UTAH PREVENTION

State of Utah
Department of Human Services
Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health

# Student Health And Risk Prevention

# 2011 Prevention Needs Assessment Survey Results

Report Prepared By:
Bach Harrison, LLC
116 South 500 East
Salt Lake City,
Utah 84102
Phone: 801-359-2064

## Utah County LSAA

## DSAMH Region Profile Report

# Table of Contents


- Introduction
- The Charts and Tables in this Report
- Data Charts:
  - *Lifetime and 30 Day ATOD Use*
  - *Problem Substance Use, Mental Health, and Antisocial Behavior*
  - *Places of Alcohol Use*
  - *Risk and Protective Factor Profiles*

- The Risk and Protective Factor Model of Prevention
- Building a Strategic Prevention Framework
- School and Community Improvement Using Survey Data
- Risk and Protective Factor Scale Definitions
- Data Tables
- Appendix
- Contacts for Prevention

# Introduction

## 2011 Utah County LSAA Prevention Needs Assessment Survey Report

This report summarizes the findings from the Utah 2011 Prevention Needs Assessment (PNA) Survey that was conducted as part of the Student Health and Risk Prevention (SHARP) Statewide Survey. The survey was administered to students in grades 6, 8, 10 and 12 in 39 school districts and 6 charter schools across Utah.

The results for your Local Substance Abuse Authority (LSAA) region are presented along with comparisons to 2007 and 2009 SHARP Survey results, where applicable. Results from administrations prior to 2007 may be found by consulting past years' profile reports. The PNA Survey was designed to assess adolescent substance use, anti-social behavior, and the risk and protective factors that predict adolescent problem behaviors.

Further, in keeping with the vision that prevention services are designed to have a positive impact on the lives of individuals, efforts have been made to ensure that the PNA survey also gathers data on issues such as mental health and suicide, gang involvement, academic issues, health and fitness, and other prevention-related topics.

Table 1 contains the characteristics of the students who completed the survey from your LSAA and the State of Utah. Because not all students answer all of the questions, the total number of survey respondents by gender and survey respondents by ethnicity may be less than the reported total students.

When using the information in this report, please pay attention to the number of students who participated from your community. If **60% or more** of the students participated, the report is a good indicator of the levels of substance use, risk, protection, and antisocial behavior. If fewer than 60% participated, consult with your local prevention coordinator or a survey professional before generalizing the results to the entire community.

Coordination and administration of the Utah PNA Survey was a collaborative effort of State of Utah, Department of Human Services, Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health; Office of Education; Department of Health; and Bach Harrison, LLC. For more information about the PNA or prevention services in Utah, please refer to the *Contacts for Prevention* section at the end of this report.

**Table 1. Characteristics of Participants**

| Total Survey Respondents | LSAA 2007 | | LSAA 2009 | | LSAA 2011 | | State 2011 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| | 3,821 | 100 | 4,581 | 100 | 6,367 | 100 | 49,707 | 100 |
| **Survey Respondents by Grade** | | | | | | | | |
| **6** | 1,098 | 28.7 | 1,208 | 26.4 | 1,771 | 27.8 | 15,587 | 31.4 |
| **8** | 1,025 | 26.8 | 1,144 | 25.0 | 1,452 | 22.8 | 13,437 | 27.0 |
| **10** | 956 | 25.0 | 1,203 | 26.3 | 1,797 | 28.2 | 11,360 | 22.9 |
| **12** | 742 | 19.4 | 1,026 | 22.4 | 1,347 | 21.2 | 9,323 | 18.8 |
| **Survey Respondents by Gender** | | | | | | | | |
| **Male** | 1,796 | 47.5 | 2,173 | 48.1 | 3,109 | 49.0 | 24,063 | 48.6 |
| **Female** | 1,982 | 52.5 | 2,348 | 51.9 | 3,232 | 51.0 | 25,499 | 51.4 |
| **Survey Respondents by Ethnicity** | | | | | | | | |
| **African American** | 40 | 1.0 | 36 | 0.8 | 76 | 1.2 | 743 | 1.5 |
| **Asian** | 48 | 1.2 | 62 | 1.4 | 78 | 1.3 | 855 | 1.7 |
| **Hispanic** | 434 | 11.0 | 448 | 9.9 | 605 | 9.8 | 5,619 | 11.5 |
| **American Indian** | 53 | 1.3 | 57 | 1.3 | 87 | 1.4 | 953 | 1.9 |
| **Pacific Islander** | 65 | 1.7 | 69 | 1.5 | 110 | 1.8 | 798 | 1.6 |
| **White** | 3,187 | 81.0 | 3,637 | 80.6 | 4,854 | 78.3 | 36,723 | 75.1 |
| **Multi-racial** | 106 | 2.7 | 204 | 4.5 | 387 | 6.2 | 3,220 | 6.6 |

# The Charts and Tables in this Report

There are five types of charts presented in this report: 1) substance use charts, 2) problem use, mental health and antisocial behavior (ASB) charts, 3) places of alcohol consumption, 4) risk factor charts and 5) protective factor charts. Data from the charts are presented numerically in Tables 3 through 10.

## Understanding the Format of the Charts

There are several graphical elements common to all the charts. Understanding the format of the charts and what these elements represent is essential in interpreting the results of the 2011 SHARP survey.

- **The Bars** on substance use and antisocial behavior charts represent the percentage of students in that grade who reported a given behavior. The bars on the risk and protective factor charts represent the percentage of students whose answers reflect significant risk or protection in that category.

  Each set of differently colored bars represents one of the last three administrations of the PNA: 2007, 2009, and 2011. By looking at the percentages over time, it is possible to identify trends in substance use and antisocial behavior. By studying the percentage of youth at risk and with protection over time, it is possible to determine whether the percentage of students at risk or with protection is increasing, decreasing, or staying the same. This information is important when deciding which risk and protective factors warrant attention.

- **Dots and Diamonds** provide points of comparison to larger samples. The dots on the charts represent the percentage of all of the youth surveyed across Utah who reported substance use, problem behavior, elevated risk, or elevated protection.

  For the 2011 PNA Survey, there were 49,707 participants in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12, out of 76,338 sampled, a participation rate of 65.1%. The fact that over 49,000 students across the state participated in the PNA make the state dot a good estimate of the rates of ATOD use and levels of risk and protective factors of youth in Utah. The survey results provide considerable information for communities to use in planning prevention services.

  The diamonds represent national data from either the Monitoring the Future (MTF) survey or the Bach Harrison Norm. The Bach Harrison Norm was developed by Bach Harrison LLC to provide states and communities with the ability to compare their results on risk, protection, and antisocial measures with more national measures. Survey participants from eight statewide surveys and five large regional surveys across the nation were combined into a database of approximately 460,000 students. The results were weighted to make the contribution of each state and region proportional to its share of the national population. Bach Harrison analysts then calculated rates for antisocial behavior and for students at risk and with protection. The results appear on the charts as BH Norm. In order to keep the Bach Harrison Norm relevant, it is updated approximately every two years as new data become available.

  A comparison to state-wide and national results provides additional information for your community in determining the relative importance of levels of alcohol, tobacco and other drug (ATOD) use, antisocial behavior, risk, and protection. Information about other students in the state and the nation can be helpful in determining the seriousness of a given level of problem behavior. Scanning across the charts, it is important to observe the factors that differ the most from the Bach Harrison Norm. This is the first step in identifying the levels of risk and protection that are higher or lower than those in other communities. The risk factors that are higher than the Bach Harrison Norm and the protective factors that are lower than the Bach Harrison Norm are probably the factors your community should consider addressing when planning prevention programs.

## Lifetime and 30-Day ATOD Use

- **Ever-used** is a measure of the percentage of students who tried the particular substance at least once in their lifetime and is used to show the percentage of students who have had experience with a particular substance.

- **30-day use** is a measure of the percentage of students who used the substance at least once in the 30 days prior to taking the survey and is a more sensitive indicator of the level of current use of the substance.

## Problem Substance Use, Need for Treatment, and Antisocial Behavior

- **Problem substance use** is measured in several different ways: binge drinking (having five or more drinks in a row during the **two weeks prior**

to the survey), use of one-half a pack or more of cigarettes **per day**, and youth indicating drinking alcohol and driving or reporting riding with a driver who had been drinking alcohol during **the past 30 days**.

- **The need for treatment** estimates the percentage of students in need of substance abuse and mental health treatment.

  **Substance abuse treatment needs** are estimates of youth in need of alcohol treatment, drug treatment and an estimate of students that need either alcohol OR drug treatment. The need for treatment is defined as students who have used alcohol or drugs on ten or more occasions in their lifetime and marked three or more of the following six items related to their **drug or alcohol use in the past year**: 1) spent more time using than intended, 2) neglected some of your usual responsibilities because of use, 3) wanted to cut down on use, 4) others objected to your use, 5) frequently thought about using, and 6) used alcohol or drugs to relieve feeling such as sadness, anger, or boredom. Students could mark whether these items related to their drug use and/or their alcohol use.

  **Needs Mental Health Treatment** was estimated using the K6 Scale that was developed with support from the National Center for Health Statistics for use in the National Health Interview Survey. The tool screens for psychological distress by asking students "During **the past 30 days**, how often did you: 1) feel nervous? 2) feel hopeless? 3) feel restless or fidgety? 4) feel so depressed that nothing could cheer you up? 5) feel that everything was an effort? and 6) feel worthless?

  Answers were scored based on responses: *None of the time* (0 points), *A little of the time* (1 point), *Some of the time* (2 points), *Most of the time* (3 points), *All of the time* (4 points). Students with a score of 13 or more points were determined to be in need of mental health treatment.

