

The three regional education service center crime prevention and drug education coordinators possessed a wide range of experience in program and staff development. As regional coordinators they were responsible for assisting local school districts in the development and implementation of crime prevention and drug education curricula in response to H.B. 467 (6).

The three local school district crime prevention and drug education coordinators had extensive experience in the development of innovative techniques in curriculum design. Each of these advisory panel members had implemented an innovative program in crime prevention and drug education within the curriculum of their respective school districts.

The three Texas Education Agency consultants brought to the panel experience in program and staff development and program evaluation. In addition, they had been instrumental in the development of guidelines and instructional materials for school districts as directed by H.B. 467.

The advisory panel was asked to review the two instruments for clarity and appropriateness in gathering data related to the questions stated in the purpose of the study. The members were requested to recommend additional questions which they considered appropriate for the purposes of the
study, modify existing items contained in the two instruments if they were considered not clear, or delete items which members considered inappropriate.

Selection of the Jury Panel for the Survey Instruments

The jury panel consisted of nine members who were selected on the basis of their experience in the development, implementation, and administration of crime prevention and drug education programs. The membership of the panel was representative of school districts, regional education service centers, and the Texas Education Agency.

Jury panel members included two school district superintendents, both of whom had administrative experience in developing crime prevention and drug education curricula as mandated by H.B. 467. In addition, one of the superintendents had served in an advisory capacity in the development of proposed standards for crime prevention and drug education programs. Two of the jury panel members were executive directors of regional education service centers. They further served as members of the Elementary and Secondary Education Planning Council, Ad Hoc Committee on Crime Prevention and Drug Education. One of the regional education service center executive directors who served on the jury panel was chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee. Three panel members were selected from the Texas Education Agency, Continuing Committee on Crime Prevention and Drug Education.
These members were experienced in the development of crime prevention and drug education curriculum development, with special emphasis in the areas of social studies, health and physical education, and science. The final two members of the jury panel were selected from among the twenty regional education service center crime prevention and drug education coordinators. Their expertise in program development and evaluation contributed much to the establishment of the content validity of the two survey instruments.

Each jury panel member was initially contacted by telephone. They were requested to serve as jury members in assessing the items contained in the two survey instruments for clarity and appropriateness. The survey instruments and a letter of instruction were mailed to the jury panel with the request that the evaluated instruments be returned within ten days.

Validation of the Survey Instruments

The two survey instruments were sent to the jury panel for their assessment of each statement or question contained in the instruments. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was mailed with each set of survey instruments for their return following validation of the items. The jury members were asked to rate each item contained in the two instruments on a scale of one to three. The numbers "1," "2," and "3" were typed in the left margin preceding each item contained in the questionnaire. Jury members were asked to respond to each
item by assessing its clarity and appropriateness for the purposes of the study. If the jury member assessed the survey item as clearly stated and appropriate for its stated purposes, a circle was drawn around the "1." If the jury panel member was undecided about the item, the "2" was circled. If the item was judged to be unclear or inappropriate for collecting data related to the purposes of the study, it was so indicated by circling the "3."

It was decided that acceptance of an item by six of the nine-member jury panel would constitute content validity and justify inclusion in the final survey instruments.

Construction of the Final Survey Instruments

The final survey instruments were developed from the responses of the jury panel (see Appendix, p. 256 and p. 257). There were several changes made in the instrument which was developed to assess principals' and teachers' perceptions of drug misuse and abuse. No changes were recommended for the interview instrument.

Six of the twenty-two items contained in the perception instrument received unanimous approval from all nine jury members. Of the remaining sixteen items, ten received one "undecided" vote, one item received two "undecided" votes, and one item received three "undecided" votes. Four items contained in the perception instrument received one "unclear or inappropriate" vote and one item received two such votes.
Fourteen items of the twenty-four-item interview instrument received unanimous approval from the jury panel. Of the remaining ten items, nine received one "undecided" vote and two received one "inappropriate or unclear" rating.

All items contained in each of the survey instruments were ruled valid based on the replies of the jury panel. However, in order to strengthen the perception instrument, several minor changes were made. It was recommended that the anonymity of the respondent be stressed more strongly in the introduction of the instrument designed to measure the perceptions of principals and teachers toward drug misuse and abuse. A special "Note" was added to the introduction which instructed the respondent to "Please do not place your name on the instrument. Your response will remain completely anonymous."

Item 15 was originally stated, "Students who cannot clarify their values system are more likely to abuse drugs." It was recommended that the wording be changed to "Students who have not clarified their values system are more likely to abuse drugs." These recommended changes were made and presented to the jury panel for their review. No questions were raised by the jury panel members regarding the changes.

Establishing the Reliability of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument which was designed to determine the perceptions of principals and their teaching staffs
toward drug abuse was revised as suggested by the jury panel. The instrument was then administered to fifty-six principals and teachers who were enrolled in graduate classes at North Texas State University. The purpose of this procedure was to establish the reliability of the instrument. To determine the stability of the measurements, the instrument was administered to the same individuals on two occasions. A period of three weeks elapsed between administrations.

The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation was used to establish the correlation coefficient for the instrument (4, p. 71). A correlation coefficient of .60 was established as the minimum acceptable correlation coefficient in advance of the two administrations. A correlation coefficient of .60 or above was established for fourteen of the items included in the survey instrument. Because of the narrow range of possible responses (one through five), eight of the items included in the survey instrument did not achieve the .60 level of correlation. These items, however, were retained in the instrument since over two-thirds of the respondents utilized in establishing the reliability of the instrument responded within the range of "agree/strongly agree" or "disagree/strongly disagree" on both the pre- and post-administration of the survey.
Administration of the Final Survey Instruments

Following the reconstruction of the validated instruments, they were administered to principals, teachers, and those individuals assigned primary responsibility for the development and coordination of the crime prevention and drug education program in the school districts studied.

The instrument which was developed to assess principals' and teachers' perception of drug misuse and abuse was administered to the sample described. A cover letter was included with the perception instrument explaining the purpose of the study and requesting the participation of the individual in completing the survey instrument (see Appendix, p. 276). Each participant was asked to respond to the demographic information portion of the instrument prior to completion of the perception instrument. The demographic information indicated the position held by the respondent in the school system, sex, age, number of years of administrative and/or teaching experience, and the ethnic origin of the respondent. This information was needed in order to develop certain tables used in reporting the findings of the study. The participants were then asked to respond to the statements in the instrument by checking the appropriate point on the five-option Likert scale, ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." A total of 1,184 perception instruments were distributed to teachers, and 149 perception instruments were distributed to principals.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

The findings presented here were derived from a review of materials developed by the Texas Education Agency, Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education, personal interviews, and a survey questionnaire. The review of materials developed by the Texas Education Agency was undertaken to provide information concerning the sequential development of the crime prevention and drug education program by the agency.

Interviews were conducted with those individuals who were responsible for the development and coordination of crime prevention and drug education programs in nineteen school districts. The purpose of the interviews was to determine procedures used by these school districts in developing their crime prevention and drug education programs.

The survey questionnaire was sent to a random sample of teachers in each of the nineteen school districts participating in the study. All principals, both elementary and secondary, received a questionnaire. The purpose of the questionnaire was to determine the perceptions of teachers and principals toward selected factors related to drug abuse.
The findings are presented under the following main headings: (1) "Development of the Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program by the Texas Education Agency," (2) "Responses to Personal Interviews," (3) "Personal and Professional Data Pertaining to Teacher Respondents," (4) "Teachers' Perceptions of Drug Abuse," (5) "Personal and Professional Data Pertaining to Principals," and (6) "Principals' Perceptions of Drug Abuse."

Development of the Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program by the Texas Education Agency

Subsequent to the passage of House Bill 467 (20) by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature, a multidisciplinary task force was appointed to plan the developmental phase of the crime prevention and drug education program in September, 1969 (2). One of the first objectives of the task force was to secure funding for the program, since the state legislature had not appropriated state funds to initiate the program which it had mandated (16).

In order to determine the developmental process which was followed in developing the Texas Education Agency Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program, a personal interview was conducted with Louise Dooley (2). In November, 1969, a proposal was written and submitted to the Perot Foundation to fund a training laboratory in drug education (2). The grant was awarded and a contract made with Sonny Davis to
provide the training. Approximately one hundred educators
and representatives from the Departments of Mental Health-
Mental Retardation, Health, Public Safety, and Rehabilitation attended the training sessions. Educators were representative of public schools, universities, regional education service centers, and Texas Education Agency staff members. The training program proved to be very productive. From this training effort it was decided that the laboratory method of instruction would be the approach used in the drug education program effort (2).

Dooley further explained that "the task force was also instrumental in facilitating a four-day materials review in January, 1970. This review of materials, related to crime prevention and drug education, was very productive for all participants, including publishers who gained insight into the needs of those who would be utilizing their materials" (2).

In January, 1970, the governor called all heads of state departments together and requested that they consider drugs a priority (2). Each department head was urged to work cooperatively with all other departments to do something about the drug abuse problem in the state of Texas.

A plan of action (15) was developed by the staff of the Texas Education Agency and reported to the Advisory Commission, which had been established by House Bill 467, in March, 1970 (2). After the approval of the plan of action
by the Advisory Commission and the State Board of Education, a funding proposal was developed and submitted to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in Washington. A grant of $115,000 was awarded to the Texas Education Agency to further develop the crime prevention and drug education programs in the public schools of Texas.

House Bill 467 (20) defined the role of the Texas Education Agency as one of developing curricula and teaching materials for units of study on the dangers of crime and narcotics for grades five through twelve. It further defined the role of the Texas Education Agency as one of providing annual training sessions, with the cooperation of the Advisory Commission, for teachers in order to keep them abreast of the latest developments. The plan of action (15) which was approved by the State Board of Education and the Advisory Commission on Crime and Narcotics was designed to implement House Bill 467. It was elaborated upon as follows:

This plan, designed to implement the bill, also will serve as a vehicle for change in education, insofar as there are no traditional approaches such as curriculum concepts and techniques, teacher certification training methods, and accreditation standards. It will also provide an opportunity to cooperate with other community agencies in an effort to help today's youth cope with the rapidly changing environment. The affective behavior changes in every child need to be those which will allow him to develop a positive self-image and a capacity for close interpersonal contacts.

Moreover, it provides for the development, during a 12-month period, of resources within the Texas Education Agency and the twenty Education Service Centers for their supervision
of the continuing program of crime prevention and misuse of drugs and narcotics. In cooperation with the Education Service Centers, approximately 1,250 teachers, administrators, students, resource personnel, and Texas Education Agency staff will be trained on how to utilize the laboratory method of learning to combat crime and drug abuse.

The Task Force on Crime and Drugs was set up to meet the immediate emergency as well as to project a long-range design which will serve as a vehicle for moving educational programs toward more relevance to the fulfillment of needs, a continuing process that extends throughout the life of each individual. Some of the more important needs of all students are:

1. Achieving a growing understanding and acceptance of self, capacities, and goals
2. Satisfying peer and social relationships
3. Achieving a masculine or feminine role through understanding self
4. Achieving emotional independence from parents and home and an expanding awareness of widening environmental boundaries
5. Planning for and moving toward economic independence (This involves education and vocational preparation.)
6. Understanding family life and home responsibility
7. Developing intellectual skills and concepts
8. Developing a valuing system as a guide to self-directed behavior
9. Adapting to a changing self and a changing world.

It is known that effective education is one of the most important factors as a deterrent to drug misuse. There is widespread interest on the part of educators in doing something about the problem. Few teachers have received specific training in drug education and are not prepared to teach the subject. There are very few drug education programs in the State at the present time. Those local education agencies operating drug programs are operating autonomously. There is no provision for the funding of classroom teacher units in the local education agencies. A limited amount of federal funding has been made available to help support an office in the
State agency and one professional staff member in each of the twenty regional education service centers.

In the past the development of youth was goal oriented—concerned with attaining "the good life"—success and failure. Today's youth are different in their orientation in that they are role oriented and concerned with their role in life as human beings (15).

In March, 1970, the U.S. Office of Education received discretionary funds, directly from President Nixon, which were placed in the Education Personnel Development area of the U.S. Office of Education (2). The Texas Education Agency applied for and received a grant in the amount of $145,000 to be used in the further development of the crime prevention and drug education program.

In addition to the funds received from each of the above sources, the Texas Criminal Justice Council, utilizing Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Funds, granted funds to the regional education service centers, through local councils of government, to employ regional drug coordinators. Funding of these positions, through the local councils of government, was for the period of September 1, 1970, through June 30, 1971. The amount of the grant was $192,000. A two-month extension to fund the twenty positions through August 31, 1971, was granted in the amount of $44,000. Had funding not been secured for a drug coordinator's position in each of the regional education service centers, the Texas Department of Public Safety had agreed to assign ten of its officers to the educational effort. These
officers would have been assigned on the basis of one officer working with two regional education service centers (2).

The acquisition of federal funds made it possible to create the Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education under the administration of the Department of Teacher Education and Instructional Services in the spring of 1970. The office of the newly organized division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education was staffed by five professional staff members and two secretaries (2).

In April, 1970, the U.S. Office of Education had their first training session for state leaders assigned responsibility for the development of drug abuse prevention programs. The meeting was conducted in Chicago. Attending the meeting from the Texas Education Agency were L. Harlan Ford, Assistant Commissioner for Teacher Education and Instructional Services; Louise Dooley, Director, Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education; and Vern Laws, Consultant, Division of Guidance and Counseling. The one-week training session utilized group process as an instructional method. Participants were divided into small groups where members of the Black Panthers were included as participants (2).

At that time, the U.S. Office of Education announced that there would be four training centers located in the United States with teams of six people from each state. One of the training center sites was San Antonio. Permission
was granted to extend training to all regional service center drug coordinators and three staff members from the Texas Education Agency, Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education. Training was extended in the planning process, group process, interpersonal relations, and decision-making skills (2).

The twenty crime prevention and drug education coordinators and regional education service centers cooperated with the Texas Education Agency in planning and implementing in-service training of teams of three (one administrator, one staff member, and one student) for each local school district who, in turn, were responsible for program development and staff training on the local level. These activities were begun in the fall of 1970 (2).

Funding for the crime prevention and drug education program was segmented from the outset (2). The funding sources previously stated funded the Texas Education Agency through June 30, 1971, and the regional drug coordinators through August 31, 1971. At that time, the U.S. Office of Education awarded the Texas Education Agency a three-year grant in the amount of $252,900 (2). Each fiscal year for the three-year period extending from 1971-1972 through 1973-1974, the Texas Education Agency received a grant of $84,300 for administration and coordination of the statewide program.
In September, 1971, the Texas Education Agency made application to the Texas Criminal Justice Council to act as fiscal agent for a grant to fund the salaries and operating expense of the twenty regional education service center drug coordinators (2). The application was approved by the Texas Criminal Justice Council and a grant in the amount of $44,000 was awarded for the three-month period extending from September 1, 1971, through November 30, 1971. At that time application was again made by the Texas Education Agency to the Texas Criminal Justice Council for funds to continue the services of the twenty drug coordinators. The application was denied in the initial review by the council. Following appeal, however, the Texas Criminal Justice Council awarded a final grant in the amount of $192,000 for the period extending from December 1, 1971, through August 31, 1972 (2).

Funds to continue the services of the twenty regional education service center drug coordinators were requested through Title III, National Defense Education funds in September, 1971 (2). Title III funds were provided in the amount of $360,000 for the period of September 1, 1972, through August 31, 1973.

The Sixty-Third Texas Legislature enacted Senate Bill 506 (4), later codified as Texas Education Code 21.118, which appropriated state funds for the crime prevention and drug education program for the first time. The appropriation
was in the amount of $560,000 for each of the two years of the biennium 1973-1974 and 1974-1975. This appropriation provided funding for the administration and coordination of the state-wide effort by the Texas Education Agency, and salary and operational expenses of the twenty regional education service center drug coordinators (4). It did not, however, provide funds for local school districts which would have enabled them to provide in-service training for teachers and develop or acquire materials related to the crime prevention and drug education effort.

The present state funding for crime prevention and drug education is from the general revenue appropriation (4). Therefore, it will be necessary for a new bill to be introduced during the Sixty-Fourth Texas legislative session to be held in 1975. It is possible that a bill may be introduced which would include the crime prevention and drug education program as part of the Foundation Program (2). If this should occur, the crime prevention and drug education program would be included as part of the state appropriation for education and it would no longer be necessary to introduce a new bill to the legislature every two years.

A grass-roots approach, which utilized a six-component system, was utilized during the 1970-71 school year. This system was reported in the 1971-72 State Plan for Crime Prevention and Drug Education as follows:
1. Communication Network. A foundational communication network has been established. This allows a cooperative effort in program development and feedback information for continuous evaluation and recycling of the program. Minimal awareness of the problem and a greater willingness to work in seeking its solution exists.

2. Staff Development. It has been determined that staff development is a key factor in the success of the program and must precede program implementation. Training has been provided for the Texas Education Agency staff, education service center coordinators, and local education agency district teams. Three training laboratories have been facilitated by the education service center coordinators for the local education agency teams. Purposes for sessions were: to bring about awareness of the complexity of drug education to include the psychological, sociological, physiological, pharmaceutical, cultural, and legal nature of the problem; to introduce the laboratory method as a process best suited for the technique to use in drug education; to introduce the systems approach to planning a program unique for each school; to utilize the conceptual approach to curriculum development; and to initiate plans for the total inservice training of professional personnel.

3. Program Development. The Texas Education Agency together with the education service centers have developed a plan of action and guidelines for program development. The instructional program must stress attitude formation and an affective behavior change. Success of the program will be measured by the students' ability to assume the responsibility for their own decision making. Each school is developing its unique plan for teaching drug education.

4. Materials Development. Materials developed by Texas Education Agency serve as guidelines for use by the local school districts in program development. Materials from the National Institute of Mental Health, a Planning Process Laboratory Manual and an updated Drug Information Manual have been printed and distributed by the regional education service center staff. The tentative materials include: Scope and Sequence of Concepts; Guidelines for Training Laboratories; tentative drafts of bulletins for High School Tabloid Newspaper in Drug Education, Elementary Cartoon Booklet in
Drug Education, Parents and Drugs and Teacher's Guide to Drug Education. These materials were developed during the summer by a task force of persons that included students, teachers, administrators, pharmacists, parents, law enforcement personnel and Texas Education Agency task force staff. They will be revised this summer after they are reviewed and piloted in the public schools.

5. Interagency Cooperation. The Interagency Council on Drug Abuse was formed to coordinate all aspects of drug abuse. The Texas Education Agency has had a working relationship with the council in program planning, has cooperated in its community assistance program to local communities, and has participated in preparing and disseminating the brochure "Guidelines for Community Action on Drug Abuse."

6. Community Involvement. Local school districts are taking a leadership role in initiating total community involvement (16, p. 2).

Primary emphasis was placed on the development of materials and staff as related to the drug education component of the legislative mandate during the 1970-71 school year. Written into the State Plan for Crime Prevention and Drug Education, 1971-72 was the following statement of "Desired Conditions":

It is desired that sufficient funding be made available to maintain existing administrative costs for staff and program development and expand the program in order to fuse crime prevention education into the already existing drug education program (16, p. 2).

The State Plan for Crime Prevention and Drug Education, 1971-72 set forth goals and sub-goals to meet the discrepancy between what exists and the desired conditions. The primary goal set forth in the State Plan was

The development and implementation of a model designed to provide staff those
competencies to enable them to effectively provide a program for all students in crime prevention and drug use, misuse and abuse education (16, p. 3).

Sub-goals, objectives, and activities were presented for the Texas Education Agency, regional education service centers, local education agencies, and university teacher training institutions to follow in the further development of program and staff (16, pp. 3-16).

One of the most far-reaching activities presented in the 1971-72 State Plan was the first of a proposed three-year training program to be initiated during the summer of 1971. Contained in the document were the following plans:

Three sites will be chosen for centers to train three hundred drug education specialists. Participants are to be selected in the following priority order: additional education service center community crime and drug education consultants, juvenile officers and allied health professionals. These persons will receive four weeks of intensive training in the Summer of 1971 for skill development in planning, group process, drug information and drug education using a self assessment model. Throughout the 1971-72 school year, these persons will intern and field test by working with local school districts, other juvenile law officers and a pilot group of doctors, lawyers, pharmacists, nurses, etc. A continuing education program is to be implemented in 1971-1972 (16, p. 7).

