2010

APN Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment Student Survey

White County Profile Report

Arkansas Department of Human Services Division of Behavioral Sciences Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention

Conducted by International Survey Associates dba Pride Surveys

.

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION1.1The Risk and Protective Factor Model of Prevention	6 9
2	TOOLS FOR ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING	9
3	SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT USING SURVEY DATA3.1What are the numbers telling you?3.2How to decide if a rate is "unacceptable."3.3Use these data for planning:	10 10 10 10
4	HOW TO READ THE CHARTS AND TABLES	11
5	NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND PROFILE	57
6	STUDENT TOBACCO USE, EXPERIENCES AND PREVENTION SERVICES	63
7	DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PROGRAM CORE MEASURES	66
8	PREVENTION RESOURCES8.1Regional Prevention Resource Centers8.2State and National Contacts	68 68 70

List of Tables

1	Student Totals
2	Grade
3	Sex
4	Ethnic Origin
5	Risk and Protective Factor Scale Definition
6	Alcohol - Lifetime Use
7	Cigarettes - Lifetime Use
8	Chewing Tobacco - Lifetime Use
9	Marijuana - Lifetime Use
10	Hallucinogens - Lifetime Use
11	Cocaine - Lifetime Use
12	Inhalants - Lifetime Use
12	Sedatives - Lifetime Use 39
13	Meth - Lifetime Use 40
	Stimulants - Lifetime Use
15	
16	
17	Ecstasy - Lifetime Use
18	Prescription Drugs - Lifetime Use
19	Over-The-Counter Drugs - Lifetime Use
20	Alcopops - Lifetime Use
21	Any Drug - Lifetime Use
22	Alcohol - Past 30 Day Use
23	Cigarettes - Past 30 Day Use
24	Chewing Tobacco - Past 30 Day Use
25	Marijuana - Past 30 Day Use
26	Hallucinogens - Past 30 Day Use42
27	Cocaine - Past 30 Day Use
28	Inhalants - Past 30 Day Use
29	Sedatives - Past 30 Day Use 43
30	Meth - Past 30 Day Use
31	Stimulants - Past 30 Day Use
32	Heroin - Past 30 Day Use
33	Ecstasy - Past 30 Day Use
34	Prescription Drugs - Past 30 Day Use
35	Over-The-Counter Drugs - Past 30 Day Use
36	Alcopops - Past 30 Day Use
37	Any Drug - Past 30 Day Use
38	Binge Drinking
39	Pack of Cigarettes
40	Suspended from School
41	Drunk or High at School
42	Sold Illegal Drugs
43	Stolen a Vehicle

44	Been Arrested	46
45	Attacked to Harm	46
46	Carried a Handgun	46
47	Handgun to School	46
48	Community Risk - Low Neighborhood Attachment	47
49	Community Risk - High Community Disorganization	47
50	Community Risk - Transitions and Mobility	47
51	Community Risk - Laws and Norms Favorable to Drug Use	47
52	Community Risk - Perceived Availability of Drugs	47
53	Community Risk - Perceived Availability of Handguns	
54	Family Risk - Poor Family Management	48
55	Family Risk - Family Conflict	48
56	Family Risk - Family History of Antisocial Behavior	48
57	Family Risk - Parental Attitudes Favorable to ATOD	48
58	Family Risk - Parental Attitudes Favorable to ASB	
59	School Risk - Academic Failure	48
60	School Risk - Low Commitment to School	
61	Peer Risk - Rebelliousness	49
62	Peer Risk - Early Initiation of Drug Use	
63	Peer Risk - Early Initiation of ASB	49
64	Peer Risk - Peer Favorable Attitudes to ASB	
65	Peer Risk - Peer Favorable Attitudes to Drug Use	
66	Peer Risk - Intentions to Use	
67	Peer Risk - Peer Perceived Risk of Drug Use	
68	Peer Risk - Interaction with Antisocial Peers	
69	Peer Risk - Friends' Use of Drugs	50
70	Peer Risk - Sensation Seeking	
71	Peer Risk - Peer Rewards for Antisocial Involvement	
72	Peer Risk - Depressive Symptoms	
73	Peer Risk - Gang Involvement	
74	Community Protective - Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement .	
75	Community Protective - Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	
76	Family Protective - Family Attachment	
77	Family Protective - Family Opportunities for PSI	
78	Family Protective - Family Rewards for PSI	
79	School Protective - School Opportunities for PSI	
80	School Protective - School Rewards for PSI	
81	Peer Protective - Religiosity	
82	Peer Protective - Social Skills	
83	Peer Protective - Belief in a Moral Order	
84	Peer Protective - Prosocial Involvement	
85	Peer Protective - Peer Rewards for Prosocial Involvement	
86	Peer Protective - Interaction with Prosocial Peers	
87	Sources of Alcohol	
88	Location of Alcohol Use	54

89	I feel safe at my school.	55
90	How often have you taken a handgun to school	55
91	How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to take a gun	
	to school	56
92	Have any of your brothers/sisters ever taken a gun to school	56
93	Avg Age of First Marijuana	57
94	Avg Age of First Cigarettes	57
95	Avg Age of First Alcohol	57
96	Avg Age of First Regular Alcohol Use	57
97	Avg Age of First School Suspension	57
98	Avg Age of First Been Arrested	58
99	Avg Age of First Carried a Gun	58
100	Avg Age of First Attacked to Harm	58
101	Avg Age of First Belonged to a Gang	58
102	Cigarettes - Lifetime Use	63
103	Chewing Tobacco - Lifetime Use	63
104	Cigarettes - Past 30 Day Use	63
105	Chewing Tobacco - Past 30 Day Use	63
106	Which statement best describes rules about smoking inside your	
	home?	64
107	Which statement best describes rules about smoking in your family	
	cars?	64
108	During this school year, were you taught in any of your classes about	
	the dangers of tobacco use?	65
109	During the past 12 months, have you participated in any commu-	
	nity activities to discourage people your age from using cigarettes,	
	chewing tobacco, snuff, dip or cigars?	65
110	Core Measure by Grade for Past 30 Day Use	66
111	Core Measure by Grade for Perception of Risk	66
112	Core Measure by Grade for Parental Disapproval	66
113	Core Measure by Grade for Age of Onset	66
114	Core Measure by Sex for Past 30 Day Use	67
115	Core Measure by Sex for Perception of Risk	67
116	Core Measure by Sex for Parental Disapproval	67
117	Core Measure by Sex for Age of Onset $\hdots \hdots \hdot$	67

List of Figures

1	Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 6
2	Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 8
3	Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 10
4	Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 12
5	Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 6
6	Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 8
7	Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 10
8	Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 12
9	Risk Factors - Grade 6 20
10	Risk Factors - Grade 8
11	Risk Factors - Grade 10
12	Risk Factors - Grade 12
13	Protective Factors - Grade 6
14	Protective Factors - Grade 8
15	Protective Factors - Grade 10
16	Protective Factors - Grade 12
17	School Safety Profile - Grade 6
18	School Safety Profile - Grade 8
19	School Safety Profile - Grade 10
20	School Safety Profile - Grade 12
21	Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 6
22	Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 8
23	Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 10
24	Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 12
25	No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 6
26	No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 8
27	No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 10
28	No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 12

1 INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes findings from the Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment Survey (APNA), a survey of 6th, 8th, 10th and 12th grade school students, conducted in the fall of 2010. This survey was available free of charge to all Arkansas public school districts that chose to participate. The survey was designed to assess adolescent substance use and related behaviors, and risk and protective factors that predict these behaviors. In this report, the results are presented for each grade along with the overall results for the State. Table 1 provides information on the total number of students, the number of school districts and the number of schools represented by this report. Table 2 provides information on the number and percent of students at each grade. Table 3 provides information on the number and percent of students by sex. Table 4 provides information on the number and percent of students by ethnic origin.

The APNA Survey was first administered in the fall of 2002 and has been administered in the fall of each school year since then. Because trends over time are very important to prevention planning, readers are encouraged to review the results from the previous surveys. By comparing the results of the previous surveys, changes in ATOD (alcohol, tobacco and other drugs) use, rates of ASB (antisocial behavior), and levels of risk and protective factors can be determined for a specific grade. It is important to note that the results in this report are for students who were not sampled in the even grades (6, 8, 10, and 12) during the previous year's survey. Those students are now in grades 7, 9, 11 or are out of school. Together, the results of the current and past APNA surveys provide a complete picture of ATOD use, antisocial behavior, risk, and protection for students in Arkansas. (Methods Note Regarding Long-Term Trend Data:) The 2006 procedures varied from those used in this report, as well as those used in all other earlier reports. Non-standard procedures for calculating: 1) drug prevalence rates, and 2) for calculating scores on the risk and protective factor questions, were used in the 2006 report. The variation in 2006 procedures related to how missing data (i.e., instances where the student did not respond to a question) were counted. The effect of the 2006 procedure was to slightly reduce the reported prevalence levels for all drugs, and to lower the calculated scores for the risk and protective factor questions.

In this report, the computational methods used for all calculations are identical to those used in all prior reports, other than the 2006 report. In addition, to produce the most accurate long-term trend data possible, 2006 results have been recalculated using standard procedures consistent with all reporting years. This means that, in some cases, small deviations in 2006 data points will be noted between this report and the actual 2006 report.

Table 1: Student Totals

Response	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
Total Students	county	2,675	2,642	2,868	2,847
	state	79,598	85,130	88,912	87,760

Table 2: Grade

		2007-8		2008-9		2009-10		2010-11	
Response	Group	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n
6	county	27.6	739	25.5	673	28.4	814	28.1	800
	state	28.8	22,910	28.8	24,553	28.5	25,324	29.8	26,125
8	county	23.7	633	26.1	690	27.2	779	28.0	797
	state	27.7	22,082	27.7	23,547	27.8	24,711	28.4	24,882
10	county	25.3	678	26.1	690	23.9	686	23.6	672
	state	24.3	19,315	24.0	20,451	24.3	21,629	23.4	20,530
12	county	23.4	625	22.3	589	20.5	589	20.3	578
	state	19.2	15,291	19.5	16,579	19.4	17,248	18.5	16,223

Table 3: Sex

		2007-8		2008-9		2009-10		2010-11	
Response	Group	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n
Male	county	45.0	1,191	49.9	1,292	47.2	1,337	50.4	1,420
	state	47.9	37,614	48.5	40,590	48.3	42,276	48.7	42,253
Female	county	55.0	1,456	50.1	1,297	52.8	1,496	49.6	1,399
	state	52.1	40,835	51.5	43,061	51.7	45,185	51.3	44,591

Table 4: Ethnic Origin

				-					
		20	07-8	20	08-9	20	09-10	20	10-11
Response	Group	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n
Hispanic	county	4.4	127	4.2	118	5.6	180	5.5	174
	state	8.3	7,386	8.2	7,828	8.8	8,900	9.3	9,427
Black or African American	county	4.6	135	4.8	135	5.8	186	5.6	176
	state	16.5	14,752	17.1	16,250	18.2	18,449	16.7	16,904
Asian	county	0.7	19	1.2	34	0.8	27	0.9	28
	state	1.5	1,339	1.5	1,460	1.5	1,532	1.7	1,731
American Indian	county	4.0	115	4.0	111	5.0	162	4.1	130
	state	4.5	4,041	4.6	4,341	4.4	4,480	4.8	4,843
Alaska Native	county	0.0	1	0.2	6	0.2	6	0.2	7
	state	0.2	192	0.2	181	0.2	213	0.2	206
White	county	81.4	2,364	80.8	2,269	77.1	2,495	78.9	2,495
	state	61.3	54,915	60.7	57,673	58.6	59,377	59.2	60,031
Native Hawaiian	county	0.6	16	0.5	15	0.6	19	0.5	16
	state	0.5	487	0.5	489	0.6	627	0.7	734
Other	county	4.4	127	4.2	119	4.9	159	4.3	136
	state	7.2	6,406	7.2	6,832	7.6	7,703	7.4	7,553

1.1 The Risk and Protective Factor Model of Prevention

Risk and protective factor-focused prevention is based on a simple premise: 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 attacks such as diets high in fats, lack of exercise, and smoking, a team of researchers, the Social Development Research Group (SDRG), at the University of Washington, have defined a set of risk factors for drug abuse. The research team also found that some children exposed to multiple risk factors manage to avoid behavior problems later even though they were exposed to the same risks as children who exhibited behavior problems. Based on research, they identified protective factors and processes that work together to buffer children from the effects of high risk exposure and lead to the development of healthy behaviors.

Risk factors include characteristics of school, community, and family environments, as well as characteristics of students and their peer groups that are known to predict increased likelihood of drug use, delinquency, and violent behaviors among youth (Hawkins, Catalano & Miller, 1992; Hawkins, Arthur & Catalano, 1995; Brewer, Hawkins, Catalano & Neckerman, 1995).

2 TOOLS FOR ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING

Protective factors exert a positive influence or buffer against the negative influence of risk, thus reducing the likelihood that adolescents will engage in problem behaviors. Protective factors, identified through research reviewed by the Social Development Research Group, include social bonding to family, school, community and peers; and healthy beliefs and clear standards for behavior.