  **Youth considering suicide** are also in need of mental health services. This section of the report also contains the percentage of students answering yes to the question, "During **the past 12 months**, did you ever seriously consider attempting suicide?"

- **Antisocial behavior (ASB)** is a measure of the percentage of students who report any involvement **during the past year** with the eight antisocial behaviors listed in the charts.

## Places of Alcohol Use

This chart presents the percentage of students who used alcohol in six specific places **during the past year**. The number of students answering the question is presented to assist in interpreting the results.

## Risk and Protective Factors

Risk and protective factor scales measure specific aspects of a youth's life experience that predict whether he/she will engage in problem behaviors. The scales, defined in Table 2, are grouped into four domains: community, family, school, and peer/individual. The risk and protective factor charts show the percentage of students at risk and with protection for each of the scales.

## Additional Tables in this Report

Tables 11 to 15 contain additional data for prevention planning and reporting to state and federal agencies.

## Drug Free Communities

Table 11 contains information relevant to Drug Free Community (DFC) grantees. These tables report the four DFC Core Measures on alcohol, tobacco and marijuana:

- **Past 30-Day Use -** The percentage surveyed reporting using the substance at least once in the past 30 days
- **Average Age of Onset** - The average age respondents report first trying the substance
- **Perception of Risk** - The percentage of respondents who report that regular use of the substance has *moderate risk* or *great risk*
- **Perception of Parental/Peer Disapproval** - The percentage of respondents who report their parents feel regular use of alcohol/ANY use of cigarettes or marijuana is *wrong* or *very wrong.*

## Data for Prevention Planning

Table 12 contains information on student perceptions of school safety, bullying, classroom and school discipline, and student perception of ATOD use among their peers.

## Perceived Parental Approval and ATOD Use

Tables 13, 14 and 15 explore the relationship between perceived parental approval and ATOD use. A full explanation of how to interpret these data is available accompanying the tables.

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Lifetime and 30-Day ATOD Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 6




* Prescription Stimulants SHARP wording is not identical to MTF wording, but is roughly equivalent.
** The Sedatives question from previous surveys has been split into Prescription Tranquilizers and Prescription Sedatives for the 2011 SHARP PNA. (Consult the appendix for further explanation.)
† Monitoring the Future does not survey 6th grade students.

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Lifetime and 30-Day ATOD Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 8




* Prescription Stimulants SHARP wording is not identical to MTF wording, but is roughly equivalent.
** The Sedatives question from previous surveys has been split into Prescription Tranquilizers and Prescription Sedatives for the 2011 SHARP PNA. (Consult the appendix for further explanation.)

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Lifetime and 30-Day ATOD Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 10




* Prescription Stimulants SHARP wording is not identical to MTF wording, but is roughly equivalent.
** The Sedatives question from previous surveys has been split into Prescription Tranquilizers and Prescription Sedatives for the 2011 SHARP PNA. (Consult the appendix for further explanation.)

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Lifetime and 30-Day ATOD Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 12




* Prescription Stimulants SHARP wording is not identical to MTF wording, but is roughly equivalent.
** The Sedatives question from previous surveys has been split into Prescription Tranquilizers and Prescription Sedatives for the 2011 SHARP PNA. (Consult the appendix for further explanation.)

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Lifetime and 30-Day ATOD Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, All Grades




* Prescription Stimulants SHARP wording is not identical to MTF wording, but is roughly equivalent.
** The Sedatives question from previous surveys has been split into Prescription Tranquilizers and Prescription Sedatives for the 2011 SHARP PNA. (Consult the appendix for further explanation.)
† 'All Grades' MTF data are not available.

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Problem Substance Use, Need For Treatment, and Antisocial Behavior
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 6




* 6th grade MTF data for Binge Drinking and 1/2 Pack Cigarettes/Day are unavailable.
** National comparison data for Driving While Drinking, Riding with a Drinking Driver, and Antisocial Behavior are Bach Harrison Norm values.
Please see Tables 6 and 7 for more information on the time frames for the values presented in this chart.

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Problem Substance Use, Need For Treatment, and Antisocial Behavior
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 8




* National comparison data for Binge Drinking and 1/2 Pack Cigarettes/Day are Monitoring the Future values.
** National comparison data for Driving While Drinking, Riding with a Drinking Driver, and Antisocial Behavior are Bach Harrison Norm values.
Please see Tables 6 and 7 for more information on the time frames for the values presented in this chart.

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Problem Substance Use, Need For Treatment, and Antisocial Behavior
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 10




* National comparison data for Binge Drinking and 1/2 Pack Cigarettes/Day are Monitoring the Future values.
** National comparison data for Driving While Drinking, Riding with a Drinking Driver, and Antisocial Behavior are Bach Harrison Norm values.
Please see Tables 6 and 7 for more information on the time frames for the values presented in this chart.

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Problem Substance Use, Need For Treatment, and Antisocial Behavior
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 12




* National comparison data for Binge Drinking and 1/2 Pack Cigarettes/Day are Monitoring the Future values.
** National comparison data for Driving While Drinking, Riding with a Drinking Driver, and Antisocial Behavior are Bach Harrison Norm values.
Please see Tables 6 and 7 for more information on the time frames for the values presented in this chart.

# Substance Use and Antisocial Behavior

## Problem Substance Use, Need For Treatment, and Antisocial Behavior
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, All Grades




* 'All Grades' MTF data for Binge Drinking and 1/2 Pack Cigarettes/Day are unavailable.
** National comparison data for Driving While Drinking, Riding with a Drinking Driver, and Antisocial Behavior are Bach Harrison Norm values.
Please see Tables 6 and 7 for more information on the time frames for the values presented in this chart.

# Places of Alcohol Use

## Places Of Alcohol Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 6




* At or near school is new for the 2011 SHARP PNA.

** Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one place of drinking alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample. In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

# Places of Alcohol Use

## Places Of Alcohol Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 8




* At or near school is new for the 2011 SHARP PNA.

** Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one place of drinking alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample. In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

# Places of Alcohol Use

## Places Of Alcohol Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 10




* At or near school is new for the 2011 SHARP PNA.

** Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one place of drinking alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample. In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

# Places of Alcohol Use

## Places Of Alcohol Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 12




* At or near school is new for the 2011 SHARP PNA.

** Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one place of drinking alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample. In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

# Places of Alcohol Use

## Places Of Alcohol Use
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, All Grades




* At or near school is new for the 2011 SHARP PNA.
** Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one place of drinking alcohol. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample. In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Risk Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 6



# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Protective Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 6



# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Risk Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 8



# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Protective Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 8



# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Risk Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 10



# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Protective Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 10



# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Risk Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 12



# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Protective Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, Grade 12



# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Risk Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, All Grades



# Risk and Protective Factor Profiles

## Protective Profile
## 2011 Utah County LSAA Student Survey, All Grades



# The Risk and Protective Factor Model

Prevention is a science. The Risk and Protective Factor Model of Prevention is a proven way of reducing substance abuse and its related consequences. This model is based on the simple premise that to prevent a problem from happening, we need to identify the factors that increase the risk of that problem developing and then find ways to reduce the risks. Just as medical researchers have found risk factors for heart disease such as diets high in fat, lack of exercise, and smoking; a team of researchers at the University of Washington have defined a set of risk factors for youth problem behaviors.

**Risk factors** are characteristics of school, community and family environments, and of students and their peer groups known to predict increased likelihood of drug use, delinquency, school dropout, and violent behaviors among youth. For example, children who live in disorganized, crime-ridden neighborhoods are more likely to become involved in crime and drug use than children who live in safe neighborhoods.

The chart below shows the links between the 19 risk factors and five problem behaviors. The check marks indicate where at least two well designed, published research studies have shown a link between the risk factor and the problem behavior.

**Protective factors** exert a positive influence and buffer against the negative influence of risk, thus reducing the likelihood that adolescents will engage in problem behaviors. Protective factors identified through research include strong bonding to family, school, community and peers, and healthy beliefs and clear standards for behavior. Protective bonding depends on three conditions:

- **Opportunities** for young people to actively contribute
- **Skills** to be able to successfully contribute
- **Consistent recognition** or reinforcement for their efforts and accomplishments

Bonding confers a protective influence only when there is a positive climate in the bonded community. Peers and adults in these schools, families and neighborhoods must communicate healthy values and set clear standards for behavior in order to ensure a protective effect. For example, strong bonds to antisocial peers would not be likely to reinforce positive behavior.

Research on risk and protective factors has important implications for children's academic success, positive youth development, and prevention of health and behavior problems. In order to promote academic success and positive youth development and to prevent problem behaviors, **it is necessary to address the factors that predict these outcomes**. By measuring risk and protective factors in a population, specific risk factors that are elevated and widespread can be identified and targeted by policies, programs, and actions shown to reduce those risk factors and to promote protective factors.

Each risk and protective factor can be linked to specific types of interventions that have been shown to be effective in either reducing risk(s) or enhancing protection(s). The steps outlined here will help your LSAA make key decisions regarding allocation of resources, how and when to address specific needs, and which strategies are most effective and known to produce results.