The three sites which were chosen for the training centers were Houston, McAllen, and Midland. Training sessions were conducted for four weeks at each of these sites from July 12 to August 6, 1971. The evaluation of the training sessions and the follow-up to the training sessions
which was held in San Antonio, February 16-18, 1972, was conducted for the Texas Education Agency by William Brown (1).

The goals, objectives, and activities for the 1972-1973 fiscal year were set forth in the Annual Plan for Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program, 1972-1973 (6). The goals, both immediate and long range, remained unchanged.

The immediate goal was the development and implementation of a model to "... provide staff those competencies to enable them to effectively provide a program for all students in crime prevention and drug abuse education" (6). This goal was expressed as a continuation of the same goal which had been established for the State Plan for Crime Prevention and Drug Education 1971-72 (16).

The long-range goal which was set forth in the Annual Plan for 1973-1974 was stated as follows:

Educational delivery systems will be developed and implemented that will become vital public instruments in training young people to cope with their environment. The system will become the basic vehicle for providing relevance to the complexity of fulfilling human needs to the degree that participating youth and adults will accept self and others, have interpersonal relation skills and understand the possible consequences and alternatives for the decisions they make in their changing environment (6).

The following immediate or short-range objectives were established to meet the immediate goal set forth in the Annual Plan for 1972-1973:
1. Training activities that will increase the competencies of individuals involved in drug education and crime will be continued. Training emphasis will focus on needs of the individuals as related to training areas such as individualized instruction, juvenile delinquency, conflict resolution, decision making, valuing, etc.

2. Pertinent communications and data regarding crime prevention and drug education programs will be collected and circulated. Special emphasis will be placed on timely dissemination of current information and new materials.

3. Leadership in stimulating, initiating, and coordinating regional programs will be provided. Consultative services, guidance, and assistance to regional programs will be supplied. New, improved, and innovative programs and methods will be developed.

4. Cooperative relationships with other agencies, state and regional organizations, national associations, and multidisciplinary groups involved in crime prevention and drug abuse education will be continued and expanded.

5. Procedures for a statewide evaluation of crime prevention and drug education will be developed and implemented.

6. Cooperative relationships with other Divisions in exploring means of meeting such student needs as work, recreation, and individualized education will be expanded. Other special areas of focus will be community and career education.

7. Cooperative relationships with other divisions and agencies involved in youth services will be expanded.

8. Cooperative relationships with other divisions and universities in exploring the feasibility of revising teacher training programs to provide a set of experiences that will prepare teachers with the necessary flexibility to maximize learning and adapt to societal change will be further developed (6).

Long-range objectives which were set forth in the Annual Plan for 1972-1973 included

1. All necessary activities which will ultimately produce an educational delivery system for primary and secondary schools will be planned. The delivery systems will be
designed to provide constant, effective, and appropriate training in the behavioral sciences.

2. A model educational program that is based on the triad: self, others, and environment will be planned, piloted and disseminated. The focus must be on the individual and his action or interaction with other persons as influenced by environmental factors.

3. Programs that develop understanding and complete involvement of school administrators will be initiated. Most important are teacher training with indepth and expertise in attitudinal development, behavior modification, interpersonal relationships, group dynamics, and other areas of behavioral sciences and management.

4. Total community planning and involvement is necessary. Education agencies will assume a catalytic role in coordinating and encouraging total participation in resources.

5. Instructional programs for students will stress attitude formation and affective behavior change. Students will gain the ability to assume responsibility for their own decision making and commitment. Self-understanding and timely, constructive self-direction will be stressed. A positive climate for learning will be provided through the active involvement of every student in the learning process (6).

Activities designed to complement and enhance both immediate and long-range objectives as set forth in the

Annual Plan for 1972-1973 included the following:

A. Conduct a dynamic and ongoing liaison program with other agencies involved with crime prevention and drug abuse programs. Some of the agencies are:

1) Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation
2) Commission on Alcoholism
3) Health Department
4) Department of Public Safety
5) Office of the Attorney General
6) Blind Commission
7) Board of Pardons and Parole
8) Department of Corrections
9) Employment Commission
10) Criminal Justice Council
   (Governor's Office)
11) Department of Community Affairs  
   (Governor's Office)  
12) Department of Public Welfare  
13) Texas Youth Council  
14) Rehabilitation Commission

B. Develop training activities to increase the competencies of personnel involved in crime prevention and drug education programs. Training will be focused on the individual needs of staff and education service center representatives. Training sessions are scheduled for September, 1972 (4 days), January 1973 (4 days), and June 1973 (3 days) and will include areas of emphasis such as conflict resolution, individualized instruction, group process, decision making, values, peer counseling, evaluation, juvenile delinquency, correctional systems, psycho/legal/physiological/social aspects of drug abuse, and school related crime.

C. Be aware of and publicize in and out of state training programs that would benefit and upgrade the competencies and capabilities of staff personnel.

D. Collect information in order to ascertain critical areas in staff training that need further consideration. Immediate efforts will be devoted to developing innovative and suitable programs, techniques, methods, etc.

E. Collect materials and review for appropriateness. Disseminate pertinent information, on a quarterly basis, to education service centers and other interested agencies.

F. When not available or inappropriate, develop materials to meet special needs as suggested by the education service centers.

G. Develop and publish a drug education and crime prevention manual to include information and data relating to the administration and management of the program, legal aspects, personnel development, staff roles in the program, program development, and other pertinent areas of concern.

H. Compile and publish a list of persons and organizations expert in areas relating to drug education and crime prevention. These individuals and organizations could be considered resource persons for training and/or consultative services when needed.

I. Provide input into the TEXAS DRUG SCENE, TEXAS OUTLOOK, and other periodicals concerning new developments and activities in the areas of crime prevention and drug education.
J. In close cooperation with other divisions, conduct a needs assessment of institutions that provide teacher training to determine the availability, content, utilization, needs and other information relating to crime, prevention and drug education training programs. When appropriate, collaborate with teacher training institutions in the development of crime prevention and drug education courses.

K. Identify areas needing evaluation, design projects, and conduct an indepth evaluation of selected community/school drug education and crime prevention programs.

L. In close cooperation with other divisions and institutions explore the feasibility of developing criteria used in the selection of teacher trainees. Also, participate in joint planning projects to develop educational models for pre- and inservice teachers.

M. Work load permitting the following activities will be initiated:

1) Cooperate with the division of adult education in the development of programs for the community school.

2) Review Social Seminar materials and recommend those that would be effective in the classroom, teacher inservice training, community drug education, etc.

3) Cooperate with the Task Force on Career Education to explore the implications of work and use of leisure as relates to drug abuse and juvenile crime.

4) Cooperate with other divisions and agencies in exploring the feasibility of a program for the delinquent retardate.

5) Explore the feasibility of pursuing a VD prevention program.

6) Act as a catalyst in the development of state strategy for a youth development and delinquency prevention program.

7) Explore the feasibility of developing joint projects with the Commission on Alcoholism (16).

In order to effectively utilize available resources in reaching the objectives stated in the Annual Plan for 1972-1973, it was necessary to establish priorities and schedule staff activities. The following reflects priorities and
activities which were set forth for the Annual Plan for 1972-1973:

1) Training for education service center and division staff
2) Publish a quarterly newsletter
3) Publish a resources manual
4) Conduct a needs assessment of teacher training institutions
5) Conduct a needs assessment of schools
6) Publish a list of resource persons and organizations
7) Develop a glossary of terms
8) Develop pharmacological materials
9) Establish coordination with divisions and institutions regarding teaching techniques and methods
10) Initiate efforts to develop state strategy for youth development and delinquency prevention
11) Social Seminar materials utilization
12) Study community/school drug education and crime prevention programs
13) Explore joint projects with the Commission on Alcoholism
14) Cooperate with Task Force on Career Education
15) Explore feasibility of developing programs for the delinquent retardate
16) Explore feasibility of developing VD prevention program
17) Explore feasibility of developing cooperative programs for the community schools (6).

House Bill 467 (20) called for a comprehensive program on the dangers of crime and narcotics to be taught each academic year for all students in grades five through twelve. One of the first documents developed by the Texas Education Agency, therefore, was a publication entitled Crime and Narcotics Scope and Sequence (8).

The rationale for the document recognized that crime and the misuse of drugs are growing problems among youth and young adults in our society. The rationale further recognized
that such problems exist in one form or another at all socio-economic levels and in cities, suburbs, and rural areas. "Crime and drug abuse can and do occur anywhere, regardless of education, race, religion, economic or social level" (8, p. 1).

Some of the more important needs of all students which were set forth in the rationale of the Crime and Narcotics Scope and Sequence include

1. Achieving a growing understanding and acceptance of self, capacities, and goals
2. Satisfying peer and social relationships
3. Achieving a masculine or feminine role through understanding self
4. Achieving emotional independence from parents and home and an expanding awareness of widening environmental boundaries
5. Planning for and moving toward economic independence (This involves education and vocational preparation.)
6. Understanding family life and home responsibility
7. Developing intellectual skills and concepts
8. Developing a valuing system as a guide to self-directed behavior
9. Adapting to a changing self and a changing world (8, p. 2).

The Crime and Narcotics Scope and Sequence (8) represented the first attempt of the Texas Education Agency to provide the public schools with a guide to curriculum development in crime prevention and drug education. It is important to note, that although the Scope and Sequence set forth major concepts and behavioral objectives, accompanied by subconcepts and behavioral objectives for grades five
through twelve, it was not intended to represent a curriculum guide. Each local school district was encouraged to assess its own needs with regard to the crime and drug problem. Based on this needs assessment, each school district was encouraged to develop its own crime prevention and drug education curriculum guide (17, p. 5).

The Crime and Narcotics Scope and Sequence set forth certain factors which must be considered in developing a program for crime prevention and the misuse of drugs and narcotics:

1. Such a program is complex and must have total community planning and implementation. The role of the school is one of leadership to involve home and community resources.
2. The program must meet the unique needs of the particular school district.
3. The overall objective is the minimization of the incidence of crime and drug misuse among the youth of the community.
4. The instructional program must stress attitude formation and an effective behavior change. Success of the program will be measured by the students' ability to assume the responsibility for their own decision-making and commitment rather than in terms of knowledge transmitted.
5. Despite the urgency, a "crash program" (short-term, one dimensional assembly, lecture or film) is questionable. It must not serve as a substitute for a carefully planned program focusing on basic causative factors.
6. The curriculum should not be further fragmented to incorporate drug and crime information; it should be included in existing programs.
7. Drug education should present the truth and deal with facts. It should not preach, moralize or use scare tactics. Facts about people are equally as important as those about crime and drugs, if not more so. The focus must be on people, relating to the emotional and
social components of drug abuse. It must promote self-understanding and prompt, constructive self-direction among young people.

8. The selection of the teacher is a key factor for the success of any program for crime and drug misuse. The teacher must be well grounded in the physiological, psychological, and sociological disciplines; he should expertly use techniques and methods designed to effect desirable attitudinal and behavioral changes.

9. The program must focus on the positive and constructive use of drugs in our society.

10. The technique and method of presentation is more important than content of the subject matter (8, p. 4).

In order to further the involvement of parents and the community in the understanding and development of crime prevention and drug education programs, the Texas Education Agency developed the Parents' Bulletin About Drugs (14) which was completed during the summer of 1970. Included in the nineteen-page bulletin were factors related to the abuse of drugs such as curiosity, peer pressure, boredom, despair, and frustration (14, pp. 1-2).

Also included in the Parents' Bulletin About Drugs was a summary of the state of Texas narcotic and dangerous drug laws (14, pp. 3-8). This section presented basic legal consequences related to the unlawful use of drugs such as penalties, compulsory treatment of narcotic addicts, contraband narcotics, and other legal consequences of conviction (14, pp. 2-8).

A "Checklist on Drug Abuse" was presented as a means of helping parents recognize symptoms of drug abuse. An observant parent might avoid trouble by noting abrupt or
unusual changes in behavior or physical health such as

1. Abrupt personality change such as loss of interest in dates, sports, and other activities. Truancy and carelessness of dress and personal appearance may also result.
2. Loss of appetite, increased thirst, and constipation are physical symptoms that may occur.
3. Chronic shortage of money.
4. Excessive activity, nervousness, irritability, and argumentativeness.
5. Sunglasses worn at inappropriate times that may hide dilated or constricted pupils.
6. Appearance of drunkenness with no alcohol odor on breath.
7. Continuous wearing of long sleeves that may hide needle marks.
8. Unusual ups and downs in mood during a short time period (approximately four hours).
9. Odor similar to burning rope on breath and clothing--may be masked by burning of incense or by excessive use of deodorizers.
10. Tendency to doze at inappropriate hours.
11. Telltale signs of paraphernalia; little glassine bags which often hold the drug; hypodermic syringe or eyedropper and needle; spoon or bottle cap for dissolving powders; cotton balls for straining a solution before injecting it (14, p. 9).

Finally, the bulletin presented recommendations regarding "What Parents Can Do" (14, p. 10) to improve communications with their children and where to turn for help if a drug problem is suspected (14, p. 12). Although there is no one place to turn for help, a number of resources were presented. A large percentage of Texas parents speak Spanish as a primary language. The Parents' Bulletin About Drugs, therefore, was also printed in Spanish.

In November, 1970, the Texas Education Agency disseminated a publication entitled Teacher's Handbook on Drug Education. The introduction to the Teacher's Handbook on Drug Education
was identical with that of the Parents' Bulletin About Drugs which had been developed the previous summer. The Teacher's Handbook on Drug Education also included an appendix which contained all information which had been included in the Parents' Bulletin About Drugs. That portion which was added to the Teacher's Handbook on Drug Education included the "State Drug Education Goals" (10, p. 1), "Teacher and Student Objectives" (17, p. 2), and suggested procedures for the development of "Curriculum" (17, pp. 5-7).

The three goals which were set forth in the Teacher's Handbook stipulated that all youth and participating adults in Texas should

1. have information regarding the pharmacological, physiological, legal, psychological, sociological and cultural aspects relating to drug use, misuse and abuse that will enable them to make rational decisions which affect themselves and others.

2. have skills in the dynamics of communications, interpersonal relationships and decision making in order to better cope with a changing milieu.

3. have leadership traits that include the following self-actualizing characteristics: existentiaity, feeling reactivity, spontaneity, self-regard, self-acceptance, constructive nature of man, synergistic awareness, ability to accept aggression, a capacity for intimate contact, and, time competent, inner directed, self-actualizing values (17, p. 1).

A self-actualized person was described as a person who is "... realistic, accepting of himself and others, spontaneous, problem centered, objective, autonomous, affectionate, democratic, creative and realizes one's potentiality" (17, p. 1).
The "Teacher and Student Objectives" set forth as an appropriate approach for the teacher, when dealing with the problem of use, misuse, and abuse of drugs, were to "... help students develop attitudes and acquire knowledge that will enable them to make decisions which lead toward self-fulfillment without experiencing negative drug dependence" (17, p. 2). It was suggested that the laboratory method, which combines group dynamics with problem solving to cause cognitive and affective behavior, learning and action, might be utilized as an instructional approach (17, p. 3). The following basic steps were presented:

1. students identify problems to be studied;
2. students design the methods for finding solutions to the problem;
3. students research problem and share information to arrive at solutions;
4. students evaluate the procedures used; and
5. students determine new problems to be solved as a result of the evaluation.

The following conditions were presented as a means of creating a desirable group setting when employing the laboratory method:

1. Mental Environment--All discussion should be free of restraints, open and relaxed. (This condition can occur in a non-threatening atmosphere.)
2. Physical Environment--A circular arrangement is desirable so that each student can see,
hear and address any other member of the group. (Provisions for writing, note taking and visual aids should be made.) (17, p. 4).

The section of the Teacher's Handbook on Drug Education which presents factors related to curriculum states, Because the complexion of the drug problem differs from community to community, curricula for drug education must be designed by local school districts in order to meet its unique needs. Some procedures which might be used in developing program include the following:

Conduct an assessment in order to determine:

a. the nature and extent of the local drug problem through a community survey and a student behavior survey
b. the attitudes and knowledge of students and others about drugs
c. the instructional practices in drug education, and
d. the resource personnel available (17, p. 5).

A supplement to the Teacher's Handbook on Drug Education was printed and distributed to all public school districts in Texas in the fall of 1972 (9). The goals for the crime prevention and drug education program, both immediate and long-range, were commensurate with those set forth in the Teacher's Handbook on Drug Education.

The Supplement included a section entitled "The Administrator as the Leader of the Local School Team" (9, pp. 2-7). The administrator's role is outlined in the Supplement as follows:

The philosophy of the Texas Crime Prevention and Drug Education Program includes the proposition that educators must first recognize the human relations needs of students. If an administrator accepts this premise, the first step for
him may be discovering his own relationship to students and how students accept the educational climate which he has established (9, p. 6).

Broadly categorized areas of involvement which characterize the role of an administrator included

The administrator becomes aware of the attitude of staff and students toward himself and the total education process
becomes aware of the services being provided at the community, regional, and State-Federal levels
structures staff and student dialogue to establish some generalized interest in approaching the human needs of students
begins dialogue with community leaders about the educational needs of students to enable them to make decisions about crime and drugs
accepts the regional education service center's assistance
makes available time for supportive and teaching personnel and students to plan and initiate awareness sessions for students and faculty about drugs, crime, and problems related to them
facilitates a general assessment of the drug use, misuse and abuse and crime among the student population in the school district (he may need to promote through community organizations this same level of assessment for the entire community)
supports the efforts of building and/or district teams who are given the task of building a program and a curriculum
cooperates with efforts to educate the citizens of the community
sanctions and coordinates public relations and informational communications among faculty, students, and the community
seeks resource people and materials and facilitates their inclusion into the program, curriculum, or planning efforts
causes to be developed and carried out an ongoing and over-all program evaluation
establishes an inservice program for teachers, counselors, and other supportive staff (9, pp. 6-7).
The role of the local school district team was also emphasized in the *Crime Prevention and Drug Education Supplement* (9, p. 8). Emphasis was placed on the importance of each team member sharing some responsibilities in the team effort, as illustrated in Figure 1. The roles of each member are described as follows:

**THE ADMINISTRATOR**
- Provides leadership in program and staff development activities.
- Develops awareness of services and resources available to the community for the prevention of crime and drug abuse.
- Facilitates the use of these services and resources.
- Provides leadership in community awareness activities.
- Assists in the development of a program evaluation plan.
- Establishes priorities for program and staff development.
- Plans and directs the utilization of LEA resources in the development of the crime prevention and drug abuse education program.

**THE STUDENT**
- Becomes a special liaison between the LEA and the student population.
- Helps organize and provide leadership for special committees which function in the crime prevention and drug education program.
- Enlists the cooperation and involvement of fellow students in on-going co-curricular program activities.
- Provides leadership in student training activities.
- Seeks cooperation and creativity of fellow students in designing curriculum as well as staff training.

**THE TEACHER**
- Works as a member of the curricular team.
- Utilizes appropriate teaching strategies.
- Provides instructional leadership for staff training.
- Emphasizes open dialogue and free exchange of ideas.
Stimulates the development of human and material resources.
Helps coordinate school and community resources (9, p. 9).

"Staff development is of utmost importance and must precede implementation" (9, p. 10). This statement, with the following steps toward fulfillment of an in-service training program, was presented in the Crime Prevention and Drug Education Supplement:

1. An intensive training program in staff development will be provided by the education service centers to prepare at least one selected staff member (teacher), one administrator, and
one student in every school district in instructional competencies and leadership ability. In addition, each school district is encouraged to include a counselor, a parent, and school nurse with the original team of three.

2. At the local level, a task force of three persons (one administrator, one teacher, one student) from each building or campus should be identified and trained for leadership roles. This training will be done by the persons who were trained at the regional workshop. The local school district will then have the option of using the three building representatives as a task force for their building or combining the efforts of all building representatives as an over-all school district task force.

3. Training laboratories will be conducted for school staff (administrators, teachers, teacher aides, custodians, lunchroom personnel, school nurses, counselors) by the representatives trained in Step 2.

4. Laboratories in education will be planned and conducted for all students by the local task force.

5. Two days of evaluation, in-depth inservice training, and curriculum revision will be planned and conducted by the local task force for all teachers.