Research on risk and protective factors has important implications for prevention efforts. The premise of this approach is that in order to promote positive youth development and prevent problem behaviors, it is necessary to address those factors that predict the problem. By measuring risk and protective factors in a population, specific risk factors that are elevated and widespread can be identified and targeted by preventive interventions that also promote related protective factors. For example, if academic failure is identified as an elevated risk factor in a community, then mentoring and tutoring interventions can be provided that will improve academic performance, and also increase opportunities and rewards for classroom participation.

Risk and protective factor-focused drug abuse prevention is based on the work of J. David Hawkins, Ph.D., Richard F. Catalano, Ph.D.; and a team of researchers at

the University of Washington in Seattle. Beginning in the early 1980's, the group researched adolescent problem behaviors and identified risk factors for adolescent drug abuse and delinquency. The chart below shows the links between the 16 risk factors and the five problem behaviors. The check marks have been placed in the chart to indicate where at least two well designed, published research studies have shown a link between the risk factor and the problem behavior.

	PF	ROBLI	EM BEH	IAVIOR:	S
YOUTH AT RISK	Substance Abuse	Delinquency	Teen Pregnancy	School Drop-Out	Violence
Community					
Availability of Drugs and Firearms	 ✓ 				1
Community Laws and Norms Favorable Toward Drug Use	1				
Transitions and Mobility	1	1		1	
Low Neighborhood Attachment and Community Disorganization	1	1			1
Extreme Economic and Social Deprivation	1	1	1	1	1
Family	1				1
Family History of High Risk Behavior	 ✓ 	1	 ✓ 	1	
Family Management Problems	1	1	1	1	1
Family Conflict	1	1	1	1	1
Favorable Parental Attitudes and Involvement in the Problem Behavior	1	1			1
School					
Early and Persistent Antisocial Behavior	1	1	1	1	1
Academic Failure in Elementary School	1	1	1	1	1
Lack of Commitment to School	1	1	1	1	
Individual/Peer					
Alienation and Rebelliousness	1	√		1	
Friends Who Engage in a Problem Behavior	✓	√	1	✓	1
Favorable Attitudes Toward the Problem Behavior	1	1	1	1	
Early Initiation of the Problem Behavior	1	1	1	1	1

3 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT USING SURVEY DATA

Data from the Arkansas Prevention Needs Assessment Survey can be used to help school and community planners assess current conditions and prioritize areas of greatest need.

Each risk and protective factor can be linked to specific types of interventions that have been shown to be effective in either reducing the risk(s) and enhancing the protection(s). The steps outlined below will help your school and community 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.

3.1 What are the numbers telling you?

Review the charts and data tables presented in this report. Using the table in section 3.3, note your findings as you discuss the following questions

- Which 3 to 5 risk factors appear to be higher than you would want?
- Which 3 to 5 protective factors appear to be lower than you would want?
- 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?

3.2 How to decide if a rate is "unacceptable."

- Look across the charts to determine which items stand out as either much higher or much lower than the others.
- Compare your data to statewide data and national data. Differences of 5% or more between the local and other data should be carefully reviewed.
- Determine the standards and values held in your area. For example: Is it acceptable in your community for 75% of high school students to drink alcohol regularly even when the statewide percentage is 90?

3.3 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.
- Promising approaches talk with 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 area, and in improving the protective factors that are low.

	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Unacceptable	Unacceptable
Measure	Rate $\#1$	Rate #2	Rate #3	Rate #4
30 Day				
Drug Use				
Antisocial				
Behavior				
Risk				
Factors				
Protective				
Factors				

How do I decide which intervention(s) to employ?

- Strategies should be selected based on the risk factors that are high in your community and the protective factors that are low.
- Strategies should be age appropriate and employed prior to the onset of the problem behavior.
- Strategies chosen should address more than a single risk and protective factor.
- No single strategy offers the solution.


How do I know whether or not the intervention was effective?

• Participation in the annual administration of the survey provides trend data necessary for determining the effectiveness of the implemented intervention(s) and also provides data for determining any new efforts that are needed.

4 HOW TO READ THE CHARTS AND TABLES


- 1. Student responses for risk and protective factors, substance use and antisocial behavior questions are displayed by grade on the following pages.
- 2. The factors are grouped into 4 domains: community, family, peer-individual, and school.
- 3. The bars represent the percent of students in the grade who reported elevated risk or protection, substance use, antisocial behaviors or school safety concerns.
- 4. Scanning across these charts, you can easily determine which factors are most (or least) prevalent, thus identifying which are the most important for your community to address.
- 5. Bars will be complemented by a small dot. The dot shows the comparison from the state and provides additional information for you in determining the relative importance of each risk or protective factor.
- 6. A dashed line on each risk and protective factor chart represents the percentage of youth at risk or with protection for the seven state sample upon which the cut-points were developed. The seven states included in the norm group were Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Oregon, Utah and Washington. This gives you a comparison to a national sample.
- 7. Brief definitions of the risk and protective factors can be found following the graphs.
- 8. The tables provide more detailed information and are broken down by grade level. The combined category consists of all the grade levels represented in this report combined together (ie. if the report is based on 10th and 12th graders then the combined category will be all the 10th and 12th graders combined). For the tables on substance use, some substances also have a comparison to the Monitoring the Future (MTF) data. Monitoring the Future is an annual federally funded national survey of substance use across the country for students in grade 8, 10 and 12. For some substances and for some years or some grades, there is no corresponding MTF data.
- 9. The following abbreviations are sometimes used in the tables and charts due to space constraints:

ATOD stands for Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use.ASB stands for Antisocial Behaviors.PSI stands for Prosocial Involvement.MTF stands for Monitoring the Future.




Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 6 White County

Figure 1: Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 6




Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 8 White County

Figure 2: Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 8




Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 10 White County

Figure 3: Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 10




Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 12 White County

Figure 4: Alcohol, Tobacco and Other Drug Use - Grade 12




Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 6 White County

Figure 5: Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 6




Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 8 White County

Figure 6: Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 8




Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 10 White County

Figure 7: Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 10




Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 12 White County

Figure 8: Heavy Use and Antisocial Behavior - Grade 12




Risk Factors - Grade 6

Figure 9: Risk Factors - Grade 6




Risk Factors - Grade 8

Figure 10: Risk Factors - Grade 8




Risk Factors - Grade 10 White County

Figure 11: Risk Factors - Grade 10




Risk Factors - Grade 12 White County

Figure 12: Risk Factors - Grade 12




Protective Factors - Grade 6 White County

Figure 13: Protective Factors - Grade 6




Protective Factors - Grade 8 White County

Figure 14: Protective Factors - Grade 8



Protective Factors - Grade 10 White County

Figure 15: Protective Factors - Grade 10



Protective Factors - Grade 12 White County

Figure 16: Protective Factors - Grade 12

School Safety Profile - Grade 6 White County




Figure 17: School Safety Profile - Grade 6

School Safety Profile - Grade 8 White County




Figure 18: School Safety Profile - Grade 8

School Safety Profile - Grade 10 White County




Figure 19: School Safety Profile - Grade 10

School Safety Profile - Grade 12 White County






Figure 20: School Safety Profile - Grade 12




Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 6 White County

Figure 21: Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 6




Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 8 White County

Figure 22: Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 8



Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 10 White County

Figure 23: Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 10



Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 12 White County

Figure 24: Sources and Locations of Alcohol Use - Grade 12

	Community Domain Risk Factors
Low Neighborhood	A low level of bonding to the neighborhood is related to higher
Attachment	levels of juvenile crime and drug selling.
Community	Research has shown that neighborhoods with high population
Disorganization	density, lack of natural surveillance of public places, physical
	deterioration, and high rates of adult crime also have higher
	rates of juvenile crime and drug selling.
Laws and Norms	Research has shown that legal restrictions on alcohol and to-
Favorable Toward	bacco use, such as raising the legal drinking age, restricting
Drug Use	smoking in public places, and increased taxation have been fol-
	lowed by decreases in consumption. Moreover, national surveys
	of high school seniors have shown that shifts in normative atti-
	tudes toward drug use have preceded changes in prevalence of
	use.
Perceived Availability	The availability of cigarettes, alcohol, marijuana, and other il-
of Drugs	legal drugs has been related to the use of these substances by
-	adolescents.
Perceived Availability	The availability of handguns has also been related to the use of
of Handguns	these substances by adolescents.
	Community Domain Protective Factors
Opportunities for	When opportunities are available in a community for positive
Prosocial	participation, children are less likely to engage in substance use
Involvement	and other problem behaviors.
Rewards for	Rewards for positive participation in activities help children bond
Prosocial	to the community, thus lowering their risk for substance use.
Involvement	
	Family Domain Risk Factors
Poor Family	Parents' use of inconsistent and/or unusually harsh or severe
Management	punishment with their children places them at higher risk for
	substance use and other problem behaviors. Also, parents' fail-
	ure 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	When children are raised in a family with a history of problem
Antisocial Behavior	behaviors (e.g., violence or ATOD use), the children are more
Dellavior	

continued on the next column

Risk and Protective Factor Scale Definition (continued)

Parental AttitudesIn 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) 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) ousing behavior, for example, asking the child to light the parent's cigarette or get the parent a beer from the refrigerator.Parental AttitudesIn families where parents are tolerant of their child's antisocial behavior (i.e. fighting, stealing, defacing property, etc.), chil- dren are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.Family AttachmentYoung 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 InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Low Commitment to School Domain Risk FactorsSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- ucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or no- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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, 	Risk and Protective Factor Scale Definition (continued)		
Drug Useto become drug abusers during adolescence. The risk is further increased if parents involve children in their own drug (or alco- hol) using behavior, for example, asking the child to light the parent's cigarette or get the parent a beer from the refrigerator.Parental AttitudesIn families where parents are tolerant of their child's antisocial behavior (i.e. fighting, stealing, defacing property, etc.), chil- dren are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.Family AttachmentYoung 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 InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning in the late elementary grades (grades 4-6) academic failure increases the risk of problem behaviors.Low Commitment to SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucingens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Dyportunities for ProsocialWhen young people are given more opportunities to participate <br< th=""><th></th><th></th></br<>			
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. Parental Attitudes Favorable Toward Antisocial Behavior Voung people who ree parents are tolerant of their child's antisocial behavior (i.e. fighting, stealing, defacing property, etc.), children are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence. 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 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 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 Usureys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hallucingers, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non-medically prescribed tranquilizers 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 Voung people are given more opportunities to participate Prosocial Note set or 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 Note set or angage in drug use and other problem behaviors. Rewards for Prosocial Note set or angage in drug use and other problem heaviors. Note set or angage in drug use and other problem heavior	Favorable Toward	alcohol, or are tolerant of children's use, children are more likely	
hol) using behavior, for example, asking the child to light the parent's cigarette or get the parent a beer from the refrigerator.Parental Attitudes Favorable Toward Antisocial BehaviorIn families where parents are tolerant of their child's antisocial behavior (i.e. fighting, stealing, defacing property, etc.), chil- dren are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.Family AttachmentYoung 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 InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic Failure to School Domain Risk FactorsSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen young people are given more opportunities to participate meaningfully in important activities at school, they are less likely to engage in drug use.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen young people are given more oppotunities to participate meaningfully in importa	Drug Use	to become drug abusers during adolescence. The risk is further	
parent's cigarette or get the parent a beer from the refrigerator.Parental Attitudes Favorable Toward Antisocial BehaviorIn families where parents are tolerant of their child's antisocial behavior (i.e. fighting, stealing, defacing property, etc.), chil- dren are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.Family AttachmentYoung 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 InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSchool Seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Copportunities for ProsocialWhen young people are given more opportunities to participate meaningfully in important activities at school, they a		increased if parents involve children in their own drug (or alco-	
Parental Attitudes Favorable Toward Antisocial BehaviorIn families where parents are tolerant of their child's antisocial behavior (i.e. fighting, stealing, defacing property, etc.), chil- dren are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.Family AttachmentYoung 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 InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucingens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Dyportunities for ProsocialWhen 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.<		hol) using behavior, for example, asking the child to light the	
Favorable Toward Antisocial Behaviorbehavior (i.e. fighting, stealing, defacing property, etc.), children are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.Family AttachmentYoung 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 InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic Failure to School Domain Risk FactorsBeginning in the late elementary grades (grades 4-6) academic failure increases the risk of broth drug abuse and delinquency. It appears that the experience of failure itself, for whatever reasons, increases the risk of problem behaviors.Low Commitment to SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young pe		parent's cigarette or get the parent a beer from the refrigerator.	
Antisocial Behaviordren are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.Family Domain Protective FactorsFamily AttachmentYoung 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 InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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.Deportunities for ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at	Parental Attitudes	In families where parents are tolerant of their child's antisocial	
Family Domain Protective FactorsFamily AttachmentYoung 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 InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucingens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Favorable Toward	behavior (i.e. fighting, stealing, defacing property, etc.), chil-	
Family AttachmentYoung 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 InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Antisocial Behavior	dren are more likely to become drug abusers during adolescence.	
are less likely to engage in substance use and other problem behaviors.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Family Domain Protective Factors		
behaviors.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 InvolvementWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Family Attachment	Young people who feel that they are a valued part of their family	
Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementYoung people who are exposed to more opportunities to par- ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		are less likely to engage in substance use and other problem	
Prosocial Involvementticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		behaviors.	
Involvementfamily are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Opportunities for	Young people who are exposed to more opportunities to par-	
Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureSchool Domain Risk FactorsAcademic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Prosocial	ticipate meaningfully in the responsibilities and activities of the	
Rewards for Prosocial InvolvementWhen parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en- courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureSchool Domain Risk FactorsAcademic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Involvement	family are less likely to engage in drug use and other problem	
Involvementcourage, and attend to things done well by their child, children are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.Academic FailureSchool Domain Risk FactorsAcademic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		behaviors.	
are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.School Domain Risk FactorsAcademic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Rewards for Prosocial	When parents, siblings, and other family members praise, en-	
School Domain Risk FactorsAcademic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Involvement	courage, and attend to things done well by their child, children	
Academic FailureBeginning 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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		are less likely to engage in substance use and problem behaviors.	
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 SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	School Domain Risk Factors		
appears that the experience of failure itself, for whatever reasons, increases the risk of problem behaviors.Low Commitment to SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Academic Failure	Beginning in the late elementary grades (grades 4-6) academic	
increases the risk of problem behaviors.Low Commitment to SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		failure increases the risk of both drug abuse and delinquency. It	
increases the risk of problem behaviors.Low Commitment to SchoolSurveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal- lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		appears that the experience of failure itself, for whatever reasons,	
to Schoollucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non- medically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance			
omedically prescribed tranquilizers 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.Opportunities for Prosocial InvolvementWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Low Commitment	Surveys of high school seniors have shown that the use of hal-	
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.Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	to School	lucinogens, cocaine, heroin, stimulants, and sedatives or non-	
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 FactorsOpportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		medically prescribed tranquilizers is significantly lower among	
and perceiving the coursework as relevant are also negatively related to drug use.School Domain Protective FactorsOpportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		students who expect to attend college than among those who do	
related to drug use. School Domain Protective Factors Opportunities for When young people are given more opportunities to participate meaningfully in important activities at school, they are less likely involvement Rewards for When young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		not. Factors such as liking school, spending time on homework,	
School Domain Protective Factors Opportunities for When young people are given more opportunities to participate meaningfully in important activities at school, they are less likely involvement Rewards for When young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		and perceiving the coursework as relevant are also negatively	
Opportunities for ProsocialWhen 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 ProsocialWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance		related to drug use.	
Prosocialmeaningfully in important activities at school, they are less likelyInvolvementto engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards forWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contributions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	School Domain Protective Factors		
Involvementto engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.Rewards forWhen young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri- butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Opportunities for	When young people are given more opportunities to participate	
Rewards for When young people are recognized and rewarded for their contributions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Prosocial	meaningfully in important activities at school, they are less likely	
Prosocial butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	Involvement	to engage in drug use and other problem behaviors.	
	Rewards for	When young people are recognized and rewarded for their contri-	
Involvement use and other problem behaviors.	Prosocial	butions at school, they are less likely to be involved in substance	
	Involvement	use and other problem behaviors.	