In addition to helping assess current conditions and prioritize areas of greatest need, data from the SHARP Prevention Needs Assessment (PNA) Survey can be a powerful tool in applying for and complying with several federal programs (such as the Strategic Prevention Framework process, the No Child Left Behind Act and Drug Free Communities grants), outlined later in this report. The survey also gathers valuable data which allows state and local agencies to address other prevention issues related to academic achievement, mental health, gang involvement, health and fitness, and personal safety.

| Risk Factors | Community | | | | | | Family | | | | School | | Peer / Individual | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Community Laws & Norms Favorable Toward Drug Use, Firearms & Crime | Availability of Drugs & Firearms | Transitions & Mobility | Low Neighborhood Attachment | Community Disorganization | Extreme Economic & Social Deprivation | Family History of the Problem Behavior | Family Conflict | Family Management Problems | Favorable Parent Attitudes & Involvement in the Problem Behavior | Academic Failure | Lack of Commitment to School | Early Initiation of Drug Use & Other Problem Behavior | Early & Persistent Antisocial Behavior | Alienation & Rebelliousness | Friends Who Use Drugs & Engage in Problem Behaviors | Favorable Attitudes Toward Drug Use & Other Problem Behaviors | Gang Involvement | Constitutional Factors |
| **Substance Abuse** | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| **Delinquency** | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| **Teen Pregnancy** | | | | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| **School Drop-Out** | | | ✓ | | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | |
| **Violence** | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ |

SOURCE: COMMUNITIES THAT CARE (CTC) PREVENTION MODEL, CENTER FOR SUBSTANCE ABUSE PREVENTION (CSAP), SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (SAMSHA)

# Building a Strategic Prevention Framework

The PNA is an important data source for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF). CSAP created the SPF model to guide states and communities in creating planned, data-driven, effective, and sustainable prevention programs. Each part represents an interdependent element of the ongoing process of prevention coordination.

**Assessment: Profile Population Needs, Resources, and Readiness to Address the Problems and Gaps in Service Delivery.** The SPF begins with an assessment of the needs in the community that is based on data. The Utah State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup (SEOW) has compiled data from several sources to aid in the needs assessment process. One of the primary sources of needs assessment data is this Prevention Needs Assessment Survey (PNA). While planning prevention services, communities are urged to collect and use multiple data sources, including archival and social indicators, assessment of existing resources, key informant interviews, and community readiness. The PNA results presented in this Profile Report will help you to identify needs for prevention services. PNA data include adolescent substance use, anti-social behavior, and many of the risk and protective factors that predict adolescent problem behaviors.

**Capacity: Mobilize and/or Build Capacity to Address Needs.** Engagement of key stakeholders at the State and community levels is critical to plan and implement successful prevention activities that will be sustained over time. Some of the key tasks to mobilize the state and communities are to work with leaders and stakeholders to build coalitions, provide training, leverage resources, and help sustain prevention activities.

**Planning: Develop a Comprehensive Strategic Plan.**
States and communities should develop a strategic plan that articulates not only a vision for the prevention activities, but also strategies for organizing and implementing prevention efforts. The strategic plan should be based on the assessments conducted during Step 1. The Plan should address the priority needs, build on identified resources/strengths, set measurable objectives, and identify how progress will be monitored. Plans should be adjusted with ongoing needs assessment and monitoring activities.

**Implementation: Implement Evidence-based Prevention Programs and Infrastructure Development Activities.** By measuring and identifying the risk factors and other causal factors that contribute to the targeted problems specified in your strategic plan, programs can be implemented that will reduce the prioritized substance abuse problems. After completing Steps 1, 2, and 3, communities will be able to choose prevention strategies that have been shown to be effective, are appropriate for the population served, can be implemented with fidelity, are culturally appropriate, and can be sustained over time. One resource for evidence-based prevention practices is SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices www.nrepp.samhsa.gov.

**Evaluation: Monitor Process, Evaluate Effectiveness, Sustain Effective Programs/Activities, and Improve or Replace Those That Fail:** Finally, ongoing monitoring and evaluation are essential to determine if the desired outcomes are achieved, assess service delivery quality, identify successes, encourage needed improvement, and promote sustainability of effective policies, programs, and practices. The PNA allows communities to monitor levels of ATOD use, antisocial behavior, risk, and protection.

**Sustainability and Cultural Competence** are at the core of the SPF model, indicating the key role they play in each of the five elements. Incorporating principles of cultural competence and sustainability throughout assessment, capacity appraisal, planning, implementation and evaluation helps ensure successful, long lasting prevention programs.

**Sustainability: Sustainability is accomplished by utilizing a comprehensive approach.** By building adaptive and flexible programs around a variety of resources, funding and organizations, states and communities will build sustainable programs and achieve sustainable outcomes. A strategic plan that dynamically responds to changing issues, data, priorities, and resources is more likely to achieve long term results.

Sharing information gathered during the evaluation stage with key stakeholders, forging partnerships and encouraging creative collaboration all enhance sustainability.

**Cultural Competence: Planners need to recognize the needs, styles, values and beliefs of the recipients of prevention efforts.** Culturally competent prevention strategies use interventions, evaluations and communication strategies appropriate to their intended community. Cultural issues reflect a range of influences and are not just a matter of ethnic or racial identity. Learning to communicate with audiences from diverse geographic, cultural, economic, social, and linguistic backgrounds can increase program efficacy and ensure sustainable results.

Whether enlisting extended family networks as a prevention resource for single parent households, or ensuring there are resources available to bridge language gaps, cultural competency will help you recognize differences in prevention needs and tailor prevention approaches accordingly.

A one-size-fits-all program is less effective than a program that draws on community-based values, traditions, and customs and works with knowledgeable people from the community to develop focused interventions, communication and support.

# School and Community Improvement Using Survey Data

## What are the numbers telling you?

- Review the charts and data tables presented in this report. Note your findings as you discuss the following questions.

- Which 3-5 risk factors appear to be higher than you would want when compared to the Bach Harrison Norm?
- Which 3-5 protective factors appear to be lower than you would want when compared to the Bach Harrison Norm?
- Which levels of 30-day drug use are increasing and/or unacceptably high?
    - Which substances are your students using the most?
    - At which grades do you see unacceptable usage levels?
- Which levels of antisocial behaviors are increasing and/or unacceptably high?
    - Which behaviors are your students exhibiting the most?
    - At which grades do you see unacceptable behavior levels?

## How to identify high priority problem areas

- **Look across the charts** – which items stand out as either much higher or much lower than the other?
- **Compare your data with statewide, and/or national data** – differences of 5% between local and other data are probably significant.
- **Prioritize problems for your area** – Make an assessment of the rates you've identified. Which can be realistically addressed with the funding available to your community? Which problems fit best with the prevention resources at hand?
- **Determine the standards and values held within your community** – For example: Is it acceptable in your community for a percentage of high school students to drink alcohol regularly as long as that percentage is lower than the overall state rate?

## Use these data for planning.

- **Substance use and antisocial behavior data** – raise awareness about the problems and promote dialogue.
- **Risk and protective factor data** – identify exactly where the community needs to take action.
- **Additional survey data** – use data on academic achievement, mental health and suicide, health and fitness, gang involvement, seat belt use, and other areas to broaden your prevention approach. Find ways to share this data with other prevention planners in your community.
- **Promising approaches** – access resources listed on the last page of this report for ideas about programs that have been proven effective in addressing the risk factors that are high in your community, and improving the protective factors that are low.

| | Sample | Priority Rate 1 | Priority Rate 2 | Priority Rate 3 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Risk Factors | 6th grd Fav. Attitude to Drugs (Peer/ Indiv. Scale) @ 15% (8% > 8-state av.) | | | |
| Protective Factors | 10th grd - Rewards for prosocial involvm. (School Domain) (down 10% from 2 yrs ago) | | | |
| 30-day Substance Abuse | 8th grd Binge Drinking@13% (8% above state av.) | | | |
| Antisocial Behavior | 12th grd - Drunk/High at School @ 21% (same as state, but still a priority.) | | | |

# Risk and Protective Scale Definitions

Table 2. Scales that Measure the Risk and Protective Factors Shown in the Profiles

| | |
|---|---|
| ***Community Domain Risk Factors*** | |
| *Low Neighborhood Attachment* | Low neighborhood bonding is related to higher levels of juvenile crime and drug selling. |
| *Laws and Norms Favorable Toward Drug Use* | Research has shown that legal restrictions on alcohol and tobacco use, such as raising the legal drinking age, restricting smoking in public places, and increased taxation have been followed by decreases in consumption. Moreover, national surveys of high school seniors have shown that shifts in normative attitudes toward drug use have preceded changes in prevalence of use. |
| *Perceived Availability of Drugs and Handguns* | The availability of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and other illegal drugs has been related to the use of these substances by adolescents. The availability of handguns is also related to a higher risk of crime and substance use by adolescents. |
| *Community Domain Protective Factors* | |
| *Rewards for Prosocial Involvement* | Rewards for positive participation in activities helps youth bond to the community, thus lowering their risk for substance use. |
| *Family Domain Risk Factors* | |
| *Poor Family Management* | Parents' use of inconsistent and/or unusually harsh or severe punishment with their children places them at higher risk for substance use and other problem behaviors. Also, parents' failure to provide clear expectations and to monitor their children's behavior makes it more likely that they will engage in drug abuse whether or not there are family drug problems. |
| *Family Conflict* | Children raised in families high in conflict, whether or not the child is directly involved in the conflict, appear at risk for both delinquency and drug use. |
| *Family History of Antisocial Behavior* | When children are raised in a family with a history of problem behaviors (e.g., violence or ATOD use), the children are more likely to engage in these behaviors. |
| *Parental Attitudes Favorable Toward Antisocial Behavior & Drugs* | In families where parents use illegal drugs, are heavy users of alcohol, or are tolerant of children's use, children are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence. The risk is further increased if parents involve children in their own drug (or alcohol) using behavior, for example, asking the child to light the parent's cigarette or get the parent a beer from the refrigerator. |
| *Family Domain Protective Factors* | |
| *Family Attachment* | Young people who feel that they are a valued part of their family are less likely to engage in substance use and other problem behaviors. |
| *Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement* | Young people who are exposed to more opportunities to participate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors. |
| *Rewards for Prosocial Involvement* | When parents, siblings, and other family members praise, encourage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors. |
| *School Domain Risk Factors* | |
| *Academic Failure* | Beginning in the late elementary grades (grades 4-6) academic failure increases the risk of both drug abuse and delinquency. It appears that the experience of failure itself, for whatever reasons, increases the risk of problem behaviors. |
| *Low Commitment to School* | Surveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of drugs is significantly lower among students who expect to attend college than among those who do not. Factors such as liking school, spending time on homework, and perceiving the coursework as relevant are also negatively related to drug use. |
| *School Domain Protective Factors* | |
| *Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement* | When young people are given more opportunities to participate meaningfully in important activities at school, they are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors. |
| *Rewards for Prosocial Involvement* | When young people are recognized and rewarded for their contributions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance use and other problem behaviors. |