6. Teachers should be selected by the task force to attend summer workshops conducted by universities, colleges, and regional service centers (9, p. 10).

In order to assist teachers and students in establishing better communications, the following suggestions were made:

1. A climate of trust and openness can be created by
   - exploring differences in values and value systems but avoiding imposing personal ideas and prejudices on others
   - being honest
   - being nonjudgmental
   - allowing for active participation
   - encouraging give-and-take creative expression throughout learning activities
practicing the art of listening
facilitating group discussion rather
than directing or leading
expressing opinions as opinions and
facts as facts.

2. Teachers should serve as resource persons
in helping the students get early assistance
from some specialized professional sources.

3. Students should accept responsibility equal
to the rights they expect to enjoy.

4. Coordination of crime and drug education
within the regular curriculum is recommended
over a single crime/drug unit (11, p. 31).

To assist educators in better understanding the legal
ramifications of crime and drug abuse, the Texas Education
Agency produced a publication entitled The Legal Aspects of
Drug Abuse and Juvenile Delinquency for the Texas Public
Schools (12). This publication presented federal and state
laws concerning the illegal use, possession and sale of
drugs (12, pp. 5-34). It also included sections on juvenile
laws of the state of Texas (12, pp. 35-36) and policies of
local school boards and law enforcement in the schools (12,
pp. 43-47).

The Legal Aspects of Drug Abuse and Juvenile Delinquency
for the Texas Public Schools was revised in September, 1973,
as a result of extensive legislative changes made by the
Sixty-Third Texas Legislature during its regular session in
1973. The revised publication (13) was written by Michael P.
Rosenthal, School of Law at the University of Texas under
contract agreement with the Texas Education Agency.
Rosenthal also wrote the original publication released in
June, 1972.
The revised Legal Aspects of Drug Abuse and Juvenile Delinquency for the Texas Public Schools (13) utilized the same subject format as the original publication (12). The primary difference between the two publications was related to the section on Texas laws dealing with drug abuse (13, pp. 15-31) and juvenile delinquency (13, pp. 32-34). Both of the sections were changed significantly by legislative action of the Sixty-Third session of the Texas Legislature.

In the fall of 1972 the Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education of the Texas Education Agency began publishing a quarterly newsletter entitled You Turn (18). The purpose of the newsletter was "... to improve communication among those persons who are helping young Texans to choose wisely the paths their lives will take" (18). Each issue of the newsletter contains the above statement of purpose and the following invitation to readers:

Contributions from readers are invited so that useful, innovative ideas can be shared. Material appearing here may be reproduced freely. Material printed in this newsletter does not necessarily reflect the views of the editor or policy of the Texas Education Agency.

Names can be added to the mailing list by sending complete addresses, including zip codes, to the Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education, Texas Education Agency, 201 E. 11th, Austin 78701 (18).

Topics which have been presented in You Turn include values clarification, audio-visual materials available, evaluation techniques, new materials available, and summaries of the findings from recent research related to drug abuse.
House Bill 467 (20) established an Advisory Commission on Crime and Narcotics which was to advise the Texas Education Agency on matters relating to the development of a statewide program on the dangers of crime and narcotics. State law (20) requires that the Advisory Commission submit periodic reports to the Governor of Texas and members of the Texas Legislature. One Advisory Commission report has been submitted to date, entitled *Advisory Commission's Report on Crime and Narcotics* (5).

Estes described the purpose of the Advisory Commission's Report on Crime and Narcotics as follows:

> It is the intent of this report to describe the responsibilities of the Advisory Commission and Texas Education Agency in coordinating and guiding the crime prevention and drug education programs of the Texas public schools. In addition, the present status of these programs is summarized. Future plans and specific recommendations for needed legislation are included (5, p. 1).

The responsibilities of the Advisory Commission and Texas Education Agency have previously been presented in the section of this study entitled "Legislative Background." At the time of the Advisory Commission's Report, the Texas Education Agency had accomplished the following:

a) Established a division of drug education and staffed it with five professionals.
b) Formulated a plan of action.
c) Developed guidelines and materials for use by local school districts.
d) Established a foundational communication network among the Texas Education Agency, the regional education service centers and the local schools and communities (5, p. 8).
Future plans for the crime prevention and drug education program were stated as follows:

Staff development and training, a critical area of need, must be continued at all levels to provide a sufficient number of persons to implement the program. The drug education program must be sustained and crime prevention education initiated. Innovative and creative methods need to be evaluated for their effectiveness and then disseminated to others. There is a growing recognition that educational institutes have the potential to deter drug abuse and to bring about changes in the living conditions of a large number of young people. Yet education also has its limitations, including a lack of funds, a shortage of teachers qualified to teach drug education and an overcrowded curriculum (5, p. 8).

In recognition of the existing conditions, the Advisory Commission submitted the following recommendations to the legislature:

1. Legislation should extend the program from grades five through twelve to grades kindergarten through twelve.
2. Adequate funding should be appropriated to support:
   a) administrative costs of the Texas Education Agency for staff and program development;
   b) a professional position in each of the twenty regional education service centers;
   c) local education agency costs for program development (5, p. 8).

In an effort to inform the general public, parents, and educators of the crime prevention and drug education program being developed in the public schools, a leaflet entitled Crime and Drug Abuse: A Crisis in Attitude (7) was printed and distributed in the spring of 1973. Crime and drug abuse among young people was described in the following way:
Juvenile crime and drug abuse are more than isolated tragedies which strike some young people and their families. They are the tips of much bigger problems, symptoms riding iceberg fashion atop the massive needs which confront and confound all generations in the final third of our century. They are, in short, cries for help.

The answer may lie in many words, but we'll settle on just three for the sake of brevity: responsible decision-making (7).

Edgar has stated, "Every student should come out of the school with skills necessary for making responsible decisions" (7). The question is asked, "How can the public schools help build strength and a sense of responsibility into the minds and actions of their students? If we had the answers, we wouldn't need to ask the question" (7). The final sentence of the leaflet states, "Success of the crime prevention and drug education effort may well be built of obstacles--and our ability to hurdle them" (7).

To assist educators in the development and implementation of crime prevention and drug education programs, a publication entitled A Framework for Crime Prevention and Drug Education in Texas: Desirable Student Outcomes (10) was developed and printed in May, 1973. This framework was the result of a two-year study by staff members of the Texas Education Agency, local school districts, regional education service centers and teacher education institutions (10, p. iv).

The following uses of the document were set forth:

There are three ways in which A Framework for Crime Prevention and Drug Education in Texas: Desirable Student Outcomes can be used. School districts that have no present program can use
the document as a basis for developing their programs. Districts that are currently operating a program without clearly stated objectives can use it to clarify the purpose of their programs. School districts that already have an operating program can use the outcomes to evaluate, expand, revise, or shift the program emphasis (10, p. 2).

Individuals in the school district who can use the document include administrators, counselors, teachers, and students (10, p 2). An explanation of the use of the framework by these individuals is presented in the introduction to the "outcomes" (10, pp. 2-6).

Each "outcome" supports one or more of the Goals for Public School Education in Texas (19) adopted by the State Board of Education. To assist users of the document, the Goals for Public School Education in Texas are included in the document (10, p. 8).

Four central themes or areas of emphasis are presented in the Framework. These include

1. decision-making, including values clarification
2. interpersonal relations
3. attitudes toward and knowledge about crime and juvenile delinquency
4. attitudes toward and knowledge about drugs (10).

All of the "student outcomes" may be categorized within these four major areas of emphasis (10, p. 6).

The "student outcomes" are divided into two sections. Section one (10, pp. 9-24) deals with interest, attitudes, values, appreciations, and adjustments. The "outcomes" found in section one are explained as follows:
In crime prevention and drug education, the major emphasis must be on what the student does and how he feels about what he does in contrast to how much he knows. The student may be knowledgeable about the effects of drugs and still be a drug abuser. Section 1 describes the outcomes that indicate the student's interests, values, attitudes, appreciations, and adjustments. These will determine what the student will do with the information he obtains (10, p. 9).

Section two (10, pp. 25-37) deals with the recall or recognition of information and the development of intellectual abilities. The "outcomes" found in section two are explained in the following way:

The outcomes listed in Section 2 describe the student's level of comprehending specific information and identify the ability to apply, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate knowledge. These outcomes are classified into four main categories: Decision-Making, Interpersonal Relations, Knowledge of Crime and Juvenile Delinquency, and Knowledge of Drugs.

A teacher referring to the models contained in Section 2 must recognize and allow for the need to correlate objectives and activities with a corresponding objective from Section 1 (interests, values, attitudes, appreciations, and adjustments). A goal directed toward attitudinal change is more closely approached if the program of activities provides for and encourages personal interaction in both large and small groups and on a one-to-one basis than if it relies upon cognitive information in a fact-oriented program (10, p. 25).

Each "student outcome" is accompanied by suggested activities, program areas and grade ranges, and suggested measures. These are explained as follows:

Activities which seem to be most conducive to the development of each outcome are recommended. The list of activities is a beginning. Each school district is urged to expand and revise the list.
Program areas and grade ranges are suggested. Since development of a person's values and interests is a continuous process, school districts deal with most of these outcomes throughout the students' school lives.

Measures of attainment are listed for each outcome. The measures are indicators stated in terms of student performance. Schools will wish to avoid reliance upon any single measure of attitude. Before the existence of a student attitude can be inferred, several measures or indicators of behavior should be employed (10, p. 10).

An instrument entitled Learner Inventory for Vital Education (11) was developed to assess the relationship of student attitudes to the first fourteen outcomes as stated in section one of A Framework for Crime Prevention and Drug Education in Texas: Desirable Student Outcomes (10). The Learner Inventory for Vital Education was disseminated to twenty school districts, one in each education service center region. Each of these schools is participating in the development of a model program in crime prevention and drug education during the 1972 through 1974 school years.

It was recommended that the survey be administered twice, once in the fall and once in the spring, to determine change in student's attitudes as a result of the pilot program in which they are participating. Scoring of the answer sheets was provided by the Texas Education Agency. A report of the findings of the survey will be provided to each district following the post-administration of the survey instrument in the spring of 1974.
Responses to Personal Interviews

One of the stated purposes of this study was to determine the current status of the crime prevention and drug education program in nineteen school districts. To gather data related to the nine questions posed in the statement of purposes of the study, a personal interview was conducted with the individual in each participating school district who was assigned primary responsibility for the coordination of the crime prevention and drug education curriculum in his district. Twenty-four questions were asked of each individual interviewed (see Appendix, p. 269). The school districts were divided into five strata based on the average daily attendance. Stratum 5 included school districts with an average daily attendance of under 1,000 students. Stratum 4 was composed of school districts with 1,001 to 2,000 in average daily attendance. Stratum 3 was composed of school districts with average daily attendance of 2,001 to 5,000 students. School districts with an average daily attendance of 5,001 to 15,000 were included in Stratum 2. If a school district had an average daily attendance in excess of 15,000, it was included in Stratum 1. Two school districts were included in Stratum 1, two in Stratum 2, six in Stratum 3, three in Stratum 4, and six in Stratum 5 (see Appendix, p. 259).

The first question asked was "Has your school district implemented a program in crime prevention and drug education?"
As shown in Table V, all nineteen school districts included in the study answered in the affirmative.

**TABLE V**

RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Has your school district implemented a program in crime prevention and drug education?

In response to the question "When did your school district begin planning its instructional program in crime prevention and drug education?" all schools in Stratum 1 and 2 indicated that they began planning their instructional program in the fall of 1970. As shown in Table VI, the staff of one school district in Stratum 3 did not begin planning their program until fall of 1973.

The staff of one school district began the planning phase of their curriculum in the fall of 1971, one in the spring of 1971, and three in the fall of 1970. The fall semester of 1970 was the first school semester following the passage of House Bill 467. The staffs of two school districts in Stratum 4 began the planning phase of their crime prevention and drug education curriculum in the fall of 1970.
TABLE VI
RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When did your school district begin planning its instructional program in crime prevention and drug education?

The staff of the third district in Stratum 4 did not begin planning until the spring of 1973. Six school districts were included in Stratum 5. The staffs of three of these schools began planning in the fall of 1970, two in the spring of 1971, and one in the fall of 1972.

Table VII shows the semester and year in which the crime prevention and drug education program was implemented by the school districts participating in the study. The programs in both school districts included in Stratum 1 were implemented in the spring semester, 1971. In Stratum 2, one program was implemented during the fall semester, 1970. The program in the second school district was implemented during the fall semester, 1971.

In Stratum 3, two programs were implemented during the spring semester, 1971, two during the fall semester, 1971,
### TABLE VII

**RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*When did your school district implement its plan of instruction in crime prevention and drug education?*

One during the spring semester, 1972, and one during the fall semester, 1973. One program in Stratum 4 was implemented during the fall semester, 1970, one during the spring semester, 1971, and one during the fall semester, 1973. In Stratum 5, one program was implemented during the fall semester, 1970, two during the spring and one during the fall semester, 1971, and one during the fall and one during the spring semester, 1972.

Table VIII indicates the individuals within the five strata who were assigned primary responsibility for planning and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program.

Within the two school districts included in Stratum 1, the individual assigned primary responsibility for the program in one district was the director of health and physical
TABLE VIII
RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>Curriculum Director</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Nurse</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Who was assigned primary responsibility for planning and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program?

...
Three superintendents and two principals had primary responsibility for the programs included in Stratum 5.

Table IX shows the organizational approach used in the planning and implementation of the crime prevention and drug education program.

**TABLE IX**

RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Administrative Staff Only</th>
<th>Administrative and teachers only</th>
<th>Administrative, teaching, and supportive staff</th>
<th>Administrative, teaching, supportive staff, and students</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The approach used in curriculum planning and implementation involved:

No school districts utilized the administrative staffs only. The most frequently reported approach utilized administrative, teaching, supportive staff, and students. One school district in Stratum 3 indicated that it utilized a committee composed of administrative, teaching, and supportive staff and parents rather than students.
When asked which grade levels the original implementation of the crime prevention and drug education program was placed in, most respondents in Stratum 5 indicated grades seven through twelve. The two respondents in Stratum 1 indicated grades seven through nine and grades four through twelve. Both schools in Stratum 2 included all elementary, junior high, and high school grades in their program. Three schools in Stratum 3 included elementary through high school. The remaining two indicated grades five through eight and seven through twelve. The three schools included in Stratum 4 indicated grades one through six, four through twelve, and seven through twelve.

When asked if the original implementation of the crime prevention and drug education program was on a single campus, system-wide, in a single subject area or interdisciplinary, the two respondents in Stratum 1 indicated that the original implementation in both districts was system-wide. One district utilized an interdisciplinary curriculum approach. The other district restricted its program to the social studies curriculum. Both school districts in Stratum 2 implemented their original program system-wide utilizing an interdisciplinary approach. School districts in Stratum 3 indicated that four initiated their original program system-wide and two on a single campus. All districts in Stratum 3 utilized an interdisciplinary approach, with the exception of one school district which utilized the science
curriculum only. All school districts in Stratum 4 utilized a system-wide interdisciplinary approach for the original implementation of their program. Three of the six school districts in Stratum 5 utilized a system-wide approach for the original implementation of their program. The remaining three originally implemented their programs on a single campus. All six school districts in Stratum 5 originally utilized an interdisciplinary approach for the program.

When asked if the crime prevention and drug education program was currently conducted on a single campus, system-wide, in a single subject area or interdisciplinary, all respondents in Stratum 1, 2, 3, and 4 indicated that the program was now system-wide utilizing an interdisciplinary approach. Three of the six school districts in Stratum 5 indicated that they were currently utilizing a system-wide approach. The other three school districts were utilizing a single campus for their instructional program. All six school districts in Stratum 5 utilized an interdisciplinary approach of instruction.

When asked if administrative problems such as teacher resistance, staff development, material acquisition, or financing of the program had occurred, both respondents in Stratum 1 indicated that providing adequate in-service training in the area of crime prevention and drug education had been a problem. This response was given by both respondents in Stratum 2, two of the six respondents in
Stratum 3, and four of the six respondents in Stratum 5. None of the respondents in Stratum 4 perceived this to be a problem. Two respondents in Stratum 3, one in Stratum 4, and two in Stratum 5 indicated teacher resistance had been a problem in administering the program. Respondents indicated that reluctance might be a better term to describe the reaction of some teachers to the program. Material acquisition was mentioned as a problem by one of the respondents in Strata 1, 2, and 3. Three of the respondents in Stratum 5 indicated that material acquisition had been a problem. Financing of the program was given as an administrative problem by both respondents in Stratum 1, one respondent in Stratum 2, one respondent in Stratum 4, and one respondent in Stratum 5. Other problems which were indicated by respondents in Stratum 2 included a lack of specific patterns of curricular approaches adequate for average campus units and inadequate principal leadership. An administrative problem indicated by a respondent in Stratum 4 involved the proper utilization of available materials by teachers.

In response to the question, "Has the planning and implementation of your crime prevention and drug education program resulted in increased cost to the school district?" one-half of the respondents in each of the first four strata indicated "yes," as shown in Table X. Five of the six
respondents in Stratum 5 indicated that the program had resulted in increased cost to the school district.

**TABLE X**

RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Has the planning and implementation of your crime prevention and drug education program resulted in increased cost to the school district?

One respondent in Stratum 1, one in Stratum 2, and two in Stratum 4 indicated that the crime prevention and drug education program had resulted in increased cost to the school district for staff development. One respondent in Stratum 1, one respondent in Stratum 2, three respondents in Stratum 3, two respondents in Stratum 4, and five respondents in Stratum 5 indicated that the acquisition of materials had resulted in increased cost. One respondent in Stratum 1 and one in Stratum 3 indicated that the school district had added additional staff members to coordinate the crime prevention and drug education program.

When asked if the school district had developed a school board policy with regard to the crime prevention and
drug education program and/or student misuse or abuse of drugs, all but two respondents indicated that they had such a policy. As shown in Table XI, one respondent in Stratum 3 and one respondent in Stratum 5 indicated that they did not have an official school board policy regarding the crime prevention and drug education program and/or student misuse or abuse of drugs.

TABLE XI

RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does the school district have an official school board policy with regard to the crime prevention and drug education program and/or student misuse or abuse of drugs?

When asked what provisions were made in school board policies, with regard to the program, both respondents in school districts included in Stratum 1 indicated policies relative to student possession of drugs and/or narcotics on school premises. Neither indicated an official board policy relative to the instructional program. School board policy relative to possession of drugs or narcotics provided for
suspension from school for a period of time ranging from fifteen days to the remainder of the school term. One school district in Stratum 1 also provided, by school board policy, provisions for the search of student lockers, cars, or personal effects, in the presence of the student, by school personnel and/or police to determine the presence of drugs or narcotics. Both school districts in Stratum 2 had official school board policies relative to possession of drugs or narcotics while on school premises. The provisions of these policies were basically the same as those of Stratum 1. One school in Stratum 2 also had a policy relative to the instructional program. Provisions of this policy expanded the instructional program from grades five through twelve, as mandated by House Bill 467, to include grades kindergarten through twelve. Each teacher was to be provided a comprehensive curriculum guide and a continuing program of crime prevention and drug education in-service training. The building principal was to be responsible for the implementation of the program. In Stratum 3, one respondent indicated that their district did not have an official school board policy relative to drug abuse. Respondents in four school districts in Stratum 3 indicated school board policies relative to student possession but not to the instructional program. One school district in Stratum 3 had an official school board policy relative to the instructional program of crime prevention and drug
education. The policy provided for an instructional program which would satisfy the provisions of House Bill 467.

Two of the three school districts included in Stratum 4 had official school board policies relative to the instructional program. Both of these school districts had extended the instructional program to include grades kindergarten through twelve rather than grades five through twelve as mandated by House Bill 467. One school district in Stratum 4 had a school board policy with regard to student possession of drugs or narcotics but not the instructional program.

Five of the six school districts included in Stratum 5 had official school board policies. Two of the school districts in Stratum 5 had school board policies which set forth provision for an instructional program. Three school districts had policies which were related to students found in possession of drugs while on school premises. The provisions of these policies were basically the same as those in the other strata.