continued on the next column

	Individual/Peer 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	Early onset of drug use predicts misuse of drugs. The earlier the
of Drug Use	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.
Early Initiation	Early onset of antisocial behaviors such as being suspended from
of Antisocial Behavior	school, arrests, carrying handguns, fighting, etc. makes young
	people more likely to be involved in substance abuse.
Attitudes Favorable	During the elementary school years, most children express anti-
Toward Drug Use	drug, anti-crime, and pro-social attitudes and have difficulty
	imagining why people use drugs. However, in middle school,
	as more youth are exposed to others who use drugs, their atti-
	tudes often shift toward greater acceptance of these behaviors.
	Youth who express positive attitudes toward drug use are more
	likely to engage in a variety of problem behaviors, including drug
	use.
Attitudes Favorable	During the elementary school years, most children express anti-
Toward	drug, anti-crime, and pro-social attitudes and have difficulty
Antisocial Behavior	imagining why people engage in antisocial behaviors. How-
	ever, in middle school, as more youth are exposed to others
	who engage in antisocial behavior, their attitudes often shift to-
	ward greater acceptance of these behaviors. Youth who express
	positive attitudes toward antisocial behavior are more likely to
	engage in a variety of problem behaviors, including antisocial
	behavior.
	continued on the next column

Risk and Protective Factor Scale Definition (continued)

Risk and Protective Factor Scale Definition (continued)

Tisk and Totective Factor Scale Demitton (continued)				
Perceived Risk of	Young people who do not perceive drug use to be risky are far			
Drug Use	more likely to engage in drug use.			
Interaction with	Young people who associate with peers who engage in problem			
Antisocial Peers	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 be-			
	havior. 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.			
Depressive	Young people who express feelings of sadness for long periods			
Symptoms	over the past year and who have negative attitudes about them-			
	selves and life in general are more likely to use drugs.			
Rewards for	Young people who receive rewards for their antisocial behavior			
Antisocial Behavior	are at higher risk for engaging further in antisocial behavior and			
	substance use.			
	Individual/Peer Protective Factors			
Religiosity	Young people who regularly attend religious services are less			
	likely to engage in problem behaviors.			
Social Skills	Young people who are socially competent and engage in positive			
	interpersonal relations with their peers are less likely to use drugs			
	and engage in other problem behaviors.			
Belief in the	Young people who have a belief in what is "right" or "wrong"			
Moral Order	are less likely to use drugs.			
Prosocial	Participation in positive school and community activities helps			
Involvement	provide protection for youth.			
Rewards for	Young people who are rewarded for working hard in school and			
Prosocial	volunteering in the community are less likely to engage in prob-			
Involvement	lem behavior.			

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	19.6	21.5	23.0	16.3
	state	17.7	18.5	18.1	14.1
8	county	48.6	40.7	37.5	37.7
	state	41.0	41.2	38.8	33.8
	MTF	38.9	38.9	36.6	35.8
10	county	61.9	62.1	60.3	53.2
	state	62.1	60.4	59.9	54.8
	MTF	61.7	58.3	59.1	58.2
12	county	75.2	70.3	66.0	69.0
	state	71.9	71.3	70.7	66.3
	MTF	72.2	71.9	72.3	71.0
Combined	county	50.5	48.0	44.7	42.0
	state	45.5	45.2	44.3	38.9

Table 6: Alcohol - Lifetime Use

Table 7: Cigarettes - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	13.6	12.0	12.3	11.3
	state	10.8	10.4	10.3	8.8
8	county	31.1	24.0	20.4	25.3
	state	26.8	25.2	23.9	22.0
	MTF	22.1	20.5	20.1	20.0
10	county	40.6	43.8	41.7	33.9
	state	40.0	38.8	38.0	35.8
	MTF	34.6	31.7	32.7	33.0
12	county	55.3	47.7	47.4	52.4
	state	49.7	48.2	46.0	44.3
	MTF	46.2	44.7	43.6	42.2
Combined	county	34.7	31.5	28.7	29.1
	state	30.0	28.9	27.9	25.5

Table 8: Chewing Tobacco - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	9.1	8.7	10.7	7.4
	state	6.1	5.9	5.7	5.9
8	county	19.4	14.7	15.0	15.9
	state	13.5	12.9	12.3	12.8
	MTF	9.1	9.8	9.6	9.9
10	county	26.0	27.2	22.7	24.2
	state	19.6	19.2	19.6	21.0
	MTF	15.1	12.2	15.2	16.8
12	county	27.7	29.8	24.2	31.0
	state	23.2	23.2	22.4	23.8
	MTF	15.1	15.6	16.3	17.6
Combined	county	20.3	19.8	17.5	18.6
	state	14.8	14.5	14.2	14.7

Table 9: Marijuana - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	1.3	0.9	2.9	1.5
	state	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.3
8	county	10.1	8.5	6.9	8.7
	state	9.5	9.6	9.6	9.3
	MTF	14.2	14.6	15.7	17.3
10	county	22.0	22.9	22.1	20.2
	state	23.4	23.4	24.3	23.8
	MTF	31.0	29.9	32.3	33.4
12	county	32.9	35.0	30.8	36.7
	state	34.8	34.2	35.0	34.4
	MTF	41.8	42.6	42.0	43.8
Combined	county	16.2	16.2	14.3	15.2
	state	15.5	15.4	15.8	14.9

5					
Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.1
	state	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2
8	county	0.5	0.7	0.3	0.9
	state	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.6
	MTF	-	3.1	3.3	1.8
10	county	1.9	2.7	2.1	2.6
	state	2.0	2.3	2.0	1.9
	MTF	_	6.3	5.5	3.0
12	county	4.9	4.4	1.6	2.8
	state	4.0	3.9	3.6	3.3
	MTF	_	8.1	8.7	4.0
Combined	county	1.8	1.9	1.0	1.5
	state	1.5	1.6	1.4	1.3

Table 10: Hallucinogens - Lifetime Use

Table 11: Cocaine - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.6	0.5	1.4	0.3
	state	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3
8	county	1.1	1.0	0.5	0.8
	state	1.2	1.2	1.0	0.9
	MTF	3.1	3.1	2.6	2.6
10	county	2.5	2.7	3.0	2.0
	state	2.4	2.4	2.1	1.6
	MTF	5.3	5.2	4.6	3.7
12	county	4.5	5.4	2.1	3.5
	state	5.0	4.3	3.3	2.8
	MTF	7.8	7.8	6.0	5.5
Combined	county	2.1	2.3	1.7	1.5
	state	2.0	1.9	1.6	1.2

Table 12: Inhalants - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	12.0	10.8	11.9	9.3
	state	9.3	8.9	8.7	7.0
8	county	17.2	15.5	14.6	11.9
	state	16.0	15.9	14.7	12.0
	MTF	15.6	15.7	14.9	14.5
10	county	17.1	16.4	16.4	11.4
	state	14.9	14.6	15.1	12.1
	MTF	13.6	12.8	12.3	12.0
12	county	12.2	15.5	12.0	11.4
	state	12.0	12.1	11.4	9.9
	MTF	10.5	9.9	9.5	9.0
Combined	county	14.6	14.5	13.7	11.0
	state	13.0	12.8	12.4	10.2

Table 13: Sedatives - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	4.4	6.4	6.1	4.9
	state	4.9	4.9	5.0	3.9
8	county	10.5	9.4	11.6	9.0
	state	10.2	10.4	9.7	8.1
	MTF	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.4
10	county	21.1	17.8	18.8	14.2
	state	16.6	15.9	16.3	14.4
	MTF	7.4	6.8	7.0	7.3
12	county	22.4	25.2	19.6	17.5
	state	20.2	18.8	18.4	16.0
	MTF	9.5	8.9	9.3	8.5
Combined	county	14.5	14.4	13.4	10.9
	state	12.2	11.8	11.7	9.8

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.4
	state	0.4	0.4	0.5	0.3
8	county	1.6	1.0	0.5	0.5
	state	1.2	1.1	0.9	0.7
	MTF	1.8	2.3	1.6	1.8
10	county	1.9	3.1	2.1	1.5
	state	2.1	1.8	1.8	1.6
	MTF	2.8	2.4	2.8	2.5
12	county	3.6	3.5	2.4	2.1
	state	3.4	2.7	2.2	1.9
	MTF	3.0	2.8	2.4	2.3
Combined	county	1.9	2.0	1.3	1.1
	state	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.0

Table 15: Stimulants - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	0.9	0.8	0.1
	state	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.3
8	county	2.0	1.5	1.2	0.5
	state	1.6	1.5	1.3	1.0
	MTF	6.5	6.8	6.0	5.7
10	county	5.3	3.7	3.0	3.5
	state	4.6	4.1	4.0	3.3
	MTF	11.1	9.0	10.3	10.6
12	county	9.3	7.3	5.2	4.1
	state	6.9	6.2	6.1	5.3
	MTF	11.4	10.5	9.9	11.1
Combined	county	4.0	3.2	2.3	1.9
	state	3.1	2.8	2.7	2.1

Table 14: Meth - Lifetime Use

Table 16: Heroin - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.3	0.2	0.4	0.3
	state	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.1
8	county	1.0	0.4	0.4	0.7
	state	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5
	MTF	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.3
10	county	1.3	2.2	1.5	0.6
	state	1.1	1.1	1.3	0.9
	MTF	1.5	1.2	1.5	1.3
12	county	3.3	2.8	1.9	2.3
	state	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.7
	MTF	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.6
Combined	county	1.4	1.4	1.0	0.9
	state	0.9	0.9	0.9	0.7