# Risk and Protective Scale Definitions

Table 2. Scales that Measure the Risk and Protective Factors Shown in the Profiles (cont'd)

| | |
|---|---|
| *Peer-Individual Risk Factors* | |
| *Rebelliousness* | Young people who do not feel part of society, are not bound by rules, don't believe in trying to be successful or responsible, or who take an active rebellious stance toward society, are at higher risk of abusing drugs. In addition, high tolerance for deviance, a strong need for independence and normlessness have all been linked with drug use. |
| *Early Initiation of Antisocial Behavior and Drug Use* | Early onset of drug use predicts misuse of drugs. The earlier the onset of any drug use, the greater the involvement in other drug use and the greater frequency of use. Onset of drug use prior to the age of 15 is a consistent predictor of drug abuse, and a later age of onset of drug use has been shown to predict lower drug involvement and a greater probability of discontinuation of use. |
| *Attitudes Favorable Toward Antisocial Behavior and Drug Use* | During the elementary school years, most children express anti-drug, anti-crime, and pro-social attitudes and have difficulty imagining why people use drugs or engage in antisocial behaviors. However, in middle school, as more youth are exposed to others who use drugs and engage in antisocial behavior, their attitudes often shift toward greater acceptance of these behaviors. Youth who express positive attitudes toward drug use and antisocial behavior are more likely to engage in a variety of problem behaviors, including drug use. |
| *Intention to Use ATODs* | Many prevention programs focus on reducing the intention of participants to use ATODs later in life. Reduction of intention to use ATODs often follows successful prevention interventions. |
| *Perceived Risk of Drug Use* | Young people who do not perceive drug use to be risky are far more likely to engage in drug use. |
| *Interaction with Antisocial Peers* | Young people who associate with peers who engage in problem behaviors are at higher risk for engaging in antisocial behavior themselves. |
| *Friends' Use of Drugs* | Young people who associate with peers who engage in alcohol or substance abuse are much more likely to engage in the same behavior. Peer drug use has consistently been found to be among the strongest predictors of substance use among youth. Even when young people come from well-managed families and do not experience other risk factors, spending time with friends who use drugs greatly increases the risk of that problem developing. |
| *Rewards for Antisocial Behavior* | Young people who receive rewards for their antisocial behavior are at higher risk for engaging further in antisocial behavior and substance use. |
| *Depressive Symptoms* | Young people who are depressed are overrepresented in the criminal justice system and are more likely to use drugs. Survey research and other studies have shown a link between depression and other youth problem behaviors. |
| *Gang Involvement* | Youth who belong to gangs are more at risk for antisocial behavior and drug use. |
| *Peer-Individual Protective Factors* | |
| *Belief in the Moral Order* | Young people who have a belief in what is "right" or "wrong" are less likely to use drugs. |
| *Religiosity* | Young people who regularly attend religious services are less likely to engage in problem behaviors. |
| *Interaction with Prosocial Peers* | Young people who associate with peers who engage in prosocial behavior are more protected from engaging in antisocial behavior and substance use. |
| *Prosocial Involvement* | Participation in positive school and community activities helps provide protection for youth. |
| *Rewards for Prosocial Involvement* | Young people who are rewarded for working hard in school and the community are less likely to engage in problem behavior. |

# Data Tables

**Table 3. Number of Students Who Completed the Survey**

| Number of Survey Respondents | Grade 6 | | | | Grade 8 | | | | Grade 10 | | | | Grade 12 | | | | All Grades | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 |
| | 1,098 | 1,208 | 1,771 | 15,587 | 1,025 | 1,144 | 1,452 | 13,437 | 956 | 1,203 | 1,797 | 11,360 | 742 | 1,026 | 1,347 | 9,323 | 3,821 | 4,581 | 6,367 | 49,707 |

**Table 4. Percentage of Students Who Used ATODs During Their Lifetime**

| In your lifetime, on how many occasions (if any) have you… (One or more occasions) | | Grade 6 | | | | Grade 8 | | | | Grade 10 | | | | Grade 12 | | | | All Grades | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 |
| Alcohol | had alcoholic beverages (beer, wine or hard liquor) to drink - more than just a few sips? | 5.0 | 2.2 | 4.6 | 8.3 | 14.7 | 9.0 | 9.8 | 19.3 | 22.1 | 11.4 | 16.1 | 28.9 | 20.2 | 18.4 | 23.5 | 37.3 | 15.4 | 10.0 | 13.0 | 22.8 |
| Cigarettes | smoked cigarettes? | 1.0 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 4.8 | 8.2 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 7.9 | 9.7 | 17.3 | 12.6 | 10.4 | 14.4 | 23.2 | 8.3 | 6.2 | 7.9 | 13.8 |
| Chewing Tobacco | used smokeless tobacco (chew, snuff, plug, dipping tobacco, chewing tobacco)? | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.9 | 4.7 | 3.8 | 5.3 | 5.5 | 8.3 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 3.9 |
| Marijuana | used marijuana (grass, pot) or hashish (hash, hash oil)? | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 7.9 | 9.4 | 6.5 | 8.4 | 17.2 | 10.7 | 11.5 | 14.6 | 24.0 | 5.7 | 5.1 | 6.4 | 12.2 |
| Hallucinogens | used LSD (acid) or other hallucinogens (like PCP, mescaline, peyote, "shrooms" or psilocybin)? | 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 1.7 | 2.5 | 4.8 | 2.2 | 4.1 | 4.3 | 7.0 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 3.4 |
| Cocaine | used cocaine (like cocaine powder) or "crack" (cocaine in chunk or rock form)? | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 3.0 | 2.5 | 2.1 | 3.4 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.6 |
| Inhalants | sniffed glue, breathed the contents of an aerosol spray can, or inhaled other gases or sprays, in order to get high? | 6.4 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 5.5 | 9.7 | 7.9 | 8.4 | 8.9 | 8.7 | 5.7 | 6.3 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 7.0 | 8.0 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 7.1 |
| Methamphetamines | used methamphetamines (meth, speed, crank, crystal meth)? | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 0.9 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.9 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.1 |
| Prescription Stimulants | used prescription stimulants or amphetamines (such as Adderall, Ritalin, or Dexedrine) without a doctor telling you to take them? | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.4 | 2.9 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 4.1 | 5.6 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 7.4 | 7.5 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 3.4 | 4.1 |
| Prescription Sedatives* | used prescription sedatives including barbiturates or sleeping pills (such as phenobarbital, Tuinal, Seconal, Ambien, Lunesta, or Sonata) without a doctor telling you to take them? | 2.2 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 6.0 | 4.0 | 5.8 | 5.6 | 8.6 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 7.7 | 10.2 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 8.1 | 6.7 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 5.8 |
| Prescription Tranquilizers | used prescription tranquilizers (such as Librium, Valium, Xanax, Ativan, Soma, or Klonopin) without a doctor telling you to take them? | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | | 0.2 | 0.4 | | | 0.4 | 0.8 | | | 0.9 | 1.4 | | | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| Narcotic Prescription Drugs | used narcotic prescription drugs (such as OxyContin, methadone, morphine, codeine, Demerol, Vicodin, Percocet) without a doctor telling you to take them? | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 2.5 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 5.4 | 7.0 | 6.8 | 7.6 | 8.1 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 3.1 | 3.8 |
| Heroin | used heroin? | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.8 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 |

* The *Sedatives* question from previous surveys has been split into *Prescription Tranquilizers* and *Prescription Sedatives* for the 2011 SHARP PNA. (Consult the appendix for further explanation.)