In response to the question, "How were teachers selected for the crime prevention and drug education program of instruction?" one respondent in Stratum 3 and one in Stratum 5 indicated that teachers volunteered. All school districts in Strata 1 and 2, four school districts in Stratum 3, two in Stratum 4, and three in Stratum 5 indicated that teachers were selected on the basis of subject area. As shown in Table XII, one respondent in Stratum 3
and two in Stratum 5 indicated that all teachers were required to teach crime prevention and drug education. One respondent in Stratum 4 indicated that teachers were selected on the basis of attitude, classroom atmosphere, and subject matter.

**TABLE XII**

RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 14*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Volunteered</th>
<th>Selected on Basis of Subject Area</th>
<th>All Teachers required to Teach</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*How were teachers selected for the crime prevention and drug education program of instruction?

Table XIII shows responses to the question, "Who is assigned primary responsibility for teacher in-service training in crime prevention and drug education? In Stratum 1, one respondent indicated that the director of instruction was responsible for teacher in-service training. The other school district in Stratum 1 had employed a coordinator for the crime prevention and drug education program who was responsible for teacher in-service training. In Stratum 2, the director of instruction was indicated as the individual
TABLE XIII
RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 15*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Superintendent</th>
<th>Director of Instruction</th>
<th>Director of Personnel</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Who is assigned primary responsibility for teacher in-service training in crime prevention and drug education?

assigned primary responsibility for teacher in-service training in one school district. The supervisor of health and physical education was assigned this responsibility in the second school district in Stratum 2. In the six school districts included in Stratum 3, one superintendent, four directors of instruction, and one principal were assigned the responsibility for teacher in-service training. Respondents in Stratum 4 indicated that one director of instruction, one counselor, and one drug coordinator were responsible for teacher in-service training. In Stratum 5, three superintendents, one director of instruction, one principal, and one curriculum supervisor were assigned primary responsibility for teacher in-service training.

As shown in Table XIV, the majority of the respondents in Strata 1, 3, 4, and 5 indicated that all teachers,
TABLE XIV
RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>All Teachers (System-Wide)</th>
<th>All Teachers (Selected Campuses)</th>
<th>Teachers within Certain Teaching Disciplines</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Is in-service training in crime prevention and drug education provided for:

system-wide, received in-service training in crime prevention and drug education. Both respondents in the school districts included in Stratum 2 indicated that in-service training was provided for teachers within certain teaching disciplines.

In response to the question regarding who determined the content of teacher in-service training programs, one respondent in Stratum 2, and one in Stratum 3 indicated that the central office staff only determined the content of teacher in-service training. As shown in Table XV, one respondent in Stratum 5 indicated the central office staff and principals assumed this responsibility. One respondent in Stratum 1, one in Stratum 2, five in Stratum 3, two in Stratum 4, and five in Stratum 5 indicated that the central
TABLE XV

RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 17*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Central Office Staff Only</th>
<th>Central Office Staff and Principals</th>
<th>Central Office Staff, Principals and Teachers</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The content of in-service training programs in crime prevention and drug education is determined by:

Office staff, principals, and teachers shared the responsibility for determining the content of teacher in-service training in crime prevention and drug education. One respondent in Stratum 1 indicated that the drug education coordinator had primary responsibility for determining the content of teacher in-service training. In Stratum 4, one respondent indicated that the responsibility for in-service training content was jointly shared by the teachers and education service center drug coordinator.

As shown in Table XVI, in response to the question, "To what extent do you feel that teacher in-service training in crime prevention and drug education has helped teachers and students establish better understanding and communication skills?" the majority of respondents checked the category "some." One respondent in Stratum 1 and one in
TABLE XVI
RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 18*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Very Satisfactory</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent do you feel that teacher in-service training in crime prevention and drug education has helped teachers and students establish better understanding and communication skills?

Stratum 4 indicated that they felt it had helped very little. One respondent in Stratum 1, two in Stratum 3, one in Stratum 4, and one in Stratum 5 indicated "very satisfactory."

When asked, "To what extent has the Regional Education Service Center cooperated with your district in developing your in-service training program?" the majority of the respondents indicated "very satisfactory." Only two respondents, one in Stratum 3 and one in Stratum 4, indicated less than "very satisfactory." In both cases, those who indicated less than "very satisfactory" said that the regional education service center had provided "some" service to the local school district.

When asked if "school district staff," "regional education service center staff," or "outside consultants" had
been used for in-service training programs, all respondents in Strata 1 and 2 indicated that all three had been used. Four of the six respondents in Stratum 3 indicated all three had been used. Two respondents in Stratum 3 indicated that they had used only the regional education service center drug coordinators. In Stratum 4, two respondents indicated that they had used all three resources and one indicated only the use of the regional education service center drug coordinator. Two of the six respondents in Stratum 5 indicated that they had utilized all three resources. Two indicated that they had used both outside consultants and regional education service center staff but not school district staff. Only the regional education service center staff was listed by the last two school districts in Stratum 5.

Table XVII indicates responses to the statement, "The Texas Education Agency has provided adequate guidelines for the development and implementation of our crime prevention and drug education program."

Four of the respondents, one in each of the first three strata and one in Stratum 5, indicated that they disagreed with the statement. Two of the respondents in Stratum 3 were undecided. Agreeing with the statement was one respondent in Stratum 1, one in Stratum 2, one in Stratum 3, three in Stratum 4, and five in Stratum 5. Two respondents in Stratum 3 strongly agreed with the statement.
### TABLE XVII
RESPONSES, BY STRATA, TO INTERVIEW SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 21*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Texas Education Agency has provided adequate guidelines for the development and implementation of our crime prevention and drug education program.

In response to the statement, "The regional education service center has provided adequate assistance to the school district in planning and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program," the majority of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed. As shown in Table XVIII, both respondents in Stratum 1 agreed with the statement. In Stratum 2, one respondent agreed and one strongly agreed that the service center staffs had provided adequate assistance. In Stratum 3, two respondents agreed and four strongly agreed with the statement. One respondent was undecided and two agreed with the statement in Stratum 4. The only negative responses occurred in Stratum 5. One respondent strongly disagreed, one disagreed, one agreed, and three strongly agreed with the statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Regional Education Service Center has provided adequate assistance to the school district in planning and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program.

When asked if the school districts had used "teacher made," "regional education service center," or "commercial" materials, all respondents indicated that they had utilized all three resources. No additional resources were listed.

When asked if "teacher observation," "teacher-made instruments," or "standardized test" were utilized in assessing the crime prevention and drug education program, both respondents in Stratum 1 indicated teacher observation and standardized test. Both respondents in Stratum 2 indicated that "teacher observation" was used in the assessment of their programs. In addition, one of the two districts in Stratum 2 indicated that they used teacher-made instruments and Texas Education Agency materials in the assessment of their programs. Three of the six respondents in Stratum 3
indicated they used teacher observation and teacher-made instruments. Two indicated that they used all three methods. One respondent in Stratum 4 indicated that his school district used both teacher observation and teacher-made instruments to evaluate the crime prevention and drug education program. The two remaining respondents indicated that they used teacher observation and standardized tests to assess the effectiveness of their program. Four of the six respondents in Stratum 5 indicated that they used only teacher observation to assess their program. The other respondents indicated that they utilized all three methods of program assessment.

Personal and Professional Data Pertaining to Teacher Respondents

Teacher respondents to the perception survey were asked to provide information about their sex, age, years of teaching experience, and ethnic origin. Responses to questions related to personal and professional data are reported by strata. Five strata are presented according to the average daily attendance of each school district. Stratum 5 consisted of those school districts having an average daily attendance of less than 1,000 students. Stratum 4 included school districts with an average daily attendance of 1,001 to 2,000 students. Those school districts participating in the study with an average daily attendance of 2,001 to 5,000 were placed in Stratum 3. If a school district had an
average daily attendance of 5,001 to 15,000, it was included in Stratum 2. School districts with an average daily attendance of over 15,000 were included in Stratum 1.

**Sex**

In the group of 804 teachers responding to the survey, there were 226 males and 578 females. The females constituted the majority of the respondents with 71.9 percent. The male respondents constituted the remaining 28.1 percent of those completing the survey.

**Age**

The teacher perception survey question related to age group provided four response categories. The categories were (1) 21 through 30, (2) 31 through 40, (3) 41 through 55, and (4) over 55. Table XIX reflects the responses of the 804 teachers by strata.

Across strata, 54 male and 139 female respondents indicated that they fell within the age range of 21 through 30. The 31 through 40 age group contained 91 male and 146 female respondents. There were 61 male and 195 female respondents within the age range of 41 through 55. The remaining 20 male and 97 female respondents were over 55 years of age.
TABLE XIX

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA, BY STRATA, PERTAINING TO TEACHERS RESPONDENTS' AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male N = 226</th>
<th></th>
<th>Female N = 578</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching Experience

Teachers were asked to report the number of years they had taught. Four response categories were provided: (1) 1 through 5 years of teaching experience, (2) 6 through 10 years of teaching experience, (3) 11 through 20 years of teaching experience, and (4) over 20 years of teaching experience. The responses to this item in the survey can be seen in Table XX.

Across strata, 60 male and 152 female respondents indicated that they possessed teaching experience which fell within the 1 through 5 years range. Sixty-seven male and 145 female respondents indicated teaching experience which fell within the range of 6 through 10 years. Reporting
TABLE XX

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA, BY STRATA, PERTAINING TO TEACHER RESPONDENTS' EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Strata</th>
<th>Male N = 226</th>
<th>Female N = 578</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teaching experience which fell within the 11 through 20 years range were 71 male and 149 female teachers. The remaining 28 male and 131 female respondents reported teaching experience in excess of 20 years.

**Ethnic Origin**

Teachers were asked to respond to the statement, "I belong to the following group by birth." Six response categories were provided which included (1) American Indian, (2) Negro/Black, (3) Mexican American/Spanish surnamed, (4) Oriental, (5) all others, and (6) "I prefer not to answer." Table XXI reflects the responses to the question regarding ethnic origin.
TABLE XXI
PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA, BY STRATA, PERTAINING TO TEACHER RESPONDENTS' ETHNIC ORIGIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1 0 2 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 3 0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro/Black</td>
<td>0 2 3 4 2</td>
<td>1 16 16 11 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American/</td>
<td>0 1 2 1 0</td>
<td>1 1 2 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Surname</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>20 19 74 38 37</td>
<td>75 57 188 83 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Prefer Not to Answer</td>
<td>2 1 7 6 3</td>
<td>1 4 6 8 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23 23 88 49 43</td>
<td>78 78 215 102 105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across strata, 4 male and 4 female respondents indicated an ethnic origin of American Indian. Eleven male and 55 female respondents indicated an ethnic origin of Negro or Black. Mexican-American or Spanish-surnamed respondents were represented by 4 male and 4 female teachers. There were no teacher responses to the category of Oriental. The majority of respondents indicated that their ethnic origin fell outside those specified. Therefore, these individuals indicated their ethnic origin as "All Others." Responding to the "All Others" category were 188 male and 485 female teachers. To accommodate those individuals who did not wish
to indicate their ethnic origin, a sixth response category was included, titled, "I prefer not to answer." Electing to respond to this category were 19 male and 30 female respondents.

Teachers' Perceptions of Drug Abuse

It was proposed that this study would provide information which would assist the Texas Education Agency in providing answers to selected questions. One of the questions to be answered was related to the perceptions of principals and their staffs toward drug misuse and abuse by students. As a means of gathering this information, a survey instrument was developed which consisted of a series of thirty statements related to drug abuse. The respondents were requested to check the appropriate response category which reflected their perception of agreement or disagreement with the statement. A Likert-type scale, utilizing a five category response from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree," with a median response of "undecided," was used.

The first survey item was related to the presence of drug abuse within the school district. As reflected in Table XXII, only 4 of the 804 teachers strongly agreed that there was no drug abuse among students in their school district.

The largest number of responses reflected disagreement with the statement. Across strata, responses ranged from
### TABLE XXII

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**
- Strongly Agree: 4.37
- Agree: 4.24
- Undecided: 4.30
- Disagree: 4.01
- Strongly Disagree: 3.93

**Standard Deviation**
- Strongly Agree: 0.630
- Agree: 0.720
- Undecided: 0.626
- Disagree: 0.761
- Strongly Disagree: 0.931

*There is no drug abuse among students in this school district.*
50.6 percent in Stratum 5 to 58.2 percent in Stratum 4. The response category which received the second largest number of responses was the "strongly disagree" category. Responses in this category ranged from 27.0 percent for Stratum 5 to 42.0 percent for Stratum 1. Only 11.4 percent of the respondents were undecided or perceived that there was no drug abuse among students in their school district. The remaining 88.9 percent perceived drug abuse to exist within all five strata of school districts.

When asked to compare the incidence of drug abuse within their school district with that in other school districts throughout Texas, respondents in all but one stratum of school districts indicated that the incidence of drug abuse within their district was low compared to other districts. As shown in Table XXIII, the majority of the respondents in Stratum 1 were undecided regarding the comparative incidence of drug abuse in their school district.

Although many of the respondents in Stratum 1 were undecided with regard to the incidence of drug abuse within their district as compared to other districts, more respondents indicated that they disagreed that the incidence was lower in their district than agreed with the statement. Respondents in Stratum 5 expressed strong agreement that the incidence of drug abuse among students in their school district was lower than in other school districts throughout Texas. Responses indicated that 21.6 percent of the
TABLE XXIII
RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                  | 3.15   | 3.06   | 2.84   | 2.59   | 2.34   |
Standard Deviation    | .892   | .953   | .984   | .909   | 1.10   |

*The incidence of drug abuse among students in this school district is relatively low as compared to other students in schools throughout Texas.
respondents in Stratum 5 strongly agreed that the incidence of drug abuse among students in their district was lower.

In response to the statement, "Drug abuse among students will increase significantly within the next few years," perceptions were varied. The greatest number of responses across strata were in the undecided category. These responses ranged from 27.7 percent in Stratum 5 to 45.0 percent in Stratum 4. The "agree" or "disagree" responses were closely balanced across Strata 2, 3, 4, and 5, as seen in Table XXIV.

The greatest variance in the "agree" or "disagree" categories was found in Stratum 1. Almost twice as many respondents disagreed with the statement (41.0 percent) as agreed (22.0 percent).

Alcohol abuse was seen as more serious than other forms of drug abuse in all school district strata. As seen in Table XXV, 30.4 percent to 35.9 percent of the respondents agreed that alcohol abuse was more serious among students in their school district than other forms of drug abuse.

Expressing strong agreement across all strata was 6.0 percent in Stratum 1, 8.8 percent in Stratum 2, 9.0 percent in Stratum 3, 13.7 percent in Stratum 4, and the highest response to "strongly agree," 18.9 percent in Stratum 5. Those indicating disagreement with the statement ranged from 17.0 percent in Stratum 4 to 32.4 percent in Stratum 2.
### TABLE XXIV
RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| Mean            | 3.18     | 2.96     | 3.00     | 3.05     | 2.90     |
| Standard Deviation | 0.825   | 0.933    | 0.896    | 0.856    | 0.894    |

*Drug abuse among students will increase significantly within the next few years.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6  9  27  21  28</td>
<td>6.0  8.8  9.0  13.7  18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>33  31  108  51  53</td>
<td>33.0  30.4  35.9  33.3  35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>33  25  82  52  36</td>
<td>33.0  24.5  27.2  34.0  24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>25  33  73  26  28</td>
<td>25.0  32.4  24.3  17.0  18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3  4  11  3  3</td>
<td>3.0  3.9  3.6  2.0  2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100  102  301  153  148</td>
<td>100  100  100  100  100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.86  2.92  2.78  2.60  2.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.964  1.07  1.03  .989  1.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Alcohol abuse among students is more serious than other forms of drug abuse in this school district.*
As shown in Table XXVI, most respondents view as erroneous the statement, "Drug abuse among students is primarily a problem with the high-achieving or top-ranking student." Responding to the "disagree" category were 62.7 percent of the respondents across all strata. Expressing strong disagreement with the statement were 14.9 percent of the respondents across all strata. Only 45 of the 804 respondents expressed agreement with the statement.

Table XXVII indicates the response to the statement, "A primary reason for drug abuse among students is the easy access to drugs." The range of responses which disagreed with this statement was 17.0 percent to 25.5 percent.

The majority of the respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement with the statement. Responses ranged from 45.1 percent to 67.0 percent in agreement with the statement. Sixty-seven respondents indicated strong agreement with the statement.

There was wide agreement to the statement, "The single most important factor leading to drug abuse is experimentation." Indicating agreement with the statement were 513 of the 804 respondents. This represented 63.3 percent of those responding to the statement. As shown in Table XXVIII, only 85 respondents indicated disagreement. The percentage range of those expressing agreement with the statement was 61.5 percent to 67.6 percent. This represented a rather uniform distribution, by strata, to the "agree" category.
### TABLE XXVI

**RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

| 3.93 | 3.97 | 3.87 | 3.81 | 3.79 |

**Standard Deviation**

| .728 | .682 | .724 | .849 | .740 |

*Drug abuse among students is primarily a problem with the high-achieving or top-ranking student.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Strata 1</th>
<th>Strata 2</th>
<th>Strata 3</th>
<th>Strata 4</th>
<th>Strata 5</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean: 2.42, 2.44, 2.61, 2.69, 2.71
Standard Deviation: 0.819, 0.950, 1.03, 1.03, 1.06

*A primary reason for drug abuse among students is the easy access to drugs.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.787</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The single most important factor leading to drug abuse is experimentation.*
Responses to the statement, "An important reason for drug abuse among students is the dissatisfaction or disillusionment with the prevailing educational system," are shown in Table XXIX. Respondents tended to disagree with this statement in all strata.

The range of responses in the "disagree" category were from 45.8 percent in Stratum 4 to 63.0 percent in Stratum 1. The greatest disagreement with the statement was seen in Stratum 1, with 63.0 percent in disagreement and 12.0 percent in strong disagreement with the statement.

Most respondents agreed with the statement, "An important reason for drug abuse is that the student feels a need 'to belong' or to be with the 'in group.'" As shown in Table XXX, the range of responses in the category "agree" was from 70.0 percent in Stratum 1 to 77.0 percent in Stratum 5.

Strong agreement was expressed by 13.0 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 13.7 percent in Stratum 2, 14.3 percent in Stratum 3, 9.2 percent in Stratum 4, and 13.5 percent in Stratum 5.

Responses to the statement, "The crime prevention and drug education program is meeting the individual needs of student," were mixed as can be seen in Table XXXI.

Many respondents were undecided with regard to the statement. Across strata, 32.4 percent to 41.0 percent of the respondents indicated that they were undecided. More
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>3  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1  0</td>
<td>4  4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>15 18</td>
<td>45 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9  20</td>
<td>58 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>63 55</td>
<td>161 70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12  9</td>
<td>33 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 102</td>
<td>301</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean:**
- Strongly Agree: 3.70
- Agree: 3.54
- Undecided: 3.58
- Disagree: 3.37
- Strongly Disagree: 3.57

**Standard Deviation:**
- Strongly Agree: .905
- Agree: .886
- Undecided: .921
- Disagree: .945
- Strongly Disagree: .942

*An important reason for drug abuse among students is the dissatisfaction or disillusionment with the prevailing educational system.*
### TABLE XXX

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>.589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An important reason for drug abuse is that the student feels a need "to belong" or to be with the "in group."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean 3.42 3.51 3.60 3.45 3.62
Standard Deviation .713 .898 .853 .888 .877

*The crime prevention and drug education program is meeting the individual needs of students.
respondents disagreed with the statement than agreed. To the response category "disagree," the range was 37.9 percent in Stratum 4 to 46.0 percent in Stratum 1. The strongest disagreement was expressed by Stratum 5, with 16.2 percent of the respondents strongly disagreeing with the statement.

As shown in Table XXXII, the majority of respondents in all strata agreed with the statement, "Small groups, honestly and freely discussing the problems of drugs, would do more toward solving the drug problem than would establishing a formal course of drug education in the curriculum." The range of responses in the "agree" category for Strata 1 through 4 was 61.0 percent, 57.9 percent, 56.8 percent, and 62.0 percent.