Table 17: Ecstasy - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0
	state	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1
8	county	1.0	0.6	1.3	0.7
	state	1.2	1.1	1.1	0.9
	MTF	2.3	2.4	2.2	3.3
10	county	2.8	3.4	3.8	2.9
	state	3.4	3.3	3.2	2.8
	MTF	5.2	4.3	5.5	6.4
12	county	7.3	4.5	5.2	5.5
	state	5.4	5.2	5.3	4.6
	MTF	6.5	6.2	6.5	7.3
Combined	county	2.7	2.1	2.4	2.0
	state	2.3	2.2	2.2	1.8

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	5.0	5.2	2.8
	state	0.0	3.9	3.7	2.9
8	county	0.0	11.5	9.3	8.6
	state	0.0	10.6	9.1	7.8
10	county	0.0	22.0	20.3	16.7
	state	0.0	18.0	17.7	15.5
12	county	0.0	27.0	21.4	24.0
	state	0.0	22.2	21.2	19.6
Combined	county	0.0	16.1	13.2	12.2
	state	0.0	12.8	12.1	10.4

Table 18: Prescription Drugs - Lifetime Use

Table 19: Over-The-Counter Drugs - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	3.0	3.4	2.3
	state	0.0	2.5	2.3	2.0
8	county	0.0	6.7	5.0	4.3
	state	0.0	6.0	5.4	4.3
10	county	0.0	10.7	10.3	7.9
	state	0.0	9.4	9.0	7.3
12	county	0.0	13.7	10.8	12.2
	state	0.0	11.0	9.6	8.7
Combined	county	0.0	8.4	7.0	6.3
	state	0.0	6.8	6.2	5.1

Table 20: Alcopops - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	0.0	11.9	8.4
	state	0.0	0.0	9.0	6.6
8	county	0.0	0.0	26.1	26.0
	state	0.0	0.0	25.6	22.0
	MTF	_	-	29.4	30.0
10	county	0.0	0.0	46.9	39.0
	state	0.0	0.0	44.8	39.5
	MTF	-	-	51.4	51.3
12	county	0.0	0.0	55.2	53.5
	state	0.0	0.0	54.7	50.1
	MTF	-	-	67.4	62.6
Combined	county	0.0	0.0	33.0	30.1
	state	0.0	0.0	31.3	26.8

Table 21: Any Drug - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	15.2	17.7	17.7	13.9
	state	13.2	15.2	14.6	12.2
8	county	25.3	27.7	27.7	26.0
	state	25.0	29.0	27.0	23.8
10	county	36.0	41.0	40.6	33.7
	state	35.0	38.5	39.3	35.9
12	county	42.4	47.1	41.1	45.8
	state	42.3	45.5	45.4	43.2
Combined	county	29.3	33.0	30.7	28.6
	state	27.4	30.6	30.0	26.8

Table 22: Alcohol - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	4.4	4.1	6.8	3.2
	state	3.6	3.9	3.8	2.6
8	county	18.4	15.6	10.8	11.3
	state	15.5	15.0	13.8	11.3
	MTF	15.9	15.9	14.9	13.8
10	county	30.8	31.7	26.2	23.2
	state	30.3	28.5	28.2	24.8
	MTF	33.4	28.8	30.4	28.9
12	county	41.1	41.3	33.0	39.4
	state	40.3	39.1	37.7	34.7
	MTF	44.4	43.1	43.5	41.2
Combined	county	23.2	22.7	17.9	17.7
	state	20.5	19.8	19.1	16.2

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	2.5	1.1	2.4	1.6
	state	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.5
8	county	8.6	7.6	5.3	6.8
	state	8.1	7.5	6.8	5.9
	MTF	7.1	6.8	6.5	7.1
10	county	15.3	17.7	17.8	14.3
	state	15.3	14.6	14.6	14.1
	MTF	14.0	12.3	13.1	13.6
12	county	27.6	23.9	19.8	25.9
	state	23.5	22.7	21.3	20.0
	MTF	21.6	20.4	20.1	19.2
Combined	county	13.2	12.3	10.4	11.1
	state	11.1	10.6	10.2	9.1

Table 23: Cigarettes - Past 30 Day Use

Table 24: Chewing Tobacco - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	2.3	1.4	2.4	2.0
	state	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.6
8	county	7.6	6.5	4.7	5.1
	state	5.5	5.3	5.2	4.6
	MTF	3.2	3.5	3.7	4.1
10	county	10.6	12.4	11.0	10.2
	state	9.5	8.6	9.4	9.4
	MTF	6.1	5.0	6.5	7.5
12	county	13.3	12.6	9.6	15.5
	state	10.8	10.7	10.7	10.5
	MTF	6.6	6.5	8.4	8.5
Combined	county	8.3	8.2	6.5	7.6
	state	6.5	6.1	6.3	5.9

Table 25: Marijuana - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.3	0.3	0.9	0.5
	state	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.4
8	county	3.4	3.7	1.7	3.1
	state	4.1	3.9	4.1	3.9
	MTF	5.7	5.8	6.5	8.0
10	county	7.5	9.7	8.9	8.6
	state	10.4	10.4	11.4	11.2
	MTF	14.2	13.8	15.9	16.7
12	county	13.2	13.8	10.2	15.0
	state	15.3	14.6	15.7	16.1
	MTF	18.8	19.4	20.6	21.4
Combined	county	5.9	6.6	4.9	6.2
	state	6.8	6.6	7.1	6.8

Table 26: Hallucinogens - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.0
	state	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
8	county	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3
	state	0.3	0.4	0.3	0.2
	MTF	-	0.9	0.9	0.6
10	county	0.3	0.6	0.8	0.5
	state	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.6
	MTF	-	1.7	1.3	0.7
12	county	0.7	2.1	0.3	0.2
	state	1.1	1.1	0.9	0.9
	MTF	_	1.6	2.2	0.8
Combined	county	0.3	0.7	0.4	0.2
	state	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.4

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.1
	state	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1
8	county	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.5
	state	0.5	0.5	0.4	0.3
	MTF	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.6
10	county	0.7	0.3	0.9	0.3
	state	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.5
	MTF	1.3	1.3	0.9	0.9
12	county	1.0	0.5	0.2	0.4
	state	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.6
	MTF	2.0	2.0	1.3	1.3
Combined	county	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.3
	state	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.3

Table 27: Cocaine - Past 30 Day Use

Table 28: Inhalants - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	5.4	5.1	5.7	3.9
	state	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.1
8	county	6.3	7.6	7.0	5.4
	state	6.5	6.3	6.1	4.5
	MTF	3.9	4.1	3.8	3.6
10	county	4.5	3.6	5.3	2.0
	state	4.1	3.8	4.1	3.3
	MTF	2.5	2.1	2.2	2.0
12	county	1.0	3.0	1.4	1.6
	state	2.3	2.3	2.3	1.7
	MTF	1.2	1.4	1.2	1.4
Combined	county	4.3	4.9	5.1	3.4
	state	4.4	4.2	4.2	3.3

Table 29: Sedatives - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	1.7	1.9	1.5	1.9
	state	1.9	1.9	1.9	1.5
8	county	4.2	4.3	4.1	3.0
	state	4.6	4.6	4.3	3.7
	MTF	-	-	_	1.2
10	county	9.7	7.6	8.1	6.9
	state	7.6	7.3	7.6	6.6
	MTF	-	_	-	2.2
12	county	10.7	11.7	8.7	7.1
	state	9.2	8.3	8.2	6.7
	MTF	2.7	2.8	2.5	2.5
Combined	county	6.5	6.2	5.3	4.5
	state	5.5	5.2	5.2	4.3

Table 30: Meth - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0
	state	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1
8	county	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.3
	state	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2
	MTF	0.6	0.7	0.5	0.7
10	county	0.3	0.7	0.8	0.0
	state	0.6	0.4	0.5	0.4
	MTF	0.4	0.7	0.6	0.7
12	county	0.5	0.7	0.9	0.0
	state	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.4
	MTF	0.6	0.6	0.5	0.5
Combined	county	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.1
	state	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.1
	state	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1
8	county	0.5	0.6	0.8	0.0
	state	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.3
	MTF	2.0	2.2	1.9	1.8
10	county	1.9	1.2	1.2	1.4
	state	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.1
	MTF	4.0	2.8	3.3	3.3
12	county	2.0	1.4	1.4	0.9
	state	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.6
	MTF	3.7	2.9	3.0	3.3
Combined	county	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.6
	state	0.9	0.9	1.0	0.7

Table 31: Stimulants - Past 30 Day Use

Table 32: Heroin - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
	state	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
8	county	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.3
	state	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.2
	MTF	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
10	county	0.6	0.6	0.3	0.2
	state	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.2
	MTF	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
12	county	1.3	1.4	0.3	0.7
	state	0.6	0.6	0.6	0.5
	MTF	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Combined	county	0.5	0.5	0.2	0.3
	state	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.2

Table 33: Ecstasy - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	state	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
8	county	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.3
	state	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.3
	MTF	0.6	0.8	0.6	1.1
10	county	0.7	0.6	0.6	1.1
	state	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.8
	MTF	1.2	1.1	1.3	1.9
12	county	2.1	0.0	0.9	0.2
	state	1.4	1.0	1.2	0.9
	MTF	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.4
Combined	county	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.4
	state	0.7	0.6	0.6	0.5

Table 34: Prescription Drugs - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	1.7	2.0	0.6
	state	0.0	1.6	1.6	1.2
8	county	0.0	3.4	3.5	3.3
	state	0.0	4.7	4.1	3.5
10	county	0.0	9.4	9.5	7.9
	state	0.0	8.1	8.1	6.8
12	county	0.0	12.5	9.2	9.1
	state	0.0	9.8	9.3	8.0
Combined	county	0.0	6.6	5.7	4.9
	state	0.0	5.6	5.4	4.4

Table 35: Over-The-Counter Drugs - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	1.6	1.5	1.5
	state	0.0	1.2	1.2	1.0
8	county	0.0	4.2	2.8	2.2
	state	0.0	3.1	2.8	2.1
10	county	0.0	4.2	4.1	4.3
	state	0.0	4.2	4.0	3.0
12	county	0.0	5.8	3.3	3.7
	state	0.0	4.2	3.9	3.2
Combined	county	0.0	3.9	2.8	2.9
	state	0.0	3.0	2.9	2.2

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.0	0.0	4.3	1.5
	state	0.0	0.0	2.7	1.8
8	county	0.0	0.0	7.1	7.7
	state	0.0	0.0	9.8	8.0
	MTF	_	-	9.5	9.4
10	county	0.0	0.0	17.0	15.0
	state	0.0	0.0	19.2	16.3
	MTF	_	-	19.0	19.4
12	county	0.0	0.0	19.3	23.2
	state	0.0	0.0	23.9	21.1
	MTF	_	-	27.4	24.1
Combined	county	0.0	0.0	11.2	11.0
	state	0.0	0.0	12.8	10.6

Table 36: Alcopops - Past 30 Day Use

Table 37: Any Drug - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	7.0	8.4	8.8	6.4
	state	5.9	7.3	7.2	6.0
8	county	10.8	13.8	13.0	13.0
	state	12.2	14.6	14.0	12.0
10	county	17.5	21.1	21.0	16.5
	state	17.1	20.0	21.2	19.2
12	county	20.0	25.4	19.0	21.9
	state	20.6	23.2	23.9	22.6
Combined	county	13.7	16.9	14.9	13.8
	state	13.2	15.5	15.8	13.9

Table 38: Binge Drinking

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	4.7	4.2	2.7	1.8
	state	3.5	3.3	1.7	1.2
8	county	11.5	11.7	5.9	6.2
	state	10.3	10.4	7.4	6.1
10	county	20.5	17.8	15.5	13.5
	state	19.3	17.7	17.2	15.0
12	county	23.2	26.6	20.8	26.6
	state	26.0	25.2	25.2	23.0
Combined	county	14.8	14.8	10.3	11.0
	state	13.6	13.1	11.7	9.9

Table 39: Pack of Cigarettes

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1
	state	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
8	county	0.8	0.8	0.7	0.4
	state	0.7	0.7	0.6	0.4
10	county	0.9	2.9	2.8	1.2
	state	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.4
12	county	4.2	4.1	2.5	3.3
	state	3.1	2.8	2.5	2.1
Combined	county	1.5	1.9	1.4	1.1
	state	1.3	1.2	1.0	0.9

Table 40: Suspended from School

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	8.5	6.8	6.8	7.4
	state	11.1	10.5	11.2	10.9
8	county	11.7	10.1	11.0	12.8
	state	16.6	16.6	16.3	15.5
10	county	10.2	11.4	9.4	10.8
	state	14.8	15.1	15.2	14.7
12	county	7.2	7.2	7.2	6.8
	state	10.6	10.6	10.9	10.3
Combined	county	9.4	8.9	8.6	9.6
	state	13.4	13.3	13.6	13.0