# Data Tables

**Table 5. Percentage of Students Who Used ATODs During the Past 30 Days**

| In the past 30 days, on how many occasions (if any) have you... (One or more occasions) | | Grade 6 | | | | Grade 8 | | | | Grade 10 | | | | Grade 12 | | | | All Grades | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 |
| Alcohol | had alcoholic beverages (beer, wine or hard liquor) to drink - more than just a few sips? | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 4.5 | 5.7 | 11.2 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 17.0 | 4.9 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 8.6 |
| Cigarettes | smoked cigarettes? | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 7.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 3.8 |
| Chewing Tobacco | used smokeless tobacco (chew, snuff, plug, dipping tobacco, chewing tobacco)? | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.3 |
| Marijuana | used marijuana (grass, pot) or hashish (hash, hash oil)? | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 7.9 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 9.8 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 5.3 |
| Hallucinogens | used LSD (acid) or other hallucinogens (like PCP, mescaline, peyote, "shrooms" or psilocybin)? | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.0 |
| Cocaine | used cocaine (like cocaine powder) or "crack" (cocaine in chunk or rock form)? | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 |
| Inhalants | sniffed glue, breathed the contents of an aerosol spray can, or inhaled other gases or sprays, in order to get high? | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 3.4 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.8 |
| Methamphetamines | used methamphetamines (meth, speed, crank, crystal meth)? | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Prescription Stimulants | used prescription stimulants or amphetamines (such as Adderall, Ritalin, or Dexedrine) without a doctor telling you to take them? | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 0.8 | 1.7 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 1.4 |
| Prescription Sedatives* | used prescription sedatives including barbiturates or sleeping pills (such as phenobarbital, Tuinal, Seconal, Ambien, Lunesta, or Sonata) without a doctor telling you to take them? | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 2.7 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 2.1 |
| Prescription Tranquilizers | used prescription tranquilizers (such as Librium, Valium, Xanax, Ativan, Soma, or Klonopin) without a doctor telling you to take them? | | | 0.0 | 0.1 | | | 0.2 | 0.4 | | | 0.4 | 0.8 | | | 0.9 | 1.4 | | | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Narcotic Prescription Drugs | used narcotic prescription drugs (such as OxyContin, methadone, morphine, codeine, Demerol, Vicodin, Percocet) without a doctor telling you to take them? | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 2.6 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 1.1 |
| Heroin | used heroin? | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 |
| Ecstasy | used MDMA ('X', 'E', or ecstasy)? | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.4 |
| Steroids | used steroids or anabolic steroids (such as Anadrol, Oxandrin, Durabolin, Equipoise or Depotesterone)? | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 |

* The *Sedatives* question from previous surveys has been split into *Prescription Tranquilizers* and *Prescription Sedatives* for the 2011 SHARP PNA. (Consult the appendix for further explanation.)

# Data Tables

**Table 6. Percentage of Students With Problem Substance Use and Treatment Needs**

| | | Grade 6 | | | | Grade 8 | | | | Grade 10 | | | | Grade 12 | | | | All Grades | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 |
| **Problem Use** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Binge Drinking* | How many times have you had 5 or more alcoholic drinks in a row in the past 2 weeks? (One or more times) | 1.0 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 3.4 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 4.2 | 2.4 | 4.2 | 8.2 | 4.0 | 5.1 | 6.7 | 12.2 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 6.6 |
| 1/2 Pack of Cigarettes/Day | During the past 30 days, how many cigarettes did you smoke per day? (11 to 20 cigarettes, More than 20 cigarettes) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 |
| **Alcohol and Driving** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Drinking and Driving | During the past 30 days, how many times did you DRIVE a car or other vehicle when you had been drinking alcohol? | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 4.1 | 1.4 | 1.9 | 3.9 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.8 |
| Riding with a Drinking Driver | During the past 30 days, how many times did you RIDE in a car or other vehicle driven by someone who had been drinking alcohol? | 6.3 | 4.1 | 2.0 | 5.0 | 8.4 | 6.1 | 4.9 | 8.4 | 9.9 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 10.1 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 5.7 | 10.5 | 8.1 | 5.8 | 4.5 | 8.5 |
| **Need for Treatment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Needs Alcohol Treatment | Answered "Yes" to at least 3 alcohol treatment questions and has used alcohol on 10 or more occasions | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 3.9 | 4.8 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 6.0 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 1.5 | 2.9 |
| Needs Drug Treatment | Answered "Yes" to at least 3 drug treatment questions and has used any drug on 10 or more occasions | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 4.2 | 5.8 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 3.2 |
| Alcohol or Drug Treatment | Needs alcohol, drug or alcohol AND drug treatment as per criteria above | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 6.6 | 6.9 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 9.2 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 2.7 | 4.8 |
| Needs Mental Health Treatment | Scored 13 or more points on the K6 screening scale for psychological distress. (See text for further explanation.) | n/a | 8.8 | 6.6 | 8.6 | n/a | 9.6 | 9.7 | 11.7 | n/a | 9.9 | 10.5 | 12.7 | n/a | 11.0 | 10.7 | 12.0 | n/a | 9.8 | 9.3 | 11.2 |
| Considering Suicide | Answered "Yes" to "During the past 12 months, did you ever seriously consider attempting suicide?" | n/a | n/a | 4.3 | 5.3 | n/a | n/a | 10.6 | 10.6 | n/a | n/a | 9.3 | 11.4 | n/a | n/a | 10.4 | 10.3 | n/a | n/a | 8.6 | 9.4 |

* Since not all students answer all questions, the percentage of students reporting binge drinking may be greater than the percentage reporting 30-day alcohol use.

# Data Tables

**Table 7. Percentage of Students With Antisocial Behavior**

| How many times in the past year (12 months) have you: (One or more times) | Grade 6 | | | | Grade 8 | | | | Grade 10 | | | | Grade 12 | | | | All Grades | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 |
| Been Drunk or High at School | 1.6 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 2.9 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 6.0 | 6.8 | 4.5 | 5.6 | 10.3 | 6.6 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 12.8 | 4.4 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 7.4 |
| Been Suspended from School | 3.6 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 5.6 | 8.9 | 7.4 | 7.7 | 10.2 | 5.9 | 3.8 | 6.0 | 8.7 | 3.4 | 4.4 | 5.2 | 6.7 | 5.5 | 4.6 | 5.3 | 7.8 |
| Sold Illegal Drugs | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 2.0 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 3.3 | 5.0 | 2.6 | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 3.2 |
| Stolen or Tried to Steal a Motor Vehicle | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 2.2 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.3 |
| Been Arrested | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.2 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 1.9 | 3.2 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 4.4 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 2.9 | 4.8 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.1 | 3.3 |
| Attacked Someone with the Idea of Seriously Hurting Them | 6.1 | 4.3 | 4.9 | 8.4 | 9.0 | 6.0 | 7.5 | 10.6 | 7.9 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 7.7 | 6.4 | 7.1 | 7.7 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 8.5 |
| Carried a Handgun | 3.2 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 5.2 | 2.9 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 5.6 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 3.9 | 6.4 | 5.8 | 3.7 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 5.5 |
| Carried a Handgun to School | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 |

**Table 8. Places of Alcohol Use**

| **During the past year did you drink alcohol at any of the following places?** | Grade 6 | | | Grade 8 | | | Grade 10 | | | Grade 12 | | | All Grades | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 |
| *Sample size** | *33* | *79* | *1,197* | *115* | *114* | *2,280* | *172* | *265* | *2,900* | *203* | *259* | *3,008* | *523* | *717* | *9,385* |
| At my home or someone else's home without any parent permission | 45.5 | 43.0 | 35.5 | 61.7 | 58.8 | 57.5 | 65.1 | 67.2 | 66.0 | 70.9 | 62.2 | 69.2 | 65.4 | 61.4 | 61.1 |
| At my home with my parent's permission | 39.4 | 44.3 | 57.2 | 26.1 | 36.0 | 42.2 | 29.1 | 34.0 | 37.3 | 20.7 | 25.5 | 36.0 | 25.8 | 32.4 | 40.6 |
| At someone else's home with their parent's permission | 21.2 | 22.8 | 26.1 | 20.9 | 24.6 | 28.2 | 28.5 | 31.7 | 34.0 | 38.4 | 37.1 | 45.9 | 30.2 | 31.5 | 35.4 |
| At or near school** | n/a | 12.7 | 16.0 | n/a | 12.3 | 15.4 | n/a | 21.9 | 17.8 | n/a | 19.3 | 17.6 | n/a | 18.4 | 16.9 |
| In a car | 9.1 | 21.5 | 18.4 | 22.6 | 20.2 | 19.3 | 27.3 | 30.9 | 27.6 | 43.3 | 30.9 | 30.7 | 31.4 | 28.2 | 25.4 |
| In some other place | 39.4 | 49.4 | 37.1 | 37.4 | 39.5 | 40.0 | 30.8 | 45.3 | 41.7 | 39.4 | 47.9 | 44.0 | 36.1 | 45.7 | 41.4 |

* Sample size represents the number of youth who chose at least one place of alcohol consumption. Students who indicated they had not drunk alcohol in the past year are not included in the sample. In the case of smaller sample sizes, caution should be exercised before generalizing results to the entire community.