Only Stratum 5 fell below the 50.0 percent level of agreement. This was compensated for, however, by a 16.9 percent response in Stratum 5 to the category "strongly agree." The range of responses to the category "strongly agree" for Strata 1 through 4 was 9.2 percent by Stratum 4 to 15.7 percent by Stratum 2. Eighty-two respondents disagreed with the statement. Twelve respondents strongly disagreed.

Respondents in all strata indicated agreement above the 56.0 percent level to the statement, "No crime prevention and drug education program will be successful unless the students, themselves, are involved in the planning and implementation of the program." As shown in Table XXXIII, the
TABLE XXXII
RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers Number</th>
<th>Percent Strata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata 1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.815</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Small groups, honestly and freely discussing the problems of drugs, would do more toward solving the drug problem than would establishing a formal course of drug education in the curriculum.
### TABLE XXXIII
RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| Mean                   |        | 2.06   | 1.99   | 2.11   | 2.17   | 2.10   |        |        |        |        |        |
| Standard Deviation     |        | .750   | .790   | .898   | .849   | .879   |        |        |        |        |        |

*No crime prevention and drug education program will be successful unless the students, themselves, are involved in the planning and implementation of the program.
range of response, across Strata 1 through 5 was 68.0 percent, 63.7 percent, 57.2 percent, 56.2 percent, and 56.8 percent.

Those expressing "strong agreement" with the statement ranged from 17.0 percent in Stratum 1 to 22.5 percent in Stratum 2. The range of responses to the category "disagree" was 5.9 percent to 10.3 percent. Two percent or less indicated strong disagreement with the statement within any stratum.

In response to the statement, "One of the most effective means of combating the problem of drug abuse is to utilize ex-drug abusers as 'antidrug educators.'" The majority of respondents indicated agreement or strong agreement with the statement. As shown in Table XXXIV, 55.0 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1 and 55.4 percent of the respondents in Stratum 5 expressed agreement with the statement.

The stratum indicating the highest percentage of strong agreement was Stratum 2. Respondents in this stratum indicated 17.6 percent in strong agreement with the statement. The highest percentage of disagreement with the statement was in Strata 3 and 4. Stratum 3 respondents indicated 10.3
disagreement and Stratum 4 had 10.5 percent disagreement with the statement.

As shown in Table XXXV, the majority of respondents indicated agreement with the statement, "Students who abuse
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mean**

2.25  2.40  2.46  2.54  2.37

**Standard Deviation**

0.809 1.09 0.958 0.843 0.874

*One of the most effective means of combating the problem of drug abuse is to utilize ex-drug abusers as "antidrug educators."
TABLE XXXV
RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 14*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean          | 2.37   | 2.42   | 2.32   | 2.34   | 2.42   |
Standard Deviation | 1.05   | 1.00   | .905   | .860   | .926   |

*Students who abuse drugs tend to have a low self-concept.
drugs tend to have a low self-concept." Across Strata 1 through 5, respondents indicated 50.0, 53.9, 54.2, 56.2, and 54.7 percent agreement with the statement.

Indicating strong agreement with the statement, as reflected in Strata 1 through 5, was 18.0, 12.7, 14.3, 11.8, and 10.8 percent of the respondents. It was of interest to note that the largest percentage of respondents expressing agreement and strong agreement was found in Stratum 1, since they also indicated the greatest percentage of disagreement with the statement.

As shown in Table XXXVI, the major portion of the respondents agreed with the statement, "Students who have not clarified their values system are more likely to abuse drugs." Responding in the category "agree" were 76.0, 64.7, 71.8, 66.6, and 72.3 percent of the respondents in Strata 1 through 5.

Indicating strong agreement with the statement in Strata 1 through 5 was 18.0, 18.6, 14.0, 13.1, and 13.5 percent of the respondents. Respondents who disagreed with the statement were represented by 3.0, 5.9, 3.3, 5.2, and 2.7 percent of the respondents across Strata 1 through 5. Expressing strong disagreement with the statement was 2.0 percent of the respondents in Stratum 2, 0.3 percent in Stratum 3, and 0.7 percent in Stratum 4.

More respondents agreed with the statement, "Television commercials for drugs encourage a liberal attitude toward
### TABLE XXXVI

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 15*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Strata 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               | Mean    | 1.91 | 2.08 | 2.04 | 2.14 | 2.03 |
| Standard Deviation | .570 | .829 | .638 | .726 | .599 |

*Students who have not clarified their values system are more likely to abuse drugs.
drug abuse by students," than agreed. This agreement, however, did not constitute a majority of perceptions. As shown in Table XXXVII, respondents in Strata 1 through 5 indicating agreement with the statement represented 39.0, 37.3, 39.5, 41.2, and 46.6 percent of the respondents.

Conversely, 30.0, 25.5, 26.6, 22.8, and 20.3 percent of the respondents indicated disagreement with the statement. Respondents indicating the strongest agreement were those in Stratum 2. Indicating strong agreement in Stratum 2 was 9.8 percent of the respondents.

The majority of respondents indicated disagreement or strong disagreement with the statement, "Drug abuse by students today is no more serious than alcohol abuse by students in the 1950's." As reflected in Table XXXVIII, respondents in Strata 1 through 5 indicated 46.0, 43.1, 39.5, 41.8, and 42.6 percent disagreement. Indicating strong disagreement across Strata 1 through 5 was 8.0, 7.8, 11.3, 9.2, and 8.8 percent of the respondents.

Although the majority of responses fell within the disagree/strongly disagree category, there were those who agreed with the statement. The range of agreement to the statement was 17.0 percent in Stratum 1 to 25.5 percent in Stratum 2. Expressing strong agreement with the statement across the five strata were 4.0, 6.9, 5.3, 2.6, and 8.1 percent of the respondents.
TABLE XXXVII
RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean             | 2.91   | 2.75    | 2.79    | 2.78    | 2.68    |
Standard Deviation| .877   | 1.04    | .928    | .912    | .921    |

*Television commercials for drugs encourage a liberal attitude toward drug abuse by students.
TABLE XXXVIII
RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 17*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4  7  16 4  12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17 26 74 35 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>25 17 58 36 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>46 44 119 64 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>8  8  34 14 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 102 301 153 148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Standard Deviation
3.36 3.20 3.27 3.32 3.24
0.994 1.12 1.11 1.01 1.12

*Drug abuse by students today is no more serious than alcohol abuse by students in the 1950's.
In response to the statement, "Students abuse drugs as an escape from a world which they view as confusing, frustrating, ridiculous, and unjustified," the majority of respondents indicated agreement. As shown in Table XXXIX, 61.0, 51.1, 54.4, 55.5, and 58.1 percent of the respondents indicated agreement with the statement across the five strata. A small percentage disagreed with the statement. Indicating disagreement across Strata 1 through 5 were 15.0, 18.6, 14.0, 13.7, and 10.8 percent of the respondents.

An even smaller percentage of respondents indicated strong disagreement with the statement. Indicating strong disagreement with the statement were 2.9 percent of Stratum 2, 1.3 percent of Stratum 3, 2.0 percent of Stratum 4, and 2.0 percent of Stratum 5. Expressing strong agreement with the statement across the five strata were 9.0, 9.8, 11.0, 10.5, and 9.5 of the respondents.

As shown in Table XL, the majority of respondents across strata indicated disagreement or strong disagreement with the statement, "The provisions of state laws on possession of marijuana are too severe." Indicating strong disagreement were 20.0, 19.6, 20.4, 20.9, and 20.3 percent of the respondents across Strata 1 through 5.

Indicating disagreement with the statement were 47.0, 49.0, 38.9, 39.6, and 50.0 percent of respondents in Strata 1 through 5. Agreeing with the statement were 14.0, 12.7, 18.9, 17.0, and 10.8 percent of the respondents across the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students abuse drugs as an escape from a world which they view as confusing, frustrating, ridiculous, and unjustified.
### TABLE XL

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                           | 3.57     | 3.72     | 3.49     | 3.51     | 3.69     |
Standard Deviation             | 1.19     | .989     | 1.18     | 1.15     | 1.08     |

*The provisions of state laws on possession of marijuana are too severe.*
five strata. A small percentage of respondents indicated strong disagreement with the statement. Indicating strong disagreement were 8.0, 2.0, 5.6, 5.2, and 5.4 percent of the respondents across Strata 1 through 5.

In response to the statement, "The provisions of state laws for sale of marijuana are too severe," the majority of the respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Disagreeing with the statement across Strata 1 through 5 were 51.0, 52.0, 46.5, 48.4, and 49.4 percent of the respondents. As shown in Table XLI, a large percentage of respondents indicated strong disagreement with the statement.

Across Strata 1 through 5, 39.0, 34.3, 32.2, 30.1, and 28.4 percent of the respondents indicated strong disagreement with the statement. A small percentage of respondents indicated agreement with the statement. Indicating agreement across strata were 3.0, 3.9, 6.0, 5.2, and 1.4 percent of the respondents. Indicating strong agreement with the statement were 1.0, 2.0, 1.7, 3.9, and 3.4 percent of the respondents.

As shown in Table XLII, most respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "A school policy which authorizes principals to search student lockers for drug possession is desirable." Indicating agreement with the statement were 45.0 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 52.9 percent in Stratum 2, 49.6 percent in Stratum 3, and
### TABLE XLI

RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 20*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1  2  5  6  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3  4 18  8  2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6  8 41 19 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>51 53 140 74 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>39 35 97 46 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100 102 301 153 148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>.780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The provisions of state laws for sale of marijuana are too severe.*
### TABLE XLII

**RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A school policy which authorizes principals to search student lockers for drug possession is desirable.*
53.6 percent in Stratum 4. Respondents in Stratum 5 indicated 41.9 percent agreement with the statement; however, 25.7 percent of the respondents in Stratum 5 indicated strong agreement.

Indicating strong agreement in Strata 1 through 4 were 23.0, 21.6, 17.0, and 11.8 percent of the respondents. Disagreeing with the statement across Strata 1 through 5 were 14.0, 7.8, 9.6, 15.7, and 10.1 percent of the respondents. A small percentage indicated strong disagreement with the statement. Indicating strong disagreement were 2.0, 2.0, 4.3, 2.6, and 5.4 percent of the respondents in Strata 1 through 5.

As shown in Table XLIII, the majority of respondents indicated agreement with the statement, "All teachers, counselors, and administrative personnel should receive in-service training in crime prevention and drug education." Agreeing with the statement were 67.0 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 53.9 percent in Stratum 2, 59.2 percent in Stratum 3, 57.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 58.7 percent in Stratum 5.

Indicating strong agreement with the statement in Strata 1 through 5 were 18.0, 30.4, 21.9, 24.2, and 26.4 percent of the respondents. Expressing disagreement with the statement were 6.0, 2.9, 9.3, 6.5, and 3.4 percent of the respondents in Strata 1 through 5. The range of
### TABLE XLIII
RESPONSES OF TEACHERS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 22*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>148</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|               |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Mean          | 2.03    | 1.90    | 2.09    | 2.05    | 1.93    |         |         |         |         |         |         |
| Standard Deviation | .717   | .790    | .902    | .884    | .753    |         |         |         |         |         |         |

*All teachers, counselors, and administrative personnel should receive in-service training in crime prevention and drug education.
responses strongly disagreeing with the statement was 0.0 percent in Stratum 1 to 2.0 percent in Stratum 4.

Personal and Professional Data Pertaining to Principal Respondents

Principal respondents to the perception survey were asked to provide information about their sex, age, combined years of experience as a teacher or principal, and ethnic origin. Responses to questions related to personal and professional data are reported by strata. Five strata are presented according to the average daily attendance of each school district. Stratum 1 consisted of those school districts having an average daily attendance of less than 1,000 students. Stratum 2 included school districts with an average daily attendance of 1,001 to 2,000 students. Stratum 3 represented school districts with an average daily attendance of 2,001 to 5,000 students. Those school districts participating in the study with an average daily attendance of 5,001 to 15,000 were included in Stratum 4. If a school district had an average daily attendance of over 15,000, it was included in Stratum 5.

Sex

In the group of 119 principals responding to the survey, there were 114 males and 5 females. The males constituted the majority of the respondents with 95.8 percent. The
female respondents constituted the remaining 4.2 percent of those completing the survey.

**Age**

The principals' perception survey question related to age group provided four response categories. These categories were (1) 21 through 30, (2) 31 through 40, (3) 41 through 55, and (4) over 55. Table XLIV reflects the responses of the 119 principals by strata.

### TABLE XLIV

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA, BY STRATA, PERTAINING TO PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS' AGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male N = 114</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Female N = 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>0 0 1 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>6 11 5 2 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-55</td>
<td>22 12 14 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 55</td>
<td>8 9 5 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0 1 0 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 32 25 9 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 0 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across strata, 2 male and no female respondents indicated that they fell within the age range of 21 through 30. The 31 through 40 age group contained 31 male and 1 female respondents. There were 57 male and 2 female respondents.
within the age range of 41 through 55. The remaining 24 male and 2 female respondents were over 55 years of age.

Teaching Experience

Principals were asked to report the combined number of years teaching and principal experience. Four response categories were provided: (1) 1 through 5 years of experience, (2) 6 through 10 years of experience, (3) 11 through 20 years of experience, and (4) over 20 years of experience. The responses to this item in the survey can be seen in Table XLV.

TABLE XLV

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA, BY STRATA, PERTAINING TO PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS' EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience</th>
<th>Male N = 114</th>
<th>Female N = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata 1</td>
<td>Strata 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across strata, 3 male and no female respondents indicated that they possessed experience which fell within the 1
through 5 year range. Eight male and no female respondents indicated experience which fell within the range of 6 through 10 years. Reporting experience which fell within the 11 through 20 year range were 44 male and 1 female principal. The remaining 59 male and 3 female respondents reported experience in excess of 20 years.

**Ethnic Origin**

Principals were asked to respond to the statement, "I belong to the following group by birth." Six response categories were provided which included (1) American Indian, (2) Negro/Black, (3) Mexican American/Spanish surnamed, (4) Oriental, (5) all others, and (6) "I prefer not to answer." Table XLVI reflects the responses to the question regarding ethnic origin.

Across strata, 1 male and no female respondents indicated an ethnic origin of American Indian. Six male and no female respondents indicated an ethnic origin of Negro or Black. Mexican-American or Spanish-surnamed respondents were represented by 2 male and 1 female principal. There was 1 male and no female respondents to the category "Oriental." The majority of respondents indicated that their ethnic origin fell outside those specified. Therefore, these individuals indicated their ethnic origin as "all others." Responding to the "all others" category were 104 male and 4 female principals. To accommodate those
TABLE XLVI

PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL DATA, BY STRATA, PERTAINING TO PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS' ETHNIC ORIGIN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>Male N = 114</th>
<th>Female N = 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata 1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>Strata 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro/Black</td>
<td>1 4 1 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican American/Spanish surname</td>
<td>1 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0 0 0 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>33 27 23 8 10</td>
<td>1 2 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I prefer not to answer</td>
<td>0 0 1 1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36 32 25 9 12</td>
<td>1 2 0 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

individuals who did not wish to indicate their ethnic origin, a sixth response category was included, titled, "I prefer not to answer." Electing to respond to this category were 3 male and no female respondents.

Principals' Perceptions of Drug Abuse

Principals were requested to complete the same perception survey which the teachers completed. Survey instruments were completed by 119 principals.

In response to the statement, "There is no drug abuse among students in this school district," the majority of the respondents disagreed. Disagreeing with the statement were
64.9 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 51.5 percent in Stratum 2, 57.8 percent in Stratum 3, 62.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 76.9 percent in Stratum 5. Respondents in three strata indicated strong disagreement with the statement as shown in Table XLVII.

Expressing strong disagreement were 32.4 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 33.4 percent in Stratum 2, and 30.8 percent in Stratum 3. Principals in four strata agreed with the statement. Indicating agreement were 9.1 percent of the respondents in Stratum 2, 3.8 percent in Stratum 3, 12.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 15.4 percent in Stratum 5. Principals in only two strata strongly agreed that there was no drug abuse among students in their school district. Strong agreement was expressed by 3.0 percent of the principals in Stratum 2 and 3.8 percent of the principals in Stratum 3.

The majority of the principals in Strata 3, 4, and 5 either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "The incidence of drug abuse among students in this school district is relatively low as compared to other students in schools throughout Texas." Indicating agreement, as shown in Table XLVIII were 50.0 percent of the respondents in Stratum 3, 50.0 percent of the respondents in Stratum 4, and 76.9 percent of the respondents in Stratum 5.

Respondents in Stratum 1 indicated 43.2 percent in agreement with the statement, 43.2 percent undecided, and
### TABLE XLVII

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 1*

| Type of Response  | Number | | | | | Percent | | | | |
|-------------------|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|                   | Strata | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5      | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   |
| Strongly Agree    |        | 0   | 1   | 1   | 0   | 0      | 0.0 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Agree             |        | 0   | 3   | 1   | 1   | 2      | 0.0 | 9.1 | 3.8 | 12.5| 15.4|
| Undecided         |        | 1   | 1   | 1   | 2   | 1      | 2.7 | 3.0 | 3.8 | 25.0| 7.7 |
| Disagree          |        | 24  | 17  | 15  | 5   | 10     | 64.9| 51.5| 57.8| 62.5| 76.9|
| Strongly Disagree |        | 12  | 11  | 8   | 0   | 0      | 32.4| 33.4| 30.8| 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Total             |        | 37  | 33  | 26  | 8   | 13     | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

**Mean**

- 4.30
- 4.03
- 4.07
- 3.50
- 3.62

**Standard Deviation**

- .520
- 1.02
- .935
- .756
- .768

*There is no drug abuse among students in this school district.*
TABLE XLVIII

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata 1</td>
<td>Strata 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>.494</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The incidence of drug abuse among students in this school district is relatively low as compared to other students in schools throughout Texas.
10.8 percent in disagreement with the statement. Indicating agreement in Stratum 2 was 27.2 percent of the respondents; however, 6.1 percent indicated strong agreement. Indicating disagreement were 30.3 percent and strong disagreement 6.1 percent of the respondents in Stratum 2. The greatest agreement with the statement was found in Stratum 5 and the greatest disagreement in Stratum 2.

Seventy-five percent of the respondents in Stratum 4 indicated disagreement with the statement, "Drug abuse among students will increase significantly within the next few years," as shown in Table XLIX. Respondents in Stratum 2 indicated the greatest agreement with the statement. Indicating agreement with the statement was 33.3 percent of the respondents in Stratum 2.

Conversely, 42.5 percent of the respondents in Stratum 2 disagreed with the statement. The majority of respondents in Stratum 3 disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement. Indicating disagreement in Stratum 3 was 50.0 percent of the respondents. Indicating strong disagreement in Stratum 3 was 3.8 percent.

In response to the statement, "Alcohol abuse among students is more serious than other forms of drug abuse in this school district," the majority of respondents in Strata 1, 3, and 4 either agreed or strongly agreed. As shown in Table L, 30.3 percent of Stratum 2 disagreed with the statement and only 18.2 percent agreed.
TABLE XLIX

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2 0 0 0 0</td>
<td>5.4 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10 11 4 0 3</td>
<td>27.0 33.3 15.4 0.0 23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10 8 8 2 5</td>
<td>27.0 24.2 30.8 25.0 38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14 14 13 6 3</td>
<td>37.8 42.5 50.0 75.0 23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 2</td>
<td>2.8 0.0 3.8 0.0 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 33 26 8 13</td>
<td>100 100 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.809</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Drug abuse among students will increase significantly within the next few years.
TABLE L
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                      | 2.73   | 2.88  | 2.54  | 1.88  | 2.85  |
Standard Deviation        | .962   | .992  | 9.84  | 1.13  | 1.28  |

*Alcohol abuse among students is more serious than other forms of drug abuse in this school district.
The strongest agreement was found in Stratum 4 where 50.0 percent of the respondents were in strong agreement with the statement.

In response to the statement, "Drug abuse among students is primarily a problem with the high-achieving or top-ranking student," the majority of respondents across strata were in disagreement or strong disagreement. As seen in Table LI, Stratum 2 was the only stratum with responses in the "strongly agree" and "agree" categories. Three percent of the respondents strongly agreed and 3.0 percent agreed with the statement. Stratum 5 indicated the highest degree of disagreement, with 76.9 percent in disagreement and 23.1 percent in strong disagreement with the statement.