Table 41: Drunk or High at School

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	2.8	2.1	2.7	2.1
	state	2.0	2.0	2.2	1.7
8	county	7.9	7.2	5.7	5.3
	state	8.3	8.2	7.8	6.8
10	county	13.4	14.8	16.7	12.6
	state	15.0	15.0	16.2	14.1
12	county	16.6	17.9	14.5	18.5
	state	18.7	18.2	18.5	17.1
Combined	county	9.9	10.3	9.3	8.9
	state	10.1	10.0	10.3	8.9

	Table 42: Sold Illegal Drugs							
Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11			
6	county	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.4			
	state	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3			
8	county	1.6	1.9	1.2	1.4			
	state	2.6	2.1	2.0	2.1			
10	county	5.8	7.2	6.2	5.3			
	state	6.4	6.6	6.6	6.0			
12	county	9.7	9.2	8.2	8.4			
	state	8.7	8.6	8.4	8.0			
Combined	county	4.1	4.5	3.7	3.5			
	state	4.1	4.0	3.9	3.6			

Table 43: Stolen a Vehicle

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	1.8	1.7	1.4	1.7
	state	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2
8	county	2.7	2.3	1.4	1.8
	state	2.7	2.3	2.2	2.0
10	county	2.7	3.5	2.9	2.4
	state	3.4	3.5	3.1	2.8
12	county	1.8	2.2	1.7	1.2
	state	2.2	2.0	2.2	1.7
Combined	county	2.2	2.4	1.8	1.8
	state	2.4	2.2	2.1	1.9

Table 44: Been Arrested

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	1.9	1.4	2.1	2.5
	state	2.2	1.9	2.1	2.0
8	county	3.8	2.8	2.3	4.7
	state	5.7	5.7	5.0	4.5
10	county	3.6	6.9	5.0	3.9
	state	7.4	8.2	7.4	6.9
12	county	5.0	5.7	5.0	4.2
	state	7.1	7.2	7.1	6.2
Combined	county	3.5	4.1	3.5	3.8
	state	5.4	5.5	5.2	4.6

Table 45: Attacked to Harm

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	11.2	14.3	15.1	12.0
	state	13.1	13.5	13.9	11.9
8	county	14.6	14.9	16.9	13.2
	state	18.1	18.6	18.4	15.9
10	county	17.3	19.0	18.8	17.2
	state	18.0	18.3	18.8	16.5
12	county	13.2	15.1	11.1	13.9
	state	14.6	14.5	15.2	13.1
Combined	county	14.1	15.9	15.6	14.0
	state	16.0	16.3	16.6	14.3

Table 46: Carried a Handgun

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	3.7	4.7	5.3	4.2
	state	4.0	4.2	4.1	3.7
8	county	4.6	4.1	6.0	4.6
	state	5.3	5.7	5.2	4.3
10	county	7.0	8.3	6.3	2.5
	state	6.0	6.4	6.3	5.3
12	county	4.5	8.2	5.8	5.7
	state	5.7	6.3	6.1	5.1
Combined	county	4.9	6.3	5.8	4.2
	state	5.1	5.6	5.3	4.5

Table 47: Handgun to School

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	0.6	0.3	0.4	0.3
	state	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4
8	county	0.8	0.3	0.5	0.5
	state	0.8	0.8	0.6	0.7
10	county	0.3	0.6	1.2	0.3
	state	0.9	1.1	0.9	0.9
12	county	0.6	0.3	0.2	0.2
	state	0.9	1.1	1.0	1.0
Combined	county	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.3
	state	0.7	0.8	0.7	0.7

Table 48: Community Risk - Low Neighborhood Attachment

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	41.4	37.3	42.1	41.8
	state	44.3	44.1	44.7	42.5
8	county	38.4	30.3	31.7	33.5
	state	36.2	35.3	35.5	35.4
10	county	41.3	38.1	44.4	38.5
	state	41.6	41.5	42.5	41.7
12	county	45.0	38.8	44.5	45.2
	state	45.3	44.2	44.9	44.4
Combined	county	41.6	36.0	40.3	39.4
	state	41.6	41.1	41.6	40.6

Table 49: Community Risk - High Community Disorganization

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	38.6	38.8	38.7	34.2
	state	37.2	37.2	38.4	34.7
8	county	35.7	32.4	32.4	31.7
	state	32.8	33.9	34.5	32.2
10	county	45.5	46.5	48.1	43.5
	state	45.2	45.1	46.6	45.0
12	county	43.5	45.7	45.7	44.0
	state	43.3	42.7	45.5	43.3
Combined	county	41.0	40.7	40.7	37.8
	state	39.2	39.3	40.8	38.1

Table 50: Community Risk - Transitions and Mobility

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	45.1	44.4	44.4	45.3
	state	52.6	52.1	51.1	50.0
8	county	53.2	47.3	47.1	47.2
	state	56.6	55.5	53.1	53.8
10	county	56.9	54.5	52.9	50.4
	state	60.5	61.1	59.9	60.2
12	county	51.9	43.9	51.5	51.0
	state	49.6	50.4	51.1	52.5
Combined	county	51.9	47.7	48.7	48.3
	state	55.0	55.0	53.8	54.0

Table 51: Community Risk - Laws and Norms Favorable to Drug Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	45.5	46.7	44.8	41.8
	state	41.0	40.1	39.2	35.7
8	county	40.4	35.4	31.0	32.1
	state	34.9	33.5	33.7	31.0
10	county	42.7	43.0	42.9	35.6
	state	40.9	40.1	41.3	38.1
12	county	36.5	34.3	35.8	34.5
	state	33.6	33.8	33.7	31.6
Combined	county	41.4	40.0	38.7	36.0
	state	37.8	37.0	37.1	34.1

Table 52: Community Risk - Perceived Availability of Drugs

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	21.7	24.3	24.6	20.6
	state	22.4	23.7	22.7	18.9
8	county	29.9	25.3	22.9	22.4
	state	27.6	26.9	25.7	22.9
10	county	38.8	44.4	37.3	34.5
	state	38.9	37.5	36.3	33.9
12	county	48.6	46.2	43.5	46.9
	state	45.8	44.3	42.5	40.1
Combined	county	34.9	34.9	31.2	30.2
	state	32.6	32.2	30.9	27.7

Table 53: Community Risk - Perceived Availability of Handguns

	-			-	-
Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	29.1	31.2	30.4	27.7
	state	25.7	26.0	24.6	23.5
8	county	44.0	42.5	40.9	38.5
	state	39.3	39.4	37.3	35.6
10	county	37.2	37.1	34.8	31.1
	state	33.1	31.8	31.7	30.5
12	county	42.4	43.6	39.1	38.1
	state	38.7	39.1	36.6	35.8
Combined	county	38.1	38.5	36.2	33.8
	state	33.9	33.8	32.3	31.0

Table 54: Family Risk - Poor Family Management

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	31.8	34.7	39.8	34.1
	state	35.9	37.8	38.2	36.0
8	county	35.7	36.5	32.6	36.4
	state	38.2	40.3	39.7	36.6
10	county	36.9	36.3	37.8	31.6
	state	37.5	38.1	38.1	36.0
12	county	36.2	40.2	37.6	36.9
	state	39.6	41.0	39.7	37.0
Combined	county	35.2	36.8	36.9	34.7
	state	37.7	39.2	38.9	36.4

Table 55: Family Risk - Family Conflict

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	33.6	38.3	42.9	33.6
	state	36.2	39.2	40.5	36.0
8	county	49.2	47.1	49.9	45.8
	state	47.6	49.5	49.1	46.7
10	county	38.1	44.5	45.6	42.7
	state	39.4	39.3	40.8	39.5
12	county	36.4	37.2	37.6	40.3
	state	35.4	36.7	38.6	37.2
Combined	county	39.1	42.0	44.4	40.6
	state	40.0	41.5	42.6	40.1

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	35.3	39.9	36.9	35.1
	state	34.9	35.8	35.3	33.3
8	county	40.4	34.7	34.5	35.5
	state	37.1	37.1	35.4	33.8
10	county	40.8	43.7	40.2	35.9
	state	40.8	40.4	40.4	38.5
12	county	37.5	38.9	34.1	39.2
	state	37.7	37.9	39.1	37.5
Combined	county	38.5	39.3	36.5	36.3
	state	37.6	37.7	37.4	35.5

Table 57: Family Risk - Parental Attitudes Favorable to ATOD

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	11.7	12.7	18.6	14.5
	state	13.3	13.6	14.5	12.7
8	county	28.8	26.5	24.0	25.1
	state	27.0	27.0	27.0	25.1
10	county	44.5	43.8	42.8	36.7
	state	41.7	41.1	41.5	38.1
12	county	46.6	44.5	38.2	44.3
	state	41.4	41.0	40.6	38.8
Combined	county	33.1	31.7	30.0	29.2
	state	29.7	29.6	29.9	27.2

Table 58: Family Risk - Parental Attitudes Favorable to ASB

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	31.5	36.7	39.3	34.2
	state	32.7	33.1	33.3	32.0
8	county	51.1	45.3	45.3	41.8
	state	45.3	45.2	45.8	43.9
10	county	51.6	55.4	55.3	51.4
	state	50.1	50.1	50.5	48.8
12	county	51.2	53.9	47.9	49.9
	state	48.4	49.3	48.0	47.0
Combined	county	46.3	47.7	46.5	43.8
	state	43.6	43.9	44.0	42.2

Table 59: School Risk - Academic Failure

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	40.1	41.8	45.6	48.2
	state	44.2	42.9	42.6	42.2
8	county	48.0	43.7	44.4	43.5
	state	47.0	44.9	44.6	43.0
10	county	50.4	47.1	49.5	45.1
	state	48.5	47.5	46.4	45.5
12	county	42.6	39.8	40.0	36.9
	state	41.3	41.2	39.6	39.7
Combined	county	45.2	43.2	45.0	43.8
	state	45.5	44.2	43.5	42.8

Table 60: School Risk - Low Commitment to School

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	43.2	46.3	43.0	40.7
	state	42.0	42.9	42.0	40.1
8	county	40.4	38.8	35.5	39.2
	state	35.3	35.4	35.1	34.0
10	county	42.2	43.9	41.5	37.4
	state	39.5	38.1	38.7	38.0
12	county	41.6	46.3	40.6	43.8
	state	42.2	42.2	40.6	40.9
Combined	county	41.9	43.7	40.1	40.1
	state	39.6	39.5	39.0	38.0

Table 61: Peer Risk - Rebelliousness

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	47.7	47.0	48.5	42.1
	state	46.8	47.4	44.6	42.3
8	county	44.4	35.0	35.5	38.1
	state	38.1	38.7	36.8	35.4
10	county	45.3	46.3	42.0	41.5
	state	44.6	44.7	44.5	43.6
12	county	40.6	43.6	38.6	42.3
	state	43.0	43.3	41.5	40.0
Combined	county	44.6	42.9	41.4	40.9
	state	43.1	43.6	41.8	40.2

Table 62: Peer Risk - Early Initiation of Drug Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	25.3	29.6	30.7	22.8
	state	25.4	26.4	25.8	21.7
8	county	32.9	25.5	23.9	25.7
	state	28.7	28.1	26.7	23.2
10	county	33.2	33.0	30.2	26.0
	state	32.4	30.9	30.8	27.6
12	county	32.5	32.2	30.5	35.1
	state	33.0	31.4	30.8	28.7
Combined	county	30.8	30.0	28.7	26.9
	state	29.5	28.9	28.3	24.8

Table 63: Peer Risk - Early Initiation of ASB

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	23.6	22.2	24.0	21.9
	state	25.9	25.8	26.8	24.2
8	county	30.5	27.7	35.0	31.4
	state	37.3	37.4	37.8	34.3
10	county	37.2	38.7	40.0	32.9
	state	40.6	41.3	41.7	39.1
12	county	33.4	38.3	34.1	37.1
	state	39.1	40.0	40.6	38.3
Combined	county	31.0	31.5	32.9	30.3
	state	35.2	35.5	36.2	33.2

Table 64: Peer Risk - Peer Favorable Attitudes to ASB

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	37.5	44.7	45.7	41.8
	state	37.5	38.9	39.2	38.3
8	county	35.4	31.6	31.8	34.7
	state	33.3	33.3	34.3	32.7
10	county	41.1	45.9	40.1	42.7
	state	41.7	41.5	42.3	41.9
12	county	39.7	45.3	35.3	39.0
	state	39.0	39.8	39.3	38.0
Combined	county	38.4	41.7	38.4	39.5
	state	37.7	38.2	38.6	37.5

Table 65: Peer Risk - Peer Favorable Attitudes to Drug Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	17.8	20.1	22.3	18.0
	state	17.9	18.0	18.0	15.6
8	county	25.8	21.8	18.9	20.9
	state	22.8	22.5	23.0	21.2
10	county	33.9	33.5	32.7	30.8
	state	33.1	32.8	34.1	32.4
12	county	34.5	35.6	29.7	35.9
	state	32.9	32.9	32.6	32.2
Combined	county	27.7	27.5	25.4	25.6
	state	25.8	25.7	26.1	24.2