** *At or near school* is new for the 2011 SHARP PNA.

# Data Tables

**Table 9. Percentage of Students Reporting Risk**

| Risk Factor | Grade 6 | | | | Grade 8 | | | | Grade 10 | | | | Grade 12 | | | | All Grades | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 |
| **Community Domain** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low Neighborhood Attachment | 24.6 | 29.7 | 28.2 | 35.8 | 25.8 | 25.2 | 22.8 | 27.6 | 31.9 | 20.3 | 30.8 | 33.7 | 34.6 | 30.4 | 36.1 | 39.9 | 29.1 | 26.4 | 29.3 | 34.1 |
| Laws & Norms Favor Drug Use | 16.0 | 20.3 | 16.3 | 23.9 | 12.9 | 14.2 | 9.4 | 19.9 | 8.2 | 6.6 | 9.4 | 15.5 | 10.1 | 12.2 | 11.8 | 19.8 | 11.8 | 13.4 | 11.8 | 19.7 |
| Perceived Availability of Drugs | 29.2 | 23.2 | 24.1 | 30.0 | 20.2 | 16.0 | 18.4 | 27.1 | 27.1 | 19.7 | 24.2 | 29.9 | 27.0 | 25.0 | 31.9 | 32.5 | 25.9 | 20.9 | 24.5 | 29.8 |
| Perceived Availability of Handguns | 24.3 | 22.9 | 22.4 | 21.3 | 35.2 | 31.5 | 30.3 | 32.6 | 29.2 | 23.0 | 24.2 | 23.0 | 33.2 | 27.1 | 31.1 | 30.3 | 30.4 | 26.1 | 26.8 | 26.7 |
| **Family Domain** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Poor Family Management | 35.0 | 33.8 | 33.4 | 38.6 | 26.7 | 27.6 | 26.3 | 34.0 | 25.0 | 20.4 | 26.4 | 29.8 | 25.6 | 26.2 | 26.7 | 29.7 | 28.1 | 27.0 | 28.3 | 33.0 |
| Family Conflict | 37.8 | 34.8 | 32.2 | 33.5 | 36.4 | 27.2 | 27.5 | 27.6 | 39.8 | 29.4 | 28.6 | 31.8 | 32.3 | 33.2 | 30.1 | 30.6 | 36.6 | 31.1 | 29.7 | 30.9 |
| Family History of Antisocial Behavior | 23.8 | 20.9 | 21.5 | 28.5 | 17.9 | 14.5 | 16.0 | 23.2 | 25.9 | 16.5 | 19.0 | 26.8 | 23.8 | 19.6 | 25.2 | 28.0 | 22.9 | 17.9 | 20.3 | 26.6 |
| Parental Attitudes Favorable to ASB | 24.0 | 19.2 | 29.1 | 31.4 | 34.7 | 32.8 | 40.7 | 46.2 | 41.8 | 35.6 | 45.3 | 51.0 | 35.0 | 38.1 | 47.4 | 49.5 | 33.9 | 31.1 | 40.2 | 44.2 |
| Parental Attitudes Favorable to Drug Use | 3.9 | 3.1 | 4.3 | 7.4 | 9.5 | 7.8 | 9.5 | 16.5 | 15.1 | 9.9 | 15.6 | 23.7 | 7.6 | 8.7 | 12.3 | 21.0 | 9.1 | 7.3 | 10.3 | 16.9 |
| **School Domain** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Academic Failure | 23.8 | 27.8 | 22.9 | 29.2 | 32.4 | 27.6 | 26.0 | 31.3 | 30.8 | 25.6 | 25.1 | 31.7 | 30.2 | 31.0 | 34.3 | 36.2 | 29.3 | 28.0 | 26.8 | 32.0 |
| Low Commitment to School | 38.5 | 40.9 | 31.2 | 34.3 | 38.1 | 41.4 | 37.0 | 39.0 | 36.9 | 30.4 | 31.5 | 32.7 | 33.8 | 33.4 | 32.6 | 35.1 | 36.9 | 36.8 | 33.1 | 35.3 |
| **Peer-Individual Domain** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rebelliousness | 24.2 | 15.3 | 18.1 | 21.2 | 28.4 | 20.8 | 23.8 | 26.2 | 35.4 | 26.1 | 30.0 | 31.9 | 33.5 | 31.4 | 35.4 | 33.1 | 30.3 | 23.2 | 26.5 | 28.0 |
| Early Initiation of ASB | 14.1 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 18.1 | 20.1 | 18.2 | 20.1 | 25.4 | 24.0 | 18.3 | 22.0 | 27.2 | 24.2 | 20.7 | 27.6 | 30.7 | 20.5 | 17.0 | 19.9 | 25.1 |
| Early Initiation of Drug Use | 7.0 | 5.1 | 5.9 | 12.3 | 12.9 | 10.2 | 9.1 | 17.9 | 11.0 | 7.7 | 9.4 | 17.2 | 10.6 | 10.1 | 12.0 | 20.0 | 10.4 | 8.2 | 9.0 | 16.7 |
| Attitudes Favorable to ASB | 22.6 | 22.5 | 18.5 | 24.1 | 24.3 | 18.4 | 20.2 | 24.7 | 34.2 | 27.2 | 25.6 | 31.1 | 28.6 | 34.2 | 27.8 | 31.3 | 27.4 | 25.3 | 22.8 | 27.6 |
| Attitudes Favorable to Drug Use | 4.3 | 4.4 | 3.6 | 6.7 | 12.0 | 10.3 | 10.0 | 16.4 | 15.0 | 11.5 | 12.6 | 21.3 | 11.1 | 15.0 | 14.3 | 21.2 | 10.5 | 10.1 | 9.9 | 16.1 |
| Perceived Risk of Drug Use | 21.5 | 24.2 | 24.6 | 34.1 | 16.7 | 16.7 | 16.1 | 23.4 | 23.0 | 17.2 | 20.8 | 28.9 | 15.6 | 17.1 | 21.0 | 27.9 | 19.2 | 18.8 | 20.7 | 28.7 |
| Interaction with Antisocial Peers | 22.9 | 19.8 | 17.5 | 27.8 | 20.9 | 19.0 | 20.7 | 25.8 | 22.7 | 16.6 | 20.7 | 24.2 | 20.1 | 21.6 | 21.0 | 24.9 | 21.7 | 19.2 | 19.9 | 25.7 |
| Friend's Use of Drugs | 5.0 | 6.6 | 5.8 | 11.0 | 17.5 | 13.9 | 14.6 | 23.5 | 14.6 | 8.1 | 14.2 | 21.6 | 11.4 | 11.4 | 13.8 | 20.7 | 12.1 | 10.0 | 11.9 | 19.0 |
| Rewards for ASB | 17.1 | 13.3 | 15.2 | 20.0 | 13.5 | 18.3 | 16.9 | 24.5 | 20.7 | 17.8 | 19.3 | 28.1 | 17.2 | 25.1 | 21.9 | 30.0 | 17.2 | 18.5 | 18.2 | 25.6 |
| Depressive Symptoms | 25.0 | 25.4 | 25.1 | 31.5 | 31.9 | 29.3 | 31.3 | 35.4 | 37.3 | 32.5 | 36.1 | 37.4 | 31.7 | 33.7 | 32.4 | 34.0 | 31.5 | 30.1 | 31.1 | 34.6 |
| Gang Involvement | 3.3 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 4.4 | 5.0 | 3.3 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 3.8 | 4.2 | 2.3 | 4.2 | 4.5 | 4.6 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 3.2 | 4.0 |
| Intentions to Use Drugs | 8.9 | 9.7 | 9.0 | 19.7 | 9.1 | 5.5 | 9.0 | 16.2 | 11.0 | 8.9 | 12.3 | 21.6 | 8.2 | 10.6 | 15.3 | 24.4 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 11.3 | 20.4 |

# Data Tables

**Table 10. Percentage of Students Reporting Protection**

| Protective Factor | Grade 6 | | | | Grade 8 | | | | Grade 10 | | | | Grade 12 | | | | All Grades | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 |
| **Community Domain** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rewards for Prosocial Involvement | 74.2 | 70.9 | 64.1 | 51.3 | 74.1 | 72.5 | 69.3 | 57.9 | 71.9 | 82.2 | 69.9 | 56.9 | 77.1 | 76.4 | 70.8 | 57.5 | 74.3 | 75.4 | 68.4 | 55.8 |
| **Family Domain** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Family Attachment | 75.8 | 73.2 | 76.4 | 66.2 | 69.1 | 76.2 | 73.4 | 65.2 | 69.8 | 78.4 | 72.5 | 68.4 | 71.7 | 78.9 | 68.8 | 68.1 | 71.6 | 76.6 | 72.9 | 67.0 |
| Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement | 74.7 | 72.3 | 72.6 | 62.7 | 76.7 | 76.0 | 72.3 | 66.3 | 67.7 | 74.5 | 66.1 | 62.8 | 69.3 | 72.7 | 64.6 | 62.8 | 72.1 | 73.9 | 69.0 | 63.7 |
| Rewards for Prosocial Involvement | 68.7 | 66.3 | 67.6 | 59.5 | 61.0 | 60.0 | 61.8 | 53.5 | 65.3 | 69.8 | 65.3 | 61.0 | 66.2 | 68.8 | 61.6 | 59.3 | 65.4 | 66.1 | 64.3 | 58.4 |
| **School Domain** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement | 56.0 | 52.2 | 62.5 | 59.4 | 65.7 | 69.3 | 74.1 | 68.3 | 71.7 | 79.6 | 77.1 | 74.9 | 74.9 | 74.0 | 76.7 | 74.7 | 66.9 | 68.3 | 72.3 | 69.0 |
| Rewards for Prosocial Involvement | 60.6 | 62.5 | 71.2 | 66.8 | 49.5 | 54.0 | 59.6 | 57.8 | 66.5 | 73.2 | 71.3 | 69.6 | 54.3 | 58.4 | 57.9 | 56.7 | 57.8 | 62.0 | 65.4 | 63.0 |
| **Peer-Individual Domain** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Religiosity | 79.5 | 75.1 | 72.5 | 57.1 | 83.7 | 88.6 | 83.1 | 67.9 | 83.6 | 87.5 | 82.3 | 66.4 | 88.7 | 86.0 | 81.7 | 65.8 | 83.8 | 84.4 | 79.9 | 64.3 |
| Belief in the Moral Order | 81.9 | 78.0 | 75.8 | 69.4 | 78.1 | 82.1 | 77.4 | 69.1 | 71.6 | 75.4 | 69.2 | 59.9 | 73.5 | 68.4 | 61.0 | 58.7 | 76.3 | 76.2 | 71.0 | 64.3 |
| Interaction with Prosocial Peers | 76.2 | 68.4 | 76.9 | 67.1 | 73.3 | 78.0 | 78.4 | 68.5 | 77.8 | 86.3 | 83.2 | 73.2 | 81.5 | 80.4 | 81.0 | 70.3 | 77.1 | 78.0 | 79.8 | 69.7 |
| Prosocial Involvement | 69.9 | 56.6 | 70.5 | 63.0 | 66.0 | 63.9 | 69.6 | 61.6 | 68.2 | 71.6 | 68.5 | 62.8 | 72.8 | 68.8 | 69.4 | 64.2 | 69.2 | 65.0 | 69.5 | 62.9 |
| Rewards for Prosocial Involvement | 70.6 | 58.1 | 67.5 | 58.4 | 68.9 | 61.4 | 66.5 | 59.0 | 77.8 | 78.6 | 79.1 | 73.7 | 83.5 | 81.1 | 86.2 | 77.1 | 75.1 | 69.5 | 74.5 | 66.9 |