Table LII indicates the response to the statement, "A primary reason for drug abuse among students is the easy access to drugs." The majority of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with this statement.

Expressing agreement with this statement across Strata 1 through 5 were 54.1, 42.4, 50.0, 62.5, and 61.5 percent of the respondents. Indicating disagreement were 37.8, 27.3, 19.2, 12.5, and 23.1 percent of the respondents in Strata 1 through 5. The greatest disagreement with the statement was expressed in Stratum 1. The greatest agreement with the statement was found in Stratum 4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 3.95, 3.88, 3.92, 3.75, 4.23
Standard Deviation: 0.524, 0.740, 0.484, 0.707, 0.439

*Drug abuse among students is primarily a problem with the high-achieving or top-ranking student.*
TABLE LII
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2 4 0 1 0</td>
<td>5.4 12.1 0.0 12.5 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20 14 13 5 8</td>
<td>54.1 42.4 50.0 62.5 61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1 5 8 1 2</td>
<td>2.7 15.2 30.8 12.5 15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14 9 5 1 3</td>
<td>37.8 27.3 19.2 12.5 23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0 1 0 0 0</td>
<td>0.0 3.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 33 26 8 13</td>
<td>100 100 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                      | 2.73 2.67 2.69 2.25 2.62 |
Standard Deviation        | 1.05 1.11 .788 .886 .870 |

*A primary reason for drug abuse among students is the easy access to drugs.
In response to the statement, "The single most important factor leading to drug abuse is experimentation," the majority of respondents were in agreement. As shown in Table LIII, 67.7 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 63.6 percent in Stratum 2, 65.4 percent in Stratum 3, 62.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 84.6 percent in Stratum 5 were in agreement with the statement.

Only one individual expressed strong disagreement with the statement. This individual was in Stratum 2. Expressing strong agreement with the statement were 8.1 percent in Stratum 1, 9.2 percent in Stratum 2, 11.5 percent in Stratum 3, 12.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 7.7 percent in Stratum 5.

The majority of principals was in disagreement with the statement, "An important reason for drug abuse among students is the dissatisfaction or disillusionment with the prevailing educational system." As shown in Table LIV, the greatest percentage of response to the category "disagree" was in Stratum 1. Also expressing disagreement with the statement were 69.7 percent of the respondents in Stratum 2, 69.2 percent in Stratum 3, 62.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 53.8 percent in Stratum 5.

No response was indicated for the category "strongly agree." Expressing agreement with the statement were 13.5 percent of Stratum 1, 6.1 percent of Stratum 2, 15.4 percent of Stratum 3, 12.5 percent of Stratum 4, and 15.4 percent of Stratum 5. Respondents in Strata 2 and 4 expressed 12.1 percent and 12.5 percent strong disagreement with the statement.
TABLE LIII
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
<td>1  2  3  4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3  3  3  1  1</td>
<td>8.1 9.2 11.5 12.5 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>25 21 17 5 11</td>
<td>67.6 63.6 65.4 62.5 84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4  4  4  1  0</td>
<td>10.8 12.1 15.4 12.5 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5  4  2  1  1</td>
<td>13.5 12.1 7.7 12.5 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0  1  0  0  0</td>
<td>0.0 3.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 33 26 8 13</td>
<td>100 100 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean          | 2.30 2.36 2.19 2.25 2.07 |
Standard Deviation | .812 .929 .749 .886 .641 |

*The single most important factor leading to drug abuse is experimentation.
TABLE LIV
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.838</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An important reason for drug abuse among students is the dissatisfaction or disillusionment with the prevailing educational system.
Respondents in Stratum 4 indicated 100 percent agreement with the statement, "An important reason for drug abuse is that the student feels a need 'to belong' or to be with the 'in group.'" As shown in Table LV, the majority of the respondents in each stratum indicated agreement with the statement. Respondents in Stratum 1 indicated 81.1 percent agreement, Stratum 2, 87.8 percent, Stratum 3, 69.3 percent, and Stratum 5, 69.2 percent agreement with the statement. No responses were recorded in the "strongly disagree" category.

No one strongly agreed with the statement, "The crime prevention and drug education program is meeting the individual needs of students." As shown in Table LVI, the stratum indicating the greatest agreement was Stratum 5 (38.5 percent).

Indicating disagreement with the statement were 56.8 percent of Stratum 1, 51.5 percent of Stratum 2, 30.8 percent of Stratum 3, 62.5 percent of Stratum 4, and 7.7 percent of Stratum 5. Both Strata 3 and 5 indicated 23.0 percent "strong disagreement" with the statement.

Responses to the statement, "Small groups, honestly and freely discussing the problems of drugs, would do more toward solving the drug problem than would establishing a formal course of drug education in the curriculum," were in the affirmative. As shown in Table LVII, 48.6 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 57.6 percent in Stratum 2,
TABLE LV
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                  | 2.16 | 2.00 | 2.16 | 2.00 | 2.46 |
Standard Deviation     | .501 | .354 | .653 | 0.0  | .776 |

*An important reason for drug abuse is that the student feels a need "to belong" or to be with the "in group."
TABLE LVI
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                  | 3.54| 3.61| 3.69| 3.38| 3.15|
Standard Deviation    | 0.803| 0.659| 0.928| 0.916| 1.21|

*The crime prevention and drug education program is meeting the individual needs of students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>73.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.893</td>
<td>.893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.788</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.855</td>
<td>.855</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Small groups, honestly and freely discussing the problems of drugs, would do more toward solving the drug problem than would establishing a formal course of drug education in the curriculum.
73.2 percent in Stratum 3, 75 percent in Stratum 4, and 69.2 percent in Stratum 5 indicated agreement with the statement. Stratum 4 respondents indicated the strongest agreement (75.0 percent) and strong agreement (12.5 percent). No one in Stratum 4 indicated disagreement or strong disagreement. Expressing the greatest disagreement was Stratum 1 (21.6 percent). Only one person indicated strong disagreement with the statement. This individual represented 3.8 percent of the respondents in Stratum 3.

The majority of respondents were in agreement with the need to involve students in the planning and implementation of programs in crime prevention and drug education. As shown in Table LVIII, 51.4 percent of the respondents in stratum 1, 66.7 percent in Stratum 2, 69.2 percent in Stratum 3, 62.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 53.8 percent in Stratum 5 agreed with the statement, "No crime prevention and drug education program will be successful unless the students, themselves, are involved in the planning and implementation of the program." No responses were recorded in the category, "strongly disagree." No disagreement was recorded in Stratum 4; however, 24.3 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 12.1 percent in Stratum 2, 19.3 percent in Stratum 3, and 7.7 percent in Stratum 5 disagreed with the statement. Twenty-five percent of the respondents in Stratum 4 indicated strong agreement with the statement.
TABLE LVIII
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number 1</th>
<th>Number 2</th>
<th>Number 3</th>
<th>Number 4</th>
<th>Number 5</th>
<th>Percent 1</th>
<th>Percent 2</th>
<th>Percent 3</th>
<th>Percent 4</th>
<th>Percent 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                     | 2.57     | 2.27     | 2.42     | 1.88     | 2.23     |
Standard Deviation       | .959     | .801     | .857     | .641     | .832     |

*No crime prevention and drug education program will be successful unless the students, themselves, are involved in the planning and implementation of the program.
In response to the statement, "One of the most effective means of combating the problem of drug abuse is to utilize ex-drug abusers as 'antidrug educators,'" 61.5 percent of the respondents in Stratum 5 and 51.4 percent in Stratum 1 agreed with the statement. As shown in Table LIX, only 12.5 percent of the respondents in Stratum 4 agreed with the statement. The majority of respondents in Stratum 4 were undecided regarding the statement; however, 25.0 percent of the respondents in this stratum disagreed with the statement. The stratum indicating the greatest percentage of responses to the category "disagree" was Stratum 3 (30.8 percent).

The majority of the respondents in Strata 2 through 5 agreed with the statement, "Students who abuse drugs tend to have a low self-concept." As shown in Table LX, 63.5 percent of the respondents in Stratum 2, 61.5 percent in Stratum 3, 62.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 61.5 percent in Stratum 5, were in agreement with the statement.

Indicating strong agreement were 8.2 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 15.2 percent in Stratum 2, 11.5 percent in Stratum 3, 12.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 15.4 percent in Stratum 5. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents in Stratum 1 disagreed with the statement. No responses were recorded in the category "strongly disagree."

A large percentage of the respondents were in agreement with the statement, "Students who have not clarified their
TABLE LIx
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number Strata</th>
<th>Percent Strata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean: 2.68 2.91 3.23 3.13 2.54
Standard Deviation: 0.944 1.10 1.07 0.641 0.776

*One of the most effective means of combating the problem of drug abuse is to utilize ex-drug abusers as "antidrug educators."


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                  | 2.65| 2.12| 2.27| 2.13| 2.15|
Standard Deviation    | .978| .740| .827| .641| .801|

*Students who abuse drugs tend to have a low self-concept.
values system are more likely to abuse drugs." As shown in Table LXI, 83.8 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1 agreed with the statement. Indicating agreement in Stratum 2 was 75.7 percent. The greatest percentage of agreement was found in Stratum 3 (84.7 percent). Stratum 4 and Stratum 5 indicated 75.0 percent and 61.5 percent agreement. Indicating strong agreement with the statement were 5.4 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 15.2 percent in Stratum 2, 11.5 percent in Stratum 3, 12.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 7.7 percent in Stratum 5. No responses were recorded in the category "strongly disagree."

In response to the statement, "Television commercials for drugs encourage a liberal attitude toward drug abuse by students," 23.1 percent of the respondents in Stratum 5 strongly agreed. As shown in Table LXII, the range of agreement in Strata 1 through 4 was 34.6 percent in Stratum 3 to 50.0 percent in Stratum 4. Only one stratum indicated strong disagreement. One respondent in Stratum 3, or 3.8 percent, strongly disagreed with the statement. The three strata indicating the largest percentage of disagreement were Stratum 2 (27.3 percent), Stratum 4 (25.0 percent), and Stratum 1 (24.4 percent).

Respondents tended to disagree rather than agree with the statement, "Drug abuse by students today is no more serious than alcohol abuse by students in the 1950's."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.392</td>
<td>.535</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Students who have not clarified their values system are more likely to abuse drugs.
### TABLE LXII

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Mean: 2.76, 2.79, 2.69, 2.75, 2.46
- Standard Deviation: 0.863, 0.893, 0.928, 0.886, 1.05

*Television commercials for drugs encourage a liberal attitude toward drug abuse by students.
As shown in Table LXIII, 45.9 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1 indicated disagreement, 54.5 in Stratum 2, 46.2 percent in Stratum 3, 50.0 percent in Stratum 4, and 38.5 percent in Stratum 5. Conversely, 40.5 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1 agreed with the statement. Indicating agreement in Strata 2 through 5 were 21.2 percent, 19.2 percent, 25.0 percent, and 30.7 percent of the respondents.

Indicating agreement with the statement, "Students abuse drugs as an escape from a world which they view as confusing, frustrating, ridiculous, and unjustified," were 59.5 percent of Stratum 1, 57.6 percent of Stratum 2, 53.9 percent of Stratum 3, 37.5 percent of Stratum 4, and 46.2 percent of Stratum 5. As shown in Table LXIV, no responses were recorded in the category "strongly disagree." Indicating strong agreement with the statement were 5.4 percent of Stratum 1, 9.1 percent of Stratum 2, 7.7 percent of Stratum 3, and 7.7 percent of Stratum 5. Disagreeing with the statement were 18.9 percent of Stratum 1, 12.1 percent of Stratum 2, 11.5 percent of Stratum 3, 12.5 percent of Stratum 4, and 15.3 percent of Stratum 5.

Respondents tended to disagree with the statement, "The provisions of state laws on possession of marijuana are too severe." As shown in Table LXV, 51.4 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 18.2 percent in Stratum 2, 38.4 percent in Stratum 3, 25.0 percent in Stratum 4, and 38.5 percent in Stratum 5 disagreed with the statement. Indicating strong
TABLE LXIII

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 17*

| Type of Response | Number | | | | | | Percent | | | | |
|------------------|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                  | 1      | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Strongly Agree   | 1      | 2  | 1  | 0  | 0  | 2.8| 6.1| 3.8| 0.0| 0.0|      |      |      |      |      |
| Agree            | 15     | 7  | 5  | 2  | 4  | 40.5|21.2|19.2|25.0|30.7|      |      |      |      |      |
| Undecided        | 4      | 4  | 4  | 1  | 2  | 10.8|12.1|15.4|12.5|15.4|      |      |      |      |      |
| Disagree         | 17     | 18 | 12 | 4  | 5  | 45.9|54.5|46.2|50.0|38.5|      |      |      |      |      |
| Strongly Disagree| 0      | 2  | 4  | 1  | 2  | 0.0 |6.1 |15.4|12.5|15.4|      |      |      |      |      |
| **Total**        | 37     | 33 | 26 | 8  | 13 | 100 |100 |100 |100 |100 |      |      |      |      |      |
| **Mean**         | 3.0    | 3.33|3.50|3.50|3.39|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| **Standard Deviation** | 1.0 | 1.08|1.11|1.07|1.12|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

*Drug abuse by students today is no more serious than alcohol abuse by students in the 1950's.
TABLE LXIV
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 18*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                  | 2.49   | 2.36   | 2.42   | 2.75   | 2.54   |
Standard Deviation    | .870   | .822   | .809   | .707   | .877   |

*Students abuse drugs as an escape from a world which they view as confusing, frustrating, ridiculous, and unjustified.
### TABLE LXV

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1  2  3</td>
<td>4  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1  5  0</td>
<td>0  0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>2  1  6</td>
<td>1  2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3  21 2</td>
<td>2  2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19  6 10</td>
<td>2  5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12  0  8</td>
<td>3  4 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37  33 26</td>
<td>8  13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean     | 4.05 3.85 3.77 3.88 3.85 |
| Standard Deviation | .941 .906 1.14 1.13 1.07 |

*The provisions of state laws on possession of marijuana are too severe.*
disagreement with the statement were 32.0 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 30.8 percent in Stratum 3, 37.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 30.7 percent in Stratum 5. The largest percentage of agreement with the statement in a single stratum was found in Stratum 3 (23.1 percent).

A large percentage of respondents expressed disagreement or strong disagreement with the statement, "The provisions of state laws for the sale of marijuana are too severe." As shown in Table LXVI, a small percentage of respondents strongly agreed or agreed with the statement.

Indicating disagreement with the statement were 43.2 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 54.5 percent in Stratum 2, 50.0 percent in Stratum 3, 37.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 46.2 percent in Stratum 5. Respondents indicating strong disagreement across strata were 43.2 percent in Stratum 1, 39.4 percent in Stratum 2, 42.4 percent in Stratum 3, 50.0 percent in Stratum 4, and 23.1 percent in Stratum 5.

In response to the statement, "A school board policy which authorizes principals to search student lockers for drug possession is desirable," the majority of the respondents either agreed or strongly agreed. As shown in Table LXVII, 36.8 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 42.4 percent in Stratum 2, 57.7 percent in Stratum 3, 62.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 46.2 percent in Stratum 5 agreed with the statement.
TABLE LXVI
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 20*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1 0 0 0 1</td>
<td>2.7 0.0 0.0 0.0 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>1 0 1 0 1</td>
<td>2.7 0.0 3.8 0.0 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>3 2 1 1 2</td>
<td>8.2 6.1 3.8 12.5 15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16 18 13 3 6</td>
<td>43.2 54.5 50.0 37.5 46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>16 13 11 4 3</td>
<td>43.2 39.4 42.4 50.0 23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 33 26 8 13</td>
<td>100 100 100 100 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.22 4.33 4.30 4.38 3.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>.917 .595 .736 .744 1.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The provisions of state laws for sale of marijuana are too severe.
TABLE LXVII
RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 21*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td>Strata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                   | 1.76   | 1.91     | 1.85     | 1.88     | 2.15     |
Standard Deviation      | .683   | .980     | .732     | .641     | 1.14     |

*A school policy which authorizes principals to search student lockers for drug possession is desirable.
Indicating strong agreement with the statement were 35.1 percent of Stratum 1, 39.4 percent of Stratum 2, 30.8 percent of Stratum 3, 25.0 percent of Stratum 4, and 30.8 percent of Stratum 5. No responses were recorded in the "strongly disagree" category.

The majority of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "All teachers, counselors, and administrative personnel should receive in-service training in crime prevention and drug education." As shown in Table XLVIII, 70.3 percent of the respondents in Stratum 1, 60.6 percent in Stratum 2, 38.5 percent in Stratum 3, 87.5 percent in Stratum 4, and 61.5 percent in Stratum 5 were in agreement with the statement. Indicating strong agreement with the statement were 10.8 percent of Stratum 1, 24.2 percent of Stratum 2, 38.5 percent of Stratum 3, and 30.8 percent of Stratum 5. No response was recorded in the "strongly disagree" category.


**TABLE LXVIII**

RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS, BY STRATA, TO PERCEPTION SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 22*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th></th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4 8 10 0 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8 24.2 38.5 0.0 30.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26 20 10 7 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>70.3 60.6 38.5 87.5 61.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>4 2 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8 6.1 7.7 12.5 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>3 3 4 0 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1 9.1 15.3 0.0 7.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0 0 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 33 26 8 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>100 100 100 100 100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean                      | 2.16 2.00 2.00 | 2.13 | 1.85 |
Standard Deviation         | .727 .829 1.06 | .354 | .801 |

*All teachers, counselors, and administrative personnel should receive in-service training in crime prevention and drug education.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The problem of this study was to determine the extent to which the Texas Education Agency and selected school districts have implemented the legislative provisions of House Bill 467. The purpose of the study was twofold: first, to describe the sequential development of the crime prevention and drug education program by the Texas Education Agency as mandated by House Bill 467; and second, to determine the current status of the crime prevention and drug education program in selected school districts. It was further proposed that this study would provide information which would assist the Texas Education Agency in providing answers to the following questions concerning the crime prevention and drug education program: (I) Has the application of House Bill 467 resulted in increased cost to the local school district? (II) Has the Texas Education Agency provided adequate leadership in developing and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program?
(III) What are the problems which are of concern to administrators in developing and implementing crime prevention and drug education program? (IV) What methods and procedures have been utilized in the planning, implementation, and assessment of teacher in-service training programs in crime prevention and drug education? (V) What factors are included in school board policy? (VI) What types of instructional materials are used? (VII) How were teachers selected? (VIII) What time structure is utilized for instruction? (IX) What evaluation procedures are used? (X) What are the perceptions of principals and their staffs toward drug abuse by students?

The review of the literature and related research is presented in the following sequence: (1) the legislative background, (2) school district surveys in Texas, and (3) related federal and state programs.

To gather data related to the questions posed in the statement of the purposes of the study, two survey instruments were developed, with the assistance of an advisory panel. The survey instruments were then validated by a nine-member jury panel. One survey instrument, developed to determine the perceptions of principals and their staffs toward drug abuse by students, was administered twice to a group of principals and teachers attending graduate school at North Texas State University. The purpose of administering the instrument to this group was to establish the reliability
of the instrument. Following the establishment of its reliability and validity, the perception survey instrument was mailed to 1,184 teachers and 149 principals in 19 school districts, one located in each of 19 education service center regions (see Appendix, p. 264). The 19 school districts participating in the study were divided into five strata. Strata were determined on the basis of average daily attendance. Stratum 5 included school districts with less than 1,000 students in average daily attendance. Stratum 4 was composed of school districts with 1,001 to 2,000 students in average daily attendance. Comprising Stratum 3 were those school districts with 2,001 to 5,000 students in average daily attendance. Stratum 2 included school districts with 5,001 to 15,000 students in average daily attendance. Stratum 1 included school districts with average daily attendance above 15,000. A survey instrument, a letter requesting participation in the study, and a self-addressed, postage-paid return envelope were mailed to each of the 1,184 teachers and 149 principals. This procedure resulted in a return of 804 usable survey instruments from teachers and 119 usable survey instruments from principals.

A second survey instrument was utilized to gather data related to the current status of the crime prevention and drug education program in the nineteen school districts participating in the study. The second instrument was a
semi-structured personal interview designed to answer the first nine questions posed in the statement of the purposes in Chapter I. Nineteen interviews were conducted, one in each of the nineteen school districts participating in the study. The individual interviewed in each district was the person who had been assigned primary responsibility for coordination of the drug education program in that district.