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	35.1	38.6	40.9	35.9
	state	35.3	37.4	37.7	36.5
8	county	26.6	25.5	23.0	24.6
	state	26.4	27.2	27.7	26.5
10	county	36.1	38.2	39.2	35.1
	state	38.3	38.3	40.1	39.4
12	county	27.8	29.2	25.5	31.5
	state	28.7	29.4	29.9	30.1
Combined	county	31.6	33.0	32.5	31.6
	state	32.3	33.2	34.0	33.1

Table 66: Peer Risk - Intentions to Use

Table 67: Peer Risk - Peer Perceived Risk of Drug Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	27.5	28.9	31.4	26.5
	state	32.6	32.2	33.1	33.3
8	county	30.7	33.1	31.2	34.2
	state	36.4	36.3	37.7	36.8
10	county	30.1	32.0	33.8	34.5
	state	34.6	35.2	37.2	37.4
12	county	38.2	39.8	38.5	42.1
	state	41.6	41.2	43.1	43.7
Combined	county	31.4	33.2	33.4	33.8
	state	35.9	35.9	37.3	37.2

Table 68: Peer Risk - Interaction with Antisocial Peers

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	34.0	35.8	36.0	39.6
	state	38.9	38.7	40.1	39.0
8	county	46.9	44.3	44.0	49.2
	state	50.6	51.5	51.7	48.5
10	county	47.1	48.5	46.1	47.5
	state	52.1	52.6	52.2	50.4
12	county	45.0	50.2	45.0	51.2
	state	49.4	50.4	49.2	47.3
Combined	county	43.0	44.6	42.5	46.5
	state	47.4	47.9	48.0	45.9

Table 69: Peer Risk - Friends' Use of Drugs

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	22.3	20.9	21.7	21.0
	state	20.6	21.3	21.2	19.2
8	county	34.8	26.5	25.2	28.2
	state	30.8	31.2	30.7	28.4
10	county	29.7	36.4	32.6	27.3
	state	33.1	33.3	33.9	31.4
12	county	30.3	31.2	23.7	30.8
	state	31.0	31.1	30.5	28.0
Combined	county	29.0	28.7	25.7	26.5
	state	28.5	28.9	28.8	26.3

Table 70: Peer Risk - Sensation Seeking

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	48.8	54.7	48.4	45.0
	state	50.6	49.3	48.9	44.9
8	county	53.6	51.0	47.7	46.0
	state	49.6	50.1	50.0	44.3
10	county	50.9	53.3	50.9	42.3
	state	48.4	48.3	48.6	44.0
12	county	53.3	52.1	48.8	47.4
	state	50.5	51.3	49.1	45.5
Combined	county	51.5	52.8	48.9	45.1
	state	49.8	49.7	49.2	44.6

Table 71: Peer Risk - Peer Rewards for Antisocial Involvement

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	24.6	25.4	27.8	25.6
	state	22.1	23.7	23.7	24.2
8	county	45.1	38.4	37.4	36.2
	state	37.4	38.6	38.6	36.0
10	county	42.2	42.9	40.9	40.8
	state	41.3	40.2	41.6	42.7
12	county	52.3	58.4	50.5	63.5
	state	54.8	55.0	54.5	55.1
Combined	county	40.5	40.8	38.2	40.0
	state	37.4	38.0	38.2	37.7

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	40.0	38.6	41.4	39.5
	state	39.5	39.6	39.1	38.0
8	county	48.2	40.7	46.4	40.4
	state	44.1	43.6	43.1	42.8
10	county	45.9	48.8	50.9	49.1
	state	46.2	45.1	45.6	46.0
12	county	41.3	40.5	39.9	44.2
	state	40.4	40.2	40.9	41.3
Combined	county	43.8	42.3	44.7	43.0
	state	42.6	42.1	42.2	41.9

Table 72: Peer Risk - Depressive Symptoms

Table 73: Peer Risk - Gang Involvement

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	18.3	18.8	19.3	16.9
	state	20.2	20.6	19.9	19.5
8	county	14.0	13.6	14.4	16.8
	state	21.5	22.7	21.0	18.8
10	county	18.6	21.4	22.4	21.0
	state	25.7	26.3	26.7	26.3
12	county	15.5	15.6	15.8	20.0
	state	22.7	23.0	23.8	25.7
Combined	county	16.7	17.4	18.0	18.5
	state	22.4	23.0	22.6	22.0

Table 74: Community Protective - Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	48.4	42.6	44.6	47.0
	state	44.7	43.6	42.8	45.4
8	county	47.3	54.3	50.8	47.9
	state	50.5	50.8	49.7	51.8
10	county	53.1	46.9	45.9	53.1
	state	48.4	49.2	47.7	49.3
12	county	46.9	53.0	51.1	46.6
	state	48.4	48.8	47.7	48.9
Combined	county	49.0	49.2	48.0	48.6
	state	48.0	48.0	46.9	48.8

Table 75: Community Protective - Rewards for Prosocial Involvement

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	56.0	52.6	48.9	49.7
	state	51.7	51.8	49.9	49.6
8	county	42.1	46.1	45.5	43.6
	state	43.3	43.8	43.0	42.3
10	county	51.2	49.5	47.9	50.2
	state	49.3	49.8	49.0	48.0
12	county	49.8	53.2	52.5	47.2
	state	48.4	49.1	47.7	47.1
Combined	county	49.9	50.2	48.5	47.6
	state	48.1	48.6	47.3	46.7

Table 76: Family Protective - Family Attachment

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	56.5	58.8	52.9	56.6
	state	57.0	57.6	54.4	55.6
8	county	51.0	59.6	53.2	51.5
	state	52.6	53.3	52.2	52.6
10	county	45.3	46.6	39.8	47.7
	state	45.3	45.7	44.0	44.9
12	county	57.1	55.4	51.4	52.9
	state	56.2	55.7	54.6	54.9
Combined	county	52.4	55.0	49.6	52.2
	state	52.7	53.1	51.2	52.1

Table 77: Family Protective - Family Opportunities for PSI

	-			-	
Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	60.5	59.0	55.7	61.8
	state	62.1	61.8	59.2	61.0
8	county	62.4	67.4	61.3	62.0
	state	63.9	62.9	62.4	64.1
10	county	54.7	56.8	50.7	58.7
	state	55.1	55.7	54.5	56.6
12	county	53.8	55.4	53.8	56.2
	state	55.6	55.1	54.1	56.3
Combined	county	57.7	59.8	55.7	59.9
	state	59.5	59.2	57.9	59.9

Table 78: Family Protective - Family Rewards for PSI

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	59.0	56.1	53.9	54.9
	state	55.8	56.3	53.5	55.3
8	county	59.0	68.6	64.2	60.3
	state	64.2	63.8	63.4	63.1
10	county	52.5	58.0	49.7	55.2
	state	54.7	55.2	54.1	54.1
12	county	55.2	55.3	51.7	52.0
	state	54.4	54.6	52.9	53.4
Combined	county	56.2	59.6	55.3	55.8
	state	57.5	57.7	56.2	56.9

Table 79: School Protective - School Opportunities for PSI

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	48.5	48.3	49.0	47.2
	state	49.2	48.1	48.3	47.8
8	county	68.1	69.9	66.6	61.3
	state	66.5	67.3	67.3	65.3
10	county	64.9	69.1	65.2	68.5
	state	65.3	65.4	64.6	65.4
12	county	67.1	67.3	69.5	71.2
	state	65.2	65.1	66.1	66.3
Combined	county	61.7	63.7	61.9	61.1
	state	61.0	60.9	61.0	60.4

Table 80: School Protective - School Rewards for PSI

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	57.0	60.5	57.7	57.1
	state	58.9	58.5	56.1	56.8
8	county	53.4	56.0	54.8	57.1
	state	56.1	57.1	56.1	56.2
10	county	67.8	69.1	67.4	68.8
	state	64.5	64.9	64.5	65.5
12	county	52.1	53.8	57.9	58.8
	state	50.0	49.6	49.4	51.2
Combined	county	57.7	60.0	59.3	60.2
	state	57.8	57.9	56.9	57.7

Table 81: Peer Protective - Religiosity

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	71.4	71.0	64.4	67.5
	state	63.7	63.0	60.9	61.1
8	county	70.0	65.7	71.0	70.9
	state	68.0	67.5	66.6	67.3
10	county	67.6	66.7	67.4	68.5
	state	64.9	66.1	65.3	64.2
12	county	87.7	86.4	86.9	85.9
	state	86.1	85.7	86.0	85.3
Combined	county	73.9	71.9	71.6	72.5
	state	69.6	69.5	68.5	68.1

Table 82: Peer Protective - Social Skills

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	71.5	70.4	66.2	71.1
	state	71.0	70.5	69.0	70.1
8	county	65.9	70.0	70.1	67.4
	state	66.9	66.6	66.7	69.2
10	county	60.4	56.0	59.7	65.7
	state	57.4	58.6	57.9	61.2
12	county	66.2	65.7	72.3	68.8
	state	67.4	67.6	68.5	70.8
Combined	county	66.1	65.5	67.0	68.3
	state	65.9	66.0	65.5	67.9

Table 83: Peer Protective - Belief in a Moral Order

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	65.8	62.3	58.9	62.2
	state	65.0	63.9	61.3	63.3
8	county	64.5	67.1	67.3	68.0
	state	64.4	64.1	63.9	64.8
10	county	67.4	67.0	67.2	70.3
	state	66.5	66.9	65.7	67.2
12	county	54.5	48.9	55.5	51.4
	state	51.4	50.8	51.1	52.6
Combined	county	63.2	61.8	62.5	63.5
	state	62.6	62.1	61.1	62.7

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	44.5	46.8	47.4	43.9
	state	43.2	43.8	43.0	42.1
8	county	45.9	46.6	50.4	44.2
	state	47.6	48.0	47.3	45.9
10	county	49.7	48.8	50.1	50.7
	state	49.1	48.9	49.4	47.1
12	county	44.2	40.3	44.5	41.7
	state	43.5	43.2	44.3	43.0
Combined	county	46.1	45.8	48.3	45.2
	state	45.9	46.1	46.0	44.5

Table 84: Peer Protective - Prosocial Involvement

Table 85: Peer Protective - Peer Rewards for Prosocial Involvement

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	62.7	61.0	60.6	61.4
	state	63.2	61.9	62.0	64.0
8	county	67.5	68.1	69.6	69.9
	state	69.8	68.5	69.4	71.1
10	county	64.0	60.9	68.8	63.8
	state	64.1	65.8	66.6	66.9
12	county	54.8	47.8	55.9	44.9
	state	53.9	54.4	56.1	56.5
Combined	county	62.3	59.9	64.1	61.0
	state	63.4	63.2	64.1	65.3

Table 86 [.]	Peer	Protective -	Interaction	with	Prosocial	Peers
	1 CCI	I TOLCCLIVE	muchaction	VVICII	1 10500101	1 0015

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	60.6	61.4	56.8	63.9
	state	56.7	56.1	55.8	57.3
8	county	66.3	67.5	70.9	64.3
	state	65.3	65.2	64.6	65.3
10	county	65.8	64.0	66.0	66.7
	state	63.3	63.9	62.4	62.6
12	county	62.2	59.6	67.4	55.4
	state	60.5	61.0	60.7	61.0
Combined	county	63.6	63.3	65.0	62.9
	state	61.5	61.5	60.8	61.5

			Bought It					Home			Took It	
		Bought It	Myself	Someone I	Someone I		Home WITH	WITHOUT		A Stranger	From a	
		Myself WITH	WITHOUT a	Know Age 21	Know Under	My Brother	Parents'	Parents'	Another	Bought It	Store or	
		a Fake ID	Fake ID	or Older	Age 21	or Sister	Permission	Permission	Relative	For Me	Shop	Other
6	county	0.0	3.1	16.9	0.0	3.1	24.6	10.8	6.2	1.5	1.5	32.3
	state	1.6	0.8	14.4	4.6	3.7	18.0	10.2	9.2	0.9	0.5	36.1
8	county	1.1	1.6	24.5	9.6	3.7	18.6	9.0	6.9	0.0	0.5	24.5
	state	0.9	0.5	22.3	9.8	4.4	15.0	12.9	10.8	1.0	0.6	21.9
10	county	0.4	0.4	35.1	16.8	5.3	13.4	8.4	6.5	1.1	0.4	12.2
	state	0.7	1.2	32.7	14.5	3.9	11.9	8.0	7.6	1.7	0.3	17.3
12	county	0.6	0.9	53.9	14.7	1.9	10.7	1.6	3.1	1.6	0.3	10.7
	state	1.1	2.7	46.2	14.3	2.8	9.2	2.7	4.2	2.2	0.3	14.3
Combined	county	0.6	1.1	38.5	13.1	3.5	14.4	6.1	5.3	1.1	0.5	15.9
	state	1.0	1.5	33.6	12.6	3.6	12.2	7.4	7.3	1.7	0.4	18.9

Table 87: Sources of Alcohol

Table 88: Location of Alcohol Use

				Open Area	Sporting	Restaurant,	Empty			
			Someone	Like a	Event or	Bar, or a	Building or			
		My Home	Else's Home	Park, etc.	Concert	Nightclub	Site	Hotel/Motel	In a Car	At School
6	county	50.0	31.7	11.7	3.3	0.0	1.7	0.0	1.7	0.0
	state	47.3	29.0	11.7	1.8	2.8	2.1	1.5	2.3	1.5
8	county	43.8	41.4	9.5	1.2	1.2	0.0	2.4	0.6	0.0
	state	39.4	42.2	9.7	1.7	1.5	1.0	1.6	1.7	1.2
10	county	31.7	57.5	7.5	0.0	0.4	0.0	1.2	0.8	0.8
	state	29.1	53.6	9.3	1.3	1.8	0.5	1.3	2.0	1.0
12	county	20.2	63.5	11.7	0.7	2.3	0.0	0.3	1.0	0.3
	state	21.3	60.6	9.8	1.0	2.3	0.4	1.9	2.1	0.7
Combined	county	31.2	54.4	9.9	0.8	1.3	0.1	1.0	0.9	0.4
	state	29.9	51.8	9.7	1.3	1.9	0.7	1.6	2.0	1.0

		NO!	no	yes	YES!
6	county	4.6	7.7	36.7	51.0
	state	5.5	9.0	37.7	47.8
8	county	6.1	9.5	52.2	32.2
	state	7.0	13.2	50.7	29.2
10	county	4.0	10.2	61.0	24.8
	state	7.7	13.1	56.3	22.9
12	county	4.0	5.7	61.9	28.3
	state	6.6	10.9	55.3	27.2
Combined	county	4.8	8.4	52.0	34.9
	state	6.6	11.5	49.0	32.9

Table 89: I feel safe at my school.