# Data Tables

**Table 11. Drug Free Communities Report (2011 data)**

| Outcome | Definition | Substance | Grade 6 | | Grade 8 | | Grade 10 | | Grade 12 | | All Grades† | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | Total | | Male | | Female | |
| | | | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample |
| **Perception of Risk* (People are at Moderate or Great Risk of harming themselves if they...)** | drink 1 or two drinks nearly every day | Alcohol | 87.6 | 1,721 | 87.8 | 1,358 | 88.5 | 1,679 | 84.2 | 1,263 | 87.1 | 6,021 | 85.8 | 2,933 | 88.5 | 3,068 |
| | smoke 1 or more packs or cigarettes per day | Cigarettes | 92.0 | 1,742 | 95.4 | 1,398 | 94.1 | 1,735 | 93.9 | 1,306 | 93.8 | 6,181 | 93.2 | 3,010 | 94.5 | 3,151 |
| | smoke marijuana regularly | Marijuana | 92.8 | 1,693 | 93.5 | 1,360 | 90.7 | 1,674 | 86.3 | 1,250 | 91.0 | 5,977 | 89.5 | 2,908 | 92.6 | 3,052 |
| **Perception of Parent Disapproval* (*Parents feel it would be Wrong* or *Very Wrong to...*)** | drink beer, wine, or hard liquor regularly | Alcohol | 98.9 | 1,760 | 98.0 | 1,415 | 96.7 | 1,784 | 95.3 | 1,338 | 97.3 | 6,297 | 97.4 | 3,070 | 97.2 | 3,201 |
| | smoke cigarettes | Cigarettes | 99.8 | 1,758 | 98.9 | 1,415 | 98.6 | 1,782 | 97.5 | 1,336 | 98.8 | 6,291 | 99.0 | 3,066 | 98.5 | 3,199 |
| | smoke marijuana | Marijuana | 99.9 | 1,740 | 99.3 | 1,401 | 98.2 | 1,777 | 96.6 | 1,333 | 98.6 | 6,251 | 98.2 | 3,046 | 98.9 | 3,179 |
| **Perception of Peer Disapproval* (*I think it is Wrong* or *Very Wrong for someone my age to...*)** | drink beer, wine, or hard liquor regularly | Alcohol | 99.2 | 1,757 | 95.2 | 1,409 | 93.2 | 1,778 | 88.9 | 1,340 | 94.4 | 6,284 | 93.7 | 3,064 | 95.1 | 3,194 |
| | smoke cigarettes | Cigarettes | 99.5 | 1,755 | 95.4 | 1,410 | 95.3 | 1,777 | 92.5 | 1,338 | 95.9 | 6,280 | 95.8 | 3,059 | 95.9 | 3,195 |
| | smoke marijuana | Marijuana | 99.5 | 1,754 | 95.6 | 1,408 | 92.3 | 1,780 | 90.0 | 1,339 | 94.6 | 6,281 | 93.8 | 3,059 | 95.4 | 3,196 |
| **Past 30-Day Use*** | at least one use in the Past 30 Days | Alcohol | 0.9 | 1,761 | 2.5 | 1,417 | 5.7 | 1,777 | 8.0 | 1,334 | 4.1 | 6,289 | 4.2 | 3,061 | 4.0 | 3,202 |
| | | Cigarettes | 0.4 | 1,729 | 1.7 | 1,374 | 2.8 | 1,751 | 3.2 | 1,320 | 2.0 | 6,174 | 2.0 | 2,999 | 1.9 | 3,151 |
| | | Marijuana | 0.2 | 1,758 | 1.2 | 1,414 | 3.4 | 1,775 | 5.5 | 1,333 | 2.4 | 6,280 | 2.9 | 3,057 | 2.0 | 3,197 |
| **Average Age of Onset**** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample | Percent | Sample |
| ***(How old were you when you first…)*** | had more than a sip or two of beer, wine or hard liquor? | Alcohol | 5.7 | 1,758 | 12.2 | 1,437 | 19.8 | 1,784 | 25.9 | 1,343 | 15.5 | 6,322 | 16.1 | 3,080 | 14.9 | 3,216 |
| | | *Average age:* | 10.3 years | | 11.6 years | | 13.1 years | | 14.4 years | | 13.1 years | | 13.0 years | | 13.2 years | |
| | smoked a cigarette, even just a puff? | Cigarettes | 2.6 | 1,762 | 5.8 | 1,441 | 10.3 | 1,788 | 13.4 | 1,339 | 7.8 | 6,330 | 8.2 | 3,085 | 7.4 | 3,219 |
| | | *Average age:* | 10.4 years | | 11.8 years | | 12.8 years | | 13.8 years | | 12.8 years | | 12.7 years | | 12.9 years | |
| | smoked marijuana? | Marijuana | 0.7 | 1,764 | 2.8 | 1,441 | 9.2 | 1,790 | 14.8 | 1,342 | 6.6 | 6,337 | 7.5 | 3,087 | 5.6 | 3,224 |
| | | *Average age:* | 10.9 years | | 12.5 years | | 13.7 years | | 14.9 years | | 14.1 years | | 14.0 years | | 14.3 years | |

* For Past 30-Day Use, Perception of Risk, and Perception of Parental/Peer Disapproval, the "Sample" column represents the sample size - the number of people who answered the question and whose responses were used to determine the percentage. The "Percent" column represents the percentage of youth in the sample answering the question as specified in the definition.

** For Average Age of Onset, the "Sample" column represents the overall sample size: the total number of people that responded to the questions about Age of Onset. This includes responses that are not used to calculate the average age of onset (i.e., youth that have never used alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana). The "Percent" column represents the percentage of youth in the sample reporting any age of first use for the specified substance. "Average age" is calculated by averaging the ages of first use of students reporting any use.

† "All Grades" represents responses from students in all grades surveyed. The "All Grades" sample may contain additional data from grades that did not make the sample cutoff, and so may exceed the sum of the individual grade columns displayed. (In order to report individual grades/genders accurately, the grade or gender must have a minimum of twenty students reporting data. "All Grades" data not meeting the minimum number of respondents are displayed as "n/a.")

# Data Tables

**Table 12. Additional Data for Prevention Planning**

| | | Grade 6 | | | | Grade 8 | | | | Grade 10 | | | | Grade 12 | | | | All Grades | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 | LSAA 2007 | LSAA 2009 | LSAA 2011 | State 2011 |
| **Safety** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| During the past 30 days, on how many days did you not go to school because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on your way to school? | One Or More Days | 5.4 | 5.6 | 3.4 | 5.6 | 9.8 | 5.5 | 5.4 | 6.8 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.6 | 4.3 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 4.0 | 6.3 | 4.7 | 4.0 | 5.3 |
| During the past 12 months, how often have you been picked on or bullied by a student ON SCHOOL PROPERTY? | More Than Once | 17.3 | 21.1 | 16.4 | 18.4 | 18.1 | 16.2 | 17.4 | 17.7 | 12.7 | 6.8 | 9.6 | 10.6 | 8.7 | 6.6 | 6.4 | 7.5 | 14.1 | 12.6 | 12.4 | 13.5 |
| **Discipline** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| My teachers maintain good discipline in the classroom. | Strongly Agree or Agree | 94.6 | 92.9 | 93.3 | 92.4 | 87.6 | 89.4 | 92.6 | 87.9 | 89.3 | 92.1 | 90.5 | 89.2 | 88.7 | 90.7 | 94.0 | 90.0 | 90.1 | 91.3 | 92.5 | 89.8 |
| The principle and assistant principal maintain good discipline at my school. | Strongly Agree or Agree | 91.4 | 90.9 | 90.0 | 88.9 | 88.3 | 86.7 | 89.3 | 86.1 | 87.1 | 89.1 | 89.6 | 87.1 | 84.9 | 86.5 | 89.3 | 86.7 | 87.9 | 88.3 | 89.6 | 87.2 |
| **Perceived vs. Actual ATOD Use** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Smoke Cigarettes every day | Perceived Use | 2.0 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 2.5 | 15.6 | 10.1 | 11.5 | 16.0 | 21.6 | 16.2 | 19.5 | 25.7 | 20.0 | 18.8 | 20.1 | 24.9 | 14.6 | 11.3 | 12.6 | 17.0 |
| | Actual Use | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.3 | 2.4 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.6 |
| Drank Alcohol in past 30 days | Perceived Use | 3.1 | 1.8 | 1.3 | 3.3 | 19.7 | 13.1 | 13.7 | 21.4 | 33.5 | 22.8 | 25.1 | 35.5 | 34.2 | 28.6 | 28.2 | 38.7 | 22.3 | 16.2 | 16.5 | 24.3 |
| | Actual Use | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.4 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 2.5 | 6.0 | 6.9 | 4.5 | 5.7 | 11.2 | 8.1 | 7.8 | 8.0 | 17.0 | 4.9 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 8.6 |
| Used Marijuana in past 30 days | Perceived Use | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 11.6 | 7.8 | 10.2 | 16.9 | 19.7 | 16.3 | 20.2 | 29.4 | 22.7 | 22.1 | 23.6 | 30.3 | 13.6 | 11.4 | 13.1 | 19.3 |
| | Actual Use | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 7.9 | 3.6 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 9.8 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.4 | 5.3 |