In the presentation of findings, Chapter IV, tables are used to report data, by strata, which were gathered through the use of the two survey instruments. These data are reported in the form of frequency of responses, percentage of response, mean, and standard deviation.

Findings

A survey of the literature reveals the following findings:

1. House Bill 467 underwent extensive revision between the time the original bill was introduced by Representative Joe Golman of Dallas and its final passage by the Sixty-First Texas Legislature.

2. No state funds were provided in support of House Bill 467 from the date of its enactment in 1969 until September, 1973.

3. Students do not possess a high percentage of accurate information about drugs.
4. There is a wide difference between teacher attitude toward drug usage and student attitude. Students possess a more liberal attitude toward drug usage.

5. A State Program on Drug Abuse office has been established to coordinate the efforts of all state agencies in the area of drug abuse prevention and treatment.

Data obtained from the investigation of the sequential development of the crime prevention and drug education program by the Texas Education Agency and pervasive underlying theories upon which the program is based show the following:

1. State-wide goals and objectives for the crime prevention and drug education program in Texas public schools are revised annually and set forth in the Texas Education Agency's State Plan for Crime Prevention and Drug Education.

2. One crime prevention and drug education consultant is assigned to each of the twenty regional education service centers. These twenty consultants are expected to assist 1,147 school districts develop their crime prevention and drug education curriculum.

3. A team approach has been used to initiate the crime prevention and drug education program in the public schools. Each school district sent one administrator, one teacher or counselor, and one student to regional workshops for training in crime prevention and drug education. They, in turn, were to return to their district to conduct in-service training for other staff members.
4. Materials related to the crime prevention and drug education program were developed, printed, and distributed to parents, teachers, administrators, and students.

5. No state curriculum guide has been developed or adopted by the Texas Education Agency. Since all school districts are different, with differing needs, each school district has been encouraged to develop its own plan of action.

6. The central themes or areas of emphasis for the crime prevention and drug education program are (a) decision-making, including values clarification, (b) interpersonal relations, (c) attitudes toward and knowledge about crime and juvenile delinquency, and (d) attitudes toward and knowledge about drugs.

To determine the current status of the crime prevention and drug education program in the nineteen school districts participating in the study, nine questions were formulated. The questions have been answered here and reviewed in terms of the findings in Chapter IV.

I. Has the application of House Bill 467 resulted in increased cost to the local school district?

Fourteen of the nineteen respondents, or 73.7 percent, indicated that the application of House Bill 467 had resulted in increased cost to the school district. Acquisition of materials was indicated as one area of increased cost by twelve of the respondents, or 63.2 percent. Staff
development was indicated by four respondents and added staff by two respondents as factors contributing to increased cost for the school district.

II. Has the Texas Education Agency provided adequate leadership in developing and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program?

Thirteen, or 68.4 percent, of the respondents perceived the guidelines for program development and implementation to be adequate. Two (10.5 percent) of the respondents were undecided, while four (21.0 percent) did not perceive the guidelines to be adequate.

III. What are the problems which are of concern to administrators in developing and implementing crime prevention and drug education programs?

Providing in-service staff training was reported as an administrative problem by ten, or 52.6 percent, of the nineteen respondents. Five (26.3 percent) of the respondents identified teacher resistance as an administrative problem. Material acquisition was mentioned by six (31.6 percent) of the respondents as an administrative problem. Five (26.3 percent) of the respondents indicated financing of the program to be an administrative problem.

IV. What methods and procedures have been utilized in planning, implementation, and assessment of teacher in-service training programs in crime prevention and drug education?
Across strata, eight, or 42.1 percent, of the respondents indicated that the director of instruction was assigned primary responsibility for teacher in-service training. In school districts with less than 1,000 students in average daily attendance, three, or 50 percent, of the respondents indicated that the superintendent assumed primary responsibility for teacher in-service training. Two counselors, two principals, and one health and physical education supervisor were assigned primary responsibility for teacher in-service training. In two school districts, a program coordinator for the drug education program had been employed and assigned primary responsibility for teacher in-service training. Fourteen, or 73.7 percent, of the respondents indicated that in-service training in crime prevention and drug education was provided for all teachers system-wide. Fourteen, or 73.7 percent, of the respondents also indicated that the content of in-service training for teachers was determined by central office staff, principals, and teachers through cooperative planning. Sixteen, or 84.2 percent, of the respondents perceived in-service training in crime prevention and drug education as beneficial in helping teachers and students establish better understanding and communication skills. The same number of respondents perceived the cooperation and assistance given by the staff members of the regional education service centers in developing in-service training programs in crime prevention and drug education as
beneficial. All nineteen respondents indicated that they had utilized the regional education service center drug coordinator to provide in-service training for teachers. Fourteen, or 73.7 percent, indicated the use of outside consultants for teacher in-service training. Twelve, or 73.2 percent, of the respondents reported the use of local school district personnel in providing teacher in-service training. Teacher observation was indicated by eighteen, or 94.7 percent, of the respondents as the primary means of assessing the effectiveness of teacher in-service training and the overall program.

V. What factors are included in school board policy?

School board policies were developed around two areas of emphasis: (1) student possession of drugs or narcotics while on school premises, and (2) the instructional program on crime prevention and drug education. Six, or 31.6 percent, of the school boards had developed board policies relative to the instructional program in crime prevention and drug education. Twelve, or 63.2 percent, had developed policies relative to student possession of drugs or narcotics while on school premises.

VI. What types of instructional materials are used?

All respondents indicated that they had used teacher-made, regional education service center, and commercial materials in their crime prevention and drug education programs.
VII. How were teachers selected?
Thirteen, or 68.2 percent, of the respondents indicated that teachers for the crime prevention and drug education program, were selected on the basis of subject area.

VIII. What time structure is utilized for instruction?
All respondents indicated that they were utilizing an interdisciplinary approach to their instructional program on crime prevention and drug education. The time structure varied considerably, depending on the grade level and subject area in which it was included. No rigid time element was provided by any school district responding.

IX. What evaluation procedures were used?
Eighteen, or 94.7 percent, of the respondents indicated that teacher observation was the primary means of assessing the effectiveness of the crime prevention and drug education program.

Data from the perception survey questionnaire completed by principal (N = 119) and teacher (N = 804) respondents revealed the following findings:

1. Almost all of the teacher respondents indicated that they perceived some incidence of drug abuse among students in their school district. Only a small percentage of the respondents, less than 8.8 percent in each stratum, indicated that they perceived no drug abuse among students in their school district. Most principals perceived some incidence of drug abuse in their school district. A larger
percentage, 15.4 percent in Stratum 5 and 12.5 percent in Stratum 4, indicated that they perceived no drug abuse among students than was indicated by the teacher respondents.

2. Both teachers and principals tended to agree that the incidence of drug abuse among students in their school district was relatively low as compared to other students in school districts throughout Texas.

3. Approximately the same percentage of teachers in Strata 2 through 5 perceived that drug abuse among students would increase significantly within the next few years as perceived that it would not. Forty-one percent of the teachers in Stratum 1 perceived that drug abuse would not increase, while 22 percent perceived that it would increase significantly. The major percentage of principals were undecided or perceived that drug abuse would not increase significantly within the next few years.

4. Both teachers and principals tended to perceive alcohol abuse among students as a more serious problem than other forms of drug abuse.

5. The majority of teachers (74.5-83.0 percent) and principals (62.5-100 percent) disagreed or strongly disagreed that "drug abuse among students is primarily a problem with the high-achieving or top-ranking student."

6. Teachers (53.6-71.0 percent) and principals (50.0-75.0 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that "a primary reason for drug abuse among students is the easy access to drugs."
7. Teachers (72.3-84.0 percent) and principals (75.0-92.3 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that "the single most important factor leading to drug abuse is experimentation."

8. In response to the statement, "An important reason for drug abuse among students is the dissatisfaction or disillusionment with the prevailing educational system," 53.0 to 75.0 percent of the teachers and 53.8 to 81.1 percent of the principals indicated disagreement or strong disagreement.

9. Most teachers (83.0-90.5 percent) and principals (69.2-100 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that "an important reason for drug abuse is that the student feels a need 'to belong' or to be with the 'in group.'"

10. Many teachers (32.4-41.0 percent) were undecided with regard to whether "the crime prevention and drug education program is meeting the individual needs of students" or is not. Teachers in all strata, however, tended to disagree or strongly disagree (49.0-56.5 percent) with the statement. The majority of principals in Strata 1 through 4 either disagreed or strongly disagreed (53.8-62.5 percent) with the statement. A higher percentage (38.5 percent) of principals agreed with the statement than disagreed (7.7 percent) or strongly disagreed (23.0 percent). Almost one-third (30.8 percent) of the principals in Stratum 5 were undecided regarding agreement or disagreement with the statement.
11. The majority of both teachers (60.8-74.0 percent) and principals (54.0-87.0 percent) either agreed or strongly agreed that "small groups honestly and freely discussing the problems of drugs, would do more toward solving the drug problem than would establishing a formal course of drug education in the curriculum."

12. Most teachers (74.5-85.0 percent) and principals (59.4-87.0 percent) either agreed or strongly agreed that "no crime prevention and drug education program will be successful unless the students, themselves, are involved in the planning and implementation of the program."

13. Teachers in all strata tended to agree or strongly agree (54.2-69.0 percent) that "one of the most effective means of combating the problem of drug abuse is to utilize ex-drug abusers as 'antidrug educators.'" The majority of principals in Stratum 1 (54.1 percent) and Stratum 5 (61.5 percent) either agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. More principals agreed or strongly agreed in Stratum 2 (42.5 percent) than disagreed or strongly disagreed (30.2 percent). More principals disagreed or strongly disagreed in Stratum 3 (42.2 percent) and Stratum 4 (25.0 percent) than agreed or strongly agreed (25.0 and 12.5 percent).

14. Most teachers (66.6-68.5 percent) and principals (54.1-78.7 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that "students who abuse drugs tend to have a low self-concept."
15. A high percentage of teachers (83.3-94.0 percent) and principals (69.2-96.2 percent) either agreed or strongly agreed that "students who have not clarified their values system are more likely to abuse drugs."

16. Teachers (40.0-51.3 percent) and principals (42.3-50.0 percent) across strata tended to agree or strongly agree that "television commercials for drugs encourage a liberal attitude toward drug abuse by students."

17. Both teachers (41.8-54.0 percent) and principals (45.9-62.5 percent) tended to disagree or strongly disagree that "drug abuse by students today is no more serious than alcohol abuse by students in the 1950's."

18. The majority of the teachers (60.9-70.0 percent) either agreed or strongly agreed that "students abuse drugs as an escape from a world which they view as confusing, frustrating, ridiculous, and unjustified." The majority of principals in Strata 1, 2, 3, and 5 (53.0-66.7 percent) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. Fifty percent of the principals in Stratum 4 were undecided; however, 37.5 percent agreed and only 12.5 percent disagreed with the statement.

19. The majority of teachers (57.5-70.3 percent) disagree or strongly disagree that the provisions of state laws on possession of marijuana are too severe." The majority of principals (62.5-82.8 percent) in Strata 1, 3, 4, and 5 also disagree or strongly disagree with the statement.
A majority of the principals in Stratum 2 (63.6 percent) were undecided with regard to the severity of the state laws on possession of marijuana.

20. Most teachers (78.5-90.0 percent) and principals (69.3-93.9 percent) either disagreed or strongly disagreed that the provisions of state laws for sale of marijuana are too severe.

21. Most teachers (67.5-74.5 percent) and principals (71.9-88.5 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that "a school policy which authorizes principals to search student lockers for drug possession is desirable."

22. Most teachers (81.1-85.1 percent) and principals (77.0-92.3 percent) agreed or strongly agreed that "all teachers, counselors, and administrative personnel should receive in-service training in crime prevention and drug education."

Conclusions

If the selective findings presented herewith are considered tenable, then the following conclusions merit close scrutiny by the reader:

1. Although House Bill 467 underwent extensive revision between the dates of its original introduction and final enactment, adequate state funds have not been provided to effectively implement the mandate contained in the bill.
2. It appears that accurate information about drugs has not been presented in an effective manner by some school districts.

3. Apparently, teacher and student communication with regard to attitudes toward drug usage has been limited.

4. There appears to be a cooperative relationship between the various state agencies involved in drug abuse prevention.

5. The Texas Education Agency has provided flexibility to change program thrust on an annual basis through its State Plan for Crime Prevention and Drug Education.

6. One crime prevention and drug education consultant, assigned to each of the twenty regional education service centers, does not seem adequate to meet the needs of 1,147 school districts.

7. The Texas Education Agency has used a "multiplier" approach to staff development in crime prevention and drug education through training small teams for each school district. These teams were responsible for training other staff members in their respective school districts.

8. Materials have been developed by the Texas Education Agency to meet the needs of a variety of individual interests in the crime prevention and drug education program.

9. The Texas Education Agency does not plan to provide a curriculum guide for all school districts in Texas to follow.
10. The instructional approach to the crime prevention and drug education program advocated by the Texas Education Agency requires a balance of cognitive and affective skill development by the student.

11. The implementation of House Bill 467 by the public schools has resulted in increased cost to the school districts.

12. Guidelines for the crime prevention and drug education program were perceived as adequate by the majority of school districts.

13. Problems which appeared to be of primary concern to administrators include teacher in-service training, material acquisition, and financing of the program.

14. The most common practice utilized in providing in-service training included: (a) staff participation in planning in-service training programs, (b) utilization of the regional education service center drug coordinator to provide staff training, (c) involvement of all teachers, system-wide, in the in-service training program, and (d) teacher observation as a means of assessing the effectiveness of the training.

15. It would appear that there is a need for school boards to develop official school board policies which set forth the provisions for meeting the mandate contained in House Bill 467.
16. There is an adequate supply of teacher-made, regional education service center, and commercial materials available for all school districts.

17. Most individuals who teach in the crime prevention and drug education program are selected because of their teaching field.

18. No specific time structure for instruction in drug education is common among all school districts.

19. Teacher observation appeared to be the most common means of assessing the effectiveness of the crime prevention and drug education program.

20. Although teachers and principals agreed that there was some incidence of drug abuse among students in their school district, they perceived this incidence to be low as compared to other school districts throughout Texas.

21. Most teachers were undecided on whether drug abuse would or would not increase significantly within the next few years. Principals tended to perceive that it would not increase significantly.

22. Alcohol was perceived by teachers and principals to be a more serious problem among students in their school district than other forms of drug abuse.

23. There does not appear to be a significant difference between teachers' and principals' perceptions of drug abuse among top-ranking students.
24. Easy access to drugs, experimentation, and a need "to belong" or be with the "in group" seemed to be perceived as contributing more to the incidence of drug abuse than dissatisfaction or disillusionment with the prevailing educational system.

25. Teachers and principals did not seem to perceive the crime prevention and drug education program as meeting the individual needs of students.

26. Teachers and principals perceived the students' role in planning and participating in the drug education program as one of importance.

27. Ex-drug abusers, as perceived by teachers and principals, can be an effective resource when used as "antidrug educators."

28. As perceived by teachers and principals, students who abuse drugs tend to have low self-concepts.

29. Teachers and principals perceived "values clarification" to be an important deterrent to drug abuse.

30. Principals and teachers perceived television commercials for drugs as an influencing factor in forming liberal attitudes toward drugs by students.

31. The use of drugs by students today was perceived as a more serious problem than alcohol abuse by students in the 1950's.

32. Teachers and principals perceived drug abuse by students as a means of escape.
33. State laws on possession and sale of marijuana were not too severe, as perceived by teachers and principals.

34. School board policies which authorize student locker searches for drug possession were perceived as desirable by teachers and principals.

35. In-service training in crime prevention and drug education was perceived as needed by all teachers, counselors, and administrative personnel.

Implications

Based on the findings and conclusions stated above, the following implications are advanced:

1. If the provisions of House Bill 467 are to be effectively implemented in the public school curriculum, teachers, counselors, and all personnel assigned responsibilities in the crime prevention and drug education program must be provided with in-service training. Such training requires released time for teachers and skilled consultants to provide the training. Both released time and outside consultants are costly to the school district, which will necessitate additional state funds. Additional state funds are needed to add competent staff members capable of developing and coordinating a continuing instructional program in crime prevention and drug education. The acquisition of materials for student and teacher use is costly. Although adequate materials are available, many small school districts can
afford only teacher materials. No student materials are provided.

2. If teachers are to provide students with accurate information about drugs, improve communications skills, develop their own curriculum guides, and develop other cognitive and affective skills in students, they will need extensive pre-service and in-service training. Teacher-training institutions will need to become more aware of the need for teaching competencies in the affective domain.

3. The implementation of a new program requires flexibility. Such flexibility must be maintained within and among state, county, and local agencies. The State Plan for Crime Prevention and Drug Education, developed annually by the Texas Education Agency, needs to be reviewed by other state agencies. A cooperative relationship needs to be maintained between the Texas Education Agency and other state and local agencies.

4. Additional specialists are needed to assist school district personnel in developing their drug education curriculum. One coordinator in each of the twenty regional education service centers is not adequate to meet the needs of 1,147 school districts.

5. Involvement is conducive to commitment. For this reason, school districts need to involve central office staff, teachers, supportive staff, students, and community
resources in planning curricula and in-service training of those assigned direct responsibilities related to the program.

6. Dissemination of current information on research, innovative programs, and training programs is of vast importance to a developing program. It is important, also, that the Texas Education Agency continue to develop and disseminate a variety of informational materials to parents, administrators, teachers, and students regarding effective ways of combating drug abuse.

7. The school board is the legal authority of each school district. As such, it is important that it develop a specific plan of action in the form of an official school board policy which sets forth the conditions through which the school district will meet the provisions of House Bill 467. The plan should include the subject areas and grade levels in which the crime prevention and drug education program will be taught and the title of the individual to whom the responsibility for developing the program will be assigned. It would also be advantageous for the school board to develop a policy related to students found to be in possession of drugs while on school premises. This policy, also, needs to address the issue of student rights and procedures to be followed with regard to student locker and personal search by school personnel.
8. House Bill 467 stipulates that instruction in the dangers of crime and narcotics shall be provided annually for all students in grades five through twelve. The original bill, introduced by Representative Joe Golman, stipulated that two hours of instruction would be provided each week. The final version of the bill, however, did not contain any provision for a specific number of hours of instruction. It is important that no specific time limitation be placed on the instructional program. Such a limitation would interfere with the creative and innovative programs currently being developed by many school districts.

9. Evaluating an instructional program that is related to both the affective and cognitive domain is most difficult. Attitudes are difficult to measure even with standardized tests. Most school districts have utilized teacher observation rather than standardized tests to evaluate the effectiveness of their programs. Teacher observation would seem to provide a continuum of observation which would reflect an accurate judgment on behalf of the teacher with regard to the effectiveness of the program on his or her students.

10. If individuals to whom the responsibility for program development has been assigned are to plan wisely, there is a need for accurate needs assessment. There is a need for information related to the incidence of drug abuse within each school district if program planners are to plan
wisely. Current trends in drug abuse need to be assessed in order to determine the upward or downward incidence of drug abuse. Although many individuals do not think of it as such, alcohol is still the most abused drug. There is a need for an assessment of the extent of alcohol abuse within each school district.

11. Easy access to drugs, experimentation, and a need "to belong" or be with the "in group" were perceived by many teachers and principals as contributing to drug abuse among students. If these perceptions are tenable, then a need exists for teachers to become more aware of the basic elements of psychology and human behavior. Teachers and administrators need to be more perceptive of the needs of students to explore their environment and interrelate with one another. They need to understand the strong need for peer acceptance which is felt by the developing adolescent.

12. Ex-drug abusers have been widely used in drug abuse prevention programs. They are perceived by teachers and principals as a valuable tool when used as "antidrug educators." There is, however, an inherent danger in utilizing ex-drug abusers. Students may develop a type of hero worship toward the sometimes colorful escapades of those who have been a part of the drug culture. Teachers, therefore, need to be aware of such pitfalls and avoid the use of ex-drug abusers who present their past experiences in a positive manner.
13. Teachers and principals will need to develop drug education programs which will build upon the positive characteristics of each student. Low self-concept, as perceived by principals and teachers, is conducive to drug abuse. If this perception is true, there is a need for improved skills development for teachers in the area of character development and promotion of positive self-concepts for students.