Table 90: How often have you taken a handgun to school.

		Never	1-2 times	3-5 times	6-9 times	10-19 times	20-29 times	30-39 times	40+ times
6	county	99.7	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
	state	99.6	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
8	county	99.5	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	state	99.3	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
10	county	99.7	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
	state	99.1	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2
12	county	99.8	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	state	99.0	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2
Combined	county	99.7	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
	state	99.3	0.3	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1

				A Little	Not Wrong
		Very Wrong	Wrong	Bit Wrong	at All
6	county	90.3	7.0	2.0	0.6
	state	92.1	6.1	1.2	0.6
8	county	87.1	10.0	1.6	1.3
	state	86.4	10.2	2.6	0.8
10	county	87.9	10.6	1.2	0.3
	state	85.4	10.5	2.9	1.2
12	county	90.1	7.6	1.9	0.3
	state	89.4	7.4	2.2	1.1
Combined	county	88.8	8.8	1.7	0.7
	state	88.4	8.6	2.2	0.9

Table 91: How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to take a gun to school.

Table 92: Have any of your brothers/sisters ever taken a gun to school.

				l don't			
				have any			
				brothers or			
		No	Yes	sisters			
6	county	95.1	0.6	4.3			
	state	95.1	0.8	4.1			
8	county	94.2	1.7	4.1			
	state	94.2	1.4	4.4			
10	county	93.6	1.4	5.0			
	state	93.4	1.9	4.7			
12	county	93.0	1.1	5.9			
	state	93.4	1.6	5.0			
Combined	county	94.0	1.2	4.8			
	state	94.1	1.4	4.5			

5 NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND PROFILE

The No Child Left Behind Profile looks specifically at student responses to the questions "How old were you when you first ...". The questions cover both first incidences of drug use (marijuana, cigarettes, alcohol, and regular use of alcohol) and first incidences of antisocial behaviors (suspension, arrest, carrying a gun, attacking someone and belonging to a gang). Possible responses to these questions range from age 10 to age 17 or the student can respond to the question with Never. The average age figures are based only on those students who responded to the question with an answer other than Never.

Table 93: Avg Age of First Marijuana

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	10.6	10.6	10.4	10.8
	state	10.8	10.8	10.8	11.0
8	county	12.1	12.1	11.8	12.3
	state	12.0	12.1	12.1	12.1
10	county	13.4	13.5	13.4	13.8
	state	13.3	13.4	13.4	13.5
12	county	14.7	14.6	14.6	14.7
	state	14.5	14.6	14.5	14.6
Combined	county	13.8	13.9	13.7	14.0
	state	13.6	13.7	13.6	13.7

Table 94: Avg Age of First Cigarettes

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	10.4	10.3	10.3	10.4
	state	10.4	10.4	10.4	10.4
8	county	11.1	11.2	11.1	11.3
	state	11.2	11.3	11.3	11.3
10	county	11.9	12.1	12.2	12.3
	state	12.1	12.2	12.3	12.4
12	county	13.3	13.0	13.4	13.3
	state	13.2	13.3	13.3	13.4
Combined	county	12.1	12.1	12.1	12.2
	state	12.0	12.1	12.1	12.2

Table 95: Avg Age of First Alcohol

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.6
	state	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5
8	county	11.6	11.6	11.7	11.8
	state	11.6	11.6	11.6	11.7
10	county	13.0	12.7	12.8	12.9
	state	12.9	12.9	12.9	13.0
12	county	14.0	14.0	14.1	14.1
	state	14.0	14.1	14.1	14.2
Combined	county	12.7	12.6	12.5	12.7
	state	12.6	12.6	12.6	12.7

Table 96: Avg Age of First Regular Alcohol Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	11.1	10.7	11.0	10.7
	state	11.0	10.9	10.8	10.8
8	county	12.4	12.4	12.4	12.3
	state	12.3	12.3	12.3	12.3
10	county	14.1	13.9	13.9	14.0
	state	14.0	14.0	14.0	14.0
12	county	15.2	15.4	15.3	15.3
	state	15.3	15.3	15.3	15.3
Combined	county	14.2	14.2	14.1	14.3
	state	14.1	14.1	14.1	14.1

Table 97: Avg Age of First School Suspension

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.6
	state	10.5	10.5	10.5	10.5
8	county	11.6	11.5	11.4	11.7
	state	11.6	11.6	11.5	11.5
10	county	12.5	12.4	12.5	12.5
	state	12.5	12.5	12.4	12.5
12	county	13.2	13.3	13.2	13.0
	state	13.4	13.3	13.2	13.2
Combined	county	12.1	12.2	12.0	12.1
	state	12.0	12.0	12.0	12.0

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	10.4	12.0	10.8	10.5
	state	10.9	10.9	10.9	10.9
8	county	11.9	12.1	11.6	12.2
	state	12.3	12.3	12.3	12.2
10	county	13.2	13.7	13.7	13.2
	state	13.6	13.7	13.7	13.6
12	county	15.2	15.3	15.0	14.9
	state	15.0	15.0	15.0	14.9
Combined	county	13.5	14.0	13.3	13.1
	state	13.5	13.5	13.5	13.4

Table 98: Avg Age of First Been Arrested

Table 99: Avg Age of First Carried a Gun


Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	10.9	10.5	10.5	10.8
	state	10.8	10.7	10.7	10.7
8	county	11.6	11.9	11.7	11.7
	state	11.7	11.7	11.7	11.7
10	county	12.1	13.3	12.0	12.5
	state	12.8	12.9	12.8	12.8
12	county	14.0	14.4	13.2	14.0
	state	14.1	14.1	13.9	13.9
Combined	county	12.3	12.8	11.8	12.1
	state	12.4	12.4	12.3	12.3

Table 100: Avg Age of First Attacked to Harm

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	10.6	10.7	10.6	10.7
	state	10.7	10.6	10.6	10.6
8	county	11.8	11.9	11.7	11.6
	state	11.7	11.8	11.8	11.7
10	county	13.1	12.6	12.8	12.9
	state	12.8	12.8	12.7	12.8
12	county	13.8	13.6	13.6	13.5
	state	13.7	13.7	13.6	13.5
Combined	county	12.5	12.4	12.1	12.2
	state	12.2	12.2	12.2	12.2


Table 101: Avg Age of First Belonged to a Gang

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	10.7	11.0	11.1	11.0
	state	11.0	10.9	10.9	10.9
8	county	11.5	12.4	11.7	12.2
	state	12.2	12.2	12.1	12.0
10	county	13.0	13.0	13.5	13.0
	state	13.1	13.1	12.9	12.9
12	county	13.9	14.4	12.8	12.9
	state	13.7	13.7	13.4	13.6
Combined	county	12.2	12.8	12.2	12.1
	state	12.4	12.5	12.3	12.4




No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 6 White County

Figure 25: No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 6




No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 8 White County

Figure 26: No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 8



No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 10 White County

Figure 27: No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 10



No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 12 White County

Figure 28: No Child Left Behind Profile - Grade 12

6 STUDENT TOBACCO USE, EXPERIENCES AND PREVENTION SERVICES

Tobacco use is the leading preventable cause of death in the United States. The 2009 survey added four new tobacco-related questions (Q86-Q89) to the already existing items (Q82-Q85) to explore this topic.

Arkansas youth typically have higher rates of tobacco use, including both cigarettes and smokeless tobacco, than the national average. Higher tobacco prevalence rates are common across the Southeast United States. This is due to a variety of cultural and economic factors that have traditionally supported greater tobacco use. The following table shows the results of the lifetime and past 30 day use of cigarettes and chewing tobacco.

Table 102: Cigarettes - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	13.6	12.0	12.3	11.3
	state	10.8	10.4	10.3	8.8
8	county	31.1	24.0	20.4	25.3
	state	26.8	25.2	23.9	22.0
10	county	40.6	43.8	41.7	33.9
	state	40.0	38.8	38.0	35.8
12	county	55.3	47.7	47.4	52.4
	state	49.7	48.2	46.0	44.3
Combined	county	34.7	31.5	28.7	29.1
	state	30.0	28.9	27.9	25.5

Table 103: Chewing Tobacco - Lifetime Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	9.1	8.7	10.7	7.4
	state	6.1	5.9	5.7	5.9
8	county	19.4	14.7	15.0	15.9
	state	13.5	12.9	12.3	12.8
10	county	26.0	27.2	22.7	24.2
	state	19.6	19.2	19.6	21.0
12	county	27.7	29.8	24.2	31.0
	state	23.2	23.2	22.4	23.8
Combined	county	20.3	19.8	17.5	18.6
	state	14.8	14.5	14.2	14.7

Group	2007.8	2008.0	2000 10	20
Table 104:	Cigarettes	- Past 30	Day Use	

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	2.5	1.1	2.4	1.6
	state	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.5
8	county	8.6	7.6	5.3	6.8
	state	8.1	7.5	6.8	5.9
10	county	15.3	17.7	17.8	14.3
	state	15.3	14.6	14.6	14.1
12	county	27.6	23.9	19.8	25.9
	state	23.5	22.7	21.3	20.0
Combined	county	13.2	12.3	10.4	11.1
	state	11.1	10.6	10.2	9.1

Table 105: Chewing Tobacco - Past 30 Day Use

Grade	Group	2007-8	2008-9	2009-10	2010-11
6	county	2.3	1.4	2.4	2.0
	state	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.6
8	county	7.6	6.5	4.7	5.1
	state	5.5	5.3	5.2	4.6
10	county	10.6	12.4	11.0	10.2
	state	9.5	8.6	9.4	9.4
12	county	13.3	12.6	9.6	15.5
	state	10.8	10.7	10.7	10.5
Combined	county	8.3	8.2	6.5	7.6
	state	6.5	6.1	6.3	5.9

The new tobacco-related items, Q56-Q57, explore rules regarding smoking at the student's home, and Q58-Q59 assess the availability of tobacco prevention programming within school settings. The following tables show the results for these four items.

		Smoking is not allowed anywhere inside your home	Smoking is allowed in some places and at some times	Smoking is allowed anywhere inside the home	There are no rules about smoking inside the home	l don't know
6	county	67.3	6.9	5.2	5.2	15.5
	state	68.8	7.3	3.3	4.9	15.7
8	county	68.3	7.3	4.4	8.1	12.0
	state	67.2	6.9	3.4	7.4	15.1
10	county	71.2	5.8	3.8	9.6	9.6
	state	68.3	6.6	4.3	8.8	11.9
12	county	71.3	6.9	4.2	9.7	7.9
	state	70.4	6.9	4.7	8.9	9.0
Combined	county	69.3	6.7	4.4	8.0	11.5
	state	68.5	7.0	3.8	7.3	13.4

Table 106: Which statement best describes rules about smoking inside your home?

Table 107: Which statement best describes rules about smoking in your family cars?