# Substance Use and Perceived Parental Acceptability

**Table 13. State-level Alcohol Use in Relation to Perceived Parental Acceptability**

| How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to drink beer, wine, or hard liquor regularly? | Has Used Alcohol At Least Once in Lifetime | Has Used Alcohol At Least Once in Past 30 Days |
|---|---|---|
| Very Wrong | 14.6 | 4.2 |
| Wrong | 59.6 | 24.9 |
| A Little Bit Wrong | 80.2 | 44.7 |
| Not Wrong At All | 68.6 | 42.7 |

**Table 14. State-level Marijuana Use in Relation to Perceived Parental Acceptability**

| How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to smoke marijuana? | Has Used Marijuana At Least Once in Lifetime | Has Used Marijuana At Least Once in Past 30 Days |
|---|---|---|
| Very Wrong | 8.5 | 3.0 |
| Wrong | 48.4 | 24.0 |
| A Little Bit Wrong | 72.6 | 46.5 |
| Not Wrong At All | 65.1 | 49.5 |

**Table 15. State-level Cigarette Use in Relation to Perceived Parental Acceptability**

| How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to smoke cigarettes? | Has Used Cigarettes At Least Once in Lifetime | Has Used Cigarettes At Least Once in Past 30 Days |
|---|---|---|
| Very Wrong | 10.5 | 2.2 |
| Wrong | 42.6 | 14.6 |
| A Little Bit Wrong | 67.3 | 37.1 |
| Not Wrong At All | 58.7 | 40.9 |

# Even a Small Amount of Perceived Parental Acceptability Can Lead to Substance Use

When parents have favorable attitudes toward drugs, they influence the attitudes and behavior of their children. For example, parental approval of moderate drinking, even under parental supervision, substantially increases the risk of the young person using alcohol. Further, in families where parents involve children in their own drug or alcohol behavior, for example, asking the child to light the parent's cigarette or to get the parent a beer, there is an increased likelihood that their children will become drug users in adolescence.

In the Utah PNA Survey, students were asked how wrong their parents felt it was to use alcohol, marijuana, or cigarettes. The tables above display lifetime and past 30 days use rates in relation to parents' acceptance of alcohol, marijuana, or cigarette use.

As can be seen in Table 13, relatively few students (14.6% lifetime, 4.2% 30-day) use alcohol when their parents think it is "Very Wrong" to use it. In contrast, when a student believes that their parents agree with use somewhat (i.e. the parent only believes that it is "Wrong," not "Very Wrong"), alcohol use increases to 59.6% for lifetime use and 24.9% for 30-day use. Similar findings regarding marijuana and cigarette use can be viewed in Tables 14 and 15.

Tables 13-15 illustrate how even a small amount of perceived parental acceptability can lead to substance use. These results make a strong argument for the importance of parents having strong and clear standards and rules when it comes to ATOD use.

# Appendix: Changes in the 2011 PNA

As new issues come to the forefront and new prevention modalities are implemented, the SHARP PNA survey evolves to reflect these concerns.

## Weighting procedures for 2011

During the analysis of SHARP survey data, Bach Harrison analysts have applied weights to the data to make the results more accurately reflect the total population of Utah students in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12.

Beginning in 2011, the State of Utah requested that Bach Harrison change the weighting procedure to account for the probability of a school participating in the survey and the probability of inclusion of students in each grade and gender category in each school. This differed from the weighting procedure used with past SHARP surveys that was based upon school district enrollment in grades 6, 8, 10, and 12.

To examine the effects of this weighting change, a comparison of ATOD use rates, antisocial behavior, and risk and protective factor scales was conducted using the two weighting procedures. Results showed that the two methods produced nearly identical results at the state level with differences of less than 1%. Thus, we believe that the 2011 data presented in this report are comparable to data from previous administrations.

For most school districts, results obtained using the two weighting procedures were also very similar. However, a few school districts, mostly those with a small student population, had some differences that exceeded 1%. If you have any concern about whether observed trends over time are a result of the new method of weighting the survey data please contact Bach Harrison. We will be happy to review the survey weighting procedure with you and if necessary conduct further analyses of your data to assist in accurately determining trends over time for your area. Bach Harrison's contact information can be found on the final page of this report.

## Changes to ATOD Questions

With the recent focus on prescription drugs, the stimulant and sedative questions were reworded slightly for 2011. The new wording emphasizes the fact that they are prescription drugs and the questions now match those asked by the national Monitoring the Future (MTF) survey.

In order to match the MTF questions, the 2007/2009 sedative question was divided into two questions; 1) sedatives/sleeping pills and 2) tranquilizers. The wording for these new questions matches the MTF exactly and makes national comparison more accurate and timely. Further, questions regarding cocaine and hallucinogens were updated to more closely match the MTF questions. The changes added examples of the drugs in order to increase the likelihood that students would recognize the drugs they used. Examples of the 2011 questions can be found in Tables 4 and 5 of this report and the wording for questions from previous surveys can be found in survey reports for 2007 and 2009.

## New Health-Related Questions

Extra tobacco and health department questions were added in 2011. Health issues include questions about:

1) asthma
2) height and weight
3) physical activity
4) watching TV and playing video games
5) texting in a car
6) depression and suicide
7) diabetes
8) using tanning devices
9) getting sunburned
10) consuming soda and sweetened drinks
11) eating fast-food.

## Changes to Alcohol Usage Questions

In 2011, all questions related to the sources of obtaining alcohol were removed. The places of alcohol use were the same as prior years with the addition of the choice, *At or near school.*

## New Entitlement and Gang Questions

Questions from the Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice (CCJJ) that measure youth feelings of entitlement and perceptions of why kids join gangs were added in 2011 to provide more information on the gang issue in Utah.

# Contacts for Prevention

## National Contacts

**National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism**
http://www.niaaa.nih.gov

**National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information**
http://ncadi.samhsa.gov/

**The National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) Drugs of Abuse Information Clearinghouse**
http://www.nida.nih.gov/DrugPages.html

**Center for Substance Abuse Prevention**
http://www.samhsa.gov/prevention/

**Monitoring the Future**
http://monitoringthefuture.org

**National Survey on Drug Use and Health**
http://www.oas.samhsa.gov/nsduh.htm

## State Contacts

**Utah Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health**
120 North 200 West, #209
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103
http://dsamh.utah.gov/

Craig L. PoVey, Program Administrator
801-538-4354
Email: clpovey@utah.gov

Ben Reaves, Program Manager
801-538-3946
Email: breaves@Utah.gov

Brenda Ahlemann, Research Consultant
801-538-9868
Email: bahlemann@utah.gov

Susannah Burt, Program Manager
801-538-4388
Email: sburt@utah.gov

**Utah State Office of Education**
Verne Larsen
Coordinator, At Risk Services
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111
801-538-7583
Email: larsen.Verne@schools.utah.gov

**Utah Department of Health**
Amy Sands
Tobacco Prevention and Control Program
P.O. Box 142106
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2106
801-538-9374
Email: asands@utah.gov

## Regional Contacts

**Summit Planning District**
Pamella Bello
Valley Mental Health
1753 Sidewinder Drive
Park City, UT 84060
435-649-8347
Email: pamellab@vmh.com

**Utah County Planning District**
Pat Bird
Utah County Div. of Substance Abuse
151 South University Avenue Suite 3200
Provo, UT 84601
801-851-7126
Email: ucadm.patbi@state.ut.us

**Wasatch Planning District**
Kathy Day
Heber Valley Counseling
55 South 500 East
Heber, UT 84032
435-657-3228
Email: kday@co.wasatch.ut.us

## Regional Contacts (Cont.)

**Four Corners Planning District**
Sarah Bauman
Four Corners Behavioral Health
198 E. Center
Moab, UT 84532
435-259-6131, ext 27
Email: sbauman@fourcorners.ws

**Bear River Planning District**
Cathy Lloyd
Bear River Health Department
655 East 1300 North
Logan, UT 84341
435-792-6529
Email: clloyd@brhd.org

**Weber Planning District**
Paula Price
Weber Human Services
237 26th Street
Ogden, UT 84401
801-625-3674
Email: paulap@weberhs.org

**Southwest Planning District**
Allen Sain
Southwest Center
245 East 680 South
Cedar City, UT 84720
435-867-7622
Email: asain@swcbh.com

**Central Planning District**
Jolene Salisbury-Blackburn
Central Utah Counseling Center
390 West 100 North
Ephraim, UT 84627
435-283-4065
Email: joleneb@cucc.us

**Salt Lake Planning District**
Jeff Smart
Salt Lake County Government Center
2001 S. State Suite S-2300
Salt Lake City, UT 84190
801-468-2042
Email: jlsmart@SLCo.org

**Tooele Planning District**
Julie Spindler
Valley Mental Health
100 South 1000 West
Tooele, UT 84074
435-843-3538
Email: julies@vmh.com

**Northeastern Planning District**
Robin Taylor
Northeastern Counseling Center
285 W. 800 S.
Roosevelt, UT 84066
435-725-6334
Email: robint@nccutah.org

**Davis Planning District**
Debi Todd
Davis Behavioral Health
2250 N. 1700 W.
Layton, UT 84041
801-447-8459
Email: debit@dbhutah.org

**This Report Was Prepared for the State of Utah by**
by Bach Harrison LLC
http://www.bach-harrison.com
R. Steven Harrison, Ph.D.
R. Paris Bach-Harrison, B.F.A.
Taylor C. Bryant, B.A.
Mary VanLeeuwen Johnstun, M.A.