14. Television commercials are continuously emphasizing that there is no need for pain of any kind. Drugs, as presented in television commercials can relieve pain, frustration, and anxiety. Teachers and principals perceive this as conducive to the development of a liberal attitude toward drug abuse by students. If this perception is accurate, there is a need for improved and expanded consumer education in the public schools. The major emphasis in the consumer education program would need to be placed on not only cognitive information, but also on the development of affective areas such as attitude, values clarification, and decision-making skills.

15. Laws are enacted in the best interest of the people by those individuals whom the people have elected to enact such laws in their behalf. In planning drug education curricula, it is important that provisions be made to incorporate the need for drug legislation into the program. Student attitudes toward drug laws are formed, in part, by
comments made by their peers with regard to the fairness or severity of the law. Teachers need to assume the responsibility for providing an environment which is conducive to open classroom discussion regarding the current state and federal drug laws.

Recommendations for Future Research

Based on this study of the crime prevention and drug education program developed by the Texas Education Agency and selected school districts, the following recommendations for future research are made:

1. It is recommended that similar studies of drug education programs be conducted in other states, especially those states which are developing drug education programs in response to mandates provided through legislation.

2. It is recommended that a study be conducted to develop evaluation instruments and procedures which would assist school districts with a comprehensive assessment of their drug education program.

3. It is recommended that a study be made to determine ways in which teacher-training institutions can develop pre-service and in-service training programs which will provide teachers with both affective and cognitive knowledge and skills related to drug education.

4. It is recommended that a comprehensive state-wide study be conducted to determine the extent of drug usage among public school age students.
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APPENDIX C

Dear

Your assistance is requested in establishing the validity of a survey questionnaire to be used as part of a doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University. The dissertation is being written under the direction of Dr. E. V. Huffstutler, Professor, Division of Administrative Leadership.

The problem of the study will be the investigation of House Bill 467, mandating the establishment of instructional units in crime prevention and drug education and its implementation by the Texas Education Agency and selected local school districts. The study will provide information which will assist in answering such questions as those listed in Attachment A.

Following validation of the survey instrument, it will be mailed to administrative and staff personnel of selected school districts for response. The completed questionnaire will provide information needed to answer the questions posed on Attachment A.

As you evaluate the questionnaire, decide whether or not each item is appropriate to the study and stated clearly. The numbers in the left margin provide a rating scale for each item. If you feel an item is both clearly stated and appropriate to the study circle one (1). If you are undecided about the appropriateness and clarity of the question circle the two (2). If the item is judged inappropriate and unclear circle the three (3). If you judge the question to have merit but feel that it could be worded more effectively, please use the space at the end of the questionnaire to suggest its improvement.

Your assistance in establishing the validity of the survey instrument, thereby providing the researcher with an effective means of gathering data will be most appreciated. Please use the self-addressed, stamped envelope to return the evaluated questionnaire.

Sincerely yours,

Ernest L. Roberts, Jr.
Program Director
Division of Crime Prevention
and Drug Education
ATTACHMENT A

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED BY STUDY

I. Has the application of House Bill 467 resulted in increased cost to the local school district?

II. Has the Texas Education Agency provided adequate leadership in developing and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program?

III. What are the problems which are of concern to administrators in developing and implementing crime prevention and drug education programs?

IV. What methods and procedures are currently being utilized in the planning, implementation, and assessment of teacher in-service training programs in crime prevention and drug education?

V. What factors are included in school board policy?

VI. What types of instructional materials are used?

VII. How were teachers selected?

VIII. What time structure is utilized for instruction?

IX. What evaluation procedures are used?

X. What are the perceptions of principals and their staffs toward drug misuse and abuse by students?
### APPENDIX D
### ALPHABETICAL LISTING AND ADA OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>ADA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abilene ISD</td>
<td>18,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alamo Heights ISD</td>
<td>4,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrews ISD</td>
<td>2,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borden Co. ISD</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borger ISD</td>
<td>3,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canutillo ISD</td>
<td>1,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester ISD</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gainesville State School for Girls</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goliad ISD</td>
<td>1,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving ISD</td>
<td>22,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Vega ISD</td>
<td>1,855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Eylau RHSD</td>
<td>2,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockhart ISD</td>
<td>2,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall ISD</td>
<td>6,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nocona ISD</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal ISD</td>
<td>874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Angelo ISD</td>
<td>13,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snook ISD</td>
<td>513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuloso Midway ISD</td>
<td>2,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

TEXAS EDUCATION CODE

Statutes Relating to Crime Prevention and Drug Education

Section 21.113. DANGERS OF CRIME AND NARCOTICS

The Central Education Agency shall develop curricula and teaching materials for units of study on the dangers of crime and narcotics. The units of study shall be required for all students each academic year for grades 5 through 12.


Section 21.114. ADVISORY COMMISSION

(a) The Crime and Narcotics Advisory Commission is created. The advisory commission is composed of nine members, who shall serve for terms of two years expiring January 31 of odd-numbered years.

(b) The governor shall appoint three members of the commission with the following representation:

(1) a licensed physician;
(2) an official of the Department of Public Safety; and
(3) a narcotics official from the Federal Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs.

(c) The lieutenant governor shall appoint three members of the commission, with the following representation:

(1) an official of a local-level law enforcement agency;
(2) a group social worker; and
(3) a public school superintendent in a city with a population of over 200,000, according to the last preceding federal census.

(d) The speaker of the house of representatives shall appoint three members of the commission, with the following representation:

(1) a businessman;
(2) a college student who is either a senior or a graduate student; and
(3) a juvenile judge who serves in a city with a population of over 200,000, according to the last preceding federal census.
(e) The advisory commission shall meet when the chairman deems necessary. The commission shall elect its chairman, vice chairman, and any other officers it deems necessary. The commission shall adopt rules to govern the conduct of its business.

(f) Members of the commission shall serve without compensation, but each member is entitled to reimbursement for actual and necessary expenses incurred in performing his duties, as provided by legislative appropriation.


Section 21.115. DUTIES OF ADVISORY COMMISSION

(a) The advisory commission shall:

(1) advise and assist the Central Education Agency in developing curricula and teaching materials for a course on the dangers of crime and narcotics;

(2) advise and assist the Central Education Agency in designating the number of hours that the course shall be taught; and

(3) assist local citizens' groups formed to combat unlawful use of and traffic in drugs and narcotics.

(b) The commission shall develop a research program designed to measure the effectiveness of the commission's activities and shall prepare a research report annually to facilitate planning and development.

(c) The commission shall cooperate and coordinate its activities with any other state agency or legislative committee or commission that is investigating or studying drug and narcotics activity, availability, or use in Texas.


Section 21.116. INSTRUCTION SESSIONS FOR TEACHERS

(a) In order to keep the teachers abreast of the latest developments in the subject matter, the Central Education Agency, with the cooperation of the advisory commission, shall provide by regulation for annual instruction sessions.

(b) Every person assigned to teach the course in the public schools shall attend the instruction sessions as required by regulation of the Central Education Agency.

Section 21.118. CRIME AND NARCOTICS PROGRAM, ADMINISTRATION.

(a) A comprehensive program to provide for an effective state-supported administration of course preparation, instruction and teaching in the public schools of this state, as required by law, on the dangers and prevention of crime, narcotics, and drug abuse shall be developed under policies and regulations of the Central Education Agency. Such program administered by the agency shall provide for and encompass also the services of the regional education service centers and the school districts of this state, thereby to coordinate and effectuate improvement in instruction, development of teachers therein, and preparation and distribution of instructional materials and guidelines for program development.

(b) Among desired conditions necessary to provide and implement an effective education program, the Central Education Agency in its development of such program shall consider the following:

1. Carefully conducted assessment(s) of the drug problem of each local school district, to include the needs of students, thereby to provide data on a regional service center and statewide basis and to define specific needs.

2. Continued training of Central Education Agency, regional education service center and school district personnel in drug-crime education.

3. Cooperative efforts to educate all members of the community concerning the drug problem and ways community involvement can contribute to the solution.

4. Continued research and study to define further needs and design of model program to such needs.

5. Future accreditation standards and teacher certification requirements.

(c) The commissioner of education shall establish the requirements for teachers who teach in this program.

(d) The comprehensive program authorized by this Act shall be state funded as provided hereafter to include the following:

1. Administrative costs of the Central Education Agency for program development and administration.

2. Coordinating and training professional positions assigned to each regional education service center on a formula basis determined by the State Board of Education ensuring one position in each region but allowing for increase in personnel in the more populated regions.
(3) School district costs for materials and staff development.

(4) The commissioner of education shall transmit or cause to be transmitted the money as authorized to be expended herein to the respective regional service centers and school districts pursuant to policies adopted by the State Board of Education providing for the approval and disbursement thereof.

(e) The cost of operating the comprehensive program as authorized and developed herein shall be borne by the state. The state's share of the cost shall be paid from the general revenue fund or other source in the amounts as may be specifically appropriated and allocated in the general appropriation bill for the purpose of this Act. No state funds provided for herein shall be used for any purpose other than for the program herein.

There is hereby appropriated to the Central Education Agency from the general revenue fund for the items prescribed by Subdivisions (1) and (2) of Subsection (d), Section 21.118, Texas Education Code, as added by this Act, the sum of $560,000 for the school year beginning September 1, 1973, and $560,000 for the school year beginning September 1, 1974.

This Act shall be effective for the school year beginning September 1, 1973, and thereafter.
Geographic Distribution of School Districts Included in the Study and Regional Education Service Centers

APPENDIX F

Gainesville State School For Girls

Irving ISD

Liberty Eylau ISD

Marshall ISD

Snook ISD

Chester ISD

Royal ISD

Goliad ISD

Tuloso Midway ISD

Borger ISD

Borden ISD

Andrews ISD

Canutillo ISD

Abilene ISD

San Angelo ISD

La Vega ISD

Lockhart ISD

Alamo Hts. ISD
NOTE: Please do not place your name on the instrument. Your response will remain completely anonymous.

This survey instrument is designed to gather data which will assist in determining the factors that principals and teachers feel influence drug abuse. Your school district, along with others, is cooperating with the Regional Education Service Centers and the Texas Education Agency in developing a model program for crime prevention and drug education. Your response to the following statements will assist in planning future program and staff development activities.

DIRECTIONS: Please complete the following statements by placing a check (✓) mark in the appropriate space to the left of your response.

A. I am a
   ( ) Teacher
   ( ) Principal
   ( ) Other (Specify)

B. I am
   ( ) Male
   ( ) Female

C. My age is
   ( ) 21 to 30
   ( ) 31 to 40
   ( ) 41 to 55
   ( ) Over 55

D. I have been teaching
   (Principals indicate combined years experience as teacher and principal)
   ( ) 1 to 5 years
   ( ) 6 to 10 years
   ( ) 11 to 20 years
   ( ) Over 20 years

E. I belong to the following group by birth
   ( ) American Indian
   ( ) Negro/Black
   ( ) Mexican American/Spanish Surnamed
   ( ) Oriental
   ( ) All Others
   ( ) I prefer not to answer
There are no right or wrong answers to the statements contained in the instrument. You are simply asked to respond to each item in terms of how you perceive the statement.

Example:
Students who have long hair are more likely to abuse drugs.

For example, a check (/) placed in the response block headed "Agree" would indicate that you agree with the statement in general, but do not have strong convictions with regard to the relationship of long hair to drug abuse. Likewise, a check (/) placed in a block below one of the other headings would indicate your perception of the statement.

In responding to the following statements, read each carefully and place a check (/) in the response block which corresponds most closely to your opinion. Please check (/) only one response for each statement.

1. There is no drug abuse among students in this school district.
2. The incidence of drug abuse among students in this school district is relatively low as compared to other students in schools throughout Texas.
3. Drug abuse among students will increase significantly within the next few years.
4. Alcohol abuse among students is more serious than other forms of drug abuse in this school district.
5. Drug abuse among students is primarily a problem with the high-achieving or top-ranking student.
6. A primary reason for drug abuse among students is the easy access to drugs.

7. The single most important factor leading to drug abuse is experimentation.

8. An important reason for drug abuse among students is the dissatisfaction or disillusionment with the prevailing educational system.

9. An important reason for drug abuse is that the student feels a need "to belong" or to be with the "in group."

10. The crime prevention and drug education program is meeting the individual needs of students.

11. Small groups, honestly and freely discussing the problems of drugs, would do more toward solving the drug problem than would establishing a formal course of drug education in the curriculum.

12. No crime prevention and drug education program will be successful unless the students, themselves, are involved in the planning and implementation of the program.

13. One of the most effective means of combating the problem of drug abuse is to utilize ex-drug abusers as "antidrug educators."

14. Students who abuse drugs tend to have a low self-concept.

15. Students who have not clarified their values system are more likely to abuse drugs.
16. Television commercials for drugs encourage a liberal attitude toward drug abuse by students.

17. Drug abuse by students today is no more serious than alcohol abuse by students in the 1950's.

18. Students abuse drugs as an escape from a world which they view as confusing, frustrating, ridiculous and unjustified.

19. The provisions of state laws on possession of marijuana are too severe.

20. The provisions of state laws for sale of marijuana are too severe.

21. A school policy which authorizes principals to search student lockers for drug possession is desirable.

22. All teachers, counselors, and administrative personnel should receive in-service training in crime prevention and drug education.
APPENDIX H

FACTORS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF HOUSE BILL 467
(Personal Interview)

School District ____________________________
Street No. ____________________________
City, State ____________________________

Individual Interviewed ____________________________
Title ____________________________
A/C(____ ) ____________________________
Telephone Number ____________________________

Instructions

The following questions regarding factors related to the implementation of House Bill 467, enacted by the 61st Texas Legislature have been prepared to ascertain the impact of this legislative mandate on the public school. A check mark will be placed by one or more appropriate responses to each question.

Since the purpose of the study is to determine the impact of House Bill 467 on the public schools collectively, absolute anonymity is assured to each individual school district responding to the questionnaire. Although all school districts participating in the study will be listed as participants, no school district will be identified by its individual response to items contained in the questionnaire.

A report of the results of this study will be provided to the respondents if desired.

1. Has your school district implemented a program in crime prevention and drug education?
   _____ a) Yes
   _____ b) No

2. When did your school district begin planning its instructional program in crime prevention and drug education?
   _____ a) Fall semester 1970
   _____ b) Spring semester 1971
   _____ c) Fall semester 1971
   _____ d) Spring semester 1972
   _____ e) Fall semester 1972
   _____ f) Spring semester 1973
   _____ g) Fall semester 1973
   _____ h) Other (specify)
3. When did your school district implement its plan of instruction in crime prevention and drug education?

- a) Fall semester 1970
- b) Spring semester 1971
- c) Fall semester 1971
- d) Spring semester 1972
- e) Fall semester 1972
- f) Spring semester 1973
- g) Fall semester 1973
- h) Other (specify)

4. Who was assigned primary responsibility for planning and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program?

- a) Superintendent
- b) Curriculum director
- c) Principal
- d) Teacher
- e) Counselor
- f) Nurse
- g) Other (specify)

5. The approach used in curriculum planning and implementation involved:

- a) Administrative staff only
- b) Administrative and teaching staff only
- c) Administrative, teaching, and supportive staff only
- d) Administrative, teaching, supportive staff, and students
- e) Other (specify)

6. The original implementation of your planned crime prevention and drug education program was:

- a) On the elementary level (Grades 1-6)
- b) Junior high school level (Grades 7-9)
- c) High school level (Grades 10-12)
- d) Other (specify)
7. The original implementation of your planned crime prevention and drug education program was:

_____ a) On a single campus

_____ b) System wide

_____ c) In a single subject area

_____ d) Interdisciplinary

_____ e) Other (specify)

8. The crime prevention and drug education program is now conducted:

_____ a) On a single campus

_____ b) System wide

_____ c) In a single subject area

_____ d) Interdisciplinary

_____ e) Other (specify)

9. What administrative problems have been encountered in planning and implementing your crime prevention and drug education program?

_____ a) Teacher resistance

_____ b) Staff development

_____ c) Material acquisition

_____ d) Financing the program

_____ e) Other (specify)
10. Has the planning and implementation of your crime prevention and drug education program resulted in increased cost to the school district?

_____ a) Yes

_____ b) No

11. If the crime prevention and drug education program has resulted in increased cost to the school district, in what areas has such cost been predominant?

_____ a) Staff development

_____ b) Materials acquisition

_____ c) Added staff

_____ d) Other (specify)

12. Does the school district have an official school board policy with regard to the crime prevention and drug education program and/or student misuse or abuse of drugs?

_____ a) Yes

_____ b) No

13. If the school board has established a policy with regard to the crime prevention and drug education program and/or student misuse or abuse of drugs, what are the provisions of the policy? (specify)
14. How were teachers selected for the crime prevention and drug education program of instruction?

____ a) Volunteered
____ b) Selected on basis of subject area
____ c) All teachers required to teach crime prevention and drug education
____ d) Other (specify) ____________________________

15. Who is assigned primary responsibility for teacher in-service training in crime prevention and drug education?

____ a) Superintendent
____ b) Director of instruction
____ c) Director of personnel
____ d) Other (specify) ____________________________

16. Is in-service training in crime prevention and drug education provided for:

____ a) All teachers (system wide)
____ b) All teachers (selected campuses)
____ c) Teachers within certain teaching disciplines
____ d) Other (specify) ____________________________
17. The content of in-service training programs in crime prevention and drug education is determined by:

- a) Central office staff only
- b) Central office staff and principals only
- c) Central office staff, principals, and teachers
- d) Other (specify) __________________________

18. To what extent do you feel that teacher in-service training in crime prevention and drug education has helped teachers and students establish better understanding and communication skills?

- a) None
- b) Very little
- c) Undecided
- d) Some
- e) Very satisfactory
- f) Other (specify) __________________________

19. To what extent has the Regional Education Service Center cooperated with your district in developing your in-service training program?

- a) None
- b) Very little
- c) Undecided
- d) Some
- e) Very satisfactory
- f) Other (specify) __________________________

20. What resources are used in conducting crime prevention and drug education in-service training programs?

- a) School district staff
- b) Regional Education Service Center staff
- c) Outside consultants
- d) Other (specify) __________________________
21. The Texas Education Agency has provided adequate guidelines for the development and implementation of our crime prevention and drug education program.

_____ a) Strongly disagree  
_____ b) Disagree  
_____ c) Undecided  
_____ d) Agree  
_____ e) Strongly agree  
_____ f) Other (specify) 

22. The Regional Education Service Center has provided adequate assistance to the school district in planning and implementing the crime prevention and drug education program.

_____ a) Strongly disagree  
_____ b) Disagree  
_____ c) Undecided  
_____ d) Agree  
_____ e) Strongly agree  
_____ f) Other (specify) 

23. What types of materials have been used in the crime prevention and drug education program?

_____ a) Teacher made  
_____ b) Regional Education Service Center  
_____ c) Commercial  
_____ d) Other (specify) 

24. Which of the following statements best describes the assessment of your crime prevention and drug education program?

_____ a) Teacher observation  
_____ b) Teacher made instruments  
_____ c) Standardized test  
_____ d) Other (specify)
December 7, 1973

Dear

In accordance with article 21.113, Texas Education Code, the Texas Education Agency, Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education, in cooperation with the Regional Education Service Centers and your school district is engaged in the development of curricula and teaching materials for units of study on the dangers of crime and narcotics. Your cooperation is requested in gathering information on principals' and teachers' perceptions of factors which influence drug abuse.

The data gathered through the use of the enclosed instrument will be of assistance in planning future program and staff development activities as related to the model program now being conducted in your district. It will also be used to make comparisons with the perceptions of principals and teachers in other school districts who are engaged in the development of model programs in crime prevention and drug education.

You are requested to distribute the enclosed survey instruments to those teachers addressed. They will return the instrument directly to the Texas Education Agency, Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education, in the enclosed pre-addressed envelope by December 20, 1973. A summary report of the findings of the survey will be provided to your school district.

If you desire further information regarding the purpose of the survey, please contact the Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education, Texas Education Agency.

Sincerely yours,

Ernest L. Roberts, Jr.
Program Director
Division of Crime Prevention and Drug Education
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