		Smoking is never allowed in any car	Smoking is allowed sometimes or in some cars	Smoking is allowed in any car anytime	There are no rules about smoking in the car	We do not have a family car	l don't know
6	county	58.2	12.6	5.6	7.3	0.9	15.4
	state	61.9	12.0	3.9	6.7	1.0	14.4
8	county	55.3	13.1	6.5	12.2	0.8	12.1
	state	58.7	11.5	5.1	9.4	1.0	14.3
10	county	59.8	11.8	6.6	11.5	0.8	9.6
	state	58.2	12.2	6.0	10.9	1.0	11.7
12	county	58.3	15.0	5.5	12.7	2.3	6.3
	state	58.7	14.2	5.9	10.6	1.9	8.9
Combined	county	57.8	13.0	6.0	10.8	1.1	11.2
	state	59.5	12.3	5.1	9.2	1.2	12.7

		Strongly			Strongly	l don't
		agree	Agree	Disagree	disagree	know
6	county	46.4	26.7	5.5	7.2	14.3
	state	49.2	24.6	5.4	5.9	14.9
8	county	40.6	28.4	8.1	5.5	17.5
	state	32.6	32.1	9.7	8.9	16.7
10	county	22.5	29.8	14.2	15.2	18.3
	state	20.4	32.3	15.0	15.0	17.2
12	county	12.3	26.6	21.6	22.9	16.6
	state	14.1	27.3	18.0	24.2	16.4
Combined	county	31.9	27.9	11.7	11.9	16.6
	state	31.1	29.1	11.3	12.3	16.2

Table 108: During this school year, were you taught in any of your classes about the dangers of tobacco use?

Table 109: During the past 12 months, have you participated in any community activities to discourage people your age from using cigarettes, chewing tobacco, snuff, dip or cigars?

		Strongly			Strongly	l don't
		agree	Agree	Disagree	disagree	know
6	county	29.9	18.9	11.3	17.4	22.4
	state	24.8	19.2	14.2	17.0	24.7
8	county	19.7	17.9	18.1	19.4	24.9
	state	17.0	19.7	19.1	21.1	23.1
10	county	11.1	16.5	23.0	27.1	22.3
	state	12.0	18.2	23.0	26.9	19.8
12	county	7.3	14.5	25.0	34.9	18.3
	state	10.9	15.6	22.7	34.0	16.8
Combined	county	17.7	17.1	18.9	24.0	22.2
	state	17.0	18.4	19.3	23.7	21.6

7 DRUG-FREE COMMUNITIES SUPPORT PRO-GRAM CORE MEASURES

The Drug-Free Communities Support Program, administered by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention, requests specific data which is typically referred to as the Core Measures. The drug categories measured are tobacco, alcohol and marijuana and the table is broken down by grade level. For each drug, and at each grade level, the percentage of students who responded positively to the question and the number of students who responded to the question are reported. For *Age of Onset*, the average age of first use for those students who reported using is reported.

- **Past 30-Day Use** The question *On how many occasions have you used ... in the past 30 days?* is used to measure this statistic by reporting the percentage of students who report any use in the past 30 days.
- **Perception of Risk** The question *How much do you think people risk harming themselves if they* ...? is used to measure this statistic by reporting the percentage of students who report that using the drug is a *Moderate Risk* or a *Great Risk* to their health.
- **Perception of Parental Disapproval** The question *How wrong do your parents feel it would be for you to ...?* is used to measure this statistic by reporting the percentage of students who report that parents would feel it is *Wrong* or *Very Wrong* to use tobacco, alcohol and marijuana.
- **Age of Onset** The question *How old were you when you first...?* is used to measure this statistic. The possible responses to this question range from *10 or Under* to *17 or Older*. The table shows the average age of onset of use of those students who answered the question with a response other than *Never Used*.

Table 110: Core Measure by Grade for Past 30 Day Use

	Alcohol		Ciga	rettes	Marijuana		
Grade	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n	
Grade 6	3.2	752	1.6	756	0.5	754	
Grade 8	11.3	767	6.8	761	3.1	769	
Grade 10	23.2	652	14.3	658	8.6	654	
Grade 12	39.4	563	25.9	568	15.0	566	
Combined	17.7	2734	11.1	2743	6.2	2743	

Table 111: Core Measure by Grade for Perception of Risk

	Alcohol		Ciga	rettes	Marijuana		
Grade	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n	
Grade 6	70.9	756	85.0	755	74.3	755	
Grade 8	66.8	753	88.4	761	63.2	760	
Grade 10	67.0	657	89.7	658	52.1	657	
Grade 12	64.7	566	92.3	569	42.4	569	
Combined	67.5	2732	88.6	2743	59.2	2741	

Table 112: Core Measure by Grade for Parental Disapproval

	Alcohol		Ciga	rettes	Marijuana		
Grade	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n	
Grade 6	95.2	684	96.9	683	98.7	677	
Grade 8	90.4	709	95.6	710	97.0	704	
Grade 10	85.6	624	92.0	626	94.6	625	
Grade 12	72.7	546	82.0	545	91.7	544	
Combined	86.7	2563	92.2	2564	95.7	2550	

Table 113: Core Measure by Grade for Age of Onset

	Alcohol			C	Cigarettes			Marijuana		
Grade	pct	n	age	pct	n	age	pct	n	age	
Grade 6	21.4	780	10.6	11.7	780	10.4	1.2	782	10.8	
Grade 8	42.5	781	11.8	28.5	783	11.3	8.1	780	12.3	
Grade 10	55.6	667	12.9	38.6	664	12.3	20.7	667	13.8	
Grade 12	71.2	576	14.1	56.1	576	13.3	38.1	577	14.7	
Combined	45.6	2804	12.7	31.9	2803	12.2	15.3	2806	14.0	

Table 114: Core Measure by Sex for Past 30 Day Use

	Alcohol		Ciga	rettes	Marijuana		
Sex	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n	
Male	18.1	1346	11.4	1353	6.1	1352	
Female	17.4	1360	11.0	1362	6.2	1363	
Combined	17.7	2706	11.2	2715	6.2	2715	

Table 115: Core Measure by Sex for Perception of Risk

	Alcohol		Ciga	rettes	Marijuana		
Sex	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n	
Male	62.6	1346	88.9	1355	57.7	1353	
Female	72.7	1358	88.6	1360	61.2	1360	
Combined	67.6	2704	88.7	2715	59.5	2713	

Table 116: Core Measure by Sex for Parental Disapproval

	Alcohol		Ciga	rettes	Marijuana		
Sex	pct	n	pct	n	pct	n	
Male	86.1	1261	92.6	1262	95.9	1255	
Female	87.4	1275	91.9	1275	95.6	1269	
Combined	86.8	2536	92.2	2537	95.7	2524	

Table 117: Core Measure by Sex for Age of Onset

	Alcohol			Cigarettes			Marijuana		
Sex	pct	n	age	pct	n	age	pct	n	age
Male	47.5	1395	12.4	32.0	1392	12.1	15.8	1397	13.8
Female	43.7	1381	13.0	31.7	1383	12.3	14.8	1381	14.2
Combined	45.6	2776	12.7	31.9	2775	12.2	15.3	2778	14.0

8 PREVENTION RESOURCES

8.1 Regional Prevention Resource Centers

Region 1 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Decision Point 614 East Emma Street, Suite M426 Springdale, AR 72764

Ms. Laurie Reh, PRC Coordinator (479) 927-2655 Fax: (479) 927-2752 E-MAIL: lreh@jtlshop.jonesnet.org Counties: Benton, Carroll, Madison, Washington

Region 2 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by North Arkansas Partnership for Health Education Area Health Education Center (AHEC-NW) at Harrison 303 N. Main St., Ste. 301 Harrison, AR 72601

Elaine Fulton-Jones, PRC Coordinator (870) 391-3178 or (870) 391-3179 Fax: (870) 391-3507 E-MAIL: efultonjones@northark.edu Counties: Baxter, Boone, Marion, Newton, Searcy

Region 3 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Health Resources of Arkansas, Inc. P.O. Box 492 (211 Blanchard St.) Mountain View, AR 72560 Website: http://www.hra-health.org

Ms. Margaret Morrison, PRC Coordinator (870) 269-6770 Fax: (870) 269-2196 E-MAIL: m2prc@mvtel.net

Counties: Cleburne, Fulton, Independence, Izard, Jackson, Sharp, Stone, Van Buren, White, Woodruff

Region 4 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Crowley's Ridge Development Council 2114B North Church St, 72401 P.O. Box 1497 Jonesboro, AR 72403 Website: http://www.crdcnea.org

Ms. Dorothy Newsom, PRC Coordinator (870) 933-0033 Fax: (870) 933-0048 E-MAIL: dnewsom@ritternet.com Counties: Clay, Craighead, Greene, Lawrence, Mississippi, Poinsett, Randolph

Region 5 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Harbor House, Inc. P.O. Box 4207 615 North 19th Street Fort Smith, AR 72914

Ms. Cindy Stokes, PRC Coordinator (479) 783-1916 Fax: (479) 783-1914 E-MAIL: hhiprc@aol.com Counties: Crawford, Franklin, Logan, Polk, Scott, Sebastian

Region 6 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Community Service, Inc. P.O. Box 679 100 South Cherokee Street Morrilton, AR 72110

Mr. Terrence Love, PRC Coordinator (501) 354-4589 Fax: (501) 354-5410 E-MAIL: tlove@communityserviceinc.com Counties: Conway, Faulkner, Johnson, Perry, Pope, Yell

Region 7 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Crowley's Ridge Development Council 593 Hwy 243 Marianna Civic Ctr. Marianna, AR 72360

Mr. Kendon Gray, PRC Coordinator (870) 298-2250 Fax: (870) 298-2249 E-MAIL: kendongray@yahoo.com Counties: Crittenden, Cross, Lee, Monroe, Phillips, St. Francis

Region 8 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Family Service Agency 1401 Malvern Avenue, Suite 200c Hot Springs, AR 71901

Ms. Shelly Blackwell, PRC Coordinator (501) 318-2648 Fax: (501) 624-5636 E-MAIL: sblackwell@fsainc.org Counties: Clark, Garland, Hot Spring, Montgomery, Pike

Region 9 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Family Service Agency 628 West Broadway, Suite 300 North Little Rock, AR 72114

Mr. Hayse Miller, PRC Coordinator (501) 372-4242 Ext. 327 & 328 Fax: (501) 372-6565 E-MAIL: hmiller@fsainc.org Counties: Lonoke, Prairie, Pulaski, Saline

Region 10 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Southwest Arkansas Counseling & Mental Health Center, Inc. P.O. Box 1987 601 Hazel Street Texarkana, AR 71854

Ms.Trena Goings, PRC Coordinator (870) 774-2435 Fax: (870) 774-4216 E-MAIL: tgoings@swacmhc.com Counties: Hempstead, Howard, Lafayette, Little River, Miller, Sevier

Region 11 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by UAMS/AHEC - **South Arkansas** 460 W. Oak El Dorado, AR 71730

Ms. Susan Rumph, PRC Coordinator (870) 864-2497 Fax: (870) 863-9341 E-MAIL: srumph@ahecsa.uams.edu Counties: Calhoun, Columbia, Dallas, Nevada, Ouachita, Union

Region 12 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by St. James United Methodist Church 900 N. University Pine Bluff, AR 71601

Mr. Harold Eichelberger, V, PRC Coordinator (870) 850-7216 Fax: (870) 536-6327 E-MAIL: hjeichelbergerprc@gmail.com Counties: Arkansas, Cleveland, Grant, Jefferson, Lincoln

Region 13 PREVENTION RESOURCE CENTER

Operated by Phoenix Youth & Family Services P.O. Box 654 310 N. Alabama Street Crossett, AR 71635

Ms. Roshunda Davis, PRC Coordinator (870) 364-1676 Fax: (870) 364-1779 E-MAIL: rdavis@phoenixyouth.com Counties: Ashley, Bradley, Chicot, Desha, Drew

8.2 State and National Contacts

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention Division of Behavioral Health Services Arkansas Department of Human Services 305 S. Palm St. Little Rock, AR 72205 Telephone: (501) 686-9866 FAX: (501) 686-9396 Website: http://www.arkansas.gov/dhhs/dmhs

Ms. Jo Ann Warren, Director Prevention Services Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention E-MAIL: Jo.Warren@arkansas.gov

Mr. Joe M. Hill, Director Alcohol and Drug Abuse Prevention E-MAIL: Joe.Hill@arkansas.gov

Arkansas Department of Education Federal Programs Liaison Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program Officer Learning Services/School Improvement #4 Capitol Mall Room 304B Little Rock, AR 72201 Telephone: (501) 683-5425 FAX: (501) 683-5409 Website: http://www.arkansased.org

Ms. Otistene Smith Federal Program Liaison Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program Officer E-MAIL: otistene.smith@arkansas.gov

International Survey Associates dba Pride Surveys

160 Vanderbilt Court Bowling Green, KY 42103 Telephone: (800) 279-6361 FAX: (270) 746-9598 Website: http://www.pridesurveys.com

Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities

U.S. Department of Education Website: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SDFS

Southwest Center for the Application of Prevention Technology Website: http://captus.samhsa.gov/southwest

Southwest Prevention Center/ The University of Oklahoma

Website: http://swpc.ou.edu/

Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMSHA) Website: http://www.samhsa.gov

Electronic copies of reports can be found at http://www.state.ar.us/dhs/dmhs/adap_survey.htm.
Some reports require passwords.